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ABSTRACT

A number of modern Western writers have discussed in more or less detail the origins of hadith. One of them is G. H. A. Juynboll, who claims that he adopts a new approach and comes up with new conclusions regarding the subject. His main theory is that the prophetic hadiths which are to be found in later hadith collections are, mainly, a development of the products of the early authorities. The beginning of the transmission of hadith, according to him, came into existence as late as toward the end of the first century.

This thesis is an examination of Juynboll's approach to the subject. It consists of two parts; the first part investigates the following five issues, which Juynboll adduces to support the above chronology:

1. Awa'il evidence;
2. The chronology of the growth of traditions;
3. The origin of the concept 'prophetic sunna';
4. The earliest development of the hadith centres;
5. A tentative chronology of talab al-ilm.

The second part deals with various aspects of the early hadith, as Juynboll visualizes it, which are discussed in the
first chapter of his *Muslim tradition* and other associated articles. In this part a scrutiny is made of the study of two *mutawâtir hadiths* in which Juynboll attempts to prove that even *tawâtur* gives no guarantee of the authenticity of *hadith*. Finally, a comparison is made of Juynboll's views on the subject with those of his predecessors.
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INTRODUCTION

One of the latest Western writers to concern himself with the origins of the transmission of *hadith* is G. H. A. Juynboll. His most important work on *hadith* is his *Muslim tradition: Studies in chronology, provenance and authorship of early hadith*. In the first chapter of this book, which is entitled "A tentative chronology of the origins of Muslim tradition", he formulates his hypothesis on the origins of *hadith*. He believes that although some materials may come from the time of the Prophet, *hadith*, in general, originated in the generation of the Successors. In his summary of this chapter, he raises three questions which he thinks should be asked in connection with the early *hadith* and he gives his answers to them:

"1. Where did a specific *hadith* originate?

Probably in the region where the traditionist mentioned at the Successor's level in its *isnād* 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 isnād 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 hadīth originated in the region where the Companion of its isnād 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." (Tradition, p.71)

2. When did a specific hadīth originate?

... 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. ... But the overall majority of allegedly the most ancient traditions is likely to have originated 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)." (Tradition, p.72-73)

3. Who may be held responsible for bringing a tradition into circulation?
... 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 hadīth 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 Ḥasan al- Баṣri 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."(Tradition, p. 73)

In Juynboll's view, the materials that were circulated during the first century, especially those of the quṣṣāṣ whose work, according to him, foreran the transmission of hadīth, and those of the fuqahā and the ʿulamā, were developed to be prophetic hadīth. Fabrication of hadīth did start, as he
says, immediately after the prophet's death, if not even before. The above mentioned are considered, in Juynboll's thesis, as the earliest materials which preceded the transmission of hadith. In his own words, he says: "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 quṣṣāṣ.

Parallel with this phenomenon we find fuqahā and also ʿulamā, 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. . . . The activities of fuqahā and ʿulamā also developed into what later came to be called hadith transmission.

The first stories (qiṣṣaṣ, aḥādīth) related by the quṣṣāṣ probably contained tarhib wa-targhib and fadāʾil/mathālib elements. The contents of the statements and opinions disseminated by the fuqahā and to a certain extent also those spread by the ʿulamā 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." (Tradition,
p.74)

Expressing his doubt over the hadiths which are contained
in the hadith collections as only a reflection of the sayings and
opinions of the Companions and Successors which by means of
raf‘ were raised to the level of prophetic sayings, he says:
"We have seen that the need for traditions traced all the way
back to Muḥammad only began to be emphasized under 'Umar
II (reigned 99-101/717-20) and that only as a consequence 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 therefore 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 isnād ending in that Companion or, for that matter, any other old authority other than the prophet himself."( Tradition, p. 72)

In this chapter, Juynboll adduces various arguments, in order to prove that the earliest origins of hadith transmission only began to exist toward the end of the first century, concentrating on the five following matters:

1. Awā'il evidence;
2. The chronology of the growth of traditions;
3. The origin of the concept 'prophetic sunna';
4. The earliest development of the hadith centres;
5. A tentative chronology of talab al-īlm.

My thesis will be confined to the first chapter and other associated articles plus an examination of chapter three of the
book in which he attempts to prove how even *tawātur* gives no guarantee of the authenticity of *ḥadīth*, a chapter which provides a practical application of his theory of the late origin of *ḥadīth*.

I have divided my thesis into two parts. In the first part, which consists of five chapters, I have examined, in the same order, the five issues which, Juynboll contends, support his hypothesis of the late origin of *ḥadīth*. In the second part, I have dealt with some aspects of *ḥadīth* which are discussed in Juynboll's work:

Juynboll’s thesis of the *quṣṣāṣ* and the *fuqahā‘* as the two main categories whose materials constituted the developing *ḥadīth* transmission;

the beginning of *iṣnād* and its association with the *fitnah*, with some focus on the idea of the ‘growing backwards’ of the *iṣnād*;

the two *mutawāṭir ḥadīths* chosen by Juynboll to demonstrate how even *tawātur* cannot guarantee the authenticity of *ḥadīth*;

A discussion of Juynboll's evidence for some features of the early *ḥadīth*, in particular local character and the ‘age trick’.

Finally I have compared Juynboll's findings and views with those of his predecessors, and then I give my conclusions. At the end of the thesis I list, in an appendix, the names and
origins of the *hadith* transmitters used in determining the origins of *isnâds*. A bibliography is given in which the works and sources which I have used and consulted in this study are arranged in alphabetical order.

The main reason which motivated me to choose Juynboll's approach to the subject is his claim of having formulated new views on it. He declares that, in doing his research, although he was influenced by the work of some modern Writers, in particular Goldziher and Schacht, he did not expose himself to the influence of his predecessors until his research was complete. The research, he says, led him to take a point of view regarding the origins of *hadith* between those of "Muslim and western scholarship". "As I see it, the sources appear to have provided me with sufficient evidence to maintain a position between the extremes". (*Tradition*, p. 1)

My primary intention here is not to establish the authenticity of *hadith*, as such, but to assess Juynboll's approach to it and to discuss it with respect to the direction from which Juynboll approaches it.
PART ONE

THE EVIDENCE FOR THE ORIGINS OF

ḤADĪTH TRANSMISSION
In the present part are discussed the five issues, in five chapters, which have been mentioned in the introduction, in which Juynboll approaches the origins of the transmission of ḥadīth and proposes the date of its beginning as late as towards the end of the first century. These chapters are:

1. Awā'il reports as evidence;
2. Juynboll's hypothesis of the growth of ḥadīths;
3. The prophetic sunnah;
4. Early ḥadīth activities;
5. Ṭalāb al-ʿilm.

My examination of these issues and Juynboll's approach to them has led me to a different conclusion.
CHAPTER ONE

AWĀ'IL REPORTS AS EVIDENCE

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE AWĀ'IL REPORTS

The first evidence that Juynboll adduces to support his view that the transmission of ḥadīth only began at a late date is the awā'il reports on the subject. He says of this type of material: "... 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". (1) Juynboll produces no examples to show in what respects the awā'il literature differs from 'other works on early Islamic history', as far as exaggeration is concerned, nor does he offer any reasons why this should be so. My point here is not to dismiss the significance of the awā'il reports, but to inquire why they should be considered more valuable than these other works. The awā'il reports concerning the transmission of ḥadīth are ascribed to later
scholars, who sometimes present contradictory accounts. (2) Juynboll says, in appraisal of the early reports, "... 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". (3) So in view of this statement, some of the awâ'il reports are not to be totally accepted. (4) However, Juynboll does not discuss the historical reliability of individual awâ'il reports, or indicate what his criteria are for this.

However, supposing that we accept that the awâ'il evidence is significant in determining the origin of hadith, how far does this evidence support Juynboll's view of the late beginning of its transmission. After an examination of his treatment of this issue, one is bound to conclude that these reports do not disprove the early beginning of the transmission of hadith. In fact, some of the awâ'il reports, which do not figure in Juynboll's argument, would suggest the opposite of his view.
A DISCUSSION OF THE AWA'IL REPORTS IN JUYNBOLL'S ARGUMENT

Juynboll begins this section by adducing the awā'il reports regarding the first quṣṣāṣ whose activities, according to him, foreshadowed the transmission of ḥadīth. He also alludes to the activities of the early fuqahā' whose personal opinions, he believes, later developed into prophetic ḥadīth. These he considers to be the two main categories of material that were the predecessors of the ḥadīth literature. In part two a full discussion will be devoted to this, and in chapter 4 of this part an extensive investigation of ḥadīth activities among the Companions and the Successors will be presented.

Except for the three reports concerning isnād, which will be discussed below, the awā'il reports adduced in Juynboll's argument deal mostly with the introduction of ḥadīth to various conquered regions, and with the development of the organization and compilation of ḥadīth material. For example, he mentions reports regarding those who were the first, during the second century or later, to compile organized ḥadīth collections whether with a general or a particular orientation: musnad collections and sahīh collections. This kind of
report has no relevance, in my view, to the issue of the early or late beginning of the transmission of hadith; the question here is whether or not the material in the first structured collections can be shown to exist before the time of the authors of these collections. The abundant material concerning the activities of the Companions and Successors in oral and/or written transmission of the hadith, and the reasonable amount of material that suggests that the writing down of hadith had already begun during the Prophet’s lifetime,(6) may surely be taken as evidence that the transmission of hadith was a notable feature of the first century. What, then, is the relevance of the reports regarding the first compilers of organized collections of hadith to the early beginning of its transmission? Moreover, other awā’il reports which will be given below, suggest that activity concerned with hadith did indeed take place at an early date.

However, despite the fact that many of the awā’il reports have no value as evidence for the late beginning of the transmission of hadith, it may be argued that some of them are relevant. Let us examine here some examples other than those that will be adduced on the subject of isnād later.

Juynboll refers to an awā’il report which describes al-Bukhārī (d. 256) as the first to compile a sahih collection; he
says, "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". (7) This report concerns the first collection to be exclusively devoted to sound hadiths. Others argue that Mālik (d. 179) was the first to compile a collection of sound hadith. (8) In any case, whether it was Mālik or al-Bukhāri who was the first, it makes no difference to the authenticity of the hadith, provided that their material descended by isnād in oral and/or written transmission. Another of Juynboll's reports is that which describes al-Nadr b. Shumayl (d. 204) as the first to propagate (azhara) the sunnah in Marw and the whole of Khurāsān. (9) In fact, the context of this report makes it clear that sunnah here is not meant to refer to hadith material. It is the opposite of bid'ah, "innovation". Khurāsān was well-known for the innovative ideas that appeared there, for example, the Jahmiyyah. (10) Al-Nadr is described in a report as being an adherent of sunnah. (11) Moreover, in the rijāl lexica, one encounters numerous earlier transmitters and scholars engaged in hadith transmission who settled in Khurāsān or spent some time there. In addition to mentioning some Companions who went there, Ibn Sa'd gives the names of their successors who were there, among whom are Abū
Mijlaz (d. between 100 and 109), ʻAtā al-Khurāsānī (d. 135), Yahyā b. Yaʻmur (d. 129), and ʻAbd Allāh b. al-Mubārak (d. 181). al-Dāhhāk b. Muzāhim (d. 105) went to Khurāsān, where he resided and related hadith. Al-Shābī, the famous Successor, stayed in Khurasān ten months. ʻAlqamah b. Qays, a Kufan Successor (d. 62-73), was in different parts of Khurāsān for some years. Nasr b. ʻImrān (d. 124-128), a Basran Successor, lived in Nisābūr, then Marw, and finally died in Sarakhs.

Another example is that which Juynboll quotes from Tahdhib al-Tahdhib: "Yazid b. Abi Ḥabib, 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 credited with having been the first to discuss ḥalāl wa-ḥarām matters and issues of a more general nature". Let us examine this report in the source to which Juynboll refers us:

Ibn Sa'd says: "He was the mufti of the people of Egypt in his time; he was prudent and intelligent, and he was the first to propagate al-ʻilm in Egypt and discussion of al-ḥalāl wa-al-ḥarām and legal questions."
In this context the word *al-`ilm* here means علم الفقه. al-Suyūṭi cites this report when he describes Yazid as the first to propagate علم الفقه in Egypt. While Juynboll here makes the word `ilm in this passage refer to 'traditions of any sort', he translates it elsewhere as "knowledge" in the wider sense. In fact, in one place he asserts that it refers to historical reports rather than hadith. At any rate, even assuming that we accept Juynboll's interpretation of this statement, we find that the report, which does not appear in the *Tabaqât*, is hardly consistent with what Ibn Sa`d says there concerning Yazid b. Abī Ḥabib. Listing the transmitters who were in Egypt, Ibn Sa`d mentions first some of the Companions who settled there, among them `Abd Allāh b. `Amr, who is well known for his activities in the transmission of hadith. After this Ibn Sa`d mentions those who were so engaged after these pioneers, divided into various tiers according to their period. Yazid b. Abī Ḥabib comes at the beginning of the third tier.

**AWĀ`IL REPORTS UNFAVOURABLE TO JUYNBOLL'S ARGUMENT**

In the same sources which Juynboll consults, there are various awā`il reports indicating the early origins of hadith or
contradicting Juynboll's view regarding this. However, since some of these are mentioned, but left out of account, by Juynboll, and others are not mentioned at all, it seems appropriate to examine some of them here.

There is an *awā'il* report that al-Shābī said:

> the first who put lies in the mouth of the Prophet was 'Abd Allāh b. Saba (d. c. 40). (24) It would be in contradiction to the ideas held by Juynboll that fabrication and forgery most probably began immediately after the death of the Prophet, if not before. (25)

In his argument to show the late use of *isnād*, Juynboll adduces a report attributed to Ibn Sirīn, which runs: (26)

Juynboll maintains that by the word fitnah in this report is meant the civil strife between the Umayyads and Ibn al-Zubayr. (27) Moreover he holds the view that Ibn al-Zubayr's revolt is "the first event of this kind generally referred to as fitna." (28) " The term fitna for the civil war ensuing from the killing of 'Uthmān came into use only at a relatively late date, probably several decades after 110/728, the year in which
Ibn Sirin died: \( (29) \) In his article "The date of the great \( \text{fitna} \)", Juynboll adduces an \( \text{awā'il} \) report, which occurs in al-Bukhārī's \( \text{Ṣaḥīḥ} \), attributed to Saʿīd b. al-Musayyab. This report runs: \( (30) \)

وقال الليث عن يحيى بن سعيد عن سعيد بن المسيب "وقت الفتنة الأولى - يعني مقتل عثمان - فلم تبق من أصحاب بدر أحدا، ثم وقت الفتنة الثانية - يعني الخرجة - فلم تبق من أصحاب الحديثية أحدا، ثم وقت الثالثة فلم ترفع للناس طباخ.

Juynboll dismisses this report. He says: "the report is an obvious forgery. Not only does Saʿīd (d. between 93/712 and 100/718) appear in numerous spurious \( \text{isnāds} \), but also the factual content of the remark is unfounded." \( (31) \) However, in an excursus to his later article "Muslim's introduction to his \( \text{Ṣaḥīḥ} \)", he does again discuss this report. He finds another version of it appearing in an earlier source, 'Abd al-Razzāq's \( \text{Muṣannaf} \). This report runs: \( (32) \)

معمر عن يحيى بن سعيد عن ابن المسيب قال: نارت الفتنة الأولى فلم بيق من شهد بدر أحدا، ثم كانت الفتنة الثانية فلم بيق من شهد الحديثية أحد. قال وأظن لو كانت الثا لثة لم ترفع وفي الناس طباخ.

The explanatory remarks which appear in the later version are not found in the earlier. Juynboll understands from this report that, when the first \( \text{fitna} \) occurred, there was
no one alive of those who had fought at the Battle of Badr. The explanatory remark in al-Bukhari's version contradicts, he thinks, what we know to be the case, that "when 'Uthmân was murdered, quite a few of those who fought at Badr were still alive". So in view of the version of 'Abd al-Razzāq's Muṣannaf, Juynboll believes that the explanatory remarks are a later insertion. "And taken thus, without the idrāj, the words fa-lam tubqi min āshâb Badrin aḥadan constitute in actual fact a quite accurate dating of al-fitna al-ūlā", which he takes to mean Ibn al-Zubayr's fitnah, because all those who had fought at Badr were dead before the fitnah of Ibn al-Zubayr occurred. (33) Concluding his argument regarding this report, Juynboll says: "It is safe, I think, to assume that the incorrect, and therefore misleading, idrāj, ya'ni maqtal 'Uthmân, can be dated roughly to the time between the years of death of the compilers, that is 'Abd ar-Razzāq b. Hammām for the older version who died in 211/827 and, for the later version, Bukhāri who died in 256/870. It is true that there are many unambiguous reports in which the first fitna in Islam is identified with the political upheaval resulting from 'Uthmân's murder, reports which are also listed in 'Abd ar-Razzāq's Muṣannaf, but the mere fact that a report indicating Ibn az-Zubayr's coup as the first fitna has survived at all leads
me to believe that in actual fact that is what at least the Muslims of the first/seventh and possibly the first few decades of the second/eighth century considered it to be." (34)

Below, I will explain how neither the dating of this remark nor the analysis of this report made by Juynboll are any longer tenable. However, be that as it may, this report is still attributed to the same person, Sa‘id b. al-Musayyab; this attribution was one of the two reasons which enabled Juynboll to label the later version as an obvious forgery in his first discussion of it. The other unambiguous reports which Juynboll alludes to are also attributed to authorities who lived during the first century. We may cite some of them here:

الزهرى قال: ... وكان يعد في العرب حتى ثارت الفتنة الأولى خمسة ، يقال لهم ذوو رأي العرب ومكيتهم ، يعد من قريش معاوية وعمرو ...

"...Until the time when the first fitnah erupted, five persons among the Arabs were considered worthy to be called ' those who judge and plan for the Arabs!'" From Quraysh, Mu‘awiyah and ‘Amr were included ..."(35)

قال الزهرى: ... أما بعد ، فان الفتنة الأولى ثارت وأصحاب رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - من شهد بدرا كثير .

- al-Zuhri said: "... then, the first fitnah erupted and there
were many of the Companions of the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) who had fought at Badr..." (36)

Ibn Sa'd narrated, on the authority of Khālid b. Samir, that Musā Ibn Ṭalḥah described Ibn ʿUmar: "... By Allah, Quraysh could not provoke him in its first fitnah. I said to myself: 'This man is blaming his father for his death'." (37)

Ahmad narrated that Habib b. Maslamah came to Qays b. Sa'd b. ʿUbādah during the first fitnah, riding a horse... (38)

Hudhayfah b. al-Yamān describes the murder of ʿUthmān: "Indeed, it was the first of the fitan." (39)

Murrah al-Ṭayyib said: "When the first fitnah occurred, Allāh protected him from [taking part in] it, and when the fitnah of Ibn al-Zubayr occurred, he was protected from [taking part in] it." (40)

Turning back to Ibn al-Musayyab's report, the words

وقت الفتنة الأولى - يعني مقتل عثمان - فلم تبق من أصحاب بدر أحدا...
do not mean that when the fitnah occurred all those who had fought at Badr were already dead. One of the commentators on this report, al-Dāwūdi, thought it meant that when ʿUthmān was killed, all those who fought at Badr were also murdered at that time. Therefore, it was wrong to consider the first fitnah as the one of ʿUthmān; it would be rather the one in which al-Ḥusayn was killed. al-Qistīlānī and Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī dispute this because there was no one alive from al-Badriyyīn at that time. They say that it does not mean that they were killed between the time of the killing of ʿUthmān, but it means that they had died between the fitnah at the killing of ʿUthmān and the fitnat al-Ḥarraḥ. (41) Juynboll’s dating for the explanatory remarks, we shall see, is no longer tenable. The remark on al-fitnah al-ūlā appears in al-Muwatta’ of Mālik (Shaybānī’s version), (42) a source which is earlier than the Muṣannaf of ʿAbd al-Razzāq:

وقعت الفتنة - يعني فتنة عثمان فلم يبق من أهل بدر أحد ، ثم وقعت فتنة المهرة فلم يبق من أصحاب الخديبية أحد ، فإن وقعت الثالثة لم يبق با لناس طباخ.

But the crucial question is whether it is justifiable for Juynboll to conclude that remarks that appear in al-Bukhārī are later insertions, because he finds a version of the report that appears in an earlier source where there is no mention of
these remarks. In fact, we find that the version of ‘Abd al-Razzāq does appear in a late source, later than al-Bukhāri, just as it appears in al-Muṣannaf, without the explanatory remarks. (43) The report appears in early sources in various versions. e.g.:

Finally, the explanatory remarks derive not from Saʿīd b. al-Musayyab himself but from his pupil, Yahyā b. Saʿīd. (44)
Dealing with the recording of *hadith*, Juynboll adduces *awā'il* reports regarding those who made organized collections who died in the middle of the second century and later. He comments on this that "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". (45) There seems to be no connection between the existence of *isnād* and the first organized collections. Nevertheless, there is a famous *awā'il* report which describes al-Zuhri (d. 124) as the first to record *al-ilm*. (46)

So, if we add this report to Juynboll's conviction that *isnād* began late in the first century, and his acceptance of the report concerning al-Zuhri being the first to make consistent use of *isnād*, (47) we find a clear indication that *isnād* and recording the *hadith* go hand-in-hand from the beginning. Juynboll is aware of the above report. He cites it, but not in the *Awā'il* section, and says that al-Zuhri "is recorded to have been the first to make an organized collection of all the *ilm* he could find." (48) Furthermore, Juynboll himself mentions the two reports side by side when he speaks about al-Zuhri somewhere else: "... Zuhri was allegedly the first to make a systematic collection of *hadith* and all other *āthār* 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."(49)

In addition to this *awā'il* report, Juynboll also neglects in the *awā'il* argument the highly significant one regarding the writing down of the *ḥadith* during the prophet's lifetime:

> أخرج الخطيب من طريق عطاء عن عبد الله بن عمرو بن العاص، أَتْهَرَأْنَ: يا رسول الله إن نسمع منك أحاديث، أفتناذن أن أكتبها؟ قال: نعم. فكان أول ما كتب.

- *Abd Allāh b. Amr b. al-Āṣ* said: "oh Messenger of Allāh, we hear *ahādith* from you, will you permit me to write them down? He said: Yes. Thus, it was the first to be written down. This can also be read: it was the first that he wrote down.(50)

There are also reports regarding the first to compile the biography of the Prophet. One report describes ʿUrwah (d. 94) as the first to compile *Maghāzī*.(51) Another report gives al-Zuhri as the first to compile *Siyyar*. (52) In other report, however, it is said that Ibn Ishāq was the first author in this genre.(53)

In dealing with the *awā’il* pertaining to the examination
and criticism of Isnād, Juynboll disregards various reports.

He adduces a report in which al-Shābī (d. 103-10) is credited with being the first to examine the transmitters of hadith. He says: "The first systematic examination of informants ever recorded is reported to have occurred in Kūfa when Shābī (d.103-10/721-8) interrogated ar-Rabī‘ b. Khuthaym as to his informant regarding a certain hadith. However, Ibn Hibbān consider ʿUmar (d. 23) and ʿAli (d. 40) as the first. Commenting on the practice of them interrogating the transmitters, he says:

وَهَذَا الْأَوَّلُ مِنْ فَتْنَةٍ عَنِ الْرَجُلِ فِي الْرِوَايَةِ، وَبَحْتَا عَنِ النَّقِلِ فِي الْأَخْبَارِ،

"These two were the first to examine the man in the narration and to investigate the transmission of the reports; other people then followed them in this". In another source, Abū Bakr is considered as the first to do this.

Al-Ḥākim enumerates those who showed concern to prevent fabrication on the authority of the Prophet; he records Abū Bakr as the first, then ʿUmar, then ʿAli, then Abd Allāh b. ʿAbbās then ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar...
Juynboll proposes a date for al-Sha'bi's incident: the year of the death of al-Rabi' (d. 61) ' or only a short time earlier'. With respect to this he says: "Ar-Rabi' is said to have died after the battle of Karbala of 61/680, so the 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 (. . .) - 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
that he 'did not reach (in Arabic: lam yudrik) [the time when] 'Āṣim b. 'Adi [was still alive].' This 'Āṣim 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 (...) 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 Başra or Küfa."(58)

Despite all the sources and reports which assert that al-Sha'bi's birth took place either in 19, 20 or 31,(59) Juynboll contends that it was in '40/660 or a little later'. In part two I have dealt with Juynboll's theory of the 'age trick', but if he accepts that al-Sha'bi might have died in his seventies, as he suggests in the passage, he could have been born in 31. To support his proposition for the date of birth of al-Sha'bi, he cites Ibn Ḥajar's quotation in Tahdhib al-Tahdhib. In fact, this statement, which is only partially quoted in Tahdhib, comes from Abū Ḥātim, who states clearly in the same passage that al-Sha'bi saw 'Ali b. Abi Ṭālib (d. 40).(60) At any rate, interrogation of transmitters is recorded in various reports in which early Companions applied it to their informants, as the awā'il reports, mentioned above, point out and attribute the initiation of this practice to them. The Successors followed
them in this and we find Successors not only questioned other Successors about their material, as al-Sha‘bi did, but also Companions. For instance, Abidah with Ali b. Abi Talib,(61) Marwan b. al-Hakam with Yusuf b. Abd Allah b. Salam,(62) Sa‘id b. al-Musayyab with Sa‘d b. Abi Waqqas,(63) Urwah b. al-Zubayr with Abu Humayd al-Sadi,(64) and Abd al-Rahman b. Abd Rabb al-Kabah with Abd Allah b. Amr b. al-‘As.(65)

Juynboll also quotes a report in which Shubah b. al-Hajjaj (d. 160) is given as the first critic of isnād. He further says: “Since Shu‘ba allegedly occupied himself with collecting traditions for the last thirty years or so of his life, we can assume the starting date of systematic rijal criticism in Islam to be about 130/747.”(66) In fact, the report which Juynboll alludes to is not about collecting hadiths but propagating them: (67) Shubah started collecting hadith in his early life. It is reported that he heard hadith from al-Hakam b. Utaybah (d. 113-115), ten years before Sufyan did so.(68) Qatada (d. 117-118) even used to ask Shubah about his own hadith.(69) However, other awā’il reports give other earlier people, and, indeed, one puts Shubah in third place. These also are known
to Juynboll. (70) One of them describes Ibn Sirin (d.110) as "the first to criticise the transmitters and to distinguish between the reliable ones and the others." (71) In another report, Ibn al-Madini (d.234) is recorded to have said: "we do not know of anyone prior to Muḥammad b. Sirin that scrutinized the ḥadīth and examined the isnād. Then there were Ayyūb and Ibn ʿAwn; then there was Shuʿbah, then Yaḥyā b. Saʿd and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān [b. Mahdi]." (72)

In conclusion, from the foregoing it becomes clear that the awāʾil reports adduced by Juynboll do not affect the question of the early existence of ḥadīth. Indeed, if we take the awāʾil evidence at face value, it appears rather to indicate that ḥadīth had early origins.
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كان من بنظر في الحديث ويفتش من الإسناد، لا تعلم أحداً أول منه: محمد بن سيرين ثم كان أيوب
وابان عون ثم كان قنبرة ثم كان يحيى بن معبد وعبد الرحمن.
CHAPTER TWO

JUYNBOLL'S HYPOTHESIS OF THE GROWTH OF HADĪTH

In the second section of his first chapter, "The chronology of the growth of traditions", Juynboll investigates the material of the four Rightly Guided caliphs in the Ṭabaqāt of Ibn Saʿd as compared with their musnads in some of the earliest hadith collections. He reaches two main conclusions:

In Ibn Saʿd's tarjamahs of these caliphs, there is hardly any material transmitted on their authority which could be considered as a hadith; they relied almost entirely on their own personal judgement rather than following the example of the Prophet.

A comparison of their musnads in the earliest hadith collections suggests that it was in Iraq that the aḥādīth developed and significantly increased in number.

AL-KHULAFĀʾ AL-RĀSHIDŪN AND THEIR MATERIAL IN ṬABAQĀT IBN SAʿD

Juynboll details his findings in Ibn Saʿd's Tabaqāt concerning the first three caliphs. These findings are not
On Abū Bakr Juynboll says: "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 *ḥadīth*." (2) I have found thirteen *ḥadīths* on his authority, six of which are repetitions, enlargements or abridgements. (3)

On ʿUmar he says: "In an early historical source, such as Ibn Sa'd's, it appears that ʿUmar hardly figures in traditions relating sayings of the prophet which can also be traced to the classical *ḥadīth* collections". (4) In fact, I have found twenty-two *ḥadīths* which could be traced in the *ḥadīth* collections, six of which are repetitions, etc. (5) On ʿUthmān he says: "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 Ṭabaqāt with the exception of the famous dictum *Man qāla 'alayya mà lam aquil* etc." (6) This is not the case; there is one legal one and some others. In addition to the one mentioned, I have found six, one of which is a repetition. (7) Juynboll does not tell us about the material on ʿAlī in Ibn Saʾd. However, I have found on his authority sixteen *ḥadīths*, four of which are repetitions, etc. (8) My findings represent the caliphs' *ḥadīths* only in their own *tarjamaḥs* and in other sections of the Ṭabaqāt which I
have consulted for other purposes. If the whole of Ibn Sa'd's Tabaqāt were to be examined, the number might be found to be greater. This said, the question may well be asked as to what the significance of the occurrence or non-occurrence of such hadith material in the Tabaqāt is. To it I would feel bound to reply that I see no connection between the growth of hadith in the way in which Juynboll envisages it and such material in Ibn Sa'd. The Tabaqāt is a historical work, as Juynboll knows, and it is not to be expected that hadith material should be present there, unless it is relevant in some way to the events or the actual biographies which Ibn Sa'd deals with. This, in fact, is exactly the case with the hadiths that do occur there.

From his findings, Juynboll draws the conclusion that these caliphs were guided by their own personal judgement rather than scrupulously following the Prophet's example. Commenting on 'Umar's tarjamah in Ibn Sa'd, Juynboll says: "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". On the other hand, commenting on 'Uthmān, he says: "As far as Ibn Sa'd is concerned, 'Uthmān seems to have relied solely on his own judgement. If he was inspired by the prophet, this does not show in the Tabaqāt, 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."(10) How many references does Juynboll need to suggest that the caliphs followed the prophet's example? Even if we pass over the contradiction between these two comments, the question arises as to why Ibn Sa'd should give space to accounts indicating that the caliphs acted according to the example set by the Prophet, any more than to accounts indicating or implying that the caliphs took decisions on problems brought to them contradicting those of the Prophet. It is hardly to be expected that the caliphs should recite a Qur'anic verse or refer to an action of the Prophet in every situation they have to deal with. Since we do not encounter either in Ibn Sa'd reports indicating that the Qur'an played a decisive role in their decision making, we might equally well assume that they relied exclusively on their own personal judgement rather than following the Qur'an.

Finally, we have to consider whether or not Juynboll fairly represents the accounts of the caliphs in Ibn Sa'd in claiming that they relied almost exclusively on their own judgement. As far as Abū Bakr and 'Umar, at least, are concerned, he does not. There are several accounts in Ibn Sa'd which depict these two caliphs as meticulous followers of the Prophet rather
than anything else.

In Abū Bakr's speech just after assuming office, he says:

"Oh people, I have been given authority over you, but I am not the best of you. But the Qur'ān was revealed and the Prophet (s) established al-Sunnah; he taught us and we learned... Oh people I am a follower not an innovator. So if I do right aid me and if I deviate correct me". Ibn Sirīn says: "There was none after the prophet who feared the unknown more than Abū Bakr, and there was none after Abū Bakr who feared the unknown more than 'Umar. Abū Bakr was confronted with a problem for which he could find no principle in the book of Allāh and no suggestion in the Sunnah; so he said; I will apply my own judgement (ra'y) ... (12) After having appointed 'Umar as his successor, Abū Bakr prayed for him to be among the rightly guided caliphs who followed the guidance of the Prophet and his pious followers. (13) Ibn Sa'd also mentions various reports concerning the controversy about the prophet's legacy where Abū Bakr followed the Prophet's words and actions. (14) Aḥmad mentions a version of this story where Abū Bakr said: "I shall not cease doing anything that the Messenger of Allāh (s) used to do; I fear that if I fail to do something that he commanded, I shall go astray." (15) All of
these reports appear in Ibn Sa'd but Juynboll does not mention them.

We may also refer here to a significant report, in another source, illustrating the practice of Abū Bakr in dealing with a problem. He would first search in the Qur'ān and then in the prophetic sunnah. If he did not find anything relevant there, he would ask the community if they knew any prophetic sunnah on that topic. If he was still unsuccessful, he would consult the most prominent men; if they agreed upon a decision, he would apply it. (16)

Juynboll also quotes some passages from Ibn Sa'd on 'Umar. He feels that they "... describe 'Umar as an authoritarian primus inter pares rather than a blindly obeyed despot whose every word and action become law". (17) These passages from the Tabagāt, however, appear to me to be either misinterpreted or irrelevant to Juynboll's inference. Juynboll says: "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 Ramaḍān incumbent upon all Muslims". (18) He misinterprets part of this report. It does not deal with the fast of Ramaḍān, but with certain prayers that ought to be
voluntarily performed during the nights of Ramađān(19) but are not 'incumbent upon all Muslims'. It is hardly necessary to say that the fast of Ramađān was established during the Prophet's lifetime.(20) In other sources, for example, in the earlier work, Mālik's Muwatṭa', we learn that the practice of qiyām Ramađān was established by the prophet himself in the first place and revived by ʿUmar.(21) On the punishment for drinking wine, it is merely the number of lashes that ʿUmar laid down; the punishment had been inflicted by the prophet himself. ʿUmar consulted the people on the question of the number of lashes, and one of the Companions suggested that the lighter of the punishments specified for qadhf in the Qur'ān should be applied.

Commenting on a report of ʿUmar's stressing, on his deathbed, the importance of the ṣalāt, Juynboll says: "Of all religious rites he thought the ṣalāt most important".(22) It seems to me that in the light of the numerous verses in the Qur'ān and of the sizeable number of prophetic hadiths on the subject, there is no need to point out who was the first to think that the ṣalāt was most important. Interestingly enough, we learn from the same reports concerning the stabbing of ʿUmar, in which ʿUmar makes his statement, that those who were present when ʿUmar was stabbed performed their prayer
immediately, despite the shock of this assault, because they were afraid that the time of the prayer would pass. This, of course, occurred before 'Umar made his statement, indicating quite clearly the importance that the Muslims placed on ṣalāt. Juynboll also says: "There are indeed numerous instances when, under a variety of different circumstances and in many different situations, he is alleged to have performed certain ṣalāts, without these reports being meant in the first place as descriptions of exemplary behaviour zealously imitated by his followers." (23) It is difficult to see the force of this remark, since the references he gives are all to ordinary prayers. (24) Juynboll mentions a report that appears in Ibn Sa'd in which 'Umar uses the word sunnah which he takes to mean "the normative behaviour of a good Muslim in the widest sense of the word". (25) In the next section, I give evidence which demonstrate that the word sunnah used by the Companions means the prophetic sunnah.

Next Juynboll deals with 'Umar and the concept of the prophetic sunnah. He badly misinterprets one report concerning 'Umar in regard to this matter. There will be a detailed discussion of this in the following section. Juynboll refers to two reports in Ibn Sa'd to prove that 'Umar was not in favour of the prophetic hadith being spread or written
down. In fact, these reports show 'Umar's caution about the Qur'an and the hadith. Other reports strewn throughout the historical sources reflect this. For example, after taking command 'Umar said: "Tell little on the authority of the Messenger of Allâh (s), unless it relates to some practical matters." Mu'awiyah, the first Umayyad caliph, is reported to have said, "Oh people beware of all hadiths of the Messenger of Allâh (s) other than those that were mentioned during 'Umar's reign; he used to make the people fear God [in this matter]." 'Uthmân once said: "It is not permissible for anyone to transmit a hadith that he did not hear during the time of Abû Bakr or 'Umar. I was not prevented from telling about the Messenger of Allâh by not having the most retentive memory among the Companions for what he said; however, I heard him say: 'He who claims that I said what I did not say has already settled in his place in Hell'. "'Umar himself is reported to have said: "If someone hears a hadith and transmits it as he heard it, he will be safe."

In his discussion, Juynboll refers to reports in Ibn Sa'd of 'Umar following the prophet's example, but he says, "there are just a few." In fact there are some other reports in Ibn Sa'd that he does not mention, but Ibn Sa'd is not the only source that one may turn to in order to trace such reports.
Numerous reports which are similar to these occur in many sources; in these 'Umar is represented as an caliph who was very anxious to follow the Prophet's example whenever possible. However, the number of these reports is irrelevant, in my opinion. It is one of the essential teachings of the Qur'an that the Prophet's exemplary behaviour should be imitated. It is not necessary for the caliphs, as I have said above, to declare that they are following the Qur'an or the Prophet in every action they take. 'Umar once wrote a letter to Abū Mūsā, his governor in Kufah, telling him that he commanded them to do what the Qur'an commanded, and prohibited them from doing what the Prophet prohibited them from. In another report, he advised Shurayh, the famous Iraqi judge, to decide in accordance with the Qur'an; if he found nothing relevant there, then in accordance with the prophetic sunnah; if he found nothing in either of these, then according to the judgement of the upright; if there was no precedent by which they could judge, he should either proceed according to his own opinion or refrain from deciding. The latter course was preferable.

Another feature of 'Umar, associated with the previous one, is that he acquired the reputation of being one who sought other people's opinions, in particular those of the Companions,
on both legal and administrative issues when there were no precedents in either the Qur'ān or the sunnah. Reports of such instances as this occur frequently in the various sources, including Ibn Sa'd's Ṭabaqāt. One report says: "If the people disagree on a matter, consider how 'Umar decided on it, for he never decided on a matter that had not been previously decided on, without consultation". (35) Ibn Sa'd has a number of other reports of 'Umar's consultations. (36)

THE MUSNADS OF THE FOUR CALIPHS IN ḤADITH COLLECTIONS

Juynboll makes a detailed comparison of the number of the ḥadiths of the four rightly guided caliphs in selected early ḥadith collections. These are al-Muwatta of Mālik and the Musnad of al-Ḥumaydī, which are considered as Ḥijāzī collections, and the Musnad of al-Ṭayālīsī, and the Musnad of Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, which are considered as Iraqi collections. He finds that the number of prophetic ḥadiths transmitted through the caliphs is small in the two Ḥijāzī collections. On the other hand, the ḥadiths transmitted through them in the two Iraqi collections is relatively large. He accordingly comes
to the conclusion that it was in Iraq that hadith originated and gradually increased.

However, these collections cannot be considered as representing the whole of their authors' material, let alone the whole of the material that was current in their authors' time. None of the compilers wrote an introduction to his book, saying that it contained all that he had. In fact, there is evidence to show that their collections comprise only small part of the authors' material.

Mālik is reported to have said: "I wrote with my own hand 100,000 hadiths. He first included 9000 or 10,000 of them in al-Muwatta; he later reduced that number gradually to the present number. One famous scholar, Ḥamd b. Sāliḥ, saw the original drafts of Mālik's books and found there approximately 12000 hadiths. Mālik himself states clearly, according to various reports, that he did not relate all the hadiths that he had obtained. Al-Muwatta itself differs in its different versions in the number it contains; one version, Abū Muṣ'ab's, has about 100 hadiths more than the others. A comparison of the caliphs' material in the two versions of the Muwatta which are available to us now, that of Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā and that of al-Shaybānī is instructive. The only hadith of Abū Bakr in the former version does not appear in the
latter, and, while there are three prophetic *hadiths* on the authority of 'Uthmān in Yahyā’s version, only one is found in al-Shaybāni’s version.

Al-Ḥumaydī in Hijāz is compared in the *sunnah* field with Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal in Iraq. Al-Bukhārī, one of his pupils, praises his knowledge in *hadith*; he is reported to have said that al-Ḥumaydī was the Imām in *hadith.* (44) Ibn Saʿd describes him as a reliable authority who acquired a great many *hadiths.* (45) Al-Shāfī‘ī, who was accompanied by al-Ḥumaydī when he went to Egypt, credited al-Ḥumaydī with memorizing, on the authority of Ibn ʿUyaynah alone, 10,000 *hadiths.* (46) Al-Ḥumaydī compiled another book entitled, *al-Nawādir;* this has, unfortunately, not survived, but seems to have contained *hadiths* that are not included in the *Musnad.* (47) We also find *hadiths* on his authority recorded by some of his pupils in their collections which are not included in his *Musnad.* (48) It is apparent, from these various considerations, that al-Ḥumaydī’s *Musnad* cannot be considered as a comprehensive collection of al-Ḥumaydī’s *hadiths.*

To indicate the proliferation of *hadiths* in Iraq, Juynboll makes a comparison between al-Ṭayālīsī’s *Musnad* (d. 203) and Aḥmad’s *Musnad* (d. 241). In fact, there is evidence to
suggest that the author of the former *Musnad* is not al-Ṭayālīsī but a later scholar from Khurāsān who compiled only what one of al-Ṭayālīsī's pupils, Yūnūs b. Ḥabīb, transmitted from him. According to Abū Nu'aym, Abū Mas'ūd al-Rāzī (d. 258) was the compiler of the *Musnad*. However, even if al-Ṭayālīsī was the real author, in reading through his *tarjamaḥ* in *rizāl* works, we find that his *Musnad* represents only a very small part of the material that he possessed. He was renowned for his ability to memorize a huge number of ḥadīths. When he was in Iṣfahān, 40,000 ḥadīths are said to have been written down on his authority, transmitted by memory. He boasted that he could relate 30,000 ḥadīths consecutively, and that he had memorized 12,000 ḥadīths on the authority of ʿUthmān al-Barri; since no one in Basrah was interested in hearing them, he went to Iṣfahān to spread them there. He tells us that he wrote on the authority of 1000 masters. Yūnūs b. Ḥabīb, the transmitter of *Musnad al-Ṭayālīsī*, informs us that, when al-Ṭayālīsī was in Iṣfahān, he dictated from memory 100,000 ḥadīths.

Although the *Musnad* of Aḥmad contains a large amount of the prophetic ḥadīth, being one of the largest collection of ḥadīth, it does not, as pointed out above, represent all the material Aḥmad possessed. A comparison between the
Musnad of Aḥmad and other hadith collections of the same period, including musnad collections which contain far less material, as will be shown below, indicates that a comparison of this kind is not an appropriate method for gauging the growth of hadith.

Juynboll compares books that differ in their purposes. The Muwaṭṭa and the Sahih of Muslim are arranged according to various subjects, with Mālik concentrating particularly on legal matters, and they are greatly concerned with the authenticity of the hadith. The purpose of the musnad collections, on the other hand, is to list the hadith of each Companion separately, regardless of their subject matter or their authenticity. (58) Aḥmad, in particular, tries to make his Musnad an authoritative reference work that may be referred to in case of dispute concerning a hadith. (59) If Mālik or Muslim do not mention a hadith this does not indicate that the hadith did not exist or they did not know it.

To test the method applied by Juynboll for charting the growth of hadith, I have applied it to some other hadith collections, of the same period as those to which he applies it. The outcome of this application indicates that the method is of no use.
Before giving my findings, I shall summarize Juynboll’s, in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hijāzi Collections</th>
<th>Iraqi Collections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the <em>Muwatta</em> of Mālik (d. 179)</td>
<td>the <em>Musnad</em> of al-Ṭayālī (d. 203)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the <em>Musnad</em> of Humaydi (d. 218)</td>
<td>the <em>Musnad</em> of Ahmad (d. 241)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the <em>Sahih</em> of Muslim (d. 261)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hijāzi</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Iraqi</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>79 (38)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 (15)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>304 (123)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15 (14)</td>
<td>131 (57)</td>
<td>17 (16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>819 (450)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The figures between bracket indicate the number of prophetic hadiths without repetition abridgements or enlargements.

* The count made by Juynboll of the prophetic hadiths in the sources is not invariably correct; for example those related by Ahmad via Abū Bakr, without repetition etc. and Abū Bakr’s own sayings, actually amount to 28, not 38.

Thus, because the number of prophetic hadiths traced back through the Caliphs' in the two Hijāzi collections is small, whereas a gradually increasing number is found in the two
Iraqi collections, Juynboll is convinced that the prophetic *hadith* originated and underwent its first major growth in Iraq.

As I have pointed out above, these collections cannot be taken as a true representation of their authors’ total material, let alone of all the material that circulated in their time. In the course of the second half of the second century numerous works on *hadith* were produced, which unfortunately have not survived; if they had, we should have a better picture of the situation concerning the compilation of *hadith* at that time. (60) Ibn Wahb, a famous scholar, originally from Egypt, who associated with Mālik from 148 till his death, more than thirty years later, (61) was well known for his activity in preserving the Ḥijāzi and Egyptian *hadiths*. (62) According to his pupil, Aḥmad b. Ṣāliḥ, he related 100,000 *hadiths*. Abū Zurqāh, a famous critic, looked into 30,000 *hadiths* from Ibn Wahb’s material, without finding a single one which had no basis. (63)

*Al-Muwatta* and Humaydi’s *Musnad* are only two of the few earliest *hadith* collections which have come down to us; we should not judge from them the entire body of *hadith* of their time. As we have seen, the number of the prophetic *hadiths* in Muslim traced back through the two caliphs for
whom Juynboll gives figures is very small: for Abū Bakr five
and for Uthmān seventeen with one repetition; in fact without
the repetitions the number for Uthmān turns out to be only
nine. (64) This certainly cannot represent all of the material
traced back through them at that time, not only as regards
other authors but also as regards Muslim himself. (65) The
question that should be asked here is rather why the number
shrinks from seventy-nine in Aḥmad to five in Muslim and
from one hundred thirty-one in Aḥmad to nine in Muslim. Any
explanation is likely to apply equally to Mālik.

To support my view that to use a few particular hadīth
collections to judge the entire body of the prophetic hadīth at
that time is not an appropriate method, I have made a
detailed investigation of the prophetic hadīths traced back
through the caliphs in other early hadīth collections at the
same time of Juynboll's collections.

If we compare with al-Muwatta' similar works from Iraq,
al-Āthār of Abū Yūsuf (d. 182) and al-Āthār of al-Shaybānī (d.
189 ), we find that the number of prophetic hadīths traced
back through the caliphs is less in the latter two than in the
former.

In Abū Yūsuf there is nothing for Abū Bakr and Uthmān,
only three for 'Umar, (66) and also three for 'Ali with one
further repetition. (67) In al-Shaybāni the case is worse. There is nothing for Abū Bakr and 'Uthmān and only one each for 'Umar (68) and 'Ali. (69) These works do not represent either the amount of material available at that time or the material of the authors themselves. For instance, in his other work al-Kharāj, Abū Yūsuf gives three ḥadīths for Abū Bakr, (70) six, with one further repetition for 'Umar, (71) only one for 'Uthmān (72) and five with one further repetition for 'Ali. (73) The material in al-Kharāj is different from that in al-Āthār.

