*by the same author*

MUSLIM STUDIES

VOLUME ONE

IGNAZ GOLDZIHER

# MUSLIM STUDIES

(MUHAMMEDANISCHE STUDIEN)

EDITED BY S. M. STERN
*Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford*

Translated from the German by
C. R. Barber and S. M. Stern

VOLUME TWO

ALDINE · ATHERTON
CHICAGO · NEW YORK

This translation copyright © 1971 by George Allen & Unwin Ltd
All rights reserved

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK PRESS
ALBANY

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Goldziher, Ignác, 1850-1921.
Muslim studies (Muhammedanische Studien)

Translation of Muhammedanische Studien.
Includes Bibliographical references.
1. Islam—Addresses, essays, lectures. I. Stern, Samuel Miklos, 1920-1969, ed. II. Title.
BP25.G6143 297 72-11731
ISBN 0-87395-234-0

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

Dr. S. M. Stern died on October 29, 1969

A colleague saw this volume through the press

In this volume of *Muslim Studies*, as also in the first, Dr. Stern added, within square brackets, material which brought up to date and otherwise supplemented the original footnotes of Goldziher.

VOLUME TWO

The original, published by Max Niemeyer
in Halle a.s.
bore a dedication

*To my dear*
AUGUST MÜLLER
*in true friendship*

CONTENTS

VOLUME TWO


ABBREVIATIONS page 9

PREFACE 13

ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE HADĪTH

I. *Ḥadīth and Sunna* 17

II. *Ummayads and 'Abbāsids* 38

III. *The Ḥadīth in its relation to the conflicts of the parties in Islam* 89

IV. *Reaction against the fabrication of ḥadīths* 126

V. *The Ḥadīth as a means of edification and entertainment* 145

VI. *Ṭalab al-ḥadīth* 164

VII. *The writing down of the Ḥadīth* 181

VIII. *The Ḥadīth Literature* 189

VENERATION OF SAINTS IN ISLAM (I-X) 255

EXCURSUSES AND ANNOTATIONS

I. *The Ummayads as fighters for religion* 345

II. *Ḥadīth and New Testament* 346

III. *Imitations of the Koran* 363

IV. *Women in the Ḥadīth literature* 366

V. *Ordeals in sacred places* 369

INDEX 371

## ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations have been employed in this translation

### (a) Periodicals

*BSOAS—Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*
*BTLV—Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* [van *Nederlandsch-Indië*].
*Isl.—Der Islam*
*JA—Journal Asiatique*
*JAOS—Journal of the American Oriental Society*
*JASB—Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*
*JPHS—Journal of the Punjab Historical Society*
*JRAS—Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*
*MFOB—Mélanges de la Faculté Orientale de Beyrouth*
*REI—Revue des Études Islamiques*
*REJ—Revue des Études Juives*
*RHR—Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*
*RSO—Rivista degli studi orientali*
*WJL—Wiener Jahrbücher der Literatur*
*WZKM—Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*
*ZA—Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*
*ZDMG—Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*
*ZDPV—Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästinavereins*
*ZVS—Zeitschrift für Volkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft*

### (b) Catalogues, etc.

*Agh.*—Abu 'l-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī, *al-Aghānī*, Būlāq, 1285
B.—al-Bukhārī (see p.f.)
Berl. Cat.—*Verzeichnis der arabischen Handschriften* by Wilhelm Ahlwardt, 10 vols. (vols. 7–9, 16–22 of *Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*), Berlin, 1887–99.
Bodl. Cat.—*Bibliothecae Bodleianae codicum manuscriptorum orientalium . . . arabicorum, persicorum, turcicorum, copticorumque catalogus a Joanne Uri confectus*, Part I, Oxford, 1787; Part II, vol. I by Alexander Nicoll, Oxford, 1821, vol. II by E. B. Pusey, Oxford, 1835.

Cairo Cat.—*Fihrist al-kutub al-ʿarabiyya al-maḥfūẓa bilkutubkhāne al-Khidiwiyya al-Miṣriyya*, 7 vols., Cairo, 1306/9.

*Cat. ar. Br. Mus.*—*Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum orientalium qui in Musaeo Britannico asservantur*, Part II, *Codices arabicos amplectens*, 3 vols., London, 1846–79.

*Cat. ar. Lugd. Batav.*—*Catalogus codicum arabicorum bibliothecae academiae Lugduno-Batavae*, 2nd ed. of *Cat. Lugd. Batav.*, by M. J. de Goeje and M. Th. Houtsma, 2 vols., Leiden, 1888–1907.

*Cat. Bibl. Nat.*—*Catalogue des manuscrits arabes de la Bibliothèque Nationale* by Baron de Slane, 3 vols., Paris, 1883–95.

*Cat. Brill*—*Catalogue d'une collection de manuscrits arabes et turcs appartenant à maison E. J. Brill à Leide* by M. Th. Houtsma, 2 vols., Leiden, 1886–9.

*Cat. Ind. Off.*—*A Catalogue of the Arabic Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office* by Otto Loth, London, 1877.

*Cat. Lugd. Batav.*—*Catalogus codicum orientalium bibliothecae academiae Lugduno-Batavae*, Parts I–II by R. P. A. Dozy; Parts III–IV by P. de Jong and M. J. de Goeje; Part V by de Geoje; Part VI by M. Th. Houtsma, Leiden, 1851–77.

*Cat. périod.*—*Catalogue périodique de livres orientaux* by E. J. Brill, 9 vols., Leiden, 1883ff.

*EI*—Encyclopaedia of Islam.

Escur.—*Les manuscrits arabes de l'Escurial* by H. Derenbourg, Vol. I, Paris, 1884.

*Fihrist*—*Kitāb al-Fihrist* by Ibn al-Nadīm, ed. Gustav Flügel, Leipzig, 1871–2.

*GAL (S)*—*Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur* by Carl Brockelmann, 2 vols., Leiden, 1943–9, *Supplementband*, 3 vols., Leiden, 1937–42.

Gotha Cat.—*Die arabischen Handschriften der Herzoglichen Bibliothek zu Gotha* by Wilhelm Pertsch, 5 vols., Gotha, 1877–92.

H. Kh.—*Lexicon bibliographicum et encyclopaedicum a Mustapha ben Abdallah Katib Jelebi dicto et nomine Haji Khalfa celebrato compositum* ed. Gustav Flügel, 7 vols., Leipzig, 1835–58.

*Landberg. Samml.*—*Kurzes Verzeichnis der Landbergschen Sammlung arabischer Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin* by Wilhelm Ahlwardt, Berlin, 1885.

Leip. Cat.—*Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum, qui in bibliotheca senatoria civitatis Lipsiensis asservantur*, ed. A. G. R. Neumann, *Codices orientalium linguarum descripserunt* by H. O. Flesicher and Fr. Delitzsch, Grimmae, 1838.

Tab – al-Ṭabarī, *Annales* ed. De Goeje, etc., Leiden, 1877–1901.

Vien. Cat.—*Die arabischen, persischen und türkischen Handschriften der Kaiserlich-Königlichen Hofbibliothek zu Wien* by Gustav Flügel, 3 vols., Vienna, 1863–7.

THE second volume of *Muslim Studies* takes us into the midst of partly theological, partly popular factors which are the most important points of the historical development of Islam. The greater part of the following studies appears here for the first time. 'The Veneration of Saints' is based on the essay *'Le culte des saints chez les Musulmans'*, which was first published in the *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, II, pp. 257–351; this is, however, repeated here in a completely recast form. Apart from several omissions, some sections have been furnished with more comprehensive materials, while others are quite new. Excursus no. 2 reproduces, with some essential changes, my article *'Influences chrétiennes dans la littérature religieuse de l'Islam'* published in the aforementioned *Revue*, XVIII, pp. 180–199.

The printing of the volume had already begun when Part IV of Wellhausen's *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, published at that time, became available to me; otherwise the results of that work would have been used for the first chapters of the study of Ḥadīth. Here I wish to point out that Wellhausen p. 70 has now to be considered in connection with pp. 26–7. Vol. II of Ahlwardt's extensive Berlin Catalogue, which can be called with full justification the most complete repertory of the literary history of the Ḥadīth, became available just before the delivery of the MS., at the last moment, so to speak.

Of MSS. quoted in this volume, I must give details about those which are often referred to in the notes: al-Shaybānī's *K. al-Siyar al-Kabīr*, with the commentary of al-Sarakhsī, Leiden MS. Warner no. 373 (unfortunately in this, as well as the Vienna MS. of this work, the text cannot always be sharply distinguished from the commentary);[1] the work of al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, characterized below, p. 171, the same collection, no. 353[2]; Ibn Qutayba's *Mukhtalif al-Ḥadīth*, the same, no. 882;[3] Abū Bakr al-Khaṣṣāf's *Adab al-Qāḍī*, the same, no. 550[4]; Ibn al-Jawzī's *K. al-Quṣṣāṣ wa'l-Mudhakkirīn*, [x] the same, no. 998; *Asānīd al-Muḥaddithīn* is in Leiden MS. Amīn no. 39 (Landberg, *Catalogue*, p. 13). The following belong to the Rifā'iyya

[1] [Al-Shaybānī's work with al-Sarakhsī's commentary was published in Hyderabad, 1335–6.]
[2] [Ed. Hyderabad, 1357.]
[3] [Ed. Cairo, 1326.]
[4] [*GAL* I, pp. 180–1, *S.I.*, p. 292.]

collection of the Leipzig University Library: al-Nawawī's *Taqrīb* (an adaptation of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's book, see below p. 242) and *al-Masā'il al-Manthūra* (both in one volume, D.C. no 189)[1]; 'Abd al-Ghanī al-Nābulusī's travel book (cf. p. 290): *K. al-Ḥaqīqat wa'l-Majāz* (no. 362)[2]; al-Munāwī's *al-Kawākib al-Durriyya* (no. 141)[3]; al-Biqā'ī's *Ṭabaqāt al-Abrār* (nos. 234–37); Abu'l-Fatḥ al-'Awfī's *Ibtighā' al-Qurba bi'l-Libās wa'l-Ṣuḥba* (no. 185). Of MS. works which are quoted but rarely, particulars are given in the notes concerned.

The Ḥadīth works are quoted according to the following editions: al-Bukhārī with al-Qastallānī's commentary, Būlāq, 1285, in 10 vols.; Muslim with al-Nawawī's commentary, Cairo, 1284, in 4 vols.; Abū Dāwūd, Cairo, 1280, in 2 vols; al-Nasā'ī, lithography Shāhdra, 1282, in 2 vols.; al-Tirmidhī, Būlāq, 1292, in 2 vols.; Ibn Māja, lithogr. Delhi, 1282; the *Muwaṭṭa'* with al-Zurqānī's commentary, Cairo, 1279–80, in 4 vols.; al-Shaybānī's recension of the *Muwaṭṭa'* with 'Abd al-Ḥayy's commentary, lithogr. Lucknow, 1297 (cf. p. 207); al-Dārimī's *Sunan*, lithogr. Cawnpore, 1293; al-Baghawī's *Maṣābīḥ al-Sunna*, Cairo, 1294, in 2 vols. Of other frequently quoted works al-Damīrī is quoted after the edition Būlāq, 1284, al-Kutubī's *Fawāt al-Wafayāt* after ed. Būlāq, 1299 (cf. p. 327), al-Suyūṭī's *Ta'rīkh al-Khulafā'* after ed. Cairo, 1305 (with al-Ḥasan al-'Abbāsī's *Āthār al-Uwal* on the margin).

I also wish to use this opportunity for thanking friends and colleagues, and liberal library administrations, for enabling me to use literary sources and resources which would otherwise have remained inaccessible to me. This time I owe special gratitude to Mr Vollers, Director of the Viceregal Library in Cairo, for his readiness to support my work by extracts and notes from the MSS. of the library which he administers.

July, 1890 I. Goldziher

[1] [*Taqrīb*, ed. Cairo, 1307; '*Le Taqrīb d'en-Nawawī*', transl. and ed. M. Marçais *JA*. 9th Series, XVI (1900), pp. 315–46, 478–531; XVII (1901), pp. 101–49, 193–232, 524–39; XVIII (1901), pp. 61–146; *al-Masā'il al-Ma'thūra* (sic), ed. Cairo, 1352.

[2] [*GAL* II, p. 457, *S* II, p. 474; ed. Cairo, 1324.]

[3] [*GAL* II, p. 394, *S* II, p. 417.]

# ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ḤADĪTH

CHAPTER ONE [3]

# ḤADĪTH AND SUNNA

## 1

THE word ḥadīth means 'tale,' 'communication'. Not only are communications among those who have embraced the religious life called ḥadīth, but also historical information, whether secular or religious, and whether of times long past or of more recent events.[1] Abū Hurayra asks: 'Shall I regale you with a ḥadīth from your ḥadīths, O community of the Anṣār?' and then tells them a story of an episode in the conquest of Mecca meant to strengthen their sense of community, just as pagan Arabs used to sing and recite stories of their *ayyām*.[2] In the context of legends, sagas and fables the word ḥadīth is also applied to the subjects of the narrative;[3] hence the saying 'to become a ḥadīth,' i.e. to become an example which will still be recounted by later generations,[4] to become a *māshāl* (Deut. 28:37; Jer. 24:9 etc.) to posterity.[5]

From early times linguistic usage reserved this word in religious [4]
circles for a certain type of tale and communication without, however, removing it from its general context.[6] 'Abd Allāh b. Mas'ūd says: 'The most beautiful ḥadīth is the book of Allāh, and the best

[1] Also, in ancient usage, 'tales from the tribal past': *wa-mimma'l-ḥadīthi mahālīkun wa-ḥbulūdu*, 'there are tales (from the history of the tribe) which bring destruction (for the *ḥasab* of the tribe); others ensure everlasting fame', Ubayy b. Huraym, in scholium to al-Ḥādira, ed. Engelmann, pp. 12, 13. Zuhayr, *Mu'allaqa*, v. 29 (for *umrajjamu* cf. expressions such as al-Ṭabarī, iii, p. 2179, 4, *rajmun bi'l-ẓunūn*); tales of everyday events, Imrq., 40, 1–2; 50, 1.

[2] Al-Balādhurī, p. 39.

[3] *Fragmenta historicorum arabicorum* [vol. I, Leiden, 1868], ed. de Goeje, p. 102, 11: *min aḥādīth al-'arab wa-min asḥ'ārihā*; Wāqid, IV, p. 899, 8: *wa-min aḥādīth ahl al-Yaman*.

[4] *Ṣāra ḥadīthan*, *Agh*., XIV, p. 47, 11, or *uḥdūthatan*, XXI, p. 150, 10.

[5] Both expressions are united in a verse by Abū Kalda, *Agh*., X, p. 120, 22: *wa-lā tuṣbiḥū uḥdūthatan mithla qā'ilin/bihi yaḍribu'l-amthāla man yatamaththalu*.

[6] Stories from secular history are usually called *akhbār*: *rumāt al-ḥadīth wa'l-akhbār*, Ibn Qutayba, *Shu'arā'*, ed. Rittershausen, p. 4, 8 (text). [Ed. de Goeje, p. 3, 9; it is more likely, however, that *akhbār* here is tautological and the words refer to the transmitters of the Prophet's tradition, who could be counted.]

guidance[2] is that of Muhammed'.[2] It seems that this statement, which was gladly taken up and widely disseminated by the community of the faithful, was ascribed to Muhammed himself by making him say, in an exhortation to the community: 'The most beautiful ḥadīth is the book of Allāh; blessed is he whose heart is adorned therewith by Allāh,[3] he whom He has permitted to be converted to Islam from unbelief, and he who prefers it to all other ḥadīths of man. Verily, it is the most beautiful and perfect ḥadīth'.[4]

A certain type of ḥadīth is here particularly praised and favoured, and it is for this type also that the term is later used in preference to others. The book of Allāh, however, this 'most beautiful and perfect ḥadīth', is contrasted with the general concept of ḥadīth as being the highest of all religious authorities, and the term ḥadīth is restricted to the Prophet's sayings, made either on his own initiative or in response to a question. Abū Hurayra relates that he put to the Prophet the question: 'Who is the most likely to be made happy by your intercession on the day of the resurrection?' and that he was given the reply: 'I have been expecting, Abū Hurayra, that you would be the first to queston me about this ḥadīth, as I have observed how eager you are for the ḥadīth'.[5]

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,
[5] 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 ḥadīths 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 ḥadīths 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 ḥadīth, 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

[1] *Hadyun* and *hadan* are synonymous with sunna and are sometimes interchanged with it, as e.g. in the parallel passage, Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 240.

[2] B. *I'tiṣām*, no. 2.

[3] Literally: into whose heart Allāh has put it as an ornament.

[4] Ibn Hishām, p. 340. In later days it was found objectionable that the Koran should be called ḥadīth and in this sentence ḥadīth was altered to *kalām* (speech), Ibn Māja, p. 8.

[5] B. *Riqāq*, no. 51.

attempt to express the most tentative opinion as to which parts of the ḥadīth 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 ḥadīths 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,[1] 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. It contains invaluable evidence for the evolution of Islam during the years when it was forming itself into an organized whole from powerful mutually opposed forces. This makes the proper appreciation and study of the ḥadīth so important for an understanding of Islam, in the evolution of which the most notable phases are accompanied by successive stages in the creation of the ḥadīth.

## II

[6] Each single ḥadīth consists of two parts. First there is the chain (*silsila*) of attestors, from its originator to its last transmitter, who have handed down the particular tradition and on whose authority its authenticity is based. This whole chain is called the *sanad* (support), or *isnād* (supporting), of the ḥadīth; it contains the documentation of the ḥadīth.[2]

[1] To quote his own words: 'Je m'étonne toujours, non pas qu'il y ait des passages faux dans la tradition (car cela résulte de la nature même des choses), mais qu'elle contienne tant de parties authentiques (d'après les critiques les plus rigoureux, la moitié de Bokhârî mérite cette qualification) et que, dans ces parties non falsifiées, ils se trouvent tant de choses qui doivent scandaliser un croyant sincère.' *Essai sur l'histoire de l'Islamisme*, trans. V. Chauvin, p. 124.

[2] In order to understand the nature of the *isnad*, a knowledge of the distinctions—over-subtle and meticulous though they be—established by the Muslim science of ḥadīth-tradition and expressed in a skilfully contrived terminology, is useful even for the purposes of modern criticism. To discuss these distinctions and terms here would involve unnecessary repetition. It is enough to refer to previous expositions of the subject in their chronological order:

1 E. E. Salisbury, 'Contributions from original sources to our knowledge of the science of Muslim Tradition', *JAOS*, VII (1862), pp. 60–142 (cf. 'Die Zâhiriten, ihr Lehrsystem und ihre Geschichte', *Beitrag zur Geschichte der Muhammedanischen Theologie*, Leipzig, 1884, p. 22, note 1).

2 Rev. E. Sell, *The Faith of Islam* (London and Madras, 1880), pp. 70–2.

3 T. P. Hughes, *A Dictionary of Islam* (London, 1885), s.v. tradition, pp. 639–46.

(over)

This formal element is followed by the actual wording of the saying; this is called *matn*, the text of the ḥadīth. It is to be noted
[7] that the word *matn*[1] is pre-Islamic and did not originally signify ḥadīth-text. In Old Arabic it had been used to denote 'written text.'

As is well known, the traces of deserted habitations (*aṭlāl*) are in ancient poetry often likened to runes,[2] to the mysterious old scripts of Christian monks or the Persians of Kisrā's time, etc.,[3] to tattoo-marks,[4] and even to the worn designs on old swords and scabbards,[5] etc. Zuhayr once called the crumbling ruin of deserted dwellings[6] 'year-old[7] parchments'.[8] The word *matn* (pl. *mutūn*).

[1] In this context we need not explain its use as the name of a part of the body.

[2] Frequently *waḥy* (e.g. Zuhayr, 15, 5 = ed. Landberg, p. 104, v. 3; 17, 3 = L., p. 137, v. 1) or *waḥiyy* (Labīd, *Mu'allaqa*, v. 2), which is explained by *kitāba*, by no means, however as 'revelation'.

[3] Many passages are to be found in Siegmund Fränkel, *Die aramäischen Fremdwörter* [im *Arabischen*, Leiden, 1886], p. 244; cf. my additions in Part I, p. 111, note 1. One may also mention *Hudhayl*, p. 260, 1: *ḏyātuhā 'ufrw*; for the latter word Wellhausen's apparatus has the Var. *sifrw*; in *Agh.*, XXI, p. 148, 22, the reading is *sufrw*.

[4] *Mufaḍḍ.*, 30, 2; *Hudhayl.*, 90, 4; 154, 1; Ṭarafa, *Mu'all.*, v. 1; al-Mutanakhkhil, Yāqūt, I, p. 414, 7; Labīd, p. 91, v. 3; Zuhayr, *Mu'all.*, v. 2; *Dīwān*, 18, 3 (Landberg, p. 166, v. 3); 'Antara, 27, 1.

[5] Passages in Ṭarafa, Part I, l.c.; cf. *Agh.*, II, p. 121, 11.

[6] Cf. Ṭarafa, 19, 2: *ka-saṭūri-'l-riqqi raqqashahu bi'l-ḍuḥā muraqqishun yashīnuh. Mufaḍḍ.*, 32, 1: *kamā raqqasha'l-'unwānu fī'-'l-riqqi kātibu*, deriving from Arabic writing conditions; *Hudhayl.*, 280, 5, 6. Cf. from later times *Agh.* 2, p. 75, 10.

[7] *Muḥīl*. This epithet is also used for the *aṭlāl* themselves. *Agh.*, III, p. 83, 6, *mushirus* (to which the faulty v. 1. of the Būlāq ed. must probably be corrected)
[over]

---

4 F. Risch, *Commentar des 'Izz al-Dīn Abū 'Abdallāh über die Kunstausdrücke der Traditionswissenschaft nebst Erläuterungen*, Leiden, 1885.

From these studies of the terminology of the *isnād* the reader will gather everything worth noting. Works not dealing specifically with *isnād* but of basic importance for our subject are:

5 Several of Sprenger's studies, which were the first to treat of the ḥadīth scientifically, i.e.: (a) 'Notes on Alfred v. Kremer's edition of Wakidy's Campaigns', *JASB*, XXV (1856), pp. 53–74, 199–220; (b) 'On the origin of writing down historical records among the Musulmans', ibid., p. 303–29, 375–81; (c) 'Über das Traditionswesen bei den Arabern', *ZDMG*, X (1856), pp. 1–17; (d) His excursus 'Die Sunna', *Leben und Lehre des Mohammad*, III (1865), pp. lxxvii–clv.

6 William Muir, *The Life of Mahomet and History of Islam to the Era of the Hegira* (London, 1858), I, pp. xxviii–cv (suggestive remarks on tendentious traditions).

7 Alfred von Kremer, *Culturgeschichte des Orients unter den Chalifen* (Vienna, 1875), pp. 474–504. On *isnād* terms, p. 480.

8 C. Snouck Hurgronje, 'Nieuwe bijdragen tot de kennis van den Islam', *BTLV*, IV, part 6 (1883), pp. 36–65 of the offprint. Development of the concepts of sunna and *ijmā'* (= Verspreide Geschriften, II, pp. 33–58).

belongs to the series of expressions used in such comparisons *Wa-jalā-l-suyūlu 'ani-l-tulūlī ka-annahā/zuburun tujiddu mutūnaha aqlāmuhā* 'Gushing brooks lay open the traces of habitations as if they were books whose (faded) texts are revealed by the pen'.[1]

We find the same comparison used by a later poet in a verse for which the words by Labīd just quoted suggest a very plausible emendation. Al-Aḥwas says in his description of a deserted camp (following the usual text of the poem): *dawārisu ka'l-'ayni fi'l-* [8] *mahraqi*.[2] The word *'ayn* has no proper sense here unless it is explained as 'like that which is visible in the writings', i.e. that which had previously been visible.[3] When the graphic outline *'ayn* is corrected to *matn* the description takes its place in the group of comparisons of which we have quoted several: 'Like the text upon an ancient scroll, the traces of habitation have vanished.' *Matn* thus obtains in this context the meaning 'a written text'[4] in the same way as *'ayn* is the old name for a text delivered by word of mouth.[5] The choice of the word *matn*[6] to describe the text of a ḥadīth in

[1] Labīd, *Mu'allaqa*, v. 8 (Kremer, *Über die Gedichte des Labyd*, p. 6; *mutūnahā* is translated 'outlines').

[2] *Agh.*, VII, p. 124, 10.

[3] *'ayn*, opposed to *ḍimār* ('invisible thing'), *Hudhayl*, 165, 4. Also *athar* ('trace') is opposed by *'ayn*, i.e. the thing itself: *lā 'ayna minhu walā athar*, Labīd, ed. Huber, 21, 2; cf. al-A'lam, ed. Landberg, p. 175, 8. Al-Maydānī, I, p. 111, penult.: *taḥsibu atharan ba'da 'aynin*; cf. an example in D. H. Müller, *Burgen und Schlösser*, i, p. 88, 8.

[4] One must resist the temptation to find this meaning also in the words of Ka'b b. Zuhayr regarding his *rāwī*, *Agh.* XV, p. 147, 23: *yuthaqqifuhā* (*sc.* the verses) *ḥattā taʿūda matūnuhā*. The image here is taken from the preparation of a spear (cf. Schwarzlose, *Waffen der alten Araber*, in the index s.vv. and p. 139, 5) and is stated even more clearly in 'Adī b. al-Riqā', *Agh.*, VIII, p. 184, 1–4 = Nöldeke, *Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Poesie der alten Araber* [Hannover, 1864], p. 47, 3–4. This passage also shows that the old *rāwīs* were not merely echoes of the poets but that they participated in the perfection of the works of others which they passed on. Therefore famous poets may be *rāwīs* of works of their fellow-poets (see Zuhayr in Ahlwardt, *Bemerkungen über die Echtheit der alten arabischen Gedichte*, p. 62). Of a poet who is also a *rāwī* it is said: *ijtama'a lahu al-shi'r wa'l-riwāya*. Interesting information about this relationship is to be found in *Agh.*, VII, p. 78.

[5] See my note in Fleischer, *Kleinere Schriften* [von *Heinrich L. Fleischer, Gesammelt, durchgesehen und vermehrt*, Leipzig, 1885–8] I, p. 619; cf. 'Urwa b. al-Ward, ed. Nöldeke, 30, 3; *Agh.* II, p. 94, 22.

[6] Unfortunately I have unable to determine the earliest occurrence of this term in ḥadīth literature.

---

*wa-muḥtila*. This also explains the saying directed against *aṣlāl* poetry: *qālā'l-salāmu 'alayka yā aṣlāla/qultu'l-salāmu 'alā'l-muḥilli m*, *Imtāʿ* al-Maydānī, II, p. 253, 22. Cf. *al-talal al-muḥawwil* in Yāqūt, III, p. 648, 2.

[1] *Raqqan muḥtilā*, Zuhayr, II, 2 (Landberg, p. 188, v. 2); cf. ibid., 18, 1 (L. p. 166, v. 1) *lahu ḥuqubun*.

contradistinction to its documentation through a chain of authorities may be considered to disprove the assumption that in the view of Muslims the ḥadīth in its original form could not have been written down and was confined only to verbal traditions. Rather can it be assumed that the writing down of the ḥadīth was a very ancient method of preserving it, and that reluctance to preserve it in written form is merely the result of later considerations.[1] The oldest parts
[9] of the ḥadīth material are presumably those of which it is said that they were already preserved in writing during the first decades.[2] There is nothing against the assumption that the Companions and disciples wished to keep the Prophet's sayings and rulings from being forgotten by reducing them to writing. How could communities which preserved the wise sayings (*ḥikma*) of ordinary mortals in writing in *ṣaḥīfas* (as will be more fully described in the first section of Chapter VIII) have left the survival of the Prophet's sayings to the chance of oral transmission? Many a Companion of the Prophet is likely to have carried his *ṣaḥīfa* with him and used it to dispense instruction and edification to his circle. The contents of these *ṣaḥīfas* were called *matn al-ḥadīth*; those who disseminated these texts named in succession their immediate authorities, and thus the *isnād* came into being.

There is a whole range of data available about such *ṣaḥīfas* from the first generation of Islam. It cannot be ascertained whether the existence of those expressly mentioned as *ṣaḥīfas* and *kutub* accords with reality, or whether they are the inventions of later generations used to provide justification for later *ṣaḥīfas* against an opposition hostile to the writing down of ḥadīth. The *kitāb* of Asmā' bint Umays (d. 38), who took part in the flight to Ethiopia with her husband Ja'far b. 'Alī Ṭālib and married Abū Bakr after Ja'far's death,[3] will no doubt inspire much distrust. It is said that various sayings of the Prophet are collected together in this *kitāb*, and it is cited by a Shī'ite historian,[4] probably because of the supposition that Asmā' was constantly in the company of Fāṭima and would thus be a proper source for knowledge of ḥadīth. Many reports are derived from Asmā', among others the communication about the miracle of the splitting of the moon (*shaqq al-qamar*).[5] Another *kitāb* from ancient times is that of Sa'd b. 'Ubāda (d. in Hawrān ca. 15), from which a

[1] See Chapter VII below.

[2] Kremer, *Culturgesch.*, I, p. 475.

[3] Some information about this woman is to be found in *Agh.*, XI, p. 67.

[4] Al-Ya'qūbī, II, pp. 114, 128.

[5] It seems that there was some resistance in Sunnī circles to the recognition of ḥadīths derived from Asmā'; the remark of Aḥmad b. Ṣāliḥ (180–248) would indicate such reluctance: 'He who follows the path of science should not neglect the ḥadīth of Asmā' as it belongs to the proofs of tradition'; Qāḍī 'Iyaḍ, *al-Shifā*, i, p. 240.

son of Sa'd hands down legal customs of the Prophet,[1] and there is a [10]
*ṣaḥīfa* of 'Abd Allāh b. 'Amr b. al-'Āṣ (d. 65), which this Companion named *al-ṣādiqa* ('the truthful one').[2] This is likely to be the *ṣaḥīfa* from which his great-grandson, 'Amr b. Shu'ayb (d. 120), took his traditional material,[3] and for this reason later critics have not considered traditions derived by him from his great-grandfather as being entirely valid.[4] From the *ṣaḥīfa* of Samura b. Jundab (d. 60)[5] ḥadīths were also taken; these records, about which however there is some confusion,[6] are probably identical with the *risāla* of Samura to his children 'in which there was much knowledge (*'ilm*)'.[7] Finally, the *ṣaḥīfa* of Jābir b. 'Abd Allāh (d. ca. 78)[8] must be mentioned, dating from the time of the Companions; we are told that 'Irāqī Qatāda (d. 117) passed on the contents of this collection of ḥadīths.[9]

The Shī'ite branch of Islam mention a number of *kutub* dating from ancient times, for the authenticity of which there is no really firm basis. (These adherents of the Shī'a are even more prone than orthodox Islam itself to refer back to old writings and documents containing justification for their teachings,[10] and have therefore produced more pseudo-evidential literature than the so-called Sunnites.) To these belongs the *ṣaḥīfa* of Asmā' bint Umays mentioned above. Shī'ite critics often admit, with commendable frankness, the fact that apocryphal books exist in the literature of their sect.[11] Regarding one book, which was handed down under the name of 'Umāra b. Ziyād, alleged to be associated with the Anṣār, the person responsible for putting it into circulation admitted that 'Umāra was a man who descended from heaven in order to communicate the [11]
traditions contained in it and then returned to heaven without delay. This caused even Shī'ite critics[12] to confess that this 'Umāra never

[1] Al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 251, 21.

[2] Occasionally mentioned in Ibn Qutayba, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 230, 5, but erroneously attributed to 'Abd Allāh b. 'Umar; cf. W. Muir, *Mahomet*, I, p. xxxiii. [See also al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *K. Taqyīd al-'Ilm*, pp. 84ff.]

[3] *Tahdhīb*, p. 479.

[4] Al-Tirmidhī, I, pp. 66, ult., 125, 14.

[5] Ibid., I, p. 244, 4: *ṣaḥīfat Samura*.

[6] Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 132, ult., confuses this with a *kitāb* of Ibn Sabra (d. 162) (cf. Ibn Qutayba, p. 246, 16): *kitāb Ibn Sabra wa-qālū Samura wa-qālū Samayra*.

[7] *Tahdhīb*, p. 304, 7.

[8] *Tab. Ḥuff.*, 4, no. 11, without giving a source.

[9] Al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 247, 3: *innamā yuḥaddith Qatāda 'an ṣaḥīfat Sulaymān al-Yashkurī wa-kāna lahu kitāb 'an Jābir b. 'Abd Allāh*.

[10] See my *Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte der Shī'a [und der sunnitischen Polemik* in Sitzungsberichte der K. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna, 1874], p. 55.

[11] Al-Ṭūsī, *List of Shī'a Books*, p. 148, 1 ff.

[12] In 'Alam al-Hudā, *Naqd al-Īḍāḥ*, p. 236.

existed and that the books linked to his name must be spurious. As one of the oldest books appearing in these circles is mentioned the *kitāb* of a companion of 'Alī named Sulaym b. Qays al-Hilālī[1] who died at the time of the persecution of the enemies of the Umayyads under al-Ḥajjāj.[2] Shī'ite theologians refer to this book even in later times.[3]

The ancient writings here mentioned by no means exhaust the number of *ṣaḥīfas* and *kutub* which are quoted as written documents for the ḥadīth of the first century. Further examples of this type are given in a collection of sources by Sprenger,[4] which the references above are intended to supplement.

## III

The terms sunna and ḥadīth must be kept distinct from one another. Several attempts have been made to define the difference between the two, though, on the other hand, it has also been asserted that they are identical or relatively synonymous. The latter view has some justification as far as the later development of Islamic terminology is concerned; but if only the original senses of the two words are considered, they are by no means the same. The difference which has to be kept in mind is this: ḥadīth means, as has been shown, an oral communication derived from the Prophet, whereas sunna, in the usage prevailing in the old Muslim community, refers to a religious or legal point, without regard to whether or not there exists an oral tradition for it. A norm contained in a ḥadīth is
[12] naturally regarded as sunna;[5] but it is not necessary that the sunna should have a corresponding ḥadīth which gives it sanction. It is quite possible that the contents of a ḥadīth may contradict the sunna or, as we might say, the *jus consuetudinis*,[6] and it is the task of subtle theologians and harmonists to find a way out.

The distinction between ḥadīth and sunna is also retained in the literature of the subject, the first being a theoretical discipline, the second a compendium of practical rules; their only common char-

[1] Flügel confuses this man in his notes (p. 95) to the *Fihrist* with a man of the name of Sulaym who, however, died in the time of 'Uthmān. See Wüstenfeld, *Register zu den genealogischen Tabellen*, p. 430.

[2] *Fihrist*, p. 219.

[3] In 'Alam al-Hudā, op. cit., p. 354, penult.

[4] *JASB* (1856), pp. 317 ff.

[5] For example, Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 48, quotes a saying of the Prophet on the occasion of the death of a Muslim in the state of *iḥrām*. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal remarks on this: *fī hādhā'l-ḥadīth khams sunan* ('five sunnas are contained in this ḥadīth'), i.e. five religious and ritual customs of the Prophet from which the norm for similar cases must be derived.

[6] *Al-Tanbīh*, ed. Kazan (1883), p. 362, penult.: *fa-hādhā'l-ḥadīth mukhālif li'l-qiyās . . . wa'l-sunna wa'l-ijmā'*.

acteristic is that the knowledge of both of them is rooted in tradition. This can be seen from the following example: 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. al-Mahdī (d. 198) characterizes the three theological authorities Sufyān al-Thawrī, al-Awzā'ī and Mālik b. Anas by saying that the first was an imām in the ḥadīth but not in the sunna (i.e. he had gathered much material about the Prophet's sayings without becoming an authority for what is to be taken as the traditional norm in the rites and laws that govern the practical conduct of life); the second was: *imām fi'l-sunna wa-laysa bi-imām fi'l-ḥadīth* (i.e. he knew the law without being an authority on the traditional sayings of the Prophet); but Mālik was an undisputed master in both these fields (*imām fīhimā jamī'an*) [1] In the same way it is said of Abū Yūsuf, the well-known pupil of Abū Ḥanīfa, that he was *ṣāḥib ḥadīth wa-ṣāḥib sunna*.[2]

A striking example from the Ḥadīth literature which may serve to exemplify the difference is this. At the end of a tradition by Abū Dāwūd, which is traced back to the Companion Anas b. Mālik, but not to an oral communication of the Prophet, it is said: 'If I were to say that he (the transmitter) has traced back (*rafa'ahu*) this saying to the Prophet, I would be speaking the truth, but he only said, "Thus is the sunna",'[3] i.e. there is no ḥadīth relating to this but it must be taken as sunna.

With this is connected the fact that, if the sunnas are attested by passages in the ḥadīth which support them, this point is specifically mentioned. For example, a book is entitled in this sense: *kitāb* [13] *al-sunan bi-shawāhid al-ḥadīth*, i.e. a book of the sunnas with supporting passages from the ḥadīth.[4]

IV

The concept of the sunna was from the beginning influential as the standard of correctitude in the ordering of individual and communal life in those Arab communities which from the appearance of Islam embraced a way of life and order of society in accordance with Islamic religious beliefs.

There was no need for Muslims to invent this concept and its practical significance; they were already current among the old pagans of the Jāhiliyya (see Part I, p. 46). For them sunna was all that corresponded to the traditions of the Arabs and the customs and habits of their ancestors, and in this sense the word was still used in Islamic times by those Arab communities which had been

[1] In al-Zurqānī, I, p. 4.
[2] Yaḥyā b. Mu'īn in *Tab. Huff.*, VI, no. 41.
[3] Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 210, bottom.
[4] *Fihrist*, p. 230, 3.

only very little affected by Muslim religion.[1] Under Islam the content of the old concept and the meaning of the word that corresponded to it underwent a change. To the pious followers of Muhammed and his oldest communities sunna meant all that could be shown to have been the practices of the Prophet and his earliest followers. The Muslim community was supposed to honour and obey the new sunna in the same way as the pagan Arabs had revered the sunna of their ancestors. The Islamic concept of sunna is a revised statement of ancient Arab views. 'May you follow'—so the Prophet is made to say—'in the ways of those who preceded you, span by span, ell by ell, though they lead you to the lair of a lizard.'[2] [3]

The sunna appears to have gained prevalence first of all among the pious circles of Medina. The oldest saying, which exhorts the people to keep to customs and conditions as they were during the patriarchal times of Islam and condemns all innovations which are not founded on such customs, bears the stamp of Medina. According
[14] to this saying, the Prophet declared Medina to be sacred (*ḥarrama*); no tree may be felled there, *man aḥdatha fīhā ḥadathan*, i.e. 'may he who introduces new things into this town be cursed by Allāh, his angels and all men.'[4] It is true that originally by *ḥadath* was meant political *bid'a*, political dissidence,[5] but for a Muslim acknowledgement of a lawfully established government falls within the category of sunna in the same way as obedience to other religious laws. In fact the word *ḥadath* is also used from early times for ritualistic *bid'a*. *Yā bunayya iyyāka wa'l-ḥadath*, 'My son, beware of innovations,' says a father to his son[6] when he hears him recite the *bismillāh* formula aloud at the beginning of the *ṣalāt* (*jahran*) whereas, according to the putative sunna[7] it should be whispered. In some versions of the saying discussed here a sentence is inserted before the curse: *wa-man āwā muḥdithan*, 'and he who harbours an innovator.'[8] The same idea appears in another context, in a saying which also has the purpose of combating an opinion of the followers

[1] *Agh.*, VII, p. 119, 5: *wa-innā'l-nā'ūna bi'l-sunnati*: and also the term *bid'a*, to be discussed later, ibid., p. 111, 4, 5 from the bottom. There is no trace of Islam among the people who figure in these stories.

[2] In al-Damīrī, i, p. 408, 8 from the bottom, where this tradition is cited, it reads 'into a hive of bees'.

[3] B. *I'tiṣām*, no. 14, cf. Ibn Māja, p. 296, ult. [*Verspreide Geschr.*, II, pp. 72 f.]

[4] *I'tiṣām*, no. 6. [Cf. Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidenthums*, p. 70]

[5] Cf. *Agh.*, XXI, p. 144, 22: *mā aḥdathū fi'l-islāmi ḥadathan wa-lā akhrajū min jā'atin yadan*, Ibn Qutayba, p. 106, 1. Cf. Hebrew *shōdhīm*, Prov. 24:21, 'those who change' = 'rebels'.

[6] Al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 51; and the son says of the father: *wa-lam ara aḥadan min aṣḥāb rasūli-llāhi kāna abghaḍa ilayhi al-ḥadath fi'l-islām*.

[7] Cf. *Literaturgesch. der Schi'a*, p. 86.

[8] B. *Faḍā'il al-Madīna*, no. 1, *Jizya*, no. 10, 17, al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 17.

of 'Alī (Shī'a) who believed that the Prophet had imparted to 'Alī special doctrines which he withheld from the other believers. Orthodox Islam endeavoured to fight this view in very many of the ḥadīths. The sentence referred to is ascribed to Ibrāhīm al-Taymī of Iraq (d. 92), who is reputed to have said of his father: 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib has told us in his *khuṭba*, 'He who believes that he may find among us something that we read apart from the book of Allāh and this scroll here'—meaning a scroll hanging from the scabbard (*qirāb*) of his sword— 'is lying. This scroll contains the laws relating to compensation for damage caused by animals and for other injuries.[1] It also contains this: The Prophet says: 'Medina is *ḥaram* between the mountains of 'Ayr and Thawr;[2] he who introduces new [15] things into this area or harbours an innovator, may he meet with . . . etc.' Yet other laws—about the equality of Muslims, the prohibition of the use of any other than a genuine genealogy[3]—are quoted as being contained in this scroll.[4]

We thus see that this group of sayings forbidding the introduction of innovations has special reference to Medina. This town was to become the stronghold of the sunna, as also the oldest source of its rise and growth. In Medina lived those who first taught the sayings of the Prophet by which life was to be regulated,[5] and for this reason it is also called the home of the sunna, *dār al-sunna*.[6] But things did not stop there. When the sunna which till then had been neglected began to be disseminated to the outside world, Medina's privilege as guardian of the patriarchal way of life was universalized. The tradition was already current in the earliest 'Abbāsid period that 'Umar inserted in every treaty made with a conquered town a clause that the inhabitants must not give refuge to innovators (*lā yu'wā landa muḥdithan*).[7] How such a universalization came about may easily be seen by considering another, shortened, version (cited from a different source) of the speech of 'Alī just mentioned (where, incidentally, *qirāb*, 'scabbard', has changed to *qarn*,[8] 'horn'),

[1] These are also quoted from other scrolls, e.g. the *K. al-Ḥazm*, see *Ẓāhiriten*, p. 211, top. In another version the paragraph on Medina is not quoted among the contents of the scroll; al-Dārimī, p. 308.

[2] This mountain, which is not situated in the district of Medina, has given the commentators much trouble, and its occurrence in the definition of the territory of Medina was variously interpreted. Al-Nawawī, in a note on the passage, and Yāqūt, s.v., I, p. 939: *bayna lābatayhā*, 'between the two areas of lava (*ḥarra*)', is another way of delimiting Medina.

[3] See Part I, p. 126.

[4] Muslim, III, p. 291.

[5] Note the remark of al-Nawawī, *Tahdhīb*, p. 362, 2.

[6] Al-Ṭabarī, i, p. 1820, 18; *I'tiṣām*, no. 16.

[7] *K. al-Kharāj*, p. 22, 16.

[8] Perhaps this word may be explained by the following version of the story: *kataba kitāban fī'l-ṣadaqati faqaramahu bi-sayfihi*, *K. al-Kharāj*, p. 43, 16.

in which a general reference is made to people 'who introduce new things and give refuge to innovators'; there is no longer any mention of Medina.[1] But this tendency to extend the curse to innovators in general appeared even in the oldest text. In 'Alī's saying the word
[16] 'within' (*fīhā*, 'in Medina') was simply cancelled. Thus this sentence was made to apply beyond Medina to the whole of Islam.[2]

## V

*Aḥdatha*[3] is the most usual term in the early Islamic period for the introduction of innovations not based on the ancient customs of patriarchal times. 'Ā'isha quotes the Prophet's saying: *man aḥdatha fī amrina hādhā mā laysa minhu*[4] *fa-huwa raddun*, 'he who introduces into our cause new things that are not already in essence within it, is reprehensible';[5] or in another version: *man ʿamila ʿamalan laysa ʿalayhi amrunā fa-huwa raddun*, 'he who does something that is not in accordance with our cause is reprehensible.'[6] From this follows the doctrine: *sharr al-umūr muḥdathātuhā*, 'the worst things of all are innovations,'[7] or, as the poet Ḥassān b. Thābit is made to say: *inna'l-khalā'iqa fa-'lam sharruhā'l-bidaʿu*, 'Know that of all attributes the most evil are innovations.'[8]

Conformity with traditional custom, i.e. the sunna, is enjoined as strongly as new forms and institutions are discouraged.[9] The standard of the sunna is above all the direct commandment, the tacit agreement, or the indubitable practice of the Prophet. The sunna is anything that the Prophet has decreed, whether spontaneously or

[1] *Aghā.*, III, p. 159.

[2] The tradition is in this form in Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 202, II, p. 162, without *fīhā*.

[3] This expression is used even in reference to God. Before the migration of the faithful to Ethiopia it was customary for the Prophet to return salutations even during prayer. He later abandoned this practice, giving the reason that God had revealed to him a new law regarding it: *inna-llāha yuḥdithu min amrihi mā yashā'u wa-inna-llāha jalla wa-ʿazza qad aḥdatha an lā tukallimū fī'l-ṣalāti*; Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 92, bottom.

[4] Var. *fīhi*.

[5] Muslim, IV, p. 169; B. *Ṣulḥ*, no. 5; Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 169; Ibn Māja, p. 3. This *ḥadīth* is quoted by al-Shaybānī, *K. al-Siyar al-Kabīr*, fol. 49a [I, 148] (v. 1. *adkhala*) in reference to someone performing a pious religious service which was not based on the sunna.

[6] *I'tiṣām*, no. 10. In Abū Dāwūd, ibid. : *man ṣanaʿa amran ʿalā ghayri amrinā*.

[7] Ibid., no. 2. This sentence is put to polemic use in a poem by the Shī'ite poet Abū Hurayra al-'Ijlī, *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 230, 4 from the bottom.

[8] Ibn Hishām, p. 936, ult. = *Aghā.*, IV., p. 9, 8. [*Dīwān*, ed. Hirschfeld, no. 23, 4].

[9] Al-Ghazālī, *Iḥyā'*, I, pp. 78–80, brings together many sayings relevant to this point.

in a given case, *ṣāra* or *kāna sunnatan*,[1] or, as is said, *jarat*[2] or *maḍat* [17]
*al-sunna 'alayhi*[3] or *bihi*,[4] i.e. the sunna is guided by it, it is recognized as valid sunna. In cases where no fixed law existed, the pious looked for evidence of the way in which the Prophet judged such circumstances. If any such evidence could be produced it became possible to establish the sunna in respect to the case in doubt. In 'Umar II's time the boundary between majority and minority had still not been decided; Nāfi' succeeded in finding a ḥadīth from which it was evident that the Prophet had refused a youth of fourteen the rights of majority but unhesitatingly accorded them a year later when he had attained the age of fifteen. 'Umar, who was always zealous to establish the sunna in all matters, thereupon said: This, then, is the age-limit between majority and minority.[5] Only by such documentation could a legal opinion or institution acquire the force of law in the eyes of pious Muslims. 'Is this a matter which you have heard from the Prophet or is it merely your own opinion?'[6] was the question that pious followers of the sunna asked about each new institution they encountered.

It was not only to matters relating to important institutions of communal life and social conduct that the standard of the sunna was applied. Even in regard to the most trivial circumstances and usages of private life and intercourse, pious Muslims sought the sunna, for a relevant indication from the way of life of the Prophet, in order to imitate it or to avoid contradicting it. In deciding whether it was permissible to wear a gold signet ring, the sole criterion was to find out whether the Prophet wore such jewellery.[7] Even questions of good manners and social behaviour were settled by reference to [18]
the sunna. It regulated the forms of greeting and good wishes; if someone wanted to know what to say to a person who sneezes he would find rules in the sunna, and he was not a good Muslim if he was guided in such matters by his own invention or, worse, by foreign customs. A pious Muslim historian takes it amiss that in matters of court etiquette the 'Abbāsid rulers did not follow the sunna but the more refined customs of the 'Ajam, and that they did not permit ordinary men to approach the ruler with their wishes and

[1] B. *Libās*, no. 6; *Tafsīr*, no. 183; *Aymān*, no. 28.
[2] B. *I'tiṣām*, no. 4. *nafidat sunnatan*, Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 167.
[3] *Al-Muwaṭṭa'*, III, p. 54; ibid., IV, p. 33; *Taḥdhīb*, p. 284, 5: 'When Sa'īd b. al-Musayyib says *maḍat al-sunna*, one's doubts must needs be stilled'.
[4] *Agh.*, XV, p. 94, 16: *naṭaya'l-kitāba lahum bidhāka muqaddiqan lwa-maḍat bihi sunanu'l-nabiyyi'l-ṭāhiri*. In the text quoted in *Zāhiriten*, p. 220, 7, 8. *qāḍiya* must therefore twice be corrected to (sunna) *māḍiya*.
[5] B. *Shahādāt*, no. 18; Abū Yūsuf, *K. al-Kharāj*, p. 106.
[6] Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 233.
[7] B. *I'tiṣām*, no. 4.

requests in the accustomed way.[1] A Barmecide court official reproved an Arab for making the usual response when the caliph sneezed; the caliph approved the official's action with the words: *asāba'l-rajul al-sunna wa-akhṭa'a'l-adab*, 'the man acted correctly from the point of the sunna, but he sinned against etiquette.' The pious historian cannot, however, refrain from remarking: 'Refined customs are to be found nowhere but in the sunna of the Prophet.'[2]

The chapters *adab* ('good manners') and *libās* ('dress') in the various collections of traditions afford a number of good examples on this point. For the sake of brevity we will quote but one passage.[3] 'Abd Allāh b. 'Umar was questioned by his companion 'Ubayd b. Jurayj: 'I see that you practise four things that I have seen none of your companions do: of the corners of the Ka'ba[4] you touch only the
[19] two southernmost;[5] further, I notice that you wear tanned sandals; then, that you colour (your hair) yellow;[6] and finally, that when you arrive in Mecca you call out the *tahlīl* formula on the day of the *tarwiya* (the eighth day of the pilgrim-month) whereas other people call it as soon as they see the new moon.'[7] 'Abd Allāh replied: 'As regards the corner-stones, I have seen the Prophet touch only those two corners; as to the tanned sandals, I have seen the Prophet wearing sandals without hair, and performing his ablutions in them;[8] I have also seen the Prophet dye his hair yellow,[9] and that is why I

[1] *Al-'Iqd*, I, p. 165, bottom, throws much light on the story of Maqrīzī; there the views of the Barmecide Yaḥyā b. Khālid on proper deportment towards kings is fully discussed.

[2] Al-Maqrīzī, ed. G. Vos, p. 56, 53 f. Their high officials surrounded themselves with greater pomp than had been customary in earlier periods, Abū'l-Maḥāsin, I, p. 379, 9.

[3] *Al-Muwaṭṭa'*, II, p. 164 = al-Shaybānī, p. 222; B. *Libās*, no. 37; Abū Dāwūd, 1, p. 177.

[4] It was an ancient Arab custom to do reverence to all four corners (*Al-Muwaṭṭa'*, II, p. 211) and one apparently retained in early Islam (*Hudhayl.*, 286, 37: *wa-mustalimun arkānahā mudaṭṭarwifu*, cf. Ibn Qutayba, *Shu'arā'*, p. 9, 6, Rittershausen [ed. de Goeje, p. 8] = Nöldeke, *Beitr. Poesie*, p. 44, 1) before the sunna prevailed; after this only the two *yamāniyyān* were so treated. On this point Mu'āwiya is said to have gone contrary to the practice ascribed to the Prophet by saying: 'No part of the (holy) house may be omitted' (Al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 163). According to a version in al-Azraqī (p. 295, top) the question was not why 'Abd Allāh touched only two corners, but why he touched any at all; cf. parallel passages in al-Nasā'ī, I, p. 265.

[5] *al-yamāniyyayn*, dual *a potiori*, i.e. the southern and eastern (Snouck Hurgronje, *Mekka*, I, p. 2, bottom) or, better, the Yemenite and 'Irāqī. This example may be added to Grünert's study, *Die Begriffspräponderanz im Altarabischen* (Vienna, 1886).

[6] See *Taḥdhīb*, p. 83, 3.

[7] Snouck Hurgronje, *Het Mekkaansche Feest*, p. 75, note 1 [= *Verspreide Geschr.*, I, 51, note 4].

[8] Cf. al-Nasā'ī, I, p. 12, bottom.

[9] Ibid., II, p. 215.

prefer to do the same. But as for the *ihlāl*, I have never heard the Prophet say the formula before his mount was ready for the journey.'

VI

The power attributed to the sunna as the normative principle in the Muslim's life is as old as Islam. Already at the end of the first century the principle was formed: *al-sunna qāḍiya 'alā'l-Qur'ān wa-laysa al-Qur'ān bi-qāḍin 'alā'l-sunna*, 'the sunna is the judge of the Koran, and not vice versa.'[1] Yet a comparison of the evidence from different periods leads to the conclusion that the overriding power given to the sunna—we consider here the theoretical views of pious circles—has been continuously increasing with the passage of time. The example of Makḥūl (d. 112) shows that in olden times considerable latitude was still allowed regarding the practical application of the sunna. In a ḥadīth a decision of the Prophet is related which says that a man who is unable to provide a bridal gift for the girl he is wooing—'not even an iron signet ring'—can satisfy the obligation (which is, of course, normally an essential factor in validating a marriage) by teaching the bride some verses of the [20]
Koran. Makḥūl declares without hesitation that this decision of the Prophet cannot possibly be a generally acceptable norm.[2] Likewise al-Zuhrī (d. 124) can still take the liberty of declaring that an extremely lenient decision of the Prophet regarding the law of fasts cannot be taken as a precedent and belongs to the category of special privileges (*khaṣā'iṣ*) of the Prophet.[3] Later scholars have often made use of such remarks when they tried to curb and discipline the mania for sunna, which went to ridiculous lengths.[4] In general, however, it is noticeable that the endeavour to raise the sunna to a position of equality with the sacred book in establishing the law comes more and more into evidence. Everything that the Prophet ordained in religious matters—the theological term is *sunan al-hudā*[5]—He has decreed at God's command; it was revealed to him as was the Koran, or as Muslim believers put it, it was brought by the angel Gabriel at Allāh's command. Anas b. Mālik is quoted as saying: 'Accept my communications, for I have received them from the Prophet, and He from the angel Gabriel, who had them from God.'[6] This divine origin of traditional laws and prac-

[1] Al-Dārimī, p. 77, top. The saying is ascribed to Yaḥyā b. [Abī] Kathīr (d. 120) in *al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī*, fol. 6a [ed. Hyderabad, p. 14].
[2] Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 209.
[3] Ibid., p. 238: *wa-innamā kāna hādhā rukhṣatan lahu khāṣṣatan.*
[4] *Zāhiriten*, pp. 81–5.
[5] Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 47, bottom: *inna'llāha shara'a li-nabiyyihi sunan al-hudā.*
[6] Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 314, bottom.

tices was not taken for granted in olden times, as is evident from 'Umar II's comment to 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr: 'Think what you say'[1] when the latter told him the story of the revelation regarding the proper times for prayer (which were still not settled in the Umayyad period). Such scruples had vanished by the time of the development of ḥadīth-theology (second to third centuries). Sunna and Koran were considered as of entirely equal importance. Already by the middle of the second century al-Shaybānī had decided in a positive sense the problem whether ordinances of the sunna could abrogate those of the Koran,[2] and al-Shāfi'ī did not find this view surprising.[3] The Qādī
[21] al-Khaṣṣāf (d. 261) takes it for granted in the third century that a *sunna mutawātira* (i.e. a sunna recognized by an unbroken chain of generations) has equal force with the Koran,[4] and his contemporary Ibn Qutayba defends, and gives reasons for, the thesis of the divine origin of the sunna.[5]

Imitation of the *salaf*, the pious ancestors who formed their habits of life under the eyes and on the example of the Prophet, became more and more the ideal of pious Muslims.[6] Gradually *salafī*, i.e. 'one who imitates his ancestors',[7] becomes the supreme title of praise in pious society. This view of life positively bred the fanatics of the sunna who searched everywhere for evidence relating to the habits of the Prophet and his Companions[8] and sought opportunities to practice them in order to rescue them from oblivion. resuscitation of an antiquated custom that had disappeared because *Iḥyā' al-sunna*,[9] 'revival of the sunna,' was the name given to the of altered circumstances.[10] This was the highest praise, in the eyes of the pious, and rulers whose piety it was desired to acclaim were said to have 'revived and renewed the sunna of those who lived before.'[11] Such a revival was considered most meritorious, and its

[1] Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 15; cf. p. 41.

[2] *Al-Siyar al-Kabīr*, fol. 24b [i, 68]: *ma-nasikh al-kitāb bi'l-sunna al-mashhūra allatī talaqqāhā al-'ulamā' bi'l-qabūl fīhi*.

[3] In al-Suyūṭī, *Itqān*, II, p. 25; for various opinions on this point see al-Taftazānī, *Talwīḥ*, ed. Kazan (1883), p. 416. [Cf. J. Schacht, *The Origins of Muhammedan Jurisprudence*, pp. 15, 46–7].

[4] [Abū Bakr al-Khaṣṣāf,] *Adab al-Qāḍī*, fol. 7a, top.

[5] *Mukhtalif al-Ḥadīth*, pp. 194, 232, elucidates this view by examples.

[6] Abū'l-Muḥāsin, I, p. 739, 15: *tashabbaha bi'l-salaf*.

[7] *Tab. Huff.*, XXVIII, no. 21; cf. *al-Mushtabih*, ed. de Jong, p. 269, 9.

[8] A satirical reference to this way of life may be found in *Maqāma* 29 of Ḥarīrī (ed. de Sacy, p. 358, 1: 363, 8): a family who fixed the amount of their daughter's dowry by what the Prophet gave for his bride.

[9] In olden times the 'revival of the sunna' is often nothing but its first origin and establishment; see my study 'Muhammedanisches Recht in Theorie und Wirklichkeit' (*Ztschr. f. vergleich. Rechtswissenschaft*, VIII, pp. 409 ff.).

[10] Another phrase is: *an'asha sunnatan*, *Takdhīb*, p. 468, 5, 10.

[11] Ibn Māja, p. 19.

promoter enjoyed the reward of all those who in consequence of his action followed again the defunct sunna.[1] All parts of the Islamic world have contributed their share to the curiosities of sunna-revival. The Maghribī provinces, however, have proved richer sources of extravagant revivals than eastern Islam. A scholar of Cordova in the fourth century revived the disused legal custom of *li'ān* by allowing himself to pronounce this curse against his wife in a public assembly [22] at the mosque; and when his contemporaries considered that this was beneath his dignity he replied: 'My only object is *iḥyā' sunnatin*.[2] The Andalusian Umayyad ruler al-Ḥakam endeavoured in his war against the Christians to restrict the fighting to the times of day during which the Prophet had once fought the unbelievers; and the teller of the tale remarks that he probably did so in order to take an example from the ḥadīth of the Prophet[3] (*ta'assi'an bi-ḥadīth al-nabī*).[4] In the Maghrib entire dynasties sought their legal title in the restoration of the sunna, and none more so than that of the Almohads,[5] of whom some went to extremes in this direction. In 693 Abū Ya'qūb discontinued the use of the customary units of dry measure and made his *faqīhs* introduce the *muddī* (*al-muddī al-nabawī*[6]) which was in use at Medina at the time of the Prophet.[7] Such things were called *iḥyā' al-sunna*.

The opposite from *iḥyā al-sunna* is *imātat al-sunna*, i.e. the killing of the sunna, the neglect of the details of legal practices as fixed by the sunna. In this context the object of the word *amāta* is sometimes the name of the legal practice of which the details and conditions prescribed by the sunna are neglected though the legal institution itself is maintained. It is said, for example: *idhā kānat 'alaykum umarā' yumītūna al-ṣalāt*, 'if you are subjected to rulers who kill the *ṣalāt*';[8] this does not mean those who abolish the institution of the *ṣalāt* but those who *yu'akhkhirūna al-ṣalāt*, i.e. do not keep exactly to the times of the *ṣalāt*-rite as decreed by the sunna.

## VII

Parallel to the 'revival of the sunna' is the 'killing of innovations,' *imātat al-bid'a*. *Bid'a* is the opposite of sunna and a synonym for

[1] *Agh.*, XV, p. 94, 18.
[2] Ibn Bashkuwāl, ed. Codera, no. 19, p. 15, and cf. B. *Ṣalāt*, no. 44.
[3] B. *Jizya*, no. 1.
[4] *Al-Bayān al-Mughrib*, II, p. 76.
[5] *ZDMG.*, XLI, pp. 106 f.
[6] Cf. Snouck Hurgonje, *Mekka*, II, p. 98.
[7] *Qarṭās*, p. 266; cf. for this measure al-Maqqarī, I, pp. 810 f.
[8] Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 45. In another version we find the paraphrase: *yuṣallūna al-ṣalāt li-ghayr mīqātihā*.

*muḥdath* or *ḥadath* (pl. *aḥdāth*),[1] together with which it often appears
[23] in the parallelism of Arabic style.[2] The Muslim theologian understands by the term *bid'a* innovations of practice, i.e. 'anything that is practised without a relevant example from olden times and, more especially in religion, anything that was not practised in the time of the Prophet'[3]—as well as innovations of dogma[4] that are not based on traditional religious sources,[5] i.e. heresies. In general *bid'a* is something arbitrary that springs from individual insight and the admissibility of which is not documented in the sources of religious life.[6] In an Arabic translation of the Gospels quoted by Fakhr Al-Dīn al-Rāzī the words *οὐ γὰρ λαλήσει ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ* of John 16:13 are rendered: *li-annahu laysa yatakallamu bid'atan min tilqā'i nafsihi*.[7]

The exaggerated, fanatical attitude to the sunna, even in quite trivial matters, is matched by a similar fanaticism towards *bid'a*. Modern Wahhabism follows the pattern of earlier times in striving to brand as *bid'a* not only anything contrary to the spirit of the sunna but also everything that cannot be proved to be in it. It is known that the ultra-conservative opposed every novelty, the use of coffee and tobacco, as well as printing, coming under this heading. Muslim theologians even today are not entirely reconciled to the use of knife and fork.[8] This attitude of mind has its origin in the rigorism of their predecessors. The stern pronouncements of tradition against *bid'a* stem from such circles. The Prophet is said to have made this *khuṭba* at an *'īd*: 'He whom God leads cannot be misled by
[24] anyone; he whom He misleads, no one can set upon the right path. Verily, the most truthful communication (*aṣdaq al-ḥadīth*) is the Book of Allāh, the best guidance is that of Muhammed, and the worst of all things are innovations;[9] every innovation is heresy,

[1] Al-Ya'qūbī, ed. Houtsma, II, p. 295, 5 from the bottom: *anāta ʿbnīha'l-sunnata jahlan wa-aḥyā'l-bid'a wa'l-aḥdātha'l-mudillata 'amdan*.

[2] Hassān b. Thābit in Ibn Hishām, p. 936, ult., in a verse of A'shā Hamdān: *aḥdathū min bid'atin* [R. Geyer, *Gedichte von . . . al-A'shā*, p. 320, x, 4].

[3] Al-Qasṭallānī, X, p. 342.

[4] *Aḥlā'l-ahdā'i* (cf. *ahlu'l-islāmi*, al-Ṭabarī, II, p. 150, 3) is the term used by a poet of al-Mutawakkil's time of one who follows doctrines suppressed by that caliph (*dhā sunnatin*). Al-Suyūṭī, *Ta'rīkh al-Khulafā'* (Cairo, 1305), p. 138, 9. The form *ahdā'* is derived from the singular *bid'*, *Sūra* 46:8.

[5] *Mishkāt al-Maṣābīḥ*, introduction [Delhi, 1851–52, fol. 2]. Cf. *JAOS*, VII, p. 63.

[6] Walīd b. Yazīd, *Agh.*, IX, p. 41, 18. *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 121, 4: *wa-mā ataynā dhāka 'an bid'atin/aḥallahu'l-furqānu li-ajma'a*—*Agh.*, VI, p. 109, penult., with other v. 11.

[7] *Mafātīḥ al-Ghayb*, VII, p. 197. Muhammed himself considers the celibacy of monks from this point of view (Sūra 57:27 *ibtada'ūhā*).

[8] Snouck Hurgronje, *Mekkanische Sprichwörter und Redensarten*, p. 23.

[9] It will be seen that this ḥadīth is a parallel version of the saying quoted above, p. 17.

every heresy is error, and every error leads to hell' (*wa-sharrū'l-umūri muḥdathātuhā wa-kullu muḥdathatin bid'atun wa-kullu bid'atin ḍalālatun wa-kullu ḍalālatin fī'l-nāri*).[1]

In an apparently later presentation of the same idea all this is stated somewhat more diffusely and at the same time more precisely.[2] The Prophet said the morning prayer with his community and then exhorted them. The eyes of his audience filled with tears and all hearts trembled. One of the listeners said: 'O Prophet of God, this exhortation is like that of one who is about to depart (*mawʿiẓatu muwaddiʿin*). Give us, therefore, a last instruction.' The Prophet replied: 'With these parting words I call you to the fear of God (*taqwā*) and to absolute obedience (hearing and obeying), as of an Ethiopian slave. For those of you who survive me will hear many conflicting opinions. It is your duty to follow my sunna and the sunna of just and enlightened caliphs; bite it (this sunna) with your teeth[3] (i.e. cling closely to it). I warn you against innovations, as every innovation is *bid'a* (var., as every *bid'a* is an error).'

We also hear similar doctrines expressed in the name of the oldest teachers of Islam. 'Abd Allāh b. Mas'ūd says: 'Obey (*ittabiʿū*)[4] and do not make wilful innovations (*wa-lā tabtadiʿū*), as you have your sufficiency (in the sunna).'[5] Abū Qulāba (d. ca. 104–8) even teaches that he who introduces *bid'as* has forfeited life (*ustuḥilla al-sayf*).[6] The exegesis to Sūra 1:7, which is cited by al-Tha'labī corresponds to this category of ideas: according to it the expression [25]
'those with whom God is angered' refers to people 'with whom *bid'as* gain the upper hand' and 'those who err' are those who deviate from the sunna.[7] The *ṣāḥib bid'a* has in fact been regarded with abhorrence from the earliest times in Islam. Even his religious practices were declared completely invalid and his good works are of no avail if he is guilty of *bid'a*.[8]

[1] Al-Nasā'ī, I, p. 143.

[2] Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 169; al-Dārimī, p. 26. Cf. al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 113; Ibn Māja, p. 5.

[3] Cf. al-Ṭabarī, I, p. 1944, 3. for this expression.

[4] This is a *praegnante* construction, the omitted object being *al-sunna*. Cf., in a speech of Abū Bakr, Ṭab, I, p. 1845, ult.: *wa-innamā anā muttabiʿ* and *lastu bi-mubtadiʿ*; the same words are said to have been spoken by 'Umar II in a *khuṭba*. (The French translation of al-Mas'ūdī, V, p. 421, ult., is inaccurate: *je ne suis pas un novateur, mais un disciple.*) Al-Dārimī, p. 62. The same object is also omitted after other verbs, e.g. *ghayyartum*, 'you have altered (the sunna of the Prophet)', B. *Īdāḥ*, no. 6. *Asāna* is often used with the meaning 'to practise the right sunna', or equally often, *aṣāba sunnatan* (in indeterminate form); opposed to *akhṭaʾa al-sunna*, al-Ya'qūbī, II, p. 213, 7.

[5] Al-Dārimī, p. 38.

[6] Ibid., p. 26.

[7] *Al-maghḍūbu ʿalayhim bi'l-bidʿa wa'l-ḍāllūna ʿan al-sunna.*

[8] Ibn Māja, p. 6.

This extreme interpretation of the concept of *bid'a* (whose triumph would have made the free development of society quite impossible) provoked reaction among the theologians to the same extent that they also felt themselves called to moderate inordinate fanaticism on behalf of the sunna. In essence these two endeavours were identical in that they gave effect to the same thought concerning the positive and negative aspects of the same intellectual current. There soon arose the problem of harmonizing Muslim ideas with the requirements of practical living.[1] If what was theoretically taught about *bid'a* had been logically carried out, a life in different circumstances from the patriarchal conditions of the first three decades of Islam in Medina would have been impossible. For everything which was not known, practised or used during that period must be branded as *bid'a*. In this category fall all possible conveniences of everyday life—which were unknown to men accustomed to primitive conditions. The use of sieves,[2] the employment of alkaline substances (*al-ushnān*) in the washing,[3] the use of tables, etc., are explicitly designated as being among the oldest *bid'as* which arose after the time of Muhammed.[4]

The concept of *bid'a* had therefore to be accommodated to the requirements of the times, and there now arose the distinction be-
[26] tween good or praiseworthy and bad or objectionable *bid'as* (*b. ḥasana* or *maḥmūda*[5] and *b. sayyi'a* or *madhmūma*). For this distinction we possess data from the time of the oldest teachers of Islam. Even Mālik b. Anas, with reference to an innovation in the rite of *ṣalāt*, transmitted the words attributed to 'Umar *ni'mat al-bid'atu hādhihi*, 'truly, this is a good *bid'a*!'[6] Al-Shāfi'ī formulated unequivocally the distinction just mentioned between good and objectionable *bid'as*: 'An innovation which contradicts the Koran, a sunna, an *athar*,[7] or *ijmā'* is a heretical *bid'a*; if, however, something new is introduced which is not evil in itself and does not contradict

[1] *Zahiriten*, p. 59.

[2] Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 58, states explicitly that these were not used at the time of the Prophet and tells how people managed to separate the chaff from the barley. Ibn Khaldūn, too, *Muqaddima*, p. 170, 4 from the bottom, notices the absence of sieves (*manākhil*) in his description of the primitive simplicity of the Arab way of life.

[3] One gets occasional glimpses of what these theologians knew of Arab antiquity. Zuhayr 1:29 (ed. Landberg, p. 158), attests the use of *ushnān* (*ḥurūf*) in ancient times: 'The lustre of a Yemeni garment, which is made to glitter by means of *ḥurūf* and water.'

[4] Al-Ghazālī, *Iḥyā'*, I, p. 126, 5.

[5] Also *bid'a mubāḥa* (permitted *bid'a*). An example is seen in *Mawāhib al-Rahmān*, fol. 9a. Cf. Sell, *The Faith of Islam*, p. 15, top.

[6] *Al-Muwaṭṭa'*, I, p. 214.

[7] A tradition going back to Muhammed, but to a Companion (or Successor, *tābi'*).

the above-mentioned authorities of religious life, then it is a praiseworthy, unobjectionable innovation.'[1]

The existence of this concession (although not in such precise, theoretical form) must have been presupposed in a saying included in the canonical ḥadīth. The Prophet is made to declare the following doctrine: 'Anyone who establishes in Islam a good sunna (*s. ḥasana*) which is followed by later generations will enjoy the reward of all those who follow this sunna, without their losing their proper reward; but anyone who establishes in Islam an evil sunna[2] . . .'[3] Thus, in this passage (which has the appearance of being a polemic against excessive persecution of *bid'a*) the fact is presupposed that the new sunnas may be introduced until the end of time.

This distinction between good and bad *bid'as* soon became the common property of the Muslim world, familiar to the most commonplace people and even penetrating folk-poetry.[4] The author of the Romance of 'Antar and other popular books and legends[5] seems to have assumed understanding of this distinction even among hearers and readers who were not theologically educated. 'My opinion is (says Mālik to the father of 'Antar, whom he wishes to bring to [27] acknowledge the latter as his son) that you should introduce this sunna among the Arabs and get them to observe it. For good characteristics are worthy of reward, provided they are not *bid'as* or objectionable things.'[6]

Individual rigorists did not cease in private life to disregard the distinction just mentioned; in public life, however, this distinction has penetrated everywhere[7] (in spite of some opposition to it), and in theology it supplied the motives for the approval of completely new arrangements. Only a little broadmindedness is needed for men to tolerate or approve under the title of *bid'a ḥasana*, things which are absolutely contrary to Islam.

[1] Al-Bayhaqī, *Manāqib al-Shāfi'ī*, in Qasṭallānī, X, p. 342. Cf. Muḥammad al-'Abdarī, *al-Madkhal* (Alexandria, 1293), III, p. 295.

[2] Cf. *al-sunnat al-shan'ā'a*, Labīd 28:5, ed. Huber.

[3] *K.al-Kharāj*, p. 43, 10; Muslim, V, p. 287; al-Dārimī, p. 70; al-Nasā'ī, I, p. 229; Ibn Māja, p. 18, bottom.

[4] In literary poetry, too, the concepts *sunna* and *bid'a* appear in poetical comparisons.

[5] *Sīrat Sayf*, XV, p. 59: 'This is indeed a *bid'a*, but a fine, completely harmless one.' Cf. *Arabian Nights*, Būlāq ed., (1279), II, p. 273, 1.

[6] *Sīrat 'Antar*, II, p. 63, top: *in kan tshun bid'a walā munkar*.

[7] Cf. my communication in *ZDMG*, XXVIII, pp. 304 ff.

[28]

# CHAPTER TWO

# UMAYYADS AND 'ABBĀSIDS

## I

To regard religious life in the Islamic sense as having taken hold amongst the masses of the Muslim population from Syria to Transoxiana, from the very beginning would be to give an altogether faulty picture of the development of the system of Islamic religion. It would be, first of all, quite unjustified to believe that religious life in the Islamic world was from the first based on what could be called with more or less justification 'the sunna'. This may have been the case in Medina, where there was much interest in religious matters from the start, and where a certain usage developed out of the elements of ecclesiastical law and life which later obtained canonic validity as the sunna. But such development can hardly be assumed for the outlying provinces with their Muslim population mainly consisting of colonized Arab warriors and indigenous converts. Among the Arabs transplanted to the eastern provinces there were presumably some Companions and 'followers' who worked for religious life and who spread the piety of Medina to the provinces. But at the time of the first conquests there was no ready-made system to be taken from Medina, since the new order was only developing even there; and also the number of those learned in religion was far exceeded in the conquered lands by the indifferent and the ignorant.

