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Preface

The five chapters of this book were written during the years 1976–81. Some of them were presented in condensed form at various conferences, colloquia and seminars. The reactions and criticisms they evoked have been incorporated where appropriate. Thus Chapters 2 and 4 were read at UEAI congresses held respectively in Aix-en-Provence (1976) and Amsterdam (1978). Chapter 2 was also introduced at a SOAS seminar in London in 1977 as well as at a seminar organized by the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, where, during a year’s stay (1979–80), I had the opportunity to discuss also Chapter 3 and 4.

When researching this book I greatly benefited from a number of persons and institutions whose suggestions and help I should like to acknowledge with gratitude.

First of all, I am thankful to I. R. Netton and J. N. Mattock for proposing corrections of my English style.

My year’s stay at the Institute for Advanced Studies in Jerusalem, on the invitation of M. J. Kister and S. Shaked, proved a wonderful opportunity to write most of Chapters 1 and 5.

Leiden University Library’s excellent Oriental collection, made available especially through the good offices of A. J. W. Huisman and J. J. Witkam, was indispensable.

I would not have been able to compose a major part of Chapter 1’s footnote material, if I had not had the latter’s and W. Raven’s cooperation; they willingly put at my disposal their index of personal names of the canonical hadith literature, an index which is in the process of being compiled as volume viii of Concordance et Indices de la tradition musulmane.

I am grateful to A. Wakelam for his work on the illustrations.

Finally, I want to thank M. A. Cook for making a large number of valuable suggestions, when he read the last draft of the manuscript.

I am convinced that this book, whatever its merits, could not have been written without the inestimable help of all those persons and institutions mentioned here.

September 1982

G. H. A. Juynboll
NOTE TO THE READER

Of necessity, a study such as the present one abounds in Arabic technical terms. Anyone conversant with hadith jargon and that of related disciplines is bound to agree that using these Arabic terms' English equivalents—which are often quite cumbersome—consistently or even just occasionally, may obscure the argument rather than clarify it. Throughout this book I introduce Arabic words which are only rarely accompanied by their English counterparts. Most readers can indeed do without the latter, I am sure. However, for those users of this book who are not entirely clear sometimes about the nuances of certain technical terms used, I have provided an extensive glossary incorporated in the general index which concludes this book.
This book deals with various aspects of the formative period of Muslim tradition, in Arabic: hadith; throughout this study the term ‘tradition’ is used as the equivalent of the Arabic word hadith and is to be understood in this sense only. A hadith proper is the record of a saying ascribed to the prophet Muḥammad or a description of his deeds. In the course of time these records were compiled into a number of collections which together form the so-called hadith literature. Several of these collections acquired so much prestige that they became sacrosanct in the eyes of the Muslims and, subsequently, were vested with an authority second only to the Qurʾān.

When, in the mid-sixties, I wrote my study on modern Muslim discussions about the authenticity of the hadith literature,¹ I realized that I did not take sides, neither in the disputes among Oriental scholars nor in the ones occasionally flaring up between Oriental and western scholars. I had been influenced by the books of Goldziher and Schacht, of course, but also by those of modern Muslim scholars, and I kept postponing my commitment to any particular point of view. Initially I thought of the problems raised by Oriental and western scholars concerning the origins of hadith as mutually irreconcilable. If two points of view could differ so widely, how could anyone even attempt to bring them into harmony?

Then, in 1976, I embarked on an examination of the role early Muslim qādis were supposed to have played in the spreading of traditions. My pre-conceived ideas about the outcome of my investigation were shattered. It taught me that there was, after all, a conceivable position that could be taken between the two points of view represented respectively by Muslim and western scholarship. But since that time I no longer wanted to expose myself to the influences of either side, and I returned to the earliest sources and did my research without constantly comparing my findings with those of either Oriental or western scholars until after it was all over.

As I see it, the sources appear to have provided me with sufficient evidence to maintain a position between the extremes. This book constitutes an account of this research.

¹. See my Authenticity in the bibliography.
I am fully aware of the fact that I am not the first one to write about the origins of *hadith* nor will I be the last one. Over the centuries Muslim scholars have devoted themselves assiduously to this literature, which had become sacred to them, only second in holiness to the Qur'an. The results of their studies are laid down in a never-ceasing flow of publications. Up to this very day *hadith* is studied everywhere in the Muslim world. An overall impression one gleams from nineteenth and twentieth centuries' works is that the point of view taken hardly differs from that crystallized during the late Middle Ages, when the research into the origins and the evolution of *hadith* literature virtually seemed to have come to a standstill with a formulation of its history commonly accepted by all sunnite and most Shi'ite Muslims.

It is true that from time to time several studies saw the light in which a different approach was propounded. In these studies certain basic theories which had long become axiomatic to the extent that further scrutiny was considered almost a sin, were looked into from new angles. But they mostly evoked bitter criticism, were subsequently hushed up and/or quickly forgotten.

Also in the West the study of the tradition literature aroused the interest of scholars. *Hadith* studies as a whole received a major impetus though with the publication of Goldziher's *Muhammedanische Studien*, volume 11. This work is generally considered – at least in the West – as the first milestone among western efforts to depict the earliest history of *hadith*. A re-evaluation of previously published works on the subject, it was also a steppingstone for a number of later publications. With the possible exception, perhaps, of several writings by the late J. Fück, no studies were carried out in the West, as far as I know, in which conclusions were drawn that differed basically from those arrived at by Goldziher.

Gradually, Goldziher's theories, also because of the translation into Arabic of his *Vorlesungen*, became known in the Muslim world and met with opposition. Until the present day perhaps the most articulate critique


3. Cf. *my Authenticity*, especially Chapter IV; see also *Muslim self-statement in India and Pakistan 1857–1968*, pp. 49–54, in which Chirāgh 'Ali (1844–1895) is named as having anticipated Goldziher in his scepticism concerning the authenticity of even the classical collections; cf. also the introduction by Azīz Ahmad (p. 5).


was formulated in the 1966 Cambridge doctoral dissertation of Muhammad Muṣṭafā al-Aʿẓamī (M. M. Azmi), which was published in Beirut in 1968, entitled *Studies in early ḥadīth literature*, and which is now also available in an Arabic translation with the title *Dirāṣāt fī ḥadīth an-nabawī wa-taʿrīkh tadwīnīhi*, Beirut 1973, Riyaḍ 1976, 1979.

Since the subject of ḥadīth is very delicate among Muslim scholars, every researcher who publishes his findings which differ from those formulated by Muslim ḥadīth specialists in the Middle Ages runs the risk of creating hostility. That also happened to Goldziher. And there is also that deep-rooted feeling of uneasiness which seizes many Muslim scholars when confronted with yet another effort of a Westerner to throw new light on Islam. It seems that, with the possible exception of Qurʾān studies, of all the studies carried out in the West ḥadīth studies have caused Muslim scholars the most embarrassment, much more so than any endeavours on the part of western scholars into any other field of Islamics. This embarrassment has given rise on more than one occasion to unfortunate wrangles. As long as these wrangles have not yet been sorted out by means of a dispassionate investigation, they are likely to remain always obstacles in the path toward full scholarly cooperation between Muslim and western scholars.


However much I admire Schacht’s *Origins* – I have in particular benefited from his theories that ‘isnāds have a tendency to grow backwards’ and his ‘common link theory’ – because of its countless cross-references it also makes heavy reading and its style seems to rub many readers, western and Muslim, up the wrong way. This style is generally felt to be somewhat supercilious and definitely too apodictical for Muslim ears. Strangely enough, Schacht’s book seems to be little known among Muslim scholars, but some of those who did read it, found its terseness and its all too readily

7. Thus we read: ‘The traditional Islamic criticism of ḥadīth literature and the creation of criteria for distinguishing between true and false ḥadīth must not be in any way confused with the criticism of European orientalists made against the whole corpus of ḥadīth. From the Islamic view this is one of the most diabolical attacks made against the whole structure of Islam.’ This quotation was taken from Ṭabāṭabāʾī (Muhammad Ḥusayn), *Shīʿī Islām*, translated from the Persian and edited with an introduction and notes by Seyyed Hossein Nasr, Albany N.Y. 1975, p. 119, note 24, which is one of the translator’s. Cf. also S. H. Nasr, *Ideals and realities of Islam*, London 1975, pp. 78ff.


9. Only Azmi subjected it to extensive criticism. See also Chapter 5, note 179. Cf. also Sibāʾī, pp. 24f.
formulated and at the same time sweeping theories, which many a time sounded more like statements, hard to swallow. Rather than taking it as a starting-point in an attempt at improving upon its findings, I sought to write my own account, in doing so covering more or less the same ground and using my own source material. Moreover, I did not want to confine myself to mainly legal traditions. Although Schacht also made use of and quoted from many of the same sources, he did it in a manner which I feel to be decidedly different from my own. Some of my aims in writing this book are fulfilled if the style in which I mould my ideas does not recall the style of my predecessors. Much as we may be indebted to our predecessors— something which we should gratefully acknowledge— we need not necessarily express ourselves in the same tone of voice.

Sezgin’s epochal work presents a new approach. Where Goldziher’s and Schacht’s findings amounted virtually to denying the ascription of the bulk of hadith literature to its alleged originators (the prophet, his Companions or even later authorities) as authentic, Sezgin appears to be a great deal less sceptical. His main thesis that the writing down of hadith as well as other material started almost immediately after the death of the prophet, and continued virtually uninterrupted during the first three centuries of Islamic history, and this on an increasing and ever more sophisticated scale, has raised little doubt as far as I know. And Azmi, in his study referred to above, arrived quite independently at more or less the same conclusion. But unearthing and cataloguing material, as Sezgin has done, is something altogether different from establishing its authenticity. By that I mean establishing whether the material ascribed to certain early authorities is, in actual fact, theirs or whether it originated with later authorities who, for a variety of reasons, wanted it to appear older and, therefore, projected it back artificially onto older and thus more awe-inspiring authorities. Apart from a few isolated cases in which Sezgin questions the authenticity of certain texts, he presents the bulk of them as if he has no qualms as to their genuineness. Something which always struck me in the work of Sezgin, Azmi and also in that of Abbott— to which I shall turn in a moment— is that they do not seem to realize that, even if a manuscript or a papyrus is unearthed with an allegedly ancient text, this text could very easily have been forged by an authority who lived at a time later than the supposedly oldest authority given in its isnād. Isnād fabrication occurred, as everybody is bound to agree, on just as vast a scale as matn fabrication. And internal evidence gleaned from isnāds should always be suspect because of this wide-scale forgery, exactly as each matn should be scrutinized as to historical feasibility and never be accepted on the basis of solely isnād criteria. To this may be added that the repeated use of ‘sound’ isnāds, as can be proven with overwhelming evidence from the sources, was felt to be much easier than the creation of new, and therefore automatically more suspect, ones.

Where Sezgin’s work betrays a certain credulousness, so does Nabia
Abbott’s volume II. But let me say first that it constitutes a western account of the origins of hadith which I suppose is quite sympathetic to Muslim readers. It suffices to say that, on the whole, she agrees with Sezgin and Azmi as to the important part which writing played in the transmission of hadith, even during its earliest stages. And she shares his credulity as to most information that can be gleaned from isnāds. Thus, like Sezgin and indeed Azmi, she takes the role allegedly played by certain famous Companions for granted in gathering and transmitting sayings and descriptions of deeds of the prophet. I do not deny the possibility that the Companions talked incessantly about their deceased leader, but I think that it never took the programmatic form that the sources want us to believe, and hadith became only standardized after the last Companions had died, not while a relatively large number of the younger Companions were still alive. Even the role allegedly played by certain major representatives of the next generation, e.g. 'Ikrima, Abū Ishāq, Ḥasan al-Baṣārī to name but a few, seems in many respects doubtful, a surmise for which there is an overwhelming amount of evidence in the sources as the following chapters may show.

Abbott seems to rely too heavily on much of the information given in isnāds and in books about isnāds concerning the three oldest tabaqāt. In my view, before the institution of the isnād came into existence roughly three quarters of a century after the prophet’s death, the aḥādīth and the qiṣṣās were transmitted in a haphazard fashion if at all, and mostly anonymously. Since the isnād came into being, names of older authorities were supplied where the new isnād precepts required such. Often the names of well-known historical personalities were chosen but more often the names of fictitious persons were offered to fill in gaps in isnāds which were as yet far from perfect.

Abbott, again, relies too heavily on the information the sources give about ‘Umar’s stance in the transmission of hadith as she also has too detailed and too clear-cut ideas about Zuhri’s role. Her views on the Umayyads’ participation in hadith are equally too explicit. However, her description of ‘Umar II is in my eyes quite feasible. With ‘Umar II’s rule we have, I think, a terminus post quem after which governmental promotion of the gathering of hadith, also concerning al-dīl wa-haram, becomes gradually discernible. Before that time the Umayyad rulers may have only been vaguely interested in the political possibilities present in the faḍā’il/mathiḥīl genres.10

Furthermore, Abbott’s plea for the historicity of family sahīfas is in my view not convincing. Reading through several of these preserved in their

entirety in later sources, I come across just as many obviously fabricated traditions as elsewhere. And checking the respective stages of the isnāds by looking up the members of that one family in the rijāl works I find that most are just as controversial as other transmitters who do not figure in family isnāds. Tradition experts of the second/eighth and third/ninth centuries were probably more easily misled by these sahīfas than by collections gathered through other channels, hence, perhaps, the popularity of family sahīfas.11

Abbott lists many figures indicating the high numbers of traditions certain transmitters are supposed to have transmitted. But it seems to me that using these figures indiscriminately and placing a little too much trust in them may lead to serious misconceptions. For example, she mentions the 70,000 ḥalāl wa-harām traditions of one Abū Bakr b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī Sabra, without adding that that seems an excessively high figure for the ḥalāl wa-harām genre (at any rate, at this early stage – Ibn Abī Sabra died in 162/788) and without mentioning that this man was generally accused of forgery. This information supports my own theories much more firmly than her own. Besides, Abbott tries to account for the seemingly tremendous growth of hadith with references to mass-meetings during which certain famous muhaddithūn were alleged to have transmitted traditions to crowds totaling 10,000! Visualizing sessions such as this with many dozens of mustālīs moving about, shouting the traditions down to the last rows of eager hadith students may lift the reader into the realm of 1,001-night fantasies, but in whatever way you look at it, it is difficult to take accounts like that seriously.

On the whole, Abbott’s views, as also may appear from the foregoing, are perhaps too romantic, e.g. when she speaks of the ahl al-hadith ‘... bracing themselves to meet the onslaughts of legal innovation and doctrinal heresy ...’ Powerful as this description may be, reading the sources with a little more sense of reality does help to draw up a historical picture which probably reflects ‘what really happened’ much more faithfully.

On the other hand, there may be readers whose scepticism bars them from making use of that particular genre of early reports in the sources as I have done and who, in turn, would label me gullible.

To this I can only say that I realize that it is difficult to accept that all those early reports are to be considered historically true, or that the details in each one of them should be taken as factually correct. But I maintain that, taken as a whole, they all converge on a description of the situation obtaining in the period of history under scrutiny which may be defined as pretty reliable. For the sceptics I may have used terms such as ‘allegedly’, ‘reportedly’ etc. too sparingly. In reply to this I venture the opinion that a

11. Not every family isnād was taken at face value; we read in Ibn Ḥajar’s Lisān, ii, p. 38, no. 131: Wa-Bashīr [b. Salama] wa-abīhu wa-jadduḥu majhūlūn.
judiciously and cautiously formulated overall view of what all those early reports (akhbâr, fadâ‘il/mahâlib – very often distilled from the major rijâl works) collectively point to, may in all likelihood be taken to be not very far from the truth of ‘what really happened’. I think that a generous lacing of open-mindedness, which dour sceptics might describe as naiveté, is an asset in the historian of early Islamic society rather than a shortcoming to be overcome and suppressed at all costs.

In the five chapters of this book I have dealt with the following subjects:

Chapter 1 is structured on a framework of awâ’il with the purpose of coming to a definitive chronology of the origins of hadîth and hadîth-related sciences. It gives a bird’s eye view of the different centres of hadîth collecting and emphasizes their initial ‘regionalism’. In the summary of this chapter, the last part, the three main questions, which also underlie the title of this study, are asked for the first time:
1. Where did a certain hadîth originate?
2. In what time did a certain hadîth originate?
3. Who may be held responsible for bringing a certain hadîth into circulation?

Although perhaps not always expressis verbis, these three questions – provenance, chronology and authorship – also underly most of the subjects dealt with in subsequent chapters.

Chapter 2 assesses the role the early qâdis of Islam may have played in the spreading of hadîth, arranged according to centre. Among the appendices at the end of this study there is one fairly lengthy one listing all the qâdis found in a variety of sources who lived during the first three centuries of the Muslim era outside the main centres studied in this chapter.

Chapter 3 tackles the concept mutawâtîr and, mainly with the help of argumenta e silentio, tries to guide the reader to the inevitable conclusion that the qualification mutawâtîr as such does not constitute incontrovertible proof for the historicity of a tradition’s ascription to the earliest authority of its isnâd. The two mutawâtîr traditions featuring in this chapter are the one prohibiting the lamenting of the dead and the one threatening the mendacious in hadîth with Hell.

Chapter 4 deals mostly with names, namely that body of information provided at the beginning of a hadîth transmitter’s tarjama in the biographical lexica. On the one hand the theory is launched that of all the people sharing one particular name and/or kunya the majority is in all likelihood fictitious. On the other hand a case is made for considering the nisba Zuhri as not solely the name with which one famous transmitter, sc. Muḥammad b. Muslim Ibn Shihâb az-Zuhri, is identified but may very well be taken as disguising the true identity of a great number of individuals who had, through kinship, patronage or otherwise, also the nisba Zuhri and who lived at more or less the same time as the great Zuhri.

Chapter 5 contains an analysis of the technical terms used to assess the
(de)merits of hadīth transmitters. The concept kadhīb (= mendacity in hadīth) is extensively dealt with as well as the extremely delicate subject of the Companion Abū Hurayra’s alleged legacy in Muslim tradition and the equally sensitive subject of the collective ta’dīl of the Companions. Finally Schacht’s ‘common link theory’ is illustrated with examples which, more so than was the case with its originator’s evidence, underline the workability of this theory.

Among the Appendices is one listing the most important of Ibn Hajar’s early sources which he drew from when he compiled his biographical lexic of hadīth transmitters. All appendices are closely linked with various issues raised in the chapters, and can be read as extended footnotes.

What does hadīth mean for twentieth century Muslims? In answer to this question it seems opportune to quote here a newsflash taken from the periodical Muslim world, lxvi, p. 72, which, more than anything I can think of, illustrates the popularity of hadīth and its canonized compilations with present day Muslims:

The Muslim Student’ Association of the United States and Canada held a seminar on hadīth in July 1975... to celebrate the 1200th anniversary of... Bukhārī.

Over one thousand Muslims of all ages and nationalities attended. It was a religious event in which everyone enthusiastically participated in the five daily ṣalāts.

Besides lectures on Bukhārī subjects like The indispensability of hadīth in Islam, and the role of hadīth in Islamic law and in the understanding of the Qur’ān were discussed. They also discussed methods of transmission, history, methodology. Speakers were unanimous in stressing the need for the study of hadīth and for following the sunna of the Prophet.

This account speaks for itself. What more is there to say, then, than that I sincerely hope that this book will also find its way to Muslim readers for whom it was written in the first place. I cannot disagree more than with the statement of a London colleague who said not long ago that Orientalists’ studies constitute a ‘private enterprise destined only for a handful of learned colleagues in the West’. I presume that it is this kind of attitude which eventually prompts such authors as E. W. Said to write books like his Orientalism.

When I say that this book was in the first place written for Muslims, that means that I have taken pains to express myself in as neutral a manner as possible, eschewing value judgements, especially where I come to speak of various fundamental articles of the Muslim faith. I have tried to place these articles of faith, such as the collective ta’dīl of the prophet’s Companions (Chapter 5) in their historical contexts. Illuminating them in their purely religious contexts I leave to others who are better qualified to do so.
CHAPTER ONE

A tentative chronology of the origins of Muslim tradition

Wa-da'anka ard'a 'r-rijali wa-qawlahum *
fa-qawlu rasâli 'llahi azkâ wa-ash'âhu
Abû Bakr, the son of Abû Dâwûd, the author of the Sunan

Introduction

Nobody is likely to deny that the earliest origins of what later became known as the tradition literature can be traced back to the time when Muhammad was still alive. As soon as he had established himself as the leader of the new movement and had made a sizable number of converts, his followers must have begun to talk about him and in their conversations (in Arabic ahâdîth) they must have called to mind his exploits. The memory of the prophet was thus kept alive also after he had died. The new community's cohesion was for a large part based upon the collective concept his followers had of him. More and more it was the new religion he had preached that began to bind them together, not in the first place tribal, clan or family ties, which had been the principal binding force hitherto. But the new religion was still a long way from being defined within the terms under which it became known in, say, the third/ninth century of the Hijra. The mainstays of the new religion, to which time and again Muhammad's followers went back, which kept them together, which inspired them to more efforts in making the community stronger, were the divinely inspired utterances within a few decades after his death collected in the Qur'an and the prophet's own example gradually taken as normative for the entire Islamic community. We are here solely concerned with the latter.

According to Muslim scholars the way in which Muhammad's followers talked about him was standardized soon after his death and, with the creation of the institution of the isnâd, moulded in a rigid form which was subject to evolution but which was never to change basically. It is here that my point of view starts to differ from that held by Muslim scholars. I do not deny the probability that his followers talked about him, but I do not believe that this talking as early as a few decades after the prophet's death was already to result in the formal transmission of information about him.

1. For a new, and in my opinion doubtful, chronology of the codification of the Qur'an, see J. Wansbrough, Quranic studies. Sources and methods of scriptural interpretation, passim, e.g. p. 44.
being standardized in a way ultimately developing in what we have later come to call the *hadith* literature. I contend that a beginning of standardization of *hadith* took place not earlier than towards the end of the first/seventh century. I base this hypothesis on a number of arguments centring on the following issues which I should like to deal with separately in more detail.

It will become apparent that the evidence adduced to support one issue may serve also to corroborate one or more others, thus producing a framework of evidence in which the various issues, while supporting each other, converge on my main hypothesis: the genesis of the *hadith* literature proper must be sought in a time considerably later than most Muslim scholars have hitherto thought. These issues are:

I. *Awā’il* evidence, in particular that pertaining to the date of origin of the *isnād*; 
II. The chronology of the growth of traditions; 
III. The date of origin of the concept ‘prophetic *sunna*’; 
IV. The earliest development of the different *hadith* centres; 
V. The evolution and a tentative chronology of *talab al-‘ilm*.

After these sections I shall give a summary and try to arrange my conclusions.

**Awā’il evidence**

It has not escaped scholars in East or West that many *awā’il* may be considered as having a sound historical basis. The underlying basis for bringing *awā’il* information together was surely the establishing of a *terminus post quem* for an institution or a procedure to become customary, or indicating who could be credited with having invented something. *Awā’il* can roughly be divided into three categories, those dealing with pre-Islamic information—which is mostly legendary—from Adam onwards, those put into the mouth of *Muḥammad* and finally those, considered to be historically reli-

2. Cf. J. Wansbrough, *The sectarian milieu. Content and composition of Islamic salvation history*, p. 36; A. Noth, *Quellenkritische Studien zu Themen, Formen und Tendenzen frührömischer Geschichtsüberlieferung*, Vol. 1, pp. 97–100. Noth’s description of *awā’il* as possibly also ‘amusante Spielferei’ (p. 100) is certainly valid for a large number of them but not applicable to the *awā’il* adduced in the present study. His scepticism concerning their historicity as perhaps fabricated for the sake of reaping in the implied merit of ‘having been the first to introduce such and such’ deserves attention, but does not seem to affect my argument either. In any case, his views, intrinsically correct as they may be, do not alter my—admittedly—intuitive feeling that if the *awā’il* quoted here had been *exaggerated* accounts of how *early* various novel ideas were introduced, the question why the majority of these *awā’il* support my proposed chronology as opposed to the chronology of *hadith* proposed by medieval Muslim scholars and henceforth generally accepted in the entire Islamic world, remains unexplained.

3. Among these we find notorious fabrications such as the *awā’il* indicating who of all Muḥammad’s followers embraced Islam first, cf. Ibn al-Jawzī, *Kitāb al-mawdū‘at*, 1, pp. 342ff.
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able on the whole, dealing with Islamic history after the prophet's death in the widest sense of the word. It is a striking fact that *awā'il* belonging to the third category rarely contradict each other, and if they seem to do so, they can mostly be interpreted in such a way that the contradiction is lifted. On the whole, the impression one gets from this third category of *awā'il* is that they constitute a pretty consistent genre of historical data which hardly ever give reason for profound scepticism. Exaggeration, in other works on early Islamic history a well-known feature, which makes the historical data contained in them so difficult to assess, is almost totally lacking in *awā'il* literature. The first famous collection of *awā'il* was made by Abū Hilāl al-'Askari (d. after 395/1005), which outshone the few collections made by earlier authors - such as the one of at-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971) - but when one reads that source, one only occasionally comes across those *awā'il* that form the basis of the arguments that will presently be made the subject of discussion. It will appear that most *awā'il* adduced here were gleaned from a wide variety of sources in which they were only mentioned in passing, sources mostly dealing with traditions and traditionists in the widest sense of the word.

The earliest indications of people spreading stories which in the course of time became known as *ḥadāths* are the *awā'il* about the first *qussās*. In Medina the first to be called a *qās* was Tamīm ad-Dārī (d. 40/660) who related his stories from the reign of 'Umar onward.4 In Mecca the first to relate stories was allegedly 'Ubayd b. 'Umayr (d. 68/687) who also began to do so under 'Umar.5 In Egypt the first to relate *qīṣās* is reported to have been a man called Sulaym b. Itr who was appointed *qās* and *qādi* in 39 or 40/659-660 and the first to do so in Iraq were the Ḥarāriyya or simply the Khawārij.6

The exact contents of these earliest *qīṣās* permit the following speculations. It is conceivable that they will have contained material that, in the


7. Cf. Ibn al-Jawzi, *Quṣṣās*, p. 23. Another report has it that al-Aswad b. Sari (d. 42/662) was the first *qās* in the mosque of Basra, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, *Iṣāba*, 1, p. 74; Ibn Ḥanbal, *Kitāb al-ṭilal wa-ma'rifat ar-rijūl*, 1, no. 1879. For Khūfa, see Shaqiq ad-Dabbi, *Khārijite*, *qās*, in Ibn Ḥajar, *Liṣān*, 11, p. 151. It is precisely because of his antipathy for the Khawārij that Abū 'l-Abwas Awf b. Mālik (d. sometime in the nineties/710s) may have been qualified as a *qās* who was actually reliable, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhib*, viii, p. 169. In Dārīmi, *muqaddima* 32 (= p. 53), we read how Ibn Sirin, one day, entered the mosque where one - otherwise totally unknown - Sumayr b. 'Abd ar-Rahmān related *qīṣās* and Ḥumayd b. 'Abd ar-Rahmān related *ilm*. It is implied that the latter's occupation was by far the more meritorious of the two. Perhaps this is one of the earliest signs - I tentatively date the story in the nineties of the first century/710s - of the dichotomy between *qās* and *ilm*.
course of time, found its way to the genre which later came to be called *tarhib wa-targhib*. In conformity with the later position of the *qāṣṣ* in society, who delights as well as scares his audience, the earliest *qīṣās* may well have contained sermon-like accounts of an edifying nature concerning the prophet and the Muslims of the first period.¹ The likelihood that these *qīṣās* will have comprised also the genre of *ḥalāl wa-ḥārām* is slight in view of the fact that legal thinking on the basis of individual judgement as well as precedent in Islam is a development of somewhat later times, as I shall try to show below. Besides, in chapter 2, where the earliest *qādis* who seemed also to have been recruited from the class of *qūṣās*, are investigated, it will appear that these *qādis* relied almost solely on their personal judgement or common sense (*raʿy*).⁹

On the other hand, it is most probable that another important genre of *ḥadīths* originated in those early days immediately following the prophet’s demise, the *fadāʾil* genre. Already during the caliphate of Abū Bakr the spreading of sayings attributed to ‘Alī seems to have originated. Ibn Abī l-Ḥadid (d. 655/1257), the commentator of that famous collection of sayings attributed to ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, the *Nahj al-balāgha*, candidly points to this where he says:

> Know that the origins of fabrications *infadāʾil* traditions were due to the Shi’a, for they forged in the first instance traditions concerning their leader. Enmity towards their adversaries drove them to this fabrication... When the Bakriyya (sc. those favouring Abū Bakr) saw what the Shi’a had done, they fabricated for their own master traditions to counter the former... When the Shi’a saw what the Bakriyya had done, they increased their efforts...¹⁰

9. A link between the *qāṣṣ* who tells edifying stories and the one who uses his common sense and proper judgement is found in a passage where the Egyptian *qāṭīnas* ‘Abd ar-Rahmān b. Ḥujayra... *yaqṣusu*... *fi mutʿatiʿ l-muthūlāqati bi-halāthati danānir*, cf. Kindi, *Governors*, p. 317; that we should not simply emend the text and read *yaqqid* instead of *yaqṣusu* finds its justification in the editor’s footnote 2 on that page. The verb *qāṣa* is, furthermore, identified with *bayyana*. We read in Firūzābdī’s *Al-qāmis al-muhīt*, s.v.: *nahnu naqṣsu alayka aḥsana ‘l-qaṣṣa ni ḥabyyinu laka aḥsana ‘l-bayāni*. That *qīṣās* at one time, were placed on a level more elevated than even *ḥadīth* is reflected in a report cited in Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr’s *Jaʿmī* *bayān al-ʿilm wa-fadāʾilihi*, ii, p. 121, where we read:... *yā rasūla ʿilāh, ḥaddithnā hayʾan fawqa ‘l-ḥadīth wa-dīna ‘l-ʿurān yaʿnūna ‘l-qīṣas*; cf. Ṣabīrī, *Tafsir*, xi, p. 150.
10. Ibn Abī l-Ḥadīd, *Sharḥ nahj al-balāgha*, xi, pp. 48f. The chances that we will ever find distinct traces of these earliest *fadāʾil* are slight. Perhaps those compiled in Fasawi, i, pp. 446–55, give an idea of what they may have been like. What is now known in our sources under the name of, for instance, Abū Bakr *fadāʾil* is in fact material that came much later into existence, when the controversy between ‘Alī’s partisans and Abū Bakr’s partisans acquired a new edge with the emergence of the Rafidiyya. Bikriyya traditions meant to counter those of the Rafidiyya can be found, for example, in Ibn al-Jawzī, *Kitāb al-mawdūʿāt*, i, pp. 303–19; all the *insāds* of these traditions contain information pointing
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The fact that it is Ibn Abī l-Ḥadīd, himself a Shi'ite (as well as a Mu'tazilite), who ascribes the first *fada'il* fabrication to the Shi'a, is significant and it can therefore be assumed, I think, that this allegation is historically correct. Furthermore, Ibn Abī l-Ḥadīd cites from the *Kitāb al-ahdhath* of Madāʾiṇī (d. 215-35/830-50). It seems appropriate to quote also a passage from this early source which is otherwise lost:

Muʿawiya wrote one and the same letter to his tax collectors after the year of the Jamāʿa (sc. 40/661) in which he said: 'Let the conquered people refrain from mentioning any merit of Abū Turāb or his kinsmen.' So in every village and on every pulpit preachers stood up cursing 'Ali, washing their hands of him, disparaging him and his house . . . [In another letter Muʿawiya wrote:] 'Make a search for those you can find who were partisans of 'Uthmān and those who supported his rule and those who uphold (*yarawna*; it is perhaps better to read *yarwāna*, relate) his merits and qualities. Seek their company, gain access to them and honour them. Write down for me everything which everyone of them relates, as well as his name, that of his father and his clan.' Thus they did until they had increased the number of merits and qualities of 'Uthmān. In exchange Muʿawiya sent them presents, garments, gifts and [he even made them the owners of] pieces of land. This was showered over Arabs and *mawali* alike and it occurred on a large scale in every city, the people competing in rank and worldly honours. Every lowly individual who went to any governor of Muʿawiya and related about 'Uthmān a merit or a virtue was received kindly, his name was taken down and he was given preferential treatment. This continued for some time.

Then Muʿawiya wrote to his governors saying: 'Hadith about 'Uthmān has increased and has spread in every city, town and region. When this letter from me reaches you, summon the people to relate the merits of the Companions and the first caliphs. And do not let any Muslim relate anything about 'Ali without bringing something contradicting this about the Companions. This I like better and it pleases me more, it invalidates Abū Turāb's claims and those of his Shi'ā in a more definitive way and it is for them more difficult to bear than the virtues and the merits of 'Uthmān.'

Muʿawiya's letters were read out to the people. And many forged reports concerning the merits of the Companions, in which there was no [grain of] truth, were related. The people went out of their way in relating reports in this vein until they spoke thereof in glowing terms from the pulpits. The teachers in the schools were instructed to teach their young pupils a vast quantity of these until they related them and studied them just as they studied the Qurʾān and until they taught these to their daughters, wives and servants. God knows how long they persisted in this.11

to the probable forgers who lived in a period considerably later than the first decade after Muhammad's death. It is likely that the first *fada'il* sayings or slogans, at which Ibn Abī l-Ḥadīd points in this passage, bore no resemblance whatsoever to *fada'il* brought into circulation as from 40/661, i.e. after 'Ali's caliphate. For an assessment of how the Rāfidites fabricated traditions, see ibidem, p. 338, where they are also compared with the Jews with whose ideas they are said to have much in common.

Even if the historicity of the actual wording of these letters is doubtful, the general picture offered by this fragment has much to commend it as being historical and describes in vivid terms the - what one might call - first large scale, political campaigning with which the various factions in early Islam sought to outdo one another.

Another significant passage from an Arabic source describing how the qāṣṣ's help was enlisted by the caliph deserves to be quoted in full, if only because it corroborates the measures taken by Mu'āwiya as depicted in the above 'correspondence'.

Sulaym b. 'Itr, Egypt's first qāṣṣ who later was also appointed qādī as mentioned above, was rebuked by a certain Companion, one Šīla b. al-Ḥārith al-Ghifārī, for his activities as qāṣṣ, which were considered by Šīla as breaking with the generally accepted norms such as laid down in the time of the prophet. This incident is recorded in Kindī. The reason why Šīla allegedly found it necessary to take Sulaym the qāṣṣ to task is supplied in a treatise by Ibn Ḥajar. Here we read:

When 'Alī had returned from Šīfnī, he stood long in prayer and called down God's wrath upon those who opposed him. [News of] that reached Mu'āwiya. He ordered the qāṣṣ, after the morning and evening salāt, to invoke God's blessing over him (sc. Mu'āwiya himself) and over the people of Syria, and dispatched orders to [other] cities to do likewise. Layth [b. Sa'd] said: Thus there are two [ways of] 'story telling' (in Arabic: qaṣṣāni; in other words: two ways for the qāṣṣ to perform his duty in the mosque), the 'ordinary, usual way' (qaṣṣas al-'ūmma) when the people gather around him and he admonishes them and preaches to them, and the 'special way' (qaṣṣas al-khāṣṣa), which Mu'āwiya instituted by putting a man in charge of the qaṣṣas. When the ḫāmā has uttered the [final] formula in the morning salāt, the qāṣṣ sits down, invokes God, praises and extols Him, invokes His blessing upon His prophet. [After that] he invokes God's blessing upon the caliph, his people, his government officials, his soldiers and then he invokes God's wrath upon the caliph's enemies (read ḫābīhi instead of ḡīzbihi) and upon all the unbelievers . . . Sulaym used to raise his hands during his qaṣṣas.

Here we see how the qāṣṣ, who initially confined his preaching to subjects of a generally edifying tenor, was forced to become the mouthpiece of the ruler by spreading official government propaganda in the form of religio/political slogans which were soon to develop into fadā'il and mathālib. In later times qaṣṣās were thought to keep the imagination of the common

12. Cf. Noth, Quellenkritische Studien, pp. 71–80, for a convincing argument in favour of rejecting any 'correspondence' as unhistorical without, however, losing out of sight the possibility that the events alluded to might in actual fact be taken to be more or less accurately depicted. Noth thinks these 'correspondences' may possibly also have come into existence as 'embellishment of the information' (Auflockerung der Berichterstattung), cf. p. 78.
14. Ibidem, note 1, where a ms. of his Rar al-īṣr is quoted.
people in check (cf. Ibn Ḥajar, *Lisān*, 1, p. 414) and thus prove their value for society.

As I said earlier, it is difficult to visualize that, at this early stage, the *ḥalāl wa-ḥaram* genre, at least in a form where the example of older authorities is quoted, had already found a place also in the stories that were to develop ultimately into standardized *ḥadīths*. It goes without saying that issues concerning *ḥalāl wa-ḥaram*, whether or not they had already been brought together under this technical term, have occupied the minds of Muslims ever since Muḥammad’s community began to grow into a structured and regulated society. However, during the first few decades after the prophet’s death legal thinking was predominantly the occupation of individuals (among whom were, as we have seen above, the first *qādis*) who, rather than look back at examples already set by others, developed their own ideas of what was prohibited and what permissible. To support this view the following considerations and evidence may be offered.

It is a generally accepted fact that the first four caliphs set their own standards. They ruled the community in the spirit of the prophet, thinking of their own solutions to problems rather than meticulously copying his actions. The same can be said of the first few great legal minds which Islam has produced. For example, Sa’īd b. al-Musayyab (d. 94/713) was known during his lifetime as the greatest expert in *fiqh* matters. Many traditions, later appearing in collections with *isndds* containing his name, can be traced also in other sources as utterances of himself that do not go back to persons older than himself.


(2). The precept *idhā qablati ’l-ḥaydatu tarakati ’ṣ-ṣalāt* (i.e. when [a woman] feels that her period has started, she abandons performing the *ṣalāt*), ascribed to Ibn al-Musayyab (Abū Dāwūd, *ahdār* 109, = ed. M. M. ’Abd al-Ḥamīd, 1, p. 76) is found in a slightly different version in a prophetic saying, e.g. Nasā’ī, *ḥayd* 2, = ed. H. M. al-Mas‘ūdī, 1, p. 181 passim;

(3). The legal maxim *lā nikāḥa illā bi-walīyyin* (i.e. no marriage without a guardian) is listed as a prophetic tradition (Tirmidhī, *nikāḥ* 14, = ed. M. F. ’Abd al-Baqī, 111, pp. 407ff.) and also as a ruling of various *fuqahā* among the Successors such as Sa’īd, but also Ḥasan al- Боṣrī, Shurayḥ and ʿIbrāhīm an-Nakḥāʾī (ibidem, p. 411);

(4). The legal maxim *al-walad li ’l-firdāš* (i.e. the child belongs to the marital bed),
allegedly transmitted with Sa'īd b. al-Musayyab in the isnād between Zuhrī and Abū Hurayra, is on the other hand, according to a report of the awā'il genre, a rule of the pre-Islamic judge Aktham b. Šayfi, cf. E.I. 2, s.v. (Kister) and Ibn Bāṭish, Ghāyat al-wasā'il ilā ma'rifat al-awā'il, 1, p. 184;

(5). Darimi, wuṭūq 85 (= p. 109) lists a number of precepts concerning the ablutions of the mustahhāda ascribed to Ḥasan al-Baṣrī and Sa'īd b. al-Musayyab. Although many ablation precepts exist traced back to the prophet, this precept of Sa'īd has remained unambiguously ascribed to him;

(6). In Mālik we often find mursal traditions and also Sa'īd's own statements preceded by the same texts as prophetic sayings, e.g. sa-lat 60 and 61, = ed. M. F. 'Abd al-Baqī, pp. 94f. On the whole, precepts formulated by Sa'īd are very numerous in the Muwatta'.

In al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādi's Kifāya, p. 404, last few lines, we read a statement in which it is implied that all the marāsil of Ibn al-Musayyab were in the course of time brought into circulation with perfect isnāds via other people. On p. 405 we find a statement to the contrary.

I maintain that it is Sa'īd b. al-Musayyab who is to be credited with these legal decisions (which sometimes take the form of maxims) rather than the prophet or a Companion as mentioned in the hadīth collections compiled some hundred and fifty years later. It must be assumed that, at this early stage, fiqh did not yet mean insight in matters permissible and forbidden as verbally dictated by the new religion, but as ad hoc problem solving, at most inspired by it. In other words, revelation, which was in due course also to include the example set by Muḥammad, had not yet become identical with religious law.

The reason why these legal decisions should be considered, in the first instance, as being the products of Sa'īd's own juridical insight, rather than as being traceable back to previously set examples, lies in the mere fact of them being quoted as Sa'īd's decisions at all. A legal decision that indeed does go back to the prophet or one of his Companions simply does not require being put into the mouth of Sa'īd as also being a product of the latter's reasoning. The numerous instances where Sa'īd is credited with juridical opinions definitely point to one conclusion only. He thought of the solution to the problem in these terms first, before this decision was moulded into a saying attributed to authorities preceding Sa'īd. There is indeed no necessity whatsoever for crediting Sa'īd with merely having repeated a legal opinion of his predecessors, be they the prophet or one or more of his Companions.

16. How Muslim scholars have wrestled with the problem of mursalāt and munqaḍīt āt versus that same material properly provided with isnāds going back to the prophet (muwtafilat) is, I think, nowhere better illustrated than in al-Khaṭīb, Kifāya, pp. 404ff., 386ff. Cf. pp. 415ff., for an appraisal of traditions that are sometimes marfu', sometimes mawqūf. Al-Khaṭīb leaves me with the impression that he has done his utmost to rescue as many traditions as he possibly could from being rejected, granting a certain value to anyone of them - no matter how little - rather than, by applying critical standards, to sift the
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Looking at the various centres of Islamic intellectual activity we see that in Basra the same situation obtains. A younger contemporary of Sa'd b. al-Musayyab, Hasan al-Bashri (d. 110/728), has numerous legal decisions and even maxims traced to him which can be found in the explanatory remarks (= ta'liqät) Bukhari adds to traditions duly traced back to the prophet containing in most cases exactly the same wording or brief statements amounting to the same decisions.¹⁷

Thus far an attempt has been made to demonstrate that (1) apart from all those who simply talked about the prophet (in Arabic ta.addatha), it was probably the qussas who started spreading stories (ahadith) of a generally edifying tenor about the prophet and his first supporters;

(2) the disappointment of 'Ali and his adherents led, immediately after the death of the prophet with the appointment of Abu Bakr as caliph, to the fabrication of forged fadail eulogizing 'Ali countered by the fabricated fadail favouring Abu Bakr at the hands of the Bakriyya;

(3) halal wa-harâm, if any, must have been extremely limited in scope and were mainly the products of individual judgement on the part of the first legal minds Islam produced; later these juridical opinions seem to have been remoulded into hadiths going back to the prophet.

An important feature that was to grant the material enumerated under these three rubrics a more or less standardized form is the isnad. Already during the life of the prophet, or shortly after his death, certain Companions are said to have shown caution by not immediately accepting everything that was related before having scrutinized the informant. 'Umar and 'Ali are said to have been the first who screened their informants.¹⁸ But according to Muslim scholarship the isnad came definitely into use after the troubles ensuing from the murder of the caliph 'Uthman in 35/656, when people transmitting information could no longer be trusted automatically but had to be examined firstly as to whether or not they harboured innovative ideas and, in general, as to reliability, veracity and other lofty character traits. The report often adduced to procure a historical basis for this is the saying attributed to Muhammad b. Sirin (d. 110/728): "They [sc. the traditionists] were not used to inquiring after the isnad, but when the fiina occurred they said: Name us your informants. Thus, if these were ahl 'reliable' from the 'not so reliable'. Or, differently put, al-Kha'ib has tried to reason away any objections that were raised - or that theoretically could be raised - to traditions which were not transmitted marfu', or otherwise undeniable examples of the sunnat an-nabi; for him any mawqif, mursal, or even munqiq isnad can, with a little effort, be looked upon as potentially marfu'. Cf. especially p. 424. See also Nawawi's Taqrîb, translated by W. Marçais in JA, xvi, 1900, pp. 326ff., and the literature quoted there.

¹⁷. E.g. Bukhari, mawâqi' 40. Mostly, Hasan's decisions in Bukhari's ta'liqät are limited to statements such as lâ ba's bihi, karisha 'l-Hasan etc. For more examples of Hasan's sayings and rulings that finally evolve into prophetic traditions, see below pp. 52-5.

as-sunna their traditions were accepted, but if they were ahl al-bida' their traditions were not accepted.\textsuperscript{19} The word fitna was generally taken to indicate the civil strife following 'Uthmān's murder.\textsuperscript{20} Elsewhere\textsuperscript{21} I have tried to show that it is more likely that with this word the civil war is meant between 'Abd Allāh b. az-Zubayr and the Umayyad caliphs in Damascus. Since the publication of this hypothesis only one counterargument was brought forward which can be construed as undermining its validity.\textsuperscript{22} I have dealt with this counterargument in another publication.\textsuperscript{23} Moreover, with the help of awā'il it is possible to adduce additional evidence in favour of my initial hypothesis. But first it should be pointed out that it seems more likely to interpret Ibn Sirin's use of the word fitna as alluding to an event which occurred during his own adult life rather than to an event which took place when he was still an infant.\textsuperscript{24} Furthermore, to Ibn Ma'in (d. 233/848) is ascribed a remark concerning al-A'mash, who allegedly never heard traditions before the fitna. Since al-A'mash lived from 59-61 (679-681) until 145/762, we again have here a context in which the concept fitna and tradition transmission are mentioned in one breath,\textsuperscript{25} in which by fitna definitely the one of Ibn az-Zubayr is meant. Both reports seem to be substantiated by a statement ascribed to Mālik b. Anas who is reported to have said: Awwalu man asnada 'l-hadhīth Ibn Shihbā.\textsuperscript{26}

The verb asnada in this context admits of two interpretations. Firstly it may mean that Malik indicated Ibn Shihbā az-Zuhri, who lived from ± 50/670 until 124/742, as the first who made consistent use of isnāds;
secondly, it can be explained as indicating Zuhri's consistent search for *isnāds* going back all the way to the prophet, *isnāds*, in other words, which are *musnad*; interpreted thus it may be taken to mean that he consistently looked for *isnāds* that were *marfuʿ*. This latter interpretation is, however, somewhat difficult to harmonize with the statement al-Ājurri has made on the authority of Abū Dāwūd as-Sijistānī concerning Zuhri's methods. It is alleged in this remark that Zuhri had collected in all 2,200 traditions half of which were *musnad*. Taken literally this might mean that he only found 1,100 *musnad* traditions, but the question may be asked why he collected the other 1,100 if he was supposedly not interested in them. That he indeed was also on the look-out for non-*musnad* traditions is borne out by a statement of Śālih b. Kaysān (d. after 140/758) as reported by Maʿmar b. Rāshid (d. 154/770) in which Zuhri's search for sayings attributed to Companions is explicitly attested.

To conclude from this that it was Zuhri who was the first to make consistent use of *isnāds*, as I suggested in the first interpretation above, seems the more appropriate. In view of Zuhri's lifespan – he was born in 50 – it seems more likely, therefore, to consider the *fiṭna* alluded to in the statement of Ibn Sirīn as the one resulting from the conflict of Ibn az-Zubayr and the Umayyads.

Other *awā'il* testifying to the chronology of the origins of *ḥadīth* proper as perhaps somewhat later than the majority of Muslim scholars have thought are those dealing with *isnād* examination evolving into full-fledged *isnād* criticism and *ḥadīth* recording. If the birth of the institution of the *isnād* is accepted as having taken place sometime in the late sixties or early seventies rather than in 35, *awā'il* about the first *isnād* critics become a great deal more plausible, or, differently put, if the date of origin of the *isnād* is taken to be around 35, it is all the more incomprehensible that it took so long for the first Muslim *isnād* critics to apply their criticism, because the circulation of forged *ḥadīths* had become eminently noticeable by the end of the first century. (In the following as well as in all other chapters I computed people's ages in *lunar* rather than solar years.)

The first systematic examination of informants ever recorded is reported to have occurred in Kūfā when Shaʿbī (d. 103–10/721–8) interrogated ar-Rābīʿ b. Khuthaym as to his informant regarding a certain *ḥadīth*. Ar-Rābīʿ is said to have died after the battle of Karbalāʾ of 61/680, so the

---

27. For Abū 'Ubayd Muhammad b. Āḥmad al-Ājurri, see Sezgin, GAS, 1, p. 165.
30. In a late source, the *Tadhib ar-rāwī fī sharḥ tağrib an-Nawawī* by Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505), we come across a definition of a *musnad* which seems to corroborate also my first interpretation: wa-huwa man yarwū 'l-ḥadīth bi-isnādihi siwāʾan kāna 'indahu 'ilmun bihi aw layṣa lahu ʿill mujarradu riwāyātin, cf. 1, p. 43.
31. For still more evidence, see the excursus at the end of my paper referred to in note 23 above.
conversation, if it is assumed to be historical, must have taken place prior to that date. In view of Sha'bi's alleged date of birth, given as 20- which makes him either eighty-three or ninety when he died – or 31, which makes him seventy-two or seventy-nine at the time of his death, and in view of the fact that so many traditionists pretended to be older than they were in reality – a common practice of especially Kufan transmitters (see pp. 46ff. below) – I think that it is safe to say that it took place in the same year or only a short time earlier.

Taking Sha'bi's alleged time of death as the point of departure, which is given as 103/721 or 110/728, or sometime between these two dates, and assuming he was in his sixties or, at most, in his seventies when he died, that suggests that he was born in 40/660 or a little later. This would make him a man in his early twenties when he interrogated ar-Rabi'. This is not an unreasonable proposition, when we read in his tarjama that he 'did not reach (in Arabic: lam yudrik) [the time when] 'Aṣim b. 'Adī [was still alive].' This 'Aṣim died in 40/660 according to Ibn Ḥajar (Tahdhib, v, p. 49). And that traditionists did not usually begin collecting hadith before the age of twenty (see notes 150 and 220 below) is furthermore in the case of Sha'bi supported by the information that he allegedly did not hear traditions with Samura b. Jundab, who died in 58/678 or 60/680 in Baṣra or Kūfa.

If it is assumed, then, that this first examination of transmitters occurred sometime in the early sixties, the first isnād critic as such, who systematically examined every isnād and made the reliability of transmitters a conditio sine qua non for accepting their traditions, was Shu'ba b. al-Ḥajjāj, who died in 160/777 when he was allegedly 77 years old.33 He is recorded to have said to someone: Innaka là takādu tajidu ahadan fattasha 'l-ḥadith taftshi wa-qad naṣartu fihi ṣa-wajadtuhu lā yāsīhu minhu ath-thulth (i.e. You will hardly find anyone who scrutinized the tradition or searched for it as I have done and after inspection I found not [even] one third of it to be 'sound'.34 Since Shu'ba allegedly occupied himself with collecting traditions for the last thirty years or so of his life,35 we can assume the starting date of systematic rijāl criticism in Islam to be at about 130/747. And for Medina we have the report concerning Mālik b.


34. Cf. Qabul, p. 6; an alternative translation might be: ... I found one third of it to be 'weak'. Although the latter translation seems the more grammatically correct, the former interpretation is borne out by another statement attributed to Shu'ba: Law lam uḥaddithkhum illā 'anti th-thiqāt lam uḥaddithkhum illā 'an nafarin yasīrin, cf. Ibn Rajab, p. 105.
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Anas (d. 179/795), although this, admittedly, does not imply that he was necessarily the first isnād critic as such.36 There is, however, no explicit mention in the sources of any rijāl expert from Medina who preceded Mālik, and in view of the still far from sophisticated use of isnāds in the Muwaṭṭa' that is hardly surprising.

As for the recording of sayings concerning Muhammad, there is sufficient material to build up a strong case in favour of the theory that Muslims started to write certain things down perhaps already during their prophet's lifetime. But it is difficult to maintain that this must have been carried out on a scale suggesting that this was in any way the custom. Awā'il concerning persons who first made a collection of the Qur'ān indicate, as was to be expected, Abū Bakr37 and 'Umar.38 Interesting in this context is perhaps the fact that the first to use diacritical points in Qur'ān copies was a certain Yaḥyā b. Ya'qūb from Baṣra, one time qāḍī of Marw, who died in 129/746.39

But awā'il describing the first organized hadith collections date to a time considerably later than one would expect from so important an activity, that is, if the early chronology as proposed by Muslim scholars is taken as point of departure. Even if it were maintained that writing down traditions or simply taking notes had been going on from the earliest times, it was Bukhārī (d. 256/870) who was credited with having compiled the first collection that was sahiḥ; that means that more than one and a half centuries had elapsed since the isnād had come into existence before a compilation was made that was generally considered sound.40 It was also at a relatively late date that the first instances were recorded of people who voluntarily showed what they had written to interlocutors in order to prove that they had made reliable notes.41

Before Bukhārī there had been others recorded as having made structured collections of traditions, but again it appears that a long time had elapsed since the last few decades of the first/seventh century when the isnād probably came into existence. The first to do so was 'Abd al-Malik b. Ṭāhil b. Ṭāhil.
'Abd al-'Azīz, better known as Ibn Jurayj, who died ca. 150/767 when he was seventy years old. He seems to have been quite impressed with his own efforts, for he is alleged to have said: *mā dawwana 'l-'ilmā tadwini ahadun* (i.e. no one has recorded this science as I have done). He was active in Mecca. For Medina we find Mālik (d. 179/795) or Ibn Isbāq (d. 151/767) according to some medieval scholars quoted by Kattānī. In Yemen it was Ma'mar b. Rashid (d. 153/770) who compiled the first collection in a book. Another traditionist who is credited with having made a systematic collection as the first in his city was Sa'id b. Abi 'Arfiba (d. 157/773) in Basra. But also ar-Rabr b. Sabib (d. 160/777) is mentioned in this respect. For Kifā it was Yahyā b. Zakariyyā' b. Abī Zā'ida (d. 182/798). Musnad collections came even later into existence. In Kifā Yahyā b. 'Abd al-Hamid (d. 228/847) was the first to compile a *musnad*, and in Basra Musaddad b. Musarhad (d. 228/847). Furthermore, we also have the name of the first traditionist to compile a *musnad* collection who lived in Egypt. He had collected his material in Iraq. This was Nu'aym b. Ḥammād b. Mu'āwiya who died in 229/848.49 The relatively late growth of traditions is, furthermore, attested in several *awd'il* dealing with those people who were credited with having been the first to introduce *hadith*, specified in genre as well as unspecified, into certain areas of the Islamic world. Yazid b. Abī Ḥabīb, who died in 128/745 at the age of seventy-five, was reputedly the first to introduce traditions of any sort into Egypt. He is also...

42. Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhib*, vi, pp. 403f., a statement of Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal; see also his *Iṣḥal*, i, no. 2294.


48. Cf. ibidem, x, p. 109; and also Ibn Rajab, p. 71.

49. Cf. Ibn Bāṭish, i, p. 169; Sufyān ath-Thawrī is mentioned here as having preceded him in this; this is probably Ibn Bāṭish's own opinion not borne out by the above; Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhib*, x, p. 459; cf. also al-Khaṭīb, *Ta'rīkh Baghdađ*, xiii, p. 306. Ḥabīb ar-Raḥmān al-'A'zami, in the preface of his edition of Ḥumaydī's *Musnad*, p. 1, wrongly quotes Kattānī's *Ar-risāla al-mustuṣrifa*, as if Asad b. Mūsā (d. 212/827) was the first to do so. For other tradition centres (Shām, Rayy, Wāsiq etc.), see Rāmahurmuzi, p. 612. Cf. also Kattānī, *Ar-risāla al-mustuṣrifa*, pp. 8f. Even for an outpost like Transoxania we have data, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhib*, vi, p. 10, Ibn Rajab, p. 72.
credided with having been the first to discuss *halāl wa-harām* matters and issues of a more general nature. This may even be considered relatively early, if it is realized how long it took for Islam to grow roots in Egypt; the first teacher of Qur’ān recitation was a man who flourished as late as the second century, ‘Abd Allāh b. Lahi‘a, who died in 174/790 allegedly at the age of 78 or even 104. The first to enter Andalus with traditions was Mu‘āwiya b. Ṣāliḥ al-Ḥimṣī who moved there in 125/742. He was appointed qādī and died in 158/775. And the first to introduce there *fiqh* and *halāl wa-harām* was Ziyād b. ‘Abd ar-Rahmān al-Lakhmī (d. between 193/809 and 199/815), who is not even listed in the *Tahdhib* as having engaged in the transmission of traditions. Also on the basis of evidence culled from sources dealing with other areas it is demonstrable that *fiqh* and *hadith* do not necessarily go hand in hand. Furthermore, it was an-Naʿrī b. Shumayl, who died in 204/820, who was the first to introduce the *sunna* in Marw and all of Khurāsān. Finally, Abū ʿIshāq Ibrāhīm b. Hāshim b. al-Khalīl, who flourished about 200/816, was the first who spread traditions from Kūfān transmitters in Qumm.

The *awā’il* evidence collected here converges, I think, on one conclusion, that is that the earliest origins of standardized *hadith* cannot be traced back earlier than, at most, to the seventies or eighties of the first century. What had preceded this was, as we have seen above, still unstructured and still unstandardized material of edifying contents (*quṣṣās, tarbih wa-targhib*) or with a political slant (*fadā’il_mathālīb*).

**The chronology of the growth of traditions**

The growth of traditions has been occasionally alluded to in the previous section, but will be the main subject of discussion in the following. In order

51. *Wa-kdna [Yazid b. Abī Ḥabīb] awwala man azhara ‘l-‘ilm bi-Misr wa ‘l-kalām ft ‘l-halāl wa ‘l-hārām wa-masā’il*, according to Ibn Sa‘d as quoted in Ibn Hājar, *Tahdhib*, xi, p. 319. (This is not found in the *Ṭabaqāt*, however). Note the use of the term *kalām*, and not ‘ilm or *ahādīth*, referring to legal issues. Mālik’s *Muwaṭṭa* was first introduced by ‘Abd ar-Rahmān b. al-Qāsim b. Khālid (d. 191/807), who was not a *ṣāhiḥ hadith*, cf. Ibn Hājar, *Tahdhib*, vi, pp. 252ff. The first to introduce Mālik’s *masā’il* into Egypt was ‘Uthmān b. al-Ḥakam al-Judhāmī (d. 163/780), cf. ibidem, vii, p. 111.

52. Cf. Ira Lapidus, *The conversion of Egypt to Islam*, and also Chapter 2.


55. Khushānī, ibidem.

56. Ibidem, p. 46; from Humaydī, *Jadhwat al-mugtabis*, pp. 202f., it appears that he introduced Mālik’s *fiqh* and that hitherto they had followed the *madhhab* of Awzāʾī.

57. See Chapter 2.


to depict the earliest origins and first growth of hadīth a detailed investigation has been made of the transmitted material and/or personal opinions of a small number of important Companions as described in a major early historical source, Ibn Sa‘d, as compared with the respective musnads of these Companions in a few of the earliest collections. The Companions most eminently suited for such a comparison in the first place seem to be the four rightly-guided caliphs, since the number of traditions traced back to them are small and therefore easier to handle in comparison with the numbers traced back to other Companions, mostly much younger persons, whose occurrences in isnāds form, as may become abundantly clear in later chapters, no guarantee whatsoever anyhow that these isnāds may, in actual fact, be traced to them.

Reading through Ibn Sa‘d’s tarjama of Abū Bakr and other occurrences in the Ṭabaqāt, we hardly find any material that eventually emerges as a hadīth. Of the forty-four traditions of Malīk’s Muwaṭṭa’, in which Abū Bakr occurs, only one contains a prophetic saying transmitted through him via a totally deficient isnād to Malīk.60 Abū Bakr’s musnad is small throughout. In Ṭayalisi (d. 203/818) it comprises nine traditions, seven of which are of the tarhib wa-targhib genre and two are historical accounts.61 In Ibn Ḥanbal’s Musnad there are many more, seventy-nine in all.62 Forty-one of these are repetitions, enlargements or abridgements, and of the remaining thirty-eight twenty-eight deal with tarhib wa-targhib, four are historical accounts and only six can be construed as belonging to ḥalāl wa-ḥaram, among which we find the famous zakāt precepts.63 These were transmitted on saḥīfas, the authenticity of which was never doubted by Abbott,64 and which Schacht was inclined to date back at least to the time of ‘Umar.65

It is indeed tempting to consider this list of tariffs a genuine institution of the prophet. We read in the Kitāb al-amwāl that two versions of this list, one allegedly transmitted in writing to Zuhri via ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar and his son Sālim66 and one allegedly transmitted via the descendants of ‘Amr b. Ḥazm – which someone went to copy in Medina by order of ‘Umar II67 – present striking similarities to the list allegedly transmitted from Abū Bakr, via Anas to his grandson Thumāma. Therefore I am inclined to lend

60. Musnad, p. 231, no. 27: a prophet is only buried at the very spot he has died.
61. Musnad, nos. 3 and 6. This last one is at the same time of the farā’īl genre singing the praises of Ṭalha.
62. At the beginning of vol. i.
63. Musnad, i, pp. 11 f. (no. 72).
64. Vol. i, p. 31, where she inadvertently mistook Anas’ grandson Thumāma, who allegedly transmitted the precepts via his grandfather on one of those saḥīfas, for a grandson of Abū Bakr with the same name. There is no such person.
66. Regrettably, this is the only version preserved in the Muwaṭṭa’ (vol. 1, pp. 257 ff.), otherwise the evidence adduced would have been even more convincing.
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credence to the list as possibly going back to the time of Muḥammad, although the version transmitted through Anas need not necessarily be so old but a copy made later by Ḥammād b. Salama (d. 167/783) or someone using his name. Finally, the five traditions in Muslim's *Ṣaḥḥ* going back to Abū Bakr do not present new material and can all be traced in Ibn Ḥanbal in longer or shorter versions. In conclusion, it is safe to say that Abū Bakr cannot be identified with *ḥadīth* in any extensive way. This may show that during his reign examples set by the prophet or his followers did not play a decisive role in Abū Bakr’s decision making. If this had been the case, many more traditions traced back to him, whether or not this ascription is historically genuine, would have been found in the earliest collections. On the contrary, these collections convey rather the idea that the first caliph of Islam, who suddenly saw himself faced with the enormous task of leading a community that had just lost its spiritual leader, relied almost exclusively on his own judgement.

Another conclusion that suggests itself is that it is in Iraqi collections, and not in the earliest extant and most authoritative Medinan collection – the *Muwatta* – that we have to look for the first sizable numbers of *ḥadīths*, including those on *ḥalāl wa-ḥarām*. A Hijāzī collection that originated a few decades after the *Muwatta*, the *Musnad* of al-Ḥumaydī (d. 219/834), corroborates this conclusion with only one of its seven traditions traced to Abū Bakr having a Medinense isnād (no. 5).

A comparison of ‘Umar in all his doings and decisions as described by Ibn Sa’d with the traditions traced back to him as listed in the earliest standard collections yields the following interesting results:

In an early historical source, such as Ibn Sa’d’s, it appears that ‘Umar hardly figures in traditions relating sayings of the prophet which can also be traced to the classical *ḥadīth* collections. In his *tarjama* there are only a few references to activities where he set standards that later developed into legal prohibitions and injunctions. For example, he was the first to condemn wine-drinkers to eighty stripes and to make the fasting of Ramadān incumbent upon all Muslims. Of all religious rites he thought the *ṣalāt* most important: *la islāma li-man taraka 'ṣ-ṣalāt or: la ḥazza li ‘mrī’in fī ‘l-islāmi adā’a 'ṣ-ṣalāt* (i.e. he who neglects the prayer ritual has no part in Islam). There are indeed numerous instances when, under a variety of

---

68. Abū Dāwūd is quoted as saying that Ḥammād only possessed one *kitāb* – that of Qays b. Sa’d – i.e. that he transmitted usually from memory, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhib*, iii, p. 15. This sort of information makes any *isnād* indicating transmission of other written material suspect.

69. Ed. M. F. ‘Abd al-Baqī, v, p. 225; I have used Muslim’s *Ṣaḥḥ* for this purpose rather than any other collection because of the extensive indexes given in vol. v.

70. Ibn Sa’d, iii 1, pp. 190–274.


72. E.g. ibidem, pp. 250, 254.
different circumstances and in many different situations, he is alleged to have performed certain ṣalāţs, without these reports being meant in the first place as descriptions of exemplary behaviour zealously imitated by his followers.\textsuperscript{73} There is even one report in which 'Umar is described as being somewhat forgetful in the ṣalāţ so he appointed someone to prompt him where necessary.\textsuperscript{74} Whether or not this report is historical, this, as well as the majority of the others in his tarjama, do describe 'Umar as an authoritarian primus inter pares rather than a blindly obeyed despot whose every word and action become law. This is clearly reflected in the story where he had someone shave his body hair on which occasion he is alleged to have said that this practice was no part of the sunna; the term is surely used to mean: the normative behaviour of a good Muslim in the widest sense of the word.

The sunna of the prophet, a concept emphasized for the first time by 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz rather than by the prophet himself or his immediate followers,\textsuperscript{75} is conspicuously absent in a report in which 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb on his deathbed made certain recommendations: in case of difficulties his followers should resort to the Qur'an, the muhājirūn, the anṣār, the people of the desert and, finally, the ahl adh-dhimma. (Conspicuously absent – as yet – are also the qurrd'!).\textsuperscript{76} This report tallies with the reputation which 'Umar acquired in a number of reports strewn over practically all historical sources that he was not in favour of aḥādīth concerning the prophet being spread, let alone being fixed in writing. Also Ibn Sa'd lists such a report.\textsuperscript{77}

In all there are just a few reports in which 'Umar referred to a decision of the prophet or where he explicitly followed his example. One concerns the famous verse, not included in the Qur'an, on the lapidation of adulterers, where 'Umar is alleged to have said that the prophet resorted to this punishment before him, so why not he.\textsuperscript{78} This issue requires a separate study, for which this is not the proper occasion.\textsuperscript{79} Another one describes how 'Umar loathed the smell of garlic and onions, something which, as he said, had prompted the prophet to have a man removed from the mosque, whose breath stank of it.\textsuperscript{80} Furthermore, the prophet had enjoined 'Umar not to forget the distant relatives (kalālā) as potential heirs.\textsuperscript{81}

It is true that there are a few more reports in which 'Umar mentions an

\textsuperscript{73} E.g. ibidem, pp. 205 (22), 216 (9), 217 (12f.), 225 (18), 261 (11).
\textsuperscript{74} Ibidem, p. 205 (23ff.).
\textsuperscript{75} See below pp. 31–39, and also Tilman Nagel, Rechtleitung und Kalifat. Versuch aber eine Grundfrage der islamischen Geschichte, pp. 50–5.
\textsuperscript{76} Ibn Sa'd, III 1, p. 243.
\textsuperscript{77} Ibidem, p. 206 (sf.), cf. p. 210 (4f.).
\textsuperscript{78} Ibidem, p. 242.
\textsuperscript{79} Cf. Wansbrough, Quranic studies, pp. 193–6, for a few interesting new ideas, if one takes the author's point of issue for granted.
\textsuperscript{80} Ibn Sa'd, III 1, p. 243 (12–15).
\textsuperscript{81} Ibidem, p. 243 (6ff.).
opinion of the prophet but they are either non-committal, or provided with such perfect isnāds that we may assume that Ibn Sa’d, who died in 230/845, copied them complete with isnād from a tradition collection circulating during his lifetime. An example of such an isnād is: ‘Affān b. Muslim – Ḥammād b. Salama – Thābit – Anas.82 In a report supported by this isnād ‘Umar referred a woman, who wept over him after the ultimately successful attempt on his life, to the dictum of the prophet: he who is bewailed [by his relatives] will be punished [in the Hereafter].83 Elsewhere in this study I have tried to prove that a similar dictum with a derivative of the root NWH (= lamenting) cannot be traced to a date earlier than ca. 40/661.84 If ‘Umar’s saying, which has the verb ‘awwala for ‘bewailing’, is taken to be genuinely his, and there are indeed reports in which the saying is traced back to him exclusively,85 it can be considered as a forerunner of the dictum in the form of a prophetic utterance.

As far as Ibn Sa’d’s treatment of ‘Umar is concerned and his position in the spreading of ahādīth about Muḥammad, the above is all the relevant material that could be found. Looking now into the earliest general collections of hadīths, such as Mālik’s Muwatta’, we find our findings so far eloquently corroborated. Of all the 234 traditions in which ‘Umar occurs, only fifteen contain sayings or descriptions of actions of the prophet with three more which are mere repetitions.86

But when we look in the earliest Iraqi collections, it becomes once more abundantly clear when and where prophetic traditions transmitted through ‘Umar originated. In the Musnad of Ṭayālīsī (d. 203/818) we find sixty-two traditions of which only one or two contain ‘Umar’s own views or statements and of which four are repetitions, abridgements or enlargements, while the Medinese contemporary of Ṭayālīsī, Ḥumaydī, lists in all only twenty-five traditions allegedly transmitted by ‘Umar, ten of which via Iraqi and Syrian isnāds brought to his attention by Ibn ‘Uyayna and al-Walid b. Muslim respectively. Looking once more at Iraq, just a few decades later another Musnad, the one of Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855), was compiled. Here a total of 304 traditions transmitted by ‘Umar is listed. Only six of these are historical accounts, 123 are pure prophetic traditions and the remaining 175 are repetitions, abridgements or enlargements. The fact that we do not find a representative sample of ‘Umar’s hadīth in Ibn Sa’d may indicate that their spreading was restricted to hadīth circles only.

82. See Chapter 4 for a tentative solution for the ‘mysterious Thābit’, and below pp. 46 and 67ff. for a study of the reliability of ‘Anas isnāds’.
83. Ibn Sa’d, iii 1, p. 263 (7–10).
84. See Chapter 3.
85. Ibn Sa’d, iii 1, p. 263 (14, 17, 25). ‘The dictum, with instead of ‘awwala the noun bukā’, is also attributed to ‘A’isha, p. 263 (22).
86. Muwatta’, idayn 5, qudrān 5, 9, zakāt 49, 50, Ḥajj 115, muddār 14, far‘īd 7, ṣalāq 53, buyā’ 38, madīna 18, 22, 24, 25, qadar 2, libs 18, isdī’hdān 3 and ṣadaqa 9.
A scrutiny of the traditions allegedly transmitted by 'Uthmân yields a more or less similar result. When one reads through the occurrences of 'Uthmân in Ibn Sa'd, one is struck by the total lack of legal traditions, although he is enumerated on various occasions as one of the few Companions whose personal advice was sought on legal issues. Although the number of people who allegedly transmitted material from him is large, not one prophetic tradition - legal or other - on his authority is listed in the Tabaqat with the exception of the famous dictum Man qa'la 'alayya mà lam aqul etc. As far as Ibn Sa'd is concerned, 'Uthmân seems to have relied solely on his own judgement. If he was inspired by the prophet, this does not show in the Tabaqat, a source in which we would have expected to encounter at least a few references to his having copied the prophet's example, if that had been his custom.

Likewise it appears that among the numerous occurrences of 'Uthmân in Mâlik's Muwatta' only three concern his transmitting of a prophetic tradition, whereas in Hûmaydi's Musnad there are only four. But, again, in the earliest Iraqi musnads we find a gradually increasing number. In Tayâlisî there are fifteen prophetic traditions allegedly reported by 'Uthmân with one repetition and in Ibn Ḥanbal a total of 131 of which 74 are repetitions, abridgements or enlargements. This number appears to be reduced in the canonical collection of Muslim to seventeen with one repetition.

So far a pattern seems discernible. A major historical source depicts the first three caliphs as mainly relying on their own personal judgements, offering only very few instances when they allegedly resort to following an example set by the prophet. In Mâlik's Muwatta' and in Hûmaydi's Musnad, the latter compiled at the same time as Tayâlisî, the number of prophetic traditions traced back through them is very small. In the earliest Iraqi collections, however, a gradually increasing number of prophetic traditions is found. It is not surprising that 'Ali's alleged position in the spreading of hadîth proved to be predictable on the basis of this provisional conclusion. Only five of the twenty-eight traditions in Mâlik on his authority allegedly go back to the prophet; in Hûmaydi that number is twenty-one including repetitions and also those supported by Iraqi isnâds; in Tayâlisî we find already ninety-two prophetic traditions of which just a few are repetitions, and in Ibn Ḥanbal there are listed a total of 819 traditions. In order to determine the number of repetitions, enlargements and abridgements of these traditions, an average of the occurrences has been taken of those in the musnads of Abû Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmân dealt with above as guiding principle, and it has been calculated that of these 819 some 450 will turn out to be repetitions etc. Even so, that means that during Mâlik's lifetime

87. Cf. Ibn Sa'd, II 2, pp. 99 (9), 109 (22), 110 (2).
88. Ibn Sa'd, II 2, p. 100 (15). Cf. Chapter 3 for an analysis and a tentative dating of this saying (middle second century).
89. 'Abd al-Rahmân, 29, Ḥajj 70 and buya' 32.
there circulated in Iraq several hundred prophetic traditions traced back to 'Ali of which there were hardly any traces in Medina shown by the near-absence of 'Ali traditions in the *Muwatta*.

As alluded to above, it would indeed be a time consuming task to analyse in the same way the growth of traditions in the various centres allegedly transmitted by even a few of the most important Companions. A number of the younger Companions are credited with such colossal numbers of traditions that applying the above methods will turn out to be unfeasible, while the overall conclusion amounts to the same as the one reached so far: in Iraq *hadith* underwent its first major growth as a brief comparison of these Companions' *musnads* preserved in Medinese collections with those preserved in Iraqi collections will demonstrate. Perhaps I should add to this the consideration that it is especially *isnāds* ending in such Companions as Anas, Abū Hurayra, Ibn 'Abbās, Ibn 'Umar, Ibn 'Amr, Ibn Mas'ūd,93 Jābir b. 'Abd Allāh and a number of others that were attached to fabricated traditions, as a cursory glance through Ibn al-Jawzī's *Kitāb al-mawdūʿāt* or Ibn Ḥajar's *Lisān* will verify.

Perhaps an illustration of the rapid but relatively late growth of Iraqi traditions in particular can be found in Rāmahurmuzi, who quotes a report attributed to 'Awān b. 'Abd Allāh (d. between 110/729 and 120/739) who, at one time, said that to Ibn Mas'ūd a total of a mere fifty traditions were traced.91 Compare this low figure with the 900 collected in Ibn Hanbal's *Musnad*,92 and it will be clear that it was in the course of the second/eighth century that the proliferation of *hadiths* in Iraq flourished, perhaps even later. We have, after all, a statement of Ghundar Muḥammad b. Ja'far (d. 193/808) who is alleged to have said that Ibn 'Abbās did not hear more than nine traditions from the prophet, while Yahyā b. Sa'id al-Qaṭṭān (d. 198/813) believed this figure to be ten.93 Even though Ibn Ḥajar has tried to invalidate these statements,94 it is significant, to say the least, that two major *muḥaddithūn*, who both died toward the end of the second century, are reported to have had these ideas about Ibn 'Abbās' output, which in Ibn Ḥanbal's *Musnad*, dating from barely half a century later, reached the

90. The last four constitute together the 'Abādīla, but it is not always specified, when mention is made of the three 'Abādīla', what three of these four are meant. One finds, for example, sometimes 'Abd Allāh b. az-Zubayr included among the three 'Abādīla' within a Hijāzī context, cf. Ibn 'Asākir, *Ta'rikh kabīr*, i, pp. 59ff.; Ibn Ḥajar, *Lisān*, ii, p. 18, and *Tahdhib*, ii, no. 399. One can safely say that among the 'three' in a Iraqi context Ibn Mas'ūd is always included, also Ibn 'Abbās, but there are no definite pointers to the third being Ibn 'Umar or Ibn 'Amr. Cf. Also Ibn al-Jawzī, *Kitāb al-mawdūʿāt*, ii, p. 242.
The origin of the concept ‘prophetic sunna’

The approximate date of origin of the narrowing down of the concept *sunna*, formerly comprising the *sunna*, or exemplary behaviour, of the prophet as well as his most devoted followers, to the exemplary behaviour of the prophet only, is another issue on which the findings presented here differ with the generally held view in the Islamic world. The Islamic view boils down to fixing this date of origin during the life of the prophet, when his behaviour was generally and undisputably taken as normative for all his followers, especially immediately after Muhammad’s death when the Muslim community had nothing else to be guided by except an, as yet, uncodified Qur’an. This is supposed to have soon resulted in the standardization of the tools with which this exemplary behaviour of the prophet was transmitted to later generations, which may, according to Muslim scholars, be taken to coincide with the date of origin of the standardization of the *iṣnād*, some twenty-five years after the prophet’s death.

I think that the time when the concept *sunna* began to be exclusively identified with *sunnat an-nabī* is to be set in a time some six or seven decades later, that is toward the end of the first century of the Hijra. This chronology is based on the following evidence and considerations.

In the foregoing, while dealing with the *ḥadīth* material traced back to ʿUmar, I mentioned a report in which ʿUmar, on his deathbed, enumerated where the Muslim community should look for the solutions to its problems, namely the Qurʾān, the *muḥājirīn*, the *aṇṣār*, the desert dwellers and finally the *ahl adh-dhimma* (cf. p. 26 above). It was pointed out that the concept *sunna* was conspicuously absent from this enumeration. Where we

---

95. For an account of the *sunnat an-nabī* having allegedly been established during the prophet’s lifetime, see M. M. Bravmann, *The spiritual background of early Islam*, pp. 123–98, especially pp. 168ff. Bravmann holds the view that, originally, *sunna* meant: procedure... ordained, decreed, instituted, introduced into practice (by a certain person or - less frequently - by a group of definite persons), and that its meaning ‘custom of the community’ must be considered as secondary (p. 155). I do not dispute this. Besides, it is not in conflict with the findings laid down in this section of the present chapter.

In Martin Hinds, *The Šiffin arbitration agreement*, p. 100, we find the word *sunna* used in two versions of an agreement, one probably early and seemingly historically reliable: *as-sunna al-ʿadila al-jāmīʿa ghayru ’l-mufarrika*, and one probably later version: *sunnat rasūli llāh al-jāmīʿa*; Hinds’ proposed chronology seems to be supported by my findings. Furthermore, see Schacht’s paper *Sur l’expression “Sunna du Prophète”* in *Mélanges d’orientalisme offerts à Henri Massé*, pp. 361–65.

96. According to the modern author ʿIzzat ʿAlī ʿAtiya, *Al-bid’a tahdīdūhā wa-mawqīf al-islām minhā*, pp. 117–122, *sunna* is *sunna* of the prophet to which some authors add, as he says, that of the *rāṣḥidūn* and of the noblest Companions.
would have expected it to be mentioned, namely immediately after the Qur'an, we find instead the two major contingents of the prophet's followers.

Now, it may be conceded that submitting a problem to a muhājjīr or an anṣārī, as 'Umar enjoined his fellow Muslims to do after his disappearance, might very well result in this muhājjīr or anṣārī suggesting a solution inspired by the prophet's example but, surely it is just as feasible to maintain that the interrogated muhājjīr or anṣārī might offer a solution based upon the generally accepted normative behaviour of the majority of muhājjīrūn and anṣār as a group, or a solution based upon his own fair appraisal of the problem, in other words: his ra'y. Thus came into existence personal ideas and concepts of how a good Muslim should behave in certain circumstances. Early tradition collections and other early works on the science of tradition, as is well-known, abound with reports traced back to Companions and also Successors, who volunteer solutions to problems presented to them. Even if the ascription of many of these reports is open to doubt, one should not categorically reject their historicity as a whole. Very many of these private opinions remained in the course of time identified and connected with the name of a Companion or Successor, while a great many others - based upon ra'y as well as inspired by the example of the prophet and/or other Companions or Successors - are found in later collections moulded in the form of prophetic sayings. Witness to this phenomenon are the countless references in the earliest rijāl works and other sources to people who 'raise' a report of a Companion or a Successor 'to the level' of a prophetic saying. The Arabic terms used are derivatives of the root RF'.

Names of transmitters from different periods mentioned in connection with ra'f are among innumerable others:
Rufay' b. Mihrān Abī 'l-'Alīya (d. ca. 93/712), whose traditions occur in all classical collections;99
Hāsan al-Baṣrī (d. 110/728),100 who will be extensively dealt with on pp. 49–55;
'Adi b. Thābit (d. 116/734), whose traditions occur in all classical collections;101
Simāk b. Ḥarb (d. 123/740), whose hadith occur in five of the 'six books'102

97. Later theoreticians have tried to minimize the role of Companions expressing their own personal views as, for instance, reflected in Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, Jāmi', 11, pp. 90f.
98. As I pointed out in the Introduction, Schacht has presented in his Origins, e.g. p. 5, among other things, the major theory that '... anāds have a tendency to grow backwards'. It will appear that in the following, in dealing with this phenomenon, I have sought to approach it from a quite different angle.
99. Ibn Hanbal, 'Ila', 1, nos. 63 and 539.
101. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, vi., p. 166 (line 2).
102. Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Taqdimā, p. 158.
'Alī b. Zayd ibn Jud'ān (d. 129/746), also found in five of the 'six';103
Farqad b. Ya'qūb as-Sabakhī (d. 131/748), in two of the 'six';104
Aḥān b. Abī 'Ayyāsh (d. 138/755), whose occurrence in isnāds is also a subject of discussion elsewhere;105
Shu'ba b. al-Ḥajjāj (d. 160/776), a key figure in Iraqi hadīth;106
Mubārak b. Faḍāla (d. 166/782), whose traditions are listed in three of the 'six', and who may be held responsible for 'raising' very many sayings and opinions of Ḥasan al-Ṭaṣrīfī ‘to the level’ of prophetic sayings;107
And finally in this shortlist the famous as well as notorious Syrian al-Walīd b. Muslim (d. ca. 195/810), in whose highly contradictory tarjama in Ibn Ḥajar’s Tahdhib108 we read the highest praise as well as the bitterest criticism and also that he was a rāffa'.

Apart from dozens of other transmitters from the classical collections, one can glean the names of hundreds of people accused of the same practice from Ibn Ḥajar's Lisān. The 'raising' did not in all cases reach the level of a prophetic saying,109 in the majority of cases, however, it did and was many a time the subject of discussion in the early sources.110

Turning back to 'Umar’s saying mentioned above, one is undoubtedly on safe ground when concluding that, if the concept sunna had already been exclusively identified with sunnat an-nabī by the year 23/644, when ‘Umar allegedly made this statement, he would have used this expression and not muḥājirān and anšār, which is, as perhaps demonstrated above, a much wider concept. Differently put, it is significant that ‘Umar did not use the term sunnat an-nabī, if the term sunna had developed into this limited specification already by the time he made this statement.

In sum, although the concept sunnat an-nabī occasionally emerges in the earliest sources, in the vast majority of cases we find merely sunna, with or without the definite article, while the contexts do not make clear to whom and/or to what region the sunna in question is ascribed.

As may have become apparent in the foregoing investigation into the alleged role played by the rāshidūn in transmitting traditions, the position of 'Umar’s successors vis-à-vis sunna or sunnat an-nabī is in no conspicuous way different from that of 'Umar. The same obtains for the first seven

104. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, viii, p. 264.
105. Cf. Chapter iv, p. 144; cf. also Ibn Hibbān, Kitāb al-majrūhīn, i, p. 56.
106. Ibn Hanbal, 'Ilal, i, no. 1794.
109. E.g. Dirīmī, Sunan, p. 81, a maxim concerning the 'idda as starting immediately upon the demise of the husband was first contributed to a Successor and subsequently to a Companion but was never made into a prophetic saying, at least nowhere listed as such.
110. E.g. Ibn Hanbal, 'Ilal, i, no. 2779; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Kitāb al-majrūhīn, i, pp. 18, 66, 76ff., where, among other things, Ibn Hibbān makes the bold, but in my opinion doubtful, statement that the great experts have been successful in sifting the artificially marfū material from the genuine marfū'; Rāmahurmuzī, p. 312, etc. etc.
Umayyad caliphs who, if anything, were merely concerned with countering anti-Umayyad slogans by means of pro-Umayyad ones.\textsuperscript{111}

The development of Islam as a religion in general, and of Islamic precepts in particular\textsuperscript{112} was mainly in the hands of those who are described in the biographical lexica as fuqaha' or 'ulamā'. When conflicts arose between people or solutions were sought to problems of a more general nature from whatever sphere of life, people generally speaking did not go to the ruler\textsuperscript{113} but sought advice from wise men, fuqahā' or 'ulamā'.\textsuperscript{114}

During the time that several of the younger Companions of the prophet were still alive, these were allegedly approached and asked for advice. If this advice was based upon private judgement (ra'y), such a Companion became known as a faqih, and if he chose to refer his interlocutor to the ra'y of a fellow Companion or to an example set by the prophet, which could be taken as a precedent, then this 'knowledge', this 'ilm, earned him the honorific 'ālim. In the study of the qādis of early Islam (Chapter 2) an attempt is made to show that, especially during the earliest years, say the first century of the Hijra, fiqh and 'ilm were only occasionally combined in one and the same person.

And so, in the course of the first/seventh century, Islam can be characterized by two methods of development: the resorting to individual judgement = common sense = ra'y (cf. Chapter 2) as opposed to the quest for, and transmission of, precedent. Previous pages have briefly dealt with the main representatives of the former method (Sa'īd b. al-Musayyab, Ḥasan al-Baṣrī);\textsuperscript{115} we can now concentrate for a while on 'ilm as comprising the knowledge, including the transmission, of āthār, akhūd or āḥādīth, depending on the person(s) to whom these were ascribed.\textsuperscript{116} All three terms

\textsuperscript{111} Abbott's plea (vol. ii, pp. 18-25) for considering the Umayyads as being very much interested in hadith is in my opinion not convincing. In the first place she believes in a chronology of the earliest hadith which predates mine by at least half a century. Thus she accepts at face value Mu'āwiyah's role as a transmitter simply on the basis of the existence of his musnad in, for example, Ibn Ḥanbal, and also that of Marwān b. al-Ḥakam.

\textsuperscript{112} Cf. Wansbrough, Sektarian milieu, p. 123.

\textsuperscript{113} The first to put himself at the disposal of people who sought to solve conflicts (mażālim) was 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz, but it was only under the 'Abbāsid that mażālim sessions became institutionalized, see al-Māwardi, Al-ahkām as-sulṭānīyya, p. 131.

\textsuperscript{114} The dichotomy between 'ilm and fiqh in early usage is very clearly and succinctly outlined in E.I. 2, s.v. fikh (Schacht). For the contrast between sahib hadith and ra'y, see e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal, 'Ilal, i, no. 1212.