In al-Yaman, a centre which, like Egypt, 'owed a great deal to Medinese successors', as Juynboll believes, (74) the great scholar 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Ṣan'ānī (d. 211), engaged in ḥadīth activities. The two most important of his works are al-Muṣannaf and al-Jāmi'. The former has survived but not the latter. However, it is highly probable that it contained material different from that in al-Muṣannaf; al-Kattāni describes it as a large collection, and most of the material in it is to be found in the 'six books'. (75) I have examined the eleven volumes of al-Muṣannaf in search of the prophetic ḥadīths traced back through the four Caliphs' in it. The outcome corroborates my hypothesis. There are five ḥadīths for Abū Bakr, (76) sixty-four for 'Umar, of which twenty-five are repetitions, abridgements or enlargements, (77) thirteen for 'Uthmān, of which six are
repetitions, etc. (78) and ninety-two for 'Ali, of which forty are repetitions, etc. (79) This, however, does not represent the entire material that 'Abd al-Razzāq possessed. As indicated above, he had other works, which almost certainly contained additional material. Aḥmad, a pupil of 'Abd al-Razzāq has in his Musnad hadiths on the authority of the caliphs which he heard directly from 'Abd al-Razzāq, but which cannot be found in al-Muṣannaf. For instance, he mentions two hadiths in the musnad of Abū Bakr which are not found in al-Muṣannaf. (80)

In two Musnad collections compiled at the same time as Aḥmad's, the number of the prophetic hadiths traced back through the caliphs is very small in comparison with that in Aḥmad's Musnad. In Musnad Al-Šaḥabah, compiled by Aḥmad's contemporary, Ibn Abi Shaybah (d. 235), who is not merely Iraqi but specifically from Kufah, we find nineteen hadiths for Abū Bakr, (81) sixty-six for 'Umar, (82) thirty-five for 'Uthmān, (83) one hundred seventy for 'Alī. (84) In al-Muntakhab, a Musnad compiled by 'Abd b. Ḥumayd (died 249, one decade after Aḥmad), the number is not only very small in comparison with that in Aḥmad's Musnad, but it is also small, for some of the caliphs, in comparison with that in the earlier collections, al-Ṭayālisi and 'Abd al-Razzāq. He gives seven for
Abū Bakr, (85) thirty-seven for ʿUmar, (86) eighteen for ʿUthmān (87) and thirty-four for ʿAlī. (88) A definitive example of such variations between different works of the same author may be seen in two works of the later al-Dāraqūṭnī (d. 385). (89)

Finally, I compared the material in ʿAbd al-Razzāq's Musannaf with that in Ḥumaydi's Musnad and Ahmād's Musnad for the two caliphs Abū Bakr and ʿUthmān. (90) I found that while none of the five hadiths of Abū Bakr in ʿAbd al-Razzāq could be traced in Ḥumaydi, who died one decade after ʿAbd al-Razzāq, all except one are in Ahmād. Excluding the repetitions, there are seven hadiths on the authority of ʿUthmān in ʿAbd Al-Razzāq. Only one of them appears in Ḥumaydi. However all of them are found in Ahmād. All of the eleven hadiths have Ḥijāzi isnāds except one. This seems to suggest that Iraq has nothing to do with the explanation of the sizeable number of hadiths in Ahmād's Musnad, and that the small number in the two Ḥijāzi collections is to be attributed to the particular purposes that their compilers had in mind.
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CHAPTER THREE
THE PROPHETIC SUNNAH

JUYNBOLL'S CONCEPT OF THE LATE APPEARANCE OF THE PROPHETIC SUNNAH

The chronology of the origin of the concept 'prophetic sunnah' is another issue which Juynboll adduces in his study to support his theory. In this section, he discusses what he calls "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". (1) He holds the idea that the term sunnat al-nabi is a later concept, as late as the end of the first century. He says: "I think that the time when the concept sunna began to be exclusively identified with sunnat an-nabi 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". (2) At the end of his argument on this issue, he says: "... 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."(3)

Before I go through Juynboll's considerations in supporting this view, there is a question that should be asked here, i.e. how significant the date of the origin of the term *sunnat al-nabi* is for the dating of the *hadith* material. M.M Bravmann devotes an extensive chapter to the concept *sunnah* in his book, *The spiritual background of early Islam*. In this chapter, he contends "that the concept *sunnat Rasūli-llāh* " the *sunnah* of the prophet" is a very early and genuine Islamic idea and that it cannot be considered as based on later doctrinal considerations..."(4)

Juynboll is aware of this study, and he comments on it as follows: "For an account of the *sunnat an-nabi* 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. M.M. 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".(5) So if Juynboll is in agreement with the view that *sunnah* is a practice established
by individuals, what difference do the questions of whether the example of the Companions as well as that of the Prophet himself was described by the term *sunnah* until the late first century, and whether the term *sunnat al-nabi* already existed from an early date, make to that of the early existence of *hadīth*. But Juynboll does not mean only the late coming into existence of the term *sunnat al-nabi* but also the lateness of its authority. Apart from the other evidence that may be readily gleaned from various sources, (6) indicating the early authority of the 'sunna, or exemplary behaviour, of the prophet', it is one of the most essential concepts of the Qur'ān. Although the term *sunnat al-nabi* does not appear in the Qur'ān, it is well known that the legislative authority of the prophet and his example is already established in the Qur'ān. People are enjoined to adhere to the Prophet's example and to pay full obedience to him in his commands or his interdictions. (7)

My aim here is to approach the question of the early existence of the prophetic *sunnah* only with respect to the direction from which Juynboll approaches it.
AN EXAMINATION OF THE EVIDENCE OF HIS CHRONOLOGY

Now let us scrutinize Juynboll's considerations for his chronology of this issue. The main evidence he adduces to support his argument of the late coming into existence of the concept "prophetic sunnah" is a report concerning 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, which appears in Ibn Sa'd. He says: "In the foregoing, while dealing with the hadith material traced back to 'Umar, I mentioned a report in which 'Umar, on his deathbed, enumerated where the muslim community should look for the solution to its problems, namely the Qur'ān, the muhājirūn, the ansār, 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 would have expected it to be mentioned, namely immediately after the Qur'ān, we find instead the two major contingents of the prophet's followers". In the passage to which he refers us to, he writes: "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, 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 al-
dhimma". (9)

Juynboll argues that "if the concept sunna had already been exclusively identified with sunnat an-nabi by the year 23/644, when ʿUmar allegedly made this statement, he would have used this expression and not muhājirūn and anṣār, which is, as perhaps demonstrated above, a much wider concept. Differently put, it is significant that ʿUmar did not use the term sunnat an-nabi, if the term sunna had developed into this limited specification already by the time he made this statement ." (10) However, if one has recourse to Ibn Saʿd, it is difficult to see how Juynboll reaches his interpretation. In fact, the report is not about recommendations as to where the Muslim community should resort or look for solutions to its problems. The sense of the recommendation, as is quite clear both from this version and from anthor version that appears also in Ibn Saʿd, is to remind the community to take care of those mentioned. The two versions runs as follows:

 فقال: أوصيكم بكتاب الله فإنكم لن تضلوا ما اتبعتموه. وأوصيكم بالمهاجرين فإن الناس يكتبون و يبكمون. وأوصيكم بالأنصار فإنهم شفب
"I commend to you the book of Allâh, for you will not go astray as long as you follow it. And I commend to you the Muhâjjirin because people may overestimate or underestimate. And I commend to you the Anşâr because they were the sanctuary Islam resorted to. And I commend to you Aârâb (the Bedouins) because they are your origin and your constituent element [in a variant version] they are your origin, constituent element, brethren and the enemy of your enemy. And I commend to you ahl ad-Dhimma because they are your Prophet's compact and the livelihood of your children. Leave me!" (11)

In the other version, from which the Qur'ân is absent, the sense of the recommendation is clearer.

ثم قال عمر: أوصي الخليفة من بعدي بتنوي الله والمحاربين الأولين أن يحفظ لهم حplementary and áووصيهم بهم حرمنهم، وأوصيهم بالآصرار خيرا فانهم ردد الإسلام وغيط العدو وجبابة المال أن لا يؤخذ منهم إلا فضلهم عن رضي منهم وأوصيه بالآصرار الذين تبوؤا الدار والإلايان أن يقبل من محسنهم ويتجاوز عن مسيئهم، وأوصيه بالأعراب خيرا فانهم أصل العرب ومادة الإسلام، وأن يؤخذ من حواشي أسويلهم فبرد على فترائهم، وأوصيه بذمة الله
I commend to the caliph after me the fear of God, and that he maintain the rights of *al-Muhājirūn al-Awwalūn* and acknowledge their privileged position (*hurmatahum*); and I commend to him to be good to the people of the *amṣār* (the provinces?), for they are the aid of Islam, the (cause of the) anger of the enemy and the reservoir of funds, if only their surplus is taken, by their consent; and I commend to him the *Anṣār*, "who settled in the territory and the faith", to receive from those of them that do good and to turn a blind eye to those of them that do ill; and I commend to him to be good to the *Aṭrāb* (the Bedouins), for they are the origin of the Arabs and the constituent element of Islam, and that a levy should be made on their more modest property and given to their poor; and I commend to him the (people guaranteed) protection of God and that of his Prophet, that he may fulfil to them the compact made with them, and that they may not have imposed on them more than they can bear, and that he should combat those beyond them." (12) Not only does Juynboll misinterpret this report, in enlisting its support for his argument, but he also overlooks a highly significant report in
which Umar refers to the concept "prophetic sunnah". This occurs in Ibn Sa'd, on the same page as the recommendation just discussed. In this report, in which Umar addresses his people in the final year of his reign, regarding the appointment of his successors, he is reported to have said: "Oh Allah, I ask you to bear witness upon the governors of the provinces; for I sent them only that they might teach the people their religion and the sunnah of their Prophet ..."

Another significant report in Ibn Sa'd is one in which Umar is recorded to have said [to someone who visited him from Iraq]:

"I have not appointed my governors over you to beat your skins or to abuse your dignity or take your money. I have
appointed them to teach you the book of your Lord and the
sunnah of your Prophet ..." (15)

THE AUTHORITY OF THE PROPHETIC SUNNAH IN EARLY TEXTS

It hardly seems that Juynboll can justify, from 'Umar's recommendation, the statement: "one is undoubtedly on safe ground when concluding that, if the concept sunna had already been exclusively identified with sunnat an-nabi by the year 23/644, when 'Umar allegedly made this statement, he would have used this expression and not muhājirūn and anṣār, which is, as perhaps demonstrated above, a much wider concept." (16)

There are numerous reports in which the Prophet, the first four caliphs, and some of his devoted Companions, especially those who were considered among the legal experts, stress the authority of the "prophetic sunnah." It may be appropriate here to give a selection of these reports in order to demonstrate how early the authority of the prophetic sunnah was:

- قال رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - تركت فيكم أمرين لن تضلوا ما
  مسكتم بهما، كتاب الله وسنة نبيه.
The Prophet said "I left with you two things; you will never go astray as long as you adhere to them: the book of Allāh and the sunnah of his Prophet." (17)

The people of al-Yaman came to the Messenger of Allāh (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and said: "O Messenger of Allah, send with us Muḥādh b. Jabal in order to teach us the book of our Lord and the sunnah of our Prophet..." (18)

The Prophet said "You must have my sunnah and the sunnah of the rightly guided caliphs and adhere to it..." (19)

"He who turn away from my sunnah is not of me (is not following me)". (20)

"There will be governors after me who will not follow my guidance or comply with my sunnah." (21)
If someone brought a dispute to Abū Bakr, he used to look in the book of Allāh [for a solution (verdict)]. If he found in it something that would solve the dispute, he would make his decision accordingly. If there was nothing in the book, but he knew a ūsunah on the authority of the Messenger of Allāh (ṣ) on the matter, he would decide accordingly. If he still could not find a solution he would go out and ask the Muslims saying: "I have been faced with such and such [a matter]. Do you know if the Messenger of Allāh gave any decision on this?" Sometimes
the whole of the group would come to him agreeing on a
decision of the Messenger of Allāh on it. Then Abū Bakr would
say: " Praise belong to Allāh who put among us those who
remember our Prophet's practice." If he could still not find a
sunnah of the Messenger of Allāh (ṣ) on the matter, he would
gather together the chiefs and nobles of the people and consult
them, and if they agreed upon a decision he would to apply
it.(23)

Abū Bakr said to her [a grandmother, who came to him
demanding her share of an inheritance] : " There is nothing
for you in the book of Allāh and I do not know of anything for
you in the sunnah of the Mesenger of Allāh (ṣ). Go back, until
I ask the people...".(24)
Umar wrote to his famous judge Shurayh advising him of how to apply his judgement. In this report, he enumerates the authorities which Shurayh should go to when he encounters any matter. These are the book of Allah, then the *sunnah* of the Prophet, then the *ijma*, then his personal judgement. (25)

أumar describes Ali "... indeed, he is the most appropriate one to rule them according to their Prophet's *sunnah* (ṣ) ....." (26)

-Umar said "if we take what is in the book of Allah, and if we take what is in the *sunnah* of the Messenger of Allah..." (27)

"... O' people! Stoning is a *hadd* of Allah, so do not turn
away from it. It is in the book of Allāh and in the sunnah of your Prophet (ṣ). The Messenger of Allāh (ṣ) stoned, Abū Bakr stoned and I have stoned . . .". (28)

أخرج الطيالسي عن الصبي بن معبد أنه أهل بالحج والعمرة جميعا فذكر ذلك لعمر فقال: هديت لسنتة نبيك - صلى الله عليه وسلم -

أumar said to al-Šabi b. Maʿbid, who performed the hajj and the umrah together, " You have been guided to the sunnah of your Prophet ". (29)

أخرج ابن سعد: أن عمر بن الخطاب لما خضير قال: " إن استخلف فسنتة وإلا استخلف فسنتة، توفي رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - ولم يستخلف، وتوفي أبو بكر فاستخلف، فقال علي: فعرفت والله أنه لن يفضل بسنتة رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم -

أumar said on his deathbed: " if I appoint a successor, this is a sunnah, and if I do not, this is also a sunnah. The Messenger of Allāh (ṣ) died without appointing a successor. But when Abū Bakr died he did appoint a successor." ʿAli said:"I knew that he would not treat anything else as equal to the sunnah of the Mesenger of Allāh (ṣ)." (30)

أخرج عبد الرزاق قصة مبايعة عثمان عن طريق المسور بن مخرمة وفيها قول عبد الرحمن بن عوف مباينا عثمان: . . . عليك يا عثمان وفد الله وميثقه وذمته وذمة رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - أن تعمل بكتاب
In this report, Ṭābi' to swear, after he was elected as caliph, that "... he would act by the book of Allāh and the sunnah of his Prophet and the practice of the two caliphs after him ..." (31)

Ali justified himself when he refused to obey Ṭābi's prohibition of al-mut'ah during the pilgrimage, by saying: "... I would not desert the sunnah of the Messenger of Allāh(ṣ) on the word of anyone. ...". (32)

Ali b. Abī Ṭalib said, after he applied the punishment to a women who committed adultery: "I flogged her as in the book of Allāh and I stoned her as in the sunnah of the Prophet. (33)

Aḥmed b. Ḥusayn said: "The Qur'ān was revealed and the
Mesenger of Alläh (ṣ) established al-sunan. Then he said:

"Follow us; by Alläh, if do not, you will go astray."(34)

According to Ibn Massūd, when someone asked him about a matter:

"Provided that you ask us about something in the book of almighty Alläh that we know about we shall tell you, or something in a sunnah from the Prophet of Alläh (ṣ) we shall tell you ... "(36)

Ibn Masūd said "... If you prayed in your houses as this stay-behind does, you would abandon the sunnah of your Prophet, and if you abandoned the sunnah of your Prophet you would go astray..."(37)
Ibn ʿAbbās, in his argument with al-Ḥarūriyyah, said: "Tell me, if I read to you from the infallible book of Allāh and relate to you from the sunnah of His Prophet (ṣ) what you can't deny, will you come back?" They said: "Yes..." (38)

Ibn ʿAbbās said: "He who produces an opinion that is not in the book of Allāh and does not occur in the sunnah of the Messenger of Allāh (ṣ) does not know what he will get when he meets almighty Allāh. (39)

Ibn ʿAbbās said: "There is only the book of Allāh and the sunnah of his Messenger (ṣ). As for anyone who says anything thereafter, from his own judgment, I do not know whether he will find it counted among his good deeds or his evil deeds. (40)
Abū Sa'īd al-Khudri met Ibn 'Abbās and said: I have seen your fatwā on "sarf" (exchange). Is it something you have found in the book of Allāh, or a sunnah from the Messenger of Allāh ...? (41)

In this report, Ibn 'Umar wrote a letter to the Umayyad caliph: "... And I affirm to you that I will hear and obey, according to the sunnah of Allāh and the sunnah of his Messenger, in so far, as I am able." (42)

Ibn 'Umar said: "Is it the sunnah of the Messenger of Allāh (§) that is more worthy to be followed or the sunnah of 'Umar?..." (43)

In the light of the large number of reports which I have come across in the sources, a selection of which have already
been given, (44) it seems to me to be strange that Juynboll should say: "In sum, although the concept sunnat an-nabi 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". (45) He gives us no information as to what sources he relies on in drawing this general conclusion. What is certain, however, is that, regardless of the comparative frequency of occurrence, the concept sunnat al-nabi emerges in numerous reports in the sources, and not just "occasionally".

THE EARLY MEANING OF THE TERM AL-SUNNAH (pl. AL-SUNAN)

In addition to sunnat al-nabi, there is ample evidence to suggest that al-sunnah (pl. al-sunan) refers, in the early first century, to the prophetic sunnah, especially when used by the Companions.

It is used by the prophet himself. (46) 'Imrān b. Ḥuṣayn, a Companion who went to Basrah to teach the people there, says: "The Qur'ān was revealed and the Messenger of Allāh (ṣ) established al-sunan. Then he said: Follow us; by Allāh, if you do not you will go astray". (47)
Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb refers to the practice of the Prophet in the punishment of adultery in the same context as the determining of the faqīḥ and the establishing of the sunan. (48)

There are a number of reports that show clearly that al-sunnah is used to refer to the prophetic sunnah by both Companions and Successors. Ibn Ābbās was asked about a particular gesture during the prayer. He replied that it was al-sunnah. When those who had raised the question appeared unsatisfied, Ibn Ābbās said: "It is your prophet's sunnah." (49) Again, he once preached at such great length that the people feared that they might miss the time of the maghrib prayer. On being repeatedly reminded of this, Ibn Ābbās said: "Are you telling me what the sunnah is?" He then referred to a practice of the Prophet as authority for his own conduct. (50) A further example is that of al-Ḥajjāj, the notorious governor of Iraq, making the pilgrimage with the Companion Ibn Īmar and his son, Sālim, one of the greatest fuqahā' in al-Madīnah. al-Ḥajjāj asked Ibn Īmar what one should do in the mawqif on the day at Arafah. Sālim said: "If you want to know the sunnah, pray at midday on the day at Arafah." His father confirmed this: "He is right, they used to combine the prayers of al-zuhr and al-ṣaṣr in the sunnah." Asked if the Messenger
of Allah did that, Sālim replied: "Would they follow anything but his sunnah in that?"(51)

In 'Abd al-Razzāq’s Musannaf there are two reports on the authority of Ibn al-Musayyab, the prominent Successor in al-Madinah. In the first, he is reported to have seen someone performing prayer repeatedly after the dawn, and to have told him not to do so. The man asked: "Will Allah punish me for the ṣalāt?" Ibn al-Musayyab replied: "No, but he will punish you for acting contrary to the sunnah." In the second report, Ibn al-Musayyab quotes the Prophet to the effect that: there is no prayer after the nidā except the two rak‘ahs of Fajr.(52) The implication is that Ibn al-Musayyab meant the prophetic sunnah when using the term al-sunnah.

'Urwah b. al-Zubayr once reported a hadith pertaining to the prayer of the eclipse on the authority of the Prophet. Al-Zuhri then told 'Urwah how his brother, Ibn al-Zubayr, performed this prayer in a different way. 'Urwah's reply was: "Because he has mistaken the sunnah."(53)

Abū al-Zinād is quoted in one report as mentioning a well known precept established by the Prophet as an example of al-sunan.(54) When we look closely into the report of al-Zuhri quoted by Juynboll, it clearly emerges that the application of the term sunnah to material from the Companions is a later
practice. "A significant report attributed to Ṣāliḥ b. Kaysän (d. 140/758 or later) describes how Zuhri went about it: 'Ibn Shihāb and I', said Ṣāliḥ, 'were looking for īlm and we agreed to record the sunna. (55) Thus we wrote down everything we heard about the prophet. Then Zuhri said: "Let us write down what we can find attributed to his Companions". But I said: "No, that is not sunna". Zuhri, however, insisted that it was and recorded this also.' Added Ṣāliḥ ruefully: 'I did not record it, so Zuhri became a successful traditionist, whereas I did not.' "(56) If such an application had been general at that time, Ṣāliḥ would not have argued in the way he did. Al-Zuhri himself is recorded as describing the practices of the prophet as al-sunnah. (57)

The foregoing evidence indicate that al-sunnah/ al-sunan was applied in the early first century to the prophetic sunnah, and that it was probably during the period of the Successors that it first came to be used of material from the Companions as well.

But whether al-sunnah/ al-sunan refers to the exemplary behaviour of the Companions as well as that of the Prophet or not, it does not affect, in my opinion, either the existence or the authority of the term sunnat al-nabi as early as during the Prophet's own lifetime.
In the light of the foregoing pages, it seems to me strange to claim that the *sunnah* of the prophet is "a concept emphasized for the first time by 'Umar b. 'Abd al-‘Aziz rather than by the prophet himself or his immediate followers." Juynboll dismisses the concern of the Prophet's successors with the prophetic *sunnah*. As quoted above, he considers 'Umar b. 'Abd al-‘Aziz to be "the first man to apply himself to the concept *sunnat an-nabi* more than to *sunnas* ascribed to other persons or localities." Interestingly enough, Juynboll's findings adduced as arguments demonstrate that 'Umar b. 'Abd al-‘Aziz was concerned with the other *sunan* equally with the prophetic *sunnah*. Juynboll stresses that "'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'an. He is considered to be the first theoretician of the *sunna." In fact, I do not dispute that 'Umar b. 'Abd al-‘Aziz was important in the history of the prophetic *sunnah*; what I question is the view that he was the first person to be concerned with it. Juynboll's argument seems to rest on very
slender premises and to disregard a considerable quantity of contrary evidence. In claiming that ʿUmar II "is considered to be the first theoretician of the sunna", he refers us to a passage in ʿAbd al-Qahir al-Baghdādi's *Uṣūl al-dīn*. In this passage, al-Baghdādi is using *al- sunnah* in its sense as the opposite of *bidʿah*, rather than in the sense under discussion here. In any case, ʿUmar II is specified only as *awwal mutakallimi ahl al-sunnah min al-Tābiʿin*. To clarify this, I shall quote the passage: (61)

Apart from the evidence of the *Qurʾān* and the *hadith* in which the authority of the Prophet and his *sunnah* is
emphasized, we have seen how his followers, and in particular the four first caliphs, are recorded in various reports as emphasizing the authority of the "prophetic sunnah" as second only to that of the Qur'an. The reputation which ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Aziz gained with regard to the "prophetic sunnah" is not because he was absolutely the first person to concern himself with it, but because the Umayyad caliphs before him had been rather less concerned. This is the reason for his being called the fifth of al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidin.(62)
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EARLY ḤADĪTH ACTIVITIES

At the beginning of the section on "the earliest development of the ḥadīth centres", Juynboll says: "In the following I should like to concentrate on the earliest development of ḥadīth 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 700s-720s A.D. the interest for ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth 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."

He goes on to say: "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-750s 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". (1) He classifies the oldest hadith transmitters into four main categories according to their provinces: Ḥijāzi, Egyptian, Syrian and Iraqi. In each one he simply mentions the names of various Companions and Successors who were, "allegedly", active in these centres.

He does not seem to establish his claim "that during the last two or three decades of the first century of the Hijra/the700s-720s A.D. the interest for hadith slowly increased," nor does he make a convincing case for the regional character of the hadith isnāds in these centres. One thing should be mentioned here first regarding his investigation, namely that, he appears to neglect the abundant information in the sources concerning the activities of these Companions and Successors in the transmission of hadith and dismisses their part in hadith activities. On the other hand, he does consider the sparse information in the sources regarding the activities of the quṭṭāṣ during the first century, believing that it is their works that foreshadow the transmission of hadith. (2) However, if anything should be supposed to have foreshadowed the transmission of hadith, it is, in my opinion, logically the work of those who are recorded
as having engaged in *hadith* activities rather than that of the *quṣṣāṣ.* While enumerating the important figures among the oldest transmitters in the various centres, Juynboll considers also the information describing some of them in the sources as *fuqahā,* (3) a term which, according to him, refers to those who based their advice upon individual judgement (*ra'y*), whereas the term *ʿulamā* refers to those who consulted precedents including the example of the Prophet. (4)

If we accept, for the sake of argument, Juynboll's definition of the term *fuqahā,* we can hardly ignore the information describing the same figures in the same sources as *ʿulama* and the numerous reports illustrating their activities in both collecting and propagating *hadith* material. It is surprising then to see Juynboll claiming that during the first century "*fiqh* and *ʿilm* were only occasionally combined in one and the same person." (5) In fact, all those mentioned in Juynboll's work as great *fuqahā* are described also as *ʿulamā*. (6)

This disparity between neglecting the information concerning *hadith* activities in the first century and considering all other information concerning other activities seems to me anomalous.

After extensive reading in the same historical works that
Juynboll relies on, I have come to the conclusion that if we take at face value the information relating the kinds of activities during the first century, we see hadith activities predominating from the first half. To support this view I shall rehearse a cross section of the information pertaining to hadith activities during the first century and the involvement of the Companions and the Successors in it, concentrating on those mentioned in Juynboll's work.

It is well established that, after the Prophet's death, the Companions of the Prophet spread out into the expanding Islamic world. Some of them were officially appointed in the various centres to instruct the people there in the new religion.

Umar, the second caliph, who reigned between 13 and 23, sent the three Companions, Mu'ādh, 'Ubādah b. al-Ṣāmit, and Abū al-Darda' for this purpose to al-Shām, where they remained until their deaths. He also sent 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Ghunm al-Ash'ari to al-Shām, 'Imrān b. Ḥusayn and 'Abd Allāh b. Mughaffal to Basrah, and 'Abd Allāh b. Mas'ūd to Kufah, for the same purpose.

After the Prophet's death, the Companions were widely sought for their īmām. Ibn 'Abbās (d. 68), the young
Companion, was concerned to collect prophetic hadith from other Companions immediately after the Prophet's death. (11) The son of 'Ubādah b. al-Šāmit, al-Walid, who was born during the Prophet's lifetime, and died during the reign of 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān (d. 86), and his grandson, 'Ubādah, are reported as having come to the Anṣār, probably from al-Shām, (12) for the purpose of seeking 'ilm from them while they were still alive. (13) When Abū al-Salīl al-Qaysī approached Ṣilah al-ʿAdawi in order to learn from him, he told him that he was behaving as he himself had done in approaching the Companions of the Prophet in order to learn from them. (14) Qays b ʿIbād (d. after 80) who came to al-Madinah from Basrah during ʿUmar's reign (15) said: "I went to al-Madinah in search of 'ilm and sharaf." (16) Masrūq (d. 62), a prominent Kufan Successor, tells us that he sat with the Companions of the Prophet [to learn from them] and found them to vary in their knowledge. (17) He went to al-Madinah for that reason. (18) The pupils of Ibn Masūd would travel from Kufah to al-Madinah to learn from ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb. (19) Zirr b. Ḥubaysh (d. 81-83) came with a group from Kufah to al-Madinah during ʿUthmān's reign, swearing that the only thing that induced him to go there was the chance of meeting the Companions of the Prophet. He
frequented Ubayy b. Ka'b and 'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Awf. (20)

Abū al-Āliyah al-Riyāḥi (d. after 90) said: "We used to hear al-riwāyah in Basrah on the authority of the Companions of the Messenger of Allāh (ṣ) but we were not satisfied without going to al-Madinah and learning it from their mouths". (21)

Many more examples will be given either below or in the following section. How important the role was that the Companions and Successors played in the transmission of hadith will appear from what follows.

THE ACTIVITIES OF THE COMPANIONS

The involvement of the Companions, in various centres, in hadith activities, especially of those on whose authority a considerable quantity of hadith is transmitted, is something that features largely in the various sources. Ibn Abī Laylā (d. 83) (Kufah) who engaged in the transmission of hadith, when asked for his opinion about the qaṣaṣ, replied: "I found that Companions of the Prophet (ṣ) would sit with one another, each of them relating to the other what he had heard. They would not allow any Khaṭīb to sit with them." (22)

The Companion Abū Saʿid al-Khudrī said: "When the Companions of the Messenger of Allāh (ṣ) sat down talking to
each other, their conversation would be about *al-fiqh* but they asked someone to read a *sūrah* of Qur'ān. (23) Abū Saʿīd himself was involved in this activity. Ibn ʿAbbās enjoined his son and his mawlä Īkrimah to go to Abū Saʿīd to hear his *ḥadīth*. (24) Abū Saʿīd advised his pupils to study the *ḥadīth* with one another. (25)

Ibn ʿAbbās, one of the youngest Companions, who is reputed for his expertise in *fiqh*, is one of the key figures in *ḥadīth* activities. After the Prophet's death, he went to the Companions asking them about the prophetic *ḥadīths*. He made a considerable effort to collect them. (26) The most devoted pupils of his were the well known Successors, Mujāhid, Tāwūs, Saʿīd b. Jubayr, ʿAṭā, Jābir b. Zayd and Īkrimah, who were recorded as being both *muhaddithūn* and *mustūn*. (27) Among those who are reported to have recorded his *ḥadīth* were Saʿīd b. Jubayr (28) and ʿAmr b. Dinār. (29) Ibn ʿAbbās's *mawlä*, Kurayb (d. 98), had a great deal of material from him. (30) Ibn Jurayj (d. 150) paid great attention to Ibn ʿAbbās's *ḥadīth*. He did his utmost to collect it. (31) Once, Ibn ʿAbbās went with Muʿāwiyyah (d. 60) for pilgrimage, where Muʿāwiyyah had his own entourage, and Ibn ʿAbbās had one consisting of those who sought *iḥlīm*. (32)
Jābir b. ʿAbd Allāh promulgated his ḥadīth in the two main Ḥijāzi centres, Makkah and al-Madinah. He had a circle in the mosque where people learned ḥadīth on his authority. (33) Abū Jaʿfar al-Bāqir (d. 114-118) and ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. ʿAqīl (d. after 140) used to write down [ḥadīth ] from him. (34) During the time that he spent in Makkah, he held ḥadīth sessions for scholars and transmitters; when they left the session, they would study and memorize his ḥadīth. Among these were the famous Makkan Successors, ʿĀṭā b. Abī Rabāḥ and Abū al-Zubayr. (35)

ʿĀʾishah, the beloved wife of the Prophet, through whom a large number of prophetic ḥadīths were transmitted, was famed for her knowledge of the prophetic sunnah and the large number of the Prophet's ḥadīth that she possessed. The two Caliphs, ʿUmar and ʿUthmān, used to ask her about al-sunan. (36) When the Companions of the Prophet had doubts concerning something, they would ask ʿĀʾishah, in whom they would find ʿilm. (37) She was also praised for her knowledge of farāḍi (i.e. inheritance), on which the prominent Companions referred to her. (38) ʿUrwah b. al-Zubayr, a nephew of ʿĀʾishah, felt, four years before
A'ishah's death, that if she died, he would not regret that there was anything about which he had not asked her. (39)

When she was in Makkah, she was visited regularly by the two Makkanc Successors 'Ata and 'Ubayd b. 'Umayr. (40)

Abd Allah b. Amr b. al-'Ash is well known for his having written down hadith. He asked the prophet to permit him to write what he heard from him, and the Prophet permitted him to do so. (41) An awā'il report, mentioned above, gives this episode as the first occasion of the writing down of hadith. (42) Ibn 'Abbas praised his 'ilm and said that he used to ask the Prophet about halāl and harām issues. (43)

Zayd b. Thabit was well-known for his wide knowledge. (44) He is reputed to have preserved the farā'iq in writing. (45) Once he went to Marwān b. al-Ḥakam, the governor of al-Madinah, who asked him about some prophetic hadiths; in replying, he cited a prophetic hadith recommending the spreading of the Prophet's hadith. (46)

Ibn 'Umar, the son of the second caliph, was one of the Companions who gave legal advice and who engaged in the transmission of hadith from the death of 'Uthman. (47) He
was very meticulous in relating a *hadith* on the authority of the Prophet, for fear of addition or diminution. (48) He was very keen to familiarize himself with the Prophet's sayings and actions. (49) In one report, Nāfi', his *mawla*, tells us that Ibn 'Umar used to look carefully at his notes before he came out to speak to the people. (50) Ibn 'Umar was a frequent visitor to Makkah, where he held a circle in the mosque. (51) He was also asked for *fatwās* during the pilgrimage and on other occasions. (52) Sa'īd b. Jubayr used to go twice a year to Makkah for the *umrah* and the *hajj*, (53) on which occasions he would hear *hadith* from Ibn 'Umar and Ibn 'Abbās and write it down. (54)

The famous Abū Hurayrah, on whose authority the greatest number of *hadith* were transmitted, is extremely well known for his activities in transmission. During his three years companionship with the Prophet he enthusiastically memorized what he heard from him. (55) He said that he did not know any one of the Companions who memorized more prophetic *hadith* than he. (56) His fellow Companions conceded his exalted status as far as the knowledge of prophetic *hadith* was concerned. (57) He was most influential in the diffusion of the *hadith* throughout the Islamic world. He used to hold
hadith sessions before the Jumu’ah prayer. When Ibn ʿUmar was asked if he could fault anything that Abū Hurayrah related, he said: "No, but he is brave and we are cowardly." Abū Hurayrah said: "Is it my fault if I have remembered and they have forgotten?" The place in which he sat to relate hadith was close to ʿAʾishah's quarters, and he once asked her if she had found fault with anything that he said; she did not contradict anything that he had said, but remarked: "The Messenger of Allah did not present one hadith after another as you do." Bashir b. Ka'b used to write down what he heard from Abū Hurayrah, and when he was about to leave for Basrah again, he would read his notes to Abū Hurayrah in order to make sure that he had not made any mistakes. Abū Hurayrah spent a whole night relating hadith on the authority of the Prophet for those who congregated in a particular place to hear him while he was in Damascus. Ibn Sirin, one of the best pupils of Abū Hurayrah tells us that Abū Hurayrah held a hadith session every Thursday.

In al-Shām there were a number of Companions who were involved in hadith activities. ʿAbd al-Aziz b. Marwān, the governor of Egypt (64) from 60 until his death, between 82
and 86, sent a letter to Kathir b. Murrah (d. between 70 and 80), who had found in Himṣ seventy of those who had taken part in the battle of Badr, asking him to write down for him only hadiths that he had heard from Companions of the Prophet except for Abu Hurayra's, since he already had all of the latter's material. (65) We have alluded above to the Companions Abū al-Dardā, ʿUbādah b. al-Šāmit and Muʿādh b. Jabal, who were appointed officially as instructors in al-Shām. A famous Syrian Successor, Abū Idris al-Khwālānī (d. 80) tells us that he was able to meet, and obtain material on the authority of, Abū al-Dardā, ʿUbādah b. al-Šāmit and Shaddād b. Aws, but that Muʿādh b. Jabal had already died. (66)

Wāthilah b. al- Asqa (d. 83-85) was a Companion whose hadiths had a modest circulation in the hadith collections. He went to Syria after the Prophet's death and he is thought to have been the last Companion to die in Damascus. (67) He used to dictate hadiths to people, who would write them down in his presence. (68) The well known Syrian Successor Makhūl went with Abū al-Azhar to Wāthilah asking him to relate hadith to them on the authority of the Prophet. (69) Wāthilah did not concern himself with the
verbatim text of the ḥadīth, but said that it would be sufficient if he related the gist of the ḥadīth. (70)

‘Abd Allāh b. Busr (d 88-96), who settled in Ḥims, also engaged in the transmission of ḥadīth. It is reported by one of his pupils that he used to relate ḥadīth until just before the time of prayer. (71)

One more ḥadīth activist who deserves to be mentioned here is Abū Umāmah, who was born during the Prophet's lifetime. (72) Sālim b. Āmir (d. 130), the Syrian transmitter, said: "We would sit with Abū Umāmah and he would relate to us numerous ḥadīths on the authority of the Messenger of Allāh (ṣ)." Then he would say: "Understand what you have heard and then transmit it on our authority." (73)

In Basrah, there were a number of Companions who engaged in ḥadīth activities. The Basran Successor, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Jawshan al-Ghaṭafānī said that he found eighteen Companions in the Basrah Mosque. (74) At the head of them was Anas b. Mālik, the servant of the prophet, who also sought prophetic ḥadīth from older Companions. (75) He remained there until his death. His devoted pupil, Thābit,
says that he accompaniéd Anas for forty years. The sons of Anas complained to their father that he did not relate to them as much *hadith* as he did to the outsiders. He was once asked if a *hadith* that he had just related was from the Prophet. This annoyed him, and he said: "By Allāh, we have not heard all of what we have related to you directly from the Prophet, but we (the Companions) trust one another." (78)

[Ibrāhīm b. Husayn, who was sent to Basrah by ʿUmar to instruct its people, was a *hadith* activist there. He was seen, by Hilāl b. Yusuf, a Kufan Successor who went to Basrah, relating *hadith* to a circle. (79) One Companion, Hishām b. ʿĀmir complained that some Successors neglected him to go to hear *hadith* from Ibrāhīm and other Companions. (80) However, despite the activities of Ibrāhīm b. Ḥuṣayn in the transmission of *hadith*, he seems to have been one of those who opposed the writing down of the *hadith*. (81)]

Abū Mūsā al-Ashʿarī was a governor of ʿUmar in Basrah, where he taught the *Qurʾān* and *al-Dīn*. (82) When he discovered that his son wrote down *hadith* on his authority, he had the writings destroyed and advised him to receive *hadiths* in the traditional manner [to memorize them]. (83) In
a report reflecting the keen interest in the transmission of *hadith*, a Basran transmitter says: One of the Prophet's Companions came to us, and people would gather around him; if there were very many of them, he would go up into the roof of house and relate [hadiths] from there. (84)

Of course, Kufah, from its establishment, was a centre to which many Companions went or settled in. 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Abī Laylā (d.82), the Kufan Successor, was able to meet 120 Companions from the *Anṣār* in the Kufah mosque, each of whom, when asked to relate a *hadith* or to give a *fatwā* would claim that any of the others was more competent to do so than himself. (85)

*Ibn Masūd*, who was sent to Kufah as an instructor, as we have mentioned above, used to hold a session every Thursday, which he would open with the words: "إن أحسن الحديث كتاب الله وخير الناس سن محمد -صلى الله عليه وسلم- وشر الأمور *محدثاتها*..." (86) He was aided by his pupil *Alqamah* in teaching the people the *Qur'an*. After they had finished, they would discuss the chapters of *al-manāsik* and *al-ḥalāl wa-al-ḥarām*. (87)
Al-Barā’ b. Āzib, who was originally from al-Madinah, then settled in Kufah and died there in 72, (88) said: "Not all of what we related to you did we heard from the Messenger of Allāh (ṣ); we heard it from our Companions, but we do not lie." (89) His ḥadīth session was apparently an organized class, as Abū Ishāq al-Sabīṣī, a well known Iraqi Successor, tells us that they used to sit one behind the other in this class, (90) and we learn from another report that al-Barā’'s pupils used to write down his material with reed pens on their hands. (91)

A group of people used to come to Salmān al-Fārisī (d. 33-37) to hear his ḥadīth. (92) When he obtained money, would buy meat with it and invite the muḥaddithūn to eat with him. (93)

THE ACTIVITIES OF THE SUCCESSORS

The lively ḥadīth activities already during the first century may be represented by two reports. First, that mentioned above of the Companion Ibn Ābbās's being accompanied by an entourage of those who sought ʿilm during the pilgrimage he performed with Muḥāwiyah (d. 60). (94) The second is a report of Ibn Sirin's being recorded as saying: "I
came to Kufah before *jamājim* [the battle in 82] and I saw there 4,000 people who were in search of *ḥadīth.* (95)

Some of the Successors would meet regularly in order to exchange and discuss their material. *Abd al-Rahmān b. Abī Laylā* (d. 82) asked his fellow *Abd Allāh b. Ūkaym* (d. during the rule of al-Ḥajjāj) to come to study the *ḥadīth* because that was the way in which it would survive. (96) *Ibn Abī Laylā,* once, met *Abd Allāh b. Shaddād b. al-Ḥād (d. 81-82), a Madinan Successor who used to come to Kufah, who was *kathīr al-ḥadīth,* (97) then they discussed the *ḥadīth.* (98) The famous Kufan Successors, *Ibrāhīm al-Nakhaṣi* (d. 96), *Abū al-Ḍuḥā* (d. 100) and *al-Shābī* (d. 103-110) used to meet in the mosque in order to discuss *ḥadīth.* (99) *Shutayr b. Shakal* once met *Masrūq* (d. 62-63); a group of pupils of *ḥadīth* came to them, and *Shutayr* said to *Masrūq:* "these people have come to hear something; now, either you should relate some *ḥadīth* and I should corrobarate you or I should relate some and you should corrobarate me." (100) The Basran Successors, *Abū ʿUthmān al-Nahḍī* (d. 95 or later), *Abū Naḍrah* (d. 108 or 109), *Abū Mijlāz* (d. between 100 and 109) and *Khālid b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥrīz* used to study the *ḥadīth* and the *sunnah* and when someone suggested the reading of a *sūrah* from the *Qurʿān,* they thought this was no better than what they were
doing. (101) When the Makkan Successor ʿAtāʾ b. Abī Rabāḥ and his fellows came out from the Companion Jābir b. ʿAbd Allāh (d. 73–78) they discussed his hadīth. (102) Qabīṣah b. Dhuʿayb (d. 86–89), the Madinan Successor who later settled in Syria reported that, until the end of Muʿāwiyyah’s caliphate (d. 60), he and others, among them some prominent Madinan Successors, namely ʿUrwaḥ b. al-Zubayr, Abū Bakr b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān, Ibrāhim b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. ʿAwf, and ʿUbayd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUtbaḥ, would gather in a circle in the mosque during the night. Qabīṣah said that he would sit with the Companion Zayd b. Thābit, and then he and Abū Bakr b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān would hold sessions with Abū Hurayrah; however, their fellow ʿUrwaḥ was in a better position than they, because he had access to ʿĀʾishah, the Prophet’s wife, in her room (103) [she was his aunt].

The activities of a number of Successors in the transmission of hadīth have already been mentioned, in connection with those of the Companions. However, in working through the sources, I found it an immense task to trace and record all the information dealing with the Successors in this field. Thus, I have confined myself to a number of the Successors, who are called the fuqahāʾ: Those who, in Juynboll’s view, constitute a group who formulated their own
ideas which in the course of time became the prophetic *hadith*
either through their own endeavours or at the hands of their
pupils or other anonymous persons.

First of all, all the *fuqaha* mentioned in Juynboll's work
are also described in the sources as *ulama*, (104) a term
which indicates, in Juynboll's interpretation, those who
referred to precedents and examples including those of the
Prophet.

Dealing with Madinan isnads, Juynboll mentions some of
the major transmitters of *hadith* among the Madinan
Successors who are described as *fuqaha* in the sources. While
Juynboll accepts their reputation as an experts in matters of
*fiqh*, he dismisses their contribution to the transmission of
*hadith*. However, the sources contain ample material
demonstrating their knowledge and activities in this field as
well. Abū al-Zinād enumerates in one report some of the
prominent Madinan Successors who were considered both to
be among the *fuqaha* of the Madinans and among those who
had knowledge of *al- sunan*: Sa'īd b. al-Musayyab, al-Qāsim
b. Muhammad, 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr, Abū Bakr b. 'Abd al-
Rahmān, Khārijah b. Zayd, 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Abd Allāh and
Sulayman b. Yasār.(105)
One of Sa'īd b. al-Musayyab's best pupils, al-Zuhri, was asked from where Sa'īd b. al-Musayyab acquired his knowledge. He said: "From Zayd b. Thābit, and he would also sit with Sa'd b. Abi Waqqāṣ, Ibn 'Abbās, and Ibn 'Umar. He had access to the wives of the Prophet (ṣ), 'Ā'ishah and Umm Salamah, and he heard hadith from 'Uthmān b. 'Affān, 'Ali, Suhayb, and Muhammad b. Maslamah. Most of his prophetic hadiths are on the authority of Abū Hurayrah, to whose daughter he was married. He further received hadith from the Companions of 'Umar and 'Uthmān. It was said that there was no one who had more knowledge of all the decisions of 'Umar and 'Uthmān than he.(106) Ibn al-Musayyab himself said that there was no one still alive who was more knowledgeable concerning the decisions of the Prophet, Abū Bakr and 'Umar than he.(107) He specialized in 'Umar's material. So he was called the transmitter of 'Umar.(108) He was anxious to discover and collect material connected with 'Umar; in fact, he became such an authority that 'Umar's son, 'Abd Allāh, used to consult him concerning some of the actions taken by 'Umar.(109) Sa'īd frequented the well known Companions, Sa'd b. Abi Waqqāṣ and Abū Hurayrah.(110) He was praised by one of his pupils as being the most knowledgeable of people concerning al-āthār, and as having
great insight in his opinions. Ibn al-Musayyab would travel for days and nights in search of one hadith.

Although he was one of the Successors who were not in favour of the hadith being written down, he permitted one of his pupils to do so, because the latter had a bad memory. In one report, a man came to him and asked him about something; Sa`id dictated the answer to him. When the man asked him his own opinion, Sa`id told him this also, which the man also wrote down. When Sa`id was told of this, he tore up the paper.

<Urwa b. al-Zubayr>

There has already been mentioned a report in which <Urwa and other Successors held a circle during the night exchanging their material. He made considerable efforts in collecting hadith from the Companions. Describing the extensive hadiths he had on the authority of `A`ishah, he claimed four years before her death that if she were to die then he would not regret that she might still possess a hadith that he did not have. His books were burnt on the day of al-Harrah, which caused him great sadness. He was very concerned with the diffusion of the hadith. Once he sent to al-Zuhri asking him to meet him, in order to relate to him a
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hadith which contained sunnah.(119) He urged his sons to ask him about hadith,(120) and he studied and compared the material that they had.(121) 'Urwah asked his son Hishām if he had written down hadith material. When he said he had, 'Urwah asked him if he had compared his material with his source; when he said that he had not, 'Urwah said: "Then you have not written it down."(122)

Al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad enumerates in a report the Companions whom he frequented and sat with in order to hear and learn hadith on their authority. These were well known for their activities in the transmission of hadith, namely, 'Ā'ishah, Ibn 'Abbās, Abū Hurayrah, and Ibn 'Umar.(123) He was considered one of the three Successors who was most knowledgeable concerning 'Ā'ishah's hadith.(124)

Abū Salamah b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān would select a boy from the kuttāb to accompany him to his home, where he would dictate to him hadiths to write down for him.(125)

'Ikrimah Mawlā Ibn 'Abbās was taught the Qur'ān and the sunan by his master, Ibn 'Abbās.(126) He tells of
himself that he searched for *ilm* for forty years. He was well known for his extensive travelling around the Islamic world; he disseminated his *hadiths* in the provinces he visited.


His transmission on the authority of Ibn 'Umar was widely recognized. His best pupil, Mālik, did not care to hear a *hadith* on the authority of Ibn 'Umar from any one else if he had heard it from Nāfic. His material on the authority of Ibn 'Umar was preserved in writing. He would hold *hadith* sessions at which his pupils read to him and wrote down the *hadiths*. When, on one occasion, he was told that they wrote down his *ilm*, he requested them to bring it to him for correction. 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz sent him to Egypt to teach its people the *sunnah*.