These circumstances explain the otherwise incomprehensible lack of knowledge and orientation during the first century (which alone is here the subject of our consideration) regarding religious matters in the non-Arab territories conquered for Islam. The government did
[29] little for the consolidation of religious matters. The Umayyad rulers and their governors—who can hardly be said to have been Islamic-minded—were not the people to promote a religious and social life corresponding to the sunna. These rulers fostered sunnas of a very different nature. Mu'āwiya I was fond of referring to the 'sunna of 'Umar'[1] according to which half the estate left by a deceased high state official was to be annexed for the treasury. The rulers of that time searched for precedents in the sunna for such measures. They were little concerned about the religious life of the population. As

[1] Al-Ya'qūbī, II, p. 264, top.

true Arabs, they paid little attention to religion either in their own conduct or in that of their subjects. If a man was seen absorbed in devout prayer in a mosque it was a pretty safe assumption that he was not a follower of the Umayyad dynasty but, for example, an 'Alīd partisan.[1] '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 'Abbāsids, had to send emissaries into the various provinces of his empire in order to teach his people how a Muslim, and a Muslim society, should order life.[2]

Individual indications show the state of affairs in the provinces in this respect. Islamic tradition itself gives us characteristic examples, though it was by no means interested in painting a picture from which the lack of continuous tradition for Islamic law could be deduced. From these examples we can easily guess at the ignorance prevailing in the first century in regard to ritual, which was already established, and religious doctrine, which was developing; and at the extent of uncertainty and fluctuation which we find instead of a law which many systematicians would like to believe to have been a canon of the Islamic world from the beginning.

When Ibn 'Abbās asked the people in Baṣra to fulfil the duty of the fast-alms (*zakāt al-fiṭr*), they took counsel and sought to find Medinians who might inform them about this religious duty which was entirely unknown to them.[3] The same community in the first years of its existence had no inkling of how to perform the *ṣalāt*, and Mālik b. al-Ḥuwayrith (d. 94) had to give them a practical demonstration in the mosque of the actions accompanying the liturgy.[4] Everyone certainly knew that the conquests were made in the name of Islam and the conquering hordes, wherever they came, erected mosques for Allāh;[5] but this did not prevent them from being completely ignorant of the elements of the cult. In Syria in olden times it was not generally known that there were only five obligatory *ṣalāts*, and in order to make certain of this fact it was necessary to find a Companion still alive who could be asked about it.[6] It is not astonishing that the Arab tribe of the Banū 'Abd al-Ashhal were unable to find anyone among themselves to lead them in prayer except a slave (*mukātab*) of the tribe, Abū Sufyān;[7] [30]

[1] Abū Ḥanīfa Dīnawarī, [*K. al-Akhbār al-Ṭiwāl*, ed. V. Girgas (Leiden, 1888)], p. 249, 9.

[2] Cf. *ZDMG*, XLI, p. 39.

[3] Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 162, al-Nasā'ī, I, p. 143.

[4] B. *Adhān*, no. 46; al-Nasā'ī, I, p. 100, bottom.

[5] Abū Ḥan. Dīn. p. 125, 2; 141, 2.

[6] Al-Dārimī, p. 195; Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 142; al-Nasā'ī, I, p. 42.

[7] *Takdhīb*, p. 726. This characteristic detail seems the more credible as it is in contradiction to the prejudices of the time when the tradition was in the

he had probably more feeling for religious observances than the Arabs, who, especially in early times, showed little taste for this aspect of their new form of life.[1] The people had so little accustomed themselves to the Islamic way of thought that at that time the Muslims had to be taught that one could not say *al-salām 'alā Allāh*.[2] What must have been the state of knowledge of Muslims when it was possible for people to stand in the pulpit and recite Arabic verses, thinking them to be passages from the Koran?[3] At the time of al-Ḥajjāj and 'Umar II people had no idea of the proper times for prayer and the most pious Muslims were unsure of the quite elementary rules.[4] The pious, however, endeavoured to demand adherence to a fixed sunna in the name of the Prophet and, when they found that the government did not support them in efforts which seemed unimportant to the latter, they produced the following Prophecy of Muhammed: 'There will come emirs after me who will kill the *ṣalāt* (*yumītūna*)[5] but continue to pray the *ṣalāt* at the proper
[31] times all the same.'[6] Later historians who were unable to imagine this state of affairs could only suppose that the godless Umayyads deliberately altered the times of the *ṣalāt*.[7] The fact is, however, that during the whole of the Umayyad period the populace, living under the influence of their rulers with little enthusiasm for religion, understood little of the laws and rules of religion. Medina was the the home of such rules and it would have been vain to seek them in circles under Umayyad influence. 'Kingship is with the Quraysh, judgement (in the religious sense) is with the Anṣār.'[8] This saying possibly intends to reflect the circumstances just described.

## II

'Kingdom'—*al-mulk*[9]—this expression characterizes the trend of Umayyad rule. It was entirely secular, showing little concern with religious law as practised by the pious and laying no stress on the

[1] Part I, p. 59 ff.
[2] Al-Nasā'ī, I, p. 102; cf. pp. 112, 114.
[3] *Fihrist*, p. 91, 10 ff. [cf. also Ibn al-Jawzī, *Akhbār al-Ḥarqā*, 1345, p. 70, bottom, O. Rescher, *Der Isl.*, XVI, pp. 156 ff.]
[4] Al-Nasā'ī, I, pp. 46–7.
[5] P. 33 above.
[6] Al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 37.
[7] Al-Maqrīzī, ed. Vos, p. 6, 2.
[8] Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 329.
[9] Cf. *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 113, 13.

making. To make a *maṣala* precentor was thought to be an act of pious self-effacement: *al-Iqd* in Kremer, *Culturgeschichtliche Streifzüge [auf dem Gebiete des Islams]*, p. 64, no. V, at the beginning [Cairo 1321, II, 74]. The passage quoted in *Takdhīb*, p. 798, 8 must also be added.

fact that it wielded a power which derived from the Prophet. The true followers of the Umayyads also felt no particular need to honour the founder of theocratic rule. It must have been the sneers of such people that stopped the Zubayrid from giving the usual blessing on the memory of the Prophet in his speeches.[1] The founder of the dynasty was the first who called himself king, and the pious Sa'īd b. al-Musayyib made this bitter comment:[2] 'May Allāh repay Mu'awīya, as he was the first who converted this condition[3] (dominion over true believers) into *mulk*.'

Pious people of Sa'īd's kind frowned at the state of affairs under such rule; they decried the tyrannical government, defied it by [32] passive resistance and even showed their dissatisfaction openly,[4] occasionally going so far as to refuse homage.[5] In return they were hated and despised by the ruling circles. It is sufficient to consider the way in which al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf deals with Anas b. Mālik; he rebukes him like a criminal and threatens "to grind him as millstones would grind and to make him a target for arrows."[6] The caliph Yazīd b. 'Abd al-Malik contemptuously calls the pious Ḥasan al-Baṣrī a *shaykh jāhil*, a doddering old man whom he would like to kill because his pietistical opposition is repellent and inconvenient to him.[7] This Ḥasan had said that the governor Mughīra had made a fateful step, in so far as he inspired the hereditary caliphate of the Umayyads, by arranging that homage should be paid during Mu'awiya's life to his son Yazīd; the pious preferred the electoral caliphate (*shūrā*) of patriarchal times.[8] The aims of the pious were divorced from reality.

During the time when religious people were pushed into the

[1] Al-Mas'ūdī, V, p. 184, 7.

[2] Al-Ya'qūbī, II, p. 276, 13 *awwal man a'āda hādhā'l-amra mulkan*.

[3] The preceding caliphate is called *khilāfat al-nubuwwa*, *ZDMG*, XLI, p. 126, 1 (of the text), cf. Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidenthums* [Part III of *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, (Berlin, 1887)], p. 204, note. Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 171, refers to this change: the prophetic caliphate last thirty years, *thumma yu'tī' llāhu'l-mulka man yashā'u*. In Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal's *Musnad* (V, 220–1) the saying is quoted: The caliphate (*al-khilāfa*) lasts thirty years, after that it becomes *mulk* (in al-Suyūṭī, *Ta'rīkh*, p. 5, 2.), cf. quotations from other works on tradition, ibid., p. 77, 7 ff. Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 35, bottom: Sa'īd b. Jabahān says: 'The B. Umayya think that the *khilāfa* is with them; the Banu'l-Zarqā lie, they are kings of the worst kind'. [Cf. also H. Lammens, in *MFOB*, II, pp. 81 ff.= *Etudes sur le règne du calife Omaiyade Mo'awiyaler*, pp. 189 ff.) *Mo'awiya I^er*.]

[4] Al-Ya'qūbī, II, pp. 339, 11; 340, bottom.

[5] In this context, too, we meet the same Sa'īd b. al-Musayyib, Ibn Qutayba, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 224, 1.

[6] Abū Ḥan. Dīn., p. 327, 6 ff. A much extended version of this story is quoted by al-Damīrī (s.v. *al-ṣadā*), II, pp. 71 f., cf. *al-'Iqd*, III, pp. 17 ff.

[7] *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 66, 15.

[8] In al-Suyūṭī, *Ta'rīkh*, p. 79, bottom, without mention of the source. [For al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī see, however, H. H. Schaeder, *Isl.*, XIV, p. 67.]

background by the rulers, they, like the Jewish rabbis under Roman rule, occupied themselves with research into the law, which had no validity for the real circumstances of life but represented for themselves the law of their ideal society. The god-fearing elements of society looked upon these men as their leaders and even some lax persons occasionally approached them for guidance *in casu conscientiae*.[1] Without paying any attention to reality these men founded the sunna of the Prophet upon which the law and jurisprudence of the Islamic state was to be based. The Companions and 'followers' living amongst them gave them the sacred material which formed the contents and basis of their endeavour. What these latter could not offer was looked for afar. People travelled to Medina, the place of origin of the ḥadīth, from where the religious stream flowed[2] into the Muslim diaspora in those godless times. Zealous men travelled ever further in the Muslim world where they might hope to
[33] meet Companions and 'followers' who might enlighten them about the obscurities of the law. Makḥūl's saying (d. 112; cf. Part I, p. 110 note 1), which is preserved by Abū Dāwūd, gives some idea of the extent of such journeys of enquiry during the first century: 'In Egypt I was the slave of a woman of the Hudhayl tribe who gave me my freedom, but I did not leave Egypt before I had gathered all available knowledge there; then I went to the Ḥijāz, and from there to 'Irāq, with the same purpose and success. Thereafter I journeyed to Syria and sieved (*gharbaltuhā*) this country too. On all these journeys I sought for (an authentic statement about) the law of war booty (*al-nafl*), but I did not find anyone who could relate it to me. Eventually I met an old man called Ziyād b. Jāriya al Tamīmī whom I asked: "Have you heard anything about the *nafl*?" He replied: "Yes, I heard from Ḥabīb b. Maslama al-Fihrī who said: I was present when the Prophet distributed the fourth part at the beginning and the third part on the return." '[3]

These are the beginnings of the travels *fī ṭalab al-'ilm*, of the fruition of which in the later ages we shall have to deal in a separate chapter.

Thus there arise new people to relate sayings ascribed to the Prophet, but some new things also came into being. Anything which appears desirable to pious men was given by them a corroborating support reaching back to the Prophet. This could easily be done in a generation in which the Companions, who were represented as the intermediaries of the Prophet's words, were no longer alive. The fact, that by disseminating these teaching they thought they were working against the godless tendency of the time, quietened

[1] *Aghā.*, X, p. 54, 18: 'A'isha bint Ṭalḥa makes Sha'bī come in order to consult him about a question of conscience.

[2] Al-Dārimī, p. 75.

[3] Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 274, cf. *Tahdhīb*, p. 572.

the conscience of the pious inventors of traditions, who related their own teachings and those of their immediate teachers back to the authority of the Master who was for all, including even the lax, an undisputable source of law. Since the pious opponents of the dynasty looked upon the 'Alid pretenders as the chosen saviours of the empire, a large part of these falsifications was dedicated to the praise of the Prophet's family without being a direct attack upon the Umayyads. But nobody could be so simple as not to recognize the negative implications.

III

Thus the ḥadīth led in the first century a troubled existence, in silent opposition to the ruling element which worked the opposite direction. The pious cultivated and disseminated in their orders the little that they had saved from early times or acquired by [34] communication. They also fabricated new material for which they could expect recognition only in a small community. 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. Later generations had the impression of his reign that when he sent a decree to the provinces[1] it usually dealt with one of three things: the revival of a sunna or the abolition of a *bid'a*, the distribution of the obligatory alms taxes (*ṣadaqa*), or the return of property unlawfully annexed by the treasury.[2] Therefore even the orthodox church has added him as the fifth in the number of the *Khulafā' rāshidūn*.[3] His rule did not aim at *sulk*. Amongst his successors the anti-sunna spirit appeared in a less glaring form than under the rulers who were represented by governors such as Ḥajjāj; but protection of the pietists did not exist under their rule either.

This must not lead us to believe that during this period theologians in opposition were alone at work on the tradition. The ruling power itself was not idle. If it wished an opinion to be generally recognized and the opposition of pious circles silenced, it too had to know how to discover a ḥadīth to suit its purpose. They had to do what their opponents did: invent, or have invented, ḥadīths in their turn. And that is in effect what they did. A number of facts are

[1] *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 63, bottom.

[2] Cf. above, p. 38.

[3] Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 170, from Sufyān: *al-khulafā' khamsa*. cf. *J.A.*, 1850, I, p. 168, note 2.

available to show that the impetus to these inventions and falsifications often came from the highest government circles; and if it is realized that even among the most pious of theologians there were willing tools to further their invention, it is not surprising that, among the hotly debated controversial issues of Islam, whether
[35] political or doctrinal, there is none in which the champions of the various views are unable to cite a number of traditions, all equipped with imposing *isnāds*.

Official influence on the invention, dissemination and suppression of traditions started very early. An instruction given to his obedient governor al-Mughīra by Mu'āwiya I is in the spirit of the Umayyads: 'Do not tire of abusing and insulting 'Alī and calling for God's mercifulness for 'Uthmān, defaming the companions of 'Alī, removing them and omitting to listen to them (i.e. to what they tell and propogate as ḥadīths); praising, in contrast, the clan of 'Uthmān, drawing them near to you and listening to them."[1] This is an official encouragement to foster the rise and spread of ḥadīths directed against 'Alī and to hold back and suppress ḥadīths favouring 'Alī. The Umayyads and their political followers had no scruples in promoting tendentious lies in a sacred religious form, and they were only concerned to find pious authorities who would be prepared to cover such falsifications with their undoubted authority. There was never any lack of these. The knowledge of the mechanics of Islamic ḥadīth does not give us any cause to mistrust the voices coming from the camps of the enemy.

When the Umayyad caliph 'Abd al-Malik wished to stop the pilgrimages to Mecca because he was worried lest his rival 'Abd Allāh b. Zubayr should force the Syrians[2] journeying to the holy places in Ḥijāz to pay him homage, he had recourse to the expedient of the doctrine of the vicarious *ḥajj* to the Qubbat al-Ṣakhra in Jerusalem.[3] He decreed that the obligatory circumambulation (*ṭawāf*) could take place at the sacred place in Jerusalem with the same validity as that around the Ka'ba ordained in Islamic Law. The pious theologian al-Zuhrī was given the task of justifying this politically motivated reform of religious life by making up and
[36] spreading a saying traced back to the Prophet, according to which there are three mosques to which people may make pilgrimages:

[1] Al-Ṭabarī, II, p. 112.

[2] During the war the pilgrimage to the *ḥaram* from the north was impossible, since the besieging Syrians let no pilgrim pass. A noteworthy account of this is found in Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 186.

[3] Umayyad rulers (according to some, as early as Mu'āwiya I) also wished to transfer the Prophet's pulpit from Medina to Syria. At a later time the frustration of this sacrilegious attempt was ascribed to various miraculous happenings: al-Ṭabarī, II, p. 92; Ibn al-Faqīh al-Hamadānī, p. 24, 1; al-Ya'qūbī, II, p. 283; al-Mas'ūdī, V, p. 66.

those in Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem.[1] This ḥadīth shows its sharp tendentiousness in an addition which, apparently, belonged to its original form but was later neglected by levelling orthodoxy in this and related sayings: 'and a prayer in the Bayt al-Maqdis of Jerusalem is better than a thousand prayers in other holy places,'[2] i.e. even Mecca or Medina. Later, too, 'Abd al-Malik is quoted when the pilgrimage to Jerusalem is to be equated with that to Mecca,[3] and Syrians never tired of creating ḥadīths expounding the excellence of visits to the Syrian sanctuaries and their equality with the holy places of the Ḥijāz. Muslims are recommended, for example, under a promise of paradise, to combine the *ḥajj* with a pilgrimage to al-Khalīl, etc.[4]

It seems likely that the fable that the Zamzam well pays a yearly visit[5] to the spring of Siloah during the night of 'Arafāt belongs to this group of tendentious beliefs and aimed at giving Jerusalem an equivalent to the miraculous Zamzam.

A large number of ḥadīths have the purpose of demonstrating the special dignity of the Jerusalem sanctuary, which was brought to the fore during the Umayyad period. Maymūna, a woman of the Prophet's entourage, is said to have asked the following question of him: 'Give us a decision about the Jerusalem sanctuary (*bayt al-maqdis*)'; whereupon the Prophet replied: 'Make pilgrimages to it and pray there'—war was then rampant in these lands[6]—'and, if you are unable to get there and pray, send oil in order to light the [37] lamps.'[7] In general, all traditions dealing with the question of

[1] Al-Ya'qūbī, II, p. 311, cf. Clermont-Ganneau in *JA*, 1887, I, p. 482. It is not surprising that orthodox writers do not mention al-Zuhrī's role in the establishment of the Qubbat al-Ṣakhra as a place of pilgrimage; al-Damīrī (s.v. *al-shāh*), II, p. 51. [There is no doubt that in this extreme form, according to which 'Abd al-Malik intended to substitute the pilgrimage to Jerusalem for the *ḥajj*, the tradition is an anti-Umayyad invention; yet it is not impossible that the Umayyads had a share in the propagation of traditions supporting the holiness of Jerusalem. For these problems cf. S. D. Goitein, in *JAOS*, 1950, pp. 104 ff.; O. Grabar, in *Ars Orientalis*, III, pp. 35–6, 43–6.]

[2] Ibn al-Faqīh al-Hamadānī, p. 95, 3; Ibn Māja, p. 102.

[3] Al-Ya'qūbī, ibid., p. 358, ult.

[4] *Manthūrāt al-Nawawī*, fol. 22a. Of the ḥadīths criticized here it is expressly noted that they are current amongst the common people of Syria (*'awāmm ahl al-Shām*).

[5] Yāqūt, III, p. 726, 7. Perhaps this tendency also influenced the development of the legends of the Ṣakhra; the Ṣakhra was said to compete with the 'black stone' of Mecca. It is possible also that 'Abd al-Malik had this in mind when he extended the Al-Aqṣā mosque to include the Ṣakhra in its territory.

[6] From this parenthesis the tendency of the ḥadīth is evident. In other versions there is the addition also here: because a prayer in this is worth a thousand prayers (anywhere else): Ibn al-Faqīh, p. 96, 10. cf. above.

[7] Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 48; the tradition in respect of the three mosques, ibid, p. 202: *'an al-Zuhrī 'an Sa'īd b. al-Musayyib 'an Abī Hurayra 'an al-nabī*; cf. B. *Jumu'a* no. 26; al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 67.

whether Syria of Medina had preference[1] and answering it in favour of Syria are probably due to Umayyad influence. In effect, the decision of this question is connected with the other one: Banū Umayya or Banū Hāshim?[2] The Umayyads called the Prophet's city *al-khabītha*, the dirty one,[3] and a governor of Yazīd I gave it the name of *al-natna*,[4] the evil-smelling one, in contrast to the epithet *ṭayba*, the sweet-smelling one, which pious Muslims gave[5] to the venerable city and which they claimed had been used for the Prophet's city already in the *Tawrāt*.[6]

On the other hand it was possible at the same time to hear widely spread popular songs in the streets of Medina which glorified this town at the expense of its rival, Damascus, so that the caliph al-Walīd II declared that he would have to abstain from the *ḥajj* since in the Ḥijāz he had always to listen to such songs.[7] The following account gives us some insight into the conflict of these two trends: Abu'l-Dardā' (who acted as a judge in Syria) asked Salmān al-Fārisī to come to the 'holy land'—meaning Syria—(*halumma ilā'l-arḍ al-muqaddasa*) whereupon Salmān is said to have answered: 'Nobody can sanctify the land, but good deeds sanctify man.'[8]

How the Umayyads made it their business to put into circulation
[36] ḥadīths which seemed to them desirable, and how people of the type of the pious al-Zuhrī acquiesced in being their tools—though they certainly were not guided by selfish motives[9] but merely by reasons of state expediency—is to be seen from evidence preserved by al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī which deserves to be considered in this context. Here we find an account which is handed down by various

[1] Ḥadīths invented in favour of Syria are likely to be found preserved and collected in large numbers in a chapter concerning this in the monograph on Damascus by Ibn 'Asākir; unfortunately I have no access to this work. See the titles of the relevant chapters in Kremer, *Über meine Sammlung orientalischer Handschriften*, [Vienna, 1865] p. 16. [This is now available in Vol. I of the Damascus ed., by al-Munajjid, 1323, and in the new Damascus ed., 1951 ff.)

[2] See esp. *Agh.*, XV, p. 30, 11, and cf. Yāqūt, III, p. 243, 9.

[3] Al-'Iqd, II, p. 140, 8 from the bottom.

[4] Al-Ma'sūdī, V, p. 161, 3.

[5] The saying in B. *Tafsīr*, no. 61 (to Sūra 4:71) sound like polemics against the nickname *al-khabītha*: *innahā ṭayyibatun tanfī'l-khabatha kamā tanfī'l-nāru* (var. *kīru*) *khabathat al-ḥadīdi* 'this city is sweet-smelling, it removes dirt as fire removes dirt from silver (var. *ḥadīd* iron); cf. *Al-Muwaṭṭa'*, IV, p. 61. Originally *al-balad al-ṭayyib* seems to have been opposed to *b. khabīth* in the sense that it was fertile and the other sterile soil: Sūra 7:56.

[6] *ZDMG*, XXXII, p. 386; cf. Ḥassān, in Ibn Hishām, p. 1022, 5.

[7] *Agh.*, I, p. 21, 6 ff.; cf. p. 22, 25 ff.

[8] *Al-Muwaṭṭa'*, III, p. 245.

[9] The selflessness of al-Zuhrī is especially praised: his contemporary 'Amr b Dīnār says of him: *mā ra'aytu aḥadan al-darākimu wa'l-danānīr ahwan 'alayhi minhu, kānat al-darākimu wa'l-danānīr 'indahu bi-manzilati al-ba'ar*, in al-Tirmidhī, p. 104, bottom.

'ways' from 'Abd al-Razzāq (d. 211), a disciple of Ma'mar b. Rāshid (d. 153), in the name of the latter; Ma'mar himself belonged to the group of the disciples of al-Zuhrī. This account tells us that the Umayyad Ibrāhīm b. al-Walīd—it is not stated whether he was the subsequent ruler[1] of this name (d. 126)—came to al-Zuhrī with a note-book he had written, and asked his permission to spread the sayings contained in it as ḥadīths communicated by al-Zuhrī. The latter gave his permission easily: 'Who else could have told you the ḥadīths?'[2] Thus the Umayyad was enabled to circulate the contents of his manuscript as texts taught him by al-Zuhrī. This account fully confirms the willingness of al-Zuhrī (for which we have quoted an example above) to promote the interests of the dynasty by religious means. His piety probably caused his conscience to be troubled occasionally but he could not for ever resist the pressure of the governing circles. The Ma'mar just mentioned preserved a characteristic saying by al-Zuhrī: 'these emirs forced people to write ḥadīths' (*akrahanā 'alayhi ha'ulā'i'l-umarā'*).[3] This account can only be understood on the assumption of al-Zuhrī's willingness to lend his name, which was in general esteemed by the Muslim com- [39]
munity, to the government's wishes.

In the next chapter we shall have to consider more closely the relation of the intransigent pious groups with the Umayyad government. Al-Zuhrī did not belong to the circle of the irreconcilable but to those who thought a *modus vivendi* with the government was desirable. He did not avoid the court but moved unhesitatingly in the ruler's entourage,[4] and we even see him, during a pilgrimage of al-Ḥajjāj, among the followers of this bogey of the pious.[5] He was employed by Hishām as tutor to the prince[6] and under Yazīd II he even consented to accept the office of judge.[7] In such circumstances he must have had the gift of overlooking certain measures not conforming to religion and could hardly belong to the circles who with

[1] The text of the story goes against this: *ra'aytu rajulan min Banī Umayya* ('a man of the B. Umayya') is a phrase hardly likely to have been used of the prince. On the other hand, this Ibrāhīm is mentioned among those people who took over ḥadīths from al-Zuhrī, Ibn 'Asākir in al-Suyūṭī, *Ta'rīkh*, p. 99, 11. [See Ibn 'Asākir, ed. 1323, II, 303; the following story is also found there.]

[2] Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, fol. 73b [ed. Hyderabad, p. 266].

[3] *JASB*, 1856, p. 322, no. 71 [=al-Khaṭīb, *Taqyīd*, p. 107: for other passages cf. the editor's notes.] Sprenger does not explain these words correctly: 'we induced also those chiefs (who are not mentioned) to disapprove of it'. From the above it is evident who 'those emirs' are. Sprenger's explanation is based upon the wrong reading *akrahnā* instead of *akrahnā*: cf. Muir, *Mahomet*, I, p. xxxiii.

[4] *Al-'Iqd*, II, p. 310.

[5] *JASB*, 1856, p. 326, no. 93. [=al-Khaṭīb, *Taqyīd*, p. 140].

[6] In Sprenger's article: 'Alfred von Kremer's edition of Wākidy,' *JASB*, 1856, p. 210. [Cf. the references in *BSOAS*, 1957, p. 11].

[7] Ibn Qutayba, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 239, 9.

passive resistance opposed the *khulafā' al-jawr* or *al-ẓalama*[1]—as the pious called the rulers of the dynasty under whose governors 'the world was filled with injustice.'[2] These groups, which contained men who even took it amiss if poor readers of the Koran practised their pious trade at the court of some mighty man of the period,[3] regarded any association with the powers that be and the prevailing trend as prohibited. 'He who follows the government will be led into temptation' (*man ittaba'a al-sulṭān iftatana*).[4] It was considered impermissible—and one bluntly refused—to enter government service and any office depending on it, especially that of Qāḍī.[5] Since the government was well aware that such refusal was based on an aversion on principle to the rules, a refusal of office was often cruelly punished or the acceptance of the office enforced.[6] In order
[40] to escape such compulsion 'Āmir al-Sha'bī (d. ca. 103–10) dressed in coloured robes, engaged in trivial games and mixed with the youths in the streets with the intention of appearing to be unworthy of the office of Qāḍī.[7] This Sha'bī was an enemy of the government since he actively participated in the rising of al-Ash'ath against al-Ḥajjāj.[8] To accept the office of judge under the wicked government was considered illicit by such people[9] and the pious did not relinquish this principle even under the 'Abbāsids. 'He who accepts office as judge is like someone who is being slaughtered without a knife' (*fa-qad dhubiḥa bi-ghayr sikkīn*).[10] These people were more consistent and morally serious than those poets who—like al-Ṭirimmāḥ (d. 100)—sided with the Khārijites[11] or other opposition parties and nevertheless did not refuse to present panegyrical *qaṣīdas* to the Umayyad governors for the sake of money.[12] Al-Zuhrī did not have to consider scruples about accepting public office under the Umayyads[13]

[1] Cf. *JA.*, 1850, I, p. 178.

[2] Abū'l-Maḥāsin, I, p. 243, 9.

[3] Cf. the story about Ḥasan al-Baṣrī in al-Jawāliqī, ed. Derenbourg, *Morgenländische Forschungen*, p. 140, bottom; this is connected with the ḥadīth that 'before Allah the most despicable readers of the Koran are those who visit the wicked emirs' (*yazūrān al-umarā'*, var. *al-jawara*), Ibn Māja, p. 23.

[4] Al-Nasā'ī, II, p. 139.

[5] E.g. Ibn Qutlubughā, p. 4, no. 11; cf. the *Recueil de textes et de traductions* publ. by the École des langues orientales vivantes, 1889, I, p. 280.

[6] An example, *Agh.*, V, p. 137, top.

[7] Al-Sarakhsī, *Sharḥ Kitāb al-Siyar al-Kabīr*, fol. 7b [I, 13].

[8] *Agh.*, V, p. 153, 4.

[9] The story in al-Mas'ūdī, V, p. 458, is very instructive in this respect.

[10] Al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 249, 4; *Agh.*, VIII, p. 45, 14, cf. Yāqūt, III, p. 80, 5.

[11] Cf. the passage in Part I, p. 130, note 3.

[12] *Agh.*, X, pp. 159, 3 from the bottom, 160.

[13] Conciliatory theologians have endeavoured to prove the acceptibility of the office of judge under a *sulṭān fā'ir* by theological arguments. The introduction to the *K. Adab al-Qāḍī* by al-Khaṣṣāf (d. 261), who was a practising judge himself, is concerned with such proof.

since he had always shown himself willing to co-operate with the ruling powers.

Ḥadīths which were fabricated or, like the last example given, sanctioned, on official orders did not invariably refer to the great political and dynastic interests of the Umayyad house. Occasionally the rulers desired to alter the rites in a way not in accordance with pious Medinian tradition, and this easily aroused the opposition of those gloomy circles. The official invention of ḥadīths under the Umayyads would be used even for such trivial purposes. Pious sayings were meant to break down the resistance of the pious and to disarm them. Here is an example of such a case. As is well known, on Fridays the Imām makes two speeches (*khuṭba*) to the assembled community in the weekly general gathering. In early times this [41] rite was carried out in the capital by the caliph himself. It is likely that the humble rulers of the patriarchal epoch fulfilled this function standing on a primitive platform (*minbar*);[1] and it is hardly conceivable that of old it was so arranged that the speaker should remain seated during this liturgical speech before the community. But standing in front of the community was apparently not to the taste of proud Umayyad princes. They did, however, value highly ascending the *minbar* as head of the people, and considered this privilege as an important part of their dignity as rulers, as is evident from the panegyrics on the rulers of this dynasty. Mu'āwiya is praised as *'rakūbu'l-manābiri waththābuhā'*[2] after his death. The same image, in which the pulpit figures as mount and the ascending prince as bold rider,[3] appears in a poem which Yaḥyā b. Abī Ḥafṣa addressed to al-Walīd after the death of his father 'Abd al-Malik:

> The pulpits mourned on the day that he ('Abd al-Malik) died; the pulpits mourned the death of their rider;
> When al-Walīd ascended them as caliph, they said: 'this is his son, in his image,' and they were quietened;
> If after him (the father) another had knocked at the pulpits, they would have reared and thrown him.[4]

[1] [This is an error: the *minbar* was originally a kind of tribunal where the head of the community was seated. See C. H. Becker, 'Die Kanzel im Kultus des alten Islam', *Orientalische Studien Th. Nöldeke gewidmet*, I, pp. 331ff. = *Islamstudien*, I, pp. 450ff.; H. Lammens, *Etudes*, pp. 203–8 = *MFOB*, II, pp. 95–100.]

[2] *Agh.*, XVI, p. 34, 20; cf. X, p. 62, 1, about the beautiful spectacle when Mu'āwiya first ascended the *minbar*.

[3] Cf. ibid., X, p. 142, 2.

[4] Ibid., IX, p. 38, 18 ff. Their governors also greatly valued ascending the *minbar*, and in panegyrics addressed to them reference is often made to their function on the *minbar*. Ziyād al-A'jam goes so far as to call a governor 'the best who ascended the pulpit in fear of God after the Prophet', ibid., X, p. 155, 7 from the bottom. An emir of Mecca is praised as *zaynu'l-manābiri yustashfā bi-khuṭbatihi*, *Hudhayl.*, 256:46.

But their aristocratic arrogance—if the mind of those proud Qurayshites is pictured—seems to have revolted at the idea of standing like hired preachers before their subjects. It was also aristocratic arrogance, strengthened by the fear of assassination, which caused the first Mu'āwiya to have boxes (*maqṣūra*) constructed beside the great mosques for himself and his court, contrary to custom, in order to avoid mingling with the people.[1] This Umayyad institution was abolished under the first 'Abbāsids, according to some as early as
[42] under al-Mahdī, according to others only under al-Ma'mūn.[2] The manner of the *khuṭba* was altered for the same considerations. The highest representative of power must be distinguished from paid *khaṭībs* and the dignity of the regent was to be displayed before the people even on this solemn occasion. The *khuṭba* itself gave them considerable uneasiness, though they did not wish to renounce the opportunity to parade at the head of the people. 'Abd al-Malik is said to have given the reason for his early grey hair: 'How can I avoid going grey if I have to expose my esprit to the people once a week.'[3] Thus they endeavoured to achieve an effect at least outwardly corresponding to their position as rulers. The first Umayyads therefore introduced various alteration in the ceremony of the *khuṭba* and its staging in such a way as to divest it of its ancient democratic character. Mu'āwiya had some steps added to the *minbar* so that the representative of the ruling power should occupy, during the act which was solemnly symbolizing it, a more elevated place than was customary in democratic times.[4] Fine *minbars*, made even from metal,[5] were constructed everywhere[6] in order to give the caliph and his lieutenants more weight by a sumptuously set "stage" for the *khuṭba*. In former times things were kept more simple,[7] and 'Umar I destroyed a *minbar* which his govenor 'Amr b. al-'Āṣ had built in Fusṭāṭ. (Perhaps this is a polemical invention meant to protest against tendencies of a later time.)[8] Originally the

[1] Al-Ṭabarī, II, p. 70 ult. [For the *maqṣūra* cf. Lammens, *Études*, pp. 202–3 = *MFOB*, II, pp. 94–5.]

[2] Al-Ya'qūbī, II, p. 571, 15; *Fragm. hist. arab.*, pp. 272, 14; 273, 8. Ibn Khaldūn appears not to believe in the abolition of the *maqṣūras* under the 'Abbāsids, but considers this innovation of the Umayyads as a justifiable institution belonging to the various privileges of the caliphate; he even calls it *sunnat 'Allāh fī-'ibādihi*, *Muqaddima*, p. 225, 2.

[3] *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, p. 177; cf. *al-'Iqd* I, p. 295.

[4] Al-Ya'qūbī, II, p. 283, 15.

[5] Abū'l-Maḥāsin, I, p. 78, ann. 93; p. 350, ann. 132. ['Metal' is due to an error; for *ḥadīd* read *jadīd*, as pointed out by Becker, p. 396.]

[6] A reaction to this is the saying ascribed to the Prophet in which he forbade his companions to erect stone *minbars*, Ibn Ḥajar, IV, p. 188.

[7] For the primitive *minbar* ascended by 'Alī in Kūfa, see al-Ḥartī, *Durrat*, p. 133.

[8] Abū'l-Maḥāsin, I, p. 76. In the year 161 the 'Abbāsid al-Mahdī ordered the

*khuṭba* was given after the general prayer. During the Umayyad [43]
period the caliphs began to give the *khuṭba* of the *'id* before the *ṣalāt* on the pretext that the people might disperse before hearing what they had to say to the congregation.[1] It could have been considered as degrading for the government if the speech made from the pulpit by the ruler or his lieutenant was not as equally well attended as the liturgy itself. For prestige reasons the caliph was now to give one *khuṭba* seated. That this meant a change of the rite of the *khuṭba* is often confirmed by the historians.[2] But this seems to have aroused the disapproval of pious people faithful to the sunna and an official theologian had to be found in order to instruct them:[3] Rajā' b. Ḥaywa (d. 112), otherwise praised as a pious authority—who was considered a sort of adviser in matters of conscience in the court of several Umayyad rulers,[4] asserted that one of the old caliphs, 'Uthmān, upon whom the legitimacy of the dynasty was, as is well known, founded, also used to stand during the first *khuṭba* but delivered the second seated.[5] These circles said even of 'Alī that he delivered the *khuṭba* seated; it is, however, interesting to observe that the significance of this account was already obliterated by the third century, when the victory of the sunna had rendered the stoutly independent attitude of the old Arab rulers no longer comprehensible, and that even al-Jāḥiẓ is only capable of giving a very naive explanation.[6]

How far-reaching were the falsifications inspired by the Umay- [44]
yads in the interests of the privileges claimed by them is evident from the fact that they not only cited 'Uthmān, but even the

[1] According to a report in al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 105, II, p. 26, Marwān first introduced this alteration. Al-Ya'qūbī, II, p. 265, cf. Abū'l-Faraj, *Historia Dynastiarum*, ed. Pocock, p. 194, names Mu'āwiya as its founder. The pro-'Alid historian gives as the reason for this change that the people left the mosques after the *ṣalāt* in order not to be present at defamations of 'Alī in the *khuṭba*.

[2] Al-Ya'qūbī, II, p. 341, 4. Also the governors, Ibn Ḥajar, III, p. 142 (referred back to an earlier time).

[3] *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 64, 2. It is remarkable how great a part is ascribed to this Rajā' in building a new mosque in Jerusalem, which was to serve for the repression of the pilgrimage to Mecca, *ZDPV*, XII, p. 183, cf. *Orient and Occident*, I, p. 448.

[4] *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 7: *anna K.b.H. rawā lahum hādhā fa-akhadhū bihi*, cf. ibid., p. 187.

[5] In Abū'l-Maḥāsin, I, p. 249 the matter is represented differently: it was not Rajā' who invented the tradition; it was he who stated that other people made it up in order to support Umayyad practice.

[6] *Bayān*, fol. 208, [I, 118]: *yurīdu bi-qawlihi qā'idan khuṭbat al-nikāḥ*; here it is related on the authority of al-Haytham b. 'Adī that the *khuṭba* was never given seated.

---

destruction of the *minbars* erected under the Umayyads and reduced them to what was customary in patriarchal times, al-Ṭabarī, III, p. 486.

Prophet as their examples, and that opponents of these falsifications make Jābir b. Samura, a Companion of the Prophet, conclude his description with the words: 'He who tells you that the Prophet delivered the *khuṭba* sitting is a liar.'[1]

IV

If so much trouble was taken by authority to find theological support for such trivial ritualistic details, how much greater must have been the activity shown by the machinery of government in cases concerned with spreading among the masses traditional authority for political and dynastic interests. The greater part of the traditions invented for these purposes were probably due to official initiative and influence. It is expressly reported of the great general al-Muhallab, the scourge of the Khāriǰite dissenters (d. 83), that he was concerned with falsifying traditions to encourage his soldiers against these mutineers.[2] Amongst high officials of the Umayyad dynasty there are several who are accounted as *muḥaddithūn*; to name only Ḥafṣ b. al-Walīd al-Ḥaḍramī (d. 128) and 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Khālid (d. 124).[3] Amongst traditions which the *mawlā* Layth b. Sa'd spread on the authority of the latter there are presumably many which were to benefit the prevailing political tendencies, because this 'Abd al-Raḥmān was for years an important official of Umayyad princes. Al-Nasā'īs strict criticism is lenient towards him, which might not have been the case if al-Nasā'ī had been more closely acquainted with the circumstances. This fact is curiously illuminated by an unintentional, and naive, saying of Ibn 'Awn (d. 151). This refers to Shahr b. Ḥawshab (whose date of death is uncertain; either 98 and 112); he was considered unreliable in his communications because he had accepted a government post.[4]
[45] This view is telling evidence that tendentious traditions were smuggled in through official initiative. Later[5] the real understanding for this phenomenon was lost and al-Bukhārī declared Shahr to be worthy of credit since nothing bad was known about his character.[6] People who were nearer to the conditions of the time could judge things differently, like Ibn 'Awn who lived but a few decades after

[1] Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 109, al-Nasā'ī, p. 215: *fa-man ḥaddathakum anna rasūlallāhi kāna yakhṭubu qā'idan faqad kadhaba.*

[2] Al-Mubarrad, p. 632, 14; *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, p. 106, 2.

[3] Abū'l-Maḥāsin, I, p. 293, 309, cf. p. 325.

[4] In al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 117.

[5] Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal considers Shahr as not worthy of consideration, al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 16.

[6] We find Shahr as an authority in innumerable ḥadīths, e.g. ibid., I, p. 327, 352; II, pp. 11, 81, 88, 97, 210, 244, 260, 267, etc.

Shahr and perhaps had proof that theologians in official position were used—or were willing, without outward pressure, because of their interest in the prevailing power—to put into circulation tendentious traditions.

The fact that, amongst the ḥadīths that have been handed on to us, in spite of their being of a preponderantly tendentious character, the Umayyad ones are not well represented is no proof that they did not exist in a much greater number than they are found in our various collections. Tendentiousness in the field of ḥadīth did not only consist in making new traditions but also included the suppression of existing party arguments. For this we have found examples also in the Umayyad camp. There is no doubt that there existed also a large number of tendentious dynastic traditions in favour of the Umayyads, communications in which the praise and fame of the founder of the dynasty, who was one of the Prophet's companions, as well as of persons and families who supported the Umayyad government, were made into objects of piety, as was later the case with the memory of the persons on whom the family traditions of the hostile dynastic parties were founded. If we bear in mind, however, that the consolidation of the study of traditions continued under the 'Abbāsids, we will understand that utterances friendly to the Umayyads, to the founder and supporters of their dynasty—such as have been preserved, e.g. in the tradition of Islam not approved ecclesiastically—vanished from the mouths of the traditionists.[1]

The example of one ḥadīth may show us of what nature were these tendentious traditions of the Umayyads. It apparently has the purpose of glorifying the position of the Umayyad statesman Khālid al-Qasrī (a successor of al-Ḥajjāj), who was abhorred by all true believers. In the Arab manner this is achieved by putting the ancestors of Khālid in favourable relations with the Prophet. The [46] following ḥadīth does this:

Asad b. Kurz (the assumed ancestor of Khālid)[2] was converted to Islam in company with a man of the tribe of Thaqaf. He presented the Prophet with a bow, and when he handed over this gift the Prophet asked: 'O Asad, where did you get this wood?' 'It grows in our mountains in the Sarāt.' Thereupon the Thaqafite asked: 'O apostle of God, does this mountain belong to us or to them (the B. Asad)' The Prophet replied: 'Verily, this mountain is the Qasr mountain from which Qasr b. 'Abqar (ancestor of Asad) took his name.'[3] Then Asad said: 'O emissary of God, bless me.' The Prophet said: 'O

[1] *Agh.*, XVI, p. 34.
[2] Cf. Part I, p. 188.
[3] See Ibn Durayd, p. 302, 7. There seems to be a corruption in the *Aghānī* text: *bihī summiya Ibrāhīm Qasr 'Abqar*.

God, let thy victory and the victory of thy religion take place through the offspring of Asad b. Kurz.'[1]

The last words without doubt show the cause of the fabrication of this ḥadīth. The deeds of Khālid, his siding against the 'Alids and his action against the pious Muslims were to be justified as furthering the cause of Islam. Such stories had to disappear in the days of the 'Abbāsids.

Official influence did its utmost to prevent the glorification of the memory of the 'son of Hind'. When we hear of al-Ma'mūn that he sent an announcer into the streets in order to declare in the name of the caliph 'that he refuses his protection to anyone who mentions Mu'āwiya favourably,'[2] we may conclude first that as late as during Ma'mūn's time there were still traditions current among the people—perhaps attached to pious authorities—which redounded to Mu'āwiya's honour; as the people of Damascus still in the third century demanded such ḥadīths from al-Nasā'ī (d. 303) in a decidedly importunate manner;[3] secondly that there was official pressure to eradicate such things. For example, al-Bukhārī[4] can no longer give any *manāqib* of Mu'āwiya as sound ḥadīths, though no doubt many existed in the Umayyad period; but these as well as anything
[47] friendly to the Umayyads were officially suppressed and destroyed. In contrast, a large number of ḥadīths were circulated which were intended to show the people the unworthiness of that dynasty. A typical collection of such anti-Umayyad ḥadīths was made at the time of the caliph al-Mu'taḍid (248) and worked up into an edict in which this ruler intended following the measures of al-Ma'mun, just mentioned, to order the cursing of Mu'āwiya as a ritual act.[5]

## V

So far there have been repeated references to the tendentious fabrications of traditions during the first century of Islam and in the course of our further account we shall continue to meet this method of producing religious sources. It is a matter for psychologists to find and analyse the motives of the soul which made such forgeries acceptable to pious minds as morally justified means of furthering

[1] *Agh.*, XIX, p. 54; Yāqūt, IV, p. 93.

[2] *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 370, 14, cf. Abū'l-Maḥāsin, p. 617, penult.

[3] Yāqūt, II, p. 777, 17 ff.

[4] B. *Manāqib*, no. 36, contains a few notes only about *dhikr Mu'āwiya*.

[5] Ṭab, III, pp. 2170 ff. cf. section v of the next chapter. [For the different attitudes towards the memory of Mu'āwiya cf. Goldhizer in *ZDMG*, I, pp. 97–128, 493; LIII, pp. 646; H. Lammens, *Le califat de Yazid Ier*, p. 14= *MFOB*, IV, p. 246; Ch. Pellat, 'Le culte de Mu'āwiya au IIIe siècle de l'Hégire', *Studia Islamica*, VI (1956), pp. 53 ff., with further references.]

a cause which was in their conviction a good one.[1] The most favourable explanation which one can give of these phenomena is presumably to assume that the support of a new doctrine (which corresponded to the end in view) with the authority of Muhammed was the form[2] in which it was thought good to express the high religious justification of that doctrine. The end sanctified the means.[3] The pious Muslims made no secret of this. A reading of some of the sayings of the older critics of the tradition or of the spreaders of traditions themselves will easily show what was the prevailing opinion regarding the authenticity of sayings and teachings handed on from pious men. 'Āṣim al-Nabīl, a specialist in the study of tradition (who died in Baṣra in 212 aged 90), said openly: 'I have come to the conclusion that a pious man is never so ready to lie as in matters of the ḥadīth.'[4] The same has also been said by his Egyptian contemporary Yaḥyā b. Sa'īd al-Qaṭṭān (d. 192).[5] An acknowledgement of this general experience is frequently applied to individual [48]
*muḥaddithūn*. Wakī' says of Ziyād b. 'Abd Allāh that he lies in ḥadīths[6] despite his nobility (*ma'a sharafihi*). This being so, smaller excesses in the *isnād*, obfuscations, had to be treated more leniently. It happens frequently that Muslim critics find themselves in the position of having to testify with regard to the most respected religious authorities that they unconcernedly practised the *tadlīs*,[7] a most leniently judged[8] form of the *dolus* (the two words are connected etymologically)[9] which, it is true, did not influence the essence of the ḥadīth. Yazīd b. Hārūn (d. 206) reported that during his time in Kūfa all spreaders of traditions were *mudallisūn*[10] with the exception of one whom he names. If this assessment is perhaps too severe, it is enough to consider that even men such as the two Sufyān (b. 'Uyayna and al-Thawrī)[11] and others (who otherwise were

[1] *Li-nuṣrat al-sunna*, 'to support the sunna', as it was said, cf. *Literaturgesch. der Šhī'a*, p. 12.

[2] Cf. the pertinent observations of Snouck Hurgronje in *RHR*, XX (1889), p. 77 [= *Verspreide Geschr.*, VI, pp. 86–7]; *Mecca*, II, p. 202.

[3] Cf. Döllinger, *Akademische Vorträge*, I, p. 168, 'Such fabrications . . .'

[4] Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, fol. 25 b; [ed. Hyderabad, p. 84] *mā ra'aytu al-ṣāliḥ yakdhib fī shay' akthar min al-ḥadīth*.

[5] Muslim, introduction, p. 48; cf. Nöldeke, *Geschichte des Qorans*, [Göttingen, 1860] p. XXII.

[6] Al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 203, 14.

[7] Cf. *JASB*, 1856, p. 218, note; Salisbury, p. 92, 1; Risch, p. 20; Sprenger, *Mohammad*, III, p. XCIX, translates it 'dishonesty'.

[8] Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, fol. 99 [ed. Hyderabad, p. 361] The *mudallisūn* are differentiated from actualliars, *al-kadhaba*: Ahlwardt's *Londberg. Samml.* no. 149.

[9] Fränkel, *Aram. Fremdw.*, p. 188; *dalsa* is synonymous with *khad'a*, al-Mas'ūdī, IV, p. 302, ult.

[10] Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, loc. cit.

[11] *Taqrīb*, fol. 40a [*sane* 12 transl. M. Marcais, *JA*, 9th Ser., XVI (1900), p. 523]; cf. Ibn Khaldūn, *Muqaddima*, p. 268, 4.

praised as reliable in ḥadīth and of punctilious piety in their conduct) were nevertheless included in the list of the *mudallisūn*.[1]

The Muslims of the second century were fully aware that to derive a saying from Muhammed was merely a matter of form for acknowledging validity and that among the 'good' ḥadīths many were false. They made the Prophet himself make this observation in a ḥadīth which characterizes the circumstances very tellingly. 'After my departure,' says the Prophet, 'the number of sayings ascribed to me will increase in the same way as sayings have been ascribed to previous prophets. What therefore is told to you as a saying of mine
[49] you will have to compare with the Book of God (the Koran), and what is in accordance with it is by me,[2] whether I have in fact said it myself or not (*fa-ḥuwa 'annī qultuhu aw lam aqulhu*).'[3] It would have been impossible to state more openly that the important thing was not so much the actual authenticity of a saying but its religious correctness, and that it is permissible to hand down sayings and teachings in the name of the Prophet which in fact he had never uttered. 'What is said of good speech I have said myself'—the Prophet is made to put this principle in an even more general form (*mā qīla min qawlin ḥasanin fa-anā qultuhu*).[4]

These principles, which came to be formulated as facts of experience only some decades later, assisted consciously or unconsciously in the formation of tradition and explain the essence of the ḥadīth in its fabricated connection with Mumammed.

The possibilities which the Muslims admit themselves in this field are evident from a tradition in which the authorities seem to give away the secret quite unconsciously: 'The Prophet,' it says in a tradition in al-Bukhārī,[5] 'gave the order to kill all dogs except hunting and sheep-dogs.' 'Umar's son was told that Abū Hurayra also hands down the words: 'but with the exception of farm dogs as well.' 'Umar's son says to this: 'Abū Hurayra owns cornfields,' i.e. he has a vested interest in handing down the order with the addition that farm dogs should be spared as well. This remark of Ibn 'Umar is characteristic of the doubt about the good faith of the transmitters that existed even in the earliest period of the formation of tradition.[6]

[1] Abū'l-Maḥāsin, I, p. 507, 12, cf. Ibn Khaldūn, *Muqaddima*, p. 263, 3. Examples for *tadlīs*: al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 242, 19, II, p. 260, 14; 290, 12.

[2] Even that is not always so. In B. *Ṭibb*, no. 19, the Prophet is made to teach that man is not saved by his own good works but by God's grace (*lan yudkhil aḥadan 'amaluhu'l-jannata*), in direct contrast to Sūra 7:41; 16:34; 43:72.

[3] Al-Jāḥiẓ, *Bayān*, fol. 114 b. [II, p. 28, cf. Schacht, *Origins of Muh. jurispr.*, pp. 28, 45, 253–4].

[4] Ibn Māja p. 4, 9.

[5] *Ṣayd*, no. 6; cf. *Ḥarth*, no. 3; al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 281, 17.

[6] This passage must be considered in relation to the evidence which makes it clear that in earlier times Abū Hurayra was not considered an authority

The historian is, however, more interested in the objective than in the subjective side of this phenomenon and in the effects that such fabrications had upon the circles for whose edification and instruction they were meant.

It seems that teachings presented as sayings of Muhammed were received as such without much probing into the credentials which sought to prove them to be the oral teaching of the Prophet. The [50] carelessness and credulity of people in those days and in those circles are shown in a phenomenon related to matters of tradition which demonstrates even more characteristically the facility with which the quotation of testimony from early times was undertaken.

In order to fix certain legal norms, recourse was had not only to the fabrication of oral traditions but also to the production of written documents which were to be taken as the expression of the wishes of the Prophet. Such documents found easy credence at that time. In the case of a copy, nobody thought of asking for the original, let alone of investigating its credentials.[1] How far enterprising falsifiers dared go is shown for example in the story that, during the time of the last but one Umayyad ruler, the copy of a *ḥilf* document was produced by people who sought to reconcile the northern and southern Arab factions; this document was alleged to have been drawn up on the occasion of the solemn alliance between the Yemenite and Rabī'a Arabs at the time of Tubba' b. Malkikarib, far back in the Jāhiliyya; it was claimed to have been preserved by a descendant of the last independent Ḥimyarite prince living at Kūfa and its text is given in full.[2] It was not difficult to find credence for more recent documents amongst people who were impressed by such productions. It happened for instance that the tariff for the *ṣadaqa* tax for large and small livestock had to be fixed. Different traditions about this were in existence but it was not convenient to derive texts, in which numbers played a decisive part, from the oral tradition of zealous collectors. One quoted even from the oldest times written instructions for the tariffs of tax and ransom money

[1] It is not possible to find out whether the treaties of the Prophet quoted as written documents are an exception as to the authenticity of their wording. W. Muir has supported his assumption of their genuineness with convincing arguments: *Mahomet*, I, p. lxxxii (now cf. Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, IV).

[2] Abū Ḥanīfa, *Dīn*, pp. 352 f. It is notable for the questions dealt with in Part I, pp. 68 and 226–7 that in this document the ratification of the *ḥilf* in the following way: the contracting parties 'mixing their blood, add wine to it and drinking it, cut their forelocks and nails, which the king throws into the sea in a parcel,' ibid, p. 353, 9–11.

worth of much consideration. (Sprenger calls him 'an extreme in pious deception' *Moḥammad*, III, p. lxxxiii). The proofs for this are given in detail in *Ẓāhiriten*, pp. 78–9.

which the Prophet gave to his various governors in all parts of
[51] Arabia.[1] It was these documents the contents of which the traditionists were considered to hand down orally.

But in the interests of traditional accuracy this was not deemed enough. The documents themselves had to be shown, and several seem to have been produced. The family of the first 'Umar preserved such a document, of which 'Umar II, who endeavoured to follow the tradition of the old caliphs in his acts as a ruler, had a copy made for himself; Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī mentions this as an authentic document.[2] Ḥammād b. Usāma, a *mawlā* of the Quraysh tribe in Kūfa (b. 121, d. 201), who was a fertile writer of traditions,[3] produced a document furnished with the seal of the Prophet which he was said to have obtained from a certain Thumāma b. 'Abd Allāh b. Anas; Thumāma declared this document to be an original decree which Abū Bakr addressed to Anas in the name of the Prophet when he began his journey as tax collector (*muṣaddiq*). This is a tariff concerned with all kinds of tax and it is prefaced with the following introduction: 'This is the obligation to pay tax which the Prophet imposed upon the Muslims according to the order of Allāh given to His Prophet. He who demands tax of Muslims according to this law (*'alā wajhihā*), to him must it be given, to him who demands more than that, it should be refused, etc.'[4] Ḥammād himself doubted the genuineness of this document, as appears from his words: *za'ama anna Abū Bakr* etc.; he (Thumāma) pretended that Abū Bakr had written this. '*Za'ama*' (he believes) is as Arab scholars say, 'a *kunya* for the concept of lie.'[5] This word is normally used as introduction
[52] to traditional statements (*za'ama A. 'an B.*) with the supposition that it is rather doubtful that A really heard the contents of it from B.[6],

[1] Tax tariffs for Mu'ādh b. Jabal, *K. al-Kharāj*, p. 31, 18; tariff of the ransom money fixed in writing for 'Amr b. Ḥazm, *al-Muwaṭṭa'*, IV, p. 30. In less well-known ḥadīths other written communications by the Prophet are mentioned, e.g. al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 208, 'Abd Allāh, son of 'Amr b. al-'As, shows a *ṣaḥīfa* in which the Prophet wrote down a *da'wā* formula for Abū Bakr. Ibn Sa'd (turn of the second and third century) talks of documents of Muḥammed and Abū Bakr which were kept in his days in the families of those for whom they were made (in Sprenger, *JASB*, 1856, p. 326, no. 94. [Ibn Sa'd, II, pp. 38 ff. passim]. The descendants of Abū Dumayra show this document of release, which the Prophet gave to their ancestors, so the caliph al-Mahdī (al-Ṭabarī, I, p. 1781, 6).

[2] Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 156.

[3] *Ṭab. Ḥuff.*, VI, no. 71.

[4] Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 155, cf. Sprenger, *JASB*, 1856, p. 317, no. 45. [=al-Khaṭīb, *Taqyīd*, p. 87; for other passages see editor's note].

[5] In al-Damīrī, II, p. 382, 15: *Ḥ-ḥulli shay'in kunyatun wa kunyatu'l-kadhbi za'amā* cf. *Banāt Su'ād*, ed. Guidi, p. 78.

[6] Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 99: *yaz'umu 'an rasūli'llāhi*; Yāqūt, IV, p. 306, 22: *za'ama Abū Ḥiffān 'an Abī Mu'ādh*.

or it is used to cover reports which he who passes them on does not himself quite believe.[1] An unbelieving Beduin says to Muhammed: 'Your emissary wants us to believe (*za'ama lanā*) that you are of the belief (*taz'umu*) that we are obliged to observe five *ṣalawāt*.'[2] The lexicographers, and even more the theologians, teach, however, that *za'ama* also occurs in the general sense of *qāla*, to say,[3] i.e. to communicate something bona fide as true. The former base this on the formula commonly used by Sībawayhi, *za'ama Khalīl*;[4] the latter quote some examples of the ḥadīth (*za'ama Jibra'īl*, etc.).[5] It would not surprise us if some Muslim commentator should attempt to prove the authenticity of the document of Thumāma from this point of view.

VI

In order to evaluate the difference between the points of view of Umayyad and 'Abbāsid rule we must contrast the religious circumstances of the earlier epoch with the spirit prevailing after the rise of the 'Abbāsid dynasty. The change in the government of the state which occurred after the downfall of the Umayyad dynasty can be studied from many different vantage points, and whichever is chosen the essential change in the circumstances of the new regime [53] will be clearly evident. In the first part of this book we had the opportunity to consider the national side of political life and to learn that the national Arab character of the Islamic state declined with the beginning of the 'Abbāsid rule,[6] and foreign elements came to the fore. The religious side of government, on the other hand, was much strengthened. For this the foreign elements which only gained prevalence now were anything but a hindrance. The Persian *mawālī*, not to name other elements, transferred their own religious traditions

[1] E.g. Part I, p. 181, note 2; Yāqūt, II, p. 343, 14: *za'ama li ba'ḍ ahl bādiyat Tayyi'*; Abū Ḥanīfa Dīnaw., p. 306, 16: 'He (Mukhtār) is a liar, he pretends (*yaz'umu*) to honour Banū Hāshim, whereas in reality he pursues wordly interests'; cf. *Agh.*, XI, p. 164, penult. Notice also prooimion to *Bar Bahlūl's Lexic. Syriac.*, ed. Duval, I, c. 3., ult.

[2] Al-Dārimī, p. 87.=al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 120.

[3] In this sense *za'm* (*al-qawl*) is supposed to be 'speaker' and to belong to the last group of words discussed by Nöldeke, *ZDMG*, XLII, p. 481: schol. to *Ham.*, p. 704, v.l; cf. also D. H. Müller, *Burgen und Schlösser*, II, p. 44, note.

[4] E.g. *K. Sībawayhi*, II, p. 429, 11; 436, 9; 445, 4, etc.; *za'ama Abū'l-Khaṭṭāb*, p. 448, 1.

[5] Al-Nawawī, I, p. 27; Abū'l-Baqā', *Kulliyyāt*, p. 200; de Goeje, *Gloss. Fragm.*, s.v., p. 33; cf. B. *Tafsīr*, no. 8; *fa-za'ama Maḥmūd annahu samā'a* etc. The Muslim exegesis declares here too *za'ama=akhbara* (al-Qasṭallānī, II, p. 387, 1) but from the concluding passage it is evident that the correctness of Maḥmūd's saying is doubted.

[6] Abū Ḥan. Dīn., p. 360, 15, and al-Maqrīzī, ed. Vos, pp. 51, 56, may also be adduced.

from their original environment into the new circles; they had only to translate their inherited religious sense into Islamic idiom. They were rather more fitted for this than were the original Arab elements who inwardly rejected Islam and who had not been prepared by their past to create a higher social and moral conception of life from its seeds. Whereas the Umayyad rule was entirely secular—with the exception of the episode of 'Umar II's reign—and was little permeated by religious motives in its forms and aims, the 'Abbāsid rule bore from the beginning the hallmark of a religious institution. This had its root in the traditions of the Banū Hāshim. It is related that 'Abd al-Malik said: 'While the poets praise the Banū Hāshim for their religious practices, their prayers throughout the day and night, their fasting and reading of the Koran, the same poets in their panegyrics liken the Umayyads to roaring lions, steep mountains and salt seas.'[1] This comparison is borne out by examination of the relevant literature, of which we shall have the opportunity to give a few examples below.

The Umayyad king[2] has his counterpart in the 'Abbāsid caliph in his character of a religious leader; though he was not at the apex of a hierarchy, he was a hierarch himself, ruler not only of the state but also of the state church. He surrounded himself with theocratic
[54] attributes and wished to assert himself as Imām.[3] He felt himself to be the successor of the Prophet in the spiritual leadership of the community, the holder of a dignity established by God. The insignia of the Umayyads were the sceptre and the state seal[4] and were passed on in succession;[5] to this the 'Abbāsids added the mantle, *al-burda*, of the Prophet,[6] which is the one which the Prophet is said to have presented to the poet Ka'b b. Zuhayr for his panegyric *Bānat Su'ād*. The first 'Abbāsid caliph had already acquired this relic,[7] which was inherited by his successors.[8] This mantle was worn

[1] *Agh.*, XXI, p. 10. It hardly needs proof that 'Abd al-Malik did not make this remark himself.

[2] Cf. above p. 40 Al-Faraẓdaq uses of Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik the epithet *mumallak*, *Agh.*, XIX, p. 15, 23, cf. Mehren, *Rhetorik der Araber*, p. 17, 1. Al-Walīd b. Yazīd, 'above whose forehead the light of *mulk* shines' says Ibn Mayyāda (*Khizānat al-Adab*, I, p. 328, 19).

[3] Umayyad rulers are also occasionally called Imām: Jarīr [*Dīwān*, ed. al-Ṣāwī, p. 24, 9] *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 34, 3 from below = *Hist. Chalif. Sokjmani*, ed. Anspach, p. 41, 4, cf. *Fragm.*, p. 145, 12.

[4] In eschatology the seal (of Sulaymān) and staff (of Moses) are put also in the hand of the *dābbat al-arḍ*, al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 206, top.

[5] *Al-qaḍīb wa-khātam al-khilāfa*, *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 82, 9, cf. p. 124, 3.

[6] Al-Ṭabarī, III, p. 455; al-Mas'ūdī, VII, p. 369, cf. *Fragm. hist. arab.*, pp. 341, 4, 415 penult. (Cf. also R. Basset, *La Bānat Soʿād*, Algiers, 1910, pp. 30–1, and 'Burda' in *EI* 2nd ed.)

[7] *Fragm. hist. arab.*, pp. 208, penult, 283, 5. It seems a fable that the Umayyads already owned this treasure (al-Mas'ūdī, V, p. 188, 8, Ibn Hishām,

by them at the first paying of homage by their subjects,[3] at all festive occasions, at solemn, and also martial, events.[4] In particular, they appeared wrapped in this sacred relic while performing the public *ṣalāt* before the community.[5] At important state functions, when the mantle was not used as clothing it was spread in front of the caliph.[6] It was quite different with the Umayyads: the king of this dynasty did not consider it inappropriate to appear in full military armour for the *'īd* service.[7] The *burda* was meant to indicate that the 'Abbāsids were the true caliphs and successors of the Prophet: it was to represent the theocratic character of their caliphate and to prove the exclusive right of the possessor of this relic to the theocratic office, as against other pretenders. The prince and poet 'Abd Allāh b. al-Mu'tazz used this argument in order to refute the claims of the 'Alids.[8] [55]

The 'Abbāsids surrounded their sceptre with a theocratic nimbus. They spoke of 'the light of the caliphate'[9] and even of 'the light of prophecy' which shines from the forehead of the prince.[8] It was said, in these very words: 'Hārūn al-Rashīd permitted himself to be praised with things by which only the prophets were praised; he did not disapprove of it and did not refuse it.'[9] Zealous admirers when mentioning the caliphs use the eulogy[10] which otherwise is permissible only after the name of the Prophet and is applied also to 'Alī and the 'Alids only by some zealous Shī'ites. Special blessing is

[3] Probably also in earlier times, but my evidence for it is only from the year 622 (enthronement of al-Ẓāhir, after the report of an eye-witness in al-Suyūṭī, *Ta'rīkh*, p. 11, 9.

[4] *Recueil Seldj.*, II, p. 237, 5.

[5] During the flooding of Baghdad (466) the caliph al-Qā'im held a public prayer of expiation, wrapped in the *burda* and carrying the *qaḍīb*; Ibn al-Athīr, X, p. 34.

[6] *Recueil Seldj.*, II, p. 13, penult.: *ma-biyadīki al-burda wa'l-qaḍīb*.

[7] Yazīd b. al-Walīd; al-Suyūṭī, *Ta'rīkh*, p. 98, 4, bottom.

[8] Quṭb al-Dīn, *Chron. Mekka*, p. 154, 8. [*Dīwān*, Cairo, 1831, p. 6, 15]. The pro-'Alid poet Ṣafī al-Dīn al-Ḥillī (d. 750) refuted the poem of Ibn al-Mu'tazz in a poem composed in the same rhyme-form and the same metre; from it the points of controversy between the 'Abbāsids and the 'Alids can be seen; al-Kutubī, *Fawāt al-Wafayāt*, I, pp. 243 f.

[9] Isḥāq al-Mawṣilī, *Agh.*, V. p. 116, 7.

[8] *Recueil Seldj.*, II, p. 237, 4.

[9] *Agh.*, XII, p. 18, 8 from the bottom.

[10] *Amīr al-mu'minīn salāmāt Allāh 'alayhi*, *Recueil Seldj.*, II, p. 240, ult.

---

ed. Guidi, p. 6, 7 from below, *ZDMG*, X p. 448, note 4): certain of which was made up to prove its genuineness. At any rate, it is certain that the *burda* is never met with in the Umayyad period as one of the insignia of the ruler.

[8] These insignia were carried off by Seljuk enemies under the caliph al-Mustarshid, *Recueil de textes relatives à l'histoire des Seldjoucides*, ed. Houtsma, II, p. 242, 1.

said to emanate from the personal appearance and presence of the caliph.[1]

Adherence to this sacred person is an integral element in Muslim belief. 'He who does not cling to the *amīn Allāh*, "the confidant of God"—by which the caliph is to be understood[2]—will not benefit by the five *ṣalawāt*.'[3] For the caliph of patriarchal times the epithet 'the best of the Qurayshites' was sufficient[4] (Abū Bakr refused even
[56] this on his accession),[5] but the 'Abbāsids have their court poets give them a title which was otherwise applied only to the Prophet:[6] 'the best of all creatures'.[7] Eventually the caliphs hear this epithet so often that they apply it to themselves in their own speeches.[8]

The Umayyads were overthrown by them because of their godlessness and opposition to religion;[9] this political upheaval, which in the first instance was effected by Abū Muslim—the man with the 'cudgel for the unbelievers'[10]—was meant primarily to be the establishment of the pillar of *dīn*.[11] The new dynasty became intolerant towards the practice of other religions and this marks a morally retrogressive step in comparison with the Umayyads.[12] The representatives of the new regime give themselves the appearance, at least outwardly, of having come to inaugurate government regime

[1] There are many examples of this in the passages of the Seljuq chronicle of 'Imād al-Dīn al-Kātib al-Iṣfahānī (see al-Bundārī, ed. Houtsma), in which the caliph, who was a powerless shadow at the time of the events narrated in this chronicle, now and then appears, e.g. *barakat ḥarakatihi*, II, p. 289, ult. ff.

[2] We meet this title also in the earliest times (address of the poet Hawdha to 'Umar I, *Khizānat al-Adab*, I, p. 166, 23) and in respect of the Umayyad ruler; al-Mas'ūdī, V, p. 309, 1, 458, 6; also of the Umayyads in Spain, *al-'Iqd*, II, p. 360, 11, 21.

[3] Al-Namirī, of the caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd: *Man lam yakun bi'amīni'llāhi mu'taṣiman fa-laysa bi'l-ṣalawāti'l-khamsi yantafi'u*, *Agh.*, XVII, p. 142, 3; the first heuristic is given differently in *Agh.*, XII, p. 20, 13.

[4] *'Umaru Khayru Qurayshin*; Abū Ḥan. Dīn., p. 190, 11.

[5] *Wa-lastu bikhayrikum*, Ṭab., I, p. 1829, 3.

[6] Even the Prophet rejects, according to a tradition, this address, which is to be reserved for Ibrāhīm only. Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 173. During pagan times this title was much used in panegyric *qaṣīdas*, al-Nābigha, 18:5; 'Abd Yaghūth, *Agh.*, XV, p. 75, 23: *khayr al-bariyyati mīlidan wamaḥtaru* (cf. Zuhayr, 4:4 = Landberg p. 146, v. 2: *khayri'l-budāti wa-sayyidi'l-ḥaḍri*) and in Islamic poetry this free usage which the old poet had made of the title still finds echo, e.g. Ibn Hishām p. 801, 1; *Agh.*, XI, p. 68, 21; cf. Yāqūt, II, p. 886, 2.

[7] With reference to al-Amīn, *Agh.*, XXI, p. 17, 7, to al-Mutawakkil, Yāqūt, II, p. 87, 21; cf. Ṭab., II, p. 2098, 13.

[8] Al-Qā'im says: *naḥnu Banu'l-'Abbās khayru'l-nās*, *Recueil seldj.* ed. Houtsma, p. 20, 17.

[9] Abū Ḥan. Dīn., p. 367, 18; al-Ya'qūbī, II, p. 427, 15.

[10] Cf. Houtsma, 'Bih'afrīd', in *WZKM*, III, p. 36; cf. for *kāfir kūbāt*, *Agh.*, IV, p. 93, 21; van Guelder, *Mochtār, de valsche profeet*, p. 73.

[11] Agh., XXI, p. 87, 2: *wa-shāidta ruknu'l-dīni*.

[12] See an example in my article, *ZDMG*, XXXVIII, p. 674.

in the spirit of the Prophet and the old caliphs. 'The *amīr al-mu'minīn* Muhammed has revived the sunna of the Prophet with regard to what is permitted, what forbidden'; thus the poet Marwān b. Abī Ḥafṣa, a client of the Umayyad Marwān b. al-Ḥakam, praises the caliph al-Mahdī, and the latter was pleased to hear the compliment. The princely reward of 60,000 dirham and exquisite clothes were the reward of the poet for the panegyric of which this line is the climax.[1] Apart from 'Umar II, such a poem could not have been dedicated to any Umayyad; but al-Mahdī was not the only 'Abbāsid to whom such praise could be applied.[2]

The princes were keen to exhibit practical piety in this sense. [57]
Haughty behaviour seems to have been found only amongst the first of the 'Abbāsids and the Barmakids contributed much to that. But it is almost impossible to imagine, in reference to an Umayyad, the humility said to have been shown by al-Mutawakkil, a monster of cruelty and vengefulness. When this caliph pontificated before the assembled people at the Feast of the end of Ramaḍān, the population were extraordinarily enthusiastic in their homage and thronged to a depth of four miles to pay homage to the caliph as he entered the mosque. When he returned to his palace he put a handful of dust upon his head,[3] saying: 'I have seen the cheering crowds and it befits me now to be humble before God.'[4]

These caliphs submitted to the divine law even in respect of their own persons, just as they required this of their subjects. Only under the 'Abbāsids was it possible to award the epithet 'god-fearing' to the caliph.[5] Even as early as in his time al-Manṣūr allowed a case that one of his subjects brought against him to be decided by a judge of the religious law. Few of the princes of the Umayyad dynasty would have tolerated that, and a comparatively unbiased historian of the two dynasties comments on this incident that the imāms excel the kings (probably meaning the Umayyad princes, see above, p. 40) in that they willingly subordinate themselves to the ordinances of religious law (*bi'l-tawāḍu' ilā awāmir al-sharī'a*).[6] This must have enhanced their aura of religiousness.

It is true that during the full flowering of 'Abbāsid rule the court at Baghdād was not less gay than the Umayyad court at Damascus; though even in this place of joy the pietist spirit takes hold—in the harem of Zubayda (wife of Hārūn al-Rashīd) a hundred odalisques

[1] *Agh.*, IX, p. 45, 20: *abyā amīru'l-mu'minīna Muḥammadun***sunana'l-nabiyyi ḥarāmahā wa-ḥalālahā.*

[2] Al-Mutawakkil, above.

[3] Cf. *ZDMG*, XLII, p. 590, note 3.

[4] Al-Ṭabarī, III, p. 1455.

[5] Abū Nuwās, in Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, in Freytag's *Chrestom. Arab.*, p. 87, 3 from the bottom.

[6] *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 269, 9.

hum the Koran 'like a hive of bees'[1]—in general little attention is paid to the punctilio of the law. There is gay song and bold drinking; while theologians dispute the *ḥadd* of drinking wine the
[58] emir of the true believers and his courtiers indulge with singing girls and gay persons in the forbidden beverage.[2] The caliph al-Mutawakkil, who re-established the orthodox dogma which his predecessors had impaired, was an immoderate drinker in his own palace.[3] Kremer has described this side of Baghdād court life in a vivid picture to which we refer readers.[4] But it must be remembered that side by side with the inner life of the court there is, in comfortable contrast, a quickening religious interest, such as was inconceivable before, and yet diametrically opposed to this way of life. In public and particularly in official life the religious law had to be strictly followed. Under the Umayyad caliphs a wine feast could be held even in the mosque;[5] but this was unthinkable under the 'Abbāsids. The caliph who leads a gay life with his courtiers does not extend it beyond his palace. To the outside world he wishes to be the imām, a representative of religious dignity and to carry out, and have carried out, the religious laws.[6] The caliph al-Qāhir (320–2) who took strict measures against wine drinkers, singers, and singing girls 'was hardly ever found sober'.[7] There were people who did not overlook the hypocrisy implied in such behaviour: 'They (the caliphs and their courtiers) drink wine while imposing legal punishment upon other drinkers'—thus Sufyān al-Thawrī is said to have characterized the religious state of affairs in an outspoken epistle to Hārūn al-Rashīd.[8] A poet says: 'While his (Ibn Abī Duwād's) companions drink into the early hours of the morning they profoundly investigate the problem of whether the Koran is created.'[9]

A strong interest in problems of religious doctrine is patronized from above. It is typical that even during a drinking bout religious matters (*fī amr al-dīn wa'l-madhāhib*) are discussed.[10] Even the most liberal-minded among the 'Abbāsid caliphs, such as al-Ma'mūn, demonstrate their liberalism by fostering religious and dogmatic
[59] speculation. Al-Ma'mūn himself is said to have written some

[1] Abū'l-Maḥāsin, I, p. 632, 3f.

[2] Scenes such as *Agh.*, XXI, p. 239, top, are among many such depictions of this time.

[3] See the story in *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 554, bottom, not to mention other examples.

[4] *Culturgesch.*, II, pp. 62–86.

[5] Abū'l-Maḥāsin, I, p. 242.