\textsuperscript{115} Cf. Ibn Abd al-Barr, Jami', ii, pp. 61f., for a good survey of the earliest Muslims who relied heavily – if not exclusively – on their own personal judgement distributed over the various centres of the empire.

\textsuperscript{116} Usually – but not always – the terms āthār and akhūd refer to statements made by Companions or Successors, whereas the term hadith is usually reserved for prophetic traditions. The use of technical terms is a lot less stringent than, for instance, Sezgin leads us to believe. E.g. cf. how Malik and others are quoted in Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, Jami', ii, pp. 175f.; cf. also al-Khaṭīb, Kifāya, pp. 305–10. Furthermore, we read in Qādī 'Iyād b. Mūsā, Kitāb al-'ilmā, p. 125: āwallu man aḥdatha al-faqīr bayna hādhayni 'i-lafzayni [sc. akhbaranā and ḥaddathanā] Ibn Wahb bi-Mīr [who died in 197/813].
denote transmitted materials often describing *sunnas*, whether of the community as a whole, or specifically of the prophet, or of one specific region or centre, or of one individual other than the prophet.

The first man to apply himself to the concept *sunnat an-nabī* more than to *sunnas* ascribed to other persons or localities was, as Muslim sources inform us, ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz. His request to Abū Bakr b. Muḥammad b. ‘Amr b. Ḥāzm and Zuhrī to note down what *‘ilm* they possessed is well-known and has already been dealt with extensively by others. But in view of the present discussion it may be interesting to look closely once more at the exact wording in which he is alleged to have moulded his request. As recorded in Ibn Sa’d ‘Umar asked literally for (1) *ḥadīth rasūl ‘llāh*; (2) *ṣunna mādiya* (N.B. without the definite article); and (3) *ḥadīth* from ‘Amra bint ‘Abd ar-Rahmān (d. 98/717 or 100/719). Numbers two and three can be construed as not containing exclusively *sunnat an-nabī*, as is the case with number one. In other words, although ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz is described in history as a champion of the prophetic *sunna*, he did not neglect *sunnas* from other sources. This view can be substantiated by passages from the biographies devoted to him.

For example, we find in Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s *Sirāt ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz* a saying attributed to him: *ṣunna rasūl ‘llāh* (ṣ) *waa-wulāt u ’l-amri ba’dahu sunanan* . . . (i.e. the Messenger of God, and after him his successors in office, instituted *sunnas*), which conveys clearly the (still) wide interpretation given to the term *sunna*. And he is also credited with the remark that he would not have been capable of managing the affairs of state properly, if he had not paid heed, apart from the *Qurān* and the *sunna* of the prophet, to other matters . . . *allātī rīn ra’yi n-nās* (i.e. belonging to the people’s private opinions).

‘Umar II was born in 60/680, 61/681 or 63/683, so it can be assumed that he started to emphasize his ideas concerning the *sunnat an-nabī* in any case not earlier than the year 80/700 and probably somewhat later. As noted above, on ‘Umar II’s instigation, in all likelihood after he had become caliph in 99/717, but perhaps somewhat earlier, Zuhrī, who was then allegedly in his forties or fifties, is recorded to have been the first to make an organized collection of all the *‘ilm* he could find. A significant report attributed to Ṣāliḥ b. Kaysān (d. 140/758 or later) describes how Zuhrī went

121. Ibn Sa’d, ii, p. 134.
124. Abū Zur’ā, *Tā’rikh*, p. 569, intimates that he did not live to see 40.
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about it: 'Ibn Shihâb and I', said Sâlih, 'were looking for 'ilm and we agreed to record the sunna. Thus we wrote down everything we heard about the prophet. Then Zuhrî said: "Let us write down what we can find attributed to his Companions." But I said: "No, that is not sunna." Zuhrî, however, insisted that it was and recorded this also.' Added Sâlih ruefully: 'I did not record it, so Zuhrî became a successful traditionist, whereas I did not.'

Even if we have here an instance of organized hadîth collecting, from the prophet as well as from his Companions, it is erroneous to think that this example was immediately and automatically followed in Medina, Syria or in the other main centres of the Islamic empire. A look at the biographies of Zuhrî's contemporaries in those centres demonstrates that hadîth collecting was not yet taken up in any systematic way, at least for some time to come. People in the different centres were scarcely aware of each other's activities. Zuhrî, in any case, appeared to be ignorant of what was going on in other centres. For example, he learned to his astonishment that people such as al-'A'mash (d. 148/765) did indeed possess traditions worthy of being taken into consideration.

As mentioned above, 'Umar II, more than any ruler before him, was determined on granting the sunna of the prophet a position as guiding principle in importance only second to the Qur'ân. He is considered to be the first theoretician of the sunna. But many of his administrators did initially not subscribe to this policy when he became caliph in 99/717. So he allegedly wrote to his governor in Baṣra, 'Adî b. Arîtāt (d. 102/720): It has reached me that you follow the customs (an tastanna bi-sunan) of al-Ḥajjâj ... and in another letter he wrote to one of his governors: I enjoin you ... to follow the sunna of the Messenger of God and to abandon mā aḥḍatha 'l-muhdîthun ba'dahu mimmd qad jard sunnatuhu, this last sentence being an indication that he was aware of the sometimes doubtful role

126. For an assessment of the difficulties concerning the different names various key figures in early Islamic hadîth transmission were known by, such as Zuhrî = Ibn Shihâb, see Chapter 4.

127. Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, Jâmi', I, p. 76. A similar report is attributed to Ābû 'z-Zīnâd (d. 133/751) who confined himself to recording halâl wa-hârdâm, cf. ibidem, p. 73. 'Ābd Allâh b. Dhakwân Ābû 'z-Zīnâd was allegedly born in 64/684, so if we assume that he started writing down halâl wa-hârdâm at an early age, we have here an indication of a time when a man devoted himself exclusively to recording this genre of traditions, namely circa 90/709. Until now I have not found a transmitter who may be assumed to have started this sort of work earlier than Ābû 'z-Zīnâd.

128. Cf. Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, II, p. 34.

129. Awwalu musâkalîmîn 'ahî as-sunan mina 'l-tâbi'in 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azîz wa lahu risâlatun bi'lqâlidhun ft' 'ra-ddî ala' l-qadarîyya, 'Abd al-Qâhir al-Baghîdâdî, Usâl ad-dîn, p. 307, referred to by J. van Es in Abru nahrain, XII, p. 19. The first to be designated thus among the Companions was 'Ālî because of his dispute with the Khârijîtes, cf. ibidem. 'Umar was also called mu'allim al-ulamâ', cf. Ābû Zur'a, Ta'rîkh, p. 520.

played by innovators who obstructed the ‘establishing’ of the prophetic sunna. (Even if it is tempting to read muhaddithūn instead of muḥdithūn, this does not seem to be correct.)

Furthermore, 'Umar II allegedly demanded that the qādis he appointed be possessors of 'ilm who would ask others concerning the issues about which they had no knowledge or who would consult the people of ra'y. When we investigate 'Umar's qādis in more detail, we see that, although this was in theory what he wanted, in practice precious few of his requirements were met. The majority of qādis who held office during his reign in the less important centres can in no way be identified with sunna or tradition transmission.

Ahwāz: Sālim b. Abī Sālim, cf. Waki', Akhbār al-qudāt, iii, p. 320, not listed in the rijāl works;
Arminiya: al-Ḥārith b. 'Amr al-Asadi, cf. Waki', i, p. 264, idem;
Filaṣṭīn: (1) an-Naḍr b. Maryam, cf. Waki', i, p. 264, idem; (2) 'Abd Allāh b. Mawhab, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, vi, p. 47, on the whole little known figure;
Ifrīqiyā: (1) 'Abd ar-Rahmān b. Rāfi', cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, vi, pp. 168f., good faqīh, but his traditions were munkar; (2) Ismāʿīl b. 'Ubayd Allāh b. Abī l-Muhājir, a mawla who died in 131/749, the first reliable transmitter so far, also good faqīh, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, i, pp. 317f.;
al-Jazīra: (1) Maymūn b. Mihrān, allegedly reliable but he transmitted only a few traditions, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, x, pp. 390ff.; (2) 'Adī b. 'Adī b. 'Amīra, faqīh, but there was doubt as to his reliability in ḥadīth, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, vii, pp. 168f., and Ibn Sa'd, vii, p. 179;
Khūrāsān: al-Jarrāḥ b. 'Abd Allāh, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, i, pp. 251 and 285, not identified with sunnat an-nabī;
Mawṣil: Yahyā b. Yahyā b. Qays, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, xi, pp. 299f., faqīh, but only a few traditions;
Ṣanāʾ: Wabī b. Munabbih, thiqa, but also considered weak, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, xi, pp. 166ff.;
Yemen: 'Urwa b. Muḥammad as-Sa'dī, had to use his ra'y, cf. Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, Jāmi', ii, p. 60;
As for Damascus, the capital of the Umayyads, according to Wakī', iii, pp. 203f., a totally non-descript qādi, one 'Abd ar-Rahmān b. al-Ḥasās, served under 'Umar II; also one Sulaymān b. Ḥabīb is mentioned, cf. Abū Zur'a, Ta'rikh, p. 202, and Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, iv, p. 178.

As for the qādis in the main centres, we find for Baṣra Iyās b. Muʿāwiyah

133. Ibidem, lines 21f.: 'alimum bimā kāna qablahu yastashīru dhawi 'r-ra'y.
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(d. 122/739) who can hardly be associated with hadīth or sunna, but who was a goodfaqīh, though,134 and Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, whose alleged activities in hadīth transmission are doubtful in the extreme as elucidated below (pp. 49–54).135 In Kūfa‘Umar allegedly had a qāḍī who was very much concerned with hadīth (according to Ibn Sa’d), al-Qāsim b. ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān (d. 120/737), a grandson of Ibn Mas‘ūd, but whoseṣam‘ā‘from his informants is generally doubted, which means that in all probability someone anonymous used his name in fabricatedīsnāds or he is himself to be held responsible for that material with the transmission of which he is credited.136 Finally for Medina we find‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān b. Ma‘mar b. Ḥazm (d. 134/751), who is ḳāṭīr al-hadīth, but also qualified asṣadīq137 and Abū Bakr b. Muḥammad b. ‘Amr b. Ḥazm mentioned above (p. 34). So it is only in Medina that ‘Umar’sqādis more or less met the requirements he is reported to have stipulated.138 Even so, when the son of the last mentionedqāḍī, called Muḥammad (d. 132/749), wasqādí Medina, he passed sentence on the basis of the generally held practice of Medina rather than on the basis of ḥadīth, this practice being considered as more binding (in Arabic:aqwā) than hadīth.139 It is safe to assume that this ‘practice’ is none other than that based upon the ra‘y of the famous Medinanfuqahā‘(e.g. Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyab a.o.) whose alleged activities in hadīth transmission were discussed above (pp. 15f.) as probably unfounded, an issue which will again be referred to below on pp. 42f.

‘Umar II’s own role in transmitting traditions should, furthermore, not be overrated. It is true that we have a musnad140 exclusively devoted to all the traditions in whose transmission he supposedly has been instrumental. Thismusnad contains in all forty-three different traditions going back to the prophet. Theīsnāds show an as yet very primitive state and are, according to the criteria developed in laterrijālcriticism, for the most part to be considered weak. An opinion as to whether these traditions, or at least a few of them, can be taken as historically genuine utterances of the prophet is, as is always the case in these matters, difficult to form. The various

135. About one‘Abd al-Malik b. Ya‘lā‘al-Laythi (d. between 100/719 and 104/723) it is not certain whether he served asqāḍī under ‘Umar II or someone else. In any case, he is in no way identified with traditions, cf. Ibn Hajar, Tahdhib, vi, pp. 429f., where it says that he is only mentioned in Bukhārī’sta‘līqā‘.
138. Not even that! ‘Umar’sqādis during his governorship was‘Abd ar-Raḥmān b. Yazīd b. Jāriya (d. 93/712), listed asqālī al-hadīth in Ibn Sa’d, v, pp. 60f.; anyway, every time ‘Umar himself had to give aqāda‘, he consulted Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyab, ibidem, p. 90.
140. It was edited by A. H. Harley inJASB, n.s. xx, 1924, pp. 391–488, henceforth quoted as ‘Harley’. 
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precepts regarding the proper execution of the salāt and other references to ritual may very well be historical, and this in spite of their isnāds showing 'defects', but, for instance, the obvious vaticinatio post eventum in which the prophet allegedly referred to the qadar issue is very probably a forgery of a rāwī occurring in the second tier above 'Umar II. Furthermore, when a suspect saying attributed to Mu‘awiya is examined, who is then quoted as quoting the prophet, a likely candidate for having brought this tradition into circulation can be found in the rāwī again two tiers above 'Umar. Given the fact that the number of traditions transmitted by him as referred to in an early biography (Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam's) and even in a late one (Ibn al-Jawzi's) is extremely limited, the conclusion seems justified that, even if his emphasis on prophetic sunna is accepted as historically established, 'Umar II cannot in any way be identified with the knowledge and/or the transmission of a sizable number of prophetic traditions. This conclusion is, moreover, borne out by the near-absence of traditions in a text where we would have expected them most. I am referring, of course, to an epistle attributed to him, Radd 'alā 'l-qadariyya, allegedly written toward the end of his life. If anywhere, it is in this text that 'Umar would have adduced what appropriate traditions he knew of in support of his argument. That he does not can have in my view only one feasible explanation, that is that appropriate traditions had not yet been brought into circulation.

Other documents belonging to the earliest remnants of Arabic literature, i.e. going back to the first/seventh century, bear out the conclusion

141. This rāwī is 'Umar b. Yazīd an-Naṣrī (or: Nadīrī, fl. 125/743), a notorious manipulator of isnāds (and not the rāwī identified by Harley, cf. p. 483), who is listed in Dhahabi's Mizān al-l'tīdāl as having transmitted – which I interpret as 'having forged' – this very same tradition. Cf. Harley, p. 439 and Dhahabi, i, pp. 231f.

142. This rāwī is 'Abd al-Jabbar b. 'Umar al-Ayli (d. between 160/777 and 170/786), a mawla of the clan of Umayya. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, vi, p. 104, quotes a remark of 'Alī b. 'Umar al-Ḥarbi (d. 386/996) concerning him, namely kāna yatafaqqahu, which may be interpreted as 'devoting himself to fiqh' as well as 'posing as a faqih'. His having been a mawla of the clan of Umayya, as well as his alleged interest in fiqh, both aptly corroborate the hypothesis that he is to be 'credited' with this report ascribed to Mu‘awiya in which the latter ridicules the achievements of the Medinese in fiqh matters emphasizing his own. Cf. Harley, pp. 423, 442f.

143. Furthermore, 'Umar does not (yet) find it imperative to mention the isnāds of the sayings he is reported as having quoted, cf. Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam, Sira, pp. 103, 107; Jamharat rasāl al-ʿarab, ed. Ahmad Zakī Şafwat, vol. ii, Cairo 1937, p. 337. At any rate, his predilection for traditions may be due to the influence 'Umar II supposedly underwent from the qāsī/qādī Muslim b. Jundab (d. 106/724), cf. Abū Zur‘a, Ta‘rīkh, p. 568, Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, x, p. 124.

144. Cf. the edition by J. van Ess in Anfänge muslimischer Theologie, Beirut 1977, pp. 43–54 of the Arabic text.
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derived from the foregoing, namely that traditions came relatively late into existence together with, and probably also because of, the concept *sunna* being narrowed down to *sunnat an-nabi* only as late as toward the end of the first/seventh century. The (near-) absence of traditions in these early documents can surely only be accounted for if the theories outlined in the above are accepted.

The earliest development of the hadith centres

In the following I should like to concentrate on the earliest development of hadith transmission and collection as carried out in the various centres. It is hoped to demonstrate that during the last two or three decades of the first century of the Hijra/the 70os-72os A.D. the interest for hadith slowly increased in the separate administrative centres of the Islamic empire.

It is on purpose that these centres are referred to as ‘separate’. One overall characteristic of hadith evolution in its earliest stages deserves to be emphasized before anything else. In the beginning there was little or no contact between the centres especially if they were far apart. In other words, in each centre there circulated different hadiths. Initially collectors of hadith traveled only rarely to other centres to learn with new masters, at least during the first/seventh century. In this investigation into this early development I have come to recognize that the vast majority of isnāds, as far as their three oldest transmitters are concerned, can be considered as being particular to one centre. At a somewhat later stage, say, during the first few decades of the second century/the 720s-75os A.D., contacts do seem to have been established between centres and we witness the emergence of isnāds that can be labeled as being particular to more than one centre. The next section of this chapter will deal with the evolution of the ṭalaḥ al-ʿilm which gave rise to these isnāds of ‘mixed’ origin. But first I propose to classify isnāds, concentrating exclusively on their oldest transmitters, into the following principle categories: Hijāzi, Egyptian, Syrian and Iraqi.

Taking these categories now one by one, the earliest history of hadith may be depicted on the basis of the isnāds characteristic of each.


According to the number of Successors active in the main cities, Mecca and Medina, we may conclude that more people occupied themselves with hadith in the latter. But this does not mean that the position of Mecca as a hadith centre should be underrated, at least not if we take its number of alleged hadith transmitters as something to go by. The Companions to whom we find most traditions traced back are the four ‘Abādila (i.e. Ibn ‘Umar, Ibn ‘Abbās, Ibn ‘Amr and Ibn az-Zubayr), ‘Ā’ishah and Jābir b. ‘Abd
Allāh. In Mecca a certain number of Successors allegedly held key positions in the transmission of ḥadīths. Of these should be mentioned here Mecca's first qaṣṣ, ʻUbayd b. ʻUmayr (d. 68/687), the mawlā Miqsam b. Bujra (d. 101/720), the mawlā Mujāhid b. Jabr (d. ± 102/721), Ibn Abī Mulayka (d. 117/735), the mawlā ʻAmr b. Dinār (d. 125/742), the mawlā Abū ʻz-Zubayr (d. 126/743) and finally the mawlā Abū Suṣfān ʻAlī b. Nāfī (d. ± 120/738) who settled later in life in Wāṣīf from where his ḥadīth became known with Iraqi transmitters. Supposedly one of the first Successors to introduce Iraqi material into Mecca was Abū Umayya ʻAbd al-Karīm (d. 127/744).

As far as knowledge of fiqh matters is concerned, pride of place goes perhaps to the mawlā ʻAṭā b. Abī Rabāḥ (d. 114/732), whose fatwās are reported to have been widely sought and whose expertise in manāsik, i.e. ḥajj ceremonials, was allegedly unrivaled. He probably was one of those fuqahā' whose legal decisions, either through his own endeavours or at the hands of anonymous others, were in the course of time moulded into prophetic sayings, a procedure mooted on pp. 15f. above and again in more detail on pp. 42f. below. Proof for this surmise can be gleaned from the fact that his samā' from a large number of Companions is doubted and that he is 'credited' with numerous mursalāt which did not enjoy general acceptance.146

2. Medina

Because of the large number of Successors who allegedly transmitted traditions in Medina from a sizable number of different Companions, it is difficult to give accurate figures.

As far as the Companions are concerned, not one of the important figures is exclusively Medinan, as is sometimes the case with other Companions who appear in the isnāds of only one centre. For Medina the Companions Abū Hurayra, ʻĀ'isha and Zayd b. Thābit are of major importance, but they also emerge in isnāds centring on Successors of other centres. Another Companion, who is perhaps the most clear-cut example of one who is claimed by two centres, is Anas b. Mālik.147 It is hard to say whether the Baṣrān isnāds with his name outnumber the Medinan ones. But a distinction is easily made when the provenance of the Successor, who allegedly heard with him, is investigated.

As for the Successors of Medina, they are far too numerous to list in toto. If we want to begin with the most important one, mention should be made in the first place of Ibn Shihāb az-Zuhri (d. 124/742). No matter what

147. Cf. M. J. Kister, On 'concessions' and conduct, p. 12. It is difficult to keep track of where Anas was during the last few decades of his life. But we find, for instance, that he was supposedly in Medina when ʻUmar II was appointed governor there (from 867-705/6 until 93/712), cf. Ibn Sa'd, v, p. 244; Khalifa, Ta'rikh, p. 315.
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criteria one applies to the historical value of isnāds, no list of early authorities is complete without Zuhri being included. Zuhri is at the same time one of those characteristic figures who was active in two centres, Medina and Damascus. Isnāds that mention Zuhri are therefore either Medinan or Syrian depending on the provenance of the transmitters who learned from him and also on the provenance of several of his masters, e.g. Abū Idrīs al-Khawlānī (d. 80/699) who supposedly was only active in Syria.

Besides, for various materials Iraqi tradition centres also claim Zuhri as their informant. It turns out, however, that the large number of so-called pupils of Zuhri in Iraq, who asserted that they had heard traditions with him, were practically all exposed in the rijāl works as having falsely claimed to have been pupils of Zuhri. In Chapter 4 a special study will be devoted to Zuhri. There the theory will be presented, with supporting evidence, that possibly those people mentioned by the nisba Zuhri in otherwise Iraqi isnāds may be considered as having been among the numerous transmitters with that nisba active in Iraq who were called, or who called themselves, by that nisba. This was only to lend the isnād in which they appeared more prestige, a clear-cut case of deception known as tadlis.

As mentioned above (p. 34) Zuhri was allegedly the first to make a systematic collection of hadīth and all other traditions while making consistent use of isnāds. Born in 50/670, 51/671 or between 56/676 and 58/678, we may therefore assume that he started his activities absolutely not earlier than 70/689 and most probably several – perhaps ten – years later. His samā' from Ibn 'Umar, who died in 74/793, for one thing, is doubted.

Other allegedly major hadīth transmitters among the Successors of Medina were:
'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Utba (d. between 92/711 and 99/718);
'Urwa b. az-Zubayr (d. between 92/711 and 101/720);
Abū Bakr b. 'Abd ar-Rahmān b. al-Ḥārith (d. 93/712);

148. The notorious forger 'Abd Allāh b. Ziyād Ibn Sam'ān, one time qādī of Medina, only transmitted his fabricated traditions in Syria, naming Zuhri as one of his masters, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, v, pp. 219ff., and Ibn Ḥanbal, 'Ilal, i, no. 652.
149. See below in Chapter 4, pp. 146-58, and especially notes 57 and 64.
150. Not earlier, since the phenomenon of children collecting traditions emerges only at a later stage. Cf. Rāmahurmuzi, pp. 185f., where Zuhri is reported to have said that he had never seen anyone in search of traditions younger than Ibn 'Uyayna who was only fifteen years old at the time. Ibn 'Uyayna was born in 107/725; Zuhri must, therefore, have made this statement – if he made it – in 122/740. As I said, whether or not this report is historical is doubtful. If Ibn 'Uyayna really met Zuhri, while he supposedly died in 198/814, as the sources assert, he must have reached the for those days incredible age of 91 (lunar) years. Compare my exposé on the 'age trick' below, pp. 46ff.; cf. also Rāmahurmuzi, pp. 198ff. and in al-Khaṭīb, Kifāya, p. 359, we read a report in which samā' between Zuhri and Ibn 'Uyayna is subjected to serious doubt. Furthermore, cf. Dhahabi, Ahl al-mi'a fa-sā'idan, no. 47.
151. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, ix, p. 450 (penult.).
Abū Salama b. ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān (d. 94/713 or 104/723);
Khārijī b. Zayd b. Thābit (d. 99/718 or 100/719);
al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad (d. 106/725);
Sālim b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb (d. 106/725).\textsuperscript{152}
All these were major representatives of what later came to be called a madhhab.\textsuperscript{153} They were reputed to share the following characteristics, which they had in common with Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyab (d. between 93/712 and 100/719): all were Arabs, they were all great experts in fīqh matters, noted for the large number of traditions they were supposed to have transmitted and, in addition to this, they were all known for īrsāl or, differently put, several cases of ābdā‘ from Companions were doubted in the case of each of these.

Famous māwlās noted for the same qualities and shortcomings were:
Sulaymān b. Yaṣār (d. 107/726);
Nāfi‘, Ibn ‘Umar’s māwlā (d. 117/735 or 120/738);
Muḥammad b. ‘Ajlān (d. 148/765).

As I have tried to demonstrate above (pp. 15f.), it is more than likely that the bulk of traditions in the transmission of which these early fuqahā‘ were supposedly instrumental, started life as legal opinions of these fuqahā‘ themselves who merely expressed their own personal judgement. These opinions or legal advices were in the course of time ‘raised to the level’ (in Arabic: marfū‘) of prophetic sayings, when the emphasis on the concept sunnat an-nabi had eclipsed sunan of Companions and Successors. That their legal decisions, or as they were called above ad hoc solutions to problems presented to them, were in the course of time moulded into decisions of the prophet, can also be inferred from the confusion concerning sāmdā‘ from many of their informants.\textsuperscript{154}

Not of every major faqih have private statements and rulings survived in the canonical collections. Here follows a selection of those that have. This list could easily be extended and is only meant as a representative cross-section.

‘Urwa b. az-Zubayr:

(1) A statement in Dārāmī, muqaddima 17 (= p. 28) is in Ibn Māja a prophetic tradition (muqaddima 8, = 1, p. 21).

(2) The way in which he wiped his shoes (mash al-khuffayn) described in Mālik, tāḥārā 45 (= 1, p. 38), is also found supported by numerous different īsnāds traced to the prophet, passim in the ‘six’.

(3) An ablution rule (Mālik, tāḥārā 61, = 1, p. 43), is in slightly different wording traced to the prophet (Ibn Māja, tāḥārā 63, = 1, p. 161).

\textsuperscript{152} The famous īsnād ending in Sālim – Ibn ‘Umar – prophet was used by, among others, one ‘Amr b. Dinār (Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, viii, no. 46, allegedly not the famous traditionist from Mecca) to substantiate munkar material.

\textsuperscript{153} Cf. Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Taqdimā, p. 252, where ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān b. Mahdī is labeled as also an adherent of the madhhab tāḥī‘i or the Madīna.

\textsuperscript{154} Cf. pp. 15f. above. The statements and judgements of these Successors were collected in the same way as other material, cf. Ibn Ḥanbal, ‘Ijtil, 1, nos. 1445, 1456.
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Abū Bakr b. 'Abd ar-Rahmān b. al-Ḥārith:

1) In Mālik, *safar* 23 (= 1, p. 150) we find a custom of his, which was also practised by the prophet (cf. no. 26, = 1, p. 151).


Al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad:


2) After a tradition about the prophet’s custom regarding Qur'ān recitation in the *ṣalāt* (Mālik, 1, p. 84) there follows a similar custom of al-Qāsim (ibidem, p. 85).

3) Al-Qāsim’s custom concerning the shaving of his head (Mālik, *hajj* 185, = 1, p. 395) is simply juxtaposed to the custom of the prophet (ibidem, no. 184).

Sālim b. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Umar:

1) Proud of his descent from 'Umar, Sālim haughtily asserts that he does not go near a menstruating woman (Dārīmi, *wudā`* 107, = p. 128).

2) Sālim performs the *ṣalāt* without a *wudā`* for a nosebleed (Mālik, *tahāra* 50, = 1, p. 39).


Other famous Successors from Medina, not generally recognized for their insight in *fiqh* matters but allegedly major transmitters of *ḥadīth*, were the following persons, all mawlās:

Dhakwān Abū Šālih (d. 101/720);

'Āṭa’ b. Yasār, the well-known *qādī* (d. 103/722);

Sa‘īd b. Abī Sa‘īd al-Maqbūrī (d. between 117/735 and 123/741);

Shu‘abīl b. Sa‘īd (d. 123/741), allegedly an expert on those who fought at Badr;

Šālih b. Nabhān (d. 125/743), suspected of having spread *mawdū‘āt* on the authority of *thiqāt*;

'Abd Allāh b. Dīnār (d. 127/745);

'Abd Allāh b. Dhakwān, better known as Abū ‘z-Zinād (d. 130/748).

This is just a sample but, perhaps, a representative one. Every one of them is recorded in the *rijāl* works as having had one or more cases of *samā‘* and/or *liqā‘* questioned. We may conclude from this that those early transmitters were not (yet) concerned so much with recording the names of their informants and, furthermore, since *rijāl* criticism got under way at the earliest only some half a century later, that too much time had elapsed for establishing the historicity of these links with any degree of certainty.

Through the activities of Medinese Successors other *ḥadīth* centres came into being, notably Yemen where the *mawla* Tāwūs b. Kaysān (d. 101/720 or 106/725) settled. He was also suspected of *irsāl*. And also the *ḥadīth* centre to be dealt with next owed a great deal to Medinese Successors, Egypt.
2. Egyptian isnāds

Of the Companions heading many Egyptian isnāds, among others 'Uqba b. 'Āmir should be mentioned, who was made governor of Egypt by Mu'āwiya in 44/664. Among the Successors of typically Egyptian isnāds no one stands out in particular. As alluded to in the awā'il section of this chapter and also pointed out in Chapter 2, in Egypt the transmission of traditions came relatively late into full swing with the well-known 'Abd Allāh b. Lahi'a (d. 174/790) who, with his pupil 'Abd Allāh b. Wahb (d. 198/813), can rightly be considered as the originators of hadīth circulation in the province, but with the consideration that the bulk of their material was supposedly gathered in various Iraqi hadīth centres and not in Egypt itself. When we scrutinize, for example, Ibn Wahb's Jāmi', it appears that a large percentage of the isnāds is Iraqi judging by the provenance of the transmitters at the Successors' level or the one following that.

The regional character of Egyptian traditions is, perhaps, no better illustrated than in the words of Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam: '... now follows an enumeration of those Companions from whom the Egyptians transmitted [traditions] ... and of those Companions from whom also people outside Egypt (ahl al-buldān) transmitted'. Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam's work is remarkable in another respect. In his enumeration of allegedly Egyptian traditions he very often mentions the key figures of Egyptian hadīth, such as Ibn Lahi'a and al-Layth b. Sa'd, at the beginning of the isnāds. Then he proceeds by enumerating the older rijāl down to the prophet plus the matn, after which he enumerates the one or two younger transmitters bridging the period between himself and Ibn Lahi'a, al-Layth or other key figures. It seems as if he tacitly indicates that Egyptian hadīth began roughly in the time of these key figures and that the names of the older transmitters in the isnād were simply added for completion's sake. A closer scrutiny of these transmitters makes rapidly clear that the vast majority were indeed unknown, if not fictitious, people about whom the rijal works offer only scant and mostly contradictory information. All these isnāds may be considered, possibly, as dating from a time not earlier than the first half of the second/eighth century.

3. Syrian isnāds

Above mention has already been made of Ibn Shihāb az-Zuhri's role in transmitting traditions supposedly heard with Medinan as well as Syrian informants. 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz, whose activities with hadīth were scrutinized in the previous section of this chapter, can also be considered as

156. The difference between Zuhri's Medinan and Syrian hadīths is, for example, referred to in his words: ... wa-lam asma' hadīhā 'i-hadīth ūtāyu 'sh-Shām, cf. Ḥumaydī, Musnad, ii, no. 875.
someone who established a link between Medina and Damascus and their respective tradition materials. Other well-known Successors, who should however be identified solely with Syrian hadith as allegedly obtained from such Companions as Mu‘adh b. Jabal, ‘Ubāda b. as-Šāmīt – both famous for their expertise in fiqh matters – and Abū ‘d-Dardā‘, are Abū Idrīs ‘A‘īdh Allāh b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Khawlānī (d. 80/699), qāṣṣ and qāḍī of Damascus, and the mawlās Shahr b. Hawshab (d. 111/729) and Makhūl (d. sometime between 112/730 and 118/736), all three supposedly well-versed in fiqh matters. The remarks made in connection with Medina’s fuqahā’ are applicable here too. Moreover, several cases of irdāl are imputed to them. That Syrian traditions were relatively late in gaining recognition is reflected in a remark of the Iraqi expert ‘Amr b. ‘Ali al-Fallās (d. 249/863) who said literally that among the first Syrian transmitters, who were not da‘if, were one Sa‘īd b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz (d. 167/783) and Awzā‘ī (d. 158/774). Even so, opinions about Awzā‘ī are mixed; whereas Shāfi‘ī is reported to have said that he had never set eyes on anyone whose fiqh so much resembled his hadith – one may ask, what came first? – Ibn Ḥanbal declared that Awzā‘ī’s hadith was weak.

Damascene isnāds are, finally, not the only isnāds particular to Syria; a limited number of isnāds are also found containing from the tier following the Successor’s level only people hailing from Ḥims. And, to name one more example, also the border town (in Arabic: thaghr or ribāṭ) Maṣṣiṣa developed its own hadith activities.

4. Iraqi isnāds

According to the transmitters mentioned at the Successors’ level and the following one, Iraqi isnāds can be subdivided into Baṣrān and Kūfān, but

157. An example of a transmitter whose attempt at collecting materials from both centres was not deemed successful was Ismā‘īl b. ‘Ayyāsh (d. 181/797), cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, i, pp. 323ff.

158. Ascribed to Makhūl we find the maxim: kullu muskirin šarām (cf. Nasā‘ī, ashriba 53, last line, = viii, p. 331). And the statement: man šalaba ‘l-i‘īm etc. is listed in Dārīmī, muqaddima 34 (= p. 57) first as Makhūl’s and then as a mursal. In Mālik, aqdiya 44 (= ii, p. 756) he is listed as consulting a fellow faqih from Medina.

Shahr b. Hawshab reports a saying of Luqmān (Dārīmī, muqaddima 34, = p. 57) which is also listed as a prophetic tradition in Ibn Māja, muqaddima 23 (= i, p. 93). The saying: man ja’ala humāha hamman waḥidan etc., ascribed in Abū Nu‘aym, Ḥilya, v, p. 123, to Abū Idrīs, is also listed in Ibn Māja, muqaddima 23 (= i, p. 95) as a prophetic saying. See for Abū Idrīs also E.I. 2, s.v. al-Khawlānī.


161. First and foremost among Ḥims’s transmitters was Ismā‘īl b. ‘Ayyāsh, cf. note 157 above.

162. With the arrival of Ibn Ibrāhim b. Muhammad b. al-Ḥarīth Abū Ishāq al-Fazārī (d. 185–890/4), cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, i, p. 152, who disseminated mainly Kūfān material.
we also find *isnāds* with one early authority from the one city and his pupil from the other; we call these Baṣran/Kūfān.

Even more so than was the case with Successors from the other centres dealt with so far, a surprisingly large percentage of Iraqi Successors supposedly lived to such a ripe old age that I have developed the theory that lying about one's year of birth must have been common practice. Living conditions in seventh and eighth century Iraq cannot have been easy and simply do not admit of the supposition that the vast majority of tradition transmitters died at an age considerably more advanced than the average age reached by males living in the twentieth century in, for example, the West. This deceit is what I have come to call the 'age trick'; it deserves, I think, a short digression, because so many Iraqi Successors as well as later transmitters, also from other centres, resorted to it.

The credulity on the part of the living when confronted with the age which elderly people claimed to have reached is attested in the *tarjama* of the famous Companion 'Ammār b. Yāsir. There it is reported that 'everybody agreed' that when he finally met his end, fighting at the side of 'Alī at Ṣiffin(!) in 37/658, he was ninety-three years old. But lying about one's age cannot have been all that difficult. If one, for example, persuaded one's descendants to spread the story of one's fictitious year of birth, scarcely anyone among the living would be able to testify to the contrary. Ibn Ḥanbal seems to have believed a daughter's assertion that her father was 120 years old when he died. This automatically enabled this man to claim the coveted status of Companion. And when one Yazid b. Muslim al-Hamdānī told him that he was 135, which could earn him the status of Successor, Ibn Ḥanbal did not comment upon that either. Anas b. Mālik's alleged late year of death, 90/708, especially constituted an obvious challenge for those who wanted to be included in the generation of Successors by claiming that they had heard traditions from him. Later

---

163. This may also have struck A. H. Harley, for in his edition of 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz's *Musnad* he referred to the 'remarkable longevity' of certain traditionists, cf. p. 411. He did not follow it up, though, as far as I know.

164. I have proposed this theory on an earlier occasion at a colloquium on early Islamic history held at Oxford in July 1975. See my *On the origins of Arabic prose*, pp. 170ff.


167. Cf. M. Muranyi, *Die Prophetengenossen in der frühislamischen Geschichte*, pp. 21–29, for an appraisal of the merits Companions were deemed to have, which could not be attained by later generations. Likewise Successors enjoyed higher esteem than Successors of Successors. Cf. *Ilāl*, i, no. 6.


A tentative chronology of the origins

rijāl critics must have known of this fraud for they coined the phrase uh-subihu bi 'sinin (compute someone’s age and that of his informant). 171

This phenomenon also gave rise to various traditions dealing with the ideal age for a man to engage in hadīth transmission or other activities. A Bāṣrān tradition has the prophet say: ‘The average age [at death] of my community is between fifty and sixty; only a few will reach seventy’. 172 And Rāmahurmuzi declared that a traditionist could be expected to pursue his activities best in his forties, or at most his fifties; as already referred to above (p. 41, n. 150), a traditionist should not start his search for traditions before he has reached his twenties. 173 Rāmahurmuzi confessed to being thunderstruck by those transmitters still carrying on while in their eighties, the age of senility. 174 On the other hand, we also find traditions countering the ones just mentioned. Hushaym b. Bashir (d. 183/799), a transmitter of highly doubtful reliability but of enormous productivity, mentioned that the traditionists of Medina, by mouth of Ṣafwān b. Sulaym az-Zuhrī and others, claimed that the prophet once said that God loved octogenarians (in a mursal tradition). 175

came to Medina when ‘Umar II was appointed governor. For a list of Anas’ more disreputable ‘pupils’, see Appendix II.

171. Cf. al-Khaṭīb, Kifāya, pp. 119f. Of course, not everybody was believed on his word: Zakariyya’ b. Durayd’s (or Duwayd’s) claim that he was 135 years old seems to have been dismissed, cf. Ibn al-Jawzī, Kītāb al-mawdū‘āt, 1, p. 325, and Ḏhahābī, Mīzān, 1, p. 72. And one al-Muẓaffar b. ‘Āṣim, who claimed at one time to be 189 years old, was not believed either, cf. Ibn al-Jawzī, 11, p. 40, and Ḏhahābī, Mīzān, 11, p. 131. That the age trick as such seems not to have escaped detection in some cases, may be distilled from the exclamation (Ibn Ḥajar, Taḥdīḥ, vi, p. 363): fa-qultu [li-Abū Mus‘ab] yuhaddithu [*Abd al-'Azīz b. Yahyā] ‘an Sulaymān b. Bilāl fa-qāla: kadhdḥāb! ana akbaru minhu wa-mā adraituhi.


173. In Ibn al-Jawzī, Kītāb al-mawdū‘āt, 1, p. 233, we find the tradition: istawdī‘ t-l-'ima ‘l-ahdāha idh radītumāhunum, attributed to al-Walīd b. Muhammad al-Mūqārī (d. 182/798). Perhaps this forged saying may be interpreted as heralding the phenomenon of children as hadith collectors. And the notorious forger Wahb b. Wahb Abū ‘l-Bakhtārī (d. 200/816) is alleged to have fabricated the ‘prophetic’ saying: irḥāmā . . . ‘aliman tātalā ‘abī bhihi ‘s-sibyān, cf. Ibidem, pp. 236f.

174. Cf. Rāmahurmuzi, pp. 352, 353 and 354. In Wākī’, 11, p. 54, we read that the first white hairs in a transmitter’s beard may be taken as an indication that he has reached the proper age for handling traditions.

I have dealt with the ‘age trick’ in some detail because it surely is a major feature of early muhaddithūn and its inclusion in this survey of Iraqi isnāds stems from the conviction that this fraud was practised in Iraq on a scale vaster than in any other centre. But that it was practised everywhere goes without saying and can easily be inferred from the – on the whole – incredibly advanced ages that traditionists all over the Islamic empire claimed to have reached.

Iraqi tradition centres are, furthermore, characterized by various features not found – at least not so conspicuously – in other centres. For example, it was in Basra that the discussions on predestination (qadar) started. The majority of traditions against this issue are, as a result, supported by isnāds of transmitters from that city. Kūfa, on the other hand, from its founding had always been the strong-hold par excellence of 'Alī b. Abī Ţalīb’s supporters. The majority of tarājim of Kufan transmitters, especially the tābaqāt of the Successors and the one following, contain as a consequence references to tashayyu’ in a wide variety of gradations, from lukewarm to fanatical.

What tashayyu’ meant in the usage of tradition experts is neatly summarized by Ibn Hajar in the following words:

176. A piece of corroborating evidence can be found in Ibn Sa’d’s tarjama of one an-Nu‘mān b. Bashir (vi, p. 35), where we read that he was the first anṣārī baby to be born after the Hijra, namely after some fourteen months. But as for the Kūfans: .. . fa-yaruwāna ‘anhū riwāyātan kathāratan yaqūlu fīhā samītu rasūla ‘Ilāhi (3) fa-dalla ’ālā annahu akbāru sinnan mimām rawā aḥlu ‘l-Madīna fī mawlidih.

177. That also the opposite occurred is proved by the fact that there was a proverb that said: akẖābū mīn shaykh gharīb, which is explained as referring to elderly men who sought to marry (young) women of their choice by lying about their age. Claiming to be thirty years younger than one’s actual age was apparently no exception, cf. Ibn Shidhan, Adab al-wuzurā, p. 144, and Maydānī, Majma’ al-amthāl, no. 3196.

178. Awwalu man takallama fī ‘l-qadar bi ‘l- Banār Ma’bad al-Juhānī (d. between 80 and 90/699 and 709) Ibn Hajar, Tahḏīb, x, p. 225, and also: awwalu man nataqatu fī ‘l-qadar . . . Sawṣan kāna nasrāniyyan . . . fa-akhdāhā ‘anhū Ma’bad (ibidem, p. 226); other reports mention Yūnus al-Awsārī, cf. Ibn Hajar, Līṣān, vi, p. 335, and Abū ‘l-Aswad (d. 69/689), cf. Abū ‘l-Qāsim al-Balkhī, Qabūl al-akhbār, p. 213, and Ibn Bāṭish, ii, p. 107. This last awā’il report should, I think, not be accepted without reservation, since Abū ‘l-Aswad is also mentioned in another one, in which he is earmarked as the first to have busied himself with grammar (awwalu man takallama fī ‘n-nahw, cf. Ibn Hajar, Tahḏīb, xii, p. 10). At some stage in the transmission the words qadar and nahw might have been confused (?). But, in fact, he does appear in qadar traditions, see J. van Ess, Zwischen Hadit und Theologie, pp. 47f., 51; cf. also his Ma’bad al-Guhanā, in Festschrift Meier, pp. 49–77.

179. The first record of a Qadarite in Egypt, whose function as a professional witness at court was discontinued because of his convictions, dates to the year 200/815, cf. Kindi, Governors, p. 422.


181. Cf. Tahḏīb, i, p. 94.
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Tashayyu’, in the usage of the scholars of old (al-mutaqaddimān), is the belief that ‘Ali is to be preferred to ‘Uthmān and that ‘Ali had the right on his side in his wars and that those who opposed him were in the wrong, but with the belief that the two shaykhs (i.e. Abū Bakr and ‘Umar) are to be given precedence as well as preference. Sometimes the belief that ‘Ali is the most excellent of all creatures after the Messenger of God is held by some, but when they express this belief out of pious considerations, in sincerity and religious fervour, their transmission of traditions ought not to be rejected because of this, especially if they do not pose as propagandists (of this doctrine).

As for tashayyu’ in the usage of later tradition scholars (al-muta’akhkhirān), that is tantamount to downright rejection (in Arabic: raf’d mahd, sc. of all first three caliphs) and, consequently, the transmission of an extreme Rāfiḍite ought not to be accepted.

I shall now deal with the principal Successors of each centre.

Baṣra.

In Baṣra two people stand out above everybody else, Ḥasan al-Baṣrī and Muḥammad b. Sīrīn (both died within a few months of one another in 110/728–9). Doubt has already been expressed above (p. 17) as to Ḥasan’s position among transmitters of traditions. Here the theory is proposed that he is one of those early devout Muslims reputed for his insight in all matters of pious behaviour whose advice was sought in so many problems concerning fiqh as well as faith that he became known as an overall expert,182 but that his activities in the transmission of hadiths, if anything at all, are at best minimal. Strong supporting evidence for this theory is found in an argumentum e silentio, which was already adduced by others,184 namely that early treatises attributed to Ḥasan do not contain any hadiths, even in contexts where these would have fitted admirably. Therefore, it is surely not far wrong to infer from this that, even if appropriate traditions had already been brought into circulation at the time Ḥasan wrote his epistles, he either did not know about them – which is at best unlikely – or he left them deliberately unmentioned – which is even more unlikely. Either way


184. E.g. J. van Ess, Zwischen, pp. 31, 51; the same, Umar II and his epistle against the Qadariya, p. 23. Moreover, in the epistles ascribed to Ḥasan collected in Ḥamharat rasā’il al-‘arab, pp. 378–391, there is not one tradition either. Whether or not these epistles are genuinely Ḥasan’s is open to doubt.
he cannot possibly be identified with hadith transmission on any measurable scale, if at all. But as his fame spread, a rapidly increasing number of people falsely claimed, especially after his death, that they had heard traditions with him. This can be substantiated with the following evidence.

Over the years I have collected the names of some 380 people who are alleged to have heard traditions with Hasan, culled from a number of different sources. That the vast majority of these were inexperienced transmitters appears from the overall defectiveness characterizing most Hasan al-Baṣrī isnāds. This resulted in his tarjama in the rijāl works, notably the one in Ibn Ḥajar’s Tahdhib, turning out to be an on the whole very unfavourable one, not at all commensurate with a man of his stature and renowned piety. Very many cases of sama’ were questioned and surely Hasan al-Baṣrī should once and for all be exonerated of these critical allegations.

Moreover, the list of alleged pupils of Hasan reveals crowds of shadowy, probably fictitious figures as well as a great many notorious forgers, propagandists of the qadar doctrine and otherwise ‘unreliable’ transmitters. (For a representative cross section of those so-called pupils, see Appendix I.) At the same time, as mentioned above, the epistles he is credited with, whose authorship has so far not been invalidated conclusively in my opinion, do not contain one single tradition.

Recently, Wansbrough (cf. his Quranic Studies, pp. 160–3) has brought together arguments in favour of dating it to a time about one century after Hasan, interpreting the very absence of hadiths as pointing probably to a deliberate attempt of the anonymous author to emphasize the Qur’ān asasl for the formulating of religious values in opposition to those who accorded value also to other than the Qur’ān. The fact that the sunna of the prophet, as well as transmission, are mentioned, cannot, I think, be construed as evidence that the risāla must, therefore, have been composed some one hundred years after Hasan.

As I tried to demonstrate above (pp. 30ff.), confirmed more than anything by the findings of Bravmann (cf. n. 95 above), sunna and sunnat an-nabi are old enough concepts to be mentioned in a treatise written in the first/seventh century. But if the

185. Born in 21/642, he was allegedly scribe in the service of Mu‘awiya’s governor of Khurāsān, ar-Rabi’ b. Ziyād, until the latter’s death in 51/671, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Isāba, ii, p. 458, and Tahdhib, iii, p. 243. This simply rules out sama’ with a number of Companions as falsely claimed in the biographical notices devoted to Hasan. In Ibn al-Madini’s Al-’ilal, pp. 54–65, we find enumerated a seemingly complete list of these mistaken cases of sama’. See also under Sahl (or Suhayl) b. Abī Farqad in Appendix I; Ibn Ḥanbal, ‘Ilal, i, no. 1428, and note 199 on p. 53 below.

186. Even Ritter (E.I. 2, s.v.) admitted to agreeing with this criticism.

187. Concerning transmitters being ‘shadowy’ or ‘fictitious’, see Chapter 4. Not mentioned there are the names of alleged pupils such as various men called: Abān (Tahdhib, i, pp. 94f.; Lisdān, i, p. 25); Ash’āth (Tahdhib, i, pp. 350, 352ff., 355f., 357ff. and Lisdān, i, p. 454); ‘Atā’ (Tahdhib, vii, pp. 203–7, 208ff., 215f., Lisdān, iv, p. 173); ‘Imrān (Tahdhib, viii, pp. 137ff., 142ff., Lisdān, iv, pp. 344, 345, 352);
risāla ascribed to Hasan constitutes in reality, as Wansbrough contends, nothing more than an ʿusūl controversy of the late second/eighth century, why does it not contain by far the best and most conclusive arguments supporting the view of the Qurʾān’s supremacy over the other ʿusūl, namely ‘traditions’ brought into circulation in great quantities in exactly that time emphasizing the Qurʾān’s pride of place? What weapon is there to cut down to size ḥadīths as ʿṣīḥ that is more effective than ḥadīths doing just that? See, for example, the chapters entitled Fadāʾil al-ʿqrān in Bukhārī (vol. iii, pp. 391–410, especially bāb 17 and 18 on p. 401), Dārīmī, pp. 422–43, especially bāb 6 on p. 428. See also the traditions adduced in Shāfiʿī’s Risāla, where Qurʾān and sunna are weighed against each other, e.g. pp. 50f. and 64f. of the A. M. Shākir edition. The Risāla was written, if we believe the appraisal of ʿAbd ar-Rahmān b. Mahḍī (d. 198/814) printed on the title page to be historical, before the end of the second century (± 815).

Yet another consideration deserves to be taken into account. Many alleged pupils of Ḥasan did not even bother to mention the name of the Companion from whom Ḥasan was supposed to have heard the prophetic saying. This resulted in large numbers of mursalāt. It is reported that Ḥasan, asked for a reason why he so often left out the name of the Companion, explained that, where he did so, ‘Aleş name had to be inserted, which, for fear of al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf, the then governor, he dared not mention. But in the case of ‘Alim, ru’yā (i.e. seeing ‘Ali in the flesh, even from a distance) has not even be established. What is more, in many instances even the prophet himself is not mentioned. It seems feasible that a sizable number of ‘traditions’, in whose isnāds Ḥasan’s name appears, are in reality his own utterances moulded after his death into prophetic sayings with the help of sometimes seemingly sound but in most cases clumsily fabricated isnāds. Sifting Ḥasan’s authentic utterances from those ‘prophetic sayings’ with Ḥasan isnāds, put together by contemporary or later people who merely used his name and reputation to lend more prestige to these sayings, will require a good deal of diligent research. Of course, the following list only scratches the surface.

However, before this list is given, one final argument should be added to support the theory that Ḥasan al-Baṣrī should in no significant way be associated with the transmission of ḥadīth, as already adduced above when Saʿīd b. al-Musayyab was dealt with (p. 17). This argument boiled down to

Maymūn (Tahdhib, x, pp. 388f., 391f., 394, 395f., Lisān, vi, no. 488);
as-Ṣalt (Tahdhib, iv, pp. 434f., Lisān, iii, pp. 195, 198 (879, 890));
Sulaymān (Tahdhib, iv, pp. 168f., 201f., 212, 220f., Lisān, iii, nos. 319 and 321);
ʿUmāra (Tahdhib, vi, pp. 416f., 423f., 424);
al-Walīd (Tahdhib, xi, pp. 133, 156f., Abū Nuʿaym, Hilya, ii, p. 152); and finally a name mentioned in Chapter 4, but without references: Ziyād (Ibn Saʿīd, iii 1, p. 271 (9), Lisān, iii, p. 499, and Tahdhib, iii, pp. 362–86, for seven (!) more).

190. One source in which we find quite a few hikam directly ascribed to Ḥasan is Māwardi’s Al-amthāl waʾl-hikam, MS. Leiden (Or. 655(2)). It might be interesting to trace these in other collections and see whether they ‘stop’ there at Ḥasan also.
considering Hasan's own sayings recorded in various sources as indeed his own, in spite of these sayings also being recorded as prophetic sayings in other sources with Hasan merely mentioned as transmitter in the isnād, or not even that. In any case, the few alleged pupils of Hasan, who were generally considered reliable - and even that epithet is extremely rare\textsuperscript{191} - can, therefore, not be held responsible for the hundreds of sayings supported by Hasan isnāds. Their names might simply have been inserted by otherwise anonymous people. Occasionally we stumble upon transmitters who allegedly heard with Hasan and who exclusively transmitted his private opinions.\textsuperscript{192} We shall also have the opportunity in the following list to draw attention to the other important Baṣrān Successor, Muhammad b. Sirin, since he played a particular role in the transmission of some of the same material - at least, that is what various isnāds, taken at face value, may lead us to believe. Ibn Sirin is also reported more than once to have expressed himself in a critical way about Hasan's alleged activities with hadith. Thus he accused him of gullibility,\textsuperscript{193} and in a most probably apocryphal dream explanation he intimated that Hasan embellished hadith by means of his logic.\textsuperscript{194} The allegedly basic difference between Ibn Sirin and Hasan is the former's insistence on riwāya lafziyya (i.e. transmitting a text to the letter) versus the latter's slackness in confining himself to transmitting only the sense without paying heed to the actual wording (\textit{= riwāya ma'naviyah}).\textsuperscript{195} Finally, he is reported to have said: 'Do not relate to me traditions from Hasan and Abū 'l-'Āliya Rufay' b. Mihrān for they do not pay attention to whom they get their traditions from'.\textsuperscript{196}

\textbf{LIST OF STATEMENTS AND RULINGS ASCRIBED TO HĀSAN AL-BAṢRĪ\textsuperscript{197}}

In the \textit{Sunan} of Abū Dāwūd (\textit{ta'līq} 13, = ii, p. 263), cf. Tirmidhi, \textit{ta'līq} 3 (iii, p. 481) and Nasā'ī, \textit{ta'līq} 11 (vi, p. 147), we find a maxim attributed to Hasan: \textit{amruki bi-yadiki} (i.e. \pm you rule over your own affair), which was unsuccessfully traced back to the prophet. In Mālik, however, we find it traced back to one of Muhammad's wives, Ḥafṣa bint 'Umar, with a seemingly perfect isnād (\textit{ta'līq} 27, = ii, p. 563). Compare also al-Khaṭīb, \textit{Kifāya}, p. 138.\textsuperscript{198}

\textsuperscript{191} Take, for example, Yūnūs b. 'Ubayd (d. 140/757). In Ibn Ḥajar, \textit{Tahdhib}, xi, pp. 442-5, we read only praise but Ibn Abī Khaythama is quoted as having called him a \textit{mudallis} (Abū 'l-Qāsim, \textit{Qubāl}, p. 127). This view is shared by Shu'ba (cf. Ibn Abī Ḥātīm, \textit{Taqdimān}, pp. 134f). Even so, Yūnūs is considered more reliable in Hasan traditions than 'Abd Allāh b. 'Awn (d. 151/768), cf. \textit{Tahdhib}, xi, p. 443.

Another highly esteemed alleged pupil of Hasan is Ḥumayd at-Tawīl (d. 142/759), who is also generally censured for \textit{tadlis} (\textit{Tahdhib}, iii, p. 40). And although it is stated that Ḥumayd and 'Ubāda b. Muslim supposedly had been Hasan's best pupils (\textit{Tahdhib}, iii, p. 39), the latter is described (\textit{Tahdhib}, v, pp. 113f.) in a \textit{tarjama} full of contradictions.


\textsuperscript{194} Cf. Ibn Ḥanbal, \textit{Iḥlāl}, 1, no. 2654.

\textsuperscript{195} Al-Khaṭīb, \textit{Kifāya}, p. 392. 197. Cf. also note 17 above.

\textsuperscript{196} Cf. also Abū Dāwūd, \textit{sunna} 6 (= iv, p. 204), where Hasan is reported to have stated that he would rather drop to his death than say \textit{al-amru bi-yadi}.
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In Abū Dāwūd, *'iq* 7 (iv, p. 26) a saying is listed attributed to Ḥasan which in the same chapter is also duly traced to the prophet (*man malaka dhā raḥimin maḥrūmin fa-huwa hurr* i.e. he who possesses [as a slave] a relative whom he cannot marry, that relative is to be freed).

Another legal maxim (*lā nikāha illā bi-walī* i.e. no marriage without a guardian) put into the mouth of Ḥasan is, according to Tirmidhī, *nikāh* 14 (iii, pp. 407ff.) also ascribed to various other *tābi‘ūn*, such as Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyab, Shurayb b. al-Ḥārith (d. between 78 and 99/697 and 717), the — perhaps legendary — *qādī* of Kūfa and (for a few years) also of Başra, Ibrāhīm b. Yazīd an-Nakḥā’ī (d. 96/715) and ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz. Here we see how a maxim is ‘claimed’ by four different *ḥadīth* centres. It is also found as a prophetic saying, cf. Tirmidhī, ibidem, and al-Khatib, *Kifāya*, pp. 409ff. Cf. also *’Ābd ar-Razzāq*, vi. nos. 10473, 10475, 10492 and 10506.

In Nasī‘ī we find a particularly interesting case: in *sayd* 38 (vii, pp. 210ff.), there is a story attributed to Ḥasan (*nazala nabiyyun mina ‘I-anbiya’ tahta shajaratin fa-ladaghathu namlatun* etc. i.e. a certain prophet sat down under a tree and was stung by an ant etc.), then with a brief addition and supported by the *īnsād* Ibn Sīrīn — Abū Hurayra *marfū‘* to the prophet (the *samā‘* between Ibn Sīrīn and Abū Hurayra never having been doubted, that probably seemed a most expeditious way of providing a sound *īnsād*), and then once more *mawqūf* with the *īnsād* Qatda — Ḥasan — Abū Hurayra. The *samā‘* between Ḥasan and Abū Hurayra has for long been a hotly debated issue, but was never generally accepted.199

Nasī‘ī, *zīna* 7 (vii, p. 132) constitutes a similar case; the tradition *nahā rasālu ‘Ilāhī* (s) *‘anī ‘t-tarajjuli illā ghibban* (i.e. the Messenger of God forbade to tend the hair except occasionally) on the authority of ‘Abd Allāh b. Mughaffal is also listed here as a personal saying of Ḥasan and as a *mursal*.200

The saying *manhimdni la yashba‘ani* etc. (i.e. two cases of greed will not be satisfied etc.) is attributed to Ḥasan in Dārimī, *muqaddima* 32 (= p. 32) and a few lines down also to Ibn ‘Abbās with the *īnsād* Layth — Tāwūs — Ibn ‘Abbās.

In Dārimī, *muqaddima* 34 (= p. 34, line 1) there is a saying attributed to Ḥasan (al-‘ilmu ‘ilmdni etc. i.e. knowledge is bipartite etc.) which immediately after that is also made into a *mursal* prophetic saying.

---

199. The oldest authority recorded who denied *samā‘* between Abū Hurayra and Ḥasan was the latter’s alleged pupil Yūnus b. ‘Ubayd (d. 140/757), cf. Ibn Hajar, *Tahdhīb*, ii, p. 267, as reported by Shu’ba. Other early authorities who denied this *samā‘* were Bahz b. Asad (d. 197-200/813-16), Ibn al-Madīnī (d. 239/853), Ahmad b. Ḥanbal (d. 241/856), Abū Zūr’a ‘Ubayd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Karīm ar-Rāzī (d. 264/878) and Abū Ḥatīm (d. 277/890), cf. Ibn Hajar, *Tahdhīb*, ii, pp. 266-70. In Dhhābī’s *Mīzān* (1, p. 108) there is preserved an amusing anecdote describing how one of Islam’s most notorious forgers, Ahmad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Khālid al-Juwaybīrī (fl. ± 175/791) fabricated on the spot with an *īnsād marfū‘* the saying attributed to the prophet: *samī‘a ‘l-H asan min Abi Hurayra*, in order to solve this controversy once and for all. Ahmad Muhammad Shākir’s plea for accepting this *samā‘* is unconvinving and does not throw new light on the issue, cf. my article Ahmad Muhammad Shākir (1892-1958) and his edition of Ibn Ḥanbal’s *Musnad*, p. 231. Al-‘Izzī (about whom more will be said in Chapter 5), for all his expertise in early sources, simply seems to ignore that there is doubt about this *samā‘*, cf. his *Difti‘ an Abi Hurayra*, pp. 132 and 135.

200. Cf. also Nasī‘ī, *ashriba* 29 (= viii, p. 304) and 53 (p. 330), for a ruling of Ḥasan juxtaposed to prohibitions of a similar tenor.
In the chapter on *istihāda* (Dārimi, *wuqūr* 84, = p. 108) we find various rulings ascribed directly to Hasan. (It strikes one that rules and regulations concerning personal hygiene for women are almost invariably drawn up by men; a reply attributed to Ibn Sirīn (ibidem, line 7: *an-nisā'ī a'llamu bi-dhālika* i.e. women are more aware of those things) is a rarity in Muslim laws about ritual purity of women.) Cf. also ‘Abd ar-Razzāq, 1, no. 1168.

A slogan regarding the inheriting of foundlings (Dārimi, *farā'id* 44, = p. 404) attributed to both Ibn Sirīn and Hasan appears to be tantamount to the rulings ascribed to Abū Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān (cf. ibidem).

One of the very few *farā'id* prescriptions listed in Dārimi’s *Sunan* (53, = p. 409) allegedly going back to the prophet (*naḥā rasūlu 'llāhi* (ṣ) *'an bay‘i 'l-walā'ī wa-'an hibātiḥi* i.e. the Messenger of God forbade to sell clientage or to give it away as a present) is also mentioned as merely (?) disapproved of by Hasan and Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyab.

The position of Hasan’s opinions versus rulings attributed to Companions is neatly pointed out by a statement ascribed to Abū Isḥāq as-Sabī‘ī in Dārimi’s chapter on *waṣāyā* (no. 44 on p. 422): *huddīthtu annā 'Alīyyān kānā yujīzuhu mithla qawli 'l-Ḥasan* i.e. I have been informed that ‘Alī used to permit this just like Hasan used to rule.

A good example of a saying attributed to Hasan which, provided with the controversial *ḥisnad* Hasan – Abū Hurayra – prophet, also turns up as a *ḥadīth*, is found in Dārimi, *faḍā'il al-qur'ān* 21 (= p. 435) and concerns the merit of *sarat yasin* (= xxxvi). In *bab* 22 (= p. 436) we find a similar case and in *bab* 30 (= p. 439) there is preserved a *mursal*.

The one and only prophetic tradition in Malik’s *Muwaṣṣa*’ ascribed to Hasan as well as Ibn Sirīn on the authority of an anonymous Companion (*'itq* 3, = vol. ii, p. 774) crops up in the *Sahih* of Muslim (aymān 56, vol. iii, p. 1288) with a ‘perfect’ *ḥisnad* in which the Successor is Abū ‘l-Muhallab (Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhib*, xi1, p. 250) from Basra.

In Ibn Ḥanbal’s *Musnad* quite a few *mursalāt* are listed with Hasan – prophet *ḥisnāds* which can be traced with ‘perfected’ *ḥisnāds* elsewhere. Here follow a few references to the old Cairo edition, e.g.:

ii, p. 382, as compared with Bukhārī, *jum‘a* 18 (= vol. 1, p. 230) and Muslim, *masājid* 153 (= 1, p. 421).

ii, p. 385, the ‘perfected’ *ḥisnad* as well as the *mursal* one supporting the maxim: *man ǧamī‘ Ramaḍānā ǧaman wa‘lḥisābān* etc. (i.e. he who fasts during Ramaḍān faithfully anticipating [divine reward] etc.).

ii, pp. 492f.: various *mursalāt* of Hasan juxtaposed to Ibn Sirīn – Abū Hurayra – prophet *ḥisnāds* followed by the same *maṭn* (as it says in Arabic: *mithla dhalika*).

v, p. 22: a *mursal* of Hasan juxtaposed to the same with the *ḥisnād* ‘patched up’ by means of the insertion of Samura b. Jundab between Hasan and the prophet.


On v, p. 27 we find an *ḥisnād* which is tentatively ‘patched up’ with Hasan: . . . *haddathand Qatāda ‘an rajulim huwa ‘l-Ḥasan in sh’a ‘l-lāhu ‘an Ma‘qil b. Yasār* etc. (i.e. Qatāda related to us from a man who might be Hasan from Ma‘qil etc.).

In Humaydī’s *Musnad* (11, no. 1119) we find a dictum ascribed to Hasan (*li ‘l-umm aṭh-thulthānī mina ‘l-birr wa-li ‘l-ab aṭh-thulth* i.e. the mother gets two thirds of filial piety, the father one third) the idea of which can be traced in a prophetic
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tradition, cf. Humaydi, n, no. 1118, and Mundhiri, At-targhib wa 't-tarhib, iii, p. 532 and n. 4.

In the preceding list we have seen that Ibn Sirin often emerged in isnāds supporting materials that were also brought into circulation via mostly defective Hasan isnāds. It is difficult to say whether Ibn Sirin is to be held responsible for this; it is more likely that his name was used by later generations in order to preserve poorly supported Hasan traditions simply because he was contemporaneous with Hasan.201 But, on the other hand, it cannot be denied that it was Ibn Sirin who is credited with drawing attention to the importance of isnāds. Apart from the famous saying attributed to him concerning the necessity of establishing isnāds, something which had become imperative as a consequence of the fitna (see above p. 17), he is also reported to have once said: Ḥādhā 'l-ʿilmu (sc. the collecting and the transmitting of hadith) dinun faʿnūrūʿ 'amman taʾkhudhāna dinakum (i.e. this science sc. of hadith is a religion, so look from whom you receive it). This statement or slogan was cited in context with a remark of Dārimi who ventured that it could be considered as initiating the consistent use of the isnād,202 once more good supporting evidence for my theory concerning the chronology of fitna and isnāds.

After Hasan and Ibn Sirin a few more famous (or notorious) Successors who allegedly promoted hadith in Basra deserve to be mentioned here.

ʿIkrima, Ibn ʿAbbās’ mawlā (d. between 104/722 and 107/725),203 has

201. That his name was used in isnāds supporting doubtful material is, for example, attested in the tarjama of Ishāq b. Najīb al-Malāṭī who sought to introduce Abū ʿAbbās’s raʾy by means of the isnād ʿUthmān al-Battiʿan Ibn Sirin, cf. Ibn Hajar, Tahdhīb, i, p. 252.

202. Dārimi, Sunan, p. 61. Pellat, Le milieu basrienn et la formation de Ġāhib, p. 87, note 9, mentions Ibn Sirin as the first traditionist in Basra to reject doubtful traditions; the source material Pellat refers to does not, however, contain an awālʾ report. Furthermore, it seems that Ibn Sirin was well aware of juridical opinions being eventually ‘raised to the level’ of prophetic sayings, cf. Wakiʿ, i, p. 67, if that is how we have to understand the verb raʾfaʿa (line 16); at least, that is how the editor, ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Muṣṭafā al-Marāghi, seems to understand it.

203. My selection of ʿIkrima as a specifically Baṣrān transmitter, although in Ibn Hajar’s Tahdhīb (vii, p. 263) he is listed as al-Madānī, finds its justification, perhaps, in the following considerations. ʿIkrima, allegedly of Berber extraction, was donated to ʿAbbās when the latter was governor of Baṣra (as from 36/656). ʿIkrima was later manumitted. In whatever way one assesses the historicity of his having heard traditions with his master (later his patron) as well as with a few other Companions, or the historicity of his having traveled widely in the Islamic empire (as Schacht points out in his E.I. 2 article on him), the number of his alleged pupils from Iraqi hadith centres is in actual fact far greater than from Hijāzī hadith centres. It is true that his alleged Kūfī pupils do outnumber his alleged Baṣrān ones, but a quick count of the traditions transmitted via him, which have found their way to the canonical collections, as enumerated in al-Mizzi’s Tuhfa (v, pp. 107–181), makes abundantly clear that traditions transmitted via alleged Baṣrān pupils far outnumber those transmitted via pupils from any other centre including Kūfā. It is because of these considerations that it seems more appropriate to call him a Baṣrān.
always been a subject of controversy. Reading through his lengthy *tarjama* in the *Tahdhib* (vii, pp. 263–73), one gains the impression that, on the one hand, the *hadith* experts did not trust him but, on the other hand, could not do without the material allegedly transmitted via him. On the one hand he is accused of having spread false traditions on the authority of his master. We read how Ibn 'Umar as well as Sa'īd b. al-Musayyab are both reported to have warned their *mawls*, Nāfi' and Burd respectively, with the words: ... *la takdhib 'alayya kamā yakhdhibu 'Ikrima 'alā 'bni 'Abbās* (i.e. do not spread lies about me as 'Ikrima did about Ibn 'Abbās). On the other hand, the *hadith* collectors could not do without his traditions; I quote from his *tarjama*: *lam yastaghnū 'an ḥadīthihi wa-kāna yatalaqqā ḥadīthuhu bi 'l-qabūll wa-yuḥtajjū bihi qarnan ba'da qarnin wa-imāman ba'da imāmin ilā waqti 'l-a'immati 'l-arba'ait 'lladhīna akhrājū 'ṣ-ṣaḥīḥa wa-mayyazū thābitahu min saqīmihī wa-khāta'ahu min sawābihi wa-akhrajū riwāyatahu wa-humū 'l-Bukhārī wa-Muslim wa-Abū Dāwūd wa 'n-Nasā'i fu-ajma'ū 'alā ikhrājī ḥadīthihi wa 'ḥajjī bīhi* (p. 272) (i.e. they were not able to dispense with 'Ikrima’s traditions which met with acceptance and were used as arguments, generation after generation, by one *imām* after the other, until the time of the four *imāms* [sc. four of the ‘Six’]. They selected the ‘sound’, distinguishing between the reliable and the unreliable, between the faulty and the correct; and they selected [also] 'Ikrima’s transmitted material. Those ‘four’, namely Bukhārī, Muslim, Abū Dāwūd and Nasā‘ī, agreed to publicize [also] ‘Ikrima’s traditions, [even] adducing them as arguments). And ‘Ikrima is also reported to have spread so-called Ibn ‘Abbās traditions which were in reality the products of his own *ra'y* (p. 269).

In fact, only very few *tarjamas* are as controversial as his. Even if it is believed that Bukhārī and the others have been successful in sifting the genuine material from the fabricated — and in Chapter 5 below I shall try to bring together conclusive evidence of a different nature that they have not — still a huge number of very weird traditions that have found their way to the canonical collections with 'Ikrima in the *isnāds* has to be accounted for. But, as was the case with Ḥasan *isnāds* discussed above, later anonymous forgers are likely to have profited from ‘Ikrima’s fame and may have brought material into circulation in which ‘Ikrima himself had no part at all. The *mawlā* Simāk b. Ḥarb (d. 123/741), for example, was especially suspect in his ‘Ikrima traditions, and the *mawlā* Ismā‘il b. ‘Abd ar-Rahmān as-Suddī (d. 127/745), so called because he used to sit all the time on the threshold (sudd) of the mosque in Kūfa, used to expound the Qur‘ān in his own

204. Even in this century; cf. Abūmad M. Shākir tries to argue away the controversy about ‘Ikrima’s alleged *irṣāl* from ‘Ali in his edition of Ibn Ḥanbal’s *Musnad*, ii, p. 97, the commentary on no. 723.
A tentative chronology of the origins

particular fashion; the public liked it but his fellow traditionists did not trust him especially since he used to substantiate his exegesis by merely attaching an *iṣnad* to it. As he was also called ignorant (*qad uḥțiyya ḥazzan min jahlin* (and not *iḥlīm*) bi *l-qur‘ān*) it seems self-evident that he himself cannot be credited with this exegesis, but that he got it from someone else, either *Ikrima* or someone using this name.\(^{207}\) Then there was the *mawla* 'Amr b. Abī 'Amr (d. 144/761) who was censured for having forged a tradition of which he claimed that he had heard it from *Ikrima*.\(^{208}\) The *mawla* Dāwūd b. al-Ḥusayn (d. 135/752) transmitted suspect *munkar* traditions with the *iṣnad* *Ikrima–Ibn Abbās–prophet.*\(^{209}\) 'Abd b. Maʾṣūr (d. 152/769) committed *taḍlis* while transmitting from *Ikrima*.\(^{210}\) Abū Yazīd al-Madani transmitted from Ibn 'Abbās with or without mention of *Ikrima* as intermediary.\(^{211}\) And then there are listed numerous totally untrustworthy alleged pupils of *Ikrima* of whom it is not said *expressis verbis* that they put forged material into *Ikrima*'s mouth but who may be safely assumed to have done just that.

Since tradition collections centring on *Ikrima* are not (yet) available, an appropriate way to get acquainted with the *hadith* he is alleged to have transmitted is to read through Ibn 'Abbās' *musnad* in Ibn Ḥanbal's *Musnad*, Cairo 1313, vol. i, pp. 214–374, new edition by A. M. Shākir, vol. iii, p. 252 to vol. v., p. 183. Here we read, for example, the controversial tradition about the prophet's age when he died with an indication of the number of years he was active in Mecca before the Hijra which is, as far as I know, nowhere else corroborated (cf. Shākir's ed., iii, no. 2017; nos. 2110 and 2242, also with *Ikrima* in the *iṣnad*, give the generally accepted but different chronology). On the whole, these traditions in Ibn Ḥanbal are not as far-fetched in contents as some from the *qīṣas al-anbiyāʾ* literature or early *tafsīr*, but some remain controversial such as the one about sodomy in which *Ikrima* is common link, cf. Shākir's edition, iv, nos. 2420, 2727, 2733; or the one about whether the prophet actually saw God, cf. ibidem, no. 2580, or the prophet's partaking of *nabīdīn*, cf. ibidem, nos. 1963, 2143 and 2606; or the one describing a rich man's and a poor man's conversation in paradise, etc. By far the most extensive *Ikrima* material is found in al-Mizzi's *Tuhfat al-ashraf bi-maʿrifat al-arḍ*, v, pp. 107–81, which covers the occurrences of *Ikrima–Ibn Abbās iṣnāds* in all the 'six books'. Here again we see that, on the whole, the traditions listed do not seem so controversial as *Ikrima*-supported reports in non-canonical collections.

---

207. Cf. ibidem, i, pp. 313, penult. and 314, lines 15f. 'Uthmān b. Ghiyāth was also a weak transmitter of *tafsīr* material, which he probably had – or claimed to have received – from *Ikrima*, cf. ibidem, vi, p. 147.

208. *Man atā bahimatan faʾqulahu*, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhib*, viii, p. 83. Another transmitter blamed for the same thing was 'Abd Allāh b. 'Īsā b. 'Abd ar-Rahmān (d. 135/752) (*man khabbaba mraʿiyan etc.*).


Another Successor of the stature of the aforementioned Baṣrān transmitters is Qatāda b. Diʾāma (d. 117/735). An analysis of his tarafama in the Tahdhib, especially of his alleged pupils, yields results so similar to the ones obtained in the analysis of ‘Ikrima’s that we can dispense with it here.²¹² On the whole, it is an astonishing feature of Baṣrān Successors that, with the possible exception of Ibn Sirin, they are almost all highly controversial figures as far as their hadith transmission is concerned, something which has not prevented the great collectors of the second half of the second/eighth and the first half of the third/ninth centuries from relying heavily on materials supported by isnāds parading their names. If it is assumed that later tradition experts, in compiling their collections, set so much store by rijāl criticism, it is incomprehensible that they nevertheless incorporated hadīths allegedly transmitted by such people as Ḥasan, ‘Ikrima or Qatāda in their collections at all.

Hadīth traffic between the two main Iraqi centres is attested in the activities of a few old Successors²¹³ but the majority of Successors remained as a rule in one centre.

Kūfa

In Kūfa the activity in collecting traditions may have been the most lively in the entire Islamic empire judging by the number of people who allegedly engaged in it.²¹⁴ This is also true for the tabaqā of the Successors. As far as the names of Companions, who are immediately associated with Kūfa, are concerned, where Baṣra had one Companion, Anas, who died at such an advanced age that quite a few transmitters who flourished well into the second/eighth century could claim to belong to the Successors, Kūfa also boasted of a few long living Companions. Besides such famous ones as ‘Abd Allāh b. Masʿūd (d. 32–3/652–3), Abū Mūsā al-Ashʿarī (d. 42–4/662–4), Hudhayfah b. al-Yamān (d. 36/657) and al-Mughirah b. Shuʾba (d. 49–50/669–70), we find a few minor Companions who ‘conveniently’ died at an advanced age about three quarters of a century after the prophet.²¹⁵

²¹² For an appraisal of Qatāda as muḥaddith, see G. Vetestam, Qatāda b. Diʾāma as-Sadūṣī et la science du hadīth.
²¹³ E.g. Abū ‘Uthmān ‘Abd ar-Rahmān b. Mallān-Nahdī (d. 95–100/714–19 at the age of 130 or 140!), Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, vi, no. 546; Muwrarīq b. al-Mushamrij (d. 103/721), ibidem, x, no. 581, and the unreliable qāṣ Abū Dāwūd al-Aʿmā, whose Kūfī traditions were said to be worthless, Ibn Ḥajar, Lisān, vi, p. 145 (cf. Tahdhib, x, pp. 470ff.).
²¹⁴ Information based upon extensive reading in the rijāl works and privately made statistics.
²¹⁵ E.g. Abū Juhayfah Wahb b. ’Abd Allāh (d. 74/693), ‘Amr b. Hurayth (d. 85/704) and allegedly the last Companion to die in Kūfa in 86–7/705–6 was ’Abd Allāh b. Abī Awdā, cf. their respective tarafajim in Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, xi, p. 164; vii, p. 18 and v, p. 152. This enabled, for example, the mawālī Ismāʿīl b. Abī Khālid, who died in 146/763, to claim the title of Successor, a feat not emulated by very many Baṣrāns. Cf. also Ibn Qutayba, Kitāb al-maʿārif, p. 341, for other ṣahābis dying late.
Another striking characteristic of Kufan Successors is the frequency with which three or even four of al-khulafa’ ar-rashidun are mentioned as having been among those Companions from whom they allegedly heard traditions.216 We may, perhaps, see in this an attempt to establish on the firmest possible basis certain claims to the legitimacy of power as centred in Kufa, especially during ‘Ali’s caliphate from 35/656 until 40/661 and also in later years when Shi’ite claims resulted in innumerable pro-‘Ali traditions. As pointed out earlier, whereas Baṣra is the centre from which proliferated qadar traditions, Kufa is the centre par excellence in which emerged ideas and ideals of tashayyu’. Thus we find the well-known Successor ‘Adi b. Thābit (d. 116/734) holding the position of imām in the mosque of the Shi’ites, in which he also used to tell qisas.217 On an earlier occasion he was mentioned as one of the raffā’un (p. 31 above).

As was the case with famous experts in other centres (Sa’īd b. al-Musayyab in Medina or Hasan in Baṣra), among the Successors of Kufa there are a number who are noted for their juridical insight alluded to with the terms ra’y or fiqh. The early ones among them allegedly received most of their ‘knowledge’ from Ibn Mas’ūd, but since their opinions are also recorded as products of their own personal thinking, without mention of the fact that they had arrived at these with the help of older authorities, the same consideration as set forth in the case of Sa’īd and Hasan (cf. p. 15 above) applies here. Among these Successors are ‘Alqama b. Qays (d. between 61 and 73/680–92),218 Masrūq b. al-Ajda’ (d. 63/682) and al-Ḥārith b. ‘Abd Allāh al-A’war (d. 65/684).219 A slightly younger Successor, a famous faqih and allegedly one of Kufa’s most important hadith transmitters, was ‘Āmir b. Sharāḥil, usually called simply ash-Sha’bi (d. 103–10/721–8). Although Ibn Mas’ūd is listed among his masters, samā‘ from him was questioned; in view of the latter’s date of death (32–3/652–3) and Sha’bi’s alleged date of birth (20/641 or somewhat later as it says in the sources, or nearer 40/661 as perhaps demonstrated above on pp. 19f.) this is hardly surprising. In those early days boys did not yet collect traditions.220 Besides, his samā‘ from ‘Ali (d. 40/661) is doubted as well. Sha’bi’s case is especially interesting since in

216. This is corroborated by the findings referred to above (pp. 23–30).
217. A well-known qāṣ who served the cause of the Khārijites was Shaqiq ad-Ḍabbi, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Lisān, ii, p. 151.
218. According to a report in Rāmahurmuzi, p. 238, ‘Alqama’s fatwās were even sought after by Companions.
219. Regrettably, their private statements are no longer traceable in the canonical collections barring a few, all having been provided with ‘complete’ isnāds via Ibn Mas’ūd, ‘Ali, ‘Ā’ishah and others. But one maxim of Masrūq has survived, cf. Nasā’ī, ashriba 43 (= vni, p. 315, first lines), which is also found in slightly different wording as a prophetic tradition in Ibn Mājā, ashriba 4 (= ii, p. 1120). And in Dārīmi’s muqaddima 30 (= p. 51, lines 3ff.), we read two more private statements of Masrūq. The three tarājim devoted to them in Ibn Sa’d do not preserve any of their sayings either.
the tarjama devoted to him in the Tahdhib we find three remarks attributed to him (in Arabic: kāna yaqūlu . . .) which can be considered as not yet fully developed rules of good behaviour which, in due course, became exactly that supported by isnāds going back to the prophet:221

(1) mà ḥalalu ḥubwattā ilā shay’in mimmā yanzuru ‘n-nāsū ilayhi, which may be summarized as: I have never done anything ostentatiously in order to attract people’s attention; in the course of time this rule, foreshadowed in the Qur’ān (e.g. IV, 38 and 142), cropped up in numerous prophetic traditions forbidding ostentatiousness, cf. Concordance, s.v. the third stem of ra’ā;

(2) ‘I never beat a slave of mine’, which is reflected in a prophetic tradition forbidding this (cf. Tirmidhī, birr 30, = ed. I. ‘A. ‘Iwaḍ, vol. IV, p. 335; Muslim, aymān 34ff., = iii, pp. 1280f.; Ibn Ḥanbal, Musnad, old ed. IV, p. 120, v, p. 274) in the various isnāds of which we find al-A’mash (d. 147/764), a younger contemporary of Sha’bī, as common link;

(3) ‘Whenever a relative of mine died without having settled his debts, I did that for him’; there is a statement attributed to the prophet (e.g. Tirmidhī, jand’iz 69, = vol. iii, ed. M. F. ‘Abd al-Bāqī, p. 382) in which he himself accepts responsibility for the debts left by a dead man. This statement is preserved under various isnāds which all seem to be Medinan, and in which Zuhrī seems to be (one of) the common link(s).

A slightly younger man, who was in reality not a Successor in the technical sense of the term, Ibrāhīm b. Yazid an-Nakha’ī (d. 96/715 at the relatively ‘early’ age of 49, according to others 58),222 was also a faqīh whose statements were in the course of time provided with ‘sound’ isnāds going back to Muḥammad.223

Finally, in this enumeration of Kūfī Successors, one very important person cannot be left unmentioned, Abū ʿIṣḥāq ‘Amm b. ‘Abd Allāh as-Sabī’ī (d. 126–9/743–6 when he was allegedly in his nineties). Elsewhere I have devoted a special study to him,224 and in Chapter 4 the theory is ventured of how his kunya may have been made use of by other, anonymous transmitters and how, subsequently, very much material supported by unspecified Abū ʿIṣḥāq isnāds has to be considered of doubtful historicity. He, allegedly together with the mawlā Sulaymān b. Mihrān al-A’marsh (d. 147/764),225 Manṣūr b. ʿAl-Mu’tamir (d. 132/749) and Zubayd b. al-Ḥarīth (d. 122–4/740–2), belonged to the ‘leaders of Kūfī’s transmitters’ (in Arabic:

222. This also struck Rāmahurmuzī (cf. p. 356) as exceptional.
223. Cf. Schacht, Origins, p. 33, and e.g. Bukhārī, mawāqiṭ 37, = 1, p. 157, for a ruling of Ibrāhīm which is also one of the prophet’s; idem, ii, p. 116, bāb 4; see furthermore above p. 15, no. 3. Examples of Ibrāhīm’s rulings and precepts abound in the ‘six’ and in Dārīmi, but – as was to be expected – are lacking in the Muwatta’.
224. Cf. my On the origins of Arabic prose, pp. 170ff. To the sources cited there may be added Abū ‘I-Qāsim al-Balikhī, Qābul al-akhbār, p. 84, where Abū ʿIṣḥāq and al-A’marsh are blamed for having corrupted Kūfān hadith.
225. Ibn Ma’in (cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, iv, p. 225, lines 13f.) preferred him to Zuhrī, because he did not work for the Umayyads.
ru'ūs muhaddithi 'l-Kūfa). Does this mean that they wielded some sort of authority over their fellow transmitters? The sources leave us in the dark in this respect, but Abū Ishāq apparently had his own mosque so he had a locality at his disposal to gather the people around him.

In Ibn Ḥajar, *Lisān*, no. 803, we read that a certain Mu'tazilite, 'Umar b. Ibrāhīm al-'Alawi (d. 539/1444), used to be imām of the mosque of Abū Ishāq as-Sabī'i. Although this man lived some four hundred years later, I presume there must always have been this Abū Ishāq mosque. I do not think that this was a mosque founded after Abū Ishāq's death and named after him, for he was not the sort of person who, during his life, gathered so much fame that his followers sought in this way to keep his memory alive; the *tarājim* devoted to him in the various *rijāl* works are simply too negative for that. I rather think that Abū Ishāq had a kind of private musalla which he made into some sort of public meeting place in order to disseminate his ideas to as wide an audience as it could accommodate. His propaganda for the Shi'i cause demanded this. I presume that Abū Ishāq's musalla, also after his death, remained a place where people gathered and, in the course of time, came to be called Abū Ishāq's mosque. It is inconceivable to me that this mosque was founded (long) after his death, in sum, I think it much more likely that it is indeed a first/seventh century institution. In Baṣra Thābit al-Bunānī had his own mosque and mu'adhdhin, Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhib*, iv, p. 188. Cf. also Dhahabī, *Mizān*, iv, no. 9701, Ibn Ḥajar, *Lisān*, ii, no. 1732. Ayyūb b. Abī Tamīma as-Sakhtiyānī is also reported to have had his own mosque with its own imām, Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhib*, ii, no. 218.

Abū Ishāq is, furthermore, a good example of a transmitter who may have resorted—or concerning whom other traditionists resorted—to the age trick. But he is by no means a far-fetched example. The following Successors, otherwise not such important transmitters, supposedly reached incredible ages: Qays b. Abī Ḥāzm (died 84-98/703-16 at the age of well over one hundred),227 Ziyād b. 'Ilāqa (died 135/752 at the age of almost one hundred; another report has it that he was born in the Jāhiliyya),228 Abū 'Amr Sa'd b. Iyās (died 95-8/714-17 at the age of 120),229 al-Ma'rūr b. Suwayd (when al-A 'mash saw him he believed him to be 120),230 Suwayd b. Ghafāla (died 80-2/699-701 at the age of 120 or 130; he claimed to be just as old as the prophet,231 Zirr b. Ḥubaysh (died 81-3/700-2 at the age of 127),232 etc.