‘Aṭā‘ b. Abī Rabāh (d. 114) was also one of those who stand out as experts in matters of *fiqh*. He was also one of the *hadith* activists in Makkah. He met 200 Companions, the most important of whom were Jābir b. 'Abd Allāh, ‘Ā‘ishah, Abū Hurayrah and Ibn 'Abbās. When Jābir b. 'Abd Allāh came to Makkah, ‘Aṭā‘ and his fellows attended
his ḥadīth sessions, and when they left him they studied his ḥadīth.(135) ʿAtāʾ and the other Successor ʿUbayd b. ʿUmayr (d. 68) used to come to ʿĀʾishah, when she was living in the vicinity of the holy mosque.(136) He held sessions where ḥadīths were recited to him to authenticate.(137) His son, Yaʿqūb, said that he had not seen his father memorizing anything as thoroughly as the buyyūʿ (commercial transactions).(138) ʿAtāʾ travelled to al-Madina, thus enhancing his status in comparison with that of his fellow Makkan Successors.(139)

It is been remarked above that a number of Companions settled in al-Shām at an early date. In addition to the Syrian Successors who were active in ḥadīth,(140) there were other ḥadīth activists who came from outside al-Shām and settled there.(141) There is a report indicating that the muḥaddithūn in al-Shām would gather in a circle in which they exchanged ḥadīth material.(142) Among the Syrian Successors is the well known Abū Idrīs al-Khulānī (d. 80), who informs us that he associated with the Companions Abū al-Dardāʾ, ʿUbādha b. al-Ṣāmit, and Shaddād b. Aus and received material on their authority.(143) Having once related a ḥadīth about whose authority he was questioned, he said:(144)

لا نأ قدر على إلا سناد مني على الحديث.
Makhūl, the most famous Syrian faqih, was also a hadith activist. He travelled the world in search of ilm. (145) In various reports, Makhūl is represented as having held sessions at which hadiths were studied and read to him. (146) He seems to have organized his material in writing. (147)

The oldest, best known and respected of the Kufan Successors were the pupils of the famous Companion ʿAbd Allāh b. Māsūd (d. 34). (148) They were reputed for their knowledge and reliability in the transmission of hadith. One of the Kufan transmitters, Mughirah b. Muqsim (d. 133-136), said that no hadith was accepted unless it was on the authority of the companions of ʿAbd Allāh [b. Masūd]. (149) In another report, he is recorded as saying that the soundest hadith is according to the transmission of the companions of ʿAbd Allāh. (150) The younger Successor, Ibrāhim al-Nakhaʿī (d. 96), enumerated in one report some of the companions of ʿAbd Allāh who taught the people the Qurʾān and the sunnah: ʿAlqamah (d. 61-73), al-Aswad (d. 74 or 75), ʿAbidah (d. c. 70), Masrūq (d. 62 or 63), al-Ḥārith b. Qays (d. c. 40), ʿAmr b. Shurāḥbil (d. 63). (151) The pupils of ʿAbd Allāh did not confine themselves to their master, but would also travel from Kufah to al-Madinah to acquire hadith from
al-Aswad b. Yazid was an adherent of Umar and Alqamah of Abd Allah, but when they met they did not disagree with each other. The strong adherence of Alqamah to Ibn Mas'ud caused Ibn Mas'ud to say that anything he had read or knew, Alqamah had read or knew as well. Ibn Mas'ud and Alqamah would teach the people how to read the Qur'an, and when they had finished that, they would study material on al-manasik and al-halal wa-al-harâm. The great concern of Alqamah with hadith appears in his advice: أطيلوا كر الحديث لا يدرس. He asked his fellow, Masrūq, to write for him al-nażā'ir, so that he might consider them and then erase them.

Masrūq also engaged in hadith activities, as we have already seen in various reports. He is recorded in one report as having associated with the Companions of the Prophet, and having discovered the variety of their knowledge. Al-Sha'bi is recorded as having said that he did not know anyone who was more widely travelled than Masrūq. He went to al-Madinah where he found the Companion Zayd b. Thābit to be one of the most deeply rooted in ilm. Masrūq was much sought after by students of
Amir b. Shurāhīl al-Shābī (d 103-110), who was known for his knowledge of hadith as well as his expertise in fiqh, made considerable efforts in the diffusion of hadith. Makhūl, the Syrian Successor, is recorded as having said that he had never set eyes on anyone who was more knowledgeable with regard to any sunnah mādiyāh than al-Shābī.(163) Al-Shābī advised his audiences to write down whatever they might hear from him.(164) He used to gather with two of his colleagues in the mosque to study and memorize the hadith.(165) The Basran transmitter 'Āṣim al-Ahwāl says that they read to Amir [al-Shābī] a saḥīfah written on the authority of Jābir b. 'Abd Allāh. Al-Shābī told them that he had already heard all that from Jābir himself.(166) In another report, 'Āṣim says that they read to al-Shābī hadiths concerning fiqh and he gave his approval of them.(167)

Ibrāhīm al-Nakha‘i, who was one of the greatest fuqahā in Kufah, is praised for his knowledge of hadith. Al-A‘mash, his devoted pupil, says that he could never mention a hadith to Ibrāhīm without his relating it to him or adding to
He approached the *hadith* in a critical spirit. He was one of those who related the sense of the *hadith* rather than its precise form. He was principally concerned with its legal aspects. Al-A‘mash asked him to give his *isnād* when he related *hadiths* on the authority of Ibn Mās‘ūd. Ibrahim said that if he omitted the links it meant that he had heard it from more than one of Ibn Mās‘ūd’s companions. Ibrahim was one of those who objected to *hadith* being written down. He is reported to have written some down, in his youth, on the authority of ’Abidah, who, however, expressed a wish that his own writings should not be kept after his death. Although some pupils gathered around Ibrahim in a circle in which he may have transmitted *hadiths*, it was never his intention to hold formal *hadith* sessions.

Abū Iṣḥāq al-Sabī‘i tells of himself that he used to frequent the two Companions, ’Abd Allāh b. ’Umar and Rāfi‘ b. Khadij. He used also to attend al-Barā‘ b. ’Āzib’s sessions. When asked how Abū al-‘Hwāṣ used to relate *hadith*, he said: "he would pour them upon us in the mosque, saying: "’Abd Allāh says ... ’Abd Allāh says ... " Al-A‘mash was pleased with his meetings with Abū Iṣḥāq
because he received hadith of 'Abd Allāh b. Ibn Mas'ūd in them. (180)

Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī is a key figure, in Basrah, in hadith transmission. Shu'bah asked one of his reliable pupils, Ayyūb al-Sikhtiyāni, if he had transmitted 1,000 hadiths on the authority of al-Ḥasan. Ayyūb said that he had, plus a further 1,000 and then a further 1,000. (181) Al-Ḥasan seems to have held hadith sessions regularly, and one of his pupils told him that it was difficult for him to attend, to hear hadith directly from him; he accordingly asked his permission to read with him his hadiths, which he received from others, and to relate them, on his authority, with the formula ḥaddathāni. (182) The great amount of time that al-Ḥasan devoted to the muḥaddithūn is reflected in Thābit al-Bunāni's saying: (183)

لولا أن تصنعوا بي ما صنعتم بأخسن فشددتكم أحاديث مؤثة. ثم قال:
منعوه القائة، منعوه النوم.

His hadiths were recorded in writing. (184) His pupil, Ḥumayd al-Ṭawil, says that he borrowed al-Ḥasan's books and copied them. (185) In one report, al-Ḥasan says that he has consulted his books. (186) His son, 'Abd Allāh says his father burnt his books, of which only one sahifah escaped, at the end of his
life. (187) However, two features marked his method of *hadith* transmission: The one is that he is said to have been more concerned for the content of the *hadith* than for the exact form; (188) the other is the relating of *ahādīth mursalah*, not only omitting the Companions, but also sometimes omitting other links, including his pupils. (189)

Muḥammad b. Sirin heard *hadith* directly from the two famous Companions, Ibn ʿUmar and Abū Hurayrah. (190) He went to Kufah, before the battle of Jamājim, where he found 4,000 searching for *hadith*. (191) On this journey he met ʿAbidah, ʿAlqamah, and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Laylā. (192) He says that when he went to Kufah there were five scholars there, ʿAbidah, ʿAlqamah, Masrūq, Shurayh and al-Ḥārith al-Aʿwar. (193) He says that he used to approach ʿAbidah with the atrāf [of *hadīths*] and ask him about them. (194) His strong association with the Kufans made him an authority on their ʿilm; it was for this reason that Ibn ʿAwn sought his opinion on the abundant ʿilm that he heard in Kufah. (195) During Ibn al-Zubayr's period, Ibn Sirin went on the ḥajj; on this occasion he heard [ahādīth] both from Ibn al-Zubayr and from Zayd b. Thābit. (196) Ibn Sirin was concerned to relate *hadith* in the precise form in which he had received them. (197)
JUYNBOLL'S EVALUATION OF THE STATUS OF THREE SUCCESSORS IN THE TRANSMISSION OF \textit{HADITH}

In dealing with Basrah, Juynboll dismisses the part played by three Successors in the transmission of \textit{hadith}. In this discussion it appears that he does not take the relevant information at face value but rather takes account of any piece of information which may go in the direction of his view and turns a blind eye to, and puts aside, any other contradictory information.

On al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, Juynboll says: "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 \textit{fiq\text{h}} as well as faith that he became known as an overall expert, but that his activities in the transmission of \textit{hadiths}, if anything at all, are at best minimal. Strong supporting evidence for this theory is found in an \textit{argumentum e silentio}, which was already adduced by others, namely that early treatises attributed to Ḥasan do not contain any \textit{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 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."(198)

Regardless of the controversy about the authenticity of the treatises ascribed to al-Ḥasan al-Baṣri, *hadiths* are not absent from all of them. In the *risālah* ascribed to al-Ḥasan al-Baṣri, entitled *Faḍā'il Makkah wa al-sakan fihā*, there are 32 *hadiths*. The editor of this *risālah* points out that there is another *risālah*, entitled *Farā'id al-dīn*, which is ascribed to al-Ḥasan al-Baṣri, consisting of *Qur'ānic* verses and *hadiths* on 54 *farīḍahs*. (199) In his treatise to the Umayyad caliph, although *hadiths* do not occur, the concept of the *sunnat al-Nabi* appears:

"وجدنا أدركنا يا أمير المؤمنين السلف الذين عملوا بأمر الله ، ورووا حكمته واستنوا بسنة رسوله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - ... فما ترك الله للعباد بعد الكتاب والرسول حجة "الحسن البصري" ص324

"وذكر من ذلك ما لا ينكره أمير المؤمنين ، بل يعرفه ويعرف تقديقه في كتاب الله وسنة رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - "ص327

However, it is not necessary that such small treatises should contain the relevant *hadiths*. We find, for example,
that al-Ţahāwi (d. 321) who compiled important ḥadīth collections (200) does not relate one single prophetic ḥadīth in his dogmatic treatise, al-‘Aqidah al-Ţahāwiyyah, though he makes allusion to the relevant ḥadīths in general.

In a footnote, Juynboll adduces the following as an additional argument: "Moreover, in the epistles ascribed to Hasan collected in Jamharat rasā’il al-‘arab, pp. 378-391, there is not one tradition either. Whether or not these epistles are genuinely Hasan’s is open to doubt. (201) In fact, these are merely rasā’il ważiyyah in which there is not one Qur’ānic verse either.

Examining the position of the three Successors, al-Ḥasan, 'Ikrimah and Qatādah, in the transmission of ḥadīth, Juynboll concentrates on the information undermining their activities in this field. For all three Successors he neglects the part of their reliable pupils in transmitting materials on their authority. On the other hand, he considers the part of unreliable transmitters and holds them responsible for the material recorded on the authority of the Successors. On al-Ḥasan, he says: "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 Ḥasan 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 samāc were questioned and surely Ḥasan al-Baṣrī
should once and for all be exonerated of these critical
allegationtions.

Moreover, the list of alleged pupils of Ḥasan 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.)”(202) The appendix contains, as Juynboll says,
"A cross section of Ḥasan’s most notorious pupils in
alphabetical order". And the material of al-Ḥasan which is
recorded on the authority of the reliable transmitters is,
Juynboll believes, in fact, not their work but the work of
‘anonymous people’, who used their names. He says: “In any
case, the few alleged pupils of Ḥasan, who were generally
considered reliable - and even that epithet is extremely rare-
can, therefore, not be held responsible for the hundreds of
sayings supported by Ḥasan isnāds. Their names might
simply have been inserted by otherwise anonymous people."(203)

According to Juynboll, many of al-Hasan's pupils are accused of transmitting *mursalāt* on the authority of al-Hasan; in fact, this was a feature of al-Hasan's transmission. In this regard Juynboll says: "Many alleged pupils of Hasan did not even bother to mention the name of the Companion from whom Hasan was supposed to have heard the prophetic saying. This resulted in large numbers of *mursalāt*. ... 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* Hasan'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*."(204) He gives a list of sayings ascribed to al-Hasan in one source and to the prophet in other sources - a phenomenon which has been discussed in the second chapter- and several of Hasan's *mursalat*.

In `Ikrimah's case, although his *tarjamaḥ* in *Tahdhib al-Tahdhib* is full of reports both favouring him and not favouring him, (205) Juynboll cites only some of those which undermine his activities in *hadīth* transmission. Discussing
Ikrimah’s pupils, Juynboll believes that “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.” He then gives several pupils of Ikrimah, mentioned in Tahdhib al-Tahdhib, whose hadiths on the authority of Ikrimah are suspicious in one way or another. After giving them, he says: “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.”(206)

On Qatādah, Juynboll says: “Another Successor of the stature of the aforementioned Basran transmitters is Qatāda b. Di‘āma (d. 117/735). An analysis of his tarjama 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.”(207) Qatādah’s tarjama in Tahdhib al-Tahdhib abounds with reports pointing to the ability and reliability of Qatādah in the transmission of ḥadīth. A quick glance at the tarjama of Ikrimah and Qatādah in, for example, Tahdhib al-Tahdhib, reveals some of the best ḥadīth transmitters as being among their pupils.(208)
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CHAPTER FIVE

TAŁAB AL-_ILM

A DISCUSSION OF JUYNBOLL'S PROPOSAL OF THE BEGINNING OF THE SECOND CENTURY AS A DATE FOR THE FIRST TAŁAB AL-ILM JOURNEYS

In this section, Juynboll presents another and final argument in support of his hypothesis regarding the late date of the beginning of the transmission of hadith. He holds the idea that hadith activities in the various centres were not more than regional. He believes that the chronology of the tałab al-ilm journeys supports this view. Proposing a date for the beginning of this activity Juynboll says: "This argument concerns the tałab 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 tałab 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 hadith centres during the first hundred years or so
after the prophet's death". (1) In fact, after scrutinizing Juynboll's evidence and sources, I have found it extremely difficult to see how he establishes this chronology for the *talab al-*ilm journeys. In this discussion we will see that not only are the data on which Juynboll relies merely selective reports but also that they do not even support his view. The earliest data on *talab al-*ilm journeys negates the "regional character" of this activity, as do also other factors. But before presenting this material, we should examine Juynboll's evidence. He says: "I found one unambiguous *awā'il* report indicating who was the first traveling ḥadīth collector. It is this same Maḥmar b. Rāshid. Furthermore, Rāmahurmuzi gives a concise list of *tabaqas* of ḥadīth travelers in which he mentions ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Mubārak (d. 181/797) as the first traveler of the first *tabaqa*. In his *tarjama* we read that he started collecting ḥadīths in the year 141/758. But in ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAwn (d. 151/768) we encounter a ḥadīth 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". (2)

With respect to the *awā'il* report, Juynboll selects it from a book devoted entirely to the *talab al-ḥadīth* journeys, i.e. al-
Rihlah fi tālab al-ḥadīth, which abounds with reports referring to a time much earlier than Juynboll proposes. But besides this fact, the report under discussion cannot be taken into account as supporting his proposed chronology.

The report, which is ascribed to Ibn Ḥanbal, runs: "... He travelled in search of ḥadīth to al-Yaman. He was the first to travel."(3) Although this version may suggest that Mašmar b. Rāshid was the first travelling ḥadīth collector, I found another version recorded by al-Nasāʾi in al-Kunā, which states specifically: ".... He was the first to travel to al-Yaman."(4) Ibn Ḥanbal himself mentions, in another report, that the companions of Ibn Masʿūd used to travel from Kufah to al-Madinah in order to learn and hear ḥadīth from ʿUmar (d. 23). In another version of this report ʿAlqamah (d. 62-73) and al-Aswad (d. 74-75) are mentioned in particular.(5)

Also Juynboll refers us to the work of al-Rāmahurmuzi, al-Muḥaddith al-fāsil. When we consult this work we find that the title referred to categorizes those who visited a number of different provinces in their travels.(6) Moreover, previous to this list, al-Rāmahurmuzi mentions various reports which represent some of the prominent Successors who flourished during the first century as having engaged in this kind of activity. In particular, these reports contain the names of
Sā'id b. al-Musayyab (d. 94/), Abū Qilābah (d. 104 or later), Abū Ma'shar al-Kūfī (d. 119-20), the famous companion, Jābir b. ʿAbd Allāh (d. after 70), al-Sha'bī (d. 103-110), Masrūq (d. 62 or 63). Furthermore, after giving the list, al-Rāmahurmuzi names some of those who travelled to just one province. Among these are some who are much earlier than Ibn al-Mubārak, for example, Muḥammad b. Sirin (d. 110) and Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhri (d. 124). In the case of ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAwn, I consulted the Tahdhib al-Tahdhib, to which Juynboll refers us; however, I found that we do not "encounter a ḥadīth traveler who started his search for traditions allegedly ten years earlier in 131/750" as Juynboll says, but perhaps half a century earlier. The report there says: "He heard [ḥadīth] in al-Madinah from al-Qāsim (d. 106) and Sālim (d. 106), in Basrah from al-Ḥasan (d. 110) and Ibn Sirin (d. 110), in Kufah from al-Sha'bī (d. 103-110) and al-Nakha'i (d. 96), in Makkah from ʿAṭāʾ (d. 114) and Mujāhid (d. 101-104), in al-Šam from Makhlūl (d. 112-118) and Rajāʾ b. Ḥaywah (d. 112). So Ibn ʿAwn's journeys must have taken place prior to the dates of the deaths of these Successors. Thus it means that Ibn ʿAwn must have begun his journeys at the latest by the end of the first century. What may, perhaps, have caused Juynboll to think that Ibn ʿAwn
started his search for *hadith* in 131/750 is a misreading of a report concerning the beginning of his propagating his material, which has nothing to do with his search for *hadith*.(10)

After giving these reports, Juynboll argues away two reports showing the engagement of two Successors in *talab al-*<i>ilm</i> journeys. He says:

"It is true that there is also a reference to the Syrian Successor Makhül (d. between 112/730 and 118/736) as having made extensive journeys in search of knowledge, but perhaps Makhül 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 ( ... ), as is also substantiated by the numerous cases of *samāʾ* from Companions which are doubted.

Besides, the term *<i>ilm</i>* in Makhül's alleged statement (*tuftu ʾ-arḍa kullaha li *talab al-*<i>ilm</i>* ( 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*. *<i>Ilm</i>* in this context should rather be identified with *fatwās*, *qaḍāʾ* 's or, simply, *raʾy*. This can be substantiated with various quotations from the *tarjama* of an older *faqih*, Masrūq
b. al-Ajdac (d. 63/683) from Kūfā. In this tarjama Shābī is recorded as having said that he had never set eyes on someone who was ʿatlab li ʿ-ilm (i.e. more widely traveled) than Mārsūq. Here ʿilm definitely must refer to something other than ḥadīth, if we want to harmonize that with Aḥmad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ijli’s statement who reported that Mārsūq was one of the fatwā givers and Ibn Saʿd’s brief description of him (lahu aḥādīth sāliḥa) which is tantamount to saying that he allegedly transmitted a few traditions of passing quality mainly of religious - not legal - tenor.” (11)

A distinction can hardly be made, at this early period, between the terms faqih and mufti, on the one hand, and muḥaddith, on the other. We have already seen, in the previous chapter, the participation of the great early fuqahā in the activities of ḥadīth. Mārsūq and Makhūl are no exception. They are recorded in various reports as fully involved in the transmission of ḥadīth. So the word ʿilm should be interpreted in the context of these report. Moreover, there is a report that comes just after al-Shābī’s remark in which Mārsūq is recorded as one of the companions of Ibn Masʿūd who taught the people al-sunnah.(12) So Juynboll should take into account this report when he harmonizes al-Shābī’s remark with the other two reports.
Makhül, in a report, tells in some detail of his journey. In this report an example of the *ilm, which Makhül was looking for, is given. It is a prophetic *hadith*:

Nevertheless, even supposing that the significance of these reports were indisputable, what about the considerable number of reports which are to be found in the sources on which Juynboll relies in his study, but which he ignores? In fact, these reports clearly demonstrate that *talab al-ilm* journeys constituted general practice as early as the time of the Companions. In the following, I will present the data on the *talab al-ilm* journeys and on other factors which testify to the strong contact between the centres during the first century.
Abū Ayyūb al-Anṣārī (d. 50 or later)

He travelled to Uqbah b. Āmir (d. 58) in Egypt to hear a hadith from him. (14)

Jābir b. Abīd Allāh (d. 73-78)

He travelled for a month to al-Shām in order to hear one hadith from Abīd Allāh b. Unays (d. 54). (15)

Jundub b. Abīd Allāh al-Bajālī (d. between 60 and 70)

He went to al-Madinah in search of ilm where he found the people in the Prophet's Mosque in groups exchanging aḥādith (yataḥaddathūn). (16)

The companions of Ibn Masūd

They used to travel from Kufah to al-Madinah in order to learn and hear hadith from Abū &mar (d. 23). In another version of this report Abīqamah (d. 62-73) and al-Aswad (d. 74-75) are mentioned in particular. (17)

Abīqamah b. Qays al-Nakhaṣi (d. 62-73)

He was the most intimate of Ibn Masūd's companions. He and his fellow, al-Aswad, used to travel with Abū Bakr and Abū &mar. (18) He said that he prayed behind Abū &mar for two years. (19) When he went to Abū &mar, other people asked him to memorize riwāyah from him for them. (20) Also it is recorded
that he went to al-Shām, where he entered the mosque of Damascus and sat with the Companion Abū al-Dardā'。(21)

**Masrūq b. al-Ajdāc** (d. 62 or 63)

Al-Sha'bi records that he had never known anyone who travelled more widely in search of ʿilm than Masrūq。(22) In another report, Masrūq is reported to have travelled for a ḥarf。(23) He went to al-Madinah, where he found the Companion, Zayd b. Thābit, who was firmly rooted in ʿilm。(24)

**al-Ḥārith b. Muʿāwiyah al-Kindi**

He travelled from al-shām to al-Madinah in order to meet ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb。(25)

**ʿAmr b. Maymūn al-Awdī** (d. 74 or later)

He was originally from Yaman. He went with Muʿādh b. Jabal to al-Shām, stayed with him until his death, and then settled with Ibn Masʿūd in Kufah。(26)

**Abū Baḥrayyah al-Kindi** (d. 77)

He went to al-Shām to meet the Companion Muʿādh b. Jabal。(27)

**Qays b. ʿĪbād** (d. after 80)

He went to al-Madinah in search of ʿilm。(28)

**Arbidah al-Tamīmī**

He is reported to have said: I went to any country in which I heard that there was ʿilm。(29)
Zirr b. Ḥubaysh (d. 81-83)

He travelled with a delegation of Kufans to al-Madinah during the caliphate of ʿUthmān. The reason for his visit was simply to meet and learn from the Companions of the Prophet. He attached himself to Ubayy b. Kaʿb and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAwf. (30)

ʿAbd Allāh b. Fayrūz al-Daylami (d. around 80)

He travelled from Palestine to al-Ṭāʾif to hear a ḥadith from the Companion ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ. (31)

Khaythamah b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (d. after 80)

He went to al-Madinah where he met Abū Hurayrah. He told him that he came from Kufah in order to ask for good things (altamis al-khayr). (32)

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Laylā (d. 83)

There is a statement attributed to him in which he says that he travelled throughout the Amšār. (33)

Abū al-ʿĀliyah al-Riyāḥi (d. after 90)

He is recorded as having said: "We used to hear al-riwāyah in Basrah on the authority of the Companions of the Messenger of Allāh (ṣ), but we were not satisfied until we traveled to al-Madinah and we heard it from their own mouths". (34) In another report, he states that he used to travel for days in order to hear riwāyah from someone. (35)
He recited the Qurʾān to Ubayy b. Kaʿb who lived in al-Madinah. (36) He had been in al-Shām with Abū Dharr. (37)

Saʿid b. al-Musayyab (d. after 90)

He said that he would travel days and nights in search of one ḥadīth. (38) He used to go regularly to Abū Hurayrah in Dhū al-Ḥulayfah. (39)

ʿUbayd Allāh b. Adī b. al-Khiyār (d. at the end of the reign of al-Walīd)

He travelled from al-Madinah to Iraq to hear a ḥadīth from ʿAli (d. 40). (40)

Saʿid b. Jubayr (d. 95)

He was a Kufan Successor, but he is known for his adherence to two most important Companions who lived in Ḥijāz: Ibn ʿUmar and Ibn ʿAbbās. When the Kufans disagreed on various matters, he would write them down, and then go to Ibn ʿUmar to ask him about them. (41) On one occasion, they disagreed about one particular verse, so he travelled to Ibn ʿAbbās, to ask him. (42) ʿAli b. al-Ḥusayn (d. 92-100), the Madinan Successor, said that when Saʿid used to pass by—perhaps on his way to the ḥajj—he would be questioned about the farāʾīd and other things. (43)

Shaqiq b. Salamah al-Asdi (d. during the reign of ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz)
He went to al-Shām where he heard [ḥadīth] from Abū al-Dardā'.(44)

Abū Burdah b. Abī Mūsa (d. 104)

His father sent him to al-Madinah to learn from the Companion cAbd Allāh b. Salām (d. 43).(45)

Abū Qilābah (d. 104-107)

He is a Basran Successor who moved to Syria and settled there. He is recorded as having said that he once stayed in al-Madinah three days waiting for someone to come there, in order to hear a ḥadīth from him.(46)

cĀmir b. Shurāhil al-Sha'bi (d. 103-10)

He once related a ḥadīth to someone and told him that he was giving it to him for nothing, even though people travelled to al-Madinah for something less important than this ḥadīth.(47) He went to Makkah in order to meet a Companion of the Prophet because of three ḥadīths which were mentioned to him.(48) Al-Sha'bi is recorded in some reports as demonstrating the importance of the journeys for ṭalab al-ṣilm.(49)

Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣri (d. 110)

He travelled to Kufah to meet the Companion Ka'b b. cUjrah.(50) When he went to Makkah, people there, among whom were some prominent Ḥijāzi Successors, sat him in a
chair and gathered around him to hear him relate
[ḥadīth].(51)

Muḥammad b. Sirin (d. 110)

He travelled to Kufah where he met the prominent Kufan Successors, ʿAbidah, ʿAlqamah, and ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Abi Laylā.(52) He heard [aḥādīth] from Abū Hurayrah in al-Madinah.(53)

Makhūl al-Dimashqī (d. 112-118)

He roamed the ʿamsār in search of ʿilm,(54) visiting Egypt, Iraq, al-Madinah, and al-Shām.(55) In his travelling he met some of the famous Successors, for example, ʿAskīd b. al-Musayyab,(56) al-Shābī(57) and Shurayḥ.(58)

ʿĀṭāʾ b. Abī Rabāḥ (d. 114)

He went to al-Madinah, which gave him, when he returned to Makkah, higher status than his Makkan fellows, ʿAmr b. Dinār, Mujāhid and others.(59)

Qatādah b. Dīāmah al-Sudūsī (d. 117)

He went to Kufah to al-Shābī.(60) He also went to al-Madinah, where he asked who was the most knowledgeable among its people concerning divorce, and he was told that it was Sulaymān b. Yasār.(61)

Ḥumayd b. Hilāl al-ʿAdawī al-Baṣrī

He travelled from Basrah to Kufah to meet Abū al-Ḥwāṣ.(62)
Abū Miṣṣar al-Ḳūfī (d. 120)

He went from Kufah to Basrah to hear a *ḥadīth* from the Basran transmitter Abān b. Abī ʿAyyāsh. (63)

Busr b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥāḍramī (al-Ṣāmī) (d. around 120)

He used to travel to the various *ʿamṣār* in order to hear one *ḥadīth*. (64)

Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhri (d. 124)

He travelled to al-Shām to meet ʿAṭāʾ b. Yazid, Ibn Muḥayriz and Ibn Ḥaywah. (65) He commuted between Ḥijāz and al-Shām for forty-five years. (66) Al-Zuhri himself was sought out by other transmitters from various centres. (67)

ʿAmr b. Dinār (d. 126)

He went to al-Madinah in order to meet al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad (d. 100). (68)

Yahyā b. Abī Kathīr (d. 132)

He was an expert in *ḥadīth* of Ḥijāz. He was originally from Basrah, but he settled in al-Yamāmah. (69) He travelled to al-Madinah in order to meet the sons of the Companions who were there. (70) It is said that he stayed in al-Madinah ten years in order to engage in *ṭalab al-ʿilm*. (71)

ʿAṭāʾ al-Ḳhūrasānī (d. 135) went to al-Madinah, but most of the Companions were already dead. (72)
THE ḤAJJ JOURNEY

An important factor, touched on by Juynboll only in passing (the same is true also of the next factor that we mention), which contributed to the diffusion of the ḥadīth, already during the first century, was the use of the occasion of the ḥajj or of making the ‘umrah. Scholars from all over the Islamic world had the opportunity to gather in Makkah, which enabled them both to meet the Hijāzi scholars and to meet each other and exchange their material. Ayyūb al-Sikhtiyānī (d. 131), speaking about his predecessors, said: "They used to make the ḥajj in order to meet each other". (73) Ayyūb himself, when he returned from Hijāz, used to urge his pupils to memorize what he brought from there. (74)

A good reflection of ṭa’lab al-‘ilm activities during the ḥajj can be seen in two reports. Ibn ʿAbbās once performed the ḥajj accompanying the Umayyad caliph Muʿāwiya (d. 60); Muʿāwiya had his entourage and Ibn ʿAbbās had his of those who sought al-‘ilm. (75) The other report represents Ibn ʿAbbās as being surrounded by groups of his pupils during the nights of the ḥajj. (76)

Some of the Successors made many pilgrimages during their lifetimes. al-Aswad b. Yazid al-Nakhaʾi (d. 74-75), who
performed either the *hājj* or the *umrah* 80 times,(77) had a close contact with *Ā*‘ishah, to whom he would send his son as a go-between.(78) Abū ‘Uthmān al-Nahdī (d.95-100), who lived first in Kufah and then in Basrah, performed either the *hājj* or the *umrah* 60 times.(79) He once performed the *hājj* with the principle of meeting Abū Hurayrah in order to hear directly from him one *hadith*, which had already been related to him by someone else.(80) Sā‘id b. Jubayr(d.95), from Kufah, used to go to Hijāz twice a year, once for the *hājj* and once for the *umrah*. (81) ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn(d. 92-100) said that Sā‘id used to pass by [al-Madinah], where he would be questioned about *farā‘īd* and other matters.(82) If the Kufans had disagreed on any a matter, Sā‘id wrote it down, in order to ask ‘Ibn ‘Umar about it when they met.(83)

Such journeys facilitated meetings in which Companions and Successors from different regions discussed and learned *hadiths*.

‘Urwah b. al-Zubayr was advised by his aunt, *Ā*‘ishah, to meet the Companion ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr, who passed them on his way to the *hājj*, to profit from the large amount of *ilm* he had on the authority of the Prophet. ‘Urwah did this, and he also met him on the next *hājj*, to check a one particular *hadith*. (84)
A number of Kufan Successors discussed one particular matter throughout their journey to perform the hajj. When they arrived, one of their number, 'Alqamah al-Nakha'i was deputed to ask 'Ā'ishah about it, and she obliged with a hadith on the subject.(85) When the people of Kufah learnt that the Successor 'Abd Allāh b. Abi al-Hudhayl was going to Makkah, they composed a list of questions in a sahifah and gave it to him. Ibn 'Abbās held a majlis at Makkah, in which he answered these questions.(86) Tawús (d. 106) and 'Amr b. Dinār (d. 126), both Hijazi Successors, once found themselves sitting with a man from Basrah, called Bashir b. Ka'b al-Adawi. Tawús said: "I saw this man come to Ibn 'Abbās and relate [hadith] to him, upon which Ibn 'Abbās said: 'It is as if I heard the hadith of Abū Hurayrah'."(87) After performing the hajj, a group of women (probably from Syria) went to al-Madinah and then they visited Ṣafiyyah bint Ḥuyay (d. 50), one of the Prophet's wives, to question her concerning various matters. They also found a group of women from Kufah, present for the same purpose.(88)

There are numerous further references in the sources which depict the importance of the hajj and the 'umrah in the diffusion and exchange of hadith. In the following some examples of scholars either teaching or learning 'ilm in
connection with this journey are given.

<Abd Allāh b. 'Amr b. al-Āṣ (d. 63)

<Abd Allāh b. 'Amr was seen, in the shadow of the Kasbah, relating *hadīth* on the authority of the Prophet to crowds of people round him.(89)

<Abd Allāh b. al-Ḥārith b. Juzay (d. 85-88)

Abū Ḥanīfah went on the *ḥajj* with his father in the year 93. He saw there the Companion <Abd Allāh b. al-Ḥārith b. Juzay surrounded by people to whom he was relating *ahadīth* on the authority of the Prophet.(90)

Ṣaʿīd b. al-Musayyab (d. after 90) (al-Madinah)

When the Iraqi Successor Maymūn b. Mihrān (d.117) came to al-Madinah, he asked who was the most knowledgeable *faqih* among its people. He was advised to go to Ṣaʿīd b. al-Musayyab. He questioned him as if he was already familiar with the *hadiths* available there.(91) In another report , we find that Ṣaʿīd was also sought out by Basran transmitters who came to al-Madinah after performing the *ḥajj* .(92) Whenever <Ali b. Zayd b. Jadān went to Makkah, al-Ḥasan al-Βāṣri would ask him to question the Madinan scholar Ṣaʿīd b. al-Musayyab about some matters.(93)
Abū Ja'far al-Bāgir (d. 114–118) said that what motivated him to perform the ḥajj was to meet ‘Amr b. Dinār.(94) The Yamānī Successor Ṭāwūs, who performed forty pilgrimages during his life,(95) advised his son, ʿAbd Allāh, that when he arrived at Makkah, he should frequent ‘Amr b. Dinār because of the knowledge that he had had from the other scholars.(96)

Scholars used to gather around the Makkan Successor ʿAtā b. Abī Rabāḥ, during the mawāsim, learning from him.(97)

‘Amr b. Dinār heard him during the ḥajj in the year 70 near the steps of Zamzam, relating ḥadīth to ‘Amr b. Aws (d.90 ) ( al-Ṭāʾif) and Jabir b. Zayd (d.93–103 ) ( Basrah).(98)

When he came to Makkah, people gathered round him while he sat and related [ḥadīth] to them. Among those who attended this session were the famous Makkan Successors Mujāhid , ʿAtā , Ṭāwūs, and ‘Amr b. Shu‘ayb.(99)

He performed ḥajj during Ibn al-Zubayr's period (65–74)
in which he heard [hadith] from him and from Zayd b. Thäbit. (100)

Sâlim b. Abî al-Jâd (d. 97-101) (Kufah)

He used to relate hadith, in the holy mosque, on the authority of Ibn cAbbâs. (101)

al-Ḥakam b. ʿUtaybah (d. 113-115) (Kufah)

He was seen in al-Khif mosque, where the scholars resorted to him. (102)

Umay b. Rabîʿah (Kufah)

He performed the ḥajj in the year 100. On this occasion, he met al-Ḥasan, ʿAtâ, and Ṭawûs. (103)

Jâmiʿ b. Shaddâd (d. 127 or 128) (Kufah)

He went to Makkah for the ḥajj and inquired who was the most knowledgeable of the people of Makkah. He was told to frequent Abû Bakr b. ṬAbd al-Raḥmân (d. 94). (104)

Ibn Shihâb al-Zuhri (d. 124) and Muḥammad b. al-Munkadir (d. 130 or later) were seen sitting in the holy mosque studying al-ʿilm. (105)

Thawr b. Yazîd al-Shämi and al-Awzâʿi, both from al-Shâm, went on the ḥajj in the year 105 and people heard [aḥâdîth] from them during that time. (106)

Al-Layth b. Saʿd (d. 175) (Egypt)

He went on the ḥajj in the year 113. On this occasion, he
heard [ahadith] from various scholars. Among them were Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhri, Ibn Abi Mulaykah, <Atā>, Abū al-Zubayr, Nāfi', <Imrān b. Abi Anas.\(^{(107)}\)

**MOVEMENT BETWEEN PROVINCES**

The following is a list of Companions and Successors who transferred from one province to another for various reasons.

**Mu'ādh b. Jabal (d. 18)**

The Prophet sent him to al-Yaman.\(^{(108)}\) After the Prophet's death, he went to al-Shām, where he died.\(^{(109)}\)

**Abū Hurayrah (d. 57-59)**

He visited Kufah.\(^{(110)}\) He also visited Damascus in which he was requested by the muḥaddithūn to relate to them prophetic hadiths.\(^{(111)}\)

**ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbbās (d. 68)**

He spent his youth collecting 'ilm in al-Madinah.\(^{(112)}\) He was the ruler of Basrah for ʿAli (d. 40).\(^{(113)}\) Then he went to Ḥijāz and settled in Makkah.\(^{(114)}\) He finally resided in al-Ṭā'if for one or two years until his death.\(^{(115)}\)

**ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb (d. 73-74)**

He took part in the conquests of Egypt and Persia,\(^{(116)}\) having been in Syria.\(^{(117)}\)
<Abd Allah b. cAmr b. al-cĀṣ (d. 63)

He was in al-Shām, Egypt and Kufah. (i18) He had estates in Egypt and al-Ṭā'if.(i19)
al-Barā' b. cĀzib (d. 72)

He was originally from al-Madinah, but, he settled in Kufah and died there. (120)
Abū al-Ṭufayl, cĀmir b. Wāthilah (d. 85)

He settled in Kufah and then in Makkah. (121)
<Alqamah al-Nakhāṣī (d. 61-73) (Kufah)

He spent two years in Marw.(122)
Qabiṣah b. Dhu'ayb (d. 86-89) (al-Madinah)

He moved to Syria, probably after the battle of Ḥarrah (64), and died there.(123)
Abū Salamah b. cAbd al-Raḥmān (d. 94 or 104) (al-Madinah)

He visited Kufah. (124) He also visited Basrah during the rule of Bishr b. Marwān. (125)
Abū Rāfiʿ al-Madani Nufayr b. Rāfiʿ al-Ṣā'igh (d. after 90) (al-Madinah)

He settled in Basrah. (126)
<Urwa b. al-Zubayr (d. 94) (al-Madinah)

He lived in Makkah for nine years with his brother <Abd
Allāh b. al-Zubayr (64-73);(127) he is reported once to have invited the Makkans to attend and hear ḥadith from him.(128) He also went to Egypt, where he stayed for seven years and married.(129)

‘Ikrimah Mawlä Ibn ‘Abbās (al-Madinah)

He settled in Makkah then in al-Madinah. He travelled extensively in Khurāsān, al-Shām, Yaman, Egypt, Ifriqiyyah, and Iraq, in all of which scholars and muhaddithūn came to learn and to hear ahadith from him.(130)

Abū Ṣāliḥ al-Sammān (d. 101) (al-Madinah)

He was one of the best pupils of Abū Hurayrah.(131) He was from al-Madinah but he used to go to Kufah frequently for commercial reasons.(132) The famous Kufan transmitter al-Acmash heard 1000 ḥadīths from him.(133)

Mujāhid b. Jabr (d. 101-104) (Makkah)

He was known for his extensive travelling.(134) It is said that at the end of his life he settled in Kufah.(135)

al-Dāḥhāk b. Muzāhim (d. 105)

He settled in Khurāsān, where the people heard [ḥadīth] from him.(136) He met Sa‘id b. Jubayr in al-Rayy and received tafsīr on his authority. (137)

Sālim b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar (d. 106) (al-Madinah)
He came to Syria three times during the rule of the three Ummayyad caliphs, ʿAbd al-Malik, al-Walid and ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAziz.(138)

al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (d. 110) (Basrah)

He was a kātib for al-Rabiʿ b. Ziyād al-Ḥārithi, the governor of Muʿāwiyah in Khurāsān, who died in the year 51.(139)

ʿĀmir b. Shurāhil al-Shābī (d. 103-110) (Kufah)

He fled from al-Mukhtār to al-Madinah where he stayed for eight or ten months accompanying the companion ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar.(140) A Kufan transmitter said that he stayed with al-Shābī in Khurāsān for ten months.(141) In another report, we learn that he was with ʿAlqamah in Marw for two years.(142)

Rajāʿ b. Ḥaywah (d. 112) (al-Shām)

He arrived in Kufah accompanying Bishr b. Marwān. Abū Isḥāq al-Hamdāni and Qatādah heard [ḥadīth] from him on his arrival.(143)

ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Hurmuz al-ʿraj (d. 117) (al-Madinah)

He moved away to Egypt at the end of his life and died there.(144)
Muḥammad b. Ka'b al-Qūrazi al-Madani (d. 117-120)
(al-Madinah)

He settled first in Kufah where he was greatly admired, (145) then in al-Madinah. (146)

ʿAmr b. Shuʿayb as-Sahami (d. 118)

He settled in al-Ṭaʿīf, but he used to come frequently to Makkah and disseminate ilm. (147)

Ḥabib b. Abī Thābit al-Kūfī (d. 119) (Kufah)

He came to al-Ṭaʿīf, where it is said that the people were delighted as if a prophet had come to them. (148)

Nāfic ibn cUmar (d. 117-120) (al-Madinah)

ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz sent him to Egypt to teach them sunnah. (149) He also appointed him to collect the ṣadaqat of al-Yaman. (150)

Abū Ishaq al-Sabiʿi (d. 126-29) (Kufah)

He was in Khurāsān during Muʿāwiyah's (d. 60) caliphate. (151)

Abū Zurqah, in a report, mentions some of the scholars who came to Syria and settled there during the caliphate of ʿAbd al-Malik b. Marwān (65-86). (152) These are:

al-Qasim b. Mukhaymirah (d. 100) (Kufah)
Muslim b. Yasär (d. 100-101). (153) (Basrah)

Abū Qilābah (d. 104-107) (Basrah)

ʿUqbah b. Wasāj (d. 82-83) (Basrah)

ʿAbdah b. Abī Lubābah (d. 127). (154) (Kufah)

Khālid b. Durayk al-Shāmi

al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥurr (d. 133 in Makkah). (155) (Kufah)
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PART TWO

ASPECTS OF ḤADĪTH
The qāṣṣ (pl. qussāṣ) is also known as wāʿiz and mudhakkir. Such a person acted as an exhortatory and minatory preacher, drawing upon all the material available to him, the Qurʾān, the sunnah, āthār and poetry, to convey his message. Describing the contents of the qussāṣ, Pedersen says: "the information about the older qussāṣ shows that their activity consisted in interpreting the Qurʾān and hadith, enforcing law, and impressing people with fear and hope. This is tadhkir or waʿz." In Juynboll's study, the activities of the qussāṣ are considered to be the forerunners of the transmission of hadith. He takes the awā'il reports concerning the first qussāṣ as "the earliest indications of people spreading stories which in the course of time became known as hadith." He summarizes his views about this: "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 earlist hadiths provided with isnâds came into circulation, were the quṣṣās.(5) He also says: "The first stories ( qiṣaṣ, ahâdith) related by the quṣṣās probably contained tarhib wa-targhib and faḍā‘il/mathâlib elements."(6) He believes that the quṣṣās played an extremely important role in early Islam.(7)

Passing over any exaggeration of the role the quṣṣās played in early Islam, I see no reason to believe that only the activities of the quṣṣās foreshadowed the transmission of hadith. If the sources tell us little about the quṣṣās in the first century, they tell us more about the engagement of the Companions and the Successors in hadith activities;(8) thus, if anything is to be considered as foreshadowing what Juynboll calls "the standardized and regulated hadith transmission", it is these activities.

Having said that, I would disagree with the deep significance Juynboll puts on the quṣṣās activities in early Islam. according to the awâ’il evidence, the phenomena of the quṣṣās is a new one in Islamic life. There is a report which
dates it toward the end of ʿUmar's reign (d. 23). Another report dates it during al-fitnah (35-40). So because it was a new practice in Islamic life, quṣṣāṣ activities, generally speaking, had not found a favorable reputation either with the Companions or with the older Successors, in particular those who were called ʿulamāʾ and fuqahāʾ, who were involved in the transmission of the ḥadīth. The lack of this activity among the Companions is illustrated in a report attributed to one of the prominent Successors, ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Abi Laylā (d. 82), who was asked for his opinion on the qaṣṣāṣ. He says:

There are various reports demonstrating the disapproval of the Companions of the quṣṣāṣ activities. They considered it as something contrary to the path of the Prophet and his Companions. Among those who condemned these activities we find ʿAlī, Ibn Masʿūd, ʿĀṣihah, Ibn ʿUmar, ʿSilah b. al-Ḥārith, Anas b. Mālik, Khabbāb, Umm al-Dardāʾ. ʿUmar is reported to have allowed the first qāṣṣ in Islam, Tamim al-Dārī, to be a qāṣṣ; he hesitated at first and admonished him continuously. There are other reports which show his objection to activities of the quṣṣāṣ.
The unfavorable reputation of the activities of the *quṣṣāṣ* among the Companions, is supported by the fact that this sort of *quṣṣāṣ* is rare among them. We find only two or three Companions in the sources who are said to practise *qāṣaṣ*. Although the activities of the *quṣṣāṣ* increased, in the course of time, in importance among the public, and their ranks had been entered by a number of Successors who engaged in *ḥadīth* activities, particularly younger Successors, the notorious reputation of the *quṣṣāṣ* grew among the *ʿulamāʾ* and *fuqahāʾ*. Muʿāwiya b. Qurrah (d. 113) describes the position of the *qāṣṣ* during the generation of the Successors:

“When we saw someone yaqussu, we used to say ‘He is šāhib *bidʿah*’.(17) Not only did most Of the Successors who are called *ʿulamāʾ* and *fuqahāʾ* not engage in *quṣṣāṣ* activities, but some of them were reported actually to condemn and disapprove of the activity of the *quṣṣāṣ*. Among these we find ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Abī Laylā (d. 83) Abū ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Sulami (d. after 70), Saʿīd b. al-Musayyab (d. 94), Ibrāhīm al-Nakhaṣi (d. 96), ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz (d.101), , Abū Qilābah (d. 104), , al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad(d.106), Khārijah b. Zayd b. Thābit (d. 100), Sālim b. ʿAbd Allāh (d. 106 ), Abū Bakr b. Ḥazm (d. 110-120 ), Maymūn b. Mihrān (d.117).(18)

However, some of the more reliable *quṣṣāṣ* had the
admiration of some of those who were not in favour of qaṣaṣ activity. (19) And as I have mentioned above, some muḥaddithūn also engaged in this activity. (20)

Of course, in the above evaluation of the activities of the quṣṣāṣ, I do not dispute the fact that there were among the quṣṣāṣ some who abused ḥadīth in one way or another. In fact, their order, especially at a later time, was considered to be one of those which was responsible for the circulation of bogus ḥadīth. (21) What concerns us here is the special reputation that they gained, the important role that they played in early Islam, and the claim that their material could be taken as "foreshadowing the standardized and regulated ḥadīth transmission, of, say, the last few decades of the first century/700s-720s ...". In fact, if anything is to be taken as foreshadowing the transmission of ḥadīth, it is, in my view, the activities of the Companions and the Successors in this field. There is no reason, in my opinion, to emphasize the activities of the quṣṣāṣ on the one hand and to overlook the activities of the Companions and the Successors in the transmission of ḥadīth on the other hand.
AL-FUQAHA' 

A DISCUSSION OF JUYNBOLL'S THESIS THAT THEIR OPINIONS ARE RAISED TO THE LEVEL OF 'PROPHETIC SAYINGS'

Apart from transmitters' errors and other reasons which cause a saying of the Prophet to be attributed to a Companion or to a Successor and vice versa,(22) it is a well known fact that a Companion or a Successor might relate a prophetic hadith on the authority of the Prophet on one occasion and give it as a fatwā on another, without mentioning the Prophet.(23) It was a general practice for the first fuqahā in Islam, among both the Companions and the Successors, to use precedents as fatwās in solving problems presented to them. The finding of a report, containing a piece of advice or a legal decision attributed to a Companion or to a Successor, and in another report attributed to the Prophet, does not mean it is, automatically, raised to "the level of a prophetic saying".