[6] Cf. Aug. Müller, *Isl.*, I, pp. 470, 537.

[7] Abū'l-Maḥāsin, II, p. 254.

[8] Al-Ghazālī in al-Damīrī (s.v. *al-faras*), II, p. 256, 1.

[9] In al-Suyūṭī, *Ta'rīkh*, p. 142, 3.

[10] *Agh.*, VI, p. 179.

theological treatises.[1] The apparently liberal teachings which the 'fanatical good sense' (a phrase of Karl Hase's)[2] emanating from the caliph's court wishes to establish, are spread by means of religious fanaticism; not in the name of freedom of thought but in the belief that these teachings correspond to orthodox dogma.[3] In the same way their iconoclastic colleagues in Byzantium declared war against the worship of images, not so much from motives of common sense but in the name of the orthodox dogma. The inquisitors of liberalism were possibly even more appalling than their literalist brethren; their fanaticism is certainly more repugnant than that of their imprisoned and maltreated victims.

The Umayyad prince had a worldly education. From the Islamic point of view some of the princes were such as to make them utterly unsuitable to lead the community in prayer and their testimony invalid in the sense of the religious law.[4] It must have been a peculiar atmosphere in which al-Walīd II grew up, who hardly 110 years after the Prophet answered the threats of the Koran against 'the stubborn opponents' (14:8,9)[5] by making the Koran the target for his arrows, saying:

> You hurl threats against the stubborn opponent, well then, I am a stubborn opponent myself.
> When you appear before God at the day of resurrection just say: My Lord, al-Walīd has torn me up.[6]

In these people Arab paganism had survived. The theological element has a large part in the education of 'Abbāsid princes. Al-Ma'mūn had to listen to lectures by *fuqahā'* and *muḥaddithūn*,[7] and this explains his continued interest for the finer points of Mu'tazilite dogma. When Hārūn al-Rashīd heard of the great work of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Shaybānī on the Islamic law of war, he sent the princes with their tutors to hear the lectures in which the author [60] delivered the contents of the book.[8] The 'Abbāsids' interest in canonical studies increased in the same measure as their political

[1] *Fihrist*, p. 116.

[2] *Handbuch der protestantischen Polemik* (1st ed.), p. 321.

[3] Cf. *ZDMG*, XLI, p. 68, bottom.

[4] *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 131, 5 from the bottom.

[5] Pious people seem to have applied this phrase from the Koran to him, al-Mas'ūdī, V, p. 360, ult., as well as to Yazīd I, Abū Ḥanīfa Dīnāw., p. 279, 11, to Mu'āwiya I, al-Mas'ūdī, V, p. 99, 4, and to al-Ḥajjāj, ibid., p. 337, ult.

[6] Al-Mas'ūdī, VI, p. 10, (ed. F. Gabrieli, in *RSO*, 1934, p. 42, no. 27). There are interesting facts about the freedom in religious matters of these Umayyads in *Agh.*, VI, p. 141, *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 114.

[7] Al-Ya'qūbī, II, p. 507, 3; cf. *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 321, 11.

[8] Al-Sarakhsī in the introduction to his *Sharḥ K. al-Siyar al-Kabīr*, fol. 5a., [I, p. 4.]

influence was taken away by governors and usurpers.[1] The less they were true kings the more they became imāms. The less they had their say in temporal affairs the more they adopted pompous theocratic titles and granted high-sounding epithets (*alqāb*) to their vassals and followers.[2] These *alqāb* were conferred by decree[3] and the same method was followed in adding a new one to existing honorary titles.[4]

> Why do I see the Banū'l-'Abbās invent so many *kunyas* and honorary titles?
> Few are the drachmas in the hands of our caliph; therefore he presents people with titles.[5]

Then was their custom ridiculed by the poet Abu Bakr al-Khārizmī[6] in the fourth century. This example shows that at the time when the caliphs had to give up their worldly powers in favour of upstart vassals the poets dared to ridicule even the throne. Abū Ya'lī b. al-Habbāriyya (d. 504),[7] who himself had the by-name of al-'Abbāsī, called the caliph in a satirical sketch: 'the poor Muqtadī, without brains, understanding, or feeling.'[8]

Historians of literature report of a Baghdād poet of the fifth century, Hibat Allāh b. al-Faḍl b. al-Qaṭṭān (d. 498), that nobody could escape his ridicule, *lā al-khalīfa wa-lā ghayrahu*, 'neither the caliph nor anybody else.'[9]

[61] Among the signs of the enhanced theocratic dignity of 'Abbāsid rulers the most suggestive is the fact that the title *khalīfat Allāh*, 'representative of God' (which occurs also earlier)[10] and other synonymous designations became more and more general, even

[1] A historian expresses this state of affairs: the caliph was *maḥkūm 'alayhi, addāllamenta* to Ibn Khallikān, ed., Wüstenfeld, I, p. 34, 2.

[2] Ibn Khaldūn, *Muqaddima*, pp. 190 ff.; *ZDMG*, XXVIII, p. 306; Kremer, *Geschichte der herrschenden Ideen [des Islams: Der Gottesbegriff, die Prophetie, und Staatsidee*, Leipzig, 1868], p. 417. [See also al-Birūnī, *al-Āthār al-Bāqiya*, pp. 132 f., quoted by A. Mez, *Die Renaissance des Islâms*, p. 133.]

[3] Cf. Derenbourg, *Ousama ibn Mounkidh un émir Syrien*, etc. I, p. 15, note 2.

[4] *Al-Bayān al-Mugḥrib*, I, p. 283. Later it happened that after the father's death the son inherited the *laqab* of the latter, as is seen in Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, II, pp. 26, 109 (fourth century Egypt).

[5] Part I, p. 242.

[6] *Yatīmat al-Dahr*, IV, p. 145: *mā lī ra'aytu Banī'l-'Abbāsi qad fataḥū/ mina'l-kunā wa-mina'l-alqābi abwābā* [6] *galla'l-darāhimu fī kaffay khalīfatina /hākdā fa'anfaqa fī'l-aqwāmi alqābā.*

[7] Cf. for his poetical work Derenbourg, Escur, I, p. 318, no. 474. [*al-Sādiḥ wa'l-Bāgiḥu*, see *GAL* I, p. 293, *SI*, p. 447].

[8] *Recueil Soldj.*, ed. Houtsma, II, p. 65, 11.

[9] Al-Kutubī, *Fawāt al-Wafayāt*, II, p. 314, 25.

[10] Regarding 'Uthmān, Ḥassān b. Thābit, *Dīwān*, p. 98, 15. ed. Hirschfeld, XX, 9.]

popular.[1] When the Umayyads used this pretentious title[2] it was merely intended to convey the unlimited power of the ruler. Under the 'Abbāsids[3] the title was filled with theocratic content in accordance with their general view of the nature and duties of the caliphate.[4] The 'Abbāsid caliphs considered themselves to be the representatives of 'God's rule on earth'[5] and even as 'God's shadow on earth'. The ruler was to personify the power of which it was taught: *al-sulṭānu ẓillu'llāhi fi'l-arḍi ya'wī ilayhi kullu malhūfin*, 'the government is God's shadow on earth, all those troubled find refuge in it.'[6] What this sentence attributed to the Prophet taught about the institution of secular authority, the 'Abbāsids eagerly referred to [62] their own person.[7] As late as the eighth century the puppet caliph of Egypt guarded by the Mamluk sultans is addressed in a ridiculous document of homage as 'God's lieutenant on earth' (*nā'ib Allāh fī arḍihi*).[8] From the 'Abbāsid caliphs these pompous theocratic

[1] In the *Arabian Nights*, 894, Būlāq, ed. 1279, IV, p. 198, 7, 5 from the bottom, Maryam al-Zunnāriyya is made to address the caliph Hārūn as *khalīfat Allāh fi arḍihi*; it is unnecessary to seek a polemic meaning in this (*ZDMG*, XXXIV, p. 613).

[2] Miskīn al-Dārimī's address to the Umayyads assembled round Mu'āwiya I is typical, *Basā Khulafā'i-'Llāhi, Agh.*, XVIII, p. 71, penult. According to al-Ṭabarī, II, p. 78, 10, the poet Ḥāritha b. Badr addressed Mu'āwiya I by this title; cf. al-Mas'ūdī, V, pp. 105, 1, 152, 7, 330, 6 ('Abd al-Malik); in a song of the camel-drivers 'Abd al-Malik is called *khalīfat Allāh, Agh.*, XV, p. 6, 12.

[3] *Agh.*, III, p. 95, 5; IX p. 44, 4; XXI p. 128, 5; al-Māwardī, ed. Enger, p. 22: *imāmu al-muslimīn wa-khalīfat rabb al-'ālamīn; al-'Iqd*, III, p. 30, 3 from the bottom; cf. ibid, p. 32, 14. Ṭab., III, p. 2177, 9: in an edict of Mu'taḍid the 'Abbāsids are called: *khulafā' Allāh wa-a'immat al-hudā*.

[4] Only later is this title found inadmissible by theologians in an entirely theoretical discussion. Al-Nawawī, who devotes a paragraph of his *Manhūrāt*, fol. 32a, to this question, finds that it is not permissible to use this title; only Adam and David, who are called this in the Koran, have a claim to it. Ibn Khaldūn also discusses this controversial question in an account of his theory of the caliphate, *Muqaddima*, p. 159, plt.

[5] Ṭab., III, p. 426, 16: al-Manṣūr says of himself: *innamā anā sulṭān Allāh fī arḍihi*.

[6] In al-Shaybānī, *K. al-Siyar*, fol. 8b [I, p. 15.] = *WJL*, XL, p. 50, no. 24, this sentence; according to *Anṣāb al-Ashrāf*, p. 33, top, the Umayyad 'Abd al-Malik already makes use of this saying, but it may be assumed that a later opinion has been here dated back to an earlier period.[ Cf. Goldziher, 'Du sens propre des expressions Ombre de Dieu, etc.', *RHR*, XXXV (1897)].

[7] Al-Mas'ūdī, VII, p. 278, *ẓill Allāh al-mamdūd baynahu wa-bayna khalqihi*; cf. ibid, VIII, p. 135; *al-ẓill al-imāmī, Recueil saldj.*, II, p. 242, 2; cf. al-Tha'ālibī, *ZDMG*, V, p. 180, no. 12. The Shī'ites call their *ṣāḥib al-zamān* thus, *Kashkūl*, p. 88, 10.

[8] Al-Suyūṭī, *Ta'rīkh*, p. 198, penult. (Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī calls Muhammed in a passage of his *Waṣiyya* in Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, II, p. 28, 9, *nā'ib Allāh*). This title was given as easily as that of 'shadow of God'. Not only the sultans of Morocco but also Indian princelets call themselves 'lieutenants of God' [*Verspreide Geschriften*, ii, p. 208]. Snouck Hurgronje, *Kritik der Beginselen v.V.d.B.*, 2nd part, p. 68.

titles, which must have appeared to contemporaries the emptier the less of real power corresponded to them, were at all times and in all countries transferred to the real temporal rulers[1] and were even applied to minor princelets by flattering courtiers.[2] The Ottoman sultans were, as the protagonists of Islam, thought to have a special claim for adopting these titles of the old caliphs,[3] just as the name *khalīfat Allāh* was transferred to them.[4]

Out of the wide field of political sovereignty the 'Abbasīd ruler [63] had to be satisfied with the sadly reduced privilege of having his name put on coins and hearing it resound from the pulpits (*al-sikka wa'l-khuṭba*). Al-Muṭī' (334–63) finds himself in such a position that he is able to answer Bakhtiyār when he came to ask the caliph for funds to fight disturbances in the capital: 'In the circumstances I am living in, when I have no right or say over the income of the state, I am not obliged to provide the means for the Muslim's welfare; this duty falls to those who have the power, I possess nothing beyond the *khuṭba*.'[5] But even this last vestige of outward manifestation of rule had ceased by that time to indicate the power of the ruler, as had happened under the Umayyads (cf. above, p. 50). The humiliated caliph was unable to appear personally in the place of assembly at the head of his people in order to perform the sacred rites, and al-Rāḍī (322–9) was the last to ascend the *minbar*.[6] Thus 'coin' and '*khuṭba*' soon became synonyms for ridiculous

[1] The Persian poet Sa'dī bestows this title upon the Ilkhān (*sāya-'i-khudā*) *ZDMG*, IX, p. 135 v. 80. (*Kulliyyāt*, ed. Furūghī, section *qaṣā'id*, p. 41, ult.] as well as upon the Atabeg Muẓaffar al-Dīn b. Sa'd b. Zengī (*Gulistān, dībāja*, ed. Gladwin, p. 7, 10). The Tartar prince Öljaytu (in Fleischer, Leip. Cat p. 352a), in the same way as the later Tatar conqueror Muḥammad Shaybānī is called by his panegyrist *tingri sāyasi* and *khalīfa-i-Raḥmān* (*Die Schejbanïade*, ed. Vámbéry, p. 22, v. 27, cf. *ẓill-i-khudā*, ibid. p. 266, v. 103). The same title was also given to the Mamluk sultan in Egypt, al-Ḥasan al-'Abbāsī, *Āthār al-Uwal fī Tartīb al-Duwal*, p. 69.

[2] The Naṣrid prince in Andalusia was called thus, M. J. Müller, *Geschichte der westlichen Araber*, p. 15, 8. The modern philologist Fāris al-Shidyāq addresses the Bey of Tunis: *ẓill al-illāhī ZDMG*, V, p. 232, v. 52.

[3] The conqueror of Constantinople, Sultan Muḥammad II, is called *ẓill Allāh 'alā'l-'ālamīn* in the introduction to his work (ed. Cairo p. 3, 18) by Mullāh Khōjn-zāde (father of the famous Tashköprü-zāde) who wrote, commissioned by the sultan, a dogmatic-polemic work entitled *Tahāfut al-Falāsifa* modelled on al-Ghazālī's work of the same title. Cf. also Quṭb al-Dīn, *Chron. d. St Mekka*, pp. 4, 3 from the bottom; 6, 9, 17; 330, 12; *ZDMG*, XIII, p. 179, 21; XV, p. 319, 3, from the bottom; XLII, p. 577, v. 24; *Mélanges orient.* (Paris, 1883), p. 83, penult, II (1886), p. 75.

[4] Fleischer, *Kleinere Schriften*, III, p. 112.

[5] Ibn al-Athīr, VIII, p. 222, ann. 361.

[6] Abū'l-Maḥāsin, II, p. 294, 4 [al-Tanūkhī, *Nishwar al-Muḥadara*, II, p. 196; Ibn al-Athīr p. 319].

formality and empty pretence[1] because, just as the names of the real rulers (once even that of a woman who was able to call herself 'queen of the Muslims', *malikat al-muslimīn*)[2] appeared next to those of the caliphs on the coinage, so they were also mentioned from the pulpit.[3] The imām compensates for the gradual decay of all his worldly power by unctuous exhortations[4] which he addresses to the incomparably mightier vassals in his capacity as religious head; [64] investing the vassal with the investiture valued by the latter[5] because the imām's sanction gives him an increased status before the people. The recognition of the vassal's power is accepted as undisputed fact even by the caliphs, who at the most still have the role of arbiter when there are disputes between various local rulers.[6] This office is exercised by the caliph in his capacity of spiritual head of Islam. Gradually the ruler is displaced by the pontifex and the representatives of this dignity increasingly emphasize the spiritual character of their office, which impressed the people who had always shown a tendency to consider the caliph's person as especially favoured by God's grace.[7]

The belief that the person of the caliph was a support to the order of the universe was much fostered. It was believed, despite the frequent experience of the caliph being murdered, that if he were killed it would disturb the course of nature, the sun would darken, rain would fall and all vegetation wither.[8] Even the mighty vassals

[1] Towards the end of the Baghdād rule their originated the proverb: *qani'a fulān bi'l-sikka wa'l-khuṭba* 'he was satisfied with the coin and *khuṭba*,' i.e. he is master of something only in name, but has in reality no say; al-Fakhrī, p. 38.

[2] In the seventh century, the Egyptian princess Shajarat al-Durr; for such a *dīnār* (in the British Museum) see *Bulletin de l'Institut égyptien*, series 2, no. 9 (1888), pp. 114 ff.

[3] Examples of the *sikka* are afforded by the observation of coins of such local rulers; I mention as example *JRAS*, 1886, p. 515. The first whose name was mentioned with that of a caliph in Baghdād in the *khuṭba* was the Būyid 'Aḍud al-Dawla, Ibn al-Athīr, VIII, p. 229, ann. 367. [ed. Thornb. VIII, p. 229]. A Būyid boasts: *Atmā'unā fī-wajhi kulli dirhamin/wa-fawqa kulli minbarin li-khāṭibi* (*Yatīmat al-Dahr*, II, p. 6). In the provinces the regent's name was also mentioned in the *khuṭba* before the date given above. Al-Mutanabbī says of Sayf al-Dawla that his name sounded from all pulpits, was missing from no dīnār or dirhem (Rosen-Girgas, *Arab. Chrestom.*, p. 544, v. 9). In the capital the privilege of the caliphs seems to have been respected for longer. Interesting details about the circumstances in Egypt are to be found in al-Suyūṭī, *Ta'rīkh*, p. 200, 14; *Āthār al-Uwal*, pp. 119–20.

[4] E.g. *Recueil Seldj.*, II, p. 174, bottom.

[5] See the account in Kremer's *Herrschenden Ideen*, pp. 417 f. Muslim princes reigning in far-away countries asked for investiture even from the Egyptian 'Abbāsids; an interesting account is in Ibn Baṭṭaṭa, I, pp. 364 ff.

[6] E.g. in Freytag, *Chrestom. arab.* p. 113, 11; *ZDMG*, VIII, p. 819.

[7] According to *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 101, 11, the people believed even at an early date in the superstition that the caliph was immune from plague.

[8] Al-Fakhrī, p. 166.

who in reality held the caliph a prisoner, seem to have attached to the latter's person some sort of awe, as Ibn Khaldūn says: *yadīnūna bi-ṭā'ati'l-khalīfati tabarrukan*, i.e. they profess obedience to the caliph hoping to gain thereby religious blessing.[1] They thus hesitated to attack the powerless inmate of the caliph's palace at Baghdād and considered opposition to him as ill-omened (*shu'm*).[2] It was thought that to go to war against the imām was tantamount to fighting God.[3] Only thanks to such superstitious fear did the vestiges of the caliph's authority survive until Hūlāgū Khān had the last Arab ruler at Baghdād executed. Then it was seen that in the words of the Persian poet Sa'dī—'the Tigris continued on its normal course at Baghdād even without caliphs.'[4]

[65] These conditions begin to prevail during the third century and become more firmly entrenched in relation to the development of political affairs. The decline of power is matched by the increase of theological interests. At the court of the caliph al-Muhtadī (255) the theologians—these being the *ahl al-'ilm*—are the most respected persons.[5] Al-Mustaẓhir (487–512) compensates for the superior power of his Seljuk vassals by having the theologian Abū Bakr al-Shāshī al-Qaffāl write a work on the points of difference among the *madhāhib al-fiqh*, which also bears his name (*al-Mustaẓhirī*);[6] he also commissioned al-Gazālī to prepare an exposition of the teachings of the *Ta'līmiyya*.[7] In the year 516 the successor of this prince attends the theological lectures of Abu'l-Futūḥ al-Isfarā'īnī.[8] In order to gain an idea of the interference of the caliph in affairs at the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century it is enough to consider the administrative activities of caliph al-Qādir bi'llāhi (381–422). This ruler is chosen because he was said to have strengthened the central government; he is said to have diminished the influence of Turks and Daylamites, to have revived the authority of the caliphate and to have known how to command obedience and respect.[9] But in the varied destinies of his empire his influence is nowhere to be encountered. The historian whose words were just quoted could give no other examples of the administrative

[1] Ibn Khaldūn, *Muqaddima*, p. 174, 9.
[2] *Recueil seldj.*, II, p. 152, 21; 236, 9.
[3] Ibid, p. 247, ult.
[4] *Gūlistān*, VIII, no. 105, ed. Gladwin, p. 249.
[5] Al-Ya'qūbī, II, p. 617, 9.
[6] Cairo Cat. III, p. 224; *Hilyat al-'Ulamā' fī Madhāhib al-Fuqahā* [*GAL* I, p. 489, *S* I, p. 679].
[7] *JA.*, 1877, I, p. 42 [ed. Goldziher, *Streitschrift des Gazālī gegen die Bāṭinijja-Sekte*, (Leiden, 1916)].
[8] *ZDMG*, XLI, p. 64, note 3. Al-Muqtafī (530–55) goes even further. (*Recueil Seldj.*, II, p. 216) as the pupil of an eloquent theologian.
[9] Ibn al-Athīr, IX, p. 155.

measures of this caliph, praised as energetic, than the following. He reprimanded the Mu'tazilites and Shī'ites and other dogmatic dissenters (*arbāb al-maqālāt*);[1] in a written decree he forbade Būyid Jalāl al-Dawla to let the drums be beaten during the canonical prayers, though this decree had to be revoked[2] and his successor was forced to grant the title *malik al-mulūk* to this Būyid (even the theologians were not allowed to object);[3] and a preacher who pronounced the *khuṭba* in incorrect form was subjected to disciplinary investigation.[4] The caliph himself wrote a book on Sunnite belief.[5] [66]

The less real power the Baghdād court had, the more did the theologians ponder on the canonical law of the state, which so beautifully delineated the powers of the caliph in a theoretically definitive way at a time when the caliphate in fact had only the ideal character of imām. It was at this time that al-Māwardī compiled his classical handbook of public law.[6] It is true that he had to take the circumstances of his time into account and devote a paragraph to the question of the status of the caliphate of a ruler 'who is hindered in exercising his rights and one of whose assistants seized power in order to administer independently the affairs of state, without, however, open rebellion against the caliph.'[7]

## VII

From the above account it is evident that the rule of the 'Abbāsid dynasty favoured the development of religious law and the cultivation of public law in the religious spirit, during the time of its flowering as well as in the epoch of its decline when the troubled circumstances of the time gave more and more scope for the influence of pietist elements. At the apogee of this dynasty, when its representatives exercised full power of government,[8] development in this

[1] A.H. 408, ibid, p. 214.

[2] A.H. 418, ibid. p. 235.

[3] A.H. 429, ibid p. 271; cf. Enger, *De vita et scriptis Mawerdii commentatio* (Bonn, 1851), pp. 2 f.

[4] Ibn al-Athīr, IX, p. 148.

[5] Ibid., p. 155: *ṣannafa kitāban 'alā madhhabi'l-sunnati*. The contents of this work are more closely defined by Ibn al-Ṣalāh in al-Suyūṭī's *Ta'rīkh*, p. 165: 'He discussed in it the excellences of the companions, the unbelief of the Mu'tazilites and those who teach the created nature of the Koran; this book was read every Friday in the assembly of the Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth in the Jāmi' al-Mahdī in the presence of many listeners.'

[6] The points of view of this system of public law are set out in Kremer's *Herrschenden Ideen*, pp. 420 ff. [Cf. H. A. R. Gibb, 'Al-Mawardi's Theory of the Caliphate,' *Studies in the Civilization of Islam*, pp. 151 ff.]

[7] *Constitutiones politicae*, ed. Enger, p. 30, bottom.

[8] It is reported in the name of the contemporary Muḥammad b. Salām of

[87] sense was encouraged by a stressing of the religious character which the caliph assumed in contrast to their predecessors. It was in accordance with this religious spirit that theologians of the epoch adopted an attitude of instruction towards the court and, correspondingly, the rulers gave, in accordance with that instruction, a religious bias to the administration of law and government. Mālik b. Anas addressed a letter to Hārūn al-Rashīd[1] containing exhortations and advice (it seems that this letter is preserved in a manuscript in the Escurial).[2] The same caliph asked the theologian Abū Yūsuf, a most eminent pupil of Abū Ḥanīfa, to furnish him with a memorandum about the regulation of taxes and the administration of the state in order to put a stop to the arbitrariness which had prevailed under the Umayyad rulers. The caliph's invitation is no longer extant but when the book in which Abū Yūsuf attempted to carry out the task is studied, the points of view prevalent in public life at that time become evident. He exhorts the amīr al-Mu'minīn[3] as follows: 'I recommend that you guard what God has entrusted to your vigilance and watch over what God has given into your care; you should pay regard in these things only to Him. If you act contrary to this, the smooth paths of right guidance will become rough for you, your eyes will lose the light and the traces will be blotted out, so that the easy roads will narrow and you will approve what is objectionable and object to what should be approved. Fight with your own soul as one who is fighting for victory for its own good, not its disadvantage. For the shepherd who loses part of his flock must make up what his negligence has damaged. . . . Beware, then, that your flock does not come to harm, because the owner of the flock may demand compensation from you for the damage and indemnify himself out of your wages for what you have lost. A building must be supported before it collapses. What you do for those given by God into your care will be to your advantage; what you neglect will be to your disadvantage. Therefore do not forget to be the caretaker

[1] *Fihrist*, p. 199, 4.

[2] Derenbourg, Escur., I, p. 384, no. 556, 3 [Ed. Būlāq, 1311, *GAL* I, p. 186; the authenticity of the text is, however, uncertain, cf. *EI*, s.v. 'Mālik b. Anas.']

[3] *K. al-Kharāj* p. 3, bottom.

---

the caliph al-Manṣūr: The caliph was asked whether after having obtained so many wordly goods there was anything desirable that remained. To this he was said to have answered: 'I have still one unsatisfied wish: to be seated upon a *masṭaba* surrounded by students of tradition, while the famulus (*wuṣṣāfī*, cf. Kremer, *Geschichte des Lebyd*, p. 28; Ibn Bashkuwāl, p. 201, top; al-Ṭūsī, *Shi'a Books*, p. 21, 11) [al-Sam'ānī, *Adab al-Imlā' wa'l-Istimlā'*, ed. Weisweiler, Leiden, 1952; M. Weisweiler, 'Das Amt des Mustamlī', *Oriens*, 4 (1951), pp. 27 ff.] asks me: 'Whom have you mentioned here, may God be merciful to you?', i.e. he wishes to teach tradition. Al-Suyūṭī, *Ta'rīkh*, p. 104, 12. Almost literally the same is, however, told of al-Ma'mūn, ibid., p. 231, 23.

of the affairs of those whose welfare God has entrusted to you; then you yourself shall not be forgotten. Do not neglect what is to their [68] welfare, so that your own welfare may not be neglected. Your share in this world will not be lost during the nights and days through frequent moving of your lips in mentioning God in *tasbīḥ, tahlīl, taḥmīd* and the *ṣalāt* for the Prophet of mercy and leader on the right path. God in His mercy, pity and forgiveness has appointed the temporal rulers as caliphs on earth, He has given them light with which they may illuminate for their subjects everything that appears dark in their daily affairs, and with which they may make clear those of their rights which are in doubt. The illumination provided by the mighty is the maintenance of legal ordinances (*ḥudūd*) and the guarding of the rights of all through firmness and clear command. *The revival of the sunna, propagated by a pious generation, takes highest place, because reviving the sunna is one of those good deeds which continue and do not perish.* Unrighteousness in the shepherds means the ruin of the flock and *to demand support from others as reliable, good (i.e. pious) people, is the ruin of the community.*' In this manner the 'Abbāsid caliph took counsel and this spirit permeates the whole design of Abū Yūsuf, in which he undertakes to regulate all fields of the public administration of the state by the sunna and does not weary of repeating to the caliph from case to case the teaching which he had given, as the representation of divine words, in the words just quoted. 'Thus is it related to us from the Prophet, and I pray to God that He may make you one of those who takes example from his deeds (*an yaj'alaka mimman istanna bi-sunnihi*).'[1] Hārūn was not the only caliph who deemed it good to consult the theologians about the laws of government. Passing over the evidence from the time of the decline of the caliphate, we merely mention that al-Muhtadī, too, asked the theologian al-Khaṣṣāf (d. 261) for an opinion about the laws of administration,[2] which was likewise entitled *K. al-Kharāj*.[3]

However precisely the theologians drew up the line which the caliphs must follow in public life in order to establish the rule of the sunna, they showed themselves indulgent as regards the private life of the ruler which, as we have seen (p. 64), did not always corres- [69] pond to the role which the Imāms felt called upon to play in their relations with the community. The court theologians took full account of the private side of the caliph's life. They showed themselves learned and ingenious when it came to finding religious exculpations for life contrary to the sunna led by pleasure-seeking rulers. The same Abū Yūsuf, who knew how to declaim so unctuously

[1] Ibid., p. 43, 22.
[2] *Fihrist*, p. 206, 14.
[3] Flügel, *Die Krone der Lebensbeschreibungen*, p. 85, note 44.

about the sunna as the only guidance for the Commander of the Faithful, also knew how to quieten the caliph's conscience when it came to making available to him an enjoyment forbidden by religion. With elastic dialectics he finds soothing arguments for Hārūn al-Rashīd in the same religious law that he used for his text when preaching against a wicked world. It is only necessary to read the relevant chapter in the *Ṭuyūrriyyāt* of al-Silafī (d. 578), which al-Suyūṭī incorporated into his historical compendium,[1] in order to find edifying examples.

Hārūn al-Rashīd's father also had an obliging court theologian who was willing to render him a service by reconciling court amusements with the sunna. The caliph al-Mahdī loved to race pigeons, a sport strictly condemned by orthodox theological opinion. Jewish law also forbade this amusement and declared all who indulged in it debarred from bearing witness and swearing oaths. The Islamic law givers are of the same opinion.[2] The inhabitants of the sinful city of Sodom, whom Allāh obliterated from the surface of the earth because of their misdeeds, invented this game, and he who indulges in it 'will not die without having experienced the affliction of poverty'.[3] The caliph then did not wish to act contrary to the law. A scholar was found called Ghayāth who knew how to assuage the caliph's scruples by adjusting the law to his master's way of life. One day this man produced the following sentence of tradition:
[70] 'Racing is allowed only with animals who have claws, hoofs,[4] or wings.' This sentence was supposed to bring the condemned sport practised by the ruler within the amusements allowed by the law. The pious man had interpolated the words 'or wings'[5] and for this falsification, undertaken for the sake of quietening the orthodox conscience of the Commander of the Faithful, he was given a princely gift.[6] It is told that the caliph eventually became aware of

[1] *Ta'rīkh*, p. 114; the accounts are derived from Ibn al-Mubārak (d. 181). Perhaps these stories were invented by the adherents of tradition out of spite for the *ra'y* lawyer Abū Yūsuf.

[2] It is true that—presumably in consideration of existing conditions—the limitation was added in the third century that the ban on bearing witness was to be applied only in cases where the sport had become an obsession such that prayers and other religious duties were neglected; al-Khaṣṣāf, *Adab al-Qāḍī*, fol. 87b.

[3] Al-Damīrī, I, p. 324, where the story is told with reference to Hārūn al-Rashīd and the theologian Abu'l-Bakhtarī.

[4] An Egyptian governor, Abū Khālid Yazīd b. 'Abd Allāh (middle of third century), who was concerned with abolishing the *bida'*, went so far as to stop even horse-racing and sold all horses meant for racing, Abu'l Maḥāsin, I, p. 741, top.

[5] According to Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 256, the rule reads: *lā sabaqa illā fī khuffin aw fī ḥāfirin aw naṣlin* = al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 317, 7, from the bottom.

[6] Quṭb al-Dīn, *Chron. Mekka*, p. 98.

the imposture and had all pigeons in his possession killed because they had been the occasion for falsifications of the Prophet's words; but the tale nevertheless shows what a court theologian was capable of doing in matters of the tradition. Theologians who wished to reconcile theory with the practices of life had to have recourse to such subterfuges, and this consideration became one of the chief factors in the history of the growth of the ḥadīth. Racing pigeons was not only indulged in at the prince's court. During the third and fourth centuries this game was widely spread in 'Irāq.[1] Only in the dark times when the autocrats of the Islamic empire, having lost their temporal power, developed into priestly obscurantists, executors of the whims of the scholastic theologians, did the caliph al-Muqtadī (467–87) destroy all dove-cotes and forbid the sport with pigeons.[2]

The rise of the 'Abbāsid dynasty is thus the time when the movement to establish the sunna as a science and as the standard of life received official recognition. In the period of the Umayyads the *ahl al-'ilm*, the Medinians and those of the same tendency, had lived in retirement, in their sulking corner, so to speak, and looked upon the wicked world with inward, but ineffective, anger. Now their appearance was favoured and they gained official influence, and their science itself began to flourish. Let us remember how the Umayyads treated these men (p. 41). How different the position of these people had become under Hārūn al-Rashīd. It is sufficient to consider the great honour this mighty prince heaped upon the Medinian teacher [71]
Mālik b. Anas[3] although he was not an unconditional follower of the ruling house.[4] In the administration, too, a quite different attitude is assumed towards the religious elements. Under the Umayyads, little of their influence was felt in public affairs. But from Hārūn al-Rashīd we have the following document of investiture for Harthama, governor of Khurāsān: 'He (the caliph) recommends to him (the governor) the fear of God (*taqwā Allāh*) and obedience. In all things concerning him, he should take the book of God as his rule of conduct, permit what is allowed in it and forbid what is forbidden in it. In doubtful cases he is to hold his hands and ask the authorities on law, religion and knowledge of the book of God.'[5] The advice of these authorities was henceforth always decisive. The murder of al-Mutawakkil was committed on grounds of a *fatwā*

[1] Al-Mas'ūdī, VIII, p. 85.

[2] Ibn al-Athīr, XI, p. 85.

[3] *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 298; cf. Dugat, *Histoire des philosophes et des théologiens musulmans*, pp. 265 ff. [The story shows, however, a somewhat legendary colour; cf. *EI*, s.v. 'Mālik b. Anas'.]

[4] A note on this can be found in Ṭab., III, p. 200.

[5] Ibid., p. 717, 10; *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 314 6 ff.

which the *fuqahā'* gave to his son and successor al-Muntaṣir.[1]

Theologians now find the ground prepared to make accepted in practice the sunna which in the Umayyad period was pushed into the background and in part was still quite unknown. In 'Irāq, for example, Shu'ba (d. 160) made the sunna prevail in public.[2] His method of finding the right sunna can be learned from the example that, in order to find the correct form of calling to prayer (*adhān*) he consulted a pious muezzin who had his knowledge from another pious colleague—their names are mentioned—who was able to trace back the rules to Ibn 'Umar.[3] In Marw and Khurāsān[4] al-Naḍr b. Shumayl (d. 204) was the first to make the sunna public (*aẓhara al-sunna*) and likewise we learn of 'Abd Allāh al-Dārimī of Samarqand (d. 255): 'He made public the sunna in his native country and propagated it and defended it, suppressing all those who acted contrary to it.' Such action was possible only because of the spirit
[72] which the 'Abbāsids encouraged and supported in public life. From this evidence we can also see in what a bad way Sunnite life was in the preceding period and how late it was before what is called Islamic law became in fact the actual norm in the public life of Muslim society. As late as the third century in Sijistān, marriages were contracted under circumstances when according to the sunna they were not valid at all, and only the Qāḍī Abū Sa'īd al-Iṣṭakhrī (d. 328) succeeded in enforcing the sunna laws in this respect.[5]

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 *ḥalāl wa-ḥarām*, 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,[6] 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

[1] *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 561, 5.
[2] *Taḥdhīb*, p. 315, from the bottom.
[3] Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 54; al-Nasā'ī, I, p. 59.
[4] *Tab. Ḥuff.* VI, no. 64; *Taḥdhīb*, p. 594; *Ḥuff.* IX, no. 5; cf. for al-Andalus, ibid. no. 1.
[5] Ibn Khallikān, no. 157, ed. Wüstenfeld, II, p. 88.
[6] [Cf. below, p. 202 note.]

with the cultivation and production of moral and ascetic teachings[1] 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. The evidence available for one of the provinces of Islam seems to be largely applicable also to the other parts of the huge empire. Amongst the Muslims who emigrated to Egypt only, such accounts were cultivated in the first century [78] and passed on orally in the form of traditions (*yataḥaddathūna*) as are known under the names of *malāḥim* and *fitan*, i.e. prophetic revelations[2] about revolutions and disturbances in the empire—similar to our calendars of a hundred years and similar popular books. The Egyptians were only concerned with such traditions until Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb (d. 128), son of a Nubian prisoner of war,[3] attempted to introduce the cultivation of *ḥalāl wa-ḥarām* and religious law (*al-fiqh*).[4]

VIII

Favoured from above, or at least not hampered by disregard, studies of the law could now develop freely, and the few stones laid by the repressed theologians of the first century in their quiet retirement could now be expanded by steady increase to form the edifice of Islamic legal science. This was predominantly the work of the second and third centuries and the zeal, which managed to produce in a century and a half what took the Romans, for example, several centuries to develop, is worthy of admiration.

As we saw the caliph himself wished to be informed of what was right in legal life according to religion, and the theologians of the next generation were not remiss in providing material. In order to judge this activity properly one important factor must be remembered.

The preparatory work of previous generations was too scanty to afford a foundation on which to build up a system of Islamic law. There was no fixed norm for the most elementary questions of law

[1] A sort of Agādā. Al-Ḥajjāj asks for a *muḥaddith* from the mosque to come and shorten his sleepless night with his tales, al-Masʿūdī, V, p. 312.

[2] The word *malḥama* (sing.) also means 'predestination, mysterious decision of God.' To Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya the saying is attributed that the martyr's death of Ḥusayn existed in the 'wise remembrance' (*fī'l-dhikr al-ḥakīm*, a notable expression) that it was a *malḥama* inflicted upon him, a gift of mercy (*karāma*) given him by Allāh, Ṭab., II, p. 607, 8; cf. also D. H. Müller, *Burgen und Schlösser*, I, p. 67, 9; 75, 17.

[3] Yāqūt, II, p. 599.

[4] Abū'l-Maḥāsin, I, p. 343; al-Nawawī to Muslim, p. 131.

even within a single province of Islam. The generation of the 'successors' was occasionally unsure even of Koranic law, though
[74] there had never been any doubt that this pillar of religious law was untouchable. 'Abd Allāh, son of Abū Hurayra, asked the son of 'Umar whether fish that had been washed ashore by the sea could be eaten. The divine who was asked the question thought he must answer with a firm negative. But shortly afterwards he asked for a Koran to be brought to him and there found a passage (5:97) from which he was forced to conclude that he had given the wrong answer to the son of Abū Hurayra.[1]

It can be imagined what uncertainty there was about questions and circumstances for which no provision was made in the Koran. At that time people were ignorant about even the most primitive dietary laws: e.g., the most contradictory information was quoted as to whether horse-meat was permissible or not.[2] The same uncertainty prevailed in matters of law, e.g., rules of inheritance,[3] and all other legal fields. Only the assumption that in early times the most elementary questions of legal life were not the subject of normative decision can explain this uncertainty and wavering in most questions of everyday life. Without this assumption it is difficult to understand how it was possible that during the second century various teachings about ritual and legal problems sprang up in the several *madhāhib*, and even in the same *madhab*, with which harmonizing theologists could do no more than consider them as equally justified, and even declare their very diversity to be a blessing to the Islamic community.[4] Already 'Umar II, to whom religious decrees are usually attributed, is said to have declined to create a general norm for the whole Muslim community and to have sent in consequence a decree to the outlying provinces according to which each of them was to follow the teachings of the local *fuqahā'*.[5]

The Muslim theologians followed two different ways in the formation of legal science (*fiqh*).

1. The more natural, and perhaps we may also say the more honest one, was that followed by the so-called Aṣḥāb al-Ra'y.[6] There were
[75] not sufficient ḥadīths establishing legal norms handed down from the first century to regulate all circumstances. This scanty material had to suffice for all aspects of the *fiqh*. If it was desired to avoid having recourse to new falsifications and invented traditions to fill

[1] *Al-Muwaṭṭa'*, II, p. 357.
[2] Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 93.
[3] An interesting example is in al-Mas'ūdī, V, p. 335.
[4] *Zāhiriten*, pp. 94 ff. Add to the passages quoted there Quṭb al-Dīn, *Chron. Makk.*, p. 210, 3 ff. The same principle is extended to dogmatic differences, Ṭab., II, p. 19, ult. (ascribed to Mu'āwiya).
[5] Al-Dārimī, p. 79, *Bāb ikhtilāf al-fuqahā'*.
[6] For more detailed references see my *Zāhiriten*, pp. 5 ff.

in all the gaps in the documentary material, the little that was available had to be elaborated speculatively by all the methodical means of legal deduction, which had still to be created, and, by allowing this deductive element great authority, a legal system had to be built up which in its positive parts showed results based not upon the ḥadīths but upon the intellectual work of scholars. Frequently legal norms were incorporated from Roman law, which thus unintentionally extended its world-conquering power to the Islamic peoples by this way of voluntary submission. The same social points of connexion and contact, which Kremer has proved to be the causes by which the dogmatic theses and problems of Oriental Christianity entered into the intellectual life of Islam,[1] also explain the infiltration of Byzantine legal doctrines and methods.[2] The borrowing of such legal doctrines and legal maxims learnt from the canonical lawyers of the conquered countries has often been stressed.[3] General legal principles were also often borrowed and we need recall only the supreme principle of procedure *affirmanti incumbit onus probandi*, and that the oath principally devolves upon the defendant,[4] the various methods of presumption which, as is probable at least, Muslim lawyers borrowed directly from these sources. But more [76] decisive is the fact that the attitude towards the legal sources and the methods of legal deduction has been taken from that alien source. The *consuetudo aut rerum perpetuo similiter judicatarum auctoritas* has been transferred almost literally into the system of the Muslim *fuqahā'*. The right of *ra'y* (opinion) also appears to be but an Arabic translation of the *opinio prudentium*, and the right allowed to the *fuqahā'* with respect to the *interpretatio juris civilis* did not develop without the influence of Roman law. It is impossible here to discuss in greater detail this important question of cultural history, which calls for a monograph. But this much can be seen from the previous

[1] *Culturgesch. Streifzüge*, pp. 2–8.

[2] In my Hungarian essay 'On the beginnings of Muslim legal science' (Budapest, 1884, *Proceedings of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences*). I have dealt with this question at greater length, and I hope to present a new version of that essay in another instalment of the present Studies. [This plan was not carried out.]

[3] Enger, introduction to his edition of al-Māwardī, p. xvi, Dozy, *De contractu do ut des*, pp. 17, 148; Kremer, *Culturgesch.*, I, Chapter 9 passim, the most important example p. 532; Henri Hugues, 'Les origines du droit musulman,' *La France judiciaire*, 1880, pp. 252–265 (cf. Dareste, *Journal des savants*, 1882, pp. 252–265); Van Berchem, *La propriété territoriale sous les premiers Califes* (passim), cf. Dugat *Cours complémentaire de géographie, histoire et législation des états musulmans*, Leçon d'ouverture (Paris, 1873), p. 33.

[4] *al-bayyina 'ala'l-mudda'ī wa'l-yamīn 'ala'l-mudda'ā 'alayhi*. B. *Aḥkām*, no. 6; *Shahādāt*, nos. 19, 20; al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 251; the latter principle seems to have been current amongst the Arabs in early times, cf. the procedure in *Agh.*, VIII, pp. 103f.

remarks—that the Muslim lawyers in Syria and Mesopotamia who began to elaborate an Islamic legal system in the first half of the second century did not perform a labour which (as Renan thinks) grew out of 'Arab genius'.[1]

*Fiqh* is as little a product of the Arab spirit as are grammar (*naḥw*) and dogmatic dialectics (*kalām*), and the Muslims of early times were fully aware that *fiqh* was something important. The following saying, ascribed to 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr is characteristic as a document of this conviction and the distaste which came as its consequence: 'The affairs of the Banū Isrā'īl continued on their good path until new elements of the nation, children of alien prisoners, whom the Banū Isrā'īl captured from alien nations, arose to teach *ra'y* and thus to mislead them'.[2] In this saying the distaste for the non-Arab method of legal science mostly cultivated by *mawālī*, is masked but not hidden. The very first and most important representatives of this trend were of alien non-Arab extraction and the most outstanding amongst them, Abū Ḥanīfa,[3] was of Persian race. They are the creators of what Renan considers an innate product of the Arab spirit, or what an earlier French writer even thought to be the product of the 'desert'.[4]

[77] 2. This independent method of building an Islamic legal system is usually connected with the name of the *imām* Abū Ḥanīfa (d. 150 but he was, as has been proved elsewhere,[5] not its first founder but merely the teacher in whose school this method achieved its highest perfection.

The reaction against an untainted *ra'y* system sets in even amongst his immediate pupils. Abū Yūsuf has recourse to traditions against teachings based on analogy which departed from them, and he contradicts his teacher Abū Ḥanīfa by appealing to tradition.[6] Al-Shaybānī, the other great pupil of Abū Ḥanīfa, seeks traditional foundations for the teachings of *fiqh* in Medina at the feet of Mālik b. Anas, and he endeavours in a special work[7] to produce the ḥadīth material upon which Abū Ḥanīfa's teaching is founded. He represents the right wing of the *ra'y* party. This tendency was more clearly expressed by the school opposing *ra'y* whose followers call

[1] *Histoire générale des langues sémitiques*, 3rd ed., pp. 380f.

[2] Al-Dārimī, p. 28—Ibn Māja p. 7, top: *mā zāla amr B. Isrā'īl mu'taditan laysa fīhi shay' hattā nasha'a fīhim al-muwalladūn abnā' sabāyā al-umam abnā' al-nisā' allati sabat B. Isrā'īl wa-ghayrihim faqālū fīhim bi'l-ra'y fa'aḍallūhum* [cf. also al-Khaṭīb, *Ta'rīkh*, XIII, pp. 394–5].

[3] Cf. *Literaturgesch. der Shī'a*, p. 69.

[4] Michaud et Poujoulat, *Correspondance d'orient*, 1830–31 (Brussels, 1841), III, p. 283.

[5] *Zākiriten*, p. 13.

[6] *K. al-Kharāj*, pp. 30, 10ff; 39 bottom; 109, 2, etc.

[7] Al-Āthār MS. of the Viceregal Library, Cairo, Cat. III, p. 2 [*GAL*, I, p. 179, *S* I, p. 231.]

themselves Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth. It is younger than the *ra'y* school and came into being out of opposition to the latter's methods. Its followers wished to refer back all law to the authority of the Prophet, i.e. to a proper ḥadīth. We have said that the path followed by them was a less honest one, for it may readily be imagined that, in view of the small number of ḥadīths available at the beginning of the activity of law-making, the ḥadīths which were to be the authority for a particular doctrine had to be fabricated or adapted. *Ra'y*, the law as an independent decision, was to be rejected at all costs and even a weakly documented ḥadīth was thought to be infinitely preferable to it. Frequently this was, in the nature of things, merely a battle of words, for the advocates of the ḥadīth produced on the basis of a ḥadīth the same law which the advocate of *ra'y* established by independent deduction. The principle however had to be preserved even if this preservation could only be achieved by falsifications. The only admissible authorities are those who say *ḥaddathanā, akhbaranā*: 'the rest are no good', says Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal.[1] From these circles came the many derogatory judgements about Abū Ḥanīfa[2] which had to be refuted by later generations when the difference between ḥadīth [78] and *ra'y* had shrunk to one of merely theoretical importance.

Since there was no fixed practice for most legal questions it was unavoidable that for one and the same question contradictory ḥadīths were invented according to the opinions of various theologians of various groups, or different ḥadīths were selected from earlier material to be handed down. These ḥadīths were then called upon to support the individual opinion or usage customary in a particular circle, since the ḥadīth had often only to justify existing customs. The Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth at that time did not trouble unduly about the authority for the sentence quoted or the complete respectability of its informants. The strict investigation of the informants of the *isnād* developed only later when the facility with which traditions were fabricated made the tradition appear as a convenient support for all kinds of religious and social tendencies condemned by orthodox theologians. The form of the tradition also did not trouble them much. Sayings which arose like the traditions of al Zuhrī mentioned above (p. 47) and were circulated as the ḥadīths of the Prophet could be considered by them as acceptable evidence. Only the advocates of *ra'y* in 'Irāq[3] applied stricter criteria to the investigation

[1] In Ibn Bashkuwāl, ed. Codera, p. 252.

[2] The oldest collection of such judgements is in Ibn Qutayba, *Mukhtalif al-Ḥadīth*, pp. 63 ff.

[3] This can be seen from the interesting facts which are collected in this connection by al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, fols. 73ff. [ed. Hyderabad pp. 262ff.] It is remarkable that al-Bukhārī also—as he told al-Tirmidhī orally—does not disapprove of al-Zuhrī's manner of handing down the tradition (*al-'an'ana*), al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 121, top.

of the origin of and the form of transmission of the tradition, because they were able to find their way through problems of law even without the use of directly transmitted ḥadīth. The followers of the party who were unable to get along without a ḥadīth were compelled to grasp at any text at all which could serve as proof for their theses. It may be imagined how greatly the fabrication of ḥadīths flourished under these circumstances.

## IX

The teaching of the Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth had become a religious postulate for the Muslim people. It followed from the presuppositions of a believing Muslim that nothing was more self-evident than that the law had to be based on the authority of the Book or on other communications of the supreme legislator of the Islamic church, i.e. the Prophet. The practitioners of *ra'y* had soon to
[79] adjust themselves to this demand. Since they did not want to sacrifice the doctrines which they had reached through speculation, they were now driven on to a slippery path. All the positive doctrines they taught in their schools had to be supported by ḥadīths or—and this opened up a less dishonest way—existing ḥadīths had to be interpreted, adapted, or accommodated to their doctrine. These are the Baṣran, Kūfan, etc., ḥadīths which were discarded by the Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth.[1] These were ḥadīths intended to provide arguments to support the results of *ra'y*. In the later *ra'y* schools therefore (even that bearing the name of Abū Ḥanīfa) the ḥadīth formally occupies the same position as in the opposing school. The exploitation of traditions in 'Irāq, however—where the *ra'y* schools predominated and had taken their name from this province—continued to show that subtle character which was typical of the theology of this school from the period when its founders had allowed more authority to free deductions. The 'Irāqī school was put in opposition in this respect to the Ḥijāzī school which, more faithfully preserving the old Medinian traditions, showed little talent in subtle interpretations and thus did less violence to the custom.[2] The name

[1] Cf. e.g. al-Zurqānī to the *Muwaṭṭaʾ*, II, p. 7 (Ibn 'Abd al-Barr), p. 12: *Āthār Baṣriyya Kūfiyya*; al-Shāfi'ī, *Risāla*, para. 34, *wa-remā'l-Baṣriyyūna*, etc.

[2] It is characteristic that even a Medinian adherent of the *ra'y* school, Abū Sa'īd, ridicules the 'Irāqīs, who reply with an epigram in which they say that *dīn* is fostered only in 'Irāq whereas the Medinians have time only for musicalinstruments (*al-banān wa'l-mathānā wa'l-ṣiʿr*) (*al-'Iqd*, III, p. 132, bottom; p. 133, 2 in place of *al-ṣiʿr* read *al-ṭiʿr*). While in 'Irāq itself Khālid al-Qasrī officially forbade the practice of the art of singing (*Agh.*, II, p. 123, bottom), the *mughannūn* of Medina were permitted to bear witness in court, a laxity which offended the 'Irāqīs (ibid, V, p. 142, 12ff., cf. VII, p. 168, 19). The meeting of Abū Yūsuf with the Ḥijāzī singer Ibn Jāmiʿ affords an example of how 'Irāqī theologians valued singers (VI, p. 70, *top*). The combination of singing and

Ḥijāzī school can only be taken *cum grano salis*. In Medina there was no lack of teachers of *ra'y*; it suffices to mention Rabī'a b. Farrūkh (d. 132, 133 or 142) because he was especially called Rabī'at al-Ra'y.[1] In a later chapter we shall also see that the great Ḥijāzī teacher Mālik was unable to create a law-book without *opinio* if he was to avoid falsifications. He mentioned this Rabī'a as an outstanding example, and he took over and handed down some of his traditions.[2] He valued his method so highly that he expressed the judgement: 'The refinement of *fiqh* has ceased with Rabī'a's death.'[4] He remained true to Ḥijāzī tradition in valuing the sunna of his home more highly than the ḥadīths made up for the new doctrine. [80]

A characteristic example in this field is the difference of opinion regarding a form of gift called *al-'umrā*, i.e. a gift for life which reverts to the donor or his heir on the death of the receiver. This type of gift seems to be based on the ancient Arab customary law[5] and was recognized as valid at Medina in Mālik's time.[6] It is however opposed by a number of traditional sayings which Mālik himself knew and which declare the limiting clause of the *'umrā* gift as invalid and grant the heirs of the temporary owner the right to consider the object of the *'umrā* as their own after his death.[7]

We do not intend to probe deeper into the ritual and legal differences between the various schools (*madhāhib*). But for the understanding of the difference in the use of traditions in the 'Irāqī school on the one hand and in the Ḥijāzī school on the other[8] we will just mention an example concerning a detail of Islamic marriage law.

When the tribe of Thaqīf was subjugated—it is told—Muḥammed found the first opportunity to come to a decision as to what was to [81]

[1] Opponents ridiculed him and his contemporary Abū Ḥanīfa, and other teachers of *ra'y* (*Ẓāhiriten*, p. 16) and invented malicious anecdotes about them. Rabī'a was described as a gossip, al-Jāḥiẓ, *Bayān*, fol. 178 [I, p. 102].

[2] In Ibn Bashkuwāl, p. 164, 10.

[3] E.g. *al-Muwaṭṭa'*, II, p. 28.

[4] In al-Zurqānī, III, p. 44.

[5] Follows from Labīd, p. 22, v. 4: *wa-mā'l-māl illā mu'ārāun wadā'i'u*.

[6] *Al-Muwaṭṭa'*, III, p. 224.

[7] The opposing traditions are quoted in greatest detail by al-Nasā'ī, II, pp. 74–7. cf. Abū Dāwūd, II, pp. 71–2.

[8] The points of difference between the two schools were listed for the first time by the chronicler al-Wāqidī; he also treated the 'umrā question, *Fihrist*, p. 99, 10.

---

religious learning such as in those days (e.g. XIV, p. 45 top), and even Mālik b. Anas was a singer at first and only changed his profession because his ugly face did not promise success in that line (IV, p. 39 bottom). The answer of a Medinian to Hārūn al-Rashīd's question: 'Who in Medina condemns song?'—'He whom God has punished with Mālik b. Anas' punishment'—(II, p. 78, 14) refers to this.

be done with the wives of newly converted pagans who were married to more than four wives, because Ghaylan, who had been converted to Islam, had ten wives. The Prophet ordered him to 'keep four of these women and to part with the others'.[1] This decision became the ḥadīth source for all similar cases.[2] But Muhammed's decision is differently interpreted by the two schools. The Ḥijāzīs, taking the authoritative sentence literally, say that it makes no difference which of the women are dismissed[3] as the Prophet only asks that four women be retained, the others dismissed. The 'Irāqīs investigating, and having regard to the *ratio* of the law, stress that from an Islamic point of view only the oldest four wives are legal spouses since marriage with the later ones was forbidden by Islam. If, then, a pagan living in such illicit marriage dissolves the unions, he may keep four wives in the order of their seniority, and the younger wives whom he married as fifth, sixth etc., he must dismiss as being illegitimate.[4]

This shows the influence of the speculative element upon the method of 'Irāqi interpretation; and even this sophistry, by which they sought to adapt an acknowledged tradition to their independent doctrine, was distasteful to their opponents. When the Medinian 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Umar, a great-grandson of the caliph 'Umar I, came to 'Irāq in the second half of the second century, he felt called upon to accuse the religious leaders of that country of
[82] corrupting and obscuring religious knowledge.[5] Mālik b. Anas did not believe that any of his 'Irāqian contemporaries, with the single exception of Hushaym b. Bashīr from Wāsiṭ (d. 183), could handle the ḥadīth properly.[6] For this dislike of 'Irāqī method its enemies invented pretexts from early Islamic history. An 'Irāqī of the period of 'Umar I, Ṣabīgh b. 'Isl, is said to have travelled amongst the armies of the true believers garrisoned in the various conquered provinces, in order to explain dubious points of the Koran; but when he also came to Medina he was soundly whipped by 'Umar, and everyone was warned not to have dealings with him.[7] Traditionists

[1] Al-Shaybāni, p. 240.

[2] From the traditions in Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 222, this is even more obvious: the Prophet is made to say there: *ikhtar minhā arba'an.*

[3] Cf. Ibn Ḥajar, IV, p. 690. From Ibn Jurayj: 'Islam came and Abū Sufyān b. Ḥarb had six wives; Ṣafwān b. Umayya also had six wives (giving their names) . . . He then divorced Umm Wahab who was already old; from Fākhita bint al-Aswad he was separated by the law of Islam because she was formerly his father's wife; under 'Umar's reign he also parted from 'Ātika (not because of the law but voluntarily).' (Umm Wahab and Fākhita are in the first and second places in the list of wives.)

[4] In al-Suhaylī to Ibn Hishām, notes, p. 199.

[5] *Takdhīb*, p. 403, 3.

[6] Ibid, p. 608, 7.

[7] Yāqūt, III, p. 677, 19.

recount Ṣabīgh's punishment with great glee,[1] and anecdotes were told of his subtleties which were designed to ridicule this whole trend of religious scholarship.[2]

But not only in specific questions of the application of the law do the two schools follow different ways. Occasionally this difference extends to much more general legal questions. To give but one example we will just mention that, according to the Ḥijāzī school, judgement should never be given on the basis of subjective presumptions or the personal conviction of the judge (*bi-'ilmihi*); the judge must always base his sentence on objective proofs, and if those are lacking[3] judgement must be suspended despite the moral conviction of the judge.[4] The 'Irāqī school[5] was more inclined to favour the admissibility of the subjective conviction of the judge.[6] In this general question also we see that the theologians do not withold recognition of the value and justification of subjective intuition. [83]

## X

From the preceding it can be seen that, even in the earliest times of its development, it is impossible to speak of a uniform sunna in Islam, since different contradictory ḥadīths concerning one and the same question, which arose in order to support the conflicting opinions of the various schools, are juxtaposed as having equal authority. Theoretically there were several methods of reconciling such contradictory sayings. The consolidation of the study of tradition produced the criticism of the ḥadīths and their authorities, whereby it became possible to give more credence (*tarǰīḥ*) to the authorities for one ḥadīth than to those for another. Thus one obtained a reason for preferring one tradition to another, which involved a conflicting doctrine.

The adjustment of differences which arrived at eliminating the existence of a contradiction by a process of harmonization, seems to be an earlier method. This harmonization was practised very early on, because opponents of the ḥadīth as a whole liked to attack

[1] In greatest detail in al-Dārimī, p. 31.

[2] Ibn Durayd, p. 139, bottom.

[3] This recalls the Talmudic legal rule: *ên la-ddayyānîm ellā mā she'ênāvo'oth*, *Baḳra*, fol. 131 a (correct the reference in Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterbuch*, I, p. 399a, and Kohut *Arukh*, III, p. 93b, bottom).

[4] But concessions or principles were possible also within this teaching by using the principle of *istiṣlāḥ*, about which see *WZKM*, I, p. 229.

[5] But within this there were also differences of opinion, as is explained in detail in al-Khaṣṣāf, *Adab al-Qāḍī*, fols. 95 ff. Al-Qurṭubī, in al-Zurqānī, III, p. 181 declaims against those lawyers who defend the principle and hold that 'the witness that dwells within a man is more trustworthy than an outside witness.'

[6] B. *Aḥkām*, no. 21.

this contradictory character of the different traditions in order to prove that the authority attributed in pious circles to such 'traditions' was unjustified. The followers of the ḥadīth had to be prepared for such attacks. The easiest line of defence was to get rid of such contradictions by attempts at harmonization. Al-Shāfi'ī (d. 204), who of all the early teachers has earned the greatest credit for the creation of a methodology in legal science, has dedicated many chapters to this in his *Risāla* (a treatise on *uṣūl al-fiqh*, the principles of legal science),[1] and he developed the theory according to the principles of which contradictory ḥadīths can be made to agree. Ibn Qutayba already handles these weapons of defence with great ease, which indicates that this method was already well established in the circles to which he belongs. An example will best illustrate this
[84] methodical trick: 'They (the opponents of tradition) say two conflicting ḥadīths about the (young) children of unbelievers. You relate that Ṣa'b b. Jatthāma said to the Prophet: "During a raid in the darkness of the night our horses trample the children of the unbelievers." The Prophet then said: "They (the children) belong to their fathers."[2]—And then you relate that the Prophet sent a detachment of troops who killed the women and young children, which the Prophet disapproved of very strongly. They said: "These are the offspring of unbelievers." But he replied: "Are not your best the offspring of unbelievers?"'[3]

'We say of this that there is no difference between the two traditions. Ṣa'b b. Jatthāma stated that the horses "during a raid in the darkness of the night . . ." etc. To this the Prophet replied that the children belong to their fathers, i.e. in this world they must be judged similarly to their fathers. It was a dark night, a raid was made on the unbelievers; you ought not to withdraw because of young children, since they get the same as their fathers. One ought not, however, to intend the killing of the children.'

'What he disapproved of in the other tradition is that they have killed women and children intentionally (*ta'ammadū dhālika*) because of the unbelief of their fathers. About this he said: "Are not your

[1] This work, which is important for the history of the interpretation of the ḥadīth, is the point of departure of Islamic legal science; the Viceregal Library at Cairo possesses two manuscript copies of it [ed. A. Shākir, Cairo, 1940].

[2] Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 264.

[3] The Prophet selected those of the prisoners of the B. Qurayẓa who had beards and these he had killed; the others were spared, according to 'Aṭiyya al-Qurażī who owed his life to this fact, *Takdhīb*, p. 425, 7; accordingly the unintelligible *thmm ythbtū* in *Takdhīb*, p. 522, 4, must be corrected to *lam yunbitū*. In Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 259, top, al-Tirmidhī I, pp. 298, 300 the instructions ascribed to the Prophet about wars with unbelievers are given. To spare children, women and old people is unconditionally recommended. Cf. *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 75, 1, Ṭab., I, p. 1850.

best offspring of unbelievers?", i.e. perhaps there are some amongst them who would make honest Muslims when they reach maturity.'[1]

There are few chapters of Islamic law the tradition material of which is free of such contradictions. It is obvious that in fact, in the actual practice of daily life, tradition prevailed which was based on a recognition of the existing state of affairs and which gave it legal authority[2], which became an element of discipline in the [85] uncertainty and wavering of the chaotic circumstances of early times, or which regulated in an un-contradictory manner a new aspect of life which had only arisen through Islam. It would be illusory to think that a ḥadīth running altogether contrary to prevailing usage would succeed in actually upsetting the existing circumstances, even taking into account the protection granted to those busy with its study.

The increasing importance of the sunna under the 'Abbāsids was not enough to make all and sundry the prey of the men of the sunna. At first their activity appears to have been kept at the level of the demands of everyday life, which they endeavoured to regulate in a religious spirit. Life, however, could not be adapted to all the extravagances which their study might produce. It was impossible to abolish deep-rooted legal practices and other habits which were not to their taste and did not correspond to the consequences of their theological presuppositions. Again and again the problem arose that practice did not always agree with the sunna. If only local deviations were concerned the theologians could declaim against them and could vent their anger against the rulers who did not aid them sufficiently in *taghyīr al-munkar*.[3] Occasionally they found a god-fearing governor who hoped to obtain Allāh's grace in supporting them.

Frequently, however, more than local deviations were at stake. Amongst the teachings of pious traditionalists there were some which were in contrast to the practice followed in wide fields of public life. They did not, however, possess the power—though they were rather inclined to claim it—to remodel trends to conform with their fictions. It was impossible to achieve this with customs and ideas which were of more than local importance and so deeply rooted in practice that they had justly to be considered as *ijmā'*, 'the consensus of the whole community'. The theologian then had to come to terms. He either conceded that his ḥadīth was abrogated by another text (*mansūkh*)—it was easy to find an abrogatory text (*nāsikh*) in the welter of contradictory ḥadīths in circulation—or the ultimate con- [86] cession which could be expected of him had to be made, i.e. he had to

[1] *Mukhtalif al-Ḥadīth*, p. 315.

[2] As e.g. in Medina—according to p. 83—those *ḥadīths* gained ascendancy which sanctioned the customary right of the *'umrā* gift.

[3] Cf. *ZDMG*, XLI, pp. 56ff.

admit that, although the *ijmā'* contradicts the clear expression of the sunna, it does not abolish the wording of the law, since the *ijmā'* is unable to abrogate the sunna, just as it cannot itself be abrogated; but its contradiction of the sunna serves as proof that somewhere there must exist an abrogatory sunna (on which the *ijmā'* is based) even if this cannot be documented.'[1] This is a rabulistic trick intended to rescue the sunna's authority in the face of the powerful claims of the realities of life. In earlier times,[2] however, people were more sincere. They did not presuppose the existence of unknown ḥadīths which could be used to justify everyday usage as being in accordance with the sunna; instead it was admitted freely—for instance by Ibn Qutayba, one of the most zealous advocates of the Aṣḥab al-Ḥadīth against the teachers of the *ra'y*, in the third century—that 'the truth was more likely to be contained in the *ijmā'* than in tradition. The ḥadīth is subject to many vicissitudes, due to the negligence of those handing it down, confused explanations, the abrogations which may have occurred, the unreliability of informants, the existence of two contradictory ḥadīths. . . . The *ijmā'* of the community is free from such vicissitudes. . . . This is the reason why people hand down ḥadīths going back to the Prophet but follow in practice other ways.'[3]

This contradiction brought to maturity the doctrine about the weight of the general opinion and general practice of the Muslim community (this is *ijmā'*), and this great principle weighed more in Muslim conscience than any other argument. 'My community reaches no agreement that is an error,' Muḥammed is said to have declared.[4] Only a few theologians have stood out against the un-
[87] conditional validity of the *ijmā'*.[5] The *ijmā'* is thus a counterweight to the attempt of traditionists to reform existing customs according to their own views and to oppose sharply the customary laws of society. As we have just seen, they had to admit their weakness in the face of such power and they were clever enough to find a form for this admission which made the recognition of *ijmā'* an element of the sunna.

[1] Al-Nawawī, I, p. 22, 17.

[2] Mālik b. Anas decides in favour of the correctness of praxis rather than conflicting ḥadīths; this is to him on a par with *ijmā'*; cf. the discussion of this question in al-'Abdarī, *Madkhal*, I, p. 292.

[3] *Mukhtalif al-Ḥadīth*, p. 311. Examples, ibid., p. 112.

[4] Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 131, bottom; al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 25; *Maṣābīḥ al-Sunna*, I, p. 14; *Zāhiriten*, p. 33, note 2. The *ijmā'* tradition is not mentioned by B. and Muslim; it did not count as *ṣaḥīḥ* (of undoubted correctness) but only as *ḥasan*.

[5] Especially in philosophical circles, e.g. the Mu'tazilite al-Naẓẓām. The following train of thought is attributed to him: 'It is possible that all Muslims admit an erroneous teaching; the whole of Islam, for example, teaches unanimously that in contrast to other prophets Muḥammed had a mission to the whole of mankind. The fact is, however, that God sent every prophet to all mankind' etc., *Mukhtalif al-Ḥadīth*, p. 19.

CHAPTER THREE [88]

# THE ḤADĪTH IN ITS RELATION TO THE CONFLICTS OF THE PARTIES IN ISLAM

## 1

FOR cultural history the legal parts of the ḥadīth are of lesser importance than those which show how the religious elements of the Muslim world came to grips with political circumstances and relations in Islam. Like all their teachings, opinions on these matters are given in the form of the ḥadīth. In this connection we shall have to consider some groups of ḥadīths which will illuminate the relationships which grew from the attitude of religiously orientated circles to the actual powers of the state.

First of all our attention will be devoted to a group of political ḥadīths which owe their origin to the intention of securing obedience to the government under circumstances in which it might have appeared a religious duty just for the religiously minded to refuse obedience. Such circumstances were first brought about by the Umayyad regime, which was completely opposed to religion. It could not appear as self-evident to a pious Muslim that he should submit to it in the same way as the Syrians, who have been characterized as 'the most eager to show obedience towards men and the most reluctant to show obedience towards God';[1] and even if a Muslim faithful to religion had not been led by his own feelings to doubt whether the rulers at Damascus and their devoted generals and governors, such as al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf, Khālid al-Qasrī and similar men, were the rightful leaders of the religious community, enough pretenders and revolutionaries could be found, whose emissaries did not omit to put a pietistic veil round their aims in [89] order to be more effective.

The problem throughout of how true believers were to behave under such rulers appeared in this period as one of the most important questions in religious life. It was solved in various ways and the tradition has preserved a reflection of these decisions. We

[1] In Abū'l-Maḥāsin, I, p. 80, 10.

have already shown in the previous chapter that there were intransigents who did not acknowledge at all these wicked rulers and their organs, to whom they gave the name *muḥillūn*, the profanity-doers[1] and met them with passive resistance. These people shared entirely the point of view of the Khārijites in regarding it a duty to fight such rulers, but they were divorced from them by their conviction about the justification of the caliphate of 'Alī and possibly of his successors. They completed, even at the hour of their death, their belief in God and in Muhammed's mission with the confession that al-Ḥajjāj cannot be reckoned amongst the believers.[2] The more patient and the milder among them circulated ḥadīths like the following: 'You will eventually be ruled by emirs, who will dispose of your daily bread and will refuse it unless you admit their lies to be true and support them in their unbelief: give unto them what is theirs by law as long as they accept the same from you, but if they act as traitors in this, fight them and he who is killed because of such conduct will be deemed a martyr.'[3]

This opposition party contrasted sharply with a completely loyal trend, whose adherents were apparently called Murji'ites[4] because they did not consider the virtual rejection of religious laws by the Umayyads as sufficient reason to refuse obedience even theoretically[5] or to brand them as *kāfirūn*[6] and declare them as damned, and because in order to acknowledge the Umayyads as
[90] true believers it was sufficient in their eyes that they professed Islam in general; they did not ask too many questions about actual behaviour.[7] Thus these people did not object to the cruel measures

[1] *Aghā.*, VI, p. 31, 15, *muḥill* about al-Ḥajjāj, cf. *Aghā.*, XV, p. 8, Yāqūt II, p. 429, 3 from the bottom. This is of course a one-sided subjective opinion: the Umayyads in their turn call the pious Zubayrids in Mecca *al-māḥithūn*, *Aghā.*, XXI, p. 146, 5.

[2] Al-Mas'ūdī, V, p. 377, 6.

[3] In Ibn Ḥajar, IV, p. 167.

[4] [For the Murji'a see also Goldhizer, *Vorlesungen über den Islam* (Heidelberg, 1910), index, s.v. 'Murdschia'; G. van Vloten, 'Irdschā', *ZDMG*, XLV, pp. 165ff.; A. J. Wensinck's article 'al-Murji'a' in *EI*.]

[5] In later times this difference of attitude became the theoretical scholastic problem of *taʾthīmat al-fāsiq*, i.e. whether a sinner may be the head of the Muslim community. Abū Ḥanīfa, as a Murji', is said to have answered this affirmatively, but some of the followers of his school deny this; al-Khaṣṣāf, *Adab al-Qāḍī*, fol. 26b.

[6] The mild judgements about the Syrian opponents of 'Alī collected in *al-'Iqd*, II, p. 283, come from these moderate circles.

[7] In a report of Ibn Jarīr (al-Ṭabarī) the view that Sūra 18:110 (*fa-man kāna yarjū liqāʾa rabbihi faʾl-yaʿmal ʿamalan ṣāliḥan*) was the last revelation of the Koran (not liable to abrogation) is ascribed (probably after an earlier source) to the caliph Muʿāwiya I, without the indication of a special reason for this attribution: al-Suyūṭī, *Itqān*, I, p. 34 [from al-Ṭabarī's commentary on the passage, XVI, p. 28.] It can be surmised that it is not without intention

of the Umayyads and their governors against those pious men who refused them their allegiance, and they defended the massacre which the Umayyads caused amongst their pietist adversaries. Even pious doctors of the law belonged to the Murji'ite party[1]—no doubt those theologians whom we have already met as willing tools and lenient judges of the Umayyad trend. They were expected by the authorities to declare the opponents of the dynasty and their abettors as 'unbelievers' and to spread this doctrine with the motivation that 'those who split the staff,[2] break the oath of allegiance, leave the community and thus threaten the security of the Muslims are worthy of the name of *kāfir*'.[3] Without such help it would hardly have been possible for the Umayyads to gain a foothold in Islam. We have sure evidence from 'Awn b. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Utba b. Mas'ūd, a pious theologian (end of the first century), that he sided with these Murji'ites at first. Later he left them in order to fight in the rebel army of al-Ash'ath against al-Ḥajjāj and only under 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz did he become reconciled to the Umayyads,[4] because this prince himself adhered to the principle: that the man who opposes an unjust ruler is not a rebel but the unjust ruler is one, since there is no obedience which is practised by disobedience to God.[5] 'Awn was also a poet and a little poetic document exists regarding his separation from the loyal Murji'ites, which shows what the Murji'ites taught about relationships with the Umayyads:

'The first from which I unquestionably separate myself—I renounce what the Murji'ūn confess: [91]
They say the blood of believers may be shed,[6] whereas their blood must be spared;
They say a believer may belong to the unjust (*ahl*[7] *al-jawr*), whereas the unjust (*al-jā'irūn*) are no believers.[8]

[1] E.g. Ibn Qutayba, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 240,3.

[2] Cf. al-Maydānī I, p. 57, bottom, to the proverb: *iyyāka wa-qātil al-'aṣā*; for the expression, *Agh.*, XIII, pp. 52, 8 from the bottom, 59, 18.

[3] *Al-'Iqd*, III, p. 25, top.

[4] Cf. *Fragm. hist. arab.*, pp. 42f.

[5] Al-Mas'ūdī, V, p. 422, 1.

[6] One should only remember the words of Ziyād b. Abīhi to Ḥasan: 'I love to eat meat (to kill people) of which you are made,' *al-'Iqd*, III, p. 5, 3 from the bottom.

[7] Var. *āl*; this reading would give even better reason to relate to the Umayyad family.

[8] Ibn Qutayba, p. 129 = *Agh.*, VIII, pp. 92, 13ff; cf. Kremer, *Culturgesch. Streifzüge*, p. 5, note 2.

---

that the opponents of the Murji'ites attribute the refutation of that party just to the Umayyads. The hamzated root from which the name of the party is derived is often confused with the root *rjw* (to hope).