227. His case constitutes the well-known *topos* describing those people who, during the lifetime of the prophet, set out to Medina to pay their allegiance but who were prevented from doing so by the news of the latter's untimely death, expressed, for instance, in the words fa-qubida (sc. the prophet) wa-huwa ḥa'īrāq or similar, eminently recognizable expressions. He is, furthermore, one of those Iraqi transmitters preferred by Ibn Ma'in to Zuhri, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhib*, viii, pp. 387f.; cf. note 225 above.

231. Ibidem, iv, pp. 278f.; he constitutes another case of the —what may be styled—'conversion topos'; this time we read in his *tarjama*: qadima 'l-Madīnata hina nufiḍati 'l-aydi min dafnī rasāli 'l-līḥ (§). Cf. also ibidem, vi, no. 465, and al-Khaṭīb, *Ar-rīhla*, pp. 166f.

The *tarājim* devoted to these centenarians in the *rijāl* works are on the whole very favourable without a shadow of a doubt being cast on the ages they claimed to have reached. This must have greatly facilitated the manipulation with *isnāds*, whether they did that themselves or whether this occurred at the hands of other anonymous people. Furthermore, traditions supported by *isnāds* including their names occur, without exception, in all the canonical collections.

As far as the other *ḥadīth* centres are concerned such as the ones in Khurāsān, these came into being a little later, as was the case with Egypt. If we take the *awā’il* information regarding an-Naḍr b. Shumayl (d. 204/820), for example, as *terminus a quo*, it is only during his lifetime that *sunna* was introduced into all of Khurāsān (cf. p. 23 above). It is likely that, when we encounter an *isnād* with predominantly Khurāsānian transmitters, the material it supports hails from the time and/or environment of the *rāwī* mentioned at the Successor’s level, or the tier above that, which, in the case of a Khurāsānian *isnād*, will most likely turn out to be from Basra or Kūfah. The same principle applies to the numerous *isnāds* with predominantly Bagdadi transmitters.

Another major city, which in the course of time developed into a *ḥadīth* centre of some importance, was Wāṣīt, allegedly founded by al-Ḥajjāj in 83/702 or 84/703. There is evidence in the sources that it ‘claimed’ for itself certain illustrious *ḥadīth* transmitters. Thus various people asserted that they had ‘seen’ Anas b. Mālik there, who, in the mid-eighties of the first century, must have been already a very old man, that is, *if* we give this report any credit at all. And also Shu’ba, a key figure of Basran *ḥadīth* transmission, is ‘claimed’ by Wāṣīt as one of theirs. There is a report that relates how, when Shu’ba arrived in Basra (for the first time?) and asked directions to Hasan’s dwelling, people frowned, whereupon he excused himself on the ground that he came from Wāṣīt.

After this survey of the principal transmitters in the different *ḥadīth* centres, it seems appropriate to adduce here some more evidence pointing to the overall regional character of these centres.

There is a report describing a conversation the Caliph Abū Ja’far al-Manṣūr (reigned from 136/754 until 158/775) is alleged to have had during a visit to Medina with Mālik b. Anas. This conversation neatly depicts the development leading to the situation obtaining at the time it supposedly took place, i.e. in 150/767. Even if it cannot be proved that this conversation ever took place or that the dialogue took the form as reported – one
may doubt, for example, the unmistakable faḍāʾil slant in favour of Medina—I see no cogent arguments against accepting this appraisal. Even if it is granted that the conversation in itself is probably apocryphal, the appraisal of the situation, it seems to me, is basically not incorrect. Here follows a paraphrase:

Al-Manṣūr asked Mālik: ‘Is there anyone more learned [i.e. in matters concerning this our religion] than you?’

‘Yes’, Mālik replied.

‘Name them.’

‘I do not know their names.’

Al-Manṣūr went on: ‘During the time of the Banū Umayya I investigated this matter and I know it now for what it is. The transmitters of Iraq are liars and forgers; those of Syria are constantly at war (i.e. with Rūm), they have no great scholar left; as for the transmitters of the Hijāz, they have preserved the last item there is to know (about the prophet) and you are the principal scholar of the Hijāz. Don’t you dare contradict me! I should like to unify this ʿilm so that I can have it recorded and sent to the army commanders and judges in order that they make themselves acquainted with it. He who later on acts contrary to it, I shall have him beheaded!’

‘O Commander of the Faithful’, Mālik answered, ‘while the prophet was still alive, he sent his people forth on campaigns but not much land was conquered before he died. Then Abū Bakr ruled, but not much land was conquered under him either. After them, under ʿUmar, so much territory was conquered that he felt obliged to send the Companions of the prophet out as teachers (of the new religion) and their knowledge never ceased to be transmitted from generation to generation until this very day. If you now try to divert them from what they know to what they do not know, they will consider that as kufr. Therefore, let the people of every region stick to that knowledge (sc. about the prophet and the origins and precepts of the religion) which they now possess, and select for yourself of this ʿilm whatever you deem most appropriate.’

In another account (see note 236 on p. 62 above), which may very well be considered as describing another fragment of the conversation, al-Manṣūr is reported to have asked Mālik:

‘Why do you rely so heavily on the words of ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar among so many Companions?’

237. This may sound an unusually harsh statement especially coming from someone who had his domicile in Iraq, but it is not at all unlikely that al-Manṣūr was simply repeating an opinion commonly held in Iraq in those days. In Chapter 3 below I have tried to prove that mendacity in tradition transmitting was first countered by the man kadhabaʿalayya dictum in Iraq, and that this may have originated precisely during his reign or probably even a little later.

238. Cf. Abū ʿl-Qāsim al-Balkhī, Qabūl al-akhbār, p. 168, where the people of Syria are called jund bant Marwān.
Mālik replied:

'Since he was the last Companion to stay alive (sc. he died in 74/693) and since the people needed his advice, they asked him and acted according to what he said.'

But no matter how fair all this may sound from Malik's mouth, he decidedly had his doubts concerning even his most famous fellow transmitters. Thus he is reported to have said about Sufyān ath-Thawrī: 'I hope that he has been ṣāliḥ'.239 In Chapter 5 it will appear that this term in many a context is almost identical with 'unreliable'. Surely that is not what Malik may have meant in the statement reported here, but his words do not admit of an interpretation more favourable or positive than: I hope his traditions were harmless in the sense that they did not create too much confusion.

Another overall appraisal of ḥadīth collecting activities in the various centres, emphasizing the different approaches in each, is found in a statement Sufyān b. 'Uyaynā is alleged to have made. Even if the ascription of these words to Sufyān cannot be proved, the words in themselves constitute, perhaps, a fair description of the situation obtaining in his days. He suggests that those who want to know more about pilgrimage rituals (manāsik) should consult the traditionists of Mecca,240 those who want to collect information on the precise times ṣalāts are to be performed (mawāqit) have to repair to Medina, those whose interests lie in details concerning the prophet's life and campaigns (siyar) should ask the people of Syria and finally, in a perhaps mocking way, those who want information in which true cannot be distinguished from false should go to Iraq.241 Sufyān, if it was indeed he who made this statement, may be considered as having been perfectly aware of what was going on in three, perhaps four, centres: the first part of his life he lived in Küfa, then in 163/780 he moved to the Hijāz and settled in Mecca.

Different points of view, sometimes resulting in rivalry, are, furthermore, attested in the following reports. The controversy Medina/Iraq is apparent in the suggestion that what Ma'mar b. Rāshid (d. 153/770) transmits from Baṣrān or Küfān transmitters should be rejected, whereas what he produces from Zuhrī and other Medinans can be considered quite reliable.242 Even common measures were different. So it is recorded that the

239. Cf. Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Taqdim, p. 94 (ult). In Suyūṭī's Is'af al-mubaqqā', p. 878, we find a highly significant report supporting this issue; someone asked Mālik: 'How come, you do not transmit traditions from the Iraqis?' Mālik replied: 'Our predecessors did not transmit their predecessors' traditions, as our contemporaries leave present day Iraqi transmitters well alone.'

240. Cf. p. 40 above, especially note 146.

241. Cf. Ibn 'Asākir, At-ṭa'rikh al-kabīr, 1, p. 70. The term siyar in this report admits, apart from the interpretation 'campaigns' (= maghāzi), also of the interpretation 'law of war and peace' (= al-maqāsir wa-amm al-ghazw). Both interpretations are found in variant readings of this report listed in Ibn 'Asākir's Ta'rikh madinat Dimashq, 1, p. 316.

mudd of the prophet according to the Iraqis amounted to two rāls, while the people of the Hijāz thought it to be only one and one third. More specifically, the vast differences in jurisdiction between Medina and Kūfa are attested in the dismay Yahyā b. Sa‘īd al-Anṣārī (d. 144/761) allegedly displayed when he took up the function of qādī in the latter city. Rivalry between Bagdad and Medina can be gleaned from the tarjama of Ibn Abī ‘z-Zīnād (d. 174/790). It is reported there that what he transmitted in Medina was sound, at least of passing quality, but what he transmitted in Bagdad was corrupted by the Bagdabis.

Iraqis supposedly detested the ḥadīth transmitted via Ismā‘īl b. ‘Ayyāsh (d. 181/797), whereas his fellow Syrians could not find fault with it. Iraqis are also reported to have called Syrian traditions mere fables (khurāfāt). From this we discern Iraqi/Syrian rivalry.

The regional character is, furthermore, not only restricted to the different provinces of the empire but can also be distilled from reports concerning rivalries between centres in one province. The remark: tafarrada bihi ahlū ‘l-Kūfa . . . lam yushrikhum fihi aḥadūn can be contrasted with: tafarrada bi-dhikri ‘l-amrī ahlū ‘l-Ḫaṣa‘ra (i.e. the Kūfans, c.q. the Baṣrans, were the only ones who spread a certain ḥadīth), although we also find the concept isnād ahlī ‘l-‘Iraq mentioned. The contrast between Baṣra and Kūfa is humorously depicted in the remark: When you see a Baṣran drinking nabīdī, hold him in suspicion, but when you see a Kūfan doing that, you need not suspect him, for the Kūfan drinks out of devotion, and the Baṣran leaves it out of devotion. The extreme Shi‘ite al-Harith b. Ḥaṣīra (fl. 140/757) transmitted mainly fādā‘īl ahlī ‘l-bayt in Kūfa and traditions of various contents in Baṣra.

In the course of the second half of the second/eighth century, also after the talab al-‘ilm — about which more will be said below — had gradually lost its purely local character and was on an ever increasing scale carried out in more than one centre, the sharp edges of the rivalries described in the above gradually disappeared. So it was Shāfi‘ī (d. 204/820) who is reported to have said: ‘I do not care where a tradition comes from, be it Kūfa, Baṣra or Syria, as long as it is sound.’ And the famous Baṣran traditionist, the mawlā

244. Cf. al-Khaṭīb, Ta‘rīkh Baghda‘d, xiv, p. 104.
246. Cf. ibidem, i, p. 323.
247. Abū ‘l-Qāsim al-Balkhī, Qabūl al-akhbār, p. 54.
249. Ibidem; cf. also al-Khaṭīb, Ta‘rīkh Baghda‘d, ix, p. 257, where Shu‘ba is described as: born in Wāsi‘i, he lived in Baṣra, but his ‘ilm was that of Kūfa.
250. E.g. cf. Tabārī, Ta‘rīkh, i, p. 1784.
251. Cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, i, p. 278.
252. Cf. ibidem, ii, p. 140. Cf. also Abū ‘l-Qāsim al-Balkhī, Qabūl al-akhbār, p. 169, where the Kūfans are said not to set store by the bulk of Baṣran traditions.
'Abd ar-Rahmān b. Mahdī (d. 198/814) upheld the views of various hadīth centres, while he preferred the ra'y of the Medinese.254

**A tentative chronology of ṭalab al-‘ilm**

In the foregoing section I have tried to demonstrate that the predominant characteristic of the various centres, in which in early Islam traditions were collected and recorded, was their regionalism. It is proposed here to adduce yet another argument in support of this view. This argument concerns the ṭalab al-‘ilm journeys and the relatively late date when this activity became the general practice. If it can be proved, as will be attempted in the following pages, that the earliest data on ṭalab al-‘ilm journeys cannot be traced back to a time earlier than the beginning of the second century/the 740s–750s, this constitutes, surely, additional evidence for the overall regional character maintained in the various hadīth centres during the first hundred years or so after the prophet’s death.

The Arabic expression ṭalab al-‘ilm, first of all, does not necessarily point to extensive traveling; only when traveling is *expressis verbis* referred to in context with ṭalab al-‘ilm are we justified in interpreting the expression as collecting hadīths also in centres outside one’s own. As we have seen above, various transmitters, who flourished during the latter half of the first century were sometimes claimed by more than one centre, e.g. Zuhri, but this did not entail that henceforth Syrian and Medinan traditions constituted the same material. There are also transmitters who, born in one centre and having heard traditions with the local hadīth masters, moved to another centre and disseminated the learned material there (cf. above p. 40, Abū Umayya ‘Abd al-Karīm). Yet other transmitters moved away, with the hadīths learned in their city of birth, via one other centre, to settle definitively in a third. Mā’mar b. Rāshid is a good example of such a traditionist. Born in Baṣra, he allegedly started collecting traditions after Ḥasan al-Baṣrī had died in 110/728. Then he traveled to the Hijāz where he also collected hadīth to settle finally in the Yemen, where he died in 153/770.

I found one unambiguous ṣawa’il report indicating who was the first traveling hadīth collector. It is this same Mā’mar. b. Rāshid.255 Furthermore, Rāmahurmuzi gives a concise list of ṭabaqas of hadīth travelers in

255. Cf. al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Ar-riḥla fi ṭalab al-hadīth*, ed. Nūr ad-Dīn ‘Ītr, Damascus 1975, p. 94, a statement ascribed to Ibn Ḥanbal. Another early transmitter, who traveled around to contact Successors but who was otherwise universally mistrusted, was an almost exact contemporary of Mā’mar, al-Mughira b. Ziyād (d. 152/769), cf. Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhib*, x, p. 260. That Egypt is again lagging behind in comparison with the other hadīth centres, seems to be substantiated by the report that the first to travel from Egypt to Iraq in search of ‘ilm was one Abū Sa‘īd ‘Uthmān b. ‘Aṭīq al-Ḥuraqī (d. 180/796), cf. Ibn Bāṭish, 1, p. 256.
which he mentions 'Abd Allāh b. al-Mubārak (d. 181/797) as the first traveler of the first ṭabaqa. In his tarjama we read that he started collecting hadiths in the year 141/758. But in 'Abd Allāh b. 'Awn (d. 151/768) we encounter a hadith traveler who started his search for traditions allegedly ten years earlier in 131/750. All these data point, as mentioned above, to a time well into the second century.

It is true that there is also a reference to the Syrian Successor Makhlūl (d. between 112/730 and 118/736) as having made extensive journeys in search of knowledge, but perhaps Makhlūl constitutes one more example of that class of Successors, who were at the same time well-known fuqaha', whose personal opinions were in the course of time 'raised to the level' of prophetic traditions (see above p. 45, note 158), as is also substantiated by the numerous cases of samā' from Companions which are doubted.

Besides, the term 'ilm in Makhlūl's alleged statement (tu'fu 'l-arḍa kullahu fi ṣalab al-'ilm) (i.e. I roamed the world in search of knowledge) may, moreover, for a change very well be interpreted as referring to something other than hadiths. 'Ilm in this context should rather be identified with fatwās, qaḍā's or, simply, ra'y. This can be substantiated with various quotations from the tarjama of an older faqith, Māsrūq b. al-Ajdā' (d. 63/683) from Kūfah. In this tarjama Sha'bi is recorded as having said that he had never set eyes on someone who was ṣalab li 'l-ilm (i.e. more widely traveled) than Māsrūq. Here 'ilm definitely must refer to something other than hadith, if we want to harmonize that with Ahmad b. 'Abd Allāh al-'Ijli's statement who reported that Māsrūq was one of the fatwā givers and Ibn Sa'd's brief description of him (lahu ahadith salīḥa) which is tantamount to saying that he allegedly transmitted a few traditions of passing quality mainly of religious – not legal – tenor.

It is also true that we find quite a few references to slightly older transmitters who made one or more pilgrimages to Mecca and used the opportunity to hear traditions with Ḥijāzī masters. But this did not result, at least not during the first/seventh century, in the bulk of hadiths becoming 'common property' of more than one centre. And although Anas b. Mūlik's alleged traditions from the prophet are 'claimed' by both Medina and Başra – he supposedly lived many years in each centre, although it is impossible to

256. Rāmahurmuzi, pp. 229-33. Other names in this list of the earliest major traveling hadith collectors are Zayd b. al-Hubab (d. 203/818), Ābu Dāwūd Sulaymān b. Dāwūd at-Ṭayālīsī (d. 203-4/818-19), Asad b. Mūsā (d. 212/827) etc.
258. Ibidem, p. 347. This may be considered as more or less the period that Sufyān ath-Thawrī (d. 161/778) began his activities.
263. Ibidem. Extensive reading in Ibn Sa'd and other rijāl works has taught that this is the precise meaning of those words. See Chapter 5 for more nuances of the adjective salīḥ.
ascertain exactly when he lived where (see also p. 46 and note 169 above) – it is a striking fact and a highly significant one, I think, that examination of Anas’ traditions in the Muwatta’ tells us264 that Medina’s ‘claim’ to Anas rests on various Medinese Successors in Anas isnāds, such as Zuhri, Sharīk b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Abi Namir, Isḥāq b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī Talha and al-‘Alā’ b. ‘Abd ar-Rahmān. However we also encounter in the Muwatta’ various Iraqi Anas isnāds with Successors such as the Baṣrān Humayd at-Ṭawil and the Kūfun forger ‘Amr b. Shamar (cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Lisān, iv, nos. 1075 and 1096).

If, for the sake of argument, Anas is held responsible for all this diverse material, the simple – but nonetheless inevitable – question why he has not instructed his Baṣrān pupils in the same traditions as his Medinan ones, or for that matter his Medinan pupils in the same material as his Baṣrān ones, remains unanswered. Even if we accept Anas’ traveling up and down between Baṣrā and Medina as historical, his alleged activities in hadith transmission are doubtful in the extreme, something for which Anas himself is not to blame, only those countless transmitters who falsely claimed to have heard traditions with him. In sum, the dichotomy between Iraqi material traced back via Anas to the prophet and Medinan/Syrian material traced back via Anas to the prophet cannot satisfactorily be explained, if the historicity of Anas as transmitter of prophetic traditions is maintained.

In connection with ṭalab al-ʿilm traveling a few sayings inciting people to this meritorious activity came into existence. The sources have preserved indications of the persons who brought them into circulation. Piecing together these indications yields a result which can be adduced as an argument in favour of the chronology suggested in the beginning of this section.

The saying Ṭalab al-ʿilm farḍa (searching for knowledge is an obligation) was reputedly invented by one Ziyād b. Maymūn who probably flourished in the first half of the second/eighth century.265 As a variant of this saying may be considered the slogan Ṭalab al-ḥalāl farḍa baʿda ʿl-fardā (searching for permissible [precepts] is a secondary duty) ascribed to the forger ‘Abbād b. Kathir ar-Ramli (d. after 170/786).266 Another hint of a date can be distilled from the alleged forger of the well-known saying Uṯlubū ʿl-ʿilm wa-law bi ʾṣ-Ṣin faʾinna ṭalab al-ʾilm farḍa ʾalā kulli muslim (search for knowledge even as far as China, for this is incumbent upon every Muslim) who is listed267 as Ṭarīf b. Sulaymān (v.1. Salmān) Abū ʿĀtika. It may be

264. With the exception of one (ṭahāra 44, = vol. 1, p. 37), with a complete isnād, one (ṣiyām 51, = vol. 1, p. 307) with a munqat isnād (which is his own saying) and four opinions ascribed to ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb (libs 19, = ii, p. 918; sifat an-nabī 30, = ii, p. 933; salām 5, = ii, p. 961, and kalām 24, = ii, p. 992), all the other thirty hadiths are also listed in either Bukhārī or Muslim or both.

265. Cf. Dhahabi, Mizān, ii, pp. 94f.; cf. also Ibn Ḥajar, Lisān, i, no. 353, in which one Ibrāhīm b. Mūsā is credited with this saying.

266. Cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, v, pp. 102f.
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assumed that he flourished ca. 160/777 or later, when we see that a pupil of his, one Ḥasan b. ʿAtiyya, died in 211/826.268 As a forger of the last half is also mentioned Ḥafṣ b. Sulaymān (d. 180/796), a notorious kadhdhāb.269 It is worthy of note in this context that medieval commentators labeled the ḥadīth weak only as far as its isnād is concerned, and sound in maʿnā.270 For example, Shams ad-Dīn Abū ʿl-Khayr Muḥammad b. ʿAbd ar-Ḥaṁmān as-Sakḥāwī (d. 902/1497), in his commentary on this ḥadīth, went to considerable trouble to point out that in spite of its numerous isnāds being all ḍaʿif, the message contained in the saying was sound.271

Another ṭalāb al-ʿilm tradition runs as follows (after a lengthy preamble):

Man salaka ʿarīqan yatlubu fihi ʿīlman salaka bihi ʿarīqan min ʿurūq al-janna (he who sets out searching for knowledge, sets out on a path that leads to paradise). The oldest common link (for this term see Chapter 5) in its various isnāds is ʿĀṣim, supposedly the son of the famous Rajāʾ b. Ḥaywa, ʿUmar II's chief advisor. The transmitter from whom this ʿĀṣim allegedly received it is, as is so often the case with a cluster of isnāds branching out after the oldest common link, a majhūl, one Dāwūd b. Jamīl. He, in turn, transmitted it from another majhūl, one Katīr b. Qays. In reverse order, here we have a saying with the isnād: prophet – Companion (sc. Abū ʿd-Dardāʾ) – majhūl – majhūl – ʿĀṣim b. Rajāʾ – various different transmitters. The evidence to be gleaned from this isnād makes it a Syrian one which originated probably during ʿĀṣim's lifetime, i.e. presumably in the 130s or 140s (750s or 760s) at the hands of ʿĀṣim himself or (a) person(s) using his name.

This tradition has an Iraqi equivalent of similar wording with a common link, a man again called ʿĀṣim, but this time it is allegedly the famous Qurʾān expert, the son of Bahdul. The two transmitters from this ʿĀṣim b. Bahdala Abū ʿn-Najjād to the prophet are both from Kūfa, Zīr b. Ḥubaysh and the Companion Ṣafwān b. ʿAssāl respectively. ʿĀṣim b. Bahdala having allegedly died in 128/746, we may assume that this Kūfan fabrication came into existence a decade or so earlier than its Syrian counterpart. Interesting is a remark attributed to Ismāʿīl b. Ibrāhīm b. Miqṣam, commonly known as Ibn ʿUlayya (d. 193/809), that everyone with the name ʿĀṣim has a bad memory.272 (Does he hint at the phenomenon described in Chapter 4 of

269. Cf. Ibn Mājā, Sunan, 1, p. 81 and Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, ii, pp. 400ff.; other candidates are Ibrāhīm b. Sallām, cf. Lisān, 1, no. 159; Ahmad b. Ibrāhīm, ibidem, no. 408, and, furthermore, al-Haythami, Majmaʿ az-zawā'id, 1, pp. 119ff., for a number of others featuring in Tabārānī's three collections; next we read this tradition supported by the highly doubtful isnād: Kudaymi-ʿUbayd Allāh b. Mūsā-ʿA mash-Anas-prophet, in which it is not entirely clear which link may be held responsible, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, iv, p. 224.
270. Cf. the sources quoted in Ibn Mājā, Sunan, 1, p. 81.
clusters of names of probably fictitious namesakes around one historical person, sc. this 'Āsim the Qur'ān expert?) Even if the editor, Nūr ad-Dīn 'Ītr, of al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī’s Ar-riḥla fi ṭalab al-ḥadīth does his utmost to cleanse all these ṭalab al-‘ilm traditions from blemishes and, therefore, also tries to reason away any criticism leveled at this Kūfan one, he does quote Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr who said that this tradition is extant as a mawqūf as well as a marfūʿ. As a mawqūf the saying is attributed to the Companion Ṣafwān b. ‘Assālī and the marfūʿ version is given in the Jāmiʿ. The fact that both versions have survived seem to point unmistakably to the saying having originated in 'Āsim’s lifetime or shortly thereafter, being in the course of time ‘raised to the level’ of a prophetic saying.

Finally, the fact that traveling around in those early days was no sinecure is amply attested in an entertaining account of a journey of Abī Ḥātim (d. 277/890). In its simplicity and ingenuity this account has the ring of truth.

Summary and conclusions

In any study of an allegedly early Muslim ḥadīth there are, I think, three questions that should be asked before any other:

1. Where did the ḥadīth originate?
2. In what time did the ḥadīth originate?
3. Who may be held responsible for bringing it into circulation?

Through the ages Muslim scholars, who devoted their energy to the study of prophetic traditions, have asked – among others – these same questions and have found the following answers:

If a tradition is considered ‘weak’, because one or more of its iṣnād’s transmitters turn out to be ‘weak’ or unknown or notorious for mendacity or simply guilty of having brought this particular tradition into circulation, then therein lie the required answers.

But if a tradition is deemed ‘sound’, that is, if the iṣnād it is supported by is ‘sound’ by the generally accepted standards, because all its transmitters have impeccable reputations and each pair of consecutive transmitters are known to have met one another or are at least known to have been contemporaries at some point, and/or if this tradition is listed in one of the canonical collections, where it is labeled ‘sound’ by learned medieval commentators, then it is simply assumed to have originated there where its matn indicates it has, that is somewhere in the Ḥijāz, in Mecca, Medina or during a campaign, during the life of the prophet, whose activities and/or statements are reported by one or more of his ever reliable Companions.

We do not possess accurate figures, but one would not be far off the mark in saying that probably the vast majority of Muslims of today, scholars and

274. Jāmiʿ bayān al-‘ilm, i, p. 33.
laymen alike, do not in any fundamental way disagree with the findings and theories of Muslim scholars concerning the hadith as formulated in the early Middle Ages and henceforth transmitted down through the centuries until this very day with but a few minor and immaterial modifications added.

This study does not deny that in all probability the prophet’s statements and/or activities may have, at least partially, been reported by one or more of his followers, but it may have become apparent from the foregoing pages that I am sceptical as to whether we will ever be able to prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that what we have in the way of ‘sound prophetic traditions’ is indeed just that what it purports to be.

Differently put, it seems likely that at least part of the prophetic traditions listed in one or more canonical— or even non-canonical—collections deserves to be considered as a fair representation of what the prophet of Islam did or said, or might have done or said, but surely it is unlikely that we will ever find even a moderately successful method of proving with incontrovertible certainty the historicity of the ascription of such to the prophet but in a few isolated instances.

The conclusions derived from the foregoing pages which underline and/or corroborate what has just been said can be summarized as follows, as centring in the three basic questions asked at the beginning of this summary.

1. Where did a specific hadith originate?
Probably in the region where the traditionist mentioned at the Successor’s level in its isnad operated. (This answer may apply to the majority of traditions listed as ‘sound’ in the so-called canonical collections; in later, not canonized, collections we encounter traditions which may not be so easy to identify as to region of origin since wholesale isnad fabrication had become sophisticated enough to disguise a hadith’s provenance more or less successfully.) The chance that we are able to conclude that a certain hadith originated in the region where the Companion of its isnad resided—if that is different from the Successor’s region—is remote in view of the fact that the historicity of the link between Companion and Successor appeared the most difficult of all to establish.

Too many Companions, especially Anas, Abū Hurayra, Ibn ‘Abbās and Jābir b. ‘Abd Allāh to name but a few of the most important alleged hadith transmitters among them, were ‘credited’ with such colossal numbers of obviously forged traditions that it is no longer feasible to conceive of a foolproof method to sift authentic from falsely ascribed material.

Moreover, the majority of Companions had already died when the necessity to name one’s informant became generally felt. So if a Successor had indeed heard a report concerning the prophet from an older Companion—or, for that matter, that Companion’s own personal opinion or judgement—it was not until, at the earliest, in the seventies of the first century (690s),
and probably later, that he was required to name that informant. And by 
that time the possibility to check his claim as to truthfulness was no longer 
there. Even if it is assumed that he actually correctly remembered that he 
had heard it from a specific Companion, that did not automatically mean 
that this Companion reported on a situation pertaining to the prophet's 
lifetime, describing the *sunnat an-nabi*. We have seen that the need for 
traditions traced all the way back to Muhammad only began to be em-
phasized under 'Umar II (reigned 99–101/717–20) and that only as a conse-
quence of this emphasis what was known as reports containing the personal 
opinions of Companions or Successors became 'raised to the level' of a 
prophetic saying, no doubt in order to lend them more prestige. It is there-
fore impossible to dismiss the assumption that any 'prophetic' tradition 
from a canonical collection may have started life as the personal opinion of 
a Companion or a later authority, especially if we find this same tradition 
also somewhere else with an *isnad* ending in that Companion or, for that 
matter, any other old authority other than the prophet himself.

Even if it is maintained that a 'prophetic' tradition, *because* it cannot be 
found also in the form of a personal opinion ascribed to another authority, 
has therefore to be accepted as being just that, the fact that there are so 
many examples of 'prophetic' sayings that *are* traceable to a Companion or 
a Successor, makes any 'prophetic' saying suspect as also belonging to that 
genre, but whose counterpart simply has not survived in the sources avail-
able at present.

Moreover, the Successors of *isnāds* are by no means automatically 
responsible for those *isnāds* having been 'raised to the level' of a prophetic 
tradition. This could have been achieved at the hands of a later generation. 
We also saw that not only did the four rightly-guided caliphs in the majority 
of cases bring forward their own solutions, but the *fuqahā* of the different 
administrative centres of the young Islamic empire relied also mainly on 
their own proper judgements to solve problems presented to them by those 
who lacked their special insight. Their opinions, as far as they are still listed 
as such scattered over various sources, can be assumed to have originated in 
the regions where they resided.

2. When did a specific *hadith* originate?

Part of the answer lies, I think, already in the answer given to question 1: at 
the earliest sometime during the lifetime of the Successor of the *isnād* or 
later, as was probably the case with Egyptian *hadīths*; or earlier, as can be 
proved in a few isolated cases with evidence from other sources. Historical 
sources can sometimes be called upon to date a certain precept more accu-
rately as in the case of, for example, the fast of Ramaḍān which was for the 
first time made obligatory under 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb's caliphate 
(13–23/634–44). This may mean that all other reports dealing with this same 
issue might have their historical origin in the same period. But the overall 
majority of allegedly the most ancient traditions is likely to have originated
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at the earliest in the course of the last few decades of the first century (700s–720s), when for the first time the need for traditions became generally felt. The isnād as institution had just come into being and slowly but gradually the concept sunnat an-nabi began to eclipse the sunna of a region or of a (group of) person(s). That the number of traditions was still very small in the first century is proved by the total absence of them in certain authentic – or at least until now not yet conclusively proven as being unauthentic – early Islamic documents, where we would have expected them to be adduced in the first place, such as Hasan al-Baṣrī's epistle to 'Abd al-Malik, or the near-absence of them in, for example, 'Umar II's epistle addressed to the Qadariyya. It was in Iraq that the hadith literature underwent its first major growth and this started probably not much earlier than the final years of the first century/710s.

3. Who may be held responsible for bringing a tradition into circulation? Again the answer to this question has already partially been given in the answers to questions one and two. If isnāds have any historical value at all – and those that were not fabricated in their entirety have that, but how shall we ever be able to prove in the case of every single isnād that it was not fabricated? – it is again in most cases the Successor who can be held responsible as the earliest likely candidate. But as the investigation into the growth of traditions may have shown, the first major growth of hadith occurred several decades after the turn of the first century/750s and later, a time when most of the Successors were already dead, something which makes the following tier in the isnāds, the so-called class of ‘Successors of Successors’, into even more likely candidates. What is more, there is always the possibility, as the case of Hasan al-Baṣrī made abundantly clear, I think, that pupils, or anonymous persons using those pupils' names, contemporaneous or from a later period, simply inserted his name in otherwise fictitious isnāds in order to support those ‘traditions’ they sought to bring into circulation. This form of fraud, so widespread during the second/eighth century and known by the general term tadlis, was hardly ever detected. Sometimes we are just fortunate in that the rijāl works have preserved the information that such and such was solely responsible for having invented a certain hadīth, information which makes the caution concerning tadlis committed by (an) otherwise unknown person(s) rather less imperative. But in the case of numerous transmitters listed in isnāds supporting traditions from the canonical collections we are not so fortunate. There are still a great number of transmitters dealt with in the rijāl works whose reputations are described as being without any blemish, even if on the basis of data adduced from elsewhere it can be proven with undeniable evidence that the material in whose transmission they are said to have been instrumental bears sure signs of fabrication, a fabrication which in all likelihood dates from their lifetimes. In Chapters 4 and 5 more will be said regarding the on the whole limited success of Muslim rijāl
criticism which, as we saw above, came relatively late into being, in spite of the fact that the isnad as instrument of scrutiny had come into existence relatively early and that the beginnings of fabrication on the one hand, and the ‘raising to the level’ of prophetic traditions on the other hand, had been in process several decades before full-fledged rijāl criticism came into being.

After these three questions it seems appropriate to give a bird’s eye view of how the earliest stages of hadith transmission in Islam could be described.

During the prophet’s lifetime most of his followers can be assumed to have talked about him. After his death the only people who continued to do so in a way that may be construed as foreshadowing the standardized and regulated hadith transmission of, say, the last few decades of the first century/700s–720s, when, as was perhaps demonstrated above, the earliest hadiths provided with isnāds came into circulation, were the quūṣās.

Parallel with this phenomenon we find fuqahā’ and also ‘ulamā’, the former formulating their own ideas about how life should be approached in the light of the new religion, the latter mainly pointing to formulations of this sort arrived at by others. A few quūṣās may be assumed to have entered the ranks of the ‘ulamā’ or even those of the fuqahā’ by popular acclaim, whereas a few ‘ulamā’ or fuqahā’ may not have been able to maintain their position among their colleagues and were subsequently classified, or downgraded, as belonging to the quūṣās. The activities of fuqahā’ and ‘ulamā’ also developed into what later came to be called hadith transmission.

The first stories (qīṣās, aḥādīth) related by the quūṣās probably contained tarhib wa-targhib and faḍlā‘il/mathālib elements. The contents of the statements and opinions disseminated by the fuqahā’ and to a certain extent also those spread by the ‘ulamā’ will probably have comprised facts and features, as well as enjoinments and prohibitions, pertaining to the new religion, in other words, materials of a legal/ethical nature with a sometimes strong religious flavouring, which was probably directly inspired by more or less successfully preserved memories of what the prophet had said and done, or derived from the spirit of the revelation which Muḥammad said that he had received from God.

Fabrication or forgery, that is the deliberately falsely ascribing of invented texts (matns), often taking the form of dicta, maxims or slogans, of distinctly anti-Islamic, or un-Islamic, or purely socio-political, or doctrinal, or otherwise objectionable – or, in many cases, perfectly unobjectionable – tenor to revered authorities, whose respectability was expected to guarantee these texts’ acceptance, had begun probably almost immediately after the prophet’s death, if not on a small scale even already during his lifetime.

In the course of the second half of the first century/700s and later, the bringing into circulation of suchlike materials, which were felt to have no
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footing whatsoever in the new religion and its lofty ideals, instigated some people to start interrogating informants as to their sources. Also the all too rapid proliferation of less objectionable traditions, mainly the result of religious fervour and imagination of quṣṣāṣ and other devout individuals, traditions in short that can be classified in the category of tarḥīb wa-targḥīb—generally considered harmless—prompted the more sceptical collectors to probe into the way traditions were obtained.

Scrutiny of informants gave way to the creation of the institution of the isnād probably at the earliest in the late seventies of the first century (the late 690s). The isnād, if found ‘sound’, was thought to guarantee the authenticity of the matn it supported. This scrutiny of isnāds resulted in an increasingly sophisticated criticism which developed in the course of time into a separate science, whose birth can be dated to at least half a century after the birth of the isnād.

But ḥadīth criticism, mainly confined to isnād criticism, came too late to become an adequate tool for sifting the material that could genuinely be ascribed to the oldest authority of its isnād from that which could not thus be ascribed. And apart from its having come too late to the rescue of the developing ḥadīth literature, it suffered from two serious, interrelated shortcomings both pointing to its naïveté:

(1) isnāds, even ‘sound’ ones, could have been fabricated in their entirety, something which in the case of especially the traditions in the canonical collections never seems to have been taken into consideration; and directly related to this:

(2) the near-absence of the application of suitable criteria for probing mains.

Equally undetected in the science of ḥadīth criticism, but for a relatively small number of cases, was the phenomenon of traditions being ‘raised to the level’ of prophetic traditions concomitant with the narrowing down of the broader and largely unspecified concept sunna (of one person or a group of people, or a region) to the more limited concept sunnat an-nabi, something which required isnāds going back all the way to the prophet himself.

That the large-scale fabrication of ‘proper and sound’ isnāds with the prophet at the very end remained on the whole undetected is all the more astonishing when we realize that in the later compiled tarājim devoted to Islam’s first and foremost fuqahā’, practically no one was not noted for īrsāl or various cases of doubtful samā’. As examples of those fuqahā’ Sa’īd b. al-Musayyab and Hasan al-Baṣrī held a prominent position. The age trick proved, furthermore, an adequate and almost entirely undetected means to compose ‘sound’ isnāds.

Thus ḥadīths multiplied, and this in the Iraqi centres of the Islamic empire much more so than in the other centres. The proliferation, collection and codification of ḥadīths in the different centres occurred, at least during the first century, largely on a local scale. Until the middle of the first
half of the second century (about 740) the centres were characterized by – among various other individual features – an overall regionalism which, only with the onset of *talab al-ilm* journeys, gradually disappeared.

This regionalism enables us, I think, finally to draw the conclusion that, for instance like in the case of Anas b. Mālik, the Companion of an *isnād* cannot possibly be held responsible for the material traced back through his name, when, although he is ‘claimed’ by two different centres, the traditions transmitted in these two centres in his name do not show a considerable overlap.
CHAPTER TWO

The role of qādīs in the spreading of traditions

Al-qūdātu thalātha: qādiyyīni fi 'n-nūr wa-qādīn fi 'l-jannā: rajulun qadā bi-ghayri 'l-haqqī fa-ahāka fa-dhāka fi 'n-nūr wa-qādīn la ya'tamu fa-ahāka huqūqa 'n-nūs fa-huwa fi 'n-nūr wa-qādīn qadā bi 'l-haqq fa-dhalika fi 'l-jannā.

A prophetic saying transmitted on the authority of Burayda b. al-Ḥuwayb, from the Ḥadīth of Tirmidhi, Kitāb al-ahkām.

Introduction

In the previous chapter I have indicated on various occasions among the early Islamic transmitters of traditions certain distinct categories, such as the early quṣṣāṣ, the ‘ulamā’, the fuqahā’ and also those who sometimes combined more than only qīṣāṣ, or only ‘ilm, or only fiqh in their transmission.

In the present chapter it is proposed to scrutinize in more detail the ḥadīth output — if any — of another category of people, who seem to constitute excellent study material for drawing conclusions as to how the spreading of ḥadīth in early Islam fared at the hands of a certain group of officials, namely the qādīs. But what distinguishes the qādīs favourably as a group from the above-mentioned categories is the fact that, whereas the above-mentioned admit — besides the synchronic one — only partially of a diachronic historical approach, since common distinctive characteristics soon became blurred in the course of the first two centuries A.H., the qādīs’ spreading of ḥadīth can be studied diachronically just as well as synchronically because the function was never abolished. This study also admits of drawing overall conclusions as to qādīs’ procedures when the various centres of the early Islamic empire are compared with one another.

Furthermore, a special study of qādīs seems promising when it is realized that, with the exception of the muḥaddithūn proper, it was the qādīs who, eventually, could not even help coming into contact with ḥadīths through their office, even if they sometimes — as will be amply demonstrated below — seemed to have ignored or pretended to ignore their existence. It may appear that the findings of this chapter seem to corroborate fully the hypotheses and theories outlined in Chapter 1, as to chronology, authorship and provenance of Islam’s earliest ḥadīths.

There is much difference of opinion as to who was the first to be appointed qādi in early Islam. One report says that it was ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb. But another indicates that the prophet and Abū Bakr did not appoint qādīs and
that it was 'Umar who ordered one Yazid b. Sa'id b. Thumama (also called Ibn Ukht an-Namir) to take care of the minor cases. Among the other people mentioned as having been the first qādis are Zayd b. Thabit, 'All, Ubayy b. Ka'b, Mu'adh b. Jabal, Ibn Mas'ūd and others.²

Whatever the historical value of these contradictory reports may be, it is an established fact that when the ruler in early Islam was not able to settle disputes himself, this task was eventually undertaken by the qādi.³ How did he apply himself to this task? There is a well-known, but most probably fabricated, report in which the prophet enjoined Mu'adh b. Jabal to pass final judgement on the basis of the Qur'an, the prophetic sunna and his own personal discernment in that order of preference.⁴ The reason why this report is likely to be a forgery of a later date lies in the assumption that the concept 'prophetic sunna' as one of the possible roots of Islamic jurisprudence is a relatively late one and originated not earlier than toward the end of the first century of the Islamic era (cf. Chapter 1, pp. 30ff.). What, then, if we surmise that this report is not authentic, did the early qādis of Islam have at their disposal to administer justice with?

It seems safe to assume that, wherever possible, certain Qur'anic verses will have been adduced to support certain verdicts, at least by those qādis who knew these verses by heart. That these qādis were by no means numerous may be evidenced by the fact that so many verdicts, which could have been based upon a Qur'anic passage, were in actual fact arrived at in a very different manner. Besides, the Qur'an is not first and foremost a law book and the legal precepts contained in it are limited in number as well as scope. It is, therefore, self-evident that the qādis of early Islam had to resort - and did resort - to other means. These means, apart from a few individual ad hoc measures applied once and never again made use of,⁵ may be

1. Or as-Sā'ib b. Yazid Ibn Ukht an-Namir, according to as-Suyūṭi, Al-wāsad' il lā musāmarat al-awā'il, p. 104.
2. Cf. Waki', Muhammad b. Khalaf b. Hayyān, Akhbār al-qudāt, i, pp. 84ff., 97ff., 104f., 113f.; Suyūṭi, Al-wasd' il, pp. 104f. This list is strikingly similar to that of those Companions who knew all, or large parts, of the Qur'an by heart, cf. Ibn Sa'd, ii 2, pp. 112f. Cf. also Abū Hilāl al-'Askārī, Kitāb al-awā'il, pp. 285ff.
3. In early days the function of qādi was often combined with other functions, cf. Waki', i, pp. 100, 135 and 256 (qādi and amir, cf. Abū Zur'a, Ta'rikh, pp. 198, 610), Waki', i, p. 118 and Ibn Hajar, Tah., vi, p. 272 (qādi and chief of police), Ibn Hajar, Tahdhib, x, 391 (qādi and kharāj collector), Ibn Hajar, Tahdhib, vi, p. 160 (qādi and treasurer), ibidem, viii, p. 268 (qādi and al-bahr = naval forces or islands in the east Mediterranean?).
4. E.g. Waki', i, p. 98; cf. also a letter from 'Umar to Abū Mūsā reproduced, translated and annotated by D. S. Margoliouth in JRAS, 1910, pp. 307-26. For the dichotomy between 'ilm and ra'y, see above Chapter 1, passim, e.g. pp. 74.; Bravmann, pp. 184f.
5. Cf. Kindi, The governors and judges of Egypt, pp. 437f., where a qādi, 'Īsā b. al-Munkadīr (d. 215/830), allowed the person, in whose favour he had passed sentence, to make his opponent lie down on the ground and to place his foot on the man's cheek to humiliate him. On another occasion the judge suggested that the one person, whom he had put in the right, spit in the other person's face for similar reasons. The people did not care much for these methods and requested that the judge refrain from them, which he did.
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classified under two general headings: (1) their own personal judgement, in Arabic ra’y, and (2) traditions going back to earlier authorities, traditions which, as from the end of the first/seventh century and especially in the course of the second/eighth century, were narrowed down to the prophetic sunna and which ash-Shāfi‘ī (d. 204/820) for the first time incorporated in the roots of Islamic jurisprudence.

As mentioned above, this chapter tries to assess what role the qādīs of early Islam have played in transmitting traditions and introducing fabricated ones. It will also be noted to what extent they resorted to ra’y rather than to traditions. The overall picture presented here may perhaps be found useful as a representative cross section of hadith transmitters in general.

With this aim in mind I collected data on all the qādīs I could find, in total some 400, arranged in chronological order up to the time of al-Mutawakkil (d. 247/861) and also by the regions in which they held office. These regions are Egypt, Syria, Medina, Mecca, Baṣra, Kūfah and Bagdad, but I have also made an extensive list comprising the earliest qādīs from other regions, which were added to this study as Appendix III.

Apart from the regional biographical lexica utilized in appendix III, I have used as source material Kindī’s Governors and judges of Egypt, Akhbār al-qudāt by Wāki‘ Muḥammad b. Khalaf b. Ḥayyān, al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī’s Ta’rikh Baghdād, Kitab at-tabaqāt al-kabīr by Ibn Sa‘d, Buhkārī’s Kitāb at-ta’rīkh al-kabīr, Kitāb al-jarh wa’t-ta’dīl by Ibn Abī Ḥātim ar-Rāzī and finally Tahdhib at-tahdhīb by Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī and Līsān al-mīzān by the same author. Since the last two works are supposed to contain all the transmitters of traditions of all recognized hadith compilations of at least the first three centuries of the Islamic era, it can safely be concluded that if a certain qādi is not listed in either one, he was generally, not even in the widest sense of the word, known as a traditionist, although it cannot be denied that he occasionally might have adduced a tradition.

It is probable that many a student of early Islamic history, who asks the question: ‘what role have the qādīs played in the spreading of hadith?’, immediately comes forward with the provisional answer that they are likely to have participated whole-heartedly in fabricating as many traditions as suited their professional needs. My investigations have led me to the conviction that the answer to this question is not so self-evident and should be cautiously formulated with due consideration being given to certain subtle distinctions. There is discernible a great variety of attitudes with qādīs living at different times in different regions of the Islamic empire. I therefore propose to deal with each area separately. Let me begin with depicting the situation in Egypt.

The qādīs of Egypt

Of the forty Egyptian qādīs I have examined, twenty-eight are not listed in either of Ibn Ḥajar’s rijāl works, the Tahdhib or the Līsān. That means that
only thirty per cent are known as having occupied themselves with traditions in any way. The first to become well-known for his activities in transmitting traditions was the twenty-third qādi, 'Abd Allāh b. Lahi‘a. However, he was generally recognized as a very poor traditionist whose traditions could not be adduced as arguments. Ibn Lahi‘a was appointed qādi in 155/772. Only five of his twenty-two predecessors are recorded as having transmitted one or a few traditions. In other words, it took a whole century and a half after the prophet’s lifetime before an Egyptian qddi was notably involved in the transmission of hadith. Of the seventeen qādis who held office after Ibn Lahi‘a, twelve were in no way identified with hadith, and of the remaining five only one enjoyed a good reputation. The other four were all known for having transmitted weak traditions, or were otherwise discredited.

Seven of the forty Egyptian qādis were described in the rijāl works as great fuqaha’. Not one of these distinguished himself in any way as a good traditionist. Fiqh and hadith go together only rarely, as will also appear later on various occasions. During the brief reign of ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, the Egyptian qadfs upheld close contacts with this ruler and reached many a decision based solely on their respective ra’y. Fourteen years after the death of Abū Ḥanīfa, which occurred in 150/767, a qādi introduced his madhhab in Egypt, much to the regret of the people who feared for their religious endowments. However, a few years later a qādi was appointed who introduced the Malikite madhhab in Egypt. He had been a pupil of the leading fuqaha’ of Medina, among whom ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān b. al-Qāsim, the first scholar who read Mālik’s Muwatta’ in Egypt. The qādi in question devoted much time and energy to restoring the waqfs to their old splendour.

7. ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān b. Ḥujayra (d. 83/702), Tahdhib, vi, p. 160; ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān b. Mu‘āwiya b. Ḥudayj (d. 95/714), Tahdhib, vi, pp. 217f.; ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān b. Ḥujayra (fl. 90/709), Tahdhib, v, pp. 292f.; Yabyā b. Ma’mūn al-Ḥadrāmi (d. 114/732), Tahdhib, xi, pp. 291f., and Khayr b. Nu‘aym al-Ḥadrāmi (fl. 135/752), Tahdhib, iii, p. 179. It was, in fact, Yazīd b. Abī Ḥābid (d. 128/746) who was the first to propagate ‘knowledge’ in Egypt and to discuss ḥalāl wa-ḥarām and other legal matters. He was mufti of Egypt and one of Ibn Lahi‘a’s masters. Cf. Tahdhib, xi, pp. 318f.
12. Cf. note 10 above, the last qādi enumerated.
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The *madhhab* of Abū Ḥanīfa had a few more representatives among the *qādis* of Egypt, but there were also *qādis* well-versed in either *madhhab*. With the introduction of professional witnesses, mostly lower-class people of Medina who imported their own peculiar ways of life, the *qādi* and his entourage became, even more than hitherto, exposed to ridicule. The singing and dancing of these witnesses inspired many poets of the time to write poems satirizing them.

It is probably a feature common to most human beings to dislike the people who are vested with power. This is also eloquently attested to by the lack of esteem in which the *qādis* in Egypt were often held. Of one of the first *qādis* it was said that when he was still the storyteller, the *qāṣṣ*, he was aided by two angels, but when he also had become *qādi* he was assisted by two demons. One of the best-known depreciatory sayings about *qādis* attributed to the prophet runs: *Man ju'ila qādiyan fa-qad dhubiha bi-ghayri sikkīn* - 'He who is appointed judge will be slaughtered without a knife'. This saying, which apparently also circulated in Egypt in the first half of the third century, is almost certainly a forgery which, probably, came into existence towards the middle of the second/eighth century.

The saying *Man ju'ila qādiyan fa-qad dhubiha bi-ghayri sikkīn* is a – what I might call – well-known anti-*qādi* slogan. Most of the various readings of this slogan have the Successor Sa‘īd b. Abī Sa‘īd al-Maqbūrī as common link in the *isnād*. This al-Maqbūrī, the son of a slave, is one of a category of transmitters belonging to the Successors about whom there is much difference of opinion. In his *tarjama* in the *Tahdhīb* (iv, pp. 38ff.) it says that there are fourteen (!) transmitters of that name. I venture the theory that, when *isnāds* were evaluated in which the name of a transmitter such as this appeared, the *rijāl* experts just could not figure out what to think. His name, Sa‘īd, the son of the father of Sa‘īd, is in itself an indication of the uncertainty about this man. The confusion becomes even greater when all the different *isnāds* supporting this saying, as enumerated in Waki'ī, i, pp. 5–13, are scrutinized. Al-Maqbūrī is not the only common link, neither is he the latest.


18. Cf. *Kindī*, p. 311. It was not uncommon that the functions of *qāṣṣ* and *qādi* were combined in one person. E.g. *Kindī*, pp. 315, 348, 427, but also in other parts of the Islamic empire, e.g. *Listān*, iii, p. 151 and *Tahdhīb*, ii, pp. 265f. Cf. also Yousuf Moukddad, *Richteramt und Rechtswesen in Bagdad von der Stadtgrundung bis zum Ende der Buyidenzeit*, p. 60. (I thank Stefan Wild for drawing my attention to this dissertation) and P. G. Dannhauer, *Untersuchungen zur frühen Geschichte des Qadi-Amtes*, pp. 36–9; cf. my review of this study in *JSS*, xxiii, 1978, pp. 232f. For a report comparing the *qāṣṣ* with the *qādi*, see Waki'ī, v, p. 333.
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All these transmitters are reasonably reliable according to their respective tarajims. It seems justified to assume that the slogan originated at the very earliest in a time contemporary with, or after, the lifetime of the latest common link al-Akhnasi. He must have died circa 150/767, if we assume that his death, which is not recorded, occurred approximately between that of al-Maqburi (d. 117 or 123 or 126/735-744) and that of, for instance, al-Makhramî (d. 170/787). In the tarjama of al-Makhramî we find a salient detail which might almost prompt us to ascribe the slogan to him. Ibn Sa'd reported that he was one of the learned people of Medina who was well-versed in maghâzî and fatwâ. Consequently he was beseeched to accept the function of qâdî, but he succeeded in turning it down until he died (cf. Tahdhib, v, p. 172).

The mystery in which this cluster of isnâds is enveloped becomes even greater, when we see that, instead of Sa'îd al-Maqburi, sometimes Sa'îd b. al-Musayyab is mentioned. It does not seem difficult to guess how this confusion came about, if we realize that the transmitter, instead of with his full name Sa'îd al-Maqburi, is referred to sometimes only as Sa'îd. A later traditionist, who came across this isnâd, may have mistaken this Sa'îd for the well-known Medinese Successor Ibn al-Musayyab (d. between 93 and 100/712-19). Subsequently we also encounter isnâds in which we find the full name Sa'îd b. al-Musayyab. These isnâds either go back to the prophet via Abû Hurayra (marfû'), or directly report the prophet's words (mursal) or stop at Ibn al-Musayyab, as if the saying constituted his own words (mawqûf). Even if this last isnâd may seem to be the oldest, according to the well-known adage formulated by Schacht — the more defective an isnâd, the likelier is its authenticity —, I think the saying should not be dated to Ibn al-Musayyab's lifetime. This Successor, as recorded by Ibn Sa'd, was not at all vigorously opposed to qâdis, as the saying presupposes. All his life he is reported to have issued fatwâs and to have occupied himself with legal matters. Had the slogan been his, it would certainly have been recorded in the lengthy tarjama Ibn Sa'd devoted to him (v, pp. 88-106).

Another argument in favour of the hypothesis that the saying in question is of a later date, if we read for Sa'îd: Sa'îd b. al-Musayyab, is provided by the early isnâd expert 'Ali b. 'Abd Allâh b. Ja'far al-Madini (d. 234/849). He is recorded to have said that al-Akhnasi's traditions from Sa'îd b. al-Musayyab via Abû Hurayra from the prophet are to be rejected (munkar), cf. Tahdhib, viii, p. 152, and also his Al-'ilal, pp. 78ff.

Waki' (i, pp. 11f.) mentions four more isnâds in which Sa'îd al-Maqburi is quoted by transmitters other than al-Akhnasi. All these four isnâds are weak because of one or a few transmitters being either unreliable or unknown. Finally, Waki' (i, pp. 13f.) adduces the saying supported by the Companions Abû Mûsâ al-Ash'ârî and 'Abd Allâh b. 'Abbâs. These two isnâds are also invalidated by weak transmitters.

On the whole, one may conclude that the qâdis of Egypt, more so than their colleagues in other parts of the Islamic empire to be dealt with later, formed an unassuming class of people. They did not participate in wholesale fabrication of traditions. Only two qâdis are mentioned in con-
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The role of qādis, together with the verb wāda’a, the most common technical term for forgery. One is reported to have been too God-fearing to lie,19 and of Ibn Lahi’a it was said that he did not lie on purpose but rather out of carelessness.20 The requirements for the office were not high, certainly not in the beginning. There are some anecdotes recorded in Kindi, which have a ring of truth and which clearly testify to the - what I might call - provincialism of Egypt at the time. When Marwān b. al-Ḥakam visited the country in 65/605, he asked who the local qādi was and sent for him. The qādi, ‘Aḥi b. Sa‘id, was then interrogated as to his merits qualifying him for this office. Marwān said: ‘Do you know the Qur’ān by heart?’ ‘No.’ ‘Can you apply the Qur’ānic laws of inheritance [the farā’iḍ]?’ ‘No.’ ‘Can you write?’ ‘No.’ ‘But how do you administer justice?’ Said the judge: ‘I pass judgment on the basis of what I do know and I ask about those things I do not know.’ Then Marwān said: ‘You shall be qādi [here].’21 And another qādi, a simple and superstitious man, used to conceal an amulet in his beard on Fridays when he had to deliver the sermon. He was afraid of the evil eye of his predecessor whom he supposed to be in the congregation.22

The qādis of Syria

The qādis with whom I should like to deal next all held office in Damascus. Of the twenty-three qādis whose lives I studied, only eight are in any way associated with the transmitting of traditions. Of these eight not one was a great muḥaddith. Whether trustworthy or untrustworthy, they were known for having transmitted a few, sometimes only one, tradition. One was qādi and qāṣṣ at the same time,23 another was considered weak.24 Only two of the twenty-eight were known as experts in fiqh.25 Not one of these is identified with a certain madhhab. It seems that the conclusion is justified that, even more so than in Egypt, the qādis in Syria relied on their skill at improvising.

The qādis of Medina

The qādis of Medina to be discussed next present a picture different from those dealt with hitherto. I have examined a total number of thirty-five

22. Kindi, p. 420; for a few amusing anecdotes about simple-minded qādis, see Ibn al-Jawzi, Akhār al-ḥamqā wa l-muḥkafalān, pp. 64ff.
23. Abū Idrīs al-Khwālānī, Cf. Tahdhib, v, p. 85 and also E.l, 2, s.v.
25. Abū Idrīs al-Khwālānī (d. 80/697), Tahdhib, v, p. 85 and Yazīd b. Abī Mālik (d. 130/748), Tahdhib, xi, pp. 345f. Cf. also Shams ad-Dīn Ibn Ṭulūn, Qudāt Dimashq, pp. 5 and 8f. On the whole one is struck by the scanty information on Syrian judges, on anything Syrian in fact.
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qādis. Twenty-six of them, that is almost eighty per cent, were known as transmitters of traditions. Of those twenty-six, eight were famous for the great number of hadiths they transmitted and fifteen passed on one or only a few. Whether or not this information is historically reliable remains to be seen. It was common practice to insert the names of great people of the past in fictitious isnāds. In any case, four of the twenty-six were notorious forgers. They belong to the last few qādis of the period under discussion. Twenty-six qādis precede them on whose character lay no blemish. Of the four allegedly notorious forgers, the two last ones were at one time also qādis in Bagdad. Traveling from the Hijāz to Iraq in order to collect traditions always changes someone’s outlook, it says in a report. I read in this: always corrupt one’s views. One of these forgers fabricated traditions whenever it suited his ra’y. His judgeship was always mentioned in one breath with his being a liar. When, towards the end of the second century, he held office in Medina, the people were appalled at the unabashed way in which he forged hadiths.

Only five out of the thirty-five qādis were known as competent fuqahā’. That is one out of seven. Four of these five were also great traditionists, one transmitted only a few traditions. All in all, tradition occupies a much more important place among the tools of the trade of the qādis of Medina than was the case with the qādis of Egypt and Syria. And although Medina developed into a recognized centre of fiqh, not one of the seven famous fuqahā’ of Medina is listed as ever having held the function of qādi. Furthermore, the concept ra’y hardly plays a role of importance in the sources that deal with the qādis of Medina, in other words, less emphasis on improvization.

The qādis of Mecca

Let us turn next to the qādis of Mecca. There is but little information about them. It appears, for example from Khalifa b. Khayyāt’s Ta’rikh, that


28. See the last qādi of note 26 above and also Waki’, i, pp. 243–54.


Mecca went without a qādi for certain periods of time. Eight of the fourteen qādis, whose tarājim I scrutinized, are reported as having transmitted traditions. Three of these eight were weak, and of the remaining five, three transmitted a fair number of traditions, whereas two only a few. In general, hadīth played a moderately important part. No mention at all is made of fuqahā' among the qādis of Mecca. The only salient feature that deserves our attention is the fact that quite a few qādis hailed from the noble clan al-Makhzūm.

The qādis of Başra

After the Hijāz we must turn our attention to Iraq, and first of all to the qādis of Başra. I have collected the lives of forty-six. Thirty-two are reported as having transmitted traditions, that is two out of three. Of these thirty-two, nine were considered weak traditionists. But, on the other hand, only one of these was famous as a transmitter and that was Hasan al-Baṣri, whose traditions are probably not even his but attributed to him at a later stage for the sake of prestige.

Ten of Başra's qādis were known as great fuqahā' who, unlike those of Medina, were on the whole very poor traditionists. Hasan al-Baṣri, just mentioned, admitted that he preferred his ra'ay to that of others. Of another faqih it is said that he was weak, although not belonging to the ahl al-kadhib, the people of falsehood. And one faqih was even branded a liar, who purchased tradition collections in Egypt, which he then transmitted under his own name, a procedure deemed equivalent to stealing.

34. This does not mean that there were no faqīhs in Mecca, cf. e.g. Ibn Hanbal, 'Ilal, i, no. 802; Abū Bakr b. 'Abd Allāh as-Sabri claimed that he had 70,000 halāl wa-harām traditions, Tahdhib, xi, p. 27.
35. Cf. also D. Sourdel, Les cadis de Basra d’après Waki'.
36. It is a well-known fact, already observed by a few others also (e.g. cf. J. Schacht, Origins, p. 229), that the famous letter to 'Abd al-Malik ascribed to Ḥasan al-Baṣri does not contain one single tradition, although in a text such as that it was to be expected that arguments were corroborated by hadīths. For an extensive study of Ḥasan as traditionist, see Chapter i, passim. 37. Ibn Sa’d, vii, 1, p. 120.
38. Al-Ḥajjdj b. Artff (d. 145/762), al-Khatib, vii, pp. 230-6. See also Ismā'īl b. Hammad b. Abi Ḥanifa (d. 212/827) who was also da'īf as well as a faqih of even greater repute than Ḥasan al-Baṣri, Lisān, i, pp. 398f. and al-Khatib, vi, pp. 243ff.
Among the qādis of Basra there are a few who are famous—or notorious—for having done something for the first time and, therefore, rightfully would have deserved to be mentioned in the awā'il literature. Since awā'il information is often corroborated by evidence from different sources, I opt for not rejecting it out of hand as unhistorical. No matter how reasonable most early Islamic awā'il seem to be, however, sometimes the information contained in them is baffling (cf. Chapter 1, pp. 10 and 12). When we read that it was already more than one hundred years after the death of the prophet, when the first qādi appeared on the scene who committed injustice (in Arabic: jawr), then that seems stretching our credulity a little too far. And what are we to think of a judge, who died in 145/762, who is reported to have been the first qādi in Islam to accept bribes? It seems difficult to believe that among all those dozens of qādis, who prior to him held office all over the Islamic empire, there was no one who succumbed to palm-greasing! On the other hand, there is seemingly reliable information about the qādi Sawwār b. 'Abd Allāh (d. 156/773) who took his office very seriously. He was the first to take into his service reliable agents, whom he paid wages. Among other things, he also took charge of the waqfs which he placed under trustworthy custodians. In so doing, he considerably enhanced the prestige of his office. It also says in another report that whenever he had to pass sentence he lifted his head to the sky and his eyes became moist.

But apart from this upright qādi—and like his there are quite a few other stories about irreproachable judges—the office became gradually identified with fraudulent practices. The first qādi in whose tarjama I found the allegation that judgeship was considered to entail the deterioration of hadith transmission died towards the end of the second/eighth century. It says in this tarjama: Ma 'alimu anna ahadan qadima baghdada illā wa-qad tu'lliqa 'alayhi fi shay'in mina 'l-hadithi illā Mu'ādh al-'Anbari fa-innahum mā qadarū an yata' allaqā 'alayhi fi shay'in mina 'l-hadithi ma'a shughlihi bi 'l-qada'. 'I did not know of anyone coming to Bagdad whose traditions did not in any way become open to criticism except Mu'ādh al-'Anbari. Indeed, they were not able to expose any of his traditions to criticism in spite of his office of qādi.' But whether reliable or not, even when this qādi was finally dismissed the people slaughtered a camel out of joy and gratitude.

That a qādi who does not rely on traditions and/or his fiqh still may turn out to be a satisfactory official, is indicated in a tarjama of a judge who, in spite of his ignorance in fiqh matters, brought his judgeship to a successful

end exclusively relying on his common sense, his 'aql. From this information it can be inferred that, as was the case with fiqh and hadith, fiqh and qadā' need not necessarily go hand in hand either.

The qādis of Kūfa

Of Kūfa I have examined thirty-eight qādis. Just as in Baṣra, two out of three were in one way or another connected with the transmission of hadiths. Nine were known for a great number of traditions, eleven for a small number. Thirteen Kūfan qādis, that is one out of three—the highest score so far—were good fuqahā', two of whom, both mawlās, were notorious forgers. There are two qādis of Kūfa about whom the sources present an extraordinary incongruity. In the rijāl works they are described as having transmitted very little. Even so, in Akhbar al-qudāt they are listed as the authorities of hundreds of traditions and reports. Virtually all these can therefore, in my view, be considered as of a later date. Shurayḥ b. al-Ḥārith (d. sometime between 78/617 and 99/718) supposedly was qādī for sixty years. He is merely a legendary figure, according to Schacht. His traditions, if there are more than one, are incorporated only in Nasā’ī’s Sunan and in Bukhārī’s Al-adab al-mufrad. Even so, Waki’ lists countless traditions and reports on his authority covering more than two hundred pages. The other example is that of the famous judge ‘Abd Allāh b. Shubruma (d. 144/761). He is not known as a prolific transmitter, even so, in Akhbar al-qudāt there are ninety pages solely devoted to reports on his authority.

46. ‘Abd Allāh b. Sawwār (d. 228/901), Waki’, ii, p. 155; Cf. Kindī, p. 357, where the same is said about an Egyptian qādī.
47. Kūfa’s position regarding fiqh vs. the mere transmission of traditions without fiqh is eloquently attested in a saying attributed to Waki’ b. al-Jarrāḥ (d. 196/812) as recorded in Ḥākim’s Mā’īf, p. 11: . . . wa-hadithun yatadwaluhu ‘l-fuqahā’ khayrun min an yatadawalahu ‘sh-shuyūkh.
48. Nāḥ b. Darrāj (d. 182/798), Tahdhib, x, pp. 482ff., al-Khaṭīb, xiii, pp. 315–18, and al-Ḥasan b. Ziyād al-Lu’lu’ (d. 254/868), Lisān, ii, pp. 208ff., Waki’, iii, pp. 188ff., al-Khaṭīb, vii, pp. 314–17. About another qādī (also a mawlā, although he pretended not to be one, Waki’, iii, p. 129, but see Waki’, iii, p. 140, where it is implied that he was) it is reported that he did not lie deliberately, Tahdhib, ix, p. 303.
50. Cf. Tahdhib, iv, p. 326. I only found one mursal tradition in Nasā’ī’s ‘umra 4 (= vi, p. 277). Circa twenty-five times Shurayh’s personal decisions are recorded in the six books.
52. Thirty-one going back to the prophet, of which five mursal via Hasan al-Baṣrī, twenty-five going back to a Companion and forty-nine ‘stopping’ at a Successor or later authority apart from countless others, Waki’, iii, pp. 37–129.
I think the conclusion is justified that, like those attributed to Shurayh, all these traditions and reports are someone else's and ascribed to him by later generations in order to lend them more prestige. I venture the theory that the names of these two judges may have been inserted for the first time in isnad as late as the middle of the third/ninth century.

The theory that the names of Shurayh and Ibn Shubruma were for the first time inserted in isnads only towards the middle of the third century may be tenable on the basis of the following arguments.

If we explain the virtual absence of traditions and reports with these qādisū in the isnads from collections such as the Musnad of Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/856) and the Sahih of Bukhārī (d. 256/870), whereas in the collection of Waki (d. 306/918) they abound, the assumption seems feasible in my view that they came into existence roughly between 250 and 300/865 and 912. It could be argued that the absence is explained by these reports being considered weak, but in actual fact we can trace the majority of them in the 'six books' and other revered collections supported by isnads in which our two judges are not mentioned. It may be interesting to sketch how a certain isnad with 'Abd Allah b. Shubruma as transmitter developed.

In Ibn Shubruma's tarjama in the Tahdhib (v, pp. 250f.) it says that his traditions can be found in ḥath (the abbreviation for the ta'āliq of Bukhārī, as indicated by Ibn Ḥajar in vol. i, pp. 5f.), m (=Muslim), d (=Abū Dāwūd), s (=Nasā'ī) and q (=Ibn Māja). Looking up the prophetic traditions with Ibn Shubruma in the isnads (as recorded in Waki') in Concordance et indices de la tradition musulmane, we find, for instance, the isnād: ... 'an 'Umāra b. al-Qa'qa' b. Shubruma 'an Abī Zur'a 'an Abī Hurayra ... (Bukhārī, adab 2 = 11, pp. 77). In a technical remark, which Bukhārī adds (=ta'liq) we read: ... wa-qala Ibn Shubruma wa-Yahyā b. Ayyūb ḥaddaithanā Abū Zur'a mithlahu. The same sort of ta'liq we find in Muslim, for example birr 4 (=iv, p. 1974). In birr 3 we read the following isnād: ... Sharīk 'an 'Umāra wa-bn Shubruma 'an Abī Zur'a (= Waki', m, p. 39). This seems to me an intermediate stage in the evolution of the isnād in question. And where Waki' (m, p. 40) has the isnād: ... 'Umāra b. al-Qa'qa' wa-bn Shubruma, we find supporting the same tradition in Muslim, imāra 103 (= iii, p. 1495): ... 'an 'Umāra wa-huwa 'bnu 'l-Qa'qa' ... Nasā'ī has this tradition also, supported by a different isnād (jihād 24 = vi, p. 25) as well as by the isnād: ... 'an 'Umāra b. al-Qa'qa' 'an Abī Zur'a ... (imān 24 = viii, pp. 119f.). This last one we find also in Ibn Māja (jihād 1 = ii, p. 920) and Ibn Ḥanbal, Musnad (ed. Cairo 1313, 6 vols), ii, pp. 231, 384 and 494. Ibn Māja (waṣyda 4 = ii, p. 903) has: ... 'an 'Umāra b. al-Qa'qa' b. Shubruma 'an Abī Zur'a ... This we find again in Ibn Ḥanbal, ii, p. 415, but on pp. 231 and 250 we read only: ... 'an 'Umāra 'an ...

In conclusion, it seems justified in my eyes to say that old isnāds, which had 'Umāra b. al-Qa'qa' b. Shubruma (cf. Tahdhib, vii, p. 423, a nephew of 'Abd Allāh b. Shubruma but older than his uncle) as transmitter, got confused and, via the stage in which nephew and uncle are mentioned both, developed into isnāds in which the uncle appeared alone.

Besides, with the help of the Concordance, I checked a good number of Ibn Shubruma reports, as collected in Waki', in the canonical collections, but our judge never figured in the isnāds.

On the other hand, the phenomenon, various times described in Chapter
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1, namely that sayings of later authorities became ‘raised to the level’ of prophetic sayings in the course of time, can also be witnessed with qādis’ sayings. An eloquent example of this is a saying of the Başran qādi ‘Abd al-Malik b. Ya’lā who died a short time after 100/718. To him is traced the saying Man taraka thalātha jumā’in min ghayri ‘udhrin lam tajuz shahādatuhu (i.e. he who fails to attend three Friday congregational prayers, should not be permitted to testify). The same saying, but with a slight variant (man taraka ‘l-jum’ata thalātha marrātān tahāwunan bihā taba’ā ‘llāhu ‘alā qalbihi, i.e. he who fails to attend the congregational prayer three times out of indifference, will receive God’s imprint on his heart) can be found attributed to the prophet with the wholly obscure Companion Abū ‘l-Ja’d aḍ-Ḍamrī, whose only tradition this is said to be.

In Waki’ there is preserved a dialogue between a Kūfan qādi and a scholar from Medina. This dialogue, although it is difficult to establish its historicity, gives a fair picture of the different ways of approach in the two cities in gathering hadīth. The Kūfan, al-Hasan b. Ziyād, asked his Medinese opponent, ‘Abd ar-Rahmān b. Abī ’z-Zinād: ‘Why do you transmit so many traditions from the prophet and his Companions, while, even so, you do not live accordingly?’ Said the Medinese: ‘We transmit what is adhered to as well as that which is not adhered to in order to know the difference.’ Then the Kūfan said: ‘When you’ll have filled your bag with useless matter, you will find that there is no place left for the truth.’ The Medinese opponent was, according to the Tahdhib, also a mawla, whose traditions transmitted in Medina were deemed more reliable than those he transmitted in Iraq.

The qādis of Bagdad

In Bagdad we see that the qādis, more so than anywhere else, are identified with transmitting traditions. This is not surprising, if we take into account that, when Bagdad was founded, the spreading of traditions had been well under way already for some time. Only two of the twenty-six qādis of Bagdad, whose tarājīm I have studied, seem not to have participated in it. The qādis who held office during the inquisition (218-34/833-48) are not listed in the rijāl works I consulted and have, therefore, not been incorporated in this survey. Their attitude versus hadīth was positively hostile and rooted in religio-political interests rather than in mere indifference. This excluded them automatically from my investigations. But of those qādis, who did not neglect hadīth, who were even prolific transmitters, twelve in all, nine were notorious forgers, two of whom were also known for

their knowledge of fiqh. Of the twenty-four qādis who were concerned with hadith, seventeen were weak transmitters, that is two out of three. The qādis in Bagdad, more so than in regions west of Iraq, seem to have participated in bringing into circulation great numbers of forged traditions. A sizable percentage of these were mawlās, and this in spite of the fact that mawlās were not normally eligible for the function of qādi.

That these forgers did not go about their activities unheeded is attested in numerous anecdotes. For example, when a certain mawlā, who had been appointed qādi, related traditions which he claimed to have heard from Zuhri, the traditionist Ibn 'Uyayna (d. 198/814) used to stick his fingers in his ears. And when Sufyān ath-Thawri (d. 161/778) heard that an old friend of his had become qādi, he rebuked him for having accepted this office. 'It would even have been better for you, if you had been a peddler of salted fish in the streets of Kūfa, than to be judge.' Another famous traditionist, Sulaymān b. Ḥarb (d. 224/839), is reported to have intimated that qādis were usually forgers. The same is implied in a sarcastic remark attributed to the well-known Bagdad qa'ī, Hafs b. Ghiyāth (d. 194/810). When someone kept asking him questions concerning legal matters, he suddenly said: 'Is it perhaps that you want to be appointed qādi? Verily, it is better for someone to stick his finger into his eye to pluck it out and throw it away then to become qādi!'

On the whole, there have been quite a few people who resorted to tricks in order to avoid being installed as qādis. When, on a certain occasion, Hārūn ar-Rashid wanted to appoint a judge, three people were brought forward. The first one acted as if he was semi-paralysed and threw himself on the ground. Hārūn said: 'He won't do', and the man was ushered out. The second man pointed with his finger to his eye and said: 'O commander of the believers, I have not been able to see with this for a year now.' Naturally, Hārūn assumed that the man meant his eye, but in reality he meant his finger. The excuse was accepted and the third man, much to his dismay, got the nomination.

The qādis in other centres

Finally, in this survey of the different centres of the Islamic empire, there remain the outer provinces with their urbanized settlements. The number

60. Also mentioned among the qādis of Medina, see note 26 above, the third qādi. And see note 34 above, where he is mentioned among the qādis of Baṣra.
64. Tahdhib, XI, p. 181. He was at one time qādi in Mecca, see the third qādi of note 32 above.
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- The percentage of qādis who were in one way or another involved in hadith transmission.

- The percentage of qādis who were considered good faqih.

- The percentage of qādis who were known for hadith transmission as well as for their expertise in fiqh matters.

- The percentage of qādis about whom we do not (yet) have relevant information.

of qādis whom I found in the sources is too small to say anything definite about each region or city in particular. I have the impression that the percentage of mawāli among those who were nominated as qādis increases with the geographical distance from Bagdad. Only two judges were known to have been expert fuqaha.67 The majority were bad transmitters. It seems

67. Sharīk b. ʿAbd Allāh (d. 177/793), a very poor transmitter who was also qādi of Wāsiṭ, Tahdhib, iv, pp. 333-7 and the mawla Muhammad b. al-Ḥasan ash-Shaybānī (d. 189/805), qādi of Raqqa, who was also known as a forger of traditions, Lisān, v, pp. 121f.
that most qādīs in the outer provinces relied solely on their common sense. For an extensive list, see Appendix III, and figure 1.

Summary and conclusions

Summing up, it seems justified to exonerate most judges in early Islam from the all too facile imputation that they simply fabricated traditions whenever they needed them. Wholesale fabrication of traditions started in Iraq (cf. Chapter 3), it is true, but only in the course of the second half of the second/eighth century and nowhere else did it attain to the dimensions of Iraq. Mendacity in traditions is, for instance, almost unheard of in Egypt and the limited extent to which it occurred in Syria and the Ḥijāz warns us that we should not conceive of it as something common to all Muslims. Furthermore, although only a few mawāli were appointed qādī, it was they, first and foremost, who were recorded in the rijāl works as forgers. This opinion - as are many of the following - is founded on many years of reading in Muslim rijāl works and privately made statistics.

The office of qādi was nowhere popular. Poems satirizing judges vastly outnumber those eulogizing them. But it is only occasionally that we find scorn expressed for qādīs because of their activities in transmitting traditions. It was in Iraq that qādīs in the end became associated with the fabrication of hadith. Nowhere else is this the case. Another striking fact is that references to bad and unjust qādīs, who abused their office to enrich themselves, are rare. I have mentioned a few of these before. On the other hand, numerous are the references to qādīs who, in spite of the low esteem in which judgeship was held in general, were thought to have done a reasonably good job. Since mathālib defaming judges are just as easy to bring into circulation as fadā'īl glorifying them, it seems to me that the fact that fadā'īl do outnumber mathālib is significant.

This significance is, I think, in no way diminished by the observation that common ‘anti-judgeship slogans’ out-number slogans praising the office in general. These slogans, such as: ‘He who is appointed qādi, will be slaughtered without a knife’ - as referred to before - and: ‘Of every three judges, two will end up in Hell, and only one in Paradise’, on the basis of internal evidence gleaned from their isnāds, these slogans may all have come into being during the time when the muḥaddithūn were at their most fanatic in reviling their Mu'tazilite opponents. That qādīs in general formed a gratifying target may probably have been instigated by the role qādīs played during the mihna (218-34/833-48).

References to judges having been good fuqaha' are on the whole scarce. Only in Medina did fiqh and sound hadith allegedly go hand in hand, in other places the transmission of many traditions seems to have been an

68. In Ḥākim, Ma'rifā, p. 99, it is implied that this slogan has its origin in Khurāsān.
impediment rather than a virtue in a faqih. Cf. figure 2. References to ra’y abound, and often without any tie being indicated with one of the schools of law that gradually came into being. Ra’y may, therefore, in my opinion, also be considered equivalent to ‘capacity for improvisation’, ‘discretion’, or ‘common sense’, connotations which seem lacking in the lofty standard translation ‘individual judgement’.

The overall impression I gained from scrutinizing these 400 judges is one which can hardly be called unexpected. As far as the tarājim allowed it, they came forward as very human, in their sophistication as well as in their lack of it.
CHAPTER THREE

The *man kadhaba* tradition and the prohibition of lamenting the dead. An investigation into *mutawātir* traditions


**Introduction**

One of the customs from the Jāhiliyya generally felt to be incompatible with Islam was the *niyāḥa* i.e. the lamenting of the dead. Although this custom is still found in practically the entire Muslim world, in one form or another, there are many sayings attributed to the prophet and various important contemporaries in which it is officially forbidden.

Goldziher pointed to the *niyāḥa* as constituting one of the major pre-Islamic customs frowned upon by the Muslims of the first generations. He adduced much material from Arabic sources to prove this point and concluded: 'Es liegt wohl hier die Meinungsverschiedenheit zeitgenössischer Theologen vor, welche nach der in dieser Literatur herrschenden Methode in die älteste Zeit zurückverlegt wird. Was man vom Propheten anführt, ist allem Anscheine nach die im II. Jhd. im Hijāz herrschende rituelle Praxis, die man nicht im Unrechte belassen konnte . . .' (italics mine; Schacht’s theory on *isnāds* growing backwards is already hinted at here).

In its vagueness Goldziher’s theory is a tenable one, but one may justly regret that he did not attempt to be a little more precise as to the chronology of the development of this prohibition in Islam. The ban came into being after all on the basis of a host of canonical prophetic sayings which, by his sweeping statement, are all more or less branded as forgeries spread in the name of the prophet to lend them more prestige. As intimated in the final pages of Chapter 1, where I dealt with the three questions one should always ask, I think that, whenever a ‘canonical’ tradition is a subject of research, the first and most important step to be taken is an attempt to date it. Furthermore, if the conclusion is inevitable that a tradition is a fabrication of a date later than the time of the prophet, it is also imperative that the geographical area in which it probably came into existence should

1. Cf. *Muhammedanische Studien*, 1, pp. 251–63, especially p. 258. So far the most extensive study on mourning practices in early Islam, as far as I know, is the dissertation of Irene Grüetter entitled *Arabische Bestattungsbräuche in frühislamischer Zeit* (nach Ibn Sa’d und Buhārī). Furthermore, see A. J. Wensinck, *Some Semitic rites of mourning and religion.*
be defined. Finally, if it is possible to give an account of how the forgery was made, this should be undertaken as well.

In Muslim terminology the hadiths containing a prohibition of niyāha can be considered mutawātir,2 the most common reference to it being the maxim: ‘The deceased will be punished3 by the lamenting [or in a variant: bukā’ = weeping] of his relatives over him.’ This dictum sounds like a slogan and is mentioned in a great many different contexts. Sometimes it occurs separately; at other times it is preceded by a preamble and/or followed by a sequel.

Another mutawātir tradition, even more famous and allegedly reported by a vast4 number of Companions, runs: ‘He who [deliberately] tells lies about me, will have to seek for himself a place in Hell.’ This maxim, which is sometimes thought to be the most mutawātir tradition in the entire tradition literature,5 is often found in connection with the niyāha prohibition. If one investigates the evolution of the one, one inevitably runs across the other on many occasions. Since the latter is also considered by various Western scholars as a fabrication which came into existence a considerable time after the prophet’s death,6 whereas in the Islamic world no one – as far as I know – has ever ventured to air an opinion such as this, two birds may be killed with one stone, if the examination of the one includes an examination of the other.

There is another incentive to study these two traditions in more depth. Since they are both held to be mutawātir traditions, the results of this study may, at the same time, constitute a valid assessment of the concept tawātur in general. An Oriental scholar who, otherwise, appears just as sceptical as Goldziher, where the ascription of the majority of Muslim traditions to the oldest authorities of their isnāds is concerned,7 still seems to set store by a

2. For a survey of definitions given by Muslim scholars through the ages to the concept mutawātir, see Subbi ‘$-Silih, ‘Ulm al-hadth wa-mu4.alahuhu, pp. 147–52. Since the textual variants in traditions prohibiting niyāha are rather numerous, it is perhaps better to speak of them as being mutawātir ma’nawī rather than mutawātir lafte. There was also some considerable difference of opinion regarding the legal implications of the prohibition of niyāha. Without going into details here, I might refer the reader to Nawawī’s commentary on Muslim’s Sahīh, vi, pp. 228ff.

3. In Arabic: Yu’adhhabu, cf. Fritz Meier, Ein profetenwort gegen die totenbeweinung, in which the subtle differences between the nuances ‘to torture’ and ‘to punish’ are examined.

4. In his commentary on Muslim’s Sahīh Nawawī mentioned (i, p. 68) that opinions as to the exact number of Companions who reported this saying from the prophet vary between 40, 60, 87 and 200. See note 18 of my translation of Muslim’s Introduction to his Sahīh in JSAI, v.


tradition being *mutawātir* as a possible guarantee for the historicity of its ascription to the prophet. It is also because of this putative unimpeachability of *tawātūr* – one can almost speak of an aura of holiness – that until today no one seems to have gone to the trouble of investigating *mutawātir* traditions in particular. My own attempt at unraveling the multitude of different *īsnāds* of a ‘genuine’ *mutawātir* tradition resulted in the unforeseen, but in the final analysis inevitable, conclusion that *tawātūr* as such is no guarantee for the historicity of a *ḥadīth*’s ascription to the prophet, as the following pages may show.

It will appear that the present study’s crucial arguments are practically all *argumenta e silentio*. This may, at first sight, seem unsatisfactory or, at least, inadequate to those who only adduce *argumenta e silentio* in support of other, ‘stronger’ arguments but never by virtue of their own strength. To this I can only reply that if there had been other, ‘stronger’ arguments, these would certainly have been adduced first, but there were none as far as I was able to ascertain. Furthermore, another consideration deserves mention here.

It is well-known that the compilatory activities of Muslim collectors in most cases boil down to collecting everything that older compilers have brought together to which one’s own data are simply added. Differently put, since it is the rule to incorporate all the material one’s predecessors have compiled, the absence of certain material in certain collections may be considered as a relevant fact with significant implications for the chronology of that material or its provenance. Especially in the case of such famous dicta or slogans, which later became characterized thanks to the number of their *īsnāds* as *mutawātir* traditions, the mere fact that in some collections they are not listed is significant, and this fact cannot, I think, be dismissed with the consideration that it ‘merely’ constitutes an *argumentum e silentio*. The importance of such sayings as came to be labeled *mutawātir* in the canonical collections is such that their non-occurrence in some other collections raises questions that want answering. In sum, the more famous the *ḥadīth*, the more significant is its absence where we would have expected it to be included and, consequently, the greater is the value of this non-occurrence being adduced as an *argumentum e silentio*.

8. Cf. ibidem, p. 49: Parmis tous ces ḥadīths, il en est un (sc. the tradition *man yakhdīhi ʿllāhu fa-ta maḍīla lahu* etc.) qui connut une immense fortune... Il nous est parvenu avec des *īsnāds* multiples – qui rendent sa révocation en doute impossible en le classant dans la catégorie du *ḥadīth* *mutawātir*.

9. An exception to this general rule can be found in, for example, Ibn Abī Hāṭim’s *Al-jārīḥ wa ʿr-rādīl* as compared with Ibn Ḥajar’s *Tahdhib* and *Lisān*. A close comparison of these biographical lexica shows that from the former work large numbers of unknown, probably fictitious, transmitters were left unmentioned in the latter two.


**NWH in sources other than ḥadīth**

When the occurrence of the verb *nāḥa* – *yanāḥu* with its two verbal nouns *nawh* and *niyāḥa* is traced in all the earliest sources, certain remarkable facts come to light.