When 'Umar sent some Companions to the provinces, he prevented them giving fatwās according to their own opinions.(24) Some Companions adhere mostly to previous
examples in giving fatwās, but others employ their own judgement in fatwās if there are no such previous example. For instance, Sulayman b. Yasār describes to us the behaviour of the two Companions, Ibn ʿAbbāṣ and Ibn ʿUmar:(25)

A confirmatory report concerning Ibn ʿAbbāṣ is found in Ibn Saʿd:

In sum, in the case of a hadith traced back to the Prophet as well as to Companions or to Successors, attribution to the later authorities might be the secondary stage, either through their giving the prophetic hadith as a fatwā or for the other reasons alluded to above. Juynboll, in his study, understands the situation in a different way and gives some examples to support this. He believes that the prophetic hadiths regarding ḥalāl wa ḥarām matters "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 *ḥadīths* going back to the prophet". (*Tradition*, p. 17) To support this view, he puts forward examples of statements and practices attributed to a number of the early *fuqaha* in some reports which are attributed to the Prophet in other reports. After giving examples in the case of Saʿīd b. al-Musayyab, Juynboll says: "I maintain that it is Saʿīd 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 *ḥadīth* 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 Saʿīd's own juridical insight, rather than as being traceable back to previously set examples, lies in the mere fact of them being quoted as Saʿīd'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." (Tradition, p.16)

Before examining these examples, I propose first to consider statements by various Successors and followers as to their actual practice in the matter, and then to present a number of examples supporting this from Muṣannaf ʿAbd al-Razzāq.

Shurayḥ b. al- Ḥārith

He served for a long period in qaḍā', in which he was praised for his knowledge. (26) He was in favour of following al-sunnah rather than qiyās. He says: (27)

He states clearly that he followed al-athar. (28) Ibrāhīm al-
Nakha'i, one of his pupils, tells us that Shurayh used to base his judgements on those of 'Abd Allāh [b. Mas'ūd].

**Sa'id b. al-Musayyab**

According to one of Sa'id’s pupils:

جل ما أخذ به سعيد بن المضب من القضاء وما كان يفتى به عن زيد بن ثابت.

On being asked about a particular matter, he said:

اختف به أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ولا أرى لي معهم قول.

Abū al-Zinād asked Sa'id about the case of a man who cannot afford to maintain a wife. Sa'id said that they should divorce. Abū al-Zinād then asked him if this was sunnah. Sa'id said that it was. Ibn 'Umar was asked about some matter. He gave an answer and told his questioner to go to Sa'id and ask him the same question. The man did so, and Sa'id gave him the same *fatwā* as Ibn 'Umar had done. When Ibn 'Umar was informed of this, he said: "Well, I told you that he was an *ālim."

**'Urwa b. al-Zubayr**

His son, Hishām, who was also a *faqih* and a *muhaddith*, said that he had never heard his father give a decision on any matter according to his own judgement. 'Urwa insisted
on following *al-sunnah*.(35)

Sālim b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar

He was approached for a *fatwā* on a particular matter. He told his questioner that he had heard nothing concerning the matter. The man said: "I will accept your opinion". Sālim told him: "I may give you an opinion and, then, when you have gone away, I may come to a different opinion, at a time when I cannot reach you".(36)

ʿIkrimah Mawlā Ibn ʿAbbās

He said: I have not spoken according to my own opinion [on any matter] but two ...(37)

ʿAṭāʾ b. Abī Rabāḥ

He was cautious about giving his own opinion as a *fatwā*. He was once asked about a matter, on which he said: I do not know. He was then asked: Why not give your opinion on it? So he said: إني استحبي من الله أن يدان في الأرض برأيي (38)

When ʿAṭāʾ pronounced on any matter, Ibn Jurayj, his devoted pupil, would ask him if what he had said was *ilm* or *raʾy*. If it was *athar* he would say *ilm*, but if it was *raʾy* he would say *raʾy*. (39)
Ibrahim al-Nakahî

Al-Ḥasan b. ʿUbayd Allāh asked him if he had heard [as ʿathar] everything concerning which he gave fatwās. He said: 'No, but I have heard [āthār] and I have produced an analogy for those things that I have not heard from those things that I have heard.(40) One of his pupils, al-ʿAmash, said that he had never heard Ibrahim reporting anything according to his own opinion.(41)

Muḥammad b. Sirin

He used not to give his own opinion as a fatwā, unless it was based on some report that he had heard.(42) He said: they would consider someone to be on the right path, as long as he followed al-ʿathar.(43) He was once asked about al-mutcahibal-cumrāh ilā al-ḥajj (combining the ʿumrah and the ḥajj in a particular way). He said: ʿUmar b. al-Khattāb and ʿUthmān b. ʿAffān disliked this practice; if their disapproval was based on ʿilm, they were more knowledgable than I. If it was based on raʾy, their raʾy was better than mine.(44)

Qatādah b. Dīāmah al-Sudūsi

Qatādah was once asked by one of his pupils concerning a particular matter. He said: "I do not know". His questioner
then asked him to give his opinion; Qatādah told him that he had not used *ra'y* for forty years. He was fifty years old at that time.\(^{(45)}\) In another report, he declared that he had not given a *fatwā* based on *ra'y* for thirty years.\(^{(46)}\)

**al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī**

al-Ḥasan was asked by Abū Salamah b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān if he gave *fatwās* to the people according to what he had heard from others or according to his own opinion. He told him that not all his *fatwās* were based on what he had heard, but that his opinion was better for them than their own opinion.\(^{(47)}\)

**Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhri**

He was told by the well known *faqih* Rabiʿat al-Raʿy: 'When you give the people your opinion, inform them that it is just your opinion; and when you give them something from the *sunnah*, inform them that it is *sunnah*, in order that they may not think that it is your opinion.\(^{(48)}\)

**Ayyūb al-Sikhtiyānī**

He was asked about a matter concerning which he said that he had heard nothing. Then he was asked to give his opinion on
it. He said that his ra'y was inadequate to deal with it. (49)

In the following, I shall quote examples from al-Muṣannaf of ʿAbd al-Razzāq, one of the great early ḥadīth collections. In this book, the materials from the Companions and the Successors are given, in addition to the prophetic ḥadīth. From these examples, we shall see that the early fuqahā' would repeat earlier material verbalism in giving their fatwās, without attribution.

al-Muṣannaf abounds with reports traced to ʿAṭā, the greatest faqih of his time, in Makkah, on the authority of Ibn Jurayj. Ibn Jurayj is considered to be one of the first authors to compile a collection of ḥadīth, and to have been the best pupil of ʿAṭā, whom he frequented for 17 years. (50) ʿAbd al-Razzāq, in his turn, is regarded as a reliable source for Ibn Jurayj. (51)

* - ابن جريج قال سال انسان عطاء فقال: أشرب واتوأضا من ماء يكون في ظرف ولم يدبغ؟ قال أنكى؟ قال: نعم وليس بميطة، قال: لا بأس بذلك.

۲۱/۱ (۱۸۲)

- عن ابن جريج عن عطاء أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال: إذا ذهب جلد الميت فحسبه فليتنفع به. (۱۸۲) ۲۱/۱
- ابن جريج قال: سمعت عطاء يقول: كنت شاة
داجئة لإحدى نساء النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - فماتت، فقال النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - إفلا استمتعتم بإيابها. (187) 12/1

- ابن جريج عن عطاء عن ابن عباس قال: أخبرتني ميمونة، أن شاة ماتت
 فقال النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - لا دبغت إيابها؟ (188) 12/6

- ابن جريج قال سمعت عطاء يقال عن أولاد الخنزير... قال اتدبج؟ قال:
نعم، قال: فحسبه البسوة. (202) 10/6

- ابن جريج قال عن عطاء عن إنسان: ما تستمتع عن صوف الميتة فكرهه، وقال: إنني لم
أسمع أنه يرخص إلا في إيابها إذا دبغت فإن
دباغها طهوره وذكائه. (211) 10/6

- ابن جريج قال سأل سأل عن عطاء عن صوف الميتة فكرهه، وقال: إنني لم
أسمع أنه يرخص إلا في إيابها إذا دبغ. (207) 17/6

- عن ابن جريج عن عطاء قال: سمعت أبا هريرة يقول: إذا صليت فإنك تتجاوز
ريك فلا تسبق أمامك ولا عن يمينك ولكن عن شمالك فإن كان عن شمالك ما
يشغلك فابسق تحت قدميك. (180) 2/16

- معمر عن الزهري عن حميد بن عبد الرحمن عن أبي هريرة أن رسول الله
صلى الله عليه وسلم - رأى نخامة في قبة المسجد فحكها بمجردة أو بسيئ ثم
قال: إذا قام أحدكم إلى الصلاة فلا يتتنخم أمامه ولا عن يمينه فإن عن يمينه
ملكاً ولكن ليتنخم عن يساره أو تحت قدمه اليسرى. (168) 2/43

- معمر عن همام بن منبه أنه سمع أبا هريرة يقول: قال رسول الله - صلى الله
عليه وسلم-إذا قام أحدكم إلى الصلاة فلا يبرق أمامه ، إنه ينادي الله ما دام في مصلاه ولا عن يمينه وعن يمينه ملك، ولكن يبصق عن يساره أو تحت رجليه. (186) 1/7-6-4

عن ابن جريج قال: قال لي عطاء: ليبصق الرجل في الصلاة عن يساره فإن لم يجد مكاناً فليرفع رجله اليسري فيبصق تحتها. (1662) 1/2-4-4

أورد أحاديث أخرى مرفوعة

- عن ابن جريج عن عطاء قال سمعت ابن عباس يقول: إذا أوتر أول الليل فلا يشفع بركمة وصل شفعة حتى يصبح، قال: فكان عطاء يفتي يقول إذا أوتر من أول الليل ثم استيقظ بعد فليصل شفعة حتى يصبح. (4685) 2/2-2-3


- عن ابن جريج قال: أخبرني أبو الزبير أنه سمع ابن عمر وسأله عبد الرحمن بن أيمن مولى عروة: كيف ترى في رجل طلق إمراتة حا ثنا؟ فقال: طلق عبد الله بن عمر ... فليرجاها فردها ولم يرها شيئا، فقال: إذا طهرت فلطلق أو ليمسك. (1061) 1/9-1-10-1

- عن ابن جريج قال قلت لعطاء: طلقها حانضاً؟ قال: بردها حتى إذا طهرت طلق أو أمسك. (1962) 1/2-21
عن ابن جريج قال: قلت لعطاء يطلقها حاضرا، قال: لا تعتد بها، لفسد
ثلث حيض، قلت: فطلقها ساعة حاضتا، قال: لا تعتد بها، قال: بلغنا أن
النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - قال: لابن عمر: اردها حتى إذا طهرت فطلق
أو أمسك (1929) 6/11-2112

- عن ابن جريج قال، سألت عطاءا عن رجل طلق بعد الفداء، قال: لا يحسب
شيئا، من أجل أنه طلق امرأة لا يملك منها شيئا، فرد سليمان بن موسي
فقال عطاء: اتفق على ذلك ابن عباس وأبن الزبير في رجل اختلط امرأتاه ثم
طلقها بعد الخلع فانتقا على أنه ما طلق بعد الخلع فلا يحسب شيئا، قال: ما
طلق امرأتاه، إذا طلق مالا يملك (1772) 6/487

- عن ابن جريج قال: قلت لعطاء: أرأيت إن نفاه بعد ما تصنعه؟ قال: أولى
عنها والولد لها، قال: أولم يقل النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم: الولد
للفرشة وللعاهر الحجر؟ قال: نعم، إنا ذلك لأن الناس في الإسلام ادعوا
أولادا، ولدوا على فراش رجال فقالوا: هم لنا، قال النبي صلى الله عليه
وسلم: الولد للفرشة وللعاهر الحجر (1369) 9/7

- كبرنا ابن جريج، قال قلت لعطاء: أم ولد ميسرة - مولى ابن زياد - تزعم
أن ولدها ليس من ميسرة، قال: لا، الولد للفرشة وللعاهر الحجر، فقال له
ابن عبيد، ابن عمر: أفلأ يدعى له القاقة، قال: الولد للفرشة وللعاهر
الحجر. قال ابن جريج: وأقول أنا: إذا قالت الحرة كذبت وضربت (1381)
7/12

- عن ابن جريج قال: سميت عبد الله بن عبيد يسأل عطاء عن رجل، أتُعجب
عبدا له فولدت له فديه السيد بعض أولادها فقال: لا دعوى له، الولد
للفرشة وللعاهر الحجر (1382) 8/7
Examples of other early *fuqahā'*:

**Abū Saʿīd al-Khudri**

> معمر عن أيوب عن نافع قال: جاء رجل إلى ابن عمر فقال: إن أبا سعيد أفتاني أن الذهب بالذهب والورق بالورق لا زيادة بينهما قال نافع: فأخذ عبد الله بن عمر بيد الرجل وآنا معهما، حتى دخلنا على أبي سعيد فقال ابن عمر: زعم هذا، حدثتني يحدث عن النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - في الصرف. قال: نعم سمعت رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - يقول: يذكرن هاتين وأبصئت بعيني هاتين، أنه قال: الذهب بالذهب...*(1456)* 172/8

**Uqbah b. ʿĀmīr al-Juhani**

> عن أبي سعيد البصري أن عقبة بن عامر الجهني سأل النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - فقال: إن أختي نذرت أن تمشي حافية غير مختمرة قال مروها فلتترك ولتختمر ولتتصم ثلاثة أيام. وبه كان يفتي. *(1587)* 451-505/8

**Abū Saalāmah b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān**

> معمر عن يحي بن أبي كثير عن أبي سلمة بن عبدالرحمن قال: سنثل ابن عباس وأبو هريرة عن رجل توفي عن امرأته فوضعته قبل أن تمضي لها أربعة أشهر، فقال ابن عباس: تعتد آخر الأجلين، فقال أبو سلمة: فقُلْتِ! إذا وضعت حملها فقد حُلّت أبلى، قال أبو هريرة: أنا مع ابن أخي، يعني أبا سلمة، فارسل ابن عباس وأبو هريرة إلى أم سلمة وهي في حجرتها، وهم في
المسجد، يسألونها عن ذلك...
ثم ذكرت قصة سبيعة بن الحارث وقال النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - لها:

إذا وضعت حملك فقد حل أجلك (١٢٧٢) / ٨٧٤

Saíd b. Júbayr

- معمر عن الأمام عمicago بن جبير قال: ما أحد أشعر على الأنف من الله، يدعون له ولدا وهو يعفو عنهم، ويذرون له صاحبا وشريكهما وهو يرزقهم، ويدفع عنهم، قال: قلت: من حذرك هذا؟ قال: أبو عبد الرحمن السلمي عن أبي موسى الأشعري عن النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - (٢٠٧) / ١٨٢١١

Qatádah b. Díyámah al-Sudúsi

- معمر عن قتادة أن عليا قال: إذا خرجها فاختارت فهي واحدة وهو أملك بها، وإن اختارت نفسها فهي واحدة وهي أحق بنفسها، وكان قتادة يفتي به.

(١١٩٧) / ٩٧

- معمر عن قتادة قال: سئل عمر عن رجل طلق أمرأته في الجاهلية تطليقتيين، وفي الإسلام تطليقة، فقال عمر: لا أマーك ولا أنهاك، فقال عبد الرحمن بن عوف لكني أمرك ليس طلاقك في الشرك بشيء، قال معمر: وكان قتادة يفتي به، يقول: ليس طلاقك في الشرك بشيء. (١٢٨٩) / ١٨١٧

al- Hasan al-Báṣri

- معمر عن سمع الحسن يقول: إن خيرها فاختارت زوجها فهي واحدة وله الرجعة عليها. (١١٩٧) / ١٠٧

- معمر عن سمع الحسن يقول: إن خيرها فاختارت زوجها فهي واحدة، يرفعه الحسن إلى زيد بن ثابت، وكان الحسن يفتي به ويقول: هو أملك بها.
An examination of Juynboll's examples

The first examples that Juynboll adduces to support his argument, which are sufficient for us to examine here, are those of Sa'id b. al-Musayyab. He asserts that: "Many traditions, later appearing in collections with isnāds containing his name, can be traced also in other sources as utterances of himself that do not go back to persons older than himself". Then he gives his examples:

is also listed as a prophetic tradition in Ibn Māja, ẓalāq 17 (= ed. M. F. <Abd al-Bāqī, II, p. 660);

(2). The precept idhā aqbalatī ʾl-ḥayḍatu tarakatī ʾs-ṣalāt (i.e. when [a woman] feels that her period has started, she abandons performing the ṣalāt), ascribed to Ibn al-Musayyab (Abū Dāwūd, tāhāra 109, = ed. M. M. <Abd al-Ḥamīd, I, p. 76) is found in a slightly different version in a prophetic saying, e.g. Nasāʾi, ḥayḍ 2, = ed. Ḥ. M. al-Masʿūdi, I, p. 181 passim;

(3). The legal maxim lā nikāḥa illā bi-waliyyin (i.e. no marriage without a guardian) is listed as a prophetic tradition (Tirmidhī, nikāḥ 14, = ed. M. F. <Abd al-Bāqī, III, pp. 407ff.) and also as a ruling of various fuqahā' among the Successors such as Saʿīd, but also Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, Shurayḥ and Ibrāhīm an-Nakhāq (ibidem, p. 411);

(4). The legal maxim al-walad li ʾl-firāsh (i.e. the child belongs to the marital bed), allegedly transmitted with Saʿīd b. al-Musayyab in the ʾisanād between Zuhri and Abū Hurayra, is on the other hand, according to a report of the awāʾil genre, a rule of the pre-Islamic judge Aktham b. Ṣayfī, cf. E.I. 2, s.v. (Kister) and Ibn Bāṭish, Ghāyat al-waṣāʾil ilā maʿrifat
(5). Darimi, *wuđū* 85 (= p. 109) lists a number of precepts concerning the ablutions of the *mustahāda* ascribed to Ḥasan al-Baṣrī and Saʿīd b. al-Musayyab. Although many ablution precepts exist traced back to the prophet, this precept of Saʿīd has remained unambiguously ascribed to him;

(6). In Mālik we often find *mursal* traditions and also Saʿīd's own statements preceded by the same texts as prophetic sayings, e.g. *ṣalāt* 60 and 61, = ed. M. F. ʿAbd al-Bāqi, pp. 94f.

On the whole, precepts formulated by Saʿīd are very numerous in the *Muwaṭṭa*.

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."

In fact, I have examined all of the six examples that he gives, but I have found none that bears out his assertion that "many traditions, later appearing in collections with *isnāds* containing his name, can be traced also in other sources as utterances of himself that do not go back to persons older than himself". In the following a discussion of these examples in order of number corresponding to those of Juynboll:
1. This utterance is ascribed, as appears from Juynboll's quotation, to persons either older than Sa'īd, i.e. ʿAllī (d. 40), and Shurayḥ (d. around 80) or contemporary with him, for example, ʿUrwa b. al-Zubayr (d. 94), Sa'īd b. Jubayr (d. 95), and Abū Bakr b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. al-Ḥārith (d. 94). When I consulted Ibn Mājah, a source which Juynboll refers us to, to see this legal maxim as a prophetic hadith, I found no isnāds of the three hadiths mentioned there that contain Sa'īd's name. However, we do not need to compare these two canonical collections; the legal maxim can be traced, as being ascribed to the prophet, as well as to the companions and the successors, in two of the earliest hadith collections. See, al-Muşānnaf 6, p. 415 ff. Ibn Abī Shaybah 5, p. 15ff.

2. There is no need to trace the precept, which is ascribed to Sa'īd b. al-Musayyab in Abū Dāwūd, in Nāsā'ī to find it as a prophetic hadith; it appears in Abū Dāwūd himself as a hadith ascribed to the Prophet (see tahārah, no. 282, 283, 285. 1, p. 74-75). However, not one of the isnāds that relate this hadith to the Prophet has Sa'īd's name as a transmitter. Moreover, this precept is ascribed to other Successors, in slightly different words, or at any rate in the same sense: to ʿĀʾishah and al-Ḥasan (Dārimi, tahārah (83), no. 795, 799.
1,166-167), to Salim (or al-Qasim) (see Ibn Abi Shaybah, 1, p. 128). I found one version of this report ascribed to Sa‘id, with the indication that it did not represent his ra’y. On being asked about al-mustahada, he said: ‘O son of my brother, there is no one left who is more knowledgable concerning this than I ... (al-Darimi, ta‘arah (83) no. 792, 1, p. 166)

3. The prophetic hadith is listed as a ruling of various Successors in Tirmidhi, as Juynboll mentions, but Tirmidhi gives it as a ruling of various Companions as well, in the same place. Tirmidhi’s words indicate that the ascription of this maxim to Companions and Successors is no more than a reflection of their issuing fatwas based on the prophetic hadith. As a fatwa, it is ascribed not only to persons contemporary with Sa‘id, but to some of those who were older than he. Furthermore, Sa‘id’s name is not included in the isnads going back to the Prophet.

After mentioning the prophetic hadiths, al-Tirmidhi says:

والعمل في هذا الباب على حديث النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - لا نكاح إلا بولی ً عند أهل العلم من أصحاب النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - منهم عمر بن الخطاب وعلي بن أبي طالب وعبد الله بن عباس وأبو هريرة وغيرهم. وهكذا روي عن بعض فقهاء التابعين أنهم قالوا: لا نكاح إلا بولی ً، منهم سعد بن الممسك والحسن البصري وشريح وإبراهيم النخعي وعمر بن عبد العزيز
4. This example is, in fact, not one of an utterance ascribed to Sācid in one source and to the Prophet in another. Al-Zuhri transmits this *ḥadith*, from the Prophet, on the authority of Sācid and other Successors, i.e. Abū Salamah, on the authority of Abū Hurayrah, and Urwah b. al-Zubayr on the authority of Ā‘ishah. Also there are other channels, in which Sācid and al-Zuhri do not appear. (see for example, *Muwatta*, aqdiyah (21) no. 20.2, p.739. *al-Muṣannaf* 7, p. 442-43, no. 13818, 13819, 13821. 4, p.148 no. 7277. *al-Tirmidhi*, waṣāyā (5), no. 2120, 2121).

5. The precept of the ablution of the *mustahādah* attributed to Sācid which Juynboll says "has remained unambiguously ascribed to him" is also ascribed to others in various reports on the same page of al-Dārimi, specifically to Ā‘ishah, Ibn Umar, Ātā, al-Ḥasan, and al-Awzā‘ī.

6. This example does not represent "Sācid's own statement preceded by the same texts as prophetic sayings". These two numbers, in *al- Muwatta*, ṣalāt 60 and 61, are two versions of a *mursal* prophetic *ḥadith*, but they are preceded by two
versions of a prophetic *hadith* in the same sense with full *isnāds, ṣalāt* 58 and 59. Moreover, these two *isnāds* do not include the name of Saīd.

68-أبو بكر بن أبي تميمة السختياني، عن محمد بن سيرين عن أبي هريرة:

أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم-انصرف من اثنتين.....

69-دارو بن الحسين، عن أبي سفيان مولى ابن أبي أحمد: أنه قال سمعت أبا هريرة يقول: صلى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم-صلاة الصلاة....

60-ابن شهاب، عن أبي بكر بن سليمان بن أبي حثمة: قال: بلغني أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم-رفع ركعتين.....

61-ابن شهاب، عن سعيد بن المسيب، وعن أبي سلمة بن عبد الرحمن، مثل ذلك.

Juynboll’s comment on the statement, which appears in al-Khaṭib’s *Kifāyah*, regarding Saīd’s *marāsil* is incorrect, in my opinion. He says that "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". In fact this statement runs:

لا إن مراسيل سعيد تتبعت فوجدت كلهامسانيد عن الصحابة من جهة غيره

This means that the *marāsil* of Saīd are found as *muttaṣilah*
on the authority of the Companions through other transmitters. Having said this, the argument here is about Sa'id's own statements as developed into prophetic sayings, not about *mursal hadiths* developed into *muttaṣil*.

It appears from these examples that decisions that are attributed to Ibn al-Musayyab are also attributed to other Successors from more than one centre; why, then, should these be taken as Ibn al-Musayyab's own products?
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CHAPTER TWO

THE ISNÄD

JUYNBOLL’S CHRONOLOGY OF THE BEGINNING OF THE ISNÄD

The isnäd is one of the two main features of the hadith; the other being the matn. It is essential to the transmission of hadiths; without it, hadiths are regarded as worthless. Juynboll does not believe that the isnäd was used in the transmission of the hadith material earlier than the last few decades of the first century. In discussing the origin of the isnäd, he suggests a definite date: "...the birth of the institution of the isnäd is accepted as having taken place sometime in the late sixties or early seventies ..."; however, in the conclusion of his first chapter, he says: "Scrupity of informants gave way to the creation of the institution of the isnäd probably at the earliest in the late seventies of the first century (the late 690s)".

THE ISNÄD AND ITS ASSOCIATION WITH THE FITNAH

The main evidence Juynboll adduces to support this chronology is "the saying attributed to Muḥammad b. Sirin (d.
110/728): 'They [sc. the traditionists] were not used to inquiring after the *isnād*, but when the *fitna* occurred they said: Name us your informants. Thus, if these were *ahl as-*sunna their traditions were accepted, but if they were *ahl al-*bida\(^{*}\) their traditions were not accepted."(3) Juynboll contends that by the word *fitnah* in this report is meant the conflict between the Umayyads and Ibn al-Zubayr. He devotes a separate study to an attempt to prove this interpretation. Before I consider his arguments for this view, I shall refer to two reports which he mentions as substantiating his arguments.

With respect to the first, he says: "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, in which by *fitna* definitely the one of Ibn az-Zubayr is meant."(4) In fact, from another remark ascribed to Abū Dāwūd, we learn that by *fitnah* here is meant Ibn al-Ash'ath's *fitnah* and not Ibn al-Zubayr's.(5)
The other report is an awā'il report, ascribed to Mālik b. Anas, in which he says: أول من أسد الحديث ابن شهاب. Regarding this report Juynboll says: "The verb asnād in this context admits of two interpretations. Firstly it may mean that Mālik indicated Ibn Shīhāb 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 marfū'. 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 Ṣāliḥ b. Kaysān (d.after 140/758) as reported by Ma'amār 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 fitna alluded to in the statement of Ibn Sirin as the one resulting from the conflict of Ibn az-Zubayr and the Umayyads."(6)

Indeed, I would agree with Juynboll in dismissing the second interpretation but the first one seems to me unlikely too. In fact, al-Zuhri was one of those who related mursal hadiths. Some critics considered his mursalāt as worthless.(7) Mālik, in one report, said that al-Zuhri used to relate on Ibn 'Umar's authority without mentioning his informant.(8) According to Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, the famous commentator on al-Muwatta, Mālik relates there 132 prophetic hadiths on the authority of al-Zuhri. In 15 of these, al-Zuhri does not mention the authorities that link him to the prophet.(9) On the other hand, Mālik relates 80 prophetic hadiths on the authority of Nāfi', the mawlā of Ibn 'Umar, who was older than al-Zuhri. All of these hadiths are muttaṣilah except one
(no. 618), which, however, according to other versions, is also muttasil.(10)

At any rate, even if we accept Juynboll’s interpretation of Malik’s statement, it denotes the consistent use of the isnād but not its initiation.

A SCRUTINY OF JUYNBOLL’S THEORY CONCERNING ‘THE DATE OF THE GREAT FITNA’

Turning back to the report of Ibn Sirin mentioned above, it is Juynboll’s conviction that by the word fitnah in this report is meant Ibn al-Zubayr’s conflict with the Umayyads and not the civil war ensuing from the killing of ‘Uthmān in 35. To justify this view, Juynboll makes a separate study of the chronology of the term al-fitnah in an attempt to prove that the first fitnah that came to be known by this term is the one of Ibn al-Zubayr, and that, consequently, the word fitnah in Ibn Sirin’s statement cannot interpreted as that which ensued from the killing of ‘Uthmān.(11) The following is a brief summary of Juynboll’s article.

He traces the word fitnah in connection with the killing of ‘Uthmān in various reports which appear in early sources. He orders them according to the dates of the death of their
authors. These works are:

*Kitāb al-ṭabaqāt al-kabīr* by Ibn Saʿd (d. 230)

*Nasab Quraysh* by al-Muṣaʿb b. ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Muṣʿab al-Zubayri (d. 236)

*Tārikh Khalīfah b. Khayyāt* (d. 240)

*Musnad Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal* (d. 241)

*al-Uţmāniyyah* by al-Jāhid (d. 255)

*al-Futūḥ* by Ibn Aṯḥam al-Ṭūfī (d. after 252)

*Sāḥiḥ* al-Bukhāri (d. 256)

Then he refers to sources which, as he says, "were mostly historical texts". These are:

*al-Maṣārīf, ʿUyūn al-akhbār, and Taʿwil mukhtalīf al-ḥadīth* by Ibn Qutaybah (d. 270)

*Ansāb al-ashrāf* by al-Balādhuri (d. 279)

*al-Akhbār al-tiwal* by al-Dinawari (d. 282)

*Tārikh al-Yaʿqūbi* (d. 284)

*Tārikh al-Ṭabarī* (d. 310)

*Kitāb al-tārikh al-majmuʿ ʿalā al-tahqīq wa al-taṣdiq* by Saʿid b. Biṭrij (Eutychius) (d. 328)

*Kitāb al-unwān* by Maḥbūb al-Manbiji (Agapius) (d. 350)

*Murūj al-dhaḥab* by al-Masʿūdi (d. 345)

Juynboll concludes from his consideration of these reports
that "Evaluating the reports with the word fitna given so far I venture to say that not a single one originated in the time as suggested by the sources, but have all come into existence at dates relatively close to the death dates of the compilers of these sources, whereas in the Christian sources the word does not occur in the context under discussion. That means, I hazard to say, that the connotation 'civil war ensuing from the killing of 'Uthmān' of the word fitna originated not earlier than the latter half of the second century of the Hijra. Of almost every report cited above can be said without a reasonable doubt that it came into existence after the 'Abbāsids had come to power."(12)

Then he reviews most of the above mentioned sources, and others,"to compare the occurrence of the word fitna in the connotation 'civil strife after 'Uthmān's killing' with its occurrence in different connotations and contexts". His finding is "that in the history of Islam the first political event that is most often called the fitna is the revolt of 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr against the Umayyad caliphs. But inasmuch as other disturbances, earlier as well as later, also came to be called fitna, I propose to give a detailed list of occurrences of the word."(13)
There is a counterargument which was raised against this chronology by Josef van Ess. He published a *risālah* ascribed to al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafiyyah (d.95+), in which the word *fitnah* occurs in connection with the killing of ʿUthmān. He thinks that this may undermine Juynboll's proposal of the late date, as late as the latter half of the second century, at which the civil war ensuing from the killing of ʿUthmān was to be called by the term *fitnah*. Juynboll tries to rebut this elsewhere. However, before discussing the counterargument and Juynboll's reply to it, it should be said that it is the way in which Juynboll treats his sources that invalidates his theory rather than anything else. I base my argument on the following considerations:

First, before detailing his sources, Juynboll says: "In the following we shall try to trace the evolution of the word *fitna* as used in the accounts of the turmoil around ʿUthmān's death on the basis of the earlist sources available.

The sources will be dealt with here in the order of the dates of their authors' deaths. This is done merely for reasons of efficiency. In most cases it is impossible to ascertain the age of a report. The only evidence that such a report offers is that it is definitely not later than the year of death of the
writer who inserted it in his book. (14) In his enumeration, he mentions 15 reports in which the word *fitnah* appears in connection with 'Uthmān's killing. He dismisses all of them, but he differs in the way he evaluates each report. Some he dismisses simply as forged prophecies of a common kind. Others he dismisses because the word *fitnah*, which appears in them, is not in the context of the civil war ensuing from the killing of 'Uthmān. Even though Juynboll has grave doubt concerning the value of the *isnād*, he adduces an argument based on *isnād* in relation to certain reports. At any rate, his reasons for dismissing the reports are arguable. (15) In view of his different method of the evaluation of these reports, I cannot follow his conclusion that "not a single one originated in the time as suggested by the sources, but have all come into existence at dates relatively close to the death dates of the compilers of these sources". To judge from the above quotation, by which he introduces his sources, he appears to consider all these reports as products of the 'Abbāsid period because they appear in sources dating from that time. This being so, there would seem, in any case, no good reason for his considering them on other grounds, before dismissing them.

On the other hand, in dealing with the occurrences of the
word *fitnah*, in various sources, with other connotations, an investigation which causes him to regard Ibn al-Zubayr's *fitnah* as "being the first event of this kind generally referred to as *fitna*", Juynboll does not apply the same criticism as he does to the reports referring the term to `Uthmān. Moreover, all of the reports, that he considers to refer to Ibn al-Zubayr's *fitnah* also appear first in `Abbāsid sources. Thus, if first appearance in `Abbāsid sources is the sole reason for dismissing the reports referring to the `Uthmān *fitnah*, the same should apply to reports referring to Ibn al-Zubayr's *fitnah* since they also appear first in much the same sources. While Juynboll does not admit, in his argument, one single report which he accepts as referring to the event ensuing from the killing of `Uthmān as a *fitnah*, he adduces any allusion in these sources to any other *fitnah*, from "the *fitna* shortly after `Ali's death" onwards.

Secondly, he does not consider all the reports that appear in the sources he consults. So, supposing that we accept all the arguments by which he dismisses the significance of certain reports, what about the unmentioned ones, which number far more than the 15 that he discusses? For example, the first source he consults is the *Tabaqāt* of Ibn
Sa'd. He says: "Ibn Sa'd gives two reports concerning the killing of Uthmān in which the word fitna occurs"; he refers to these two reports and dismisses them. However, there are also in Ibn Sa'd the following additional reports:

أخبرنا عفان بن مسلم ومسلم بن إبراهيم قالا نا الآسود بن سهبان قالا 
أبو نواف ابن أبي مقرض قال: كان عمر بن ياسر من أطول الناس سكتا وأقله
كلاما وكان يقول عائذ بالله من فتنة. قال: ثم عرضت له بعد فتنة عظيمة.
18/1

أسماعيل بن إبراهيم عن أبواب عن محمد قال: قال رجل ما أحد منا أدركه
الفتنة إلا لو شئت لقت فيه غير ابن عمر 23/6-1

أخبرنا روح بن عبادة قال حدثنا الأسود بن سهبان قال حدثنا خالد بن سمير
عن موسى بن طلحة قال: يرحم الله عبد الله بن عمر... والله ما استغفرته
قريش في فتنتها الأولى، فقتل في نفسي إن هذا ليزر في أبيه في مقتله.
11/12

أخرج عن قيس الخارفي قال: سمعت عليا يقول على المنبر سباق رسول الله
صلى الله عليه وسلم - وصلى أبو بكر وثقت عمر ثم لبستنا فتنة فهو ما شاء
الله 91/6

وقال بعض أهل العلم أن كعب بن سود لما قدم طلحة والزبير وعائشة
البصرة دخل في بيت وطين عليه وجعل فيه كوة يتناول منها طعامه وشرابه
اعتزلاً للفتنة 7-10/6-1
Thirdly, tracing the word *fitnah* in connection with the killing of `Uthmân in what he calls "historical texts" , Juynboll suggests that the occurrences that he mentions are all that there are in the sources. This is not the case. I shall cite Juynboll’s comments on each of these sources and then give the reports that he does not mention.

"Balâdûrî (d. 279/892) has a report in which the plural *fitan* is used" (p. 151)

al-Balûdhûrî, Ansâb al-ashrâf

...فلم يزل واليا على الكوفة (أي أبو موسى الأشعري) حتى كتب إليه علي من ذي قار . وأمره أن يستنفر الناس فشتبهم وقال : هذه فتنة ، فوجه علي حينئذ عمرو بن ياسر مع الحسن بن علي إلى الكوفة لا ستنفار
قال أبو محفص: وبعث علي من الربيدة... فجعل أبو موسى: يخذلهم ويأمرهم بالمقام عنه ويحذرهم الفتنة، ولم ينهض معه أحد... ص ٢٣٤

قالوا: وقم علي حين ظهر وظفر [على القوم] خطيباً فقال يا أهل البصرة قدو عقوب عنكم فإياكم والفتنه فإنيكم أول الرعية [كذا] نكت البيعة وشق عصا الأمة... ص ٢٣٤

وقال الشاعر في يوم الجمل وقيل هو عثمان بن حنيف:

شهدت الحروب فشيئيتي فلم أن يوماً كيوم الجمل

أشد على مؤمن فتنة وأقبل منه لآخرب بطل

فليت الظلمينة في بيتها وياليت مسكر لا يرتجل ص ٢٧

... عن عبد الوهاب الزبيدي عن أشياخه قالوا: لما وقعت الفتنة لم يكن أحد من قريش أعفا فيها من عمرو بن العاص، أتى مكة فاقام بها، فلم يزل كافاً حتى كانت وقعة الجمل... ص ٢٨٤-٢٨٣

السود بن شيبان قال سمعت الحسن يقول - وذكر الفتنة - إن القوم نعسوا نعسة في دينهم... ص ٢٩٩

... وقال سعد بن أبي وقاص: أنا أحص الناس بهذا الأمر، لم أشرك في دم عثمان ولم أحضر شيئا من هذه الأمور الفتنة [كذا] ص ٢٤٤

قال: إن ابتك لرجل صدق لكنك قد غمسته في الفتنة... ص ٣٥ القاتل أبو موسى الأشعري لعمرو بن العاص
al-Dinawari, al-Akhbār al-tiwāl

أورد خبر تثبيط أبي موسى أهل الكوفة من الدخول في الفتنة، أول ما أرسل على إلينهم ليستهضهم:

... أيها الناس إن الفتنة إذا أقبلت شهبت وإذا أبهرت تبينت، وإن هذه الفتنة الباقرة لا يدرى من أين تأتي، ولا من أين تؤتي شيموا سيفكم وانزعوا أسنة رماحكم واقطعوا أوتار قسيكم والزموا قصور البيوت ... ص ١٤٥

- فجمع معاوية إليه أشراف أهل بيه فاستشارهم في أمره فقال أخوه عتبة بن أبي سفيان: استعن على أمرك بعمرو بن العاص، وكان مقيماً في ضيعة له من حيز فلسطين، قد اعتزل الفتنة ... ص ١٥٧

- أورد في سياق محاولة الحكمين: قال أبو موسى: وبحكم يا عمرو، إن المسلمين قد أتمنى إلينا أمراً بعد أن تقارعوا بالسيوف وتشاكوا بالرماح، فلا ندرهم في الفتنة ... ص ٢٠٠

"Dinawari (d.282/895) mentions the word fitna once in connection with ‘Ali" (p.151)
"Yaṣqūbi (d.284/897) does not have the word fitna in his account of the killing of 'Uthmān in his Tārikh" (p. 151)

Tārikh al-Yaṣqūbi

بعد أن سافر النبي في سنة 39 قال: لما بنى الرحمان بن عمير بن كريز وعبيد الله بن أبي الحكيم وأبوه وهو بان مقاتلون ونافذون ثم خرجوا من عنده وهم يقولون ويسعون الناس، إن الله قد حقن بابن رسول الله الدماء وسكن به الفتنة وأجاب إلى الصلح... ٢٥٥/٢

"Tabari (d.310/923) has the word in two reports" (p. 151)

Tārikh al-Tabari

... فهشي الناس عليك فأجابوا نباهك فقد ترى ما نزل بالإسلام وما تبينا به من ذوي القربي، فقال علي: دعوني والتمسوا غيري فإننا مستقبلون أمراً له وجهه وله الوان لا تفلح له القلوب، ولا تثبت عليه العقول، فقالوا: ننشدك الله، لا ترى إلا ترى الإسلام، لا ترى الفتنة إلا تخاف الله... ٢٧٧/١

... وما رجع سهل بن حنفية من طريق الشام وأثنت الأحاديث ورجع من رجع، دما على طلحة والزبير، فقال: إن الذي كنت أحذركم قد وقع يا قوم، وإن الأمر الذي وقع لا يدركون إلا بما عنه، وإنها الفتنة كالنار كلما سمعت أزدادت واستنارت... ٢٨٩/١

... عن الشعبي قال: بالله الذي لا إله إلا هو ما تهض في تلك الفتنة إلا ستة بدرتين ما لهم سابع أو سبعة ما لهم شامين. ٢٩٥/١
- عن أبي عمرة مولى الزبير قال: لما بابع أهل البصرة الزبير وطلحة قال الزبير: ألا ألف فارس أسبر بهم إلى علي فإنه بيته وإنا صحبته لعلي أقتله قبل أن يصل إليها فلم يجبه أحد، فقال: إن هذه له الفتنة التي كنا نتحدث عنها، فقال له مولاه أسميها فتنة وقاتل فيها ... 217/1

يقول أبو موسى الأشعري للكوفيين - بعد أن أتاه ابن عباس والاشتر يستنضهانه لمنازرة علي - ... فاما إذ كان ما كان فإنها فتنة صماء ... فا غمدوا السيف وانصلوا الأسئلة واقطعوا الأورار وأروا المظلوم والمضطهد. حتى يلتئم هذا الأمر وتنجلي هذه الفتنة. 314/1

- وقام أبو موسى فقال: ابنا الناس ... إن الفتنة إذا أقبلت شهبت وإذا أدرت بببنت، وإن هذه الفتنة باقرة كأن البطن تجري بها الشمال والجنوب والصبا والدبور ... استنصحوني ولا تستغشوني واطيعوني يسلم لكم دينكم ودنياكم ويشقي بحر هذه الفتنة من جناها ... 48-49/1 وانظر أيضاً من 189/2

- أن عبد خير الحيواني قام إلى أبي موسى ... هل تعلم أحداً خارجاً من هذه الفتنة التي تزعم أنها هي فتنة إنما بقي أربع قرون، علي بظهر الكوفة وطلحة والزبير بالبصرة ومعاوية با لشام وفرقة أخرى با لجاز لرجب بها في ولا يقاتل بها عهد فقال له أبو موسى: أولئك خير الناس وهي فتنة ... 182/1

- قال أبو موسى -مظاطبا عمرو بن العاص في التحكيم - ... ان ابنك وجل صدق، ولكنك قد غمسته في هذه الفتنة. 325/1

- من نافذ مولى ابن عمر قال: ... فقال عبد الله بن عمر: لا والله لا أرضع عليها شيئاً أبدا، وقال يا ابن العاص، إن العرب أسدت إليه أمرها بعدما تقارعت بالسيوف وتناجزت با الرماح فلا ترد منهم في فتنة. 56/1
"...al-Mas'üdi, ... (345/956), did not use it either" (p. 152)

al-Mas'üdi, Murūj al-dhahab

Fourthly, there are other early sources in which the word *fitnah* appear to mean the one connected with killing of Uthmān:
Mālik b. Anas (d. 179), al-Muwatṭa’ of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Shaybānī

- أخبرنا يحيى بن سعيد أنه سمع سعيد بن المسبب يقول: وقعت الفتنة - يعني فتنة عثمان فلم يبق من أهل بدر أحد، ثم وقعت فتنة الحرمة فلم يبق من أصحاب الحديثية أحد، فإن وقعت الثالثة لم يبق لنا طباخ. ص ٢٤٢ (٩٩١)

Abd al-Razzāq (d. 211), al-Musannaf

- معمر عن الزهري قال... وأمر الواليد بن عقبة ثم شهد على الواليد فقلذه ونزعه، وأمر سعيد بن العاص مكانه، ثم قال الناس ونشموا في الفتنة فحجج سعيد بن العاص ثم قلق من حجه فلقيه خيال العراقي فرجعوه من العذيب وأخرج أهل مصر عبد الله بن سعد بن أبي سرح وأتى أهل البصرة عبد الله بن عامر بن كريز فكان كذلك أول الفتنة حتى إذا قتل عثمان - رحمه الله - بايع الناس علي بن أبي طالب... فلم يزل بعوضهما وعملهما يختلفون إلى المدينة ومكة حتى قتل علي - رحمه الله تعالى - ثم اجتمع الناس على معاوية، ومروان وأبي البختري يغلبان علي على أهل المدينة في تلك الفتنة... وكانت مصر في سلطان علي بن أبي طالب فائر عليها قيس بن سعد بن عبادة الأنصارى... وكان قيس من ذوي الرأي من الناس إلا ما غلب عليه من أمر الفتنة، فكان معاوية وعمرو بن العاص يجهدان على إخراجه من مصر... فأمهت شرطة الخمسين قيس بن سعد، وتعاهدوا وتعاقدوا على تتال معاوية وعمرو بن العاص حتى يشترط لشيء علي ولن كان اتبعه على أموالهم ودمائهم وما أصابوا من الفتنة... وكان يعد في العرب حتى ثارت الفتنة الأولى خمسة يقال لهم ذو رأى العرب ومكيتهم يعد من قريش معاوية وعمرو و يعد من الأنصار قيس بن سعد... ٥٥٧ - ٤٦٣ (١٧٧)
- عن معاوية وعمرو، وبعد من الأنصار قيس بن سعد، وبعد من الحجاجين عبد الله بن بديل بن ورقاء الخزاعي، وبعد من ثقيف المغيرة بن شعبة (25/11) (2726)

- معاوية عن الزهري قال: ثارت الفتنة و 
عبد الله بن المبارك قال أنا مأمون عن الزهري قال: كتب إليه سليمان بن هشام سائلا عن امرأة لحقت بالحرمية وفقرت زوجها، وشهدت على قومها بالشرك وتزوجت فيما ثم رجعت تائهة، فكتب إليه الزهري وأنا شاهد: أما بعد فإن فتنة الأولى ثارت وأصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم - ممن شهد بدرا كثير فروا أن يهدروا أمر الفتنة ولا يقام فيها حد على أحد من فرج استحله بتآويل القرآن ... (368/2) (1259)

Muṣannaf Ibn abi Shaybah

- عن ابن عمر قال: لم يقص زمان أبي بكر ولا عمر، إنما كان القصص زمن الفتنة. (746/2) (1241)

- عن حذيفة قال: فذكر قتل عثمان قال: إما إنها أول الفتنة 1/14/113 (1778)

- عن حذيفة قال: أرأيت يوم الدار كانت فتنة يعني قتل عثمان فإنها أول الفتنة وأخرها الدجال. (167/2) (1129)

- عن محمد أن رجلا من أصحاب النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - قال: ما أدرك الفتنة أحداً مات لا شئت أن أقول فيه لعلت فيه إلا عبدالله بن عمر (15/162) (1914)

- كان الحارث بن سويد ينكر فقال إياكم والله الفتنة فإنها قد ظهرت، فقال رجل: فانت قد خرجت مع علي، قال: وأبين لكم إمام مثل علي (76/16) (1915)

- ميمون بن سهاب عن جندب بن عبد الله، أنه قال في الفتنة: إنه من اتبجس له أردته (76/16) (1916)

- عن شريح قال: ما أخبرت ولا استخبرت مذ كانت الفتنة، قال له مسروق: لو كنت مثل لسرني أن أكون قدمت، قال شريح: فكيف باكثر من ذلك، ما في الصدور، وتلتقي الفتنة وإنا جداهما أحب إلي من الآخر (122/162) (1937)
... سمعت أبا وائل يقول: لما قتل عثمان قال أبو موسى: إن هذه الفتنة
فتنة با قرة كده البطن ... 15 26 - 27 (1949)
... عن أبي نصرة قال: نكروا عليًا وعثمان وطلحة وزيد والزبير عند أبي سعيد
 فقال: أقوم سبقت لهم سوابق، وأصابتهم الفتنة فردوا أمرهم إلى الله 15
(1967) 275

أحمد بن حنبل، al-Ilal

... عن الحسن بن الأسود بن سريع، وكان أول من قص في هذا المسجد،
وكان يسمى حماد ربه فلما وقعت الفتنة انطلق إلى فارس حتى مات بها ... 1
(1679) 281
... يثوب عن محمد بن سيرين قال: هاجت الفتنة وأصحاب رسول الله
على الله عليه وسلم - عشرة آلاف فما خف فيها منهم مائة بل لم يبلغوا
ثلاثين. 196/2 (1369)

أبو جعفر محمد بن حبيب باشمير البغدادي
(d.245)، al-Muhabbar

ثم مات معاوية لهلال رجب من سنة ستين وهو ابن سبع وسبعين سنة
وكانت ولايته تسع عشرة سنة وثمانية أشهر من ذلك الفتنة أربع سنين
وشهرين واثنان وعشرون يومًا. ص 21

أبو عمر محمد بن يوسف البكندي (d. 350 or after 362),
Kitāb al-wulāt wa- Kitāb alqudāt

... عن ابن شهاب قال: كانت مصر من جيش علي فامض على قيس بن سعد
وكان من ذوي الرأي والباس إلا ما غلب عليه من أمر الفتنة فكان معاوية
وعمرو جاهدين أن يخرجوا من مصر فتغلب على أمرها ... ص ٢١٠-٢١١
- عن علي بن الحارث بن عثمان بن قيس بن أبي العاص ، أخبره أن جده عثمان ولده عمر بن الخطاب - رضي الله عنه - القضاء بمصر ... حتى توفي
بعد قتل عثمان - رضي الله عنه - في الفتنة . ص ٢٠٦

Ibn Shabbah (d.262 ), Tārikh al-Madinah al-Munawwarah

- قتل عثمان رحمة الله ووقعت الفتنة وهم الفريقان أن يتحاربوا ... ٢

١٦١
- عن زيد بن وهب قال : كنا عند حذيفة - رضي الله عنه - فقال : ما تعودون قتل عثمان - رضي الله عنه - فيكم ، أتعدون فتنة ؟ قلنا : نعم . قال : هي والله أول الفتنة ، وأخرى الدجال ٤ / ١٢٤٧
- عن زيد بن وهب قال : قال لنا حذيفة - رضي الله عنه - : أي الفتنة تعودن أول ؟ فسكتنا ، فقال : أول الفتنة الدار وأخرى الدجال ٤ / ١٢٤٧
- سعيد بن عامر قال : حدثنا هشام عن محمد قال : وقعت الفتنة وبالدينة عشرة آلاف أو قال أكثر من عشرة آلاف من أصحاب رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - فما دخل الفتنة منهم كلههم إلا ثلاثة ٤ / ١٢٧١
- محمد بن حاتم قال : حدثنا ابن علية عن أيوب عن محمد قال : هاجت الفتنة وأصحاب رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - عشرة آلاف فما خف فيها منهم مائة . (قيل) لا يبلغون ثلاثة ٤ / ١٢٧١
- سليمان بن بلال ، عن يحي بن سعيد قال ، سمعت سعيد بن المسبب يقول : وقعت الفتنة الأولى - يعني فتنة عثمان - فلم يبق من أصحاب بدر أحد ، ثم وقعت الفتنة الثانية - يعني فتنة الحيرة - فلم يبق من أصحاب الحديدة أحد ، وأنى وقعتها الثالثة.
- لم ترتفع وبالناس طبغ ٤ / ١٢٧٤
- سفيان بن عبيدة عن يحي بن سعيد عن سعيد بن المسبب قال : وقعت
فترة الدار بِمثلهٰ ۴ / ۱۲۷۴

- عن ابن عمر - رضي الله عنهما قال: نزلت علينا الآية، ثم إنكم يوم القيامة عند ربكم تختصمون. وما ندري ما نفسرها حتى وقت الفتنة، فقلنا هذا الذي وعدنا أن نختصم فيه۴ / ۱۲۹۴.