It is highly probable that the origin of the Murji'ite party is to be sought in such loyal accommodation with the Umayyad rule. When later this cause disappeared and the justification of 'shedding the blood of true believers, had lost all reality, the Murji'ites concentrated their attention upon the dogmatic evaluation of the practice of law (*'amal*) on salvation. Thus we should have to postulate, as the historical antecedent of this dogmatic Murji'a, a political Murji'a. This, however, throws no more light upon the linguistic obscurity concerning the literal meaning of this party's name.[1]

Since the politico-religious opponents of the Umayyads, in so far as they were not Khārijites, mainly adopted the party of the 'Alids, the Murji'a was a natural contrast to the Shī'a and the actual existence of such opposition may serve as proof of the correctness of our view.[2] In a poem of the Kaysānite poet al-Sayyid al-Ḥimyarī (d. ca. 173–9) which praises the two sons of 'Alī, the poet calls to his opponents: *khalūlayya lā turjī'ā wa'lamū|bi'-anna'l-hudā ghayra mā taz'umūni* ('My friends, do not commit *irjā'* and know that the right guidance is not this which you believe').[3]

[92] *Irjā'* (*nomen verbi* of the same root from which *murji'* is *nomen agentis*) here means the rejection of the 'Alīd imāms and recognition of their opponents. In effect, in the continuation of this poem (v. 10), the recognition of the Umayyads (Ibn Ḥarb, *wa-ashyā'ihi*) is described by the verb *yurji'*. The poet uses this word, however, in an extended, perhaps ironical, meaning in reference to his own imām: 'My *irjā'* concerning Abū Ḥasan ('Alī)[4] is the right (*irjā'*) turning away from the two 'Umars (Abū Bakr and 'Umar), whether they are just or damned'.[5]

The Murji'ites thus form the loyal opposition party to the 'Mountain', those unbending religious opponents of the Umayyads and in the course of history also of other rulers who acted against the religious law, for the disgust of the pious with the life lived at the centre of government did not die with the disappearance of the Umayyads. Between these two extreme trends there is a middle

[1] Cf. Houtsma, *De strijd over het dogma [In den Islām tot op el-Ash'arī*, Leiden, 1875], p. 34.

[2] Ibn Qutayba, p. 230, 15: *ithnani yatashayya'āni wa-thnāni murji'āni wa-thnāni yarayāni ra'ya-l-khawārij*; *Agh.*, IV, p. 63, penult: *ikhtaṣama Sht'i wa-Murji'i*'. Whereby not the political but the dogmatic Murji' was meant, the Murji' is opposed with *wa'īdī*; al-Ṭūsī, *Sht'a Books*, p. 376, no. 850, cf. ibid., p. 368, no. 808; *yaqūl bi'l-irjā'*; contrast: *yadhhab ilā'l-wa'īd*.

[3] *Agh.*, VII, p. 16, 12. (My friend Snouck drew my attention to this passage.)

[4] It must be noted that in this sense also the first conjugation of *rjw* (tertiae *w*) is used, e.g. in the same poem v.1: *arjā Abā Ḥasanin 'Aliyyan*; cf. al-'Iqd, III, p. 22, 11, in a pro-Umayyad sense: *innī la-'arjā li'l-Ḥajjāj*; cf. above p. 90 note 7.

[5] *Agh.*, VII, p. 11, 12; cf. ibid, 1, 16: *fa-laysa 'alayya fī-l-irjā'i ba'sun*.

party, which succeeded in penetrating the collective consciousness of Islam and whose outlook has also left the most traces in the ḥadīth. These mediating theologians—for it is of them we speak—achieved a very clever feat. As the unworthiness of the rulers from the point of view of religion could not be denied, despite the tolerance of the Murji'a, these theologians spread the doctrine that obedience was in all circumstances due to the *de facto* rulers in the interest of the state and the unity of Islam from those who were convinced that personally they were unworthy. By spreading ḥadīths inculcating this teaching these people unintentionally performed an invaluable service to the ruling circles; and it seems that they thereby greatly helped to ensure that each ruler was quietly accepted by the populace, which tolerated and paid homage to the unworthy regime, while also accepting as accomplished fact every revolution which managed to legitimatize itself by success. It was merely necessary to calm the religious conscience incited by pietistic demagogues, rebels and pretenders; and if this was done the people at large did not care much whether Zayd or 'Amr sat on the throne of the caliphate—'Come with Ramla or Hind, we shall pay them homage as Commanders of the Faithful.[1] What can it matter to us which king [93] exerts his power about us?'[2]

For the earlier[3] as well as all later times the words of the poet 'Amr b. 'Abd al-Mālik al-'Itrī, contemporary of the rivalry between the two 'Abbāsid princes Amīn and Ma'mūn, characterize public feeling: 'We will not leave Baghdād, even if this or the other departs or stays; if only we can live comfortably we are not concerned whether this or the other is imām.'[4]

## II

Religious scruples were removed by the pious theologians with their ḥadīths. We will now concern ourselves with this layer of calming ḥadīths which had such an important influence upon the development of Islamic state life. The reader will be able to observe that the ḥadīths represent different grades of mediation[5] which it does not seem necessary to keep apart here. All of them have the same purpose: to teach that even a wicked government must be obeyed and that it must be left to God to cause the downfall of

[1] Al-Mas'ūdi, V. p. 71, 6.
[2] Ibid p. 174, penult.
[3] Cf. Kremer, *Herrschenden Ideen*, p. 356, bottom.
[4] Al-Ṭabarī, III, p. 890.
[5] The oppositional teaching is still mirrored in the following ḥadīth: 'The Prophet was asked: This your cousin Mu'āwiya orders us to do, must we obey him? Obey him, said the Prophet, in obedience to God, refuse him in resistance to God,' Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 131.

rulers of whom He disapproves. Abū Yūsuf already has collected the doctrines belonging into this category in his epistle to Hārūn al-Rashīd[1] and in al-Shaybānī's work on the law of war is another collection of them.[2] 'He who disapproves of some of his ruler's actions may bear this in patience, for he who leaves obedience by even a span will die like a pagan.'[3] 'It is better to have a tyrannical government for a time than to have a period of revolution.'[4] 'He who
[94] leaves the community by the distance of but one span, has cast away the rope of Islam (sign of submission).' 'Hell has seven gates; one of them is destined for those who draw the sword upon my community (*ummati*)'[5] 'One day many, very many, evils will arise in my community; but he who undertakes to split the common cause of the Muslims is to be killed with the sword, whoever he may be,' 'How will you behave'—the Prophet is made to ask—'when rulers succeeding me will take for themselves part of the booty (i.e. squander the state treasury)?' 'Then', is the answer, 'we shall take the sword upon our shoulder[6] and fight (against the ruler) until we meet you again.' The Prophet replies: 'But I will show you what is better than that: be patient until you meet me again.' 'Every emir is to be followed into war whether he be just or not (*barran kāna aw fājiran*), and the *ṣalāt* must be performed behind any Muslim, be he just or wicked'.[7] 'Obey your superiors and resist not, for to obey them is to obey God, to rebel against them is to rebel against God. . . . If someone manages your affairs and acts against God's will, may he be cursed by God (i.e. God will know how to punish him but you must not refuse obedience).'"[8] The Prophet's saying: *man ahāna sulṭāna'llahi fi'l-arḍi ahānahu'llāhu* (He who despises God's government on earth, him God will humble)[9] is quoted to those who disapprove. 'Do not insult the regents, because of actions of the representatives of the government which are against the sunna. If they are acting well they deserve God's reward and you must be grateful; if they act badly the sin rests with them and you must be patient; they are the whip with whom God punishes those he wishes to punish. Do not receive the scourge of God with

[1] *K. al-Kharāj*, pp. 5ff.
[2] *WJL*, XL, pp. 58ff. [I, pp. 106ff.]
[3] B. *Fitan*, no. 2.
[4] Mālik b. Anas in al-Maqqarī, I, p. 900, 4. *sulṭān jā'ir muddatan khayr min fitnati sā'a*. A similar saying is given as motto of 'Amr b. al-'Aṣ: *sulṭan ẓalūm ghashūm khayr min fitna tadūm*, al-Ya'qūbī, II, p. 263, 14. (In al-Maydānī, I, p. 313, ult., mentioned as *muwallad*).
[5] Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 191, 15.
[6] Cf. B. *Jizya* no. 18: *waḍa'nā asyāfanā 'alā 'awātiqina*.
[7] Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 252; II, p. 183; cf. B. *Jizya*, no. 4.
[8] Ibn Ḥajar, IV, p. 319.
[9] Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 35.

anger and annoyance but receive it with humility and subjection.'[1] From such considerations the representatives of this view reject the murder of tyrants: 'Al-Ḥajjāj is a punishment sent by God; do not meet God's punishment with the sword.'[2]

Generally, true believers are exhorted not to join any party in [95] times of political rebellions and revolutions (*fitan*), but to remain quietly at home and to await the end in submission and with patience (*ṣabr*). 'The seated one[3] is better than he who stands, the standing better than he who walks, the walker better than he who strives.'[4] 'Be stay-at-home' (*kūnū aḥlāsa*[5] *buyūtikum*). 'Blessed is he who avoids public agitations (*inna'l-sa'īd la-man jānaba'l-fitan*),[6] and if against one's will one is forced by the rebels to show one's views, it is better to be 'Abd Allāh the killed than 'Abd Allāh the killer.'[7] At the time of the *fitna* one should 'break one's bow, tear the strings', 'take up a wooden sword',[8] etc.,[9] but best of all one should hide in the furthest and least comfortable corner from such revolutions[10] in order not to be involved in the movement. To this group belong those traditions which exhort the believers and comfort them by saying that if it is not possible to alter prevailing evil with hand and tongue, it is sufficient to protest with the heart.[11] 'He who is an eyewitness and disapproves will be considered as if he had not seen it' (*man shahidahā wa-karihahā ka-man ghāba 'anhā*).[12]

These were general principles given to the people by the theologians in order to support the existing order and to prevent civil troubles. They also endeavoured to find practical examples from the ancient history of Islam for their general theoretical teachings. These [96] examples were meant to show that pious Muslims of patriarchal times

[1] In *al-Fakhrī*, ed. Ahlwardt, p. 40.

[2] *Al-'Iqd*, III, p. 22, bottom.

[3] Cf. the speech of Abū Mūsā al-Ash'arī to the people of Kūfa, Abū Ḥan. Dīn., p. 154, 5, where it says, 'The lying one (*al-mā'im*) is better than the standing.' For this use of *nāma* in earlier language see Dozy, *Supplém[ent aux dictionnaires arabes*, Leiden, 1881], p. 790a; cf. *Oesterr. Monatsschr. für den Orient*, XII (1885), col. 209a: *qā'im mā-nā'im*, Yāqūt, IV, p. 594, 13.

[4] Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 31.

[5] Also *bilis bayṭihi* in the singular; for the explanation see scholias to Abu'l-'Alā', *Saqṭ al-Zand*, II, p. 156, v. 1; cf. *bils min ahlās bayṭihi*, Abū Ḥanīfa Dīnaw. p. 234, 19.

[6] Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 133.

[7] Ibn Qutayba, *Mukhtalif al-Ḥadīth*, p. 182.

[8] It seems obvious to think of a connection with the fact discussed by van Gelder, *Mochtar de vaalsche profeet* (Leiden, 1888), p. 72.

[9] Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 32.

[10] B. *Imān* no. 20, p. 12, bottom. By this *firār min al-fitan*, therefore, is not meant escape from moral temptation (Krehl, *Beiträge zur Charakteristik der Lehre vom Glauben im Islam*, Leipzig, 1877, p. 36) but the avoidance of insubordination against authority.

[11] *ZDMG*, XLI, p. 57, note 1.

[12] Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 142.

had rejected political life and its disorders from this pacific point of view. Al-Aḥnaf b. Qays reports: I set forth in order to help 'this man' (i.e. 'Alī before the battle of the camel) I met Abū Bakra and he said: 'Where are you going?' 'I want to go and help this man.' 'Turn back,' countered Abū Bakra, and I heard the Prophet say: 'If two Muslims draw swords against one other, both, the murderer and the murdered, will go to hell.'[1] When Nāfi', a client of Ibn 'Umar' who did not wish to participate in the revolt of Ibn al-Zubayr, was asked about his negative behaviour towards the revolt against the evil government in Syria, he is made to reply: 'It is said in the Koran (2:189) "Fight them (the unbelievers) so that there may be no rebellion and so that there may be submission to God". We have fought to end revolt and to lead God's *dīn* to victory. Your war leads to revolt and to a state where *dīn* does not belong to God.'[2]

The following account, which is also referred to Nāfi', is clearer than all the other religious accounts on this subject. When the Medinians declared the Umayyad Yazīd b. Mu'āwiya deprived of the caliphate, 'Umar's son (whose client was Nāfi') gathered together his intimate companions and his children and addressed them: 'I have heard the Prophet say that on the day of resurrection a flag will be hoisted before all who have broken faith.[3] We have paid homage to this man (Yazīd) by God and by His apostle. I know of no greater perfidy[4] than to pay homage to a man by God and His apostle and then to go and lift the sword against him.'[5] This story is meant to teach the believers of all times that the duty of a subject's submission must not be refused, even to the most evil of all possible
[97] rulers.[6] This was meant as a lesson to those who saw a virtue in

[1] B. *Diyāt* no. 2 = *Fitan*, no. 10.

[2] B. *Tafsīr*, no. 14; cf. no. 103, end, to Sūra 8:33.

[3] See Part I p. 23; add to the reference a note 2; B. *Jizya*, no. 22, Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 275, al-Dārimī, p. 338. The account of the flag hoisting in the Jāhiliyya seems to originate with a poetical figure of speech. Cf. *wa-yurfa' lahum fī kulli majma'atin liwā'u*, Zuhayr 1:63 (ed. Landberg, p. 165, v. 4); *idhā mā rāyatun rufi'at li-majdin*, al-Shammākh, *Agh.*, VIII, p. 106, 21 = *Taḥdhīb*, p. 148, penult.

[4] The *lectio vulgata* is *'udhran*, but the variant *ghadran* is preferable.

[5] B. *Fitan*, no. 22. Parallel passages to the traditions quoted here are in Muslim, IV, pp. 280–8.

[6] Later orthodox theology also took the theoretical consequences of this teaching. The question whether Yazīd may be abused is seriously considered and decided according to the interdiction of the 'abuse of the Companions' (*sabb al-ṣaḥāba*; cf. *Litteraturgesch. der Sāfi'a*, pp. 19–20); see in detail al-Damīrī, II, p. 266; al-Qasṭallānī, V, pp. 117*f.*, X, p. 193. In the fifth century a Ḥanbalite theologian, 'Abd al-Mughīth b. Zuhayr al-Ḥarrī (d. 483), goes so far as to publish a book *Fī Faḍā'il Yazīd* (on Yazīd's excellencies) which brings him heated polemics from Ibn al-Jawzī (Ibn al-Athīr XI, p. 230). [For the attitude towards Yazīd cf. Goldhizer in *ZDMG* LIII (1899), p. 646, LXIV (1912), pp. 139–43; Lammens, *Yazīd Ier*, pp. 485ff. = *MFOB*, VI (1913), 480ff.]

disobedience against authorities whom they regarded as irreligious, and who hoped to gain the martyr's crown by combating these. The change in the meaning of 'martyr', of which we shall deal in more detail in one of the excursuses of this volume, was also to serve the same tendency.

The above group of traditions has been listed without chronological order, since, in the absence of chronological criteria of even relative certainty, it is impossible to establish one. It may be supposed, however, that the basic idea of this group of ḥadīths goes back to the first century when the contrast between the spirit of the government and the ideals of the pious was most deeply felt. People who were not inspired by the defiance of a Sa'īd b. al-Musayyib but sought a *modus vivendi* with the powers that be, like the accommodating theologians whom we have just met, probably spread in those days the traditions which advised submission to the *de facto* government. The rule of those 'Abbāsid caliphs who, without impairing religious life deviated from orthodoxy in the formulation of revealed dogma and persecuted the orthodox, might also have given occasion for contemplation about the relation of a religious community to such rulers; the more reconcilable amongst the pious would possibly have been moved to develop further those appeasing and mediating principles in the interest of the common weal.

These principles also reveal the influence attributed by the theologians to the *ijmā'*, the regard to which,—as we have seen at the end of the last chapter, was fitted to help in many theological perplexities. There was to be no insubordination against a ruler recognized by the whole *umma* even if he had lost the right of the Muslim ruler in the sense of strict religious demands.

Another example will show how greatly the principle of the *ijmā'* [96] influenced the views of Muslims in judging political circumstances.

## III

Orthodox Islam had a vested interest in preventing the principle of a hereditary caliphate from taking root in the consciousness of believers. The 'Abbāsid rule no doubt meant the victory of the legitimist principle and the transmitters of religious teaching supported this dynasty, though not as the representatives of legitimacy but as the actual owners of power whose rights had been proved by the unanimous homage of the community (*ijmā' al-umma*).[1] In the teaching of orthodox Islam this *ijmā'* alone is the

[1] According to Kremer, *Herrschenden Ideen*, p. 409, this view dates back to the ideas of the ancient Arabs. A poet living under Islam, but nevertheless a typical Arab, might be quoted in this context. He is 'Abd Allāh b. Abī Tha'lab (*Hudhayl*, 242:63): *imāmun idhā khtalafa'l-'ālimūna yalta'imūna 'alayhi'lti' āmā*.

measure of the ruler's title to authority.[1] The imām who is recognized by the will of the whole community—*al-imām al-mujtama' 'alayhi*—is the rightful imām.[2] *Al-imāma lā tan'aqid illā bi-ijmā' al-umma 'an bikrat abīhim*;[3] this was the teaching particularly against those who wished to confine legitimacy to the 'Alid family.[4] Unless the rights of the first three caliphs and of the whole of the Umayyad caliphate were to be subjected to doubt, and thus so to speak the whole legal continuity of the Islamic polity during the first century
[99] dangerously undermined, which orthodox teachers did not wish,[5] the *ijmā' al-umma* upon which the legitimacy of those pre-'Abbāsid periods rested, had to be taken as the only valid yardstick for a judgement of the political affairs of the empire. The *ijmā'* alone could be sunna. Rebellions against the government and subversion, even if justified theoretically by legitimist arguments, are *fitna* and as such opposed to the sunna.[6]

The 'Abbāsid rulers themselves, of course, and their political representatives and propagandists, have asserted the rights of legitimacy against the Umayyads, and putting this principle on their standard brought the whole of the Islamic world under their rule. The *khuṭbas* quoted by historians from the early years of the rule of the house of 'Abbās show that it was chiefly the arguments of the right of inheritance which were propounded from the pulpits in those days.[7] It must be considered that the Umayyads, as well and their adherents, took great pains to adduce genealogical arguments for the claims of their dynasty.[8] They thought themselves nobler than the family nearest to the Prophet, and could not get

[1] Cf. Ṭab., II, p. 177 (Ibn 'Umar to Mu'awiya). Inheritance of sovereign rights is called by the pious *sunnat kisrā wa-qayṣar* (sunna of pagan empires), al-Suyūṭī, *Ta'rīkh*, pp. 76, 2; 78, 6.

[2] *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 145; cf. a saying by Ma'mūn on the relation of the caliphate to the *ijmā' al-umma*, al-Mas'ūdī, VII, pp. 41ff. Such words are intentionally attributed to 'Abbāsid rulers. Even during the time of the Egyptian puppet caliphate the *ijmā'* was still pointed out with gusto, see the document of homage, al-Suyūṭī, op. cit., p. 199, [ibid, p. 39].

[3] Al-Shahrastānī, p. 51. He who denies the *ijmā'* like Ibrāhīm al-Naẓẓām (see above p. 87, note) also confesses to the doctrines of illegitimacy of the first caliphs.

[4] Cf. also Snouck Hurgronje, *Kritik der Beginselen*, part 2, pp. 65, 68 (offprint). [*Verspreide Geschr.*, II, pp. 205–6, 209–10].

[5] A great number of ḥadīths were made up which clearly speak of the succession of Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Uthmān, e.g. B. *Adab*, no. 117. It is interesting to observe that this attitude made theologians under al-Mu'taḍid prevent the promulgation of an anti-Umayyad edict by the caliph; Ṭab., III, pp. 2164, bottom, 2177, bottom.

[6] Al-Ya'qūbī, II, p. 353, 9: *rajul tarfa'uhu'l-fitna wa-taḍa'uhu'l-sunna*.

[7] E.g. ibid, II, p. 422, top.

[8] Abū Ṣakhr al-Hudhalī opens the whole gamut of these arguments in a spirited address, *Agh.*, XXI, p. 145, top.

over it when the latter was praised as the noblest branch of the tribe of Quraysh. The poet Ibn Mayyāda was whipped because he put the kin of Muhammed above that of the B. Marwān in one of his poems.[1] The survival of such views was to be overcome by dynastic ḥadīth. The most perfect of these ḥadīths, and also the most transparent in its purpose, is this:[2]

Jubayr b. Muṭ'im reports that he and 'Uthmān b. 'Affān took the Prophet to task about the fact that he divided the fifth of the war booty (which according to Sura 8:42 has to go to the Prophet himself, his close relatives—*li-dhī'l-qurbā*—as well as to the poor and [100] orphaned) amongst the B. Hāshim and the B. l-Muṭṭalib. I said: 'O Apostle of God, you have given a share to our brothers the B. l-Muṭṭalib but have given nothing to us, though our relationship to you is the same as theirs.'' The Prophet answered to this: 'The B. Hāshim and B. l-Muṭṭalib are the same.'[3] Jubayr said: 'He did not give anything to the B. 'Abd Shams and the B. Nawfal of this fifth, as he had given to the B. Hashim and B.l-Muṭṭalib.[4]

The dynastic-legitimistic character of this ḥadīth is obvious. The offspring of the line of 'Abd Shams, ancestor of the Umayyads, are to be slighted as against his brother Hāshim from whom stem the 'Abbāsids. But arguments from family law were also to be brought into play against the 'Alids as well. It is remarkable that secular poetic literature, whose representatives were favoured with rich gifts by the 'Abbāsids, is filled with these arguments.

The main concern was to prove the legitimacy of the 'Abbāsids[5] against the 'Alids, who were the truly legitimistic pretenders. They, since they had never been able to rely on the *ijmā' al-umma* but had always been candidates of only a fraction of Islam, had to maintain the hereditariness of the caliphate in order to prove their claims; this hereditary claim they had to apply to one of their lines, of which there were very many.[6] The 'Abbāsid caliphs, who at the first period of the rise of their dynasty, looked jealously at any respect paid to the 'Alids[7] and were continuously haunted by the ghost of 'Alid machinations (al-Ma'mūn agreed to a dangerous

[1] *Agh.*, II, p. 102, 5ff; cf. a verse by A'shā Hamdān, *Agh.*, V, p. 160, 16, in relation to the B. Marwān: *wa-khayru Qurayshin fī Qurayshin arʿunatan/ wa-'aḥramahum illā'l-nabiyya Muḥammadan.*

[2] The exchange of letters between Mu'āwiya and 'Alī illuminates this passage, Abū Ḥan. Dīn., pp. 199, 17, 200, 4–6.

[3] B. *Manāqib*, no. 3.

[4] Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 21; cf. the commentaries on the passage of the Koran referred to (al-Bayḍāwī, I, p. 367, 24).

[5] [I assume that the 'zurück zubeweisen' of the original, which hardly gives a sense in this context, is a scribal error for something like 'za beweisen'. SMS.]

[6] 'No family in the world has more male offspring than that of Abū Ṭālib', Ibn al-Faqīh al-Hamadānī, p. 75, 8.

[7] Cf. e.g. *Agh.*, XXI, p. 120, 19.

concession to them), liked to listen to their court poets and other flatterers reciting arguments against the pretensions of their rivals. Perhaps they thought that such ideas could easily penetrate to the people by this route. We learn that Hārūn al-Rashīd demanded of his poets that 'they combine his own praise with refutation of the claims of 'Alī's descendants and with attacks against the latter.'[1]

[101] This report explains why so many subtle points of the law of inheritance are to be found in the poems by 'Abbāsid court poets. In these poetic circles an argument is spun out which culminates in the point that even under the law of inheritance the offspring of the Prophet's uncle ('Abbās) have more right to the inheritance than the offspring of the daughter's husband[2] or that inheritance should go to the uncle rather than the nephew.

> Is the Prophet's uncle nearer to him in genealogical succession than is his nephew?
> And which of them is more worthy to succeed him and who has the right to claim his inheritance?
> If 'Abbas has the greater right and 'Alī afterwards also claims relationship,[3]
> Then may 'Abbās' sons be his heirs, as the uncle must remove the nephew from inheritance—

this poem is recited before Hārūn al-Rashīd by the poet Abān b. 'Abd al-Ḥamīd[4] on the initiative of the Barmecides.[5]

Al-Mu'ammal, a court poet of al-Mahdī, went further even than that, and quoted the Koran in order to prove that 'Abbās is the rightful heir to the prophet (*wārithuhu yaqīnan*).[6] For a reward of ten thousand dirhams—the generous Hārūn gave twice that to Abān—the weak-headed al-Mutawakkil could hear the following didactic poem from Marwān b. Abī'l-Janūb:

> Yours is the inheritance of Muhammed, and by your justice is injustice banned,
> The daughter's children desire the rights of the caliphate but theirs is not even that which can be put under a nail;

[1] Ibid., XII, p. 17, 9.

[2] Al-Mubarrad, p. 284, dates poems with similar tendencies back to earlier times; cf. Marwān b. Abī Ḥafṣa in *Agh.*, IX, p. 45, 16.

[3] I give the translation of this heuristic: *ma-kāna 'Aliyyun ba'da dhāka 'alā sabab'* with great reserve; cf. also *nasabukum wa-sababukum Agh.*, XXI, p. 145, 2.

[4] Part 1, pp. 182–3.

[5] *Agh.*, XX, p. 76; cf. XII, pp. 18, 13; 28, 20.

[6] Ibid., XIX, p. 148, 6, from the bottom, or as another poet says (in respect of the hereditary claims of the 'Alīds): the 'Abbāsids are *wārithu' l-nabiyyi bi'amri' l-ḥaqqi ghayri' l-taḥādhubi*, *Agh.*, III, p. 91, 4 from the bottom.

The daughter's husband is no heir, and the daughter does not inherit the Imāmate;
And those who claim your inheritance will inherit only repentance.[1]

In this spirit the 'Abbāsids like to hear occasionally from their [102]
flatterers that they are not only the offspring of the Prophet's uncle but that they can be considered as direct descendants of Muhammed: *ḥumā'bnā rasūli'llāhi wa-'bnā'bni 'ammihi[fa-qad karuma'l-jaddāni wa'l-abawāni.*[2]

By these flatteries, which they themselves suggested and approved, it was intended to let the fact that they were not descendants of the Prophet but only his agnates be forgotten. Generally, however, the proof of more valid claims to inheritance was but one of the 'Abbāsids' weapons; more important and carrying greater weight in popular opinion was the fact that every single one of their rulers had been recognized as rightful imām by the *ijmā'* of the community of Muhammed.[3] This was the surest prop of the ruler of the Islamic empire. This view was promoted chiefly by the theologians, who seem to have been quite willing, as an example has shown us, to teach in their ḥadīths of the complete worthlessness of the godless Umayyads. As against the 'Alīds they tended to emphasize the unimportance of hereditary points of view in the interest of the ruling dynasty. The dignity of the caliph could not just be taken by one who through his kinship was reared heir to the Prophet. In order to nip the contrary teaching in the bud and to withdraw the question of the caliphate from the sphere of subtleties in the law of inheritance, the tradition had to establish the principle that nothing belonging to the Prophet could be subject to inheritance. Nobody is his heir, from the point of view of civil law and therefore by extension also in regard to his office as ruler. His property goes to the treasury and in the same way the community must decide upon his successor.

This principle appears in the following ḥadīth, which is particularly interesting for our studies since it shows how much tendentious polemic infiltrated into the various exegetical discussions of texts during later times. In a ḥadīth of Abu'l-Yaman b. Nāfi' which is related back to Mālik b. Anas it is said: 'While 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb was talking to Mālik b. Aws the doorkeeper announced Yarfā b. 'Uthmān, 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Awf, Zubayr b. al-'Awāmm and Sa'd

[1] Ṭab., III, p. 1466.

[2] *Agh.*, XXI, p. 130, 11. The caliph al-Wāthiq also is addressed by his court poet 'Alī b. al-Jahm (ibid., p. 255, 13) as 'son of the Lord of Lords' (i.e. descendant of the Prophet): *Hārūnu yā'bna sayyidi'l-sādāti.*

[3] Ibid., VIII, p. 177, 9 from the bottom: *(khulafa) jama'ta bihā ahwā'a ummati Aḥmada.*

[103] b. Abī Waqqāṣ, and they were admitted. Later also 'Alī and 'Abbās were announced and joined them. They asked the caliph to be arbiter in their quarrel about the property which the Prophet had found after the victory over the Jewish tribe of the B. Naḍīr and which on God's order he had kept for himself. (They claimed this property as their inheritance since they were the Prophet's nearest relatives.[1]) When the assembled visitors pressed 'Umar for a decision of the question he gave them the following verdict with reference to a saying of Muhammed: 'I adjure you by Him through Whose permission heaven and earth exist! Do not you know that the Prophet of blessed memory has said: 'We (prophets) do not make our property to be inherited, (i.e. our estate is not like ordinary property which is divided among the relatives according to fixed laws and rules); what we leave is charity (i.e., belongs to the treasury)''.[2] A parallel passage introduces the same saying differently.[3] Here 'A'isha tells how Fāṭima asked Abū Bakr after the Prophet's death that he should hand her her share of the inheritance consisting of the fortune which the Prophet gained as his share in war booty. Abū Bakr then quoted to Fāṭima the principle: 'We do not leave any inheritance, what we leave is for charity' (*lā nūrith, mā tarakná ṣadaqa*).[4]

This sentence, which, as has already been indicated, aims at serving a great principle of public law beyond its primary civil law interest, was inconvenient to the Shī'a, since their political-legal opposition was founded mainly on the claims of inheritance by 'Alī and Fāṭima and condemns the usurpation of the first caliph by confiscating the rights of the legal heirs of the Prophet. Therefore they change this troublesome sentence to : *lā yūrath* (passive) *mā*
[104] *tarakná ṣadagatan* (a change which cannot be properly demonstrated in transcribed form). By means of this graphic and syntactic correction the principle attains the following meaning: 'What we leave behind for charity cannot be inherited (but all else is subject to the usual laws of inheritance)''.[5] In effect, the Shī'a maintains in contrast to the Sunnite doctrine that the Prophet's property is subject to the same laws of inheritance as that of ordinary mortals. In order to

[1] This quarrel extended right into 'Abbāsid times. 'Umar II gave the property claimed to the 'Alids; Yazīd II confiscated it again (al-Ya'qūbī, II, p. 366, bottom). Al-Ma'mūn, who made a pact with the 'Alids, gave it back again (ibid., p. 573) and al-Mutawakkil again included it in the state's property (al-Balādhurī, pp. 30–2) until the pro-Shī'ite caliph al-Muntaṣir (248) recognised the 'Alīd claims (al-Mas'ūdī, VII, p. 303).

[2] B. *Maghāzī*, no. 14, 40.

[3] Cf. also Ṭab., I, pp. 1825, 9ff.; 1826, 14, with the variant *nūraṯ*.

[4] B. *Farḍ al-Khums*, no. 1; Abū Dāwūd, II, pp. 19–21; cf. al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 304.

[5] Al-Qasṭallānī, V, p. 215, IV, p. 315.

lessen the possibilities of changing the traditional sentence in the Shī'ite manner, Sunnite traditionalists have added the word *fī-huwa* before the last word of the story: *mā tarakná fa-huwa ṣadaqatun*.[1] All who are acquainted with Arabic syntax must realize that this insertion makes impossible a change of the meaning in the manner attempted by the Shī'a.[2]

IV

In the course of this study we shall return to the fact that the Muslim theologians treat the traditions received into the canonical compilations with great freedom and independence. But because of the context we shall anticipate here a phenomenon belonging to this subject.

Muslim theologians of later times considered the non-hereditary character of the prophetic and royal office of Muhammed as so important a point of orthodox teaching that they opposed every slight dimming of the principle even if that meant opposing a tradition from which a contrary view can be inferred.

The fierce opposition to every attempt to see the dignity of the Prophet as other than confined entirely and exclusively to his person, and as having continued effect in his offspring, is the main difference between the teaching of the orthodox and of those sects which are based upon 'Alīd principles. The basic idea of that party was the hereditability of prophetic dignity and rule over the empire which they strove to obtain for the family of Muhammed in the line of [105]
Fāṭima. Because acceptance or rejection of this principle became the fighting slogan between the parties, the orthodox had to try to ensure that the tradition offered nothing which might serve as an incontestable proof for the believers in the hereditary and legitimistic principles. The good and beautiful things said of 'Alī and his children in the name of the Prophet were permitted to stand[3] and orthodox authorities have even propagated traditions which show a downright Shī'ite appearance. On the other hand, however, everything was to be declared as wrong which might give support to the claims of 'Alī's descendants for special sanctity and rights to the empire. Therefore the idea of the hereditary character of spiritual dignity had to be eradicated. The example that we are quoting is a typical instance of the tendency, since it shows that orthodox

[1] In *al-Muwaṭṭa'*, IV, p. 231, the *locus vulgata* has the reading: *lā nūrith, mā tarakná fa-huwa ṣadaqatun*. In the Shaybānī recension, p. 317, *fa-huwa* is lacking. This insertion is also in Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 21 at the end of the chapter.

[2] Cf. al-Mas'ūdī, III, p. 56.

[3] Abū Mūsā mentions this saying of the Prophet: 'I and 'Alī and Fāṭima and Ḥasan and Ḥusayn will stand on the roof of my tent at the foot of God's throne at the day of resurrection', al-Zurqānī, IV, p. 174; cf. ibid, I, p. 251.

theology opposed such traditions even when they had succeeded in entering the canonical compilations owing to their apparently indifferent character.

It is not really strange that orthodox tradition, despite its usual love of minute detail in all things concerning the Prophet, finds little to say of Muhammed's sons and that it is always unmistakably vague in the few accounts bearing on this point. All male offspring of the Prophet died in infancy. The reports do not even agree whether Ibrāhīm the son of the Prophet was a child of the Copt woman Maria or of Khadīja. This Ibrāhīm died at the age of seventeen or eighteen months, having not yet completed his time of suckling (two years). The tradition makes this remark about it: 'If God had decided to have prophets after Muhammed, Ibrāhīm would not have died, but there is no prophet after Muhammed.'[1] This tradition is impugned by some of the authoritative orthodox theologians. Ibn 'Abd al-Barr (d. 463) says: 'I do not know the meaning of this. Noah was a prophet and all men descended from Noah. If it were certain that the children of prophets were always prophets, all mankind ought to be prophets.'[2] Al-Nawawī (d. 676) pronounces himself even more
[106] sharply against these traditions: 'If one hands down, on the authority of some of the elders, the sentence, 'If Ibrāhīm had lived he would have been prophet,'[3] we declare this to be wrong, to be a daring interference with God's secrets, a bold assumption attacking great things.'[4] This sentence is based on the authority of three of Muhammed's companions. It shows how orthodox theology counters all attempts at hinting at the possibility of the spiritual dignity of the Prophet being hereditary. It is unlikely that theologians waited until the fifth century before protesting against this ḥadīth from which the hereditary character of the prophecy could be inferred. Following their usual method they have opposed this tradition with one of their own, intending thus to fight the doctrine which could be derived from the first. We believe we are justified in taking the following as a counter-ḥadīth: 'If there were to be prophets after me, it would surely be 'Umar.'[5] This was to rule out belief in the inheritance of the sacred character in the line of Fāṭima.[6]

[1] B. *Adab*, no. 108.

[2] Ibn Ḥajar, I, p. 188, no. 394.

[3] To this group also belongs the tradition quoted by Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 43, that the prayer of death had not been said over Ibrāhīm (this being the privilege of prophets and martyrs).

[4] *Tahdhīb*, I, p. 133, bottom; cf. al-Qasṭallānī, X, p. 124.

[5] Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 293; *Maṣābīḥ al-Sunna*, II, p. 196.

[6] Later there was no hesitation in uttering the words: 'If there could be a prophet after Muhammed, it would surely be al-Ghazālī.' Collected treatises of al-Suyūṭī, MS. of the Univ. of Leiden, no. 474 (8), fol. 6a.

V

From all these points it is evident that the formation of ḥadīths at the time of its great advance under the 'Abbāsids served the elaboration of traditional sayings which supported the principles upon which the descendants of 'Abbās have based their claims. What we have seen hitherto can mostly be called negative argumentation, i.e. the shaking of the opponents' foundations. After our previous experience it will not be surprising that there were at that time tendentious ḥadīths which supported the case of the dynasty in even more direct ways.

We have already met (above, p. 99) one such dynastical tradition. There are very many of them the character of which is more obvious. To coin such phrases was so very important to the interest of the [107] dynasty's recognition because the opposing parties—particularly the various 'Alid factions who had been dangerous to the 'Abbāsids long enough—also circulated their fabrications amongst the people in order to discredit their opponents on religious grounds. The Umayyads had already felt called upon to stir up their court theologians into producing religious weapons against the 'Alid claims. It must have been difficult to revile in a religious form the persons of 'Alī and his children, hallowed in the consciousness of almost all the layers of population and about whom, very early on, an aura of martyrdom had been created. Therefore recourse was had to the expedient of abusing the pagan ancestor as being the archetype of his offspring. The Prophet was made to say that Abū Ṭālib, father of 'Alī, was sitting deep in hell: 'Perhaps my intercession will be of use to him at the day of resurrection, so that he may be transferred into a pool of fire which reaches only up to the ankles but which is still hot enough to burn his brain.'[1] Naturally enough this was countered by the theologians of the 'Alids by devising numerous traditions concerning the glorification of Abū Ṭālib,[2] all sayings of the Prophet. The floods of polemic released in such counter-traditions are interesting to observe.

In these sayings embittered conflict is hidden under an apparently calm surface. Often it can quite clearly be seen how a particular saying is directed against a special point enounced by the opponents. Thus the conflict between 'Alī's followers and their opponents who defend the legitimacy of Abū Bakr's election is mirrored in two groups of traditions, which give the honour of being the Prophet's

[1] Sprenger, *Mohammad*, II, p. 74. [B. *Manāqib al-Anṣār*, no. 40; *Riqāq*, no. 51; Muslim, *Īmān*, no. 360; *Musnad Aḥmad*, III, pp. 9, 50, 55; for other similar traditions cf. Wensinck, *Handbook*, s.v. 'Abū Ṭālib'.]

[2] An ample selection is to be found in Ibn Ḥajar, IV, pp. 214ff, and ibid., p. 239; cf. B. *Janā'iz*, no. 81.

first follower and the first to pray with the Prophet to each of the two respectively. These two groups of tradition can be found side by side in al-Ṭabarī. No other amongst them shows so clearly its tendentious character as the saying related on the authority of 'Abbād b. 'Abd Allāh: 'I heard 'Alī say: "I am the servant of God and brother of the Apostle of God, I am the great Ṣiddīq; after me only a liar will claim this; I prayed with the Prophet nine years
[108] before any other person did so." '[1] It must be remembered here that the honorary title of Ṣiddīq was given by Sunnite tradition to Abū Bakr.

Inventions of ḥadīths which served special Umayyad interests, without being of use to the general sunna, were suppressed in the next period for reasons which we have already explained (p. 53). Now it was more to the point to give theological support to the 'Abbāsid rulers and this too took the form of traditions which glorified the 'uncle', the ancestor of the dynasty, and defended him against the ancestors of the opposing pretenders. If it is considered that several of the caliphs showed themselves interested in research into traditions and their circulation (we now know how to interpret this) it is easily understood that such fabrications were favoured and received advancement from the highest quarters. The caliph al-Mahdī, the third of the 'Abbāsids (158–69), is listed by Ibn 'Adī as an inventor of ḥadīths.[2] In these reports al-'Abbās is invested with an aura of sanctity even though he had resisted the Prophet's cause for so long.[3] During a drought 'Umar is said to have referred in his prayers (*istisqā'*) not only to the Prophet but also to 'Abbās, since he appeared to him as particularly suitable for awakening God's mercy: 'O Allāh,' so he said in his prayer, 'we used to refer to the Prophet in our requests and You have given rain; today we refer to the Prophet's uncle (al-'Abbās), so please give us rain.' This reference was effective.[4] A normal usage[5] has here been exploited in the interest of the 'Abbāsid party. The offspring of such a holy ancestor are best suited to be the leaders of the orthodox community. This fable also served as one of the titles to fame of the 'Abbāsid caliphs, who liked to hear their flattering poets refer to it. Al-Mutawakkil has a poem engraved on a memorial coin in which it is said of the 'family of Hāshim' that by their merits rain is sent after

[1] Al-Ṭabarī, I, p. 1160. (Cf. Th. Nöldeke, 'Zur tendenziösen Gestaltung der vorgeschichte des Islām's', *ZDMG*, LII (1898), pp. 16ff. Also Jāḥiẓ's *al-Uthmāniyya* (cf. below, p. 117) contains relevant material.]

[2] In al-Suyūṭī, *Ta'rīkh*, pp. 106, 22; 109, 17. On p. 143, 6 from below, a ḥadīth is mentioned in the *isnād* of which six caliphs are named as informants.

[3] B. *Jihād'iz*, no. 80. [For traditions about al-'Abbās cf. also Nöldeke's article quoted above.]

[4] *Agh.*, XI, p. 81, *Tahdhīb*, p. 332.

[5] Part I, pp. 40–1.

God had refused it for a long time.'[1] Ibn al-Rūmī, extols in his *qaṣīda* dedicated to the caliph al-Mu'taḍid (279–89):

Your ancestor, al-'Abbās, is the one whose name did not fail when [108]
it was used in need to gain rain,
It split the clouds by a prayer which was granted and the flashing
of lightning, bestowed water, obeyed it.[2]

Al-'Abbās once complained to the Prophet: 'What have the Qurayshites against us? They meet one another with friendly faces but refuse to do likewise to us.' This made the Prophet angry, his face grew red and he said: 'By him, in whose hand my soul rests, belief does not enter anybody's heart unless he loves you for the sake of Allāh and his Apostle. O men, he who hurts my uncle hurts me, since a man's uncle is like his father.'[3]

The Qurayshites who do not like 'Abbās, despite all tribal solidarity, are here presumably the 'Alīds. It is easily seen that the aim was to make the recognition of the 'Abbāsid claims into a religious affair (*li'llāhi wa-li-rasūlihi*). The dynastic tendency is also shown by the fact that 'uncle' (*'amm*) is so heavily stressed in this as well as in related sayings (see above, p. 100). From such fabrications it was but a small step to make the Prophet declare to 'Abbās directly that his offspring would attain the dignity of caliph.[4]

The pious people of this period were fond of putting the unpleasant memory of the godless Umayyad times into the form of a ḥadīth. The factors making for the displacement of the religious element were to be made the object of the hatred of Muslims for all time. It is quite possible that the pious had already done some work in this direction in the Umayyad period itself, but it would be too daring to make definite statements as to the time of the origin of such ḥadīths. What is certain is that the 'Abbāsid rule greatly favoured the propagation of such ḥadīths. To these belongs the group of traditions in which the tribe of Thaqīf, from which sprang the tyrant al-Ḥajjāj, was condemned in the name of the Prophet;[5] also the saying of the Prophet where he advises a man who calls his son al-Walīd: 'You name your children by the names of our Pharaohs. Verily, a man with the name al-Walīd will come who will inflict greater [110]
injury upon my community than ever did Pharaoh upon his people.[6]

[1] *Al-Mumaṭṭirāt*, ed. Brünnow, p. 193, 9.
[2] *Yatīmat al-Dahr*, II, p. 303.
[3] Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 304, bottom; cf. *Taḥdīth*, p. 332, bottom. For *ṣinnu abīhi*, see Fleischer, *Kleinere Schriften*, II, p. 137; cf. also the use in *Agh.*, XV, p. 90, 22.
[4] *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 198; cf. Abu'l-Maḥāsin, I, p. 354.
[5] Part I, p. 97.
[6] *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 121.

The informant, Ya'qūb b. Sufyān (d. 288), adds that it was believed that al-Walīd I was meant until the other Walīd, grandson of 'Abd al-Mālik, came on the scene.

VI

Even more than the ruling party did the opposing factions feel it necessary to base their claims on the authority of the Prophet's word. Amongst them therefore the mischievious use of tendentious traditions was even more common than with the official party. The Shī'a became an independent organism within the Islamic world only very late, owing to political circumstances the discussion of which is beyond the scope of these studies. During the first centuries[1] they formed within the Islamic community an oppositional stream, divided into many channels, against the ruling caliphate. With this lack of strict organization went a lack of a strictly dogmatic position; their teachings develop in an unruly and free manner from the teaching of orthodox Islam, and without that discipline which can only grow within the fixed framework of a church. Even well-meaning pious men, loyal to government and religion, have imbibed the 'Alid preferences of the older Shī'a. Only exaggeration of such (otherwise unexceptionable) preferences branded people as heretics. There are but lightly demarcated grades of this *tashayyu'*, as these preferences were called: there are *tashayyu' ḥasan*[2] and *tashayyu' qabīḥ*.[3] The former is often mentioned, usually as a praiseworthy view. In early times there was no thought of a schism[4] but rather of internal propaganda favouring 'Alid pretensions—such as the 'Abbāsids owed their elevation to—which occasionally led to political revolutions and the installing of 'Alid dynasties. The effects, however, were at first of only local and provincial importance, and did not result in the rise of a Shī'a community existing at the side of the sunna community as a separate church. In those days Shī'ism
[111] is a branch of Islam in the same way as are other dogmatic or ritualistic trends; it is a *madhhab* and not a sect.[5] Only the extremists amongst them, i.e. the 'exaggerators', and those who were not satisfied with the quiet aspirations and revolted against the ruling powers, were considered to be outside the sunna. The leaders and promoters of this free propaganda, among whom, because of the nature of spiritual life in Islam, theological as well as political points came to the fore, liked to make the word of God and of the

[1] Cf., for the inner meaning of the Shī'a in those days, see the fundamental discussion by Snouck Hurgronje in *Mekka*, I, pp. 26ff.

[2] Cf. Houtsma, in the preface to his edition of Ya'qūbī, p. ix.

[3] *Agh.*, VIII, p. 32, 6.

[4] See *Literaturgesch. der Shī'a*., p. 7, 24.

[5] The change-over to sectarianism can be seen in circumstances such as those described by Ibn Ḥawqal, ed. de Goeje, p. 65, 21.

Prophet fight for them. The Koran is one of the most preferred weapons in these circles, in two ways.

As is known, these circles accuse the followers of the orthodox teaching of the Sunna with having falsified the Koran and fitted it to their own views by means of omissions. They suspect 'Uthmān, who caused the redaction of the current text of the Koran, of having suppressed five hundred words of the revealed text including the sentence 'Verily, 'Alī is the guidance'.[1] In Sura 25:30 the passage 'If only I had not chosen so-and-so (*fulānan*) as friend' is said to have originally contained a proper name which was omitted and replaced by the indefinite *fulān*.[2] Everybody knows the Shī'ite *Sūrat al-Nūr*[3] which was made known in Europe by Mirza Kazembeg.

Orthodox theology has from times of old stigmatized the attempts of the 'Alid party to declare the current Koran as falsified and to prepare it for their purposes by all sorts of interpolations under the name of *restitutio in integrum*. They accused their opponents of falsifying the text of the holy scriptures in tendentious manner like Jews and Christians[4] and attributed to the Prophet (in later collections of traditions): 'I have cursed six kinds of men and they were cursed also by God and by all prophets who had God's ear: he who adds to the book of God, etc.' refer to this movement.

This quarrel between the followers of the sunna and 'Alid partisans extends into modern times. I quote a few typical words from [112
Rycaut's work, which show how this quarrel was conceived of in the popular opinion of his times.

Rycaut says: 'The Turk also accuses the Persian of corrupting the Alchoran, that they have altered words, misplaced the Comma's and Stops, that many places admit of a doubtful and ambiguous sense, so that those Alchorans which were upon the Conquest of Babylon brought thence to Constantinople are seperated and compiled in the great Seraglio, in a place apart, and forbidden with a Curse on any that shall read them.' In the writing of the Muftī As'ad Efendi against the Shī'ites: 'You deny the verse called the Covering in the Alchoran [Sūra 88] to be authentick; you reject the eighteen Verses, which are revealed to us for the sake of the holy Aische.'[5]

Such biased changes in the Koran belong, however, to the time

[1] *Literaturgesch. der Shi'a*, p. 14 [for the Shī'ite accusations about omissions and falsifications in the Koran, and their exegesis, see Goldziher, *Die Richtungen der islamischen Koranauslegungen* (Leiden, 1920), pp. 270 ff.]

[2] *Mafātīḥ al-Ghayb*, IV, p. 470 [cf. Goldziher, *Richtungen*, pp. 287 ff.]

[3] The whole of this material can be found in Nöldeke's *Gesch. des Qorans*, pp. 216–20 [2nd ed., II, pp. 93–112.]

[4] *Al-'Iqd*, I, p. 269, in a parallel between Rawāfiḍ and the Jews.

[5] *Neueröffnete Ottomanische Pforte*, I, pp. 82a, 84a. [Here quoted from the original: P. Rycaut, *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire*, London, 1668, pp. 119 and 121.]

when the Shī'a is beginning to move away from the body of Islam faithful to the sunna. Older and more widely spread is the endeavour to obtain belief for the assertion that the followers of the sunna falsified the interpretation of the Koran.[1] The correct interpretation of a number of important passages which were suppressed by the Sunnites affords the best proof of the justification of these 'Alīd aspirations. In their opinion the Koran contains teachings about the shaping of the future as well as about the circumstances of their own times.[2] A saying ascribed to the Prophet and quoted by Jābir al-Ju'fī, zealous theological defender of 'Alīd theories (d. 128),[3] has bearing on this: 'I go to war for the recognition of the Koran as the book of God and 'Alī will fight for the interpretation of the Koran.'[4] This Jābir, who was an influential disseminator of traditions in Kūfa—Abū Ḥanīfa judges him as the most mendacious of all [113] contemporary *muḥaddithūn*[5]—made great efforts to and references to 'Alī in the Koran;[6] even the *dābbat al-arḍ* of Muslim eschatology is in his opinion nothing else but 'Alī reappearing on earth at the end of time.[7] The 'Alīds use especially verses where, as in 42:22, mention is made of the love of relatives (*al-qurbā*) and their rights (59:7)—in the same way as 'Abbāsid propaganda made use of them in their day[8]—in order to find allusions to the *ahl al-bayt* and confirmation of their sacred character in the revelation.[9]

[1] It is so obvious to Muslims that the political interests of a party are pursued with the aid of *ta'wīl* that a saying on Persian politics by Khusraw Anūshirwān assumes that even the shaping of Persian politics was influenced by the interpretation of the sacred books; al-Ḥasan al-'Abbāsī, *Āthār al-Uwal fī Tartīb al-Duwal*, p. 53.

[2] Al-Mas'ūdī, V, p. 221 ult.

[3] The Shī'ites hand down a *K. al-Tafsīr* by him to which more material was added in later times, al-Ṭūsī, *Shī'a Books*, p. 73, 4; cf. p. 244, 6.

[4] Ibn Ḥajar, I, no. 59; cf. al-Mas'ūdī, IV; p. 358 penult.; V, p. 13, 4. [Goldziher, *Richtungen*, p. 278.] The Shī'ite theologians continuously fight for the freedom of Koran exegesis (*al-tafsīr bi'l-ra'y*) against the teaching of orthodox exegetes who only permit the traditional explanation founded on the *'ilm* (al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 156). See for this the excerpt from a commentary on the *Nahj al-Balāgha* (the collected speeches of 'Alī) in *Kashkūl*, p. 370.

[5] In *Ṭab. Huff.*, IV, no. 25.

[6] Muslim, I, p. 51, in regard to Sūra 12:80, to which we shall refer in our study on the veneration of saints. The reference is admittedly far from clear.

[7] Al-Damīrī, I, p. 403.

[8] *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 200. [Sūra 42:22 was also inscribed on the coins of the 'Abbāsid partisans; see G. C. Miles, *Numismatic History of Rayy*, pp. 15–7; idem, *Excavation coins from the Persepolis region*, p. 67; S. M. Stern, *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1961, p. 261.]

[9] Sunnite polemists did not fail to notice that this explanation, propagated by Ḥusayn al-Ashqar, an 'Alīd partisan, suffers from an anachronism in that Muhammed is supposed to have spoken of Fāṭima's family in a Meccan revelation, whereas her marriage with 'Alī only took place in the year 2 A.H., al-Qasṭallānī, VII, p. 370.

This field of research occupies large space in Shī'a literature. This is easily seen when going through the Shī' a bibliography which was compiled by al-Ṭusī in the fifth century. Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī's great *tafsīr* always refers polemically to such passages used by the Shī'a and this work affords an easy insight into the direction of Shī'ite tendentious exegesis.[1] The partisans of 'Alid claims of course also annex all those passages which Sunnite exegesis—perhaps only in reaction to the endeavours of their opponents—relates to Abū Bakr.[2] The Sunnite party also liked to look for Koranic passages in which one could find expressed the prior right of Abū Bakr,[3] without however giving dogmatic value to such research and interpretation. Muslim theologians have continued to display a partiality for discussing such questions with much gravity and great fanaticism. On his expedition against Dāghestān, Nādirshāh [114] attended in Qazwīn a dispute of both parties regarding Sura 48:29; some referred this verse to 'Alī, others to the four caliphs. But as this verse contains a reference to *taurāt* and *injīl*, the prince ordered Mīrzā Muḥammad from Iṣfahan (author of the *Ta'rīkh-i-jihān-gushāy*) to ask the Jews and Christians for information as to the correct interpretation of this verse. With their aid a decision was made in favour of the Sunnites.[4] Sectarian branches of the ordinary 'Alid party, e.g. the Druzes, made special exegetic connections of their own;[5] the Druzes consulted not only the Koran (e.g. Sura 24:39) but also the Bible, where they found a number of prophecies referring to the God-man al-Ḥākim.[6]

But nothing was more common in 'Alid circles than to refer 'the tree cursed in the Koran' (17:22 *al-shajara al-mal'ūna fī'l-Qur'ān*) to the Umayyad house, and this connection is still very popular. In Shī'a writings[7] it has remained usual up to recent times to call the Umayyad dynasty *al-shajara al-mal'ūna*. The 'Abbāsids also favoured the use of this expression for the dynasty which they destroyed,[8] whereas they refer 'the blessed tree whose roots are firm and whose branches reach to heaven' (Sura 14:29) to their own

[1] E.g. *Mafātīḥ*, II, p. 700; VIII, p. 392.

[2] Esp. Sūra 92:17; *Mafātīḥ*, VIII, p. 592.

[3] Such a passage is 57:10. *Mafātīḥ*, VIII, p. 124, cited from al-Kalbī.

[4] 'Abd al-Karīm, *Voyage de l'inde à la Mekke*, transl. Langlès, pp. 88–91.

[5] Petermann, *Reisen im Orient*, I, p. 394.

[6] See my article in Geiger's *Jüd. Zeitschr. f. W. u. L.*, XI (1875), p. 78.

[7] I remember a passage in the *Rasā'il* of al-Khārizmī which I cannot find now.

[8] Abu'l-Maḥāsin, I, p. 365. Hārūn al-Rashīd uses this expression of the B. Umayya, Ṭab., III, p. 706, 14. Cf. also *ahl bayt al-la'na* with this meaning, ibid., III, p. 170, 6. In the decree of the caliph al-Mu'taḍid against the memory of the Umayyads (from the year 284), Ṭab., III, pp. 2168, 4, 2170, 5: 'There is no difference of opinion about the fact that *al-Shajara al-mal'ūna* means the B. Umayya.', Abulfeda, *Annales*, II, p. 278.

family.[2] The 'Alid is *Ibn shajarat Ṭūbā*.[3] They also liked to find their own empire prophesied in the Koran and gladly allowed their train-
[115] bearer to find such connections.[3] The favouring of this interpretation by the 'Abbāsids and their court theologians finally caused it to be accepted even by the most orthodox exegetes of the Koran, and even if they were enemies of the Shī'a.[4]

VII

In the fabrications of party ḥadīths the tendentious work of the partisans of 'Alid aspirations could unfold itself more freely and with less restraint than in the interpretation of a given sacred text. We will not consider the vast masses of traditions aiming at the glorification of 'Alī and other members of his family, many of which have found their place in the compilations of orthodox authorities. For the purpose of this chapter those ḥadīths are of particular interest which were general politico-legal principles formed in order to embody the 'Alid Shī'a.

The 'Alid cause would have been in a sad plight if it had been based entirely upon the principle of legitimacy. The followers of the party must have felt after the rise of the 'Abbāsids that they were facing weighty objections from the point of view of hereditary law in this field (see p. 100). A stronger argument in their favour (which they used independently from legitimistic claims) was their conviction that the Prophet had expressly designated and appointed 'Alī as his successor before his death, so that the succession of Abū Bakr was an invalid usurpation because the caliphate of 'Alī immediately after the Prophet had been sanctioned[5] by means of *naṣṣ wa-ta'yīn*, i.e., by means of explicit appointment,[6] or in other words by means of *waṣiyya*,[7] i.e., a last will. Therefore the 'Alid adherents were concerned with inventing and authorizing traditions which would prove 'Alī's installation by direct order of the Prophet. The most widely known tradition (the authority of which is not denied even by orthodox authorities, though they deprive it of its intention

[2] Al-Ya'qūbī, II, p. 493 (l. 15 *nābit* read *thābit*).

[3] Al-Mas'ūdī, V, p. 6, penult.

[3] A flatterer at the court of the caliph al-Mahdī gave this explanation for Sūra 16:70–1: The bees are the B. Hāshim, the healing drink which flows from their bodies is science which they spread, *Agh.*, III, p. 30; cf. al-Damīrī, II, p. 407, where the story is put in the time of Abū Ja'far al-Manṣūr.

[4] Cf. Quṭb al-Dīn, *Chron. Mekka*, p. 87, bottom.

[5] In contrast, in Sunnite circles it is taught that even in the case of *naṣṣ wa-ta'yīn* the *ijmā' al-umma* is always decisive; al-Shahrastānī, p. 85, (s.v. Karrāmiyya).

[6] Ibn Khaldūn, *Muqaddima*, pp. 164ff.

[7] Cf. Ibn al-Faqīh al-Hamadānī, p. 36, 7.

by a different interpretation) is the tradition of Khumm, which came into being for this purpose and is one of the firmest foundations of the theses of the 'Alid party.

In the valley of Khumm between Mecca and Medina three miles 116]
from al-Jahfa there is a pool (*ghadīr*) surrounded by trees and bushes, which serves as drainage for rain-water. Under one of the trees took place—according to a tradition by al-Barā' b. 'Azib—the scene which is so important for 'Alī's followers. The tradition relates: 'Once we travelled in the Prophet's company. When we rested near Ghadīr Khumm we were called to prayer. In the shade of two trees we prepared a place for the Prophet and he performed his midday prayer there. Afterwards he took 'Alī's hand and said 'Do you know that I have greater power over the Muslims than they have themselves?' 'Yes', we answered and when he repeated this question several times we gave the same reply each time. 'So know then that whose master I am, their master is 'Alī also. O God, protect him who recognizes 'Alī and be an enemy to all who oppose 'Alī.'[1] When the Prophet finished this speech the future caliph 'Umar stepped towards 'Alī and said: 'I wish you luck, son of Abū Ṭālib, from this hour you are appointed the master of all Muslim men and women.'[2] It is obvious that the Shī'ites accord the greatest importance to this tradition and consider it to be the firmest support of their doctrine. An annual feast which was promoted also by the Būyids was to keep the memory of the covenant of the Ghadīr alive.[2] The Sunnites, who do not reject this tradition do not see in it a proof of the immediate caliphate of 'Alī after the Prophet's death.

Another specifically 'Alīd tradition less accepted in orthodox circles is an episode told by Shī'ites from the life of the Prophet. It is usually condemned under the name of *ḥadīth al-ṭayr*, i.e. 'bird tradition' (derogatory). The intention to exalt the 'Alid family is connected to an apparently unimportant detail. Of the various versions we give that which shows the tendentious attitude most clearly. Once upon a time the Prophet was given as a present a bird—it is debated in the various versions what kind of bird it was; [117]
the Prophet ate it and found it to be very tasty. He said: 'O God, may you send to me (as guest) the man whom you love most of all

[1] See another pro-'Alid Khumm-tradition in *Taḥdhīb*, p. 439, top, where there are given also other ḥadīths with similar points from al-Tirmidhī and al-Nasā'ī. Al-Nasā'ī had, as is well known, pro-'Alid inclinations, and also al-Tirmidhī included in his collection tendentious traditions favouring 'Alī, e.g. the *ṭayr* tradition.

[2] See the detailed information in *Literaturgesch. der Shī'a*, p. 61; cf. Ibn al-Athīr, IX, p. 58. The festival in honour of Abū Bakr introduced in 389 as a counterweight to the 'Alīd festival is said to refer to Sūra 9:40; the Companion mentioned there was Abū Bakr. [For the tradition of Ghadīr Khumm see also Goldziher, *Vorlesungen*, p. 239: *EI*, s.v. 'Ghadīr al-Khumm'.]

creatures.' Anas was the doorkeeper when 'Alī arrived. Anas did not wish to let him enter—in some versions he repeatedly refused to let him enter—until 'Alī, pretending urgent business, forced his entrance. When the Prophet upbraided him for his late arrival 'Alī told him of Anas' behaviour towards him. The latter justified himself by saying that he had hoped that an Anṣārī would come first. The Prophet exclaimed: 'O Anas! is there anyone amongst the Anṣār who is better than or preferable to 'Alī?'[1] The partisans of 'Alī also relate a number of other traditions which are meant to prove that the Prophet gave a direct order for 'Alī to be his successor.

To counteract the effect of these traditions, orthodox theologians of the Sunna have cut the Gordian Knot by circulating traditions showing that before his death the Prophet had made no testament at all.[2] If this political tendency in the background were not known, it would be hard to see why there are disproportionately numerous sayings dedicated to relating in minute detail the single circumstance that the Prophet had died without making a will,[3] and more especially that he had appointed no successor.[4] These traditions of course do not say a word about the Prophet not naming 'Alī or someone else as his heir, the general fact that the Prophet had made no last will, either about the future of the Islamic community or of his private property, inferred the incorrectness of the opponents' claims.

[118] In one version of the tradition, however, this intention is clumsily transparent. It was mentioned in the presence of 'Ā'isha that the Prophet had made a will in favour of 'Alī. She said: 'When could this have happened? I had his head held against my breast, (variant: lap) he asked for a cup, then felt very unwell and died before I could really notice it. When could he possibly have made the will in question?

That great group of traditions, in which 'Alī himself is said to have protested against the opinion that the Prophet had told everything of importance (except the Koran) to a single person but had kept this from the community at large, must be seen in the same light. This teaching, which is repeated again and again in many versions, on many different occasions,[5] is a polemic against the teaching of the followers of 'Alī whereby 'Alī, as the Prophet's *waṣī*[6] and exe-

[1] Al-Damīrī, II, p. 400. Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 299 has incorporated this 'Alīd tradition in his collection (as he did others, see above, p. 113 note 1) with the note '*gharīb*'; [cf. also Jāḥiẓ, *al-Uthmāniyya*, pp. 149–50.]

[2] See a collection of the sentences concerned in al-Baghawī, *Maṣābīḥ*, II, p. 192; cf. Ṭab., I, p. 1810, 20.

[3] Muslim, IV, p. 91.

[4] Ibid, p. 267.

[5] B. '*Ilm*, no. 40; *Jihād*, no. 169; *Jizya*, no. 10; *Diyāt*, no. 24; Muslim, III, p. 291; above, p. 27.

[6] The Shī'ites also call rightful successors of 'Alī by this name, *Agh.*, VIII, p. 32, 8.

cutor of his intentions, was in the possession of information that the Prophet had withheld from the community. This polemical intention was strengthened by letting such protestation stem from 'Alī himself.

This part of the ḥadīth is thus, as the above examples have shown, a battlefield of the political and dynastic conflicts of the first few centuries of Islam; it is a mirror of the aspirations of various parties, each of which want to make the Prophet himself their witness and authority.

VIII

Apart from the tendentious traditions intended to serve as authority for the doctrines of a political or religious party, another use of the ḥadīth for party purposes must be mentioned: the interpolation of tendentious words into ḥadīths which in their original form were unsuitable for the purposes of party politics. The aim was the addition of a few decisive words to make an otherwise completely neutral tradition serve the tendencies of the party; and the newly invented part was to pass unchallenged under the flag of the well-authenticated part. The 'Alīd party used such interpolations rather more frequently than did their opponents; at least it is an often repeated accusation against the Rawāfiḍ that they thus falsified sacred texts. Two examples will serve to show us the nature of such [119] interpolations, one introducing us to an 'Alīd, the other to a Sunnite interpolation:

It is sufficiently well known from history that the Umayyads introduced themselves as the legal successors of the caliph 'Uthmān and that the persecutions against their opponents, the hostilities opened against 'Alī and the 'Alīds, were in the name of blood revenge (*thaʾr*) for the murdered 'Uthmān.[1] 'Uthmān is the symbol and slogan of Umayyad aspirations[2] in contrast to 'Alī, who serves this purpose for the opposing camp. 'Uthmānī, (collective: 'Uthmāniyya) is therefore the party name of the zealous followers of the Umayyad dynasty.[3] This name underwent various transformations. It soon ceased to have only genealogical meaning[4] and served to

[1] Abū Ḥan. Dīn., pp. 150, 20; 164, 11; 170; 181, 11; 206, 10.

[2] Kremer, *Herrschenden Ideen*, p. 355.

[3] It is inexplicable that Ṣuḥār b. al-'Abbās (in Ibn Durayd, p. 201, 14, "b. 'Ayyāsh") can be described in *Fihrist*, p. 90, 5–6, as Khārijī and 'Uthmanī at the same time. It is also reported elsewhere that he was a follower of the Umayyads, in contrast to his family who were partisans of 'Alī, Ibn Durayd, l.c.; Ibn Qutayba, p. 172, ult. [Cf. Lammens, *Études*, p. 121 = *MFOB*, II, p. 13.]

[4] Originally it had a merely genealogical connotation, being the name given to a person descended from the caliph 'Uthmān, *Agh.*, VII, p. 92, 11; XIV, pp. 165, 20; 169, 17; cf. *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 237, 4, 6. [More examples in Lammens, *Études*, p. 119 = *MFOB*, II, p. 11; *Études*, p. 112 = *MFOB*, II, p. 14, there are some data about the 'Uthmāniyya party.]

denote people who did not wish to participate in 'Alī's battles for the caliphate and who condemned the murder of 'Uthmān. The Anṣārī poet Ḥassān b. Thābit was considered an 'Uthmānī.[1] When 'Alī had also died and the watchword 'Uthmān or 'Alī had ceased to have real importance, the name was applied to the opponents of 'Alī's claims and to people who were not prepared to acquiesce in the *fait accompli* of 'Alī's and his family's downfall and the ascendancy of Mu'āwiya—those who accept the current *fait accompli* are the true Sunnites[2]—but who put 'Uthmān above 'Alī and thought he had greater claims to the caliphate than had the Prophet's son-
[120] in-law. The chief specific differentia of an 'Uthmānī in that generation is said to be that he 'abuses 'Alī and keeps people away from al-Ḥusayn.'[3] This means that the 'Uthmāniyya 'prefer the Banū Umayya to the Banū Hāshim and, as is stressed, give precedence to Syria above Medina.'[4] All those governors of the first Umayyad caliph who were not satisfied with a recognition of the ruling caliph alone but demanded direct acknowledgement of 'Uthmān's claims and who condemned to a cruel death all those who gave the oath of allegiance *'alā sunnat 'Umar*, though this included a tacit recognition of the non-'Alid caliphate, were 'Uthmāniyya.[5] They insisted on an unconditional recognition of the 'martyr' 'Uthmān, whom they attempted to elevate to a high religious pedestal. '"Uthmān is equal to 'Isā b. Maryam before God."'[7] This political confession was with preference also called *dīn 'Uthman* or *ra'y al-'Uthmāniyya*[8] just as the confession of the opposing party was called *dīn 'Alī*.[9] In an extended meaning, any blindly loyal follower of the Umayyad cause could be called 'Uthmānī.[10]

In the same way as, in general, theoretical quarrels which bear no relation to reality have continued in Islam up to recent times to form the watchwords of parties, the confession of the 'Uthmānī

[1] Al-Mas'ūdī, IV, p. 284.

[2] This was especially applied to all those who did not greatly care about dynastic claims but who recognized all existing facts in past and future on the grounds of the *ijmā'*. Al-Aṣma'ī characterizes the Islamic regions as follows: Baṣra is 'Uthmānī, Kūfa is 'Alīd, Shām Umayyad and Ḥijāz Sunnite; *al-'Iqd*, III, p. 356.

[3] *Agh.*, XV, p. 27, 9, from the bottom, al-Ya'qūbī, II, p. 218, 5; cf. B. *fikāh*, no. 192: *'an Abī 'Abd al-Raḥmān wa-kāna 'uthmaniyyan faqāla li'bni 'Atiyya wa-kāna 'Alawiyyan.*

[4] Al-Balādhurī, p. 308, 3.

[5] *Agh.*, XV, p. 30.

[6] Al-Ṭabarī, II, pp. 419, 3; 420, 6.

[7] *Al-'Iqd*, III, p. 23, 7.

[8] *Agh.*, XI, p. 122, 9; XIII, p. 38, 2; al-Ṭabarī, II, p. 340, 7. They are probably identical with *nawāṣib*, *ZDMG*, XXXVI, p. 281; also *nuṣṣāb* Abu'l-'Alā' in Rosen-Girgas, *Chrestom arab.*, p. 552, 4.

[9] Al-Ṭabarī, II, pp. 342, 6; 350, 20.

[10] *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, p. 26, 5.

survived far into the 'Abbāsid period. Under the 'Abbāsids theoretical defenders of Umayyad claims are still called 'Uthmāniyya.[1] Abu'l-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī reports that in his day a mosque in Kūfa was the seat of this 'Uthmānī party[2] and al-Jāḥiẓ is listed as one of the followers of the party,[3] in whose favour he has written a book[4] though he himself refuses to be counted amongst the party.[5] The [121] expression Marwāniyya[6] is, however, more usual as the designation for survivals of the Umayyad party in 'Abbāsid times.[7] For completeness' sake let it be added that Umayyad fanatics often call the enemy party Turābiyya,[8] i.e. followers of 'Alī, with reference to the by-name of 'Alī (Abū Turāb).[9] This they meant to be a derogatory name[10] and the followers of 'Alī defended themselves against it,[11] though 'Alī himself is said to have liked this name which was given him by the Prophet.[12]

The pro-'Uthmān circles, which included also those Sunnites who did not permit opposition to the rule of 'Uthmān once it was lawfully established, collected ḥadīths in which the Prophet calls 'Uthmān a martyr, makes him equal to the other caliphs, recognizes

[1] Ibn Qutayba, p. 252, 7; Abū'l-Maḥāsin, I, p. 406, 10.

[2] Agh., X, p. 85: *wa-ahl hādhā al-maḥalla ilā'l-yawm ka-dhālika.*

[3] Al-Mas'ūdī, VI, p. 56; VIII, p. 34.

[4] *K. al-'Uthmāniyya* and *Masā'il al-'Uthmāniyya*; a refutation is mentioned by al-Ṭūsī, *Shī'a Books*, p. 331, no. 720. [This book was published by 'Abd al-Salām Muḥ. Hārūn, Cairo, 1955. Excerpts from the refutation by al-Iskāfī are quoted in Ibn Abi'l-Ḥadīd's commentary on the *Nahj al-Balāgha*, III, pp. 253 ff., also reproduced as an appendix in the ed.]

[5] MS. of the Kaiser. Hofbibliothek in Vienna, N.F. no. 151, fol. 3a. [*K. al-Ḥayawān*, I, p. 11.]

[6] This designation is also opposed to Zubayriyya in Umayyad times, *Agh.*, III, p. 102, 8 from the bottom. A quite special use of the designation of Marwāniyya is found in the story in *Agh.*, IV, p. 120, top.

[7] Fleischer *Leip. Cat.*, p. 525b, note **. Cf. Al-Maqrīzī, *Khiṭaṭ*, I, p. 236. Al-Jāḥiẓ composed a treatise *fī imāmat al-Marwāniyya*, al-Mas'ūdī, VI, p. 56. [A philo-Umayyad sect called Marwāniyya survived to recent times in Central Asia; see V. V. Barthold in *Bulletin de l'Acad. Imp. des Sciences*, St Petersburg, 1915, pp. 643–8, transl. in *REI*, VII (1933), p. 395ff.]

[8] Ṭab., II, p. 136, 16. The Turābī curses 'Uthmān, ibid., p. 147, 15. In the account of the gross insult inflicted upon Anas b. Malik by al-Ḥajjāj and the satisfaction which 'Abd al-Malik grants the pious man (see above, p. 41) in al-Damīrī, II, pp. 71f., the tyrant calls Anas: *jawwālan fī'l-fitan mā' Abī Turāb marratan wa-mā' Ibn al-Zubayr ukhrā*, etc. Likewise the Shī'ites are called in India 'Ḥaydarī' after another by-name of 'Alī.

[9] Ibn Hishām, p. 422; al-Mas'ūdī, V, pp. 332, ult; 333 passim; 373, 3; *al-'Iqd*, III, p. 41, 21. About the probable origin of this name see de Goeje in *ZDMG*, XXXVIII, p. 388.

[10] *Frag. hist. arab.*, pp. 89, 1; 92, 5, from the bottom; al-Mas'ūdī, V, p. 16, ult.; 260, 4.

[11] Ṭab., II, p. 129, 5.

[12] *Tahdhīb*, p. 435, 10. Occasionally we meet the name Turābiyya as a name which the followers of 'Alī use of themselves, e.g. al-Mas'ūdī, ibid., p. 217, 7.

(though only indirectly) his predestination to the caliphate and abuses 'Uthmān's enemies. Once the Prophet omits the prayer for the body of a true believer (*ṣalāt al-jināza*, Part I, p. 229) and when asked his reason he replies: 'The dead man did not love 'Uthmān, therefore I refuse to recommend him to God's mercy.'[1]

Circles hostile to 'Uthmān, who endeavoured to heap as much disgrace as they could upon the memory of the third caliph, found a
[122] historical episode well suited for this purpose. The later caliph is said to have fled from the battlefield during the battle of Uḥud. An exploitation of this fact was bound to degrade him in the eyes of any true Arab. *Farrār* (runaway) is no honorable name to Arabs. The followers of 'Alī made good use of this historical account and the party poet, al-Sayyid al-Ḥimyarī, does not forget it when giving the reason for his faithfulness to the 'Alid cause:

*famā liya dhanbun siwā annanī/dhakartu-l-ladhī farra 'an Khaybari dhakartu'mra'an farra 'an Marḥabin/firāra'l-ḥimāri mina'l-qaswari.*

'You can accuse me of no other sin than that I have mentioned him who ran away from Khaybar,
I mention the man who fled from Marhab, like a donkey runs from the lion.'[2]

This ridicule can only be directed against 'Uthmān. The flight of 'Uthmān appears to be based on more than mere slander by his enemies. 'Uthmān's son, who has been sent as governor to Khurāsān by Mu'āwiya, is sneeringly reproached by the poet Mālik b. al-Rayb with his father's flight.[3] This would have been impossible at so early a date if the accusation had not been based on fact. But an even clearer proof of its truth is the fact that 'Uthmān's followers felt obliged to clear him of this shameful deed in their own way. They admit it but seek for alleviating circumstances. This endeavour is evident in the following ḥadīth,[4] which is reported with reference to Sura 3:149. A man,[5] after having completed the circumambulation of the sacred house, came and saw a group sitting together. He asked: 'Who are those who sit together?' He was told that they were Qurayshites. 'Who is their sheikh?' asked the stranger, and 'Umar's son was pointed out to him. To him the man said: 'I will ask you

[1] Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 297 and other collections under *Faḍā'il* or *Manāqib* 'Uthmān. [Wensinck, *Handbook*, pp. 239–40.]