First of all, the Qur’ān is silent about this Jāhiliyya practice. The root *NWH* does not occur in it, nor does any other term associated with the practice, at least in a context unequivocally referring to it, e.g. *ranna* (to wail), *‘awwalla* (to bewail), *khamasha* (to scratch the face with the nails), *shaqqa jayban* (to tear the front of the garment as a sign of mourning), *nashara sha’ran* (to let the hair down), *laṭama* or *daraba khaddan* (to strike the cheek in lamentation), *salaqa* (to lacerate the skin), *ḥalaqa* (to shave the head), *kharaqa* (to tear up the garments), not even derivatives of the roots *nadaba* (to bewail), *na’d* (to announce the death of someone) or the term *hidād* in the connotation ‘mourning’. Forms of the root *BKY* (to weep) do not occur in connection with a dead person either.

It is true, according to Muslim exegesis there is one verse in which a prohibition of *niyāḥa* is implied though not expressis verbis. In LX, 12 it says (translation Arberry): ‘O Prophet, when believing women come to thee, swearing fealty to thee upon the terms that they will not associate with God anything, and will not steal, neither commit adultery, nor slay their children, nor bring a calumny they forge between their hands and their feet, nor disobey thee in aught honourable (in Arabic: *wa-lā ya’ṣīnaka fi ma’rūf*), ask God’s forgiveness for them; God is All-forgiving, All-compassionate (italics mine).’ Although there are also other explanations offered concerning the words *ya’ṣīnaka fi ma’rūf*, the generally accepted one is that *niyāḥa* is meant. The isnāds of the reports containing this explanation are for the greater part Iraqi, a few are Egyptian with or without transmitters who practised in Syria. The relevance of these isnāds being Iraqi and Syrian/Egyptian will become apparent in the course of this investigation.

In the earliest historical sources we find the term mentioned for the first time in accounts dealing with the aftermath of the battle of Uḥud, when various (groups of) women are reported to have bewailed the death of Ḥamza b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, the prophet’s uncle. In Ibn Hishām’s *Sīra* we read the words *fa-sami’a al-buka’ wa’n-nawd’ih* (i.e. then he heard weeping and wailing) in an utterance of Ibn Ishq (d. 150/767) without isnād and a few lines down there occurs the term *nawh* in a remark which Ibn Hishām (d. 218/834) added to Ibn Ishq’s narrative. It is only in this additional remark that the prohibition of lamenting is alluded to. Since Ibn Ishq

---


spent most of his life outside Medina in Kufa, Bagdad, Rayy and other places, it is feasible that this may have been the reason why he did use the term *nawâ’ih* which, as we shall see later, may not yet have come into use in Medina in connection with the forbidding of mourning practices, while he was still living there.

In the *Kitâb al-maghâzi* of Wâqidi (d. 207/823) derivatives of the root *NWH* used in context with Hamza’s death occur twice. Like Ibn Ishâq, Wâqidi mostly mentions a collective *isnâd* after which he gives one continuous narrative. It is therefore impossible to see at a glance on the basis of what sort of *isnâd(s)* he inserts the term in his account. But a comparison of this account with the reports preserved in Ibn Sa’d’s *Kitâb at-ţabaqât al-kabîr* enables us to try at least to reconstruct these *isnâds*, something which in the case of Ibn Hishâm, as compared with those *Sîra* fragments preserved in Ţabari’s *Târikh*, has not yielded any result. Again the main concern is whether the *isnâds* can be labeled Medinese, Iraqi, Syrian or from anywhere else.

In the first place there is the story in which the prophet hears women weeping and then says: ‘But Hamza has no one to weep for him [in Arabic: *lakinna Hamzata lâ bawâkiya la-hu*], after which there does not follow a strong interdiction addressed to the women who hasten to weep over him. We find this report in Wâqidi (p. 315) and in several different versions in Ibn Sa’d one of which (iii 1, p. 5, line 15) gives Wâqidi as Ibn Sa’d’s informant. Since the two reports bear distinct similarities, it is feasible that the *isnâd* in Ibn Sa’d may be identified with the one Wâqidi used for his narrative. This *isnâd* contains a wholly unidentifiable transmitter, one ‘Umar b. ‘Uthmân al-Jahshî, who reported this on the authority of his ancestors. Whether this *isnâd* is Iraqi or Medinese cannot be ascertained but, in any case, in the sequel in Ibn Sa’d there is no trace of a derivative of *NWH*. Wâqidi may have mentioned the term in his *Maghâzi* probably for the same reason as I ventured in the case of Ibn Ishâq: he came to hear this term in context with burial proceedings in his Iraqi environment where he settled after leaving Medina.

The second occurrence in Wâqidi (p. 317), in which the prophet forbids *niyâha* in the strongest of terms, could not be traced to an *isnâd* in Ibn Sa’d with Wâqidi heading the chain of transmitters. But looking closely at the other reports in Ibn Sa’d concerning Hamza’s death we find a number of different versions headed by Medinese *isnâds*. In only one of them does a

---

15. This is a technical term coined by Western scholars. It seems to be reminiscent of Ibn Ḥanbal’s statement preserved in Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahâdhib*, ix, p. 43: *Innira‘ayyuhu yuḥaddithu ‘an jamda‘a bi‘l-ḥaddih al-wâhid wa-lâ yufasâṣilu kalâm dhâ min kalâm dhâ.*
16. The unspecific term ‘ancestors’ is probably a clumsy way of saying; ‘*an abîhi – ‘an jaddîhi*, which is the generally accepted way of indicating a family *isnâd*.
17. iii 1, p. 10 passim and 11 (9-15).
derivative of *NWH* occur.\(^{18}\) This *isnād*, it appears, is wholly defective and does not constitute decisive evidence that in Ibn Sa’\(d\)’s time there circulated reliable Medinese *isnāds* supporting reports in which *niyāḥa* was banned, but, as noted above, there were a few in which only *bukā* was frowned upon.

The *isnād* in question deserves, perhaps, the following short digression.

Muhammad b. Ismā’\(l\) Ibn Abī Fudayk–Muhammad b. Abī Ḥamīd–Muhammad b. al-Munkadīr–prophet. Of the first transmitter Ibn Sa’\(d\) says that he reported many traditions but that these should not be adduced as arguments in legal discussions (*laya* bi-*hujjatin*), cf. Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhib*, ix, p. 61. The second transmitter who also counted Wāqīdī among his pupils, who might have passed this tradition on to Ibn Sa’\(d\), is considered a wholly unreliable transmitter. Critics from all over Syria and Iraq agree in this (e.g. al-Juẓajānī, Abū Zur’a, Ibn Ma’in, Ibn Ḥanbal a.o.). He also seems to have been confused with another person of the same name. Furthermore, although this is not a decisive argument, among his masters Ibn al-Munkadīr is not listed (cf. Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhib*, ix, pp. 132ff.). This Ibn al-Munkadīr was a Medinese Successor who lived from 54/674 until 130/748. It is reported that he transmitted from various younger Companions such as ‘Ā’ishā, Abū Hurayra, Jābīr b. ‘Abd Allāh and others. Since ‘Ā’ishā and Abū Hurayra both died in or about 58/679, his traditions from them are generally considered *mursal*. An attempt at arguing this blemish away is found in a *fadā’il* statement attributed to Ibn ‘Uyayna who once said: ‘I have never seen anyone who deserved more to relate statements from the prophet without being asked who his informants were than Ibn al-Munkadīr’ (cf. Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhib*, ix, p. 475). Since Ibn ‘Uyayna was born in 107/725 and allegedly died in 198/814, it is somewhat astonishing to note from someone living in the second century A.H. a statement making little of the *isnād* method at a time when this institution was considered to have been in full use for already approximately half a century or, in the view of certain Muslim scholars, for even more than a century. In any case, Ibn al-Munkadīr does not even name his spokesman from among the Companions, something which makes this *isnād* *mursal*. As a general indication of a questionable *ḥadīth* the *isnād* Ibn al-Munkadīr ‘an Jābīr became a household term among the Medinees, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhib*, vi, p. 283. No matter what criteria one applies to this *isnād*, it is hazardous to adduce it as evidence in any argument.\(^{19}\)

We find quite a few more reports in Ibn Sa’\(d\) in which *niyāḥa* in one form or another is forbidden.\(^{20}\) All these reports concern mourning practices over persons other than Ḥamza and are supported by Iraqi and Syrian *isnāds*. There is only one *isnād* left to be discussed that, but for one wholly unknown transmitter,\(^{21}\) might have been a Medinese one. Ibn Sa’\(d\)’s informant is again Wāqīdī. The report is probably a fragment of a work of Wāqīdī otherwise not preserved, perhaps his *Kitāb ar-ridda*. These two Wāqīdī

---

18. v, 1, p. 18 (2-9).
20. Ibn Sa’\(d\), i, p. 88 (1off. and 19ff.); iii, 1, p. 25 (22ff.); i, p. 148 (18ff.); vi, p. 68 (26ff.); vii, pp. 2ff. passim.
isnāds gleaned from Ibn Sa’d are the only ones supporting reports containing derivatives of NWH that cannot positively be identified as Iraqi or Syrian, but neither can they be labeled Medinese for lack of reliable information on one or more transmitters.

Summing up, it has become clear that neither niyāha nor concomitant phenomena are mentioned in the Qur’ān. There is one verse, however, in which a reference to it is implied. An investigation of the isnāds of the traditions supporting this tafsir yields the result that, apart from being predominantly weak (mursal, munqati‘ or otherwise), not one of them is what can be called a Hijāzī (Medinan or Meccan) isnād.

In the earliest historical sources it is difficult to ascertain where Ibn Ishāq received the information containing derivatives of NWH. In view of his having left Medina at an early age he might have been exposed to the term in reports circulating in his new—Iraqi—surroundings. The same consideration applies to Wāqidi, who also made use of collective isnāds. The occurrences of the term in Ibn Sa’d, however, justify the conclusion that this collector mainly relied on chains of Iraqi or Syrian transmitters heading statements with NWH derivatives. The few Medinese or untraceable isnāds in Ibn Sa’d supporting reports that dealt with weeping at burials do not contain derivatives of NWH and the one and only that does—the one going back to Ibn al-Munkadīr—is defective to the extent that it cannot possibly be considered to constitute conclusive evidence so as to undermine all the other evidence unequivocally pointing in the direction of Iraq, and also to a limited extent to Syria and Egypt, as the breeding ground of the concept niyāha.

This undoubtedly seems, on all counts, a hazardous theory. It is, therefore, with trepidation that one directs one’s attention to the hadīth literature. This is indeed the literature in which one would expect references to niyāha to abound, and a theory such as the foregoing, if at all tenable, should be borne out by evidence provided by numerous isnāds in the hadīth literature. Only then is it to be taken seriously. One cursory glance, however, already reveals that all traditions in which derivatives of NWH occur are supported by Iraqi and Syrian/Egyptian isnāds.

NWH in hadīth literature

Beginning with the oldest printed hadīth collections, we find a variety of traditions in which the occurrence of niyāha is referred to or in which it is explicitly forbidden.

Possibly the earliest²² printed collection currently available to me is the

²². It is, however, difficult to decide which collection is oldest. Supposedly the earliest collection by far, which was edited some sixty years ago, is the Majmū’ al-fiqh attributed to the Shi‘ite imām Zayd b. ‘Ali b. Husayn b. ‘Alī b. Abī Tālib (d. 122/740). Zayd’s authorship has been disputed though and I will have to come back to this in due time, when I shall be dealing with the Shi‘ite hadīth collections.
Ibādite collection of ar-Rabi’ b. Ḥabīb who flourished in the middle of the second century. Instead of nāwh or niyāḥa he has the word bukd’ where he gives the famous slogan. Nothing can be said about the isnād, since the transmitters are nowhere listed in the biographical dictionaries. The only thing it is safe to say is that, since the Ibādites originated in Basra, the isnād is most probably also Basran. Ar-Rabi’ b. Ḥabīb, in any case, studied and acquired his knowledge in Basra. The same goes for the two other links in the isnād, Abū ‘Ubayda Muslim b. Abī Karīma and Jābir b. Zayd al-Azdi.24

In the second oldest collection available to me there is not a trace of NWH either. I mean Malik’s Muwatta’. But more or less the same tradition as in the preceding collection is found here25 with – of course – a Medinese isnād going back to ‘Ā’isha. She, however, somewhat mitigates the prohibition of weeping over the dead by pointing out that the prophet made this statement when watching the funeral procession of a Jewish woman over whom relatives wept. The prophet is alleged to have said on that occasion: ‘You may weep over her, but she will be punished in her grave.’26 This tradition clearly belongs to the genre of rukha as described so extensively by Kister.27 The other tradition in the Muwatta’28 contains a mild injunction

In the tradition collection attributed to Abū Ḥanīfa (d. 150/767), whose dubious historicity will also be discussed below, no derivative of NWH occurs. There is only one allusion to pre-Islamic mourning customs: the adḥān from the house of the deceased is forbidden, since this is reminiscent of the nā’y as practised in the Ḥijāliyya, cf. Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd al-Khwārizmī, Jāmi’ masānaḏ al-imām al-a’ẓam, 1, p. 450; cf. also Abū Yūsuf, Kitāb al-āṯār, p. 80, no. 396.

23. Ḥāshiyyat al-Jāmi’ as-saḥīḥ muṣnaḍ . . . ar-Rabi’ b. Ḥabīb by ‘Abd Allāh b. Ḥumayd as-Sālimī, ii, pp. 350f. For the authenticity of this collection, cf. Ibn Ḥanbal, Ḥal, 1, no. 1455, where it appears that Ibn Ḥanbal was once confronted with a copy of a different work by ar-Rabi’.

24. Cf. the short biographical notices preceding the Jāmi’ in vol. 1, pp. 3–8; also Shammākhī, Kitāb as-sīyar, pp. 76f., 83–6, 102–5. 25. Ḥan‘īz 37 (1, p. 234).

26. Cf. the discussion of this tradition below on p. 124.

27. M. J. Kister, On ‘concessions’ and conduct. A study in early hadīth, in Papers on Islamic history. Studies on the first century of Islamic society, pp. 89–107, especially note 28. To the references listed there may be added Amāli ‘I-Murtaḍā, 1, pp. 108 and 340–3. Also a report in Wāqīdī’s Maqāzī (p. 766) may be considered as belonging to this genre. When the prophet announces the death of Ja‘far b. Abī Ṭālib, he forbids his widow, Asmā‘ bint ‘Umays, to beat her chest, but he allows Fāṭima to weep over him. Wāqīdī’s isnād contains one majhūl, Mālik b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd ar-Rahmān, known as Mālik b. Abī ‘r-Riḍāl (Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, xi, p. 94) or Rajjāl (Jones), who is otherwise not dealt with in the biographical dictionaries. About another transmitter in this isnād, Um‘ ‘Īṣā b. al-Jazzār (or bint al-Jazzār?), nothing specific is known although she is listed in Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, xi, p. 475. Ibn Sa’d mentions the same report from his master Wāqīdī, cf. viii, p. 206. Ibn Iṣḥāq (p. 796), on the other hand, lists it with an isnād in which Mālik b. ‘Abī ‘r-Riḍāl does not occur, since he received it, he says, directly from Mālik’s informant, ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī Bakr b. Muḥammad b. ‘Amr b. Ḥāzm. The interesting point is that in Ibn Iṣḥāq’s version there is no reference to Asmā‘ beating her breast. Is the conclusion justified that Mālik b. Abī ‘r-Riḍāl, or someone fabricating this isnād using his name, is to be held responsible for this idraj in the Wāqīdī/Ibn Sa’d version? 28. Ḥan‘īz 36 (1, pp. 233f.)
that the women are not to weep over a dead person but that they are permitted to weep over him while he is still alive.

The next oldest collection at my disposal is that of the Egyptian traditionist 'Abd Allâh b. Wahb (d. 197/812). It is hardly likely that the printed edition of his Jâmî' contains everything that was originally in it. In any case, the slogan with or without a derivative of BKY or NWH does not occur in it. If a complete edition had been available, it is likely that it would have contained the reports also found in the Muwatâ' since Ibn Wahb was reputedly a devoted pupil of Mâlik until the latter's death.

The oldest Iraqi collection currently available in a printed edition is the Musnad of Abû Dâwûd at-Tabâlisi (d. 203/818). Every isnâd supporting a saying concerning weeping and bewailing appears to be Iraqi. Perhaps the most interesting is no. 12211 which runs: Abû Dâwûd at-Tabâlisi – Shu‘ba (b. al-Ḥajjâq) – Abû Ishâq ('Amr b. 'Abd Allâh as-Sabî’î) – 'Abd Allâh b. Mâlik: 'I saw Thâabit b. Wadi‘a and Qarâza b. Ka‘b al-Ansârî attend a wedding where there was singing. When I asked them about that they said: “He (sc. the prophet) permitted singing during weddings and also weeping (bukî) over the dead but without lamenting (niyâha).”' In this tradition, on the authority of two Companions who settled in Khufa, the distinction between bukî and nîyâha is for the first time made clear, while weeping seems not yet to be forbidden unequivocally.12 That Qarâza b. Ka‘b is mentioned in this context is especially relevant, since it is over his death, sometime in the late thirties or in the early forties, that for the first time nîyâha was practised in Khufa, as all the sources assert.13

This is a first indication of a date. If, for the sake of argument, we consider nîyâha traditions mutawâdit, it is significant to say the least that the prophet should already have forbidden a practice in Medina which only several decades after his death was witnessed for the first time in Khufa, and which, as we have seen so far, is not attested in traditions with Medinan or Meccan isnâds. In addition to that it can be said that this report, which clearly appears to be one from the awâ’il genre,14 may lay claim to a certain historical authenticity. Moreover, if the dating is not entirely acceptable, the event described can be construed as having taken place at a later date, but never at an earlier one. Awâ’il reports may be interpreted as accounts

33. Ibn al-ʾAthîr, Usd al-ghâbâ, iv, p. 202, states that he died when 'Ali was still in power, but that others say that his death occurred when Mughîrâ had just been appointed governor, which was in 41/661 (cf. Tabârî, Taʾrîkh, ii, p. 16). Ibn al-ʾAthîr adds that he is of the opinion that the first date is the more likely. Ibn Ḥajar (Tahdhîb, viii, pp. 368f.) is less apodictical and carefully weighs one date against the other.
34. E.g. Ibn Sa‘d, vi, p. 10; Ibn Ḥajar, Isâba, v, p. 432.
35. Strangely enough, it is lacking in perhaps the most prestigious awâ’il collection, that of Abû Hilâl al-ʾAskârî (d. 295/908) which is now available in two editions.
exaggerating how early certain events are supposed to have occurred for the first time, but they are never purposeful attempts at dating an event at a date later than it is actually thought to have occurred. Differently put, a practice allegedly forbidden in the strongest of terms by the prophet in Medina – for which not a single Hijāzi isnād can be found – was, according to this awā'il report, for the first time witnessed far away from Medina, at least thirty years after the prophet's death, possibly even longer.

Let us now consult the other hadith collections. In the Muṣannaf of Ibn Abī Shayba (d. 235/849) we find an impressive series of traditions, with sound as well as defective isnāds, dealing with NWH as well as BKY derivatives, prohibitions of various grades of severity as well as other reports in which certain forms of weeping or wailing are found to be permissible. The vast majority of isnāds is Iraqi. One is Meccan, one is Medinan/Syrian, in which we encounter Muḥammad b. Ishāq – no derivative in either of NWH! – and one is purely Medinan again without a derivative of NWH.

The list of traditions is even longer in the Musnad of Ibn Hanbal (d. 241/855). Again all traditions in which derivatives of NWH occur have Iraqi isnāds and there is one particularly defective Syrian isnād with the word nawh. One very striking feature, however, in the traditions of Ibn Hanbal’s Musnad that leaps to the eye is the emergence of the famous man kadhaba tradition in context with the prohibition of niyāha. Ibn Abī Shayba and Ahmad were practically contemporaries, both spent long periods of their lives in Bagdad but, even so, in the collection of the former there is no trace of kadhib in relation to niyāha traditions, whereas in the latter's collection we find the man kadhaba tradition inserted – I may say by way of idrāj – in a tradition with an Iraqi isnād. It goes back to al-Mughira b. Shu'ba, the then governor of Kufa, who is alleged to have said: 'I heard the Messenger of God say: Verily, lying about me is not like lying about anyone else; he who deliberately puts lies into my mouth, will have to occupy a seat in Hell! I heard the prophet say: He who is bewailed will be punished to the extent that he is bewailed [i.e. he will be punished accordingly].

This tradition follows as a sequel the account of the death of Qaraza b. Ka'b, the occasion when niyāha was for the first time heard in Kufa. In Ibn Abī Shayba’s Muṣannaf the same tradition is found, however without any allusion to kadhib, but with the same isnād. Even more significant is the fact that this particular isnād does not occur in the Musnad of Ṭayālīsī, although the man kadhaba tradition is listed in it several times. In the introduction to his Sahih Muslim gives the man kadhaba part under the

36. iii, pp. 389–94. 37. P. 391 (ult.) See also the last sentence of note 52 below.
38. P. 392 (first lines).
39. P. 392, the second tradition. A scrutiny of bukā'intiyaḥa traditions in 'Abd ar-Razzāq’s Muṣannaf, iii, nos. 6667–92 yields exactly the same results!
42. iii, p. 398. 43. Nos. 342, 362, 2421, etc.
same isnād without the prohibition of nawh,44 and the prohibition without the man kadhaba preamble but with the same isnād is listed in his kitāb al-jand'iz no. 28 (= ii p. 643), whereas in Bukhārī's Šaḥīh the two parts can be found still moulded into one tradition45 as in Ibn Ḥanbal. It is clear from this preliminary survey that NWH traditions with, as well as without, the man kadhaba preamble — added for extra emphasis, no doubt — circulated in the Iraqi centres of hadith during the first half of the third century. It is equally clear that the man kadhaba preamble was a later addition which made its first appearance sometime in the first half of the third century, in other words, NWH traditions without the preamble are the older ones. Before I embark on a more thorough investigation of the man kadhaba tradition, I should like to round off first the examination of the occurrences of NWH traditions in the collections so far not yet referred to. Perhaps we can draw up a provisional conclusion which eventually may help us also to throw new light on the man kadhaba tradition.

A thorough study of the six canonical and various other collections yields the following final results. All the traditions from the sunnite collections in which a derivative of NWH occurs have Iraqi isnāds with the exception of a few Syrian and Egyptian ones. In the Shi'ite hadith collections we find a mild prohibition of screaming (siyāḥ) over a dead person attributed to the sixth imām, Jaʿfar as-Ṣādiq46 and only four traditions with NWH in the Majmūʿ al-fiqh of Zayd b. Ṭalib.47 As I have said before, Zayd's authorship is disputed on the ground, among others, that his traditions strongly reflect the Hanafī madhhab.48 Strictly speaking, if his Majmūʿ is proven to be authentic, we have here the only Medinese isnād supporting a tradition with a derivative of NWH, but R. Strothmann has brought together sufficiently convincing arguments for rejecting Zayd's authorship altogether.49 F. Sezgin's counterarguments50 seem unconvincing and, although he refers to Madelung, he does not pay heed to that author's well substantiated view that the Majmūʿ al-fiqh originated in a time at least half a century after Zayd b. Ṭalib and represents, on the whole, a Kufan point of view.51

I think the overall conclusion is justified at this stage that niyāḥa in all its forms is an Iraqi concept and, therefore, cannot be attributed to the

---

44. No. 8 of my translation, cf. JSAl, v.
45. Janaʾiz 34 (= i, p. 325).
47. Pp. 77 and 296f.
49. In Der Islam, xiii, pp. 1–52.
50. Cf. GAS, i, pp. 557ff.
51. Cf. W. Madelung, Der Imam al-Qāsim ibn Ibrāhīm und die Glaubenslehre der Zaiditen, pp. 54–7. I may add that the man who allegedly transmitted Zayd's 'traditions' to later generations, 'Amr b. Khālid Abū Khālid al-Wāsīṭī, was universally decried a kadhdhāb by all the rijāl experts, who did not even allude to his possibly having harboured Shi'ite sympathies.
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If it was practised at all in Medina - and I see no reason why not - it was at any rate never referred to in Medinese traditions. Everybody will surely agree that, if niyāha, and not merely bukā’, had been a generally practised mourning ritual in Medina, which was, already during the prophet’s lifetime, felt to be incompatible with the dignity of Islam, it might have been alluded to in the Qur’ān or at least have given rise to sayings eventually emerging in Mālik’s Muwatta’. I do not believe that - apart from a few Syrian and Egyptian isnāds - all the isnāds heading niyāha traditions being Iraqi is a mere coincidence. The only practice referred to in Medinese traditions was weeping (bukā’). This was felt to be something definitely different from bewailing (niyāha), as appears explicitly from a few traditions and as is implied in the numerous rukhas traditions (see note 27 above). These different customs were perhaps something typical of the mourning practices of the conquered people. It is likely that the Arab women, who accompanied their husbands to the conquered territories, were heavily influenced by the indigenous women who must have formed the overall majority. It was they who set the fashion and their mourning practices, gradually adopted by everyone, may have roused the anger or the irritation of the conquering Arabs. If we lend credence to awd’il information, we can even fix a date for niyāha to have come so much into vogue as to be recorded, namely the abovementioned report about Qaraza b. Ka’b. Unfortunately, the year of his death is not certain. It is safe to say, however, that it is not unreasonable to set as terminus post quem 40 A.H., that is two decades or so after the founding of the city of Kūfa and some thirty years after the death of the prophet.

52. One additional argument in favour of my thesis are two succinct statements about a certain woman found in Ibn Sa’d, iii, 2, p. 8. The report kullu na’iṣatun takadhadhabu illā Umm Sa’d is headed by an Iraqi isnād, whereas the report kullu bākiyatin mukaddhatabutum illā Umm Sa’d is headed by a Medinan isnād. Furthermore, when we consult the index of Humaydī’s Musnad, we find the editor, Ḥabīb ar-Rahmān al-Aʿzāmī, listing a jand’iz tradition under the heading karāhiyatu ‘n-nawh wa’l-is’dīd ‘alayhi. Considering that this Musnad originated in Mecca and is predominantly supported by Hijāzī isnāds, one might expect the concept niyāha to have finally emerged (i.e. the end of the second century) in the Hijāz. However, no derivative of NWH is used, but (still) the word bukā’ (tradition no. 291).

53. In pseudo-Ibn Qutayba, Al-imāma wa’s-siyāsa, i, p. 347, there is a report on the authority of al-A’raj (d. 117/735) which states that nawh was heard for a long time in the houses of those who had lost family members in the battle of al-Ḥarra (63/683). I thank I. Hasson for this reference. In later times it is reported that even men resorted to nawh, cf. Ahmad b. al-Ḥusayn in Lisān, i, no. 512.

54. It is significant that in Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s Sirat ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, p. 108, in a letter which ‘Umar (d. 101/720) supposedly wrote to emphasize the reprehensibility of niyāha, he does not refer to a single tradition containing the slogan or any other reference to nawh, whereas he does refer to verses from the Qur’ān (ii, 156f.) in which the concept as such is not mentioned. We may perhaps conclude from this, given ‘Umar’s alleged predilection for hadith, that he did not (yet) know of the slogan, otherwise he would probably have adduced it here, where it aptly underlined his enjoinderhio. Cfr. also Ibn Sa’d, v, p. 290.
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But even this awā'il evidence does not guarantee us that we have an irrefutable terminus post quem. There is a statement attributed to one al-Mundhir b. Ya'la ath-Thawri (fl. 125/743) which runs:

Waylun li 'l-'Arab min sharrin qadi 'qaraba ... waylun li 'l-'Arab ba'da 'l-khamsi wa'l-'ishrīna wa'l-mi'a ... wa-'inda dhalika taqūmu 'n-nā'dhātu 'l-bākiyyāt ... (cf. 'Abd ar-Razzāq, Al-muannaf, xi, no. 20730) i.e. Woe to the Arabs for evil is near ... woe to the Arabs after [the year] 125 [A.H. = 743] when keening and weeping women will emerge ... But it is, of course, uncertain whether this al-Mundhir hinted at those women’s emergence as something which was to happen for the first time. It is equally feasible, if not more so, that all he was hinting at was the upheaval of the Islamic empire ensuing from the fitna after the death of the Umayyad Walid b. Yazid. In any case, this vaticinatio post eventum of circa 125 A.H. describes mourning practices as also comprising the activities of wailing women.

Man kadhaba etc. in non-Iraqi collections

Returning to the man kadhaba tradition, it is necessary to investigate first whether a form of falsehood similar to that in the dictum is already alluded to in the Qur’ān and, perhaps, likewise condemned. In other words, the question should be asked: Is there a verse, or are there verses, that can be construed as foreshadowing the man kadhaba dictum? My perusal of the numerous occurrences of derivatives of the roots KĐhB and FRY lead me to the overall conclusion that wherever in the Qur’ān the concept of lying is used in the connotation ‘falsely ascribing something to someone’, this only pertains to situations in which the unbelievers or the munāfiqūn falsely ascribe certain sayings to God. The prophet, as far as his own private statements are concerned, is never the object of these false allegations. Secondly, the roots for lying are used in various derivatives connoting ‘accusing of mendacity’, ‘calling someone (mostly a prophet) a liar’. It is therefore safe to say that the man kadhaba dictum is exclusively linked to the tradition literature in that it has no connections with, or roots in, the Qur’ān. Thus, it is in the ḥadīth literature that we have to search for the origin(s) of the dictum. It seems, therefore, appropriate to examine first in what early collections available in printed editions it is not found and those in which it is found with its various readings and in its different contexts. (Regrettably, I have never been able to acquire a microfilm of Tabarānī’s treatise on the different tariqas of the saying, cf. GAS, 1, p. 197, no. 11.)

The earliest source in which this tradition occurs is Ṭayālīṣī’s Musnad. It is true, there are other, older sources in which it is found, also of Iraqi origin – to which I will come back later – but first I should like to deal with those non-Iraqi collections in which we would expect to find it but search in vain. The non-Iraqi collections in which it does occur will be discussed below (pp. 116ff.)
In sources such as the *Jāmi‘* of ‘Abd Allāh b. Wahb and in Mālik’s *Muwatta‘* it cannot be traced, although allusions to *kadhib* are numerous in both. With the help of Wensinck’s *Handbook of early Muhammadan tradition* and the *Concordance* it can be established that the *man kadhaba* tradition does not occur in Hijāzī or in Egyptian collections from before the 180s/800s. Indeed, in the *Sunan* of Nasā‘ī (d. 303/915), who lived—and gathered *hadith*—for most of his life in Egypt, we do not find it. This is all the more astonishing if we take the following considerations into account.

It is reported that as a young man Nasā‘ī went to study *hadith* with various masters in Khurāsān but that he, already early in life, settled definitively in Egypt. It is self-evident that collecting all the names of those who reputedly were his masters from vague allusions all over the *Tahdhib at-tahdhib* of Ibn Ḥajar would take far too much time, but it seems fit to name here three from Khurāsān and one from Iraq, Qutayba b. Sa‘īd from Balkh, Aḥmad b. Naṣr and Ishāq b. Ibrahīm Ibn Rāhawayh both from Nisābūr, and Abū Shu‘ayb Ṣāliḥ b. Ziyād from Sūs. This last *shaykh* was born in Khūzistān and settled later in Raqqā. Among his masters there are two who also emerge in *isnāds* supporting the *man kadhaba* tradition. About Qutayba b. Sa‘īd (d. 240/854) and Ishāq Ibn Rāhawayh (d. 238/852) we know that they allegedly transmitted traditions from several transmitters who appear in *isnāds* of *man kadhaba* traditions, and the same goes for three masters of the second part of the maxim, which is the *jawāb*: *falyatabawwa*... does occur with a different *sharf* and a slight variant in Mālik, *aqdiya* 15 (ii, p. 727).

57. The statement of al-Mundhīrī recorded in Shākir’s commentary of Ibn Ḥanbal’s *Musnad* (no. 1413) that Nasā‘ī did have it ought to be considered erroneous. There is, however, the possibility that what we have in a printed edition does not constitute Nasā‘ī’s complete *Sunan*, but is merely a selection thereof. Suyūṭī seems to have been convinced that the *man kadhaba* tradition was also listed in Nasā‘ī, cf. Munāwī, *Fayḍ al-qadīr sharḥ al-jāmi‘* as-*ṣaghr* (li‘ī-Suyūṭī), vi, p. 214, no. 8993, where it is purported that Nasā‘ī mentioned the tradition with *isnāds* going back to Anas and az-Zubayr. Of these there is no trace in the printed editions of the *Sunan*. Cf. also GAS, i, pp. 167f. The first volume of the new edition of ‘Abd as-Ṣamād Sharaf al-Dīn (*Kitāb as-sunan al-kubrā*, Bhiwandi (Bombay) 1972) is the only one currently available to me. Only when this edition will be completed shall we have definite proof. Frankly, I would not be surprised if *man kadhaba* does turn up here.

58. Extensive reading in the *Tahdhib* has confirmed that those lists of names of masters and pupils given in each *tarjama* represent, on the whole, but a fraction of the true numbers of masters and pupils that can be culled from the *isnāds* in all the collections. Whether or not all these masters and pupils are, indeed, historical figures is then, again, a question which is difficult to answer and which requires a great deal of special research.

the masters of Ahmad b. Naṣr (d. 245/860). Even so, through these feasible channels the *man kadhaba* tradition did not reach Nasāʿī in spite of the fact that in the *Jāmiʿ* of Tirmidhī, who died some twenty-three years before him in 279/892, the whole *isnād* Qutayba b. Saʿīd–al-Layth b. Saʿīd–Zuhri–Anas – prophet, with the *man kadhaba* saying, is listed.66 Differently put, at least thirty years before Nasāʿī died, and probably much longer, as we shall see, there circulated an *isnād* headed by his master Qutayba b. Saʿīd, supporting the *man kadhaba* tradition, which Nasāʿī either never received from his master, because it was falsely attributed to the latter after the former had left for Egypt, or which the pupil rejected because he did not trust it. In actual fact, as we saw above, the *man kadhaba* tradition, together with its probably older67 variant *man qāla 'alayya mà lam aqul* etc., is already attested in an Iraqi collection compiled by someone who died almost one hundred years before Nasāʿī, namely Tayfalsī (d. 203/818). Six of the eight *isnāds* in his *Muṣnād* heading the tradition in its different readings have Shuʿba b. al-Ḥajjāj (d. 160) in common. This traditionist is also a link in traditions Nasāʿī might have received through his master Ahmad b. Naṣr (see notes 63 and 64 above). On top of all this there are *isnāds* with ʿAbd Allāh b. Lahiʿa, a key figure in the development of ḥadīth in Egypt. He claimed to have heard it from an Iraqi master (see note 62 above; for a discussion of Ibn Lahiʿa in Egyptian *isnāds*, see pp. 177f.). But it is also true, on the other hand, that Nasāʿī spurned Ibn Lahiʿa’s traditions because he did not trust him.69

**Man kadhaba in the Muwaṭṭa’**

Returning now to some other non-Iraqi collections, as I have said above, references to *kadhib* in a general sense are numerous in Mālik and Ibn Wahb’s *Jāmiʿ*. First of all, let us examine how the concept *kadhib* is dealt with in the *Muwaṭṭa’*. There is mention of mendacious bedouins who report falsely on the prophet’s customs in taking the *iḥrām*.70 However, mendacity

---

65. The occurrence of Zuhri in this *isnād* may suggest that it is a Hijāzī one. Zuhri constitutes one of the most far-reaching problems in the development of the ḥadīth literature. In Chapter IV a special study will be devoted to him exclusively. Suffice it to say here that if Zuhri is assumed to have been a transmitter of the *man kadhaba* saying, it is incomprehensible that Mālik, who was credited with having been Zuhri’s best pupil (cf. Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhib*, x, p. 7 penult) does not list it in his *Muwaṭṭa’*. A. Arazi kindly drew my attention to the *Kitāb al-kāmil fi duʿa’afāʾ ar-rijāl* of Ibn ʿAdī (d. 365/976, cf. GAS, 1, p. 198: ms. Ahmet III, 2943/1) p. 154, where we read a very late *man kadhaba* saying with an *isnād* labeled *daʿīf* featuring Zuhri.
70. Ḥājj 30 (i, p. 332). Cf. Nawawi’s commentary on Muslim, *ḥājj* 23 (i, p. 843).
is generally interpreted in three different ways. According to the *ahl as-sunna*, *kadhib* is reporting something contrary to what it is in reality, irrespective of whether this occurred on purpose (*ta'ammudan*), by mistake (*ghalatan*), or out of inattentiveness (*sahwan*). On the whole, the concept *kadhib* became a very delicate issue. The bedouins' 'mendacity' belonged to categories two and three rather than to one, according to the commentators.

Since these bedouins were most probably Muslims, the following saying attributed to the prophet is of some relevance. On the authority of 'Umar Muḥammad once said allegedly: 'I recommend to you my Companions, then the generation following them, then the generation following them. After that, falsehood (*kadhib*) will spread.' I think we can justly assume in the case of this obvious *vaticinatio post eventum* that it was fabricated sometime when the third generation of Muslims after the prophet was living or perhaps a little later. A scrutiny of the different *isnāds* does not indicate, however, one likely forger. Probably the saying was brought into circulation by a person – or persons – using the names of the transmitters mentioned as the fourth links of the six *isnāds* available to me at present. It is well-known that the spreading of falsehood described in this saying does not represent the official historical viewpoint of medieval Muslim scholars of a century or so later. Eventually it was only the generation of the Companions which was deemed collectively incapable of putting false statements in the mouth of the prophet, the generations of the Successors and the one following those, contrary to the saying just quoted, were not considered to be collectively free from mendacity. A cursory glance at Ibn Hajar’s *Tahdhib* provides us with evidence of this, sc. the names of many transmitters from these two generations who were unequivocally thought to have been liars.

Thus, after the adage of the collective reliability of the prophet's Companions was formulated, every reference to mendacity on the part of persons who had embraced Islam at the hands of the prophet seems to have been avoided. It is likely that practically all such references were in the course of time deleted from the canonical *hadīth* collections. But in an early collection like the *Muwatta*’ this unmistakable reference to lying contemporaries of Muḥammad was not duly removed and even copied in its

entirety in Muslim's Şahih. It is understandable, as we saw (note 72 above), that medieval commentators as a last resort opted for equating kadhib with ghala or sahw rather than 'amd in this case, as in all cases where it is mentioned in connection with Companions.

Kadhib as a major sin is, furthermore, referred to in the Muwatta' in the following traditions:

1. (Mursal) A man came to the prophet and asked: 'Am I allowed to lie to my wife?' The prophet answered: "There is no good in lying." 76

2. (Defective isnād; Mālik directly from 'Abd Allāh b. Mas'ūd, which makes the isnād Iraqi) ‘Speak the truth for this leads to piety (birr) and piety leads to Paradise. But beware of mendacity, for this leads to sinning (fuţār) and sinning leads to Hell.' 77

3. Finally, there is one tradition in which 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb alludes to people who might put false words in the mouth of the prophet. The word used is iaqawwala, frequently emerging also in variant readings of the man kadhaba report. The isnād is Medinan and defective. But defective or not, the abovementioned traditions are the only ones which at least point in the direction of the man kadhaba tradition proper. They may, therefore, be considered as forerunners of the numerous man kadhaba traditions in the Iraqi collections. 78

Man kadhaba with Shāfi‘i and Ḥumaydī

Before leaving Mālik and turning our attention to Ibn Wahb, it seems appropriate to deal with what is probably the first recording of the man kadhaba saying in a work of a scholar who was active in the Hijāz, I mean Shāfi‘i (d. 204/820), some 25 years after Mālik. Ibn Abī Hātim relates that Shāfi‘i at one time expressed the opinion that putting false words into the mouth of the prophet should be considered as a grave offence (in Arabic:

75. Hajj 23 (II, p. 84): cf. also Īmān 181 (=I, p. 107) and jihiḍ 49 (=III, pp. 1377ff.). Even in the twentieth century there are Muslim scholars who are concerned with invalidating every possible reference to kadhib among the šāhāba, cf. Muṣṭafā 's-Sibā‘ī, As-sunna wa-makānatuhā fi 'r-tashrī‘ al-islāmi, pp. 216-18.

76. Lying to one's wife to appease her is in other sources listed among rukhaṣ traditions in which lying is permitted under certain circumstances, cf. Yūsuf b. Mūsā al-Ḥanafi, Al-mu'taṣar mina 'l-mukhtāṣar min mushkil al-āthār, pp. 377f. For the permissibility of lying for military purposes, see Ibn Hajar, Tahdhib, x, p. 330.

77. Kālām 15 and 16 (II, p. 989). With full Iraqi isnād also in e.g. Bukhārī, adab 69 (=IV, p. 135) and Muslim, birr 103-6 (IV, pp. 2012ff.).

78. Kadhib was something that also Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyab, according to the sources one of Medina's foremost tradition scholars (but cf. Chapter 1), was afraid of. In Ibn Sa‘d, v, p. 100, we find a report in which he warns a mawla of his not to act like Ibn 'Abbās' mawla ('Ikrima?), who put false statements in the mouth of the former. And we do find Mālik referring to mendacious transmitters, e.g. in a saying attributed to him in Ibn Abī Hātim's Taqdim, p. 21; Ibn Hajar, Tahdhib, v, p. 219; Lisān, II, pp. 289ff.; Muwatta', i, p. 373; Al-Khaṭṭāb, Kifāya, p. 160; Suyūṭī, Is‘āf al-mubadda‘ bi-rijāl al-Muwatta‘, p. 874.
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wa-qāla ‘bnu abi Ḥātim arāda ‘sh-Shāfi‘i ‘t-taghlīz ‘alā man yakhdhibu ‘alān-nabiṣ). In his Risāla we find the dictum in various forms. A quick look at the respective isnāds indicates who can theoretically be held responsible for bringing the saying into circulation in the Hijāz. The isnād of no. 1090 has Shāfi‘i – ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Muḥammad ad-Darawardi (d. 186/802) – Muḥammad b. ‘Ajlān (d. 148/765) etc. Judging by his name ad-Darawardi seems of Persian descent, and this is also mentioned in his tarjama (Ibn Hajar, Tahdhib, vi, p. 353), but Ibn Sa‘d (ibidem, p. 354) is recorded as having said that he was born, and lived all his life, in Medina. Whether it is he or someone using his name who is to be held responsible for introducing the dictum in the Hijāz cannot be established, but a fact is that the shaykh from whom he allegedly transmitted it, had also been a master of Mālik. In view of the importance and the ensuing fame of the saying it is incomprehensible that Mālik, who was after all also aware of the widespread forgery of hadith, would not have included it in his Muwatta’, if he had indeed heard it from Muḥammad b. ‘Ajlān. In the isnād of no. 1091 we find also ad-Darawardi but this time his master is named as Muḥammad b. ‘Amr b. ‘Alqama, who reputedly also transmitted traditions to Mālik (Ibn Hajar, Tahdhib, ix, p. 376, 4th line from bottom). The isnād of 1092 lists after Shāfi‘i Yahyā b. Sulaym who allegedly had it from ‘Ubayd Allāh b. ‘Umar (d. 147/764). Not only is material that Yahyā transmitted from ‘Ubayd Allāh supposedly munkar, ‘Ubayd Allāh, one of Medina’s seven fuqahā, had also been a revered master of Mālik, so the same consideration as in the previous two isnāds applies here. In the isnād of 1093 we not only find ad-Darawardi again, it also contains a majhūl. On the whole, Shāfi‘i’s list of these man kadhaba variants resembles the evolution of the dictum in its earliest stages.

Another Hijāzī collector, ‘Abd Allāh b. az-Zubayr al-Ḥumaydī (d. 219/834), lists the man kadhaba saying only once with the following defective but highly relevant isnād: Ḥumaydī – Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna – man lā uḫṣī ‘an Abī Hurayra – prophet (ii, no. 1166). Ḥumaydī had been Ibn ‘Uyayna’s best pupil and had reputedly attended his hadith sessions for seventeen years. It is, indeed, astonishing that Ḥumaydī does not list a more perfect isnād for the man kadhaba saying, if we realize that he had also been a pupil of Shāfi‘i and ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Muḥammad ad-Darawardi. Through these channels he apparently did not receive it. Besides, Ibn ‘Uyayna’s remark on how he allegedly learned of the saying also deserves to be commented on. In the time of Bukhārī (d. 256/870) only four isnāds going back to Abū Hurayra were in circulation, via the Successors Abū Ṣāliḥ Dhakwān, Kulayb b. Shihāb, Muslim b. Yasār and Abū Salama.

Although all these emerge repeatedly in isnāds of Ibn 'Uayna, and although he only left Kūfa, where he was born, in order to settle definitively in Mecca in 163/780 (Ibn Hajar, Tahdhib, iv, p. 122), the man kadhaba saying had apparently not yet reached him via a ‘sound’, Iraqi or Medinese, isnād. His words man lā uḥṣī seem to convey the opposite of what they say and may well be interpreted as indicating that Ibn 'Uayna was at the time still unable to substantiate the saying with a less ‘defective’ isnād. It is as if he had caught a rumour that a saying of this content had recently been brought into circulation and that it was deemed imperative that every self-respecting muhaddith should participate in its transmission. Sufyān was indeed very much concerned with falsehood in traditions as appears unmistakably from his contempt for Jābir b. Yazid al-Ju’fi (d. ±130/748), who had been actively spreading forged traditions in Kūfa several decades before Sufyān moved to Mecca (cf. Ibn Hajar, Tahdhib, ii, p. 49).

What is a preamble of man kadhaba in other collections, the well-known saying ḥaddihū ‘an bani Isrā‘il wa-lā haraja, ḥaddihū ‘anni wa-lā takdhībū ‘alayya82 (i.e. transmit from the Jews what you want, there is no objection; transmit [also] from me but do not put false words into my mouth) precedes man kadhaba in Ḥumaydī, but is not yet part of it. Preamble and dictum can also be found moulded together, headed by a defective Syrian isnād (listing the dubious Abū Kabsha83) in other collections.84 It is interesting, finally, to note that this isnād does not yet occur in Ṭayālīsī.

Man kadhaba with ‘Abd Allāh b. Wahb

‘Abd Allāh b. Wahb (d. 197/813) devotes a lengthy chapter in his Jāmi‘ to kadhib traditions.85 Again we observe the peculiarity that the man kadhaba tradition is not listed among the circa forty(!) traditions of this chapter, although a few Companions who, according to Iraqi collections, are reported as having transmitted the saying also occur in Ibn Wahb’s isnāds of this chapter.86 A brief count yields the result that twenty transmitters from man kadhaba reports listed elsewhere also appear in this kadhib chapter. Another conspicuous feature of Ibn Wahb’s isnāds is that they are for the greatest part very defective with one, sometimes more, links simply left unmentioned. One gains the impression that one has here – that is in Egypt

84. E.g. Bukhārī, anbiyd’ 50 (= ii, pp. 372 f.); Tirmidhī, ‘ilm 13 (= v, p. 40); Dārimī, muqaddima 46 (= p. 72); Ibn Ḥanbal, Musnad, ii, pp. 159, 202 and 214; ‘Abd ar-Razzāq, Muṣanad, x, no. 19210; Abū Khaythama, Kitāb al-‘ilm, p. 119.
85. Pp. 66–73 of the page numbering of the papyrus. All further references likewise refer to this numbering.
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during the second half of the second century – the isnād in an as yet very primitive stage of its evolution, whereas Ibn Wahb lists also quite a few kadhib traditions that appear in later collections with perfectly ‘sound’ isnāds. The idea that isnāds have a tendency to grow with time in soundness\(^8\) can very well be substantiated with abundant material from Ibn Wahb’s Jāmi\(^i\) in comparison with that very same material in later Iraqi collections.\(^8\) Perhaps the most astonishing feature of the Jāmi\(^i\) is that it is literally riddled with Iraqi isnāds, again mostly very defective. If the man kadhaba tradition had circulated in Iraq during the time that Ibn Wahb practised his profession as traditionist in Egypt, and compiled this kadhib chapter, roughly during the latter half of the second century – and let us not forget that it does occur various times in Ṭayālisi’s Musnad, probably compiled at about the same time – it is all the more astounding that it is not included in the Jāmi\(^i\). Since the number of traditions with kadhib regarding the transmission of traditions in this chapter is considerable, we might even venture to conclude that, if Ibn Wahb had started putting it together a few years later, this, what I am almost inclined to call, dernier cri in vilifying mendacious transmitters would have reached him, and would subsequently have headed the list of similar, but as yet less harsh, traditions in this chapter. On the other hand, we have to take into account also – albeit with reservations (see p. 109, note 57 above) – that Nasā’ī, who died more than one hundred years later, does not have it either.

It seems appropriate to give here a short selection of these traditions from the Jāmi\(^i\) with their isnāds, defective or otherwise, to corroborate the above thesis:

1. (Mursal from Ḥasan al-Baṣrī) ‘One of the characteristics of the munāṣīq is that . . . when he transmits traditions [or tells a story?], he lies’ (p. 66). This is also found e.g. with a seemingly sound isnād in Bukhārī, inmān 24 = 1, pp. 16f.) and Muslim, inmān 107–8 (1, p. 78).

2. (Mursal from Zuhrī) ‘Lying, whether in jest or seriousness, is never condoned’ (p. 67). Cf. Ibn Mājad, muqaddima 7, (= 1, p. 18), Dārimī, riqāq 7 (p. 364) and Ibn Ḥanbal, 1, p. 410, with seemingly sound isnāds on the authority of ‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd.


4. (Mursal from Muḥammad b. ʿAjlān) The prophet used to be aware of

\(^{87}\) This information is an attempt at putting in a different light and rewording Schacht’s thesis ‘. . . that isnāds have a tendency to grow backwards’, cf. JRAS, 1949, p. 147.

mendacity in some of his Companions and he continuously confronted them with it until they repented (p. 73). As is to be expected, this tradition can no longer be traced in the canonical collections.

5. (Munqati, Shabib b. Sa'id - Shu'ba b. al-Hajjar - unknown - Samura b. Jundab - prophet) 'He who relates from me a tradition of which he thinks (variant: of which it is thought) that it is a lie, that man is one of the liars (p. 73).' In Tirmidhi, 'ilm 9 (v, pp. 36f.) we find, interestingly enough, the same tradition with a seemingly sound isnād going back to al-Mughira b. Shu'ba. Then Tirmidhi adds the following:

... this tradition is also transmitted by Shu'ba from al-Hakam b. 'Utayba from 'Abd ar-Ra'mān b. Abī Layla from Samura from the prophet, as well as with the isnād: al-'A'mash and Ibn Abī Layla - al-Hakam - 'Abd ar-Ra'mān b. Abī Layla - 'Ali - prophet. The first isnād [i.e. the one on the authority of Samura] is the sounder of the two in the eyes of the tradition scholars.

Then, after a while, Tirmidhi goes on:

I asked Dārimi: 'Does this tradition pertain to him who relates a tradition the isnād of which he knows to be faulty? Or when someone relates a mursal tradition, and someone else makes it musnad (i.e. fills in a Companion), or when someone transmutes the isnād (into something else), would the abovementioned tradition pertain to these too?' 'No', said Dārimi, 'this only pertains to him who relates a tradition of which it is not known whether it can be traced to the prophet at all. I am afraid that a man who relates a tradition like that is meant in the abovementioned prophetic saying.'

It is not difficult to guess what happened eventually to the isnād as found in Ibn Wahb, and Tirmidhi's words may well be considered as reflecting the hesitation on the part of those traditionists responsible for making this isnād 'sounder' by inserting between Shu'ba and Samura the names of al-Hakam and 'Abd ar-Ra'mān b. Abī Layla.90

One more noteworthy fact deserves to be mentioned. 'Abd Allāh b. Wahb, in whose Jāmi', as we saw, the man kadhaba dictum is not listed, does occur himself in two isnāds of such a tradition; the first is found in Ibn Ḥanbal91 with preamble and sequel concerning the prohibition of wearing silk and the second in a MS. to be discussed below. The first isnād runs: Ibn Ḥanbal - Hārūn b. Ma'rūf - Ibn Wahb - 'Amr b. al-Ḥārith - Hishām b. Abī Ruqayya - Maslama b. Mukhallad - 'Uqba b. 'Āmir al-Juhani - prophet.

89. I.e. the man who fabricated it as well as he who transmits it are both considered liars. Therefore, the last word is either read as a plural or as a dual, cf. Nawawi's commentary on Muslim, i, p. 64.

90. Ibn 'Adi (d. 366/976) is quoted in Ibn Hajar, Tahdhib, iv, p. 307, as saying that Ibn Wahb wrote traditions down from his informant, Shabib b. Sa'id, when the latter traveled to Egypt with his merchandise and that on that occasion mistakes were made. The foregoing tradition probably constitutes one of these mistakes.

91. iv, p. 156.
This isnād also supporting the man kadhaba tradition but without preamble or sequel is once more found in the Kitab al-mawdūʿāt of Ibn al-Jawzi (d. 597/1200)92 with, instead of Hārūn b. Maʿrūf, Baḥr b. Naṣr b. Sābiq. These isnāds are purely Egyptian. The Companion 'Uqba settled in Egypt and became Muʿāwiyah's governor. In this function he was succeeded by the other Companion of this isnād (incidentally lacking in Ibn al-Jawzi), Maslama b. Mukhallad (d. 62/682). Among the transmitters who heard traditions with him we do find Hishām b. Abī Ruqayya,93 but this man is nowhere else dealt with, in other words: he is a majhūl.94 'Amr b. al-Hārith, the next transmitter, was held in high esteem by Ibn Wahb who credited him with the best memory of all the 370(!) shaykhs of whom he had been a pupil.95 It is, therefore, all the more astonishing that the whole isnād does not occur in the Jāmi‘. This isnād with, instead of Hishām and Maslama, Abū 'Ushshāna as master of Ibn Wahb is also listed in Ibn al-Jawzi.96 It is hard to say when and how these isnāds came into existence. If they predate 197/813, the year of his death, we must conclude that Ibn Wahb's Jāmi‘ in the edition we have was compiled before the man kadhaba tradition reached him. If they do not – and we still have the non-occurrence of the tradition in Nasā‘ī to account for! – they are probably the handiwork of Hārūn b. Maʿrūf and/or Baḥr b. Naṣr or of one or more persons using their names.

The second isnād heading man kadhaba and featuring Ibn Wahb is one from a manuscript containing a fragment of a Muwatta’ work (?) attributed to Ibn Wahb.97 Whether this manuscript is as old as its anonymous compiler, as Arberry seems to suggest,98 namely from the 3rd century, is hard to say. The isnāds are in any case much more ‘perfect’ than in the old papyrus of the Jāmi‘. From Ibn Wahb down they all seem to be muttaṣil (with or without mention being made of all the transmitters’ names). The pupil mentioned all through the first half of the manuscript, who recorded the traditions from Ibn Wahb, was Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Ḥakam (182–268/798–882). Ibn Wahb’s pupil all through the second half of the manuscript was Baḥr b. Naṣr al-Khawlānī (180–267/796–881), who was mentioned above. The unknown compiler of this collection can be dated therefore to the middle of the third century. In this collection the man kadhaba dictum precedes a prohibition to drink wine. The main is identical with a tradition in Ibn Ḥanbal (iii, p. 422), and the isnāds also, that is, for

---

92. ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, x, p. 148.
94. ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, viii, p. 15.
95. Two isnāds supporting the man kadhaba dictum, both with Abū 'Ushshāna, the one with Ibn Lahi‘a, the other with Ibn Wahb, are found in Ibn Ḥanbal, iv, pp. 159 and 201.
96. I thank M. J. Kister for drawing my attention to this manuscript, which is no. 3497 of the Chester Beatty collection.
the five oldest links including Ibn Wahb's master, Ibn Lahi'a, who in the Musnad has Hasan b. Mūsā as pupil. The third oldest link is a majhūl, one shaykh from Himyar. The most striking feature is that, but for Ibn Lahi'a, no transmitter of this isnād figures in the Jāmi'. This may be construed as furnishing additional evidence for my surmise that Bahr, referred to above, is to be held responsible for bringing this isnād into circulation or someone using his name. If, however, Ibn Wahb did hear of the dictum after having compiled his Jāmi', we have in the birth dates of Bahr and Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Ḥakam an indication of a terminus post quem for the dictum to have come into circulation in Egypt, namely not earlier than circa 190/806.

Summing up, it seems safe to say that the saying began to circulate in Egypt not earlier than towards the end of the second century A.H. in any case, and possibly not earlier than towards the end of the third century A.H. In spite of the alleged activities in transmitting traditions of people who settled in Egypt as described above, it took one of the most famous sayings ascribed to the prophet two, maybe three, centuries to reach a province conquered less than half a century after his death.

**Man kadhaba in Iraqi collections**

As pointed out above, among the earliest Iraqi hadith collections, that of Tayālīsī (d. 203/818) lists the man kadhaba tradition several times. But Tayālīsī's is not the oldest collection available in print. Without having to raise the problem of Zayd's authorship again,99 we can pass over his Majmū' al-fiqh, since the tradition does not occur in it. I shall deal with the other Shi'ite collections below. There are, however, sunnite collections that supposedly predate Tayālīsī's. They have as yet not been under scrutiny, because it is dubious whether they should be considered authentic. I am alluding, of course, to the Musnad of Abū Ḥanīfa (d. 150/767).100

Abū Ḥanīfa is the champion of ra'y, which in this context I should like to render 'personal decision-taking based upon common sense'. Abū Ḥanīfa was not so much concerned with precedent— from whatever source—as with making ad hoc decisions. Whether or not his influence was already very much felt during his lifetime, or became a heated subject of discussion only after his death, is difficult to establish. At any rate, his stance in legal matters formed the starting point for an ever increasing polarization. On the one hand, there were the adherents to his doctrine, who were not daunted by the lack of precedents, no, who were hardly on the lookout for them, or were even scornful of them; on the other hand, there were the

99. See p. 106 above.

hadith people, who simply could not do without precedents, who were constantly aware of their religion – together with the legal system derived from it – having its roots in the past, a past that was gradually projected even further back, until no precedent was acceptable unless ascribed to the prophet himself. This polarization led to dire mutual criticism as well as ridicule on both sides.\textsuperscript{101}

In the following excursus I would like to examine to what extent – if any – Abū Ḥanīfa’s attitude towards the search for hadith in order to use it as precedent material and transmitting it to other generations of jurists, can be assessed as to its historicity.

\textit{Abū Ḥanīfa and the transmission of hadith}

The most extensive collections of sayings about Abū Ḥanīfa and of opinions attributed to him are found in al-Khāṭīb al-Baghdādi’s \textit{Ta’rikh Baghdād} and in Ibn `Abd al-Barr’s \textit{Al-intiqā’ fi faḍā’il aththalātha al-dīmima al-fuqāhā}.\textsuperscript{102} There is one story of how Abū Ḥanīfa came to select fiqh as the subject to which he was going to devote all his life. Even if it is apocryphal, it shows clearly the overall impression he made on his biographers. Abū Ḥanīfa is reported to have said:

> When I wanted to acquire knowledge, I started to choose from all branches of knowledge and I asked about the consequences which the study of the different subjects would have for me. So I was told: Study the Qur’an. But I said: When I have studied the Qur’an and committed it to memory, what will be the outcome? I was told: You will sit in the mosque and children and adolescents will recite it to you. Then it won’t be long before one of them comes to the fore who will excels you – or at least emulate you – and so your leading position will come to an end. I asked: And if I listen to hadith and write it all down until there is no one in the world who has memorized more than I have? I was told: When you are old and weak, it will come to pass that you relate traditions to which adolescents and children come and gather to listen. You cannot help making mistakes, so they will accuse you of mendacity and this will be a disgrace for the rest of your life. So I said: I have no need for this.

(Next he examines nahw, shi’r and kalām, which he feels he has to discard also for similar reasons)

\ldots I said: Suppose I study fiqh? I was told: You will be asked for legal advice, and even as a young man a judgeship will be offered you.\textsuperscript{104} I said: there is among the

\textsuperscript{101} A particularly severe attitude is demonstrated in the (fabricated) tradition ascribed to the prophet: \textit{Man qāla fi dininā bi-ra’iyihī fa’qudūhū}, Ibn al-Jawzī, \textit{Kitāb al-mawdū’āt}, iii, pp. 94f.
\textsuperscript{102} xiii, pp. 323-432. \textsuperscript{103} Pp. 122-71.
\textsuperscript{104} This is an unexpected turn in the story. According to various reports Abū Ḥanīfa was asked to accept the function of judge several times, but he always refused. Even flogging could not persuade him. It is also related that he died in jail where Mansūr had incarcerated him for his stubbornness, cf. al-Khāṭīb, xiii, pp. 326ff.
branches of knowledge nothing more beneficial than this, so I stuck to fiqh and studied it.\textsuperscript{105}

It is hard to say whether or not a story such as this is historical, but it aptly illustrates the attitude of someone devoted to fiqh rather than to tradition. All the other reports describing his views are equally difficult to gauge as to historical authenticity but they allow of several general observations.

The concept that emerges time and again in reports concerning Abū Ḥanīfa is \textit{mas'ala}, pl. \textit{masd'il}, which I render 'case' or 'problem'. The one master in whose circle he used to sit about whom all the sources are unanimous is Ḥammād b. Abī Sulaymān (d. 120/738).\textsuperscript{106} From this man Abū Ḥanīfa apparently did not transmit traditions but only learned how a variety of \textit{masd'il} were solved. It is, indeed, worthy of note that traditions never played a role of importance in reports describing the sessions at which these \textit{masd'il} were dealt with. If on some occasions it so happened that a tradition was readily at hand to be adduced, it was not discarded altogether but it never seemed to play a crucial part in the decision making. Abū Ḥanīfa's counterpart in Kūfa, who was the undisputed master in hadith, was Sufyān ath-Thawrī. Their respective attitudes are eloquently summed up in a report which runs: 'If you want āthār or hadith, go to Sufyān, but if you want legal niceties (in Arabic: \textit{daqā'iq}), you have to go to Abū Ḥanīfa.'\textsuperscript{107}

The reports vilifying Abū Ḥanīfa vastly outnumber those singing his praises, at least in the \textit{Ta'rikh Baghdad}. Practically every (younger) contemporary of Abū Ḥanīfa is recorded as having said something denigrating or disparaging about him and if this same contemporary is also quoted as having extolled one or more merits of Abū Ḥanīfa, this eulogy never concerns the latter's activities in the transmitting of traditions. For example, one hadith transmitter, 'Abd Allāh b. al-Mubārak, who is said to have admired Abū Ḥanīfa's \textit{fiqh} especially, was nevertheless suspicious of his \textit{hadith}.\textsuperscript{108}

It is true, there are reports in which there appears a certain respect on the part of Abū Ḥanīfa for \textit{hadiths}, but it is noteworthy that a cursory glance at some of these reports right away reveals inconsistencies,\textsuperscript{109} unreliable

\textsuperscript{105} Al-Khaṭīb, xii, pp. 331f.

\textsuperscript{106} Just like Abū Ḥanīfa, he adhered to the doctrine of \textit{irjā'}. He was better known for his \textit{fiqh} than for his tradition. Ibn Sa'd called him \textit{da'if} as well as \textit{kathīr al-hadīth} mainly from Ibrāhīm an-Nakha'i. And to 'Uthmān al-Battī is ascribed the saying: 'When Ḥammād used his \textit{ra'y}, he came up with the right solution, but when he transmitted opinions from persons other than Ibrāhīm, he made errors.' Cf. Ibn Sa'd, vi, pp. 232f., and Ibn Ḥajar, \textit{Tahdhib}, iii, pp. 16ff.


\textsuperscript{109} It says, for instance, in a report in which his memory for traditions with \textit{fiqh} contents is praised that Caliphs, princes and ministers honoured him for this. This information is not
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I think that it would be going too far to try and find fault with every report in which something favourable is said about Abū Ḥanīfa and his alleged handling of traditions. In the same manner practically every other report presenting something unfavourable about this issue could with a little effort be invalidated too. All these reports are after all of the fad'il or the mathālib genre and it is well known that reports belonging to either genre were not so elaborately fabricated as to escape detection. But, as I have said, the fact remains that the mathālib easily outnumber the fad'a'il and this may be construed, I think, as historically relevant. A special group of data belonging to the mathālib genre deserves to be dealt with separately.

There are several reports in which Abū Ḥanīfa appears to ridicule prophetic sayings, especially those which have taken the form of legal maxims or slogans. Thus, when his attention was drawn to the saying: *Al-bayyiʿāni bi ʾl-khiyār mā lam yatāfarraqā*112 he said: ‘That is mere rajaz.’ And when the maxim *Afjara ʾl-ḥājīm wa ʾl-mahjūm*114 was mentioned to him, he said: ‘That is (merely) *saḥ*!’115 On another occasion the prophetic saying was cited: *ʾAl-wuḍūʿ nisf al-imān*116, which prompted Abū Ḥanīfa to sneer: ‘So why don’t you perform this ablution twice in order that you perfect your faith!’117 In this vein there are quite a few more to be found.118

borne out in the sources and is inconsistent with his conflict with Mansūr – whether or not historical – as depicted above. Cf. al-Khaṭīb, xiii, p. 339, and note 104 above.

110. In a sequel to an otherwise noncommittal report, a certain Muḥammad b. Ḥamdān b. aṣ-Ṣabāḥ says that when a masʿala reached Abū Ḥanīfa, in which there was a sound ḥadīth, he followed that. This same transmitter is branded majhūl by al-Khaṭīb as recorded in Ibn Hajar, *Lisān*, v, p. 147.

111. Al-Ḥasan b. Ṣāliḥ b. Ḥayy is reported (Ibn Ḥabīl al-Barr, *Intiqād*, p. 128) to have said something favourable about Abū Ḥanīfa’s handling of prophetic traditions. It says: When Abū Ḥanīfa had a prophetic tradition which he considered sound, he would not pass by it for anything else. This assessment does not seem to tally with the fact, however, that this same man, al-Ḥasan b. Ṣāliḥ, is reported in Ibn Ḥajar, *Tadhkīr*, ii, p. 289, as having led away someone from his position as imām in the mosque, when this imām, one ‘Abd Allāh b. Dāwūd al-Khuraybī – who was inclined to favour Abū Ḥanīfa’s raʾy (cf. *Tadhkīr*, v, p. 200) – praised Abū Ḥanīfa in public.

112. Passim in the canonical collections, cf. *Concordance* s.v. *yatāfarraqā*. Translation: The seller and the buyer have the right to rescind a transaction as long as they have not separated. This practice was not observed everywhere, cf. Ibn Ḥanbal, *ʿIjār*, i, no. 1193. Cf. Waki’, *Akhbār al-qadāʾ*, ii, p. 260, where Shurayḥ is credited with this maxim.

113. Al-Khaṭīb, xiii, p. 388. Abū Ḥanīfa was right – at least in the first half – in labeling this iambic metre rajaz.

114. ‘Cupping or being cupped break the fast’, passim, cf. *Concordance* s.v. *afjara*.

115. Al-Khaṭīb, xiii, p. 388. The word *saḥ* admits here of a pejorative interpretation.


All the arguments which I have brought together here seem to me to point in one direction: Abū Ḥanifa may be considered as hardly having been concerned with hadith. The fact that there emerged collections allegedly containing all the traditions he received from masters and passed on to pupils may, in my opinion, be explained as the result of the efforts of later adherents to the Ḥanafite madhhab, who, with these collections, sought to mitigate the harsh judgements on the part of especially those critics who were contemporaries of Abū Ḥanifa such as Shu'ba b. al-Ḥajjāj (d. 160/777), 'Abd Allāh b. al-Mubārak (d. 181/797), already mentioned above as an admirer in spite of himself, or later ones such as Yahyā b. Sa'īd al-Qāṭṭān (d. 198/814), Yahyā b. Ma'in (d. 233/848) or Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/856). Even about one century later this negative opinion about Abū Ḥanifa is still clearly discernible in an important study of hadith by Ibn Hibbān who died in 354/965. In other words, if we finally look for the man kadhaba tradition in the collections ascribed to Abū Ḥanifa, we should not draw the inference that the isnāds supporting the tradition circulated in the time of Abū Ḥanifa himself, but rather that they were most probably put together a considerable time after Abū Ḥanifa's death by those responsible for the abovementioned Musnads having come into existence.

The man kadhaba dictum does occur in these Musnads. The isnāds seem sufficiently interesting for a brief analysis. The first isnād runs: Abū Ḥanifa – al-Qāsim b. 'Abd ar-Rahmān b. 'Abd Allāh b. Mas'ūd – father – grandfather – prophet. Although many of Abū Ḥanifa's ra'y decisions are eventually ascribed to Ibn Mas'ūd, al-Qāsim is not listed among Abū Ḥanifa's masters. The second isnād runs: Abū Ḥanifa – 'Aṭiyya b. Sa'd al-'Awfi – Abū Sa'īd – prophet. 'Aṭiyya, a weak transmitter, often mentioned Abū Sa'īd without specifying which Abū Sa'īd he meant. He attempted to create the impression that he alluded to Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī instead of Abū Sa'īd

118. Suffice it to mention just two of those 'pupils', Abān b. Ja'far, who is reported to have brought more than 300 traditions into circulation which he falsely attributed to Abū Ḥanifa, cf. Ibn al-Jawzī, Kitāb al-mawdū'at, ii, p. 101, Ibn Ḥajar, Lišān, i, pp. 21 and 27; furthermore, Ibn Ḥanbal is recorded to have said about one Ishaq b. Najīb al-Malāfī that he was one of the most mendacious people in that he transmitted traditions from 'Uthmān al-Batti on the authority of no one less than Ibn Sirīn containing the ra'y of Abū Ḥanifa, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, i, p. 252; examples are legion.


123. Ibidem, pp. 416 and 418. Cf. also Ibn Ḥanbal's 'Ilal, i, nos. 1372, 1486, 2566. A much older contemporary, Raqaba b. Maṣqala (d. 129/747) is also reported to have commented on Abū Ḥanifa's ra'y: he is the most learned of all people concerning that which never was (i.e. ra'y) and the most ignorant concerning that which was (i.e. precedent), cf. Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, Jami', ii, p. 145 (penult).


al-Kalbî from whom he had it.128 The third isnād runs: Abū Ḥanîfâ – Abū Ru'ba Shaddâd b. 'Abd ar-Rahmân – Abū Sa'îd – prophet.129 Abū Ru'ba is nowhere listed in the biographical dictionaries, and it is perhaps permissible to see this name as a misreading of the name Abû Dhuba or Dhabba which occurs in a comparable isnād in Abû Yûsuf's Kitâb al-āthâr.130 In that isnād Abû Sa'îd is called in full: al-Khudrî. The editor of the Āthâr mentions in a note131 that Abû Dhuba is perhaps one and the same as Abû Rawq, which is the kunya of one 'Atiyya b. al-Harîth, who, in turn, is then again confused with 'Atiyya b. Sa'd of the second isnād dealt with above. The fourth isnād runs: Abî Ḥanîfa – Sa'id b. Masrîq – Ibrâhîm b. Yazîd at-Taymî – Anas – prophet.132 Just as in the fifth isnād (Abû Ḥanîfa – Zuhrî – Anas – prophet)133 the saying was allegedly transmitted by Anas on the authority of whom many isnāds supporting the man kadhaba tradition occur in all the canonical collections,134 while these two, different from all the others, only occur in this Musnad. Indeed, the same is true for all the other isnāds analysed here. The last one is particularly defective, because Zuhrî and Abû Ḥanîfa are nowhere listed as having had a master-pupil relationship.

This analysis may have shown how clumsily these isnāds were put together. They seem to form a class apart, which I would like to call the Abî Ḥanîfa isnāds. They are nowhere found in the canonical collections of ḥadîth and were probably fabricated long after Abû Ḥanîfa’s death to lend this imâm more prestige in the matter of ḥadîth transmission and also, perhaps, to bridge the gap somewhat between the ahl ar-ra’î and the ahl al-ḥadîth.135 Besides, why would he who, as we have seen on more than one occasion, allegedly ridiculed traditions in the form of maxims be the transmitter of the best-known slogan tradition of all?

Moreover, in a text that does lay claim to having been composed by Abû Ḥanîfa but was probably written a short time after his death and which, in any case, is generally thought to be a faithful rendering of his politico-religious ideas, the dictum does not occur in a context in which one would have expected it most. I refer, of course, to the treatise entitled Al-‘âlim wa

128. Cf. Ibn Ḥanbal, ‘Ilal, i, nos. 1224f. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, vi, p. 226. In a sequel (Musnad, p. 8, no. 9) the following (revealing!) words are ascribed to him: ‘I testify that I have never put false words in the mouth of Abû Sa'îd, and that Abû Sa'îd never put false words in the mouth of the prophet!’

129. Musnad, p. 7, no. 8b.

130. P. 207, no. 922. Abû Ḥanîfa’s position as transmitter of ‘traditions’ in this book requires, perhaps, a separate study: ‘I shall not deal with that here, since the man kadhaba saying does not occur in it anyhow. For the confusion in the names, see Ibn Mâkûlî, Al-ikmâl, iv, p. 102. 131. Ibidem.

132. Musnad, p. 8, no. 10. 133. Musnad, p. 8, no. 11.


135. A good example of such a late forger who did everything in his power to promote Abû Ḥanîfa as a scholar of fiqh as well as of ḥadîth is Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Hîmmânî (d. 302/914), cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Lisân, i, no. 829.
"I-muta'allim" in which the 'ālim is identified with Abū Ḥanīfa but which was written in all likelihood by the mufa'allim, a pupil of his, Abū Muqātil Ḥaṣb b. Salm.136 This context runs:

... wa-lā yanbaghī an yakūna 'iladhi yakdhibu 'alā 'llāhi wa-'alā rasūlihi ka' iladhi yakdhibu 'alayya li-anna 'iladhi yakdhibu 'alā 'llāhi wa-'alā rasūlihi dhanbuhu a'zamu min an law kadhaba 'alā 'ālimu 'i-n-nās fa'iladhi shahidah 'alayya bi 'l-kufr fa-huwa 'indī kādhīb etc... (follows a quotation from Qurʾān v, 8 (p. 27) (i.e. It is improper [to see] the one who ascribes falsehood to God or His Messenger as [anything] like someone who puts lies into my mouth. For the former's sin is greater than if he had spread falsehood about all of mankind. He who testifies against me that I am an unbeliever is in my opinion [merely] a liar).

Also in another passage quotation of the man kadhaba saying would have fitted eminently (p. 24) but it is conspicuously lacking. From a third passage (p. 11) there appears the 'ālim's scorn for prophetic traditions in general. Finally, just as was the case with al-'ālim wa 'l-mufa'allim, in a letter to 'Uthmān al-Batti, which even Schacht considers genuine,137 Abū Ḥanīfa does not resort a single time to quoting one hadith whereas his references to the Qurʾān are numerous.

On the basis of the foregoing I venture to discard all the man kadhaba traditions with Abū Ḥanīfa in the isndād as fabrications that began to circulate perhaps as long as two hundred years after his death. Let us, therefore, return to the other Iraqi compilations and see whether an examination of those enables us to date the man kadhaba traditions in a satisfactory way.

Man kadhaba in Iraqi collections (continued): ar-Rabi' b. Ḥabīb

In the Jāmi' of ar-Rabi' b. Ḥabīb there is no trace of the dictum but in the bukd' tradition cited above (p. 103) we do find the verb kadhaba.138 It bears distinct similarities to the hadith from the Muwaffa' scrutinized above (p. 103) and runs: 'When 'Ā'isha was informed that 'Abd Allāh b. 'Umar had said: "The dead will be punished with the weeping of his fellow tribesmen", she said: "May God forgive 'Abd Allāh, he did not lie but he must have forgotten or he must have made a mistake. Perhaps he heard what the Messenger of God said when he passed [the funeral of] a Jewish woman whose relatives wept over her... etc." (Italics mine). Perhaps we are justified in considering this report, just like its counterpart - though with different isndād - in the Muwaffa', as foreshadowing or reflecting the harsh tone of later versions in which injunctions and prohibitions are emphasized with threats of Hell. Differently put, the evolution of the term kadhaba

137. P. 100, note 4. This risāla was edited (pp. 34-8) in one volume with Al-ālim wa'l-mufa'allim and Al-fiqh al-absa'.
from ‘inadvertently not telling the truth’ to ‘lying intentionally’ is witnessed in its initial stages in this \textit{bukā}' tradition into which, as is so often the case in the somewhat later collections, the concept of ‘lying’ is introduced for additional accentuation of the sinfulness of this behaviour. And I think we are also justified in determining, with the non-occurrence of the complete dictum in this collection in mind, a \textit{terminus post quem} for its emergence in Iraq. Unfortunately, we do not know exactly when ar-Rabi’ died, but it must have been in the course of the second half of the second century. And another regrettable circumstance is that his collection does not seem to have come down to us complete. At the end of the two volume edition (p. 394) a third volume is announced. It is not verifiable what that might have contained.\footnote{J. C. Wilkinson (The early development of the Ibāḍī movement in Baṣra, p. 142) claims that ar-Rabi’ died in 170/786, but he does not refer to a source where he found this. For a description of the \textit{Musnad}, see note 30 of the same paper.}

\textbf{Man kadhaba in Ṭayālīsī}

The next oldest Iraqi collection, that of Ṭayālīsī, presents us with an altogether very gratifying field of further research into the origins of the \textit{man kadhaba} dictum. Here we find again a tradition which we have already encountered in Ibn Wahb’s \textit{Jāmi’}, which can be considered as a forerunner (He who relates from me a tradition of which he thinks that it is a lie, that man is himself one of the liars). Whereas it has a defective \textit{isnād} in Ibn Wahb, in Ṭayālīsī it has a seemingly sound one.\footnote{Pp. 94f., no. 690.} His informant is Shu’ba, who also occurs in \textit{isnāds} of this tradition in other collections going back to two different Companions.\footnote{Ibn Hānbal, \textit{Musnad}, v, pp. 14 and 20; Ibn Māja, \textit{muqaddima} 5 (= i, p. 15); Muslim, \textit{muqaddima} 1 (ed. M. F. 'Abd al-Bāqī, i, p. 9).} Shu’ba b. al-Ḥajjāj (d. 160/777) is, for that matter, Ṭayālīsī’s most important informant for \textit{man kadhaba} traditions. No less than five of the seven \textit{isnāds} supporting the tradition with various preambles, sequels and, sometimes, in different versions bear his name. On the basis of the occurrence of the verb \textit{taqawwala} already in the \textit{Muwatta’} (see above p. 112), I contend that versions with \textit{qāla} are older than those with \textit{kadhaba}. A frequently occurring version reads: \textit{Man qāla (or: taqawwala) ‘alayya mā lam aqulfalyatabawwa’(... etc. We find this version with the following \textit{isnād}: Ṭayālīsī – 'Abd ar-Raḥmān b. Abī ‘z-Zinād – Abū ‘z-Zinād – ‘Āmīr b. Sa’d – 'Uthmān – prophet.}\footnote{P. 14, no. 80.} Ibn Abī ‘z-Zīnād (d. 174/790) is a controversial figure. It is alleged that he used to transmit traditions in Medina and that he was respected for that. However, when he came to Bagdad, the traditionists there disapproved of what he transmitted.\footnote{Ibn Ḥajar, \textit{Tahdhib}, vi, p. 172.} All Iraqi critics stamped him a weak transmitter. And Ibn Sa’d
states that this was especially on the basis of what he claimed that he had received from his father, as is the case with the isnād here.144 Mālik, who used to admire him generally, is also recorded as having expressed his suspicion of the material he allegedly received from his father.145 Since the father died in 130/748, the man qāla ‘alayya mā lam aqul tradition was probably introduced by his son, or attributed by someone else to his son, after that date, and this probably not in Medina, where he spent the first part of his life, but in Bagdad, where he eventually died at the age of 74. The fact that Ṭayālīsī and Ibn Hanbal are the only collectors who list this tradition, and the fact that it does not occur in later, ‘sounder’ collections, seems to be additional proof for its being deemed spurious.

Another variant reading in the tradition under discussion is the occurrence of the adverbially used participle muta‘ammidan, ‘deliberately’. In Ṭayālīsī we find a tradition,146 again with an interesting isnād, in which this word is still lacking, while in certain other collections it is added. The isnād and the matn are as follows: Ṭayālīsī—Shu‘ba—Jāmī’ b. Shaddād—‘Āmīr b. ‘Abd Allāh b. az-Zubayr—‘Abd Allāh b. az-Zubayr: ‘I said to my father: “What prevents you from relating traditions from the Messenger of God as Ibn Mas‘ud and various others do?’ Said az-Zubayr: “By God, ever since I embraced Islam I have been in his vicinity. But I heard him make the following statement: man qāla ‘alayya mā lam aqul falyatabawwa maq‘adahu min an-nār.”’ Instead of man qāla we also read man kadhaba without muta‘ammidan147 and with muta‘ammidan.148 There are even reports in which the addition of the word is a matter of dispute.149 The editor of Ibn Hanbal is probably too apodictical when he states that solely one of Shu‘ba’s pupils, who transmitted this tradition from him,150 is to be held responsible for this addition. It might be interesting to find out to what extent this statement needs revision, and whether we can pin this idrāj on one such pupil.

Persons recorded as having been pupils of Shu‘ba and featuring in man qāla/kadhaba isnāds are the following:

Ṭayālīsī; apart from the tradition just mentioned without muta‘ammidan, he lists various others, also from Shu‘ba, in which the word is inserted.151 So he could have been the one. But likewise could everybody else listed in this survey. For example:

144. Ibn Sa‘d, vii, 2, p. 69. The tradition occurs also with the same isnād in Ibn Ḥanbal, i, p. 65. Ahmad Shākir in his edition stamps the isnād sound (no. 469), not paying heed to what is said in the sources.
145. Al-Khaṭīb, Ta‘rīkh Baghdaḍ, x, pp. 229f. It must have been painful for this man, in view of this unfavourable reputation, never to have been referred to by name, ‘Abd ar-Rahmān, or by kunya Abū Muhammad, but always as the son of Abū Zinād.
148. Ibn Maja, muqaddima 4 (= i, p. 14); Ibn Ḥanbal, i, p. 165. 149. Ibn Sa‘d, iii 1, p. 75. 150. Ahmad Shākir in his commentary on no. 1413.
151. E.g. p. 45, no. 342 and p. 277, no. 2084.
The man kadhaba tradition

Wahb b. Jarir b. Ḥāzim (d. 206/821), whose traditions from Shu'ba are under suspicion,[152]

‘Affān b. Muslim (d. 220/835), on the whole a distinguished transmitter but whose traditions from Shu'ba have once or twice been subject to doubt, in jest[153] or in earnest;[154]

Abū 'l-Walīd Ḥishām b. 'Abd al-Malik (d. 227/842), who appears not to have written down his traditions from Shu'ba but solely to have relied on his memory.

But there are other transmitters not listed among Shu'ba's pupils who occur in isnāds of traditions with the additional words: Ḥasibtu annahu qāla muta'amīdan (i.e. I thought he said: deliberately) – who added this is not certain –, such as Qutayba b. Sa'id and al-Layth b. Sa'd,[156] and Hammām b. Yaḥyā (d. 163/780) is reported to have said himself: Ḥṣibuhu (sc. the prophet) qāla muta'amīdan.[157]

Finally, for the sake of completeness, there is still another isnād going back to az-Zubayr with kadhaba instead of qāla and with the word muta'amīdan. This isnād is seemingly perfect and nothing in the tarājim of the transmitters can be construed as constituting signs of fabrication.[158] From the above it may have become apparent that it is sometimes impossible to determine who is to be held responsible for an idrāj such as the one referred to here. It is safer to say that this idrāj gradually became en vogue among a generation of transmitters who began to attach to the concept kadhaba not merely inattentiveness or forgetfulness, but rather deliberate falsification. Paradoxically, the last isnād mentioned above demonstrates that constructing a seemingly impeccable isnād was indeed possible. But the fact that it supports a matn with an insertion of unquestionably later origin gives it away as one which was brought into circulation later than those supporting the dictum as yet free from this insertion. Additional proof for this contention is provided by the fact that Mālik (d. 179/795), who transmitted from the third link in this isnād, az-Zubayr's grandson

152. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, xi, p. 162.
154. Ibidem, p. 273. 'Affān was the first to be tried during the mīhna, according to reports in the Ta'rīkh Baghdād. It should, therefore, not astonish us that we also encounter his name in an isnād in Ibn Ḥanbal, i, p. 327, supporting among others the text: 'He who tells lies about the Qur'ān without knowing what he is talking about, he will have to seek himself a place in Hell.' This saying, with or without a combination with man kadhaba (qāla) alayya etc., with different isnāds, is also found in Tirmidhi's introduction to his chapter on tafsīr 1 = v, p. 199; Ibn Ḥanbal, Musnad, i, pp. 233 and 323. Shākir considers the isnāds in Ibn Hanbal da'if because of 'Abd al-Aḥmad b. Tha'lābī, but they have another, later link in common, Abū 'Awāman, who, like Shu'ba, emerges time and again in man kadhaba traditions.
155. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, xi, p. 46.
156. Cf. Tirmidhi, 'ilm 8 (v, p. 36); Ibn Ḥanbal, iii, p. 223; Ibn Māja, muqaddima 4 (= i, p. 13).
157. Cf. Muslim, zuhd 72 (ed. 'Abd al-Baqī, iv, pp. 229ff.); Ibn Ḥanbal, iii, p. 56.
158. Abū Dāwūd, 'ilm 4 (iii, pp. 319ff.).
Muslim Tradition

'Āmir, and allegedly knew of his piety, did not list the saying at all, as we have established above. So the isnād probably came into existence sometime during the last few decades of the second century. Furthermore, it is likely that its region of origin was Iraq, since all the transmitters coming after 'Āmir were Iraqi.

If we scrutinize the various man kadhaba traditions in Ṭayālisī somewhat further, another salient feature becomes apparent. Three versions, all three with Shu'ba in the isnāds that go back to Abū Hurayra, Anas and Ibn Mas'ūd, are mentioned in Ṭayālisī without the preambles they have in other, later collections. But two of these preambles still figure in Ṭayālisī as separate traditions and one does not yet occur in it. Since Ṭayālisī heard this last one going back to Ibn Mas'ūd directly from Shu'ba, his fellow pupils of that master figuring in the isnāds in later collections have, therefore, to be held responsible for the preambles and no one else. Another rule can be distilled from the above: the more composite a tradition, the later its redaction. Another example of such a later redaction is the saying: 'Do not put false words in my mouth, for he who does so goes (yalij) to Hell.' This simple, and therefore probably older, version is found with the same isnād in Tirmidhi provided with a lengthy preamble in which 'Ali is preferred to Abū Bakr and 'Umar, clearly a tradition of the fadā'il genre, while the dictum itself is given in the classical, later version with muta'amidan and a form of the verb tabawwa'a.

Summing up, what conclusions can we attach to the foregoing survey of man kadhaba traditions in Ṭayālisī? First of all, the more elaborate or composite a tradition, the later it came into circulation. This holds also true for isnāds; on one occasion Ṭayālisī records Shu'ba as saying: 'I think that this tradition is a saying Abū Hurayra received from the prophet' (italics mine). The same tradition with the same isnād is listed simply marfū' in later collections, without the additional expression of doubt on the part of Shu'ba.