Tārikh Abū Zur'ah al-Dimashqi (281)

- حدثنا أبو مسهر قال: وكانت الفتنة خمس سنين ص ۱۸۷ (۹۹)

Waki, Muḥammad b. Khalaf b. Ḥayyān (d.306), Akhbār al-Qudāt

- عن الزهري: أن آبا بكر وعمر لم يكن لهما قاض حتى كانت الفتنة، فا countertى معاوية. ۱/۱۰.۵
Juynboll summarizes the counterargument of Van Ess to his hypothesis concerning the chronology of the *fitnah*, which he defends as follows:

"In *Arabica*, XXI, 1974, pp. 20-52. J. van Ess published an early (probably first/seventh century) *risāla* attributed to Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafiya (d. circa 100/719) on the *irjā* doctrine, in which the word *fitna* occurs in a paragraph introducing the period immediately after Abū Bakr and ʿUmar. After ʿUmar the Islamic community, in Ḥasan's view, entered upon a time of *fitna* (Van Ess: *Anfechtung*) 'promised' by God, in which the *ahl al-furqa al-uwal* (Van Ess: *die erste Protagonisten der Spaltung*) were described as people "severing old bonds of allegiance and striking up new ones". Then, in *Arabica*, XXII, 1975, p. 49, he stated that, if the authenticity of this *risāla* was accepted as being a genuine product of the first/seventh century, the thesis as presented two years previously in my *Arabica* paper was no longer tenable, its supporting evidence being mainly based upon the relatively late, probably post-Umayyad, time of origin of those sources in which the term *fitna* was for the first time used for the civil war following the killing of ʿUthmān.

Although Van Ess's argument has a lot to commend it, I
maintain that the passage from the *Kitāb al-irjā* can be approached in a way that does not undermine my initial hypothesis.

The word *fitna* in the passage under discussion refers to the period *immediately following* Īmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb's reign. In other words, as from the *beginning* of the reign of Īthmān the period is characterized by *fitna*. This usage can also be found in the words *fi 'l-fitna fi zamān Īthmān* which we sometimes find.

A further description of this period is given in the words *yufāriqu rījālun ālayhi rījālan wa-yuwāli rījālun ālayhi rījālan*. This description, in my view, pertains to Īthmān's reign itself (23/644–35/656) and not especially to the period commencing twelve years after Īmar's death following Īthmān's murder, as Van Ess apparently took it to mean. 'People severing old bonds and striking up new friendships' should be taken to apply to those factions in the empire which originated *during* Īthmān's reign, not after. ... The use in this context of *fitna* is reminiscent, in my opinion, of the common Qur'ānic usage of the word, 'tribulation' or 'confusion', rather than 'civil war'. To be sure, there is no record of 'civil war' *during* Īthmān's reign, only after. If Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b.
al-Ḥanafiyya had had the civil war ensuing from ʿUthman's murder in mind when he used the word *fitna*, he surely would have mentioned ʿUthman's name as a third in the row after Abū Bakr and ʿUmar. It should also be borne in mind that, if the author of this *risāla* had meant with the qualification *fitna* the period following ʿUthmān's murder, he would automatically have implicated ʿAli, his own grandfather, as one of the major protagonists in the drama that followed, even if he had not explicitly pointed at his grandfather as also partly responsible for ʿUthmān's death and the ensuing period of grave unrest. In my view, by leaving ʿUthmān as well as ʿAli unmentioned he indicates that his *Geschichtsbild* of the earliest development of Islam underwent its first major change (for the worse) from the date that ʿUmar's reign came to an end in 13/644."

In fact, the paragraph which Juynboll refers us to does not introduce the period "immediately following ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭab's reign". Indeed, it is about the attitude which al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafiyyah took and advised the others to take toward the two caliphs, Abū Bakr and ʿUmar and what he calls *ahl al-furqa al-uwal*, i.e. ʿUthmān, ʿAli, Talḥah, and al-Zubayr. There is an element in the paragraph
which relates to the civil war ensuing from the killing of ʿUthmān. Juynboll alludes to a report where the period of the reign of ʿUthmān is described, as he thinks, by the word *fitnah*. He considers this *fitnah* as different from the one in the context of the civil war ensuing from the killing of ʿUthmān. In fact, this is precisely one of the type of reports which characterizes both the unrest that brought about the death of ʿUthmān and the civil war ensuing from his killing by the term *fitnah*. This report runs:

An مصع ب بن عبد الرحمن بن عوف ومعاذ بن عبيد الله الخيمي وأبو جعفروه بن شعوب الليثي اتهموا بقتل ابن هبّار أُخِي بني أسد، وكانوا أصابوه في الفتنة في زمن عثمان فلما اجتمع الناس على معاوية ... أخبار القضاة

On top of this, Juynboll seems to misunderstand the purpose of this *risālah* and the meaning of the words *ahl al-furqa al-uwal*. In his *tarjamaḥ*, al-Dhahabi mentions information which explains this:

وَقَالَ يَحْيِى بْنِ سَعِيدِ عَنْ عَصْمَانِ بْنِ ابْرَاهِيمِ بْنِ حَاتِبٍ أَوْلَى مِنَ تَكْلِمٍ فِي الارْجَاهِ الْحَسَنِ بْنِ مُحَمَّدِ كَنتُ حَاضِرًا بِآمَرِ تَكْلِمٍ وَكَنتُ فِي حَلْقَتِهِ مَعَ عَمِي وَكَانَ فِي الْحَلْقَةِ جَلْدُهُ وَكَانَ مَعَهُ فَتَكَلَّمَ فِي عَصْمَانِ عَلَى وَطَلْحَةٍ وَأَلْبَاءُ الْزِبْبِرُ فَأَكْثَرُوا، فَقَالَ الْحَسَنُ: سَمِعْتُ مَنْ تَكْلِمَ هَذِهِ وَلَمْ أَرْ مِثْلَ مَا كَتَبَ عَصْمَانُ وَعَلِى وَطَلْحَةٍ وَالْزِبْبِرُ فَلا يَتَوَلَّوا وَلا يَتَبَرَّأُ مِنْهُمْ ثُمَّ قَامَ فَقَمْتُ وَبَلَغَ أَبَاهُ مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ الْحَسَنِ مَالًا قَالَ فَضَرِبْ بَعْضًا فَشَجَهُ وَقَالَ لَا تَوْلِي أَبَاكَ عَلِيًا! قَالَ وَكَتَبَ الرِّسَالَةُ الَّتِي ثُبِّتَ فِي هَذَا الْأَرْجَاهُ بَعْدَ ذَلِكَ.
Al-Dhahabi goes on to say:

أرجلاء الذي تكلم به معتاه أنه يرجى أمر عثمان وعلى إلى الله فيفعل فيهم
مايشاء، ولقد رأيت أخبار الحسن بن محمد في مسند على رضي الله عنه
ليعقوب بن شيبة فارود في ذلك كتابه في الأرجلاء وهو نحو ورقتين فيها
أشياء حسنة وذلك ان الخوارج تولت الشيخين وبرئت من عثمان وعلى
فعارضتهم السبابية فبرئت من أبي بكر وعمر وعثمان وتولت علياً وافرعت
فيه وقالت المرجئة الأولى نتولى الشيخين وترجى عثمان وعلى فلا نتولاهم
ولاانتبأ منهما.

In the following, I cite the relevant passage from the *risālah* of al-Ḥasan.

إذا كانت هذه الأمىة كبعض الأمم التي مضت قبلها، جاءها نذير منها ودعاها
بما يحييها ويسعها لها وجهد وأدى الذي عليه من الحق فاستجاب له
مستجيبون وكذب به مكذبون فقالن من كذبه بن استجاب له حتى أحل
حلال الله وحرم حرامه وعمل بطاعته.

5- ثم نزل بهذه الأمة موعول الله الذي وعد من وقوع الفتنة يفارق رجال
عليه رجال ويوالى رجال عليه رجالاً، فنام أراد أن يسألنا عن أمرينا ورأينا
فإنما القوم الله رثبت الإسلام ديننا والقرآن إمامنا ومحمد نبينا، إليه نسند
ونضيف أمرنا إلى الله ورسوله، ونرضى من أثمتنا بابي بكر وعمر ونرضى
أن يطاعنا وننسخ أن يعملنا ونعد نهما عن عادنا، وترجى منهم أهل
الفرقة الأول، ونجهد في أبي بكر وعمر بالولاية فإن أبا بكر وعمر لم
تقتتل فيها الأمة ولم تختلف فيها ولم تشكن في أمرهما، وإنما الإرجال
فيمن عاب الرجال ولم نشهده.

Juynboll refers us to a variant of Ibn Sirin’s report, in *al-
*Kifāyah of al-Khaṭib al-Baghdādi, which he believes to
substantiate his view:

"... on the basis of another version of the Ibn Sirin report we can prove with a reasonable degree of certainty that he was not talking about an event which happened before he was born or sometime during his infant years, but that he was indeed referring to an event which occurred during his own adult lifetime. We are indeed fortunate in that we have a variant of the report in which the words fa-lammā waqāṣati ʿl-fitna are replaced by ḥattā waqāṣati ʿl-fitna and that this latter version has a parallel in which we find ḥattā kāna bi-akharatin (or bi-ukhratin). These last words which, like the actual mention of the fitna, are supposed to indicate the precise time for the isnād to have been introduced as a new means of checking the reliability of transmitted reports, can be rendered: "...they were not used to inquiring after the isnād until recently. Bi-akharatin or bi-ukhratin is a seemingly rare expression, for which I could not find many Belegstellen. But together these intimate a vague sort of time indication in the recent past. That this moment is situated in the recent, rather than a distant, past is unambiguously substantiated by the loci referred to in Lane, s.v. and Th. Nöldeke, Belegwörterbuch zur klassischen arabischen Sprache, bearbeitet von Jörg Kraemer,
Berlin 1952, s.v. In other words, Ibn Sirin himself says that his fellow traditionists were not given to inquiring after *isnāds* until the *fitna* broke out, that is until a short time ago. On the basis of this parallel it is out of the question, it seems to me, to interpret the word *fitna* in Ibn Sirin's statement as referring to anything but Ibn az-Zubayr's revolt." (18)

In my opinion, if anything, regarding Ibn Sirin's report would support the opposite of Juynboll's view, it is the variant which he refers us to. The sense of 'recently' for *bi-akharatin* (or *bi-ukhratin*) is not the only, or indeed the primary one. In *Lisān al-ʿArab* 1, p. 30, we find:

In a variant of this report, which appears on the same page as the above variant, there are words that Juynboll does not mention, which indicate the distant past rather than the recent past. These are: (in another source: *كان في زمن الأول في الزمان الأول*).

The following are the variants of Ibn Sirin's report in *al-Kifāyah* and, earlier, *al-ṣilal* of al-Tirmidhi:
During the first period, until the fitnah occurred, people would not ask about the isnād. When, however, the fitnah occurred, they did ask about the isnād, so that the hadiths of the people of the sunnah might be transmitted and those of the people of the bid'ah might be ignored. (19)

They would not ask about the isnād until later: Then they asked about the isnād, so that they might investigate. They wrote down on the authority of those who adhered to the sunnah, and they did not write down on the authority of those who did not adhere to the sunnah. (20)
order to acquire the hadiths of the people of the sunnah and reject those of the people of the bidā'." (21)

Finally, why can it not be assumed that Ibn Sirin was referring to an event that had occurred before his birth or just after? We have seen already, above, reports on his authority in which he refers to the fitnah ensuing from the killing of ʿUthmān by the simple term al-fitnah. On the other hand, I have found a report in which he calls that of Ibn al-Zubayr fitnat Ibn al-Zubayr: (22)

The last thing that Juynboll discusses in his excursus is the interpretation of the term ahl al-bidāh/al-bidā in Ibn Sirin's report. He believes that this is a later term, describing definite groups of people who shared 'similar innovative ideas'. Thus, he thinks that the term in Ibn Sirin's report refers to one or more particular groups of people who lived during his own time, such as the Qadarites, the Khārijites and the Rāfiḍites because there was no such group that was characterized by its beliefs at the time of the fitnah ensuing from the killing of ʿUthmān:

"The use of the word ahl followed by the genitives sunna
and *bidāʾ* may suggest that Ibn Sirin - and, indeed, also others who used this *idāfa* - referred to two *groups* of people, be they loosely defined. Every student of early Islamic history will be struck by the frequently recurring 'categorization' of certain (groups of) persons mentioned in the sources. It is as if this tendency for 'categorization' precipitated the nomenclature: *ahl* of such and such, *aššāb* of so and so. .... However, this 'categorization tendency', which I think will have been detected by many others working in this field, precludes the characterization of, for example, the *ahl al-bidāʾ* as a heterogeneous multitude of anonymous individuals who, at one time or another, upheld one or more innovative ideas of no matter what purport. I rather think that Ibn Sirin had one particular group of people in mind, or a few groups, who harboured similar ideas. Ibn Sirin's use of *ahl as-sunna* versus *ahl al-bidāʾ* suggests that we have here his 'polarized' view on the Muslim society of his days. The *ahl al-bidāʾ* may very well have been those people who had one, or a few, distinct *bidāʾas* in common and who, as a consequence, were felt by Ibn Sirin to be a danger to society. One finds the earliest individual innovators mostly referred to as *mubtadiʾ*.

The *bidāʾas* propagated by the *ahl al-bidāʾ* as referred to
in the Ibn Sirin report admit of the following assumptions:

It is probable, in my opinion, that Ibn Sirin alluded to those politico-religious bid'as of the Qadarites, the Kārijites and the Rāfiḍites such as came into being during his lifetime. The order (Qadarites, Kārijites, Rāfidites) is not arbitrary but borne out by an account of the ahl al-bid'a wa 'l-ahwā in al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādi's Al-kifāya fi 'ilm ar-riwāya (p. 120), where we find the same order. Taken literally this means that the Qadarites are taken to be at least contemporaneous with the Kārijites, if not even earlier. And from that can be inferred that with Kārijites here is not meant also the Kārijites of the first period, who deserted from 'Ali's army in protest at the latter's compliance with Mu`āwiya's suggestion to install an arbitration committee. It seems, moreover, possible to indicate a time during which these ahl al-bid'a came to be felt as constituting a 'group'. " (23)

I cannot agree with this view; as early as the time of the fitnah that ensued from the killing of 'Uthmān there were indeed distinct groups of people who shared 'one or more similar, innovative ideas'. We find the sources tracing the origins of the three group, alluded to by Juynboll back to the time of the fourth caliph, 'Ali b. Abī Ṭālib, in particular, the
Khawārij and the Rāfiḍah. The Khawārij not only deserted 'Ali but also began to formulate their own heresies at that time. In a passage adduced in the first chapter, we have seen 'Ali b. Abi Ṭalib regarded as awwal mutakallimi ahl al-sunnah min al-ṣaḥābah, because of his debate with al-Khawārij and al-Qadariyyah:

أول متكلمي أهل السنة من الصحابة علي بن أبي طالب لمناظرته الخوارج في مسائل الوعد والوعيد، ومناظرته القدرية في القدر والقضاء والمشيئة والاستطاعة. ثم عبد الله بن عمر في كلامه على القدرية وبراءته منهم ومن زعيمهم المعروف بمعبد الجهني.

There is a report in which Ibn Sirin accuses the Khawārij of being the first to practise qaṣṣāṣ. (24) In another report we have seen qaṣṣāṣ and the fitnah ensuing from the killing of 'Uthmān mentioned in the same breath. (25) In this report Ibn ʿUmar says:

لما يقص على عهد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ولا أبي بكر، ولا عمر، وإنما كان القصص حين كانت الفتنة

In another variant of this report:

لما يقص على عهد رسول الله، ولا أبي بكر، ولا عمر، ولكنه شيء أحدثوه، بعد عثمان.

The other distinctive group of ahl al-bidā' generated from this fitnah is al-Rāfiḍah or al-Shī'ah. The most
extreme of *al-Rafiḍah* is *al-Sabā'īyyah*, a group which takes its name from the name of its leader, ʿAbd Allāh b. Saba. There are two *awā'il* reports pertaining to him: he was the first to propagat *al-rafḍ* during ʿAlī's time,(26) and he was the first to put lies in the mouth of the prophet.(27)

It is implied, in Ibn Sirin's report, in my opinion, that there is a connection between the occurrence of the *fitnah* and *ahl al-bida*, and while we find such considerable *bida* resulting from the first *fitnah*, no such *bida* came into existence as a result of the conflict between the Umayyads and Ibn al-Zubayr. And it is also implied in this report that it is the consistent demand for the *isnād* that was created after the *fitnah*, whatever the *fitnah* is, not the initiation of the *isnād*. 
To demonstrate "the idea that isnāds have a tendency to grow with time in soundness", Juynboll selects a few examples of hadiths that appear in an early source, Ibn Wahb's (d.198) Jāmi', with defective isnāds, and compares those with their appearance with perfect isnāds in one or more later works. Before examining these examples, it seems appropriate to give the following account.

Apart from the transmitters' errors, there are different factors which cause the isnād to be defective or otherwise, as appears in the following examples:

- ثنا اسماعيل ثنا محمد بن اسحق حدثني مكحول أن رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - قال: إذا صلى أحدكم فشك ...
- قال محمد بن اسحق: وقال لي حسين بن عبدالله هل أسنده لك فقالت: لا: فقال: لكنه حدثني أن كرضاً مولى ابن عباس حدثه عن ابن عباس قال: جلست إلى عمر بن الخطاب فقال يا ابن عباس: إذا اشتبه على الرجل في صلاته... فببينا نحن على ذلك إذ جاء عبد الرحمن بن عوف... فقال سمعت رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - يقول هذا الحديث. مسنذ أحمد 193/1

- ثنا محمد بن حيفر ثنا شعبة وحجاج قال حدثني شعبة، قال حجاج: قال: سمعت عقبة بن وساج عن أبي الأحوص عن عبد الله عن النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - أنه قال: فضل صلاة الرجل في جميع على صلاته وحده خمس
As we can see from the above examples, transmitters might on one occasion transmit a *hadith* in a defective form, while on another occasion they might do so with a complete *isnād*.

It is true that the sources tell us of transmitters who, intentionally or unintentionally, abused the *isnāds* of *hadiths*, but they also tell us of others who were scrupulously careful with both *hadith* and *isnād*. It is surely not fair to reject all the material of the reliable transmitters because of the bad ones.(28)

At any rate, the existence of a defective *isnād* for a *hadith* does not necessarily imply the absence of other sound or uninterrupted *isnāds* for the same *hadith*, at the same time. In the early sources of the second century, the material of the Prophet is put side by side with that of the Companions and the Successors, in one place. In these collections, *hadiths*
appear with sound as well as defective *isnāds*. A *ḥadīth* can be found, in the same collection, in different forms, attributed to a Companion or a Successor, instead of to the Prophet, with different *isnāds*. The following, examples are from ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s *Muṣannaf*:

Maʿmar relates the following *ḥadīth* through different channels: Once on the authority of al-Zuhri – Abū Hurayrah as *munqatiʿ* (al-Zuhri did not hear *ḥadīth* from Abū Hurayrah), another time as a *mursal*, on the authority of Ibn Ṭawūs – his father, and the third time as muttaṣil, on the authority of Hammam b. Munabbih – Abū Hurayrah:

Maʿmar relates a *ḥadīth* with full *isnād*, on the authority of Qatādah and ʿUthmān al-Jazari, on the authority of Miqsam, on the authority of Ibn ʿAbbās (no. 9394); on another occasion,
he relates it on the authority of Qatādah and ʿUthmān al-
Jazari directly from the Prophet (no. 9728). Also ʿAbd al-
Razzāq mentions part of it as *mursal* through another
channel (no. 9390):

> ṣ- عن إسرا ظيل بن يونس قال: أخبرني أبو الهيثم عن إبراهيم التيمي، أن
> النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - صلب عقبة بن أبي معيت إلى شجرة، فقال:
> ٢٠٥/٥ (١٣٩٢) ً عن مومر عن قتادة قال، وأخبرني عثمان الجزري عن مقسم عن ابن عباس
> قال: فادى النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - بساري بدر، فكان فداء كل واحد
> منهم أربعة ألا، فقتل عقبة بن أبي معيت قبل الفداء، فقام إليه على بن
> أبي طالب، فقتله صبرًا، قال: من للصبية يا محمد، قال: النار ٢٠٥/٥ (١٣٩٢)
>
> ṣ- أخبرنا مومر عن قتادة وعنثمان الجزري قالا: فادى رسول الله - صلى الله
> عليه وسلم - بنحو ٥٠٢ (٩٩٢)

ʿAbd al-Razzāq mentions a *hadith* of Maʿmar in two forms: in
one as *mursal*, on the authority of Qatādah - al-Ḥasan; in the
other as having the link between al-Ḥasan and the Prophet in
the *isnād*:

> ṣ- عن مومر عن قتادة عن الحسن قال: أوحي إلى النبي - صلى الله عليه
> وسلم - ثم قال: خذوا خذوا قد جعل الله لهن سبيلا، الشيب بالطيب جلد مائة
> والرجم، والبكر بالبكر جلد مائة ونفية سنة، قال: وكان الحسن يفتي به
> ٣١/٧ (١٣٣٨)

> عن عبد الله بن محرر عن حطان بن عبد الله الرقاشي عن عبادة بن الصامت
Ma'mar and al-Thawri transmit a *hadith* on the authority of Ayyūb - Abū Qilābah - cImrān. With another isnād, Ma'mar relates it on the authority of another shaykh, with an additional transmitter appearing between Abū Qilābah and cImrān:

- عن معاصر من قُتِّيَة من الحسن عن حطان بن عبد الله عن عبادة بن الصامت

Macmar and al-Thawri transmit a *hadith* on the authority of Ayyūb - Abū Qilābah - cImrān. With another isnād, Ma'mar relates it on the authority of another shaykh, with an additional transmitter appearing between Abū Qilābah and cImrān:

- عن معاصر من قُتِّيَة من الحسن عن حطان بن عبد الله عن عبادة بن الصامت

Abd al-Razzāq mentions a *hadith* on the authority of Ma'mar - al-Zuhri - Nudbah ...; he then notes that another shaykh of his, Ibn Jurayj, relates this *hadith* on the authority of al-Zuhri with a transmitter intervening between him and Nudbah:

- معمر عن الزهري عن نذة مولاة لميمنة قالت: دخلت على ابن عباس

وارسلتني ميمنة إليه ...
Abd al-Razzāq gives the following prophetic hadith, through two of his shaykhs, Ma'mar and Ibn Jurayj, in various forms, with sound as well as defective isnāds. In one of these isnāds the hadith appears as Abū Hurayrah's own saying:

"... - عن ابن جريج قال سمعت عطاء يقول سمعت أبا هريرة مراراً يقول:

العين تزني ... (1382)

- عن ابن جريج قال أخبرني ابن طاووس عن أبيه قال ... قال وما أعلم إلا

كان يخبره عن ابن عباس. (1381)

- عن معمر عن ابن طاووس عن أبيه قال: قال رسول الله -صلى الله عليه وسلم- ... (1382)

- عن معمر عن الزهري وقتادة، وعن رجل عن عكرمة عن أبي هريرة، وعن

أبي هارون عن أبي سعيد الخدري عن النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم -

مثله. (1383)

- عن معمر عن همام بن منبه أنه سمع أبا هريرة يقول: قال رسول الله - صلى

الله عليه وسلم - ... (1384)

- أخبرنا ابن جريج عن القعقع بن حكيم أن أبا صالح حدثه أنه سمع أبا هريرة

رضي الله عنه - يقول: قال رسول الله ... (1388) 7/414 - 417

The following, examples of hadiths appear in two collections of the same period; in one of these they have sound or uninterrupted isnāds while in the other they have
defective isnāds:

Mālik gives the following hadīth as mursal: Hishām b. Urwah - his father - the Prophet. Abū Yūsuf relates the same hadīth in different forms, with defective as well as perfect isnāds. In one of them the link between Urwah and the prophet is mentioned:

-Wakī mentions the following hadīth, in al-Zuhd, as munqatīs, while Ibn al-Mubārak mentions it with a full isnād:

اسامعيل بن عباس قال -أخبرنا أبو سلمة الحمصي وحبيب بن صالح عن
يحي بن جابر الطائي عن المقداد بن معديكرب قال: سمعت رسول الله - صلى الله عليه - ما ملا آدمي وعاء شراً من بطن، بحسب ابن آدم أكل يعقم صلبه

- محمد بن عبد الله العقيلي عن أبي سلمة الحمصي قال: قال رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - ثلاث أكلات أو ثلاث لقمات يعقم صلب ابن آدم، فإن غلبت نفسه، فثلاث لطعام وثلاث لشراب وثلاث لنفسه. الزهيد لوكيل ۲۶۷ (۷۵)

Bab ۲۴ - (۲۷)

أخرجه أبو يوسف من عدة طرق مرفوعاً متصلاً ومرسلًا، وموقفًا، من ضمنها:
The link between Nafi' and Abū Bakr in the isnād in al-Muwatta' is absent in the isnād in al-Muṣannaf:

The Muwatta' of Mālik is an obvious example of this phenomenon. It is related in several versions by different pupils. They differ, sometimes, not only in the inclusion or exclusion of various hadiths but also in the isnāds that they give for particular hadiths. The following are examples from Musnad al-Muwatta':
ليس في رواية الملك لصاحبك. هذا في رواية ابن وهب وابن القاسم ومعن
وابن عفيف. وليس عند القعنبي إلا خارج الموطا، ولا هو عند ابن بكير وهو
مرسل عند أبي مصعب. ص 36

- عن ابن شهاب عن أبي سلمة بن عبد الرحمن عن معاوية بن الحكم السلمي
قال: قلت لرسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أمورا كثيرة تصنعها في الجاهلية
هذا في الموطا عند ابن وهب وابن القاسم وابن عفيف وابن يوسف وابن مصعب
وليس عند القعنبي ولا ابن بكير ولا أبي مصعب. ص 41-42

ابن وهب قال: أخبرني مالك بن عيسى ويونس بن يزيد عن ابن شهاب عن
حميد بن عبد الرحمن عن أبي هريرة عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال
من أنف زوجين في سبيل الله. هذا في الموطا عند ابن وهب وابن القاسم وابن
مصعب وابن بكير وابن عفيف وابن يوسف وابن مصعب وابن بره وابن
المبارك الصوري وحي بن يحيى الأندلسي، وليس هو عند القعنبي، ولم يقل
فيه ابن بكير عن أبي هريرة وروايات مرسلا. ص 43-44

- عن ابن شهاب عن سالم عن أبيه أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال:
إن بل لا ينادي بليل فكلوا واشترموا حتى ينادي ابن أم مكتوم. قال ابن شهاب
وكان ابن أم مكتوم رجلا اعمى لا ينادي حتى يقال له اصبحت. لفظهما سواء، هذا في الموطا عند القعنبي مسندًا، قال فيه من سالم عن
أبيه، وعنده غيره عن سالم فقط، وقد رواه في غير الموطا عبد الرزاق وابن
أبي أوس وابن نافع ومطرف وابو قرة ومحمد بن حرب وزهير بن عبان
وكامل بن طلحة فقالوا فيه عن سالم عن أبيه كما قال القعنبي. ص 45

ابن شهاب عن عبد الله بن عبد الله بن عتبة عن عبد الله ابن عباس أن
رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم سئل عن فارة سقطت في سمن فقال خذوها
In the third century, another type of compilation came into existence: works on hadith restricted, for the most part, to prophetic hadiths with uninterrupted isnāds, such as the Musnad of Aḥmad and the 'six books'. The hadiths just cited are found in these later works with their muttaṣil isnāds.

There is no need to list further examples similar to those mentioned above; Juynboll's examples are adequate evidence that the existence of a defective isnād does not imply the absence of a perfect one at the same time.
AN EXAMINATION OF JUYNBOLL'S EXAMPLES FOR THE HYPOTHESIS OF THE GROWING BACK OF THE *ISNĀD*

We shall now examine Juynboll's examples, to see how far they support his argument of the growing back of the isnād.

Juynboll says: "the idea that isnāds have a tendency to grow with time in soundness can very well be substantiated with abundant material from Ibn Wahb's *Jāmiʿ* in comparison with that very same material in later Iraqi collections."(29) On this sentence, Juynboll gives the following footnote: "One isnād from two Iraqi collections compared with one another must suffice here. The isnād in Ibn Abi Shayba, III, p. 389: Aswad b. ʿĀmir - Shuʿba - Qatāda - Saʿīd b. al-Musayyab - Ibn ʿUmar - prophet also occurs in Ibn Ḥanbal, I, p.50, with ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb inserted between Ibn ʿUmar and the prophet."(30)

First of all this comparison is between contemporary works, *Musnad Aḥmad* (d.241) and *Muṣannaf Ibn Abi Shaybah* (d. 235), and not, as Juynboll suggests, between an early source and a later Iraqi collection. Aḥmad, in the reference given, relates this ḥadīth on the authority of Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar (d. 192-94) and Ḥajjāj b. Muḥammad
al-Miṣṣiṣi (d. 206), on the authority of the same Shu'bah. Both are contemporaries of Aswad b. Āmir (d. 208), the Shaykh of Ibn Abi Shaybah. So this insertion, if conceded, has to be explained by something other than by the growing back of the isnād in course of time. This example confirms the idea that the existence of a defective isnād for a hadith does not necessarily imply the absence of a sound or uninterrupted one for the same hadith at the same time. However, I consulted a manuscript of Muṣannaf Ibn Abi Shaybah and I found that the absence of ṢUmar in the isnād appearing in the published edition of the Muṣannaf is merely a typographical error, and ṢUmar is, in fact, present in Ibn Abi Shaybah's isnād.(32)

Giving his examples from Ibn Wahb's Jāmi', Juynboll says:

"It seems appropriate to give here a short selection of these traditions from the Jāmi' with their isnāds, defective or otherwise, to corroborate the above thesis:

1. (Mursal from Ḥasan al-Baṣrī) 'One of the characteristics of the munāfiq 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, īmān 24 = 1, pp. 16f.) and Muslim, īmān 107-8 (1, p. 78).

2. (Mursal from Zuhri) 'Lying, whether in jest or seriousness, is never condoned' (p 67). Cf. Ibn Māja, muqaddima 7, (= 1, p.
18. Dārīmī, *riqāq* 7 (P 364) and Ibn Ḥanbal, 1, p. 410, with seemingly sound *isnanāds* on the authority of ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd.


4. (*miṣrāl* from Muḥammad b. ʿAjlān) The prophet used to be aware of 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. (*Muqṭāʿa*, Shābīb b. Saʿīd _ Shuʿba b. al-Ḥajjāj_ 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, *ʿilm* 9 (v, pp. 36f.) we find, interestingly enough, the same tradition with a seemingly sound *isnanād* going back to al-Mughirā b. Shuʿba. Then Tirmidhi adds the following:

. . . this tradition is also transmitted by Shuʿba from al-Ḥakam b. ʿUtayba from ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān b. Abī Laylā from Samura from the prophet, as well as with the *isnanād*: al-ʿAmash and Ibn Abī Laylā - al-Ḥakam - ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān b. Abī Laylā - ʿAli - prophet. The first *isnanād* [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 Ihn 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-Ḥakam and ʿAbd ar-Rahmān b. Abi Laylā." (31)

The following comments may be made on the corresponding sections of this passage:

1- a. There appears to be a lacuna between pp. 67 and 70 (where two pages, presumably originally left blank, contain entirely extraneous matters) in the kadhib section of Ibn Wahb's Jāmiʿ. Juynboll does not indicate this.

b. Ibn Wahb mentions this ḥadith, on the authority of the Prophet, with an isnād beginning with the name of al-Qāsim b. ʿAbd Allāh, but because part of the page is missing, we do not
know if it is an uninterrupted isnād or not. (See p. 70 )

c. al-Ḥasan does not appear in any of the isnāds in the collections of Bukhārī or Muslim.

d. We find, for example, that this ḥadīth, besides appearing with sound isnāds, appears with a mursal isnād on the authority of al-Ḥasan in a late source, Ṣifat al-munāfiq by al-Firyābī (d. 301) (p. 51, no. 21), because this is a source, like Ibn Wahb’s Jāmiʿ, which contains both sound and defective ḥadīths traced to the Prophet, to the Companions and to the Successors. al-Firyābī cites this ḥadīth with an uninterrupted isnād in which Ibn Wahb appears. (p. 48, n. 11)

2. This is not mursal. It is part of a saying recorded as being al-Zuhri’s own words, i.e. Maqṭū. However, I suspect that the mention of Ibn Shihāb in the isnād is incorrect.

الله بن سعد عن ابن العجلان عن عون بن عبداللهم عن ابن شهاب انه قال ماحل ... 

Both Ibn ʿAjlān and Ibn Shihāb are pupils of ʿAwn b. ʿAbd Allah, the son of Ibn Masʿūd (See Tahdhib al-Tahdhib 8, p. 172). All the variants of this report that I have collected are on the authority of Ibn Masʿūd. Ibn Wahb mentions the rest of the ḥadīth in different words in two other ḥadīths. One is given as a prophetic ḥadīth with an uninterrupted isnād on
the authority of Ibn Mas'ūd (p. 73). The other is given as a saying of Ibn Mas'ūd related by Mālik b. Anas with a defective isnād (p. 70). This is exactly as it appears in the Muqatṭa’ (2, p. 989, al-kalām 7, n. 16). The version that appears in Ibn Ḥanbal is recorded as Ibn Mas'ūd's own words:

٤١٠/١

It appears in a longer version in a work contemporaneous with Ibn Wahb's Jāmi‘, the Muṣannaf of ʿΑbd al-Razzāq (d. 211).

Al-Dārimi relates all of this version of ʿΑbd al-Razzāq as marfū‘ through another channel, on the authority of Abū Ishāq. Ibn Mājah also relates it as marfū‘, but with a
different *isnād*, which is described by al-Buṣayri as weak.

Abd al-Razzāq has another report in which the words formerly attributed to the Prophet are attributed to Ibn Masʿūd himself:

---

The first part of Ibn Ḥanbal’s report occurs in another source, contemporary with Ibn Wahb, the *Musnad* of Ibn al-Mubārak (d. 180)

3. We find this *ḥadīth* in an early source, Ibn Ṭahmān (d. 168):
While al-Nasa'i, in his *al-Sunan* relates it with the isnād Ibn ʿAjlān - his father - Abū Hurayrah in his *al-Sunan*, in his *al-Sunan al-Kubrā* he relates it with the same isnād as that in Ibn Ṭahmān, al-Aʿmash - Abū Ḥāzim - Abū Hurayrah.

(p. 93 A.)

4. Ibn Wahb presents this in two forms, one as *mursal*, the other as *muttaṣil*:

It also appears in Ḥāmid and al-Tirmidhi, on the authority of ʿAbd al-Razzāq, in whose *Muṣannaf* it does, in fact, appear in the same form as in the *Musnad Ḥāmid* (*al-Muṣannaf* 11, p. 158 no. 20195).

مسند أحمد - ثنا عبد الزاق أنا معمر عن أيوب عن ابن أبي مليكة أو غيره أن
ما شهدة قالت : ما كان خلق أبضغ إلى أصحاب رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - من الكذب ، ولقد كان الرجل يكذب عند رسول الله - صلى الله عليه
Al-Bayhaqi in *al-Sunan al-Kubra* mentions both the uninterrupted *isnād* of Ibn Wahb and that of 'Abd al-Razzāq, citing them respectively as links in the two *isnāds*. (see 10, p. 196)

5. This *ḥadith* appears in the *musnad* of al-Ṭayalisi (d. 204), a contemporary of Ibn Wahb, on the authority of al-Mughirah b. Shu'bah and Samurah b. Jundub, with *isnāds* the same as those in al-Tirmidhi.
The remark of Ibn 'Adi concerning Shabib, of which Juynboll quotes part, may explain the defective *isnad* in Ibn Wahb's *Jāmi‘*:

"وَلَدَلِ شَبِيبَا لَا قَدَمَ مَصرَ فِي تِجَارَتِهِ كَتَبَ عِنْهُ اِبْنَ وَهَبَ مِن حَفْظِهِ فُغْلَطَ وُوَهُمَ وَأَرَجوُ انَّ لَيْتَعْمَدَ الْكَذِّبَ وَإِذَا حَدَّثَ عَنْهُ اِبْنَهُ أَحْمَدَ فِكَانَهُ شَبِيبَا أَخَرِ. يَعْنَى يُجْوَدُ. تَهْذِيبُ التَّهْذِيبِ ٤/٢٧٧"
NOTES

2. Id. p. 75.
3. Id. p. 17-18.
4. Id. p. 18.


8. al-'Ilal 1, p.112 no.465. al-Tamhid 1, p. 37.

10. Id. p. 170 ff no. 539-618.
11. See "The date of the great fitna".
12. p. 152.
15. An example of this may be seen in my discussion of one of these in the first chapter.
17. Excursus to his article "Muslim's introduction to his Sahîh", p. 303-304.
18. Id. p. 307-308.
24. Ibn Sirin, when asked about sitting with the qussâs, says:

لا أمرك به ولا أنتاك عنه، القصص أمر محدث أحدثه هذا الخلق من الخوارج
Ibn Abi Shaybah 14, p. 114 no. 17774.

In a another version of this report:

سأل رجل محمد بن سيرين من القصص، فقال: بدعة: إن أول ما أحدث المرورية القصص.

Ibn al-Jawzi, *al-Qußas wa al-mudhakkirin*, p. 344 no. 196. See also p. 177 no. 26

أو ل من فصّ المرورية أوقف الخوارج.

Ibn al-Jawzi explains away the reports of Ibn 'Umar and Ibn Sirin, in favour of the report of 'Umar b. al-Khattab’s permitting *qaṣṣas* to Tamim al-Dārī:

إِنَّا أَشَارَ ابْنِ عُمَّارَ وَابْنِ سَيْرِينَ إِلَى اِشْتِهَارِ القَصَصِ وَكَثْرَتِهَا، وَإِلَّا فَقَدْ رَوَيَّنا أَنَّ عُمَّارَ آَنَّ عَمَّرَ آَنَّ لَتَحْمِيمَ الدَّارِيِّ فِي القَصَصِ.


32. See a microfilm of a manuscript of *Muṣannaf* Ibn Abi Shaybah, 1, preserved in Imam Muhammad b. Saʿūd University, Riyadh.
CHAPTER THREE

CHARACTERISTICS OF HADITH

HADITH AND REGIONALISM

LOCAL REMARKS

Adducing an argument for his thesis of "the overall regional character" of the various centres, Juynboll gives some selective reports in which remarks denoting local rivalry are exchanged between centres. He believes that local character dominated the early hadith transmission and "in the course of the second half of the second/eighth century, also after the talab al-ʿilm ... 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 Shāfīʿi (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'."(1)

Apart from the talab al-ʿilm journeys and other evidence which attest the strong contact between centres during the first century, remarks and reports, displaying the hadith
interchange between centres, abound in the sources. At any rate, the significance of the reports which are mentioned in Juynboll's argument is disputable. For example, he comments on the attitude of Mālik b. Anas towards the Iraqis that "he decidedly had his doubts concerning even his most famous fellow transmitters. Thus he is reported to have said about Sufyān ath-Thawrı: 'I hope that he has been ṣāliḥ. ... 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."(2) In fact, even assuming that Juynboll's interpretation of this remark is accurate, there are other reports in which Mālik is recorded as making remarks in favour of Sufyān and other Iraqi transmitters:

- وقال مالك: كانت العراق تجيش علينا بالدراهم والثياب ثم صارت تجيش علينا بالعلم منذ جاء سفيان. تهذيب التهذيب 4/115

- وقال مالك بن أنس: كان الناس عندنا هم اهل العراق حتى وثب انسان يقال له حماد فاعتبر هذا الدين فقال فيه برأيه. تهذيب التهذيب 2/18


(١٢٢٨)
On a report concerning the material of the transmitter Ma'amar b. Rāshid, Juynboll says: "The controversy Medina/Iraq is apparent in the suggestion that what Ma'amar b. Rāshid (d. 153/770) transmits from Baṣran or Kūfān transmitters should be rejected, whereas what he produces from Zuhri and other Medinans can be considered quite reliable." (3) The report which is referred to runs: (4)  وَقَالَ اَبِي كَيْثِمْةَ سَمِعْتُ يَحْيِي بْنَ مَعِينٍ يُقْوِلُ اَنَا حَدَّثْتُ مَعْمَرَ عَنْ الْعَرَائِيْنِ فَخَالَفَهُ اَلَا عَنَّ الْزَّهْرِيَّ وَأَبِنَ طَوَاسَ فَانَا حَدَّثْتُ عَنْهُمَا مِسْتَقِيمُ فَاَمَا اَهْلُ الْكُرَدَةِ وَاهْلُ الْبَصَرَةِ فَلَا رَمَى عَمْلٌ فِي حَدِيثِ الْأَمْشَهِ شَيْئًا. This remark was made by an Iraqi scholar who died in 233 regarding the material of an Iraqi transmitter, who moved to al-Yaman and settled there.

ANAS B. MĀLIK'S MATERIAL BETWEEN TWO CENTRES

To attest the regional character, Juynboll gives his account of Anas' material in Mālik's Muwatta: "And although Anas b. Mālik's alleged traditions from the prophet are 'claimed' by both Medina and Baṣra - he supposedly lived many years in
each centre, although it is impossible to ascertain exactly
when he lived where ( ..... ) - it is a striking fact and a highly
significant one, I think, that examination of Anas’s traditions
in the Muwatta' tells us that Medina’s ‘claim’ to Anas rests on
various Medinese Successors in Anas isnāds, such as Zuhri,
Sharik b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Abi Namir, Ishāq b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Abi
Ṭalḥa and al-ʿAlāʾ b. ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān. However we also
encounter in the Muwatta' various Iraqi Anas isnāds with
Successors such as the Baṣran Ḥumayd at-Ṭawil and the Kūfān
forger ʿAmr 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 Baṣran pupils in the same traditions as his Medinan ones,
or for that matter his Medinan pupils in the same material as
his Baṣran ones, remains unanswered. Even if we accept
Anas’ traveling up and down between Baṣra 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 satisfactory be explained, if the historicity of Anas as transmitter of prophetic traditions is maintained. (5)

In fact, all Anas’s pupils in the *Muwatta* are Madinans (6) except one, who is the Basran transmitter Ḥumayd al-Ṭawil. ʿAmr b. Shamar is not considered among Mālik’s masters or Anas’s pupils.(7) But even assuming that he was one of Mālik’s masters, where are the other Iraqi ones in the *Muwatta*? Juynboll does not explain what he means by the dichotomy between the Iraqi and the Madinan material of Anas in the *Muwatta*. He seems to wonder why the ḥadīths which are related by the Madinan Successors on the authority of Anas are not related by the Basran transmitter in the *Muwatta* as well, and vice versa. If this is the case, it can also be said that there is an internal inconsistency in the material of the Madinan Successors themselves because the material of each of them, in the *Muwatta*, on the authority of Anas, is different from that of the others.
One of the features that Juynboll claims to characterize the *hadīth* transmission is lying about one's age. Speaking about the Successors of Iraq, he says: "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."(8)

Discussing the *tarjama* of Abū Ishāq al-Sabīʿi, in an earlier article, Juynboll says: "He was born in 29 or 32 and died between 126 and 129, which makes him at least 91 or at most 97 years of age when he died. At this point the question
is justified: why select such a long-lived traditionist? The answer is simple: because there are hardly any transmitters who did not die at a ripe old age. In a recent study the average age of early Islamic scholars was fixed at 78 lunar years, that is 75 or 76 solar years. One of the very rare transmitters who died at an age corresponding with what we might expect to be the average life span of males in those days in that part of the world --namely at about 50-- was the famous Ibrāhīm al-Nakhā'ī. The vast majority of transmitters, dying at such advanced ages, may have pretended to be much older than they were in reality in order to establish at least the probability that they could have met certain masters. In so doing, they were able to claim the coveted status of Successor rather than that of Successor of a Successor.

It is my conviction that by means of this age trick a large number of Successors under the traditionists undeservedly enjoyed the privileges that went with this status."(9)

However, despite the strong conviction that Juynboll holds over his theory of the 'age trick', he does not provide his argument with explicit figures to support the claim 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." In his discussion of the case of Abū Ishāq al-Sabī'ī, he mentions 6 Kufan Successors and one Basran who reached the age of one hundred or more, suggesting that they are representative examples. (See Tradition, p. 61) In fact, it is easy to counter these examples by others who died in their forties or fifties. For example, Sa'īd b. Jubayr (d. 95 at the age of 49), Ibrāhim b. Yazid al-Nakha'i (d. 96 at the age of about 50), Ibrāhim b. Yazid al-Taymi (d. 92 or 94, at the age of less than 40), Qatādah b. Di‘āmah al-Sudūsi (d. 117-118 at the age of 56 or 57), Abān b. Sāliḥ b. ʿUmayr (d. 110+ at the age of 55), Sa‘d b. ʿUbayd al-Sulami al-Kūfi (d. after 100 in middle age), Zayd b. Abī Unaysah al-Jazari (d. 119 or 124 at the age of 36).