[2] *Agh.*, VII, p. 13, 4 from the bottom.

[3] Al-Ṭabarī, II, p. 179, 10–11.

[4] In al-Ya'qūbī, II, p. 116, the same accusations are said to 'Uthmān's face and he makes the same excuses as are contained in the following ḥadīth.

[5] In al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 296, bottom: A man from Egypt.

about a matter; please enlighten me. I entreat you by the sanctity of this house, do you know anything about 'Uthmān b. 'Affān running away on the day of Uḥud?' 'Yes' replied Ibn 'Umar. 'Do you know anything about his remaining invisible on the day of Badr and not participating in the fighting?' 'Yes' was the reply. [123]
'Do you also know that he remained behind on the occasion of the Riḍwān homage (in Ḥudaybiya) and did not attend it?' 'Yes', said Ibn 'Umar. The stranger exclaimed: '*Allāh akbar*', but Ibn 'Umar said to him: 'Come, I will explain all that you have asked me about. As regards his flight from Uḥud, I testify that Allāh has forgiven him for it. He remained absent from Badr because he was married to the daughter of the Prophet who was ill and he had to wait upon her. But the Prophet promised him reward and the same share in the booty as was received by those who participated in the battle. And as regards his absence from the homage, this also can be explained. If there had been a nobler man in Mecca than 'Uthmān the Prophet would have sent him in his stead to Mecca as envoy. But as it was, he sent 'Uthmān. Since the latter went to Mecca before the homage took place the Prophet pointed with his right hand saying: "This is 'Uthman's homage," and beating into the palm of his left said: "This for 'Uthmān." But you take this (lesson) with you.'[1]

If 'Uthmān's friends find no other expiation of his cowardice but God's merciful pardon, it is not surprising that this fact is exploited by his enemies. Na'thal, i.e. a long bearded,[2] weak, old man, is a nickname of 'Uthmān in reference to his senile weakness[3] and therefore the 'Uthmānīs are sometimes called by their enemies Na'thalīs, i.e. 'followers of the long beard.'[4] They were also not [124]

[1] B. *Maghāzī*, no. 19; cf. Ibn Hishām, p. 746, 15.

[2] See Landberg, *Proverbes et dictons*, I, p. 256, and the saying: 'long beards are the same for stupidity as manure is for the garden.' *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 350, 15; *Arabian Nights*, 872, ed. Būlāq, 1279, IV, p. 154, bottom. Proverbs and epigrams about the mental deficiency of the *fuṭūl al-dhaqn*, cf. Part I, p. 128. Satirical sayings about men with long beards are to be found in Yūsuf al-Sharbīnī, *Hazz al-Quḥūf fī sharḥ qaṣīdat Abī Shādūf* (Alexandria, lith 1289), p. 125. Early greying of the beard is also taken as a sign of mental deficiency, al-'Iqd, II, p. 140, 11.

[3] [Goldziher, 'Spottnamen der ersten chalifen bei dem Schī'item', *WZKM*, XV (1901) pp. 321 ff.; Lammens, *Études*, p. 119=*MFOB*, II, p. ii.] *Agh.*, VII, p. 23; 1, XIII, p. 42, 8; *Laṭā'if al-Ma'ārif*, p. 25; Ibn Qutayba, p. 132, 10.

[4] The 'Alid poet al-Sayyid al-Ḥimyarī (see above, p. 92) wishes to denounce the Qāḍī Sawwār to the caliph al-Manṣūr as a former enemy of the 'Abbāsids who in the past allied himself sometimes to the party of 'Uthmān sometimes to that of 'Alī: *na'thaliyyun jamaliyyun laḥumu khayru mawdīn* (*Agh.*, VII, p. 17, 9.), i.e. 'A man of the long bearded, a man of the camel battle (the followers of 'Alī call themselves *jamalī* with reference to the battle of the camel, Ṭab., II, pp. 342, 6; 350, 20) who does not obey you.' Barbier de Meynard (*JA*, 1874, II, p. 209) translates this line incorrectly: 'Une hyène, un chacal, qui

reluctant to alter the text of the tradition by an interpolation useful for their ridicule. The Prophet made the heroic 'Alī the standard-bearer of the believers and announced this to the community in the following manner: 'Verily, I give this flag to a man through whose hands God will give us victory; he loves Allāh and his apostle and Allāh and His apostle love him.'[1] So far the generally accepted text in al-Bukhārī. But in some non-canonical versions of this tradition there is the addition: *laysa bi-farrār*, i.e. 'he is no runaway';[2] and it will be no accident that it is Ibn Isḥāq who defends this addition, since he was suspected by orthodox theologians of 'Alīd leanings (*tashayyu'*).[3]

The intention to slight 'Uthmān cannot be mistaken in this interpolation, which was meant to manifest the contrast between the coward 'Uthmān and the victorious 'Alī. Thus there are good reasons why this version was not incorporated in the orthodox version of the *ḥadīth*—the same reasons for which the oldest chroniclers of the beginnings of Islam were divided about the relation of the fact itself.[4]

We shall give an example, too, of how the tendencies of the anti-'Alīd trend gave rise to interpolations: 'The fornicator does not fornicate when he is fornicating and is a true believer, and the thief does not steal when he is stealing and he is a true believer, and a wine drinker does not drink wine and he is a true believer' is the literal translation of a traditional saying which implies: He who fornicates, steals or drinks is no true believer. This sentence has the following addition in one of its versions: 'and none of you exaggerates when he exaggerates and he is a true believer: beware then, beware.'[5] Exaggeration (*ghuluww*) here means exaggerated love and worship (which in the case of some extremists went as far as deification) given to 'Alī and his family. It is evident that this addition was
[125] made for the purposes of tendentious polemics, as it is intended to prove to the Shī'ites that the exaggeration of their admiration for 'Alī and his family was unbelief. It was hoped that the less obvious form of a continuation of a well authenticated saying would give it a greater chance of diffusion and recognition.

[1] B. *Maghāzī*, no. 40; *Takdhīb*, p. 438, 9.
[2] Qastallānī to the passage., VI, p. 409.
[3] Wüstenfeld's introduction to the edition of Ibn Hishām, II, p. viii, 15; xx, 3.
[4] Cf. Muir, *Mahomet*, I, p. cii, note.
[5] Muslim, I, p. 147; cf. al-Kumayt, *Khiz. al-Adab*, II, p. 208, 8, *akfarutu*.

---

ne vous rapportera rien de bien.' For *mawāṭin* (*aid* III) cf. Zuhayr, *Mu'all.*, v. 34; *al-Mumashshā*, p. 149, 1.; Abu-l-Maḥasin, II, p. 268, 8. (after Fleischer's correction, *Kleinere Schriften*, II, p. 148) parallel to *yuṭāwi'unī*.

IX

The group of ḥadīths in which the pious, as it were, mirror the conditions of the empire (putting into the mouth of the Prophet their opinions of practices of which they disapprove in order to invest those conditions with the appearance of events preordained by God) are closely linked with the political and social circumstances of the time and grew out of them. The acceptance of the predestined character of godless rulers was meant to ease the subjection of the pious to their might, and it is interesting to see that those who denied absolute predestination were less ready to admit the justification of such rulers than were their more fatalistic colleagues.[1] This group completes the series of sayings which we have considered in their context in the first two parts of this chapter. The same circles who teach in mute resignation the duty of loyalty to a hated government (without following it unconditionally) show a sign of their consciousness of the decay of Muslim life in ḥadīth form, and they make the Prophet himself foretell these developments in Islam. 'The beginning of your *dīn* is prophecy and mercy, then kingship and mercy (the period of the four caliphs), then a wicked (*a'far*, 'similar to dust') kingship (the Umayyad period), then kingship and arrogance;[2] then wine and silk cloths will be thought permitted.[3] The best time of my community is the time when I was sent, then the period immediately following;[4] then there comes a people who press forward to give testimony without being asked for it.[5] They promise but do not keep their pledges, they are faithless and cannot be trusted; obesity will then become general."[6] 'How will you behave [126] in a time when the emir will be like a lion, the judge like a bald wolf, the merchant like a growling dog and the true believer will be amongst them like a frightened sheep in the herd, finding no refuge. What is the position of the sheep between the lion, the wolf and the dog?'[7]

Such pictures of the times in traditional form do not strictly belong to a chapter on political ḥadīths; they would best be called prophetic ḥadīths if we were to find a special name for them. This

[1] Ibn Qutayba, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 225, 14.

[2] *Mulk wa-jabarūt*. The worth of the *mulk* is established by its accompanying circumstances for the authors of this ḥadīth.

[3] Al-Dārimī, p. 268.

[4] In some versions there are repetitions of this sentence.

[5] *Yashhadūna wa-lā yustashhadūna*. In Muslim law it is not permitted to give testimony or make a judicial oath without having been asked to do so by the judge: al-Khaṣṣāf, *Adab al-Qāḍī*, fols. 20b, 29a.

[6] Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 172=al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 35.

[7] Al-Damīrī, II, p. 333, from the *Mīzān* of al-Dhahabī (Anas b. Mālik) [*Mīzān*, no. 371, s. v. Aḥmad b. Zurāna.]

type of tradition blossomed exuberantly in the system of ḥadīth. Not only the general circumstances of the empire are forecast in prophetic ḥadīths, but even minor details of no general importance have, *post eventum*, been turned into predictions by the Prophet. That one of the Prophet's wives once got barked at by dogs near the spring of Ḥaw'ab is handed down as a prediction by the Prophet, in order to create a bad omen for 'Ā'isha's campaign against 'Alī. She is said to have remembered the Prophet's words when she met with the predicted experience at Ḥaw'ab on her journey to Baṣra: 'May you not be amongst those whom the dogs at Ḥaw'ab bark at.' Shī'ite authorities do not neglect to weave this detail into their story of the 'Battle of the Camel'.[1]

The traditionalists do not restrain themselves at all when they make the Prophet speak about the general development of the Islamic empire. Muhammed foretells the future extension of the rule of the true believers, their victorious campaign against the Greek empire, and how 'the Greeks will stand before the brown men (the Arabs) in troops in white garments and with shorn heads, being forced to do all that they are ordered, whereas that country is now inhabited by people in whose eyes you rank lower than a monkey on the haunches of a camel.'[2] The Prophet reveals the future conquest of the Yemen, of the Maghrib and all the East with three strokes of the axe during the preparations for the 'battle of the ditches'.[3] Abū Hurayra, who witnessed a great part of the conquests of the 'followers' of the Prophet, is made to give expression to the feeling:
[127] 'You may conquer whatever you wish. But I swear by him who holds sway over the soul of Abū Hurayra that you will conquer no city and will conquer none to the day of resurrection without that Allāh has given its keys into the hand of the Prophet before.'[4]

Such prophetic sayings are not only to be found in traditions excluded from general recognition; even in strict collections of traditions[5] a large number of prophecies about the future of the Islamic empire are recounted. The fight against the Greek Empire and the movements which led to the passing of the empire's rule to the 'Abbāsid family are indicated fairly openly. The collection of Abū Dāwūd goes furthest in its chapters *al-Fitan*, *al-Malāḥim*,

[1] Al-Ya'qūbī, II, p. 210; *al-Fakhrī*, p. 105; cf. Yāqūt, II, p. 353.

[2] Yāqūt, III, pp. 242f.

[3] Another version in Wāqidī (ed. Wellhausen) p. 194.

[4] Ibn Hishām, p. 673.

[5] We have seen in Part I, p. 270 that the Turks are referred to; cf. Abū Dāwūd II, p. 137, where they are called B. Qanṭūrā. It might be added that warning against Turks and Ethiopians is united in one saying, ibid., and al-Nasā'ī, II, p. 12: *da'ū'l-Ḥabasha mā wada'ūhum wa'truku'l-Turka mā tarakūkum. Turk ma-Qāba'l* (cf. Yāqūt, IV, p. 221, 10) in the poem ascribed to Abū Ṭālib (Ibn Hishām, p. 174, 6).

*al-Mahdī*,[1] al-Tirmidhī is a little more moderate.[2] The affairs of state, revolutions and movements within the empire right up to the third century are forecast in apocalyptic prophetical form, resulting in puzzles of interpretation which occupied Muslim commentators very deeply. Occasionally the prophecies are clearer and more manifest in these traditions, so that one can hardly fail to recognize the references. It needs little wit to recognize the foundation of 'Abbāsid rule when the Prophet makes 'black flags move near from Khurāsān, which cannot be resisted until they are planted in Īliā' (Jerusalem).'[3]

Ḥudhayfa b. al-Yamān a zealous champion of the 'Alid cause,[4] of whom it is also said in the *ṣaḥīḥs* that the Prophet had entrusted him with the secrets of the future,[5] is the companion who was thought to be most suited as the 'carrier' of such prophecies. Even more than making him tell these openly, he was made (putting on a cloud of deep mystery) to hint at them discreetly or keep completely silent about them. 'The Prophet', so he says, 'did not fail to mention one single leader of rebellions, he named three hundred chieftains who will appear up to the end of the world quite specifically by quoting [128] their names and those of their fathers and their tribal affiliations.' The prophecies are permeated by chiliastic tendencies.[6] 'Alī, too, was often chosen as bearer of such prophecies.[7] He named a man from Transoxiana (*rajul min warā' al-nahr*) called al-Ḥārith b. Ḥurāth, who together with his general al-Manṣūr was to play a messianic part.[8] Another ruler who is named Jahjāh, a man of the *mawālī*, who will usurp the leadership at the end of days.[9]

A special branch of prophetic traditions consists of the large number of ḥadīths which grew up quite freely and unrestrainedly out of the local patriotism of the inhabitants of various regions, countries or cities. They are the expression of the enthusiasm of particular circles for their own homeland in an Islam spread over two continents, fictions through which they wanted to show the special importance of their own communities in Islamic life. The circumstances under Umayyad rule were particularly suited—as we saw before (pp. 45–6)—to make Syria favoured by the ḥadīths. 'Syria is the favourite country of Allāh and He sends those of His servants there whom He prefers to all others. O confessors of Islam, press forward

[1] Abū Dāwūd, II, pp. 130–41.
[2] Al-Tirmidhī, II, pp. 23ff.
[3] Ibid., p. 44.
[4] Al-Mas'ūdī, IV, p. 364.
[5] In *Tahdhīb*, pp. 200, 14; 201, 2 ff; cf. al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 42; *Shifā*, I, p. 282.
[6] Abū Dāwūd II, p. 142, calls the period of 500 years half a day (*niṣf yawm*).
[7] Cf. al-Ya'qūbī, II, pp. 225, 3 from the bottom; 357, 2.
[8] Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 135 ult; cf. Ibn Khaldūn, *Muqaddima*, p. 262, 10.
[9] Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 36.

towards Syria because God has chosen this country as His favourite amongst the countries of the whole world'[1] is one of the many Syrian local traditions which the inhabitants of this country invented to further the fame of their new home. They were meant as counter-weights to the self-importance of the holy Arab cities and to show the Muslims living there that there were other areas apart from Ḥijāz favoured and elected by Allāh, and that they were on sacred ground and need not feel worse in the shades of Lebanon than their brothers in the shadow of 'Arafa or Abū Qubays. There are few Islamic centres where such local traditions did not develop[2] and one need only look through these works of geographic literature whose authors had theological interests (e.g. Ibn al-Faqīh, al-Muqaddasī,
[129] Yāqūt) in order to find many scores of examples. This type of local tradition blossomed particularly in cities which were also centres of theological activity. It is not astonishing that the pious of Baṣra, in their jealousy of rival schools, let their home town be glorified by the Prophet in many extravagant sayings. 'Alī, on his withdrawal to Baṣra after the 'battle of the camel', is made to address the inhabitants with a speech in which he referred to the following saying of the Prophet: 'An area named Baṣra will be conquered. This place amongst all places on earth possesses the most regular *qibla*; the best readers of the Koran are to be found there as well as men most distinguished in the fear of God, the scholars of Baṣra are the most learned of men and the inhabitants are the foremost in charity. Four miles from this city is a place called Ubulla, etc.'[3] The later critic of traditions Ibn al-Jawzī did not, by rejecting anachronistic traditions in which the Prophet refers to the city which was only founded under 'Umar, destroy belief in them.[4] Likewise the mention of the minaret of the Umayyad mosque in Damascus only strengthened the belief in Muhammed's prophetic gifts without arousing suspicion of the boldness of the traditionalists.[5]

Wherever Muslim theologians founded their centres of learning, they simultaneously produced traditional documents for their excellence and religious vocation. This endeavour runs parallel with that which aims at connections between the indigenous population rooted in paganism and the ancestors of the first founders of Islam. We have already seen how such attempts were made by them in African Islam.[6] We shall quote some examples here where the same circles set to work to fabricate traditional evidence for religious

[1] Yāqūt, III, p. 242.
[2] I refer to the Egyptian examples in Abū'l-Maḥāsin, I, pp. 30–5.
[3] Yāqūt, I, p. 646; cf. al-Ḥarīrī's last *Maqāma*, ed. de Sacy, 2nd ed., p. 673.
[4] Al-Bajama'wī, commentary to Abū Dāwūd, p. 184.
[5] Ibid., p. 186.
[6] Part I, p. 134, further examples in *ZVS*, XVIII, p. 81.

missions of specific areas. In the book of Darrās b. Ismā'īl (d. 362 in Fez)—a glorifier of Fez tells us in 726—the following account was found in his own writing: 'Abū Muḍar in Alexandria told me in the name of Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Mawwāz, from 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Qāsim, from Mālik b. Anas, from Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī, from Sa'īd b. al-Musayyib, from Abū Hurayra. He said the Prophet of God said: "There will one day be a city in the Maghrib which will be [130] called Fās, and amongst all the cities in this part of the world it will have the most correct *qibla* (i.e. the same as the people of Baṣra claim for themselves in respect of the East) and the inhabitants of this city will be the most diligent of all the people of the Maghrib as regards prayer, they will be followers of the sunna and the orthodox church and they will walk in the path of righteousness without fail. No enemy will be able to harm them and God will keep from them what they dislike."'[1]

The town of Ceuta boasts a similar tradition. In the year 400 A.H. the inhabitants of this city were told by Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. 'Alī in the name of Wahb b. Masarra, from Ibn Waddāḥ, from Saḥnūn, from Abu'l-Qāsim, from Mālik, from Nāfi', from Ibn 'Umar, that the last-mentioned had heard the Prophet say: 'In the furthest West there is a town called Sabta which was founded by a pious man named Sabt, of the descendants of Sem, son of Nūḥ. He named the city thus after his own name and prayed for its blessing and fame. Nobody with bad intentions can approach this city without God turning his wickedness upon himself.' A credulous theologian in order to authenticate this saying adds to the above chain the experience centuries old which is said to verify Muhammed's prophecy.[2] No locality considers itself too small or insignificant to include itself in the Prophet's clairvoyance, and in order to gain an impression of the ease with which such local tradition arose it is enough to look at the goodly number of well-attested sayings which, René Basset quotes (textually and in translation) in his work on the language of the Manāṣir Berbers[3] in respect of the unimportant place Shershel in Algeria.

The village Qamūniyya, called Ἄκρα Ἄμμωνος in Strabo, which is to the south of Qayruwān, boasts a saying of the Prophet whereby it includes one of the doors to paradise. If at the end of days the war against unbelievers will be neglected in other parts of the world, it will yet continue here; 'And it is as if I', says the Prophet, 'heard the call of armies who hurry towards Qamūniyya from dawn to dusk.'[4]

[1] *Annales regum Mauritaniae*, ed. Tornberg, I, p. 18.
[2] *K. al-Bayān al-Mughrib*, ed. Dozy, I, p. 210.
[3] 'Notes de lexicographie berbère,' *JA*, 1884, II, pp. 324–26.
[4] De Goeje, *Al-Ja'ḳubii Descriptio al-Maġrebi*, p. 76.

[131]

# CHAPTER FOUR

# REACTION AGAINST THE FABRICATION OF ḤADĪTHS

## 1

ʿAbd Allāh b. Lahīʿa (d. 174) tells of a converted heretic[1] who pointed out to him that he must be careful when taking over ḥadīths because 'when we advanced one of our opinions, we used to give it the form of a ḥadīth.'[2]

The previous sections have shown that this confession corresponds to the truth. Every stream and counter-stream of thought in Islam has found its expression in the form of a ḥadīth, and there is no difference in this respect between the various contrasting opinions in whatever field. What we learnt about political parties holds true too for differences regarding religious law, dogmatic points of difference etc. Every *raʾy* or *hawā*, every sunna and *bidʿa* has sought and found expression in the form of a ḥadīth.[3]

[132] A time had to come when a reaction, whether religious or rationalistic, would set in. In this chapter we shall discuss the signs and expressions of this reaction. It shows in three different ways.

1. The simplest means by which honest men sought to combat the rapid increase of faked ḥadīths is at the same time a most remarkable

[1] *Rajul min ahl al-bidaʿ*, in another version: *shaykh min al-khawārij*.

[2] Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, fol. 53 b, [ed. Hyderabad, p. 123:] *idhā raʾaynā amran ṣayyarnāhu ḥadīthan* (another version: *idhā hawaynā amran ṣayyarnāhu ḥadīthan*).

[3] This point of view has in recent times been taken up by rationalist Muslim apologists. Moulavi Cheragh Ali writes: 'The vast flood of traditions soon formed a chaotic sea. Truth and error, fact and fable, mingled together in an undistinguishable confusion. Every religious, social and political system was defended, when necessary, to please a khalif or an Ameer to serve his purpose by an appeal to some oral traditions. The name of Mohammed was abused to support all manner of lies and absurdities, or to satisfy the passion, caprice, or arbitrary will of the despots, leaving out of consideration the creation of any standards of test.' And when he is going to quote a number of ḥadīths about a given question he reserves his position in the following words: 'I am seldom inclined to quote traditions, having little or no belief in their genuineness, as generally they are unauthentic, unsupported and one-sided but etc.' *The proposed legal, political and social reforms in the Ottoman empire and other Mohammadan states* (Bombay, 1883), pp. xix and 147.

phenomenon in the history of literature. With pious intention fabrications were combated with new fabrications, with new ḥadīths which were smuggled in and in which the invention of illegitimate ḥadīths were condemned by strong words uttered by the Prophet. Sayings of the Prophet are invented which forbid and revile in harsh words all kinds of falsification and fabrication of ḥadīths, as well as the falsifying and interpolation of old texts recognized as authentic.

The most widely spread polemical ḥadīth of this nature is the saying which survives in many versions: *man kadhaba 'alayya muta-'ammidan*[1] *fal-yatabawwa' maq'adahu mina'l-nār*,[2] 'Man who lies wilfully in regard to me enters his resting place in the fires of hell.'[3] About eighty companions[4]—not counting some paraphrases[5]—hand down this saying, which is recognizable as a reaction against the increasing forgery of prophetic sayings. Its attribution to the authority of the companions—e.g. of 'Uthmān—does not however prove the age of the saying to the extent Muir wishes to infer from it.[6] [133]

'In the later days of my community[7] there will be people who will hand you communications which neither you nor your forefathers have ever heard. Beware of them.'

'At the end of time there will be forgers,[8] liars who will bring you ḥadīths which neither you nor your forefathers have heard. Beware of them so that they may not lead you astray and into temptation.'

Further sayings and warnings of this kind were not referred back

[1] The word *muta'ammidan* is missing in some versions; its omission was probably intended to protect people who spread and repeat spurious traditions in good faith, believing them to be correct. This purpose was rather served by adding the word.

[2] Cf. B. *Maghāzī*, no. 8, towards the end, about the unbelievers who fell near Badr. *Ḥtwa tabawwa'ā maqā'idahum min al-nār.*

[3] Muslim, introduction, I, pp. 34ff.; Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 81; al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 110; Ibn Māja, p. 5. (line 4: doubts about the word *muta'ammidan*); al-Dārimī, pp. 42–43, 77; in all these passages there are other sayings with similar tendency and also the condemnation of traditions light-heartedly spread: *bi-ḥasbi'l-mar'i min al-ḥadīth an yuḥaddītha bi-kulli mā sami'a.*

[4] Al-Sam'ānī (d. 510) could tell this (*ḥadīth man kadhaba*) in 'more than ninety ways,' *Tab. Huff.* XV, no. 36.

[5] I will mention only one: *man taqawwala 'alayya mā lam aqul fal-yatabawwa' bayna'aynay jahannama maq'adan*, in al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, fol. 56b (ed. Hyderabad, p. 200.]

[6] *Makomet*, I, p. xxxvii.

[7] *Fī ākhir ummatī.*

[8] *Dajjālūn.* This expression is especially applied to forgers of the traditions: e.g. Yāqūt, II, p. 139, says of an Abū 'Alī al-Tamīmī from Herāt that he handed down on the authority of Sufyān, Wakī' and others thousands of ḥadīths which they had never uttered; 'He is an arch-liar (*akbad akbāu al-kadhb*), one of the *dajjāls* (*dajjāl min al-dajājila*); he must be mentioned for no other purpose but to expose him, to attack him and to warn against him.'

to the Prophet himself but were handed down as maxims by pious men of the first and second centuries:

'Satan'—so runs one of them—'takes human shape, comes amongst the people and gives them false ḥadīths. The hearers then scatter and one says later: I have heard a man whom I know by sight but not by name and who told us ḥadīths.'

'There are claimed devils in the sea, whom Sulaymān b. Dāwūd has exiled there and it is easily possible that they break loose and recite a (false) Koran to men.'[1]

The Prophet was also made to have had premonitions of the falsification and accommodating interpolation of sentences acknowledged as authentic: 'This science during future generations will be in the hands of its most reliable representatives, who will protect it from the perversion of heretics, from usurpation by liars and from interpolation by ignorant people.'[2] Thus the reaction of orthodox critics of tradition against tendentious interference is here foretold.

II

2. The admonitions just mentioned sprang up in those circles who
[124] indulged in fabrication of ḥadīths and their circulation but who sought to judge such activities according to whether the falsification was in the service of orthodox religion (when it was justified) or was due to the wish to combat orthodoxy and oppose its suppositions (e.g. 'Alid propaganda).

Freer thinkers did not take such distinctions and the considerations connected with them into account. Their reaction was not confined to a particular part of the luxuriously growing ḥadīth (that which appeared inconvenient to the orthodox church), but to the whole of the system of traditions. The solemn demeanour with which traditionists pretended to observe the minutiae of the *isnād* and the text even when it was quite clear to even superficial observation (if it was not daunted by the hypocrisy of the 'carriers') that there could be no question of authenticity, soon aroused sarcasm and derision from men who were little suited to admire those vessels of 'science'. It may be said that an unprejudiced and even ironical view of persons and things which impressed the common people because of their religious nature was nowhere more usual than amongst the belletrists of the Islamic world of the second and third centures. The holiest of holy is ridiculed and blasphemed here, and there is little of the fanatical atmosphere which is usually attributed to Muslim society. In these circles the study of traditions was also made the butt of ridicule. Light-hearted poets chose the form of

[1] Muslim, I, pp. 41ff.
[2] Introduction to al-Dārimī.

traditions[1] for frivolous and obscene ideas—Muḥammad b. Munādhir (d. 200) offers a classical example of this;[2] on another occasion the concept of the *isnād* is made—by Isḥāq al-Mawṣilī—the object of witticism through a witty allusion to the word *mursalāt* (Sura 77:1);[3] and the height of this tendency is found in a poem inserted in the tale of Aladdin in which a rude joke is introduced by the preface:[4] *'ḥaddathanā 'an ba'ḍ ashyākhihi Abū Bilāl shaykunā 'an Sharīk.'* Such products would not have arisen or been tolerated in circles in which the ḥadīth was honoured.[5]

Contemporary philosophers used more serious forms for the [135]
disparagement of the authorities of tradition.[6] They had no difficulty in proving for how many contrasting dogmatic and legal theses the authority of tradition had to serve as a prop; how the ḥadīths express opinions condemned by the more refined religious concept, which had gained prevalence even in Islam (e.g. the anthropomorphic presentation of divine attributes etc.) The fantastic fables with which tradition embroidered biblical legends as well as the first beginnings of eschatology in the Koran, were cited with relish. In order to disparage the ḥadīths, those passages were exploited in which popular legend and superstition (*khurāfāt*) were recorded and incorporated in religious belief as communications of the Prophet.[7] The minutely detailed instructions which the tradition contains for the most intimate relations of everyday life were held up to ridicule, etc. The urge to jeer at this last point is referred to in the ḥadīth itself; the pagan contemporaries of Muhammed are made to remark slightingly about this law: 'Your comrade (Muhammed) teaches you how to relieve yourselves.'[8] What is here put into the mouth of the Prophet's time probably reflects the opinion of the free-thinking men of later times, to whom it seemed of dubious propriety to make detailed rules

[1] Ibn Rashiq (d. 463) uses the *isnād* form quite differently for poetical purposes in a poem quoted by Mehren, *Rhetorik der Araber* p. 101, 4.

[2] *Agh.*, XVII, p. 28.

[3] Ibid., V, p. 110.

[4] *Arabian Nights*, ed. Būlāq, 1279, II, p. 95, top.

[5] [One must, however, remember that making fun of holy things does not necessarily imply lack of belief in them.]

[6] I presume that in the warning ascribed to Mu'ādh b. Jabal in Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 169, there is a scarcely veiled attack against the philosophers' attitude towards the traditions: 'I warn you of clever speeches by the wise (*zaygha al-ḥakīm*) since Satan often speaks heretical thoughts through the mouth of the wise.'

[7] In al-Jāḥiẓ, *K. al-Ḥayawān* (Vienna, MS.), fols. 53bff. [IV., pp. 286ff.] such ḥadīths are ridiculed.

[8] Al-Nasā'ī, I, p. 6: *qāla'l-mushrikūna innā narā ṣāḥibakum yu'allimukumu'l-khara'āta*; Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 3; al-Tirmidhī, p. 5: *qīla li-Salmāna qad 'allamakum nabiyyukum*, etc. In A.D. the addition is characteristic: 'I am to you as a father to his children, I teach you everything.'

for the smallest occurrences of everyday life issue from the mouth of the Prophet and to invest these with religiously obligatory authority.

Amongst the sayings belonging to this group which in the framework of tradition show polemics against those free-thinking men who, since as Muslims they had to accept the law, professed to adhere only to the Koran and attempted to reject everything that under the name of ḥadīth or sunna claimed the same normative
[136] authority for the everyday behaviour of men, one attracts our special attention. It shows the point of view of the rejecting opposition and on the other hand the attitude of orthodox adherents of the sunna. The Prophet said: 'It could happen that someone hears of my ḥadīth and would make himself comfortable in his resting place saying: Between you and us is the book of God; what is permitted therein we accept as permitted and what is forbidden we consider forbidden.[1] Verily, what the Prophet has forbidden we consider forbidden as if God Himself had forbidden it.'[2] As examples for this latter remark some dietary laws are mentioned in the ḥadīth (forbidden species of animals are quoted) which are not spoken of in the Koran. This utterance has also been invested with a humanitarian sentiment, since it was quoted to the cruel commander of captured Khaybar who committed all manner of cruelties towards the conquered inhabitants. 'Does one of you who are comfortable in your seat of rest believe that God only forbids things mentioned in the Koran? Verily, by God, I have given orders, exhortations and interdictions which count as much as the Koran if not more. Verily, God does not permit you to break into the houses of Jews without permission, that you maltreat their women and eat their fruit if they fulfil their obligations.'[3]

In the second century attacks by heretic circles against tradition were fairly widespread. Ibn al-Qaṭṭān (d. 198) could say that there was no heretic in the world who did not attack the followers of tradition (*laysa fī'l-dunyā mubtadi' illā wa-huwa yabghudu ahl al-ḥadīth*.[4] From a refutation of their arguments by Ibn Qutayba (d. 276) we can see clearly what the philosophers (*aṣḥāb al-kalām*) objected to in the ḥadīth, and we can also observe how far the polemics of freer thinkers against this overwhelming element of theological life had grown already in the third century. Ibn Qutayba endeavours in his work *Mukhtalif al-Ḥadīth* to refute all these objections from the standpoint of orthodox Muslims, but he is forced to use all manner of forced interpretations in order to lend some sense to the absurdities and silinesses, have recourse to parallels

[1] Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 169.
[2] Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 111.
[3] Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 31.
[4] Introduction to al-Dārimī.

in the Old and New Testament, and make concessions to limit the credibility and authority of the traditions. He often quite freely admits in this book that the traditions ridiculed are not credible.[1] Notorious fables he attributes to the *quṣṣāṣ* and to Jewish sources, and expresses regret that the Muslims had entrusted themselves to such guidance.[2] This influence of the Jewish Agada and Christian legend is attested with regret by orthodox theologians[3] from the earliest times of Islam up to later periods. Even in early times the traditions express this feeling. 'Umar is made to ask the Prophet: 'We hear several tales from the Jews which we like, may we write some of them down?' Whereupon the Prophet is made to reply: 'Do you wish to rush to perdition as did the Jews and Christians? I have brought you white and clean ḥadīths—'.[4] The warning against the *aḥādīth muftaʿala* of the Ahl al-Kitāb then took root in later theology from this inspiration.[5] [137]

Philosophical mockery at the authority of tradition also took poetical form. Ibn Qutayba has preserved for us such an epigram,[6] in which the fact that bearers of traditions often have no understanding of the text handed down by them is ridiculed. It runs:[7]

*Zawāmilu liʾl-ashʿāri*[8] *laʿilmaʿindahum/bi-jayyidihā illā kaʿilmiʾl-abāʿiri*

[1] In *Mukhtalif al-Ḥadīth*, p. 378, he cites e.g. the words of Hishām b. 'Urwa against Muḥammad b. Isḥāq who handed down traditions from Fāṭima, the wife of Hishām: 'Has my wife given him company?' Against the same Muḥammad he quoted the judgement of Mu'tamir whom his father warned of the liar Muḥ. b. Isḥ. ibid, p. 92, he mentions that the tradition experienced many sectarian interpolations, etc.

[2] Ibid, pp. 336ff.

[3] But al-Jāḥiẓ (*Bayān*, fol. 74a, [II, p. 113]) quotes the saying of an Arab: *ḥaddith ʿan Banī Isrāʾīl wa-lā ḥaraj*. The same saying is quoted as a ḥadīth by Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 82, al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 111, in a different context from that in al-Jāḥiẓ. [Cf. also al-Khaṭīb *Taqyīd*, I, pp. 30–1, 34; Goldziher, in *REJ*, 1902, p. 64, *Richtungen*, p. 58; G. Vajda, 'Juifs et musulmans selon le ḥadīṯ', *JA*, 1937, p. 117.]

[4] *Maṣābīḥ al-Sunna*, I, p. 14. A tradition which takes an intermediate position and advises acceptance of the truth of the *aḥādīth ahl al-kitāb* and rejection of the lies is in Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 81.

[5] Cf. al-Qasṭallānī, V, p. 665. [Cf. for the subject also Goldziher, quoted in note 3; Vajda, op. cit. pp. 115ff.]

[6] *Mukhtalif al-Ḥadīth*, p. 9.

[7] The poem is by Marwān b. Abī Ḥafṣa (d. 181/2) and refers to people who recite old poems without understanding their sense, al-Suyūṭī *Muzhir*, II, p. 161, bottom.

[8] In a marginal note whose writer presumably did not know the source of the citation this is corrected to *liʾl-asfāri* with reference to the passage in the Koran, Sūra 62:5 (*ka-mathali'l-ḥimari yaḥmilu asfāran*). The simile of the pack animal carrying books is frequent in oriental poetry for the description of sterile learning, e.g. *Gulistān*, VIII, no. 3, ed. Gladwin, p. 209, bottom, about the four-footed animal which has been loaded with books.

*La'amruka mā yadrī'l-maṭiyyu*[1] *idhā ghada/bi-aḥmālihi*[2] *aw rāḥa mā fī'l-gharā'iri.*

[138] 'Pack camels laden with poems, they know no more what is excellent in them than do camels;
As sure as you live, the pack animal does not know while carrying its load early or late what are the contents of its load.'

Another anonymous poem which appears to belong to the same group of ideas provides a parallel to this epigram:

*Inna'l-ruwāta bilā fahmin limā ḥafiẓū/mithlu'l-jimāli 'alayhā yuḥmalu'l-wada'u*
*Lā'l-wad'a yanfa'uhu ḥamlu'l-jimāli lahu/wa-lā'l-jimālu bi'ḥamli'l-wad'i tantafi'u*

Traditionalists without understanding of what they preserve are like camels who are loaded with shells;
It is of no use to the shells that they are carried by camels but it is also of no use to the camels that they carry shells.[3]

Abu'l-'Alā' al-Ma'arrī, the noble enemy of belief in authority,[4] censures the weakness of the *isnāds*:

'They bring us ḥadīths which reason does not verify, so we ask: who are the people on whose authority you recount them?
Then they refer to their false *isnāds* which are not free from mention of a sheikh whom they themselves do not praise.'[5]

Such remarks left their trace on Muslims faithful to the sunna.[6] It is against such people as the poet just mentioned and his kind that Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Naṣr l-Ḥumaydī (d. 488) wrote his *qaṣīda*: *fī'l-naqḍi 'alā man dhamma* (or *'ābā*)*'l-ḥadītha wa-ahlahu*, 'to refute one (or "those") who scorned the ḥadīth and its followers.'

[1] *Muzhir*: *ba'īru*.
[2] *Ibid*: *bi-aswāqihi*.
[3] Al-Damīrī, II, p. 462 (s.v. *al-wad'*).
[4] 'Be a servant of God but not a servant of His servants (men): the law makes slaves, independent thinking frees,' Kremer, *Über die philosophischen Gedichte des Abul 'Alā Ma'arry* (Vienna, 1888), p. 96, on p. 126 [*Luzūmiyyāt*, Cairo, 1831, I, p. 326.]
[5] Ibid, p. 103, on p. 266 [Cairo, 1831, II, p. 346].
[6] [For adversaries of the ḥadīth cf. also Goldziher, *ZDMG*, LXI, pp. 860ff., 1907. III, pp. 230ff.; Schacht, *Origins of Muh. Jurispr.*, pp. 40ff.]

III

3. The most enduring result was achieved by that form of reaction which arose in the circle of the traditionists themselves against the overwhelming growth of traditions and manifested itself in the development of a kind of criticism of true tradition.

It has already been pointed out (above, p. 56) that the pious community was ready with great credulity to believe anything that they encountered as a traditional saying of the Prophet. Doubts as to the authenticity of parts of the collected material were easily quelled. The theologians themselves appear to have extended the [139] theory of the *ijmā'* to the credibility of the ḥadīth at an early date and to have accepted the general feeling of the community as supreme judge of the truth of traditional sayings. Ibn 'Abbās is made to say: 'If you hear from me a communication in the name of the Prophet and you find that it does not agree with the book of God or is not liked by people (*fa-lam tajidūhu fī kitāb Allāh aw ḥasanan 'inda'l-nās*), know that I have reported a lie about the Prophet.'[1] In other words: also in respect of the credibility of words and actions ascribed to the Prophet the *ijmā'*, the general feeling of the community, is decisive.[2] What the *umma* considers to be true is really true.[3]

Conscientious students of tradition did not allow themselves to be guided by this easy way of deciding the authenticity of the vast accumulation of material and, in view of the danger which threatened the orthodox community from the masses of tendentious ḥadīths, they asked for other proof of credibility than the acceptance of the community.

The immediate impetus for exact assessment of all that reached the people in the form of ḥadīths was the circumstance that, through influential individuals in certain circles of the Islamic world, ḥadīths hostile to orthodox teaching were spread and recognized in wide

[1] Al-Dārimī, p. 77.

[2] Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, fol. 118a, [ed. Hyderabad, p. 430] puts together a number of ḥadīths from which it is evident that authenticity or rejection of the prophetic tradition is made conditional on the impression that it made upon the community. 'If you hear my name in a communication which is agreeable to your heart, which makes your hair and flesh tender (*ta'rifuhu qulūbukum wa-talīnu bihī ash'ārukum wa-abshāruhum*) and about which you feel that it is close to you, then none of you is as close to it as I am. But if you hear a communication in my name which is against your heart and from which your hair and flesh shrink and which repels you, then none of you are so far removed from it as I am'; in addition to this, there are other sayings of similar content.

[3] Ibn Khaldūn expresses concisely this feeling of Muslims in the words: 'The *ijmā'* is the strongest protection and the best defence' (of ḥadīths which critics dislike): *fa'l-ijmā'u a'zamu ḥimāyatin wa-aḥsanu daf'in*, *Muqaddima*, p. 260, 4 from the bottom.

areas of Islam and, according to the point of view mentioned above, could claim the *ijmā'* in their own favour. It must be remembered that the trend of the sunna in a province was mainly determined
[140] by those theologians who, at the time when the sunna began to spread, commanded the trust of the people of that province. By means of the ḥadīths that they spread, they influenced the opinion of the people in whose midst they worked. The inhabitants of Egypt valued 'Uthmān little until al-Layth b. Sa'd (d. 175) spread ḥadīths of 'Uthmān's excellences (*faḍā'il*) amongst them. Similar was the behaviour of the inhabitants of Hims in respect of 'Alī until Ismā'īl b. 'Ayāsh (d. 181) acquainted them with the ḥadīths on *faḍā'il 'Alī*.[1] 'The people of Kūfa,' says Wakī' (d. 196), 'would have remained in ignorance of ḥadīth had not Jābir al-Ju'fī brought them to them.'[2] We can easily deduce what kind of ḥadīth developed in Kūfa under Jābir's inspiration from what we know of him already (above, p. 110).

Thus the party affiliations of the transmitters of traditions decided whether the masses of the people were to be influenced one way or another.

There was therefore a real danger of the smuggling in of ḥadīths, a danger which threatened all fields of the sunna in religion and public life. Those circles who wished to protect the ḥadīth from such falsifications had to pay particular attention to the character of the authorities and informants on whom the claim of authenticity for each ḥadīth was based. Only such ḥadīths were to be accepted as expressing correctly the religious spirit of the whole community as had been handed on by men whose personal honesty as well as their attitude to the orthodox confession, were beyond doubt, who were, in the full meaning of the word, *thiqa*, 'reliable', and who were not given to ascribing to the Prophet, from mere thoughtlessness, lack of religious integrity or from party interests, sayings which were contrary to the general teaching and served their own ends. This point of view dominates the whole of the criticism of tradition as it developed in Islam. 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. Therefore the *isnād* could be called 'the legs (*al-qawā'im*) of the ḥadīth', since the right to existence of the utterances handed down rests
[141] upon it and without it they could not be sustained;[3] or 'the fetters (*qayd*) of the ḥadīth'[4] which alone can hold it together.

While the danger which threatened traditions through tendentious

[1] Al-Damīrī (s.v. *al-Layth*), II, p. 376, bottom of Uthmān b. Ṣāliḥ (d. 219).
[2] Al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 44, 8; II, p. 333, penult.
[3] Muslim, I, p. 46.
[4] *Agh.*, V, p. 110, ult.

and thoughtless transmitters was not realized, little weight was given to the authorities of the *isnād* (*al-rijāl*, 'the men').[1] Even to Mālik b. Anas the practical use is the first consideration and he cares little about the *rijāl*.[2] He takes over and passes on unhesitatingly ḥadīths told by the erotic singer 'Urwa b. Udhayna,[3] perhaps from a sympathy with the activity which he himself had indulged in in his youth.[4] Only when the invention of partisan and tendentious traditions had prevailed did anxious theologians pay closer attention to the informants of each saying with a view to making the validity of the ḥadīth dependent upon their quality.[5] It seems to have been in the time of Ibn 'Awn (d. 151)[6], Shu'ba (d. 160),[7] Abd Allāh b. Mubārak (d. 181) and others of their contemporaries that criticism of the authorities begins.[8] Criticism was strictest in 'Irāq[9] and further east where the religious and political parties were most sharply opposed and where they used in the shrewdest way temporal and spiritual means to help their ideas to victory. When in the third century, because of the systematic collection of ḥadīths, the selection of correct and objectionable ḥadīths and the rejection of the suspicious and false ones becomes a need, criticism of the traditions becomes an important part of the science of traditions,[10] whose great flowering is during the third and fourth centuries. We name two of the most respected writings of this time which are still extant: the 'Book of the Weak' (*Kitāb al-Ḍu'afā'*) by al-Nasā'ī[11] (d. 303), whom we shall meet again as an important collector, and the 'Perfect book [142] in regard to the recognition of the weak amongst the transmitters' (*al-kāmil fī ma'rifat ḍu'afā' al-muḥaddithīn*) by Ibn 'Adī (d. 365).[12]

Each of the informants mentioned in the *isnād* was investigated in order to gain insight into their character and to find out whether

[1] Al-Dārimī, p. 60, bottom.
[2] *Taḥdhīb*, p. 531, penult.
[3] *Agh.*, XXI, p. 162, ult.
[4] See above, p. 82 note 2.
[5] Muslim, I, p. 44; al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdadī, fol. 35a [ed. Hyderabad, p. 122]; *ḥattā maḍa'at al fitna*, 'the *isnāds* are not investigated'; from that time one case was taken *li-yuḥdath ḥadīth ahl al-sunna wa-yutrak ḥadīth ahl al-bid'a*.
[6] See above, p. 52.
[7] It is told of him (*Tab. Huff.* V, no. 28) that he was the first to investigate the character (read *amīr* instead of *amīr* as in ed. Wüstenfeld) of transmitters in 'Irāq and to reject the unreliable and reprehensible.
[8] This follows from several utterances of his in Muslim, pp. 47ff.
[9] Cf. above, p. 81. The greater care of the 'Irāqians is also stressed by Ibn Khaldūn, *Muqaddima*, p. 369, 3.
[10] For the beginnings of this literature see H. Kh., II, p. 591.
[11] Oxford Ms. Marsham, no. 556; Nicoll-Pusey, Bodl. Cat., CCCLXXIX no. 2, pp. 371ff. [*GAL* I, 171, *S* I, 270.]
[12] Cairo Cat., I, pp. 129ff. [*GAL S* I, 280.]

they were unobjectionable morally and religiously and whether they made propaganda for anti-Sunnite purposes,[1] whether their love of the truth was generally established, whether they had personally the ability to repeat correctly what they heard, and whether they were men whose testimony in civil cases would be admitted by a judge without hesitation. Transmission of ḥadīths was considered the highest form of the *shahāda*, bearing witness,[2] because the *rāwī* testimony that one has heard this or that saying from this or that person concerns matters of extreme importance for the shaping of religious life. According to the outcome of these investigations, informants were called *thiqa* (reliable) *mutqin* (exact), *thabt* (strong), *ḥujja* (admitted as evidence), *'adl* (truthful), *ḥāfiẓ* or *ḍābiṭ* (who faithfully keeps and passes on what he has heard). These are the qualities of the first order. Transmitters of a lower status are qualified with *ṣadūq* (saying the truth)[3], *maḥalluhu al-ṣidq* (his position is that of truth), *lā ba's bihi* (unobjectionable). Less than these are those *rijāl* who are judged with the words *ṣāliḥ al-ḥadīth*.[4] An even lesser degree of trust will be shown to those whom the critics can give no
[143] better marks than that they are no liars (*ghayr kadhāb, lam yukdhib*).[5] Critics of tradition distinguish these grades and the many intermediate gradations between them with great exactitude, and they circumscribe the theoretical and practical usefulness of traditions according to whether the informants have been awarded one or the other grade of reliability.

Such examination was the more important since the result had great influence on religious practice. According to 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Mahdī (d. 198) only those are to lead and influence the religious life of the community who are able to judge the reliability of the ḥadīths, who do not see a *ḥujja*, an argument of proof, in every

[1] Confession of *bida'* was not considered in itself as damaging to credibility; only propaganda for heretic teachings is considered as such. (Yāqūt, III, p. 464, 18, taught by Ibn Ibn Ḥibbān [d. 354] as *ijmā' al-a'imma*). Qadarites are frequent in the *isnāds* of most careful collections (e.g. B. *Buyū'* no. 15, *Tibb.* no. 26; cf. al-Qast. to these passages, IV, p. 22, VIII, p. 424). *Tab. Huff.*, V, no. 16, read *qadariyyan*, iii, instead of *qadra mā*. Concerning this question see notes to Ibn Hishām, p. 159, and *Literaturgeschichte der Schi'a*, p. 72, note 6. Some went further in this respect, e.g. a *Murji'ite* is declared weak because of this dogmatic deviation (Al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 219, 7 *ra'ā ra'y al-irjā'*), and 'Uthmān b. Sa'īd al-Dārimī (d. 280) considered every theologian an unreliable *rāwī* who professed the creation of the Koran, Abū'l-Maḥāsin, II, p. 91, ult.

[2] Sprenger, *JASB*, 1856, p. 53, has described this in detail.

[3] That such a definition does not describe absolute trustworthiness is to be seen from definitions such as: *Jarīr b. Ḥāzim rubbamā yahimu fī shay' wa-huwa ṣadūq*, al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 103, 14.

[4] Cf. al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, fols. 8a f. [ed. Hyderabad, p. 22] *Taqrīb*, fol. 45b. [*naw* 23, transl. *JA*, XVII (1910), p. 147].

[5] Al-Tirmidhī, I, pp. 57, 3 from below, 113, 14.

transmitted sentence but who know from which sources the 'science' can be derived (*makhārij*[1] *al-'ilm*).[2] Statements about the absolute or relative reliability and trustworthiness of the informants stand therefore in contrast to proofs of their unreliability and untrustworthiness. It must be noted that finding fault with the trustworthiness of transmitters is called 'wounding' (*jarḥ*) in the terminology of this science. A large number of synonyms for this concept are used to express the fact that someone is not recognized as a correct transmitter; the most usual one is the verb *ṭa'ana*,[3] to pierce someone with a spear, then *qadaḥa*, and more rarely *nazaka*,[4] which in manuscripts and editions often appears as *taraka* because of graphic similarity.[5] If the lack of trustworthiness is not asserted with certainty but as a suspicion it is cautiously said that one blinks the eyes about the informant in question (we should say one turns up the nose).[6]

According to the outcome of the investigation the suspect in- [144]
formant is described with another qualitative term. If someone is called *layyin al-ḥadīth* (tender in respect of the ḥadīth) his reliability has been 'wounded' but not fully disproved. Less credible people are characterized with the epithet *laysa bi-qawī* (he is not strong), and then in descending order: *ḍa'īf* (weak), *matrūk al-ḥadīth* or *dhāhib al-ḥadīth* (whose ḥadīth is left aside, is invalid), *khaddhāb* (liar), etc.[7]

Critical examination in order to determine these grades was called *al-jarḥ wa'l-ta'dīl*, i.e. 'the wounding and accrediting'. Its most important traces are to be found in the glosses to the words of *sunan* (see Chapter 8, as to each ḥadīth included in them the *jarḥ* or *ta'dīl* of the transmitters has been added. Such investigations gave rise to the discipline of the *ma'rifat al-rijāl*, i.e. knowledge of informants;[8] this branch of ḥadīth science reached its height with

[1] Sing. *makhraj*; this is the name of the authority which serves as a basis or support for a usage; note the use of the word in this sense in a story, *al-'Iqd*, III, p. 9, 22, 23.

[2] *Tahdhīb*, p. 391, 13.

[3] Cf. also *hallama*, Yāqūt, II, p. 158, 9.

[4] Muslim, introduction, p. 47, ult: This is less than *kadhdhaba* to accuse someone of being a complete liar, *Tab. Huff.* VII, nos. 11, 1 *f.*

[5] Thus, e.g., Ibn Qutayba, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 227, 15, for *inna Shahr utrukūhu* must be read twice, *inna Shahran nazakūhu*, the same mistake is found in al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 44, 8; II, pp. 127, 10; 178, 4, where instead of *tarakahu, tarakūhu* must be read *nazakahu, nazakūhu*.

[6] *Ghumiza 'alayhi*, al-Ṭūsī, *Sitta Books*, pp. 160, 3, 223, 7. The word giving the reason why noses are turned up at the *muḥaddith* concerned is connected with the preposition *bi*; e.g. *ghamaza 'alayhi bi-la'b al-shaṭranj*, ibid, p. 139, 4. Cf. *al-Ghammāz*, the title of a work in which suspect *ḥadīths* are criticized, Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat., II, p. 279.

[7] Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, l.c.; *Taqrīb*, l.c.

[8] *Taqrīb*, fol. 82a. [*Now* 61, transl. *JA*, XVIII (1901), p. 142.]

Ibn Abī Ḥātim ('Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Idrīs) from Rayy (d. 327).[1]

Apart from examining the personal qualities of transmitters the critics had to turn their attention also to the inner consistency of the *isnād*. Here they were able to find out the strangest things. In one *isnād*, for example, 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Laylā is mentioned as a hearer of Mu'ādh b. Jabal. But Mu'ādh died during 'Umar's reign (ca. 17–18) and 'Abd al-Raḥmān was only born in the year 17.[2] In the face of such experiences it was the critics' task to be on the lookout for chronological impossibilities in the *isnāds* of ḥadīths. If for instance Ḥasan al-Baṣrī is said to transmit *'an Abī Hurayra*, they had to state that it was not possible chronologically for these two men to have personal relations with each other.[3] Al-Bukhārī says of the *isnād* 'Qābūs b. Abī Ẓubyān from his father Abū
[145] Ẓubyān from Salmān that this chain cannot be right because Salmān was dead at the time that A.Ẓ. was able to hear traditions.[4] Such chronological criticism the forgers attempted to nullify by interpolating between the links of the *isnād* chain, between whom a real contact could not be proved, any chosen name, invented *ad hoc*: a *majhūl*, i.e. a totally unknown man. It must therefore also be the critics' task to pay attention to whether such 'unknown ones' call in doubt the validity of the *isnād*.[5]

## IV

By means of diligent research of this kind the Muslim critics of tradition succeeded in unmasking many forgers and avoided ḥadīths connected with their names.[6] The shocks which they had experienced in the course of their investigations helped to sharpen their eye and to increase their wariness and scepticism. Facts proved that such scepticism could never be taken too far if it was to keep abreast with the boldness of forgers. These latter did in fact do everything which could be expected in a field from the outset rife with falsifications of all kinds. To mention but one example for the daring of the inventors of traditions it may suffice to point out that, apart from the usual method of attributing spurious sentences to authorities whose names did in fact figure in the history of Islam, there were

[1] Yāqūt, II, p. 899, 1; *Ṭab. Ḥuf.*, XI, no. 40, read *wa'l-ta'dīl* instead of *wa'l-tanwīl*.

[2] Al-Tirmidhī, II, pp. 189, 257, top.

[3] *Tahdhīb*, p. 210, top.

[4] Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 328, top.

[5] An instructive example is in al-Sarakhsī, *Sharḥ K. al-Siyar*, fol. 235a (the passage appears to belong to the text); other examples, al-Tirmidhī, II, pp. 153, 5, 174, 17, 180, 7 from below.

[6] Muslim, introduction, p. 31, mentions a number of notorious forgers whose ḥadīths must be excluded as a matter of course.

some people who felt no scruples in inventing entirely new names with which to dupe credulous listeners. From the same century in which Ibn 'Adī wrote (see p. 135), an Abū 'Amr Lāḥiq b. al-Ḥusayn al-Ṣudarī (d. 384 in Khārizm) is mentioned who introduced made-up names in his *isnāds*, such as Tughral and Ṭirbāl and Karkadunn to whom he attributed traditions.[1] Towards such presumably not isolated incidences heightened suspicion and careful investigations [146] by the critics was indicated.[2] They did not fail—despite all leniency[3] — to carry negation as far as it was possible in this field. An example will show us how far some went in this negative criticism which also affords deep insight into the mechanics of the formation of Muslim tradition.

In several sunna works we find a paragraph about the following legal questions: Someone marries a woman and dies before consummating the marriage and without having fixed the *ṣadāq*, the bride-price needed to make the marriage fully valid. Such a case came before Ibn Mas'ūd, who made this decision: The same price must be paid to the woman as is normally granted to the women of this tribe,[4] no more or less;[5] the widow also enjoys the (legal) rights to inheritance from the man's estate, and must observe (before her re-marriage) the waiting time (*'idda*,[6] customary for every widow). 'If this judgement is right'—added Ibn Mas'ūd—'it is from God, but if it is wrong it is from me and Shayṭan, and Allāh and His Prophet have no part in it.' Some man of the tribe of Ashja' then got up, amongst them al-Jarāḥ and Abū Sinān, and said: 'We testify, O Ibn Mas'ūd, that the Prophet made the same decision as you when such a case occurred with us on account of Barwa', daughter of Wāshiq, the name of whose husband was Hilāl b. Murra al-Ashja'ī.' Ibn Mas'ūd expressed deep joy that his judgement coincided with that of the Prophet.[7] In another version he who quoted the Prophet's [147]

[1] Yāqūt, III, p. 375.

[2] In the third century the question was posed whether those transmitters were also to be considered as forgers who spread authentic sayings of the Prophet with deliberately enlarged and altered *isnāds*; greatest tolerance was shown for this kind of falsification, al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 100.

[3] So as not to be unjust and not to be tempted into condemnation by the strange sound of the names, lists of odd-sounding names of authorities who have really existed were compiled. Gotha Cat., Ms. no. 574, ibid, fol. 42, a saying is quoted from Aḥmad b. Yūnus al-Raqqī (227) in respect of the name of the Kūfan transmitter, Musaddad b. Musarhad b. Musarbal al-Asadī: 'If this name were preceded by the *bismi'llāh* it would be suitable as an incantation against scorpions'; Ibn Māja, p. 8, 3: *law qurri'a hādhā'l-isnādu 'alā maftūnin la-bara'a*.

[4] *Ka-ṣadāq nisā'ihā*, I can only relate the fem. suffix to the tribe.

[5] *Lā wakṣ* (cf. Nöldeke, *Beitr. Poesie*, p. 189, v. 7.) *wa-lā shaṭaṭ* (cf. *Agh.*, V, p. 134, 14: *fa'shtaffa 'alayhi bi'l-mahr*).

[6] Sūra 2:234f.

[7] Abū Dāwūd, I, pp. 209–10; al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 214.

judgement is called Ma'qil b. Sinān; he said: 'I have heard when the Prophet gave this judgement in respect of Barwa' bint Wāshiq.'

This is an example for the phenomenon when originally a ḥadīth was subsequently quoted for a judgement which was based upon independent reasoning (*ra'y*).[1] The judgement of Ibn Mas'ūd, as well as the ḥadīth testifying to it, are the product of later theologians; otherwise it would be inexplicable that in the second century different opinions should have arisen about this casuistic legal case and that the woman's right to the *ṣadāq*[2] should have been questioned (e.g. by al-Shāfi'ī). In his criticism of this tradition 'Uthmān b. Sa'īd al-Darmī (d. 280), a pupil of Yaḥyā b. Mu'īn and Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, goes so far as to say: 'Allāh never created a Ma'qil b. Sinān, and a Barwa' bint Wāshiq also never existed.'[3] In respect of Ma'qil he seems to have overshot the mark, as his existence can hardly be denied[4] even if his relationship to this legal case is an invention of the theologians. Al-Dārimī was not the first to dare to deny the existence of persons who figure as historical people in Muslim reports. A century before him Mālik b. Anas had had the courage to say that Uways al-Qaranī, whom later generations have given the title *Sayyid al-tābi'īn*[5] and whose person was adorned with religious legends (and prophecies of Muhammed),[6] did not exist.[7]

## V

The point of view of Islamic criticism of the traditions, despite examples of individual objectivity, was able to exclude only part of the most obvious falsifications from the ḥadīth material. Muslim criticism had chiefly formal points of departure.[8] It is mainly formal points which are decisive for judgement about credibility and authenticity or, as Muslims say, 'health'. Traditions are only
[148] 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*. If the *isnād* to which an impossible sentence full of inner and outer contradictions is appended withstands the scrutiny of this formal criticism, if the continuity of the entirely trustworthy

[1] See above, p. 80.

[2] In al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 214.

[3] *Taʾdīb*, p. 367, 15.

[4] Ibn Durayd, p. 168, 12; cf. *al-'Iqd*, II, p. 312.

[5] Abu'l-Maḥāsin, I, p. 127, 3 from below.

[6] *Maṣābīḥ al-Sunna*, II, p. 210. [Cf. also Ibn Sa'd, VI, pp. 111ff, Abū Nu'aym al-Iṣfahānī, *Ḥilyat al-Awliyā'*, II, pp. 79ff, al-Khaṭīb, *Ta'rīkh*, III, p. 15ff, al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān al-I'tidāl*, no. 1024.]

[7] Ibn Ḥajar, I, no. 496. [Cf. also al-Khaṭīb l.c., and al-Dhahabī, l.c.]

[8] Cf. Muir, *Mahomet*, I, p. xliv; Dozy, *Essai sur l'histoire de l'Islamisme*, transl. V. Chauvin, p. 123.

authors cited in them is complete and if the possibility of their personal communication is established, the tradition is accepted as worthy of credit. Nobody is allowed to say: 'because the *matn* contains a logical or historical absurdity I doubt the correctness of the *isnād*.' And if under correct *isnāds* contradictory traditions are handed down, there begins—if it is not possible to impugn the correctness of one *isnad* in favour of the other—the work of a subtle harmonistic,[1] which often extends to the smallest details.[2] If the contents cannot be reconciled at all an attempt is made—where legal traditions are concerned—to achieve this by the theory of *nāsikh wa-mansūkh* (abrogation)[3] or mere formal principles are stated which—as it is expressed—are destined to heal 'the illnesses of the ḥadīth (*'ilal al-ḥadīth*). It is for instance a principle of tradition criticism to give preference, in case of a conflict of two traditional accounts, one of which is affirmative, the other negative, to the affirmative rather than the negative one. When, e.g., Bilāl reports that the Prophet prayed at the Ka'ba, whereas a tradition attributed to Ibn 'Abbās denies this fact, and both reports fulfil the conditions of a correct *isnād*, Muslim criticism decided by this principle that the affirmative report of Bilāl is credible (*innamā yu'khadh bi-shahādat al-muthbit lā bi-shahādat al-nāfī*).[4]

Muslim critics have no feeling for even the crudest anachronisms [149] provided that the *isnād* is correct. Muhammed's prophetic gift is used as a factor to smooth over such difficulties. The Prophet is for example made to assign the places at which pilgrims coming to Mecca from the various parts of the Islamic world have to begin the *tahlīl* (the crying of *labbayka*). Even the scrupulous versions here think of pilgrims from Syria, but there are also versions which—N.B. in Muhammed's time—already made provisions for the 'Irāq pilgrim caravans; and the critics, who do not admit this latter part as having issued from the Prophet, have been led to this not because of the anachronism implied but because of the difficulties of the *isnād*.[5]

[1] Cf. above, p. 86.

[2] Thus, e.g., to solve the minor contrast between B. *Ṣayd*, no. 6, and *Muzdra'a*, no. 3, where in one passage he who keeps dogs 'loses everyday one *qīrāṭ* of his good works' whereas in the other passage two *qīrāṭs* are subtracted. Reward and punishment are often valued in *qīrāṭ* in the ḥadīth: 'He who performs over a corpse the prayer of the *janāza* has a *qīrāṭ*, he who follows the funeral procession has two,' al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 194.

[3] Frequently, e.g. al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 285, 16.

[4] Al-Suhaylī in the notes to Ibn Hishām, p. 190. The book *al-Istibṣār fīmā ikhtalafa fīh'l-akhbār* by the Shī'ite theologian al-Ṭūsī (d. 460) also concerns itself with such harmonistic (in respect of legal traditions), V. Rosen, *Notices sommaires [des manuscrits arabes du Musée asiatique*, St Petersburg, 1881] I, p. 27.

[5] Material for the gradually increasing lack of care is in al-Zurqānī, II, pp. 138ff.

This particularity of the Muslim critics of traditions might be illustrated by an example from the sphere of its application. Amongst the many varieties of tendentious traditions, one group is noticeable, the part which might best be named the traditions of schools, i.e. ḥadīths which have been invented within a particular theological school for the purpose of demonstrating its excellence as opposed to another rival school, and of giving weight and authority to their own teachings. Tendentious traditions were not only frequently invented against dogmatic heresies but the Prophet is made the supreme arbiter of the differences between the 'Irāqian and Ḥijāzian theologians (see above, p. 82). To prove that Abū Ḥanīfa was the best teacher of religious law, his followers invented this ḥadīth: 'In my community there will rise a man called Abū Hanīfa who will be the torch of the community.'[1] Abū Hurayra is the companion who is alleged to have heard these words from the Prophet directly. Belief that Muhammed mentioned the 'Irāqian theologian by name was not too much for circles who could be expected to believe in the discovery that the poet Abū Dhu'ayb and the pretender to the throne, Ibn al-Zubayr, are mentioned in the Tawrāt,[2] and to whom the monks of the 'People of the Book' could say that in their holy books there is a description of Mu'āwiya's person so clear that the
[150] first Umayyad ruler could have been picked out from among a large number of people on the strength of it.[3] To such people it was but self-evident that the oral tradition from the Prophet could mention Abū Hanīfa. But the Medinians were not to be outdone; their school, too, was to be based on the Prophet's authority. For this purpose they made up this saying of Muhammed (also referred back to the authority of Abū Hurayra): 'You will hit the flanks of the riding animals[4] (make long journeys) in order to seek (religious) science and you will find no one more learned than the scholars of Medina.'[5] This has a Mālikite sense. The saying found its way into several sunna-collections and even Muslim, who applied strict standards for correct traditions, as we shall see, wanted originally to include it in his collection. He omitted it not because of the contents or the impossibility that Muhammed should have referred to the conditions of schools in the second century, but because of the 'disease of the *isnād*.' In it Abū'l-Zubayr is connected with Abū Ṣāliḥ as his hearer, which is a chronological impossibility. If the

[1] *Taḥdhīb*, p. 702. [Cf. also al-Khaṭīb, *Tarīkh*, XIII, p. 335.]

[2] *ZDMG*, XXXII, p. 351. A monk also found another Arabian poet mentioned in a parchment scroll, *Agh.*, VI, p. 155.

[3] Al-Mubarrad, pp. 574f.; Ibn Badrūn, pp. 200, 202.

[4] For this expression cf. al-Mas'ūdī, V, p. 107, 3, *al-'Iqd*, II, p. 285, 17: *ḥattā ḍuribat 'alayhi ābāṭ al-'ibil*; in the last-named passage in evil sense: the camels are being hastened towards Medina to threaten 'Uthmān.

[5] *Maṣābīḥ al-Sunna*, I, p. 17.

forgers of this tradition had made up the preceding *catena* with greater care their product would presumably be found in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of the conscientious Muslim.[1]

Muslim circles who have retained up to the most recent times the old methods of study still follow the same direction that we have encountered as the method of centuries long past. 'Alī b. Sulaymān al-Bajama'wī, a theologian who in recent times has taken great pains in his commentaries on the six canonical works on tradition, says: 'One of the strangest things has ever happened to me was this: when I recited the traditional sayings according to which scholars are told not to mingle with the sultans, one of my listeners said: "How could the Prophet have said this, since there were no sultans in his days?"[2] This poor man did not know of the tradition that the apostle of God had predicted with prophetical insight everything [151] that is going to happen until the hour of resurrection.'[3]

The criticism of traditions thus has only two points in mind: reliability of the *rijāl* and the inner foundation of the chain of *isnād*. While in regard to the latter point objective certainty was possible, inasmuch as the chronological dates (the years of death: *wafayāt*, as it was said) were closely investigated, the first point was much more subject to the taste and subjective judgement of the critic. Only in rare cases was it possible to reach agreement on the degree of trustworthiness of a person. Often there are the most contradictory qualifications applied to one and the same informant. Ibn Sa'īd al-Dārimī (see above, p. 140), reports for example, that he once asked Yaḥyā b. Mu'īn about Jubayr b. al-Ḥasan and was told: *laysa bi-shay'in*, (he is invalid; Abū Ḥātim said: *lā arā bi-ḥadīthihi ba'san* (I see no evil in his ḥadīth); al-Nasā'ī gave him the mark *ḍa'īf* (weak, i.e. untrustworthy).[4] Occasionally judgements are vacillating[5] and the terminology created by the *akl al-naqd* (critics) is sufficiently elastic to allow the avoidance of a definitive judgement. The following marks were given to Layth b. Abī Sulaym: al-

[1] Al-Damīrī (s.v. *al-Mā'iyya*), II, p. 382.

[2] The rationalist appears not to have known that the expression *sulṭān* is much older than this sentence and originally only occurred in the meaning 'government', and only later became the title of a ruling person (*ḥadhf al-muḍāf*). *Sulṭān* is used in the first sense also in ancient legal literature, e.g. in the well-known rule that a marriage is only valid if the bride is supported by a *malk* 'and the *sulṭān* (neuter, not masc.) is the support of those who have no other *malk*' (e.g. al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 204, 6).

[3] Commentary to Abū Dāwūd, p. 175.

[4] Yāqūt, IV, p. 1034, 19ff.

[5] An interesting example is in Ibn Khaldūn, *Muqaddima*, p. 262, where on the occasion of the criticism of the Mahdī tradition the whole scale of good and bad judgements of various critics is cited in respect of one and the same authority. The whole passage can be recommended as a specimen of Muslim criticism of the traditions.

Bukhārī: *ṣadūq wa-rubbamā yahīm fī'l-shay'*, i.e. truthful but errs occasionally; Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal: 'his ḥadīth gives no joy (*lā yufraḥ fī ḥadīthihi*), often he relates communications back to the Prophet (*yarfa'*) which in parallel communications of others are not taken as far back as that, therefore he has been declared weak (*da''afūhu*).'[1] Thus one does not know whether to regard him as *ṣadūq* or *da'īf*.

It would have been impossible to create a fixed canon for such
[152] things. The critics themselves maintain[2] that the ability to judge the value of traditions can only be gained by long-continued handling of this material (*bi-ṭūl al-mujālasa wa'l-munāẓara wa'l-mudhākara*). In the absence of strict methodical rules, the subjective faculty of a man, his sense of discrimination, was in the end taken as decisive: *dhawq al-muḥaddithīn*, as it is called, the scholar's subjective taste in differentiating the 'healthy' from the 'diseased'.[3] Occasionally the formal points of view of Muslim critics also led to criticisms of some elements of the contents. In the course of examining the trustworthiness of the *isnāds* it was frequently found that certain authorities usually appeared as informants for traditions which were marked as suspect (*munkar*).[4] Even such evaluations were mainly conditioned by formal motives,[5] but the contemplation of the traditions often led to the recognition that—as Abū Nu'aym al-Iṣfahānī (d. 430) said—'such traditions lack light and in their darkness predominates';[6] in other words that their style and contents showed unmistakable signs of spuriousness. But it was just this side of criticism which have always to be left to individual *dhawq*.

[1] Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 131.

[2] 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Mahdī (d. 198) in *Takdhīb*, p. 392; top, note the context of this passage.

[3] Al-Dhahabī, in *Ṭabaq al-Mufassirīn*, ed. Meursinge, p. 17, no. 50.

[4] We give as examples: al-Tirmidhī, I, pp. 28, 21; 295, bottom; II, pp. 293, 3; 329, 19.

[5] See the definitions in Risch, p. 18.

[6] In his introduction to *Mustakhraj 'alā Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (Cairo MS., Ḥadīth, no. 417) Cairo, Cat. I, p. 307, cf. *Isnād'iḥ al-mad' alayhi ẓāhira*, *Khiz. al-Adab*, I, p. 48, bottom.

CHAPTER FIVE [153]

# THE ḤADĪTH AS A MEANS OF EDIFICATION AND ENTERTAINMENT

## I

On principle the criticism of Muslim theologians covers all branches of traditional accounts, but it must be noted that communal sentiment differentiated between various grades in the ethical judgement of the invention of traditions. We have already seen earlier that strict censure of the circulation of spurious traditions was not prevalent everywhere, and that the best people admitted alleviating circumstances from certain viewpoints for the invention and spreading of false traditions (p. 56). Strict judgement was usually reserved for those ḥadīths which dealt with questions of what was allowed and what forbidden (*ḥalāl wa-ḥarām*), i.e. legal traditions or such as could serve as sources for legal and dogmatic deductions.[1] These latter have to be free of apocryphal accretions since they are evidence for the fixing of the sunna and are guides to actions and abstentions, convictions and opinions, by which it was sought to obtain God's pleasure. Many theologians were less strict with ḥadīths which did not belong to the category of the law but offered pious tales, edifying maxims and ethical teachings in the name of the Prophet. Though falsifications in this field were not actually approved of, it was nevertheless said that the *isnāds* of such sayings need not be quite as stringently examined[2] as those of sunna, i.e. legal, traditions. Informants whose appearance in an *isnād* of a ḥadīth referring to the law made the latter invalid were considered trustworthy enough for ethical ḥadīths.[3] Al-Nawawī recommended [154] a certain *musāmaḥa* (indulgence) towards them: 'it may be a weak

[1] Cf. Sprenger, *ZDMG*, X, p. 16, ult.

[2] In relating them the *isnād* may well be left out, al-Yāfi'ī, *Rawḍ al-Rayāḥīn fī Ḥikāyāt al-Ṣāliḥīn* (Cairo, 1297), p. 5, 13ff.

[3] al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, fol. 38b [ed. Hyderabad, p. 137] cites among others Aḥmad, b. Ḥanbal: *idhā rwaynā 'an rasūl Allāh fī'l-ḥalāl wa'l-ḥarām wa'l-sunan wa'l-aḥkām shaddadnā fī'l-asānīd wa-idhā rwaynā 'an rasūl Allāh fī faḍā'il al-a'māl, . . . tasāhalnā fī'l-asānīd.*

ḥadīth but one feels content with it' (*ḥadīth ḍa'īf wa-lākin yusta'nas bihi*).[1] In view of their pious purpose they were allowed to pass. Certain circles went even further and positively encouraged the creation of false traditional sentences. There was little if any objection to the fact that in an ethical work (*Tanbīh al-Ghāfilīn*) of the highly respected theologian Abu'l-Layth al-Samarqandī (d. 375) many *mawḍū'āt* (spurious ḥadīths) are quoted[2] and it needed fanatical persecutors of *mawḍū'āt* like Ibn al-Jawzī to redact a recension of the *Iḥyā'* by Al-Gazālī purged of all suspect ḥadīths.[3] It hardly ever happened that anyone objected to weak ḥadīths used in the ethical parts of the *Iḥyā'*.