Secondly, the man kadhaba dictum must have come into circulation in Iraq sometime between the two death dates of ar-Rabī' b. Ḥabīb (see above p. 125) and Ṭayālisī, in other words, sometime in the course of the second half of the second century A.H. Responsible for the dictum are probably the

160. Respectively p. 318 (no. 2421), p. 277 (no. 2084) and p. 45 (no. 342).
161. What is one single man kadhaba tradition in Bukhārī, 'ilm 38 (= i, pp. 39f.), and adab 109 (= iv, p. 158), is two separate traditions in Ibn Ḥanbal, ii, p. 519, and Ṭayālisī, nos. 2419, 2420 and 2421. Cf. also Tirmidhi, fitan 70 (iv, p. 524) with Ṭayālisī, nos. 342 and 337.
162. Cf. Dārīmi, muqaddima 25 (pp. 32f.) and Ibn Ḥanbal, ii, p. 172, with Ṭayālisī, no. 2084.
163. Compare on the one hand Ṭayālisī, p. 17, no. 107, Bukhārī, 'ilm 38 (= i, pp. 39f.), Tirmidhi, 'ilm 8 (v, p. 35), Ibn Māja, muqaddima 4 (= i, p. 13), Ibn Ḥanbal, t, pp. 83, 123 and 150, with, on the other hand, Tirmidhi, manaqib 19 (v, pp. 632ff.), and the lengthy, but hopefully unconvincing authentication Tirmidhi devotes to this version.
164. P. 318, no. 2421.
165. Cf. the sources listed, note 161 (first part) above.
various pupils – or people using their names – of the key figures, or ‘common links’ (cf. Introduction and Ch. 5), in the *man kadhaba isnāds*, such as Shu’ba b. al-Ḥajjāj (d. 160/777), active in Baṣra and Kūfa, Abū ‘Awāna al-Waḍḍāḥ b. ‘Abr Allāh (d. 176/792), active in Wāṣīt and Baṣra, and ‘Abd Allāh b. Lahi’a (d. 174/790), active in Egypt although the majority of his masters and many of his pupils were Iraqi.

Thirdly, the actual wording of the dictum evolved from *qāla, qawwala*166 and *taqawwala*167 to *kadhaba* and even *’fitārā*.168 The oldest preambles and sequels refer to mendacity in transmission of ḥadīth, the preambles and sequels in which various legal issues are mooted and whose injunctions or prohibitions are emphasized by means of the dictum are to be considered as being of a later date.

**Man kadhaba in later Iraqi sources and conclusions**

With time the number of different isnāds supporting the dictum increased. In Tayālisi’s *Musnad* it was as yet a handful. In Ibn Ḥanbal’s time the number had increased considerably. We even find in this collection quite a few isnāds which did not find recognition in the six canonical books.169 The

---


169. Ibn Ḥanbal, 1, p. 47, from ‘Umar, without *muwa’amidan*, Shākir: *da’if* because of Dujayn; 1, p. 70, from ‘Utmān, variant: *man ta’ammad‘ayya kadhaban fayyātabawna* bayyan fi ‘n-nār, perhaps an early stage for the concept ‘deliberateness’ to appear. *Bayyan* for *maq‘adahu* can also be considered as such, Shākir: *ṣaḥīḥ*; 1, p. 78, from ‘Āli, Shākir: *ṣaḥīḥ*; 1, p. 130, from ‘Āli, Shākir: *da‘īf* because of *‘Abdāl-Al‘Ā*‘at-thalabī; 1, pp. 22, 103, 144 (cf. Shāfiʿī, *Risāla*, p. 396; the same, *Tartūb musnad*, 1, p. 17), from Ibn ‘Umar with family isnād, variant: *Inna ‘lladhiyak kadhibu ‘alayya yubnd n-taytabawwa* baytan fi ‘n-nār, probably in the evolution of the dictum the second oldest stage after *man qāla mā lam aqul* . . . etc., Shākir: *ṣaḥīḥ*; 1, pp. 158, 171, from Ibn ‘Amr, variant: *man qāla* . . . etc., with sequel on the prohibition of certain intoxicating beverages (cf. Abū Dāwūd, *ashriba* 5 = iii, p. 328 without *man qāla* etc.), Shākir: *ṣaḥīḥ*; 1, pp. 321, 365, from Abū Hurayra, variant: *taqawwala*, with sequel on the giving of sound advice; iii, p. 44, from Abū Sa‘id al-Khudri; iii, pp. 166f., 176 and 280, with three different *insāds* from Anas; iii, p. 422, from Qays b. Sa‘d b. ‘Ubāda, with sequel prohibiting intoxicating beverages; iv, p. 100, from Mu‘āwiyah (from whom there is not one single tradition in Tayālisi); iv, pp. 156, 201 and 159, from ‘Uqba b. ‘Amir, with preamble and sequel on the prohibition of silk and on ablutions; iv, pp. 366f., from Zayd b. Arqam, in the middle of a long pro-Shī‘ite tradition about the *ahl al-bayt*; v, p. 292 (cf. Khalīfa, *Ṭabaqāt*, p. 122), from Khālid b. ‘Urfaṭa, a name about which there seems to be some confusion: Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhib*, iii, p. 106, says that he only transmitted one tradition which is not the same as this one, with a preamble in which he calls Mukhtar a liar (cf. also Khalīfa, ibidem); finally v, p. 412, from a *rajul min asḥāb an-nabi* (cf. al-Khaṭīb, *Kitāba*, p. 415), a very long tradition containing many different elements as well as *man kadhaba*, a tradition which J. van Es (Zwischen Ḥadīth und Theologie, pp. 149ff.) would call “ein Kolossalgemälde”. The most conspicuous common links are in these *insāds*: three times Ibn Lahf‘a and three times Shu’re
most extensive list of *isnāds* with the saying in its different wordings is found in Ibn al-Jawzi’s *Kitāb al-mawdūʿāt*. Ibn al-Jawzi composed this list as some sort of illustrative introduction to his collection of forged sayings.170 A comparison of his *isnāds* with those in the nine books on which the *Concordance* is based yields the following result. With the exception of three,171 to which may be added one *isnad* in the *Musnad* of ash-Shāfi‘i,172 all *isnāds* from those collections occur in Ibn al-Jawzi’s list but, in addition to these, we find here a good deal more. The conclusion seems justified that the thirty-one *isnāds* which Ibn al-Jawzi lists but are not found in the nine older collections have to be considered as fabrications from the fourth century A.H. onward. An interesting fact is also that not a single Abū Ḥanīfah *isnād* found a place in Ibn al-Jawzi, something which is hardly amazing in view of that collector’s leaning toward the Ḥanbalite *madhhab*, but nevertheless deserves to be mentioned here.

We have seen above (p. 97 and especially note 5) how other people considered *man kadhaba* traditions *mutawātir*. It might, therefore, be interesting to see what overall ideas Ibn al-Jawzi has to offer on the same question.

Unlike Nawawi, Ibn al-Jawzi relates that the tradition is found going back to sixty-one different Companions among whom there were nine out of the ten to whom the prophet promised Paradise.173 Then he quotes a certain Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Isfardīnī,174 who said: ‘There is no ḥadīth in the world on which the ten Companions (i.e. to whom Paradise was promised) agree except this one.’ Then Ibn al-Jawzi adds: ‘But I have never come across a tradition in this vein traced back to ‘Abd ar-Rahmān b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Muṣṭafī ’Alī b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Muṣṭafī al-‘Abīshīq. Among the Companions in this list we do find, strangely enough, Salmān al-Fārisī who transmitted it from the prophet. Salmān is often a transmitter of prophetic sayings in Shi‘ite sources

170. 1, pp. 57–92.


172. *Tārīf musnad*, 1, p. 17, from Abū Qatāda with preamble about the transmission of ḥadīth; cf. also Risāla, p. 397. 173. 1, p. 56.

and to conclude this survey I should like to give a list of traditions from Shi'ite collections. Perhaps Salmān plays a part in those also.

But I have searched in vain. In fact, I have found that the concept kadhib did not play a role as important as in the sunnite collections. Only once does the man kadhaba dictum occur in the collections available to me in printed editions. That is in Kulaynī.176 Preamble and sequel are the same as in Ibn Abī 'l-Ḥadīd's Sharḥ naḥṣ al-balāḡa,177 but in Kulaynī's bāb al-kadhib178 the saying does not occur, a bāb where we would have expected it most. There are two more sayings, one attributed to 'Alī and one to the imām Ja'far, which, with a little effort, can be interpreted as more or less in the same vein as the sunnite traditions concerning kadhib.179 In the Jāmi' al-akhbār of Ibn Bābawayhi we find the tradition which we have come to know as one of the major forerunners of the man kadhaba saying. It is attributed to the Prophet and runs: Iyyākum wa 'l-kadhib fa-inna 'l-kadhib yahdī ilā 'l-fujūr wa 'l-fujūr yahdī ilā 'n-nār (see above p. 112). But the remainder in Ibn Bābawayhi's chapter on kadhib merely contains sayings attributed to imāms without a trace of man kadhaba.180 In conclusion, there is one more saying ascribed to Ja'far with the following preamble: 'Lying about God, His Messenger and the plenipotentiaries is a grave sin. The Messenger of God once said: Man qala 'alayya ma lam aqulhufal-yatabawwa' maq'adahu min an-nār.'181 On the basis of the foregoing material it seems safe to say that the dictum in its fully developed stage, embellished with preambles and/or sequels or inserted in other traditions by way of iḍrāj apparently never caught on in Shi'ite traditionists' circles. Whether or not they were aware of themselves as being among the most guilty by bringing into circulation masses of fabricated traditions, for instance the innumerable fada'il traditions extolling the merits of the ahl al-bayt, is difficult to say. At any rate, a Shi'ite such as Ibn Abī 'l-Ḥadīd admitted frankly that it was the partisans of 'Ali who were the first to spread forged traditions concerning their leaders.182 The overall impression one gains from reading in Shi'ite hadīth collections is that these, unlike the sunnite collections, are not so much concerned with legal issues resulting in heated discussions about pro and contra which, eventually, are emphasized with the man kadhaba dictum, but first and foremost bear the stamp of fada'il in the widest sense of the word.183

176. Al-kāfī, i, p. 62.
177. xi, pp. 38f. 178. u, pp. 338-43.
179. i, p. 52. There is one more saying attributed to Ja'far, cf. Al-hikam al-Ja'fariyya, p. 31.
183. Fada'il praising various foodstuffs such as fruits, vegetables and the like are surprisingly numerous, e.g. al-Barqi, Kitāb al-maḥāsin, pp. 315-466, and Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, vii, p. 388.
In short, every piece of evidence adduced in the foregoing pages points to Iraqi sunnite traditionist circles flourishing in the second half of the second century as the breeding ground of the *man kadhaba* saying.

One may well ask, why Iraq? It is obvious that a clear-cut answer is difficult to give. Extensive reading in the most authoritative, early *rijāl* works leaves one with the impression that lying in and fabrication of *matns* as well as deceit in the composition of *isnāds* (*tadlis*) were practised much more widely in the Iraqi centres than in Syria, Egypt or the Hijaz, whereas the 'raising to the level' of a prophetic saying seems to have been resorted to in the latter three regions on a somewhat wider scale than in Iraq. But unless the *rijāl* works' information is taken at face value—something which raises doubts discussed in the chapters that follow—and is fed into a computer, it is well-nigh impossible to quantify the evidence for the above surmise. Besides, looked at from a distance, what is the basic difference between on the one hand *kadhib*, *wad* and *tadlis* and, on the other hand, *raf*? Assuming that there is a difference, this is closely intertwined with the angle from which the discerning *hadith* experts in the respective centres during the first few centuries of Islam looked at *hadith*, but the dispassionate twentieth century student may only perceive a slight psychological difference which, once recognized, needs no longer to be taken as unduly complicating matters. Even so, a few observations could be made which, if anything, might assure that the discussion remains open.

In Chapter 1 various references were given to passages in which it was intimated that Iraq was deemed more *kadhib*-prone than the other regions (cf. notes 237 and 241). Furthermore, it seems feasible that a brief look at the composition of the population of the different regions may result in raising a few significant points. Basic to any issue regarding population in early Islam is the Arabs-*mawāli* ratio.

In the Hijaz Arabs probably outnumbered *mawāli*. The 'ulamā‘ and *fuqahā‘* who gave Islam its face were predominantly free-born Arabs, *mawāli* playing only a minor—albeit gradually far from negligible—role in gathering *'ilm* and disseminating *fiqh*.

In Egypt Islam took so long to grow roots (see also note 50 of Chapter 1 above) and Muslims were in the beginning so heavily outnumbered by Copts that active participation in the shaping of Islam on the part of the Muslims living in Egypt can well be assumed to have been virtually non-existent until such people as Layth b. Sa‘d (d. 175/791), 'Abd Allāh b. Lahi‘a (d. 174/790) and 'Abd Allāh b. Wahb (d. 197/813) began to disseminate the tradition material they had gathered for the most part in the Hijaz and Iraq. Since the development of Islam goes hand in hand with the development of *hadith*, it is understandable that where there was still virtually no Islam to speak of, there was virtually no *hadith* activity either, and thus, presumably, no *kadhib*, *wad*, *tadlis* or *raf*'. It seems safe to say that, seen
against the background of evolving Islam, Egypt lagged behind the other provinces of the Islamic empire by some three or four decades or possibly even longer.

It is more difficult to make general statements about Syria and the evolution of Islam or hadith there. This is due mainly to the lack and/or the – as yet – unavailability of sufficient source material. One gains the impression that whatever progress Islam enjoyed in Syria, this was closely linked with the way it adopted, or fought off, Christian/Byzantine ways of thinking (compare especially note 238 of Chapter 1 above). It is true that Syria had in one Umayyad ruler, 'Umar II, a man who, through his authority and incentives, may have promoted the gathering of hadith in a probably significant way. And the effect Zuhri's hadith collecting activities must have had on the evolution of hadith in Syria in general cannot be emphasized enough. But, perhaps with the exception of Awzā'ī (d. 157/774), Islam, and thus also hadith, had during the first century of 'Abbāsid rule in Syria no spectacular protagonists or theoreticians.

When we finally look at Iraq, we soon realize that it was here that the greatest activity in thinking about, and subsequently formulating, Islam was displayed. And thus it was here that the search for, and, inevitably as a concomitant factor, the fabrication of, traditions assumed such large proportions. Key figures in the development of Iraqi hadith were practically all mawdālī, as Arabs, like anywhere in the Islamic empire – with the possible exception of the Hijāz – were vastly outnumbered by the indigenous, conquered population. Now, it is hard to say whether the identification of hadith fabrication with mendacity was first thought of by one pious Arab or one devout mawlā, or whether the whole concept of mendacity in hadith slowly and gradually took shape in the minds of a class of religious people in which Arabs formed a minority and mawālī the majority. But the theory seems tenable, as the foregoing pages may have demonstrated, that the man kadhaba dictum originated in Iraq, and the harshly threatening and overall intolerant tone of the saying may well be taken to reflect also the rivalry either way between the ruling minority and the vast masses of the subordinate majority, a rivalry which, as yet, had not taken such dimensions in the Hijāz.

Zuhri is reported to have said: yakhruju 'l-hadīth shibran fa-yarji'u 'l-dhīrā' an ya'ni mina 'l-'Irāq, i.e. a tradition may emerge spanning a hand's breadth; after its return from Iraq it measures a cubit (Abū 'l-Qāsim al-Balkhī, Qabīl al-akhbār, p. 170). And someone coming to Kufa said: 'Show me the biggest liar, for the best traditions can only be found with him!' (Ibidem, p. 17.)
CHAPTER FOUR

An appraisal of Muslim hadīth criticism.

Rijāl works as depositories of transmitters' names

Lā ilāmi li'llāhi gawmaw asfāla min qawm min yātabbāna hādhā 'l-hadīth wa-yuhibbāna hādhihi 's-sunna wa-kam anīm fī 'n-nās? Wa 'līhi la-anīm aqallu mina 'dh-dhahab.

Sulaymān b. Mihrān al-A'mash in Rama'urumuz, Al-muḥaddith al-fāsīl, p. 177.

Introduction

A study dealing with the chronology of the origins and early development of hadīth cannot, of necessity, avoid dealing with the origins and early development of hadīth criticism. The present and the following chapters will be devoted to this issue.

In this chapter the first element of a hadīth transmitter's biography in the rijāl lexica, his name(s) and/or genealogy, will be studied; the following chapter will be devoted to the biographical information of a transmitter and the assessment of his skill in transmitting traditions.

As already indicated in Chapter I, the famous traditionist Shu'ba b. al-Ḥajjāj, who died in 160/776, was the first to scrutinize hadīth transmitters in Iraq or rather as it turned out in the entire Muslim world. He was soon followed in this skill by Yahyā b. Sa'id al-Qaṭṭān (d. 198/813), Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855) and many others. Their activities were eventually put down in writing and this gave rise to a new genre of literature, the tabaqāt works. In these works the transmitters are arranged according to generation and place of residence. The first great work belonging to his genre which has been preserved is Ibn Sa'd's Kitāb at-tabaqāt al-kabīr. The division in tabaqāt or classes, generations, was eventually abandoned in favour of another arrangement, a gradually more strictly observed alphabetical order of transmitters irrespective of their places of residence. The first two major works in this genre that have come down to us are At-ta'rikh al-kabīr of Bukhārī (d. 256/870) and the Kitāb al-jarh wa 't-ta'dīl of Ibn Abī Ḥātim (d. 327/938). These two works were followed by a number of others which as far as possible encompassed the information contained in already existing ones. With the Tahdhib at-tahdhib of Ibn Ḥajar this development came finally to a standstill. Ibn Ḥajar, who died in 852/1449, produced in

3. For his scholarly career, see E.I. 2, s.v. (F. Rosenthal).
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this biographical lexicon the most complete list of hadith transmitters occurring in all the canonical collections as well as a few other revered ones, a list which was based upon the works of all his predecessors and which has never been superseded by a later lexicon.

Ibn Hajar’s Tahdhib at-tahdhib

Ibn Hajar must have had sources from which he worked as is abundantly clear to everyone who is familiar with his massive works. He had at his disposal a great many books and records from older generations of scholars and he never made it a secret that he had culled his works from all those Vorlagen. So, even if Ibn Hajar is a fifteenth-century scholar, we may rely on his Tahdhib as containing the most extensive survey of the oldest source material available on the subject-matter of hadith transmitters arranged in short or sometimes lengthy tarjamas.

Before embarking on an appraisal of this material I should like first to emphasize once more one crucial point. Since it appeared just as easy during the first few centuries of Islam to fabricate isnāds for hadiths as to forge sayings, dictums, slogans, maxims or, in short, anything contained in the main of a hadith, the fact that a certain main is supported by a seemingly sound isnād should never be interpreted as indicating that, because of that isnād, the main can indeed be ascribed to the prophet or a Companion as is claimed. Conversely, if, on the basis of sound historical considerations, a saying is in all probability rightfully ascribed to the prophet or another early authority, that does not entail that the isnad via which it is transmitted is therefore necessarily genuine. If a study of hadith transmitters such as the one presented here yields any results at all, they will be results that say something about how isnāds were put together, or how weak or defective isnāds were doctored so as to seem ‘sounder’, but it will not produce information on the authorship or chronology of particular sayings unless in passing.

In what, then, lies the usefulness of Ibn Hajar’s Tahdhib? In recent years various ancient texts have been produced in printed editions which had hitherto only been known to exist in manuscript and/or in fragments in sources like the Tahdhib. These fragments confirm in the first place the authenticity of these new editions, but they can also be put together so as to form one of those other ancient sources which Ibn Hajar drew upon and which may not otherwise be extant. We are now greatly helped towards a correct appreciation of the origins of Muslim isnād criticism by the fact that we have at our disposal works such as the Kitāb al-‘ilal by ‘Ali ibn al-Madini (d. 239/849), the Kitāb al-‘ilal wa-ma’rifat ar-rijal by Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal, or a book entitled Al-muhaddith al-fāsil bayna ‘r-rāwi wa ‘l-wā’i of al-Ḥasan b. ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān ar-Rāmāhurmuzī(d. 360/970) to mention a few of those
important editions.\textsuperscript{4} And if one does not have the extensive manuscript material containing texts ascribed to — for example — Yahyä b. Ma'än (d. 233/847) at one's disposal, or — as another example — the MSS. ascribed to Ibrähim b. Ya'qîb al-Jûzajâni (d. 259/847), one can still reconstruct those texts on the basis of the numerous quotations from them in the \textit{Tahdhib}. But on top of this we also find here fragments of texts which have been otherwise lost or which at least have not been given an entry in Sezgin's \textit{GAS} or sometimes even Ibn an-Nadim's \textit{Fihrist}.

In Appendix IV I have collected the names of a few dozen people who were most frequently mentioned in the \textit{Tahdhib}. This list is far from complete and could probably be extended considerably. It is only meant to give an idea of the wealth of old material in the \textit{Tahdhib} so far untapped. Moreover, if we finally realize that Ibn Sa'd's \textit{Tabaqät} in the printed edition as we have it now shows various lacunae which, if someone devoted some time to it, could be filled with the appropriate passages ascribed to Ibn Sa'd from the \textit{Tahdhib},\textsuperscript{5} then the conclusion seems inevitable that Ibn Hajar's work can be considered to be a \textit{Fundgrube} which, until now, has not attracted the attention it seems to deserve. The present chapter also originated in my realizing this.

When one reads extensively in the twelve volumes of the \textit{Tahdhib}, one learns a great deal about the rivalries between the various centres of hadith in the Muslim world and also about the internal rivalries between traditionists of one school.\textsuperscript{6} In an endless stream \textit{faḍā'il} alternate with \textit{mathālīb} and often one stumbles upon blatant contradictions which seriously complicate matters. But I firmly believe that the solutions to many questions concerning the earliest development of Islamic tradition, raised by Goldziher and later scholars and so far never — especially not in the eyes of Muslim scholars — satisfactorily answered, can be sought in a thorough study of the \textit{Tahdhib}. Leaving those rivalries aside for the time being, I should like to concentrate on the 7,300 names of transmitters whose lifetimes span a period of some two hundred and fifty years. Are these the

\begin{itemize}
\item[4.] For details, see Bibliography.
\item[5.] The same applies to Ibn Ḥanbal's \textit{Kitāb al-ʿīlāl wa-maʾrifat ar-rijał} of which we have only volume 1 in a printed edition. Whether or not the editors will eventually bring out more volumes is anybody's guess. As long as we do not have more than the first volume, the \textit{Tahdhib} is our only printed source of information. This is also true for 'Ali ibn al-Madîni's \textit{Kitāb al-ʿīlāl} which, in the printed edition, only contains a fraction of the information scattered over the \textit{Tahdhib}. One wonders why the unique ms., dating from 628 A.H. (cf. \textit{GAS}, i, p. 108) presents so incomplete a text. Might Ibn al-Madîni's original have contained information which did not harmonize with the views of later rijał experts and were large parts of it, therefore, subsequently suppressed? Do we have, in other words, only an 'expurgated' redaction? Cf. Chapter 5 of this study. But, of course, we do not know whether Ibn Hajar had perhaps other texts of his at his disposal.
\item[6.] See also my \textit{On the origins of Arabic prose}, p. 172, cf. also Chapter 1, pp. 64f.
\end{itemize}
names of 7,300 historical figures of early Islam or are there any fictitious persons among them, and if so, who can safely be crossed out?

Even if one does not have a computer at one’s disposal, where the pressing of buttons supplies the desired information, a human being has a faculty which serves him in good stead when tackling a problem such as the one outlined above. This faculty is his awareness of unusual coincidences and, very often, his unwillingness to take these coincidences for granted. If, for example, a certain name - with or without the accompanying patronymic - occurs much more frequently than might be expected, a closer look almost invariably proves to be rewarding and reveals certain peculiarities. I have come to recognize these peculiarities and I have started to classify them. The following considerations concerning one particular name furnish a suitable starting-point and may clarify what I mean.

The case of Ḥafs b. ʿUmar

Of the thirty-five people called Ḥafs, thirteen, that is more than one third, were allegedly sons of people called ʿUmar. Eight of these thirteen were contemporaneous. When I looked to see if they had any masters in common, it appeared that three of these transmitters called Ḥafs b. ʿUmar had been pupils of the well-known Shuʿba. This peculiarity is enhanced by the fact that in Ibn Ḥajar’s lexicon dealing with the transmitters from other than the canonical collections, the Lisān al-mīzān, the patronymic ʿUmar in an even more astonishing manner outnumbers other patronymics for people called Ḥafs. Of the forty-three Ḥafs twenty had ʿUmars as fathers. Of these twenty fifteen were contemporaneous and, on top of that, five had allegedly been pupils of Shuʿba. In other words, if we take all this information at face value, there were eight different people called Ḥafs b. ʿUmar (five from the Lisān and three from the Tahdhib) who had attended Shuʿba’s hadith sessions and, if that is not enough, who had more than a dozen namesakes mostly spread over Iraqi hadith centres. I have come to recognize in this a pattern. Someone had become so well-known and was so much looked up to at a certain time at a certain place that isnāds with his name became numerous. Since an ever increasing number of isnāds were forged with his name in them supporting texts too incongruous to ascribe to a transmitter of his stature, rijāl information became automatically more extensive including various people with the same name but of lesser renown to whom the incongruous material could indeed safely be ascribed. In the case of the name Ḥafs b. ʿUmar, the first and foremost bearer of that name, whose fame and, therefore, whose inviolability had probably brought his various fictitious namesakes into being, was Ḥafs b. ʿUmar b. al-Ḥārith b. Sakhbara (d. 225/840).7

7. Tahdhib, 11, pp. 405ff. His grandfather and great-grandfather are listed in Caskel, 1, no. 216.
But if we scrutinize this one transmitter more closely in the earlier *rijāl* works even more astonishing features keep piling up and strengthen us in our initial disbelief in this capricious coincidence: almost two dozen people bearing the same not too common name fortuitously living at the same time mostly in the same area seem too hard to swallow.

In Ibn Sa'd there are two people called Ḥafṣ b. 'Umar but they lived at different times. The one we are trying to trace for our investigation is, as yet, only known by his *kunya* and his *nisba*, Abū 'Umar al-Ḥawdī. Ibn Sa'd must have met him personally or he must have obtained direct information about him, because he even mentions the very day on which Ḥafṣ died, roughly five years before his own death in 230. For the rest he does not give any more details, for example about his activities as a transmitter. He only states that the man is to be considered to hail from Baṣra. In *Khalifa* b. Khayyāt's work on *tabaqāt* it is clearly stated that he was a *mawlā* of the Banū 'Adī. Khalifa died allegedly ten years after Ibn Sa'd in 240 and it is for this reason that his information may be a little more detailed. But in *Bukhārī*’s *At-ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, a *rijāl* work composed approximately only fifteen years later, the reference to his having been a *mawlā* is substituted for his alleged descent from an-Namir, a revered ancestor of the tribe Azd, whereas in the *Kitāb al-jarh wa ’t-ta’dil* of Ibn Abī Ḥātim, containing information gathered again some fifteen years later by Abū Ḥātim (d. 277/890), Ḥafṣ’s pedigree has grown by the addition of a grandfather (al-Ḥārith) and a statement attributed to ʿAlī ibn al-Madīnī (d. 234/849) that he had been one of Shu’ba’s pupils, that he was of bedouin descent and that he was noted for his unadulterated Arabic. Returning to the *Tahdhib* we are then confronted again with a man whose complete pedigree stretches far back into the Azd tribe and about whom it is said – but only as an afterthought to which not too much historical value is to be attributed (wa-yuqālu . . .) – that he may have been a *mawlā* of the Banū ’Adī.

To sum up, the different entries in the *rijāl* works quoted here are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Sa'd (d. 230/844)</td>
<td>230/844</td>
<td>Abū 'Umar al-Ḥawdī wa’smuhu Ḥafṣ b. 'Umar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khalifa (d. 240/854)</td>
<td>240/854</td>
<td>Ḥafṣ b. 'Umar mawlā bani 'Adī al-Ḥawdī Abū 'Umar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bukhārī (d. 256/870)</td>
<td>277/890</td>
<td>Hafs b. 'Umar Abū 'Umar al-Ḥawdī an- Namārī al-Azdī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Ḥātim (d. 277/890)</td>
<td>277/890</td>
<td>Hafs b. 'Umar Abū 'Umar al-Ḥawdī Ibn al-Ḥārith an-Namārī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of namesakes increases with time as is conspicuously apparent from a chronological survey of the above-mentioned *rijāl* works.

8. Ibn Sa'd, *VII*, 2, p. 56 (lines 13ff.).
In Ibn Sa’d, as indicated above, only one other Ḥafs b. ‘Umar is mentioned, namely a grandson of Sa’d b. Abi Waqqāṣ who was killed with his father by Mukhtār presumably more than a century earlier. In the twenty-five years following Ibn Sa’d’s death fifteen more people with this name emerge in the Taʾrīkh of Bukhārī, but only four can be considered contemporary with our Ḥafs. Again a few decades later, when Ibn Abī Ḥātim’s father was actively collecting rijāl material, this number has increased to thirty-five, of whom fifteen lived at an earlier time and twenty were contemporaneous with our particular Ḥafs b. ‘Umar. After that, as we have seen, the number is still higher in Ibn Ḥajar’s Tahdhib and Lisān but not very much so. The only striking difference between Ibn Abī Ḥātim and Ibn Ḥajar is the increased volume of information in the tarjamas of the latter. And in spite of the meticulousness of these Muslim authors, a further look reveals how defectively much of the material was transmitted and to what confusion, such as the creation of new people called Ḥafs b. ‘Umar, this led.

The question remains: who can be held responsible for the invention of these transmitters? Perhaps the ultimate differentiation may have been made by later rijāl experts who had to sift questionable from acceptable material. They may have done this on the basis of genealogical and/or faḍā’il/mathālīb information partly transmitted anonymously, partly transmitted by that generation of traditionists who found a place in the tier above Ḥafs in Ḥafs b. ‘Umar isnāds. In other words, although we cannot possibly impute to one (or more) person(s) the invention of the namesakes of Ḥafs b. ‘Umar, we know with some accuracy when it must have occurred. From the foregoing it has become clear that the namesakes originated around 250 A.H., between the death dates of Khalīfa (d. 240) and Bukhārī (d. 256). In conclusion I think it is safe to say that the vast majority of people called Ḥafs b. ‘Umar, especially those who allegedly died about 220 A.H., were fictitious persons.

So far, this Ḥafs b. ‘Umar example may be taken to lead to the assumption that as soon as we find a not too common name, which an unexpectedly high number of people seem to share, they are probably fictitious persons who have come into existence around one, or sometimes two, historical ones. This phenomenon could be observed on so many occasions that it deserves to be identified as a pattern.

The case of Ikrima

Another example in regard to which it can be maintained that the not too credulous investigator refuses to believe in ‘coincidences’ concerns the

name 'Ikrima. The notorious mawla of Ibn 'Abbās is so well-known that he
needs no further introduction. Beside him we find in the Tahdhib six more
'Ikrimas of whom one is a Companion, the son of Abū Jahl,14 and the other
five are all Successors who lived at the same time. Whether the name
'Ikrima had become so notorious after the lifetime of Ibn 'Abbās's mawla
that parents no longer wanted to give this name to their sons or whether
there was another reason for the name to disappear, is a question which at
this moment is difficult to answer. The fact is that, with the exception of a
few highly doubtful 'Ikrimas in the Lisān, all people bearing this name lived
during the same period. It is my contention that the majority of these were
fictitious or represent different stages in the development of fictitious
pedigrees around one historical figure. It is indeed difficult to maintain that
the 'Ikrimas listed here are all separate, historical individuals.

'Umar b. Muḥammad

'Ikrima b. Salama b. al-'Āṣ b. Hishām

'Ikrima b. Salama b. Rabi'ā

'Ikrima b. 'Abd ar-Rahmān b. al-Ḥārith b. Hishām b. al-Mughīra b. 'Abd
Allāh b. 'Umar b. Muḥammad

As was the case with Ḥafṣ b. 'Umar isnāds, the reason for the invention of so
many namesakes of one (or at most two) 'Ikrima(s) may lie in the need of
isnād scholars of a later period to differentiate between various kinds of
material of disparate quality which could only be taken seriously and pre-
served when the theory was propounded that it had been transmitted by
transmitters of unequal expertise and background. But since these 'Ikrimas
were supposed to have lived some one hundred years earlier than those
people called Ḥafṣ b. 'Umar, the tarjamas seem to have had more time to
become a great deal more elaborate and sophisticated.

The case of Bishr

A particularly striking coincidence is presented by the transmitters called
Bishr. At the same time, however, they constitute a very complicated
problem the solution of which is not as apparently obvious as in the two
preceding cases. The point of departure is, on the other hand, one of the
most astounding 'coincidences' – as one might call these phenomena – to
embellish the pages of the Tahdhib. Even the most gullible will have to
admit that the distribution of different Bishrs over the hadith centres leaves
something to be explained. With most names it appears that the distribu-
tion over the different hadith centres is, with a few not very meaningful
exceptions, numerically proportionate to the size of the centre. For ex-
ample, the difference in numbers between Basra, Kūfa and Medina hardly

ever gives cause for amazement and, on the whole, we may conclude that
the numbers of transmitters operating in each of these three centres is more
or less similar. Thus, if we look at the distribution of Bishrs over the centres
and we find that apart from two in Himṣ, Damascus and Marw, and one in
Kūfa, there was no Bishr hailing from Medina, whereas seventeen Bishrs
were allegedly active in Baṣra, we have a problem which, so far, is in want
of a satisfactory explanation.

The case of Abū Ishāq

The problem concerning different people bearing the same names and
living roughly during the same period was already known to early ḥadīth
scholars. Ar-Ramahurmuzī, for example, devoted a sizable section of his
book to those who share names and lifetimes. However, in most cases he
does no more than hint. Thus when he talks about those who share the
kunya Abū Ishāq, he only mentions two, who are indeed the most impor-
tant muḥaddīthūn of their time with the name, ‘Amr b. ‘Abd Allāh as-Sabī’ī
and Sulaymān b. Abī Sulaymān ash-Shaybānī, both from Kūfa. What
Ramahurmuzī does not mention is that the kunya Abū Ishāq seems to have
been uncommonly popular in Kūfa and on a lesser scale also in Baṣra, for
the number of those who had this kunya is unexpectedly large and not at all
commensurate with the rather limited number of people called Ishāq who
are mentioned as having been their sons according to customary kunya
practice. And to believe in the ‘coincidence’ that those whose kunya was
Abū Ishāq had acquired this kunya contrary to the established custom is
again, I think, asking a little too much. It is true that having the name
Ibrāhīm in many cases automatically resulted in acquiring the kunya Abū
Ishāq without the apparent need of fathering male children who would then
be named Ishāq, but, even so, the kunya Abū Ishāq was given more
frequently than the overall frequency of the name Ishāq would warrant.
The frequency with which the kunya Abū Ishāq, without specification of
the ism, appears in isnāds leads one to believe that there were perhaps quite
a few people who wanted to share, by borrowing Abū Ishāq as-Sabī’ī’s
kunya, in this famous traditionist’s glory, and that what appears to be the

15. Ramahurmuzi, pp. 274-302. Cf. also al-Ḥākim, Ma’rifat ‘ulām al-ḥadīth, pp. 230f.; al-
Khaṭṭīb, Kifāya, pp. 371f.
16. Fifty-one of the hundred and fifty-four different Ibrāhīms in the Tahdhib, that is almost
one third, are called Abū Ishāq. When we look under the name Ishāq, we find only fifteen
people called Ishāq b. Ibrāhīm, of whom just a few are mentioned in the tarjamas of the
125-8, where eighteen of the twenty-four Ibrāhīms listed have the kunya Abū Ishāq. Cf.
also L. Caetani and G. Gabrieli, Onomasticon arabicum, vol. i, pp. 110f. Of the thirty-
seven people called ‘Abbās in the Tahdhib, no less than fourteen have the kunya Abū
‘l-Fadl. Is that because of the prophet’s cousin al-Fadl b. al-‘Abbās?
17. Cf. Tahdhib, xi, p. 63, where Hushaym b. Bashir is described as ‘making use’ of this kunya;
cf. also Qabūl, pp. 118f.
transmission of one person was in reality the work of many of the same name among whom one or two, in this case as-Sabî'î and ash-Shaybâni, became eventually marked as key figures. It was they who gradually were personally credited with the work of many, otherwise almost anonymous, Abû Ishâqis. I am inclined to lend credence also to the possibility that the majority of Abû Ishâqs are merely fictitious. If we assume, in any case, that the historical validity of isnâds with an unspecified Abû Ishâq at the Successor level hinges on either or both of the possibilities outlined just now, we have cast doubt on a substantial percentage of Kûfan and Başran isnâds. Besides, Abû Ishâq as-Sabî'î is a sort of controversial figure to whom is ascribed a great deal of highly doubtful material. 18 If store is to be set on isnâds at all, those with one unspecified Abû Ishâq at the Successor level are dubious in the extreme irrespective of the texts they support.

It is not unthinkable that Abû Ishâq isnâds, once established as highly useful tools to bring certain materials into circulation as prophetic traditions, started to live a life of their own and were used at all times and seasons. An even more striking example of such an isnâd is the so-called 'golden chain' (siimsilat adh-dhahab): 19 Malik – Nafi' – 'Abd Allâh b. 'Umar – prophet.

Näfi' and Shu‘ba

As is the case with a few other names, the name Näfi' seems to become gradually more popular in the course of the first one and a half centuries after which it virtually disappears. Whereas in Ibn Sa'd we only find twelve, in Bukhâri's Ta'rîkh, compiled a few decades later as we saw, we already find twenty-nine Näfi's listed, which number has become thirty-six in Ibn Abî Hâtim's lexicon. Strangely enough, this number decreases to twenty-six in the Tahdhib and the Lisân together. Again certain striking similarities characterize most of the people called Näfi'. None of them died after 200/815 and the vast majority were either Hijâzî, especially Medinese, Successors or mawâlî or (in most cases) both. One conclusion that readily presents itself is that most probably all these Successors/mawâlî called Näfi' are fictitious with the possible exception of one, the famous mawlâ of Ibn 'Umar from the 'golden chain'. If this conclusion is not acceptable and the historicity of this multitude of Näfi's is maintained, the question why the name virtually disappeared after the period during which the most famous Näfi' allegedly lived remains unanswered. Is it justifiable to assume that the meaning of the name Näfi' (= useful) is significant? Does this perhaps indicate that often mawlâs were given names that bespeak the (hidden) expectations of their masters? The significance

18. See my On the origins of Arabic prose, pp. 170ff., and also Ibn Hanbal, 'Ital, 1, no. 909.
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that certain names have special connotations or evoke special associations may become apparent later in the course of this study, when I shall come to speak of names such as Sālim and Thābit.

There seems to be no doubt that these dozens of Nāfī's have led to confusion on the part of the tradition experts. It is, therefore, wrong to think that the 'golden chain': Mālik – Nāfī – Ibn 'Umar – prophet is any guarantee at all against fabrication. In the Lisān literally hundreds of forged ḥadīths are listed supported by this isnād and it is, of course, impossible to hold the alleged pupils of Mālik in these isnāds solely responsible. Very many forged traditions supported by this isnād probably originated during Mālik's own lifetime (90–179/708–95).

One other feature of the Nāfī's, namely that the number of people so called in Ibn Abi Ḥātim's Al-jarḥ wa 't-taḍīl decreases in Ibn Ḥajar's rijal works, can also be observed with people who had the name Shu'ba. In the Jarḥ the number of Shu'bas was nine, but in the Tahdhib and the Lisān together we find only seven Shu'bas. I think this phenomenon can be explained by assuming that the popularity of the famous Nāfī and the famous Shu'ba with later ḥadīth scholars became so vast that a few of the fictitious shadow figures called Nāfī or Shu'ba, always contemporaneous with, and allegedly active in the same areas as, their famous namesakes or adjacent areas, simply vanished in the course of time.

The dependable Thābit

I have referred above to the meaning of certain names playing a significant part. As an example of such a meaningful name I have chosen Thābit, firm, stable, reliable. It is my contention that many Thābits were not historical figures, but fictitious persons inserted into rickety isnāds to give these a more reliable appearance. To illustrate this it seems appropriate to refer first to an early ḥadīth scholar, Ibn Ḥibbān al-Busti (d. 354/965). In his Kitāb al-majrūḥin, while discussing how the transmission of traditions can go wrong at the hands of certain transmitters, he mentions the category of those who, though moved by pious considerations, do not pay proper heed to the established rules of transmission and ascribe mursal isnāds to the prophet and complete interrupted isnāds with the necessary links. Sometimes they take dictums of Hasan al-Baṣrī and provide them with isnāds via Anas b. Mālik to the prophet, something which would make such an isnād

21. For the most 'reliable' isnāds, see e.g. al-Khaṭīb, Kifāya, pp. 397ff.
22. In Lisān, iii, p. 516, there is a man who claimed to have memorized ḥadīth and who was consequently nicknamed Shu'ba. He lived after 300/912. Ziyād b. Ayyūb Dalluwayh (d. 252/866) was known as 'little Shu'ba', cf. Tahdhib, iii, p. 355, al-Khaṭīb, Ta'rikh Baghdad, viii, pp. 479ff.
sound if this practice escaped notice and were not properly exposed. As an example of transmitters who were not averse to this practice Ibn Ḥibbân mentions among others Abân b. Abi 'Ayyâsh (d. 138/755).23

An interesting anecdote concerning this Abân is preserved in his tarjama in the Tahdhib. Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal is recorded as having questioned Yahyâ b. Ma'in, the famous rijâl expert, when the latter was busily copying traditions under the isnad: 'Abd ar-Razzâq - Ma'mar - Abân etc. 'But don't you know that Abân is a liar?', exclaimed Ahmad, whereupon Ibn Ma'in answered: 'Yes, but I copy this on purpose so that, if some liar comes to me and relates this material on the authority of Ma'mar - Thâbit - Anas, I am in a position to prove that this is a falsehood that has to be ascribed to Abân.'

Here we see that the mere name Thâbit was used, perhaps in jest, to refer to an imaginary, but doubtless reliable, transmitter. A further look into the Tahdhib reveals that there are at least six Thâbits who did allegedly record traditions from Anas and another eight who easily could have done so. The most famous Thâbit, who probably was a historical figure, is Thâbit b. Aslam al-Bunâni, around whom we again find this cluster of shadowy, probably fictitious, figures. It is often impossible to establish which Thâbit is meant in a particular isnad, and sometimes the confusion about it is so great that this has led me to believe that mentioning the single name Thâbit in an isnad may have been a convenient way of patching it up without too many questions asked. In any case, the words Thâbit 'an Anas became a household term in Başra for traditions which had something wrong with them.24

The case of Anas

On the whole, the two oldest links after the prophet in an isnad were the most difficult to establish since the isnad as an institution came into full use only towards the end of the first century.26 Anas’ advanced age – according to the most authoritative reports he died in 93/711 when he was allegedly

23. Kitâb al-majrâhîn, i, p. 56.
25. Cf. Tahdhib, vi, p. 283. Furthermore, there is evidence as to the fictitiousness of Thâbit figures in e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal, Musnad, old ed., iii, pp. 209 and 216, in the isnad: Shu‘ba - Thâbit - Anas - prophet. Cf. also the tarjamas of Ash’ath b. Barâz in Lisan, i, pp. 454f.; Ḥumayd at-Tawîl in Tahdhib, iii, p. 39 (where probably al-Bunâni is meant but not specified as so often is the case), whereas in the case of Šâlih b. Bashîr all his traditions from the mysterious Thâbit are considered worthless (Tahdhib, iv, p. 382). Thâbit al-Bunâni may have been aware of his name being misused, cf. Râmahurmuzî, p. 564. And a contemporary, one 'Abd al-'Abiz b. Ṣuhayb al-Bunâni (d. 130/748), was so called, because he used to go to a street in Başra called Sikkat Bunâna, cf. Tahdhib, vi, p. 342.
26. Cf. J. Horowitz in Der Islam, viii, pp. 39-47; G. H. A. Juynboll in Arabica, xx, pp. 142-59; cf. also my translation of Muslim’s introduction to his Sahîh in JSAl, and, first of all, Chapter 1 of this study.
one hundred and three years old – appeared especially convenient for those *isnād* forgers who were loath to go to a lot of trouble concocting complicated *isnāds* and simply listed a rather late Successor who allegedly had it from Anas who allegedly had it from the prophet. An *isnād* like that stretches easily to the forties and fifties of the second century A.H. Indeed, Anas became such a crucial figure in *isnāds* that he is one of the most important Companions, whose alleged activities in transmitting prophetic sayings caused other, most probably unhistorical, people with this name to come into existence. The ensuing confusion, inevitable as we have learned above, makes the reliability of any *isnād* featuring Anas suspect under the best of circumstances. Moreover, this seemingly easy way of putting *isnāds* together resulted in veritable armies of alleged pupils of Anas, whose doubtful historicity, and hence whose supposedly doubtful trustworthiness, necessitated often the patching up of certain *isnāds* with almost anonymous (read: fictitious) people whose names inspired confidence, such as the Thābits (compare note 170 of Chapter 1).

*The accumulation of certain names*

In a less specific way the use or misuse of reliable sounding names can be observed with names such as Salim, Šālih,27 Saʿīd, Ḥammād, Ḥabbād, Kathīr, Khālid, Rabīʿ, Ziyād and others. In an investigation into all the pupils to whom Ḥasan al-Baṣrī is alleged to have related traditions I have compiled a list of some three hundred and eighty transmitters.28 More than any other source I can think of, this list gives at a glance the unusual accumulation of certain not too common names and in the case of the more common ones, such as Khālid and Saʿīd also listed above, the accumulation sometimes reaches such proportions that again our credulity is stretched beyond its limits. The incredibly large numbers of namesakes, who supposedly all heard traditions with this one man from this one *ḥadīth* centre, would baffle even the most naive. The most striking case of all from the aforementioned list is formed by the Khālids, of whom most probably the vast majority is fictitious around the one Khālid whose historicity seems beyond question, the famous Khālid b. Mihrān (d. 141/758), nicknamed the cobbler, al-Ḥadhdhāʾ, not because he was so good at shoemaking but because he used to sit in the company of cobblers all the time.29

Another case in point concerns the Saʿīds. Suffice it to point out here that al-Khaṭṭīb al-Baghdādi in his – as far as I know – unpublished work *Al-muttafaq wa l-mufāriq* discussed most of the fourteen people called Saʿīd b.

28. For an appraisal of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī as transmitter of traditions, see Chapter 1 above.
29. Another transmitter who earned himself the same nickname for the same reason was 'Ubayda b. Ḥumayd, cf. *Tahdhib*, vu, p. 82. And Yaḥyā b. al-Mutawakkil, who is also mentioned as a cobbler, was moreover blind (!), cf. *Tahdhib*, xi, p. 270.
Abi Sa'id apart from the well-known Sa'id b. Abi Sa'id al-Maqburi. These fourteen Sa'ids are not even listed under separate headings in the Tahdhib, obviously for lack of any detailed information by means of which the one may be distinguished from the other. The Fulan b. Abi Fulan construction I have come to recognize, by the way, as a popular method to disguise the fact that the name of someone's father is not known. Under a great many names we find in the Tahdhib one or more Fulan b. Abi Fulans listed and their tarjamas almost invariably present us with confusion concerning these figures or, in many cases, no information at all. Another way of providing oneself with ancestors was to choose the names Din or Dirham as that of one's father. Although there are quite a few different people listed who supposedly had a certain Din or a certain Dirham as father, these fathers never seem to have led a life of their own. This can be proved easily by the total absence of these names as separate entries in the biographical lexica. That also common names such as Muslim, 'Abd Allah and 'Abd ar-Rahman often seem to have been used for unknown fathers is something which one feels intuitively reading through the rijal works, but for which there is not much tangible evidence. The only thing one can say is that the shadowy, probably fictitious, namesakes around one seemingly historical figure frequently have fathers with the commonest, and therefore the most untraceable, names.

The case of Zuhri

The patterns discussed in the foregoing seem to suggest that many more features characterizing isnads might in actual fact constitute patterns. One such feature, more prominent than any other, is the occurrence in practically every isnad of a key figure. Key figures have been previously dealt with in this study in Chapter 1, pp. 39-65, and will also be subjected to further scrutiny in the next chapter. Now it is proposed to draw special attention to one key figure, the key figure par excellence, who perhaps of all hadith transmitters occurs most frequently in isnads, i.e. Muhammad b. Muslim b. 'Ubayd Allah b. 'Abd Allah b. Shihab az-Zuhri (d. 124/742). Various striking features regarding the name Zuhri assail the assiduous

31. E.g., cf. Rashid ghayr mansab wa-qila Rashid, b. Abi Rashid, Tahdhib, iii, no. 437; al-Jarrab, a little known Companion, was also called Ibn Abi 'l-Jarrab, Tahdhib, ii, no. 105. See also Hamza b. Abi Hamza in Tahdhib, iii, p. 29 (line 10), 'Amr b. Abi 'Amr in vii, p. 84, no 124, 'Ilb b. Abi 'Ilb', in vii, no. 477, 'Alqama b. Abi 'Alqama, in vii, no. 482, Kathir b. Abi Kathir, in vii, nos. 759-64, Ma'qil b. Abi Ma'qil in x, no. 429, etc.
32. E.g. cf. Ibn Hanbal, 'I'll, 1, no. 944.
33. Tahdhib, vii, no. 219: 'Utab b. Muslim was in fact called 'Utha b. Abi 'Utha; cf. also Ramahurmuzi, p. 562, for 'Abd Allah and 'Abd ar-Rahman used as names of fictitious people.
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reader of the Tahdhib and it might be interesting to see whether these features constitute together another pattern.

It is asserted in the Tahdhib that the total number of traditions Zuhri is supposed to have transmitted is 2,200. Since this figure is positively modest compared with the tens of thousands of traditions ascribed to transmitters who lived only a few decades later, one may be inclined not to dismiss this information out of hand as one of the usual exaggerations one becomes so accustomed to in early Islamic source material. But whereas 2,200 may seem a low estimate, the number of traditions in the oldest extant hadith collections, such as the so-called Musnad of ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz and the three texts published by Azmi, suggests that even that may be taken as far too high. Privately made statistics of the Tahdhib produced the figure 214 for the number of Zuhri’s alleged masters. The number of Zuhri’s pupils in the Tahdhib is somewhat lower but, when their number is added to that of Zuhri’s alleged pupils from the Lisān, in which lexicon there are hardly any of Zuhri’s reputed masters listed, we end up with a much higher figure. Even if these figures cannot be proven to be absolutely correct, they do suggest an activity of hadith transmission around a man called Zuhri which, in view of the initial slow development of Muslim hadith set forth in Chapter 1, is hard to come to terms with. Only if it were possible to prove that the name Zuhri, which we so frequently encounter in isnāds, stands for more than one person, would this hadith activity seem to gain in historical probability and lose some of its incongruity. In other words, a few thousand traditions – a mere handful in comparison with the numbers of later times, but even so – allegedly transmitted by one man from a few hundred masters to even more pupils, seems an inconceivable state of affairs, especially if we take into account that this is supposed to have happened already during the last two decades of the first/seventh and the first two decades of the second/eighth century. But if the name Zuhri is assumed to have served more than one person, quite a sizable number of persons in fact as may be distilled from the following, the situation becomes less improbable. Even if the data given below do not admit of the clear-cut inference that Zuhri was more than one person, the indications that seem to converge on the pluriformity of ‘Zuhri’ cannot be dismissed and constitute at least striking circumstantial evidence. In short, was Zuhri more than one person?

A first clue is offered in a report attributed to Mālik b. Anas. In contrast to all other tradition experts Mālik preferred to call Zuhri by the name Ibn Shihāb, whereas all the others simply referred to him as Zuhri. This in-

34. Tahdhib, ix, p. 447 (penult.).
35. E.g. cf. Tahdhib, i, no. 216.
formation may be taken to suggest that Mālik at least was aware of confusion about the man called Zuhri. But we do find Mālik— Ibn Shihāb isnāds alternating with Mālik—Zuhri isnāds in one and the same context. The famous Zuhri—or Ibn Shihāb—is hardly ever called anything else. Even so, in an enumeration of Zuhri's most influential pupils Ibn Ḥanbal deemed it necessary to list his name and complete lineage, as if that would forestall possible confusion. But ʿUmar II called him simply by his nisba: yā Zuhri!, although there are people called Muḥammad b. Muslim (like Zuhri) who seem to have been confused with him. Moreover, there is the ubiquitous confusion when, from lists of names in an isnād, the crucial preposition 'an is dropped, thus giving rise to one person where there used to be two. This also occurred in the case of Zuhri.

The Banū Zuhra constitute an important clan of the Quraysh. Most members of this clan trace their lineage back to such famous Companions as Saʿd b. Abī Waqqāṣ and ʿAbd ar-Rahmān b. ʿAwf, two of the ten Companions whom the prophet allegedly promised that they would certainly enter paradise. The number of Zuhris who at one time or another were reported to have transmitted traditions seems comparatively large, but because we have no exact figures concerning other tribes' or clans' hadith transmitters of the first two centuries, it is hazardous to say whether they perhaps outshone other tribes in this. Even so, one is occasionally struck by the seemingly unexplainable 'accumulation' of Zuhrīs in certain texts. Abū ʿl-Qāsim, about whom more will be said in Chapter V, severely criticized three Zuhris consecutively in his Qabūl al-akhbār; in the Musnad of ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, arranged according to ʿUmar's informants, we encounter a similar 'accumulation'; and especially in Fasawi we read for pages on end about one Zuhri after another with isnāds entirely consisting of Zuhrīs.

In all I collected some 120 Zuhrīs. Of these sixty-six were slightly older than, contemporaneous with, or slightly younger than Ibn Shihāb. Many of these had reportedly been either masters or pupils of Ibn Shihāb or, in other words, had been associated in one way or another with the hadith material Ibn Shihāb had also become associated with. Not all these sixty-six were blood relatives of Ibn Shihāb but fall into different categories; quite a few

37. Ibn Ḥanbal, ʿIlal, i, no. 1022.
38. E.g. cf. Lisān, v, no. 888.
39. Cf. ʿIlal, i, no. 2451.
41. Cf. Tahdhīb, iii, no. 859; Qabūl, p. 8.
42. Compare Lisān, i, no. 325, with no. 291.
43. P. 66; cf. the following chapter for an appraisal of this text.
45. Kiṭāb al-maʿrifā wa ʿīrākīh, 1, pp. 360–422; an example of an isnād consisting of only Zuhris is the one mentioned on p. 368: Zuhrī (i.e. Ibn Shihāb)—Zurārā b. Muʿṣab az-Zuhri—al-Miswar b. Makhrama az-Zuhri—ʿAbd ar-Rahmān b. ʿAwf az-Zuhri. Each pair of transmitters considered separately, all these Zuhrīs are only distantly related; this isnād, therefore, does not constitute a proper family isnād. And what are we to think of the report: Qultu li-ʿAbd ar-Rahmān b. ʿIrāhīm: man akhbaraka anna ʿz-Zuhri wulida sanata khamshin? Qāla: baʾd az-Zuhriyyīn . . . (Abū Zurʿa, Taʿrikh, p. 613)? See also Ibn Ḥanbal, ʿIlal, i, p. 185, lines 12f.
were mawāli of the Banū Zuhra, some were ḥalifs (confederates), and others who were not expressis verbis mentioned in the sources as either mawāli or halifs seem to have been totally unrelated but had the nisba Zuhri nevertheless. The numbers of these categories are specified in the following:

Blood relatives: thirty-nine (see the five pedigrees of the Banū Zuhra, figures 3–7);

Mawāli: twelve;\(^{46}\)

Ḥalifs: four;\(^{47}\)

Others: eleven.\(^{48}\)

Of this last category most were in all likelihood also mawāli or perhaps descendants of mawāli, but since that information is lacking in their tarjamas, they have been mentioned in a separate category.

On the basis of the evidence presented in the following, I would like to venture the theory that many of those who had the nisba Zuhri, either through kinship, clientage or otherwise, may often have been addressed by that name or may have asked to be called by it, in so doing creating confusion with the one great transmitter who was alternatively called Zuhri or Ibn Shihāb.

Among the pupils of Ya‘qūb b. Ibrāhīm b. Sa‘d b. Ibrāhīm b. ‘Abd ar-Rahmān b. ‘Awf az-Zuhri (d. 208/824) we find one who is simply called az-Zuhri.\(^{49}\) He may have lived at a later time than Ibn Shihāb but, even so, this proves that the simple name Zuhri remained in use.

‘Abd ar-Rahmān b. ‘Aṭā‘ b. Ṣafwān,\(^{50}\) Imrān b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. ‘Umar\(^{51}\)

\(^{46}\) ‘Abd Allāh b. Kaysān (Tahdhib, v, no. 644); Abū ‘s-Sā‘īd (Tahdhib, xiii, no. 486); Ayyūb b. Ḥabīb (Tahdhib, i, no. 736); Bukayr b. Mīsmār (Tahdhib, i, no. 914); Khālid b. al-Lajjāj (Tahdhib, iii, no. 215); Muhājir b. Mīsmār (Tahdhib, x, no. 565); Muḥammad b. ‘Abd ar-Rahmān (Tahdhib, ix, no. 510); Muṣ‘ab b. Sulaymān (Tahdhib, x, no. 305, also in text below); Rabi‘a b. ‘Aṭā‘ (Tahdhib, iii, no. 494); Sa‘d b. ‘Ubayd (Tahdhib, iii, no. 888, also xii, no. 757); Ṣafwān b. Sulaymān (Tahdhib, iv, no. 734, Abū Nu‘aym, Hīlīya, iii, pp. 158ff.);

\(^{47}\) ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Uhmān (Tahdhib, v, no. 556); Qāriz b. Shayba (Tahdhib, viii, no. 555); Sa‘id b. Khālid (Tahdhib, iv, no. 28); ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Abī Yazīd (Tahdhib, xii, p. 280 ult.); that ḥalifs of the Banū Zuhra were indeed called Zuhri is undeniably attested in the tarjama of ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abī al-Ḥamrā‘ in Tahdhib, v, no. 543.

\(^{48}\) ‘Abd Allāh b. Sinān (Līsān, iii, no. 1241, al-Khaṭīb, Ta‘rikh Baghdād, ix, p. 469); ‘Abd ar-Rahmān b. ‘Aṭā‘ b. Ṣafwān (Tahdhib, vi, no. 469); ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. ‘Umar (Tahdhib, xi, p. 1487); Ibrāhīm b. al-Ḥasan (Līsān, i, no. 106); Muḥammad b. Abī Ḥumayd (Tahdhib, ix, nos. 185–4); Sa‘id b. ‘Abd ar-Rahmān (Tahdhib, iv, no. 98); Sa‘id b. Muḥammad (Līsān, iii, no. 162); Sulaymān b. Abī Sulaymān (Līsān, iii, no. 322); Sulaymān b. Muḥammad (Tahdhib, iv, no. 378); ‘Umar b. Muḥammad (Līsān, iv, no. 928); al-Walid b. ‘Abd Allāh (Tahdhib, xi, no. 230).

\(^{49}\) Tahdhib, xi, no. 741. Cf. also Tahdhib, xi, p. 328 (line 2), where a pupil of ‘Affān b. Muslim is mentioned solely by his nisba Zuhri.

\(^{50}\) Tahdhib, vi, no. 469.  
\(^{51}\) Līsān, iv, no. 1012.
The Pedigree of the Banū Zuḥra

Details of the pedigree for the areas A, B, C and D are shown on subsequent pages.
Names underlined indicate *hadith* collectors in the broadest sense of the word.

Names followed by + indicate approximate or exact contemporaries of Ibn Shihāb az-Zuhrī

Figure 4
Names underlined indicate hadith collectors in the broadest sense of the word.
Names followed by + indicate approximate or exact contemporaries of Ibn Shihāb az-Zuhrī.
Names underlined indicate *hadith* collectors in the broadest sense of the word. Names followed by + indicate approximate or exact contemporaries of Ibn Shihāb az-Zuhrī

**Figure 6**
Names underlined indicate *hadith* collectors in the broadest sense of the word.
Names followed by + indicate approximate or exact contemporaries of Ibn Shihāb az-Zuhri.

Figure 7
and 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-'Azīz, all three of whom Zuhrīs, were often mentioned by that name alone.53 Muṣ'ab b. Sulaym al-Asadī, a mawlā from Kūfa, was often called Zuhrī because he was the 'arif of the Banū Zuhrā.55 One 'Abd Allāh b. al-Arqam b. 'Abd Yaghūth, a Companion, was sometimes confused with a totally different person, al-Miswar b. Makhrama, because they were both descended from the Banū Zuhrā; that means that they both must at times have been addressed as Zuhrī.56

The otherwise unknown transmitter Shurayh from Tahdhib, iv, no. 572, is recorded as having been a pupil of a shaykh of the Banū Zuhrā who, in his turn, had received hadith from one al-Ḥārith b. 'Abd ar-Rahmān b. Abī Dhūbāb. This shaykh can then be identified among al-Ḥārith's pupils (cf. Tahdhib, ii, p. 148) as the prolific Ṣafwān b. Ḥāṣā az-Zuhrī (d. 198–200/814–16), also mentioned below as one of the 'Iraqi Zuhrīs'. Thus this Ṣafwān was also known as 'a Zuhrī'.

Among Ibn Shīḥāb's hundreds of pupils are a great many who may be suspected of having fabricated traditions which they subsequently ascribed to their master.57 Among the most interesting of these pupils Muḥammad b. Yahyā b. 'Abd Allāh should be mentioned. He was a so-called amīr al-mu'minīn fi l-hadith and the most learned of all his fellow Khurāsānians in Zuhrī traditions. He was sometimes called Muḥammad b. Yahyā az-Zuhrī, it says in the Tahdhib, just because of his fame in transmitting Zuhrī traditions.58 Thus the bulk of Zuhrī traditions is said to have reached a region outside Syria via a man nicknamed az-Zuhrī.

52. Lisān, iii, no. 1285.
54. For this function, see E.I. 2, s. v. (Salih A. el-Ali and Cl. Cahen).
55. Tahdhib, x, no. 305. Bukhārī, apparently, did not trust people with this function. cf. Ibidem, p. 303 (penult.)
56. Tahdhib, v, no. 249.
57. E.g. Tahdhib, xi, p. 150 (lines 6f.). Cf. Ibn Ḥanbal, 'Ilāl, 1, no. 1445, for detailed account of how a forger went to work. The technical term used is ihāla, the 'transferring of material' acquired via the dubious transmitter Ibn Lahl'a to a seemingly impeccable Zuhrī isnād, featuring his otherwise dubious nephew Ibn Akhī 'z-Zuhrī; cf. also Ibidem, no. 1456; for more suspect pupils of Zuhrī, see below. In al-Khaṭīb, Kifāya, p. 318, we read how easy it supposedly was to bring into circulation traditions which were claimed to have come from Zuhrī; anyone showing Zuhrī a saḥīfa, of which he said that it contained Zuhrī traditions, automatically obtained the master's permission to transmit them to others as such. Zuhrī did not check. This seems al-Khaṭīb's solution to the 'Zuhrī' phenomenon.
58. Tahdhib, ix, p. 516 (li-shuhratih bi-ahādīth az-Zuhrī); Ma'mar was likewise called Zuhrī, cf. Abī Zur'a, Ta'rīkh, p. 437. Muḥammad b. Yahyā's Zuhrī traditions, wherever they may have been compiled, did certainly not end up in the 'two Sahīhs'. On al-'Izzī's charts (see Chapter 5) he is only mentioned twice and this not even in isnāds in which there is also one Zuhrī, whereas dozens of Zuhrī isnāds, continued by other Zuhrīs (among whom even one of Muḥammad b. Yahyā's most outstanding masters, Ya'qūb b. Ibrāhīm b. Sa'd az-Zuhrī), support traditions in the 'two Sahīhs'.
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It is, by the way, an interesting problem to examine how Zuhri traditions, either from Ibn Shihāb and his alleged pupils or via any other Zuhri, reached Iraq. Speaking from the viewpoint of regionalism (cf. Chapter 1), Zuhri traditions are either Medinan or Syrian. Ibn Shihāb is reported to have performed the pilgrimage seven times in order to hear traditions with Ibn al-Musayyab and in Damascus he is said to have met Anas; thus Zuhri–Anas traditions should be labelled Syrian rather than Başran, that is, if we set store by this report. However, the Shi‘ites also claimed Zuhri as one of their prime transmitters; Ibn Abi Shayba (d. 235/849) is reported to have held the seemingly Hijāzī isnād: Zuhri—‘Ali b. al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭalib—father—grandfather—prophet to be the soundest of all (cf. Tahdhib, vii, p. 305). Apart from these ‘Hijāzī’ and ‘Syrian’ isnāds, there are also Iraqi isnāds. Among the persons who were blood relatives of Ibn Shihāb we find Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. ‘Umar whose Ibn Shihāb traditions finally reached Baghdād and also the well-known Sa‘d b. Ibrāhīm settled in Iraq; his numerous descendents spread the nisba Zuhri all over the region as well as a great many ‘Zuhri traditions’. It is even reported that one of Ibn Shihāb’s most outstanding ḥadīths masters, his kinsman Abū Salama b. ‘Abd ar-Rahmān b. ‘Awf az-Zuhri (d. 94/713), once visited Kufa. Among those who were seemingly not relatives of Ibn Shihāb, but were nonetheless called Zuhri, and who spread traditions in one (or more) Iraqi ḥadīth centre(s), were ‘Abd al-A‘l b. Abī al-Muwādir (Lisān, iii, no. 1534), Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad (Tahdhib, i, no. 286) and Ṣafwān b. Ḥisā (Tahdhib, iv, no. 743). Ya‘qūb b. Muḥammad b. Ḥisā (Tahdhib, xi, no. 764) was however related to Ibn Shihāb.

But not only via transmitters called Zuhri, kinsmen of Ibn Shihāb or others, did Zuhri traditions begin to circulate in Iraq; also a fair number of purely Iraqi transmitters as well as some from other centres claimed to have heard traditions with Ibn Shihāb or other Zuhrīs.

Ḥāshim b. Ḥāshim az-Zuhri (d. 144/761) was the master of the Kufan Aḥmad b. Bashir (Tahdhib, i, p. 18);

an otherwise unspecified Zuhri is listed among the shaykhs of the Kufan Tha‘labā b. Suhayl (Tahdhib, ii, no. 34);

another unspecified Zuhri is mentioned among the masters of the Baṣra Juwayriya b. Asmā‘ (Tahdhib, ii, no. 202; in view of the latter’s late year of death – 173/789 – it is highly unlikely that the Zuhri mentioned is Ibn Shihāb);

a notorious forger of Zuhri traditions was Ḥajjāj b. Arṭāt (Tahdhib, ii, no. 365) whose tarjama will be analysed in Chapter 5, pp. 182 ff.;

Ibn ‘Uyayna is reported to have put his fingers in his ears when he heard the Kufan al-Hasan b. ‘Umāra (d. 153/770) relate traditions on the authority of Zuhri (cf. Tahdhib, ii, p. 307);

the Basran Ḥammād b. Yaḥyā al-Abahh is alleged to have related a Zuhri tradition which was claimed by another to have been one related by al-Waqqaṣī, a clear indication that otherwise anonymous Zuhris could be identified as hailimg from the Sa’d b. Abi Waqqāṣ branch (Tahdhib, III, p. 22, line 11; insert the words ‘anī ‘z-Zuhrī after Ḥammād b. Yaḥyā’ in line 12); whereas his traditions from others were of passing value, those which Sufyān b. Ḥusayn related on the authority of Zuhri were disputed (Tahdhib, IV, p. 108);

Ibn Ḥanbal could not care less about the Basran Sulaymān b. Arqam’s traditions from Zuhri (Tahdhib, IV, p. 169);

it was again only Sulaymān b. Kathīr’s Zuhri traditions, which he spread in Baṣra, that were criticized (Tahdhib, IV, pp. 215ff.);

the qādī of Rayy, Shu’ayb b. Khālid, allegedly committed Zuhri’s traditions to memory when he was still a boy (Tahdhib, IV, no. 589);

‘Abd Allāh b. Bishr, qādī of Raqqā, fooled even people like Ibn Ma’in with his Zuhri traditions which turned out to be obvious forgeries (Tahdhib, V, pp. 160ff.);

the Egyptian ‘Abd ar-Rahmān b. Salmān changed ‘Uqayl – Fulān isnāds into ‘Uqayl – Zuhri – Fulān isnāds (Tahdhib, VI, p. 188, first line);

Mubashshir b. ‘Ubayd, from Kūfa, later settled in Ḥims and spread there forged traditions also on the authority of Zuhri (Tahdhib, X, p. 33);

the notorious exegete Muqāṭīl b. Sulaymān brought fabricated Zuhri ḥadīth into circulation in Khurāsān (Tahdhib, X, no. 501);

the blind (!) Kūfīan Mūsā b. ‘Umayr pretended to have Zuhri traditions (Tahdhib, X, no. 644);

another qādī, Nūḥ b. Abī Maryam from Marw, did not get away with his forged Zuhri traditions (Tahdhib, X, no. 876);

Yaḥyā b. al-‘Alā’ from Rayy, who claimed Zuhri among his masters, fabricated many traditions (Tahdhib, XI, no. 678);

and, last but not least, the illustrious Hushaym b. Bashīr from Wāṣīṭ, who is reported to have written down one hundred Zuhri traditions in Mecca, while someone else said that he had heard him deny this, his sahīfa being lost on the way back from Mecca, may have been one of the major transmitters responsible for vast numbers of Iraqi Zuhri traditions (Tahdhib, XI, p. 60, and Chapter 1, p. 47).64

The historical Ibn Shiḥāb az-Zuhrī, whom we encounter in countless

anecdotes in the early sources, emerges as an honest and dedicated hadith collector. What all these sources convey in sum is that he is the least likely person to doctor isnāds by introducing imaginary informants. But when we look a bit more closely at all the dozens of totally obscure people who are listed in the lexica as Ibn Shihāb’s informants, and we realize that the majority are nothing more than majhūlūn, we must of necessity come to the conclusion that they are not the fruits of Zuhri’s fertile imagination but rather of those of his equally obscure dozens and dozens of alleged pupils, or their pupils for that matter. In short, it is no longer possible to sift the genuine Zuhri traditions from the fabricated ones, or as is my contention, even the genuine Ibn Shihāb az-Zuhri traditions from the possible hundreds of pseudo-Zuhri ones. Through this phenomenon Zuhri, i.e. Ibn Shihāb or a pseudo-Zuhri, developed into a key figure, but one that was larger-than-life. The abundance of isnāds with only transmitters called Zuhri (e.g. on p. 341 of al-‘Izzi’s charts (cf. Chapter 5): (Abū Hurayra) – Abū Salama b. ‘Abd ar-Rahmān b. ‘Awf az-Zuhri – Ibn Shihāb az-Zuhri – Ibn Akhī ‘z-Zuhri + Ibrāhīm b. Sa’d b. Ibrāhīm b. ‘Abd ar-Rahmān az-Zuhri – Ya’qūb b. Ibrāhīm b. Sa’d az-Zuhri) constitutes again a ‘coincidence’ which the less credulous will find difficult to come to grips with. But also the name Ibn Shihāb has given rise to confusion.

I found one instance where a certain Bukayr b. Shihāb ad-Dāmaghānī was confused by no less a man than Ibn Ḥibbān with a certain Bukayr b. Mismār az-Zuhri, again someone somewhat younger than the great Zuhri. Even if this is only one single instance where the two appellatives Zuhri and Ibn Shihāb were confusingly used for two different transmitters with the same first name, it is at least likely that comparable cases of confusion have baffled tradition scholars all over the Islamic empire.65

Confusion about several persons who all share the same name is finally attested in the following amusing anecdote.

The two great hadith experts, Yahyā b. Ma‘in and Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, once came together in the mosque of ar-Ruṣāfa, where a storyteller preached to the people and said:

‘Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal and Yahyā b. Ma‘in once related to me, on the authority of ‘Abd ar-Razzāq, from Ma‘mar, from Qatāda, from Anas, that the Messenger of God is reported to have said: He who says là ilāha illā

65. A certain al-Fāḍil b. Shihāb (Līsān, iv. no. 1353) became confused with one al-Fāḍil b. ar-Rabī‘ (Līsān, iv. no. 1345). Note that the name al-Fāḍil, which must have sounded reliable, falls perhaps into the same category as Thābit. Ibn Shihāb also seems to have been confused with his own brothers; cf. Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Taqdimā, pp. 354ff. Furthermore, two Zuhris seem to have been confused in the tarjama of one of Zuhri’s pupils, Hishām b. Sa’d; we read there (Tahdhib, xi, p. 41, lines 3f.): ankara ‘l-huffaz hadithahu fi ‘l-mawāqif fi ramadān min hadith az-Zuhri ‘an Abī Salama [fb. ‘Abd ar-Rahmān b. ‘Awf az-Zuhri] qādā wa-īnna addahu az-Zuhri ‘an Ḥumayd [fb. ‘Abd ar-Rahmān b. ‘Awf az-Zuhri].
'llāh causes a bird to be created from every word; its beak is made of gold and its plumage of pearls....'

Ahmad and Yahyā looked at one another and asked each other: 'Did you really transmit this tradition?' Whereupon both swore that they had never heard it until that very moment. They waited until the storyteller had finished and had collected his money. Then Yahyā beckoned to him and asked him to draw near. Thinking that another coin would come his way, the storyteller did so and Yahyā asked him:

'Who related this tradition to you?'

'Yahyā b. Maʿin and Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal', was the answer.

Then Yahyā said:

'But I am Yahyā b. Maʿin and this man here is Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal and we have never heard this mentioned as a prophetic tradition. If you have to tell blatant lies, do not bother us with them.'

'Are you really Yahyā b. Maʿin?' the storyteller asked.

'Yes.'

'I have always heard that Yahyā b. Maʿin is stupid', the man proceeded, 'and I have never set eyes on him until this moment.'

Yahyā said:

'But how do you know that I am stupid?'

The storyteller replied:

'As if there were in the whole world no other Yahyās or Ahmads except you two! I have written down traditions from seventeen different people called Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal apart from this one here.'

Then Ahmad wrapped his face in the sleeve of his cloak and said:

'Let him be.'

With wicked glee the storyteller watched them go.

Conclusion

In conclusion I should like to sum up what the foregoing may have taught us.

The main consideration for doing so much research into Ibn Ḥajar's Tahdhib was my curiosity as to the usability of this lexicon. It is obvious that it contains countless fragments of numerous works hitherto unpublished or even lost. A reconstruction of the most important Vorlagen Ibn Ḥajar worked from would certainly enrich our knowledge of the initial stages of hadith criticism in Islam. A thorough analysis might present us with a fair picture of how isnād fabrication developed during the first two and a half centuries. Besides, apart from the merits such an analysis may have, this


67. See Appendix IV.
reconstruction may enable us to add a number of very early Muslim texts to an, as yet, scanty literature.

Furthermore, I have also had an opportunity to assess the usability of the *Tahdhib* as far as the factual information regarding names, pedigrees etc. of the *muhaddithūn* of the first two and a half centuries is concerned. I have found that on the basis of a healthy scepticism with regard to certain ‘coincidences’ the genuine historical information about certain people may, with a little effort, be sifted from the innumerable *tarjamas* of fictitious namesakes.68 We have seen that whenever a name – Nāfi’, Khālid, ‘Ikrima, Thābit or any other – occurs seemingly a little too frequently, in many cases the historical figures can be distinguished from the unhistorical ones.

Moreover, we have seen that there is undeniable evidence in support of the theory that certain key figures in *hadith* transmission, such as Ibn Shihāb az-Zuhri, constitute in reality a collection of persons who have all played a part in *hadith* and whose common name is used or misused in *isnāds* either by themselves or by otherwise anonymous *hadith* forgers. The ‘coincidences’ have helped me to ask the right questions but have not always supplied me with the right answers. Even so, the few patterns which I have been able to discern in the material do seem to form an appropriate starting-point in disentangling true from false. The fact that there are probably hundreds of fictitious transmitters listed in the *Tahdhib* and the other biographical lexica, something which most people who occasionally worked in them will have suspected, this fact does not prevent us unearthing the genuine material. It is this genuine material which is so essential for a better understanding of the earliest stages in the evolution of Islamic tradition as well as in the evolution of Islam as a whole.

68. Cf. Ibn Rajab, pp. 106ff., for the reactions of several early *rijāl* experts to the *majhāl* *māraif* issue.
CHAPTER FIVE

‘Accepting traditions means knowing the men’

*Atnî bi-ısnâdîhi mukhbirun* *wa-qad bdnal Tkadhibu ‘n-nâqili*  
Abû 'L-'Alâ' al-Ma'arri

Introduction

The following chapter ties in with the preceding ones. In Chapter 3 the phenomenon of *mutawâtir* traditions was discussed using as a prime example the *man kadhaba* saying. This saying, or better perhaps, slogan, was brought into circulation in an attempt to curb further spreading of mendacity in *hadîth*. Now I should like to deal with the methods devised by devout *muḥaddithûn* to detect *kadhib* and to expose the perpetrators of *hadîth* forgery.

One of the most important measures taken by those concerned with *hadîth* was the scrutiny of transmitters, the origins of which were described in Chapter 1. In Chapter 4 the names of these transmitters – as arranged in the earliest biographical lexica with or without accompanying biographical sketches – were studied, and it may have appeared that a great many names might well be taken as referring to non-existent transmitters. It goes without saying, however, that a sizable number of these names did indeed point to historical personalities. How the most important of those *hadîth* personalities fared at the hands of Islam’s earliest *hadîth* (i.e. eventually *ısnâd*) critics is the main subject of the present chapter.

It is not likely that *hadîth* criticism in Islam began with *ısnâd* criticism, as, indeed, *hadîth* may have had its origins in a time when the institution of the *ısnâd* had not yet come into existence. Rather, it seems safe to assume that it was the *ısnâd*, eventually to become an indissoluble part of a tradition, through which an attempt was made to authenticate further, and perhaps successfully, the text of the tradition. But prior to the institution of the *ısnâd* there must have been a time during which certain *hadîths*, brought into circulation in one way or another, made certain people raise their eyebrows. This probably resulted in a critical sense with various people based mainly upon intuition, an intuition which never seems to have disappeared entirely, if we take into account how Abû Ḥâtim (d. 277/890) tackled *hadîth*.1

However, *matn* criticism as such, without also taking cognizance of the *isnād* of that *matn*, never really got off the ground. Occasionally we see certain *matns* quoted and dismissed as too preposterous to deserve additional effort in disclosing the culprit who fabricated it, but these instances are rare and certainly never became the rule.  

During the first five decades after the prophet's death there may have been a steadily increasing number of stories (*ahādīth*) which circulated among the Muslim Arabs and, of course, also among their subjects in the conquered territories. In Chapter 1 an attempt was made to define these *ahādīth* as probably constituting *qīṣās* of a *tārhib* or *targhib* flavour and *fadā'il* of mainly religio-political tenor, while the earliest sayings, maxims, opinions, slogans and rules, formulated by Islam's earliest *fiqh* experts may possibly also trace back their date of origin to that time. Dicta with a distinct *halāl wa-ḥarām* tenor, however, as intimated above, probably came into existence some time after the rightly-guided caliphs, when, because of the overall indifference of the first Umayyads in these affairs, Islam's first *fuqahā* took matters in their own hands. As the earliest *fuqahā* in Islam we may consider people such as Sa'īd b. al-Musayyab, Makḥūl, Hasan al-Baṣrī and others, who may have been inspired, if by nothing else, by a few of the last Companions such as the 'Abādīla, some of whom allegedly lived to a ripe old age.

These three categories, the *qiṣāṣ*, the *fadā'il* and — somewhat later — the *ahkām*, all three eventually indicated collectively by the generic term *'ilm*, were since their inception susceptible to the individual tastes or whims of their transmitters. *Qīṣāṣ*, initially popular with audiences, seem to have evolved along such far-fetched lines that the more discerning members of the public slowly but gradually saw their former high esteem of the *qūṣṣāṣ* change into contempt. Whereas the *qūṣṣāṣ* of the first/seventh century enjoyed an, on the whole, reasonably favourable reputation, in later times, say, from the second/eighth century onward, the title of *qūṣṣāṣ* seems to have become virtually a term of abuse.  

This growing unpopularity of an important category of transmitters may have been one of the main reasons for the birth of the *isnād*. And the use of the *isnād* went, almost immediately after its date of origin, hand in hand with its abuse. Tampering with *isnāds*, *tadlis*, grew to increasingly serious proportions. Inventing of *matns* came to be called *kadhib*, while we see unintentional *kadhib* contrasted with deliberate *kadhib*. *Tadlis* came to be considered as a milder form of, or a stepping stone to, *kadhib*. Another form of doctoring *isnāds* was *raf*. *Mursal* and *munaqṣī* became *muttaṣīl* in a

2. For example, the notorious tradition about God creating Himself from the sweat of a running horse, cf. Ibn al-Jawzī, *Kitāb al-mawḍūʿāt*, 1, p. 105, but even here the identity of the forger is a matter of discussion.

3. E.g. cf. Ibn Hajar, *Tahdhib*, vi, p. 447, line 11, where the term *qāṣṣ* is used in close connection with qualifications like *munkar, matrāk, kadhib* etc.
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later stage; mursal was also often extended to mawqīf and then marfū', sometimes the mawqīf stage was skipped. Differently put, what was initially munqati', mursal or mawqīf became eventually muttaṣīl and marfī'ī. It is especially isnāds of āḥkām material which were subject to rafʿ. All these terms became in the course of time technical terms.

After the isnād had come into existence, transmitters were investigated as to veracity. Honesty, accuracy and expertise were qualities set against mendacity, sloppiness and ignorance. These terms, single or in various combinations, became the characteristics of ḥadīth transmitters, as formulated by their contemporaries or later generations, circulating in sayings which we might call the faddīl/mathālib ar-ruwāt genre. This genre shows also its own particular development, when a diachronic comparison is made of the earliest rijāl works and other books on the science of tradition.

In the present chapter it is proposed to discuss in some detail the following issues:

1. The evolution of tarjamas in the rijāl works;
2. The evolution of technical terms describing the (de)merits of transmitters;
3. The collective taʿdīl of the Companions of the prophet;
4. Schacht's common-link theory.

The evolution of tarjamas in the rijāl works

In the previous chapter the attention was drawn to the evolution of the names given to one single person as exemplified in the name Ḥaḍī b. 'Umar. In this first section it is proposed to adopt a similar approach to another aspect of a transmitter’s tarjama, arguably the most important aspect of any tarjama in fact, the appraisal of a transmitter's (de)merits in handling traditions. On the basis of the following examples it will appear that one can rightfully speak of an evolution in rijāl criticism: in the beginning the information is sparse and relatively non-committal; gradually, increasingly critical assessments alternate with increasingly encomiastic qualifications; finally, after a Muʿtazilite rijāl critic's attempt to upset the applecart, the rijāl science settles down in a number of works to whose information no

4. As I tried to demonstrate in Chapter 1, faddīl traditions may be considered as, if not the oldest, one of the oldest genres. It should therefore not astonish us also that a faddīl/mathālib genre constitutes the mainstay in rijāl criticism. Elsewhere (cf. my On the origins of Arabic prose, p. 172) I have drawn the attention to a remarkable feature in this genre, namely that transmitter A, compared with B in A's tarjama, is awarded first prize, while B is preferred to A in B's tarjama. Examples of this feature are e.g. 'Abd ar-Rahmān b. Maḥdī as compared with Yāḥyā b. Saʿīd al-Qaṭīfī; Sūfīyān b. 'Uyaynīa as compared with Ma'mar b. Rāshid; Ḥammād b. Zayd as compared with Ḥammād b. Salama; examples are legion.
substantial or relevant additions are made as from the second half of the fourth/tenth century until the present day.

In one of the earliest theoretical works on the science of tradition we find a shortlist of the most important early muḥaddithūn, who can be considered as key figures in their respective hadith centres. In its succinctness this list gives a perfect overall view of the earliest development of hadith, wholly in line with the chronology proposed in Chapter 1, and therefore deserves to be paraphrased here.

‘Alī b. ‘Abd Allāh Ibn al-Madīnī (d. 234/848) began his Kitāb al-‘īlāl with the following words:

I studied the isnād and found it revolving upon six persons:

For Medina: Ibn Shihāb az-Zuhrī (d. 124/742);
For Mecca: ‘Amr b. Dinār (d. 126/744);
For Baṣra: Qatāda b. Di‘āma (d. 117/735) and Yaḥyā b. Abī Kathīr (d. 132/750);
For Kūfah: Abū Isḥāq as-Sabī‘ī (d. 129/747) and al-A‘mash Sulaymān b. Mihrān (d. 148/765).
Ibn al-Madīnī goes on: Then the ‘ilm of these six was transmitted to various people who were known as the authors of books:

For Medina: Mālik b. Anas (d. 179/795) and Ibn Isḥāq (d. 152/769);
For Mecca: ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Abd al-‘Aziz Ibn Jurayj (d. 151/768) and Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna (d. 198/814);
For Baṣra: Sa‘īd b. Abī ‘Arūba (d. 158–9/775–6), Ḥammād b. Salama (d. 168/785), Abū ‘Awāna (d. 175/791), Shu‘ba (d. 160/777) and Ma‘mar b. Rāshid (d. 154/771);
For Kūfah: Sufyān ath-Thawrī (d. 161/778);
For Syria: al-Awzā‘ī (d. 151/768–158/775);

The names of a few of these men have already been mentioned on various occasions in previous chapters. Now I should like to delineate the evolution of rijāl criticism in Islam on the basis of the respective tarjamas a few of these key figures received in some of the earliest rijāl works.

In line with the chronology of the origins of hadith proposed in Chapter 1, it is feasible that the oldest of these key figures can only be assumed to have become active hadith collectors two decades or so before the first century after the Hijra drew to a close.

Rijāl expertise as a separate discipline started, as we know, with Shu‘ba b. al-Ḥajjāj (d. 160/777). Shu‘ba probably did not compile a book on the subject, but the first whose expertise does seem to have been compiled in some sort of record was in all likelihood Yaḥyā b. Sa‘īd al-Qaṭṭān (d. 198/813). His statements can be found all over Ibn Ḥajar’s Tahdhib and

6. For a concise survey of his rijāl criticism, see Ibn Rajab, p. 123.
7. Cf. note 33 of Chapter 1.
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Lisān, industriously scraped together by the latter author from the collections made probably by Yaḥyā's pupils, collections which Ibn Ḥajar may have had at his disposal (see Appendix IV) but which otherwise have not come down to us unfortunately and only survive in fragments in the above-mentioned and other rijāl lexica.