Interestingly enough, in the study which Juynboll refers us to, for the statement that "the average age of early Islamic scholars was fixed at 78 lunar years, that is 75 or 76 solar years" an age which he does not accept as an average age for males at that time, we find that the author of the study sees nothing odd in this: "On the basis of one hundred and fifty biographies in which both birth and death dates are supplied,
it can be affirmed that the average lifespan of the individuals in these two works was 78 years. As these are lunar years, however, a correction must be made for solar reckoning; and this correction yields an average lifespan of 75 solar years. And this, in fact, is what would be expected of a group of men all of whom survived infancy and childhood and who did not have to cope with cigarette smoking, air pollution, military service, and nervous tension born of modern life."(17)

Looking into the average age of the males of some Western countries, we find that 75 as an average age is not 'considerably more advanced' but rather, for some of them, it is about the same. The expectation of life at birth in Iceland in 1987-88 was 74.58, in Sweden in 1987 was 74.16, and in Switzerland in 1987-89 was 73.90. (18) The average age of scholars would, in any case, normally be higher than that of the male in general.
With respect to the situation in Egypt, Juynboll says: "In Egypt the transmission of traditions came relatively late into full swing with the well-known ‘Abd Allāh b. Lahīqa (d. 174/790) who, with his pupil ‘Abd Allāh b. Wahb (d. 198/813), can rightly be considered as the originators of ḥadīth circulation in the province, but with the consideration that the bulk of their material was supposedly gathered in various Iraqi ḥadīth 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.(19)

However, I have examined the isnāds of a full chapter from Ibn Wahb’s Jāmi‘, the same chapter which Juynboll investigates in his argument on the ḥadīth mutawātir, the kadhib chapter. There are 43 isnāds in this chapter. Only 11 of these turn out to be Iraqi, 7 of which are on the authority of two Basran transmitters who used to visit Egypt, i.e. Jarir b. Ḥāzim,(20) and Shabib b. Sa‘īd,(21) and one on the authority of
a Hijæzi transmitter, i.e. Muhammad b. Muslim; (22) there are two others which, at the Successor's level, are Madinan but, at the subsequent level, are Iraqi. However, one is on the authority of the Basran transmitter Yaḥyā b. Saṭlām, who settled in Egypt, and the other on the authority of the Egyptian al-layth b. Ṣa’d.

Iraqi

1- جرير بن حازم عن شعبة بن الحجاج أن سعد بن أبي وقاص قال

2- جرير بن حازم قال سمعت الحسن بن أبي الحسن يقول: قال رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم -

Shâmi

3- محاربية بن صالح عن حمیر بن سعد أو عامر بن جشيب عن خالد بن معدان يرفعه قال

Madani Iraqi

4- يحيى بن سلام عن عثمان بن مقسم عن نعيم بن المجر عن أبي هريرة قال قال رسول الله

Madani Miṣri

5- سعيد بن أبي أيوب عن جعفر بن ربيعة عن ابن شهاب أنه قال

Madani Miṣri

6- الليث بن سعد عن مقبل عن ابن شهاب عن أبي هريرة أن النبي عليه السلام قال

Shâmi

7- مسلمة بن علي قال قال زياد بن ميسرة

Iraqi

8- قال واخبرني أيضا عن سعيد بن بشير عن قتادة يرفعه قال

Iraqi

9- قال وقال قتادة قال ابوب الأسود الديلي

Madani Iraqi

10- الليث بن سعد عن ابن الحجلان عن موه بن عبد الله عن ابن شهاب أنه قال

Madani

11- ابن لهيعة عن أبي الأسود أنه سمع عروة بن الزبير يقول

Madani

12- ابن سمعان قال حدثنا ابن شهاب وأبو الحوارث ومحمد بن أبي بكر بن حزم أنه بلغهم من رسول الله

Madani

13- مالك بن إنس من صفوان بن سليم أن رسول الله عليه السلام سئل:

Shâmi Hijæzi

14- هشام بن سعد عن عبد الوهاب بن بخت عن سليمان بن حبيب المخاربي أنهم دخلوا على أبي إمام الباهلي

Iraqi

15- سفيان الثوري يحدث عن أبي أسحق المهداني عن الأحوص عن عبد الله بن مسعود
Madani

16 - مسلم من رجل من موالي عبد الله بن عامر بن ربيعة العدوبي عن عبد الله بن عامر أنه
قال دمتهي أمي يوما ورسول الله عليه السلام قاعداً في بيتنا...

Madani

17 - مالك وعبد الله بن عمر بن عمر بن عبد الرحمن بن حان بن عمر بن الخطاب أنه قال

Madani

18 - مالك بن انس من عبد الله بن مسعود أنه قال

19 - قال واخرجي انس بن مالك أن رسول الله عليه السلام قال

Madani

20 - سليمان بن بلال عن حيي بن سعيد قال

Madani

21 - واخرجي القاسم بن عبد الله

Madani

22 - أسامة بن زيد عن صالح بن كيسان عن سعد بن ابراهيم عن أبي سلمة بن عبد الرحمن

ان رسول الله عليه السلام قال

Shami Makki

23 - داوود بن عبد الرحمن من ابن خليفة من شری بن حرب عن أسماء ابنود يزيد

الأشعري أنها قالت سمحت رسول الله عليه السلام...

Iraqi

24 - محمد بن مسلم عن أبو السختياني عن ابن سيرين عن مانعة زوج النبي عليه السلام

Madani

25 - مالك عن صفوان بن سليم عن معاذ بن يسارد أن رجلا قال للرسول الله عليه السلام...

Madani

26 - وسمعت سفيان بن عبيدة يحدث عنه بنحو ذلك أيضاً

Madani

27 - سليمان بن بلال عن كثير بن زيد عن أم ولد محرز بن زهير رجل من أصل من أصحاب

النبي عليه السلام أنها كانت تسمع محرزاً يقول

Madani

28 - ابن لهيعة عن أبي الأسود بن عبد الله بن رافع عن أبي هريرة أن رسول الله عليه السلام

Miṣri

29 - ابن لهيعة عن أبي قيبلا ( حيي بن هانئ) قال سمعت رجلا يقول أن سمع عبد الله بن

عمرو بن العاص يقول

Iraqi

30 - جرير بن حازم عن بهذ بن هكيم عن أبيه عن جدته قال سمعت رسول الله عليه السلام

Madani Shami

31 - حفص بن ميسرة عن زيد بن اسلم أن رجلا قال للرسول الله عليه السلام...

Madani Shami

32 - حفص بن ميسرة عن زيد بن اسلم أن رسول الله عليه السلام قال

Madani

33 - هشام بن سعد عن زيد بن اسلم من أبيه أنه قال

Miṣri

34 - مروي عن الحارث بن سهل بن عقيل حدثه أن اسمعيل النبي...

Iraqi

35 - جرير بن حازم عن مجادل بن سعيد عن قيس بن أبي حازم قال سمعت ابا بكر الصديق...
On Khuräsän, Juynboll says: "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 rāwi 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 Baṣra or Küfa."(23) He does not, however, offer any examples to support this general statement.

I have examined representative isnāds of material of a Khurāsānian scholar, ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Mubārak (d. 181), who is well known for his activities in the transmission of hadith. In this scrutiny, I investigated the first part of his published
Musnad, which contain 83 isnāds. Judging by the next two transmitters after the Companion, only 22 isnāds turn out to be from Basrah or Kufah. There are 9 of which the first transmitter after the Companion is non-Iraqi, but the subsequent transmitter is either from Basrah or Kufah. The remaining isnāds are Hijāzi and to some extent Shāmi or Egyptian, and there is one Yamāmi. (24)

| Madani Baṣri | 1- معمر بن راشد عن الزهري عن أنس بن مالك |
| Hijāzi | 2- المثنى بن الصباح عن عمر بن شعيب عن أبيه من جده |
| Shāmi | 3- حماد بن سلمة عن أبي سنان الخامي عن مثمان بن أبي سودة عن أبي هريرة |
| Baṣri | 4- حماد بن سلمة عن ثابت عن أبي رافع عن أبي هريرة |
| Madani | 5- مالك بن أنس عن مهيد الله بن عبد الرحمن عن سعيد بن يسار عن أبي هريرة |
| Miṣri | 6- ابن لهيعة عن زيد بن أبي حبيب أخبره أن آبا سالم البكاشاني أتى آبا أمية في منزله فقال إني سمعت آبا ذر |
| Shāmi | 7- عبد المميد بن بهرام نا شهر بن حوشب حدثني عبد الرحمن بن غنم عن أبي مالك الأشعري |
| Shāmi | 8- عبد المميد نا شهر بن حوشب نا مهيد الله قال مهيد المميد وهو أبو إبريس من معاذ بن جبل |
| Shāmi | 9- عبد المميد نا شهر بن حوشب حدثني أبو طيبة أن شرحبيل بن السلم دعا عمرو بن ميسرة السلمي |
| Madani Baṣri | 10- شعبة حدثني أبو عمران الجوني قال سمعت رجلًا من ترشيح يقال له الحلقة قال قالت ماهشه |
| Baṣri | 11- شعبة حدثني أبو عمران الجوني عن عبد الله بن السامات أن ابنه |
| Baṣri | 12- شعبة عن عميد الطويل من أنس بن مالك |
| Madani | 13- يعمي بن مهيد الله قال سمعت أبي يقول سمعت آبا هريرة يقول |
| Küfi | 14- الحسن بن عمر الفقيحي عن الشعبي قال سمعت الثمانى بن بشير |
Baṣri

15- مبيّنة بن عبد الرحمن الغزائني عن أبيه من أبي بكرة

Madani

16- يحيى بن عبد الله قال سمعت أبي يقول سمعت أباهايرة

Baṣri

17- يحيى بن حكيم عن أبيه عن جده

Madani

18- يحيى بن عبد الله قال سمعت أبي يقول سمعت أباهايرة

Madani

19- يحيى بن عبد الله قال سمعت أبي يقول سمعت أباهايرة

Madani

20- مبيّنة الله من نافع عن ابن عمر

Kūfī

21- سفيان بن عيينة عن أبي حذيفة رجل من أصحاب عبد الله من عائشة

Shāmi

22- يحيى بن أبي عبه أن عبد الله بن زهر حدث عن علي بن يزيد عن القاسم عن أبيه إمامًا أن عمر بن الخطاب

Kūfī Miṣrī

23- ابن لهيعة نا الحارث بن يزيد بن عبد الله أنه سمع سفيان بن عوف القاري يقول سمعت عبد الله بن عمرو

Baṣri

24- يحيى بن يزيد الرشيد عن معاذ باعدة قالن سمعت هشام بن عامر

Madani

25- موسى بن عبد الله بن عبد الله عن عبد الله بن مسعد الساعد

Madani

26- هشام بن مروة عن أبيه قال سمعت عبد الله بن عمرو بن العاص

Baṣri

27- عماد بن سلمة عن علي بن يزيد بن أسس بن مالك

Shāmi

28- معرج عن يحيى بن أبي كثير عن زيد بن سلام عن جده قال سمعت أبا إمامه

Miṣrī

29- الليث بن سعد حدثني أبو هاني الخولاني عن عمرو بن مالك حدثني فجاعة بن عبيد

Baṣri

30- شعبة عن قطادة عن أسس بن مالك

Miṣrī

31- رشدين بن سعد حدثني عمرو بن الحارث عن أبي بوعشة مولى أبي هريرة أنه سمع أبا هريرة

Herūra

Madani Baṣri

32- معرج أن الزهري عن السائب بن يزيد عن عبد الله بن السعدي قال قال عمر بن

الخطاب

Shāmi

33- هشام بن سعد عن قيس بن نير الخزاعي قال كان أبي جليمسا لابي الضرر بدمشق وكان

بدمشق رجل من أصحاب النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - من الأنصار يقول له ابن الحنفية

Baṣri

34- سليمان بن المغيرة قال سمعت سعيد الجريري يحدث عن أبي نصرة عن أسس بن جابر قال

كنا نجلس بالكونة إلى محدث لنا ... فقال عمر: إن رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - ...
Maki Küfi

35- عبد الملك بن أبي سليمان عن عطاء عن أبي هريرة

Yamāmī

36- مكرمة عن هضام بن جوس قال... فقال أبو هريرة

Madani

37- أبو معاذ المدني حضن محمد بن كعب القرشي حثتني عبد الله بن دارة مولى عثمان بن مفان عن عمران مولى عثمان قال مرت على مشهور...

Madani

38- يعف بن مبيد الله قال سمعت أبي يقول سمعت أبي هريرة

Madani Shāmi

39- هشام بن الفذ عن أبي النضر أنه حدث قال سمعت وائتمة بن الأشعث.

Baṣrī

40- اسماعيل المكي يحدث عن الحسن من سمعة بن معاوية كان لقيت أبا هريرة فقال

Madani

41- الأرازعي حدثني المطلب بن حنطب المخزومي حثتني عبد الرحمن بن أبي عمران الأنصاري قال حدثني أبي

Madani

42- هشام بن يحيى بن أبي كثير عن هلال بن أبي ميمونة عن عطاء بن يسار عن رفاعة الجهني

Madani Baṣrī

43- معمور عن الزهري حدث أن محمود بن الربيع عن سمعت عثمان بن مالك

الأنصاري

Shāmi

44- إسماعيل بن مياس شنا معرور بن قيس أنه سمع عبد الله بن بسر

Kūfi

45- معمور عن أبي إسحاق من الأصر عن أبي هريرة وأبي سعيد

Madani

قال: وجدت الزبير أيضاً عن صفوان عن عطاء بن يسار عن أبي هريرة...

Madani

46- ابن أبي ذكير عن سنة المقبري عن أبي إسحاق مولى عبد الله بن الحارث عن أبي هريرة

Madani Küfi

47- سفيان عن صالح بن ثياب مولى التواءة أنه سمع أبي هريرة

Baṣrī

48- المبارك بن فضالة عن الحسن حدثني أنس بن مالك

Madani

49- شعبة من عاصم بن مبيب الله عن عبد الله بن مامر بن ربيعه عن أبيه

Madni Baṣrī

50- حماد بن سلمة عن ثابت البنداني عن سليمان مولى الحسن بن علي من عبد الله بن أبي طلحة عن أبيه

Kūfi

51- سفيان عن عبد الله بن الصبئ من زائدة من ابن مسعود

Miṣrī

52- ابن لهيعة حدثني بكر بن سوادة أن رجلاً حدثه عن ربيعة بن قيس حديث أنه سمع عقبة بن حامر الجهني

Madani

53- يث بن سعد حدثني عبد ربه بن مسعود عن عمران بن أبي أسس عن عبد الله بن نافع بن
العربية وعن ربيعة بن الحارث عن الفضل بن عباس

Madani

- محمد بن عمير: سمع أحد من أبي أحمد من أبي نصر

- يونس بن الزهري: سمعت أبا أحمد يقول: كنت كثيراً في مجلس ابن الحسين وابن المسير جالسًا في منفذه

Hijazi

- ليث بن سعد: سمع من أبي ملوك حدثه من يعنى بن ملل: أنه نال جملة

- ابناً لهيعة من الحارث بن زيد من زيد بن نعيم المضرمي عن مسلم بن مخرق

قال قلت لمائدة

Madani

- مسعود من الزهري: سلم بن عبيد الله من أبيه

Kufi

- إسماعيل بن أبي خالد: تحدث تيس بن أبي حازم عن عبد الله بن مسعود

Madani

- يونس بن الزهري: أخبرني السائب بن زياد أن شرحاً المضرمي

Makki Misi

- ابن لهيعة من أبي الزبير بن جابر

Shami Basri

- موفد من المهاجر: أبي خلخل: من أبي المليان: هدثني أبو مسلم قال: سلمت أبا ذر

Madani

- مسلم بن نكول عن سليمان الأحول عن عثمان بن عبيد:

Makki

- السامان الذي أن رجلاً حدثه قال قيل: لمبعوث مولى رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم-

Basri

- مالك بن مغول: عن مقاتل بن بشير الجميل: عن شريحة: هاني: قال: سلمت 만ائدة

Kufi

- ابن لهيعة: حبان بن راوه: عن أبيه عن سعد بن المنذر: الأنصاري

قال: رجاءً حبان: قال: أخبرني ابن النصر عن الهذيل بن شريح بن مسروق من مائدة

Madani

- محمد بن مجان: عن عمر بن عبد الله بن الزبير عن عمر بن سليم من أبي قتادة

Misi


فاطمة الأزدي

Shami

- يحيى بن أبي بكر: عن عبد الله بن زهير: عن أبي زيد: عن القاسم: عن أبيه: أمرت

أبواب الأنصاري: قال...

Kufi

- نسبة من منصور عن ذكر يحيى الأزدي: بن بشير: وأخبرني سفيان نحواً منه
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- عميد الله بن عمر عن سعيد المقبري عن عمر بن أبي بكر بن عبد الرحمن بن الحارث بن هشام من أبيه أن عمار بن عمرو

Shâmi

- زائدة بن قدامة نا السائب بن حبيش الكلامي عن معدان بن أبي طلحة البصري قال: قال

لي أبو الدرداء

Madani

- ابن أبي ذنب من سعيد المقبري عن أبيه عن أبي هريرة

Madani

- أسامة بن زيد من سعيد المقبري عن أبي هريرة

Madani

- مالك من الزهري عن حميد بن عبد الرحمن عن أبي هريرة

Madani

- سعد بن سعيد الأنصاري أن القاسم بن محمد حدثه عن عائشة

Madani

- يحيى بن عميد الله قال: سمعت أبي يقول سمعت أبا هريرة

Kūfi

- شعبة لم يذكر الخبر عن عمر بن مروز قال سمعت عمر بن ميمون يحدث عن عبد الله بن ربيعة السلمي وكان من أصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم - عن عميد بن حاذل السلمي وكان من أصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم.

Madani

- عميد الله بن عمر عن خميس بن عبد الرحمن عن حفص بن خاسيم بن عمر عن أبي هريرة

Kūfi

- الأمش عند الشعبى قال سمعت التميمى بن بشير...
NOTES

1. Tradition, p. 65.
2. Tradition, p. 64.
3. Tradition p. 64.
4. Tahdhib al-Tahdhib 10, p. 245.
5. Tradition, p. 67-68.


7. The source which Juynboll refers us to tells us (in no. 1075) that ʿAmr b. Shāmār related ḥadīth on the authority of Jaʿfar b. Muḥammād (d. 148), Jābir al-Juʿfī (d. 127-32), and al-Aʿmash (d. 148). This means that he was a contemporary of Mālik. In no. 1096 it is mentioned that the same transmitter is sometimes referred to as ʿAmr b. Abī ʿAmr in order to give the impression that he is ʿAmr b. Abī ʿAmr Mawlā Abī al-Muṭṭalīb.

8. Tradition, p. 46.
10. al-Muḥaddith, p. 357 no. 296.
11. Ibn Ḥajar, Taqrib al-Tahdhib, p. 95 no. 270.
19. Tradition, p. 44.
22. See *Tahdhib* 9, p. 444.


24. See *Musnad *ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Mubārak* 1, pp. 3-47.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE AUTHENTICITY OF ḤADĪTH:
A DISCUSSION OF TWO MUTAWĀṬĪR ḤADĪTHS

In chapter three of *Muslim tradition*, Juynboll puts under investigation two mutawāṭir ḥadīths. In this investigation, he tries to attest the late origin of ḥadīth and to designate Iraq as the place which is responsible for the fabrication of these ḥadīths. Another purpose of this study is to prove the "conclusion that tawāṭur as such is no guarantee for the historicity of a ḥadīth's ascription to the prophet." (1) In his own words: "In Muslim terminology the ḥadīths containing a prohibition of niyāḥa can be considered mutawāṭir, the most common reference to it being the maxim: 'the deceased will be punished by the lamenting [or in a variant: bukāʾ - 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 mutawāṭir tradition, even more famous and allegedly reported by a vast number of Companions, runs: 'He who [deliberately] tells lies about me, will have to seek for
himself a place in Hell.' "(2)

NIYĀḤAH

With regard to the first tradition, Juynboll suggests that niyāḥah is a Iraqi concept. His investigation reveals that almost all the hadiths which contain " a derivative of NWḤ " are headed by Iraqi isnāds, with a few Syrian and Egyptian. He investigates the existence of the term NWḤ in the early historical sources, the Sīrat Ibn Hishām, Maghāzi al-Wāqidi, and Tabaqāt Ibn Saʿd. It is found once in Ibn Hishām and twice in al-Wāqidi, in the account of the death of Ḥamzah b. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib. He is inclined to attribute the appearance of this term in these two sources to the eventual settling of their authors in Iraq. In Ibn Saʿd, he finds several reports with Madinan isnāds, concerning Ḥamzah's death; in only one report, the isnād of which is " wholly defective", does the NWḤ root occur. In the remaining reports only bukāʾ is banned. The other occurrences of niyāḥah in Ibn Saʿd in which it is forbidden are all headed by Iraqi or Syrian isnāds: "In the earliest historical sources it is difficult to ascertain where Ibn Ishāq received the information containing derivatives of NWḤ. 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 
Wāqīḍī, who also made use of collective isnāds. The 
occurrances 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-Munkadir - 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."(3) 

This result, according to Juynboll, is borne out by the case 
in the collections of hadith also, where almost all the isnāds in 
which niyāha occurs are Iraqi - and to some extent Syrian 
and Egyptians. He says: "I think the overall conclusion is 
justified at this stage that niyāha in all its forms is an Iraqi 
concept and, therefore, cannot be attributed to the prophet. 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."(4) He goes on to say: " 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 ( ..... ). 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 awā'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."(5)
The following remarks may be made concerning this discussion:

First, in fact, it is only the one prophetic saying mentioned above in the quotation from Juynboll which is considered by some muḥaddithūn to be mutawātir. They mention it with the variant: bukār = weeping. (6) This hadith appears with isnāds from both regions, Ḥijāz and Iraq.(7)

However, let us assume, for the sake of argument, that the prohibition of niyāḥah is mutawātir because of the various hadiths associated with it; does this reflect only the Iraqi factor, as Juynboll thinks? It is not our purpose here to prove that the niyāḥah hadiths are mutawātir or not but rather to evaluate the method adopted by Juynboll to prove that they are no more than the invention of the Iraqi hadith circle. But first of all, I think that it is contrary to historical fact to suggest that the niyāḥah customs were something to which Arab women were exposed only on accompanying their husbands into the 'conquered territories'. Niyāḥah, in various forms, was a practice of the Arabs during the Jāhiliyyah.
Secondly, Juynboll differentiates in his investigation between *niyāḥah* and *bukā*'. He thus sets aside all *ḥadīths* headed by Madinan *isnāds* in which *bukā* occurs, even when they describe the same events as those in which the term *niyāḥah* appears. For example, there is an event mentioned in the works of Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidi in which a derivative of *NWH* is used, something which Juynboll believes they learned from their new Iraqi environment. The same event appears with a Madinan *isnād* in Ibn Sa'd, with the word *bukā* instead of *niyāḥah*, representing, in Juynboll's view, a different practice. (8)
It is true that there are a few reports in which a distinction between *niyāḥah* and *bukāʾ* exists, but this does not mean that *niyāḥah* is not *bukāʾ*. In *Mujam maqāyis al-lughah* (9) we find:

> نوح. النحو والواو والحاء، أصل يدل على مقابلة الشئ للشيء... ومنه النحو والناحية: لتقابل النساء عند البكاء.

In fact, in these reports, a distinction is made merely between ordinary *bukāʾ* and the *bukāʾ* of *niyāḥah*. (10)

Thirdly, Juynboll does not state on what basis he defines the origin of the *isnāds* in this investigation. However, in other places he declares that he ascribes *isnāds* to their origin on the basis of the Successors or the subsequent stage. Concerning Egyptian *isnāds*, he says: "When we scrutinize, for example, Ibn Wahb's *Jāmiʿ*, 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." (11) In his investigation of the isnāds of nīyāḥah hadiths, he describes an isnād that appears in Ibn Abi Shaybah as "purely Medinan". (12) In this isnād the shaykh of Ibn Abi Shaybah is Kufan and the next two transmitters are Madinans. This isnād runs:

However, on another occasion, a different judgement is made on an isnād that appears in Ibn Saʿd, which, Juynboll claims, supports his thesis that the derivatives of NWH only appear with Iraqi isnāds. He says: "The report kullu nāʾihatin tukadhdhabu illā Umm Saʿd is headed by an Iraqi isnād". (13) In fact, it is as the same as the previous one; the shaykh of Ibn Saʿd is Iraqi and the next two transmitters are Madinans. This isnād runs:

Applying the same method of judging the origin of isnāds "by the provenance of the transmitters at the Successors' level or the one following that" to Juynboll's sources, I have found the reality to be different. Here are Juynboll's findings concerning the sources and my own examination of them.

Tabaqāt Ibn Saʿd

"We find quite a few more reports in Ibn Saʿd in which nīyāḥa
in one form or another is forbidden. All these reports concern mourning practices over persons other than Ħamza and are supported by Iraqi and Syrian isnāds.\(^{(15)}\) The reports which Juynboll refers us to are:

Two reports to which he refers are, in fact, not critical of niyāḥah:
He refers us to reports in Ibn Sa'd 8, pp. 2ff. regarding the exegesis of a Qur'anic verse. These are mostly Iraqi, but one of them, which refers to the practices of niatah, is Madinan:

Commenting on a particular isnad in Ibn Sa'd, which contains a derivative of NWH, Juynboll says: "There is only one isnad left to be discussed that, but for one wholly unknown transmitter, might have been a Medinese one." (16) This hadith is:

By the 'unknown transmitter' Juynboll means Malik b. al-Rijal. In fact, he is a known transmitter and he is one of the shaykhs of al-Waqidi, who received this hadith from him, with this
isnād, in his Maghāzi. (17)

Musnad al-Ṭayālisi

"Every isnād supporting a saying concerning weeping and bewailing appears to be Iraqi." (18) The following appear in Musnad al-Ṭayālisi:

- ... قتادة عن سعيد بن السيب عن ابن عمر عن عمر بن الخطاب أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم - قال : إن اللذي يذبح بما انتبحة عليه في قبره . ص 4

بصري مدني

... عن علامة بن مرثد عن أبي الربيع عن أبي هريرة عن النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - قال : أربعة من أمر الجاهلية لن يدعهم الناس . والنتبحة على الميت .. ص 315 (٢٣٩٥) كوفي مدني

- نافع بن عمر الجمحي ورباح بن أبي مؤروف سمعا عن ابن أبي مليكة قال : أتيت عاشقة فذكرت لها ما قال ابن عمر وابن عباس عن عمر أن اللذي يذبح ببكار أهله عليه فقالت : والله إنك لتخبرني عن غير كاذب ولامتهم ... ص ١٠ (١٥٠٥) مكي

Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah

"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*. " (19)

The following *isnāds* are found in Juynboll’s source:

- ... قتادة عن سعيد بن السيب عن ابن عمر عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال الميت يعذب في قبره بالنياحة ص 289 بصري مدني

- سعيد بن عبيد عن عبادة بن الوليد عن عبادة عن ابن عمر قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم من نحي عليه فإنه يعذب بما نحي عليه يوم القيامة . ص 289 كوفي مدني

- الأعشى عن أبي صالح عن أبي هريرة قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ان مما بالناس كفر النياحة والطعن في الانساب . ص 29 كوفي مدني

- سفيان عن زيد بن أسلم ، ولا يعصينك في معروف ، قال لا يشقق جيبا ولا يخمشن وحنا ولا ينثرن شعرا ولا يدعون ولا . ص 39 كوفي مدني

- ابن أبي ليلى عن عطاء عن جابر عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال انا نهبت من النور . ص 39 كوفي مكي

- محمد بن بشر حدثنا عبد الله بن نافع عن عبد الله ان حفصة بنت بكث على عمر فقال مهلا يا بنتي يا المعلمي عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال أن الميت ليعذب ببكت اهله عليه . ص 391 كوفي مدني
The following isnād is that which Juynboll designates as Madinan/Syrian. (20) In fact, there is no Syrian transmitter in it.

عبد الله بن نميرثنا محمد بن إسحاق عن عبد الرحمن بن القاسم عن أبيه عن عائشة قالت لما أتت وفاة جعفر عرفنا في وجه رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم الحزن فدخل عليه رجل فقال يا رسول الله ان النساء بيكين قال فارفع اليهن فاسبكتهن فآن ابن فاحث في وجهه النثر ، قالت عائشة فقلت في نفسي والله لا تركت نفسك ولا أتنت مطيع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم. ص 392 مدني

- ابن أبي ليلة عن عطاء عن جابر قال اخذ النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم بيد عبد الرحمن بن عوف فقال له عبد الرحمن تبكي يا رسول الله اولم تنه عن البكاء قال اننا نهبت عن النثر ص 393 كوفي مكي

- أسامة بن زيد عن نافع عن ابن عمر قال رجع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يوم أحد فجئت نساء ان نصار بيكين على حمزة فرقد فاستيقظ فقال ياويهن انهن لنا هذا حتى الآن مروهن فليرجعن ولا بيكين على هالك بعد اليوم. ص 394 مدني

- عطاء بن السائب ثنا عكرمة قال كان ابن عباس يقول احفظوا هذا الحديث ان احدي بنات النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم كانت في الموت فوضعها
"A scrutiny of bukā'/niyāḥa traditions in 'Abd ar-Razzāq's Musannaf, III, nos. 6667-92 yields exactly the same results!".

(21) In fact, the following isnāds are to be found in the reference given:
Again all traditions in which derivatives of NWH occur have
Iraqi isnāds and there is one particularly defective Syrian isnād with the word nawh."

- ... علامة بن مرقد عن أبي الربيع عن أبي هريرة قال: قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أربع من أمر الجاهلية لن يدعهم الناس النياحة ...

- الأعمش عن أبي صالح عن أبي هريرة قال: قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ثنتان هما بالناس كفر نياحة على اليت وطن في النسب .. 441/2 وانظر أيضاً 492 كوفي مدني

- سعيد بن عبيد عن عبادة بن الوليد بن عبادة عن ابن عمر قال: قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: من نيب عليه فإنه يجذبه بما في يد عليه يوم القيامة . 61/2 كوفي مدني

- سليمان بن سليم بن عمرو بن شعيب عن أبيه عن جده قال جاءت أميمة بنت رقيقة إلى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم تباعيه على الإسلام ... ولا تنوي ولا تبجري تبرج الجاهلية الأولى . 196/2 شامي حجازي

- قتادة عن سعيد بن المسبح عن ابن عمر عن رضي الله عنهما -عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم - قال: الليت يعذب في قبره بالنياحة عليه . 26/1 بصري مدني

Juynboll further says: "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."(23) In fact, the Ḥijāzi isnāds that are referred to above are to be found both in the six and in later hadith collections.

It is apparent, from the foregoing quotations, that Juynboll pursues both of the words niyāḥah and būkāʾ in some sources while in others, he pursues niyāḥah only.

THE MAN KADHABA ʿALAYYA ḤADĪTH

In his dealing with the man kadhab ʿalayya ḥadīth, Juynboll discusses its occurrence and non-occurrence in ḥadīth collections. He finds that it does not exist in non-Iraqi collections, or that it does but in an insignificant way. "The earliest source in which this tradition occurs is Tayālisi's Musnad ", (24) as Juynboll says, which is an Iraqi collection. The isnāds of this ḥadīth increased with time in later Iraqi collections. From this investigation, Juynboll reaches the conclusion that this ḥadīth originated in Iraqi ḥadīth circles. The method which Juynboll applies in investigating this ḥadīth is to trace its occurrence in particular ḥadīth collections, sometimes in works that are now no longer complete, a method which in view of the following examination cannot be considered.
He first examines the non-Iraqi collections. The first source examined is *Sunan al-Nasāʾi*, on which he says: "Indeed, in the *Sunan* of Nasāʾi (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 Nasāʾi 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. Saʿid from Balkh, Aḥmad b. Naṣr and Iṣḥāq b. Ibrāhīm Ibn Rāhawayh both from Nisābūr, and Abū Shuʿayb Ṣāliḥ b. Ziyād from Sūs. This last *shaykh* was born in Khūzistān and settled later in Raqqa. Among his masters there are two who also emerge in *isnāds* supporting the *man kadhaba* tradition. About Qutayba b. Saʿid (d. 240/854) and Iṣḥāq 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 masters of Ahmd b. Nasr (d. 245/860). Even so, through these feasible channels the man kadhaba tradition did not reach Nasâ'i in spite of the fact that in the Jâmi' of Tirmidhi, who died some twenty-three years before him in 279/892, the whole isnâd Qutayba b. Sa'id - al-Layth b. Sa'd - Zuhri - Anas - prophet, with the man kadhaba saying, is listed. Differently put, at least thirty years before Nasâ'i died, and probably much longer, as we shall see, there circulated an isnâd headed by his master Qutayba b. Sa'id, supporting the man kadhaba tradition, which Nasâ'i 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 older variant man qāla 'alayya mā lam aquīl etc., is already attested in an Iraqi collection compiled by someone who died almost one hundred years before Nasâ'i, namely Tayâlisi (d. 203/818). Six of the eight isnâds in his Musnad heading the tradition in its different readings have Shu'ba b. al-Ḥajjāj (d.160) in common. This traditionist is also a link in traditions Nasâ'i might have received through his master Ahmd b. Nasr
On top of all this there are *isnāds* with 'Abd Allāh b. Lahī'a, a key figure in the development of ḥadīth in Egypt. He claimed to have heard it from an Iraqi master ... But it is also true, on the other hand, that Nasā'i spurned Ibn Lahī'a's traditions because he did not trust him.*(25)*

In his *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, al-Nasā'i gives this ḥadīth through seven masters; one of them is Ishāq b. Ibrāhim b. Rāhūyah, and in four of them Shu'bah appears as transmitter: *(26)*

> أخبرنا إسماعيل بن مسعود ثنا خالد عن شعبة عن منصور. وأخبرنا محمد بن بشأن ثنا يحيى عن شعبة حدثني منصور قال سمعت ربعي يقول سمعت عليا يقول: قال رسول الله -صلى الله عليه وسلم-: لا تكذبوا علي فإنه من يكذب علي يلجل النار. وقال محمد: من كذب. ترجمة الأشراف ٢٧٦٠٧-٢٧١٠٧٨.

> أخبرنا محمد بن عبد الأعلى ثنا خالد عن شعبة أنا جامع بن شداد سمعت عامر بن عبد الله بن الزبير يحدث عن أبيه أنه قال للزبير مالي لا أراك تحديت عن رسول الله -صلى الله عليه وسلم-: شينة، قال: ما فارقته منذ أسلمت ولكني سمعته قال من كذب علي فليتبوا مقعده من النار. ترجمة الأشراف ٢٣٧٩٣٢٣٣ (٢٦٩٣)

> أخبرنا إسحاق بن إبراهيم أنا إسماعيل بن أبراهيم ثنا عبد العزيز. وأخبرنا عمران بن موسى ثنا عبد الوارث ثنا عبد العزيز عن أنس بن مالك قال سمعت رسول الله -صلى الله عليه وسلم- يقول من تعمد علي كذبا فليتبواَ
al-Shāfi‘ī

Al-Shāfi‘ī, who is a Hijāzi collector, gives this hadith, in his Risālah, (27) in variant forms, with four isnāds. His masters in these isnāds are two Hijāzis, ʿAbd al-'Aziz b. Muḥammad al-Darāwardī and Yaḥyā b. Sulaym, and one Syrian, ʿAmr b. Abi Salamah al-Tinnisi. Juynboll disregards these hadiths mainly because it is incomprehensible to him that Mālik does not mention this hadith in his Muwatta, bearing in mind its importance, since the shaykhs of these transmitters in these isnāds are also among Mālik’s shaykhs.

On the responsibility of al-Darāwardi of introducing this hadith
into Ḥijāz, Juynboll remarks "Whether it is he or someone using his name who is to be held responsible for introducing the dictum in the Ḥijāz cannot be established ..." (28)

Musnad al-Ḥumaydi

On the Ḥijāzi source, Musnad al-Ḥumaydi, he makes the following comment:

"Another Ḥijāzi collector, ʿAbd Allāh b. az-Zubayr al-Ḥumaydi (d. 219/834), lists the man kadhaba saying only once with the following defective but highly relevant isnād: Ḥumaydi - Sufyān b. ʿUyayna - man là uḥṣi ʿan Abī Hurayra - prophet (11, no. 1166). Ḥumaydi had been Ibn ʿUyayna's best pupil and had reputedly attended his hadith sessions for seventeen years. It is, indeed, astonishing that Ḥumaydi does not list a more perfect isnad for the man kadhaba saying, if we realize that he had also been a pupil of Shāfiʿi and ʿAbd al-ʿAziz b. Muḥammad ad-Darāwardi. Through these channels he apparently did not receive it. Besides, Ibn ʿUyayna's remark on how he allegedly learned of the saying also deserves to be commented on. In the time of Bukhāri (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 ‘Uyayna, and although he only left Kūfa, where he was born, in order to settle definitively in Mecca in 163/780 (Ibn Ḥajar, 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 uḥṣi seem to convey the opposite of what they say and may well be interpreted as indicating that Ibn ‘Uyayna 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 muḥaddith 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-Juḥfī (d. +130/748), who had been actively spreading forged traditions in Kūfa several decades before Sufyān moved to Mecca (cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib, II, p. 49).” (29)

I shall quote this ḫadīth as it appears in Musnad al-Humaydi:

 حدثنا الحميدي قال لنا سفيان وحدثني من لا أحسب(2) عن أبي هريرة أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال من كذب عليّ متعبداً فليبتجوا مقعده من
Two things invalidate Juynboll's comment. First, it appears from this isnād that it is al-Ḥumaydi, not Ibn ʿUyaynah, who says:  وحدثني من لأخصي. Secondly, the editor of the Musnad points out that, in the manuscript, there is a remark on the word ُعُسُي which indicates that there is something requiring correction there.

Also, from the case of al-Nasāʾī and the case of al-Ḥumaydi, it is clear, I think, that the occurrence or non-occurrence of such a hadith in a particular book is not an appropriate method of judging whether or not its author knew of the hadith or whether or not it and its isnāds existed at that time. We have seen that, while al-Nasāʾī does not mention it in his Sunan, he gives it with several isnāds in al-Sunan al-Kubrā. al-Shāfīʿī presents it with four isnāds, but al-Ḥumaydi mentions it, in his Musnad, with only one defective isnād, as Juynboll thinks, although he had "been a pupil of Shāfīʿī and ʿAbd al-ʿAziz b. Muḥammad ad-Darāwardī."
The published fragment of Ibn Wahb’s *Jāmiʿ* contains about 14 chapters, one of which is the *kadhib* chapter in which the *man kadhab ḥadīth* does not occur. From the absence of this ḥadīth Juynboll draws the following conclusion: "ʿAbd Allāh b. Wahb (d. 197/813) devotes a lengthy chapter in his *Jāmiʿ* to *kadhib* traditions. 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. A brief count yields the result that twenty transmitters from *man kadhaba* reports listed elsewhere also appear in this *kadhib chapter."(30)

Juynboll goes on to say: "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 Tayālisi’s *Musnad*, probably compiled at about the same time - it is all the more astounding that it is not included in the *Jāmiʿ*. 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 (... ) - that Nasā'i, who died more than one hundred years later, does not have it either." (31) To conclude his argument regarding the existence of this *hadith* in Ibn Wahb, Juynboll says: "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." (32)

In fact, in view of *al-Sunan al-Kubrā* and the argument regarding Ibn Wahb's work, these conclusions find hardly any
justification. In none of the *hadith* collections compiled according to subject that I have seen is the *man kadhab* *hadith* mentioned in the *kadhib* chapter. For example, none of the 'six books', or any of the works similar to the *Jāmi* of Ibn Wahb, such as *Muṣannaf* *ʿAbd al-Razzāq and Muṣannaf Ibn abi Shaybah*, give this *hadith* in the *kadhib* chapter.(33) Ibn Abi al-Duniyā gives 87 *hadiths* in connection with the concept *kadhib* in *Bāb dhamm al-kadhib*, in which the *hadith* does not appear .(34)

Concerning Juynboll's remark that "the number of traditions with *kadhib* regarding the transmission of traditions in this chapter is considerable", it is only one *hadith*, or possibly two if we count that, on the authority of Ibn Mas'ūd, which runs: بحسب المرء كذباً أن يحدث بكل ماسمع

In the fraqment of Ibn Wahb's *Jāmi*<sup>3</sup>, a *hadith* of the *man kadhab* nature, which Juynboll does not mention, exists in the chapter just before the *kadhib* chapter. This *hadith* is: (35)

وأخبرني يحيى بن حميد عن قرة بن عبد الرحمن عن ابن سمعان ... رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال ثلاثة لا يربحون ريح الجنة رجل كذب علي ورجل كذب ... ل أ رايت ما لم يرى ورجل ادعا لغير أبيه .

Ibn al-Jawzi gives this *hadith* in a different version with a different *isnād* in his account of the *turuq* of the *hadith man kadhab*. (36)
In a manuscript containing some of Ibn Wahb's *hadiths* entitled *Musnad Ibn Wahb*, preserved in al-Zahiriyah, I have found three versions of this *hadith* which Ibn Wahb related from two of his Egyptian masters and one Syrian:

- اخبارني يحيى بن أيوب عن بكر بن عمرو عن عمرو بن أبي نعيمة عن أبي
  عثمان الطندي رضي الله عنه إن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم في حلية من قال عليه ما لم أقت فلتيتبا بيتا في جهنم ومن أفتا بغير علم عن أبيه على من افتاه ومن أشار على أخيه يعلم ان الرشد في غيره فقد خانه ۱۶۵ أ

- اخبارني سعيد بن أبي أيوب عن بكر بن عمرو عن عمرو بن أبي نعيمة عن
  أبي عثمان مسلم بن يسار عن أبي هريرة عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه قال
  من قال على مالم أقت فلتيتبا مقعده من النار ومن استشار أخوه ناشير عليه
  بغير رشد فقد خانه ومن أفتا بفتيا غير ثبت فانما اشترب على من افتاه ۱۶۸ أ

- واخبارني مسلمة بن علي عن زيد بن واقف عن حازم بن حكيم سمعت انس بن
  مالك يقول سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول حدثوا عنى كما
  سمعتم ولا حرج إلا من افترا على كذب كذبا متعمدا ليضل الناس بغير علم
  فلتيتبا مقعده من النار ۱۶۵ ب

al-Ţabrānī, in his *Juz* of the *turūq* of this saying, relates the first two of these *isnāds* through different pupils, the first of whom mentions only the first part. He also relates the saying on the authority of Anas, with an *isnād* in which Ibn Hanbal gives
Said b. Abi Ayyüb's ḥadīth with the same isnād, but on the authority of 'Abd Allāh b. Yazid, in his Musnad. (40)

In another manuscript containing some of Ibn Wahb's hadiths, (41) the man kadhab exists: (42)

Juynboll doubts the authenticity of this manuscript, but he comments on this isnād, which also appears in Musnad Ahmad, featuring Ḥasan b. Musā as a pupil of Ibn Lahicāh, that "the third oldest link is a majhūl, one shaykh from Ḥimyar. The most striking feature is that, but for Ibn Lahişah, no transmitter of this isnād figures in the Ḥāmīs." (43) In fact, in addition to Ibn Lahicah, Ibn Hubayrah also figures in the published fragment of the Ḥāmīs, one of his appearances being in the kadhib chapter. (44)

Another ḥadīth, that Juynboll discusses, in the isnād of which 'Abd Allah b. Wahb occurs, is one that appears in Ahmad's Musnad: (45)
On this ḥadīth Juynboll says:

"This isnād also supporting the man kadhaba tradition but without preamble or sequel is once more found in the Kitāb al-
mawdūʿāt of Ibn al-Jawzi (d. 597/1200) with, instead of Ḥārūn b. Mārūf, Bahr b. Naṣr b. Sābq. These isnāds are purely Egyptian. The Companion Uqba settled in Egypt and became Muʿāwiya'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. Abi Ruqayya, but this man is nowhere else dealt with, in other words: he is a majhūl. Amr b. al-Ḥārith, 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. It is, therefore, all the more astonishing that the whole isnād does not occur in the Jāmiʿ. This isnād with, instead of Hishām and Maslama, Abū ʿUshshāna as master of Ibn Wahb is also listed in Ibn al-
Jawzī. 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 Jāmiʿ 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 Nasāʿi to account for! - they are probably the handiwork of Hārūn b. Maʿrūf and/or Bahr b. Naṣr or of one or more persons using their names.”(46) A few remarks may be made on this passage. Hishām b. Abī Ruqayyah is not a majhūl. His tarjamah does occur in the Rijāl works.(47) ʿUqbah b. ʿAmr and ʿAmr b. al-Ḥārith do figure in various hadiths in the Jāmiʿ. (48) Abū ʿUshshānah is not a master of Ibn Wahb, but rather he is a master of Ibn Wahb’s master, ʿAmr b. al-Ḥārith. (49)

Abū Ḥanīfah and the man kadhaba saying

Juynboll then turns his attention to the Iraqi collections. The saying occurs in the Musnad of Abū Ḥanīfah several times but Juynboll dismisses the involvement of Abū Ḥanīfah in the transmission of hadith: "I venture to discard all the man kadhaba traditions with Abū Ḥanīfah in the isnād as fabrications that began to circulate perhaps as long as two
hundred years after his death". (50) Despite this, Juynboll puts these isnāds under examination, an examination which needs to be commented on.

Juynboll says "The isnāds seem sufficiently interesting for a brief analysis. The first isnād runs: Abū Ḥanīfa - al-Qāsim b. ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Mas̄ūd - father - grandfather - prophet. Although many of Abū Ḥanīfa’s raʾy decisions are eventually ascribed to Ibn Mas̄ūd, al-Qāsim is not listed among Abū Ḥanīfa’s masters. The second isnād runs: Abū Ḥanīfa - ʿAtīyya b. Saʿd al-ʿAwfī - Abū Saʿīd - prophet. ʿAtīyya, a weak transmitter, often mentioned Abū Saʿīd without specifying which Abū Saʿīd he meant. He attempted to create the impression that he alluded to Abū Saʿīd al-Khudri instead of Abū Saʿīd al-Kalbi from whom he had it. The third isnād runs: Abū Ḥanīfa - Abū Ruʿba Shaddād b. ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān - Abū Saʿīd - prophet. Abū Ruʿba is nowhere listed in the biographical dictionaries, and it is perhaps permissible to see this name as a misreading of the name Abū Dhūba or Dhawba which occurs in a comparable isnād in Abū Yūsuf’s Kitāb al-āthār. In that isnād Abū Saʿīd is called in full: al-Khudri. The editor of the Āthār mentions in a note that Abū Dhūba is perhaps one and the same as Abū
Rawq, which is the kunya of one Ḍātiyya b. al-Ḥārith, who, in turn, is then again confused with Ḍātiyya b. Saʿd of the second isnād dealt with above. The fourth isnād runs: Abū Ḥanīfa - Saʿid b. Masrūq - Ibrāhim b. Yazid at-Taymi - Anas - prophet. Just as in the fifth isnād (Abū Ḥanīfa - Zuhri - Anas - prophet) 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, 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 Zuhri and Abū Ḥanīfa are nowhere listed as having had a master-pupil relationship.  