The invention, particularly of ḥadīths for ethical, hortatory and ascetic purposes[4], was theoretically sanctioned by the theological school of the Karrāmiyya and their opinion was then put into practice, as al-Nawawī has it, 'by some ignorant people who called themselves ascetics, in order to incite to good—as they wrongly thought.'[5] Sermons were apparently the field of predilection for such invented sentences with moralizing tendencies.[6] In the fifth century, public preachers in Baghdād had to show traditional sentences used in their sermons to their chief, the famous Abū Bakr Aḥmad al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (d. 463), before they were allowed to make public use of them,[7] which is a proof of how frivolously traditions were treated in this circle. Those who upheld the doctrine, that for moral purposes it was permissible to invent traditions and to
[155] circulate them freely, attempted to find theological foundations for their views. For the study of the methods of theological casuistry it is interesting to hear the chief argument used by them. The traditional saying in which the invention of prophetical ḥadīths is forbidden is this: 'He who knowingly relates lies about me (*'alayya*) [in order to misguide men] may he take his place in the fires of hell.'[8] The words between square brackets are not found in the original text of the sentence and are added with the intention of making possible the deduction that inventions which do not misguide men are permissible. Then it says: 'Who reports lies *'alayya*,' which is interpreted as being contrary to *lī* (for me, in my favour)=against me. Thereby inventions which strengthen

[1] *Maṭhūrāt*, fol. 17a, of the ḥadīth justifying *talqīn* before the grave.

[2] Cairo Cat. II, p. 151.

[3] Ibid., p. 132, bottom [*GAL* I, p. 540, no. 2; *S* I, p. 748, no. 2].

[4] *Fi'l-targhīb wa'l-tarhīb wa'l-zuhd*; this question is treated in the *Taqrīb*, fol. 42b [MAW 21, transl. *JA* (1901), XVII, p. 124].

[5] Al-Nawawī, to Muslim, introduction, p. 32.

[6] Cf. Ahmed Khan Bahādur's 'Essay on Mohammedan Tradition,' in Hughes, *Dict. of Islam*, p. 642a.

[7] *Ṭab. Ḥuff.*, XIV, no. 14.

[8] See above, p. 127.

piety and lead to the fear of God are not to be condemned.[1]

Thus, inventing traditions for good ends was practised *bona fide* and the forgers, when confronted with specialists, do not appear to have been ashamed of their deeds but admitted them freely. It is well-known that there are a number of pious sayings referred back to the Prophet which praise the excellences of certain Suras of the Koran and where the reward of pious people occupying themselves with those Suras is accurately calculated. Some commentaries on the Koran—e.g. the *tafsīr* of al-Baydāwī—and every *sūra* with such a saying. These sentences were originally taken from an extended ḥadīth in which they are listed in order. This inventory of 'excellences of the Koranic sūras' is traced back through Abū 'Iṣma al-Jāmi' to 'Ikrima, who is said to have obtained it from Ibn 'Abbās. It will be instructive to hear the account of Abū 'Ammār of Marw about the origin of these sayings. "Abū 'Iṣma was asked where he got this tradition which is traced back to 'Ikrima and Ibn 'Abbās, since it was not transmitted by 'Ikrima's own companions. He answered: 'I have seen that people turn away from the Koran and prefer to occupy themselves with the *fiqh* of Abū Ḥanīfa and the stories (*maghāzī*) of Ibn Isḥāq; therefore I have invented this saying with the intention of pleasing God (*ḥisbatan*) (in order to win people again for the Koran).' Another originator of traditions of this kind, Maysara b. 'Abdi Rabbihi, likewise admits that he invented them in order to turn people back to the study of the Koran. The same confession is reported in respect of other inventions of this kind. Al-Mu'ammal b. Ismā'īl reports: 'A sheikh transmitted to me, [156] in the name of Ubayy b. Ka'b, sayings about the excellences of the Koran in the order of the sūras and mentioning each one; as authority he gave a man from al-Madā'in who is still alive. I visited this man and when asked as to his source he referred me to a sheikh in Wāsiṭ, who referred me to a sheikh in Baṣra who in turn named a sheikh in 'Abbādān as informant. I then addressed myself to the latter. The sheikh led me into the company of Ṣūfī adepts amongst whom there was one whom he pointed out as informant for the tradition circulated by him. 'Where did you get this tradition from?' I asked the Ṣūfī. The man answered: 'I heard it from no one, but we noticed that people neglect the Koran and therefore made up this saying of the Prophet in order to lead back their hearts to the Koran".'[2] Such traditions were already common in the third century, for al-Tirmidhī mentions several examples,[3] and in the

[1] In al-Nawawī, op. cit., pp. 38f, we find, set out at length, the arguments and their orthodox refutation.

[2] Al-Suyūṭī, *Itḳān*, II, p. 182 = al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, fol. 110a [ed. Hyderabād, p. 701].

[3] *Abwāb thawāb al-qur'ān 'an rasūl Allāh*, al-Tirmidhī, II, pp. 143ff.

*Sunan* of al-Dārimī they fill a whole chapter,[1] though not all these sayings are attributed to the Prophet but are mainly quoted in the name of later theologians. How generally they had been accepted is shown by the fact that the saying 'everyone who reads a thousand verses of the Koran in one night will be accredited with one *qinṭār* of good works' has caused a vast apparatus of metrological investigations.[2]

II

A phenomenon particularly worthy of notice shows how lightheartedly moral sayings which were not his were ascribed to the 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 *aḥādīth mawqūfa*, i.e. sayings traced back to companions or even successors, were very easily transformed into *aḥādīth marfū'a*, i.e. sayings
[157] traced back to the Prophet, by simply adding without much scruple a few names at random which were necessary to complete the chain.[3] This was also often practised in the field of legal traditions. But matters went further still. People did not shrink from ascribing to the Prophet agreeable sayings from pagan times, which could be the more readily done since it became known that Muhammed himself did not hesitate to incorporate into the Koran sentences from paganism.[4] In a previous study[5] it has already been pointed out that the Prophet's saying 'Help your brother, be he persecutor or persecuted' is an old Arabic proverb, probably originating with pagan circles.[6] The Muslims liked it and thus ascribed it to the Prophet.[7] The sentence very often quoted among the sayings of the Prophet: 'the good is tied to the forelocks of horses' can be found in a poem by Imru' ul-Qays.[8]

Another side of this phenomenon deserving closer study is the teaching (occurring in many variations) that one should not mix in things which do not concern one (*tark mā lā ya'nīhi*). We meet this

[1] Al-Dārimī, pp. 430ff.

[2] Ibid, p. 440.

[3] E.g. al-Tirmidhī, I, pp. 90, bottom, 179 bottom, 263 bottom, 267, 22; 289, 11ff.; II, pp. 167, 15; 190, bottom, 233, 6; and very frequently. People suspect of 'pushing back' interrupted ḥadīths were called *raffā'*. Ibn Khaldūn, *Muqaddima*, p. 265, 17.

[4] Part I, p. 228, note 3.

[5] *Ẓāhiriten*, pp. 154f.

[6] *Hudhayl.*, p. 134, 19: *yu'īnuka maẓlūman wa-yu'dīka ẓālīman*, cf. in a later poet: *yasurruka muslūman wa-yarḍīka ẓālīman*, *Agh.*, VII, p. 123, 6.

[7] The earliest appearance of this sentence as a saying of the Prophet is in al-Shaybānī (*K. al-Siyar*, fol. 59a, *WJL*, XL, p. 60, no. 191) [I, p. 179].

[8] Al-Damīrī, I, p. 385; cf. Imrq., 8:1.

saying in various combinations as a basic teaching of Muslim ethics in the name of the Prophet,[1] and thus every virtuous person whose good attributes are praised is always praised for practising this virtue.[2] But the oldest sources ascribe these teachings to others: to [158]
Luqmān,[3] to the caliph 'Umar I,[4] his son 'Abd Allāh,[5] the son of Ḥusayn,[6] 'Umar II,[7] and even to al-Shāfi'ī.[8] The *ṣuḥuf* of Seth and Ibrāhīm are also occasionally mentioned as the source for this saying,[9] which originally counted as a maxim of wisdom, as a recommendation of an attribute of *ḥilm* in the old Arabic sense (cf. Part I, p. 203) and not at all as a religious teaching. In the sense of *ḥilm* it is also mentioned amongst some wise rules of Ḥāritha b. Badr (d. 50), a representative of the old *muruwwa* in the first decades of Islam.[10] Nevertheless it is later generally transmitted as a ḥadīth of the Prophet. By the same process sentences from the Old Testament[11] and the Gospels found their way in amongst the sayings of Muhammed.[12] Everything that seemed to the theologians of those days, when the development of tradition was at its height, worthy to be adopted, was preferably reproduced in the form of a ḥadīth. In this guise it could become a formative element of Islamic teaching.

III

The conviction, hardly disputed, that for the moral good of the Muslim people, and to further piety and inspire the practice of

[1] As such it can also be found amongst the *Arba'ūn al-Nawawī*, as no. 12.

[2] 'Abd al-Malik is praised: *kāna tārikan bi'l-duḥḥūl fīma la ya'nihi*., *Anṣāb al-Ashrāf*, p. 162: similarly Mālik characterizes Ja'far al-Ṣāqir (d. 148) in *Zurūq*, I, p. 209, as having this virtue: in later biographical works as often as the opposite if when people are praised for being *muqbilan 'alā mā ya'nīhi*, e.g. Ibn Bashkuwāl, pp. 202, 453, 496, 516, 518, 593, 612, etc.; cf. Abo'l-Maḥāsin, I, p. 541, 15.

[3] *Al-Mumaṭṭa'*, IV, p. 227: *ṣidq al-ḥadīth wa'adā' al-amāna wa-tark mā lā ya'nīki* are three attributes through which Luqmān acquired long life; cf. al-Maydānī, II, p. 227.

[4] *K. al-Kharāj*, p. 8, 7 from below: *lā ta'tariḍ fīmā* etc.

[5] Al-Shaybānī *Mumaṭṭa'*, p. 386.

[6] Al-Ya'qūbī, II, p. 364, penult.

[7] *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 40 bottom, among the five things which he demanded in his speech from the throne.

[8] *Tahdhīb*, p. 70, 6.

[9] Cf. the commentaries to the *Arba'ūn*: al-Nawawī, p. 28; al-Fashanī, p. 48.

[10] *Agh.*, XXI, p. 43, 15. [For the saying cf. also al-Ghazālī, Ihyā', I, Bāb 2; Hujwīrī, *Kashf al-Maḥjūb*, transl. Nicholson, p. 11; Ibn Khaldūn, *Prol.*, III, p. 196; Goldziher, *ZDMG*, LXVII, p. 532].

[11] Instead of the many possible examples, only: al-Mas'ūdī, IV, p. 168, 4: *ra's al-ḥikma ma'rifat Allāh* as saying of Muhammed. Instead of *ma'rifa* the word *maḥḥāfat* also occurs (cf. Prov. 9:10) in Fleischer, Leip. Cat., p. 428 a, bottom.

[12] See Excurses and Annotations.

religious virtues and legal duties, it was permissible to invent and circulate sayings of the Prophet, was, as the literature of traditions shows, most popular with people occupied with the circulation of traditions, whether honestly *ad majorem dei gloriam* or in their own interest. Therefore the biographies of ascetics and moralists, after
[159] praising their pious life and eagerness for the religious cause, frequently add a note to the effect that they were unreliable in respect of the traditions or even that they invented many false traditions.[1]

This freedom, which was taken for granted without scruples, was gradually indulged in in ever-widening circles. A portal was opened by which the most various elements could enter. Not everywhere, or at all times, did the pious motives prevail. Edification was joined by a psychologically related element: entertainment, intellectual enjoyment. Then it was not for long that one distinguished between various grades of it. Edifying tales slowly developed into entertaining ones and one soon arrived at farce, all within the framework of the tradition of the Prophet. It was possible, as early as the third century and perhaps even before, to exclaim in the name of the Prophet: 'Woe to him who spreads false ḥadīths to entertain the people, woe to him, woe.'[2]

We will now examine those circles addressed with triple woe, and at first shall neglect chronological order. It is told, under the date of the death of the Koran reader and singer Muḥammad b. Ja'far al-'Adamī (d. 349), that he once made the pilgrimage to Mecca in the company of Muḥammad al-Asadī and the philologist Abū'l-Qāsim. Arriving outside Medina the pilgrims noticed a blind man with a number of pilgrims gathered round him listening to the false traditions he was telling. Abū' l-Qāsim wanted to stop the impostor, but the Koran reader disapproved of such action, fearing lest it would cause the mob to defend the story-teller and to turn against his critics. He hit on an appropriate measure: he began to recite the Koran himself and, hardly did the blind man's audience hear his beautiful recitation, than they left the teller of traditions and gathered around the Koran-reader instead.[3] What could the story of the blind man have been like? On another occasion, also in Medina, a street preacher treated the crowd to this saying of the Prophet: 'Who fasts in the
[160] months of Rajab, Sha'bān and Ramaḍān, for him Allāh will build a palace in paradise. The hall of the palace will measure a thousand square miles and each gate will measure ten square miles.' The poet Bashshār b. Burd, who was just passing when the preacher reached

[1] E.g. *Ṭabaqāt al-Mufass.*, ed. Meursinge, p. 11, no. 31, s.v. al-Ḥasan b. 'Alī al-Aṣma'ī: this was an ascetic preacher (d. 434): 'but in his ḥadīth there are enormities, he was generally suspect of inventions.'

[2] Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 51.

[3] Abū'l-Maḥāsin, II, p. 353.

that point, disturbed him by calling 'Verily, such a palace must be a dreadful place in the winter.'[1]

These story-tellers of course boasted full *sanads* with which they prefaced their own invented sayings. The latter were chiefly concerned with the Prophet's biography, the subject of eschatology and cosmological fables, such as appealed to the tastes of street audiences. When the Imām Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal and his companion Yaḥyā b. Mu'īn were performing their prayers in a mosque in one of the suburbs of Baghdād a popular preacher appeared there—since they used to gather their listeners round themselves not only in the streets but also in the mosques—and told his audience this lie: 'Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal and Yaḥyā b. Mu'īn report to us it was told by 'Abd al-Razzāq, from Ma'mar, from Qatāda, from Anas, who said the Prophet said: "He who says there is no god but Allāh, for him God will create a bird from each word in the sentence; its beak will be of gold and its wings pure diamonds" '—and going on in this vein he produced a long rigmarole which would fill twenty pages. Aḥmad and Yaḥyā eyed each other with astonishment and each asked the other whether he had really been the author of this tradition. But each reassured the other that he had no knowledge whatsoever of the saying. When the preacher had finished his lecture the two learned theologians called him to them and, thinking that they too would give him some money, he hastened to them. When asked by Yaḥyā from whom he had obtained the tradition which he had quoted, the man replied that he had it from Aḥmād b. Ḥanbal and Yaḥyā b. Mu'īn. 'I am Yaḥyā b. Mu'īn and this is Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal; such a sentence never reached our ear. Friend, if you must tell lies, please select others as authority for them and spare us.' 'Verily', replied the cunning preacher, 'I now see why people say that Yaḥyā b. Mu'īn is mad. As if there were no other people of the name Yaḥyā b. Mu'īn! I alone have transmitted from seventeen different persons called Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal and Yaḥyā b. Mu'īn'.[2] This subterfuge appears not to have been unusual with these sly [161] popular preachers.[3] It is told from earlier times that Ḥarim b. Ḥayyān (d. 46)—the same of whom it is related that his mother carried him for four years—met a story-teller in a mosque who told religious tales quoting him (Ḥarim) as authority. When Ḥarim revealed his identity and it became obvious that the story-teller had never seen him, the latter answered there and then: 'I have always heard that you were a strange fellow; what you are saying now is very odd indeed. In this mosque alone there are fifteen people praying with us who are called Ḥarim b. Ḥayyān and you appear

[1] *Aghā.*, III, p. 30.
[2] Ibn al-Jawzī, *K. al-Quṣṣāṣ*, fol. 109.
[3] We meet this also in the circle of belletrists, *Agh.*, XXI, p. 90, 7.

to flatter yourself with the thought that you are the only one bearing this name.'[1] It need not be pointed out that this tale has been back-dated to those early patriarchal times from the circumstances of a later period. In Harim's times there was no such system of tradition as might have produced these excesses.

The men who entertained and edified the crowds in the street and mosques by reciting apt traditions for this purpose without being officially appointed for this task were called *qāṣṣ* or *qaṣṣaṣ*, pl. *quṣṣāṣ*, i.e. story-tellers.[2] Only the holy subject of their tales differentiated them from profane tellers of anecdotes[3] who gathered audiences at street corners in order to recite piquant stories and yarns; these latter seem to have had the same function as humorous papers have with us and they were even invited to the court of the caliphs. In the earliest times of Islam the name *qāṣṣ* did not apparently carry the unfavourable connotation which it gained in the course of the further development of the class which inherited it from more praiseworthy ancestors. The Prophet himself (Sūra 7:175, 12:3) used the name *qaṣaṣ* in respect of his own message, and in traditional stories he is quoted as speaking favourably of pious preachers who bore the name of *qāṣṣ*.[4] According to the Muslim account the development of this profession reaches back to the earliest period of Islam. 'Umar is said to have given express permission 'to tell stories to the people'[5] to the pious Tamīm al-Dārī
[162] or (according to others) to 'Ubayd b. 'Umayr, the first real *qāṣṣ*. Up to Umayyad times—under Mu'āwiya, especially the well-known Ka'b—pious men are named, who with the approval of the orthodox authorities practised freelance preaching and endeavoured to strengthen men in the beliefs, virtues and hopes of Islam by means of pious tales. We meet them in the ranks of the army, where they encourage the fighters for religion with pious exhortation—similarly to the task of the poets in pagan times.[6] One of the earliest references to this class of Muslim society is the account of three *quṣṣāṣ* in the camp of the warriors who in the seventh decade of the Hijra, in the reign of Marwān I, went forth under the leadership of Sulaymān b. Ṣurad in order to revenge the blood of Ḥusayn. The

[1] Al-Mubarrad, p. 356.

[2] [For the *quṣṣāṣ* see also Goldziher, *ZDMG*, I, p. 478, *Richtungen*, pp. 58ff.; J. Pedersen, 'The Islamic preacher: *wā'iz*, *mudhakkir*, *qāṣṣ*,' *Goldziher Memorial Volume*, I (1948), pp. 226ff. idem. 'The criticism of the Islamic preacher,' *Die Welt des Islams*, 1952, pp. 215ff.]

[3] Al-Mas'ūdī, VIII, p. 161ff.

[4] Ibn al-Jawzī, fol. 9a.

[5] Ibid., fols. 16–17.

[6] Cf. Part I, pp. 48–9. According to Abū Ḥan. al-Dīn., p. 128, 15, Sa'd used the old poets 'Amr b. Ma'dīkarib, Qays b. Hubayra and Shuraḥbīl b. al-Samṭ to encourage the Arab warriors before the battle of Qādisiyya.

three men kindled the enthusiasm of the fighters and divided their task in such a way that, while two officiated in particular parts of the army, the third wandered all the time about the camp addressing the troops, now here, now there, with inciting speeches.[1] We hear of the activity of the *quṣṣāṣ* also in the third century: a man named Abū Aḥmad al-Ṭabarī received the nickname al-Qāṣṣ because he had accompanied the Muslim troops in their wars against Daylamites and Greeks, stimulating their courage by pious tales.[2] *Quṣṣāṣ* were also mentioned with distinction as expounders of the Koran. In the second century Mūsā al-Uswārī and 'Amr b. Qā'id al-Uswārī were renowned in this field in 'Irāq, and both are also mentioned as highly respected *quṣṣāṣ*. The first gave lectures on the Koran simultaneously in Arabic and Persian; on his right the Arabs were seated and on his left the Persians, and he handled both languages with equal eloquence. Al-Jāḥiẓ remarks: 'He is one of the wonders of the world (*min 'aǧā'ib al-dunyā*), for normally when these two languages meet on the same tongue one of them usually damages the others (*adkhalat kullun minhumā al-ḍaym 'alā ṣāḥibihā*); this Mūsā is a rare exception.' The other Uswārī gave such detailed lectures on *tafsīr* that he needed forty-six years to work through the Koran; in this way he spent several weeks on the explanation of a single verse.[3] [163]
In so far as the *quṣṣāṣ* served serious religious ends, whether as homiletic exegetes or as tellers of sacred stories, they were left alone and undisturbed in their pious work; official theology gladly tolerated these free preachers and popular theologians, who in street or mosque condescended to the level of the understanding of the people, and spread amongst them ascetic beliefs which were not fostered by official theologians, who were chiefly bound up in the study of law, but which were publicly represented by these circles. Al-Jāḥiẓ gives extracts from the sermons of such men[4] and we do not hear that they were hindered in the exercise of their profession, which constituted a complementary element in the religious life of Islam.

## IV

It was only the abuses and excesses of the *quṣṣāṣ* that were combated. Such measures as we hear of were directed against greedy imposters who had at heart not religious ends but the amusement of the masses by means of the invention and circulation of false

[1] Tab., II, p. 559.
[2] Ibn al-Mulaqqin (Leiden Ms., Warner no. 532), fol. 112a; *Taḥdhīb*, p. 741.
[3] *K. al-Bayān*, fol. 111b [I, p. 368; the correct form of the name is 'Amr b. Fā'id and he spent thirty-four years on the explanation of the Koran, and died before finishing his task].
[4] Al-Jāḥiẓ., *Ibid*, fol. 127b [II, p. 31] (e.g. 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Ghazzāl al-Qāṣṣ).

traditions and fabulous elaborations of religious stories. The zeal of conservative theologians was directed against this section of religious legends, which was completely beyond religious control. We have information about this from comparatively ancient times. The earliest reference is a note from Sa'īd b. Jubayr, preserved in al-Bukhārī,[1] according to which a *qāṣṣ* by the name of Nawf b. Faḍāla worked in Kūfa. Ibn 'Abbās called him an 'enemy of God'(*'aduww Allāh*)—who denied that Moses, who in the Koran was brought into connection with Khiḍr, was to be identified with the prophet of Israel. This report presumably refers later events to earlier days.[2] As soon as the danger from such story-tellers to the proper preservation of traditions was realized, an attempt was made to discredit the beginnings of their profession by assigning them to the Khārijite
[164] camp.[3] But these street preachers, were persecuted only when, particularly in 'Irāq, they increased at such a rate that Ibn 'Awn (d. 151) could report that in the mosque at Baṣra only one single group gathered round the teacher of legal science whereas countless groups flocked to hear the story-tellers, who filled the mosques.[4] How credulous ordinary people were is seen from the following tale. The poet Kulthūm b. 'Amr al-'Attābī, who lived in the time of Hārūn and al-Ma'mūn, gathered the worshippers in a mosque of the capital and told them this ḥadīth: 'He who can reach the tip of his nose with his tongue may be sure that he will not go to hell.' As on a signal all present stuck out their tongues attempting to find out whether they possessed this pass to paradise.[5] It is understandable that the amusing and entertaining tales of the story-tellers were more attractive to the people than were the difficult material of professional theologians, especially as the story-tellers shrank from nothing which would draw the people. Al-Jāḥiẓ gives an example of the boundless frivolity in the tales of a narrator called Abū Ka'b.[6] Soon the governments issued edicts against story-tellers. In 279 it was announced in the streets of Baghdād that in neither streets nor mosques were story-tellers, astrologers or fortune-tellers to appear, and a little later, in 284, a similar order was made.[7] The company in which

[1] B. Tafsīr, no. 163, to Sūra 18:60.

[2] Here belongs also an account in al-Ya'qūbī, II, p. 270, according to which al-Ḥasan corrected a man who worked as *qāṣṣ* in front of the mosque of the Prophet at Medina by telling him that only the Prophet was entitled to this name.

[3] Ibn al-Jawzī, fol. 18.

[4] Ibid., fol. 11.

[5] *Agh.*, XII, p. 3.

[6] K. al-Hayawān, fol. 121b [III, 24-5].

[7] Ṭab., III, pp. 2131, 3; 2165 passim: Abū'l-Maḥāsin, II, p. 87, 2. In the last passage *an lā yaq'uda qāṣṣun* must be corrected to *yaquṣṣa qāṣṣun*. In this order book-dealers are also forbidden to sell philosophical and dialectical works.

street preachers are listed here clearly shows the view taken of them in official circles. A little while after the publication of these government orders, al-Mas'ūdī gives us a vivid description of the inclination of the populace in his day. 'They only gather round bear-tamers and monkey-leaders . . . they follow false saints and workers of miracles, lend their ears to lying *quṣṣāṣ* or gape at someone condemned to whipping or to the gallows.'[1] A document from the fourth century by the poet and belletrist Abū Dulaf al-Khazrajī [165] illuminates the cause which gave rise to these decrees even better than this description. This poet wrote a *qaṣīda*[2] which is highly instructive from the point of view of historians of culture.[3] He described in it the doings of the so-called *mukaddīn* or B. Sāsān,[4] the commentary on which is a mine of information on the social circumstances of those days.[5] The B. Sāsān are known from al-Ḥarīrī's XLIX *Maqāma* (*al-Sāsāniyya*), the testament of Abū Zayd in which the latter initiates his son in the Sāsānic arts.[6] The treatise by Abū Dulaf paints a picture of imposters, jugglers and tricksters of the worst type. Amongst the miraculous healers[7] and amulet writers, the *quṣṣāṣ* also appear: 'Amongst us are those who tell of the Isrā'īl (commentary: legends of the prophets) or of "span by span" (*shibran 'alā shibrin*, i.e. short stories as big as a square span; such stories therefore are also called *al-shibriyyāt*);[8] then there are amongst us those who hand down *isnāds*, whole libraries full.'[9]

They also practise the following device, among others. They gather a large crowd and then one *qāṣṣ* takes up his position at one

[1] Al-Mas'ūdī, V, p. 86.

[2] Before that al-Aḥnaf al-'Ukbarī, called *'shā'ir al-mukaddīn,'* had written a similar but shorter *qaṣīda* which can be found in *Yatīmat al-Dahr*, II, p. 285. In both *qaṣīdas* these imposters are introduced as speaking.

[3] But also from that of lexicography. From this piece the dictionary could be extraordinarily enriched with words and meanings which are not yet noted in supplements and appendices.

[4] For the origin of the name, see the commentary to de Sacy's edition of al-Ḥarīrī, 2nd ed., p. 23.

[5] This may serve to explain an interesting excerpt belonging to the literature, which Houtsma has reproduced from a Ms. of Amīn, *Cat. ar. Lugd. Batav.*, I, pp. 249–51 [al-Bayhaqī, *al-Maḥāsin wa'l-Masāwī*, ed. F. Schwally, pp. 624ff., cf. Schwally, *ZA*, 1912, pp. 420ff.]. How these imposters allied themselves with *quṣṣāṣ* is seen ibid., p. 250, 12.

[6] Al-Ḥarīrī, ibid., pp. 659ff.

[7] *Fākihat al-Khulafā'*, p. 63, penult., likens a quack to Abū Zayd and Sāsān.

[8] *Yatīmat al-Dahr*, III, p. 179, 12ff. It might be tempting to interpret 'span by span' by the fact that the *quṣṣāṣ* pretended to know the smallest details of the material of their stories (cf. *ya'rif bi-shibr*, *ZDPV*, p. 166).

[9] *Wa-man yarwī'l-asānīda wa-ḥashwa kulli qimṭarin*, *Yatīmat al-Dahr*, III, p. 184, 4.

end of the street and tells stories about the excellences of 'Alī,[1]
[166] and at the other end his colleague praises Abū Bakr beyond measure, 'thus they lose neither the dirham of the Nāṣibī[2] nor that of the Shī'ī, and at the end they share among themselves the collected dirhams.[3]

This state of affairs obtained also later. In the sixth century the rhetorician Ibn al-Athīr mentions 'story-tellers' in one breath with jugglers (*al-mushaʿbidhīn*).[4] This combination is understandable when one reads Ibn al-Jawzī's description of the characteristics of members of this class in a treatise written about them at roughly the same time. There are amongst these people some who paint their faces with all manner of herbs in order to give themselves an ascetic appearance through its yellow colouring; others use smelling substances, in order to be able to shed tears at will; others even go to the lengths of throwing themselves from the pulpit—which contrary to custom they decorate with coloured rags, or, departing from the ways of oriental orators, they produce their false pathos through all kind of gestures, by pounding the pulpit, running up and down the steps, stamping their feet, etc. Others concentrate by elegant dress and smooth movements on attracting the women, thereby becoming the cause of frequent mischief.[5]

This arrogant appearance was matched by the contents of their sermons. Whereas the 'story-tellers' of the earlier period had gained the indulgence of pious theologians by the morally and religiously edifying contents of their lectures, the street preachers of later times profaned religious subjects by using them for entertainment and amusement of their audiences; they tried to impress the uneducated populace with piquant etymologies[6] and other charlatanisms, and endeavoured to give themselves an air of engaging in serious research. Biblical legends embroidered with all kinds of anecdotes were the characteristic contents of their lectures. They loved to tell invented stories about biblical persons, and the branch of the Isrāʾīliyyāt—legends of persons in Israelitic times, which also penetrated into more serious exegetic works[7]—found its most eager promoters here. In this field too they endeavoured to attract and please by frivolous
[167] exhibition of curiosities, giving themselves the appearance of being initiated into the most intimate details of sacred history. They left no question unanswered because it would have damaged their

[1] From p. 182, 4 from below: *wa-minna'l-nāʾiḥu'l-mubkī*, we learn that they also concerned themselves with lamentations for al-Ḥusayn.

[2] Cf. *ZDMG*, XXXVI, p. 281, note 1.

[3] *Yatīmat al-Dahr*, III, p. 182, ult.

[4] *Al-Maṯal al-Sāʾir*, p. 35.

[5] Ibn al-Jawzī, fols. 101–6.

[6] Cf. Yāqūt, I, p. 293; II, p. 138.

[7] *Itqān*, II, p. 221, *tawārīkh Isrāʾīliyya*.

reputation before the populace if they had admitted their ignorance. A *qāṣṣ*, for example, was able to give the name of the golden calf, and when asked from what source he had gathered this knowledge he gave 'the book of 'Amr b. al-'Ās' as the source of his learning.[1] Another knew exactly the name of the wolf which had eaten Joseph. When it was pointed out to him that Joseph had not been eaten by a wolf, he escaped from his predicament with the answer: Well, then it was the name of the wolf who did not eat Joseph.[2]

They met learned theologians who exposed their imposture with similar pressure of mind. It is easily understood that professional theologians became their sworn enemies; since people everywhere streamed to the 'story-teller', much as, above, we saw it happen in Baṣra, and their lectures were much better attended than those of trained theologians, who thus saw dangerous rivals in the story-tellers. By means of tricks such as we have just seen these latter endeavoured to be regarded as 'scholars' in the eyes of the people, and they were more highly respected than professional theologians. Abū Ḥanīfa's mother sought advice about a religious question. She first approached her famous son, but was not satisfied with his answer and made him accompany her to the story-teller Zara'a, and only when this man confirmed Abū Ḥanīfa's judgement in his presence did she rest content.[3] But not all *quṣṣāṣ* were so deferential to acknowledged scholars as Zara'a. Usually they met theologians with great *sang froid*, and the laugh was usually on their side. We have already had examples of this and many could be added.

This mutual relationship also appears in a number of anecdotes to which it gave rise. The traditionist al-Sha'bī (d. 103), it is said, noticed one Friday in Palmyra that all the people gathered round an old man with a long beard and took notes of his lecture. Amongst other things he spoke, prefacing his words with long *isnād* going back to the Prophet, of the two trumpets of the day of judgement. Two blasts would be given on these trumpets: one would prostrate everyone into lifeless stupor and the other blast would wake them to [166] a new life. The traditionist could not bear this falsification of Koranic eschatology and reprimanded the story-teller for having made two trumpets out of one. But the latter replied: 'You evil-doer, how dare you deny what I have on the authority of a correct traditional chain from the mouth of the Prophet?' He then picked up his shoe and gave the signal to beat al-Sha'bī, and his audience, taking the hint, did not stop beating him until he swore that God had created thirty trumpets.[4] Even though this tale may not be historical it nevertheless illustrates the relationship of learned

[1] Al-Mubarrad, p. 356; *al-'Iqd*, II, p. 151; cf. also al-Mas'ūdī, IV, pp. 23, 26.
[2] Ibn al-Jawzī, fol. 129.
[3] Ibid., fol. 124. [4] Ibid., fol. 207.

theologians to story-tellers and the role of the populace in the many encounters of these two classes. Muḥammad b. Jarīr al-Ṭabarī came into a similar situation because of his energetic proceeding against a lying story-teller. A *qāṣṣ* preached to the populace about all manner of nonsense. Among other things he explained the words of the Koran (17:81) by saying that God had made room for Muhammed upon His throne next to Him. When al-Ṭabarī heard of this un-Islamic doctrine he thought it his duty to protest against such heresy and even wrote upon his front door: 'Praised be God who needs no company and has no one sitting on His throne with Him.' When the Baghdād mob saw this inscription directed against their favourite street-theologian, they besieged the house of the much respected Imām and threw stones against the door so that the entrance was blocked with stones.[1]

From all this it will be seen that the existence and effectiveness of such a class of preachers represented a real danger to the integrity of the ḥadīth and that their irresponsibility had a large share in the invention and circulation of false traditions. In early times these preachers were largely to be found in 'Irāq and further towards Central Asia, whereas there were fewer of them in the Ḥijāz. It is reported that Mālik b. Anas forbade them to appear in the mosques of Medina.[2] They were also fairly rare in the Maghrib, an area where a strict adherence to tradition predominated.[3] The falsification of tradition by these people differs from the methods previously
[169] described in that the *quṣṣāṣ* had no political, religious or party bias in mind, but they were merely concerned with the edification and entertainment of their listeners and, it may be added, the material gains which they derived from their activity among the common people. Since they were particularly out for material gain, there was of course professional jealousy amongst them. 'The *qāṣṣ* does not love the *qāṣṣ*' is a proverbial saying.[4] Collection of money appears always to have been the aftermath of such street preaching; at least it would seem so from the report which was later ascribed to the companion 'Imrān b. Ḥaṣīn. The latter passed a *qāṣṣ* who begged from his audience after his recitation from the Koran. 'Imrān quoted this word of the Prophet when witnessing the scene: 'He who reads the Koran should thereby invoke God, but there will come people who will use the Koran as an opportunity for begging.'[5]

[1] Al-Suyūṭī, *Taḥdhīr al-Khawāṣṣ* (Leiden Ms., Warner, no. 474), fols. 46–79. Cap. VII.

[2] Ibid., Cap. IX.

[3] Al-Muqaddasī, p. 236, 18.

[4] *Yatīmat al-Dahr*, III, p. 3, 17 [al-Maydānī, II, 304].

[5] Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 121. In Ibn al-Jawzī, fols. 147–9 very interestin g examples are quoted.

*Kawwaza* was the term used to denote this special form of collecting money; the person who was charged with the collection was called *muḥawwiz* (add to the dictionaries) and how artfully these collections were made can be seen in a description from the fourth century.[1] The ordinary people had such faith in the *quṣṣāṣ* that they were even used for saying prayers; a father makes a *qāṣṣ* pray for the return of his son—for payment of course.[2] These people appear also to have been busy with a kind of trade in indulgences in the fifth century.[3]

Even in modern times there could be found such freelance preachers in Muslim cities.[4] Schack in his diary from Damascus in 1870 says: 'The most interesting thing was a characteristic scene which I witnessed (in the Umayyad mosque). A sheikh leaned against a pillar, holding forth with lively gesticulations, in the midst of a large audience surrounding him. My guide said that he was no clergyman but a man from the people who preached edifying sermons to the worshippers and collected money for this.' Schack is reminded by this scene of Abū Zayd, the hero of the *Maqāmas* of al-Ḥarīrī,[5] and in fact the XLI Maqāma describes corresponding [170] scenes (the preacher of penitence and the boy collecting money in Tinnis, partly also the XI, where Abū Zayd preaches a moralistic sermon at the cemetery and then collects money from bystanders.)[6]

## V

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'ammarīn*,[7] the long-lived ones. They belong to the chapter of the inner history of the ḥadīth, for the adventurers called *mu'ammarīn* recited traditions from direct contact with the Prophet. In this they had an easier task than other inventors of ḥadīths, 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 Muḥammed's communication. Thus they escaped fault-finding criticism if they were fortunate in obtaining

[1] *Yatīmat al-Dahr*, III, p. 178, 2.
[2] Yāqūt, II, p. 123.
[3] Ibn al-Jawzī, fol. 115.
[4] E.g., for Bukhārā, *Petermann's Geogr. Mitteilungen*, 1889, p. 269a.
[5] *Ein halbes Jahrhundert. Erinnerungen u. Aufzeichnungen*, III, p. 191.
[6] Ed. de Sacy, 2nd ed., p. 129.
[7] [Goldziher wrote a monograph on the *mu'ammarūn*, as an introduction to his edition of Abū Ḥātim al-Sijistānī's book on the subject: *Abhandlungen zur arabischen Philologie*, II, Leiden, 1899.]

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.

The quality of extraordinary longevity is a motive which is often mentioned without a theological context in fables about Arab antiquity. The poet and tribal hero Zuhayr b. Janāb is made to attain 450 years of age, his grandfather is reputed to have lived 650 years.[1] One of the heroes of the 'Antar cycle, Durayd b. al-Ṣimma al-Khath'amī, is according to the fable, at the time with which the Sīra deals, already 450 years old and he continues to live for quite a while, since he lived till the epoch of the Prophet.[2] It is true that he described himself in a poem dating near the Islamic period as an old man 'between ninety and a hundred years'.[3] At that age the millstone of wars' (*raḥā al-ḥarb*), as he was called, was a broken old man, the object of the special care of the tribe which venerated him highly. The fabulous idea of longevity is often met with in traditions about the heroes of the Jāhiliyya,[4] and philologists have collected the material for this chapter of ancient Arab traditions.[5] Such traditions, preserved thanks to the philologists, were much embroidered by popular hyperbole and the Arab audiences were thus conditioned to listen to communications such as the one which a later *rāwī* of the 'Antar romance was able to tell to his audience without being laughed at. According to him one of the transmitters of the legends of the 'Antar cycle, al-'Aṣma'ī, reached the age of 670, of which 400 years were spent in the time of the Jāhiliyya.[6] This was to compensate for the anachronism that the *rāwī* had been acquainted with the subjects of his stories as an eyewitness. The story-teller of Mu'āwiya, 'Abīd b. Shariya, also reached 300 years of age, according to legend.[7]

[171]

[1] *Agh.*, XXI, pp. 99, 4; 100, 20 [Th. Nöldeke, *WZKM*, 1898, p. 354; G. Jacob, *Arabisches Beduinenleben*, 2nd ed., p. xix.]

[2] *Sīrat 'Antar*, VI, p. 73; VIII, p. 20; XX, pp. 114, 143; cf. III, p. 3.

[3] *Agh.*, IX, p. 12, 21.

[4] Philologists and historians of literature count, however, among the *mu'ammarūn* people who reached the age of 120–150 years (Sinān b. Abī Ḥarītha reached 150, al-A'lam to Zuhayr, ed. Landberg, *Tuwaf*, p. 175, 7). *Agh.*, IV, p. 3, 7.

[5] The book most often quoted is the *K. al-Mu'ammarīn* by Abū Ḥātim al-Sijistānī (d. 255) from which there are many extracts in the *Khizānat al-Adab*. [It has already been pointed out that this book was subsequently published by Goldziher himself.]

[6] *Sīrat 'Antar*, VI, p. 138; cf. *ZDMG*, XXXII, p. 342; Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 3rd ed., p. 378.

[7] Ibn al-Kalbī, in al-Ḥarīrī, *Durrat al-Ghawwāṣ*, ed. Thorbecke, p. 55, penult. [The correct form of the name is 'Ubayd b. Sharya, cf. Goldziher, *Abhandlungen*, II, pp. 40ff. of the Arabic text, pp. 29ff. of the notes; See also *GAL S* I, p. 100.]

Arising from popular fable, belief in the existence of *mu'ammarīn* entered the religious field. What in fable was assumed as a possibility in ancient times, religious sentiment of the people made into a true fact concerning contemporaries. The earliest trace of this type of *mu'ammarīn*, who used their alleged gift of grace for irresponsible ḥadīth stories (i.e., not subject to *isnād*), is to be found at the end of the third or beginning of the fourth century. A certain 'Uthmān b. al-Khaṭṭāb, with the nick-name Ibn Abī'l-Dunyā (d. 327), pretended to have known 'Alī personally and a scroll of traditions of which he was the author was handed down by many people.[1]

Not long afterwards, in the year 329, we hear amongst the Andalusian Muslims of a certain Manṣūr b. Ḥiẓām whose father was said to have been a *mawlā* of the Prophet, and Manṣūr himself claimed to have been a boy whilst 'Uthmān and 'Ā'isha were still [172] alive.[2] A younger contemporary, Ja'far b. Nestor al-Rūmī, who made capital out of the credulousness of the masses in the district of Fārāb about the year 350, went even farther. He said in one of his stories: 'I was in the Prophet's company at the battle of Tabūk when he lost his riding whip. I dismounted, fetched the whip and handed it to the Prophet who rewarded me with the words: 'May God extend your life.' Thus I am alive 320 years after this blessing,'[3] he concludes. India and Central Asia appear to have been the chief scenes for the operations of such impostors. A prince Sarbatak from India is mentioned who, at the alleged age of 725 years, pretended to have been the Indian prince to whom the Prophet had sent his missionaries. He claimed to have seen the Prophet twice, in Mecca and in Medina. He is said to have died in the year 333 aged 894 years.[4] The book of Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī on the 'Companions of the Prophet' is rich in material on such alleged Companions.[5] The credulous people could be expected to believe such things as the following: The caliph al-Nāṣir met in the year 576 a small Arab tribe on one of his hunting expeditions to the desert. Its oldest members waited upon the caliph, kissed the ground before him and offered him what food they could produce. Then they said: 'O Commander of the Believers, we own a treasure which we should like

[1] Ibn al-Athīr, VIII, p. 126, A.H. 327. [New materials about him in *Abhandlungen*, II, pp. lxvii–viii; he is sometimes called 'Alī b. 'Uthmān b. al-Khaṭṭāb.]

[2] Al-Maqqarī, II, p. 6, where other such phenomena are also described.

[3] Ibn Ḥajar, I, p. 549. [For further references see Abhandlungen, II, p. LXVIII.]

[4] Ibid, II, p. 354. [Further references in *Abhandlungen*, II, p. lxxv where there is added yet another example from the fifth century, Mu'amuras al-Mawṣilī.

[5] Ibid., I, p. 538, the poem by Jahma b. 'Awf al-Dawsī, where he sings of his own longevity (he was 360 years old).

to offer to you as a gift. We are all the sons of a man who is still with us though he is a contemporary of the Prophet and helped in making the "ditch". His name is Jubayr b. al-Ḥārith.' The caliph asked for the old man to be shown to him and he was brought in a cradle.[1] About the same time a Ṣūfī by the name of al-Rabī' b. Maḥmūd from Mardīn indulges in the same sort of swindle: he claimed in the year 599 that he was an immediate Companion of the prophet.[2]

The most extravagant swindler of this kind was however an Indian
[173] Muslim called Ratan b. Abd 'Allāh who died in the year 632 (709 according to others).[3] He claims that he was already sixteen years old when he, the pagan, had a revelation by a vision of the Prophet's appearance in Ḥijāz. He made long and wearisome journeys to see the chosen man and it was granted to him to carry in his arms, on the way between Jidda and Mecca, Muhammed, who was then but a small boy. As a reward for this he was chosen by providence to become a Muslim Methuselah. He spread about three hundred traditions which he claimed to have obtained from the Prophet himself.[4] Amongst these are sayings which are obvious in their Shī'ite bias, e.g. one on the merits of mourning on the day of 'Ashūrā. This Ratan impressed many of the most learned men of his time, who believed his fables. Ibn Ḥajar lists a number of scholars who came to India from various parts of the Islamic world, even from Spain, especially to see this man. Al-Kutubī preserved the description by a Muslim from Khurāsān, who visited Ratan in India, of his discussion with him.[5] Ratan's son Maḥmūd became, after the death of the remarkable old man, a source of elaborations on the fables of Bābā Ratan.[6] He told of his father that he was present at the splitting of the moon, at the 'Battle of the Ditch', and at other famous events of the epoch of the Prophet.

Scholars like the great lexicographer Majd al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī, the author of the *Qāmūs*, and the famous Khalīl al-Ṣafadī believed in the possibility of Ratan's role and as a companion defended him in the literature against al-Dhahabī who, proceeding from the dogma that none of the Prophet's companions survived the first century, took the trouble to contest the legend of Ratan in a special treatise *Kasr wathan Ratan* (the destruction of the idol of Ratan). 'He who believes in this miracle of the world and is convinced that Ratan

[1] Ibid, I, p. 543.

[2] Ibid, I, p. 1083.

[3] [See the detailed study by J. Horovitz, 'Baba Ratan, the saint of Bhatinda,' *JPHS*, II, pp. 97ff., and M. Shafi''s article 'Ratan' in *EI*, Suppl.]

[4] Here belong probably the *Aḥādīth Ratanīyya*, Leiden MS., Warner no. 957(5), Cat. IV, p. 101; Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat. II, p. 184, no. 1387; p. 214, no. 1486 [and a Ms. in Lucknow, see Horovitz, l.c. p. 112].

[5] *Fawāt al-Wafayāt*, I, p. 162.

[6] Ibn Ḥajar, I, pp. 1086–1106.

has lived all this time cannot be cured. Let him know that I am the first to deny it. Ratan was an old swindler, a *dajjāl*, a liar, who fobbed off the people with enormous lies and thus perpetrated a mischievous infamy! May God punish him.'[1] Ibn Ḥajar also fought this pious lie in his detailed discussion of the Ratan fables and their [174] literature: 'Ratan himself was a great liar, but not content with that people liberally invented lies and absurdities about him.'[2]—At about the same time a swindler named Abū'l-Ḥasan al-Rā'ī was active in Turkestan. He also maintained in the seventh century that he was a long-lived companion of the Prophet and said that he lifted the Prophet up in the night when the moon split for his sake. Though prudent traditionists put such people without hesitation on the list of forgers, or as they call them, *dajjāls*,[3] they themselves were well able to play on the credulousness of men, as the example of Ratan showed. Such pretence brought great advantages, as to be a Companion of the Prophet was the highest dignity obtainable. The person and honour of such people were considered untouchable, and to slight them would have been considered a capital crime.

[1] Al-Kutubī, op. cit., p. 163.
[2] Ibn Ḥajar, IV, p. 88.
[3] See above, p. 127, note 8.

[175]

# CHAPTER SIX

# ṬALAB AL-ḤADĪTH

## I

In the beginning of its development the ḥadīth had local character. It had its origin in Medina and from there was carried to all the 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 ḥadīths.[1] 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 (see above p. 42). The form of valid ḥadīths which was sanctioned by custom demanded that the transmitters (*ḥamala*) of the desired ḥadīths had to be visited personally,[2] in order to be able to spread sayings obtained from them in their name. The
[176] tradition with its whole *isnād* was taken over, thus entitling one to add one's own name as the last link in the chain of transmitters. Any other form of taking over traditions was considered abnormal. It is said with disapproval that Ibn Lahī'a (d. 174) listened to his pupils reading traditions that he had not collected personally.[3] In order to possess a tradition in authenticated forms it was necessary to meet those who were its 'carriers'.[4] 'Irāqī scholars liked to

[1] A few examples from Abū Dāwūd: I, p. 10: *ḥādhā min sunan ahl al-Shām lam yashrakhum fīhā aḥad*; p. 88: *infarada ahl Miṣr*; p. 175: *min sunan ahl al-Baṣra allādhī tafarradu bihi*; p. 241: *ḥadīth Ḥimsī* (that it was forbidden to fast on Saturdays); II, p. 155: *mimmā infarada bihi ahl al-Madīna* (that the Prophet had fixed no exact punishments—*ḥadd*—for those who infringed the prohibition of wine) etc. Different *ḥadīths* are handed on from the same man in two different provinces and the critics judge them differently. Al-Bukhārī says: *Ahl al-Shām yarwūna 'an Zuhayr b. Muḥammad manākīr wa-ahl al-'Irāq yarwūna 'anhu aḥādīth muqāraba*, al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 60, II, p. 225, 1.

[2] Abū'l Maḥāsin, I, p. 475, 2.

[3] Ibn Qutayba, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 253, s.v.

[4] 'Abd b. Ḥamīd handed down a ḥadīth in the name of 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Sa'd of Rayy. Yaḥyā b. Mu'īn who was present asked: 'Does not 'Abd al-Raḥmān intend to undertake the *ḥajj* himself so that we may be able to hear the ḥadīth from him?', al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 233, top.

make use of the pilgrimage to the holy places in order to hear Ḥijāzī traditions from the pious men living there;[1] these traditions were occasionally different from those current in their homeland, as we saw before.

Much attention was paid to taking over and then handing down all that important men transmitted in direct line from them or from those who could listen to them. Many journeys were undertaken to satisfy this desire. Aḥmad b. Mūsā al-Jawālīqī from Ahwāz (210–306), usually known as 'Abdān, travelled to Baṣra every time he heard of a tradition transmitted by Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī, in order to obtain these traditions from men who gathered them immediately at the source. Altogether he made that journey eighteen times.[2]

Religious proverbs and stimulating sayings[3] praise journeys *fī ṭalab al-'ilm*, for the purpose of seeking knowledge, even if the journey should lead as far as China. By *al-'ilm*, knowledge, is meant in such sayings religious knowledge transmitted from really early times: ḥadīth and sunna.[4] To the companion Abū'l-Dardā' is attributed this confession (which in effect belongs to a later time): 'If the explanation of a passage in the book of God presented me with any difficulties and I heard of a man in Birk al-Ghumād—an in- [177] accessible spot in Southern Arabia, which in ancient times was used proverbially as the furthest end of the Arabian continent[5]—who was able to explain this passage, I would not shrink from the journey there.'[6] 'He who departs in the search of knowledge is on "God's path" (*sabīl Allāh*) until he returns,' i.e. he gains the same merit as he who offers his life in the war of faith;[7] 'the angels spread their wings over him and all creatures pray for him, even the fish in the water.'[8]

It would be useless to list examples of the great interchange between outlying provinces which resulted from such journeys of study. From one end of the Islamic world to the other, from al-

[1] *Agh.*, XIX, p. 35, 4 (Sufyān b. 'Uyayna), cf. al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 196 bottom, 'Alī b. al-Madīnī (d. 234): *ḥajajtu ḥajjatan wa-laysa lī himmatun illā an asma'a* etc.

[2] Yāqūt, I, p. 414.

[3] Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 269, 19, in connection with the story that someone undertook the journey to investigate the sunna in respect of the *mass al-khuffayn*.

[4] *Ibid.*, II, p. 160, 12: *inna hādhā'l-'ilm* = this is the sunna, cf. above, p. 110, note 4., *al-qawl fī'l-Qur'ānī bighayri 'ilmin*; N.B. al-Tirmidhī, ibid, p. 25, 19: by *jamā'a* is meant: *ahl al-fiqh wa'l-'ilm wa'l-ḥadīth*.

[5] Yāqūt, I, pp. 589f.

[6] *Jastrai al-'Arab*, ed. D. H. Muller, p. 204.

[7] Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 108, cf. Kremer, *Culturgesch.*, II, p. 437.

[8] Ibn Māja, p. 20. [For the praise of *'ilm* cf. also Wensinck, *Handbook*, s.v. 'knowledge' (N.B. not 'science').]

Andalus to Central Asia, wandered diligent men gathering traditions in order to be able to pass them on to their audiences.[1] This was the only possible way of obtaining in their authentic form traditions which were scattered in the most diverse provinces. The honorific *al-raḥḥāla* or *al-jawwāl* is hardly ever absent from the names of traditionists of recognized importance.[2] The title *ṭawwāf al-aqālīm*, wanderer in all zones,[3] is no mere hyperbole for these travellers, who included people who could say of themselves that they had traversed the East and West four times.[4] These men do not travel in all these countries in order to see the world or to gain experience but only to see the preservers of traditions in all these places and to hear and profit by them, 'like the bird who alights on no tree without picking
[178] at the leaves.'[5] It is said of these men that they are famed for the *ṭalab*,[6] i.e. for active search and investigation of ḥadīths (*min al-mashhūrīn bi'l-ṭalab fi'l-riḥla*).[7]

II

These journeys also yielded important results for the practical development of the ḥadīth in Islam. Because of the ever increasing amount of journeys for the *ṭalab*, theologians succeeded in inserting the particular provincial traditions into the general, more and more uniform, framework of the ḥadīth. Without their success the concept of collections of ḥadīths would hardly have been possible. The third century is the time when the distinction of local traditions begin to have only theoretical importance for criticism; they are all—provided that their isnāds are unimpeachable—incorporated into the corpus of traditions and all are considered of equally binding force. Only critics continue to differentiate the provenance of separate sayings, but this has no influence upon their position within the system of sources for orthodox living.

By this eclectic proceeding some points which previously had been particular to only limited sections of Islam became of more general,

[1] Cf. *Ṭab. Ḥuff.*, VII, no. 76; VIII, no. 19; XIII, no. 53, etc.

[2] It is obvious that it is an even greater honour to be able to say of someone that he is the aim of all journeys of *ṭālibūn* from all countries, Yāqūt I, p. 894, ult. 'that because of him (i.e. to get to him) the arm-pits or livers of animals are beaten' (*tuḍrab ilaylh ābāṭ or akbād al-maṭiy*), see above, p. 142; cf. *Agh.*, I, p. 34, 3 from below; al-Mubarrad, p. 571, 12: *rukbat al-dunyā* (*tour de voyage de tout le monde*); Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, I, p. 253.

[3] Cf. the expression: *akhā safarin jawwābu arḍin.*, *Agh.*, I, p. 38, 1 ('Umar b. Abī Rabī'a).

[4] *Ṭab. Ḥuff.*, X, no. 17; XII, no. 58.

[5] Ibid., IX, no. 9.

[6] Ibid., VI, no. 17; VIII, no. 21.

[7] Yāqūt, III, p. 528, 9. [For the extended travels of the traditionist cf also al-Ghazālī, *Iḥyā'*, Book XVII: *ādāb al-safar*.]

sometimes even overwhelming, importance and made possible the development of a uniform sunna for the Islamic world in very many, though not all fields. Before that there could be no question of a uniform sunna in Islam.

If we enter the Jāmi' al-Azhar in Cairo through the 'door of the barbers' (*bāb al-muzayyinīn*)[1] the inscription on this gate (against a background of intertwining arabsques) will attract attention. It says: *Inna' l-a'māla bi'l-niyyāti wa-li-kulli'mra'in mā nawā*, i.e. verily, actions are judged by their intention and every man has what he has intended. This saying of the Prophet is considered to be one of the most important principles of Islam. As such it is not only the first of the 'forty traditions' of al-Nawawī (*al-Arba'īn al-Nawawiyya*) but before that)[2] it is mentioned as one of the four basic doctrines around which Islam revolves (*madār al-islām*). [179] Though the saying originally has a moral import[3] and measures the ethical worth of a religious act by its intention,[4] the theologians (who like to produce a guiding principle from amongst the vast sum of traditions which usually only offer concrete cases and judgements) have applied this sentence as a supreme principle in the treatment of religious and legal questions[5] and have even attached to it a lot of silly casuistry unworthy of this lofty ethical thought.[6]

This principle, which rules the whole theory of Law, was not always known in all Islam (so far as expression in a tradition is

[1] Cf. Ebers, *Aegypten in Bild u. Wort*, II, p. 72.

[2] Cf. al-Fashanī, *al-Majālis al-Saniyya*, p. 5. (allegedly from Abū Dāwūd); these four doctrines were epitomized by an Andalusian (5th cent.) in an instructive epigram (Ibn Bashkuwāl, p. 238, no. 541); the *niyya* tradition in a poem by Abū Ja'far from Elvira (al-Maqqarī, I, p. 928).

[3] This is obvious from the full version of the saying which has the addition that departure abroad is pleasing only in the case of one who has undertaken it in the name of God, but not of him who intends worldly aims (*dunyā yuṣībuhu*).

[4] *Al-Muwaṭṭa'*, II, p. 21; *inna-llāha qad amḍa'a ajraha 'alā qadri niyyatihi*; for intention in *jihād*, al-Nasā'ī, p. 77; cf. al-Dārimī, p. 318.

[5] The principle is also mainly mentioned in connection with such legal questions to prove that a legal formula (e.g. *manumissio* or *repudium*) is only of practical consequence if it is uttered with the intention of this result: B. *'Atq*, no. 6, *Ṭalāq*, no. 11, *Aymān*, no. 21, *Ḥiyal*, no. 1, *Manāqib al-Anṣār*, no. 45, Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 218, al-Nasā'ī, I, p. 8, II, pp. 41, 81; cf. also the teaching of Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'ī by which *reservatio mentalis* is to be excluded by oath, al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 253, 8 from below. It is quoted in the name of the Imām al-Shāfi'ī that the *niyya*-ḥadīth is applicable in 70 chapters of law, in Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat. II, p. 165, no. 1362. [Cf. also Wensinck, *Handbook*, s.v. 'intention'; idem, 'Die Intente in recht, ethick en mystiek der semitische volken,' in *Versl. Med. Ak. Amst.*, Ser. 5, IV, pp. 109ff., idem, s.v. 'Niya' in *EI*.]

[6] Thus, e.g., it is reasoned that by this principle the intention to redeem a promise cancels the omission to do so, al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 105. Such casuistical applications of this principle are to be found in *Taʾdhīb*, p. 729; al-Qasṭallānī, IV, pp. 347ff.

concerned). In earlier times it was transmitted in Medina[1] only and, as is expressly stated, was known 'neither in 'Irāq,[2] Mecca or Yemen,
[180] nor in Syria or Egypt.'[3] Only the eclectic tendency in the use of traditions of later days caused it to penetrate into the general ḥadīth and become an authoritative principle of Muslim legal science. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Mahdī of Baṣra (d. 198) says: 'It would be desirable to include this sentence in every chapter (*bāb*) of legal teaching.'[4]

## III

The example of the *niyya* tradition serves to show the reader how particularistic teaching of single provinces could become authoritative rules for the whole of Islam through the intercourse which led to the rise of the collections in the third century. We must say at the outset that the canonical collections are not critically sorted or methodically arranged collections of ḥadīths which the collectors selected from existing literature. The ḥadīths from which the authors chose, the many thousands of sayings from which they compiled those which were valid according to their judgement, had been brought together by them on extensive travels. Al-Bukhārī made use of a thousand sheikhs[5] in all parts of the Islamic world. It was his task to investigate their trustworthiness and that of their authorities. The same is true of the other authorities of the body of traditions used in the compilations.[6]

The rise of this literature brought no end to independent collecting,

[1] There it seems to have been especially the Qāḍī Yaḥyā b. Sa'īd al-Anṣārī (d. 143) who propagated it and Mālik is said to have taken it from him; al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 310, 14. It is remarkable that even in *al-Muwaṭṭa'* this principle is applied to concrete cases only. There it is not transmitted in an abstract form, but it is found with express reference to Yaḥyā b. Sa'īd in Shaybānī, p. 401, at the end of *Bāb al-Nawādir*. The same Shaybānī also mentions the *niyya* tradition in his work on the law of war, *WJL*, XL, p. 49, no. 6 [I, p. 9].

[2] According to Abū Ḥanīfa ('Irāqī trend) the *niyya* is not required for the validity of *mannumissio* or *repudium*, al-Qasṭallānī, IV, p. 349.

[3] Ibn Ḥibbān, in al-Jurjānī, introduction to al-Tirmidhī (Delhi, 1849).

[4] Al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 310, 14.

[5] *Taʾdhīb*, p. 93.

[6] [Al-Bukhārī, and the other authors of the canonical collections, have, however, also used written sources, on the one hand earlier compilations of ḥadīth—of which a number, such as the *Jāmiʿ* of Maʿmar b. Rāshid, the *Muṣannaf* of 'Abd al-Razzāq, and the collection of al-Humaydī, have lately been partially recovered—on the other, books by philologists. Cf. for these questions M. F. Sezgin, 'Hadis musannafat inin medhdei ve Ma'mer b. Rasid 'in Câmi'i'i,' *Turkiyat Mecmuasi*, XII, pp. 115ff.; idem, *Buhari'nin kaynaklari hakkinda arastirmalar*, Istanbul, 1956; M. Hamidullah, 'Eine Handschrift der Sunan von Sa'īd b. Mansūr, des Lehrers von Muslim,' *Die Welt des Islams*, 1962, pp. 25ff.]

which could only be furthered by *ṭalab* journeys. It was not desired to learn from books only. Books are for practical use; he who wishes to gain the merit of seeking for the Prophet's words must hunt these out from 'the mouths of the carriers'. Some of the examples quoted above relate to the time when many systematical works were already in circulation.

Abū 'Abd Allāh b. Manda (d. 395), it is related with some exu- [181]
berance, brought back forty camel-loads[1] of books and notes from his journeys. The title *khattām al-raḥḥālīn*, 'the ultimate of travellers',[2] does not mean that this kind of *ṭalab al-ḥadīth* comes to an end with him, but merely indicates the supreme rank which Ibn Manda occupies among those practising this kind of study. Until quite late centuries it is the ambition of the pious Muslim to be a 'bearer of the ḥadīth'. This he becomes not by studying the literature but by obtaining ḥadīths at first hand from other 'bearers'.

The more material was piled up of older and younger ḥadīths the more did the zeal for *ṭalab* have to concentrate upon exotic matter. It is therefore not surprising that people who possessed such exotic traditions, to obtain which others willingly undertook long journeys with their inevitable toil, did not offer their wares for nothing out of piety, but made a paying business out of their privileged position of possessing such traditions in a form which seemed authentic. Already at an early date we find disapproving remarks about people who used religious teaching as a means to gain money. 'Ubāda b. al-Ṣāmit taught the Ahl al-Ṣuffa the Koran, and one of his pupils sent him a bow as his fee. The pious teacher asked the Prophet whether he might be permitted to accept this gift with the intention of using it in religious wars. The Prophet is made to answer: 'If you desire to obtain for yourself a necklace of hell-fire you may accept the gift.'[3] When the teaching of the Koran began to become a source of maintenance for professional teachers it did not take long to find authorities for the permissibility of the acceptance of material reward.[4]

The handing-down of ḥadīths sank to the level of a business very early. *Ṭalab* journeys favoured the greed of those who succeeded in pretending to be a source of the ḥadīth, and with increasing

[1] For this kind of quantitative definition in literature see *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachgelehrsamkeit bei den Arabern* (1873), fasc. 3 pp. 39f. *Wiqr ba'ir* is in such definitions (cf. *Agh.*, XIX, p. 34, 14; *wiqr bukhti*, Abū'l-Maḥāsin, I, p. 535, 7) not always a camel load, i.e. as much as a camel can carry but also the weight of a camel; see *Agh.*, XIX, p. 128, 4, 5.

[2] *Taḥ. Huff.*, XIII, no. 29.

[3] Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 62; the same phrase in another connection, al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 124; cf. Abū'l-Maḥāsin, I, p. 541, 13; [Ibn Māja, *Tijārāt*; no. 8, cf. also B. *Ijāra*, no. 16].

[4] Cf. proofs in Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat., I, pp. 53a and 168b.

demand sprang up an ever increasing desire to be paid in cash for the ḥadīths supplied. As early as the second century Shu'ba can describe this scene: I saw [Yazīd b. Sufyān] Abū'l-Muhazzam in the mosque of Thābit al-Bunānī crouching on the floor; if anyone had offered him but twopence he would have transmitted seventy ḥadīths in
[182] return.[1] We nevertheless met this ḥadīth-beggar as an authority on canonical collections. He claimed to have spent ten years in the company of Abū Hurayra and to be able to spread the sayings of the Prophet in his name.[2] More serious people disapprove, in accordance with the tradition of earlier times, of the greed of transmitters and hold forth against those 'who take [payment] for the ḥadīth of God's emissary' (*ya'khudhūna*).[3] Even the 'old books' are for this purpose cited as authorities for this disapproval. *'Allim majjānan kamā 'ullimta majjānan*, 'teach for nothing as you were taught for nothing'; this law is cited with good reason[4] from those books. 'By mobs (*al-ghawghā'*)[5] are meant those who write down ḥadīths in order to take other people's money.'[6] The theosophist Abū Sulaymān al-Dārānī lists the writing of ḥadīths amongst those things which materialistic people exploit for their enrichment.[7] All this was the result of the long journeys which some people undertook in order to obtain new ḥadīths.

Many examples could be found in the history of Islamic literature of the strange ways in which these travellers hunted out new ḥadīths. Abū'l-Qāsim b. 'Abd al-Wārith al-Shīrāzī (d. 485) on his journey from Baghdād to Mosul reached a village called Ṣarīfīn in 'Irāq (near 'Ukbarā). He spent the night in the local mosque. The next day Abū Muḥammad al-Ṣarīfīnī led the prayer. At the end of them the traveller approached the Imam and asked him whether he had heard any ḥadīths. Abū Muḥammad replied that his father had introduced him to Abū Ḥafṣ al-Kattānī and Ibn Ḥabbāba and other transmitters of traditionists; he had heard a number of things from them and also owned booklets where he had written them down. He was very willing to show these books to the traveller. When looking through them the latter found one which contained all the

[1] Ibn Qutayba, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 252, 1.

[2] Al-Tirmidhī, I, pp. 194, 241.

[3] In al-Khaṭīb-al-Bagbdādī fol. 44a [ed. Hyderabad, pp. 153–5] these sayings are collected.

[4] This sentence does in fact occur in Rabbinic literature. Talmud, *Nedārim*, fol. 37a, remarks to Deut. 4:5 (I have taught you as Yahweh my God commanded me) *mā-ani le-ḥinnām af attem nāmē le-ḥinnām*. Differences are made between the various subjects of religious teaching.

[5] Cf. al-Mas'ūdī, V, p. 87, 1.

[6] Al-Damīrī, II p. 228 (s.v. al-ghawghā').

[7] Al-Suhrawardī, *'Awārif al-Ma'ārif*, II, p. 81 (ed. on the margin of the *Iḥyā'*).

traditions of 'Alī b. Ja'd (d. 230). Abū'l-Qāsim then read this book with Abū Muḥammad. He wrote to Baghdād and told of his dis- [183]
covery; Baghdād scholars then travelled *en masse* to Ṣarīfīn in order to get the traditions of 'Alī b. Ja'd from the only man who still preserved them.[1]

In due course journeys of study in search of curiosities degenerate into a mere sport. Long journeys were made of which the sole aim was to obtain ḥadīths, without any understanding for their contents, simply in order to allow the traveller to boast of them and figure in the *isnād* of known sentences. The above-mentioned attacks on collectors of traditions by rationalists (p. 132) show that this misuse was in full swing already in the third century. Serious theologians do not hesitate to draw attention to the swindles which were perpetrated by certain ignorant receivers and sly-witted transmitters. This evil reached its peak in the fifth century. From this century warnings by two eminent Muslim theologians are preserved and they afford a deep insight into the circumstances of the collection of traditions in those days.

One of them is Abū Bakr Aḥmad, called the preacher of Baghdād (d. 463), who at the time of the decay of his branch of scholarship felt called upon to put a stop to the prevailing irresponsibility both in theory and in practice. We have already seen a sample of his practical activity in this field. As for theory, his work *al-Kifāya fī Ma'rifat Uṣūl 'Ilm al-Riwāya* is a monument to his zeal in cleansing the ḥadīth.[2] In the introduction to this work he describes in detail the circumstances of the science of ḥadīth in his time. He says that his contemporaries were concerned only with amassing ḥadīths and writing down what they have collected without testing the sources upon which their achievements are based. 'They are satisfied with the mere name of ḥadīth and concentrate on writing down all they collected. But they are ignorant carriers of books,[3] they suffer great toil, travel, travel to faraway countries and count effort and difficulties as nought. They are continually arriving and departing, risk their lives and fortunes, experience fearful terrors, lose their health, and become haggard travelling all the time in order to achieve [184]
long *isnāds*. This is all, they are not out for more. Thus they "carry" from people whose reliability is not established, they bear from people who might be barred from giving testimony, they gather proofs from men who themselves are illiterate and cannot read what is in their books, who do not know the methods of tradition and cannot pronounce the name of their own sheikh. Consciously

[1] Yāqūt, III, p. 385.

[2] In this work are mentioned also earlier monographs by the author on various questions of the methodology of tradition.

[3] See above, p. 132.

they accept traditions from evident sinners and heretics as long as the form is preserved and there is a lengthy *isnād*. This leads to heretics slighting scholars of previous generations and facilitates their attacks against them.' Even more detailed is the description of the scorn which people have for the study of ḥadīth because of the ridiculousness of such travellers.[1] Al- Khaṭīb also characterizes the direction of their studies: 'Most of the *ṭālibī al-ḥadīth* concentrate upon the unusual (*al-gharīb*) and not upon well-known things (*al-mashhūr*), they are best pleased to hear strange stories (*al-munkar*) not recognized ones (*al-ma'rūf*).'[2]

Still more vivid is the description by a younger contemporary of the preacher of Baghdād, the experienced al-Ghazālī (d. 505): 'Another sort of scientific vanity is that of people who spend all their time on the science of tradition, i.e. in the hearing of traditions and gathering together of variants and far-reaching strange *isnāds*. Some of them have the ambition to travel in different countries, to enter into personal communication with the sheikhs in order to be able to say: I have obtained traditions of X or Y directly, Z I have seen himself, and I also possess *isnāds* as few other people have them. These people are but carriers of texts; they pay little attention to the meanings and contents of what is being transmitted. In that their knowledge is defective, they are intent only on handing down, nothing else, and they live in the belief that they have done sufficient with that . . .' This leads to many ridiculous circumstance in the activities of these allegedly direct collectors of ḥadīths. 'Occasionally you may see boys in the lecture rooms of learned sheikhs, the tradition is read, the sheikh drowses off and the listening boy plays childish games. But he has heard the tradition from the sheikh and obtains a written certificate of this. When he grows up he then
[185] claims the right to spread this tradition as a link in the chain. Adults who hear traditions are often little different and do not fulfil the conditions of listening properly . . . If such hearing were to be enough to pass on the traditions of the Prophet, madmen, babies in the cradle and unconscious beings who happened to attend the recitation of traditions would have to be accepted as transmitters.'[3]

From these contemporary descriptions it can be imagined what a fertile field was here opened for braggarts and boasters. If someone had troubled, as one of the enemies of Ibn Diḥya (d. 633) did, to ask those sheikhs from whom travellers brought ḥadīths home, he might frequently have obtained the same answer as Ibrāhīm al-Sanhūrī obtained from the alleged sheikhs of Ibn Diḥya that he had

[1] Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, introduction, fols. 2bff. [ed. Hyderabad, pp. 3ff.].
[2] Ibid., fol. 40a [ed. Hyderabad, p. 141].
[3] Al-Ghazālī, *Iḥyā'*, III, pp. 374–6.

never visited them.[1] When we bear in mind what accusations in this field were levelled by criticism against respected scholars we may well deduce what tricks were, on the basis of experience, considered possible. This is reflected in Ibn al-Jawzī's judgement about the journeys of 'Abd al-Karīm al-Sam'ānī of Marw (d. 563), the author of the *K. al-Ansāb*. It is reported of this scholar that: 'He heard many ḥadīths and undertook vast journeys to search for them. He also heard more than anybody else had ever heard. He repeatedly travelled through Transoxiana and Khorāsān, through the mountain districts, Iṣfahān, 'Irāq, Mosul, al-Jazīra, Syria and many other countries . . . He also made a list of his sheikhs, those men from whom he heard traditions (*mashyakha*),[2] and their number exceeds four thousand.'[3] The historian from whom this article about al- [186]
Sam'ānī is taken also adds to the biographical details: Abū'l-Faraj b. al-Jawzī (d. 597), who in some of his works deals with the stigmatizing of forgers and forgeries, says of this scholar that in Baghdād he took a sheikh by the hand and crossed with him to the other bank of the river Nahr 'Isā and then announced after their discussion: The shaykh N. has transmitted to me in Mā Warā'l-Nahr (beyond the river, the usual name for Transoxiana) etc. Ibn al-Athīr calls this remark of the critic an insinuation in bad taste, as al-Sam'ānī can be proved to have been in the true Mā Warā'l-Nahr and had made use of his intercourse with all the great traditionalists living there. He had no need to carry out the imposture in Baghdād which was attributed to him. His crime in the eyes of the biased Ibn al-Jawzī was that he had been a Shāfi'ite, whereas Ibn al-Jawzī followed another authority (Ibn Ḥanbal) and nobody but the Ḥanbalite anthropomorphists[4] found grace in his eyes.[5]

[1] *Zāhiriten*, p. 178.

[2] About such lists, *mashyakha* or *thabt*, Landberg in the Catalogue of the Amin MSS., Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat. I, p. 54; they are also called *mu'jam al-Shuyūkh*, Sprenger, *ZDMG*, X, p. 15, bottom. For the extent of such lists al-Kutubī, *Fawāt al-Wafayāt*, II, p. 130, may serve as example: the *thabt* of al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad al-Isbīlī (d. 739) comprised 24 volumes; cf. *majmū' ijāzāt wa-thubūt*, Ahlwardt's *Landberg. Samml.* no. 75 = Berl. Cat. I, p. 92, no. 288. Cf. also the MSS. of the Leipzig Univ. Library described in *ZDMG*, VIII, p. 579, 1. *Mashyakha*—works in respect of the extent of traditions comprised by an authority (*masmū'āt*) were occasionally written later; thus Qādī 'Iyāḍ wrote the *Mashyakha* of other people, Yāqūt, III, p. 529, ult.; IV, p. 37, penult. [On lists composed by Spanish scholars, who mostly called them *barnāmaj*, there is an article by 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Ahwānī in *Majallat Ma'had al-Makhtūtāt al-'Arabiyya*, I (1955) pp. 91ff.]

[3] Ibn al-Athīr, XI, p. 134, A.H. 563.

[4] Cf. *ZDMG*, XLI, p. 63.

[5] [For the full story cf. G. Makdisi, *BSOAS*, 1956, pp. 13–16.] Ibn al-Athīr does not speak well of Ibn al-Jawzī altogether, as can be seen from X, pp. 244, 256, XI, p. 167, XII, p. 71. In the last-mentioned passage he accuses him of biased spite against non-Ḥanbalites.

Whatever we may think of the accusation of Ibn al-Jawzī, it can serve as an instructive indication that at that time much imposture and false boasting occurred (both formally and materially) in respect of journeys to collect traditions and of the exploitation of the material gathered. Many an Abū Zayd al-Sarūjī is likely to have posed as a gatherer and transmitter of ḥadīth on adventurous journeys as a mendicant.