Besides Shu'ba and Yaḥyā b. Saʿīd there are other famous rijāl experts whose works, if not yet published on the basis of scanty MS. material, largely live on in quotes in Ibn Ḥajar's and others' lexica. Their biographical notices of the above mentioned key figures will presently be made the subject of discussion. The best-known of these experts are:

Yaḥyā b. Maʿīn (d. 233/847);
'Ali ibn al-Madīnī (d. 234/848);
Ibn Saʿīd (d. 244/848);
al-Ḥusayn b. 'Ali al-Karābīsī (d. 245/859);
al-Jūzajānī (d. 256/870);
Bukhārī (d. 256/870);
Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā adh-Dhuḥlī (d. 258/872);
Aḥmad b. Ḥāfīz al-Ṭūsī (d. 261/875);
Abū Ḥātim (d. 277/890);
Yaʿqūb b. Sufyān al-Fasawī (d. 277/890);
Abū l-Qāsim al-Balkhī (d. 319/931).

To Shu'ba is—probably falsely—attributed the saying: ihdharu ḡayrata an ḡayratu l-ḥadithi baʿdihim ʿala baʿdīna ḡayratū mina l-tuyās, i.e. beware of the traditionists' mutual jealousy for they are more jealous than billy goats. It is difficult to pin a date of origin to this saying, but it may be taken in any case as an eloquent description of the atmosphere in which the ʿaṣlā ʿilm al-ruwat were brought into circulation. On a previous occasion attention was drawn to the mutual contradictions which can be distilled from those value judgements concerning certain pairs of transmitters. As far as the critical sense of each of the above experts is

8. For various others, see Appendix IV. For a 'pedigree' of how the ʿilm ar-rijāl was transmitted among the first generations of experts, see Appendix V.


10. Occasionally, we come across a man who allegedly totally lacked this jealousy of his colleagues. One Anas b. Ṭiyād (d. 185/801 or 200/815) is described as asmahu bi-ʿilmihī, i.e. very easily divulging his traditions to others, and asmaqu yaddu'ut kutubahu ila ḡāʿulāʿi l-ʿirāqiyyin, i.e. stupidly showing his books to those confounded Iraqis, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, I, p. 376. Both descriptions are meant in a clearly denigrating manner; the second also displays regional rivalry (Medina/Iraq), the demonstrative ḡāʿulāʿi conveying more or less the same pejorative flavour as the Latin istic.

11. See my On the origins of Arabic prose, p. 172.
concerned, the following general statements may cast some light on the methods of each individual.

Shu’ba’s and Yahyā b. Sa’īd’s judgements of others are brief, to the point and relatively critical, in severity of tone easily outdone, however, by Yahyā b. Ma’in’s. This Yahyā had a vast knowledge of fabricated traditions in order to establish once and for all the doubtful reputations of their forgers and/or their transmitters. Ibn Sa’d does not seem to have acquired a substantial knowledge in this discipline; his brief appraisals – mostly tantamount to expressions such as thiqa, or ghayr thiqa and kathīriqalīl al-hadīth – seem to have been garnered from various sources which he leaves unmentioned. Al-Jūzajānī’s criticism is especially severe regarding Shi’ite tendencies in (mostly Kūfān) transmitters; himself a Syrian, his judgements point to the rivalry between the Syrian and Iraqi hadīth centres. Bukhārī’s, Abū Hātim’s and Fasawi’s are huge compilations of names followed by mostly very brief, not very critical tarjamas, but Abū ‘l-Qāsim al-Balkhi’s rijāl book, also because of its author’s Mu’tazilite leaning, is indeed more critical than any of its predecessors. It deserves a closer look.

In all likelihood, Abū ‘l-Qāsim’s work must have acquired an unfavourable reputation, for Ibn Hajar does not seem to quote from it, something which is unusual in the methods of that author. He may have left it deliberately out of consideration, but he probably knew it. Allegedly the one and only copy to survive today is preserved in Cairo, where Ibn Hajar worked most of his life. And he may also be assumed to have been familiar with its contents, since he refers in his tarjama of Abū ‘l-Qāsim to a taṣnīf fi ‘t-ṭa’n ‘alā ‘l-muḥaddithīn yadullu ‘alā kathrati ‘ṭṭila’ihi wa-ta’asṣubih, i.e. a book in which he discredits transmitters which shows his being vastly read as well as his fanaticism. Abū ‘l-Qāsim’s book received the title Qabūl al-akhbār wa-ma’rifat ar-rijāl. This title clearly conveys the critical frame of mind of the author who seems to stipulate that traditions should only be accepted if their transmitters’ reputations are impeccable; establishing those requires knowledge which his book is trusted to provide.

The two appraisals of Ibn Hajar, Abū ‘l-Qāsim’s ẓīlā’ and ta’asṣub, are, perhaps, in need of some elaboration.

From the sources Abū ‘l-Qāsim regularly quotes from, we can form an

12. Cf. Ibn Rajab, p. 111, where it is related that he wrote forged traditions down and then burnt them in his stove.
13. In Ibn Hajar, Tahdhib, viii, p. 116, line 8, we read a quotation from one otherwise unspecified Abū ‘l-Qāsim; the quote could, however, not be traced in Qabūl.
15. Cf. Līsān, iii, p. 255.
16. I thank Josef van Ess for lending me his microfilm of the Cairo unicum (cf. GAS, i, p. 623) for copying.
idea as to what his īṯīlāʾ amounted to. Works most frequently cited are, with the exception of al-Karābīsī’s more extensively dealt with below, much the same as appear in fragments in the Tahdhib, e.g. those of Yahyā b. Maʿ in (d. 233/847), ʿAli ibn al-Madīnī (d. 234/848), ad-Dūrī (d. 271/884), Abū Ḥātim (d. 277/890) – not that of his son –, Ibn Abī Khaythama (d. 279/892) and various others. The main difference, however, between Abū ʿl-Qāsīm’s and Ibn Ḥajar’s use of these sources lies in the fact that Abū ʿl-Qāsīm invariably restricts himself to citing only the unfavourable material he found in them, whereas Ibn Ḥajar gives an anthology of favourable as well as disparaging material. Examples of their respective methods will be provided below.

As for Abū ʿl-Qāsīm’s reputed taʿṣṣub, this probably is meant to refer to his sympathy with Muʿtazilite doctrine. But to conclude that he was anti-hadīth would be a mistake. In the first place, Abū ʿl-Qāsīm is quite capable of mentioning the Muʿtazila in a pejorative context, where he cites Shuʿba merely dismissing a transmitter as a muʿtazilī rāḍīdī jāsmī, 19 or Yahyā b. Saʿīd describing – in a clearly disparaging manner – Ibn Abī ʿn-Najīh as one of the Muʿtazila’s top propagandists. 20 Secondly, in spite of the generally recognized indebtedness of the Muʿtazila to their forerunners in the doctrine of predestination – or, rather, the invalidation thereof – his book contains countless references to transmitters known for their Qadarite inclinations, whose traditions should, therefore, be avoided. 21 Moreover, the first few pages of the manuscript show the author as a staunch believer in the value of hadīths, as long as they are painstakingly examined as to reliability. In sum, he is an extraordinarily critical muḥaddith, but a muḥammadīth nonetheless. He even shows now and then a peculiar lapse in his critical attitude, for example, when he omits al-Wāqīdī from his enumeration of downright weak transmitters, al-Wāqīdī who fared much worse at the hands of Ibn Ḥajar. 22

Abū ʿl-Qāsīm had a forerunner. His book owes much to an earlier, also rather critical rijāl work, otherwise lost, that of al-Karābīsī (d. 245/859). 23

18. In view of his Muʿtazilite sympathies, one would expect him to dismiss all ḥadīth; but, as Schacht has pointed out in his Origins (p. 259), the later Muʿtazilites were forced by the prevailing sunnite attitude of the day to attach at least some value to ḥadīth. Abū ʿl-Qāsīm’s Muʿtazilite views are summarized concisely and clearly in his Fadl al-iʿtizāl, p. 63.
22. Cf. Tahdhib, ix, pp. 365ff., . . . layṣa bi-shayʾin, kadhḥāb, matrak etc.; cf. Qabūl, pp. 198–202, where one would have expected a reference to him; neither does he have his own tarṣīma in that part of the book devoted to the more important transmitters (pp. 56–167); he is only briefly mentioned as layṣa bi-shayʾin on p. 210.
23. There are no manuscripts of his work listed in GAS, i, p. 600, only references to texts in which quotes from it have survived.
Elsewhere I have brought together evidence for the theory that Muslim’s anonymous adversary, who is taken to task in the introduction of Muslim’s Sahih for rejecting mu‘ān‘an isnāds, may have been this same al-Kardbisi.24

Karābisi constitutes, it seems, an early turning point in the development of isnād criticism. In a statement attributed to Ibn Ḥanbal we discern a wide difference of opinion between these two scholars. Ibn Ḥanbal’s face darkened when he was asked what he thought of Karābisi and his ideas and then he said: ‘Their affliction (in Arabic: ba‘ā‘uhum) is caused by those books they compose; they abandon the traditions of the Messenger of God and his Companions and devote themselves [solely] to those books.’25

This statement, at first sight somewhat obscure perhaps, contains a few interesting points. When Ibn Ḥanbal is asked to say something about Karābisi, he seems to ignore the question as such and starts talking about ‘them’, as if he automatically identifies Karābisi with a group of people, pupils or associates. However, an investigation of the biographical material about Karābisi does not contain clear indications as to what this group might stand for or what ideas its members propagate. Comparing the above version with one occurring elsewhere,26 fortunately, yields the information that Karabisi had embraced the theories of Jahm b. Šafwān (d. 128/746), but again a reference as to his possibly having been a prominent member or leader of a Jahmite movement is lacking. Even so, one report could be unearthed in which someone is censured for having been zealous in the madhhhab of Husayn al-Karābisi.27 The term madhhhab in this context seems to admit also of the interpretation ‘school’, but whether this school can be identified with one upholding solely (post-)Jahmite beliefs,28 or a mixture of Jahmite and Mu’tazilite theories concerning the createdness of the Qur’ān or far-reaching ideas concerning the inadmissibility of mu‘ān‘an isnāds, so violently attacked by Muslim,29 cannot be established with any degree of certainty.30

This brief appraisal of Islam’s earliest rījāl experts can perhaps be illustrated best on the basis of their respective tāรjamas of one key figure, e.g. Zuhri.

24. See my translation in JSAI, v, note 76.
25. Fasawi, Kitāb as-sunna, printed in his Kitāb al-ma’rifa wa ‘i-tawrikh, iii, p. 392.
26. Al-Khatib, Ta’rikh Baghdađ, viii, p. 66.
27. Ibn Hajar, Tahdhib, ix, p. 227.
28. There is not a trace of Karābisi in Ibn Hanbal’s Ar-radd ‘alā ‘I-Jahmiyya wa ‘z-zandāqiqa.
29. See above and my translation of Muslim’s introduction to his Sahih in JSAI, v, forthcoming. Long after Muslim there seem to have been people who opposed Karābisi’s views, cf. Ahmad b. Muḥammad al-Ṭahāwī (d. 321/933) to whom is attributed a Naqūd ‘alā ‘I-Karbīṣī (cf. Ibn Hajar, Lisān, i, p. 277), but his book might possibly refer to a different Karābisi such as the one mentioned in GAS, i, p. 442, who is Ṭahāwī’s contemporary.
30. In any case, it seems unlikely that with madhhhab in this context is meant the Shāfi‘ite madhhhab which Karābisi eventually embraced, cf. Subki, Taḥqīqāt ‘ash-Shaf‘īyya al-kubrā, ii, pp. 117ff. According to Ibn an-Nadim, Fihrist, p. 270, he was also a Ṭabāqīte.
Most detailed, as was to be expected, for his emphasis in specifically Syrian hadith data, is the tarjama of Ya'qub b. Sufyan al-Fasawi. Early Iraqi experts are very brief, probably because during the first half of the second/eighth century the still prevailing 'regionalism' (see last footnote) prevented Iraqi experts from being familiar with what was going on in Syria. In any case, Shu'ba's opinion – if any – does not seem to have been recorded; Ibn Sa'd has the usual kāna thiqa kathir al-hadith wa 'l-'ilm wa 'r-riwāya. And other early Iraqi experts air the familiar, vaguely critical remarks: Yahyā b. Sa'id did not set store by Zuhri's irsāl; Ibn Mā'in denied that Zuhri had transmitted from Ibn 'Umar who died in 74/693, thus establishing a terminus post quem for Zuhri to have started his tradition collection; 'Ali ibn al-Madini listed Zuhri among a number of other meritorious transmitters, and Abū Ḥātim and Abū Zur'a are equally vague; Bukhārī is even less concerned, for a collector who has made so much use of Zuhri isnadis indeed a feature worthy of note.

In contrast to the above, we read in Abū 'l-Qāsim al-Balkhi a few reports which are less favourable: a quarrel between Mālik and Zuhri in which the former is heavily sarcastic, Mūsā b. 'Uqba doubting Zuhri's chronology of the prophet's year of birth and a few other stories.

31. Kitāb al-ma‘rifa wa 'r-ta‘rikh, 1, pp. 620–43, largely copied by Ibn Kathir, Al-bidāya, ix, pp. 340–8, Ibn 'Asākir, Ta‘rikh madinat Dimashq, in vol. xi (which is not yet published), and others.

32. However, it does contain an interesting version of a notorious report concerning Zuhri and the Umayyads which gave rise to a bitter controversy among Oriental and western scholars, cf. Juynboll, Authenticity, pp. 112f.; for kunna nakrahu kitab al-‘ilm, we read here: Kunna lā nara‘ ‘l-kitab shay‘an, which seems to support Sezgin's interpretation, cf. GAS, 1, p. 74, and Fasawi, 1, p. 633. Particularly relevant in this context is also a report in Qabāl al-akhbār, p. 8, in which Zuhri's traditions are allegedly recorded in the Diwan of al-Walid for the people to consult. Another incentive for writing traditions down, regardless of the Umayyads' alleged pressure, is apparent in a report which, at the same time, is a neat illustration of the 'regionalism' (see Chapter 1) of the various hadith centres in those early days; Zuhri is reported to have said: Law lā aḥādithu ta‘īna min qibal al-mashriq nunkiruhd mà katabu harfan wa-lā adhintu fi kītabatihd, cf. Fasawi, 1, p. 637, cf. also al-Khaib, Taqyid al-‘ilm, p. 108.

33. There is, however, the remarkable story of Shu'ba, Sufyan ath-Thawri and Hushaym b. Bashir (d. 183/799), that highly controversial transmitter from Wasit, who were on a pilgrimage to Mecca. Hushaym is stated to have collected some Zuhri traditions. For unknown reasons Sufyan persuaded Shu'ba to erase Hushaym's Zuhri file while the owner was temporarily absent, cf. Qabāl, p. 104.

34. Cf. Ibn Hajar, Tahdhib, ix, p. 448; this information is lacking in our edition of the Tabaqāt.


37. Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Al-ja‘rāḥ, iv 1, p. 74.


The first of these stories is too interesting to pass over. Mālik b. Anas, it is reported in this anecdote, once visited Zuhri with a couple of other people to hear traditions with him. Zuhri appeared hesitant until a eunuch sent by the Umayyads came to him and likewise asked him about traditions. Then Zuhri opened up. Indignant, Mālik asked Zuhri whether he had ever heard of the saying ascribed to the prophet:  

\[
\text{Man talaba shay'an min ĥādīhā 'l-ilm alladhiyuradu bihi wajhu lāhī li-yuṣibā 'aradan mina 'd-dunyā dakhala 'n-nār} \quad \text{(i.e. He who seeks even a little of this science (sc. of tradition), so meritorious in God's eyes, in order to acquire a random profit ('arad) or honour ('ird) in this world, will enter Hell.)}
\]

Whereupon Zuhri said that he had not heard everything attributed to the prophet. 'Would you say you are familiar with half of the prophet's traditions?', Mālik asked. 'I would', Zuhri replied. 'Then this tradition surely belongs to the half that you do not know', Mālik concluded sarcastically. It seems clear that this report points to the controversial issue about Zuhri having, or not having, been under Umayyad pressure regarding the promulgation of hadiths, and that this was taken as a blemish on his character. Whether or not this anecdote is historical is hard to assess, but a scrutiny of the isnāds permits a tentative dating and provenance.

The tradition occurs, with quite a few, but insignificant, textual variants, in various collections. Aboo 'l-Qdsim does not mention an isnād, but Aboo Dāwūd ('ilm 12 = iii, p. 323) does. In reverse order: prophet – Aboo Hurayra – Sa’īd b. Yāsār – Aboo Ṭuwāālā’Abī Allāh b. ‘Abād-ar-Raḥman b. Mā’r – Fulyah b. Sulaymān, whose pupil, according to Aboo Dāwūd, is Surajj b. an-Nu’mān. Ibn Mājā (1, pp. 92f.) has the same isnād but gives, as an alternative for Surajj, Sa’īd b. Maṇṣūr, and in Ḥākim an-Nisābūrī’s Mustadrak, 1, p. 85, we read ‘Abd Allāh b. Wāḥb’s name in this tier with the additional information that a ‘group’ (jamā’a) of transmitters recorded this on the authority of Fulyah. We may therefore conclude that this Fulyah constitutes a classic example of a ‘common link’ (see the last section of this chapter).

Fulyah b. Sulaymān, who died in 168/784, was a mawlā who lived in Medina. He occurs in all the Six Books, in spite of the bad reputation he had in general with all the rijāl experts as enumerated in Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, viii, pp. 303ff. And in the tarjama Dhahabi devotes to him he is even identified with this very tradition, a sure sign that he must have had a hand in its fabrication (cf. Mīzān, iii, pp. 365f.). Although he allegedly was one of Zuhri’s pupils, he used to make disparaging remarks about Zuhri’s rijāl (= masters?), cf. Tahdhib, viii, p. 304. But how precisely Fulyah ties in with Mālik, Zuhri and the abovementioned anecdote, if at all, is anybody’s guess.

Although these reports are sometimes also found in other sources, Aboo ‘l-Qāsim succeeds somehow in making them sound harsher, probably also because he does not alternate them with laudatory ones. Moreover, Yahyā b. Ma’in is quoted in a few more vaguely critical statements not listed in Ibn Ḥajar’s tarjama, for example, that he preferred Yahyā b. Abī Kāthir’s traditions to Zuhri’s— a statement, interestingly enough, not repeated in his tarjama of the former42— and Karābīṣī is cited in a particularly vicious

42. Ibidem, pp. 90f.; Yahyā also considers the Kufan transmitter Qays b. Abī Ḥāẓim (d. 84/703 or 98/716) as more reliable than Zuhri, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, viii, p. 388, an opinion which does not seem to tally with the opinion of Yahyā b. Sa’īd regarding Qays’ alleged munkar traditions which Ibn Ma’in quotes (ibidem).
innuendo that Zuhri transmitted traditions from two famous Successors, Sālim b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar and ‘Ubayd Allāh b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Utba, which nobody else had, thereby implying that he might have fabricated them. Even an expression of doubt on the part of Bukhārī regarding Zuhri’s transmission from a certain obscure transmitter, which Bukhārī had not even included in his *tarjama* of Zuhri but had mentioned elsewhere, is eagerly adduced by Abū 'l-Qāsim as one more disparaging statement undermining Zuhri’s position as a first-class *muḥaddith*. Finally, he quotes Abū Ḥātim who implied in a statement that Zuhri could have been accused of *tadlis*, a remark, significantly enough, absent from Abū Ḥātim’s son’s *rijal* work.

After Zuhri let us turn to Ibn Ishaq. First of all, the brevity of Abū 'l-Qāsim’s *tarjama* devoted to him is in sharp contrast to the long-windedness of the one in Ibn Hajar’s *Tahdhib*. Furthermore, it is striking that in the former there is a concentration of negative appraisals like *dajjāl* (conveying a particularly nasty kind of forging) and *kadhdhāb*, which also occur in Ibn Hajar, but there they are drowned in mitigating arguments—such as the consideration that his ‘falsehoods’ did not pertain to his *ḥadīth* transmission—and loud praises. Shu’ba is recorded to have labeled him an *amīr al-mu’minin* in tradition as well as *ṣādūq*. It will appear below that, in later times, *ṣādūq* is specifically combined with disparaging qualifications, while here, with Shu’ba, it still has its basic meaning of ‘veracious’. Ibn Ma’in is only quoted by Abū 'l-Qāsim as having labeled Ibn Ishaq’s traditions as not constituting an argument, while, on the other hand, apart from this, various laudatory appraisals of his are also cited in Ibn Hajar. Finally Abū Ḥātim is quoted by Abū 'l-Qāsim who said on the authority of al-‘Asma’i on the authority of Ibn Ishaq’s contemporary Ma’mar b. Rashid that the latter marked Ibn Ishaq a *kadhdhāb*. As was the case with Zuhri, again a disparaging statement—although perhaps not representing his own opinion on the matter—attributed to the father is conspicuously absent in the son’s *rijal* work.

The development of *rijāl* criticism sketched on the basis of key figures can be illustrated further by a comparison of the *tarjamas* of another major transmitter, Sulaymān b. Mihrān al-A’mask (d. 147/764).

43. Qabūl, p. 90, lines 6 and 7.
44. *At-ta’rikh al-kabīr*, ii, p. 258.
45. Qabūl, p. 90, lines 10 and 11.
46. Ibidem, p. 218; compare Abu ‘l-jarḥ wa ‘l-ta‘dīl, iv, p. 74, lines 16 and 17, where the crucial words *fīnā lam yuddallīsā* (the dual referring to Zuhri and A’mask) were apparently left unmentioned by Ibn Abi Hitim.
47. Cf. my translation of Muslim’s introduction, JSAI, v, under *insād* 22.
50. Cf. Qabūl, p. 139, as compared with *ḥasan al-ḥadīth iḥiqa* (Tahdhib, ix, pp. 39 and 44).
51. Qabūl, p. 139.
Shu'ba is recorded as having called A'mash by the honorary title al-Mushaf.\(^52\) Other Iraqi experts pointed to various cases of sama'\(^5\) not having occurred between A'mash and his masters,\(^53\) but their opinions of him were on the whole very favourable. At any rate, when transmitters from A'mash are exposed as forgers, the forging is thereby implicitly attributed not to the master but to the pupil.\(^54\) In contrast with this we find a statement attributed to Karabisi who is quoted as having said that A'mash transmitted one thousand traditions from a certain Abū Šālih.\(^55\)

What Karabisi had in mind does not seem entirely clear. That it was meant as a disparaging remark, however, is proved by the fact that it heads Abū 'l-Qāsim's tarjama of A'mash, this author being accustomed to playing his trump cards first.\(^56\) Then he quotes as an example of those thousand traditions: 'an Abī Šālih anna 'n-nabi (s) qāla: la'ana I'llāhu 's-sāriqa yasriqu I-l-ḥabla fa-tuqa'tu yaduhu wa-yasriqu I-l-baydata fa-tuqa'tu [yaduhu],\(^57\) i.e. on the authority of Abū Šālih that the prophet said: God curse the thief; when he steals a piece of string, his hand will be cut off and when he steals an egg, his hand will be cut off.

Since this tradition also occurs in a few of the recognized collections,\(^58\) it can be assumed that it came to be considered ṣaḥiḥ. In all the isnāds, except in the one given in Qabūl, Abū Hurayra is the transmitter between the prophet and Abū Šālih. If the absence of Abū Hurayra’s name in the quote from Karabisi in Qabūl was Abū 'l-Qāsim’s – and, for that matter, Karabisi’s – sole reason for including it as constituting valid criticism of A'mash’s alleged activities as a traditionist, no more need to be said about this matter, but this seems unlikely since isnāds including Abū Hurayra’s name via Abū Šālih to A’mash are already common in Tayalisi’s Musnad compiled when Karabisi was still a young man,\(^59\) so he can be assumed to have been familiar with this isnād.

---

52. Ibn Hajar, Tahdhib, iv, p. 223.
53. E.g. Ibn al-Madini and Ibn Ma'in rejected his alleged sama' from Anas, ibidem, pp. 222f., and also Abū Hātim had reservations, ibidem, p. 223.
54. Cf. Ibn Hajar, Lisān, i, no. 30; but what did 'Abd ar-Rahmān b. Mahdi mean, as quoted in Ibn Hanbal, 'Iḥal, i, no. 2753, with the words: Ḥādhā min da'if ḥaddih al-A'mash?
55. Qabūl, p. 91.
56. Other unambiguous evidence that Karabisi meant to hurt A'mash’s reputation is provided in an anecdote describing how Ibn Ḥanbal set eyes on Karabisi’s Kitāb al-muddallisin and found fault with it also because of the latter’s ta'ālā 'l-A'mash, cf. Ibn Rajab, pp. 534f.; in this passage we can also read how a ‘group’ of Mu'tazilites – among whom Abū 'l-Qāsim’s name is not mentioned – appropriated the book on account of its attack on the ahl al-hadith.
57. The word yaduhu is missing in the MS., but could be established from numerous versions in other texts.
58. Bukhāri, ḥudūd 7, 13 (= iv, pp. 294, 297), Muslim, ḥudūd 7 (= edition with Nawawi's commentary, xi, p. 185), Nasā'i, qa' as-sāriq 1 (= viii, p. 65), Ibn Māja, ḥudūd 22 (= ii, p. 86a), Ibn Ḥanbal, Musnad, ed. Shākir, xiii, p. 175.
Other possible reasons for Karābīsī to point to A'mash 'an Abī Śāliḥ isnāds with this one, otherwise unquestionably ‘sound’, tradition cannot be reconstructed with any amount of certainty and may only tentatively be distilled from the commentaries to which this tradition gave rise. These commentaries will be briefly reviewed in the following.

A study of all the comments accompanying the occurrence of this tradition in the various collections conveys that, although the hadīth seems at first sight a simple one, it resulted in a host of contradictory interpretations and considerations. Whether Karābīsī objected to one or a few of those interpretations is hard to establish but, in any case, it is likely that, had he been presented with an outline of all of them – the majority might very well have been brought into circulation before or during his lifetime – he might be expected to have disagreed with one or more.

As far as the matn is concerned, two major issues, each subdivided into minor ones, are discernible in the commentaries.

1. (a) It was deemed unpermissible to invoke God's curse on anybody specific, but permissible in the case of a category of persons. In this light this tradition gave rise to a discussion about another point: (b) is a thief, who is properly punished for his theft, considered to be a sinner still upon whom one can call down God's wrath, or does his punishment constitute sufficient expiation of his theft so as to render him no longer deserving of God's curse?

2. There seemed to be in this tradition a contradiction of the generally accepted ruling of the nisāb, the minimum value of a stolen object for which the hadd punishment is meted out, established as one quarter of a dinār. An egg or a piece of string are well below this nisāb in value. On the one hand, Bukhārī has preserved in his ta'lit q to this tradition an opinion traced to A'mash himself who said that bayda should be interpreted as baydat al-hadid, helmet, and habl as a ship's mooring cable, thus interpreting away the seeming contradiction between the hadīth and the established nisāb; on the other hand, we read the interpretation that the tradition should be explained as tantamount to a threat or a deterrent to future thieves that stealing of trifling things inevitably leads to the stealing of more valuable objects eventually falling within the range of the nisāb.

As pointed out above, if there is something in this tradition or in one or more of its interpretations or implications with which Karābīsī, and in his wake Abū 'l-Qāsim, took issue, it is impossible to discern exactly what, since the text preserved in Qabal is too brief. Secondly, it is equally feasible

---


61. Curiously enough, another piece of armour, a shield (mijān), figures also as the stolen object in another tradition, cf. Ibn Mājā, ii, p. 862, no. 2584; this choice does not seem merely coincidental.
that Karābiṣī, followed by Abū 'l-Qāsim, merely pointed to the possibility of tādaṣṣ 62 since the kunya Abū Ṣāliḥ could just as well point to the disreputable transmitter Bādhām, a mawla of Umm Hāni' as to the mawla Abū Ṣāliḥ Dhakwān as-Samān, who is the usual choice of early Muslim commentators when they have to identify a transmitter merely called Abū Ṣāliḥ. 63 And thirdly, if for the sake of argument we accept the hypothesis that it was Karābiṣī who was Muslim's anonymous adversary concerning the admissibility of mu'an'an isnāds, 64 the majority of isnāds featuring A'mash and Abū Ṣāliḥ have merely 'an. 65 Moreover, it is not clear from Abū 'l-Qāsim's brief quote of Karābiṣī how the former interpreted the latter's criticism, except that he took it as such. For in order to answer that question we need the complete context - if any - in which Karābiṣī placed his remark. Regrettably, there are still many such questions that need answering, but the overall conclusion seems feasible that Karābiṣī, and following him Abū 'l-Qāsim, have tried to place A'mash in a decidedly different and downright unfavourable light.

Karābiṣī is not the only expert critical of A'mash. Abū 'l-Qāsim quotes a few others, such as 'Abd ar-Rahmān b. Mahdī, Yahyā b. Sa'id al-Qatṭān and, especially, Ibn al-Mubārak, whose remark is cited that Abū Ishaq as-Sabī'ī and A'mash were both responsible for the corruption of ḥadīth in Kūfah, 66 something which Ibn Ḥajar mentions also, however, not in the tarjama of A'mash but only in the one devoted to Abū Ishaq, where it is attributed to Ma'n b. 'Īsā. 67 Moreover, it is only in Abū Ishaq's tarjama, in this very statement, that A'mash is identified with tādaṣṣ, and not in his own tarjama, whereas he receives special mention in Abū 'l-Qāsim's chapter on mudallasūn, in which he quotes Karābiṣī, probably from the latter's book on the subject. 68 Ibn Ḥajar knows of this work, although he rarely quotes from it. 69

The conclusion seems to suggest itself that, in his selection of quotes concerning a certain controversial but on the whole reputable transmitter, Ibn Ḥajar takes pains to leave those quotes unmentioned which could be taken as disparaging, whereas he does not bother to apply the same method

62. In Ibn Ḥajar's commentary Fath we read a statement attributed to Ibn Ḥazm that this tradition is 'free from A'mash's tādaṣṣ' (p. 87, penult.). Unfortunately, this statement could not be traced in any of Ibn Ḥazm's works, although he mentions this very tradition a number of times in his Al-muhallā (xi, pp. 337, 351 and 356).
63. Cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhīb, i, no. 770; Ramāhurmūz, pp. 287-92, lists at least ten persons called Abū Ṣāliḥ who allegedly all heard traditions with Abū Hurayra, once more an example of the accumulation of certain names most bearers of which can safely be assumed to have been fictitious. This feature was previously discussed in Chapter 4.
65. In Bukhārī we find for 'an: samī'tu, and also in Tayalisi the isnād with samī'tu instead of 'an between A'mash and Abū Ṣāliḥ does occur (cf. nos. 2399 and 2412ff.).
66. Qabūl, p. 93.
68. Qabūl, p. 218.
'Accepting traditions means knowing the men' 175

when disparaging qualifications of that same person crop up in a *tarjama* devoted to someone different. This feature could be observed in a great many instances. Or, in other words, Abū 'l-Qāsim and Ibn Ḥajar can be contrasted with one another in their respective selection of qualifications concerning one particular transmitter in that the former tends to select the disparaging material, while the latter seems often to settle for the laudatory material, leaving the unfavourable material unmentioned. But both quote basically from the same sources. Only when we have complete and reliable editions of these early sources at our disposal, are we able to decide if so and to what extent Abū 'l-Qāsim or Ibn Ḥajar or both can be considered as having made a fair and impartial, or a biased and prejudiced, use of those sources. As things stand now, for instance on the basis of the example of A'mash outlined above, we may cautiously conclude that Abū 'l-Qāsim, also because of his frequent use of Karābīsī’s work(s), seems unfavourably disposed towards transmitters, whereas Ibn Ḥajar seems to draw up a fair cross-section of favourable and unfavourable *tarjamas* with a marked leaning, however, towards the favourable ones. And that those early sources are probably more extensive than Abū 'l-Qāsim’s and Ibn Ḥajar’s respective quotations from them put together is, for example, illustrated by the occurrence of still other quotations from Karābīsī concerning A'mash in a third source.70

After these three examples, Zuhri, Ibn Ishāq and A'mash, a pattern may have become apparent. Karābīsī, and following him Abū 'l-Qāsim, seem to be on the whole unfavourably disposed not to transmitters of *ḥadīth* in general, but to accepting blindly the all too uncritically laudatory assessments of their fellow *rijāl* experts regarding the key figures of *hadīth*. When one reads through Abū 'l-Qāsim’s appraisal of Sufyān ath-Thawrī, which goes on for five pages,71 one does not come across one single statement that could be interpreted as meant to be positive, but the same early critics are adduced as in Ibn Ḥajar’s four page biography,72 and what these critics have to say about Sufyān is often repeated in both Abū 'l-Qāsim and Ibn Ḥajar. Whereas Ibn Ḥajar begins with saying that Shu'ba, Sufyān b. 'Uyayna, Ibn Ma‘īn and others labeled ath-Thawrī as an *amīr al-mu‘minin fi ‘l-ḥadīth*,73 Abū 'l-Qāsim only mentions disparaging remarks. The majority of these are so futile as to be eminently dismissible as mere cavils or hairsplitting, but the fact that they are not interspersed with a single favourable or laudatory statement, gives the whole *tarjama* a sour flavour. Ibn Ḥajar’s *tarjama*, on the contrary, leaves, because of its mixture of favourable and less favourable statements, an impression of tentative impartiality.

More examples supporting the views expressed above could be given

here, but they are all tantamount to saying: Ibn Hajar drowns some people's shortcomings concerning hadith transmission, which he often has in common with Abū 'l-Qāsim, in a sea of encomium. And that this feature sometimes results in seemingly irreconcilable contradictions is aptly illustrated by the tarjama Ibn Hajar devotes to Wāqidi (d. 207/823); in this tarjama Wāqidi's contemporary 'Abd al-'Aziz b. Muḥammad ad-Darāwardi (d. 186/802) called him an amīr al-muʾminūn fī 'l-hadith, whereas Ibn Hanbal, also contemporary but somewhat younger, thought him a kadhdhāb.75

Amīr al-muʾminūn fī 'l-hadith and kadhdhāb are two of the technical terms which came into use among rijāl experts. Although many of these terms admit of but one perfectly straightforward interpretation, several give rise to problems of some sort and therefore require a separate study. This will be attempted in the following.

The development of technical terms in rijāl works

Hand in hand with the development of rijāl criticism in general, as sketched in the preceding section, we perceive a development of technical terms and the connotations thereof.

Reading through Ibn Ḥajar's Tahdhib, one is baffled by the haphazard fashion in which the technical terms are juxtaposed. Sometimes we find a transmitter described by one critic by means of two seemingly contradictory terms, sometimes we see some sort of evolution in terms used to describe a transmitter. In any case, the disconcerting feeling that one term means something different from the same term used elsewhere cannot have escaped anyone who has studied the Tahdhib in more than a perfunctory manner.

In the first instance, during the earliest stages of rijāl criticism, a form of social bias is discernible in the opinion of some concerning others. Zuhrī is reputed to have said that he rather transmitted from free-born Arabs than from mawāli.76 And to Ibn 'Uyayna is ascribed a blatantly discriminatory remark which deserves to be quoted in full:


74. E.g. the cases of Sufyān b. 'Uyayna, compare Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, iv, pp. 117–22 and 304f., with Qabāl, pp. 99–103, and al-Khaṭīb, Kifāya, p. 379, where Sufyān talks of a tradition heard sixty-nine years(!) previously; furthermore, Sufyān-Zuhrī traditions appear to have been thought of as problematic, Kifāya, p. 359; or Qatāda, compare Qabāl, p. 83, with Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, vii, pp. 351–6; or Maʿmar b. Rāshid, compare Qabāl, pp. 116f., with Tahdhib, x, pp. 244ff.

75. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, ix, pp. 365 and 364 respectively.

76. Cf. Rāmahurmuzi, p. 409; Ibn Saʿd, m 2, p. 135; Qabāl, p. 90.
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nāhum min abnā’ sabāyā ’l-umam, i.e. the general situation remained on an even keel until Abū Ḥanīfa appeared in Kūfā, ‘Uthmān al-Battī in Bāṣra and Rabī’at ar-Ra’y in Medina; when we looked we found them to be descendants of the conquered people. He seems to say that anyone relying on his ra’y — as in the case of the three mawlās mentioned — or, for that matter, anyone engaged in hadīth transmission (or the avoidance thereof) in a way displeasing to Ibn ‘Uyayna, belonged to the conquered people. In view of Zuhrī’s year of death (124/741) and those of the other three men mentioned, the remark may well have originated in a climate of discontent and mutual mistrust which can be dated to the first years of the second/eighth century. This period more or less coincides with the time one can expect Shu‘ba to have made a start with investigating transmitters.

But Shu‘ba was himself a mawlā. His criteria are, at any rate, more sophisticated. When asked what they were, he replied: ‘When someone on more than one occasion transmits on the authority of well-known transmitters material which those transmitters do not know themselves, or when he commits numerous errors, or when he is suspected of mendacity, or when he transmits a tradition on which everyone except himself is agreed that it constitutes an error, then his traditions should be rejected; but from someone who does not fall into any of these categories it is safe to transmit.’

At the first glance, this set of criteria may appear to be adequately severe, and the famous story in which he went from one man to another to yet another etc. to verify one single tradition, if historical, proves how seriously he took his calling. On another occasion Shu‘ba is reported to have condensed his criteria into one sentence: Khudhū ’l-ilm mina ’l-mushṭahirīn (i.e. receive knowledge [only] from well-known [masters]). Even so, a major author like Tirmidhī (d. 297/910), looking back to Shu‘ba’s time one hundred years earlier, still comes to the negative conclusion that in spite of his thoroughness in scrutinizing some transmitters, he even accepted material from a controversial figure such as Jābir b. Yazīd al-Ju‘fī (d. 128–32/745–49) (see Ch. 3, pp. 114 and 120 note 107). ‘Nobody

77. Cf. Abū Zur‘a, Ta’rikh, p. 508. Also in Ibn al-Jawzī (Kitāb al-mawdū‘i‘, 1, p. 5) a similar prejudice is noticeable. In Rāmahurmuzī (pp. 242f.) we read an anti-Quraysh, pro-mawdū‘ report, in which, allegedly, ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān found to his astonishment various circles of ‘ilm and dhikr in the Great Mosque of Mecca headed exclusively by mawdū‘, referred to in this story specifically as abnā’ al-Furs. When ‘Abd al-Malik interrogated the Quraysh about this anomalous situation, it was explained as a special favour of God. ‘Abd al-Malik is reported to have said: ‘It is indeed weird; when they ruled themselves, they did not need us and now that we rule them, we cannot do without them for a moment.’ Even if this story is perhaps apocryphal, it lively depicts the mutual resentment. Cf. also ibidem, pp. 244f.

agrees with anyone (sc. in assessing transmitters'), Tirmidhi concludes. And Shu'ba's contemporary, Sufyān ath-Thawrī, is supposed to have instructed Ibn 'Uyayna in a dream: 'Don't strive too hard to know about hadīth transmitters.' In sum, the beginnings of Muslim rijāl criticism might well be depicted as perhaps rapidly leading into a system of relative severity and sophistication but, initially at least, as on the whole inauspicious.

With time the categorization of hadīth forgers got under way. Various classification systems have been preserved, mostly ranging from consummate liars from the class of zindiqs, or Jewish or Christian 'converts', down to pious simpletons spreading self-invented stories to further the cause of their religion.

Another major criterion for accepting or rejecting transmitters in the earliest days of isnād criticism may have been the one suggested by Ibn Sīrīn (d. 110/728) as implied in the famous dictum attributed to him discussed in Chapter I, pp. 17f. Someone known for his sympathy for and/or fanaticism in promoting a certain bid'a should be left unheeded, is the main idea underlying this dictum. Judging from the biographical notices about controversial transmitters as preserved in Ibn Hajar's Tahdhib, we see that there was one group of bid'a adherents which, since they are almost wholly lacking, must have been weeded out successfully, the Khārijites. Elsewhere I have brought together evidence in support of the view that as the first ahl al-bidā' in Islam may be considered the Qadariyya, but the fact is that the Tahdhib teems with more or less fanatical Qadarites, quite a few of whom seem to have been thought to be reasonably acceptable hadīth transmitters, whereas traces of Khārijism are rare.

81. Tirmidhi, 'īlāl (= v, p. 756), cf. Ibn Rajab, p. 245. It should not astonish us that Karābīṣī and Abū l-Qāsim both criticized Shu'ba for credulity concerning Jābir, cf. Qabālī, pp. 103, 106, 107. Characteristically, the Shu'ba/Jābir al-Ju'fī controversy is not mentioned in Shu'ba's tarjama in the Tahdhib (iv, pp. 338-46), but only in that of Jābir (ii, p. 47) and there it is presented in a mitigated form because of the guardedly encomiastic statements with which it is placed in context.

82. In Arabic: aqīla min ma'rifāti 'n-nās, Ibn Ḥanbal, 'Īlāl, i, no. 2367.

83. Reputedly the greatest rijāl expert after Shu'ba, one Wuhayb b. Khālid (d. 165/782), is hardly ever mentioned in a context relevant to the present issue, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, xi, p. 170.

84. For an early one, see Ibn Ḥibbān, Kitaīb al-majrūhīn, i, pp. 48-71, and for a late one, see Ibn al-Jawzī, Kitaīb al-mawḍū'āt, i, pp. 35-43, and Abū l-Ḥasan 'Ali b. Muḥammad b. 'Arrāq al-Kinānī, Tanzih ash-sharī'ī a-marfū' a 'an al-akhbār ash-sharī'ī a al-mawḍū'ā, i, pp. 11-16.


86. One such an exception is 'Imrān b. Ḥiṣṭān (d. 84/703); in his tarjama we read the interesting statement: Wa-amma qawlu Abī Dāwūd inna l-Khwārijī șaḥīhu ahlī l-aḥwā'ī hadīthan fa-laysa 'alā șīlqāhī fa-qad ḥakā 'bnw Abī Hātim 'anî l-'qād ... Ibnī Lahī'a 'an ba'di l-Khwārijī mīmman tāba annahum kānā ıdhd hawū amran șayyārūh șadīthan, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, viii, p. 128.
Another bid'a which appears not to have interfered with a transmitter's reputation in handling traditions is Irjā. On account of the fact that so many undisguised adherents of various bid'as seem to have acquired a perfectly respectable status in the different appraisals in Ibn Ḥajar's Tahdhib, one may safely assume that the criterion allegedly formulated by Ibn Sirin does not seem to have caught on to the extent that the merest hint at someone's inclination towards an innovative idea precluded him from handling traditions with impunity.

Finally, other transmitters are reported to have applied also certain standards but of a different nature. A'mash, for example, allegedly insisted that transmitters write down their traditions otherwise, he said, they are not to be trusted.87

The foregoing seems to suggest that criteria for sifting transmitters fluctuated. The same can be said about one of the first and most important criteria, laid down in the technical term tādlīs, which indicates a transmitter's deceit in 'composing' isnāds. The name of the tradition expert who introduced this term first does not seem to have been recorded,88 but a fact is that the qualification mudallīs was already applied to first/seventh century transmitters, probably by contemporaries or people who lived a little later.89 We may therefore conclude that it may very well have come into use at the hands of Shu'ba90 or a contemporary.91

Perhaps the best early treatment of the concept tādlīs is found in al-Ḥākim an-Niṣābūrī's Kitāb ma'rīfāt 'ulūm al-hadīth.92 Ḥākim died in 405/1014. His first general definition of it is conveyed in the statement: . . .
al-mudallīsīna 'lladhīna lā yumayyīzu man kataba 'anhum bayna mdā

88. Reputedly the first book on iṣūlāhāt al-hadīth was Rāmahurmuzi's Al-muḥaddith al-fāṣil etc., but even in this work we do not find a clue as to who was the first, cf. Suyūfī, Tādīb ar-rāwī, 1, p. 52.
89. Abū Istāq (d. 126-9/744-7), al-Ḥakam b. 'Utayba (d. 113-15/731-3), Mughira b. Miqsam (d. 132-6/750-3), al-A'mash (d. 147/764), Qatāda (d. 117/735), to name just a few of the best-known ones. Allegations that they practised tādlīs are confirmed in their respective tarjamas in the Tahdhib, which are otherwise, on the whole, very favourable, and in Qabāl, p. 218, where we read also the names of quite a few others. Furthermore, see above p. 171, note 46. The issue regarding the alleged tādlīs of certain Companions such as Abū Hurayra and Ibn 'Umar (cf. Qabāl, p. 218, 5 lines from the bottom and p. 59) requires separate attention and will be dealt with below in section three of the present chapter.
90. Shu'ba is recorded to have said: Mā ra'aytu aḥasan min aṣḥāb al-hadīth illā yudallīsū illā ['Abd Allāh] b. 'Awn wa-'Amr b. Murra, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, vii, p. 103.
91. Dallasa (cf. Lane, s.v.) means 'to conceal a fault in an article of merchandise', hence it was used for transmitters concealing deficiencies in isnāds. Fraenkel is quoted as having perceived a connection between the Latin word dolus and this Arabic term, cf. JA, xvi, 1900, p. 526 (ult).
92. Naw' no. 26, pp. 103-12; for more definitions see e.g. Ibn as-Ṣaḥāb, Al-muqaddima [fi 'ulūm al-hadīth], pp. 165-72; Suyūfī, Tādīb, I, pp. 223-31; and also JA, xvi, 1900, pp. 526-531. In addition, see Nawawi in his commentary of Muslim's Sahīh, 1, p. 33.
sami'ūhu wa-mā lam yasma'ūhu (p. 103), i.e. [they are] those people, whose pupils who take notes with them do not (or perhaps better: cannot) distinguish between what their masters have or have not indeed heard themselves.

Furthermore, tadlis is called dhull, ignominy, and put on the same level as ghishsh (fraud), ghurūr (deceit), khidā' (trickery) and kadhib (falsehood, mendacity) (p. 103). Then Ḥākim distinguishes between six different forms of tadlis which, strictly speaking, are all tantamount to ‘tampering with isnāds in order to make them appear more reliable than they are in reality’. However, the first two categories he delineates comprise those famous, otherwise reputedly totally trustworthy, early Successors – such as those enumerated in note 89 above – who allegedly do not mention their spokesmen by name for no hidden purpose whatsoever, but out of undeliberate nonchalance.

Here we see how Ḥākim, probably purposefully, awards a more neutral flavour to the definition(s) of tadlis in an endeavour to exonerate various early transmitters who are otherwise too prominent to let the ‘blemish’ tadlis also be determinant of their respective reputations without questioning this or, possibly, mitigating this.93 As we saw above, Karābisi, and following him Abū ’l-Qāsim al-Balkhī, still handled the term with a definition of it in their heads of undiminished severity and unquestionable derogatoriness, which is also apparent in the use of the term by their otherwise more moderate contemporaries. Ḥākim explains his point of view in this matter by pointing out that he does not want to cause damage to the hadīth and its transmitters by mentioning too many of those a’imma who were at one time reputed to have committed tadlis.94

A slightly older contemporary of Ḥākim’s, ’Ali b. ’Umar ad-Dāraqūtni (d. 385/995), reportedly assumed a similar ambivalent attitude. Speaking about the hadīth coryphaeus ’Abd al-Malik b. ’Abd al-‘Azīz Ibn Jurayj, the key figure who was also mentioned above (p. 164 and Chapter 1, p. 22), Dāraqūtni is recorded to have said: Tajannab tadlīsa ‘bni Jurayj fa-innahu qabīḥ at-tadlīisi lā yudallisu illā fīmā samī’ahu min majrūhin mithlā Ibrāhīma b. Abī Yahyā wa-Mūsā b. ‘Ubaydata waghayrihimā w-ammā ‘bnu ’Uyaynata fa-kāna yudallisu ‘ani ’th-thiqāt,95 i.e. avoid Ibn Jurayj’s tadlis, for his is an infamous practice while he only resorts to it in traditions he has heard with [otherwise] impugned masters like Ibrāhīm b. Abī Yahyā.96

---

93. Perhaps the most poignant example of this is found in an appraisal attributed to Yahyā b. Ma’in (about whom it was implied that he himself was thought of as an amīr al-mu’minin fi ‘l-hadīth, cf. al-Khaṣīb, Kitāb, p. 146) who was once reported to have said about Sufyān ath-Thawrī: Ath-Thawrī amīrū ‘l-mu’minin fi ‘l-hadīth wa-kāna yudallisu (cf. ibidem, p. 361).


96. Who this Ibrāhīm was could not be ascertained, or is he perhaps one of the numbers 482, 483 or 485 in Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Kitāb al-jarh wa ‘l-ta’dīl, 11, p. 147?
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Mūsā b. 'Ubayda⁹⁷ and others; as for Ibn 'Uyayna, this is the sort of *tadlis* [which may be considered innocuous since he only resorts to it when transmitting traditions] on the authority of reliable transmitters.

Coming back to Ḥākim, he finally emphasizes that, contrary to all other regions of the Islamic empire, Kūfā, and to a lesser extent also Baṣra, were the centres *par excellence* in which *tadlis* was resorted to.⁹⁸ Kūfā seemed to have this reputation with more people. For instance, Yazīd b. Hārūn (d. 206/821), on a trip to this city, is recorded as having said: 'I did not meet anyone there who did not resort to *tadlis* except Miṣ'ar b. Kidām (d. 153/770) and his two mates.'⁹⁹ Whether or not the factual details of this second report are correct or historical, is of less significance than the sweeping tone of this statement, a statement attributed to a man whose own reputation was not even generally established.¹⁰⁰ But both reports may be stamped particularly significant in view of the consideration that, firstly, *tadlis* and *kadhib* were often identified as springing from the same source, the former usually leading to the latter (see also p. 180 above), and that, secondly, it was in Kūfā that the *man kadhaba* saying probably originated, as I tried to establish in Chapter 3. One could conclude from this that, at first, tampering with *isnāds* and deceit with traditions in general were thought of as being adequately covered by the term *tadlis*; but when *ḥadīth* fabrication in the course of the second/eighth century had increased to the extent that, in an endeavour to put a stop to it, harsher measures were thought of, the term *kadhib* acquired its full range of threatening connotations mainly through the *man kadhaba* saying, and the term *tadlis* was allowed to acquire a less derogatory flavour.

It was, for instance, a matter of dispute whether *tadlis* was supposed not to have occurred between two transmitters who were merely each other's contemporaries – in Arabic indicated by the technical term *mu'ašara* – or whether also an encounter (*liqā‘*) was imperative to establish this.¹⁰¹ This question was apparently never solved definitively, since it still seemed to occupy a man like Ahmad Muhammad Shākir (d. 1958).¹⁰² On the whole one can say that a man suspected of *tadlis* could be considered innocent of this form of deceit when in a certain *isnād* he happened to have been quoted explicitly as having heard the tradition(s) in person, for which the technical term *samā‘* was coined. For example, Ibn Ḥībān (d. 354/965) summarized his ideas about the merits of a certain transmitter as follows: *yu‘tabaru ḥadīthuhu idhā bayyana 's-samā‘a fa-īnna hu kāna mudallīsan*, i.e. since he

⁹⁹. Cf. al-Khaṭīb, *Kīfāya*, p. 361; who the two companions were could not be verified.
was known to have resorted to *tadlîs*, his traditions only deserve to be taken into consideration when he explicitly says that he has heard them in person.\textsuperscript{103} Finally, the whole controversy about the admissibility of *hadîths* from someone suspected of *tadlîs* is closely linked with the controversial issue about the admissibility of *mu'an'an isnâds*, as outlined, for example, in the last section of Muslim's introduction to his *Sâhih*.\textsuperscript{104}

One of the major problems a reader of early Muslim *rijâl* works is constantly confronted with is the seemingly irreconcilable extremes in laudatory as well as disparaging qualifications one single transmitter is described with, as we saw, for example, above in the case of Wâqidi (p. 176).\textsuperscript{105} To speak here of mere 'fluctuations in meaning' does not seem to constitute a proper solution to the problem. One may perhaps rather speak of different nuances certain qualifications acquire when mentioned in one breath with certain others. In an attempt to create some sort of order in the chaos which we find so often in certain people's *tarjamas*, it is perhaps best to analyse one particularly striking example of such a seemingly contradictory *tarjama*. It is proposed to dissect here the biographical notice about Hajjâj b. Artât al-Küfî.\textsuperscript{106}

This Hajjâj, who died in 145/762, was a controversial figure, as will be clear to anyone who reads through the biographical notices devoted to him. In all, some thirty people have expressed opinions about him. In chronological order:

- Ibn Abî 'n-Najîh (d. 131/748): no Kûfan who visited us (sc. in Mecca) was equal to him in merit;
- Manşûr b. al-Mu'tamîr (d. 132/749): one may write his traditions down;
- Shu'ba (d. 160/775) praised him and called him *hâfiz*;
- Sufyân ath-Thawri (d. 161/776) praised his sagacity.

These four judgements are all positive; each of these four people has allegedly been a pupil of Hajjâj. In the following judgements the first negative elements emerge:

- Zâ'ida b. Qudâma (d. 161/776): *matrûk*;
- Ḥammâd b. Zayd (d. 179/795): his traditions are more relevant than

\textsuperscript{103} Cf. Ibn Hajar, *Tahdhib*, ix, no. 525.


\textsuperscript{105} Medieval Muslim scholars also seem to have laboured under this. Dhahabi is alleged to have said: *Lam yatammi 'thnâni min 'ulamâ'î hâdhâ 'sh-sha'ni qatu 'alâ tawhiqi qa'fîn wa-lâ 'alâ taq'fi thiqâ*, quoted e.g. in Nûr al-Dîn 'Îtr, *Manhaj an-naqîd fi 'ulum al-hadîth*, Damascus 1972, p. 92. This modern author represents a truly orthodox Muslim point of view concerning *hadîth*; his book does not differ in anything essential from medieval writings on the subject.

those of ath-Thawrī and he was even more frequented by people seeking his learning than Ḥamād b. Abī Sulaymān;
'Abd Allāh b. al-Mubārak (d. 181/797): matrāk, mudallis;
Yaḥyā b. Sa‘īd al-Qaṭṭān (d. 198/813) never wrote one of his traditions down, put him on the same level as Ibn Ishāq and labeled him matrāk;
'Abd ar-Raḥmān b. Mahdī (d. 198/813): matrāk;
Yaḥyā b. Ma‘īn (d. 233/848) had a very low opinion of him, called him da‘if, laysa bi ‘l-qawi, mudallis; his traditions do not constitute arguments (lā yuḥtajja bihi), matrāk, but also: šāliḥ in what he transmitted from Qatāda, šadūq, laysa min ahl al-kadhīb.

In this opinion Yaḥyā b. Ma‘īn lived up to his reputation of the severest rijāl critic of his time, but apart from his negative comments we encounter two positive qualifications laid down in the two fundamental terms šāliḥ and šadūq. With later critics these terms appear to crop up time and again:

Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855): hāfiz, matrāk, inadmissible ziyyādāt;
Ibn Sa‘d (d. 244/858): sharīf, da‘if;
al-Jūzajānī (d. 256/870): mudallis;
adh-Dhuḥli (d. 258/872): mudallis;
al-‘Ijli (d. 261/875): faqiḥ, mufti but conceited;
Ya‘qūb b. Shayba (d. 262/876): šadūq, faqiḥ, but also disorganized and weak;
Abū Zur‘a (d. 264/878): šadūq, mudallis;
Abū Ḥātim (d. 277/890): šadūq, šāliḥ when he says explicitly: haddatha-nā; one may write his traditions down; his šadq and hifz need not be doubted when he specifies samā‘, but mudallis on the authority of weak transmitters, while his traditions do not constitute arguments.

Abū Ḥātim’s was the most elaborate appraisal so far. One gains the impression that, the qualifications šāliḥ and šadūq apart, Ḥajjāj is generally declared to be weak; whether one can write his traditions down is still a matter of debate. In the last eleven appraisals positive elements decrease slowly:

Ismā‘īl b. Ishāq al-Jahdāmī (d. 282/895): disorganized, mudallis;
Ibn Khirāsh (d. 283/896): hāfiz, mudallis;
al-Bazzār (d. 292/905): hāfiz mudallis, conceited;
Muhammad b. Naṣr (d. 294/906): iṣrāl, mudallis, changed the wording;
Nasā‘ī (d. 303/915): laysa bi ‘l-qawi;
Ṣāji (d. 307/920): šadūq, but his traditions do not constitute arguments in furū‘ or ahkām; bad hifz;
Ibn Khuzayma (d. 311/923): his traditions do not have the force of hujjā, only when he specifies the way he has received them with terms such as haddathanā or samitū;
Ibn Ḥibbān (d. 354/965): braggart, matrāk;
Ibn ‘Adī (d. 365/976): one may write his traditions down, but he is a mudallis suspected of undeliberate kadhib;
Dāraqūtni (d. 385/995): ḳā ḵuṭajja bihi;
Ḥākim (d. 405/1014): ḳā ḵuṭajja bihi, layṣa bi ḵ直辖ī.

Thus, what at the first glance reads like a contradictory jumble of positive and negative qualifications especially inasmuch as no ṡarjama enumerates different statements in chronological order turns out, on the whole, to be a pretty consistent collection of appraisals in which a slowly increasing negative attitude surreptitiously replaces the initially positive attitude. What seems contradictory, the concepts ṣidq/ṣadīq, ḥāfiz and ṣāliḥ, as opposed to all the denigrating qualifications permit of but one interpretation: ṣidq etc. was apparently a quality which was deemed perfectly well combinable with all the typically negative characteristics in a ḥadīth transmitter. In other words, every transmitter could be called ṣadīq or ṣāliḥ, even if his activities in ḥadīth were on the whole frowned upon. The question what exactly ṣāliḥ, ṣadīq and similar terms mean in a ḥadīth transmitter's ṡarjama is, I think, crucial and deserves further investigation.

Ṣāliḥ, first of all, may contain an element of uncertainty. When Ibn Ḥanbal was asked to give his opinion about a certain transmitter, one 'Umar b. Abi Salama (d. 132/749), deemed ḥa'īf by among others Shu'ba, Juzajānī and Nasā'ī, he said: 'He is ṣāliḥ, God willing', but also: 'He is ṣāliḥ and reliable (ṭhiqa), God willing.' This 'Umar's ṡarjama is full of remarks representing opposite views as to the acceptability of his traditions and the harmonization of those contradictory views seems to pivot in the term ṣāliḥ, which may be taken to sum up this controversy rather than in any way augment it.

Another transmitter, one 'Abd Allāh b. Ziyād Ibn Sam'an (f. ± 130/748), universally decried a liar and a forger, is nevertheless credited with some ṣadīq ṣāliḥa, eloquent proof for the hypothesis that fabricated traditions also could include material which people did not want to reject, probably because of its appeal.

But there is more to ṣāliḥ. Once asked about one Fīṭr b. Khalīfa (d. 153–55/770–2), Ibn Ḥanbal said: 'Except for his Shi'īe sympathies, he is reliable, his traditions are ṣāliḥ and give the impression of those of a shrewd man.' Where we may have interpreted ṣāliḥ traditions so far as indeed fabricated but nonetheless harmless traditions – not being thought of as jeopardizing the cause of religion – Ibn Ḥanbal's words seem to suggest that they could very well be brought into circulation by someone intelligent rather than merely simple-minded.

Another fair example of the difficulties involved in the correct interpretation of ṣāliḥ is offered by the ṡarjama of Ḥasan al-ʿBaṣrī's well-known pupil ar-Rabi' b. Șabīḥ (d. 160/777). The controversy whether he was or was not a ṭudullīs is dwarfed by the overall confusion clearly apparent in the
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following appraisal of Ya'qūb b. Shayba (d. 262/876) who labeled him a rajul ṣāliḥ ṣadāq thiqā da'īf jiddan.110 We have seen so far that ṣāliḥ and ṣadāq could be used in one breath with da'īf, but what thiqā means exactly in this context is a matter of speculation. Perhaps another appraisal may help in sorting out this problem; approximately one hundred years later Ibn 'Adī (d. 365/976) described this same ar-Rabī' as follows: lahu aḥādīth ṣāliḥa mustaqīma wa-lam ara lahu ḥadīthan munkaran jiddan wa-arjū annahu lā ba's bihi wa-lā bi-riwāyathi. Both these appraisals taken together admit of an interpretation of ṣāliḥ as depicting someone whose spreading of edifying traditions was not a cause for serious concern although these traditions were duly detected as having no foundation.111

The suggestion that kadhdhāb, mattrūk or da'īf might be considered as having a less vociferous or uncompromising equivalent in ṣāliḥ is, perhaps, not tenable, but ṣāliḥ does seem to have been thrown in on many occasions to mitigate the more severe connotations of the former three.112 To Yahyā b. Sa'id al-Qattn is attributed the significant statement: lan nara ʾṣ-ṣāliḥīna fi shay'in akhdhaba minhum fi 'l-ḥadīth, i.e. we'll never see the 'pious' lie more wholeheartedly than in the transmission of traditions.113 And it is feasible that ṣāliḥ and also ṣadāq came to be used euphemistically for people who were thought of as having spread traditions of their own making, the contents of which, however, were such as to mollify ḥadīth critics and only delight the general public who were advised to collect these traditions cautiously, only li 'l-i'tibār, i.e. in order to contemplate them.114

As equivalent of ṣāliḥ, with perhaps a slightly more denigrating flavour, we find the qualificationṣuwaylīḥ.115

The words arjū annahu lā ba's bihi etc. bespeak the not openly expressed desire of the rijad expert - against the possibly average opinion of du'īf prevailing among his fellow critics - to incorporate someone's - in the abovementioned case ar-Rabī'-'s - traditions within the body of acceptable, 110. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, iii, p. 248.
111. Cf. also al-Khaṭīb, Kifāya, p. 22, the penultimate paragraph. Further examples of people who combine the qualificationsṣāliḥ and/or ṣadāq with kadhib and/or du'īf are found in e.g. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, ii, p. 305, iii, p. 376, v, pp. 100, 259, viii, p. 468, x, p. 452, xi, p. 419; examples are indeed legion.
112. Ibn Mahdi is reported as having labeled a man, who related a somewhat da'īf tradition but who was nevertheless ṣadāq, as ṣāliḥ al-ḥadīth, cf. al-Khaṭīb, Kifāya, p. 22 (penultimate paragraph).
113. Cf. Ibn Rajab, p. 113, cf. p. 114, for a number of similar statements attributed to others.
114. Cf. al-Khaṭīb, Kifāya, p. 23. The collecting of traditions in writing li 'l-i'tibār is very clearly illustrated in the tarjama of one 'Abd ar-Rahmān b. 'Abd Allāh b. Dinār (Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, vi, no. 419) where we read: . . . yuṭūbat ḥadīthin wa-lā yuṣṭajja bihi . . . wa-huwa fi jumlati man yuṭuṭub ḥadīthin mina 'd-du'āfī . . . ḥuwa ṣāliḥ al-ḥadīth . . . ṣadāq. Besides, the modern author Nūr ad-Dīn ‘Ītr also mentions ḥadīth fabrications in the tarhib wa-targhib genre in connection with kadhib, cf. his Manhaj an-naqd fi ‘ulūm al-ḥadīth, pp. 442f.
115. E.g. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, i, p. 375, vi, p. 190, vii, p. 69, x, p. 53.
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'sound' traditions, probably because of their alluring or edifying qualities rather than their - in his eyes perhaps - unimpeachable trustworthiness.\textsuperscript{116} The very frequent use of the words \textit{arjū annahu} followed by a variety of different expressions, furthermore, show most \textit{rijāl} critics in their cautious scholarliness as well as in their hidden expectations and - what is of crucial significance in this context - also in their overall lack of precise and reliable information about the majority of transmitters.\textsuperscript{117}

Summarizing the above, we have seen how various criteria were applied in early Islamic \textit{rijāl} criticism and how one criterion, laid down in one term (\textit{tadlis}), evolved from a general term denoting ‘tampering with \textit{isnāds}’ to the disparaging qualification ‘deliberately tampering’ as also to the less denigrating one of nonchalantly leaving certain \textit{isnād} features unmentioned. It was, furthermore, attempted to demonstrate that a given \textit{tarjama} may, at first sight, leave an impression of utter disorganization but ultimately may turn out to be pretty cohesive and consistent when schematically presented in strictly chronological order. On the other hand, it may have become apparent that through those masses of seemingly apodictical appraisals there runs a red thread of speculation or doubt expressed in terms like \textit{sālih}, \textit{sadūq}, \textit{arjū annahu} etc. or others. The majority of \textit{rijāl} critics, the strict and the unyielding such as Ibn Ma‘īn and Karābīsī as well as the more lenient and often downright naive like 'Ijlī,\textsuperscript{118} can be assumed to have fixed their minds on the (de)merits of the transmitters in an \textit{isnād} rather than on the \textit{matn} that \textit{isnād} was meant to authenticate, probably in an effort to turn a blind eye to material which, though conspicuously doubtful in provenance, exuded inexorable forces of attraction. Thus it could happen that very many \textit{matns} had such a strong appeal for the public, scholars and laymen alike, that generally recognized fabrications were admitted into the tradition collections, mostly under the heading of \textit{tarhib wa-targhīb}, while their originators, rather than with the definitively denigrating qualification \textit{kadhīhāb} or \textit{waddā'ī}, were decked with extenuating labels such as \textit{sālih}, \textit{sadūq}, \textit{suwaylīh}, \textit{ḥāfīz} or the like.

It goes without saying that, whenever \textit{sālih} emerges in a \textit{tarjama}, that

\textsuperscript{116} Cf. Ibn Hajar, \textit{Tahdīb}, iii, pp. 245f.
\textsuperscript{117} E.g. \textit{wa-arjū annahu sālih}, \textit{Tahdīb}, i, p. 207; \textit{arjū annahu lā ya'la annadu 'l-kadhīb}, ibidem, p. 98; similar expressions are e.g.: \textit{Yaqa'uʿī fit qulbi annahu sadūq}, Ibn Ṣanbal, 'Ijlī, i, no. 2739; cf. also \textit{hawā' indi wāhid in shā'ārā 'l-lāh}, ibidem, no. 1407, etc. Examples are, again, legion. In addition, the increasingly lenient attitude of later \textit{rijāl} critics in accepting traditions from transmitters about whom they did not possess any really traceable data is clearly reflected in e.g. the exposé Nūr ad-Dīn Ṭrīr devotes to \textit{mawālīn}, cf. his \textit{Manhaj an-naqd fi 'ilām al-hadīth}, pp. 80ff. Paradoxically, this author holds the first few major \textit{rijāl} experts to be excessively severe and rigid, cf. p. 90 (read Ibn al-Madīnī for Ibn al-Qāṭīfān, lines 16f.).
\textsuperscript{118} E.g. when all his colleagues find fault with someone, he still calls him \textit{thīqa}, Ibn Hajar, \textit{Tahdīb}, x, p. 70, line 3.
does not automatically imply that the mutarjam lahu is a forger, but when sāliḥ etc is juxtaposed to qualifications such as mātrūk, kadhdhāb, mudallîs, lâ yuḥtajja bihi etc., it is convenient to realize that sāliḥ, especially in a ṣaḥīl critical context, does not only mean ‘pious’ or ‘godly’ but also may denote a (seemingly) naive or simple-minded spreader of invented stories about the prophet. This phenomenon is succinctly summarized by Ibn Rajab (d. 795/1393; cf. GAL, G ii, p. 107); his summary deserves to be paraphrased here in full:

The people who are assiduously occupied with worship and whose traditions should be discarded can be divided into two categories:

a. those whose devotional practices prevent them from memorizing ḥadīth properly so that it becomes marred with fanciful elements; who ‘raise’ statements of Companions ‘to the level’ of prophetic sayings (= raf' al-mawqūf) and who insert a Companion’s name in isnāds lacking this feature (= wasl or tawsil al-mursal);¹¹⁹

b. those who habitually and deliberately fabricate traditions.¹²⁰

This succinct categorization surely bears a certain similarity to my own conclusions (e.g. Chapter 1, pp. 73f., and 3, p. 132, above) in which the concepts raf’ and wad’ are juxtaposed as essentially amounting to the same thing.

Another group of qualifications which virtually became technical terms among ṣaḥīl critics are those words describing someone’s devotional habits, terms such as zāhid, ‘ābid, nāsik and, in a slightly later stage, ṣūfī.¹²¹ Although it is, of course, impossible to quantify the evidence of any hypothesis concerning this category of pious Muslims without feeding the Tahdhīb and the Lisān word for word into a computer and pressing a few buttons, the observation could be made that persons qualified thus more often than not were also labeled sāliḥ or ṣadāq and were frequently noted for the transmission of zuhd material which is a major ingredient of the tarḥīb wa-targhīb genre. On another occasion I made an attempt at tracing a variety of zuhd traditions to those transmitters of the corresponding isnāds who were also qualified as zuhhād, nussāk, ‘ubbād and quṣṣāṣ.¹²² What clearly defined interpretations should be given to these terms is not evident from the sources; only once a zāhid was allegedly defined by Zuhrī as someone whose expression of gratitude is not stifled by what is permissible

¹¹⁹. For another occurrence of this not very common technical term, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Lisān, 1, p. 284, line 17.


¹²¹. Ṣūfī as epithet is hardly used in the Tahdhīb but rather frequent in the Lisān which, as may be a commonly known feature of that lexicon, deals predominantly with transmitters who lived in the third/ninth century or later; among second/eighth century transmitters we find the greatest numbers of zuhhād, ‘ubbād and nussāk.

and whose patience does not succumb under what is forbidden.\textsuperscript{123} And Ḥākim an-Nisābūrī once mentioned one Shaqīq b. Ibrāhīm al-Balkhī (d. 194/810) as a paragon of \textit{zuhd}.\textsuperscript{124} In the \textit{tarjama} Ibn Ḥajar devotes to this Shaqīq\textsuperscript{125} we read a charming story of how he came to choose a \textit{zāhid}'s lifestyle,\textsuperscript{126} something which also prompts Ibn Ḥajar to say that in spite of Shaqīq's alleged \textit{manākīr} traditions, it is inconceivable to charge him with being \textit{da'if} in traditions. Shaqīq's pupils are rather to be blamed for this, he concludes. This may, perhaps, be considered as intimating an opposition \textit{zāhid/munkar al-ḥadīth}, a reflection of which we encountered in the opposition \textit{sālih/munkar al-ḥadīth} dealt with above. In other words, what applied to \textit{sālih}, \textit{sāduq} etc. also applies to \textit{zāhid}, \textit{'ābid} etc.

The categories of \textit{sālih} etc. and \textit{zāhid} etc. constitute a large number of transmitters who may be held responsible for a vast number of traditions ascribed to the prophet. And although \textit{ḥadīth} scholars, medieval\textsuperscript{127} as well as modern,\textsuperscript{128} were perfectly aware of those transmitters' roles in bringing those traditions into circulation, they rapidly acquired a widespread popularity which, judging by the ever increasing number of collections, was never to wane. In the course of time some huge and prestigious compilations of especially this edifying genre of traditions saw the light. Of those collections the following deserve to be mentioned:

the \textit{Muṣannaf} of 'Abd ar-Razzāq (d. 211/827); that of Ibn Abī Shayba (d. 235/849);

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Marifat ulām hadīth}, p. 224: \ldots \textit{az-zāhid alladhi bihi yuqrabu 'l-mathalū fi 'z-ẓuhd.}
\item \textit{Lisān}, iii, pp. 151f.
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{126} Attributed to Ahmad b. Marwān ad-Dinawarī (d. 310/922).

\begin{enumerate}
\item E.g. the rather laconic description Ibn aṣ-Ṣalāḥ (d. 643/1243) gives of this category from which I quote:
\begin{quote}
\textit{Wa 'l-wādī'āna li 'l-ḥadīthi aznāfun wa-a'zamuhum dararan(!) qawmun mina 'l-mansūbīna ilā 'z-ẓuhdī(!) wada'a 'i-ḥādīthiha 'hisābān fimā za'amū fa-taqbalu 'n-nāsū mawdū'āthiim thiqtan minhum bihiim wa-rukūnān ilayhim. Thumma nahaḍat jahābī-
dhaṭu 'l-ḥadīthi bi-kashfi 'awārīhâ wa-mahwī 'ārihâ wa 'l-ḥumdî li 'l-illâ. Wa-fimā rawaynā 'anī 'l-imāmi Abī Bakrīn as-Sam'ānī [d. 510/1116]? = Muḥammad b. Maṣṣūr b. Muḥam-
\end{quote}
\end{enumerate}

Another, more concise, qualification of a \textit{zāhid}'s traditions is offered by Muḥammad b. İshāq Ibn Manda (d. 395/1005; cf. \textit{GAS}, i, pp. 214f.) who is cited in Ibn Rajab, p. 115, as having said: \textit{İdha ra'ayta fa-ḥadithin haddathān fulūnum az-zāhidu fa 'ghsil yadaka minhu.} And Ibn 'Aḍī (d. 369/976) is recorded to have said: Aṣ-ṣāliḥīnā qad rasamā bi-hādāh 'l-ismi an yarwā 'aḥādīthāh fi faḍā'ī 'l-a'māli mawdū'ātān bawāštā wa-yuṭahāmu jamā'atun minhum bi-wādīhā (ibi dem).

\textsuperscript{128} E.g. a crossbreed of two categories of transmitters (no. 3, cf. \textit{al-Manār}, iii, 1315, pp. 546f., and no. 10, cf. ibidem, pp. 370f.) enumerated by Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā (d. 1935).
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the Musnad of Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855);
the Mustadrak of Ḥākim an-Nisābūrī (d. 405/1014);
the gigantic Kitāb as-sunan al-kubrā of Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066);
the Mishkāt al-maṣābīḥ of Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Khaṭīb at-Tibrīzī (fl. 737/1536);
the Majmaʿ az-zawāʾid of al-Haythami (d. 807/1405);
al-Jāmiʿ as-sagḥir of Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505);
and the gigantic, twenty-two volume Kanz al-‘umāl fī sunan al-aqwāl wa 'l-afʿāl of 'Alī al-Muttaqī al-Hindi (d. 975/1567).

These are the better known ones. Other, less famous collections are, for example:
the Musnad of Ṭayālīsī (d. 204/819);
the Sahih of Ibn Khuzayma (d. 311/924);
the Musnad of Abū ‘Awfāna (d. 316/928);
the Sahih of Ibn Hibbān al-Bustī (d. 354/965);
various collections of Tabārānī (d. 360/971);
and the Kashf al-aṣār ‘an zawāʾid al-Bazzār of al-Haythami.

One collection deserves to be commented upon in particular, At-targhib wa 't-tarhib by ‘Abd al-‘Āzin b. ‘Abd al-Qawi al-Mundhiri, who died in 656/1258. This is the collection containing precisely the sort of traditions dealt with above, brought into circulation by hundreds of pious Muslims who, through these traditions, sought to edify, perhaps also to proselytize. In his introduction the author enumerates what motivated him in compiling this collection in this fashion. He forgoes mentioning isnāds, and, following the matn, he briefly indicates an appraisal of the isnād. In this he does not strive after completeness; succinctness is his device. As long as the reader is vaguely aware of a tradition’s status, that suffices; the reader is painstakingly protected from being force-fed with too extensive or too technical information that might bore him: the matn is centrally placed and is supposed to speak for itself. In several editions footnotes added by the editors clarify and enlarge on various ethical points. It is through a collection such as this, apart from the Six Books, that hadith literature acquired its vast popularity in the Muslim world. And a comparison of the traditions in al-Mundhiri with those adduced in a collection of twentieth-century Egyptian Friday khutbas will reveal a remarkable similarity.129

That the book must have enjoyed, and still enjoys, a great popularity is, furthermore, attested in the relatively large number of different editions. The oldest listed in the biographical sources is a lithograph of Delhi 1300

129. Cf. Zād al-khaṭīb, a publication of the Egyptian ministry of awqāf. In modern times, however, a renewed interest in hadiths being forged seems discernible in the work of the Syrian scholar Muhammad Nāṣir ad-Dīn al-Albānī who, for the last few decades, has devoted his energy to exposing mawdūʿat and their pernicious influence - if any - on the masses, cf. his Sīlsilat al-aḥādīth ad-daʾifa wa 'l-mawdūʿa wa-aṭharuhā al-as-sayyīfī fī 'l-umma, 1392-.
(1883) without commentary, edited by Talaṭṭuf Ḥusayn, in 708 large pages. Then there are two editions, of 1324/1906 and 1326/1908 respectively, mentioned in Sarkis, column 1802. These two editions are also mentioned in Fihris al-kutub al-'arabiyya al-mawjūda bi ['d-]Dār [al-kutub], vol. 1, 1924, p. 96, each comprising two volumes. Whether one of these, or perhaps another edition yet to be mentioned, is identical with the edition listed in the British Museum catalogue of Arabic books (acquired during the years 1927–57) could not be ascertained. The two editions published virtually simultaneously are the one in four volumes printed at the Maṭba'at Muḥammad 'Alī Šubayḥ, without any commentary, Cairo 1352/1934, and the one in five volumes, printed at the Maṭba'at Muṣṭafā 'l-Bābī al-Ḥalabī, Cairo 1352/1933 (reprinted twice), with extensive commentary on edifying and ethical issues by Muṣṭafā Muḥammad 'Umāra, this commentary being by far the most elaborate of all. Then the prolific editor Muḥammad Muḥyī 'd-Dīn 'Abd al-Ḥamīd presented yet another edition in six volumes in Cairo 1960–2, at al-Maktaba at-tijāriyya al-kubrā. The next edition is the one made by Muḥammad Khalīl Harrās, with commentary in four volumes, Cairo 1969–70, at Maktabat al-jumhūriyya al-'arabiyya. The last edition I could find a reference to is the one published by Wizārat al-Awqāf in al-Maktab al-fannī li-nashr ad-da'wa al-islāmiyya, four volumes, Cairo 1976. This bibliography does not have the pretense of being complete, but one thing may have become clear: the book must have sold pretty quickly and may have been available at times in more than one edition. (Moreover, the fairly large number of MSS listed in GAL permits the observation that it may always have been a popular collection.)

The collective ta'dil of the Companions

Easily the most controversial issue in Muslim rijāl criticism, since, on various occasions, it has set pens and tongues into motion from the Middle Ages until this very day, concerns the ta'dil of the Companions, i.e. the declaration that all Muḥammad's Companions should be collectively deemed free of falsehood in transmitting hadīth from the prophet. This issue found its most extreme accentuation in the case of Abū Hurayra (d. 57/677), the Companion who allegedly transmitted more traditions from the prophet than any other. In an earlier publication I dealt with this issue extensively, especially in its setting in Egypt among present-day theologians and cultural historians.130

Indeed, approached from whatever angle, treating of the Companions of the prophet and their position in the early development of hadīth and investigating the way in which they were dealt with at the hands of early Muslim rijāl critics, will almost automatically elicit angry reactions and

130. See my Authenticity, chapters vi and vii, and also the index s.v. Abū Huraira.
bitter criticism from all those for whom the collective ta'dil constitutes virtually an article of faith. Since in early Islam the idea took root and, subsequently, gained universal recognition that Companions were exempt from scrutiny, isnād experts simply left the ʿabqa of the aṣḥāb an-nabi alone. The Companions, as a class of people, were collectively placed on a level higher than that of any other, later generation, and whoever casts, or tries to cast, the slightest blemish on the reputation of a single Companion runs the risk of being ostracized. Western as well as Oriental scholars have experienced — sometimes to their detriment — that the collective ta'dil of Muḥammad's Companions constitutes such a delicate issue that it seems to defy scholarly investigation even in the most cautious manner, unless accompanied by a firm declaration to the effect that the fundamental thesis of the collective ta'dil as such is not called into question.

This can be illustrated most eloquently by adducing the words of the president of the association of religious scholars in Iraq, Amjad az-Zahāwī, who said in a fatwā of May 30, 1967:

... Ba'da ta'dili ʾllāhi subḥānahu wa-taʾālā lahum (sc. aṣ-ṣahāba) wa-thanāʾihi ʾalayhim wa-iṯāʾānī ’r-riḍāʾ anhum ʾl-majāla ʾl-maṣāḥili ayyī ʾinsānīn muʾminīn illā bi ’t-tażkiyātī ʿa wa ’t-taḥrīfī layhim wa-bayānī ʿhsni ʿtiqādīhī fī ʿumāmīhim wa-khuṣṣāšīhim ... wa-yaʿlām anna kullu man yaqḍahu fi ʾaṣḥābīhī ʾalayhi ’s-salāmū innāmā yurdu ṣārī ālī ṣārī ṣārī ʾl-islāmi wa-lākinna ʿṣārī ʾl-islāmi a’azzu min an yuhḍama wa-nūra ʾl-islāmi ʾl-islāmi a’lā min an yuṭṣa a’wa-yaʿālā ʾl-lāhū illā an yuṭṣimu nūrāhu wa-law kariha ʾl-kafirān (= Qurʾān IX, 32).” (i.e. after God declared all Companions to be trustworthy, after He praised them and expressed His satisfaction with them, it is no longer possible for any believing person but to declare them pure, to hold them in esteem and to testify properly as to his belief in them, collectively as well as individually... Let everybody know that whosoever slanders the prophet's Companions, [obviously] only wants to demolish the fortress of Islam. But the fortress of Islam is too solid to be demolished and the light of Islam is too strong to be extinguished. 'God only wants to perfect His light, even if the infidels abhor this!')

Ironically, az-Zahāwī adduces besides the well-known Qur'anic verses alluded to above also a tradition from Tirmidhi (manāqib 59 = vol. v, p. 696, no. 3862) of which Tirmidhi himself says: Ḥādhā ḥadīth gharīb lā naʿrifulu illā min ḥādhā ’l-wajh. Investigating its isnād we read in Ibn Ḥajar’s Tahdhib, vi, pp. 176f., that the Successor, one ’Abd ar-Raḥmān b. Ziyād, is a totally unknown figure whose name is solely identified with this one tradition; in other words, he seems to have been invented for this one isnād. The next transmitter is one ’Ubayda b. Abī Rā’iṭa, also solely known for only this tradition; by sheer coincidence he shares with his namesake and contemporary ’Ubayda b. Ḥumayd dwelling place (Kūfa) as well as profession (both were called al-Ḥadhhdhā); cf. Tahdhib, vii, pp. 82f.). Do we have here again a case of a fictitious figure who shares (part of) the name and possibly other features with a historical personality, such as set forth in the case of Hāfṣ b. Ḥumar in Chapter 4? The next transmitter is a well known Zuhri, Ya’qūb b. Ibrāhīm

131. Cf. al-ʾIzzi, Dīfāʾ an Abī Hurayra, pp. 483 and 488.
b. Sa’d (d. 208/823) on whose reputation there allegedly was no blemish. Finally, the last transmitter, who was Tirmidhi’s master, was Muhammad b. Yahiya b. ‘Abd Allah (d. 252-8/866-72), again an amir al-mu'minin fi ‘l-hadith, nicknamed az-Zuhri li-shuhratih bi-hadith az-Zuhri (see above Chapter 4). Summarizing the examination of this isnād, it is safe to say that it is a rickety one with two virtual majhals; whether we should ascribe it to Ya’qub or Muhammad b. Yahiya is an open question, the latter seems to me the more likely candidate.

Although I am fully aware of the delicacy of this issue, as I tried to demonstrate in the introduction to this study, fundamental articles of faith also have historical facets and admit, therefore, of historical investigation. In what follows I have brought together evidence which may be taken to throw new light on the chronology of one of Islam’s most basic tenets of faith. My conclusions are not to be interpreted as containing in any way a value judgement of this tenet.

First of all, the abundance of references to Abū Hurayra in the majority of early Muslim historical sources constitutes ample proof that Abū Hurayra played a significant role in the community of Medina, as soon as he had arrived there from the homeland of his tribe Daws in southwest Arabia. But he is far and away best known for his alleged role in transmitting traditions from the prophet to later generations. And it is this role, about which various observations could be made, which will presently be made the subject of discussion.

But Abū Hurayra’s case, in spite of its far-reaching ramifications, would seemingly constitute only part of the overall issue of the collective ta’dīl of the Companions. That is, on the one hand, why it would seem more appropriate to deal with the latter subject first before concentrating on the former. On the other hand, a case could be made for the surmise that it was the emergence of critical appraisals of Abū Hurayra in particular which, through the rijāl critics’ efforts to exonerate him, eventually led to the formulation of the collective ta’dīl of all of Muḥammad’s Companions. The last suggestion, it appears to me, would seem more viable in view of the following considerations.

Nowhere in works from those exclusively dealing with, to those occasionally touching upon, rijāl criticism do we find any other Companion being exposed to speculations as to his veracity in transmitting the prophet’s ahādīth in quite the same manner as Abū Hurayra. Other Companions allegedly famous for the vast numbers of traditions they are reported to have transmitted on the prophet’s authority, such as Anas b. Mālik, ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abbās, ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar, ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr, Jābir b. ‘Abd Allāh or Abū Sa’id al-Khudrī, are nowhere subjected to anything like the same scrutiny as was apparently the case with Abū Hurayra. Cases of Companions allegedly mistrusting one another for whatever reason are relatively rare and have never formed more than a flimsy argument in the
hands of those who, at one time or another, have sought to undermine the doctrine of the collective ta'dil.

On only a limited number of occasions is the concept kadhib associated with Companions in mutual controversies. There is the well-known report preserved in Ibn Qutayba, in which Abū Hurayra is allegedly taken to task by four Companions, but also other incidents reputedly having occurred between Abū Hurayra and others are found in small numbers and, subsequently, invalidated in, for example, Dhahabi's Siyar a'lām an-nubalā'. Then there is the exchange between Fāṭima bint Qays and 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, which may or may not have a variant reading with the verb kadhaba. Also the case of al-Walid b. 'Uqba, labeled fāsiq in Qur'ān XLIX, 6, could be taken as broaching the kadhib issue. Once Samura b. Jundab's veracity was doubted; 'Ā'isha called Ibn 'Umar a liar; both cases of innuendo were neutralized by Ibn 'Abd al-Barr as having originated in anger. Other cases concern Ibn 'Abbās, Ibn 'Umar himself, Ibn az-Zubayr, al-Mughira b. Shu'ba, Abī Muḥammad Mas'ūd b. Aws and, finally, Ibn Mas'ūd.