Some of these remarks are actually erroneous.

a. al-Qāsim is listed among Abū Ḥanifah’s masters. (52)

b. Shaddād b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān is found in some of the Rijāl Works. (53) Discussing the name of Abū Ru‘ba, Juynboll refers to a "comparable isnād in Abū Yūsuf’s Kitāb al-Āthār". In a footnote on this sentence, he says: "... the man kadhaba saying does not occur in it anyhow." (54) In fact, the 'comparable isnād' heads the man kadhaba saying: (55)

 حدثنا يوسف بن أبي حنيفة عن أبي ذر بن عبيد الله الخدري - رضي الله عنه - عن النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - أنه قال: من كذب على ممتديًا فليتبوع مقعده من النار.
c. al-Zuhri and Abū Ḥanīfah are indeed "listed as having had a master - pupil relationship".\(^{(56)}\)

The *Jāmi‘* of al-Rabī‘ b. Ḥabīb

The *man kadhaba* saying does not exist in the incomplete edition of the *Jāmi‘* of al-Rabī‘ b. Ḥabīb which is available to Juynboll. So from this and the occurrence of a version of the *bukā‘* *ḥadīth* in this source, Juynboll reaches the following interesting conclusions: "In the *Jāmi‘* of al-Rabī‘ b. Ḥabīb there is no trace of the dictum but in the *bukā‘* tradition cited above (...) we do find the verb *kadhaba*. It bears distinct similarities to the *ḥadīth* from the *Muwāṭṭa‘* scrutinized above (...) and runs: 'When 'A‘īsha was informed that 'Abd Allāh b. ʿUmar 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 *isnād* - in the *Muwāṭṭa‘*, 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 from 'inadvertently not telling the truth' to 'lying intentionally' is witnessed in its initial stages in this buka' 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 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.” (57)

There is grave doubt concerning the authenticity of the Jāmi' of al-Rabi'. Daw b. Sālim Miskin gives convincing evidence that this Jāmi' is a work forged by its redactor, al-Warjalānī (d. 570).(58) However there is a complete edition of the Jāmi' of al-Rabi', in which the saying exists in two hadiths with two isnāds: (59)
Musnad al-Ṭayālisi

The next source that Juynboll deals with is Musnad al-Ṭayālisi, a source which he considers "the earliest source in which this tradition occurs", despite the occurrence of it in al-Shāfīʿī. This saying occurs in it 7 times, five of the isnād being headed by Shuʿbah as a master of al-Ṭayālisi. From the absence of this hadith from the incomplete edition of al-Rabiʿiʾs Jāmiʿ available to him and the occurrence of it in al-Ṭayālisi, Juynboll draws the conclusion that "the man kadhaba dictum must have come into circulation in Iraq sometime between the two death dates of ar-Rabiʿ b. Ḥabib (..... ) and Ṭayālisi, in other words, sometime in the course of the second half of the second century A.H. Responsible for the dictum are probably the various pupils - or people using their names - of the key figures, or 'common links' (..... ), in the man kadhaba isnāds, such as Shuʿba b. al-Ḥajjāj (d.160/777), active in Baṣra and
Kūfa, Abū ʿAwāna al-Waddāh b. ʿAbd Allāh (d. 176/792), active in Wāsiṭ and Başra, and ʿAbd Allāh b. Lahīqa (d. 174/790), active in Egypt although the majority of his masters and many of his pupils were Iraqi." (61)

As we have seen, this ḥadīth does exist in the Jāmiʿ of al-Rabīʿ b. Ḥabib. But supposing that it was introduced between the death dates of these two authors, how are the ḥadīth transmitters to be held responsible for circulating this ḥadīth in the various centres of Islamic world, when the dates of their deaths are about the same as that of al-Rabīʿ? (62) On the one hand, Juynboll considers ʿAbd Allāh b. Lahīqa(d. 174/790), active in Egypt", as one of the possible figures to have circulated this ḥadīth; on the other hand, he holds the view that it was being circulated in Egypt "not earlier than circa 190/806". (63)

One conspicuous feature of Juynboll's investigation of this ḥadīth that appears in the various quotations above, is that he accuses the various ḥadīth collectors, either the authors of the ḥadīth collections or their shaykhs, of mendacity because of the relating of this ḥadīth something which cannot be justified.

In actual fact, from the foregoing discussion, it appears
that it is only in the *Muwatta* that this ḥadīth does not exist. And we know that, in addition to the two versions of the *Muwatta* available to us now in print, there are many more which vary in their contents. But even if this ḥadīth does not exist in any of these versions, the *Muwatta* does not contain all the ḥadīths that Mālik had, let alone reflect the ḥadīth material at his time, as discussed in the first chapter. While this ḥadīth is found with a variety of *isnāds* in the *Musnad* of Ahmad (d. 241), it is not found in some later ḥadīth collections, for example, *Sunan al-Nasāʿi* (d. 303), *Sunan al-Dāraquṭni* (d. 385), and it appears only once in *Sunan Abi Dāwūd* (d. 275).
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CHAPTER FIVE

JUYNBOLL AND HIS PREDECESSORS

In the introduction to his book, Juynboll declares that, in formulating his ideas regarding the origins of hadith, he has not exposed himself to the influences of his predecessors, and has done his research, as he says: "without constantly comparing my findings with those of either Oriental or western scholars until after it was all over." (See Tradition, p. 1) In the following, I will compare Juynboll's views and conclusions on the origins of the hadith transmission with those of his predecessors. This will show us how heavily Juynboll has been influenced by his predecessors' views concerning the subject, especially by those of Goldziher and Schacht.

The general conception of Goldziher concerning hadith transmission is: "The Prophet's pious followers have reverently repeated the enlightening sayings of the master and have endeavoured to preserve for the edification and instruction of the community everything that he said, both in public and in private, regarding the practice of the religious obligations prescribed by him, the conduct of life in general, and social behaviour, whether in relation to the past or the future. When
the rapid succession of conquests led them to distant countries, they handed on these ḥadiths of the Prophet to those who had not heard them with their own ears, and after his death they added many salutary sayings which were thought to be in accord with his sentiments and could therefore, in their view, legitimately be ascribed to him, or of whose soundness they were in general convinced. These ḥadiths dealt with the religious and legal practices which had been developed under the Prophet and were regarded as setting the norm for the whole Islamic world. They formed the basic material of the ḥadith, which vastly increased during subsequent generations because of factors which will be described in the following chapters.

In the absence of authentic evidence it would indeed be rash to attempt to express the most tentative opinion as to which parts of the ḥadith are the oldest original material, or even as to which of them date back to the generations immediately following the Prophet's death. Closer acquaintance with the vast stock of ḥadiths induces sceptical caution rather than optimistic trust regarding the material brought together in the carefully compiled collections. We are unlikely to have even as much confidence as Dozy regarding a
large part of the ḥadīth, but will probably consider by far the
greater part of it as the result of the religious, historical and
social development of Islam during the first two centuries.

The ḥadīth will not serve as a document for the history of
the infancy of Islam, but rather as a reflection of the
tendencies which appeared in the community during the
maturer stages of its development." (Muslim Studies 2, p.
18-19)

Juynboll also takes a sceptical attitude towards the
authenticity of the ḥadīth and believes that ḥadīth
transmission is, as a whole, only a reflection of the activities of
other elements which were to be developed to constitute the
ḥadīth literature. Summarizing his views, he says: "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." (Tradition, p. 71) He continues that: "We have seen that the
need for traditions traced all the way back to Muḥammad only
began to be emphasized under 'Umar II (reigned 99-101/717-20) and that only as a consequence 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 therefore 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..." (Tradition, p. 72) "The earliest stages of hadith transmission", as Juynboll visualizes them, are explained in the following: "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 isnâds came into circulation, were the quâssâs.

Parallel with this phenomenon we find fuqahâ and also 'ulamâ, 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. ... The activities of fughā' and 'ulamā' also developed into what later came to be called hadīth transmission.

The first stories (qīṣāṣ, aḥādīth) related by the qūṣṣāṣ probably contained tarhib wa-targhib and faḍāʾil/mathālib elements. The contents of the statements and opinions disseminated by the fughā' 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
Even the two mutawātir hadiths, which Juynboll investigates to testify that tawātur itself "is no guarantee for the historicity of a hadith's ascription to the prophet", and it was in Iraq that they were fabricated, have already been indicated as alleged forgeries by Goldziher. (See for the niyāḥah hadith Muslim Studies 1, p. 229, and for the man kadhaba hadith Muslim Studies 2, p. 127)

According to Juynboll, the material, that foreran the transmission of hadith was the work of the quṣṣāṣ. Their material consisted of tarhib wa targhib associated with faḍāʾil wa mathālib: "... 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 (quṣṣāṣ, tarhib wa-targhib) or with a political slant (faḍāʾil mathālib)." (Tradition, p. 23) The material concerning ḥalāl wa ḥarām is something from a later time: "The likelihood that these qīṣṣā will have comprised also the genre of ḥalāl wa-ḥarām 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..." (Tradition, p. 12. See also p. 15)

The same concept was arrived at by Goldziher; describing the situation under the Abbāsids, he says: "The public recognition and stimulation of conduct corresponding to the sunna both in private life and in public administration and law was naturally accompanied by a freer development of the study of the traditions of the Prophet than was possible under the Umayyads. At that period such research was, so to speak, only in a latent state and was hardly in touch with everyday life. Only now was there an investigation on a large scale of the ḥalal wa-ḥāram, the allowed and forbidden, of the ritual and legal ordinances. An attempt was made to produce documents carrying the Prophet's signature, for all the details of the relations of religious and social life. Previously this had not been done to such an extent. Considering that Mālik b. Anas in the middle of the second century was able to produce only 600 sayings of the Prophet relating to legal life, it becomes evident how little was done in this direction under the Umayyads. It seems that the activities of the party of the pious were mainly concerned with the cultivation and
production of moral and ascetic teachings as well as those sayings which stood in some relation to the political situation, their views about it, and their hope for a speedy overthrow of the existing godless circumstances. At least it appears as if sayings of this kind, more than legal traditions, were the ones to have penetrated to wider circles of the people.” (Muslim Studies 2, p. 76-77. See, for Goldziher’s view on the quṣṣāṣ and their material, p. 151 ff.)

The other part of Juynboll’s thesis on the early origins of ḥadith is that the opinions and sayings of the early fuqahā’ and ʿulamā’ are ‘raised to the level of prophetic sayings’: “ḥalāl wa-ḥarām . . . 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 ḥadīths going back to the prophet. (Tradition, p. 17) On one occasion, he says: "... 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."

*(Tradition, p. 42)*

Goldziher pointed this out: "A phenomenon particularly worthy of notice shows how light-heartedly moral sayings which were not his were ascribed to Prophet. It is not at all rare in the literature of traditions that sayings are ascribed to the Prophet which for a long time circulated in Islam under the authority of another name. So-called *ahadith mawqūfa*, i.e. sayings traced back to companions or even successors, were very easily transformed into *ahādith marfū'a*, i.e. sayings traced back to the Prophet, by simply adding without much scruple a few names at random which were necessary to complete the chain. This was also often practised in the field of legal traditions." *(Muslim Studies 2, p. 148)* Schacht believes that the ascription to the Successors was the 'starting point', later these were projected back to the Companions then to the Prophet: "In the course of polemical discussion, doctrines are frequently projected back to higher authorities: traditions from Successors become traditions from Companions, and traditions from Companions become traditions from the Prophet. Whenever we find, as frequently happens, alleged opinions of
Successors, alleged decisions of the Companions, and alleged traditions from the Prophet side by side, we must, as a rule and until the contrary is proved, consider the opinions of the Successors as the starting-point, and the traditions from the Companions and from the Prophet as secondary developments, intended to provide a higher authority for the doctrine in question. When the opinion of a Successor coincides with a tradition, it would be unwarrantable to conclude, in the absence of an explicit reference or some other positive indication, that he knew and followed it." (Origins, p. 156-57) Summarizing his view regarding the "legal maxims", he says: ". . . as a rule they are earlier than traditions, and they gradually take on the form of traditions. They date, generally speaking, from the time of the first primitive systematization of Muhammadan law in the first half of the second century A.H., but often represent a secondary stage of doctrine and practice. ... The legal maxims reflect a stage when legal doctrine was not yet automatically put into the form of traditions." (Origins, p. 188-89) In a footnote on the last sentence, he says: "I do not exclude the possibility that some legal maxims may be older than the second century A. H., or may even go back to the pre-Islamic period, but this cannot be
assumed but must be positively proved in each case, . . . “ (p. 189 footnote (1))

Although Goldziher holds the view that “The rise of the ‘Abbasid dynasty is thus the time when the movement to establish the sunna as a science and as the standard of life received official recognition.” (Muslim Studies 2, p. 75), he attributes the first official recognition to the Umayyad caliph, ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Aziz: “The rule of ‘Umar II, who had imbibed the spirit of the sunna in Medina, is but a short episode in the religious history of the dynasty to which he belonged. He might be called the Hezekiah of the Umayyad house. He attempted to give practical effect to the quiet work of theologians of the first century. The catchword sunna attained official importance during his rule and he endeavoured to give it recognition in the outlying provinces of the empire.” (Id., p. 43) Elsewhere he also stresses the emphasis that ‘Umar II put on the sunnah: “‘Umar, who was always zealous to establish the sunna in all matters, ...” (Id., p. 29) “and ‘Umar II who was imbued with pious Medinian ideas and who inaugurated the real era of religion which later flourished under the sponsorship of the
Discussing 'the origin of the concept 'prophetic sunnah', Juynboll believes that 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz is "the first man to apply himself to the concept sunnat an-nabi more than to sunans ascribed to other persons or localities ..." (see Tradition, p. 34) He says: "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, ..." (Tradition, p. 26) "... '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'ān." (Tradition, p. 35)

There is no significant difference between Schacht's concept of the growth of hadith, in particular legal ones, and Juynboll's. With respect to legal hadiths, Schacht says: "One of the main conclusions to be drawn from Part I of this book is that, generally speaking, the 'living tradition' of the ancient schools of law, based to a great extent on individual reasoning, came first, that in the second stage it was put under the aegis of Companions, that traditions from the Prophet himself, put into circulation by traditionists towards the middle of the
second century A.H., disturbed and influenced this 'living tradition', and that only Shāfiʿi secured to the traditions from the Prophet supreme authority. The aim of Part II is to show that a considerable number of legal traditions, which appear in the classical collections, originated after Mālik and Shāfiʿi ..." (Origins, p. 138) He also says: "The aim of the present chapter is to provide a firm starting point for the systematic use of traditions as documents for the development of legal doctrine, by investigating the growth of legal traditions in the literary period, roughly from A.H. 150 to 250, between Abū Ḥanīfa and the classical collections of traditions, with a few extensions into the first half of the second century. The evidence presented here is only the most significant part of what could be collected, and the most important result is that whereas the growth of legal traditions from the Prophet went on over the whole period, it was particularly vigorous in the fifty years between Shāfiʿi and the classical collections, a result which can be ascribed to the joint influence of Shāfiʿi and the traditionists. The evidence must, in the nature of things, be cumulative, and whilst care has been taken to verify the presence or absence of the traditions in question in or from the sources available, an occasional oversight or the
well-known incompleteness of our sources does not invalidate the general conclusions. The best way of proving that a tradition did not exist at a certain time is to show that it was not used as a legal argument in a discussion which would have made reference to it imperative, if it had existed." (Origins, p. 140) Schacht considers the absence of hadiths in a treatise ascribed to al-Hasan al-Basri as an indication of the late appearance of hadiths: "Although the dogmatic treatise of Hasan Basri is not concerned with matters of law, it is appropriate to begin with it, because it shows that even dogmatic traditions which are, generally speaking, earlier than legal ones, hardly existed at the time of its composition, that is, in the later part of the first century A.H. There is no trace of traditions from the Prophet, and the author states explicitly: 'Every opinion which is not based on the Koran, is erroneous.' " (Id. p. 141)

Both Schacht and Juynboll considers that hadith came late but, while Schacht believes that it began to be circulated "towards the middle of the second century A.H.", Juynboll makes it somewhat earlier, "toward the end of the first/seventh century". In his discussion of the growth of hadith, Juynboll compares the respective number of hadith
that are traced back to the first four caliphs in four of the early *hadith* collections, which were compiled in the same period as that suggested by Schacht as a likely one for the major growth of *hadith*. And in the summary, he says: "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 . . .". Also he infers the same conclusion, as Schacht does, from the absence of *hadiths* in the treatise ascribed to al-Hasan al-Baṣri and in others. (See *Tradition*, p. 38-39, 73)

In the same way as Schacht associates al-Shafi'i, who "identified the 'sunna of the Prophet' with the contents of traditions from the Prophet to which he gave, not for the first time, but for the first time consistently, overriding authority..." with the growth of *hadith*, Juynboll associates 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz who is "the first man to apply himself to the concept *sunnat an-nabi* ..." with the growth of *hadith*. Concluding his argument regarding the late origins of the prophetic *sunnah*, he says: "... 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." ( *Tradition*, P. 39)
In the conclusion to his first chapter, he says: "We have seen that the need for traditions traced all the way back to Muhammad only began to be emphasized under 'Umar II (reigned 99-101/717-20) and that only as a consequence 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." (Tradition, p. 72)

As has been discussed in the chapter on Isnād, the first entry of isnād into the transmission of ḥadith, according to Juynboll, is in about "the late sixties or early seventies", in another place, he says, "the late seventies". This view is also held by Joseph Horovitz. James Robson in his review of the views of Western writers on the Isnād, summarizes Horovitz's opinion in his article "Alter und Ursprung des Isnād ", that "His conclusion is that the first entry of the isnād into the literature of Tradition was in the last third of the first century."("The isnād in muslim tradition", p. 19. See also Horovitz, in Islamic Culture 1927, 1, p. 550, who says: "Isnād in its primitive form was then - somewhere about the year 75 A. H. - already established...") Also the interpretation of the
word \textit{al-fitnah} in Ibn Sirin's report, which, Juynboll contends, refers to the conflict between Ibn al-Zubayr and the Umayyads, was already suggested by Robson. Robson refers to Schacht's argument in dismissing Ibn Sirin's report as "spurious" because" the civil war which began with the killing of the Umayyad Caliph Walid b. Yazid (A.H. 126), towards the end of the Umayyad dynasty, was a conventional date for the end of the good old time during which the sunna of the prophet was still prevailing" (\textit{Origins}, p. 36-37), and says: "I have grave doubts about this. There certainly was a civil war at the time mentioned, but it was not the first. There was the civil war between \textit{\'Ali} and Mu\textit{\'awiya} which produced a breach in Islām which exists to the present day, but it is perhaps too early a period to consider. More likely is the civil war which arose when \textit{\'Abdallah} b. al-Zubair set himself up as Caliph. In the \textit{Mu\textit{\'aw}ta\textit{\'a}} Mālik tells of Ibn \textit{"Umar} wishing to go to Mecca during the \textit{fitna} . He says that if he has difficulty in getting into Mecca, he will act as the Prophet did when he was prevented from visiting the Ka\textit{\'ba} in the year of the truce of Ḥudaibiyah. The circumstances would fit the years 64 or 72 when \textit{\'Abdallah} was besieged in Mecca. As Ibn Sirin is said to have been born in 33, he would be old enough to
speak with authority on what happened at that period." ("The isnād in muslim tradition". p. 21-22)

One of Schacht's theories on the origins of ḥadīth is " that isnāds have a tendency to grow backwards.". Juynboll emphasises this, in his study, and he comments on the examples he gives to support " the idea that isnāds have a tendency to grow with time in soundness" that " this information is an attempt at putting in a different light and rewording Schacht's thesis '... that isnāds have a tendency to grow backwards' (Tradition, p. 115)

The view of Juynboll on the chronology of the criticism of the isnād and the idea that it is applied to the isnād but not to the matn is about the same as that of Goldziher. With respect to this, Goldziher thinks: " Less attention is paid to the contents of the tradition itself than to the authorities in the isnād. Belief in the authenticity of a ḥadīth stands or falls with their reliability" (Muslim Studies 2, p. 134), and "traditions are only investigated in respect of their outward form and judgement of the value of the contents depends on the judgement of the correctness of the isnād. ... Nobody is
allowed to say: 'because the matn contains a logical or historical absurdity I doubt the correctness of the isnād.' (Id., p. 140-141) On the chronology of the criticism of the isnād, he says: "It seems to have been in the time of Ibn ʿAwn (d. 151), Shuʿba (d. 160), Abd Allāh b. Mubārak (d. 181) and others of their contemporaries that criticism of the authorities begins" (Id., p. 135)

In regard to this, Juynboll says: "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 hadith 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 hadith literature, it suffered from two
serious, interrelated shortcomings both pointing to its naivete:

(2) the near-absence of the application of suitable criteria for probing matns." (Tradition, p. 75)

According to Juynboll, hadith developed independently in the various Islamic centres at its early stage. Then with the rising of *talab al-*ilm journeys the local character disappeared. Introducing his section on 'the earliest development of the hadith centres', Juynboll says: "It is hoped to demonstrate that during the last two or three decades of the first century of the Hijra/the 700s-720s 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." (Tradition, p. 39) He also says: "The proliferation, collection and codification of hadiths 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.” *(Tradition, p. 75-76)*

Although Goldziher does not give a specific date for the beginning of *talab al-ilm* journeys, he indicates the local character of the early *ḥadīth* and the impact of *talab al-ilm* journeys on it. With respect to this, he says: "In the beginning of its development the ḥadīth had local character. It had its origin in Medina and from there was carried to all provinces of Islam. On the other hand there is a large part of it which developed independently in the provinces. The pious in all lands circulated sayings of the Prophet, partly such as were current as prophetic teachings at the cradle of the sunna and partly such as only developed in the provinces in support for some doctrine which grew up in particular circles there. The Muslim critics themselves point out the local character of many ḥadīth. If theologians of a particular province wished to fill the gaps in the tradition of their home, they had no other recourse but travel to gain the opportunity of becoming personally acquainted with the ḥadīths of other
provinces." (Muslim Studies 2, p. 164) He also says: "These journeys also yielded important results for the practical development of the hadith in Islam. Because of the ever increasing amount of journeys for the talab, theologians succeeded in inserting the particular provincial traditions into the general, more and more uniform, framework of the hadith." (Id., p. 166)

Goldziher points in Muslim Studies to the phenomenon of forgers who claimed the status of Companions in a much later age, i.e. from the fourth century onwards. With respect to this he says: "Yet another sort of imposter must be mentioned in this context. This will show that Joseph Balsamo had predecessors some centuries before him in Asia. We are referring to the mu'ammarin, the long-lived ones. They belong to the chapter of the inner history of the hadith, for the adventurers called mu'ammarin recited traditions from direct contact with the Prophet. In this they had an easier task than other inventors of hadiths, who also had to invent an isnād which brought their saying into contact with the Prophet. The 'long-lived ones' pretended to be 'companions of the Prophet' and therefore had no need to devise connecting chains
between their information and Muhammed's communication. Thus they escaped fault-finding criticism if they were fortunate in obtaining credence for their claim of having had personal contact with the Prophet. We shall see that they often succeeded in finding gullible audiences for their swindle." (2, p. 159)

Juynboll, in turn, posits a similar situation, only, this time, with regard to most of the Successors: "The vast majority of transmitters, dying at such advanced ages, may have pretended to be much older than they were in reality in order to establish at least the probability that they could have met certain masters. In so doing, they were able to claim the coveted status of Successor rather than that of Successor of a Successor.

It is my conviction that by means of this age trick a large number of Successors under the traditionists undeservedly enjoyed the privileges that went with this status. ("On the origins of Arabic prose" p. 170)
CONCLUSION

To contend that the transmission of hadith began as late as towards the end of the first century, Juynboll discusses it in a number of arguments, concentrating on the five issues which have been investigated in part I. Quite apart from the significance of these arguments in supporting this chronology, I have found that the data and information adduced in them are based, generally speaking, on a selective approach, and that some texts and references are being misused.

Even supposing that we accept the awâ'il reports as evidence for determining the early or late origins of the transmission of hadith, we have seen that most of those that are adduced in Juynboll's argument, in no way affect the question. On the other hand, there are other significant reports which point to the early origins of the transmission of hadith but they are left unquoted or put aside in Juynboll's argument.

To demonstrate his theory of the evolution of hadith, Juynboll discusses the tarājim of the first four caliphs in the
Tabaqat Ibn Sa'd, and the number of hadith traced back on their authority in four of the early hadith collections. With respect to the former, I see nothing in Ibn Sa'd that positively indicates that the four caliphs, in fact, relied on their own judgement rather than following the prophet's example. Moreover, the Tabaqat is abused, as previously explained. Further, in a detailed investigation, I have shown how it is not an appropriate method to trace the hadith transmitted on the authority of these caliphs in the four early collections in order to establish that, having originated in Iraq, it was later rather than earlier that hadith assumed the bulk that it finally attained. I have made a similar comparison with other early collections, which corroborates the above view.

Juynboll believes that the prophetic sunnah is a later concept and associates its appearance with that of the transmission of hadith. He claims that it is a concept which came into existence "only as late as towards the end of the first/seventh century". In the relevant chapter, I have explained how Juynboll not only bases his argument on a selective approach, but also sometimes abuses his evidence in order to support his theory. In the same chapter I have provided evidence pointing to the early origins of the prophetic
sunnah; Bravmann has also adduced evidence that attests that the prophetic sunnah "is a very early and genuine Islamic idea".

The various sources that are available to us now abound with information regarding the engagement of Companions and Successors in the transmission of hadith. Such data is disregarded by Juynboll; instead he considers the scattered information regarding the quṣṣāṣ as indicating what foreshadowed the transmission of hadith. In actual fact, as I have said above, if anything should be supposed to have foreshadowed the transmission of hadith, it is, in my opinion, logically the work of those who are recorded as having engaged in hadith activities rather than those of the quṣṣāṣ.

There is sufficient information to demonstrate to what a great extent talab al-ilm journeys were already undertaken during the first century. This kind of activity, and other factors, contributed to the interchange of hadith material between the centres. Not only does Juynboll depend on a few selective reports to attempt to establish the beginning of the second century as the earliest period for talab al-ilm journeys, but it can be shown that these reports do not, in fact, support his case.
In chapter two, we have discussed the activities of the quṣṣāṣ and of the early fuqahā in early Islam. As for the former, Juynboll considers their material as the forerunner of the transmission of ḥadith. As I have pointed out, in view of the great deal of information concerning the involvement of the Companions and the Successors in the transmission of ḥadith, it is their activities, if anything, that should be taken as foreshadowing the transmission of ḥadith. In fact, the quṣṣāṣ did not play such an important role in early Islam. Quṣṣāṣ were rare among the Companions. Moreover, such activities of the quṣṣāṣ were condemned by some of them. In addition, not only did most of the Successors, in particular among the <ulamā> and fuqahā, also not engage in such activities, but a number of them, too, greatly disapproved of them.

In Juynboll's thesis, because of the concern of ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAziz with the prophetic sunnah, towards the end of the first century, materials which were circulated on the authority of the Companions or later authorities were raised to the level of prophetic sayings by the Successors or their followers, or indeed anonymous persons. In fact, although there were some ḥadith transmitters who, intentionally or
unintentionally, raised sayings of Companions or Successors in this way, there were other transmitters who were scrupulous concerning the text of the hadith and its isnād. Beside this, it was a common practice of Companions, and later authorities, to cite a precedent as a fatwā without attribution while on other occasions they would relate it with attribution to its authority.

After the Prophet’s death, people were questioned regarding their transmissions on his authority. In a report of Ibn Sirin it is stated that the use of the isnād became necessary after the fitnah. Juynboll interprets this term in this report as referring to the fitnah of Ibn al-Zubayr rather than that ensuing from the killing of 'Uthmān, on the grounds that the latter was still not known by the term fitnah in the time of Ibn Sirin. In the chapter on isnād, I have explained that Juynboll’s inference comes from misuse of the sources and the texts, and that no external evidence is required to invalidate it.

By adducing examples, from Jāmi' Ibn Wahb, of reports that appear in it in a defective form, although in other later collections they appear with perfect isnāds, Juynboll attempts to buttress Schacht’s theory that ‘isnāds have a tendency to grow backwards’. In fact, it is not necessarily the case that
the appearance of a defective isnād in one source implies that a perfect isnād did not exist at the same time. Juynboll's own examples provide good evidence of this.

Apart from the dubious significance of the arguments and evidence that Juynboll adduces to support his thesis of the late coming into existence of the ḥadith, there are other considerations which undermine Juynboll's approach to the subject. He treats the sources and references in an eclectic and selective manner. Almost every argument, that he adduces to support his hypothesis is based on selective information. Further, he sometimes abuses evidence for the sake of the argument.

There is inconsistency between the inferences Juynboll makes concerning certain characteristics of the ḥadith and the evidence and examples with which he purports to support them. This is clear, for instance, in the case of the examples of Saʿid b. al-Musayyab, which Juynboll adduces as evidence that "many traditions, later appearing in collections with isnāds containing his name, can be traced also in other sources as utterances of himself that do not go back to persons older than himself", and in that of his theory that Egyptian and Khurāsānian ḥadith hail from Iraq, on 'the Successors' level or
the one following that'. An examination of representative *isnāds* from both centres gives a different conclusion.

Juynboll uses some of the criticisms which are made by the *hadith* critics themselves to the transmission of *hadith*, such as *raf", tadlis, ibrāl*, and the omission of one stage in *samā‘* between Successors and Companions, to dispose of the whole of early *hadith* transmission. However, in fact, there are contrary indications of the authenticity of *hadith*, which do not appear in Juynboll's argument. It seems only natural that there should be such criticisms of certain *hadiths*; it would be highly suspicious if there were not. However, it cannot be regarded as a reason for dismissing all as spurious, or suspicious.

The comparison of Juynboll's views with those of some of his western predecessors show us how heavily Juynboll is influenced by them. Despite his claim that he has not exposed himself to their influences, in fact, in the main views he holds regarding the origins of *hadith*, he does take theirs as a starting point in approaching the subject.
APPENDIX

A list of *hadith* transmitters, together with the provinces with which they are associated, is given here, to facilitate tracing of *isnāds*.

- أبان بن عثمان بن عفان - مدني، مات سنة 125. تهذيب التهذيب 78 (141)

- إبراهيم بن نشيط الولائي ويقال الخولاني مولاه أبو بكر المصري - توفي 163 تهذيب التهذيب 175/1 (32)

- إبراهيم بن يزيد الكوفي - قال أبو دار مات ولم يبلغ أربعين سنة، وقال غيره مات سنة (71). وقال الوقدي مات سنة (94)

- إبراهيم بن يزيد لقيس النخعي - أبو عمران الكوفي - ذكره ابن سعد في الثانية من الكوفيين - مات سنة ست وتسعين وهو ابن خمسين أو نحوها.

- ابن سعد 68-80 تهذيب التهذيب 90 (27)

- أسماء بن زيد اللمشي مولاه أبو زيد المدني - تهذيب التهذيب 280/1، التقريب 98 (312)

- إسحاق بن عثمان بن يعقوب الكلابي - أبو يعقوب البصري - تهذيب التهذيب 44-42 (317)

- أسعد المدني مولاه - قال المجلي - مدني ثقة من كبار التابعين - قال أبو عبيد توفي سنة (8) وقال غيره وهو ابن (114) - وقيل مات بين السبعين والستين - تهذيب التهذيب 116/1
- إسماعيل بن يزيد أبو عمران التحيبي المصري، قال ابن يونس: كان وجهًا بمصر.

الحرج والتعديل 2/171 (1181)، تهذيب التهذيب 1/265 (499).

- إسماعيل بن أبي خالد الأحمسي مولاه، قال العجلي: كوفي تابع ثقة وكان طحانًا. مات سنة 146 أو 147.

- تهذيب التهذيب 1/91-92.

- إسماعيل بن عبد الرحمن بن عطية البصري.

- تهذيب الكمال 1/101-102، تهذيب التهذيب 1/313-1/1.

- إسماعيل بن عياش بن سليم النجسي أبو عتابة الحمصي. مات سنة 181 أو 182 وله بضع وسبعون سنة.

- تقريب التهذيب 1/87 (373).

- إسماعيل بن مسلم المكي أبو اسحاق البصري. سكن مكة ولكثرة مجاررته قيل له المكي وكان فقيها مفتيا.

- تهذيب التهذيب 1/32-33.

- أسيد بن أبي أسيد البراد المديني.


- أسيد بن عبد الله الزبيدي، بصري. مات سنة ثلاث وثمانين.

- تقريب التهذيب 1/117 (375).

ب

- بِجَالَةً بِعِيْدَةِ التَّحِيُّبِي العَشْرِي البَصْرِي. ذَكَرَهُ الْجَاحِظُ فِي نُسَبٍ أهَلِ البَصْرَةَ. وَقَالَ مُجَاهِدُ بِعِيْدَةِ مُكَيْ مُكَيْ ثَقَةً.

- تهذيب التهذيب 1/417-418 (488).

- بِحْيِرَةٍ بِعِيْدَةِ السَّحْوِي أبو خالد الحمصي.

- تهذيب التهذيب 1/421.
- سار بن قيس التجليبي، قال صاحب تاريخ حمص كان جليساً لأبي الدرباء بدمشق، ومنزله بقنسرين.

تهذيب التهذيب ٤٥٢-
- بكر بن سوادة بن شامة الجدامي أبو شامة المصري، مات سنة بضع وعشرين ومائة.
تقريب التهذيب ١٣٦ (٧٤٢)
- بكر بن عمرو الماعري المصري.
تهذيب التهذيب ٤٨٨-٨٩٢-
- بكر بن عبد الله بن الأشع القرشي موالهم، أبو عبد الله ويقال أبو يوسف المدني، نزل مصر. قال الجلبي: مدني ثقة لم يسمع منه مالك شيئاً خرج قديماً إلى مصر فنزل بها، قيل في وفاته: ١٦٧، ١٧٢، ١٧٧. ذكره خليفة في الطبقة الرابعة من المدنيين وأعاد ذكره في الطبقة السادسة منهم.
ابن سعد ٣، خليفة ٢٦٣٣، تهذيب التهذيب ٩١-٩٢، قصيدة ٢٦٨.
- بهز بن حكيم بن معاوية بن حيدة أبو عبد الملك القرشي. مات قبل ١٦٠.
تهذيب التهذيب ٤٨٨-٩٠، تقريب التهذيب ١٢٨ (٧٤٢)

ث
- ثابت بن أسامة البناي أبو محمد البصري، مات سنة بضع وعشرين ومائة وله ست وثمانون.
تقريب التهذيب ١٣٦ (٨١)

ج
- جامع بن شداد المحاربي أبو صخرة الكوفي، مات سنة ١٢٧ وقيل ١٢٨.
تقريب التهذيب ١٣٧ (٨٨٨)
جرير بن حازم بن زيد بن عبد الله الآزدي أبو النضر البصري. قال المجلي: بصري ثقة.

ذكره ابن سعد في الخامس من أهل البصرة، وذكر عن ابنه وهو أنه ولد سنة خمس وثمانين.

في خلافة عبد الملك، وتوفي سنة سبعين ونائة. وذكره خليفة في الثامنة من أهل البصرة.

ابن سعد 7/26-23، خليفة 223، تهذيب التهذيب 2/19-19.

جمال بن هامان بن عمر أبو سعيد الأشياني ثم القتباي المصري. قال ابن يونس: كان عمر بن عبد العزيز بعثه إلى المغرب بقرتهما القرآن، وكان أحد الفقهاء، وكان قاضي الجند.

بافريقية ليشام، وتوفي في أول خلافته قريباً سنة 115.

تهذيب التهذيب 2/79.

جعفر بن ربيعة بن شرحبيل بن حسنة الكندية أبو شرحبيل المصري. قال ابن يونس توفي سنة 136.

تهذيب التهذيب 2/90.

جندب بن عبد الله الوالي الكوفي. قال المجلي: كوفي تابعي ثقة.

تجميل المنفعة 24 (148).

الحارث بن يزيد الحضرمي أبو عبد الكريم المصري. عقل مقتتل عثمان. قال ابن يونس توفي ببرقة سنة (120).

تهذيب الكمال 224-224، تهذيب التهذيب 2/163.

حبان بن واسع بن حبان بن منذر بن عمرو الأنصاري المأزيتي المدني.

تهذيب التهذيب 2/171-170.

حبيب بن أبي ثابت الكوفي. قال المجلي: كوفي تابعي ثقة. قال أبو بكر بن عياش وغيره مات سنة (119) وقيل غير ذلك.

تهذيب التهذيب 2/179-178.

حجاج بن صفوان بن أبي يزيد المدني.

تهذيب التهذيب 2/202.
- حزام بن حكيم بن حزام بن خويلد، روى عن أبيه، وعن عطاء بن أبي رباح وزيد بن رفيق.

تهذيب التهذيب 2/242

- الحسن بن ذكوان أبو سلمة البصري.

تهذيب التهذيب 2/277-278

- الحسن بن زيد بن الحسن بن علي بن أبي طالب الهاشمي أبو محمد المدني.

تهذيب التهذيب 2/279

- الحسن بن عطية بن سعد العوفي، قال ابن قانع، مات سنة 188.

تهذيب التهذيب 2/294

- الحسن بن عمر الفقيه الفقيه الكوفي، قال ابن سعد توفي في أول خلافة ابن جعفر.

وقال خليفة بن خياط مات (142)

تهذيب التهذيب 2/310

- حفص بن عاصم بن عمر بن الخطاب، ذكره مسلم في الطبقة الأولى من أهل المدينة.

تهذيب التهذيب 2/323-324

- حفص بن ميسرة العقيلي أبو عمر الصنعاني، سكن عصفون. قال أحمد والبخاري والنسائي: أنه من صنعاء. وقال أبو حاتم: أنه من صنعاء اليمن. قال أبو القاسم:

وهو أشبه.

تهذيب التهذيب 2/385-386، تقريب التهذيب 189/1

- الحكم بن عائبة أبو محمد الكński الكوفي، مات سنة 113 أو بعدها، وله نصف وستون.

تقريب التهذيب 175 (1462)

- حكيم بن حزام بن خويلد القرشي الأنصاري أبو خالد المكي، إسلام يوم الفتح، توفي سنة 154.

أو بعد ذلك.

تهذيب التهذيب 2/448-449، تقريب التهذيب 176 (1463)

- حكيم بن معاوية بن حيّة الشهري.

تهذيب التهذيب 2/451
- حماد بن سلمة بن دينار البصري، أبو سلمة، مات سنة 167.

تقريب التهذيب 178 (1499)

همان بن أيوب بن عثمان، قال معاوية بن صالح عن يحيى بن معين: حمرون من تابعي أهل المدينة ومحدثهم، ذكره ابن سعد في الطبقة الثانية من أهل المدينة من التابعين، وقال:

وتحول إلى البصرة فنزلها. قيل في وفاته 71، 72، 75، 76.

ابن سعد 298/5، تهذيب التهذيب 2/4-5

- حميد بن أبي حميد الطويل، أبو عبيدة البصري، مات سنة 142، وهو قائم يصلي، وله خمس وسبعون.

تهذيب التهذيب 38/2-4، تقريب التهذيب 181 (1044)

- حميد بن عبد الرحمن الحميري البصري.

تهذيب التهذيب 41/2

- حميد بن عبد الرحمن بن عوف الزهري المدني، قال في وفاته 95 وقيل ابن حجر.

حجر في التقريب القول الثاني.

تهذيب التهذيب 2/45-46، تقريب التهذيب 182 (1054)

- حميد بن هاشم: أبو هاشم الخولاني المصري، قال ابن يونس توفي سنة (142).

تهذيب التهذيب 2/45-51

- حبي بن يومن بن حجيل بن جريح أبو عثمان المصري، قال ابن يونس: توفي سنة (118).

تهذيب التهذيب 2/71-72

- حبي بن هانئ بن ناصر، بن ينبع أبو قبيل المعافري المصري، وقيل اسمه حي، والأول اشهر.

قال ابن يونس: مات بالبرلس سنة (138).

تهذيب التهذيب 2/71-72

خ

- خالد بن معدان الكلامي، أبو عبد الله الشامي الحمصي، ذكره ابن سعد في الثالثة من أهل الشام وقال كان ثقة. قال وأجمعوا على أن خالد بن معدان توفي سنة ثلاث وثمانية في خلافة
365

يزيد بن عبد الملك. وذكره خليفة في الثانية من أهل الشامات وقال: مات سنة ثلاث وتgonة.


- خبيبة بن عبد الرحمن بن خبيبة بن يساف الأنصاري الخزرجي، أبو الحارث المدني. مات سنة 122.

تهذيب التهذيب 137/386.

- داود بن الحسين الاموري مولاهم أبو سليمان المدني. مات سنة 135.

تهذيب التهذيب 180/425.

- داود بن عبد الرحمن العطار العبدي، أبو سليمان الملكي. ولد سنة 100 ومات سنة 174 أو 175. ذكره ابن سعد وخلعيفة في الخامسة من أهل مكة.

ابن سعد 126/376، خليفة 128/378، تهذيب التهذيب 192/442.

- ذر بن عبد الله بن زرارة المرهبي الهمداني أبو عمر الكوفي.

تهذيب التهذيب 218/476.

- رباح بن أبي موعوض بن أبي سارة الملكي.

تهذيب التهذيب 234/489.

- ربعة بن الحارث بن عبد الملك بن هاشم الباهلي. ابن عم النبي صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم. له صحبة. قال أبو القاسم الطبرياني: توفي سنة 23. قال خليفة والعسكري وغيرهما مات بالمدينة في أول خلافة عمر وارضه ابن حبان مثل الطبرياني.

تهذيب التهذيب 253/507.
- ربيعة الرأي إبن أبي عبد الرحمن أبو عثمان ، ذكره ابن سعد في الرابعة من أهل المدينة.

وقال محمد بن عمر : توفي ربيعة بن أبي عبد الرحمن بالمدينة سنة ست وثلاثين ومائة.

ابن سعد 224-225 (366).

- رشدين بن سعد بن مفلح المهرى أبو الحجاج المصري . ولد سنة عشر ومائة ومتا سنة 188.

تهذيب التهذيب 279-277 / 299-298.

روه رد النظير عن عمرو بنosl عن أبي غياث البصري . قال ابن حبان : مات قبل الحجاج في أرطاة سنة أربعة وأربعين ومائة وكان حافظاً متقناً . قال ابن حجر : وقرأ بخط الذهبية . مات سنة نياف وخمسين.

تهذيب الكمال 1 / 426. تهذيب التهذيب 299-298.

- زاذان أبو عبد الله ويقال أبو عمر الكتاني مواله الكوفي . قال خليفة : مات سنة (89).

وقال المجلي : كوفي تابعي ثقة.

تهذيب التهذيب 2 / 362-364.

- زائدة بن قلادة الثعالبي أبو الصلت الكوفي . مات سنة 160 وقيل بعدها.

تهذيب التهذيب 267-269. تقريب التهذيب 162 (1982).

- زياد بن ربيعة بن نعيم بن ربيعة الحضرمي المصري . قال ابن يونس وينسب إلى جده . مات سنة خمس وسبعين.


- زياد بن نعيم الحضرمي = زياد بن ربيعة بن نعيم.

- زيد بن أسلم العدو المدنى أبي أسامة ويقال أبو عبد الله المدناً العظيم مولى عمر . ذكره خليفة في الطبقة الرابعة من المدنين وقال توفي سنة ست وثلاثين ومائة أو نحواً . وقيل في وفاته غير ذلك.


- زيد بن أبي نعيمة أبو أسامة الرهاوي ، كوفي الأصل غنوي مواله . وقا ابن سعد : كان
س

- سالم بن أبي أمية التيمي زين النضر المدني. مات سنة تسع وعشرين ومائة.

- تهذيب التهذيب ٣٥٩/٦-٧، تهذيب التهذيب ٢٧٧/٢٩-٣٦٤

- مات بن عبد الكرم. قال ابن كثير: مات في خليفة التميمي، سنة ٩٨٠.

- ابن سعد ٢٠٦/٧، خليفة ٢٧٦، تهذيب التهذيب ٢٣٣/٩/١٢

- السابق بن حبيب الكلامي الحمصي.

- تهذيب التهذيب ٤٤١/١٠-١١، تهذيب التهذيب ٩١٣/٢٦-٢٧

- السابر بن يزيد بن سعيد الكندي. قال ابن حجر: مات سنة واحد١ وتسعم١، وقيل قبل ذلك، وهو آخر من مات بالمدينة من الصحابة.

- تهذيب التهذيب ٣٦٠/١٩-٢٠، تهذيب التهذيب ٣٨٨/٢٢

- معن بن إبراهيم بن عبد الرحمن بن عوف الزهري. كان قاضيا للمدينة. ذكره ابن سعد في الرابعة من أهل المدينة. قال في وفاته: ١٦٥، ١٦٢، ١٦٢، ١٦٢، ١٦٢، ١٦٢، ١٦٢، ١٦٢، ١٦٢، ١٦٢.

- ابن سعد ٢٠٥/٧٧، تهذيب التهذيب ٣٨٨/٣٣-٤٥٠
- سعد بن سعيد بن قيس بن عمرو الأنصاري، ذكره ابن سعد في الطبقة الخامسة من التابعين من أهل المدينة، توفي سنة 141.

ابن سعد (241) تهذيب التهذيب 376 - 356

- سعيد بن إياس الجريري أبو مسعود البصري، توفي سنة 144.

تهذيب التهذيب 7

سعيد بن أبي أيوب الخزاعي مولاه أبو يحيى المصري. قال ابن يونس: ولد سنة مائة وتوفي سنة (161) وقيل سنة (162) سنة احدى اصح. ذكره ابن سعد في الرابعة من أهل مصر، وأوردته خليفة في الثالثة من أهل المغرب.

ابن سعد 203 - 171، خليفة 226 - 217، تهذيب التهذيب 108 - 95

سعيد بن بشير الأزدي وقيل البصري مولاه الشامي. أصله من البصرة وقيل من واسط. ذكره ابن سعد في الخامسة من أهل الشام وقال: كان من أهل البصرة فتحول إلى الشام. فنزل دمشق وكان قدريا ومات بدمشق سنة سبعين ومائة. وذكره خليفة في الرابعة.

ابن سعد 207 - 172، خليفة 236 - 222، تهذيب التهذيب 108 - 95

سعيد بن أبي سعيد واسمه كيسان المقربي أبو سعد المدني. مات في حدود 120 وقيل قبلها وقيل بعدها.

تهذيب التهذيب 282 - 264، تقريب التهذيب 236 (221)

سعيد بن عبيد الطائي أبو الهذيل الكرقفي.

تهذيب التهذيب 172

سعيد بن أبي عروبة البصري. ذكره ابن سعد في الخامسة من أهل البصرة وقال: وكان ثقة كثير الحديث ثم اختلط بعد في آخر عمره. وأوردته خليفة في السابعة من أهل البصرة.

توفي سنة 156 وقيل 157 وقيل غير ذلك.

ابن سعد 205 - 173، خليفة 231 - 217، تهذيب التهذيب 136 - 124

سعيد بن فيروز وهو ابن أبي عمران أبو البختري الطائي مولاه الكرقفي. وقال هلال بن خباز كان من أشخاص أهل الكرقة. قال أبو نعيم مات في الجماجم سنة (82).

تهذيب التهذيب 240 - 227، تقريب التهذيب 236 (228)
- سعيد بن يسار أبو الجياب المدني. قال الواقدي مات سنة (16) وقيل سبع عشرة ومائة

وما هو ابن خمسين سنة. وقال الجلال: مدني ثقة.

تهذيب التهذيب 107-108/1

- سفيان بن عوف القاري بالتشديد حليف بنى زهرة. قال ابن يونس في المصريين: يروى

من عبد الله بن عمرو بن العاص.

تمجييل المنفة 107 (182)

سفيان بن هاني المصري أبو سالم الجييشاني، حليف لهم من المعافر. شهد فتح مصر ووفد

على علي رأى منه ...

تهذيب التهذيب 127/10

- سلمان الأخر أبو عبد الله المدني مولى جهينة. أصله من أصحابه. ذكره ابن سعد.

الثانية من أهل المدينة من التابعين.

ابن سعد 310/5، تهذيب التهذيب 294/143

- سلمان بن سهيب البريدي العربي أبو حذيفة الكوفي.

تهذيب التهذيب 148/4

- سليم بن جبير ويقال ابن جبيرية الدرازي أبو يونس المصري. مولى أبي هريرة. توفي

122.

تهذيب التهذيب 166/4

- سليمان بن بلاد الطيمي الفرخي موالي المدني، أبو محمد ويقال أبو أيوب. ذكره ابن سعد.