IV

The sixth century introduced into the scientific life of the Islamic world an institution which might have been destined to push into the background those *ṭalab* journeys of the tendencies and excesses of which we have just spoken. Up to now there had been no special schools for the science of the ḥadīth. Systematic teaching was chiefly confined to the practical *fiqh* and its *madhāhib*; the ḥadīth had to be obtained in travels. The very first high school for ḥadīth science (*dār al-ḥadīth*) owes its establishment in the sixth century to the pious Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. Abī Sa'īd Zengī (d. 569), who immortalized his name in Damascus by establishing the Nūriyya [187] academy which was destined to be a *dār al-ḥadīth*, a specialist high school for the science of tradition. The author of the monograph on the old residence of the caliphs, Ibn 'Asākir, was called upon to lend glamour to the new school through the fame of his learning.[1] Only a few decades later Nūr al-Dīn's foundation inspired the Ayyūbid prince al-Malik al-Kāmil Nāṣir al-Dīn in Egypt to imitate it.

In 622 he established in Cairo a *dār al-ḥadīth* on the pattern of the school in Damascus, and the former teacher of the prince, Abū'l-Khaṭṭāb Ibn Diḥya, was summoned as its first professor. But because of political circumstances, which were not suitable for the continued existence of such institutions, it decayed after a short blossoming. In the ninth century, according to al-Maqrīzī, whose judgement is probably tinged by partisan prejudice,[2] the chair of Ibn Diḥya was occupied 'by a youth who had only outward appearance in common with men but could be distinguished from beasts only

[1] Wüstenfeld, *Die Academien der Araber und ihre Gelehrten*, p. 69. From a communication of M. Hartwig Derenbourg I gather that 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ (*Cat. Bibl. Nat.*, Ms. no. 2768, fol. 4b) lists the teachers of the school up to his time. [See transl. H. Sauvaire, 'Description de Damas,' *JA*, I (1894), pp. 280–2. The ruins of the building are described by J. Sauvaget in *Les monuments ayyoubides de Damas*, I (1938), pp. 15ff., and E. Herzfeld, in *Ars Islamica*, IX (1942), pp. 49ff.]

[2] A contemporary of al-Maqrīzī was Kamāl al-Dīn b. Muḥammad (d. 874), usually called Imām al-Kāmiliyya (cf. Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat., II, pp. 77, 31; 602, 8) who is known in the history of religious literature as the author of a commentary to the *Minhāj al-Uṣūl* by al-Bayḍāwī. Mss. of this work are listed in the Cairo Cat., II, pp. 248f. [*GAL S* I, p. 742, no. 11].

by his ability to speak; this went on until lectures at this school pretty well ceased.'[1] Four years after the Madrasa Kāmiliyya (626) a new *dār al-ḥadīth* arose, also in Damascus, the Madrasa Ashrafiyya,[2] whose activity was inaugurated by the appointment of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ al-Shahrazūrī, author of the much read introduction to the sciences of tradition.[3] Al-Nawawī also was a professor at this academy.

None of these ḥadīth academies lasted for very long,[4] since they [188] only served the science of Islam, whereas for making a living men turned to the study of *fiqh*, which provided training for official posts and functions. But such schools did not satisfy the thousands of eager students of tradition either. They were not suited to appease the hunger of the *ṭālibīn* for themselves collecting the sacred material. One had to hear from hundreds of sheikhs and this the *dār al-ḥadīth* with its famous professors was not able to replace. Thus these once famous schools ceased to exist; the spirit of late Islam no longer had the living power to maintain them and to profit by them.[5]

## V

In this context we must say a few words about the *ijāza* system in Islam. This was an institution within literary life which in its normal

[1] Al-Maqrīzī, *Khiṭaṭ*, II, p. 375.

[2] Wüstenfeld, l.c. [Sauvaire, op. cit., pp. 271–3 where the date 628 is given].

[3] Under the title of *'Ulūm al-Ḥadīth* (H. Kh., IV, p. 249). Mss. of the work in the *Cat. ar. Br. Mus.* nos. 1597, 1598 (p. 721b f.); Univ. Library, St Petersburg, no. 120, under the title of *Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth* (Baron V. Rosen) [*GAL*, I, pp. 440ff., *S* I, pp. 610ff.] How popular and how much used this isagogic work was is best seen from the circumstance that it was made the subject of detailed studies and that compendia and even versified editions were repeatedly made of it. This literature is dealt with in detail in Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat., II, pp. 6ff., nos. 1037–48, cf. pp. 16ff., nos. 1064–8 [see now *GAL* l.c., also for some of the following items]. An epitome by 'Alā' al-Dīn al-Bāji (d. 714) is mentioned by al-Kutubī, *Fawāt al-Wafayāt*, II, p. 75, the compendium by Badr al-Dīn al-Kinārī (d. 733) Cat. Br. Mus. Ms. no. 191, II, by 'Imād al-Dīn b. Kathīr (d. 774). Houtsma, Cat. *Brill*, II, p. 132, no. 782, the versification by the Syrian *qāḍī al-quḍāt* Muḥammad b. Sa'āda (d. 693), ibid, p. 182, by 'Abd al-Raḥmān ['Abd al-Raḥīm in Brockelmann] al-Kurdī (d. 806), in Wüstenfeld, op. cit., p. 103. Al-Mughalṭā'ī (d. 762) wrote correcting glosses under the title *Iṣlāḥ Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ* which were followed by studies by later authors (*Cat. ar.* Br. Mus., Ms. no. 1598).

[4] Apart from the above-mentioned *dār al-ḥadīth* there were also several others in Damascus; a list of them is in Michael Meshāka's 'Cultural Statistics of Damascus; a list of them is in Michael Meshāka's 'Cultural Statistics of Damascus', transl. and ed. by Fleischer, *ZDMG*, VIII, p. 336=*Kleinere Schriften*, III, p. 318 [and Sauvaire, op. cit. pp. 271ff.]. Most of them, however, are of no importance and left little trace in the history of Islamic scholarship. [For the *dār al-ḥadīth* cf. also J. Sauvaget, *Les perles choisies d'Ibn ach-Chihna*, pp. 133–4, and the section 'Origin and diffusion of the Madrasa' in J. Pedersen's article 'masdjid' in the *EI*.]

[5] Cf. Kremer's *Aegypten*, II, p. 275.

form as well as in its excesses is a speciality of Muslim society and has no analogy in any other circles. In general we may refer to the data which Sprenger has collected and the discussion added to it.[1] A wide view of the *ijāza* system can now be obtained from the rich material which the Royal Library in Berlin has collated from this field of Islamic studies, and from the instructive work which Ahlwardt has done on this part of the collection in a special book of his *Catalogue* under the title 'Course of studies and teaching letters.'[2]

[189] *Ijāza* became a surrogate for those Muslims who were eager to obtain ḥadīths but either did not think long journeys convenient or when they did go on *ṭalab* travels were not able to stay long enough in the home town of the 'carrier' of the ḥadīths to receive them directly from him. This surrogate was to enable them, without prolonged direct intercourse with the sheikh, to take over ḥadīths from him and to spread them in his name. They obtained the sheikhs permission (*ijāza*)[3] to hand down a ḥadīth as if they had picked it up from this in verbal form, when in fact they had only received, or even only shown him, a booklet containing his traditions. A transition from the verbal passing on of traditions to the form of *ijāza* is to be found in a form of communication called *munāwala* (handing over). Instead of giving a definition of this type of transmission we will give an example which includes the characteristics of the *munāwala*. Mālik b. Anas used to present his pupils and hearers with a collection of written texts, which he had tied in a bundle, and say: Here are the texts that I wrote down, corrected and spread with reference to my predecessors; go then and spread them in my name. He permitted them to use the term *ḥaddathanā* for traditions received in this manner, as if they had been orally communicated word for word.[4] Mālik was not alone in his time in having this concept of handing down traditions. It is reported of Abū Bakr ibn Abī Sabra, Abū Yūsuf's predecessor in the office of judge (d. 162), that he copied for Ibn Jurayj a thousand good traditions which he possessed and that Ibn Jurayj was permitted to spread them with the formula *ḥaddathanā* without their having been read out by either of them.[5] The full validity of *munāwala* appears not to have

[1] *ZDMG*, X, pp. 9ff.

[2] Vol. I, pp. 54–95, cf. also Houtsma, *Cat. Brill*, 1889, pp. 134ff., nos. 795–803.

[3] The author of the *Mujmal fi'l-Lugha*, Abū l-Ḥusayn b. Fāris, offers an artificial explanation of this term (quoted by al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, fol. 83a [ed. Hyderabad, p. 312] *Taqrīb*, fol. 49b [*nawʿ* 24, transl. *JA*, 1091, xvii, pp. 216–7] in explaining it as a metaphor: *istajastuhu maʾajānī* = I have asked someone for water ('cf. *jawās al-mā*') to water my animals and fields and he has supplied me with water; the *ṭālib al-ʿilm* demands in the same the communication of traditions, and their owner 'waters' him likewise.

[4] Notes to Ibn Hishām, II, p. 115.

[5] Ibn Qutayba, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 246.

been generally recognized in early times, as al-Bukhārī[1] feels called upon to justify its validity in a special paragraph of his collection on the basis of the sunna of the earliest times. [190]

*Ijāza* goes beyond the liberality of *munāwala* by a further step. Here the personal presence of the receiver and the bodily handing over of the copied texts by the *rāwī* is no longer necessary.[2] In early times the later excesses of the manipulation of *ijāza* had not yet come to prevail and at least the personal appearance of the recipient was demanded. The following is a description of how this took place during the second-third centuries: At that time there lived in Cordova a man reputed as the *faqīh* of Andalusia, 'Abd al-Mālik b. Ḥabīb al-Sulamī of Elvira (d. 238), the commentator on the *Muwaṭṭa'* amongst whose distinguished pupils is named Baqī[3] b. Makhlad[4] al-Qurṭubī. The way in which Ibn Ḥabīb obtained his knowledge of traditions is shown in a saying by Ibn Waḍḍāḥ: "Abd al-Mālik b. Ḥabīb visited me and brought a load of books which he put before me saying, "This is your contribution to scholarship. Grant me *ijāza* to teach it all in my turn." I granted his request, but he himself has never heard a word from me personally and I have never lectured to him.'[5] In the fourth century it was no longer generally thought necessary to appear personally in order to receive an *ijāza*. Otherwise Abū Dharr al-Harawī (d. 434) would have been unable to say: 'If *ijāza* were valid, travelling (*al-riḥla*) would serve no purpose.'[6] A teacher of this Abū Dharr, a scholar from Saragossa, Walīd b. Bakr al-Ghamrī (d. 392), felt called upon to write a treatise in favour of the admissibility of *ijāza* as a method of spreading traditions.[7]

At this stage *ijāza* begins to replace the *ṭalab* practised in the form of long journeys to sheikhs, almost completely. In effect in the fifth century the granting of *ijāza in absentia* is considered as fully justified and equal to *simā'*, direct 'hearing'.[8] The preacher of Baghdād, [191]

[1] B. *'Ilm*, no. 8.

[2] Ibn Bashkuwāl, p. 577, 6 from below: 'I had conversation with him in Bona and he handed over to me (*nāwalanī*) his commentary on the Muwaṭṭa'. Later I wrote to him from Toledo and he repeatedly granted me *ijāza* (*ajāzanī*) for this work; for he had added to it after our meeting.' *Nāwalanī* = personal handing over; *ajāzanī* = handing over *in absentia*. This example is from the beginning of the fifth century (405).

[3] *Taqī* in the edition must be altered, in several passages in the text in the index of names, to *Baqī*.

[4] I take this opportunity to correct the form *Mukhallid* in my *Zāhiriten*, p. 115.

[5] Yāqūt, I, p. 349.

[6] Ibn Bashkuwāl, p. 201.

[7] Al-Maqqarī, I, p. 714, 4.

[8] Al-Fāsī, the *Muḥaddith Iṣfahān* (d. 523) *Ṭab. Ḥuff.* XV, no. 42. Conscientious transmitters make manifest the fact that they or their informants

whom we have already mentioned, a man who was certainly not frivolous in his handling of the Prophet's traditions, is able to mention liberality in the manipulation of *ijāza* as an undisputed fact. He says: 'In this sense we have seen that all our sheikhs granted *ijāza* to absent children (*li'l'aṭfāl al-ghuyyab*) without asking their age or ensuring that they have the necessary powers of understanding (*tamyīz*). We have, however, not yet seen them grant *ijāza* to unborn children, though anybody who was prepared to go so far as this would not have acted incorrectly by analogy.'[1] One might be tempted to regard these words as irony against the increasing licence. Even the most important men in Islam from that time on figure as granters of *ijāza* as well as receivers of it *in absentia*. In this way Qādī 'Iyād (d. 544)[2] obtained *ijāza* in respect of the work by Abū Bakr al-Ṭurṭūshī (d. 520, author of the *Sirāj al-Mulūk*),[3] and Abū Ṭāhir al-Silafī writes from Alexandria several letters asking al-Zamakhsharī, who lived in Mecca, for a certificate of *ijāza* for all his works.[4] The father of Ibn Khallikān (seventh century) writes to al-Mu'ayyad al-Ṭūsī in Khurāsān in order to obtain an *ijāza* for his son.[5] With this progress of the institution of *ijāza* there are people who hand on material received in this fashion with the formula of *ḥaddathanā* without specific mention of the fact.[6]

[192] The value which was placed upon obtaining *ijāzas* easily led those, from whom they were requested, to the idea of making the granting of such permission a means for making money. To be sure, material exploitation of religious knowledge is condemned theoretically (see above, p. 170) but the frequent appearance of this question is a proof that granters of *ijāzas* did not refrain from turning the spiritual goods demanded from them into cash. In the seventh century Mawhūb al-Jazarī (d. 675) had the opportunity to make a special investigation of this in his *fatwā* collection.[7]

From some of the examples mentioned above we were able to see that *ijāza* was sought and given not only for ḥadīths but also for complete literary works. No difference was made whether the book concerned belonged to the class of religious or profane (e.g. philo-

[1] Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, fol. 89a [ed. Hyderabad, p. 326].

[2] It is remarkable that he also treats theoretically of the validity of granting *ijāza in absentia*, Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat. II, no. 1036, p. 6.

[3] Al-Maqqarī, I, p. 519.

[4] Ibn Khallikān, no. 721 (VIII, p. 71, ed. Wüstenfeld).

[5] Ibid, no. 762 (ed. Wüstenfeld, IX, p. 43).

[6] Abu'l-Khaṭṭāb b. Dihya (d. 633) in *Ṭab. Huff.*, XVIII, no. 16.

[7] Al-Suyūṭī, *Itqān*, I, p. 139.

---

obtained a communication by way of *ijāza* in their *isnād*: *akhbaranī* N. *ijāzatan*; Abū'l-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī strictly conforms to this even in regard to historical data, *Agh.*, VII, pp. 114, 12; 118, 3; 119, 12, 23 etc.

logical) literature.[1] The conditions governing the dissemination of books took the same form as those obtaining in the use of ḥadīth material. A book which one has not made one's own, in the form of direct transmission through competent members of a chain going back to the author, is only owned as *wijāda*:[2] it has been 'found' but not heard and received in authentic form. Therefore books—as we can see any day in good Arabic manuscripts of whatever kind—also have *sanads* like the ḥadīths. In the better old manuscripts there are notes about the lists of teachers and bearers through whose uninterrupted mediation the text has passed from the author to the last owner or user of the work. This therefore was also an opportunity for the sport of *ijāza*. In due course it was part of every educated Muslim's prestige to own a great number of *ijāzas* granted by all sorts of authors in respect of their own works as well as of works which they themselves possessed by direct or indirect *ijāzas*. From very simple beginnings[3] these developed a special *ijāza* poetry: 'the permission' which was granted to a person to spread the works [193] of the mujīz was expressed in artificial verse.[4]

This extends into recent times and the extent to which the widest circles of Islam are seized with this craving for *ijāza* is seen for example in the report that the emir of Waregla asked for an *ijāza* from the traveller al-'Ayāshī, who passed through his realm in the year 1073.[5] It is understandable that, the more the formula of *ijāza* became meaningless, the fewer were scruples felt regarding the circle to which its validity was extended. The traveller 'Abd al-Ghanī al-Nābulūsī grants the muftī of Ṣaydā' an *ijāza* not only for all the works that have already appeared but also for everything which he would later publish. At the same time there was already serious discussion of what one was to think of an *ijāza* which had not been granted waking but in a dream.[6] If the reader wishes to follow

[1] Examples of such *ijāzas* in Thorbecke's introduction to *Durrat al-Ghawwāṣ*, p. 14, 7. Derenbourg's edition of the *K. al-I'tibār* by Usāma b. Munqidh, p. 168 (see the correction by Landberg, *Critica arabica*, II, p. 56), or Ms. of the Leiden Library, no. 1890(7) Cat. IV, p. 95, *Ijāza* for *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*.

[2] Cf. Sprenger, *JASB*, 1856, p. 53.

[3] Such poems are already common in the fourth century; al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, fols. 96a f. quotes such a *naẓm* with the date 325. [This seems to be erroneous; in the printed edition, p. 350, the date refers to a prose *ijāza*, not to one of those in verse which follow.]

[4] Examples in al-Maqqarī, I, pp. 628, 715, 743ff. An interesting specimen of a general unlimited *ijāza* in verse is to be found at the end of Ms. D.C. of the Leipzig Univ. Library, no. 262, cf. Nicoll-Pusey, Bodl. Cat., p. 393, to no. 398. Examples for ordinary *ijāzas* in prose are frequent, e.g. in *Khizānat al-Adab*, I, p. 13, Meursinge's *Ṭabaqāt al-Mufassirīn*, p. 79.

[5] *Voyage d'El-'Ajāshī*, transl. Berghrugger, p. 54.

[6] *ZDMG*, XVI, pp. 664, 666, no. 66.

up the *ijāza* system to modern times, he should refer to the list of works for which our contemporary al-Bajama'wī sought and obtained *ijāzas*. He has devoted a book to this, which he has also had printed.[1]

[1] Cairo, 1298 (*Cat. période.*, no. 404). [For the *ijāza* cf. also Goldziher's article in the *EI*, s.v.]

# THE WRITING DOWN OF THE ḤADĪTH

## 1

UP to now we have have chiefly dealt with the ḥadīth as subject of tradition. Before considering it as a subject of literature we will first make some remarks about the written preservation of the ḥadīth (*kitābat al-ḥadīth*) in general.[1]

By analogy with Jewish religious literature—written and oral law—and the idea, prevailing in it, of a prohibition on confiding the latter to writing,[2] it was wrongly imagined for a long time that in the earlier generations of Islam also the view obtained that it was only the Koran that was destined to be written down and that the ḥadīth was to co-exist with it as oral teaching whose writing down had not been envisaged by its founders. This misleading false analogy, which also resulted in a number of other erroneous conceptions, was shown by a thorough investigation of the ḥadīth to be completely untenable. Sprenger in his essay (1856) 'Über das Traditionswesen bei den Arabern' has provided a mass of material which was of service in demolishing the superstition concerning the ḥadīth's original destiny as oral tradition.

This wrong conception had, however, many theoretical defenders amongst the Muslims themselves who, contrary to the facts known to them, had a theological interest in it. In establishing this concept, the old *ra'y* schools contributed largely by their endeavour to be hampered in the free development of the law by as few *leges scriptae* [195] as possible. In this circle several stories were also invented[3] to support their views; the most outstanding of these is a scene at the Prophet's death bed, where their concept is made quite clear.[4] This point of

[1] [Cf. also Goldziher, 'Kämpfe von die Stellung des Ḥadīth in Islam,' *ZDMG* LXI (1907), pp. 860ff.]

[2] See for this Leop. Löw, *Graphische Requisiten und Erzeugnisse bei den Juden*, II, p. 132; Nehem. Brüll, 'Die Entstehungsgeschichte des babylonischen Talmuds als Schriftwerkes,' *Jahrb. für jüd. Gesch. u. Lit.*, II (1876).

[3] A report in *al-Muwaṭṭa'*, II, p. 374, also serves for the condemnation of the writing down of legal norms: 'Umar has a law which he had written down erased with the words: *law raḍiyaka Allāh agarraka*.

[4] *Ẓāhiriten*, p. 95.

view was never generally disseminated nor was it accepted at all times. Otherwise Muslims would not have transmitted reports from early times from which it is evident that the Prophet himself had written down some sayings outside the Koran and that the writing-down of non-Koranic sayings of the Prophet had begun quite early. Muhammed's contemporaries are reported to have made a start in this. Abū Hurayra once said: 'Nobody can repeat more ḥadīths from the Prophet than I, unless it be 'Abd Allāh b. 'Amr b. al-'Āṣ, for he wrote (them) down[1] but I did not write.'[2]

Such reports prove that the Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth did not reject the assumption that, even in the earliest times, sayings of the Prophet had been written down. And in fact we were able to consider in the first chapter (pp. 22f.) a number of instances evidencing the existence of *ṣaḥīfas* of traditions belonging to some of the 'Companions'. Whatever may be the historical value of such statements, for they cannot be checked, it must nevertheless be assumed that the writing of ḥadīths was considered unobjectionable even in the first century, since we find this an undisputed practice towards the end of that century. We have seen before (p. 47) that the handing down of tradition on the basis of copy-books was considered natural in the times of al-Zuhrī. Without claiming historical accuracy for the following report it may be registered in this context that al-Zuhrī, who was famed for his many-sided interest in the various branches of the knowledge of that time,[3] surrounded himself constantly with a
[196] large number of *kutub* and that, so surrounded, he neglected friends and family; so that it is told of the wife of this bookworm that she made the characteristic remark: 'Verily, dear husband, I find these books harder to bear than three co-wives.'[4] If we hear of *kutub* (books) in the old days, this certainly does not mean books in a literary sense, but *scripta*, notes in general, perhaps *collectanea*, collections of sayings, which a reverent Muslim had heard at various times and had written down for the sake of greater accuracy, for his private use.[5] Without hearing or reading out the ḥadīths oneself, the contents of a *ṣaḥīfa* were simply taken over in writing and treated as validly transmitted material.[6] Such were also the *kutub* which

[1] Seven hundred traditions were traced back to him, of which only 17 are in the two *Ṣaḥīḥs*, in B. only 8, in M. only 20; thus at the most only 45 of 700 traditions are to some extent—if even merely formally—fairly authentic.

[2] *Taʾdhīb*, p. 361.

[3] This is indicated by a saying of Ibn Abī Zinād: We wrote down only sunna, but al-Zuhrī wrote everything. If information was needed I could always be sure that he had the most comprehensive knowledge of all men; al-Jāḥiẓ, *Bayān*, fol. 132a [II, p. 290].

[4] Abulfeda, *Annales*, I, p. 456.

[5] Cf. data in Sprenger, *Moḥammad*, III, pp. xcivff.

[6] Ibn Qutayba, p. 246, 8, in reference to the first half of the second century.

'Abd Allāh b. Lahī'a (d. 174 in Egypt) had collected and whose loss in a fire is so much lamented in Muslim accounts because, after this catastrophe, 'Abd Allāh's communications, which lacked written foundation, were not as trustworthy as those based on his lost *collectanea*.[1] Mālik b. Anas taught his pupils from written texts, the hearer read them and Mālik made corrections and explanations.[2] Gradually the expression, 'write after him' becomes synonymous with 'he is a reliable authority.'[3]

II

All the same it cannot be denied that, despite its general practice, the writing down of ḥadīths had its opponents. This dislike of writing was not there from the beginning, but was the result of prejudices which arose later. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Harmala al-Aslamī (d. 145) had to get special permission from his teacher Sa'īd b. al-Musayyib to [197] write down the ḥadīths that were told to him because his defective memory made him unable to retain them accurately word by word.[4] But traditionists[5] who avoided 'paper and book'[6] at that time, and also later, were the exception rather than the rule.

The theoretical quarrel, which did not affect the practice, whether the ḥadīth might be preserved only as the subject of memory (*ḥifẓ*), or whether it was permissible to write it down, continued well beyond the time when critically sifted collections of traditions were already available, which without difficulty attained the rank of canonical texts. Even then there were partisans and cultivators of oral learning and preservation of the tradition. In the same manner as, for some time after the state press in Būlāq and other presses in the Islamic countries had issued the most important texts of Islamic studies in print, the conservative sheikhs and *mujāwirīn* at the mosque of al-Azhar continued to use their yellowed manuscript books in lectures and study, so there were people who, even after the diffusion of written traditions had gained prevalence, did not give up the old method of learning traditions; this may have been because they felt the need to be taught orally by authorities who could refer to an uninterrupted chain of informants, or because they looked at this as a

[1] *Taḥdhīb*, p. 365.

[2] An example is to be found in Muslim, III, p. 297. M. takes over from Yaḥyā a communication which he had got from Mālik by reading aloud (by the pupils): the same one that Mālik had written in *al-Muwaṭṭa'*, IV, p. 60.

[3] Mālik b. A. in al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 326, 7, cf. II, p. 261, 3.

[4] Al-Zurqānī, p. 242, bottom.

[5] In the philological field Abū Nuwās praises Khalaf al-Aḥmar in his dirge on him: *ma-lā yaḥfaẓu isnādahū 'anī'l-ṣuḥuf*. Ahlwardt, *Chalef*, p. 416 (3:16).

[6] As e.g. Wakī' b. al-Jarrah (d. 129), *Taḥdhīb*, p. 215, 21; Isḥāq b. Rāhwayhi (d. 238), *Tab. Ḥuff.*, VIII, no. 29.

SAMUEL ZWEMER INSTITUTE
BOX 365
ALTADENA CA 91002

kind of religious sport. The interest in direct contact through *ṭalab al-ḥadīth* described in a previous chapter was one side of this fact. Another side is shown by sentences, epigrams and accounts from all centuries in which, in spite of an opposite development in literature and study, great store is still set by the 'preserving of knowledge in the heart' as opposed to 'preserving it on paper'.

In this respect two groups of judgements are in contrast. In describing them we will go back to the earlier epochs in this quarrel. Both parties have had their opinions expressed by the Prophet himself in traditions. One side makes the Prophet say: *lā taktubū* [198] *'annī shay'an siwa'l-Qur'āni wa-man kataba shay'an falyamḥuhu*, i.e. 'Do not write anything of me with the exception of the Koran, but if anybody has written anything, he is to erase it.' Of the other side Ibn Jurayj transmits this report of 'Abd Allāh b. 'Umar. He asked the Prophet: 'Am I to fetter knowledge?' (*uqayyid al-'ilm*).[1] The Prophet assented and when asked what that meant he replied that he understood by this written fixation. Ḥammād b. Salama also tells us that the grandfather of 'Amr b. Shu'ayb had asked the Prophet whether he might write down all he heard from him. The Prophet said: 'Yes' 'Irrespective of whether you say something in anger or in good humour?' The Prophet answered "Yes" also to this, adding that in no state did he say anything but the truth.[2] Abū Hurayra says that an Anṣārī sat with the Prophet and listened to his communications, but was unable to remember anything. When he complained about this to the Prophet, he said: 'Take your right hand as aid, making the movement of writing.'[3] By inventing such traditions,[4] both contending parties endeavoured to produce arguments[5] in favour of their views without either of them revealing the motives for their theses. The opponents of writing expressed the fear lest sayings of the Prophet included in books might not command the respect due to such sacred contents and thought therefore that it would be preferable to abstain from compiling such books. It was also pointed out that Islam might run into the same danger as earlier religions, whose adherents neglected the word of their

[1] For the expression *Qayyada al-'ilm* cf. *Fragm. Hist. Arab.*, p. 297, 12. This saying of the Prophet is also mentioned in the small collection in al-Mas'ūdī, IV, p. 169, 2, cf. the proverb: *qayyidū al-'ilm bi'l-kitāba*; this is quoted as *mursalad* by al-Maydānī, II, p. 63, ult., in the same wording as a ḥadīth in al-Suyūṭī, *Muzhir*, II, p. 158, 8.

[2] Ibn Qutayba, *Mukhtalif al-Ḥadīth*, p. 344.

[3] The Shī'ites cite a saying of Ḥasan b. 'Alī which recommends preservation in writing, al-Ya'qūbī, II, p. 269, 10. This is connected with the phenomenon discussed above, p. 23.

[4] Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 111.

[5] Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 81, who himself used many written notes as sources for his collection, does not quote in his *Sunan* traditions condemning writing down.

God and turned to the books of their scholars; the ḥadīth might in the same way be preferred to the Koran in later time.[1] But the followers of the two opinions fought each other also in other ways—in independent sentences, epigrams, etc. On one side there are generally known and recognized sentences, such as, e.g.: *kullu 'ilmin laysa fi'l-qarṭāsi ḍā'a*,[2] 'Knowledge that is not on paper gets lost,' or: *mā ḥufiẓa marra, wa-mā kutiba qarra*, 'Things preserved in memory are transient, written matter is enduring'; and didactic poems which serve the same idea.[3] Sentences favouring writing belong to the most respected Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth. The traditionist al-Sha'bī is credited with the saying: *ni'ma'l-muḥaddithu al-daftar*, i.e. 'the best spreader of tradition is the written textbook.'[4] The Imām Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal is said to have said 'Spread traditions only from written texts'—'The book transmits most reliably' (*al-kitābu aḥfaẓu shay'in*).[5] In these circles there was a preference for telling stories which were intended to show how much the fidelity of texts is endangered, how they are exposed to additions and changes, when entrusted merely to memory and oral transmission. In a rather clumsy comparison they speak of a pearl swallowed by a pigeon and given back again sometimes enlarged and sometimes diminished. One transmitter gives back the pearl of the ḥadīth absorbed by him with his own accretions, another in diminished form, only a few render them, like Qatāda, without any alteration at all.[6] [199]

Sentences defending the writing down of ḥadīths have their counterpart in others recommending an exclusively oral tradition and condemning writing down. Al-Sha'bī, just mentioned, appears to have been considered the foremost champion of those in favour of writing ḥadīth down, for a sentence of the opposing party is attached to his name. Al-Sha'bī hears a ḥadīth from the caliph [200]

[1] These arguments are to be found in al-Dārimī, pp. 64–7, in a special chapter: *man lam yara kitābat al-ḥadīth*; then follows a chapter on the opposing opinion: *man rakhkhaṣa fi kitābat al-'ilm*. Amongst the arguments reference is also made to Sūra 20:54 (*'ilmuhā 'inda rabbī fi kitābin*). A large collection of traditional proofs from 'On the origin and progress etc.,' (*JASB.*, XXV, pp. 303–329). The above-mentioned passages, which are quoted in his collections after al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, are here taken from older sources, as is seen from the references. Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī also wrote, apart from the chapters about this subject in the work used here, a monograph on the subject: *K. Taqyīd al-'Ilm*, Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat., II, p. 4, no. 1035. [Ed. Y. al-'Ishsh, Damascus, 1949; it contains a rich collection of data on the subject; cf. also the parallel passages indicated in the editor's notes.]

[2] Fleischer, Leip. Cat., p. 364a.

[3] E.g. what is reproduced by Sprenger, *ZDMG*, X, p. 6, 4.

[4] Al-Tha'ālibī, *Syntagma*, ed. Valeton, p. 10, ult.

[5] *Taḥdhīb*, p. 143.

[6] Ibid., p. 510.

'Abd al-Malik and asks for permission to write it down; but the caliph says: 'We are a community who do not allow anybody to write things down' (*naḥnu ma'sharun lā nuktibu aḥadan shay'an*).[1] At about the middle of the third century a contemporary of al-Bukhārī and Muslim, Abū 'Alī al-Baṣrī[2] prefers men who:

> with application and zeal consider their ear as the inkwell
> and their heart as the books in which to write
> whereas students of knowledge learn only what is in books

In the fourth century Abu Sa'd 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Dost[3] says:

> You must preserve in your heart and not collect in books,
> Because these are liable to dangers which destroy them;
> Water drowns them, fire burns them,
> Mice eat them and thieves steal them.

As late as the sixth century the well-known historian of Damascus, Abū-'l-Qāsim ibn 'Asākir (d. 571),[4] recommends the oral handing on of traditions:

> My friend, strive zealously to obtain (traditions) and receive them from the men yourself (at first hand) without intermission, Do not gather them from written documents, so that they may not suffer from the disease of textual corruption.[5]

In the same way the history of Muslim scholars of all times quote examples of *ḥifẓ* of traditions who to us appear almost fabulous in their knowledge. The Qāḍī of Mosul, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. 'Umar al-Tamīmī (d. 355), is said to have known by heart the texts [201] of no less than 200,000 traditions.[6] Great importance was attached to scrupulous fidelity in the preservation of texts and to the careful observance of even the minutest points, such as, for example, that the conjunctions *wa* and *fa* should be distinguished from one another and the one should not be handed on when the other had been heard.[7] But in the early days such small points of textual transmission were neglected. Such minutiae developed as skills in the

[1] Yāqūt al-Musta'ṣimī, *Asrār al-Ḥukamā'* (Istanbul, 1300), p. 91.
[2] Al-Ma'sūdī, VII, p. 329.
[3] *Yatīmat al-Dahr*, IV, p. 306 = al-Kutubī, *Fawāt al-Wafayāt*, I, p. 263.
[4] Ibn Khallikān, no. 452, V, p. 29.
[5] I do not count here utterances like *Ṭab. Huff.*, XV, no. 2 (a teacher of tradition angrily beats those who write after him); this is to be a sign of humility: Who am I that the *ḥāfiẓ* should write after me?
[6] Ibid., XII, no. 32.
[7] Ibid, IX, no. 80.

course of the progress of the science of tradition and were foreign to the teachers of the old days when teachers had more regard for the contents than for the dead word. Defenders of the freer form of transmission could quote Sufyān al-Thawrī, who is believed to have said: 'When I say that I transmit as I have heard, do not take this literally: I merely refer to the sense.' The growing mass of traditions soon made it impossible to make literal fidelity of transmission obligatory.

In the fourth century it is stated that most of the *ḥuffāẓ* allowed a certain amount of latitude in respect of textual accuracy and were content to reproduce the substance. The question whether a ḥadīth transmitted accurately in substance but not in wording may claim to be a correct ḥadīth (*al-riwāya bi'l-ma'nā*)—a question which was raised as early as the third century[1]—becomes increasingly a real problem for the science of tradition. Whereas in the third (Muslim) century the validity of transmission of the substance was still sometimes limited[2] and willingly extended only to cases which were shortly afterwards declared unobjectionable in the fourth century. Abū'l-Layth al-Samarqandī (d. 383) still considers this question controversial, but decides eventually in favour of the liberal opinion, appealing to the activities of the earliest period.[3] The liberal point of view appears to have in fact prevailed.[4] Philologists therefore are reluctant to accept transmitted ḥadīth texts as philological evidence because their wording was subject to the individual influences of the transmitters. Only Ibn Mālik does not share these doubts.[5] People like Ibn Bakīr al-Baghdādī (d. 388) or Abū'l-Khayr al- [202]
Iṣfahānī (d. 568), who were famed for being able to recite not only the texts (*mutūn*) but also the *isnāds*[6] accurately by heart, become rare. In the tenth century al-Maqqarī (d. 1041) names Abū 'Umar ibn 'Āt from Xativa as the last to possess this ability.[7]

The more was the need felt to represent the writing down of ḥadīths as a pious act and to fix religious norms for it. Of these norms, among which detailed instructions about the insertion of diacritical marks and other aids to reading occupied an important position, we will only mention some which characterize the trend of Muslim religious thought. If a word like 'Abd Allāh b. X occurs, the word 'Abd ought to be written on the same line as the succeeding

[1] Cf. al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 335.
[2] Muslim, introduction, p. 23.
[3] *Bustān al-'Ārifīn* (marginal edition, Cairo, 1303), p. 12.
[4] The various opinions are collected in al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, fols. 48bff. [ed. Hyderabad, pp. 167ff.].
[5] *Khizānat al-Adab*, I, pp. 5-8.
[6] *Ṭab. Ḥuff.*, XIII, no. 19, XVI, no. 14.
[7] Al-Maqqarī, I, p. 874, 10, from below; cf. his contemporary 'Izz al-Dīn al-Muqaddasī (d. 615), *Ṭab. Ḥuff.*, XVIII, no. 6.

word Allāh, so that the one line does not end with 'Abd and the next begin with the blasphemous group 'Allāh b. X'. Likewise the group *rasūl Allāh ṣallā Allāhu 'alayhi* has to be written on one line so that a line should not begin with *Allāh ṣ.l. 'a.m.*[1] But one often finds that these pious rules were infringed in manuscript and in print.

[1] *Taqrīb*, fols. 53ff. [*MAW* 25, transl. *JA*, XVII (1901), no. 528.]

CHAPTER EIGHT [203]

# THE ḤADĪTH LITERATURE

## I

DESPITE the prominent position which motives of religious life occupy in the Islamic community, it is not religious elements which determine the course of literature during the first phase of the development of the Muslim empire. Apart from the Koran, at the beginning of the literary history of Islam we find not a religious but a secular literature. Only in the second century are the beginnings of canonic literature to be seen, and during that period former seeds of its later development, latent in the formerly suppressed religious society, attained a certain predominance.

The causes of this phenomenon are to be found in the different directions of intellectual trends in the Umayyad period on the one hand and the 'Abbāsid period on the other. The same phenomena which determine the tenor of higher social and political life also illuminate the change in literary pursuits. The Umayyad rule, because of its worldly spirit, was better able to influence the promotion of profane literature. It is not unlikely that the collection of pagan poetry began under the influence of Umayyad princes.[1] It was chiefly historical knowledge which was encouraged and furthered during the first period of literature in Islam, and it is only necessary to remember what Muslim historians of literature tell of the activities of 'Abīd b. Shariya. The writings of this man from [204] South Arabia are much concerned with biblical legends and stories,[2] but these for Muslims fall into the category of *ta'rīkh* or *awā'il* and not into that of religious, specifically Islamic literature. Only the

[1] Aḥmad b. Abī Ṭāhir (d. 280) in Rosen, *Zapiski* of the Archaeological Society, St Petersburg, III, p. 268, 13; cf. *Fihrist*, p. 91, 20; also in the collection of material which Wellhausen has made in respect of the beginnings of noting down ancient Arabic poetry, *Reste arab. Heidenthums*, p. 201, note 2, there are some data.

[2] See part I, pp. 94 and 169 to the passages referred to: Ibn Qutayba, *Mukhtalif al-Ḥadīth*, p. 340, cites from the work of the genealogist from South Arabia (in the Ms. vocalized 'Ubayd) a communication about the age of Luqmān with the explicit remark that such stories lack an *isnād*. Abū Ḥan. Dīn., p. 10, 1, quotes a communication about the relation of Nimrod to Ya'rūb b. Qaḥṭān, *Agh.*, XXI, p. 191, 4ff., the explanation of historical occasion for an ancient Arabic proverb.

collection of data concerning the life of the Prophet is a link between this literature and true religious interests. The nature of this rising literature of the first century can be deduced from the contrast which is drawn between it and the literary trends of the following epoch. This contrast is illuminated by the historical note that Muḥammad b. Isḥaq (d. 150) had the merit of diverting the princes from occupying themselves with books that were of no use and turning their attention to the conquests of the Prophet, his mission and the beginning of creation.[1] In as far as this note is based upon knowledge of actual literary circumstances we may presume a predominance of secular literature before the commencement of literature permeated with religious points of view.[2]

It seems that gnomic literature, which was much in accordance with ancient Arab sentiment, was also cultivated. Wise sayings were noted down in *ṣaḥīfas*—philologists report that these were given the special name of *majalla*[3]—which seem to have been individual collections only and not meant for the general public. Several pieces of information give us some idea of these written notes about the *ḥikma*. Ma'qil b. Khuwaylid, a Hudhaylite poet of pagan times, quotes three wise sayings at the end of a *qaṣīda* and introduces them with the words: 'As he says who dictates the writing on parchment, while the scribe writes' (. . . *kamā qāla mumlī'l-kitābi fī'l-raqqi idh* [205] *khaṭṭaku'l-kātibu*).[4] This is an important proof for the fact that wise sayings were noted down even in the most ancient days. 'Imram b. Ḥaṣīn once recounted the following saying from the Prophet: 'Modesty only brings good' (*al-ḥayā' lā ya'tī illā bi-khayrin*). Upon which, Bashīr b. Ka'b said: 'It is written in the *ḥikma*, 'modesty is connected with seriousness, modesty is connected with dignity' (*inna mina'l-ḥayā'i waqāran, inna mina'l-ḥayā'i sakīnatan*). 'Imran replied: 'I make a communication in the name of the Prophet and you tell me what is in your *ṣaḥīfa*.[5] Mu'āwiya I hears a witty reply of 'Adī b. Ḥatīm and says to his courtier Ḥabīb b. Maslama al-Fihrī (d. 42); 'Write this in your book, since it is *ḥikma*.'[6] Wise sayings occurring in old poems are counted as *ḥikma*;[7]

[1] Abū Aḥmad b. 'Adī in Wüstenfeld's introduction to Ibn Hishām, p. viii.

[2] Cf. Sprenger's article on Kremer's Wāqidī edition, *JASB*, 1856, p. 213.

[3] *Khizānat al-Adab*, II, p. 11, top (in respect of the variant to *Nāb.*, 1:24). This is the basis for the title of the collection of proverbs by Abū 'Ubayd (who himself cites from *Kutub al-Ḥikma*, al-Maydānī, I, p. 329, penult.): *al-Majalla*, cf. Fränkel, *Aram. Fremd.*, p. 247, note. [Read 'Abū 'Ubayda', cf. R. Sellheim, *Die Classisch-arabischen Sprichwörter-Sammlungen*, pp. 69–70.]

[4] Hudhayl., 56: 15ff.

[5] B. *Adab*, no. 76.

[6] *Al-'Iqd*, III, p. 144 top; cf. al-Mas'ūdī, V, p. 18, penult.

[7] *Agh.*, XI, p. 135, 5. Al-Aṣma'ī says of a verse by Suwayd b. Abī Kāhil that the Arabs: *ta'uddūhā min ḥikamihā*, *ibid.*, p. 171, 18; c.f., ibid, p. 44, 12, a verse by Afwah: *min ḥikmat al-'Arab wa-ādābihā*.

hence also the saying attributed to the Prophet: *inna mina'l-shi'ri ḥikmatan*, *'ḥikma* is to be found in poetry.'[1] Perhaps we may combine with these accounts the *Kitāb Banī Tamīm* (referred to on another occasion)[2] from which a wise saying is quoted, if this *kitāb* does not describes in general the *dīwān* of poets of the tribe of Tamīm. The Tamīmites are known for their wisdom, and amongst them al-Aḥnaf b. Qays is famous in *ḥikma* and *ḥilm*; in his name a number of wise sentences are quoted.[3] Aktham b. Ṣayfī also belongs to this tribe; he was one of the foremost *ḥukamā' al-'Arab*, who 'uttered many wise sayings'[4] which free-thinkers circulated in competition with the Koran as late as the third century[5] in the same way as, according to Muslim historians, the contemporaries of Muhammed [205] attempted to contrast ancient Arab wisdom with the Koran as at least its equal.[6] As last offshoot of this gnomic literature may be considered a 'Collection of sayings by the caliph al-Manṣūr', which al-Jāḥiẓ mentions, with the remark that this collection was currently in the hands of copyists and was well known by them.[7]

Fables about the conquests of Islam were written down already under the Umayyads, in connection with data from the biography of the Prophet, and read with predilection at court. According to a report from al-Zuhrī, the caliph 'Abd al-Malik saw such a *maghāzī* book in the hands of one of his sons and had it burnt, recommending his son to read the Koran and pay heed to the sunna.[8] Though the text of this account unmistakably bears the stamp of those circles who condemned unauthenticated *maghāzī* in favour of authentically

[1] Al-Mas'ūdī, IV, p. 169, penult., *Agh.*, XXI, p. 49, 17, where instead of *laḥuhman laḥikaman* is presumably to be read. Cf. also *Agh.*, XI, p. 80, 19.

[2] *ZDMG*, XXXII, p. 355, compare the wise saying quoted there (which Sayf al-Dawla adopted, *Yatīmat al-Dahr*, I, p. 30, 9) from ancient times, Zuhayr 8:2: *ma-sharru mani̇ḥatin 'asbun mu'āru*, in al-Damīrī (s.v. *al-ḥays*), I, p. 208, 8, quoted from an anonymous poet with the variant: *ḥaysun mu'āru*. Shaddād al-'Absī boasts of his horse: *lā tarūdu wa-lā tu'āru*, *Agh.*, XVI, p. 32, 6, from below, cf. *Ḥam.*, p. 101, v. 4.

[3] Al-Ḥuṣrī, II, pp. 261–8, cf. al-Maydānī, II, p. 227, to the proverb *min ḥusn* etc.

[4] Ibn Durayd, p. 127, 17: *laḥu kalām kathīr fī'l-ḥikma*.

[5] Ibn al-Jawzī in the additions to Ibn Khallikān, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 5. Abū'l-Maḥāsin, II, p. 184, 10 [cf. H. Ritter, Isl., XIX (1930), p. 4; P. Kraus, *RSO*, XIV (1934), p. 119.] Ibn al-Rīwandī son of a Jew converted to Islam who among others wrote a book with the title *Shatterer of the Koran* (see Excursuses and Annotations).

[6] Ṭab., I, p. 1208, al-Ya'qūbī, II, p. 37 (cf. Sprenger, I, p. 94), Suwayd b. al-Ṣāmit and the *Majallat Luqmān*; this last is explained by Ibn Hishām, p. 285, 3 with *ḥikmat Luqmān*.

[7] *Bayān*, fol. 156b [III, p. 367].

[8] *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, p. 172.

recommended traditions,[1] there nevertheless seems nothing against admitting the existence of such literature in early times. But even amongst people who were governed by the demands of religious life, results were produced which the next generation could not accept as valid manifestations of the religious spirit. If we consider how many objections 'Abbāsid theologians have against the old *tafsīr*[2] we may get an idea of the arbitrariness and of the trend running counter to the theological spirit which must have predominated in the exegesis of the Koran. Otherwise it would be utterly incomprehensible that the *tafsīr* is put on the same plane as things which are completely foreign to the religious trends.

The same arbitrariness also predominated in the *maghāzī* of earlier times, which were presumably only aimed against the
[207] cultivation of popular legends about the conquests. These legends are contrasted with historical reports allegedly based on more correct traditions, which were meant to push the former into the background with the rise of the religious trend to prominence. Already in the first century, 'Amir b. Shurahīl al-Sha'bī (died in the first decade of the second century) occupied himself with ḥadīths of the *maghāzī* and Mālik b. Anas points to the *maghāzī* of the Medinian Mūsā b. 'Uqba[3] (d. 141) as being the most correct *maghāzī*.[4] Only with the development of the science of traditions, which also included this chapter in its sphere, was a critical method applied similar to that used in respect of tradition in general. Before that they developed in a popular way independently of the doctrines of theologians, who showed but little confidence in them. As religious science gained ground under the 'Abbāsids, theologians turned away from the knowledge contained in that literature as being useless profane entertainment.

This attitude is partly shown in accounts concerning the old

[1] A saying is ascribed to Imām Aḥmad: three things have no foundation (*aṣl*): *tafsīr* (which is arbitrary, not based on tradition), the *malāḥim* and the *maghāzī* al-Suyūṭī, *Itqān*, II, p. 310. By *tafsīr* (of which people are warned) was meant in old days arbitrary interpretation, Al-Dārimī, p. 61: 'one should beware of the *tafsīr* of the Prophet's ḥadīth much as one should beware of the *tafsīr* of the Koran.' By this people had presumably in mind *tafsīr* of the type of the Koranic explanations of Muqātil b. Sulaymān (d. 150) whose arbitrary explanations were condemned, *Tahdhīb*, p. 374; *Itqān*, II, p. 224 [cf. Goldziher, *Richtungen*, p. 35, and for a criticism of his conclusions H. Birkeland, *Old Muslim Opposition against Interpretation of the Koran*, Oslo, 1955].

[2] See preceding note.

[3] These are mentioned in a chronological report which runs counter to Ibn Isḥāq in B. *Maghāzī*, no. 34. Note that the *maghāzī* of Mūsā b. 'Uqba were still in literary circulation at the end of the ninth century. *Asānīd al-Muḥaddithīn*, I, fol. 142a; cf. also Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat. II, p. 248, no. 1554 [ed. E. Sachau, in *Sitzungsber.* of the Berlin Academy, 1904].

[4] *Tab. Ḥuff.*, III, no. 11; IV, no. 43.

literature of which we have just given some examples. On the other hand the theological views of the 'Abbāsid period also show in some anecdotes about these times. We will quote but one: Abū Yūsuf, pupil of Abū Ḥanīfa, was greatly interested in *maghāzī*, *tafsīr* and *ayyām al-'Arab*,[1] so much so that he missed some of his master's lectures. One day after he had been absent for several days his teacher asked him: 'Now tell me, who was Goliath's standard-bearer?' Abū Yūsuf was ready with his answer. 'You are imām,' he said, 'and if you do not stop teasing me, I shall ask you in front of all the people which battle was fought earlier, that of Badr or that of 'Uḥud? You will be unable to answer; yet this is the most elementary question in history.'[2] This story shows with what superior airs theologians looked down upon historical questions, having by now completely entangled themselves in their casuistic system.

The day of the theologians had arrived. In the shadow of rulers [209]
clad in the Prophet's cloak—we cannot consider here the literature of translations which were produced chiefly by non-Muslims—the subtleties of theological jurisprudence prospered and secular literature also found it easiest to assert itself in a form which adapted itself to the demands of theological taste. This explains many peculiarities in the historical literature of those days, from which only a few original thinkers were able to break free.

This also was the time when the religious ḥadīth became a branch of literature, and as such it is the typical product of the religious spirit of that epoch. It is however wrong to think (as is sometimes done) that the collection of ḥadīth is the point of departure of legal literature and that codified law books and compendia only developed from a profound study and practical application of these sources. The facts of literary history reveal that this literature developed in just the opposite way. Legal literature proper, which represents the result of comprehensive thinking, is chronologically prior to the literature of the ḥadīth. The works of Abū Ḥanīfa and his companions and disciples, Abū Yūsuf and Muḥammad al-Shaybānī, the works of al-Shāfi'ī, the many early works on single chapters of law whose titles are listed in great number in the relevant section of the *Fihrist*, long precede ḥadīth literature proper; they are the real *fiqh* books. These books clearly show that they were not written at a time when certain results could be deduced from fixed principles; they continually reveal the gropings and unsteady gait of beginners, and frequently show differences of opinion within the same school. The authors could not yet draw on the material of collected tradi-

[1] Abu'l-Maḥāsin, I, p. 508, 7.

[2] Al-Damīrī, I, p. 176 (s.v. *al-baghl*) from *Ta'rīkh Baghdād*. [The anecdote is not in Abū Ḥanīfa's biography in the *Ta'rīkh Baghdād*, and is probably not quoted from that work at all.]

ditions conveniently to hand, as could the students of the *fiqh* in the third and fourth centuries, but had to rely, in so far as they used traditions, on single traditions, self collected and learned in each individual case, either from oral sources or from existing *ṣaḥīfas*.

II

For a long time many odd concepts were current regarding the beginning of ḥadīth collections. Many of these unfounded speculations of earlier times about the origin of the ḥadīth compilations
[209] have been deservedly forgotten and have been replaced by better knowledge which gained ground also among a wider public. But one of these oddities might usefully be mentioned, if for no other reason than to demonstrate the progress which has been achieved by scholarship during the last few decades. In 1848 a French Orientalist described the process of the development of traditions as ending with the caliph Mu'āwiya I. Jules David, historian of Muslim Syria, explained the state of affairs—we do not know on what authority—in such a way that he has the founder of the Umayyad dynasty deciding to put an end to the growth of the sunna, which had so greatly increased that the parchment, upon which the traditions had been written down, weighed two hundred camel loads. For this purpose the ruler called to Damascus two hundred theologians from all parts of the Islamic world. From these he chose the six wisest and most intelligent and instructed them 'to reduce to proportion the great mass of dreams of two generations. These scholars conscientiously set to work and reduced the vast library which they had to condense into but six books.' At the end, all the lumber (*fatras*) which was left over was thrown into the river Baradā.[1]

So naive a conception of how and when the ḥadīth was collected tallies well with the view, which was previously current and which even today is often repeated, that the sunna is by etymology and by its nature a counterpart or even an imitation of the Jewish Mishnah.[2]

This fable was by no means derived from a Muslim source, though Islamic writers do not exclude the possibility that the founder of the Umayyad dynasty, who had little belief in the sunna, paid special attention to the ḥadīths.[3] There is however no trace of that

[1] *Syrie moderne* (in *L'Univers*), Paris, 1848, p. 104b.

[2] An odd notion of a quite exceptional kind was put forward as late as 1881 by Nathanael Pischon in his book *Der Einfluss des Islam auf das häusliche, sociale, politische Leben seiner Bekenner*, p. 2. He speaks of the 'sunna, i.e. tradition' etc. and of the *haggudah*, i.e. the interpretation of it by distinguished Muslim scholars. Perhaps this is a confusion with the Jewish Haggādā?

[3] As e.g. in the anecdotes mentioned by Sprenger, *Moḥammad*, p. lxxxii, note.

council at Damascus, or of the *auto-da-fé* prepared for the old lumber which could not yet exist.

The earliest datum which Muslim authors provide in respect of the [210] collection of the ḥadīth is by Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Shaybānī (d. 189), who is said to have learnt from Mālik b. Anas that 'Umar II instructed Abū Bakr b. 'Umar b. Ḥazm: 'Seek out what is extant of the ḥadīth of the Prophet or his sunna, or the ḥadīth of 'Umar and others, and write them down, because I fear the decay of knowledge and the disappearance of the *'Ulamā'* (*durūs al-'ilm wa-dhahāb al-'ulamā'*)'.[1] This report is often quoted[2] and frequently serves as a point of departure for the Islamic literary history of the ḥadīth,[3] and modern literary history also sometimes attributes a historical character to it.[4] It is true that we hear enough of the zeal of 'Umar II for the sunna, through which he hoped to initiate a new era after the irreligiousness of his predecessors. About his zeal to have ḥadīths written down and collected we have also another account, saying that 'Umar II had individual groups of traditions written down, as for example those preserved by 'Amra bint 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ka'b b. Mālik (d. 106).[5] The caliph is also said to have ordered Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī to write down traditions, and according to al-Suyūṭī (quoting earlier authors in his *K. al-Awā'il*) this collection was the first attempt in this direction (*awwal man dawwana'l-ḥadīth al-Zuhrī*).[6] Thus we see how admiring posterity endeavoured to connect the pious caliph with the literature of Islamic tradition, just as they made his zeal for obtaining individual sayings of the Prophet in authentic form equal to that of pious theologians.[7]

Nevertheless, because of the many contradictions which appear [211] in the accounts circulated from different sides, we are unable to accept as the point of departure of literature the report of al-Shaybānī that the beginning of systematic collection was initiated

[1] Al-Shaybānī's *Muwaṭṭa'*, p. 389, *Bāb ikhtilāf al-'ilm*, cf. Sprenger, *JASB*, 1856 p. 322, no. 69.

[2] E.g. Al-Dārimī, p. 68, where there is another version according to which 'Umar II expressed this desire to Ahl al-Madīna. B. also quotes this, but I cannot give the reference. [*Al-Ta'rīkh al-Saghīr*, p. 105; cf. also Ibn Sa'd, II/2, p. 134, VIII, p. 353; al-Khaṭīb, *Taqyīd*, pp. 105–6.]

[3] Al-Zurqānī, I, p. 10, al-Qasṭallānī, I, p. 7, here passages from historical works are collected.

[4] E.g. Muir, *Mahomet*, I, p. xxxii.

[5] *ZDMG*, XII, p. 245.

[6] See the quotations in 'Abd al-Ḥayy's introduction to *Mun. Shaybānī*, p. 13. I do not think that the small collection of 200–300 ḥadīths ascribed to al-Zuhrī ([al-Khaṭīb, *Ta'rīkh*, XIV, p. 87,] Abū-l-Maḥāsin, I, p. 309, 2) is connected with this.

[7] Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 72, reports that the caliph made Abū Salām al-Ḥabashī travel to his court from afar by means of the *barīd* in order to hear from him directly (*mushāfahatan*) a ḥadīth of which he was bearer.

by 'Umar II. The work done by Abū Bakr al-Ḥazmī is nowhere mentioned in the literature and it would have been impossible to avoid using it if such work had really existed. Muslim theologians evade this difficulty by the unwarranted assumption that 'Umar II died before he had received the work completed by Abū Bakr ibn Ḥazm,[1] and the collection was therefore not promulgated and thus never got into religious circulation. Mālik, or rather his authority Yaḥyā b. Sa'īd (d. 143), was well able to supply authentic information about the activities of 'Umar II who lived only half a century before them, but the report of Mālik is suspect because it occurs in no other version of the *Muwaṭṭa'* except that of al-Shaybānī. From there it was eagerly taken up as an isolated account by scholars of later times who were searching for a point of beginning for ḥadīth literature. In itself it is nothing but an expression of the good opinion that people had of the pious caliph and his love for the sunna.

There are more positive data in Islamic literary history for the beginning of tradition literature. These data, as we shall see, even anticipate a stop which was taken only later in this literature for the characterization of its development in the second century. It is said that Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal named 'Abd al-Malik b. Jurayj (d. 150), in Ḥijāz, and Sa'īd b. Abī 'Arūba (d. 156), in 'Irāq, as the first who arranged the existing material by chapters.[2] From this historians of literature concluded—this datum is met with in nearly all later books of this kind—that these Muslim theologians represent the commencement of ḥadīth collection. This interpretation of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal's account, however, rests upon a misunderstanding. The works of these theologians are not extant and, in judging their
[212] trend and tendency, recourse cannot be had to texts. But from some indications it seems likely that the works of these two scholars of the second century had nothing to do with the collecting of ḥadīths. As to Ibn Abī 'Arūba[3] we may mention that it is reported of him that 'he made not notes (*kitāb*) but remembered by heart all the

[1] Al-Zurqānī, I, p. 10, below, of Ibn 'Abd al-Razzāq 'an Ibn Wahb in the name of Mālik.

[2] Al-Nawawī, *Taḥdhīb*, p. 787 (*awwal man ṣannafa al-ḥadīth*), *Tab. Ḥuffāẓ*, 9, no. 9; cf. Kremer, *Über die Südarab. Sage* [Leipzig, 1866], p. 15, Freytag, *Einleitung in das Studium der arab. Sprache*, p. 397.

[3] This Sa'īd was not accepted as a fully valid authority by pious people; he is said to have confessed to *qadar*. A remark relating to this by Sufyān b. 'Uyayna can be found in al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, fol. 35b [ed. Hyderabad, pp. 123–4]. That Sa'īd had rationalistic tendencies can be seen from the fact that he pretended to be the bearer of the following completely Murji'ite ḥadīth: If someone's soul leaves the body being free of three things he will enter paradise. These three things are arrogance (*al-kibar*, a nonsensical variant *al-kanz*), faithlessness with the public treasury (*al-ghulūl*) and debts (*dayn*), al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 208.

traditions that he heard.'[1] This report inspires well-founded doubts about the correctness of the conclusion concerning literary history derived from Ibn Ḥanbal's communication. Inasmuch as it was possible in those days to speak of systematic collections, these referred to *fiqh* books rather than traditions, first attempts at codices arranged in chapters of law, and also using relevant material from the traditional sunna material.[2] Such juridical attempts, which were not confined to that period, were called *sunan*, and in defining them it is expressly stated that they were arranged by *fiqh* subjects,[3] while some are expressly called *kitāb al-sunan fi'l-fiqh*.[4] The accurate summary of their contents in Ibn Abi'l-Nadīm[5] shows that the works of Ibn Jurayj and Ibn Abī 'Arūba belong to this group. These books therefore are presumably those which caused Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal to ascribe the pioneering work to these two scholars. Ibn Abi'l-Nadīm lists however even older *sunna* works of this type, e.g.—to quote but one—a *kitāb al-sunan fi'l-fiqh* by Makḥūl (d. 116).[6]

Such works corresponded to the needs of a time when in public [213] life and government people began to attach importance to conformity with the *sunna* in the administration of justice of state affairs, and when caliphs consulted the opinion of theologians on religious aspects of public law. What the time called for were not informative ḥadīth works but compendia which would serve practical needs.[7]

It would be useless speculation to puzzle one's brains about the form, contents and spirit of works of which nothing, no line or quotation, has been preserved. But one fundamental work is extant, representing roughly the level reached by the development of legal literature at that time: this is the *Muwaṭṭa'* of Mālik b. Anas.

[1] *Ṭab. Ḥuff.*, V, no. 19.

[2] The 'Irāqī judge al-Ḥasan b. Ziyād al-Lu'lu'ī (d. 204), who was a pupil of the most eminent companions of Abū Ḥanīfa, is said with some exaggeration to have claimed that he had heard from Ibn Jurayj (as must be read) 12,000 badīths of which the lawyers were in need, *kulluhā yaḥtāju 'ilayhā al-fuqahā'*. Ibn Qutlubugha, ed. Flügel, p. 16, no. 55.

[3] *Fihrist*, p. 225, 21: *kitāb al-sunan ma-yaḥtawī 'alā kutub al-fiqh*; 226, 16, 20; 25; 227, 21.

[4] Ibid., pp. 227 ult. (al-Awzā'ī); 228, 3, 5, 9, and later, from a period (third century), pp. 228, 17, 20; 229, 14, 17; 230, 5, 20 (al Bukhārī); 231, 15, 19, 23 etc.

[5] Ibid., pp. 226, 6; 227, 9.

[6] Ibid., p. 227, 23.

[7] [The distinction between *sunan* and *musannaf* is perhaps too sharply drawn. That Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal quotes an early *musannaf* by Wakī' b. Jarrāḥ (d. 169) was pointed out by Goldziher himself, *ZDMG*, I, pp. 469–70. More recently parts of early collections have been recovered, cf. M. Weisweiler, *Istanbuler Handschriftenstudien zur arabischen Traditionsliteratur* (Istanbul, 1937).]

III

The *Muwaṭṭa'* cannot be regarded as the first great collection of traditions in Islam, nor does not appear to have been considered as such in Muslim literature. Despite the great prestige which it has enjoyed, from its appearance to this day, in the east and west of the Islamic world—the history of its origin has been surrounded with large number of pious legends—and despite the great reverence shown to the name of the author, the great *imām dār al-hijra*, it did not originally gain its authority as a canonical work of tradition. We shall see that, with the exception of the Maghribī schools, this work has no place amongst the 'six books' which we shall describe later, and only the reverence of later generations, who were no longer in close touch with the origins and had the urge to widen the circle of canonic literature, occasionally included in that category.

The work of Mālik is in fact not in the proper sense a collection of traditions, forming a counterpart to the *ṣaḥīḥs* of the next century, nor one which could, from the point of view of the literary historian, be mentioned as a member of the same literary group. It is a *corpus juris*, not a *corpus traditionum*. In saying this we do not think so much of quantitative considerations, i.e. that the *Muwaṭṭa'* does not yet extend to all the chapters which form the scheme of contents in the collections of traditions, but rather of the purpose and plan of the work. Its intention is not to sift and collect the 'healthy' elements of traditions circulating in the Islamic world but to
[214] illustrate the law, ritual and religious practice, by the *ijmā'* recognized in Medinian Islam, by the sunna current in Medina, and to create a theoretical corrective, from the point of view of *ijmā'* and sunna, for things still in a state of flux. Inasmuch as the book has anything in common with a collection of traditions it lies in the sunna rather than the ḥadīth. Occasionally Mālik does not cite one single tradition in a paragraph but only cites *fatwās* by recognized authorities in actual or casuistically pointed cases in order to conclude with his own assenting opinion and by stating Medinian usage and consensus.[1] A transmitter of the ḥadīth school would have put forward not *fatwās*, but ḥadīths going back to the Prophet.

We have seen in a previous section what differences of opinion existed in the various provinces of the Islamic empire in regard to even the most elementary questions of legal and religious usage. At a time when life in accordance with the sunna, public administration in conformity with the sunna, found recognition in public life, it became of practical importance to find a 'smooth path', among the windings of contrary trends to establish legal norms authentically.

[1] E.g. *al-Muwaṭṭa'*, III, p. 15, 26, bottom, and very frequently.

The Medinian Mālik wanted to serve this interest with reference to the practice of his Ḥijāz home and he achieved this intention in two directions. First of all he collected the documents of the Medinian sunna for the several chapters of legal and ritual life, and secondly, he codified that which is lawful in individual cases, on the basis of these sunna documents or, when these were lacking, on the grounds of the consensus (*ijmā'*) which had gained validity at his home up to that time, i.e. the *jus consuetudinis*, the customary law, of Medina. This *ijmā'* of Medina is one of the main pillars of his stipulations, and he always stresses in establishing legal usages that they represent customs or opinions which are generally recognized by the scholars in our town or about which there is with us (*'indanā*) general consensus (*al-mujtama' 'alayhi*).[1] It can of course, occur that this Medinian *ijmā'* is contrary to doctrine and praxis in other countries.[2] It is, however, outside the scope of the *Muwaṭṭa'* to mention and examine the traditions on which it is based. The traditional [215] material is here not the purpose but the means and is considered only in so far as it has to serve his practical purposes. Consideration of the Medinian *ijmā'* was so much the predominating point of view for Mālik that he does not even hesitate to give it preference when it is in conflict to traditions incorporated as correct in his corpus.[3]

Mālik b. Anas therefore is not a mere collector of traditions but is first and foremost an interpreter of them from the point of view of praxis. This can be demonstrated by many examples from his work. We will content ourselves with one which appears to us to be particularly characteristic and which permits the reader clear insight into the nature of the *Muwaṭṭa'*. In the second century, no fixed legal practice had as yet developed in Islam regarding the treatment of a Muslim who became unfaithful to Islam. It appears to have been certain that the *murtadd* (apostate) had to be punished with death, but there was no unanimous opinion whether attempts had first to be made at reconversion (*istitāba*), and in the event of its success the capital punishment became void or whether the culprit was to be condemned to death without previous *istitāba*. In practice the treatment of such apostates depended largely on the arbitrary decision of the authorities and theory about this problem was also uncertain.[4] This difference in opinion is reflected in the divergent teachings of the *madhāhib al-fiqh* which are collected in the *ikhtilāf* works. Theorists have exercised their subtlety in this question too by various distinctions. 'Aṭā, a theologian from Mecca (d. 115),

[1] E.g. ibid., II, pp. 76, 365, 378; III, p. 16; IV p. 53, etc.
[2] Al-Nawawī, IV, p. 119.
[3] *Al-Muwaṭṭa'*, III, pp. 95–6; cf. above p. 88 note 2.
[4] The earliest differences of opinion are dealt with in a special chapter of the *K. al-Siyar al-Kabīr* by al-Shaybānī, fols. 374ff. [IV, pp. 162ff.]

distinguishes between apostates who were born Muslims (these were killed without previous attempts at reconversion) and converts to Islam who subsequently apostatize (in such cases reconversion must be attempted).[1] Later teachers of the law have, with almost no exception, in their codicils claimed that *istitāba* is an obligatory duty of the authority concerned.

But it took a long time before such consensus was reached;[2] and in the second century it was still very far off. Abū Yūsuf writes [216] in his politico-legal memorandum (see above, p. 72) to Hārūn al-Rashīd characterizing the different views about attempts at reconversion previous to punishment by death: Everyone quotes traditions for his opinion and finds proofs in them. Defenders of the unconditional death penalty quote the saying of the Prophet: *man baddala dīnahu fa-'qtulūhu*, i.e. 'who changes his religion, him you must kill.' Defenders of the liberal view quote the saying: I am ordered to fight the people until they confess that there is no god but Allāh; if they do so their property and blood is safe with me but they must render their account to Allāh.'[3] Evidence against the liberal view is explained away. The data quoted for and against from the earlier history of the caliphate also proves the indecision that prevailed on this question in theory and practice. Those interested in the history of this question can find the materials well set out in the relevant chapter of Abū Yūsuf. We are only concerned with the passage by Mālik b. Anas on this problem, which shows the method of this theologian:

> Mālik from Zayd b. Aslam. The Prophet has said: 'He who changes his religion, his neck you must cut off.' The meaning of these words by the Prophet is, *as it appears to us and God knows best*: He who leaves Islam and takes up another religion, as for example that of the Zindīqs or the like, he will be killed if his apostasy becomes evident. Zindīqism consists not of open confession but of secret falling away from true belief under the cloak of outward conformity. Such people are not subjected to attempts at conversion because (the sincerity of their) conversion cannot be assured since they had already been secretly unfaithful while openly confessing Islam; I do not think that conversion need be attempted in such cases as their word is not reliable. But in the case of him who openly changes to another religion from Islam an attempt must be made to re-convert him; if he returns to Islam (it is well), but if not he will be killed. If it happens that

[1] Al-Sha'rānī, *Mīzān*, II, p. 172; *Rahmat al-Umma*, p. 138.

[2] The practice in modern times can be seen from Isabel Burton, *The Inner Life of Syria*, etc., London, 1875, pp. 180–203.

[3] *K. al-Kharāj*, pp. 109ff.

such a thing occurs I am of the opinion that they must be called back to Islam and that attempts must be made to convert them; if they are converted, this is accepted, but if they do not do so they will be killed. Also those are not meant (in the above saying of the Prophet) who change from Judaism to Christianity or vice versa[1] or confessors of any other religion who change their religion but only (if they leave) Islam. He is meant who changes from Islam to another religion and confesses it openly. And it is God who knows.[2]

The words 'as it appears to us' which occur in this passage of the [217]
*Muwaṭṭa'* also lead us to another characteristic of Mālik and his work. It is generally thought that Mālik was the opponent of the 'Irāqian so-called speculative school in which the justification of *opinio* or, as they called it, *ra'y*, predominated. It is thought that Mālik had condemned its justification and that this was typical of his Ḥijāzī school in contrast to the 'Irāqi trend. Consideration of Mālik's basic work, however, would not bear this out.[3] Mālik had had sufficient contact with the *ra'y* school[4] to be convinced of the inadequacy of historically given sources for all the demands of practical life—and this was what he had in mind. Therefore he felt himself sufficiently authoritative to intervene and legislate independently in cases where he found neither a Medinian tradition nor Medinian *ijmā'*. He does, in other words, practise *ra'y* and to such an extent that he was occasionally accused of *ta'arruq*='Irāqization.[5] Muslim theologians were aware of this and they constantly refer to *ra'y Mālik* in the same way as they do to the *ra'y* of the 'Irāqis.[6] There are, in effect, not infrequent passages in the *Muwaṭṭa'* where the term *ra'aytu*, with which the proponents of *ra'y* were reproached, is used: 'my *ra'y*, my own independent opinion is such and such';

[1] The opinion also developed that these had to be killed according to the wording: He who changes his religion, cf., al-Nawawī, *Arba'īn* (Cairo, 1277, Shāhīn), p. 30 to no. 14.

[2] *Al-Muwaṭṭa'*, III, p. 197. In Shayb., p. 368, where the paragraph about the apostates occurs, this part is missing and only the subsequent tradition is told in the same words as in the *Muwaṭṭa'*.

[3] Cf. Snouck Hurgronje, in *Lbl. für orient. Phil.*, 1884, p. 425.

[4] See above, p. 83.

[5] Snouck Hurgronje l.c. For *ta'arruq* cf. also *al-Muwaṭṭa'*, IV, p. 38, 2, Zurq., III, p. 9.

[6] E.g. *Ẓāhiriten*, p. 20, note 1. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal was asked: 'Whose traditions can be written down and whose *ra'y* can be taken as a model?' The answer was 'The ḥadīth of Mālik and the *ra'y* of Mālik.' *Tahdhīb*, p. 534, 3, Zurq., I, p. 4. In Ibn Bashkuwāl—where, however, *ra'y* and ḥadīth are put into strict opposition in characterizing theological trends, e.g. ed. Codera p. 25, 4—*ra'y Mālik* occurs continuously. Cf. also Ibn Ma'īn in *Ṭab. Ḥuff.*, no. 47; *Tahdhīb*, p. 374, 12: *law yakun ṣāḥib ḥadīth wa-kāna ṣāḥib ra'y Mālik*.

likewise Mālik is asked by his pupils for his own *ra'y* with a *ra'ayta*,[1] which is strongly deprecated by traditionists but common in *ra'y* schools.[2]

From all this it is sufficiently evident that Mālik b. Anas is not properly speaking a collector of traditions in his *Muwaṭṭa'* though his [218] work is of the greatest interest also for specialists of the science of ḥadīth and represents an invaluable instrument for critical historical investigations.[3] It is not, however, the aim of the author to provide such an instrument. He himself demonstrates the material used for his own practical ends in the versions current and acknowledged in Medina in his time. Thus he is not yet troubled by the scruples of later students of tradition of the stricter school. A proper *isnād* chain is not yet considered an absolute necessity, and nearly a third of the sayings employed by Mālik are *mursal* or even *maqṭū'*, i.e. they do not go as far back as the Prophet but end the chain with a name of a Companion, or else the links of a chain going back to the Prophet are not sufficiently firm or are not closed in uninterrupted sequence:[4] 'ḥadīths without bridle and reins' (*bi-lā khiṭām wa-'azimma*) as the critics call them.[5]

Mālik uses the *marāsīl* without compunction as sources for the law.[6] He was interested only in the documentation of the sunna and not yet in the criticism of form.[7] Thus he did not spend much time seeking its confirmation by parallel versions. The collector of traditions in the school aimed at handing down a tradition in various ways (*turuq*) and it became in his eyes valuable only when he was able to illustrate it according to many *turuq*. Yaḥyā b. Mu'īn (d. 233) disregarded every ḥadīth for which he had not at

[1] Most remarkable passages for the casuistic nature of this interrogative formula in Abū Yūsuf, *K. al-Kharāj*, p. 36, *al-Muwaṭṭa'*, III, p. 199.

[2] *Al-Muwaṭṭa'*, II, p. 330.

[3] For such investigation recourse must be had, apart from the *Muwaṭṭa'*, to the traditions occurring in Abū Yūsuf (*K. al-Kharāj*), al-Shaybānī (*K. al-Siyar*) and other authors of the second century; a critical comparison of these with the contents of the collections of the next period would be very fruitful for the history of the development of Islam.

[4] There is an example in *al-Muwaṭṭa'*, II, p. 73. [For Mālik's use of *ra'y* cf. also J. Schacht, *Origins of Muh. Jurispr.*, p. 115.]

[5] Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 338, 21.

[6] Muslim, introduction, p. 64: *wa'l-mursal fī aṣl qawlinā wa-qawl ahl al-'ilm bi'l-akhbār laysa bi-ḥujjatin* (for this cf. the commentary by al-Nawawī and *Tahdhīb*, p. 285). This question is dealt with in al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, fol. 105b [ed. Hyderabad, p. 384].