As is to be expected, Abū 'l-Qāsim al-Balkhi seems to have realized the potentiality of this issue. That is why he leaves one with the impression that he pounces on Abū Hurayra. In the most important, central, and also by far the longest, part of his Qabāl aI-akhbar etc. (pp. 56–167), dealing with separate tarjamas of all those transmitters—from Companions to coryphaei such as Yaḥyā b. Ma'in, Mālik b. Anas and Shu'ba b. al-Ḥajjāj—with whom he could find fault (even the most futile and downright ludicrous faults) we find at the very beginning a lengthy tarjama of almost five pages solely devoted to Abū Hurayra. In it we read all those anecdotes, albeit without extenuating additional remarks, which are also featured in, for example, Dhahabi's Siyar (see note 134 above). Besides those, we find a few

132. Sibā'ī, one of the participants in the contemporary discussion referred to in note 130 on p. 190 above, denies that these incidents, true or false, should be interpreted as pointing to wad' having originated during the prophet's lifetime, cf. pp. 216ff. of his book.
133. Ta'wil mukhtalif al-hadīth, p. 27.
134. See also note 130 on p. 190 above. Other instances of Abū Hurayra being questioned are, for instance, found in the Jāmi' of Ibn Wahb, pp. 91f.; Rāmahurmuzi, p. 291, where the editor, Muhammad 'Ajjāj al-Khaṭīb, refers to other publications of his on the subject in which he defends Abū Hurayra efficiently; Ibn Hanbal, Ḥadīth, 1, no. 2628; Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, Jāmi', ii, p. 154 (ult.).
135. Cf. my translation of Muslim's introduction in JSAI, v (in the press); also Nūr ad-Dīn 'Itr, Manhaj an naqd fi 'ulūm al-hadīth, pp. 73f.
136. Cited in Ahmad Amin, Fājr al-islām, Cairo 1959, p. 216; Sibā'ī (p. 243) says that it was taken from the unauthoritative Musallam ath-thubūtī by 'Abd ash-Shakīr al-Bihārī.
137. E.g. Muslim, talq 46 (= ii, p. 1119), cf. also no. 40.
which, until now, could not be traced also to another source. One of these deserves to be quoted in full:


Most significant, it seems to me, in this statement is the fact that Abū ‘l-Qāsim, who died in 319/931, may have become acquainted with the doctrine of the collective ta‘dīl, which as I tried to demonstrate elsewhere\(^{147}\) may have been definitively developed in the course of the final decades of the third/ninth and the first few decades of the fourth/tenth centuries. Theoretically, the addition (‘That proves . . .’) could be ascribed to Ibn Abī Khaythama, but nothing in the biographical notices devoted to him (e.g. Ibn Hajar, Lisān, 1, no. 556, and al-Khatib, Ta‘rikh Baghdād, iv, pp. 162ff.) could be construed as pointing to his possibly having been a particularly severe rijāl critic for whom the kadhib issue was important enough to include also Companions in his incriminations. In other words, Abū ‘l-Qāsim quotes a statement of Ibn Abī Khaythama concerning Abū Hurayra probably in order to question the adage of the collective ta‘dīl, while failing to indicate in what context – if any at all – Ibn Abī Khaythama had placed this statement.

From a quotation in Ibn Hibbān’s Kitāb al-majrāhin ascribed to Abū Ḥatīm (d. 277/890) one may perhaps draw the conclusion that he was the first to have formulated the adage (cf. 1, p. 24), no earlier formulation having survived until this day. Condensed in one sentence we read: Inna ‘llāha tabāraka wa-‘ta‘ālā nazzaḥa aqḍāra asḥābī rasūlihi (s) ‘an thalbin qādīh (i.e. God has made the Companions

143. MS.: wa-ḥaddathanā.
144. The word akdhibu is in the MS. preceded by the word kadhdhab, seemingly a slip of the pen of the nāsīḥ and duly crossed out . . . Of all the numerous deletions in the MS., this particular one seems to be one of the very few that make some sort of sense.
145. For this interpretation, see Lane, s.v. daraba.
146. Qabūl, p. 58. 147. Cf. my Authenticity, p. 79.
exempt from slanderous vilification); his son promoted this opinion by incorporating it in the introduction of his *Taqdima*. He says on p. 7: *Fa-nafū* (sc. God) 

\(\text{`anhumu `sh-shakka wa `l-kadhiba wa `l-ghalata wa `r-raybata wa `i-ghamza wa-sammāhu `udāla `l-unma} (i.e. God has immunized them against doubt, falsehood, mistake, suspicion and calumny and has called them the ‘righteous of the community’). Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdaḍī (d. 463/1071) formulated it as follows: *Kullu iṣnadīni `ttaalā isndduhu bayna man rawdhu wa-bayna `n-nabiyyi (s) lam yalzami `l-`amalu bihi ilā ba`da thubāti `ad-dāri rījālihi wa-yajibu `n-naẓarū f`athwālīhi siwā `s-ṣ̣aḥābiyyī `īlādhi ra`fa`ahu ilā rasāli `l-lāh (s), li-anna `ad-dālih `s-ṣaḥābati thāabitatun ma`lumatun bi-ta`dīlī `l-lāhi lahum wa-ikhbārihi an ṭaḥāratihim wa `khtiyārihi lahum fi nāṣṣī `l-qr`ān* (*Kifāya*, p. 46).

This reads in translation: No tradition whose *iṣnad* is uninterrupted between the person who relates it and the prophet has got to be put into practice except after establishing the reliability of its transmitters. It is imperative that their biographies be scrutinized except [that of] the Companion who ‘raises’ the tradition ‘to the level’ of the Messenger of God. Indeed, the reliability of the Companions is [an] established and well-known doctrine on account of the fact that God has declared all of them to be trustworthy. He has revealed their purity and He has chosen [to mention] them in the [very] text of the Qur’ān.

The Qur’ān text referred to by al-Khaṭīb comprises two verses: Kuntum khayra ummatin ukhrijat li `n-nās (III, 110) (i.e. you are the best people to be sent forth to mankind) and: Wa-kadālika ja`alīndākum ummatan wasātan (II, 143) (i.e. thus we have made you a people in the middle); when we check these verses in the oldest *tafsir* works available, we see that nowhere among the numerous explanations is the issue of the collective ta`dil in hadith matters hinted at, although, in the case of the word wasātan (II, 143) a generally recognized interpretation was that it meant *`adl*, plural `udāl*, in bearing witness (shahāda) to the prophet’s message (cf. Mujāhid b. Jabr (d. 104/727), *Tafsir*, 1, pp. 133 and 90; Ṭabarī (d. 310/923), *Tafsir*, IV, pp. 43ff. and II, pp. 6ff.). It can, indeed, be maintained that the concept *`adl* = trustworthiness in *hadīth* transmission was derived from, or evolved out of, the concept *`adl* = reliability in bearing witness (shahāda) in the *qādi*’s court (cf. also al-Khaṭīb, *Kifāya*, pp. 84ff.). But Ṭabarī himself still thought of wasāt as something in the middle between two outermost parts (*wa-ana arā anna `l-wasāta f`ī ḥadīθa `l-mawdi`i huwa `l-wasātu `īlādhi bi-ma`nā `l-juz`i `l-lāhi huwa `īlādhi bi-ma`nā `l-juz`i `l-lāhi huwa `īlādhi bi-ma`nā `l-juz`i*). But in the collective *ta`dīl* in *hadīth* transmission, no hint yet at the collective *ta`dīl* in *hadīth* transmission.

After the adage had been firmly established and universally recognized through *ijmā‘*, reports incriminating Abū Hurayra and his allegedly doubtful role in the spreading of Muḥammad’s *ahādīth* decreased and were, in any case, never left uncommented upon or unrefuted. Abū `l-Qāsim’s innuendo may possibly be considered as the last serious endeavour at the hands of a muḥaddith of the Middle Ages to question the collective *ta`dīl* by adducing as his main argument this alleged kadhib of Abū Hurayra.\(^{149}\)

148. For the translation of *lam yalzami `l-`amal bihi etc.*, cf. ibidem, index s.v. *sunna `amaliya*.

149. Although we occasionally encounter as late as seventh century people who, apparently, cannot leave the matter alone, cf. Ibn Hajar, *Lisān*, I, no. 784, where we read how one Ṭūrī b. Ṭāhir al-Anṣārī (d. 669/1300) . . . *kāna . . . yatakallamu fi ṣ-sahāba*. 
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For centuries the Companions' *ta'dil* remained unchallenged until, in the late fifties of this century, a new 'attack' on Abū Hurayra was launched and the matter of the *ta'dil* was brought into the limelight again. In different words, the *ta'dil* may be taken as having been left alone from the fourth/tenth century onwards, but Abū Hurayra and his alleged role in *hadīth* never wholly disappeared from the scene of discussion and controversy.

Now, in view of the findings of Chapter 1, such as the proposed chronology of the birth of the *isnad* in the eighties of the first/seventh century, approximately one quarter of a century after Abū Hurayra's death, or the phenomenon of *raf* increasingly resorted to as from the second/eighth century onwards, as well as the wholesale *isnad* fabrication (= *wad*) especially practised in Iraq, all these findings seem to point to one conclusion only: *neither Abū Hurayra, nor for that matter any other Companion, can possibly be held responsible for the isnads in which he/she occurs.*

With regard to this conclusion, it may perhaps be of interest to point out that *isnads* ending in the older, more revered Companions, such as the four rightly-guided caliphs and Ibn Mas'ūd, yield on the whole much higher percentages of 'weakness' than those ending in the younger Companions such as the other 'Abdīlīlā and Abū Hurayra. This phenomenon reveals in my opinion the confusion still prevailing with certain key Successors and the generation following them in putting together *isnads* via Companions to the prophet, in which the in later times so elaborately defined rules concerning *mu'āṣara* (contemporaneity) and *samā* were not yet applied so strictly. Thus we still encounter in Ibn Hanbal's *Musnad* an *isnad* with Ḥasan al-Ḥašrī 'an Abū Bakr, for which either Ḥasan's pupil Yūnus b. 'Ubayd or the latter's pupil Ibn 'Ulayya may be held responsible, that is, if we rule out the possibility of a simple scribal mistake.

Returning now to Abū Hurayra's remark as such, the contention could be made that these words should not be ascribed to Abū Hurayra but are probably a concoction of one of the transmitters of the *isnad* or someone anonymous using any one of these transmitters' names. If, for the sake of argument, we rule out the latter possibility, it is perhaps interesting to try to select a likely candidate from its *isnad*'s alleged transmitters. This search has proved, unfortunately, unsuccessful but, nevertheless, may deserve to be described here in a few details, because it illustrates a method which, in a number of other cases, yielded all sorts of gratifying results.

Starting at the end of the *isnad*, it is probably safe to pass over Ibn Abī

---


151. Another of Abū 'l-Qāsim's innuendoes, namely that Abū Hurayra committed *tadlis* like other Companions such as Ibn 'Umar, is futile in view of this tenet, cf. *Qabūl*, p. 218, but also in view of orthodox Islam's collective *ta'dīl*. Cf. also below p. 201.

Khaythama himself (cf. p. 194 above) and his immediate predecessor Ibn Abi Shayba, who seems to have been nothing but an industrious collector of traditions and author of books (cf. Ibn Hajar, Tahdhib, vi, pp. 6ff.). Abū Mu'āwiyah the Blind was a generally recognized expert in A’mash traditions; his biographical notices do not contain a single clue why he might have found it necessary to express himself in such a manner but, also on the basis of corroborative evidence to be discussed below, his lifetime fits exactly the time in which the kadhib issue became topical (see Chapter 3 above). A’mash is an unlikely candidate. He had died before the kadhib issue had attained noticeable proportions, and he was known as the transmitter of countless traditions traced back to the prophet via a mostly totally obscure Successor – as in this case – and Abū Hurayra. Whether A’mash is himself responsible for all these isnāds is then, again, something for which we will probably never find conclusive evidence, but to maintain that A’mash would suspect Abū Hurayra of hadith fabrication and, at the same time, be a transmitter of hundreds of those hadiths, seems a bit far-fetched. Finally, the Successor Abū Razīn is one of those countless transmitters of his generation about whom there is so much controversy that they can safely be ruled out as majhūlūn or, simply, fictitious (see previous chapter). In sum, even if we are unable to point to any one of these transmitters as probably having set this alleged statement of Abū Hurayra into circulation, its place of origin is most probably Kufa, since the ahl al-‘Iraq are addressed and all the isnāds’s transmitters after Abū Hurayra himself are said to hail from Kufa (with the exception of Ibn Abī Khaythama who lived in Bagdad). Finally, for the assumption that it may have originated in a time coinciding with Abū Mu'āwiyah’s lifetime at least, another piece of evidence deserves to be adduced here.

There is an interesting anecdote describing a clamorous dispute in front of Hārūn ar-Rashid, which merits to be paraphrased here in toto, also because it supports a tentative chronology for the above saying as possibly having originated in the course of the second half of the second/eighth century.

‘Umar b. Ħabib (d. 206/821) related to us saying: I was present at a court session of Hārūn ar-Rashid [ruled from 170/786 until 193/809] at which a problem arose over which those present started to quarrel. They raised their voices. One adduced a tradition which Abū Hurayra had transmitted on the prophet’s authority as argument, another produced an uninterrupted isnād154 [for it]; arguments pro and con flew backwards and forwards, until some disputants said: ‘This prophetic tradition does not constitute a permissible argument, for Abū Hurayra is suspect in his transmission!’.  

154. The Arabic reads rafa‘a; although the context makes the insertion of a verb like ‘to reject’ or ‘to dismiss’ almost imperative, I could not locate such a connotation for rafa‘a in any authoritative dictionary. Perhaps it is better to read dafa‘a instead (= to reject).
indicating in so many words that they thought him a liar. I (sc. 'Umar b. Ḥabīb) saw that ar-Rashid tended to take the latter's side and that he supported their opinion. Then I said: 'This tradition is genuinely on the authority of the Messenger of God, and Abū Hurayra is a trustworthy transmitter, veracious (ṣadūq) in what he transmits from him as well as from others.' Ar-Rashid cast me an angry look. I stood up, left the court and went home. After a short time a messenger was announced at the door. He entered my house and said: 'Prepare yourself for death before the amīr al-mu'minin.' I prayed: 'Oh, my God, You know that I [only] defended a Companion of Your prophet; I revere Your prophet too much to let his Companions be defamed [without challenging this]. Please, deliver me from his (sc. ar-Rashid's) hands.' Then I was led into the presence of ar-Rashid. He was seated on a golden throne, with bare arms, a sword in his hand; in front of him was the leather mat. When he noticed me he said to me: 'O 'Umar b. Ḥabīb, nobody has ever confronted me with arguments refuting and rejecting my opinion as you have!' I retorted: 'O Prince of the believers, verily, in what you said, and in the argument you used, there lay disrespect for the Messenger of God and for what he has brought us; if his Companions are thought of as liars, the whole shari'ah becomes null and void; the inheritance prescriptions (farā'id), as well as the rulings concerning fasting, the prayer ritual, divorce and marriage, all these ordinances will then be abolished and will no longer be accepted.' Ar-Rashid lapsed into silence, then he said to me: 'You have really given me new insights, may God grant you a long life, 'Umar b. Ḥabīb!' And he ordered 10,000 dirhams to be given to me.

This incident, if historically genuine, may well have taken place exactly about the time that the kadhib issue resulted in the man kadhaba saying, as proposed in Chapter 3. If the story, however, is thought to be apocryphal, or in any case greatly embellished, smacking among other things of Hārūn glorification, it may well be taken to have originated more or less during 'Umar b. Ḥabīb's lifetime, something which places its fabrication also sometime in the course of the last quarter of the second/eighth century. And if it is taken to be a clear forgery of a date much later than Hārūn's reign, it may very well be considered as a story invented in order to support the doctrine of the collective ta'dil. But this third possibility seems to me the least likely of the three.

155. In Arabic nat' , used for executions.
156. In Arabic: aḥyaynā . . . aḥyāka Ilaḥ, i.e. you have given me new life, may God give you the same.
157. Al-Khaṣib, Tarākh Baghdaḍ, xi, p. 191. Another incident during which a hadīth forger was called a kadhdhab in front of an early 'Abbāsid caliph is the well-known story of Ghiyāth b. Ibrāhīm, who tried to cajole a reward out of al-Mahdi (reigned from 158/774-169/785) by including pigeons among those animals on which one is allowed to place bets, cf. Ibn al-Jawzi, Kitāb al-mawḍū'at, iii, p. 78.
At any rate, genuine or not, the anecdote seems to convey that the discussion about the alleged *kadhib* of Abū Hurayra may more or less have coincided with the general awareness that mendacity in *hadith* transmission had grown to dangerous proportions, something which resulted in, among other things, the *man kadhaba* dictum. If it is assumed that the collective *ta'dil* became definitively established during the last few decades of the third/ninth century, as intimated above, and that the discussion about it really got under way during the last few decades of the second/eighth century, the conclusion seems to suggest itself that this all-important adage took something like one whole century to evolve from a vague, undefined misgiving into a fundamental and far-reaching doctrine with ramifications in Islam’s entire religious literature. The undermining of this doctrine became tantamount to unbelief and, in any case, to jeopardizing the entire structure of Muslim *rijal* criticism on which the whole *hadith* literature is built.

It is no wonder, therefore, that an anecdote as the one paraphrased above could only be preserved seemingly intact because of the turn for the good the story is supposed to have taken. If genuine, and if Hārūn had not given in to ‘Umar b. Ḥabīb’s persuasive arguments,158 al-Khaṭīb would surely not have included it in his *Ta’rikh* without adding his comments, the contents of which, on the basis of the tone he sets in, for example, his *Kifāya*, are not difficult to guess.159

Another piece of evidence corroborating the chronology of the first so-called association of Abū Hurayra with *kadhib* is provided by a report in Abū ‘l-Qāsim,160 which, with minor textual variants, has another version in Ibn Ḥanbal.161 Both versions have as last common link (cf. the last section of this chapter) Ḥammād b. Usāma Abū Usāma (d. 201/817), an almost exact contemporary of ‘Umar b. Ḥabīb; after Abū Usāma the *isnāds* branch out. The crucial statement in this report ascribed to Ibrāhīm b. Yazīd an-Nakha’ī runs: *Kānā yatrukānna ashya‘a min aḥādīth Abī Hurayra* (Ibn Ḥanbal) and: *Kānā yatrukānna shay‘an min qawl Abī Hurayra* (Abū ‘l-Qāsim) (i.e. they used to leave some of the traditions (resp. sayings) of Abū Hurayra alone). Even so, a few different versions of the same report,

---


159. Proof for my surmise that later sources ‘polished’ certain ‘rough passages’ from earlier sources can, for example, be distilled from the fact that Abū ‘l-Qāsim’s version of a certain anecdote contains some ‘damaging’ material about the Companion Samura b. Junbād, well-known allegedly for his great mass of prophetic traditions. Abū ‘l-Qāsim (*Qabūl*, pp. 60f.) relates the story of how Muḥammad said at one time: ‘The last of the three people (who are now present here in this house) to die will go to Hell.’ Those present were Abū Hurayra (who died first), Abū Maḥdūra (who died second) and Samura. The last person in the version Ibn Hajar gives (*Tahdhib*, xi, p. 223) is first called: *Fulan* and then: *dhaliqra ‘r-rajul* instead of Samura . . .

again with slight textual variants, have in their respective isnāds a much earlier link in common, the same Ibrāhīm an-Nakha’ī. Thus, if we set store by common links (to be discussed further below) as a useful tool to determine termini post quem, we could conclude that the earliest association of Abū Hurayra with unusable traditions – only those dealing with Paradise and Hell from Abū Hurayra did he not reject162 – was probably due to Ibrāhīm (d. 96/715). And since A’mash occurs in more than one isnād too, he may also be credited with having promoted this opinion rather than with merely having transmitted it. In short, there are too many possible candidates as common links in this case for us to be absolutely certain about the matn’s chronology.

Summarizing the above and enlarging on it somewhat still, the following points are perhaps significant. The Companions have, from the beginning, been exposed to disparaging remarks. First, as we saw above, they allegedly did not see eye to eye with one another sometimes. Then they became divided into political factions which led to mutual reviling as exemplified in the Abū Bakr/‘Alī fadā‘il, which, in turn, led to the formal cursing of either ‘Uthmān, or the first three rightly-guided caliphs at the hands of the Shi‘at ‘Ali. This political cursing became in due course something which was also associated with lack of reliability in hadīth transmission. This is eloquently illustrated in the tarjama of a notorious Rāfiḍite, Yūnus b. Khabbāb (fl. ± 125/743). Ibn Ma‘īn is reported to have said of him: rajulu saw‘in wa-kāna yashtimu ‘Uthmān (i.e. a wicked man who used to curse ‘Uthmān), and al-Ju‘afar called him a kadhdhāb muftari (i.e. an inveterate liar); Abū Dāwūd as-Sijistānī labeled him a shattām as-sahāba (i.e. a curser of the Companions). And apart from being characterized also as ṣadūq and thiqā by various rijāl experts – his traditions, after all, do occur in four of the Six Books – al-Ḥākim an-Nisabūrī concluded that no one who insulted the Companions deserved to be accepted as transmitter.163 Another early controversial transmitter, on the one hand thought to be wāri‘ (here: piously reserved) in hadīth, ṣadūq, min aswathaqi ‘n-nās (i.e. the most reliable of the people) and, on the other hand, Rāfīḍite, insulting the Companions, was Jābir b. Yazīd al-Ju‘fī (d. 127–32/745–50) possibly the creator of the Shi‘ite isnād par excellence: Ja‘far as-Ṣādiq – other imām(s) – Ḥusayn and/or ʿAlī – ‘Alī – prophet.164

Differently put, apart from the above mentioned political cursing, a

164. Cf. Dhahabi, Mizān, 1, pp. 379–84; Ibn Ṣallām, p. 99; Abū Ḥanīfa, for once, participates in rijāl criticism; whereas he does not know of a man more excellent than the Meccan ra‘y expert ‘Aṭā‘ b. Abī Rabāḥ (d. 114/732), the most despicable liar is in his opinion Jābir al-Ju‘fī (cf. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Jam‘ī, ii, p. 153), probably because he had no use for traditions, let alone those of Jābir (see Chapter 3, pp. 114 and 120, note 107 above).
doctoral form of cursing emerged which, as late as the middle of the second/eighth century, may have inspired the well-known Abū 'Awāna al-Waḍḍāh b. 'Abd Allāh (d. 176/792) to compose a book on the *maʿayib asḥāb rasūli ʾllah*, the vices of the Companions. A certain Sallām b. Abī Muṭī (d. 164–73/780–9) tore it up in front of Abū 'Awāna's eyes. After that, *ḥadīth* fabrication and *kadhib* became associated. At first the culprits were also sought among the Companions, in which Abū Hurayra's reputation had to suffer the heaviest attacks. But gradually all the Companions were exonerted and this resulted in the doctrine of the collective *taʿdīl* which was formulated in its definitive form sometime towards the end of the third/ninth century. Abū Hurayra's alleged reputation gradually suffered less and less. To two Successors is ascribed the statement: *Laysa aḥadun yu.āddithu ʿan Abī Hurayrata illaʿ alimnā a-ṣādiqun huwa am kādhīb*, i.e. there was nobody who transmitted Abū Hurayra's traditions about whom we did not know whether he spoke the truth or lied. By any standard, this sounds like a boastful statement, if we assume, for the sake of argument, that the two Successors, al-Aʿraj and one otherwise unknown Abū ʿṢāliḥ, were aware of the colossal numbers of alleged pupils. Abū Hurayra is said to have transmitted traditions to more than eight hundred people; this is at least what Bukhārī is alleged to have said. Also the concept *taḍīs* (which, as we have seen, acquired a downright pejorative flavour, not as bad as *kadhib* but perhaps just as denigrating as the concept *daʿīf*) when applied to Aba Hurayra and other Companions, through the doctrine of the collective *taʿdīl*, also *taḍīs* lost its sting. When Dhahabi mentioned Abū Hurayra's putative *taḍīs*, he added that there was absolutely no harm in *taḍīs* among Companions since they were all 'udāl. Furthermore, a tradition whose *isnad* ended in a statement like... *ʿan rajul mina ʿs-s.ahdba ʿani ʿn-nabi* (i.e. on the authority of a certain Companion from the prophet) was not automatically rejected because one of its transmitters was *majhūl*; an unknown Companion was just as reliable as one mentioned by name thanks to the adage of the collective *taʿdīl*.

Abū Hurayra has never ceased to speak to the imagination of later generations. The man who allegedly preserved more traditions from the prophet for posterity than any fellow-Companion prompted many people to lose themselves in conjectures of how to reconstruct his life's history. That is, I think, one of the main reasons why the biographical notices devoted to him show so many lively incidents as well as contain so much controversial – and
contradictory - material. That is why, perhaps, Abū Hurayra's real name (ism) does not seem to have been preserved; on the contrary, a host of different names are ascribed to him.¹⁷¹ proof for the surmise that many different people's views about Abū Hurayra gained some sort of recognition.

The doctrine of the collective ta'dil of the Companions has also enhanced the status of Companion, a status exalted enough to instil in the following generation the wish to acquire the - admittedly lesser - status of Successor. In a great many tarājim we read, for example, the statement that such and such a person did admittedly not transmit traditions from one or more Companions, but he is reported to have 'seen' a famous Companion, something which might lend his status, which just fell short of Successorship, a little extra glow, if not additional prestige.¹⁷² A good example of such a person is - again - A'mash.¹⁷³ During the first few decades after the prophet's death we witness how large numbers of people sought to acquire the coveted status of Companion in order to become eligible for a stipend from the Treasury.¹⁷⁴ In later times we may discern the same ambition with a great many people to earn the status of Successor, especially in view of the prestige gained from being mentioned at the Successors' level in an isnād.¹⁷⁵ This is again, perhaps, an example of how a phenomenon in the political thinking of early Islamic society finds a reflection in the development of isnāds.

Perhaps one al-ḤIrith b. 'Abd Allāh al-A'war (d. 65/685) constitutes a case in point: he allegedly reported traditions from some famous Companions, but his reputation suffered because of his having been an extreme 'Allī partisan (ghālin ft 't-tashayyu'). One reads how in his tarjama in Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, ii, pp. 146f., various people suspected him of kadhīb, but then, eventually, this kadhīb was placed in a less harsh light by the 'restriction' of it to his hikāyāt; no kadhīb in his ḥadīth, was the verdict. But what these hikāyāt (lit. stories) may have consisted of is

¹⁷². This is illustrated in the following statements: Kafā bi 'l-muḥaddithi sharafan an yakāna 'smuha maqrīnān bi 'smi 'n-nabī (ṣ) wa-dhikruhu mutaṣālīan bi-dhikrihi wa-dhikri ahli bayāṭhi wa-aṣhābihi and awwalan uḥibbu an yajāmi'a 'smi wa 'smu 'n-nabī (ṣ) ft saṭrin wāḥid, taken from Rāmahurmuzi's introduction, p. 161.
¹⁷³. Cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, iv, pp. 222f., where we read among other things: lam yahmil 'an Anas innamā ra'āhu yakhdību (sc. his beard, the well known controversial issue) wa-ra'āhu yuṣalī; and: qad ra'ā Anas b. Mālik illā annahu lam yasta'ma' minhu wa-ra'ā Abā Bakraṭa aḥt-Ṭhaqafī (the Companion Nufay' b. al-ḤIrith who died in 50-2/670-2) wa-akhadha lahu bi-rikābīhi (an impossibility since A'mash was born circa 60/680); and: ...'ani 'l-A'mash ra'aytu Anas b. Mālik wa-mā mana'ani an asma'a minhu illā 'ṣughnā' bi-ṣughbī.
Accepting traditions means knowing the men

hard to establish; his expertise in specific subjects figuring in hadiths is attested in, 
for instance, Darimi, farā'id 3, 6 and 15 (= pp. 385, 387 and 391), and Nasā'i, ziya 25 
(= vii, pp. 147f.); furthermore, he was known as ahsab an-nās (expert in hisāb), 
afrad an-nās ta'allama 'l-fara'id min 'Ali (i.e. most learned in 'Ali's inheritance de-
cisions), as well as afiqah an-nās (i.e. the most skilful faqih). If he was thought of as a 
liar, but this kadhib did not include his alleged traditions, what else was there to be 
mendacious in? Propaganda for the Shi'a? More likely, it seems to me, is to consider 
the 'restriction' of al-A'war's kadhib to his hikayāt as an attempt to extenuate the 
harsh accusation of kadhib. In sum, it could be argued that, in this man's tarjama, 
the accusation of kadhib seems to have been wielded by political opponents and 
also, in some haphazard fashion, by his hadith colleagues, which led, consequently, 
to confusion: politics and hadith transmission going awkwardly hand in hand, re-
resulting in a differentiation between hikayāt and hadith.

Reading through the tarājim of Abū Hurayra's alleged pupils, three 
features deserve to be mentioned.

In the first place, it may strike one that so many 'pupils', who in one way 
or another may have claimed Successorship because of traditions they claim 
to have heard with Abū Hurayra, are probably fictitious people of whom, in 
many cases, it is not even known in which hadith centre they operated. In 
other words, it is the inventor of isnāds ending in an obscure transmitter 'an 
Abū Hurayra, who should be held responsible for the 'creation' of this 
Successor. Reading through hundreds of Successors' tarājim equips one 
with a relatively reliable sense of distinction between fictitious and prob-
able historical figures. A major tool is here the absence of an unambiguous 
indication as to where a certain Successor operated. Furthermore, the ab-
option of, or considerable uncertainty about, someone's precise year of death is also a reliable means to determine whether we are reading the 
tarjama of a historical or an imaginary person. Often a person is simply 
branded majhīl, but we frequently read a few – in various cases even quite a 
few – conflicting statements about the main facts of a certain person's life, 
which can be considered as being tantamount to branding him majhīl.

In the second place, we may be struck by the fact that the list of names 
from Dhahabi's Siyar, when compared with Abū Hurayra's alleged pupils 
in Ibn Ḥajar's Tahdhib, is not complete by a long shot. We may conclude 
from this, it seems to me, that the 'ilm ar-rijāl, in particular that branch of 
the 'ilm ar-rijāl occupied with sorting out and classifying all the transmitters 
from the isnāds of the Six Books, was a science still showing growth as late 
as the eighth/fourteenth century, the time namely between the respective 
dates of death of Dhahabi (d. 748/1348) and Ibn Ḥajar (d. 852/1448).176

176. This feature also struck the modern author al-'Izzi, about whom more will be said below 
(cf. his Dīfā', pp. 315f.). His estimate that perhaps some thirty alleged pupils of Abū 
Hurayra could be unearthed from the Tahdhib, who are not listed in the Siyar, is too low 
in my opinion. The figure is nearer one hundred according to my counts. Additional 
proof for this tenet is provided by a quick comparison of Dhahabi's Al-kāshīf ̵ ma'rīfat 
man lahu riwayāt fi 'l-kutub as-sītā with Ibn Ḥajar's Tahdhib.
Thirdly, Abū Hurayra’s alleged pupils were supposedly active in all the hadith centres of the Islamic empire. Most of them supposedly lived in Medina, but fair proportions are reported to have settled in Baṣra, Kūfah, Damascus and other places. The conclusion seems to be that Abū Hurayra cannot be ‘claimed’ exclusively by one centre but should rather be considered as ‘belonging’ to every hadith centre. That, as I intimated above, the historical figure Abū Hurayra cannot be held responsible for the material that goes under his name, can be amply demonstrated by comparing respectively the materials preserved in the different centres. It will appear that Abū Hurayra traditions supposedly transmitted to Ḥijazi pupils differ considerably – in some cases even widely – from Abū Hurayra traditions allegedly transmitted in, for example, Kūfah or Baṣra. Why Abū Hurayra should transmit traditions of a certain tenor to a pupil hailing from a certain city, and transmit fundamentally different traditions to a pupil hailing from another city, is a question for which anybody, who sets store by the alleged position of the historical hadith transmitter Abū Hurayra in isnāds, should try to find an answer. Above (Chapter 1, pp. 67f) I have asked the same question in the case of Anas b. Mālik.

That the controversy about Abū Hurayra is not yet settled definitively may be evidenced in the fact that still as short a time ago as 1973 a large, 500-page study was published in Bagdad with the significant title Difā‘ an Abī Hurayra (i.e. defense of Abū Hurayra). Its author, ‘Abd al-Mun‘im Šālih al-‘Ali al-‘Izzi, recapitulates once more all the ‘attacks’ on Abū Hurayra and refutes them in a manner strongly reminiscent of all those works published as from the late fifties of this century also in ‘defense’ of Abū Hurayra (see my Authenticity, pp. 39ff.). Al-‘Izzi’s work, however, contains something that was lacking in all previously published books on Abū Hurayra, something which may prove a convincing as well as a comparatively handy tool in sorting out Abū Hurayra isnāds, and reaching overall conclusions supporting the main tenets of the present study. Al-‘Izzi has gone to the considerable trouble of charting all the isnāds ending in Abū Hurayra, thus creating an apparatus which enables the student to see in one glance the multiple ramifications of isnāds from Abū Hurayra through, for example, a host of obscure Successors, to one or a few key figures, to fan out once more to large numbers of middle and late second/eighth century transmitters.

Schematically, this can be condensed in the diagram of fig. 8.

Who actually are responsible for isnāds fitting in this pattern cannot be concluded from this with certainty, but one is on safe ground with the suggestion that either the key figures themselves or anonymous people out of their entourage may be thought of as, in all likelihood, the earliest possible candidates to have created them. Since in al-‘Izzi’s charts references to the actual mātais these isnāds support are lacking, they do not serve to solve provenance and authorship problems of particular hadīths, but what
they do provide is an abstracting and, therefore, enlightening insight into the phenomenon of the *isnād*. Perhaps I should repeat that al-‘Izzi’s is a wholly traditional view; he is firmly convinced of the historical role of Abū Hurayra in ḥadīth transmission, and his intention with these painstakingly compiled charts, showing an infinite number of *isnād* details, was to indicate how Abū Hurayra’s traditions proliferated and found their way to following generations all over the Islamic empire.

To me these charts convey more or less the same idea but for the two—sometimes three—oldest links. In my view these oldest links are the result of *isnād* fabrication roughly divided into *wad* and *raf*.
Muslim Tradition

Had this book been published earlier, it would certainly have played an important part, even though its author does not hail from Egypt, in my Authenticity. Al-‘Izzi participated with gusto in the controversy created by Mahmūd Abū Rayya’s Adwā‘ ʻalā ‘s-sunna al-muḥammadiyya, Cairo 1958, over hadith authenticity and, in particular, Abū Hurayra’s alleged role in spreading forged traditions. While criticizing Abū Rayya (who did not live to see this book), al-‘Izzi also attacks studies of various mustashriqūn, but closer inspection of these attacks reveals that he is only vaguely familiar with Goldziher’s Muhammedanische Studien, vol. ii, and this only on the basis of the works of the authors who, immediately upon the publication of Abū Rayya’s book, plunged into elaborate refutations and who ‘refuted’ Goldziher in passing. Al-‘Izzi leaves Schacht’s Origins unmentioned. He does mention Helga Hemesberg’s doctoral dissertation on Abū Hurayra (Frankfurt 1965, cf. my Authenticity, p. 63, note 2) on page xi, but he could not obtain a copy. In spite of his claim that his book forms an improvement on all the previously published works on the subject of Abū Hurayra, but for the isnād charts, it does not offer essentially new ideas.

Another study by a modern author is Manḥaj an-naqd fi ‘ulūm al-hadīth by the Damascene scholar Nūr ad-Dīn ʻItr (Damascus 1972). In this book too one searches in vain for a trace of Schacht’s ideas, and Goldziher’s Muhammedanische Studien seems only partly known to the author through an Arabic translation made by a colleague of various extracts from Léon Bercher’s French translation (Etudes sur la tradition islamique, Paris 1952) of the German original. The Arabic rendering seems to leave something to be desired; for the German (p. 149): Abū Hurayra ist der Genosse, der diese Worte unmittelbar aus dem Munde des Propheten gehört haben muss, the French translation reads (p. 182): ... qui doit avoir entendu...; the Arabic translation, quoted on p. 446 of ‘Itr’s book, has for this: ... wa-qad wajaba (sic) an yakūna Abū Hurayra ... (cf. my Authenticity, p. 107, for another not altogether flawless, partial Arabic translation). Even if Goldziher’s Muhammedanische Studien is repeatedly refuted in the Middle East, nobody seems to have an adequate Arabic version of it at his disposal.177

Another most important use can be made of al-‘Izzi’s charts: they will play a crucial role in the final section of this chapter on Schacht’s common-link theory.

The common-link theory of J. Schacht

When Schacht published his Origins in 1950, western scholars seem to have been awed. Hesitantly, some accepted a few of his more detailed theories, others seemed to agree with some of his more general conclusions, but no one has ever seriously taken issue with more than one or a few relatively minor points.178 In the Islamic world his book remained largely unnoticed.

177. Although the intention to produce an adequate translation of Muhammedanische Studien, vol. ii, accompanied by extensive refutations was at one time contemplated (cf. my Authenticity, p. 36), it was the far less unpalatable Vorlesungen which was eventually published in an annotated Arabic translation. Cf. p. 2 above.

178. Cf. my paper The date of the great jumā, p. 142.
To my knowledge, until the present day, it is only the book by M. M. Azmi, referred to above, in which Schacht's ideas about the origins of ḥadīth—legal ḥadīth, that is—are extensively criticized. Moreover, in studies such as al-'Izzi's the author does not let out that he has heard of the book. In the West two major hypotheses of Schacht's book emerge here and there in works of later scholars, but without adverse criticism or even modifying comments being brought to the fore. These hypotheses are that isnāds have a tendency to grow backwards, with which I dealt in this study in Chapters 1 and 3, and his 'common-link' theory, on various occasions referred to also in previous chapters, with which it is proposed to conclude the present chapter.

Now, it must be conceded first of all that, in my opinion, the common-link theory is a brilliant one. That it, however, never seemed to have caught on on an extensive scale is due, perhaps, to the fact that this theory did not receive the attention, elaboration or, simply, the emphasis that a theory such as that seems to deserve, not even at the hands of Schacht himself (cf. his Origins, pp. 171ff.). That is why it may be appropriate to illustrate in the following the common-link theory with a few slightly more spectacular examples than had hitherto been tried.

In al-Khaṭīb's Taʾrīkh Baġhdād and Ibn al-Jawzī's Kitāb al-mawdūʿāt we find a tradition which is convenient for our purpose for various reasons: a. the matn conveys clearly in what period and where it originated; b. the numerous isnāds have one common link, who happens to be one of the most celebrated traditionists of his day and whose biography clearly indicates a possible motive for him to have brought this saying into circulation; and c. in their extensive commentaries on the isnāds al-Khaṭīb and Ibn al-Jawzī have preserved a few clues which also point to this traditionist as the probable originator, as well as transparently unsuccessful endeavours to obfuscate this fact. Unfortunately, the isnāds in the Taʾrīkh Baġhdād edition are not always clear and those in the Mawdūʿāt edition currently available are put together in such a haphazard way by its editor that for the sake of clarity and brevity it seems better to draft a schematic pedigree rather than a detailed one containing all the names with dates of death.

179. I only know of the Bagdad periodical Al-aqlâm. Majalla fikriyya ‘āmma, 1965, i, no. 5, in which we encounter an article entitled Maẓāhir taʾthir ‘ilm al-ḥadīth fi ‘ilm at-taʾrīkh ‘inda l-muslimin, pp. 22-41, in which Schacht's book is frequently cited.

180. In vol. 1, p. 27, the editor, Ṭabd ar-Raḥmān Muḥammad ‘Uthmān, explains the methods followed in his edition. It appears that he could only make use of one manuscript from the Azhar library. He does not indicate the state in which he found this manuscript. It is possible to distil from his words that it shows a great many lacunae which are difficult to emend. Judging by the isnāds in this edition, we might hope that one day, we will have a new edition based, preferably, on other MSS. as well (cf. GAL, G 1, p. 503), with somewhat effort being bestowed upon the restoration of the isnāds.
Also, because of the overall obscurity of the transmitters in the later tiers, this seems the most suitable procedure.

The tradition itself deals with Bagdad and bespeaks the misgivings of the originator about the builders and future rulers of this city, the 'Abbāsid caliphs in fact. It has numerous variant readings, but a version with as many significant variants indicated as possible might run as follows:

A city will be built between [the rivers] Dijla and Dujayl [and Qatrabull and as-Šarāt] in which the treasures of the earth will be amassed [and in which the kings and tyrants of the earth will assemble]; verily, it will go under, go to ruin, perish, suffer disgrace, be devastated (etc.) more quickly than an iron pin, an [iron] ploughshare, a piece of [heated] iron, a kuhl stick, a pickaxe in unfirm, soft earth; . . . than a dry pin in moist earth.  

Among these variants one very important one was so far not incorporated, for it deserves to be quoted separately:

. . . la-hiya asra'u, ashaddu rusūkhan(!) fi 'l-ard min [as-]sikka[t] [al-]ḥadid[a], i.e. it will be more firmly implanted(!) in the earth than an [iron] ploughshare. This variant will be referred to as version B.

The eighteen isnāds – two via Anas b. Mālik and Abū Ubayda (who is in this context no other than Ḥumayd at-Ṭawil)  and sixteen via Jarir b. 'Abd Allāh, Abū 'Uthmān 'Abd ar-Rahmān b. Mull and 'Āṣim b. Sulaymān al- Ḥawl – all, but for a few to be discussed below, converge then in one man, a common link, the noted traditionist Sufyān ath-Thawrī (d. 161/776). After him the isnāds fan out once more to a dozen or so alleged pupils. These isnāds can schematically be represented in the diagram of fig. 9 (F standing for fulān).

It should be clear from this diagram that Sufyān ath-Thawrī is not unequivocally the common link of all the isnāds; various transmitters from the generation after Sufyān are also reported to have heard the tradition directly from 'Āṣim b. Sulaymān al- Ḥawl (d. 141-3/758-60), Sufyān seemingly being skipped over. That he, nonetheless, seems the much more likely


183. This seems a clear-cut example of a well-known form of tādilīs, naming someone by a relatively little-known kunyā and not by his more commonly known ism plus laqab with the sole purpose of mystification, cf. Nawawi in JA, xvi, 1900, p. 528; Ibn aṣ-Ṣalāḥ, p. 167.
candidate as a common link than any other transmitter in this web of isnāds can perhaps be demonstrated in the following analysis.

The persons in the diagram marked F, who are reported to have heard this tradition (version A) only via Sufyān are Sāliḥ b. Bayān (F1),184 Hammām b. Muslim (F2)185 (declared daʿif and majhūl respectively by al-Khaṭīb),186 Ismāʿīl b. Abān (F3),187 ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz b. Abān (F4),188 Ismāʿīl b. Yahyā189 or b. Najīḥ (F5)190 and ‘Ammār b. Sayf (F8)191 or—erroneously—b. Yūsuf.192

Other transmitters, who allegedly also related version A, but not unequivocally on the authority of Sufyān ath-Thawrī, are again ‘Ammār b. Sayf (F8) who is reported to have said: I heard Sufyān ath-Thawrī ask ‘Āṣīm al-Aḥwal about this tradition, so ‘Āṣim related it, while I was present, on the authority of Abū ‘Uthmān . . . (follows the tradition).193 But ‘Ammār is also mentioned in the straightforward isnād: ‘Ammār b. Sayf ‘an ‘Āṣim ‘an Abī ‘Uthmān etc.194 Then again another isnād with ‘Ammār reads: Someone asked ‘Ammār: ‘Did you hear this tradition from ‘Āṣim?’, whereupon ‘Ammār said: ‘No, . . . some thīqa did . . .’.195 This apparent mystification about a transmitter between ‘Ammār and ‘Āṣīm, who is hinted at as possibly being Sufyān, is given once more in slightly different terms, but because of the poor condition of the text, that is left untranslated here.196

The above can be summarized as follows: so far we have met various transmitters unambiguously transmitting the tradition in question on the authority of Sufyān and one, ‘Ammār b. Sayf, who is also mentioned in isnāds in which Sufyān does not emerge (F8–11). It can be maintained, however, that at an earlier stage Sufyān may have indeed been part of these transmitters’ isnāds for reasons, and on the basis of evidence, detailed in the following.

In the first place, there is the transmitter Sayf b. Muḥammad (F9) who is

184. Cf. Dhahabī, Mizān, ii, p. 290, where this is confirmed.
188. Cf. Ibn al-Jawzi, p. 66, line 18; al-Khaṭīb, p. 32, line 1; identified as transmitter of this hadith also in ibidem, x, p. 445.
193. Cf. al-Khaṭīb, p. 28, lines 1 and 2, also the last two lines; Ibn al-Jawzi, p. 63, lines 4f., also ibidem, last lines.
alleged to have heard the tradition under scrutiny directly from 'Āṣim.\textsuperscript{197} Coincidence or no coincidence, he is reported to have been a nephew of Sufyān, the son of a sister.\textsuperscript{198} Secondly, we encounter Muḥammad b. Jābir (F10) 'an 'Āṣim,\textsuperscript{199} a blind transmitter, who often, automatically, transmitted traditions which had come to his notice, which he had 'stolen' from others.\textsuperscript{200} Thirdly, we find the isnād Abū Shīhāb 'an 'Āṣim.\textsuperscript{201} This Abū Shīhāb (F11) is either 'Abd Rabbihi b. Nāfī' al-Ḥanāfī or Mūṣa b. Nāfī' al-Ḥanāfī,\textsuperscript{202} and al-Khaṭīb insists that he related the tradition not 'an 'Āṣim but 'an Sufyān ath-Thawrī 'an 'Āṣim.\textsuperscript{203}

The conclusion seems to suggest itself that in the last four isnāds discussed (one of 'Amīr and three of Sayf b. Muḥammad, Muḥammad b. Jābir and Abū Shīhāb respectively) Sufyān's name was purposefully deleted, since the identification of that celebrated transmitter with isnāds supporting this commonly recognized forgery was felt to be irreconcilable with his reputation. And there seems to have been another endeavour to wash Sufyān's character clean: version B, with the crucial term rustākhan (steadfastness – a truly more glorious lot for Bagdad!) instead of terms such as dhahāban, halākan etc. Two transmitters are recorded as having transmitted this version on the authority of Sufyān, the equally famous 'Abd ar-Razzāq b. Hammām (F6) (d. 211/827),\textsuperscript{204} the author of the Muṣannaf (see p. 188 above), and one Abū Sufyān 'Ubayd Allāh (in Ibn al-Jawzī erroneously: 'Abd Allāh) b. Sufyān,\textsuperscript{205} who is indicated in the diagram as F7.

In the isnād-critical comments al-Khaṭīb and Ibn al-Jawzī add to those traditions one overwhelmingly relevant feature strikes the sceptical reader before anything else: with the exception of 'Abd ar-Razzāq (F6) all the transmitters of that tabāqa, namely F1–5 and F7–11, are outright or in covert terms accused of having fabricated it, and in the case of the 'Abd ar-Razzāq isnād it is the latter's pupil, one Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. 'Umar al-Yamānī (F12), who is labeled unreliable.

In different terms: according to a multitude of references to such early critics as Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal, Yahyā b. Maʿin and others, al-Khaṭīb and Ibn al-Jawzī want us to believe that a dozen or so obscure transmitters, in ignorance of each other, separately and individually, forged one and the

\textsuperscript{197} Cf. al-Khaṭīb, p. 30, line 6; Ibn al-Jawzī, p. 64, line 19.
\textsuperscript{198} Dhahabi, Mizʿān, ii, pp. 256f., calls him also a 'dirty liar' who transmitted on the authority of his khāl traditions labeled bāṭil.
\textsuperscript{199} Cf. al-Khaṭīb, p. 30, line 16; Ibn al-Jawzī, p. 65, line 7.
\textsuperscript{200} Ibn Hajar, Tahdhib, ix, p. 90; furthermore: \ldots kāna \ldots yulhiq fi kuubibi(1) mà laysa min ḥadithihī.
\textsuperscript{201} Cf. al-Khaṭīb, p. 30, last line; Ibn al-Jawzī, p. 65, line 13.
\textsuperscript{202} Cf. Dhahabi, Mizʿān, iv, p. 536.
\textsuperscript{203} Cf. al-Khaṭīb, p. 30, line 1.
\textsuperscript{204} Cf. al-Khaṭīb, p. 32, last line; Ibn al-Jawzī, p. 67, line 19.
\textsuperscript{205} Cf. al-Khaṭīb, p. 32, line 14; Ibn al-Jawzī, p. 67, line 11.
same tradition which they all, again in ignorance of one another, separately and individually, claim to have heard from one and the same famous man. The sheer, unfathomable coincidence obviously never caused any of the early critics to think twice, whereas the later authors simply copied and never applied hadith criteria of their own. 206 Only one calamity had to be avoided at all costs: Sufyān himself could not possibly be saddled with this tradition. It is for this all-important reason that, apparently, Ibn Ḥanbal, in a — psychologically transparent — effort to exonerate Sufyān, said: *Kullu man ḥaddatha bihi fa-huwa kadhdhāb — yaʿnī 'an Sufyān(!)*, i.e. everyone who transmits this is a liar — to wit, on the authority of Sufyān. 207

At this stage, it may arguably be conceded that version B is indeed probably not of Sufyān’s making, although he might have brought it into circulation himself for his own protection, but the conclusion that, in any case, version A originated in his mind is, I believe, obvious, not to say inevitable. Additional, circumstantial evidence for this surmise can be gleaned from Sufyān’s biography.

It is recorded that, towards the end of his life, he had offered some criticism of the ‘Abbāsids and, consequently, had aroused the anger of al-Manṣūr. The reasons for this anger given in his biography may be perfectly valid but do not include Sufyān’s spreading of anti-Bagdad, and thus anti-‘Abbāsid, traditions. But it is reported that he had to flee from Kūfah in 153/769, and that, while in Mecca in 158/774, he went into hiding after having been warned by al-Manṣūr’s governor that the caliph wanted him captured and executed. 209 The historical data are confused and somewhat contradictory, but the gist of it seems to be that Sufyān harboured anti-‘Abbāsid feelings which he might very well have moulded into a hadith, or more than one for that matter, which was or were felt as openly critical of

206. This is all the more bizarre if it is realized that, for example, in the official, Muslim illustration of the term *tawdūtur* the concept *tawdūtu ‘alā kadhib*, i.e. perchance agreeing on a falsehood, plays a significant role; a hadith *mutawdūtir* is normally defined as a tradition which has been transmitted via such a high number of channels (*ṭurqa*) that its transmitters’ *tawdūtu ‘alā kadhib* has got to be considered preposterous or inconceivable (*muḥāf*), cf. e.g. Nūr ad-Dīn ‘Ītr, *Manhaj an-naqd fi ‘ulūm al-hadith*, p. 380, where older authorities are quoted. But, in the present issue, a dozen or so transmitters coinciding in ‘inventing’ the same *man*, each under his own steam, apparently never caused any hadith expert to bat an eyelid.


208. In Qabāl, p. 111, we read about an enigmatic attitude adopted by Yahyā b. Saʿīd al-Qattān who ‘... censured those who reported on Sufyān’s authority that he had told them: “Everything I related to you is false.” ’ Could there be a connection between this report and the theory outlined in the foregoing that he can indeed be considered as having brought traditions of his own making into circulation? Al-Qattān had much respect for Sufyān, and the above report could not be traced in any other source. Why Abū ʿl-ʿQāsim adduced it is, I think, obvious.
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the 'Abbāsids' policies. In his days the manufacturing of traditions was a recognized weapon in the hands of those who sought to air political – or, for that matter, any other – ideas. Thus we read in Sufyān’s own words: . . . wa-iyāka wa'l-umard’a wa 'd-dunuwwa minhum wa-an tukhālihahum fi shay'in mina 'l-ashyā’, i.e. beware of these princes, do not seek to approach them, do not get caught up in anything they do (cf. Ibn Abī Hātim, Taqdim). Moreover, Sufyān’s own, often ascetic, statements are preserved in a source such as al-Māwardi’s Al-amthāl wa ’l-hikam (in which we also find so many aphorisms ascribed to Ḥasan al- Баšrī, Wahb b. Munabbih and other respected contemporaries). That many of Sufyān’s own sayings, through no effort of himself, were eventually provided with isnāds going back to the prophet, is perfectly feasible. It could even be maintained that Tubnā madinatun etc. started life as Sufyān’s own (pessimistic) views on the building activities going on in the vicinity of his own city and that later hadith transmitters were in actual fact responsible for the isnād links between Sufyān and the prophet.

Looking again at the exact wording(s) of the tradition, we read that it was predicted that ‘treasures would be amassed there’ (sc. in Bagdad). If it is assumed that the tradition originated in precisely the time that this was in actual fact being carried out, we are probably not far wrong in dating the tradition in the late forties or early fifties (765–70) or, at any rate, before Sufyān’s death in 161/776. The building of Bagdad began in 145/762, and was more or less completed at colossal expense some four years later.

Summarizing the above, we have seen how an anti-Bagdad tradition depicting the initial stages of the building of that city is supported by sixteen isnāds, the majority of which converge in Sufyān ath-Thawrī and the rest of which present transmitters who had conceivably strong connections with him. Ruling out the coincidence that a dozen traditionists invented individually a saying which they then, quite by chance, all attributed to the same master, we have to come to the inescapable conclusion that it is Sufyān himself who has to be held accountable for it. A motive for bringing it into circulation may be sought in his anti-’Abbāsid attitude, while the most likely period of his life, in which he might have invented it, coincides more or less exactly with various facets of Bagdad’s building-history, seemingly ‘predicted’ by Sufyān but arguably a simple vaticinatio post – or perhaps better: per–eventum.

The foregoing example of a common link is relatively rare because of its clarity and its seemingly, irrefutably strong evidence. In most cases isnāds supporting a certain tradition apparently converging for a part in a common link, often have also one or a few other transmitters in the tabaqā of that

common link. Thus we frequently read about traditions with numerous different isnāds which are on the whole so varied, or differently put, in which there are so many likely candidates whom only a few of the many isnāds have in common (moreover often in more than one tabaqā of the isnāds) that it is absolutely impossible to decide on a common link at all. Conspicuous examples of such traditions are the sayings ascribed to the prophet: He who guides a blind man forty steps will certainly go to Paradise,213 and: Search for benefits (or: charity) with those who have handsome faces.214

Besides, apart from the relatively clear-cut case dealt with above, as indicated more than once before, it is mostly impossible to prove with uncontroversial certainty that isnāds are not invented in their entirety. Thus the common link, if there is one, is often only a useful tool from which to distil an approximate chronology and possible provenance of the hadīth. But that is certainly better than nothing, and may form a suitable starting point for further investigation.

A less self-evident but nonetheless sufficiently interesting example of a tradition whose isnāds seem to have a common link is what one might call a legal maxim concerning the minimum amount of a dowry plus an idrāj. The prophet is reported to have said: Lā mahra dāna 'asharati darāhim, i.e. no dowry less than ten dirhams, which in two other versions is preceded by the idrāj: Lā yankahū 'n-nisā'a illā 'l-akfā'u wa-lā yuzawwijūhunna illā 'l-awlīyā'u,215 i.e. women should be married only to husbands of equal social status and exclusively through the intervention of their guardians. Via the Companion Jābir b. 'Abd Allāh and various Successor links, the isnāds converge in Mubashshir b. 'Ubayd; the maxim lā mahra . . . on its own is then transmitted further by one 'Abd al-Quddūs b. al-Ḥajjāj and this maxim together with two versions of the idrāj (with irrelevant textual variants) first converge in the controversial Syrian transmitter Baqiyya b. al-Walīd to fan out again after him.

Schematically, these isnāds can be represented in the diagram of fig. 10. Interesting is the fact that Ibn al-Jawzī then quotes the early rijāl critic Abū Aḥmad 'Abd Allāh b. 'Adi (d. 365/976) who said: Ḥadhā 'l-ḥadīth ma'a 'khīlāfī al-fāzihi fi 'l-mutūnī wa 'khīlāfī isnādehi bāṭilun lā yarwihi illā Mubashshir,216 i.e. in addition to its matn’s different wordings and its isnād’s heterogeneity this tradition is null and void, Mubashshir being its sole transmitter. Taken literally that means that Ibn ‘Adi described Mubashshir, who is indeed a transmitter with a questionable reputation, as a ‘common link’, as someone whom all the isnāds supporting this tradi-

213. Ibn al-Jawzī, Kitāb al-mawdū‘āt, ii, pp. 173–6, with more than a dozen different isnāds.
215. Cf. Ibn al-Jawzī, Kitāb al-mawdū‘āt, ii, p. 253; as is to be expected, no element of these maxims is traceable in Concordance etc.
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Figure 10
tion have in common. We might conclude from this (a) that the common link as phenomenon must have struck medieval Muslim hadith experts too; but (b) that they never took the issue any further but for hints at it in the case of auspicious hadith forgers or allusions to certain key figures (cf. Chapter 1, p. 44).

To be sure, as could be illustrated in the previous common link example, a man such as Sufyān ath-Thawrī could not possibly be identified with the phenomenon for fear of causing irreparable damage to his reputation. In other words, the common link as conspicuous feature of an isnād may have been familiar also to early Muslim hadith experts, but they never extended their comprehension of it also to include reputable traditionists.

Furthermore, we cannot be far wrong if we assume that the idrāj of this maxim is due to Baqīyya.218 Often we find in the fanning out of an isnād after a common link one or more partial common links, who are responsible for an idrāj, deletion, simplification or other alteration. A particularly clear example of this is provided by the multiple isnāds of a tradition concerning the alleged location of the grave of Moses analysed by a colleague.219

Finally, on the basis of some additional information given by Ibn al-Jawzi, we might decide on Sha‘bī as the probable originator of the maxim.220 He is reported to have said on the authority of ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭālib: Lā šadqqa aqallu min ‘asharati darāhim, i.e. no dowry can be less than ten dirhams. Samā‘ between ‘Ali and Sha‘bī is out of the question (see also Chapter 1, p. 20), so it is feasible that the well-known faqīh Sha‘bī himself ruled in these terms. That this ruling never caught on is proved by the absence of this maxim, in whatever form, in any of the canonical collections.

Summarizing this section, it could be maintained that the relative rarity of clear-cut examples of common links means that it deserves no more of our attention than, at most, that given to a bizarre but uncommon phenomenon. That it nevertheless is entitled to our most painstaking scrutiny may perhaps be inferred from the observation that, during the early stages of hadith evolution, the frequency of the common link phenomenon must have been much higher. It is because of insertions, interpolations, deletions and simplifications in matns that additional isnāds supporting these alterations became so complex and variegated that the initial isnād or proto-isnād, clearly showing up a common link, supporting the hadith without

218. Baqīyya b. al-Walid (d. 197/813), generally praised for his traditions from reliable masters, but taken to task for his worthless traditions on the authority of unknown and weak masters, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, 1, pp. 473–8; Ibn Sa‘d, V11 2, p. 172; Ibn Hibbān, Kitāb al-majrūḥin, 1, p. 79.
accretions was no longer separately discernible. The common link phenomenon, in other words, was buried under the accretions. How common the common link must have been, is beautifully illustrated by the isnād charts al-‘Izzī has incorporated in his book discussed in the previous section of this chapter. These charts show more than anything else how crucial the role was played by the key figures in the isnāds. Regrettably, we will never be able to establish in the case of every isnād whether it was invented in its entirety or whether, as in the Sufyān ath-Thawrī isnād analysed above, it contains genuinely historical data from which provenance and chronology can be inferred. But al-‘Izzī’s charts prove to us what isnāds, and the position of the key figure(s) in them, looked like and, if nothing else, are irrefutable proof of the phenomenon of key figures, key figures who in a few isolated cases were allowed to remain undeniably responsible for certain sayings having come into circulation and they can therefore rightfully be considered at the same time also as common links.
A cross section of Ḥasan’s most notorious pupils in alphabetical order

Abān b. Abī ‘Ayyāsh (d. 138/756), mawlā, Tahdhib, i, pp. 97–101; he made Ḥasan’s utterances via an isnād with Anas into prophetic sayings; it is stated that a total number of 1,500 traditions were brought into circulation in this manner, cf. also Ibn Hibbān, Kitāb al-majrūḥin, i, p. 56; Shu’ba is alleged to have said: la-an ashraba min bawli himārī aḥhabū itayya min an aqīla ḥaddathānī Abān; Abū ‘Awāna could kill him, he said, for his deceit, cf. Ibn Rajab, p. 116.

'Abbād b. Kathīr ath-ḥaqāfī (d. 140–50/758–67), Tahdhib, v, pp. 100ff., ḥaddatha ‘ani... ‘l-Ḥasan... bi ‘l-mu’dīlit; see further under ‘Abbād b. Rashīd with whom he probably was confused.

'Abbād b. Manṣūr (d. 152/769), Tahdhib, v, pp. 103ff.; he was dā‘īya of the qadar doctrine.


'Abbād b. Maysara, Tahdhib, v, pp. 107f., mentioned in one breath with the three previously-mentioned ‘Abbāds as ‘not strong’, but it is advised to copy his hadīth.

‘Abd b. Zayd ibn Jud‘ān (d. 129/746), Tahdhib, vii, pp. 322ff., was blind and kathīr al-hadīth; he was reputed to have a bad memory, but even so his hadīth should be copied as long as it is not adduced as argument; was also a noted raffa (see p. 32, note 103 above).

‘Amr b. ‘ Ubayd, mawlā (d. 143/760), Tahdhib, vii, pp. 70–5, the famous dā‘īya of the qadar doctrine is expressis verbis accused of having put false words into Ḥasan’s mouth, cf. e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal, ‘Ilal, i, nos. 818ff.; in Ṭabarî, Ta’rīkh, iii, p. 2490, we read an enigmatic report in which ‘Amr said: Mā kunnā na’khudhu ‘ilmā ‘l-Ḥasan illā ‘inda ‘l-guḍāb (= à contre-cœur?); in Rāmahurmuzi, p. 319, it is implied that... ‘Amr ‘ani ‘l-Ḥasan... was a generally accepted indication of forgery.

‘Awf b. Abī ‘l-Jamīla al-A’rābī (d. 146/763); some people thought highly of him because he transmitted from Ḥasan certain reports nobody else did (Tahdhib, vii, p. 167).

Bakr b. al-Aswād Abū ‘ Ubayda, the zāhid, mawlā, Lisān, ii, p. 47; Abū Nu‘aym, Hīlya, ii, pp. 145ff., Qadarite, transmitted Ḥasan’s mawā‘īz as well as prophetic traditions via Abū Hurayra.

Al-Faḍl b. Dalham, Tahdhib, vii, pp. 276ff., sympathized with the Mu’tazila; especially his traditions from Ḥasan were frowned upon.

Ḥamza b. Dinār, mawlā, Dḥahabi, Mizān, t, p. 607; Ḥasan was once censured for a qadar ḥadīth, whereupon he said: ‘It was a maw‘īza, which they made into [an article of] faith’, implying that this Ḥamza was to be held responsible for this.

Hishām b. Ḥassān, mawlā (d. 146–8/763–5), Tahdhib xi, pp. 34–7; according to
Ibn 'Uuyayna he was the greatest expert in traditions from Hasan, but others, such as Ibn Abi Shayba, Ibn al-Madini, Shu'ba and others did not think much of him.

Hishām b. Ziyād, mawla, Tadhhib, xi, pp. 38ff., considered da'if, he transmitted mawdū'at from otherwise reliable people and was thought to have transmitted manākir which he reported on the authority of Hasan.

Ḥurayth b. as-Sā'ib, see Tadhhib, ii, p. 234, for the munkar tradition he allegedly reported on Hasan's authority.

Ishāq b. ar-Rabi', Tadhhib, i, no. 430; he transmitted a munkar tradition on the authority of Hasan listed in Tadhhib but also other traditions considered ḥasan; kāna shadīdāt 'l-qawl fi 'l-qadar.

Ismā'il b. Muslim al-Makki, mawla?, was responsible for munkār traditions which he provided with isnad featuring Hasan 'an Samura, cf. Ibn Ḥanbal, 'Ilal, i, no. 2465.

Kathīr b. Ziyād, Tadhhib, viii, p. 413, was considered to be one of Hasan's major pupils, but is also accused of having transmitted maqlabat on the authority of Hasan and the ahl al-'Iraq.

Khalīd al-'Abd, Līsān, ii, p. 393; Dhaḥabī, Mīzān, i, p. 649, noted forger, especially of traditions on the authority of Hasan.


Mubarak b. Fadhala, mawla (d. 166/783), Tadhhib, viii, pp. 28–31, one of Hasan's most respected pupils, but the majority of critics considered him da'if; was also known for ra'f.

Muḥammad b. 'Amr al-Ansārī, Tadhhib, ix, pp. 378, reported unusual stories (in Arabic: awlabid) on the authority of Hasan. Is he the same man as as-Sumay'i from Ibn Sa'd, iii, p. 215(19)?

Muḥammad b. 'Umar b. Sāliḥ, Līsān, v, pp. 318f., is reported to have transmitted munkār from otherwise reliable transmitters, and also forged traditions on the authority of Hasan.

Qatāda b. Dī'ama, mawla (d. 127/745), Tadhhib, viii, pp. 351–6, the notorious mudallis, a key figure in Baṣra hadith transmission; Qadarite, allegedly one of Hasan's most important pupils; it is not likely that what is reported 'an Qatada 'an Hasan is, in reality, Qatada's responsibility but rather that of the transmitters in the tier above Qatada, e.g. cf. Ibn Ḥanbal 'Ilal, i, no. 1159, Ibn Ḥībbān, Kitāb al-majrūḥīn, i, pp. 60, 72.

Ar-Rabi' b. Barra, Līsān, ii, no. 1817, dā'iya of the qadar doctrine.

Ar-Rabi' b. Sabīḥ, mawla (d. 160/777), Tadhhib, iii, pp. 247f., often compared with Mubarak as to reliability, on the whole considered to be very weak.

Ṣāḥib (or Suhayl) b. Abī Farqad, Līsān, iii, p. 122, transmitted munkar traditions and is reported to have heard Hasan say that he had met 300 Companions, among whom there were seventy who had fought at Badr, and that he had heard traditions with each one of them; this obvious falsehood may well be taken as having lain at the basis of a multitude of forged sayings put into Hasan's mouth brought into circulation by Sahl as well as others. The many cases of disputed sama' may also have had their origin in remarks such as this.

Ṣāliḥ b. Mu'tazilite, responsible for various munkar statements put into Hasan's mouth.

Sālim b. 'Abd Allāh al-Khayyāt, mawla, Tadhhib, iii, pp. 430ff., spread traditions with the isnad Hasan–Abū Hurayra–prophet, although sama' from Abū Hurayra was generally considered never to have taken place.

Ṭarīf b. Shihāb, Tadhhib, v, pp. 111f., transmitted highly doubtful material supported by impeccable isnāds.

Wāṣil b. Abī ar-Raḥmān (d. 152/769), Tadhhib, xi, pp. 104ff., his traditions from Hasan were disputed, otherwise held to be weak transmitter.
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Yazīd b. Abān, qāss, zāhid (d. 110–20/728–738), Tahdhib, xi, pp. 309ff., converted sayings of Ḥasan into traditions traced back via Anas to the prophet; Shu'ba was particularly vociferous in criticizing his reliability, cf. Abān b. Abī 'Ayyāsh above.
The following list contains a sample of Anas' most notorious 'pupils', probably responsible – or people using their names – for the majority of the obviously fabricated material that goes under Anas' name:

Abān b. Abī 'Ayyāsh (Tahdhib, i, no. 174);
'Abd al-Hakam b. 'Abd Allah (Tahdhib, vi, no. 216);
'Abd al-Ḥamīd b. Dinār (Tahdhib, vi, no. 227);
Abū Ṭārika (Tahdhib, xii, no. 676);
Abū 'z-Zināḍ 'Abd Allāh b. Dhakwān (Tahdhib, v, no. 351);
Aḥmād b. 'Ubayd Allāh (Lisān, i, no. 676);
al-'Alā' b. Zayd (Tahdhib, vii, no. 327);
'Alāq b. Abī Muslim (Tahdhib, vii, no. 357);
'Alqama b. Abī 'Alqama (Tahdhib, vii, no. 482);
'Aṭā' b. as-Sā'īb (Tahdhib, vii, no. 385);
Bashīr b. al-Muhājir (Tahdhib, i, no. 867);
Dāwūd b. 'Affān (Ibn al-Jawzī, Kitāb al-mawḍūʿāt, i, p. 119);
Farqāb b. Yaʿqūb (Tahdhib, vii, no. 486);
Hīlāl b. Abī Hīlāl (Tahdhib, xi, no. 142);
Hīlāl b. Zayd (ibidem, no. 126);
Hīmād al-Tawīl (Tahdhib, iii, no. 65);
Ībrāhīm b. Hudba (Lisān, i, no. 370; he lived until 200 A.H.);
'Isā b. Ṭāḥmān (Tahdhib, vii, no. 398);
Iyās b. Muʿāwiyah (Tahdhib, i, no. 720);
Kathīr b. 'Abd Allāh (Tahdhib, vii, no. 746);
Kathīr b. Sulaym (ibidem, no. 745);
Khālid b. 'Ubayd (Tahdhib, iii, no. 191);
Khuṣayf b. 'Abd ar-Rahmān (Tahdhib, iii, no. 275);
Māṭār b. Maymūn (Tahdhib, x, no. 320);
Māṭār al-Warrāq (ibidem, no. 316);
Muḥammad b. Juḥāda (Tahdhib, ix, no. 120);
Muḥammad b. Tamīm (Ibn al-Jawzī, Kitāb al-mawḍūʿāt, i, p. 135);
al-Mukhtār b. Filip (Tahdhib, x, no. 118);
Mūsā b. 'Abd Allāh at-Tawīl (Lisān, vi, no. 424);
Nāfiʿ b. Hurmuz (ibidem, no. 512);
an-Nahḥās b. Qāhm (Tahdhib, x, no. 863);
Nufayf b. al-Ḥārith (Tahdhib, x, no. 847);
Qatāda b. Dīʿāma (Tahdhib, vii, no. 635);
Sharīk b. 'Abd Allāh an-Nakhaʾī (Ibn Hibbān, K. al-majrūḥān, i, p. 59);
'Umar b. 'Abd Allāh (Tahdhib, vii, no. 783);
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‘Uthmān b. ‘Aṣim (ibidem, no. 269);
‘Uthmān b. Sa’d (ibidem, no. 253);
‘Uthmān b. ’Umayr (ibidem, no. 292);
Yahyā b. Abī Kathīr (Tahdhib, xi, no. 539);
Yazīd b. Abān (ibidem, no. 597);
Yazīd b. Ibrāhīm (ibidem, no. 598);
Zayd b. al-Hawārī (Tahdhīb, iii, no 746);
Ziyyād b. ‘Abd Allāh (Tahdhīb, iii, no. 687);
APPENDIX III

In the following list the earliest qādīs are enumerated under the provinces or urban areas where they allegedly held office. The geographical names are arranged in alphabetical order and in each centre the qādīs are listed in roughly chronological order (as far as this could be ascertained). It will be noticed that sometimes also judges who lived during the second half of the third/ninth century will be listed, this in contrast to the procedure followed in Chapter 2. I thought it better at times to include a late judge than no judge at all. The circumstances of these late judges may, after all, give an idea of how their predecessors (if any) had gone about their business.

I certainly do not claim that I unearthed all the qādīs to be found in the sources, but I did find a great many more than in the admirable study on the development of the Shāfi‘ite madhab which claims to include also many of the earliest judges belonging to other madhāhib (Heinz Halm, Die Ausbreitung der sаf‘iitischen Rechtschule von den Anfängen bis zum 8./14. Jahrhundert, Wiesbaden 1974, in Beihefte zum Tübingen Atlas des vorderen Orients, Reihe B, no. 4, henceforth quoted as Haim). It will appear that I have even been fortunate in locating qādīs for cities that are not even listed in Haim.

If a qādi allegedly held office in more than one centre, he is listed under the name of the city or the region that comes first in the alphabetical order, irrespective of the fact whether it was there that he was first appointed. In such cases under the other centre(s) a reference will be found to the first. Sometimes I have not deemed it necessary to list any qādīs at all, when I thought that merely a reference to Halm or suchlike sources would suffice.

Whenever possible or relevant, I shall give references to Waki‘, Halm, the Ta‘rikh Baghdād, Ibn Ḥajar’s Tahdhib or Lisān and/or Ibn Sa‘d’s Tabaqāt, and I shall summarize the most important features listed there in connection with the judges’ preoccupation with hadith.

ABĪWARD

‘Abd ar-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. ‘Alawayh (d. 342/953), also qādi in Tūs and Bukhārā; late but very important judge; he used to fit fictitious isnāds to the ma‘ānīs he had at his disposal; he transmitted forgeries and was blamed for that, although nobody in Hamadhān, where he was staying at the time, had sufficient knowledge to distinguish true from false; Lisān, iii, p. 430.

‘ADAN

al-Ḥakam b. Abān al-‘Adani (d. 154/771), thiqa, šāliḥ, šāḥib sunna; according to Abū Makhrama, Kitāb ta‘rikh thughr ‘Adan, ed. O. Löfgren, there were no other
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qādis in the earlier period; al-Ḥakam is, at least, the only one mentioned, p. 64; cf. also al-Ja‘ḍī, Ṭabaqāt fuqahā al-Yaman, p. 66, Tahdhib, ii, pp. 423f.

AHWĀZ
Ash‘āth b. Sawwār, mawla (d. 136/754), generally held to be a weak transmitter; cf. Waki', iii, p. 320, Tahdhib, i, pp. 352ff., Ibn Sa‘d, vi, p. 249.
Sālim b. Abī Sālim, held office under 'Umar II; wrote his sentences down; cf. Waki', iii, p. 320.
Hudba b. al-Minhāl; cf. Waki', iii, p. 320.
‘Amr b. al-Walīd al-Aghḍaf (fl. 178/794), he directed the Ahwāzīs’ attention to the sunna, ‘hopefully’ there was nothing wrong with his traditions; cf. Waki', iii, p. 320, Lisān, iv, p. 378.
‘Amr b. an-Naḍr al-Bazzār (fl. 196/812); cf. Waki', iii, p. 320.
‘Alī b. Rūḥ (or Rawḥ); Waki', iii, p. 320.
Istā‘īl b. Muḥammad Abū Tamām; Waki', iii, p. 320.
Yahyā b. ‘Abd ar-Rahmān al-Arḥabī, no great master in ḥadīth but reliable enough; cf. Waki', iii, p. 320, Tahdhib, xi, p. 250.
Muḥammad b. ‘Umar b. Hayyā‘ (d. 255/869), thiqa, harmless transmitter; Waki', iii, p. 320, Tahdhib, ix, pp. 362f.
Mūsā b. Isḥāq Abū Bakr al-Khaṭmī (d. 297/910), also qādir in Rayy; the people used to write down many of his traditions; cf. Ta‘rikh Baghdad, XIII, pp. 52ff., Halm, p. 154.

‘AMMĀN
‘Umar b. Ḥafs (fl. 150/767), also qādir in Balqā‘, nothing much known about him, at times confused with Ḥafs b. ‘Umar (cf. under ḤALAB); cf. Lisān, iv, p. 300.

ANBĀR

ANȚĀKIYA
Sallām b. Razīn (fl. 160/777), his traditions considered null and void, transmitted from al-A‘mash; cf. Lisān, iii, p. 57.

ARMĪNIYĀ
‘Alī b. Mushīr (d. 189), also qādir of Mawsil, collected ḥadīth and fiqh, generally held to be reliable; cf. Ibn Sa‘d, vi, p. 270, Waki’, iii, pp. 219f., Tahdhib, vii, pp. 383f.; according to al-Azḍī, Ta‘rikh Mawsil, p. 248, he was in office from 167/784 to 175/791 under al-Mahdi; he was the successor of Yahyā Abū Kurz; Halm, p. 190.

ASWĀN (AL-QULZUM)
Ahmad b. Marwān al-Mālikī ad-Dinawarī (d. 333/944), forged ḥadīth, but was otherwise also known as thiqa, kathir al-ḥadīth; cf. Lisān, i, no. 931.

BA‘LBAKK
BALKH

'Umar b. Maymūn (d. 191/807; according to Ibn Abi 'l-Wafā', Al-jawāhir al-mudī'a, 1, no. 1105: 171/787), was judge for more than 20 years and was famous for his hilāl and vast knowledge; cf. Tahdhib, vii, pp. 498ff., Halm, p. 74.
al-Hakam b. 'Abd Allāh Abū Muṭī al-Balkhi (d. 190/815), very important judge and faqīh; although he transmitted traditions which he claimed to have heard with numerous famous masters, he hated the sunna and much preferred Abī Hanifa's ra'y; committed plagiarism and fabricated hadiths; was leading Murjī'īte; cf. Lisān, ii, pp. 334ff., Ibn Sa'd, vii 2, p. 195, Halm, pp. 73f., Ta'rikh Baghdād, viii, pp. 223ff., Nagel, Rechtleitung, pp. 343f.
Abū 'Alī Ishāq b. Ibrāhīm (fl. 180/796), no tariqa on him could be found in any of the major sources; he is only mentioned in passing in Tahdhib, vi, p. 460.

BALQĀʾ (cf. also 'AMMĀN)

Khālid b. Yazīd b. Sāliḥ (d. 167/784), thiqa, no objections to his hadith; cf. Tahdhib, iii, pp. 125f.

BUKHĀRĀ (cf. also ABĪWARD)
al-Haytham b. Abī 'l-Haytham (fl. 150/767), there seemed to be confusion with four other people with that name; cf. Tahdhib, xi, pp. 99f.
For a list of other qādis of Bukhara, see Narshakhi, The history of Bukhara, pp. 4ff.

DĪNAWAR

'Amr b. Ḥamīd (fl. 190/806), a liar who forged traditions; cf. Lisān, iv, p. 362.

FĀRS

az-Zubayr b. 'Adī (d. 131/749), thiqa, sāhib sunna, also qādi of Rayy; he once asked for a miracle and was granted one; cf. Waki', iii, p. 318, Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Taqdima, pp. 80f., 83, Tahdhib iii, p. 317, Ibn Sa'd, vi, p. 230.
Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm (d. 182/798), mawla, thiqa, intelligent, Tahdhib, ix, no. 16.

FILASTĪN

-

HĀLAB

Hafs b. 'Umar (fl. 150/767), transmitted forgeries from reliable transmitters; cf. Lisān, ii, pp. 326ff., Ibn Hibbān, Kitāb al-majrūḥin, i, p. 17.
al-Husayn b. 'Abd ar-Rahmān (fl. 220/835), thiqa but not an important transmitter; cf. Tahdhib, ii, p. 343.

'Abd as-Salām b. 'Abd ar-Rahmān (d. 247/861), qādi of Raqqā but possibly also of Hālab and Harrān; his hadiths were thought to be munkar, but he also received the predicate sāliḥ; cf. Waki', iii, pp. 277ff., Tahdhib, vi, pp. 322f.
HAMADHĀN (see also QAZWĪN)

al-Qāsim b. al-Hakam (d. 208/823), thiqa but not free from mistakes; his traditions containing *manākīr*, they could not be adduced as arguments; cf. Halm, p. 141, *Tahdhib*, viii, pp. 311f.

'Abd Allāh b. Muhammad b. Abī 'l-Aswad (d. 223/838), generally considered a reliable transmitter, but his material from Abī 'Awāna was weak; cf. *Tahdhib*, vii, p. 6.

Aṣrām b. Hawshab (fl. 225/840), a wicked liar who spread fabricated traditions on the authority of thiqāt; he tinkered with Zuhri isnāds, but his material was nevertheless sometimes copied; cf. Ibn Sa‘d, vii 2, p. 110, *Lisān*, i, pp. 461f.

ḤARRĀN (see also ḤALAB)

Khattāb b. al-Qāsim (fl. 120/738), munkar al-*hadith*, weak; cf. *Tahdhib*, iii, pp. 146f.

Yūnus b. Rāshīd (fl. 130/748), propagandist for the Murji‘ites, but his traditions were deemed reliable enough to be copied; cf. *Tahdhib*, xi, p. 439.

'Uṯmān b. 'Amr b. Sāj (fl. 140/757), also *qādi* of the Jazīra; mawla of the Umayyads; his traditions were not trusted; cf. *Tahdhib*, vii, no. 291.

Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Ulātha (d. 168/784); his traditions were said to show his mendacity, but he was also thought of as thiqa; he later became *qādi* in Bagdad, cf. *Tahdhib*, ix, no. 446.

Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Ulātha (fl. 168/784), succeeded his brother Muhammad in office; one reliable tradition is traced to him in which the prophet invokes God's wrath upon locusts; cf. *Tahdhib*, iii, pp. 377f.

Sulaymān b. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Ulātha, is credited with only a few traditions but was skilled improvisor; cf. *Waki‘*, iii, pp. 217ff., Ibn Sa‘d’s, vii 2, p. 181.

Muhammad b. 'Ubayd Allāh b. Yazīd, mawla (d. 268/881), was not a strong traditionist; cf. *Tahdhib*, ix, p. 325.


HIMṢ


HARĀT

Musha‘īth b. Tarīf (fl. 70/689), no older *qādi* known in all of Khurāsān except Yahyā b. Ya‘mar (cf. *Marw*); was considered to be an outstanding judge, but of his traditions only one is known; cf. *Tahdhib*, x, p. 156.

Zayd b. al-Ḥawārī, mawla (fl. 110/728), is reputed to have transmitted fabricated traditions on the authority of Anas b. Mālik, was therefore considered weak and his *hadith* could not be adduced as argument; cf. Ibn Sa‘d’s, vii 2, p. 9, *Tahdhib*, iii, pp. 407ff.


HIMṢ

'Imran b. Sulaym (fl. 100/718), allegedly excellent qādī, only listed in Bukhārī, At-ṭarîkh al-kabīr, iii 2, no. 2818, and Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Al-jamar wa 't-tādīl, iii 1, p. 299.


Yahyā b. Jābir (d. 126/744), thiqa, but only a limited number of hadiths is traced to him; cf. Waki', iii, p. 213, Ibn Sa‘d, vii 2, p. 164, Tahdhib, x, p. 191.


'Umar b. Ḥubaysh (fl. 140/757), unorthodox in his transmission of hadith, Waki', iii, p. 213.

al-Ḥārith b. Muhammad (fl. 140/757); cf. Waki', iii, p. 213.


Muḥammad b. al-Walīd b. 'Āmir (d. 148/765), very much favoured among Zuhri’s pupils, one of the most learned people of his time in fatwā and hadith, also a great faqīh, but his reliability remained a matter of doubt; cf. Ibn Sa‘d, vii 2, p. 169, Tahdhib, ix, pp. 502f.

an-Nadr b. Shufayy (v. 1. an-Nagr), held office under the early 'Abbasids; was thought to be a kadhḍhab, cf. Lisān, vi, pp. 161f.; in Waki', iii, p. 209, he is mentioned in an isnād supporting a statement attributed to 'Umar b. al-Khatṭāb.

al-Ḥārith b. 'Ubayda (d. 186/802), weak, unreliable; cf. Lisān, i, p. 154.

Khālid b. Khālī (fl. 197/813), of average reliability; cf. Tahdhib, i, p. 86.


HĪRA

Yahyā b. Sa‘īd al-Anṣārī (d. 144/761), the famous faqīh, reliable traditions, some tādidīs, cf. Tahdhib, xi, p. 223.

HĪT (township on the Euphrates near Ṭabarān, cf. Yaqūt, Mu‘jam al-buldān, iv, pp. 997f.)


ḤULWĀN (Iraq)


IFRĪQIYĀ

Abū ‘Alqama (fl. 60/680), a mawlā of Ibn ‘Abbās; was good faqīh and allegedly related reliable traditions; cf. Tahdhib, xii, no. 817.


Ismā‘īl b. ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Abī ‘l-Muhājir, mawlā (d. 131/749), qādī under ‘Umar II, converted the Berbers, was also governor of the region which in those days was a function combined with that of qādī; was wholly reliable in his hadith according to
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Khālid b. Abī 'Imrān at-Tujiḥī, mawla (d. 125/743), faqih and mufti, did allegedly not commit tadlis and was 'hopefully' a thiqa; cf. Abū 'l-'Arab, pp. 245ff., Tahdhib, III, pp. 110ff., Ibn Sa'd, vii, p. 207.

Yazīd b. at-Tufayl at-Tujiḥī; cf. Abū 'l-'Arab, p. 234.

'Abd ar-Rahmān b. Ziyād Ibn An'am, Successor (d. 156/773), da'if, munkar, traced his traditions back to the prophet without much to-do, committed tadlis; cf. Abī 'l-'Arab, pp. 245ff., Ibn Sa'd, VII 2, p. 207.

Yazīd b. at-Tufayl at-Tujiḥī; cf. Abī 'l-'Arab, p. 234.

Abū 'l-'Arab, pp. 245ff., Ibn Sa'd, VII 2, p. 207.

Mā'ī b. 'Abd ar-Rahmān ar-Ru'ayni; cf. Abya y'Arab, p. 235.


'Abd Allāh b. Fārīqīr (d. 175/791), was only for a short time in office, very pious, but spread manākīr traditions, also suspected of Qadarite sympathies; cf. Abū 'l-'Arab, p. 235, Tahdhib, v, pp. 356ff.

Abū 'l-'Arab, p. 235, faqih, Sağih, Yaqūt, Buldān, iii, p. 407.

Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh Abī Muḥriz; cf. Abū 'l-'Arab, p. 235.

Abū 'l-'Arab, p. 235.

ISH FAHĀN

See Halm, p. 149 and the reference quoted there to Abū Nu'yaym's Akhbar Isbahān.

JABBUL (on the Tigris near Wāsif, cf. Yaqūt, Mu'jam al-buldān, II, p. 23)

'Abd ar-Rahmān b. Mushīr, notorious figure, generally believed to be simple-minded; he used to praise himself, because the people refused to do so; when he was dismissed from his post through the machinations of Abū Yūsuf, he spread the word around that Abū Yūsuf had the same kunya as the Dajjāl; cf. Waki', III, pp. 317ff., Lisān, III, pp. 437ff.

JAZIRA (see also ḤARRĀN)


'Adīb. 'Adī b. 'Amīra (d. 120/738), qāḍī during the reign of 'Umar II, faqih, known for his ascetic disposition and 'hopefully' thiqa; cf. Waki', I, p. 264, Rāmahurmuzi, p. 244, Ibn Sa'd, vii, p. 179, Tahdhib, vii, pp. 168ff.


Shurayḥ b. 'Abd Allāh; cf. Waki', III, p. 220.