في الساسة من أهل المدينة وقال: كان يعتني بالبلد، وولي خراج المدينة، وتوفي بالمدينة

سنة اثنتين وسبعين ومائة في خلافة هارون وكان ثقة كثير الحديث. ذكره خليفة في

الثامنة وقال، مولى القاسم بن محمد، يكنى أبا محمد. وقال الخياري من هارون بن محمد

المزنوي مات سنة سبع وسبعين ومائة.

ابن سعد 316/5، خليفة 275، تهذيب التهذيب 476-75

- سليمان بن حبيب الحاربي أبو أيوب الدرازي. القاضي بدمشق. ذكره ابن سعد في الثالثة

من أهل الشام وقال: كان قليل الحديث، توفي سنة ست وعشرين ومائة.
ابن سعد 7-163/2, خليفة 362, تقريب التهذيب 25 (544)

- سليمان بن سليم الكنتاني مولاه أبو سلمة الشامي القاضي الحمصي. قال صاحب تاريخ
حسن: مات سنة سبع واربعين ومائة.

تهذيب الكمال 529/1, تهذيب التهذيب 4/196-197

- سليمان بن طرخان التيمي أبو المعتمر البيصري. نزل في اليم من قبلهم. مات سنة
143 وله ابن سبع وثمانين.

تقريب التهذيب 255 (675)

- سليمان بن قيس البيشري البيصري. قال أبو حاتم: جالس جابر وكتب عنه صحيفة ...
قال البخاري: يقال أنه مات في حياة جابر بن عبد الله ... وقال أبو داود: مات قبل جابر
في فترة ابن الزبير. قال الجملي: بيصري تابعي ثقة. وذكره البخاري في فصل من مات
مابين السبعين إلى الثمانين.

تهذيب التهذيب 218/4

- سليمان بن أبي مسلم الملك الأحول.

تهذيب التهذيب 221-230

- سليمان بن المغيرة القيسي مولاه أبو سعيد البيصري. مات سنة 165.

تهذيب التهذيب 4/218

- سليمان بن مهران الإسدي الكاهلي، أبو محمد الكوفي، الأعمش. ولد سنة 66 ومات سنة
148 أو 149.

تقريب التهذيب 265 (765)

- سليمان بن موسى الأمريكي مولاه أبو أيوب. ويقال أبو الربيع ويقال أبو هشام الديمشقي
الشقيق. قال سعد بن عبد العزيز: سليمان بن موسى كان أعلم أهل الشام بعد محول.
ذكوره ابن سعد وخلافة في الثالثة من أهل الشام.

ابن سعد 7-163/2, خليفة 362, تهذيب التهذيب 4/227-228

- سليمان الأحول = سليمان بن أبي مسلم الملكي.
شهد بن العقير الأنصاري. ويروى عن عبد الله بن هبة، روى عنه الليث بن سعد.
الثقة 20/5/4

شيء

شبيب بن سعيد التميمي الحبيبي أبو سعيد البصري. قال ابن المديني: ثقة كان يختلف في تجارة إلى مصر وكتابه صحيح. وقال ابن يونس في تاريخ الغرباء: مات بالبصرة سنة ست وثمانين ومائة فيما ذكره البخاري.
تهديب الكمال 2/189، تهذيب التهذيب 4/24.7-4، تهذيب التهذيب 2/167-170

شداد بن عبد الرحمن الكامل الشامي أبو روبة البصري.
ثقات ابن حبان 4/178، وانظر 4/169، تصميم المفتاحة 176-178

شرحيل بن السعد بن الأسود الكندي أبو يزيد ويقال أبو السعد الشامي. مختلف في صحبته. وذكر خليفة أنه كان عاملاً لمعاوية على حمص نحو مئتين سنة.
تهديب التهذيب 4/232-233

شريح بن هاني بن يزيد الحارثي المجزي، أبو المقدم الكوفي. أدرك النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم، ولم ير به ذكره ابن سعد في الطبقة الأولى من تابعي أهل الكوفة... قال خليفة: نقل مع ابن أبي بكر سنة ثمانين وسبعين.
تهديب التهذيب 4/231-232

شبيب بن محمد بن عبد الله بن عمر بن العاص الحجازي السهمي. وقد ينسب إلى جده.
ذكره ابن سعد في الطبقة الثانية من تابعي أهل المدينة. ذكره خليفة في الطبقة الأولى من أهل الخلاف.
ابن سعد 2/5، خليفة 386، تهذيب التهذيب 2/357-358
- شهاب بن عباد العبدي المصري البصري.

تهذيب التهذيب ۳۷۸/۴

شهر بن حرشم الأشوري الشامي. اختلف في وفاته على أقوال: ۸۸، ۱۱۱، ۱۱۲، ۱۱۳.

ذكره ابن سعد وخليفة في الطبقة الثانية من أهل الشام.

ابن سعد ۷/۱۸۸، خليفة ۳۱۶، تهذيب التهذيب ۳۷۷-۲۷۲.

- صالح بن كيسان المدني أبو محمد أبو الحارث. مات بعد سنة ۱۲۰ أو بعد ۱۴۰.

تقريب التهذيب ۳۷۷ (۲۸۷۴)

صالح بن نهيان المدني ويكنى أبا عبد الله مولى توأمة. ذكره ابن سعد في الطبقة الثالثة من التابعين من أهل المدينة. مات سنة خمسة٠-أوست - وعشرين ومائة.

ابن سعد ۱۴۹ (۷۲)، تهذيب التهذيب ۳۷۴ (۲۸۷۲).

- صقلان بن سليم المدني القرشي الزهري مولاهم. ذكره ابن سعد وخليفة في الطبقة الرابعة من المدنيين. مات سنة ۱۲۵ وله ۷۳ سنة. وقال أبو عيسى الترمذي مات سنة (۲۴).

ابن سعد ۲۲۴ (۲۲۷)، خليفة ۳۱۱، تهذيب التهذيب ۴/۲۰-۲۷۲.

- صقلان بن عيسى الزهري أبو محمد البصري. مات سنة مائتين وقيل قبلها بقليل أو بعدها.

تقريب التهذيب ۷۷۲ (۲۹۴۴).

- حصنم بن جوس ويقال ضخم بن الحارث بن جوس البحائي اليماني. وتكره ابن سعد في فقهاء أهل اليمامة.

تهذيب التهذيب ۴۱۲/۱۴.

- طلحة بن عبد الله بن عثمان القيعي المدني.

تهذيب التهذيب ۱۸۸/۵.
ع

- عاصم بن بُنَةَة بن هو ابن أبي النَّجُود الأَسْدِي مَوْلاهم الكوفي أبو بكر المقرئ. مات سنة 128.

تقريب التهذيب 288 (20) 41

- عاصم بن رجاء بن حيوة الكندى الفلسطيني.

تهذيب التهذيب 5

- عاصم بن عبد الله بن عاصم بن عمر بن الخطاب العدوي المدني. ذكره ابن سعد في الطبقة الرابعة من التابعين من أهل المدينة.

ابن سعد 245 (16), تهذيب التهذيب 46-69

- عاصم بن عمر بن قتادة بن النعبان الأرسي الأنصاري أبو عمر المدني. ذكره ابن سعد وخليفة في الثالثة من المدنيين. مات بعد العشرين ورمانة.

ابن سعد 245-56 (22), خليفة 245, تهذيب التهذيب 46-64

- عامر بن جشيب أبو خالد الحمسي. ذكره ابن سعد في الطبقة الرابعة من أهل الشام.

ابن سعد 76-17 (10), تهذيب التهذيب 46-67

- عامر بن سعد بن أبي وقاص الزهري المدني. ذكره ابن سعد في الطبقة الأولى من أهل المدينة وارده خليفة في الثنائية من المدنيين. توفي سنة 14. وقيل غير ذلك.

ابن سعد 245-55 (22), خليفة 245, تهذيب التهذيب 46-64

- عامر بن عبد الله بن الزبير بن العروام الأَسْدِي أبو الحارث المدني. مات سنة 131.

تقريب التهذيب 288 (19)

- مربد بن عبد الله بن الزبير الأَسْدِي المدني. قال الزبير بن بكار: كان عظيم القدر عند أبيه وكان على قضائه بعكة، وكان يستخلخله إذا حج، وكان أصدق الناس لهجة. ذكره ابن سعد وخليفة في الثالثة من أهل المدينة.

ابن سعد 106 (11), خليفة 256, تهذيب التهذيب 96/6
- مياد بن منصور الباجي أبو سلمة البصري القاضي.

تهذيب التهذيب 105-106

- ميادة بن الوليد بن ميادة بن الصامت الأنصاري المدني.

تهذيب التهذيب 114

- عبد الله بن رافع الفزؤمي أبو رافع المدني. مولى أم سلمة زوج النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم.

أرده ابن سعد و الخليفة في الثانية من المدنيين.

ابن سعد 219/7، خليفة 624/6، تهذيب الكمال 82/8، تهذيب التهذيب 217/6.

- عبد الله بن زياد بن سليمان بن سمعان الفزؤمي أبو عبد الرحمن المدني.

تهذيب التهذيب 219/1 - 221

- عبد الله بن السائب الكندى ويتال الشيباني الكوفي.

تهذيب التهذيب 320/6.

- عبد الله بن سعيد بن أبي هند الفزؤمي مولاهم أبو بكر المدني. مات سنة بضعة أربعين و وفاته.

تهذيب التهذيب 329/5، تقريب التهذيب 216/3.

- عبد الله بن الصامت الفزؤمي البصري. وقال العجلي: بصري، تابعي ثقة. وذكره البخاري في الأوسط في فصل من مات مابين السبعين إلى الثمانين.

تهذيب التهذيب 314/5.

- عبد الله بن طارس بن كيسان اليمني أبو محمد. مات سنة 132.

تقريب التهذيب 327/2.

- عبد الله بن أبي طلحة واسمه زيد بن سهل الأنصاري النجاري المدني. حنكة النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم لولد. توفي بالمدينة سنة أربع وثمانين.

تهذيب التهذيب 39/5.

- عبد الله بن عامر بن ربيعة العنزي أبو محمد المدني. حليف بني عدي. ولد في عهد النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم.

- تهذيب التهذيب 207-208، تقريب التهذيب 209/2.
عبد الله بن عبد الرحمن بن أبي حسين التنفلي المكي، ذكره ابن سعد وخليفة في الثالثة
من أهل مكة.

ابن سعد 375/5، خليفة 283، تهذيب الكمال 2/7.2.

عبد الله بن عبد الرحمن بن معمر البصري النجاري أبو طوالله المدني. كان قاضي المدينة
في زمن عمر بن عبد العزيز. توفي 124.

تهذيب التهذيب 287/5.

- عبد الله بن عبد الله بن عبد الله بن أبي ملكية الخزيمي المدني. مات سنة 117.

تقريب التهذيب 312 (240).

- عبد الله بن معيبد بن تشييز الرزغي. قال الواقدي: مات سنة ثلاثين ومائة، قتلته
الحرورية بعذاب. ذكره ابن سعد في الطبقات الرابعة من التابعين من أهل المدينة.

ابن سعد 226 (231)، تهذيب التهذيب 312، تقريب التهذيب 287/3، تقريب التهذيب 287/5.

- عبد الله بن عثمان بن خزيم القاري المكي أبو عثمان. ذكره ابن سعد في الثالثة من أهل
مكة. مات سنة 132.

ابن سعد 258/5، تقريب التهذيب 312 (246).

- عبد الله بن عمر بن هفص المدني أبو عبد الرحمن العمري. ذكره ابن سعد في الخامسة من
التابعين من أهل المدينة. وذكره خليفة في السادسة والسابعة من أهل المدينة. مات سنة 171.

وقيل بعدها.

ابن سعد 268-76، خليفة 276، 277، تهذيب التهذيب 287-276، تقريب التهذيب 314 (2849).

- عبد الله بن مالك بن أبي الأصم أبو تيمم الجيشاني الرعى المصري. أصله من اليمن. ولد
هو وأخوه سيف في حياة النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وهاجر زمن عمر. وقال ابن يونس
قرأ القرآن على معاذ باليمن وشهد فتح مصر.

التقسيط 5/49، تهذيب التهذيب 287-279.

- عبد الله بن نافع الصانع أبو محمد المدني. مولى لبني مخزوم. ذكره ابن سعد في السابعة.
السيدة من أهل المدينة، توفيت في 207.

 ابن سعد 376، تهذيب التهذيب 5-1-2.

- عبد الله بن نافع العدو مولاه المداني، ذكره ابن سعد في الخامسة وذكره خليفة في السابعة من المدنيين.

ابن سعد 409، خليفة 274، تهذيب التهذيب 53/6.

- عبد الله بن نافع بنcompareTo. قال ابن المديني: مجهول.

تهذيب التهذيب 58.

- عبد الله بن هبيرة بن أسد السبائي الحضرمي أبو هبيرة المصري، ذكره ابن سعد في الثانية من أهل مصر وقال: له أحاديث وتوفي في خلافة يزيد بن عبد الملك. وذكره خليفة في الأولى من أهل المغرب. قال ابن يونس: ولد سنة الجماعة ومات سنة ست وعشرين وثمانية.

ابن سعد 7/2-1297، خليفة 294، تهذيب الكمال 2/2، تهذيب التهذيب 212-6.

- عبد الله بن رهب بن مسلم القرشي مولاه أبو محمد المصري، ولد 1245، وتوفي بمصر.

ابن سعد 7/2، خليفة 297، تهذيب التهذيب 212-2.

- عبد الله بن يزيد المهاجري أبو عبد الرحمن الجبلي المصري، توفي بإفريقية سنة مائة.

وقال أبو بكر المالكي في تاريخ القيروان: بعث عمر بن عبد العزيز إلى إفريقية ليفقههم فثبت فيها علماً كثيراً رمط بها ودفن بباب تونس.

تهذيب الكمال 2، تهذيب التهذيب 63-8.

- عبد الحميد بن بهرام الفزاري المدائني، وقال حرب عن أحمد: ثقة كان يكون بالدائن.

تهذيب التهذيب 161-11، تقريب التهذيب 33/3(175).

- عبد ربه بن سعيد بن قيس بن عمر الأنصاري التجاري المدني، مات سنة 140 أو 142.

تهذيب التهذيب 162.

- عبد الرحمن بن جبير المصري، وقال ابن يونس: كان فقيهاً عالماً بالقراءة، شهد فتح مصر.

توقي 97 وقيل 98.

تهذيب التهذيب 163-5.
عبد الرحمن بن جوشن الفطافى البحري.

105/8

عبد الرحمن بن سليمان بن عبد الله بن حنظلة الأنصاري الأرسي أبو سليمان المدني

العروف بابن الفسيل. ذكره ابن سعد في السنة من المدنيين وقال: وكان عبد الرحمن

قدآتى الكوفة واتام بها وروى عنه الكوفيون. سنة 172.

ابن سعد 466 (446) ، تهذيب التهذيب 89/6 ، التقريب 244 (887)

- عبد الرحمن بن أبي عمرة الأنصاري التجاري. ذكره ابن سعد في الطبقة الأولى من أهل

المدينة من التابعين.

ابن سعد 6/5 ، تهذيب التهذيب 1/1 447 - 243

- عبد الرحمن بن غنم الأشعري. مختلف في صحبته. وقال العجل: شامي تابعي ثقة من

كبار التابعين. توفي 78.

تهذيب التهذيب 1/1 350-243

- عبد الرحمن بن معاوية بن حديج الكومي التجيمي. أبو معاوية المصري القاضي. توفي سنة

140.

الثقات 5/1.4.7 ، تهذيب التهذيب 1/1 372-71

- عبد الرحمن بن معاوية بن الحيوير الأنصاري الزرقي. أبو الحيوير المدني. مات سنة 120.

وقيل 128 وقيل 122.

تهذيب التهذيب 1/1 372-72

- عبد الرحمن بن مل بن عمرو أبو عثمان الجهني. سكن الكوفة ثم البصرة أدرك الجاهلية

والسوز على عبد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلام وصدق الله ولم يقع. قال ابن المدني:

هاجر الى المدينة بعد موت أبي بكر رفعت استخلاف عمر فسمع منه ولم يسمع من أبي ذر ...

مات سنة خمس وتسعة ، وقيل بعدها ، وما شاء مائة وثلاثين سنة وقيل أكثر.

تهذيب التهذيب 1/1 378-77

- عبد العزيز بن محمد بن عبيد الدراوري أبو محمد الجهني مولاه المدني. مات سنة ست

أربيع وثمانين ومائة.
تقريب التهذيب ٣٨٨ (٤٨١)

- عبد الملك بن حبيب الأزدي، ويقال الكندي أبو عمران الجوزي البصري. مات سنة ثمان.

ومشرين وقيل بعدها.

تهذيب التهذيب ٣٨٩/٧، تقريب التهذيب ٣٨٢ (٤٧٢)

- عبد الملك بن أبي سليمان العزريمي، وذكره ابن حبان في الثقات وقال ربما أخطأ، وكان

من خيار أهل الكوفة وحفظائهم ... مات في ذي الحجة سنة خمس وأربعين ومائة.

تهذيب التهذيب ٣٩٠/٦، تقريب التهذيب ٤٤٦-٤٤٧

- عبد الوهاب بن بخت الأموي مولى ال مروان أبو عبيدة ويقال أبو بكر المكي. سكن الشام

ثم المدينة.

تهذيب الكمال ٢/٨٦٩-٨٧٠، تقريب التهذيب ٤٤٦-٤٤٧

- عبيدة بن أبي لبابة. توفي ١٣٧.

سير أعلام النبلاء ٢٩٦/٥

- عبيد الله بن زهر الصغرى مولاه الافريقي. ولد بافريقيا، ودخل العراق في طلب العلم.

تهذيب التهذيب ١٣٦-١٣٧

- عبيد الله بن عبد الله بن عتبة بن مسعود الهذلي، أبو عبد الله المدني. مات سنة أربع

وتسعين وقيل سنة ثمان وقيل غير ذلك.

تقريب التهذيب ٣٧٢ (٤٨١)

- عبيد الله بن عبد الله بن موهب أبو يحيى التيمي المدني.

تهذيب التهذيب ٦٠/٥، تقريب التهذيب ٣٨٨/٤

- عبيد الله بن عمر بن حفص العمري المدني أبو عثمان. توفي سنة ١٤٧ وقيل غير ذلك.

تهذيب التهذيب ١٢١-١٢٢

- عثمان بن أبي سودة المقدسي. قال ابن سمع في الطبقة الرابعة أسماء بن أبي سودة

مولى عمرو بن العاص فلسطيني.

تهذيب التهذيب ٧/١٢١-١٢٤

- عثمان بن مقص البري أبو سلمة الكندي البصري. أورد ابن حجر قول ابن حبان: عثمان
البري من موالي كندة من أهل الكوفة روى عنه البصريون وغيرهم. مات بعد الثوري.

لسان الميزان 4/5-55 (374)

 الروة بن الزبير بن العوام بن خويلد الأصبي أبو عبد الله المدني. مات سنة أربع وتسعين على الصحيح، ولمولده في أوائل خلافة عثمان.

تقريب التهذيب 389 (451)

- عطاء بن أبي رباح القرشي مولاهم أبو محمد الملكي. ذكره ابن سعد خليفة في الثانية من أهل مكة. قيل مات سنة 114 وقيل بعد ذلك.

ابن سعد 4/445-444، خليفة 128، تهذيب التهذيب 7/199-199

- عطاء بن أبي مسلم الخراساني، نزيل الشام. ذكره ابن سعد فيمن كان بخراسان بع الصحبة من الفقهاء والحدثين وقال: وكان ثقة رمي الشام فروعه عنه الشاميين. وذكره خليفة في الثالثة من أهل الشام. وقد سنة 50 وقيل خليفة أنه مات 132.

ابن سعد 2/442-441، خليفة 313، تهذيب التهذيب 7/215-215

- عطاء بن يسار البهلاي أبو محمد المدني، القاضي مولى ميمنة زوج النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم. مات سنة 94 وقيل 104. قيل توفي بالاسكندرية.

تهذيب التهذيب 7/214-213

- عمرو بن سعد بن جنادة العوفي الكوفي. ذكره ابن سعد في الثانية وخلية في الرابعة من أهل الكوفة. مات سنة 117.

ابن سعد 6/417-416، خليفة 169، تهذيب التهذيب 7/424-424

- عقبة بن مسلم التجيبي أبو محمد المصري القاضي. أمام المسجد العتيق بمصر. قال العجلبي: مصري تابعي ثقة. توفي قريبا من سنة عشرين وثاني.

الثقات 5/49-49، تهذيب التهذيب 7/50-50

- محمد بن حكيم بن عقيل الأيلي أبو خالد الأموي مولى عثمان. ذكره ابن سعد فيمن كان بإبالة، وذكره خليفة في الثانية من أهل المغرب. سكن المدينة ثم الشام ثم مصر. مات 144 وقيل 141.

ابن سعد 2/716-715، خليفة 499، تهذيب التهذيب 7/555-555
- معركة بن عمارة المجلي أبو عمار اليمامي. بيصري الأصل. مات سنة 159.

تهذيب التهذيب 727-723

- علقة بن مرثد الحضرمي أبو الحارث الكوفي. وقال خليفة بن خياط: توفي في آخر ولاية خالد القسري على العراق.

تهذيب التهذيب 727-726

- علي بن الأثر بن عمرو بن الحارث البمدي الموقد أبو الوازع الكوفي.

تهذيب التهذيب 727-726

- علي بن زيد بن عبد الله بن زهير بن عبد الله بن جدعان الثيمي البصري أصله حجازي.

وهو المعروف بعلي بن زيد بن جدعان. مات سنة 131 وقيل قبليها.

تقريب التهذيب 10/4 (1384)

- علي بن أبي طلحة الهاشم أبو الحسن. أصله من الجزيرة وأنتقل إلى حمص. ذكره ابن سعد في الطبقة الثالثة من تابعي أهل الشام، وذكره خليفة أيضاً في الثالثة وقال حمصي. وذكر

ان وفاته سنة 120 ورجع ابن حجر أنها سنة 143.

ابن سعد 7-16/4 خليفة 10/4-1397، تهذيب التهذيب 727-726

- علي بن يزيد بن أبي هلال البهالاني ويقال الهالاني أبو عبد الملك. ويقال أبو الحسن الدمشقي.

ذكره البخاري في الإرسط فيمن مات في العشر الثاني بعد المائة.

تهذيب التهذيب 727-967

- عمر بن أبي بكر بن عبد الرحمن بن الحارث بن هشام الخزؤومي المدني.

تهذيب التهذيب 727-967

- عمر بن نهروغ الهبي أبو حفص البصري القياط.

تهذيب الكمال 7-12/2، تهذيب التهذيب 727-988
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- عمرو بن أوس بن أبي أوس الثقفي الطائفي. مات بعد التسمين من الهجرة.

تقريب التهذيب 418 (1991)

- عمرو بن أبي أوس الناصري المصري، ويقال مولى أبي خراش السلمي. مدني نزل الإسكندرية. وقال ابن يونس: قدم الإسكندرية سنة مائة، وكان معاذ الله متح في المدينة، توفي بالمدينة سنة سبع عشرة ومائة.

تهذيب التهذيب 123/8

- عمرو بن الحارث بن يعقوب الأنصاري مولاه المصري، أصله مدني. مات قديما قبل الخمسين

ومائة.

تقريب التهذيب 419-16، تقرير التهذيب 418 (1404)

- عمرو بن أبي سلمة التنبيسي أبو حفص الدمشقي، مولى بشي هاشم. قال ابن يونس: كان من أهل دمشق، قدم مصر وسكن تنبيس حديث عن الأزهاري ومن مالك بالموطأ، كان ثقة، توفي بتنبيس سنة ثلاث عشرة ومائتين، وقال مرة سنة (14).

تقريب التهذيب 423-8

- عمرو بن سليم بن خلدة الناصري الزرقي. قال العبجي: مدني تابعي ثقة. مات سنة أربع

ومائة.

تقريب التهذيب 424-8

- عمرو بن شعيب بن محمد بن عبد الله بن عمرو بن العاص الفرجي السبئي أبو إبراهيم.

ويقال أبو عبد الله المدني ويقال الطائفي. وقال أبو حاتم سكن مكة وكان يخرج إلى الطائف. ذكره ابن سعد في الطبقة الثالثة من النابعين من أهل المدينة، وذكره خليفة في الثانية من أهل الطائف وقال مات سنة ثمان عشرة ومائة.

ابن سعد 124-127 (27)، خليفة 283، تقرير التهذيب 48/8

- عمرو بن عبد الله أبو إسحاق السبئي الكوفي. مات سنة ثمان وعشرين ومائة وقيل قبل ذلك.

تقريب التهذيب 422 (56)

- عمرو بن مسَّة بن عامر السلمي، أسلم قديما وسكن أخا أبي ذر لأمه، وقال الحاكم أبو
لحمد: نزل الشام وقال غيره مات بحمص.

تهذيب التهذيب 698

- عمرو بن أبي عمرو، مولى المطلب المدني أبو عثمان. مات بعد الخمسين ومائة.

تهذيب التهذيب 808-698

- عمرو بن قيس بن ثور بن مازن الكندي، أبو ثور الحمصي. مات سنة أربعين ومائة وله مائة سنة.

تقريب التهذيب 432 (906)

- عمرو بن مالك الهمداني المرادي أبو علي الجندبى المصري. مات سنة 162 وقيل 167.

تهذيب التهذيب 968-967

- عمرو بن مرة بن عبد الله الجملي المرادي أبو عبد الله الكوفي الأعمى. مات 166 وقيل 168.

تهذيب التهذيب 1028-968

- عمرو بن ميمنون الأردني أبو عبد الله وقيل أبو يحيى الكوفي، أدرك الجاهلية ولم يلق التبي. صلبه الله عليه وآله وسلم. قال العجل: كوفي ثابث. مات سنة 75 وقيل 70.

تهذيب التهذيب 1108-1098

- عمرو بن أبي نعيمة المغافري المصري.

تهذيب التهذيب 1118-1110

- عمير بن إسحاق القرشي أبو محمد، مولى بني هاشم. ذكر ابن سعد في الطبقة الثانية من أهل البصرة عمير بن إسحاق، وقال: كان من أهل المدينة فتحول إلى البصرة فنزلها...

ابن سعد 7، 160، تهذيب التهذيب 1438-698

- عوف بن أبي جميلة العبدي الهجري أبو سهل البصري، المعروف بالأعرابي. مات سنة 146 أو 147.

تهذيب التهذيب 1698-698، تقريب التهذيب 434 (924)

- عوف بن مالك بن نضلة الجشمي أبو الأحوص الكوفي، قال النسائي في الكني: كوفي ثقة.

قيل قتلت الخوارج أيام الحجاج بن يوسف.

تهذيب التهذيب 1698-698
وفت ملك الأشجعي، صاحب مشهور، من مسلمة الفتح، وسكن دمشق ومات سنة ثلاث
وسبعين.

تقريب التهذيب 423 (517)

عون بن عبد الله بن عتبة بن مسعود الهذلي أبو عبد الله الكوفي. ذكره البخاري فيمن مات
بين عشر وماكاء إلى عشرين ومائة.

تهذيب الكمال 10/166-177، تهذيب التهذيب 8/71-83

ميسي بن سنان الحنفي أبو سنان القسملي الفلسطيني. سكن البصرة في القسام
فنسب إليهم. قال أبو زرعة: مخلوط ضعيف الحديث وهو شامي قدم البصرة.

تهذيب التهذيب 8/71-112

ميينة بن عبد الرحمن بن جرشن الغطفاني الجوشنى أبو مالك البصري. مات في حدود
الخمسين ومائة.

تهذيب التهذيب 8/71-112، تقريب التهذيب 441 (534)

ف

الفضل بن دكين، أبو نعيم الملاذي الكوفي الأحول. ذكره ابن سعد في الطبقة السابعة من
الكوفيين، وذكره خليفة في التاسعة. مات بالكوفة سنة تسع عشرة ومائتين.

ابن سعد 7/76-117، خليفة 7/172، تهذيب التهذيب 8/70-71

ق

القاسم بن عبد الرحمن الشامي، أبو عبد الرحمن الدمشقي، مات سنة 112 وقيل 118.

تهذيب التهذيب 8/72-74، تقريب التهذيب 450 (540)

القاسم بن عبد الله بن عمر بن حفص العمري المدني. ذكره البخاري في الأوسط فيمن مات
بين الخمسين إلى الستين ومائة. ذكره ابن سعد في السادسة من أهل المدينة وذكره خليفة في
السابعة.

ابن سعد 5/313، خليفة 272، تهذيب التهذيب 8/272-221.

- قتادة بن دعامة بن قتادة السدوسى البصري أبو الخطاب. ذكره ابن سعد في الطبقة الثالثة من تابعي البصرة وذكره خليفة في الرابعة. مات سنة بضع عشرة ومائة.

ابن سعد 2/2-3، خليفة 217-221، تهذيب التهذيب 8/516-518 تقرير التهذيب 452 (518).

- قيس بن بشر بن قيس الثقابي الشامي. من أهل تسعرين.

تهذيب التهذيب 285/8.

- قيس بن أبي حازم اليجلي. أبو عبد الله الكوفي. مات بعد التسعين أو قبيلها، وقد جاز بالمائة وتفقي.

تقرير التهذيب 456 (566).

- قيس بن رافع القيسي الآشجعي. أبو رافع ويقال أبو عمرو المصري. مدني الأصل.

تهذيب التهذيب 291/8.

ك.

- كثير بن زيد الأسني. ثم السهيمي مولاه أبو محمد المدني. ذكره ابن سعد في الخامسة من تابعي المدينة. وذكره خليفة في السابعة من أهل المدينة وقال: مات في آخر زمن أبي جعفر.

ابن سعد 2/242-244، خليفة 272-273، تهذيب التهذيب 8/131-145.

- كثير بن قليب بن موهب الصدفي المصري الأخر. شهد فتح مصر.

تهذيب التهذيب 425/8.

ل.

- الليث بن سعد الفهمي أبو الحارث المصري. ولد سنة 94، وتوفي سنة 176.

تهذيب التهذيب 595/415.
مالك بن أبي الرجال، مالك بن محمد بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الله بن حارثة التجاري. ذكره ابن سعد في السنة من المدائن.

ابن سعد (411هـ)، التاريخ الكبير 216/8، الجرح والتعديل 216/8 (832هـ)، تعجيل المنفعة

تقرير التهذيب 518 (1451)

- مالك بن مغول الكوفي أبو عبد الله، مات سنة تسع وخمسين ومائة على الصحيح.

تقرير التهذيب 28/10، تقرير التهذيب 519 (1454)

- مبارك بن فضالة بن أبي أمية أبو فضالة البصري، مات سنة تسع وخمسين ومائة.

تقرير التهذيب 10، تقرير التهذيب 519 (1471)

- الملكي بن الصباح اليمني الابناري أبو عبد الله ويقال أبو يحيى المكية أصله من أبناء فارس. نزيل مكة، مات سنة تسع وأربعين ومائة. ذكره ابن سعد في الطبقة الرابعة من أهل مكة.

ابن سعد (5/141)، تقرير التهذيب 10/27، تقرير التهذيب 519 (1471)

- مجدال بن سعيد بن عمرو الهيداني أبو عمرو ويقال أبو سعيد الكوفي، مات سنة أربع وأربعين ومائة.

تقرير التهذيب 31/24، تقرير التهذيب 50 (1278)

- محمد بن أبي بكر بن محمد بن عمرو بن حزم الأنصاري المداني، أبو عبد الملك ألقاضي.

مات سنة 122.

تقرير التهذيب 47، (572هـ)

- محمد بن بشير الفراشة العبدي أبو عبد الله الكوفي، توفي 259.

تقرير التهذيب 9/73-4

- محمد بن أبي حميد الأنصاري أبو إبراهيم المداني، يلقب حماد.

تقرير الكمال 1191/8، تقرير التهذيب 23-4، تقرير التهذيب 475 (832هـ)
- محمد بن جعفر الثلجي الفقيه البغدادي الحنفي. وقال زكريا الساجي: محمد بن شجاع كذاب، احتال في إبطال الحديث نصرة للرأي. مات سنة ست وستين ومائتين عن ست وثمانين سنة.

ميزان الإعتدال 3/ 77-76

- محمد بن صالح بن دينار الصمان أبو عبد الله المداني، مولى الأنصار. ذكره ابن سعد في الاستادرة من المؤديين، وأورده خليفة في السابعة منهم. مات سنة ثمان وستين ومائة.

ابن سعد 417-447 (1376)، خليفة 373، تهذيب التهذيب 225-226، تقريب التهذيب 484 (991).

- محمد أبو الرجال: محمد بن عبد الرحمن بن حارثة ويقال بن عبد الله بن حارثة الأنصاري.

أبو الرجال، كنيته أبو عبد الرحمن. ذكره ابن سعد في الرابعة من المدنين.

ابن سعد 283-296 (171)، تهذيب التهذيب 989-998.

- محمد بن عبد الرحمن بن نواف الأصدي، أبو الأسود المداني. مات سنة بضع وثلاثين ومائة.

ذكره ابن سعد في الرابعة من المدنين.

ابن سعد 212-213، تهذيب التهذيب 328-329.

- محمد بن مجلان المداني القرشي. ذكره ابن سعد في الخامسة من المدنين وخليفة في الاستادرة منهم. مات سنة ثمان وأربعين ومائة أو تسع وأربعين.

ابن سعد 250-254 (769)، خليفة 270، تهذيب الكمال 214-214، تهذيب التهذيب 412 (1137).

242 تقريب التهذيب 496 (111).

- محمد بن علي بن الحسين بن علي بن أبي طالب الهاشمي، أبو جعفر الباقر. قال العجلي: مدني ثابت ثقة. وذكره النسائي في نصفاء أهل المدينة من التابعين. مات سنة بضع عشرة ومائة.

تهذيب التهذيب 989-999، تقريب التهذيب 497 (1101).

- محمد بن كعب بن سليم بن أحمد أبو حمزة القرشي المداني، وكان قد نزل الكوفة مدة. ولد سنة أربعين على الصحيح ومات سنة عشرين ومائتين وقيل قبل ذلك.

تقريب التهذيب 504 (1277).
- محمد بن مسلم بن سوسم الطائفي. بعد في المكيين.

- تهذيب التهذيب 944/9

- مسلم بن مخراق. مولى عائشة، حجازي سكن مصر.

- تهذيب التهذيب 947/10

- مسلم بن يسار المصري، أبو عثمان الطلثذي ويقال الإفريقي. قال ابن بونس، قال يحيي بن عثمان بن صالح: توفي مسلم بن يسار بإفريقيا زمن هشام بن عبد الملك.

- تهذيب الكمال 1420-1399، تهذيب التهذيب 147-148/468-1471


- تهذيب التهذيب 1472/1469-1488، تقرير التهذيب 334


- تهذيب التهذيب 1487/1530

- مصعب بن نوح الأنصاري.

- التاريخ الكبير 22 (352/1872)، تعيين المنفتعة 404

- المطلب بن عبد الله بن المطلب بن حنطب الخزومي. ذكره ابن سعد في الطبقة الثالثة من التابعين من أهل المدينة.

- ابن سعد 315(116)، تهذيب التهذيب 1487/1798-152/1861

- معاذ بن عبد الله العدوية، أم الصباءة البصرية. امرأة صلة بن إشيم.

- تهذيب التهذيب 152/187.
دمام بن أبي طلحة وقيل ابن طلحة الكناني اليعمري الشامي. ذكره ابن سعد ومسلم.

تهدیب التحذیب ۲۲۸/۱

میرم بن راشد الأزدي البصري. سكن الیمن. ذكره ابن سعد في الطبقة الثالثة فيمن كان بالیمن، وقال: وكان من همل البصرة فانتقل فنزل الیمن. وذكره خليفة في الرايحة من أهل الیمن. مات سنة ۱۵۴ وقيل غير ذلك.

ابن سعد ۵/۳۹۷۷، خليفة ۲۸/۲۲۶-۲۲۷/۱

- مقاتل بن يشير المجلي الكوفي.

تقریب التحذیب ۵۴۴ (۱۸۴۶)

مطمور أبو سلام الأسود الحضي الأزرق الدمشي وقيل الثوبي. ذكره ابن سعد في الطبقة الأولى من تابعي أهل الشام. وقال المجلي: شامي تابعي ثقة.

تهدیب التحذیب ۹۳/۱

المتنر بن مالك بن قطعة العبیدي الفوکي البصري، أبو نضره. مات سنة ثمان أو تسع ومائة.

تهدیب التحذیب ۱۰/۱۹۲۳-۲۲۷، تقریب التحذیب ۵۴۶ (۱۸۹۶)

منصور بن المتمر الكوفي، أبو عثاب. ذكره ابن سعد في الطبقة الرابعة من أهل الكوفة.

ولذكره خليفة في الخامسة منهم. مات سنة اثنتين وثلاثين ومائة.

ابن سعد ۵/۳۳۷، خليفة ۲۲۶-۲۲۷، تقریب التحذیب ۵۴۷ (۱۸۹۶).
مهاجر بن مخلد، أبو مخلد ويقال أبو خالد، مولى البكرات.

تهذيب التهذيب ٣٢٣/١٠

مٍٰهِرٍانٍ بنٍ ابِيٍّ عِمْرٍ العٌمَّارٍ ابٍوٍ عبد اللَّهٍ الرَّمازي.

تهذيب التهذيب ٢٧٨-٢٧١/١٠

موسى بن عبيدة بن بشيطر الردي، أبو عبد العزيز المدني. توفي سنة عشرين وخمسين.

وكان مقال ابن سعد وغيره مات سنة ثلاث وخمسين.

تهذيب التهذيب ١٠٥١-٢٢/١٠

موسى بن عمرو القرشي، أبو هارون الكوفي. سكن بغداد. قال أبو حاتم: ذهب الحديث.

كباب.

تاريخ بغداد ١٤٢٠ -١٤٢٢/١٠ (١٩٤٢-١٩٤٤)، تهذيب الكمال ١٣٩٢-١٣٩٣/١٠، تهذيب التهذيب ٢٧٦/١٠، تقرير التهذيب ٢٧٥

ممّونَةُ بن مهراٍنُ الجزريٍ أبوٍ أيوب الرقي، الفقيه، نشأ بالكوفة ثم نزل الرقة. ولي الجزيرة.

لمر بن عبد العزيز. مات سنة سبع عشرة ومائة.

تهمذيب التهذيب ١٠٩٠-٩٠/١٠، تقرير التهذيب ٥٥٦ (٧٤٩)

ن

نافع بن جبير بن مطعم التوفلي، أبو محمد ويقال أبو عبد الله، المدني. مات سنة تسع

وتسعين.

تهمذيب التهذيب ١٠٣٤-٤٠/١٠

نافع بن عمر بن عبد الله الجمحي المكي، وقال ابن سعد عن شهاب بن عباد: مات بمكة سنة

تسع وستين ومائة. وذكره ابن حبان في الثقات وقال مات بفع سنة تسع وستين ومائة.

تهمذيب التهذيب ١٠٤١/١٠

نافع مولى ابن عمر، أبو عبد الله المدني. مات سنة سبع عشرة ومائة أو بعد ذلك.

تهمذيب التهذيب ١٠٤٢-٤١٤/١٠، تقرير التهذيب ٥٥٩ (٧٨٦)
النخير بن عبد الرحمن أبو عمر الخزاز الكوفي.

تهذيب التهذيب 10

نعم بن عبد الله الحمير مولى آل عمر بن الخطاب، ذكره ابن سعد في الثانية من المدنيين.

ابن سعد 41/275، تهذيب التهذيب 10

تفيد بن رافع الصاصب أبو رافع المدني، نزيل البصرة، ذكره ابن سعد في الطبقة الأولى من أهل البصرة وقال: خرج من المدينة قديما وكان ثقة.

تهذيب التهذيب 10

هشام بن أبي رقية، مصري.

التاريخ الكبير 198/1162(1232)، الجرح والتعديل 98/37، الثقات 110/5، تعميل المنافة

هشام بن سعد المدني أبو عباس وقيل أبو سعد القرشيchef. ذكره ابن سعد في الطبقة الساسة من المدنيين وقال: ومات بالمدينة في أول خلافة الهندي، وذكره خليفة في السابقة.

ابن سعد 446-444، خليفة 274، تهذيب التهذيب 11/329

هشام بن سمرة بن الزبير بن العوام الأشدي، أبو المنذر وقيل أبو عبد الله. ذكره ابن سعد فيمن كان ببغداد من الفقهاء والحدثين ومن نزلها وقدمها قوات بها وقال: وفد على أبي جمفر المتصور بالكوفة ولحق به ببغداد قوات بها ... وذكره خليفة في الساسة من المدنيين، ثم أعاده فهم نزل بغداد. ولد سنة 47، ومات سنة 84 وقيل 87 أو 141.

ابن سعد 16/217، خليفة 177، تهذيب التهذيب 11/384

هشام بن الفازن بن ربيعة الجرشي، أبو عبد الله وقيل أبو العباس الدمخيي. نزيل بغداد).

ذكره ابن سعد في الطبقة الخامسة من أهل الشام، وذكره خليفة في الرابعة. مات سنة بضع وخمسين.

ابن سعد 175/267، خليفة 116، تهذيب التهذيب 11/55، تقرير التهذيب 373 (1205)

هلال بن خبب العبدي، أبو العلاء البصري، سكن المدائن ومات بها. ذكره ابن سعد فيمن
كان بالمداشين من الحدثين والفقهاء، وقال: كان أصله من أهل البصرة ثم نزل المداشين ومات بها
في آخر سنة أربع وأربعين ومائة، ذكره خليفة في أهل المداشين.
ابن سعد 7/68، خليفة 226، تهذيب التهذيب 11 78-87
- هلال بن علي بن أبي سهيل، ويلال بن أبي ميمونة، وقيل هلال بن أبي هلال العاصري، مؤلف
المدني. قال الواقي: مات في آخر خلافة هشام بن عبد الملك.
تهذيب التهذيب 82/11

و

- واسع بن حبان بن منفذ الأنصاري المازني المدني. قال أبو زرعة: مدني ثقة.
تهذيب التهذيب 102/11

ي

- يحيى بن أبي الفاقشي، أبو العباس المصري. ذكره ابن سعد في الرابعة من أهل مصر
وذكره خليفة في الثالثة من أهل المغرب. مات سنة ثمان وستين ومائة.
ابن سعد 7/240، خليفة 296، تهذيب التهذيب 888 (511)
- يحيى بن سعيد بن قيس الأنصاري المدني، أبو سعيد الفاضلي. ذكره ابن سعد في الخامسة
من المدنيين، وذكره خليفة في الساسة وأوردا في وفاته أنها سنة 142 وقال ابن حجر: مات
سنة أربع وأربعين أو بعدها.
ابن سعد 7/373 (442)، خليفة 27، تهذيب التهذيب 891 (559)
- يحيى بن سليم القرشي الطائفي، أبو محمد ويلال أبو زكريا المكي. قال ابن سعد: طائفي
سكن مكة. وقال البخاري عن أحمد بن محمد بن القاسم بن أبي بزة: مات سنة خمس
ورتمين وهو مكي كان يختلف إلى الطائف مرسيد إليه.
تهذيب التهذيب 272/11
- يحيى بن سلام البصري. نزل مصر.

الجرح والتمديد 4/2/155 (142)

- يحيى بن عباس بن عبد الله بن الزبير بن العوام المدني. ذكره ابن سعد و الخليفة في الرابعة من المدنين وقال ابن سعد: و مات قديما وهو ابن سنت و ثمانية سنة.

- يحيى بن عبيد الله بن عبد الله بن موهب التيمي المدني.

تهذيب التهذيب 11/2/64-9

- يحيى بن أبي كثير الطائي مولاه، أبو نصر اليمامي. ذكره ابن سعد في أهل اليمامة وقال: مولى له، كان من أهل البصرة وفتحا إلى اليمامة. و ذكره خليفة في الرابعة من أهل البصرة. و مات سنة اثني عشر و ثلثين و مائة و وقيل قبل ذلك.

ابن سعد 5/4، خليفة 1/64، تهذيب التهذيب 586 (732)

- يزيد بن أوس، كوفي.

تهذيب التهذيب 11/5/5

- يزيد بن عبد الله الشيباني، أبو عبد الله الكوفي، مولى الصهباء بنت هبيرة.

تهذيب التهذيب 4/4-4

- يزيد بن عمرو العاصي المصري.

الجرح والتمديد 9/2/182 (168)، الثقات 7/254، تهذيب التهذيب 4/5-11

- يزيد بن ميسرة بن حلبس الدمشقي. يكنى آباء ميسرة و يقال أبو حلبس ويقال أبو يوسف.

الجرح والتمديد 9/2/288 (1277)، تمجيل المنظمة 4/5-4

- يزيد بن أبي يزيد الضيبي مولاه، أبو الأزهر البصري الدراوي المعروف بالرشك. مات سنة 130 بالبصرة.

تهذيب التهذيب 5/17/11

- يسحى بن حبان الأشعرى ويقال الكعبي الكوفي، يقال فيه اسمه.

تهذيب التهذيب 5/11
الكنى

- أبو إسحاق، هو مولى عبد الله بن الحارث الهاشمي، حجازي. روي عن أبي هريرة في فضل
الذكر، ومنه سعيد المتبري.

تهذيب التهذيب 8/12

- أبو الأسود الديلي وقيل الدوالي البصري، ذكره خليفة في الطبقة الأولى من أهل البصرة.
مات سنة تسع وستين.

ابن سعد 7/6، خليفة 141، تقريب 619 (740)

- أبو بكر بن عبد الرحمن بن الحارث بن هشام القرشي المدني. قال ابن سعد: ولد في خلافة
عمر. مات سنة أربع وتسعين، وقيل غير ذلك.

تهذيب التهذيب 12/12، تقريب التهذيب 2/2 (722)

- أبو بكر بن محمد بن عمرو بن حزم الأنصاري التجاري المدني القاضي. مات سنة عشرين
ومائة وقيل غير ذلك.

تقريب التهذيب 7/24 (788)

- أبو الجزراء البصري = أسس بن عبد الله الربيعي.

- أبو حازم الأشجعى، سلمان الكوفي. يقال إنه جالس أبا هريرة خمس سنين. مات على
رأس المائة.

سير أعلام النبلاء 8/5، تقريب التهذيب 24/2 (247)

- أبو الربيع المدني.

تهذيب التهذيب 9/12
- أبو سالم الجبيشاني = سفيان بن هاني المصري.
- أبو سلمة بن عبد الرحمن بن عوف الزهري المدني. مات سنة أربع وتسعين أو أربع وفترة، وكان مولده سنة بضع وعشرين، ذكره ابن سعد في الطبقة الأولى من أهل المدينة من التابعين.

ابن سعد/110-117، تهذيب التهذيب 144 (1428)

- أبو سلام الدمشقي = مطور.

- أبو صالح، مولى أم هاني، بنت أبي طالب. بلادم ويقال بابان. ذكره ابن سعد في الطبقة الثانية من تابعي أهل المدينة.

ابن سعد/227-270، تهذيب الكمال 127/127، تهذيب التهذيب 141-147

- أبو طُحمة الأموي، مولى عمر بن عبد العزيز، اسمه هلال. شامي، سكن مصر. وقال أبو حاتم: أبو طهامة قارئ مصر، روى عنه ابنا يزيد بن جابر.

تهذيب التهذيب 127/127

- أبو طيبة ويقال أبو طيبة السلفي، ثم الكلامي الحمصي.

تهذيب التهذيب 141-141

- أبو عطية الوادعي الهمداني الكوفي، مات في حدود السبعين.

تهذيب التهذيب 149/149، تهذيب التهذيب 168 (625)

- أبو عمران الجُرَّجني = عبد الملك بن حبيب البصري.

- أبو كيشة السلوقي الشامي. ذكره ابن زرعة الدمشقي في الطبقة الثانية من تابعي أهل الشام.

تهذيب التهذيب 210/210

- أبو النصر = سالم بن أبي أمية التيمي.

- أبو يزيد المدني، في أهل البصرة.

تهذيب التهذيب 280/280

- أبو يونس المصري، مولى إبي هريرة = سليم بن جعفر.
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