JUNDAYSABUR (a city in Khūzistān of which Yaqūt found hardly a trace, cf. Mu'jam al-buldān, II, p. 130)

Shuqayb b. Ayyūb (d. 261/875), also qāḍī in Wāsif (cf. Halm, p. 179), made mistakes, committed tadlis, manākīr attributed to him; cf. Tahdhib, IV, p. 348.
JURJÁN (see Halm, pp. 125f., for more qādīs than listed here)

'Abīda (not 'Ubayda as in Halm, p. 125) b. Rabi'a, a Successor who transmitted traditions from Ibn Mas'ūd; cf. Sahmī, Ta'rikh Jurjān, p. 238, Tahdhib, vi, p. 83, Ibn Sa'd, vi, p. 139.


'Anbasa b. al-Azhar Abū Yahyā (fl. 140/757), made mistakes and therefore his traditions were not adduced as arguments; transmitted from among others Abū Ishāq as-Sabī'ī; cf. Sahmī, p. 239, Tahdhib, viii, pp. 153f.

'Amr b. al-Azhar al-'Atākī (fl. 150/767), liar and weak transmitter, fabricated hadīth; is astonishingly enough not listed in Sahmī; cf. Lisān, iv, pp. 353f.


al-Jarrāh b. 'Abd Allah, qādī under 'Umar II, was also governor and 'āmil; cf. Waki', i, p. 264, Ibn Sa'd, v, p. 251 and p. 285.

'Isā b. al-Musayyab al-Bajalī (fl. 140/757), also qādī of Kūfa, weak transmitter who made so many mistakes that his traditions were no longer adduced as arguments, but is also thought of as a fair transmitter; cf. Waki', iii, p. 22, Lisān, iv, p. 405, Ibn Sa'd, vi, p. 241.

KHURĀSĀN

Ibrahim b. Bayār (fl. 150/767), doubtfull transmitter of manākīr traditions; cf. Lisān, i, pp. 41f.


KIRMĀN

Hasan b. Ibrahim (d. 186/802), not a very strong but harmless transmitter of many ahrād traditions; cf. Tahdhib, ii, pp. 245f.

Hāmid b. 'Umar (d. 233/848), thiqa; cf. Tahdhib, ii, p. 169.

MADĀ'IN

Jabr b. al-Qash'am; cf. Waki', ii, p. 184f.

'Asim b. Sulaymān al-Ahwal, mawla (d. 142/759), Successor from Basra, famous for the great number of traditions he transmitted, thiqa, one of the four huffāz, was also overseer of the markets (muhtasib); cf. Waki', iii, p. 304, Ibn Sa'd, vii 2, p. 20, Ta'rikh Baghdad, xi, pp. 243–7, Tahdhib, v, pp. 42f.
Hammad b. Dulayl (fl. 160/777), was a follower of Abü Hanifa’s ra’y, was not considered a traditionist because he had only two; cf. Waki’, iii, p. 304, Ta’rikh Baghdād, viii, pp. 151ff., Tahdhib, iii, p. 8.

Yahyā b. Zakariyyā’ b. Abi Zā’ida (d. 182-4/798-800), mawlā, was the first traditionist in Kūfa to compile a written collection, considered a good faqih, was like a perfumed bride in hadīth, cf. Tahdhib, xi, no. 349, Ta’rikh Baghdād, xiv, pp. 114ff.


Yābī’ b. Zakariyya’ b. Abī Zā’ida (d. 182-4/798-800), mawla, was the first traditionist in Kūfa to compile a written collection, considered a good faqih, was like a perfumed bride in hadīth, cf. Tahdhib, xi, no. 349, Ta’rikh Baghdad, xiv, pp. 114ff.

Yūnus b. Nāfi’ (d. 159/776), the first master of Ibn al-Mubārak; he sometimes made mistakes; cf. Tahdhib, vi, p. 30.

Ya’qūb b. al-Qa’qā’ (fl. 120/738), thiqā; cf. Ibn Sa’d, vi, p. 103, Tahdhib, xi, pp. 305ff., Raddatz, Die Stellung und Bedeutung des Suyfān at-Taurī etc., p. 13.


‘Abd Allāh b. Muslim as-Sulāmī, mawlā (fl. 110/728), his traditions were written down but could not be adduced as arguments because he was known to make mistakes; cf. Tahdhib, vi, p. 30.

Ya’qūb b. al-Qa’qā’ (fl. 120/738), thiqā; cf. Ibn Sa’d, vi, p. 103, Tahdhib, xi, pp. 305ff., Raddatz, Die Stellung und Bedeutung des Suyfān at-Taurī etc., p. 13.


al-Husayn b. Wadīd, mawlā (d. 159/776) when he administered justice he was sometimes known to make mistakes; Ibn Ḥanbal disliked his hadīth and suspected unpermissible additions, but could not pinpoint them; on the whole a fair transmitter; cf. Waki’, iii, pp. 306f., Tahdhib, xi, pp. 162f.


Yūnus b. Nāfi’ (d. 159/776), the first master of Ibn al-Mubārak; he sometimes made mistakes; cf. Tahdhib, ix, p. 449.


Muḥammad b. Iṣḥāq b. Rāhawayh (d. 294/907), also qādi of Niṣabūr, he did not meet with general approval as a judge, but his hadīth was deemed reliable; cf. Lisān, v, pp. 65f.

Bishr b. al-Mundhir (fl. 180/796), reasonably reliable; cf. Lisān, ii, p. 34.


Dāwūd b. Mānṣūr (d. 223/838), thiqā but there was doubt about some of his traditions; cf. Tahdhib, iii, pp. 202f.

Hārūn b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad az-Zuhri (fl. 230/845), one of the fuqahā’ among the adherents of Mālik, learned in controversies concerning Mālik’s utterances;
was also qāḍī in Raqqa and Bagdad; cf. Waki', iii, pp. 273–7, Ta’rikh Bagdad, xn, pp. 13f., Lisan, vi, p. 180.


MAWSIL (cf. also ARMĪNIYĀ, ḤIMṢ)

Yḥyā b. Yḥyā b. Qays (d. 133/751), in Azdī, Ta’rikh Mawsil, p. 3, only mentioned as 'āmil and amīr, learned in fatwā and jurisdiction, faqīh, transmitter of only a limited number of ḥadīths; held office under 'Umar II; cf. Waki', i, p. 264, Ibn Sa'd, vii, p. 169, Tahdhib, xi, pp. 299f.

Ma’mar b. Muḥammad, mawla (d. 145/762), a few traditions from Mawsilis, faqīh; cf. Azdī, p. 173.

'Abd Allāh b. Idris b. Qādim, mawla (fl. 145/762); cf. Azdī, p. 145.

al-Hārith b. al-Jándī (fl. 147/764), nothing known about him; cf. Ibn Ḥanbal, 'Īlā, i, no. 1770, Lisan, ii, p. 148, Azdī, p. 199; for quotations from his writings, see ibidem, index s.n.


Yḥyā b. 'Abd Allāh b. Kurz, judge in 162/780; for his successor, see under Armīniyā, seemingly confused with one 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Malik b. Kurz (cf. Lisan, iii, no. 1289) whose Zuhrī traditions did not even look like those from thiqāt; cf. Azdī, p. 244.

'Abbās b. al-reative (d. 186/802), held office during the reign of Hārūn, weak transmitter whose mendacity made people keep aloof from him, cf. Tahdhib, v, pp. 126f.

Ismā‘īl b. Ziyād ad-Du‘ali, judge from 175/791 to 181/797, munkar al-hadīth, some confusion as to his true identity, weak transmitter; cf. Azdī, pp. 274, Tahdhib, i, pp. 298–301.

'Abd Allāh b. al-Khālid, judge from 181–95(?)(797–810), his conduct was approved of; cf. Azdī, pp. 288, 312.


Muḥammad b. 'Umar Abū Bakr al-Ja‘ānī (d. 355/966) (no judges to be found, it seems, between the foregoing and this one), wrote many books, claimed to know very many traditions; cf. Lisan, v, pp. 322ff.

NĪSĀBŪR (cf. also MARW; for more qādis, apart from those mentioned here, see R. W. Bulliet, The patricians of Nishapur, p. 256).

Bukair b. Ma‘rūf Abū Mu‘ādāh (d. 163/780), harmless transmitter; cf. Ibn Ḥanbal, 'Īlā, i, no. 2503, Halm, p. 67, Tahdhib, i, pp. 495f.


Ḥaṣ b. 'Abd Allāh (d. 209/824) (incorrect in Halm, p. 67), judge for twenty years, administered justice on the basis of āthār, never relying on his ra‘y; cf. Tahdhib, ii, p. 493.

'Abd ar-Raḥmān b. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd Rabbih (fl. 170/786), majhūl; cf. Tahdhib, vi, p. 208.

al-Ḥasan b. Bishr as-Sulami (d. 244–858), was muftī of the people of Rayy; nothing more definite known about him, no qualifications; cf. Halm, p. 68, Tahdhib, ii, pp. 256f.
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Aḥmad b. Ḥafs b. 'Abd Allāh as-Sulami, *mawlā* (d. 258/872), honest transmitter of only a few traditions; cf. Halm, p. 68, *Tahdhīb*, i, pp. 24f.

QAYS (a city in the Bajā‘īḥīb)


QAZWĪN


Sahl b. 'Abd ar-Rahmān as-Sindi (fl. 170/786), the first *qādi* to hold office in Qazwīn and Hamadhān simultaneously; transmitted from Sharīk b. 'Abd Allāh; nowhere mentioned except in Ibn Bāṣīth, i, p. 169.

al-Ḥusayn b. 'Alī b. Muḥammad at-Ṭanāfisi, nothing known about him, mentioned only in passing in *Tahdhīb*, vii, p. 379.

QINNASRĪN


QŪMIS

Aḥmad b. Abī Zabya (v.l. Ṭayyiba) (d. 203/819), according to Halm, p. 126, judge of Jurjān, the majority of his traditions were *gharāʾib* which he transmitted as the only master; cf. *Tahdhīb*, i, p. 45.

QURTUBA

Mahdī b. Muslim; to him is ascribed a bizarre treatise, directed to the local prince, concerning the behaviour of *qādis̱*, in which the term *sunna* is used once, but in which there is no trace of traditions; cf. Khushani, *Qudāt Qurūba*, pp. 20–5.


Muhājir b. Nāwfall, no traditions known of him; cf. Khushani, p. 27.

Yaḥyā b. Yazūd at-Ṭujbī, no traditions; cf. Khushani, pp. 28f.


al-Muṣʿab b. ‘Imrān, was neither well-versed in the *ilm as-sunan* nor in the transmission of *akhbār*; cf. Khushani, pp. 42–6.


RĀMAHMUR MUZ


RAQQĀ (cf. also MAṢṢ ʿISA)

‘Abd Allāh b. Bishr b. at-Tayyibīn, transmitted from *thiqāt* fabricated material, liar, tinkered with Zuhri and A‘mash traditions; known for his ascetic lifestyle; cf. *Tahdhīb*, v, pp. 160f.
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Muhammad b. al-Hasan Abū 'Abd Allāh ash-Shaybānī (d. 189/805), mawlā, judge also in Rayy and Baghdad; was first known for a great number of hadiths but later became an adherent of Abū Ḥanīfa; was subsequently decried a liar and a weak transmitter, but generally deemed a great faqih; cf. Halm, pp. 136, 199, Ibn Sa'd, vii 2, p. 78, Ta'rīkh Baghdad, ii, pp. 172–82, Lisanān, v, pp. 121f.

RAYY (cf. also AHWĀZ, FĀRS, JURJĀN and RAQQĀ)

'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd Allah Abī Ja'far ar-Rāzī, mawla (fl. 100/718), thiqa; cf. Tahdhib, v, p. 286f.


Jarīr b. 'Abd al-Ḥamīd (d. 188/804), thiqa, famous for his great number of traditions for which many people came to him; cf. Tahdhib, ii, pp. 75ff.

Salama b. al-Fallāh, mawla (d. 190/806), transmitted manākīr and was therefore considered weak; his traditions were not adduced as arguments; cf. Tahdhib, iv, pp. 153f.


Ja'far b. Yahyā b. al-'Ālā (fl. 200/815), transmitted traditions from his wholly unreliable and mendacious father; cf. Lisanān, ii, p. 132.


Khalaf b. Yahyā (fl. ± 250/864), a kadhāḥāb, collected the hadith of one Abū Muqātil as-Samargandi (about him see Ibn Rajab, p. 118) who used to invent isnāds for kalām hasan, cf. Lisanān, ii, p. 322 (penult.) and ii, no. 1665.

SĀM (a qarya of Damascus)

Muhammad b. 'Uqba, unknown figure; cf. Tahdhib, ix, p. 347.

ȘAN'Ă


'Ajā' b. Muslim as-San'ānī (fl. 125/743), unknown figure; cf. Tahdhib, vii, p. 212.

Ma'mar b. Rāshid (d. 154/770); according to ar-Rāzī as-San'ānī, Ta'rīkh San'ā', p. 537, he was also qādī of San'ā', something which is not confirmed by Ja'di.
Hishām b. Yūsuf (d. 197/813), generally held to be reliable, transmitted many traditions; cf. Ja‘dī, p. 67, Ibn Sa‘d, v, p. 398, Tahdhib, xi, pp. 57f.

Muṭarrif b. Māzin (d. 220/835), mentioned only in passing in Tahdhib, x, p. 245, line 14.

**SARAKHS**


Ahmad b. Sa‘īd (d. 253/867), faqīh, knew many traditions, cf. Tahdhib, i, pp. 31f.

**SARRA MAN RA‘Ā**

aṣ-Ṣālīb b. Mas‘ūd (d. 239/855), not entirely reliable; cf. Waki‘, iii, pp. 321, 323, also qādī in Tustar; Tahdhib, iv, p. 436.

**SHIMSHĀṬ**

Maṃṣūr b. Ziyād (fl. 160/777), no arguments to be derived from his munkar traditions; cf. Lisān, vi, p. 95.

**SHĪRĀZ**

Sa‘d b. aṣ-Ṣālīb (fl. 120/738), only mentioned in Tahdhib, ix, p. 299 (ult.).

Yaḥyā b. Sa‘īd al-Fārisī (fl. 160/777), transmitted from reliable transmitters worthless material; cf. Lisān, vi, pp. 258f.

‘Abd Allāh b. Sālīh b. Muhammad b. Muslim, mawlā (d. 220/835), some critics trusted him, others thought him a liar, still others thought that, if he lied, he did not do it deliberately; pious, munkar; cf. Tahdhib, v, pp. 256–61.

Ahmad b. ‘Umar b. Surayj (d. 306/918), only a few traditions; cf. Halm, pp. 20f., Ta‘rikh Baghdād, iv, pp. 287–90.

**SIJISTĀN**


Ḥarīz b. ʿAbī Ḥarīz (fl. 150/767), Shi‘ite tendencies; cf. Lisān, ii, pp. 186f.

Zāfīr b. Sulaymān (fl. 170/787), a number of contradictory opinions about him from thiqā to qa‘if; cf. Tahdhib, iii, p. 304.

**SINJĀR**


**ṬABARIYYA** (cf. also FILASTĪN)


**ṬA‘IF**

Ibn Abī Mulayka ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Ubayd Allāh (d. 117/735), qādī for Ibn az-Zubayr, thiqā, kathīr al-hadīth; he was a Successor, cf. Tahdhib, v, pp. 306f.

**ṬATARISTĀN**, see under HIMS

**ṬARASŪS** (cf. also MAṢṢĪṢA)

al-Qāsim b. Sallām Abū ‘Ubayd (d. 224/839), qādī from 192/808 to 209/824, good faqīh, who hardly ever used traditions; famous for his common sense; author of many books; it was said that he did not need other people, but that the people needed him; he was excellent in everything except hadith; cf. Halm, p. 234, Ibn Sa‘d, vii 2, p. 93, Tahdhib, viii, pp. 315–18.

Ahmad b. al-Haytham b. Ḥafṣ (fl. 260/874), unknown figure, Tahdhib, i, no. 154.
THUGHÜR, see MAŞŞİŞA
TÜS, see ABİWARD
TUSTAR, see MAŞŞİŞA, SARRA MAN RA'Ā

'UKBARĀ
Muhammad b. al-Haytham Abū 'l-Ahwāṣ, mawlā (d. 299/912), transmitter of very few traditions, thiqa; cf. Tahdhīb, ix, pp. 498f.

URDUNN (cf. also FILASTĪN, TABARIYYA)
Qays b. al-Ḥārith, qādī under 'Umar II, Successor, very few traditions; cf. Tahdhīb, viii, p. 386.

'Abd ar-Rahmān b. Maghrā' (fl. 160/777), belonged to that group of weak transmitters from whom one wrote down the traditions in spite of their reputation; ṣāḥib samar; cf. Tahdhīb, vi, pp. 274f.

'Umar b. Abī Bakr (fl. 175/79), also qādī in Damascus; weak transmitter whose traditions were rejected; cf. Lisān, iv, p. 287.


WĀSİ{T (cf. also JUNDĂSĀBūR)
Huṣayn b. Ḥasan al-Kindī (fl. before 130/748); cf. Baḥṣhal, Ta'rikh Wāsit, p. 137.
Hāshim b. Bilāl (fl. 130/748), 'hopefully' trustworthy transmitter; cf. Wāki', iii, p. 315, Tahdhīb, xi, p. 17, Baḥṣhal, p. 137.

Hishām b. Yusuf as-Sulamī (fl. 140/757), thiqa, Tahdhīb, xi, no. 98.

'Umar b. Mūsā b. Wajih (fl. 158/775), unreliable transmitter who fabricated isnāds as well as mens; he hailed from Damascus, but since he also reported traditions on the authority of Kufan traditionists, it was surmised that he came from there; cf. Wāki', iii, p. 312, Baḥṣhal, p. 129: 'Amr, Lisān, iv, pp. 332ff.

Salama b. Ṣāḥib, pretended to be a mawlā (fl. 130/748), very weak transmitter; cf. Wāki', iii, p. 312, Lisān, iii, pp. 69f.


Ibrāhīm b. 'Uthmān Abī Shayba, mawlā (d. 169/786), very unreliable transmitter of manākir, but excellent and just qādī, who remained in this function for twenty-eight years; cf. Baḥṣhal, p. 105, Wāki', iii, pp. 308-12, Ibn Sa'd, vi, p. 267, Ta'rikh Baghdād, vi, pp. 111-14, Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Taqdimā, p. 132, Tahdhīb, i, pp. 144f., Bukhārī, Kitāb ad-du'ā'afā' as-ṣaghīr, p. 13.

Sharīk b. 'Abd Allāh (d. 177/793), also qādī of Kūfa (cf. Halm, p. 176), eccentric, was observed drunk in the mosque, made jokes, was pro-Arab and anti-mawālī; transmitted very many traditions, but made a lot of mistakes and became confused, committed tādīs, but was also deemed a good faqīh; cf. Wāki', iii, pp. 149-75, Ibn Sa'd, vi, pp. 263f., Ta'rikh Baghdād, ix, pp. 279-95, Tahdhīb, iv, pp. 333-7.

Muhammad b. al-Ḥasan b. 'Imrān, mawlā (fl. 175/791), harmless transmitter who automatically traced traditions ascribed to Companions or Successors back to the prophet; even so, some thought him a thiqa; cf. Ibn Sa'd, vii 2, p. 63, Tahdhīb, ix, pp. 118f.

Asad b. 'Amr (d. 188/804), very controversial figure; on the one hand hesitatingly called thiqa, on the other hand kadhab; he apparently lost his reputation as a transmitter because of his preference for Abū Ḥanīfa's ra'y, which he sought to
substantiate through forged hadiths; cf. Waki', III, p. 286, Ibn Sa'd, VII 2, p. 74, 
Muĥammad b. al-Mustanîr (d. 206/821), grammarian, not identified with hadith; cf. 
'Abd al-'Azîz b. Abân (d. 207/822), transmitter of many traditions, wicked liar who 
fabricated reports on the authority of Suفîn ath-Thawrî, was notorious for this; 
format: Waki', III, pp. 312ff., Ibn Sa'd, VI, p. 282, Ta'rikh Baghdađ, X, pp. 442–7, 
Tahdhib, VI, pp. 329ff.
2, p. 187(?).
Istâ'll b. Muĥammad; cf. Waki', III, p. 313.
al-Ahmar, totally unknown figure, cf. Abû 'l-Qâsim, Qabûl, p. 176.

YAMĂMA
Ayyûb b. an-Najjâr b. Ziyâd (fl. 130/748), honest and reliable but also deemed very 
weak; cf. Ibn Sa'd, V, p. 405, Tahdhib, I, pp. 413f.
Ayyûb b. 'Utba Abû Yaḥyâ (d. 160/777), could not distinguish sound from weak, 
Muĥammad b. Muhâjir (d. 264/878), unknown figure, Tahdhib, IX, p. 478.

YEMEN
'Urwa b. Muĥammad as-Sa'dî, held office under 'Umar II, had to use his ra'y, Ibn Abî 
al-Barr, Jâmî', II, p. 60.

ZABİD
Abû Qurra Müsâ b. Ţâriq az-Zabîdî (fl. 175/791), probably reliable transmitter, 
who wrote a Kitab as-sunan arranged in chapters; it is, however, doubtful 
whether he heard himself any of its traditions, cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, X, p. 350; 
author nor book mentioned in GAS, I.
In the following list a number of people have been enumerated who appear time and again in the *Tahdhib* (cf. note 5 of Ch. 4). They are arranged in chronological order according to the years in which they are reported to have died. I have tried in each case to collect the necessary evidence that points to their being the authors of books or treatises Ibn Ḥajar may have had at his disposal. Unfortunately, Ibn Ḥajar only rarely mentions the sources he quotes from by title. Ibn Ḥibbān’s *Kitāb aḥ-ḥiqāt* is in this respect an exception. But in many cases it is obvious from what particular books he quotes. Thus, when he says: *qāla Ibn Sa‘d,* he cites from the *Kitāb at-tabaqāt al-kabīr* and likewise when he says: *qāla Ibn Abī Ḥātim ‘an abīhī* (or words to that effect) what follows can easily be traced to Ibn Abī Ḥātim’s *Kitāb al-jarh wa’t-ta’līf.* Similarly, when he mentions Ya‘qūb b. Sufyān (or simply: al-Fasawi), he quotes from this author’s *Kitāb al-ma’rifa wa’t-ta’rīkh,* recently edited by Akram Dīvā’ al-‘Umarī, 3 vols, Bagdad 1974-6.

This list is confined to authors who flourished before 350/961 and whose works have not yet been made available in printed editions. I do not pretend that it is complete. On many occasions I came across names of people to whom no books on *ḥadīth* criticism in the widest sense of the word could be traced. Those people I have left out of consideration for the time being.

1. Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb (d. 128/746), *mawla,* active in Egypt. His father was made prisoner during the conquest of Egypt (cf. Kind!, p. 13) He was the first to introduce *ʿilm* into Egypt (cf. *Tahdhib,* xi, p. 319) which means in this context not *ḥadīth* but historical reports of any purport as can be demonstrated on the basis of the numerous reports ascribed to him in Kindi (cf. index, s.v.). These reports were either eyewitness accounts of anonymous persons concerning events that had occurred before his birth or accounts of events he had witnessed himself. Many of these reports were transmitted onwards by no. 2 of this list, Layth b. Sa‘d, whose *mu‘allim* he is called (cf. Kind!, p. 89). He is, furthermore, credited with having been the first to discuss *ḥalāl wa-harām* matters and *masā’il,* which in this context may be tantamount to problems regarding general facets of human behaviour seen probably in the light of religion (cf. *Tahdhib,* ibidem). In view of the above Sezgin may well be right in ascribing a book on the history of Egypt to him (cf. *GAS,* 1, pp. 255, 341ff.). Ibn Ḥajar seems to quote indirectly from it (cf. *Tahdhib,* xii, p. 173, ult.). Even so, it remains a mystery that Ibn an-Nadīm does not mention him in his Fihrist.

2. Al-Layth b. Sa‘d (d. 175/791), active in Egypt. Neither in *GAS,* 1, p. 520, nor in the short biographies devoted to him in the *Tahdhib* nor the *Ta’rīkh Baghdad* is there a reference to the title of a book Ibn Ḥajar may have used directly or indirectly, but in Fihrist, p. 295, he is credited with a *Kitāb at-ta’rīkh,* cf. R. G. Khoury, in *JNES,* xi, pp. 189ff. An indirect (?) quotation from this in *Tahdhib,* xi, p. 222?

3. ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Mubārak (d. 181/797), from Marw, active in Khurāsān and
Iraq. Although no ta'rikh or 'ilal work is attributed to him expressis verbis, Ibn Ḥajar quotes him so often that he might have had a work of this sort at his disposal, something which may be corroborated by what Dhahabi says in his Tadhkira al-huffā: . . . šahīb at-taṣānīf an-nafilā' āmdawāna 'l-îm fīl-ābwa' wa'l-fiqh waftīl-ghaww wa'z-zuhd wa'r-raqā'iq wa-ghayri dhālik (p. 275). For his creed concerning the acceptability of hadith, see Lisān, 1, p. 13.


5. Muḥammad b. al-Fudayl (d. 195/811), mawla, active in Kūfā, extreme Shīʿite; šannafa muṣannafāt fī 'l-ʾilm (Tahdhib, ix, p. 406; cf. GAS, 1, p. 96) from one of which Ibn Ḥajar seems to quote indirectly on p. 269 (ult) of Tahdhib, x.

6. ʿAbd ar-Rabman b. Mahdi (d. 198/814), Baṣra and Bagdad. Although not mentioned in GAS, it says in Tahdhib, vi, p. 281 (3rd line from the bottom): kānā . . . mimman . . . šannafa, and in the Taʾrikh Baghdadī we read that he knew the ʿuruq ar-riwayāt wa-ahwal ash-shuyākh and that he was able to distinguish šahīh from other material as 'a doctor recognizes a lunatic' (x, p. 246; cf. Tadh. huff., i, p. 331).

7. Yahyā b. Saʿīd al-Qaṭṭān (d. 198/814), Baṣra. Although he was allegedly never seen with a book in his hand but exclusively relied on his memory (Tahdhib, xi, p. 218), Ibn al-Madīnī is reported to have said (Tadh. huff., p. 298): 'I have never seen anyone more learned in (the circumstances of) transmitters than he.' The fact that Ibn Ḥajar quotes him so frequently leads me to believe that, if he did not do so himself, one or more of his pupils might have preserved his expert knowledge in writing and that Ibn Ḥajar had this record at his disposal in one way or another. Once he mentions a kitāb al-bayan of his, cf. Tahdhib, viii, p. 304.

8. An-Nadr b. Shumayl (d. 204/819), Khūrāsān. He is credited with a number of works (cf. Fihrist, p. 83), about which is recorded in the Tahdhib, x, p. 438, that he wrote about subjects in which nobody had preceded him. Furthermore, he was reputedly an expert in ayyārn an-nās. Which of these books Ibn Ḥajar had at his disposal could not be ascertained, but the frequency with which he quotes from An-Nadr makes it likely that he had at least something concerning hadith transmitters.

9. Muḥammad b. ʿUmar al-Wāqīdī (d. 207/823), Medina, Bagdad. Ibn Ḥajar does not mention a title but it was probably from his Kitāb at-tabaqāt, with which he is credited in GAS, 1, p. 297, that he cited a passage (cf. Tahdhib, vi, p. 34).

10. ʿAbd al-ʿAlā b. Mushīr Abū Mushīr al-Ghassānī (d. 218/833), from Syria. According to Tahdhib, vi, p. 99f., he was an expert in Syrian transmitters to whom his fellow traditionists applied for jarḥ wa-taḏīl information. Ibn Ḥajar must have had some sort of record of this in view of the frequency with which he quotes from him.

11. Al-Faḍl b. Dukayn Abū Nuʿaym (d. 219/834), active in Kūfah, also referred to as amīr al-muʿminīn (sc. fīl-ḥadīth). In GAS, 1, p. 101, a Kitāb at-tarīkh is attributed to him and in Tahdhib, viii, pp. 272f., we find the information that he was ʿallam bi-shuyākh wa-ansābihim wa-biʾr-rijaḥ, and that his book—what book is left unspecified—became an inām after his death. In Tahdhib, v, p. 195 (ult.) his Maʿrifat as-sahāba is mentioned.

12. Yahyā b. Maʿṭīn (d. 233/847), Bagdad. In GAS, 1, p. 107, a considerable list of riḍāl works is attributed to him. From the Tahdhib it appears that at least some of these must have reached Ibn Ḥajar in versions of Yahyā's numerous pupils, but sometimes he apparently quotes directly from Yahyā's works.

13. Ishaq b. Ibrāhīm Ibn Rāḥawayh (d. 238/852). Niṣābūr. According to GAS, 1, p. 110, he wrote a musnad and in Tahdhib, 1, p. 219, we read that he was the author of books.
14. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmmār (d. 242/856), active in Mawṣīl. It says in Tahdhib, ix, p. 265, that he had a collection of suʿādat fiʾl-ʾilāl waʾr-rijaḥ which is confirmed in Tahdīh, hussī, ii, p. 494, where he is credited with a 'large book' on those subjects.

15. Al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī al-Ḥulwānī (d. 242/856), settled in Mecca. He was allegedly an expert on riжаḥ but did not use his expertise to his advantage (cf. Tahdīh, ii, p. 303): he also wrote a book on sunan (ibidem). In Tahdīh, viii, p. 5, we read a quote from his Kitāb al-maʾrisa. Another quote in ibidem, iii, p. 294. Neither GAS nor Fihrist lists this man.

16. Al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī al-Ḳarābīsī (d. 245/859), cf. Tahdīh, ii, pp. 359–362, GAS, i, pp. 599 ff., Fihrist, p. 270, active in Bagdad; great faqīḥ. His Kitāb al-mudallisin is an important source for Abū ʿl-Qāsim’s Qabāl al-akhbār, and is also cited in Tahdīh, viii, p. 66. He may have been the unknown muḥaddith whose innovative ideas about muʿātann an isnāds were so severely criticized by Muslim in the Introduction to his Sahīḥ, cf. my translation in JSAl, v.

17. Dūyayn ʿAbd ar-Rabīʿ b. Ibrāhīm (d. 245/859), Syria. According to Tahdīh, vi, p. 132, people consulted him concerning the jarr wa-taʾdil of Syrian transmitters. This expertise must have been recorded in a collection or a book from which Ibn Ḥajar quoted, although neither GAS nor Fihrist contains any pertinent evidence of such a book.

18. ʿĀmr b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṣalīḥ al-Ijli (d. 261/875), first active in Bagdad; great faqīḥ. His Kitāb al-mudallisin is is attributed to him from which Ibn Ḥajar (e.g. Tahdīh, ii, p. 359 ff.) quotes. It is noted in Fihrist, p. 270, that he is the Ijlī who is the ‘Ijlī who is so often cited by Ibn Ḥajar. GAS, i, p. 143, only speaks of a Thiqaṭ work.

19. Ahmad b. al-Ḥasan at-Tirmidhī (d. before 250/864), Bagdad, Nisābūr. According to Tahdīh, i, no. 31, he was a pupil of Ibn Ḥanbal and an expert in ʿilāl and jarr wa-taʾdil. On the basis of the numerous quotations from him in the Tahdīh it is likely that Ibn Ḥajar had one or more books of his among his sources.

20. Ibrāhīm b. Yaʿqūb al-Ẓujaji (d. 256/870), Damascus. According to GAS, i, p. 135, he wrote a book entitled Ash-shajara fi ṣaḥwāl ar-rijaḥ which may or may not be the same book as the Kitāb ad-duʿafāʾ mentioned in Tahdīh, i, p. 182. He was particularly anti-ʿAlī and, therefore, very critical of Kufī transmitters, to which quotations from him in the otherwise favourable tarājīm of many Kufī transmitters bear witness. Ibn Ḥajar takes issue with this, saying: wa-ammaʾl-Ẓujaji fa-lā ʿibrata bi-hattihī ʿalaʾl-Kūfīyīn, Tahdīh, i, p. 93, cf. Lisān, i, p. 16.

21. Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā b. ʿAbd Allāh adh-Dhuḥlī (d. 258/872), an amīr al-muʾāminīn fiʾl-ḥadīth, Bagdad, Nisābūr. In the Taʾrīkh Baghdaḍ (iii, p. 417), it is reported that Ibn Ḥanbal did not know of anyone who was a greater expert in Zuhri traditions, and in the Tahdīh, hussī, ii, p. 531, also Tahdīh, vi, pp. 356 ff. and vi, p. 296, his ʿIlāl ḥadīṭh az-Zuhri, which apparently had shortcomings, is mentioned. The books listed in GAS, i, p. 134 f., seem to fall outside the scope of tradition criticism. In Tahdīh, vii, p. 14, the title (?) ʿAdl ḥadīṭh az Zuhri is mentioned.


23. Ahmad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṣāliḥ al-ʿIjjī (d. 261/875), first active in Bagdad, after that he moved to the Maghrib as a fugitive of the miḥna (cf. Taʾrīkh Baghdaḍ, iv, p. 214). According to Tahdīh, v, no. 449, he was the author of a Taʾrīkh, which makes it as good as certain (cf. also Tahdīh, v, p. 262, line 9) that he is the ʿIjjī who is so very often cited by Ibn Ḥajar. GAS, i, p. 143, only speaks of a Thiqaṭ work.

24. Yaʿqūb b. Shayba (d. 262/876), Bagdad, Baṣra. GAS, i, p. 144, and Taʾrīkh Baghdaḍ, xiv, p. 281, credit him with Al-musnad al-kabīr al-muʿalla which is only partly preserved. He is very frequently quoted in the Tahdīh.
25. 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Karīm Abū Zur’a ar-Rāzī (d. 264/878), the great friend of Abū Ḥātim. He was active in Rayy and Bagdad. Although he is not credited with having written books but for a Kitāb az-zuhd (cf. GAS, 1, p. 145), he is often cited in the Tahdhīb as well as in Ibn Abī Ḥātim’s Al-jarḥ wa’t-ta’dīl concerning rijāl criticism, which makes it more than likely that Ibn Ḥajar had a source other than the last mentioned at his disposal, which recorded his views.

26. Aḥmad b. Manṣūr ar-Rāmādī (d. 265/879), Bagdad. According to Tahdhīb, 1, p. 84, and Ta’rikh Baghdād, v, p. 151, he wrote a Musnad. Whether or not Ibn Ḥajar quoted from this work or any other(s) is not certain.

27. Aḥmad b. Sayyār (d. 268/881), active in Marw, Syria and Egypt. He wrote a Ta’rikh Marw, from which Ibn Ḥajar quoted (cf. e.g. Tahdhīb, 1, p. 448), GAS, 1, p. 351, only lists two fragments.

28. Hanbal b. Ishāq (d. 273/886), Bagdad. We read in Ta’rikh Baghdād, viii, p. 287, that he wrote a Kitāb muṣarraf fi’t-ta’rikh in which he related material which he had received from Aḥmad ibn Hanbal. It is likely that Ibn Ḥajar quoted from this work rather than the books attributed to him in GAS, 1, p. 510.


30. 'Abd ar-Raḥmān b. 'Amr Abī Zur’a ad-Dīmashqī (d. 280/893), from Syria. In GAS, 1, p. 302, he is credited with al-ḥadīth wa’l-ḥikāya wa’l-īlāl wa’s-su’dlat, and a Ta’rikh which was recently published by Shukr Allāh b. Ni’mat Allāh al-Qūfi, Damascus 1980.

31. Ismā‘īl b. Ishāq al-Jahdāmī (d. 282/895); in Tahdhīb, vii, p. 507, there is a quotation from his Kitāb aḥkām al-qur’ān, cf. GAS, 1, pp. 475f.

32. ‘Uthmān b. Sa‘īd ad-Ḍārīmī (d. 282/895), Jurjān, Harāt. Although he is very often mentioned in the Tahdhīb, in GAS, 1, pp. 600f., there are only two books mentioned, neither one of which deals with ḥadīth. He reputedly was a pupil of Yaḥyā b. Ma‘īn and in the Tadh. Ḥuff., ii, p. 622, it is confirmed that he had a collection of su‘ulāt ‘an ar-rijāl li-Yaḥyā b. Ma‘īn.

33. 'Abd ar-Raḥmān b. Yusuf b. Khirāsh (or Ḥirāsh) (d. 283/896), Bagdad. In Līsān, iii, no. 1732, a book entitled Mathālīb ash-shaykhayn is ascribed to him. He allegedly was a rabīd Shi‘īte and Rāfī‘ite, but he was also considered to be a reputable rijāl expert, a view which also Ibn Ḥajar must have shared otherwise he would not have mentioned him so frequently (but cf. Līsān, i, p. 16). In Līsān, iii, p. 445, line 2, it is implied that he wrote a Ta’rikh. He is also reputed to have doctored isnāds (kāna yūṣilū [or: yuwaṣṣilū] al-marāṣil, ibidem, p. 444).

34. Muḥammad b. an-Nāḍr b. Salama b. al-Jārūd al-Jārūdī (d. 291/904), active in Rayy, was considered one of the most learned of his age; he went on taḥāb journeys with Muslim. He adhered to a certain niḥla which he fanatically defended against attacks. His book on du‘a‘fā‘ is mentioned in e.g. Līsān, iii, p. 439, no. 62. Neither in GAS, i, nor in Fīhirīst. Cf. Tahdhīb, ix, no. 799.


36. Aḥmad b. Hārūn al-Bardijī (d. 301/914), Bagdad. In Tahdhīb, viii, p. 66, it is said that he was the author of a marāṣil collection, which is not mentioned in GAS, 1, pp. 166f. Cf. Abū Bakr b. Khayr, p. 207.

37. Aḥmad b. ‘Alī b. Shu‘ayb an-Nāṣārī (d. 303/916), Iraq, Syria and Egypt. It is implied in, for example, Tahdhīb, viii, p. 276 and ix, p. 47, that he wrote a kitāb al-kunā, which is not mentioned in GAS; also some sort of mashyakha work, cf. Tahdhīb, 1, no. 154.
38. Zakariyyā' b. Yaḥyā as-Sājī (d. 307/920), Basra. He is credited with a number of works from which Ibn Ḥajar might have quoted. *Lisān*, ii, pp. 488f.: *ikhtīlāf, 'īlal, riḍāl* and *ahkām al-qur'ān*; *GAS*, i, p. 350: *du'a'afā* and *Fihrist*, p. 314: *ikhtīlāfī* 'l-fiqh.

39. Muḥammad b. Ḥammād ad-Dūlābī (d. 310/922), Rayy, Egypt. Quotations from a *Kitāb at-ta'rīkh* attributed to him occur in Ibn Ḥubaysh's work on *maghāzī* (cf. L. Caetani, *Annali*, 12, par. 16f.) and also often in the *Tahdhib*. See also *GAS*, i, p. 172.

40. Muḥammad b. 'Amr b. Mis'ā al-ʿUqaylī (d. 322/934), active in the Hijāz. Ibn Ḥajar quotes extensively from his *Kitāb ad-duʿāfā* (cf. *GAS*, i, p. 177).

41. Abū l-ʿArab Muḥammad b. ʿAbmād (d. 333/945), active in Qayrawān. His *Kitāb ad-duʿāfā* (cf. *GAS*, i, p. 357) is often cited in the *Tahdhib*.

42. Yazīd b. Muḥammad b. Iyās Abī Zakariyyāʿ (d. 334/946), Mawārīl. Ibn ʿHajar quotes from his *Taʾārikh Mawṣīl* (e.g. ix, p. 266). Cf. *GAS*, i, p. 350.


44. Maslama b. al-Qasim al-Qurṭūbī (d. 353/964), traveled all over the Islamic empire and then went back to Andalus, cf. *Lisān*, vi, pp. 35f., where a few of his works are enumerated; to these may be added a *Kitāb as-sīla* mentioned in *Tahdhib*, viii, p. 234. This man is not dealt with in *GAS*.

45. Sulaymān b. Ṭaḥarānī (d. 360/971); in *Tahdhib*, vii, p. 5, a *Musnad ash-Shāmiyyīn* is mentioned which is not listed among his works enumerated in *GAS*, i, pp. 195ff.

46. Abū l-Faṭḥ al-Azdi (d. 367/977 or 374/984). In *Tahdhib*, ix, p. 7, a *Kitāb ad-duʿāfā* of his is mentioned which Sezgin (*GAS*, i, pp. 199f.) does not list.

Finally, who is the man called al-Bāwardī who, according to *Tahdhib*, i, p. 342, wrote about the Companions?

And who is al-Ḥusaynī who wrote a *Rijāl al-musnad*, cf. *Tahdhib*, vii, p. 88?
On pp. yff. of his introduction, the editor of Ibn Abī Ḥātim's *Kitāb al-jarh wa 't-ta'dil*, 'Abd ar-Rabmin b. Yaḥyā al-Mu'allimi al-Yamānī (cf. my *Authenticity*, index, s.v.), enumerates along which channels the author received the *rijāl* information which he incorporated in his work. This information can be condensed into the pedigree of fig. 11. It shows how virtually all *rijāl* data, amassed in barely a century and a half, were in the hands of a handful of people who passed them on to following generations. Karābīsī, Abū 'l-Qāsim al-Balkhī and various less severe critics who operated in Syria such as Ibrāhīm b. Ya'qūb al-Jūzajānī and Ya'qūb b. Sufyān al-Fasawi are conspicuously absent. How much Ibn Abī Ḥātim owed his father and the latter's life-long friend and colleague Abū Zur'a is nowhere better illustrated than in the former's *'Ilal al-hadith.*
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Index (Glossary)

In the compilation of this index an attempt has been made to make it exhaustive. Thus, also those page numbers are included where a certain concept is merely implied and not mentioned expressis verbis. Examples of such concepts are e.g. *argumenta e silentio*, *regionalism* and *awā'il*. Furthermore, instead of being marked *passim*, a fair number of crucial concepts are indexed from beginning to end in order to enable the reader to follow these up throughout this study. Concepts indexed in this manner are e.g. *maxim*, *key figure*, *companion*, *successor*, *mawlid* etc. All legal issues and ritual customs broached in various traditions have been included. On the whole, cross references are kept to a minimum. Even if this index, which is at the same time a well-nigh complete glossary of technical terms, may seem too bulky at the first glance to serve the purpose also of a table of contents, the different types used—*roman* for personal and geographical names, *italics* for Arabic and other non-English terms and *bold* for English concepts—may help the user to find his/her way in it more quickly. Finally, all persons who can be supposed to have had the *nisba* *Zuhri* are thus indicated with—almost always—complete pedigrees.

In the alphabetical order the Arabic article *al-* etc as well as *b.*, *bint* and *ibn*—except for initial Ibn—have been disregarded.

The following abbreviations have occasionally been used: *'Al.* = *'Abd Allāh; *'Ar.* = *'Abd ar-Rahmān; *'Az.* = *'Abd al-'Azīz; *I.* = *Ibrāhīm; M.* = *Muḥammad; S.* = *Sa'd; Sul.* = *Sulaymān; *'U.* = *'Umar; Y. = *Yahyā."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Abdālīs</th>
<th>29, 39, 162, 196</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abāb</td>
<td><em>'cluster</em> 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abān b. Abī 'Ayyāsh</td>
<td>32, 144, 218, 220, 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abān b. Ja'far</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abān b. Uthmān b. Afsān</td>
<td>15, 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abbāb</td>
<td><em>'cluster</em> 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abbāb b. Katāhir ar-Ramlī</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abbāb b. Katāhir ath-Thaqafī</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abbād b. Mansūr</td>
<td>57, 218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abbād b. Maysara</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abbās b. al-Faḍl (al-)</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abbās b. al-Husayn (al-)</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abbās b. Nuʿaym al-Awzāʾī (al-)</td>
<td>36, 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abbās b. Yazīd (al-)</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abbāsid(s)</td>
<td>33, 133, 198, 208, 212, 213, 227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbott (N.)</td>
<td>3-6, 24, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd b. al-Hārith b. Zuhra</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd al-A'la b. Abī 'l-Musāwīr az-Zuhrf</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd al-A'la b. 'Adī al-Bahrānī</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd al-A'la b. 'Amīr ath-Tha'līabi</td>
<td>127, 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd al-A'la b. Mushīr Abū Mushīr al-Ghassānī</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd Allāh b. al-'Abbās, <em>see</em> Ibn 'Abbās</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Abd Allāh b.</th>
<th>'Abd Allāh Abū Ja'far ar-Rāzi 233</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Abd Allāh b. Az. b. U. b. Ar. b. 'Awf az-Zuhri</td>
<td>153, 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd Allāh b. Abī al-Malik b. Kurz</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd ar-Rahmān b. Azhar az-Zuhrf</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd ar-Rahmān b. Hujayra</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd ar-Rahmān b. Ma'mar</td>
<td>37, 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd Allāh b. Abī Aftāf</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd Allāh b. Abī Bakr b. M. b. 'Amr b. Hazm</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd Allāh b. Abī 'l-Qāḍī al-Khwārizmī</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd Allāh b. Abī Zakariyyā b. al-Khuza'ī</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd Allāh b. Abī al-Ḥamrāʾ az-Zuhri</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd Allāh b. ‘Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd Allāh b. Amr</td>
<td>29, 39, 114, 129, 130, 192, 218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd Allāh b. al-Arqam az-Zuhri</td>
<td>151, 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd Allāh b. 'Awf b. ‘Abd ‘Awf az-Zuhri</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
fitna (plural of dam) = blood; here used to denote the law of retaliation 49
Dinawar 91, 235
Dinawari (Ahmad b. Marwân ad-) 188
divorce (e) 43, 198
Dinwân = governmental registry office 169
dowry 214, 216
du'â'f = plural of da'tif
du'â'f = weakness 185
Dujaym b. Thabit 129
Dûlābî (M. b. Ahmad b. Hâmmâd ad-) 241
Dûrî (Abbâs b. Muhammad ad-) 167, 243
Ess (J. van) 18, 116
fa'dâ'il (reports containing the alleged) merits of certain people or institutions 5, 7, 8, 12–14, 17, 23, 24, 46, 54, 63, 65, 73, 74, 94, 101, 121, 128, 131, 136, 139, 162, 163, 165, 200
Fadl b. al-'Abbâs (al-) 141
Fadl b. Dalham (al-) 218
Fadl b. Dukayn Abû Nu'aym (al-) 238
Fadl b. ar-Rahîm (al-) 158
Fadl b. Shihâb (al-) 158
Fallâs (al-), see 'Amr b. 'Ali al-Fallâs
faqih (plural faqâhâd) = jurisconsult(s) 15, 33, 36–8, 40, 42, 45, 59, 60, 67, 72, 74, 75, 77, 80, 84, 85, 87, 94, 95, 113, 132, 162, 182, 203, 216, 235, 225, 227, 228, 230, 231, 233–6, 239
fardid = Qur’anic inheritance portions 54, 83, 193
Fârâb b. Ya'qûb as-Sabakhî 32, 221
Fârs b. 91, 225, 233
Fasâwî (Ya'qûb b. Sufyân al-) 148, 165, 166, 169, 237, 242
fâsiq = (habitual) sinner 193
Fâtimâ 103
Fâtimâ bint Qays 193
fatwâ = legal advice passim
Filastîn 36, 91, 225, 234, 235
fiqh = Islamic jurisprudence 15, 16, 23, 33, 38, 40, 42, 43, 45, 49, 59, 77–80, 84, 86, 87, 90, 94, 119, 120, 123, 132, 162, 224, 238
firâ = mendacity 129
fitan = (reports describing) political upheavals of the future as well as tribulations portending and accompanying the Day of Resurrection 49
fitna = tribulation, upheaval, civil war 17, 18, 19, 55, 108
Fiṭr b. Khalîfa 184
Fraenkel (S.) 179
fu'ûl = dissolution 112
fu'lân = an anonymous somebody passim
Fulân b. Abî Fulân phenomenon 146
Fulayh b. Sulaymân 170
fuqahâ', see faqih
furū' = detailed (legal) issues 183
ghalab = unintentional mistake 111, 112
gharbâb = (philological) peculiarities, oddities 232
Ghazâlî (al-) 29
ghishsh = fraud 180
Ghiyâth b. Ibrâhîm 198
Ghundar Muhammad b. Ja'far 29
ghurîr = deceit 180
Goldziher (I.) 1–4, 96, 97, 136, 206
his Muhammedanische Studien 2, 206
his Vorlesungen 2
governor(s) 13, 35, 40, 44, 47, 50, 51, 55, 104, 105, 117, 212, 227, 229
hadhdâh =- al-) = cobbler 191
hadîth = tradition passim
authenticity 1, 2, 4, 71, 75, 206
authorship 7, 70, 73, 77, 135
centre(s) 7, 10, 17, 39–66, 77, 140, 169
chronology 7, 10, 19, 23, 24, 39, 70, 72–4, 77, 135, 164, 214
collecting 20, 35, 41, 75, 98
criticism 134–60, 161–90
fabrication 6, 13, 17, 19, 29, 38, 53, 56, 57, 68–71, 73, 74, 76, 81, 82, 84, 90, 93, 94, 113, 114, 120, 122, 151–3, 135, 155, 162, 168, 181, 185, 186, 188, 189, 206, 210, 219, 224–7, 229, 230, 232, 235, 236
growth 23–9, 47, 73, 75
fiqih and hadîth coming together 80, 87, 94
provenance 7, 70–2, 77, 214
with qâdis 36, 37, 77–95, 223–36
stealing hadîth 85, 130, 211
writing down 4, 5, 19, 21
hâfitz (plural hâffâtz) = endowed with an excellent memory 182–4, 186
Haš b. 'Abd Allâh 231
Haš b. 'Abd ar-Rahmân 231
Haš b. Ghiyâth 90
Haš b. Hâshim b. 'Utbâ b. Abî Waqqâs az-Zuhri 151
Haš b. Sa'd b. Abî Waqqâs az-Zuhri 151
Haš b. Sulaymân 69
Haš b. 'Umar 'cluster' 137–40, 163, 191
Haš b. 'Umar b. 'Ar. b. 'Awf az-Zuhri 153
Haš b. 'Umar b. al-Ḥârîrî Abû 'Umar al-Ḥâwî 137–9
Index 261

Harun 52
Hārūn 139
Hārat 91, 221
Habāl wa-ḥādīm = (precepts about) the permissible and the forbidden 5, 6, 7, 15, 17, 23–5, 28, 35, 49, 74, 80, 85, 162, 237
Halif = confederate 149
Hamadān 91, 222, 225, 232
Hāmid b. 'Umar 229
Hammād ‘el-ṭūṣer’ 145
Hammād b. Sulaymān 120, 183
Hammād b. Dula'y 230
Hammād b. Salama 25, 27, 163, 164
Hammād b. Usama b. Yazid Abū Usama 109, 199
Hammād b. Yahya Abāb 157
Hammād b. Zayd 163, 182
Hamnām b. Muslim 210
Hamnām b. Yahya 127
Hamza b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib 99–101
Hamza b. Abī Humza 146
Hamza b. Dinar 218
Hanafta madhhab 81, 106, 122
Hanbal b. Ishāq 240
Hanbalite madhhab 130
Harāt 91, 221, 240
Harb b. Ismā‘il al-Kirmānī 243
Hārith b. ‘Abd Allāh al-A‘war (al-) 59, 202, 203
Hārith b. ‘Abd ar-Rahmān b. Abī Dhūbāb (al-) 155
Hārith b. ‘Amr al-Asadi (al-) 36, 224
Hārith b. Asad (al-) 234
Hārith b. Ḥaṣira (al-) 65
Hārith b. al-Jāрук (al-) 231
Hārith b. Miskin (al-) 80
Hārith b. Muḥammad (al-) 227
Hārith b. ‘Ubayyda (al-) 227
Hārith b. Zuhra (al-) 150, 152
Hariz b. Abī Ḥarīz 234
Harley (A.H.) 46
Harra, battle of al- 107
Harrān 91, 225, 226, 228
Harrūn b. ‘Al. b. M. b. Ḥathir b. Ma‘n b. ‘Ar. b. ‘Awf az-Zuhri 80, 154, 230
Harrūn b. Ma‘rūf 116, 117
Harrūn ar-Rashid 90, 197–9, 231
Hārūn iyya 11
Hasan = fair passim
Hasan b. ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭalib (al-) 200
Hasan b. ‘Ali al-Huwāndī (al-) 239
Hasan b. ‘Āṭiya (al-) 69
Hasan b. Bishr as-Sulami (al-) 231
Hasan b. Mūsā al-Asyāb (al-) 118, 227
Hasan b. Sahl b. ‘Ar. b. ‘Awf az-Zuhri (al-) 153
Hasan b. Ṣālih b. Hayy (al-) 121
Hasan b. ‘Umar (al-) 156
Hasan b. Zayd b. al-Haṣan (al-) 57
Hasan b. Ziyād al-Lu‘ū’i‘ (al-) 87, 89
Hāshim b. Abī Bakr al-Bakrī 81
Hāshim b. Bilāl 235
Hāshim b. Hāshim b. Hāshim b. ‘Uṭba az-Zuhri 151
Hāshim b. Hāshim b. ‘Uṭba b. Abī Waqqāṣ az-Zuhri 151
Hāshim b. ‘Uṭba b. Abī Waqqāṣ az-Zuhri 151
Hāshān b. ‘Aṭiyya 130
Hāsān b. Ibrāhim 229
Hasson (I.) 107
Hātyam b. Abī ‘l-Hātyam (al-) 225
Hātyamī (al-) 189
Hermesberg (H.) 206
Hifz = memory 183
Hījāz(i) 25, 29, 39, 55, 63–7, 70, 84, 85, 94, 96, 102, 105, 107, 109, 110, 112, 113, 132, 133, 142, 156, 204, 241
Hijra = Muhammad’s emigration from Mecca to Medina passim
Hikam = wise sayings 51
Hikayāt = stories 202, 203
Hilāl b. Abī Hilāl 221
Hilāl b. Zayd 221
Hilm = forbearance 225
Hīmās 45, 91, 141, 157, 226, 231, 234
Himyar 118
Hira 227
Hīsāb = arithmetic 203
Hīshām b. ‘Abd al-Malik Abū ‘l-Walid 127
Hīshām b. Abī Ruqayya 116, 117
Hīshām b. Ḥassān 218
Hīshām b. Sa‘d 158
Hīshām b. Yūsuf 234
Hīshām b. Yūsuf as-Sulami 235
Hīshām b. Ziyād 219
Hit 91, 227
Heariness 47
Hudba b. al-Mihāl 223
Hudhayfa b. Abī Yamān 58
Hūfūz see Hifz
Hijja = argument 183
Hulwān 91, 227
Index

Humayd b. 'Ar. b. 'Awf az-Zuhri 154, 158
Humayd b. 'Abd ar-Rahmān al-Hīmyari 11
Humayd b. 'Ar. b. Humayd b. 'Ar. b. 'Awf az-Zuhri 154
Humayd at-Tawil 52, 68, 144, 208, 209, 221
Humaydī ('Abd Allāh b. az-Zubayr al-) 25, 27, 28, 112, 113
Hūrayth b. as-Sā’ib 219
Ḥusayn b. 'Abd ar-Rahmān (al-) 225
Ḥusayn b. 'All b. Abī Tālib (al-) 156, 200
Ḥusayn b. 'All b. M. al-Ṭanāfisi (al-) 232
Ḥusayn b. al-Ḥasan Abī Ma’in ar-Rāzī (al-) 243
Ḥusayn b. al-Ḥasan al-Kindi (al-) 235
Ḥusayn b. Wāqīd (al-) 230
Ḥusaynī (al-) 241
Hushaym b. Bashīr 47, 141, 157, 164, 169
Ibādíte(s) 103
Ibn 'Abd Allāh phenomenon 146
Ibn 'Abd al-Barr 70, 119, 193
Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam 34, 38, 44
Ibn 'Abd ar-Rahmān phenomenon 146
Ibn Abī Dhīb 82
Ibn Abī 'l-Hadīd 12, 13, 131
Ibn Abī Laylā (M. b. 'Ar.) 116
Ibn Abī Mulayka ('Al. b. 'Ubayd Allāh) 40, 85, 234
Ibn Abī n-Najīb 167, 182
Ibn Abī Shaybāna 105, 156, 188, 194, 197, 219
Ibn Abī 'Umayrā 226
Ibn Abī 'z-Zinād 65, 89, 125, 126
Ibn Abī b. Abī 'Abd Allāh 'Abd Allāh 183, 185, 188, 214
Ibn Abī Khālīf 'Azīzī (Muḥammad b. 'Al. b. Muslim) 152, 155, 158
Ibn Bābahaythī 131
Ibn Dinār phenomenon 146
Ibn Darīm phenomenon 146
Ibn Ḥanbal, see Ahmad b. M. b. Ḥanbal
Ibn Ḥazm 174
Ibn Ḥibbān al-Bustī 32, 122, 143, 158, 181, 183, 189, 194, 237
Ibn Hishām 99, 100
Ibn Hubaysh 241
Ibn Iṣḥāq 22, 99, 100, 102, 105, 164, 165, 171, 175, 183
Ibn al-Jawzī 29, 38, 117, 130, 207, 211, 214, 216
Ibn Jurayj ('Abd al-Malik b. 'Az.) 21, 22, 164, 180
Ibn Khuza'yima 183, 189
Ibn Lāṭī a, see 'Abd Allāh b. Lāṭī a
Ibn Māja 88
Ibn Manda (M. b. Iṣḥāq) 188
Ibn Mas'ūd, see 'Abd Allāh b. Mas'ūd
Ibn al-Mubārak, see 'Abd Allāh b. al-Mubārak
Ibn al-Munkadīr (Muḥammad) 101, 102
Ibn Musalliḥ 224
Ibn Muslim phenomenon 146
Ibn an-Nadīm 136, 237
Ibn Qunbūl b. Kāthrīb Abū 'l-Ma'shaqq 227
Ibn Qutayba 193
Ibn Rāhawayh Iṣḥāq b. Ibrāhīm 169, 238
Ibn Sa'd (M.) 24–8, 33, 67, 79, 100–2, 113, 125, 134, 138, 139, 142, 165, 166, 169, 236
Ibn as-Salāḥ 188
Ibn Shīhāb, see Zuhīrī (M. b. Muslim Ibn Shīhāb az-)
Ibn Sirīn (Muḥammad) 11, 17–19, 49, 52–5, 58, 122, 178, 179
Ibn 'Ukht an-Namīr 78
Ibn 'Ulayyā Iṣmā'īl b. Ibrāhīm b. Miṣqām 69, 196
Ibn 'Umar, see 'Abd Allāh b. 'Umar
Ibn Uwaynā (Sufyān) 21, 41, 64, 90, 101, 113, 114, 156, 163, 164, 175, 176, 178, 180, 181, 219, 243
Ibn Wahb, see 'Abd Allāh b. Wahb
Ibn az-Zubayr, see 'Abd Allāh b. az-Zubayr
Ibrāhīm 'cluster' 141
Ibrāhīm b. 'Abd Allāh b. Muslim az-Zuhri 152
Ibrāhīm b. 'Ar. b. 'Awf az-Zuhri 150, 154
Ibrāhīm b. Abī Yahyā 180
Ibrāhīm b. Baṭṭār 229
Ibrāhīm b. al-Ḥasan az-Zuhri 149
Ibrāhīm b. Ḥāshim Abū Iṣḥāq 23
Ibrāhīm b. Ḥudba 221
Ibrāhīm b. al-Jarrāh 81
Ibrāhīm b. M. b. 'Az. b. 'U. b. 'Ar. b. 'Awf az-Zuhri 153
Ibrāhīm b. M. Abū Iṣḥāq al-Fāzārī 45, 238
Ibrāhīm b. M. al-Ḫalaf al-Ẓuḥri 156
Ibrāhīm b. Mūsā 68
Ibrāhīm b. Sa'd b. Abī Waqqās az-Zuhri 151
Ibrāhīm b. S. b. I. b. 'Ar. b. 'Awf az-Zuhri 154, 158
Ibrāhīm b. S. b. I. b. S. b. I. b. 'Ar. b. 'Awf az-Zuhri 154
Ibrāhīm b. Sallām 69
Ibrāhīm b. 'Uthmān Abū Shaybāna 235
isnad – contd
with Hasan al-Baṣrī 50
with Hasan al-Baṣrī-Abū
Huraiya-prophet 53, 54, 219
with Ibn ‘Uṣayna–Zuhri 176
with Mālik (or Fūlān)-Nāfi‘-Ibn
‘Umar-prophet 142, 143, 228, 232
Medinan/Syrian 105
of mixed origin 39, 44
mu‘ān’ān 168, 174, 182, 239
primitive, defective 37, 38, 50, 112–15,
123, 125, 135
Shī‘ite 200
with ‘Uqayl-[Zuhfr–] Fūlān–Fūlān–
prophet 157
with Zuhri 147–9, 155–8, 226, 239
Isrā‘īl b. Muhammad Abū Tamām 224, 236
istiḥdāda = extra-menstrual discharge 54
istiḥlāḥ = technical terms 179
‘īr (Nūr ad-Dīn) 70, 185, 186, 206
iti‘ā = being well-informed 166, 167
īyā b. Mu‘āwiya 36, 221
‘Īzzi (‘Abd al-Mun‘im Šāliḥ al-‘Alī al-)= 53,
155, 158, 203–7, 217
Jabbul 91, 228
Jābir b. ‘Abd Allāh 29, 39, 71, 101, 192, 214,
215
Jābir b. Yazīd al-Ju‘fī 114, 120, 177, 178, 200
Jābir b. Zayd al-Azdī 15, 103
Ja‘br b. al-Qāsh‘am 229
Ja‘brī 168
Ja‘far b. ‘Ar. b. Miswar az-Zuhri 153
Ja‘far b. Abī Tālib 103
Ja‘far b. ‘Awn 110
Ja‘far b. M. b. ‘Ali b. al-Ḥusayn as-Sādiq
106, 131, 200
Ja‘far b. Muhammad b. ‘Ammār 236
Ja‘far b. Yāḥyā b. al-‘Alī 221
Jahdami (Īsā‘ī b l. Isḥāq al-) 183, 240
Jāhilīyya = the ‘days of ignorance’ before
Islam 61, 96, 99, 103
Jahm b. Šafwān 168
Jahmite(s) 168
Jām‘a‘ (year of the –) 13
Jām‘ī of Ibn Wahb (the) 44, 109, 114–18
Jām‘ī of ar-Rabī‘ b. Ḥabīb (the) 124
Jāmī b. Shaddād 126
jarh wa-ta‘dīl = disparaging and declaring
trustworthy 238, 239
Jarīr b. ‘Abd Allāh 208, 209
Jarīr b. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd 233
Jarrāḥ b. ‘Abd Allāh (al-) 36, 229
Jarrāḥ b. ‘Abī ‘l-Jarrāḥ (al-) 146
Jārubī (M. b. an-Nāṣr b. Salama b. al-Žārub
al-) 240
jawāb = main clause of a conditional
sentence 109
jawr = injustice 86
Jazīra (al-) 36, 91, 226, 228
Jews, Jewish 13, 103, 114, 124, 178
Jones (J. Marsden B.) 103
jumm’a = Friday prayer ritual 89
Jubaysābūr 91, 228, 235
Jurtīn 91, 229, 232, 233, 240
Juwayṣīya b. Asma‘ 156
Jūzajānī 91, 229
Jūzajānī (Ibrāhīm b. Ya‘qūb al-) 101, 136,
165, 166, 183, 185, 200, 239, 242
kadhdhāb = mendacious transmitter 47, 63,
69, 85, 106, 111–16, 122, 129, 144,
167, 171, 176, 178, 184, 185, 187, 194,
196, 200, 203, 211, 226–36
kadhib = mendacity 8, 70, 83, 87, 94, 105,
108–15, 119, 125, 127, 129, 130, 132,
133, 161–3, 177, 180, 181, 183, 185,
193–5, 197–9, 201, 202, 211, 226, 231
kadkhab = kadhdhāb 235
kalāla = distant relatives 26
kalām = legal discussion 23; = dialectic
theology 119
Karābīsī (al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī al-) 165, 167,
168, 170, 172–5, 178, 180, 186, 239, 242
Karābīsī (Muḥammad b. Šāliḥ al-) 168
Karbalā‘ 19
Karrāmīyya 188
Kathīr ‘cluster’ 145
Kathīr b. ‘Abd Allāh 221
Kathīr b. ‘Abī Kathīr 146
kathīr al-hadīth = credited with the
transmission of a large number of
traditions 37, 120, 166, 169, 218, 224,
234
Kathīr b. Ma‘n b. ‘Ar. b. ‘Aww az-Zuhri 154
Kathīr b. Qays 69
Kathīr b. Sulaṣm 221
Kathīr b. Ziyād 219
key figure 44, 62, 110, 129, 133, 142, 146,
150, 164, 165, 168, 169, 171, 175, 180,
196, 204, 205, 216, 217, 219
khāl = maternal uncle 211
Khalaf b. Yaḥyā 233
Khālid ‘cluster’ 145, 160
Khālid al-‘Abd 219
Khālid b. ‘Abī ‘Imrān at-Tujibi 228
Khālid b. Khalī 227
Khālid b. al-Lajjāz az-Zuhri 149
Khālid b. Muḥrān al-Ḥadhdhā‘ 145
Khālid b. Shawkāth 219
Khālid b. ‘Ubayd 221
Khālid b. ‘Urfaṣ 129
Khālid b. Yazīd b. Šāliḥ 225
Khāliga b. Khayyāt 138, 139
khāṣ ̄ = land tax 78
Khārija b. ‘Al. b. S. b. ‘Abī Waqqāṣ az-Zuhri
151
Khārija b. Zayd b. Thābit 42
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Khārijites, see Khawārij
Khātīb al-Baghdādi (al-) 16, 17, 70, 79, 119, 145, 195, 199, 207, 211
Khātīb at-Tibrizī (al-) 189
Khāṭṭāb b. al-/Qāsim 226
Khāwārij (Khārijites) 11, 59, 178
Khayr b. Nu‘aym al-Hadramī 80
khīd = trickery 180
khīyār = option in a commercial transaction 121
khulafā’ ar-rashīdūn (al-), see rāshīdūn
khurūfī = fables 65
Khurāsān 23, 36, 50, 62, 91, 94, 109, 155, 157, 226, 229, 230, 237, 238
Khushayf b. ‘Abd ar-Rahmān 221
khudīa = sermon 189
Khuzaymī b. ‘Abd ‘Amra 228
Khūzistān 109, 228
Khwārizm 91, 229
Khūzaymī b. ‘Abd ‘Amra 228
Kister (M.J.) 103, 117
kitāb = collection of written material 25
Kudaymī (Muhammad b. Yūnus al-) 69
kufī = unbelief 63
Kulayb b. Shihāb 113, 130
Kulaynī (al-) 131
kunya = agnomen passim
Kurayb b. Sayf 235

lā yuhtajjī bihi = ‘his traditions are not to be adduced as ḥujja’ 184, 187
Lamenting the dead, see niyāda
lapidation 26
laqab = nickname 208
layṣa bī ‘l-qawī = ‘he is not trustworthy’ 183, 184
laiyīn = undemanding in regard to isnāds 224
liqā’ = personal encounter (of two transmitters) 43, 181
locusta 226
longevity (of transmitters) 20, 41, 46, 47, 48, 221
Luqmān 45

Mada‘īn 91, 229
Mada‘īnī (al-) 13
Madelung (W.) 106
madhhab (plural madhāhib) = school of law or theology 23, 42, 80, 168, 223
maghāzi = campaigns 64, 82, 233, 241
Mahfīr 239
Mahdī (al-) 198, 224
Mahdī b. Muslim 232
mahdūl(ūn) = unknown, anonymous person(s) passim
Majmū‘ al-fiqh of Zayd b. ‘Ali 106, 118
Majūs (the) 233
Mahrama b. Nawf al-Zuhri 151, 153
Makhūl 45, 162
Makhzūm (al-) 85
Mālik b. Abī ‘r-Rijāl 101, 103
Mālik b. Dīnār 165
Mālik b. M. b. ‘Ar. = Mālik b. Abī ‘r-Rijāl
Mālik b. Sulaymān al-Harawi 226
Mālik b. ‘Utbā az-Zuhri 151
Mālikite madhhab 80, 81
Ma‘mar b. Muḥammad 231
Ma‘mar b. Rāshid 19, 22, 64, 66, 144, 158, 163, 164, 171, 176, 233
man kadhāba dictum 97, 105, 106, 108–18, 122–33, 161, 161, 198, 199
Ma‘n b. ‘Ar. b. ‘Awf az-Zuhri 154
Ma‘n b. ‘Īsā 174
ma‘nā = the overall sense of a tradition 69
manākīr = plural of munkar
manāsik = hajj ceremonials 40, 64
Mansūr (al-) 62, 63, 119, 211
Mansūr b. al-Mu‘tamir 60
Mansūr b. Ziyād 234
manumission 53
maqā‘ī = broken-up (isnāds) 219, 233
Ma‘qīl b. Abī Ma‘qīl 146
Ma‘qīl b. Yaṣār 54
maqūla‘(āt) = inverted (tradition(s)) 219
Marāghi (‘Abd al-‘Azīz Muṣṭafā al-) 55
mardūṣ = plural of mursal
marfū‘ = isnād going back all the way to the prophet 16, 17, 19, 32, 42, 53, 70, 82, 128, 163
marriage 53, 198, 214
ma‘rūf = well-known passim
Ma‘rūr b. Suwayd (al-) 61
Marwān b. al-Ḥakam 33, 83
Marwān b. Mu‘āwiya 109
mas‘īl (plural of mas‘ala) = legal problems 23, 120, 121, 237
mash al-khuffayn = the wiping of the shoes 42
mashyakha = plural of shaykh 240
Maslama b. Mukhallad 116, 117
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Maslama b. al-Qāsim al-Qurtubi 241
Masrūq b. al-Auja' 59, 67
Maṣṣiṣa 45, 91, 230, 232, 234, 235, 238
Māṭar b. Maymūn 221
Māṭar al-Warrāq 221
mathālib = reports – often slanderous – concerning the demerits of certain people or institutions 5, 7, 8, 13, 14, 23, 74, 94, 121, 136, 139, 165, 169, 240
Māṭī b. 'Abd ar-Rahmān ar-Ru'aynī 228
mā'tīn = text of a tradition passim
mātrāk = abandoned, left alone 162, 167, 182, 183, 185, 187
mawālib (plural of mawālā) = clients, those in the conquered territories who embraced Islam 13, 36, 38, 40, 42, 43, 45, 56–8, 60, 65, 85, 87, 89, 90, 93, 94, 112, 132, 133, 138, 140, 142, 149, 170, 174, 176, 177, 218, 219, 224–35, 237, 238
mawāqīf = the precise times at which the performance of prayer rituals should begin 64
Māwardī (al-) 213
mawādū (dt) = fabricated 43, 83, 189, 219
mawā'iza (plural mawā'iz) = exhortatory sermon 218
mawālī, see mawālib
mawāqif = isndād ‘stopping’ at a Companion or a Successor 16, 17, 53, 70, 82, 183, 187
Mawṣil 36, 91, 224, 237, 231, 239, 241
māxim (legal) 15–17, 32, 45, 52–4, 57, 74, 97, 109, 121, 123, 135, 162, 214, 216
Maymūn ‘cluster’ 50
Maymūn b. Mihrān 36, 228
mażāilit (mūsulun) = (secular court of) complaints 33
Mecca 11, 22, 36, 39, 40, 57, 64, 67, 70, 79, 84, 95, 90–2, 102, 104, 105, 107, 114, 137, 164, 169, 177, 182, 184, 200, 212, 229, 239
Mediterranean 78
mendacity, see kadhib
menstruation 15, 43, 54
miḥna = inquisition 89, 127, 239
Miḥṣam b. Buṣraj 40
Mīṣar b. Kidām 181
Miswar b. Makhrama b. Nawfāl az-Zuhrī 148, 151, 153, 155
Moses 216
mourning 96, 97, 99, 100, 102–8
Mu‘ādh b. Jabal 45, 78
Mu‘ādh b. Mu‘ādh al-Anbārī 86
mu‘addhīn = someone who calls to prayer 61
mu‘allim = teacher 237
Mu‘allimī al-Yamānī (‘Ar. b. Yahyā al-) 242
mu‘ān’an = isndās in which the transmission procedure between one or more pairs of transmitters is merely indicated by ‘an = ‘on the authority of’ 168, 174
mu‘āṣara = contemporaneity 181, 196
Mu‘awiya b. Abī Sufyān 13, 14, 33, 38, 44, 50, 117, 129
Mu‘awiya b. Sālih b. Ḥudayr al-Ḥimṣī 23, 232
Mubārak b. Faḍāla 32, 219
Mubāshshir b. ‘Ubayd 157, 214, 215
mudallīs (dn) = someone who tampers with isndās 22, 52, 174, 179, 181, 183, 187, 219
mudallīsīn, Kitāb al-ḥbarīsī 172
mudd = certain measure 65
muḍtarīb = disorganized 224
Muḥadhdal b. Faḍāla (al-) 80
muṭṭīf = giving fatwās 80, 183, 228, 231
Muḥigha b. Miḥṣam 179
Muḥigha b. Shu‘ba 58, 104, 105, 116, 193
Muḥigha b. Ziyād 66
muḥbadad (dn) = traditionist(s) passim
Muḥājir b. Mīṣmār az-Zuhrī 149
Muḥājir b. Nawfāl 232
muḥājur (dn) = those early Meccan converts who followed the prophet to Medina 26, 30, 31, 32
muḥādīl = inconceivable 212
Muḥammad, the prophet passim
Muḥammad b. ‘Al. b. ‘Abd al-Ḥakam 117, 118
Muḥammad b. ‘Al. Abū Muḥrīz 228
Muḥammad b. ‘Al. b. ‘Ammār 239
Muḥammad b. ‘Al. b. al-Mūsārak 227
Muḥammad b. ‘Al. b. Numayr 243
Muḥammad b. ‘Al. b. Ulātha 226
Muḥammad b. ‘Az. b. ‘U. b. ‘Ar. b. ‘Awf az-Zuhṛ 84, 153, 156
Muḥammad b. ‘Ar. b. ‘Awf az-Zuhru 153
Muḥammad b. ‘Ar. b. al-Muḥkāmī al-Awqāf 85
Muḥammad b. ‘Ar. b. Miswar az-Zuhrī 153
Muḥammad b. ‘Abd ar-Rahmān az-Zuhrī, mawlā 149
Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr b. M. 37
Muḥammad b. Abī Humayd al-‘Anṣārī 101
Muḥammad b. Abī Ḥumayd az-Zuhrī 149
Muḥammad b. Ahmad b. al-Bara‘ 243
Muḥammad b. ‘Ajlān 42, 113, 115
Muḥammad b. ‘Ar. al-‘Aqīma 113
Muḥammad b. ‘Ar. al-‘Anṣārī 219
Muḥammad b. ‘Ar. as-Sumayrī 219
muawāṭir laftī = muawāṭir as to the exact wording of a tradition 97
muawāṭir ma’ nawl = muawāṭir as to the gist of a tradition 97
Mu’āzilat(s) 13, 61, 94, 163, 166–8, 172, 218, 219
Muttaq al-Hindi (‘All al-) 189
muttaṣāṣ = uninterrupted isnād going back to the prophet 16, 117, 162, 163
Muwariq b. al-Mushamrij 38
Munawar’ (al-) 21, 24, 25–9, 60, 68, 103, 104, 107, 109–12, 124, 125
Muzaffar b. ‘Aṣim (al-) 47

nabīdīh = fermented drink 57, 65
Nadr b. ‘Ar. Abū ‘Umar (an-) 57
Nadr b. Maryam (an-) 36, 225
Nadr (v.l. an-Nasr) b. Shufayy (an-) 227
Nadr b. Shumayl (an-) 23, 62, 238
Nafi’ ‘cluster’ 142, 143, 160
Nafi’ b. Hurmuz 221
Nafi’ b. Juba’ry 15
Nafi’, the mawālīd of Ibn ‘Umar 42, 56, 142, 143, 228, 232
Nahhās b. Qaḥm (an-) 221
nahī = grammar 119
nāṣik (plural nussāḵ) = devotee 187
nāṣik’h = copyist 194
nawā’īth = wailing (women) 100
Nawawī (an-) 130
Nawf al. Uhayb az-Zuhri 151
nawī = lamenting the dead 99, 103, 105–7
na’y = announcing the death of someone 103
niḥla = sectarian creed 240
nīṣāb = minimum value of an object to make the theft thereof punishable by cutting off the hand 173
Nisābūr 91, 109, 230, 231, 238, 239
nīṣāb = part of a person’s name indicating descent or origin passim
nisba al-Waqqāṣī (the) 157
nisba az-Zuhri (the) 7, 41, 146–58, 192
nīyāḥa = lamenting the dead 96, 97, 99, 101–7
nomad(s) 26, 30, 107, 110, 111, 138
nosebleed 43
Nū‘aym b. Ḥammād 22
Nufay’ b. al-Ḥārith 202, 221
Nūḥ b. Abī Maryam 157, 230
Nūḥ b. Darrāj 87
Nūmān b. Bashīr (an-) 48
octogenarians 47
Oriental (ḥadīth) scholars, see ḥadīth ostentatiousness 60
Persia(n) 113
plagiarism 225

polarization of ḥadīth and ma’y 118, 119
police (chief of –) 78
propagandist(s), see dā’iya

Qabūl al-akhdār of Abū ‘l-Qāsim 166, 193
qadā’ = judicial decision, sentence 37, 67, 87
qadar (issue) = predestination 38, 48, 50, 59, 218, 219
Qadarite(s), Qadariyya 48, 73, 167, 178, 218, 219, 228, 233
qādī (plural qūdāt) = judge 1, 7, 11, 14, 21, 23, 36, 38, 45, 53, 63, 65, 77–95, 119, 157, 195, 223–36
qādī ‘l-qūdāt = chief judge 225
qalīl al-hadīth = credited with the transmission of only a handful of traditions 37, 166
Qaraqa b. Ka‘b 104, 105, 107
Qarqīz b. Shayaḥ az-Zuhri 149
qaryā = village 233
qasās al-dmma = the ordinary way in which storytellers operate in the mosques 14
qasās al-khāṣṣa = the storyteller’s political speech making 14
QāSIM b. ‘Ar. b. ‘Al. b. Mas‘ūd (al-) 15, 37, 122
QāSIM b. Bahrām (al-) 227
QāSIM b. al-Ḥakam (al-) 226
QāSIM b. Mīhrān (al-) 227
QāSIM b. Muḥammad (al-) 15, 42, 43
QāSIM b. Sallām Abū ‘Ubayd (al-) 234
QāSIM b. Suwayd (al-) 236
qāṣ (plural qāṣā) = early Islamic storytellers 11–14, 17, 23, 38, 40, 43, 45, 58, 59, 74, 75, 77, 81, 83, 135, 159, 162, 187, 220
Qatāda b. Di‘āma 53, 54, 58, 115, 158, 164, 176, 179, 183, 219, 226, 228
Qayrawān 241
Qays 91, 232
Qays b. Abī Ḥāzim 61, 170
Qays b. al-Ḥārith 36, 235
Qays b. Sa’d 25, 129
Qazwin 226, 232
Qinnasrin 36, 91, 232
qīṣāṣ = (mostly legendary) stories 5, 11, 12, 59, 74, 77, 162
qīṣāṣ al-anbiyyā = (mostly legendary) stories about pre-Islamic prophets 57
Qūmīs 95, 232
Qumm 23
Qur’ān passim
Quraysh 148, 177
qurra’ = traditionally interpreted as ‘Qur’ān reciters’; of late the interpretation ‘villagers’ is gaining recognition 26
Qurtuba 232
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riwāya ma'nawiyya = transmitting the sense or the gist 52
Rufay' b. Mihran Abū 'l-ʿAlīya 31, 52
rakhsa (plural rakhaṣ) = concession 103, 107, 112
Rūm (Byzantium) 63
Ruṣāfa (ar-) 158
ruḍā = seeing someone in the flesh 51
Sa’d b. Abī Waqqās az-Zuhri 148, 150 151
Sa’d b. I. b. ‘Ar. b. ‘Afw az-Zuhri 84, 154, 156
Sa’d b. I. b. S. b. I. b. ‘Ar. b. ‘Afw az-Zuhri 154, 236
Sa’d b. as-Salt 234
Sa’d b. ‘Ubayd az-Zuhri 149
ṣadq = controversial qualification of a transmitter meaning literally ‘veracious’ 37, 171, 183–8, 198, 200
Safwān b. ‘Assāl 69, 70
Safwān b. Ḳisā az-Zuhri 155, 156
Safwān b. Sulaym az-Zuhri 47, 149
ṣahāb(s), saḥāba, see Companion(s)
ṣāhib hadith = someone concerned with hadith 23, 33, 230
ṣāhib samar = hosting nocturnal (hadith) sessions 235
ṣāhib sunna = someone concerned with a sunna 223, 225, 232
ṣahifa = early written hadith collection 5, 6, 24, 155, 157
ṣalih = sound (adj.) passim
Ṣaḥḥ of Bukhārī 106, 155
Ṣaḥḥ of Muslim 25, 105, 112, 155, 168
Sahl b. ‘Ar. b. ‘Afw az-Zuhri 153
Sahl b. ‘Abd ar-Rahmān as-Sindī 232
Sahl (or Suhayl) b. Abī Farqad 50, 219
Sahl b. Abī ʿṣ-Sāl 219
ṣaww = inattentiveness (in the salaṭ) 111, 112
Ṣāʾib b. Yazid ibn Ukhṭ an-Namīr (as-) 78
Sāʾid ‘cluster’ 145, 146
Sāʾid b. ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz 45
Sāʾid b. Abī b. ‘Al. az-Zubaydī 233
Sāʾid b. ‘Abd ar-Rahmān az-Zuhri 149
Sāʾid b. Abī Arūba 22, 164
Sāʾid b. Abī Saʾd al-Maqbūrī 43, 81, 82, 146
Sāʾid b. Jubbayr 15, 165
Sāʾid b. Khālid az-Zuhri 149
Sāʾid b. Manṣūr 170
Sāʾid b. Marsūq 123
Sāʾid b. Muhammad az-Zuhri 149
Sāʾid b. al-Musayyab 15–17, 33, 37, 42, 53, 54, 56, 59, 75, 82, 112, 115, 156, 162, 165
Sāʾid b. Yāsār 170
Sāʾid az-Zubayrī 233
ṣaj = rhyming prose 121
Ṣājjī (Zakariyyā b. Yahyā as-) 183, 241
Sakhāwī (Shams ad-Dīn Abū l-Khayr M. b. ‘Ar. as-) 69
**Index**

**wudu'** = minor ritual ablution 43, 121

Wuhayb b. Khalid 178

Yahyā b. 'Abd al-Hamīd 22

Yahyā b. 'Abd ar-Rahmān al-Arhabī 224

Yahyā b. Abī Kathīr 164, 170, 222

Yahyā b. 'Al. b. Kurz Abū Kurz 224, 231

Yahyā b. Aktham 85

Yahyā b. 'Alā' 157

Yahyā b. Ayyūb 88

Yahyā b. ad-Dirays 233

Yahyā b. Jābir 227

Yahyā b. Ma'in 20, 60, 61, 62, 101, 122, 136, 144, 157–9, 165–7, 169–72, 175, 180, 181, 186, 193, 200, 210, 211, 238, 240, 243

Yahyā b. Ma'mūn al-Ḥadramī 80

Yahyā b. M. b. 'Az. b. 'U. b. 'Ar. b. 'Awf az-Zuhri 153

Yahyā b. al-Mutawakkil 145

Yahyā b. Sa'īd al-Ansirī 65, 84, 227

Yahyā b. Sa'īd al-Fārisī 234

Yahyā b. Sa'īd al-Qaṭṭān 20, 29, 122, 134, 163–7, 169, 170, 174, 183, 185, 186, 212, 238, 243

Yahyā b. Sulaym 113

Yahyā b. Yahyā b. Qays 36, 231

Yahyā b. Ya'mār 21, 226, 250

Yahyā b. Yazīd at-Tujibī 232

Yahyā b. Zakariyyā' b. Abī Źā'ida 22, 230

Yamāma 91, 236

Ya'qūb b. I. b. S. b. I. b. 'Ar. b. 'Awf az-Zuhri 149, 154, 155, 158, 191, 192

Ya'qūb b. Ḫishāq al-Harawī 243

Ya'qūb b. M. b. Ḫisāb b. 'Abd al-Malik b. Ḫumayyād b. 'Ar. b. 'Awf az-Zuhri 154, 156

Ya'qūb b. al-Qa'qā' 230

Ya'qūb b. Shayba 183, 185, 239

Yaṣīd b. Abān 220, 222

Yaṣīd b. Abī Habīb 22, 23, 80, 237

Yaṣīd b. Abī Mālik 83

Yaṣīd b. Hārūn 110, 181

Yaṣīd b. Ibrāhīm 222

Yaṣīd b. M. b. Ḫisāb Abū Zakariyyā' 241

Yaṣīd b. Muslim al-Hamādī 46

Yaṣīd b. Sa'īd b. Thumāmā 78

Yaṣīd b. at-Ṭūfayl at-Tujibī 228

Yemen 22, 36, 43, 66, 236

Yūnūs b. Khābīb 200

Yūnūs b. Nāfi 230

Yūnūs b. Rāshīd 226

Yūnūs b. 'Ubayd 52, 53, 196

Zabīd 236

Zāfīr b. Sulaymān 234

Zahāwī (Amjad az-) 191

ẓāhid (plural zuhdad) = ascetic 187, 188, 218, 220

Zā'īda b. Qudāma 182

ẓakāt precepts = Islam's earliest taxation system 24

Zakariyyā' b. Durayd 47

Zayd b. 'Alī b. Ḥusayn b. 'Alī 102, 106, 118

Zayd b. Arqam 129

Zayd b. Aslām 115

Zayd b. al-Ḥawārī 222, 226

Zayd b. al-Hubāb 67

Zayd b. Thābit 40, 78, 86

zung = Zoroastrian; in general: heretic 178

Zīr b. Hubaysh 61, 69

Ziyād cclus" 50, 145

Ziyād b. 'Abd Allāh 222

Ziyād b. 'Al. b. 'Ulātha 226

Ziyād b. 'Ar. al-Lakhmī 67

Ziyād b. Ḫisāb 61

Ziyād b. Ismā'il al-Makhdūmī 85

Ziyād b. Maymūn 68, 222

ziyādat = additions 183

Zubayd b. al-Ḥarīth 60

Zubayr b. 'Adī (az-) 225

Zubayr b. al-'Awāmm (az-) 109, 126, 127

Zubayr b. Bakkar (az-) 85

Zubayr b. 'Ubayd (az-) 143

zuhd = asceticism 187, 188, 238

Zuhra 150, 151

Zuhra (Banda) 148, 149–54, 155


Zurārā b. Mus'ab b. 'Ar. b. 'Awf az-Zuhri 148, 150, 154