[7] The total number of traditions of the *Muwaṭṭa'* varies according to the different versions: it is around 1720; only 600 of them have *isnāds* reaching back to the Prophet, 222 are *mursal*, 613 are *mawqūf* and 285 do not reach back to the Prophet but stop at a Companion or Successor. We take these counts from Muslim sources (al-Zurqānī, I, p. 8) accepting their word for it; it would not be worth while to check these statements by counting.

least thirty *isnād* versions,[1] whereas Mālik was really content with one. Therefore he quotes sayings which were not incorporated in [219] any of the later canonical collections.[2] Since Mālik was only concerned with the requirements of legal life he also paid little attention to traditions which contain merely historical information, even if they refer to the biography of the Prophet. He takes these into account only where legal conclusions can be derived from them. This has later been stressed as a great merit of his trend, in contrast to those industrious scholars who, already in the early period of the science of traditions, collected all manner of unimportant detail of the Prophet's biography, the contents of which often proved to be a serious embarrassment to dogmatic theologians.[3]

Thus the *use* of traditions is the foremost factor in making Mālik's work what it is. He therewith represents the transition between two extremities which delimit the legal literature of the second and third centuries. The starting point of the literature is mere *fiqh*. Mālik, with the great influence with which he attributed to traditional material, opened the following period. That he initiated this transition with conscious intent, that he wanted to supplement merely positive law with historical documentary foundations, is shown in his relation to a contemporary literary work with which his own was to compete. According to Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, 'Abd al-'Azīz b. 'Abd Allāh b. Abī Salma al-Mājashūn (d. 164 in Baghdād) was the first to summarize the teachings of Muslim theologians in Medina in a codex. In this only the doctrine, the law according to Medinian consensus, was stated without quoting any traditions to justify these teachings. This method did not appeal to his contemporary Mālik and the idea of substituting for the work of Mājashūn a codex which also contained the traditional sources of the Medinian teachings was an additional inspiration which caused him to write the *Muwaṭṭa'*.

He was however not alone among his contemporaries in this endeavour. How much the compilation of such a codex corresponded to the needs of the time is seen from the fact that when Mālik set about writing his *Muwaṭṭa'* there were many of his Medinian colleagues who were preparing similar books. Mālik is said to have foreseen, in the view of his rivals, the lasting recognition of his work by posterity, full of confidence in his own work and its justi- [220] fication. His success indeed justified his confidence, since the competing *Muwaṭṭa's* vanished from circulation 'as if they had fallen into a well.'[4] As far as we are aware, the sources of this branch of

[1] *Tahdhīb*, p. 629, 13, *Tab. Huff.*, VIII, no. 17.
[2] Cf. Ibn 'Abd al-Barr in al-Zurqānī, II, p. 139.
[3] Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ, *al-Shifā*, II, p. 240.
[4] Al-Zurqānī, introduction, p. 8.

Arabic literary history mention three works which seem to belong to these contempory *Muwaṭṭa's*. One is by the Medinian scholar Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad al-Aslamī (d. 184) and is said to have been much larger than Mālik's work.[1] Another is by 'Abd Allāh b. Wahb al-Fihrī (d. 197). The *Muwaṭṭa'* work of this scholar[2] appeared after Mālik's book was published and information derived from Mālik is mentioned in it.[3] The latter said of these two books: What was done for the honour of God will last. Abū Mūsā Muḥammad al-Iṣfahānī (d. 581) added: 'In fact Mālik's book is like the sun in its brilliance and diffusion, while only few people know Ibn Wahb's book which is hard to find nowadays.'[4] Finally I found a *Muwaṭṭa'* mentioned[5] by the Medinian scholar Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Dhīb al-'Āmirī (d. 120 in Kūfa); he belonged to the hearers of al-Zuhrī. He was ranked above Mālik, with only the reproach that he was very credulous in respect of his informants.[6]

IV

Apart from the *Muwaṭṭa'* works mentioned above we also hear of several titles of books in which the name of Mālik b. Anas's work occurs, e.g. *Muwaṭṭa'* Abi'l-Qāsim, *Muwaṭṭa'* Abī Muṣ'ab, etc. Care must be taken not to consider these as independent *Muwaṭṭa'* writings and place them in the same series to which belong the works mentioned at the end of the previous section.

[221] An unfavourable impression of the reliability of Islamic tradition in the second century is gained if one considers that the version in which various authorities hand down the *Muwaṭṭa'*, all directly, or indirectly, in the name of Mālik, differ from each other in their text and contents, as well as in plan and order, to such a degree that one might be tempted to think of them as mutually differing and by no means as identical writings. Considering the accounts available about the different versions of the *Muwaṭṭa'* and on the other hand

[1] *Ṭab. Ḥuff.*, VI, no. 2. As late as in the sixth century a commentary was written on this by Abū Bakr b. al-'Arabī (d. 546), Ḥ.Kh., VI, p. 265.

[2] Examples in al-Zurqānī, IV, pp. 61, 119.

[3] This work must not be confused with the *Muwaṭṭa'* revision of the same Ibn Wahb, which is mentioned and described in the list of Muḥammad 'Abd al-Ḥayy (see next section) under the no. 2 (p. 19, top). The work mentioned in the text is possibly identical with the *K. al-Jāmi'* of Ibn Wahb. [For fragments of the *K. al-Jāmi'* see *J.* David-Weill, *Le Djāmi' d'Ibn Wahb*, Cairo, 1939–41. In a biography—ibid., p. xvii—his 'great *Muwaṭṭa'*,' and his commentary on the *Muwaṭṭa'* (of Mālik?) are mentioned separately.]

[4] Pusey in Bodl. Cat., p. 381. The book of Ibn Wahb was used by Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ, e.g. in al-Qasṭallānī, IV, p. 232. *Ṭab. Ḥuff.*, VI, no. 52 does not mention this *Muwaṭṭa'* under the works of Ibn Wahb.

[5] Al-Zurqānī, I, p. 16, 10 from below.

[6] *Ṭab. Ḥuff.*, V, no. 27, without mentioning the *Muwaṭṭa'* work.

comparing the two versions, the full texts of which are still extant, the belief that Mālik b. Anas made a fixed text, whether orally or by *munāwala* (p. 176) the object of transmission, is severely shaken. In that case two versions of the same book could not really be so completely different. One is much more inclined to believe the reports showing that Mālik b. Anas freely authenticated *Muwaṭṭa'* texts which were presented to him. The text of the book is read from copies belonging to the students to Mālik, who listens and now and then makes correcting remarks and then gives permission to spread the text as coming from himself.[1] This would still permit of some sort of control of the text. But we also hear this: Someone comes into Mālik's auditorium and produces a manuscript from the folds of his clothes. 'This is your *Muwaṭṭa'*, o Abū 'Abd Allāh, which I have copied and collated; please grant me permission (*ijāza*) to hand it down.' 'This permission is granted, and when handing down the text you may use the formula: Mālik has told me, Mālik has reported to me.'[2] If the author authenticated various copies of his work without checking them it is obvious that not everything that was handed down as being the *Muwaṭṭa'* was completely in agreement.

The commonest version of the *Muwaṭṭa'* codex, which we might call the vulgate, is that which is derived from the Andalusian theologian and agitator Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā al-Maṣmūdī[3] (d. 234), a pupil of Mālik. This version maintained its place in scholarly use and is most often commented upon; and it is this version which Oriental and Western scholars have in mind when they speak of the *Muwaṭṭa'*. This version is called *Muwaṭṭa' Yaḥyā*. But apart from this version of Mālik's *corpus juris* there are others based on other authorities [222] who received the *Muwaṭṭa'* from Mālik. In all there are fifteen such versions listed in the work of 'Abd al-Ḥayy[4] which we shall mention presently. If one wishes to gain an impression of the differences obtaining amongst these, and between them and the vulgate of Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā, it is only necessary to remember, for example, that in a version derived from Abū Muṣ'ab al-Zuhrī, a Medinian theologian who died in 242, (no. 9 in 'Abd al-Ḥayy) about a hundred traditions are mentioned which appear in no other version, though each of them, in comparison with the remaining recensions, again shows additions and omissions. Hardly one of them agrees with another in respect of the beginning, and if, as sometimes happens,

[1] Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, fol. 84b [ed. Hyderabad, p. 309] and often elsewhere as a proof that the so-called *'arḍ* or *'iraḍ* is as equally valid a means of transmission as first-hand oral lecture by the teacher.

[2] Ibid., fol. 91a.

[3] Cf. Dozy, *Geschichte der Mauren in Spanien*, I, pp. 282ff.

[4] pp. 18–21. There are 16 listed but the last number is not a proper recension of the *Muwaṭṭa'*, but a *musnad* of it (cf. below p. 211); cf. also for the various recensions Ḥ. Kh., VI, p. 267.

we meet quotations from the *Muwaṭṭa'* which cannot be confirmed from the vulgate we may assume that they were taken from one of the other versions.[1]

There were thus fifteen archtypes of the *Muwaṭṭa'*[2], of which the *Muwaṭṭa' Yaḥya* succeeded above all in gaining predominence in scholarly and practical use. Of the remaining versions, which for a long time were a subject of study alongside the version of Yaḥya for learned Muslims,[3] one is available to us. This is known under the
[223] name of *Muwaṭṭa' Muḥammad* and is the recension of the work handed down by the famous pupil of Abū Ḥanīfa, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Shaybānī, who lived for more than three years in Medina and heard Mālik's lectures. It often disagrees with the recension of Yaḥyā from which it also differs profoundly in the division of chapters. Some of the chapters of al-Shaybānī are not present in the vulgate at all, and vice versa. We have already twice in this study pointed out communications from the *Muwaṭṭa'* which are only to be found in the version of al-Shaybānī but do not occur in the vulgate of Yaḥyā (p. 168 note 1; p. 196). The version of al-Shaybānī as a whole is shorter[4] than that of Yaḥyā and the number of the traditions included is smaller. At the same time al-Shaybānī added to nearly every chapter an epicrisis in which he notes under the heading *Qāla Muḥammad* whether the teaching contained in the preceding chapter is valid or not according to his own legal system and to the teaching of Abū Ḥanīfa. For a large part the traditions which support the conflicting opinions are also quoted; these comparative additions are sometimes very large.[5] From this it can be seen that al-Shaybānī's recension is from this point of view also a revision and a critical development of Mālik's work.

[1] Not all versions found equal circulation; only about five were studied in Spain, where in the third and fourth centuries the *Muwaṭṭa'* was studied as the fundamental religious work. From the index to Ibn Bashkuwāl, ed. Codera, it can be seen which these versions were. Instead of *Muw. al-Qa'bī* in the index as well as the text of this edition, prepared with rare carelessness, one must always read al-Qa'nabī (d. 221 in Mecca).

[2] The *Muwaṭṭa'* copy of the treasury in Egypt (*Khizānat al-Miṣriyyīna*) which contained the text that the caliph Hārūn and his two princes heard from Mālik presumably belongs to the domain of fable, al-Suyūṭī, *Ta'rīkh* p. 115, 21.

[3] Some students of tradition study the book in different versions. The biographical works offer many examples of this, I will only mention one: Ibn al-Abbār, ed. Codera, p. 268, s.v. 'Abd al-Ghanī b. Mākkī (d. 556), *Muw. Yaḥyā . . . wa-Muw. Ibn Bukayr.*

[4] Within the individual books there are fewer sections, e.g. the book on marriage in *Muwaṭṭa'*, III, pp. 1ff. has 22 chapters, in Shayb., pp. 237–48 only 16, though the *Muw.* combines in two collective chapters (*jāmi'*) many questions which in Shayb. are distributed among separate sections.

[5] The largest additions are in *Bāb al-qirā'at fī'l-ṣalat khalf al-imām*, Shayb. pp. 90–100 = *Muw.*, I, pp. 158–62.

Apart from several manuscripts the *Muwaṭṭa' Muḥammad*[1] is also available in lithographic reproductions of Indian origin. I have before me three different lithographs of this work, two from Ludhiāna[2] and one from Lucknow[3] which was made by the learned Muḥammad 'Abd al-Ḥayy and possesses a thorough and many- [224] sided introduction and an extensive commentary. It may be presupposed that the learned oriental in subjective partiality amassed all kind of arguments in order to prove that the recension of al-Shaybānī was more authentic and valuable than the *Muwaṭṭa' Yaḥya*. European scholars, however, will be little impressed with the scholastic arguments of this Muslim scholar.

The relation of the two recensions to each other could best be illustrated by putting side by side the successive paragraph headings. Since this would involve us too far, we merely take two sections after both recensions in order to show, by comparing them, how al-Shaybānī became the commentator and critic of his text.

| *al-Muwaṭṭa'*, II, p. 19. *Standing up (al-wuqūf) before funeral processions and sitting on graves* | *al-Shaybānī*, p. 162. *Standing up (al-qiyām) before a funeral procession* |
|---|---|
| Mālik from[(a)] Yaḥyā b. Sa'īd from Wāqid b. 'Amr[(b)] b. Sa'd b. Mu'adh[(c)] from Nāfi' b. Jubayr b. Mut'im from Mas'ūd[(d)] b. al-Ḥakam from 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib: The Prophet used to stand up before funeral processions.[(e)] | (a) it was reported to us. (b) omitted. (c) +al-Anṣārī. (d) Mu'awwidh. (e) singular. |
| | Muḥammad says: 'We keep to this: We do not consider standing up before funeral processions (as a command); at first this was so, but it fell into desuetude.' So also says Abū Ḥanīfa. |

[1] *Cat. ar. Br. Mus.*, p. 718b; Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat., II, p. 44, no. 1144; Cairo Cat. I, pp. 328f [*GAL* I, p. 186, *SI*, p. 298]. It is interesting to observe that the Muslim cataloguer does not know that this is only a recension of Mālik's *Muwaṭṭa'*; he characterizes the book thus: 'The author here writes in the spirit of *madhhab* Mālik and answers the objections of opponents' whereas many additions (in the final remarks are directed against Mālik's text from a Ḥanafite point of view.

[2] One in lex. 8vo from the year 1291/2 (Printing Press of Muḥammad 'Abd al-Karīm), 200 pp., with short explanatory marginal glosses; the other in 8vo from the year 1292 (Maṭba' Raḥīmī), 270 and 8 pp., with even fewer marginal remarks.

[3] Gr. 4vo from the year 1297 (Printing Press of Muḥammad Khān Muṣṭafā), 412 pp.

[This ḥadīth is mentioned in *Muw. Yaḥyā* in another chapter with a different *isnād*—going back to 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz—as 'the last thing that the Prophet had said' IV, p. 71.]

p. 168. *On the use of the grave as a place for prayers: whether it is permitted to pray there and to stretch oneself out over it.*

(a) and Christians. (b) +there should not remain two *dīns* in the land of the Arabs.

Mālik has reported: It was told to us by al-Zuhrī from Sa'īd b. al-Musayyib from Abū Hurayra that the Prophet said: May God kill the Jews[a]: they have used the graves of their prophets as mosques.[b]

[225] *al-Muwaṭṭa'*, II, p. 19

*al-Shaybānī*, p. 168

Mālik[1]: It became known to him that 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib stretched himself out over the graves[a] and lay upon them. Mālik says: It seems to us that it is only forbidden to sit on the graves and to defile them.[b]

(a) upon them

(b) missing

Mālik from Abū Bakr b. 'Uthmān b. Sahl b. Ḥanīf, who said that he heard Abū 'Umāma b. Sahl b. Ḥanīf say: We attended funeral processions and the last of the people sat down until the *adhān* was called.[c]

(c) this paragraph is missing.

III, p. 17 *Collective paragraph: what is not allowed in marriage.*

*al-Shaybānī*, p. 241

[In this chapter various forms of marriage are successively mentioned which are illegal and involve nullity of the marriage contract. In al-Shaybānī the individual paragraphs are cited as separate chapters; the present is the second chapter.]

p. 19. Mālik from Nāfi' from 'Abu'l-Zubayr al-Makkī: Once a

[1] Continuing the same chapter.

marriage was brought before 'Umar where only one man and one woman were witnesses; so he said: this is a secret marriage (*nikāḥ al-sirr*) and I do not permit[a] it; if my approval had been asked before I would have stoned (the culprits).

(a) we do not permit.

Muḥammad says: We keep to this, since marriage is not permissible with less than two (male) witnesses, whereas at the marriage which 'Umar rejected a man and a woman were witnesses and this is a secret marriage, because the witnesses were inadequate in number. If the number of witnesses had been filled by the presence of two men, or two women and one man, it would have been valid though it was [226] made in secret. Because what makes a secret marriage void is (the fact) that it is made without witnesses; if, however, valid witnesses are present it is a public marriage, even though it is kept secret. Muḥammad also says: Muḥammad b. Abān reported from Jamād to Ibrāhīm (al-Nakha'ī) that 'Umar permitted the witness of one man and two women at marriage as well as divorce. Muḥammad says: and to this we adhere and it is also the teaching of Abū Ḥanīfa.

## V

One great step forward in the literary development of the science of ḥadīth is expressed in the words *taṣnīf al-aḥādīth*.

By now it has become evident that the collection of ḥadīth material is a supremely important part of theological activities in Islam. The more it was insisted upon that the ḥadīth be taken into account in legal practice as well as in ritual life and the more the

mushroom growth of ḥadīth material increased, precisely in the service of this postulate, the more a systematic arrangement of the data amassed became necessary, in order to facilitate the use of the great masses of traditional texts which accumulated in the hands of scholars from all the lands of Islam, both for theoretical study and practical purposes.

This systematic order was achieved by considering two different points of view. The simplest kind of arrangement is connected with the emerging views about a perfect ḥadīth. This must, by means of 'sound' links, be traced back without interruption (*irsāl*, etc.) to one of the companions; in that case it is *musnad*, i.e. supported. People who collect a fair number of such ḥadīths are given the
[227] honorific name of *al-musnid*[1] and are favourite sources and centres of ḥadīth teaching. They are visited by those who wish to become acquainted with pure ḥadīths.[2] 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Ju'fī (d. 229), a sheikh of al-Bukhārī, was given by his contemporaries the title *al-musnadī* or *al-musnidī*.[3] The name *musnid* is most usually applied in connection with the name of the place or province where the scholar concerned was highly regarded in his time and whose people considered him almost as an oracle of the ḥadīth. One is called *musnid Baghdād*, another *m. Miṣr fī waqtihi*[4] or, according to the area of his authority, *m. al-Shām*, *m. al-Yaman*,[5] *m. al-'Irāq*. The French translators of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa wrongly translate this latter 'l'appui de l' 'Irāq.' In the days when women actively participated in ḥadīth studies[6] the title *al-musnida* is often found with women's names.[7] The provincial limitation, mentioned above, of the epithet *musnid* is in contrast with the extension of this title to the whole Islamic world in the case of world-famous traditionists.

Al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360) is called *musnid al-dunyā*.[8]

One method of arranging ḥadīth material is connected with the ideas regarding a perfect ḥadīth lying at the root of this title.

[1] 'Celui qui connaît les traditions et indique leur sources,' Dozy, *Supplém.*, I, p. 692b.

[2] Frequently in *ḥadīth-ijāzas*, e.g. Landberg, Cat. of the Amīn Library, p. 10. In Mss. the inexact vocalization *musnad* (passive) is common.

[3] *Qāmūs*, s.v. *snd* and *Tāj al-'Arūs a. l.*, II, p. 386.

[4] Al-Maqqarī, I, p. 550 passim.

[5] *Ṭab. Ḥuff.*, IX, no. 62; XVIII, no. 12.

[6] See Excursuses and Annotations.

[7] Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, II, p. 110, Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat. I, p. 118, 10 from below; the previous word is to be corrected to *al-aṣīla* (instead of *al-aṣīliyya*); the connection of the two epithets (as also for men: *al-musnid al-aṣīl*) is frequent in the relevant literature. The same woman is often mentioned with these titles in *Asānīd al-Muḥaddithīn*, e.g. II, fol. 11b.

[8] *Ṭab. Ḥuff.*, XII, no. 27; cf. *imām li-ahl al-dunyā*, ibid., VIII, no. 2; *Tahdhīb*, p. 145. 9.

Traditions which have been tested more or less strictly for their authenticity are sorted out from an external point of view, and those traditions which in their *isnāds* go back to the companions are put together. The scholar of tradition puts together all traditions which are ultimately derived—irrespective of the *silsila*—from, for example, al-Barā' b. 'Āzib; then follow all the traditions for which [228] the authority is some other Companion, etc.

The principle for this type of collection is thus entirely external or, so to speak, personal. The contents, the matter of the traditions are not taken into consideration in establishing the order, the decisive point being merely the name of the Companion who is mentioned as authority for a group of traditions. Such collections are called *musnad* because every single ḥadīth which in correct chain can be traced back to a Companion, who in his turn can refer to the Prophet, is a ḥadīth *musnad*, a supported ḥadīth.[1] From individual traditions this name was transferred to a collection of such ḥadīths.[2] A large number of old *musnad* collections are mentioned of which we know no more than their titles, though for a long time they were the subject of study in Islam.[3] The most frequently quoted work of this type is the *musnad* of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal,[4] of which several parts are preserved in Ms. no. 589 of the Ducal Library at Gotha[5] and in a number of Mss. of the Royal Library at Berlin.[6] Informants here have been given a special chapter, even when only a very few of the Prophet's sayings are based on their authority.[7] The *musnad* of Isḥāq b. Rāhwayhī (d. 233), one of the most ardent defenders of the ḥadīth trend at the time of the conflict of schools,[8] also shows this typical plan of a *musnad* collection.[9] [229]

[1] Risch, *Commentar des 'Izz al-Dīn*, p. 28.

[2] Introduction to al-Dārimī, p. 4; *Dictionary of Technical Terms*, p. 646, 5 from below.

[3] E.g. the *musnad* of Ḥārith b. Abī Usāma (d. 282) which was much studied in the sixth century, Ibn al-Athīr, VI, p. 169. In the eighth century it was still the subject of critical exegetical studies, Cairo Cat. I, p. 161 [*GAL S* I, p. 258]. The *musnad* of 'Abd b. Ḥamīd (d. 249) was still read in the tenth cent. in Egypt, *Asānīd al-Muḥaddithīn*, II, fol. 6a.

[4] Pertsch explains the expression *musnad* in this title: 'Collection of traditions for the support of his religious teaching,' Cat. I, p. 456. See also Sprenger, *Moḥammad*, III, p. ci, Gotha.

[5] Cf. also Mss. no. 590 and no. 609 of the same library.

[6] Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat., II, pp. 97ff., nos. 1257, 1959, 1260. [Cf. *GAL* I, p. 193, *S* I, p. 309. Printed in Cairo 1896, and a new ed. in progress. Goldziher devoted to the *Musnad* his article 'Neue Materialen zur Litteratur des Überlieferungswesens bei den Muhammedanern,' *ZDMG*, I, (1896) pp. 465ff.]

[7] E.g. Gotha Ms. no. 589, fol. 39a, a special title: Abū'l-Sanābil Ba'bak with two traditions.

[8] Teacher of Dāwūd al-Ẓāhirī, *Ẓāhiriten*, p. 27. Ibn Qutayba also heard ḥadīths from him and took over many things from him. He characterizes Isḥāq thus: 'I have never seen anyone who named the adherents of *ra'y*

Before going on to the second form of collections of traditions we must add three things. First: that even at the time when factual interests already preponderated in the redaction of ḥadīth works, *musnad* collections still continued to be compiled. In order to make their use easier an attempt was occasionally made—as is the case with the *musnad* of Abū'l-Ḥusayn Muḥammad al-Ghassānī (d. 402)—to arrange the authorities in alphabetical order,[1] and older *musnad* works which had been compiled in a different order[2] were also changed into alphabetical order for greater convenience.[3] This appears to have been most extensively practised in the *Jāmiʿ al-Masānīd wa'l-Sunan* by the Damascene scholar 'Imād al-Dīn ibn Kathīr (d. 744).[4] Before him Ibn al-Najjār of Baghdād (seventh century) wrote a comprehensive *musnad* work including all Companions[5] under the title *al-Qamar al-Munīr fī'l-Musnad al-Kabīr*.

Secondly: that zealous disciples and members of the *madhhab* extracted from the codified works of imāms, which, as we saw in respect of Mālik's in Section III, had not been meant as collections of traditions (and had not been arranged accordingly) but as works of legal science, as compendia of jurisprudence, the *musnad* traditions occurring in them in order to make them the subject of special studies. As far as they are known to us, however, these *musnads* were arranged not according to informants but according to their materials, corresponding to the chapters of the basic work from which they had been taken. They are not the work of the scholars whose names they bear. It would be wrong to think that the often mentioned *Musnad al-Shāfiʿī* is a collection which the Imām al-
[230] Shāfiʿī himself compiled in order of the Companions cited as informants. Rather, pupils of the Imām excepted the *musnad* traditions from his codex *al-Mabsūṭ* and arranged them by legal topics.

[1] Landberg, op. cit., p. 12, no. 37.

[2] Originally the sequence was according to the Islamic dignity of the companions (early acceptance of Islam, participation in the battle of Badr, etc.), see in *Dict. of Techn. Terms*., p. 646.

[3] This transformation was made in the *Musnad* of Ibn Ḥanbal, Cairo Cat. I, pp. 168, 253 [Abū Bakr al-Maqdisī, *Tartīb Musnad Aḥmad*, cf. *GAL* I, p. 193].

[4] Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat. II, p. 51, no. 1344 [*GAL* II, p. 61].

[5] Al-Kutubī, *Fawāt al-Wafayāt*, II, p. 264, 21.

[6] Ibn al-Mulaqqin, fol. 14b; Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Asamm (d. 246) is usually named as collector.

---

with greater passion, or refuted them and investigated their evil teaching with greater zeal, than Isḥāq b. Ibrāhīm al-Ḥanẓalī. He used to say of them: They have thrown away God's book and the sunna and have abandoned the *qiyās*.' *Mukhtalif al-Ḥadīth*, p. 65; cf. p. 204.

[7] Part of it is extant in the Viceregal Library in Cairo, Cairo Cat. I, p. 305 bottom [*GAL. S* I, p. 257. For other *musnads* see Goldziher, in the article quoted in note 6 above, and *GAL* I, p. 163, *S* I, pp. 256ff.]

The *Muwaṭṭa'* of Mālik was subjected to the same process, and this gave rise to the *Musnad Muwaṭṭa' Mālik*.[1] The same is true of the *Musnad Abī Ḥanīfa*.[2] The teachings of Abū Ḥanīfa more than those of other imāms were used by the followers of his school as a basis for *musnad* extracts. By pointing to the large number of *musnad* traditions used by him, it could be proved that the accusation of the opposing school, i.e. that Abū Ḥanīfa in his doctrine allowed but little influence to traditions, was untrue. Beginning with the first companions of the Imām[3] until the seventh century (my data go no further), renewed attempts were made to compile *musnads* from the teachings of Abū Ḥanīfa.[4] In the seventh century the Khārizmī theologian Abū'l-Mu'ayyad Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd found fifteen different *musnad* about Abū Ḥanīfa which he collected into one work, arranging it according to the chapters of *fiqh*.[5] But his material does not exhaust all the *musnad* literature of the Ḥanafite school.[6] This therefore is a kind of *musnad* collection which is completely different from those described at the beginning, and it must be distinguished from them.

Thirdly: that later linguistic usage by a liberal generalization [231]
extended the term *musnad* to all works on tradition. At a time when various methods of redacting traditions were no longer clearly distinguished, works of tradition are also called *musnad* which in correct usage should be called *jāmi'*. This extension of linguistic use was gradually increased. In conversation with educated Muslims one can hear every day—at least I found this to be so in Egypt—talk of the *musnads* of al-Bukhārī[7] and Muslim. The older school-language, corresponding to a more correct terminology, has different

[1] By Aḥmad b. al-Shu'ayb (d. 303). Ḥ.Kh., V, p. 543; another by Abū'l-Qāsim al-Jawharī al-Mālikī (d. 381) about the character of which we are told by a quotation in al-Ghāfiqī, in 'Abd al-Ḥayy, l.c. p. 20, see above p. 205 note 4 and Ibn Bashkuwāl, ed. Codera, p. 560, no. 1242: *musnadahu fī'l-Muwaṭṭa'*.

[2] This also disposes of the question asked in Kremer, *Culturgesch.*, I, p. 491, note 2. [For the *musnads* of Abū Ḥanīfa see *GAL* I, p. 77, *S* I, p. 286.]

[3] Abū'l-Mu'ayyad mentions Ḥammād, son of the Imām, Abū Yūsuf [*GAL*, l.c.] and al-Shaybānī among the authors of such *musnad* works. From the third and fourth centuries data can be found in Ibn Qutlubughā nos. 37, 42, 87.

[4] The Shī'ite student of tradition Ibn 'Uqda (d. 249) also wrote a *Musnad Abī Ḥanīfa*, al-Ṭūsī, *Sh'a Books*, p. 43. 2.

[5] Ḥ. Kh., V, p. 536, Ms. of Viceregal Library in Cairo, Cairo Cat. I, p. 304. Dr Vollers (to whom I owe a copy of the most interesting introduction) refers also to no. 47 of the Library Muṣṭafā Fāḍil. [See *GAL*, l.c.; printed Hyderabad 1332.]

[6] E.g. a collection by 'Alī b. Aḥmad al-Nahuftī is mentioned in *Asānīd al-Muḥaddithīn*, I, fol. 195b; cf. Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat. II, p. 96, nos. 1255–6.

[7] Cf. Fleischer, Leip. Cat., p. 465a, bottom: *al-Jāmi' al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ* of al-Bukhārī; cf. ibid., p. 465b, 12. Also Ibn Khaldūn, *Muqaddima*, p. 369, 13, 17, calls the works of al-Bukhārī and Muslim *musnad ṣaḥīḥ*.

terms for these last-named collections and those which are related to them in their arrangement.

VI

A higher principle for arranging collections of traditions is found in those redactions which are called *muṣannaf*, in contrast to the *musnads*. This term refers to collections in which the informants to which the *isnāds* lead are not decisive for the order of the sayings and accounts; it is rather the relationship of the contents and the reference of the sayings to the same subject which are of importance for the order. The material which is the subject of the traditions—not only legal material, referring to ritual life, but also biographical, historical ascetical and ethical[1] material—forms the scheme by which such collections are divided. Into every chapter are put such sayings and accounts as are transmitted in regard to a given question or event or those from which information on the subject of the chapter is to be derived (even if only from an incidental feature). Within a chapter the traditions are put together with full *isnāds* according to all *ṭarīqs* known to the collector.[2] While the *musnad* is arranged
[232] according to informants (*'alā'l-rijāl*), the *muṣannaf* is divided according to chapters[3] (*'alā-'l-abwāb*). We often find the name *musnad* or *shuyūkh* contrasted (from this formal point of view) with the term *abwāb*. The antithetic combination *al-musnad wa'l-abwāb* or *al-shuyūkh wa'l-abwāb* is frequent for the two types of ḥadīth collection in works on biography and literary history.[4]

*Musnad* and *muṣannaf* therefore are the two chief forms of collecting traditions, which for a long time appear simultaneously in literature. We have already seen that even long after the method of the *muṣannaf* predominated *musnads* continued to be compiled. Those who are more interested in a theoretical statement of the traditions that they have compiled tend to write a *musnad*, which is, so to speak, an individual achievement, a repertory for private use. Those who wish to facilitate the practical use of the accumulated traditions, by providing the relevant material for any given question together in critically sifted form, produce *muṣannafs*. These intend

[1] Inasmuch as a collection extends to this kind of material it is called *Jāmi'*; introduction to al-Dārimī, p. 4.

[2] See above, p. 202.

[3] *Ṭab. Ḥuff.*, IX, no. 65, in the list of works by Muslim: *al-musnad al-kabīr 'alā'-l-rijāl; . . . al-jāmi' alā'-l-abwāb*; cf. al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 337, 7 where Shu'ba's knowledge of traditions is compared to that of Sufyān: he was *a'lam bi'l-rijāl Fulān 'an Fulān*, the latter *ṣāḥib abwāb*, i.e. one stressed the forms of *isnād*, the other the system in which the ḥadīth was to be used.

[4] Examples: *Ṭab. Ḥuff.*, X. no. 75, XI; no. 12, XII, nos. 19, 23, 32, 47, etc.; cf. Ḥ. Kh., V, p. 540.

from the start to create works which can be handed over to the school and practical life.

We have no clear idea about the beginnings of the *muṣannaf* literature. The dates quoted by Muslim authors are suspect—as we have already pointed out (pp. 195 ff.). More positive data are available for the third century,[1] from which it can be concluded that it was at that time that people *ṣannafa al-musnad*, arranged the *musnad* according to its material,[2] and people appeared of whom it was said that they were *mimman jama'a wa-ṣannafa*, of those who collected and arranged according to subject.[3] This was also the time when the theoretical conflict between *aṣḥāb al-ra'y* and *aṣḥāb al-ḥadīth* reached its peak. The study of the ḥadīth was highly valued as a pious occupation, but the men who had to administer justice in practical life lacked the means to recall in every case the teachings [233] of the ḥadīth and the texts from which it was derived. That practical lawyers did not busy themselves excessively with the ḥadīth can be seen from an instructive account by al-Jāḥiẓ (d. 255), a contemporary of al-Bukhārī, which gives us an understanding of how great were the gaps which had then to be closed by the friends of tradition. Al-Jāḥiẓ says: 'Our experience is that a person studies the traditions for nearly fifty years, concerns himself with the exegesis of the Koran and lives among religious scholars, without being counted amongst the *fuqahā'* or being able to obtain the office of judge. This he can only achieve if he studies the works of Abū Ḥanīfa and the like and learns by heart the practical legal formulae;[4]

[1] [See, however, the editor's note to p. 197.]

[2] Details, however, such as that Na'īm b. Ḥammād b. Mu'āwiya al-Marwazī (d. 228) was the first man *jama'a al-musnad* (*Ṭab. Huff.*, VIII, no. 6) do not belong here.

[3] *Ṭab. Huff.*, VII, no. 22, VIII, nos. 3, 5, 28, 99; IX, nos. 2, 4; cf. VIII, nos. 29, 124.

[4] *Shurūṭ*, cf., Dozy, *Supplém.*, I, p. 746a, usually together with *wathā'iq* or *ṣukūk*. The knowledge of *shurūṭ* and *ṣinā'at al-tawthīq* (cf. Dozy, ibid., II, p. 779b; al-Zarkashī, *Ta'rīkh al-Dawlatayn*, p. 42, 10: *kāna faqīhan muftiyan 'ārifan bi'l-tawthīq*; ibid., p. 89, 10: *al-faqīh al-muwaththiq*) is one of the indispensable requisites of a practical judge, and is often dealt with in the relevant literature. The oldest representatives of the discipline of *shurūṭ* and *wathā'iq* are listed in the *Fihrist*, pp. 206, 16; 207, 9; 208 passim; 212, 19, 22; 213, 20. Al-Ṭaḥāwī made the most detailed compendia of this discipline, of which one (cf. Ibn Qaṭlubughā, ed. Flügel, p. 6, 10) is in Ms. in the Cairo Library (Cairo Cat. III, p. 102). [Cf. *GAL S* I, pp. 294–5. A compendium of such *shurūṭ* is the book *Biḍā'at al-Qāḍī*, Ms. of the Leipzig Rathsbibliothek, no. 213, and another Ms., Cairo Cat. III, p. 8, 9: *al-Awthāī al-Shurūṭiyya fī Taḥrīr al-wathā'iq al-shar'iyya*; cf., ibid., p. 266, top: *Maḥāsin al-Shurūṭ*., cf. the work *Mafnā' al-Lā'iq li'l-Kitāb al-wathā'iq* by Muḥammad Ibn 'Arḍūn; Krafft, *Die Handschriften der orientat. Akademie in Wien*, p. 174, where the documents are given which belong to this chapter. The 58th book of the *Fatāwā 'Alamgīrī*, the most valued of the *fatwā* works of the Ḥanafite *madhhab* (1067), has the title: *K. al-Shurūṭ*. A collection of *shurūṭ* is found in al-Saraḥsī, al-*Mabsūṭ*, Cairo, 1331, XXX, pp. 167–208.]

all this can be done in one or two years. In only a very short time such a person will be appointed as judge over a town or even a whole province.'[1]

Under such circumstances the Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth felt the need to point to the importance of the ḥadīth for religious and legal practice and to bring practical proof that every chapter of the *fiqh* could be filled with clear ḥadīth material, so that no one can ever go wrong in seeking the solution of religious questions of rite and law in these sources. By this means the opposing school were to be shown that the ḥadīth was always a sufficient source for practical legal teaching.
[234] This purpose gave the impetus to the complication of the *muṣannafāt*, and only regard for such an aim by an academic faction affords sufficient reason for the origin of works in the context of the conditions of the schools and the general trends of the time. It is no coincidence that the *muṣannafāt* originate in 'Irāq and the easternmost parts of the Islamic world, in those areas where theoretical conflict was most violent.

VII

The very first *muṣannaf* that gained prevalence in Islam shows clearly the marks of this purpose: it is the *Ṣaḥīḥ*[2] of Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl al-Bukhārī[3] (d. 256). The structure of this book is that of a pure work of traditions (without addition of *ra'y* as in Mālik, above, p. 201) written, however, for the purpose of enabling people to find their way with its aid in all chapters of the *fiqh* and in all its problems. It was to be a means of giving concrete shape to the teachings which then were represented in the school of the Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth, of whom B. mentions his older contemporary Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal from personal knowledge.[4] This end was to be achieved through the rubric[5] (*tarjuma*), heading each paragraph and showing what could be deduced from this or that *bāb* for practical purposes, or, even further, which were the deductions to which al-Bukhārī intended the reader to pay chief attention (even if the

[1] *K. al-Hayawān* (Vienna Ms.), fol. 16a [I, 87].

[2] Or *muṣannaf al-Bukhārī*, Ibn Bashkuwāl, p. 227, no. 516.

[3] We omit all biographical data as well as those concerned with the origin of the better known works, since these are often repeated in the relevant literature. As a characteristic curiosity from popularizing literature we only wish to quote this line: 'Boukhari était gendre de Bayezid I, sur-nommé Ilderun; il mourut en 1430,' thus in Ubicini, *Lettres sur la Turquie* (Paris, Dumaine, 1853) I, p. 145. The author of the *Ṣaḥīḥ* is here confused with the shaykh of Bukhārā (Hammer-Purgstall *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*, I (1827), p. 194) Amīr Sulṭān.

[4] B. *Nikāḥ* no. 24; cf. *Maghāzī*, no. 91, where Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal is not quoted from first hand knowledge.

[5] A summary of them by Krehl, *ZDMG*, IV, pp. 1ff.

paragraph actually contained hardly any clue to the practical use intended); for which of the mutually opposing theses of the *madhhib* al-Bukhārī wished to use the ḥadīth in question as an argument.

It was therefore justly said: *fiqh*[1] *al-Bukhārī fī tarājimihi*, i.e. the *fiqh* of B. is in his paragraph headings.[2] This tendency of the book [235] also explains the fact that B. occasionally gives paragraph headings without being able to provide an appropriate ḥadīth.[3] The author prepared a complete scheme for the whole *fiqh* which he filled out with relevant ḥadīth data. If then he had no *locus probans* for one or other paragraph, he temporarily left the rubric without a ḥadīth, hoping to fill the gap later. For some of the headings, B. however did not succeed in doing so.

We have in another study[4] emphasized this characteristic particularity of al-Bukhārī's codex and shown how subjectively the *Ṣaḥīḥ* intervenes[5] in the questions at issue in the *fiqh* schools (*madhhib al-fiqh*), which at the author's time were more or less definitely established. Here too we would like to cite a specimen for this and can hardly find in al-Bukhārī's book a more typical example to illustrate the point than the following.

*Ṭalāq* no. 24.

*Bāb al-Li'ān* and about the word of God, Sura 24:4–9. If a dumb man accuses his wife of unfaithfulness either in writing or by sign (*ishāra*, by hand) or through a recognizable movement (*īmā'*, of the head or lashes),[6] he is considered equal to one who has speech, because the Prophet has admitted sign language in matters of religious law. This is the doctrine of some Ḥijāzī teachers and also of other scholars. And God says (19:30): 'She (the mother of Jesus) pointed to him and they said: How shall we address him who is in the cradle, a small child?' And al-Ḍaḥḥāk said: (It says, 3:36: Your sign is that for three days you will speak to men no other) than by sign, *illā ramzan*, (i.e.) only by movements of the hands. Other people say: It is impossible (when the person concerned cannot speak) for punishment (*ḥadd*) or mutual curse (*li'ān*) to take place. Then (this school) thinks that

[1] Not *khiffat*, as in Flügel's Ḥ. Kh., II, p. 516, 1, with the translation *de levitate Bucharii in stitdis*.

[2] Al-Qasṭallānī, introduction, p. 28.

[3] Cf. B. *Tafsīr*, no. 262; Ḥ. Kh., p. 515, 12ff.

[4] *Zāhiriten*, pp. 105ff.

[5] Dugat probably confused the *tarājim* with a supposed commentary when saying of the *Ṣaḥīḥ*: 'Le commentaire qu'il y a joint est difficile à comprendre,' *Histoire des philosophes et des théologiens musulmans*, p. 300, top.

[6] This is the traditional explanation in this special case, *awma'a* has, however, a wider meaning in the language, e.g. *Aḥkām*, no. 36: *awma'a bi-yadihi*; *Agh.*, XV, p. 113, 4: *awma'a ilayki bi-na'liki*.

divorce (*ṭalāq*) can take place by writing, sign and movement; there is no difference between divorce and accusation. If then someone says: Accusation is only possible with words, it is said
[236] to him: In the same way divorce can only be possible by (explicit) speech (whereas in the last case the opposite is agreed upon), otherwise divorce and accusation and emancipation (*al-'atq*) would be impossible. Likewise a deaf man can undertake the oath by curse. Al-Sha'bī and Qatāda say: If he (the dumb one) says: You are dismissed from me, by indicating this with his fingers, then she (his wife) is separated from him by his sign. And Ibrāhīm (al-Nakha'ī) says: If he writes down the formula for divorce with his hand, this is binding for him; and Ḥammād says: If the deaf and the dumb say this with their head (by moving it), this is admissible.

So far the *tarjuma*. Then follow traditions in which it is reported that the Prophet on various occasions used gestures and signs.[1] By this example I wished to show in how unmistakable a way al-Bukhārī tried to win over readers to a certain partisan opinion in the headings and introductions of the chapters in his collection: in this particular case he advocated the view of the Ḥijāzī teachers, who claimed in opposition to the 'Irāqī party that for the validity of certain legal acts it is not always necessary that the fixed formula should actually be uttered.

VIII

In al-Bukhārī's times, and largely through his influence, the rules for preserving traditions began to assume strict forms. So conscientious a collector as al-Bukhārī never deviated an inch from the strictest discipline. Literal accuracy—with which people were not overmuch concerned before (above, p. 186)—became the watchword in reproducing what had been heard; the receiver was permitted to pass on what he had heard, whether it was *isnād* or *matn*, only in the same form as he had obtained it. If there were any doubts about the smallest details, these doubts had to be faithfully registered and the decision in favour of one or the other form of the tradition had to be noted down apart from the text. Subjective judgement in such questions of textual criticism must never influence the text, even if there was an obvious mistake. The collector had to write down everything according to the words of an equally conscientious informant. 'The Qurayshites conspired against the B. Hāshim—or against the B. 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib.' Only after the text and all parallel

[1] Cf. also my article, 'Über Geberden- und Zeichensprache bei den Arabern' in *ZVS*, XVI, pp. 376ff.

versions are finished is the collector entitled to add: Abū 'Abd Allāh (al-Bukhārī himself) says: *Bani'l-Muṭṭaliḥ aṣḥaḥ*, i.e. 'this [237] version seems to me the more likely one.'[1]

The same slavish exactness is also applied to the *isnād*. If for, example, in the *isnād* there occurs a common name born by many people, so that the special signification of this name is not certain in a given case, a closer identification must not simply be incorporated into the text of the *isnād*, but the addition of the specification must be made manifest by external signs. E.g., Abu Mu'āwiya says: Dāwūd, i.e. *Ibn Abī Hind*, reports from 'Āmir, who said: I have heard from 'Abd Allāh, *i.e. Ibn 'Amr*, etc.'[2] The words in italics are additions by the collector for the purpose of identifying Dāwūd and 'Abd Allāh. His explanatory gloss had, according to the rules of the transmission of traditions, to be made manifest in an unequivocal manner; and if he had not introduced the addition with the word *wa-huwa* or, as is done in some cases, *ya'nī* ('meaning by this'), this would have been an infringement of the fidelity of the tradition.

Thus all subjectively learned elements are scrupulously kept apart from the transmitted text, and the collector who took such liberties in tendentious use of the text, and allowed himself so much arbitrariness and partisanship in the interpretation, took great care not to alter his text by even the most minute, insignificant and often obviously necessary corrections. It also occurs that al-Bukhārī leaves a lacuna in his text if he obtained the text from his authority with that lacuna. Such a lacuna is called, in the terminology of the school, a *bayāḍ*, the white, i.e. the blank space. Once it happened that the exegete of the text of al-Bukhārī read this expression as part of the text. One of the Prophet's sayings runs: *inna āla Abī . . . laysū bi-awliyā'ī*, 'verily the family of Abū . . . are not my favourites.'[3] Probably this is one of the tendentious traditions we have dealt with in Chapter 3, and in some texts the lacuna is in fact completed by Abi'l-'Aṣ b. Umayya and in others by Abī Ṭālib. Peaceably inclined copyists might, in their indifferentism in regard to dynastic issues, have wished to leave out the names altogether; al-Bukhārī's teacher said when reaching the missing word: In the text of Muḥammad b. Ja'far, i.e. his own source, is written *bayāḍ*, i.e. a lacuna. [238] Al-Bukhārī incorporates these words of his teacher into his text. But some exegete understood this as if the word *bayāḍ* was to come after Abī, thus making the Prophet damn the family of an Abū Bayāḍ.[4]

[1] B. *Ḥajj*, no. 45.
[2] B. *Īmān*, no. 3, cf. al-Nawawī, introduction, p. 24.
[3] B. *Adab*, no. 13.
[4] al-Qasṭallānī, IX, p. 14.

But though al-Bukhārī shows conscientious fidelity in reproducing his text, on the other hand he does more than reproduce and group his material. Motivated by the desire to provide, not only a useful repertory of all that in his view was worth knowing and was at the same time sufficiently authenticated, but also a handbook useful for the practical purposes of the members of his persuasion (the Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth), he also sows the seed of a commentary on his traditions. Too much should not be made of this; but it is one of al-Bukhārī's peculiarities, which distinguishes him from his younger contemporary Muslim, that he does not refrain from explaining some difficulties in the texts by glosses, which are of course kept strictly apart from the body of the traditions. We have already seen one such example, where a short explanatory gloss is inserted to the text by means of a separating word. Where longer pieces are concerned they are introduced at the end of the text with the words: *qāla Abū 'Abd Allāh*. These are usually etymological, syntactical or lexicographical[1], also Massoretical,[2] remarks regarding single words or phrases of the text. It is characteristic that after having quoted a tradition he once adds: 'But this is no proof for the Qadarites.'[3] He always thinks first of the theoretical applications for which his material should, or should not, be used.

## IX

The text of the *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* was not handed on like the *Muwaṭṭa'* in many recensions differing in their contents; nevertheless, one could also make for the *Ṣaḥīḥ* a large genealogical table for the [239] various archetypes—called mothers (*ummuhāt*) by Muslim scholars—and recensions derived from these.[4] Directly from al-Bukhārī's lectures, several scholars, from amongst the many thousands hearers who flocked together to hear from him the *Ṣaḥīḥ*, have handed down this work, and through the mediation of these transmitters and their pupils about a dozen different Bukhārī texts came into being.

[1] E.g. B. *Manāqib*, no. 2; *Jihād*, no 197; *Jizya* nos. 36, 37; *Wuḍūʾ*, no. 69; *Zakāt*, no. 53; *Maẓālim*, no. 32 (*naṣb* = the vowel *a*, also outside the *iʿrāb*, in the word *al-anasiyyatu*), especially abundantly in *K. al-Tafsīr*, nos. 125 (*waʾl-lām waʾl-nūn uhtūn*), 218, 330 (where the triptote is called *mujran*, cf. *Fihrist*, p. 74, 24).

[2] *B. Tafsīr*, no. 263.

[3] Ibid., no. 265.

[4] Ḥ. Kh., II, pp. 515, 3, 520. [For the transmission of al-Bukhārī's text cf. *GAL S* I, p. 261; J. Fück, 'Beiträge zur Überlieferungsgeschichte von Buḫārī's Traditionssammlung,' *ZDMG*, XCII (1938), pp. 60ff.; *Le 'Ṣaḥīḥ' d'al-Buḫārī, reproduction en phototypie des manuscrits . . . de la . . . 'recension' d'Ibn Saʿāda*, I, Paris 1928, introduction by E. Lévi-Provençal (=*JA*, 1923, pp. 209 ff.); M. F. Sezgin, *Buhari'nin kaynakları* (quoted above, p. 168 note 6), pp. 167ff.]

These show more or less substantial variations in the titles as well as the contents of paragraphs. The text now commonly used is due to Muḥammad al-Yūnīnī (d. 658),[1] who took as his base a copy preserved in the *madrasa* of Āqboghā in Cairo which was itself based on good early texts; the readings of this he compared with the readings of the oldest archetypes and noted their variants.[2] It was a good old custom not to dispense with the help of philologists[3] in establishing difficult ḥadīth texts.[4]

At that time nobody amongst the living philologists was more suited as an adviser for a critical recension of the text of al-Bukhārī than the author of *Alfiyya*, Ibn Mālik (d. 672), who in a work of his own[5] has proved that he had studied al-Bukhārī from a philological point of view. He must have been interested in a correct ḥadīth text especially because he admitted linguistic forms in the ḥadīths as proof (*shawāhid*) for linguistic questions.[6] This scholar was in fact called in as philological adviser.[7] We owe to these efforts the excellent apparatus of variants which is preserved in the commentaries on al-Bukhārī and which cannot be too highly valued. By means of these commentaries (al-'Aynī, Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, etc.), and especially [240] the latest of them, by the Cairene scholar Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Qasṭallānī (d. 923), we possess the whole apparatus for the transmitters of the text of al-Bukhārī, and can turn it to account in using the text. It is impossible to come to a decisive conclusion on any passage in this work of tradition without previously considering this apparatus of variant readings. A critical establishment of the Bukhārī text must be founded in the first instance upon the weighing and sifting of the old apparatus of variant readings as it appears in the recensions which derive from different sources of the text. The reverence of Muslim scholars who transmitted the material in an uninterrupted chain, up to the most recent phase of exegetical work, has made the material for this easily accessible.

[1] Cf. Rosen, *Notices sommaires*, I, p. 26, top. [Al-Yūnīnī died in 701/1302, see the studies quoted in the preceding note.]

[2] Al-Qasṭallānī, I, pp. 46ff., provides the best information about these archetypes and the origin of the codex of al-Yūnīnī.

[3] There are examples in al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, fol. 70b [ed. Hyderabad, pp. 255–7] of the participation of the Aṣḥāb al-'Arabiyya in establishing the *i'rāb* in ḥadīths and of their opinion being asked in cases of lexical difficulties.

[4] [Yet one should not, merely for the sake of puristic points of view, correct odd peculiarities of the transmitted text, see Thorbecke, *Ibn Durejd's Kitāb al-Malāḥin*, p. 6, note 1, where a saying of al-Nasā'ī is quoted.]

[5] *Shawāhid al-Tawḍīḥ wa'l-Taṣḥīḥ li-Mushkilāt al-Jāmi' al-Ṣaḥīḥ*, of which a Ms. is described by Derenbourg, no. 141, I, p. 86. [Cf. *GAL S* I, p. 262]. It is possible that this work was due to that participation in the revision of the text.

[6] *Khizānat al-Adab*, I, p. 6, 22.

[7] Cf. al-Qasṭallānī, VII, pp. 67, 326, on the influence of Ibn Mālik in some passages of the text.

It is not impossible that some of the variants arose from dogmatic reasons. Motivated by spiritualistic scruples, early transmitters have for example expunged or weakened without much ado the objectionably anthropomorphistic phrases in traditions transmitted in al-Bukhārī.[1] Pious Muslims have an easy conscience regarding such corrections. Thus some Mu'tazilites read in Sūra 113:11, against the *textus receptus*, *min sharrin* (instead of *sharri*) *mā khalaqa*, so that *mā khalaqa* became a negative sentence and 'the evil that He (God) created' became 'before evil that He did not create'.[2] Abū Bakr ibn Muqsim was subjected to an inquisition in 322 in Baghdād for spreading such uncanonical variant readings, and his writings were burnt.[3] A year later a reader of the Koran, Ibn Shannabūd, was incarcerated for taking similar liberties.[4] Ḥadīth texts were of course less jealously guarded from corrections due to dogmatic tendencies.

Sometimes important theological definitions depend on the minutiae of the form of the text in a passage, as for example in the argument about what is meant by a 'Companion' (*ṣāḥib*) of the Prophet. In the heading of the chapter 'On the excellencies of the companions' it reads in al-Bukhārī: He among the Muslimūn who was in the company of the Prophet *or* has seen him, is to be counted among the Companions (*man ṣaḥiba'l-nabiyya aw ra'āhu min al-muslimīn fa-huwa min aṣḥābihi*). This 'or' (*aw*) is the accepted [241] reading.[5] According to it a blind man can also be counted among the Companions, on whose authority so much depends on the ḥadīth and its religious application; and in fact we find blind men also amongst the Aṣḥāb (e.g. Ibn Umm Maktūm). On the other hand there are theologians who do not consider these two conditions as being alternatives but see them both—having been in the company of the Prophet *and* having seen him—as necessary qualification for a Companion. They base their opinion upon the reading *wa-ra'āhu* = and has seen him.[6]

Yet another series of variants belongs to the group of so-called *taṣḥīfāt*, i.e. corruptions due to errors, a defect of these old texts which gave scoffers opportunity for sarcastic remarks as early as the third century[7] and which from the fourth century onwards spurred

[1] Examples for this in my *Zāhiriten*, p. 168.

[2] Al-Qasṭallānī, IX, p. 397.

[3] Ibn al-Athīr, VIII, p. 102.

[4] Abū'l-Maḥāsin, II, p. 289, cf. Qādī 'Iyūḍ, *al-Shifā'*, II, p. 290. [Goldziher, *Richtungen*, pp. 46f.; Nöldeke, *Gesch. des Qorans*, 2nd ed., III, pp. 110ff.]

[5] The ḥadīth is transmitted in this form also in the name of al-Bukhārī (rec. of al-Fīrabrī) in al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, fol. 16a, bottom [ed. Hyderabad, p. 51].

[6] Al-Qasṭallānī, VI, pp. 88f.

[7] Already Ibn Qutayba had to defend the tradition from such satires in his *Muḥtalif al-Ḥadīth*, see *Cat. Lugd. Batav.*, IV, p. 55 ult. ff.

on orthodox critics to increased care for the integrity of the sacred texts.[1] Such *taṣḥīfāt* proved to be the more tenacious of life since it was the transmitters' duty to hand on the text literally just as he had received it, a duty which was extended by some even to evident mistakes; what was received with mistakes had to be handed down unchanged, though one had the right (according to others, the duty) to point out the correct readings according to one's best knowledge[2] in the form of oral or written corrections (in the latter case as a separate gloss). This strict view also applied to unmistakable linguistic mistakes. In earlier days there were many defenders of the opinion that grammatical errors and evident vulgarisms, etc., were not to be tacitly corrected; the representatives of this view said: *hākadhā ḥuddithnā*. This rule did not however find general acceptance, especially as mistakes in syntax (confusion of the nominative with the objective case) often changed the sense of a saying.[3] The need of the expounder often caused involuntary deviation from the [242] mechanical strictness of the mere transmitter. It happens quite often that a change was made in the text of a sentence of tradition because the reference of the word in question was not understood and the correction was intended to make understanding easier. We may again refer to the *Muwaṭṭa'* for our example of this phenomenon in the history of the text. 'Uthmān b. 'Affān once sat upon the seat (in front of his house) when the *mu'adhdhin* came and invited him to the afternoon *ṣalāt*. 'Uthmān asked for water and performed the ablution. Thereafter he said: 'Verily, by God, I will tell you a ḥadīth, if there were not a verse in the Book of God (*lawlā āyat fī kitābi'llāhi*), I would not tell it to you.' Then he said: 'I heard God's Prophet say: "He who performs the ablution, performs it properly and then attends the (due) *ṣalāt*, his sins will be forgiven (which he might commit) between this and the next following *ṣalāt*"' Mālik adds as explanation that by the verse (*āyat*) to which the caliph refers, the passage in the Koran, Sūra 11:116, is meant, where as reward for prayer remission of sin is promised.[4] Much more likely, however, is the view held by other traditionists, and borne out by parallel

[1] Here belongs first of all the work of Abū Aḥmad al-'Askarī (d. 382), which was described by Kremer in *Sammlung orient. Hschr.*, p. 43, no. 93 (cf. idem, *Gedichte des Labyd*, p. 28 [*GAL* I, p. 132, *S* I, p. 193. Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (d. 463) also wrote a treatise on the *taṣḥīfāt* of transmitters, Cairo Cat. I, p. 122 bottom [*GAL* I, p. 401, no. 6, *S* I, p. 564, no. 6]. The work of Al-Dāraquṭnī (d. 360) on this subject is not available. Some remarkable examples of *taṣḥīf* are mentioned in the *Taqrīb*, fol. 67a [*new* 35, transl. *JA*, XVIII, 1901, pp. 113–7].

[2] *Taqrīb*, fol. 58b bottom [*new* 26, transl. *JA*, XVIII (1901), pp. 70–1].

[3] Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, fols. 51b–56a [ed. Hyderabad, pp. 177–98] discusses these questions at length; cf. ibid. fols. 66a–70a [pp. 245–52].

[4] *Al-Muwaṭṭa'*; I, p. 61.

passages, that the reference is to Sūra 2:154, where a curse is called upon those who keep secret any of God's teachings. 'Uthmān would be one who keeps God's teaching secret if he had not communicated the message received from the Prophet.[1] These references to verses of the Koran were probably forgotten by subsequent transmitters of this story and therefore they helped themselves in trying to understand them by changing the word *āyat* into *annahu*. Both these words in Arabic have the same graphic skeleton and only differ by diacritical points. Even the oldest versions of the *Muwaṭṭa'* read: *lawlā annahu fī kitābi'llāhi*, i.e. 'if it were not written in the book of God,' and this reading was adopted in the vulgate of the *Muwaṭṭa'*. The change added little to the sense of the text but the explicit mention of the *āyat* vanished and the hearer could no longer ask how 'Uthmān could call the subsequent saying (to which the words seemed to relate) a verse in the Book of God.

Such corrections were easily made as soon as serious difficulties
[243] appeared, and the substitution for a rare expression of a more common one made a deeper study of the text not necessary. As a matter of fact the text of the Koran was treated with the greatest freedom even for the sake of small difficulties.[2] How much easier was it to do so with the text of traditions, which was less sacrosanct!

On some other occasion Mālik b. Anas related the following event from the Medinian circle of the Prophet. A Bedouin who had paid homage to him could not stand the city climate and was continually suffering from fever. He therefore asked the Prophet to release him from the oath of allegiance so that he might return to the free desert. He repeated the request three times but the Prophet always refused to grant it. Thereupon the Bedouin left the city without permission. When the Prophet heard about it he said: 'Verily al-Madīna is like the bellows, it removes the dirt and there shines what is excellent', *innama'l-Madīnatu ka'l-kīri tanfī khabathahā* (var. *khubṯahā*) *wa-yanṣa'u ṭībuhā*. That means: Our town repels the useless stuff which disfigures it and what is good can shine even more brightly after the dirt has been removed.[3] We shall pass over the minor variations which are attached to the expression of this simple idea. The above text is the best authenticated, as is shown by the fact that Muslim, who had received it from Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā, the pupil of Mālik and editor of the *Muwaṭṭa'* vulgate, included it in his work in this form.[4]

[1] Muslim, I, p. 307.

[2] In Sūra 24:27 *tasta'nisū* was corrected to the easier *tasta'dhinū*; 73:6 *wa-aqwamu* into *wa-asmaḥu*, Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *Mafātīḥ al-Ghayb*, VIII, pp. 162, 337. In the last passage there is also quoted the opinion of Ibn Jinnī, according to which such changes must be comments rather than corrections.

[3] *Al-Muwaṭṭa'*, IV, p. 60, cf. above p. 46, note 5.

[4] Muslim, III, p. 297.

The literalists of later epochs did not find this text quite understandable. *Ṭīb* is usually used of scents, but how can a scent be said to shine? The word *naṣa'a*, here meaning 'shine', is commonly used of colour, not olfactory, impressions. Recourse was therefore had to correcting *ṭībuhā* into *ṭayyibuhā*,[1] which is used more generally for all that is good, sound and pleasant. This correction does not affect the graphic substance of the written word. More radical was the traditionist al-Qazzāz, who corrected *yanṣa'u* into *yaladawwa'u*, a [244] word used for the exhalation of scent, whereby the meaning would be 'its scent emanates'. He had merely to add one letter (*w*) to the skeleton of letters and to change the diacritical points of two letters. However, the simile of the bellows thus became rather lame.

There are many such phenomena which occurred during the transmission of the text of al-Bukhārī. In general the chapter headings are the least secure part of the work from a textual point of view. As far as they are concerned, the various recensions show the greatest divergences. Occasionally, while otherwise they have the same text, they show variants in single letters of a word owing to the nature of Arabic script. In the heading of *Fitan*, no. 14, is the received reading *bāb al-ta'arrub*, i.e. living in the desert like Bedouin Arabs. The codex of Abū Dharr, a notable version of the Bukhārī text, has *al-tagharrub*, life abroad, far from home; another text, the variant in which is considered as *taṣḥīf* by Arab scholars—evidence of how soberly their critical sense dealt with such variants—has *al-ta'azzub*, a word not quite suitable in this sense but which might be considered a synonym. Another such example is in *Janā'iz*, no. 80. 'Ibn Ṣayyād (the presumed anti-Christ) asked the Prophet: "Will you testify that I am God's envoy?" Then the Prophet ceased to ask him about (prophecy).' This last sentence is expressed in the text by *fa-rafaḍahu* (he left him); for this expression, which in fact is not quite clear (because in the further course of the story the dialogue continues between the Prophet and Ibn Ṣayyād) there are a number of variants in the different versions of the Bukhārī text: *fa-rafaṣahu* for *fa-rafaṣahu*=he kicked with the foot, *fa-raṣṣahu*=he squeezed him, *fa-waqaṣahu*=he broke his neck, for which others substituted the entirely useless *fa-raqaṣahu*. Even more variants are to be found in *Manāqib* no. 25, 'and the vessel ran over with fullness', *tanidḍu min al-mil'i*. For this the following variants are known, which I give in the sequence of their graphic distance from the vulgate: *tabiḍḍu*, *tabiṣṣu*, *tanṣabbu*, *tanaḍḍaru*, *tanḍarru*, *tanḍariju* (this is the reading of Muslim in the parallel passage), *tagṭuru*. Instructive is the passage *Janā'iz*, no. 78. Here Jābir tells how his father fell in the battle of

[1] This is the transmitted form in B. *Faḍā'il al-Madīna*, no. 10. He has the tradition from Sufyān who got it from the same source as Mālik (Muḥammad b. al-Munkadir).

Uḥud as the first martyr of Islam and shared a grave with another: 'But my soul did not wish that he should be with someone else in a grave. So I exhumed the body after six months and, behold, he was just as on the day when I lowered him into the grave,' *hunayyata*
[245] *ghayrī udhunihi*. This is the vulgate reading of which exegetical considerations made an inversion necessary, as if it read *ghayra hunayyati udhunihi*, 'with the exception of a small piece of his ears.' This variant is found in most of the authorities for the Bukhārī text. But difficulties of exegesis gave rise to the following variants: *ghayra hunayyatin fī udhunihi*, that is the logical sequence of words demanded by the exegesis introduced into the text with the addition of a preposition: 'on his ears'; al-Sfāqsī and the source of the text of Krehl offer *hay'atuhu* instead of *hunayyatan*=his condition (was quite intact) with the exception, etc.

These examples, chosen from a large number, show that the need for a tolerable sense, which the text hardly offered, unconsciously gave rise to alterations which appeared shortly after the canonical text was fixed in the earliest recensions. Partly these take the place of true corruptions in the texts, but in their multiplicity they show that they were attempts to offer something better or more plausible, and we feel we can share the opinion of Muslim critic that ignorant copyists bear the greatest responsibility for the fact that often one has to interpret the text in a tortuous manner.[1] Apart from these variants we must also mention interpolations, from which al-Bukhārī's text did not escape. With regard to an account from the Jāhiliyya which Abū Mas'ūd al-Dimishqī (d. 400) cites from al-Bukhārī, al-Ḥumaydī (d. 488) remarks in his work *al-Jam' bayn al-Ṣaḥīḥayn* (Harmonistic of the *Ṣaḥīḥs*): We have looked up this passage and found it in fact in some copies of the work 'concerning the days of the Jāhiliyya', but not in all of them. It possibly belongs to those passages which have been interpolated into the Bukhārī text (*al-muqḥamāt*).[2]

## X

According to a similar design and for the same purpose as al-Bukhārī, a younger contemporary of his, Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj[3] from Nīsābūr (d. 261), made a collection of traditions. This one is also famous in the Islamic world under the name of *al-Ṣaḥīḥ*. When comparing it to al-Bukhārī, with which it has most of the contents in common from different oral sources, a formal difference is most
[246] obvious; this also affords an insight into the character of this collection. Muslim's work is also a *musannaf* and like al-Bukhārī's

[1] Al-Qasṭallānī, IX, p. 509.
[2] Al-Damīrī (s.v. *al-ǧirḏ*), II, p. 290.
[3] [For Muslim cf. *EI* s.v., and *GAL* I, 166, *S* I, 265.]

parallel work is arranged according to the chapters of the *fiqh*, but the various paragraphs (*abwāb*) in the original edition of Muslim himself have no headings.[2] Thus Muslim also, like his contemporary, intended to serve the *fiqh* through his work but he left it to the reader to draw from the collected ḥadīth material the conclusions which seemed to him to correspond most closely to the truth. Another formal difference, which was particularly evident to Muslim scholars,[3] also finds its reason in that difference between points of view of the two collectors. Both made it their business to give the same ḥadīth according to various *ṭuruq* (i.e. according to different informants with different *isnāds*), since a ḥadīth is the more authenticated the more parallel versions it has.[3] Whereas, however, al-Bukhārī often quotes the different parallel versions of the same tradition under different chapters (because the same text serves him for various chapters of the *fiqh* and because he had no other material for some of the paragraphs but the traditions which he had already used previously). Muslim always quotes related versions together without repeating material that has already been dealt with. His purpose was not *a priori* to equip the whole scheme of *fiqh* with ḥadīth material.

We may therefore deduce that Muslim was not primarily concerned with the practical application of his collection in a particular direction but intended, as he says in his preface, to purify the existing ḥadīth material of all dross: the unreliable and untrustworthy elements which had attached themselves to this material in the course of time.[4] Also the fact that he does not start his work without any introduction, like his older contemporary and colleague, but prefaces his work with a number of introductory chapters (which are highly instructive for these studies), about the view-points of collecting traditions in general and on the grade of trustworthiness [247] of transmitting informants and on authentic and non-authentic ḥadīths, corresponds to this intention.

The two *Ṣaḥīḥs* represent, for the first time in the literature, a more rigorous criticism of the *isnād* than that customary in the preceding period. Previously it was considered sufficient if the *isnād* chain was entirely made up of names of *thiqāt*, i.e. informants known as reliable; only now the inner coherence of the *isnād*, the unctual relationship of the *thiqāt* which occur in them, begin to be tested, and the admission of traditions as legal sources is now made

[1] *Ẓāhiriten*, p. 103.

[2] Al-Nawawī, introduction, p. 10, top.

[3] See above, p. 202, Yaḥyā b. Mu'īn.

[4] I, p. 33: 'In face of the facts reported to you that the people spread objectionable accounts by means of weak and unknown *isnāds* and throw these among the ordinary public who cannot discern these faults, our heart was willing to grant your wish.' (This introduction is in the form of an address to an unknown person.)

contingent upon *isnāds* correct in this sense. Yaḥya b. Mu'īn gives as an ideal for a correct *isnād*, 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Umar: al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad: Ā''isha: Muḥammed; this *isnād* he called: 'Gold inlaid with pearls' (*al-dhahab al-mushabbak bi'l-durr*). The *isnād* chain, Mālik: Nāfi': Ibn 'Umar, is given this preference and the above-mentioned name by al-Bukhārī;[1] it was also called the 'golden chain' (*silsilat al-dhahab*),[2] and later forty-seven ḥadīths were put together whose *isnād* deserved this honorific title.[3] In general, however, there was no fixed canon for the relative evaluation of *isnād* chains in the third century; each collector had his own norm. One speaks of the *shurūṭ* (conditions) *al-Bukhārī* and *shurūṭ Muslim*, i.e. the demands that each of the two made of a tradition before incorporating it into his *Ṣaḥīḥ*. If one of the traditions collected by them did not comply with their *shurūṭ*, it was put aside as an insufficiently authenticated source for the law.

Nobody will expect us to present here all the differences between the *shurūṭ* of the *Ṣaḥīḥs*. Anybody desiring a more profound knowledge of this subject can obtain it from the native introductory works. We will only point out the chief difference, since it also serves to throw some light upon the study of traditions amongst Muslims in general. It is generally agreed that a ḥadīth which is to serve as argument for a legal doctrine (*ḥujja*) must necessarily have an *isnād* [248] in which all the informants who are mentioned are indubitably reliable *thiqāt*,[4] and that, as regards its inner cohesion, it must have that continuity which is termed *ittiṣāl*, uninterrupted cohesion. This consists of the proof for the contemporaneity of the informers who are represented as receiving traditions from each other and that there was personal contact between the man handing down and the man receiving. Such conditions of the tradition are usually marked by the formula *sami'tu, ḥaddathanī*, or *akhbaranī*. A says: '*ḥaddathanī* or *akhbaranī* B', who says: '*ḥ.* or *akhb.* C', etc., up to the Companion who makes the communication from direct contact with the Prophet. This is the *isnād* form of an 'uninterruptedly connected' ḥadīth. Various forms of 'interrupted' ḥadīths must be distinguished from this. Intermediate is the so-called *ḥadīth mu'an'an*, i.e. a ḥadīth which is attached to an *isnād* in which the informants or part of them are not linked by the above-mentioned *ittiṣāl* formulae but merely by the preposition *'an*=from, e.g.

[1] *Tahdhīb*, pp. 360, 406, 507, *mushabbak al-dhahab*.

[2] For a bad *isnād* there was a scheme too: Muḥammad b. Marwān: al-Kalbī: Abū Ṣāliḥ: Ibn 'Abbās; this chain was called *silsilat al-kadhib* (chain of lie), al-Suyūṭī, *Itqān*, II, p. 224.

[3] Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat. II, p. 274, no. 1623.

[4] Al-Bukhārī also demanded that the informants be not credulous but able to distinguish 'sound' from 'diseased' ḥadīths, al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 74.

A *'an* B.[1] Contemporaneity of the two informants is proved if there is no doubt about the veracity and reliability of A.; but does the presumption of contemporaneity alone establish the *ittiṣāl* of the *ḥadīth mu'an'an*? Here is the difference of the *sharṭ Muslim* from the *sharṭ al-Bukhārī*. Whereas, according to the 'conditions' of the first, the *ittiṣāl* is presupposed for *aḥadīth mu'an'an*,[2] the latter demands that, before such *mu'an'an* can be put on a level with a correct uninterrupted *isnād*, it should be proved that the two informants known as contemporaries had been in immediate personal contact.[3] Otherwise it could happen that A communicates *bona fide* from ('*an*) B, without having heard the account from him but only through an intermediate person, who is not named.

## XI

The period which, as we have seen, favoured the creation of the *muṣannafāt* also provided Islam with other such collections apart from the two *Ṣaḥīḥs*. We shall discuss them all together because in [249] their contrast to the *Ṣaḥīḥs* they fall into much the same category, and because together with them they form the canonical literature of tradition in Islam. We mean (1) the *Sunan* of Abū Dāwūd from Sijistān (d. 275), (2) the *Jāmi'* of Abū 'Īsā Muḥammad al-Tirmidhī (d. 279); (3) the *Sunan* of Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Nasā'ī (d. 303); and (4) the *Sunan* of Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Māja from Qazwīn (d. 283).[4] As is evident from the dates of their death, the first two were contemporaries of the authors of the two *Ṣaḥīḥs*; Abū Dāwūd, pupil of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal,[5] appears to have written his work independently from them; al-Tirmidhī was a pupil of al-Bukhārī and of Aḥmad—he also studied under Abū Dāwūd—and in his work frequently refers to his teachers and their oral communications.[6]

These works are usually bracketed together as the four *Sunan* though al-Tirmidhī's work may by right be called a *Jāmi'* owing to its contents.[7] By *Sunan* such collections are meant as concern

[1] Risch, p. 29.

[2] *Al-isnād al-mu'an'an laḥu ḥukm al-mawṣūl bi-sami'tu bi-muṣarrad kawn al-mu'an'in wa'l-mu'an'an 'anhu kāna fī'aṣr wāḥid wa'in lam yuthbat ijtimā'uhumā.*

[3] Al-Nawawī, introduction, pp. 10, 20.

[4] [See *EI* s.vv. and *GAL* I, 168, 169, 170, 171, *S* I, 266, 267, 269, 270.]

[5] Abū Dāwūd, I, pp. 20, 42; II, pp. 30, 41.

[6] He cites with preference their critical judgements on their informants: al-Bukhārī is also frequently a direct source from which T. takes ḥadīths, I, pp. 38, 73, 120, 125, 129, 134, 135; II, pp. 72, etc. He always calls him simply Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl while other people of this name are marked by a *nisba*, e.g. M. b. I. al-Wāsiṭī, I, p. 174.

[7] Cf. H. Kh., II, p. 548, bottom.

themselves, to the exclusion of historical, ethical or dogmatical sayings, only with the *sunna*, the law and legal customs, and ḥadīths referring to them, in fact with what is usually called *al-ḥalāl wa'l-ḥarām* (what is allowed or forbidden)[1] or *aḥkām*. These works differ in their contents from the two *Ṣaḥīḥs* only in that they are chiefly concerned with legal traditions.[2] There is, however, an even more
[250] marked difference which they share among themselves in contrast to the two *Ṣaḥīḥs*, in that their *shurūṭ* show a greater liberality; not only as affects their judgement of the inner coherence of *isnāds* but also of individual informants (*rijāl*) occurring in them. Without this liberality it would hardly have been possible to find traditional guidance for all points of legal practice, since, as al-Baghawī so rightly remarked, the largest part of the *aḥkām* does not rest on entirely 'sound' ḥadīths, but also uses 'beautiful' ḥadīths, i.e. at best those of second class.[3]

Whereas those two classics of the science of traditions only admitted those *rijāls* of whose veracity and reliability there was full agreement, and banned from their list all those whose authority might be impugned or doubted in any way, Abū Dāwūd, and his pupil al-Nasā'ī after him, turned this rule into a negative form. They were satisfied with informants as long as they were not unanimously condemned. Ibn Ḥajar, in attempting to interpret the thoughts of these collectors, says that critics of informants were in all periods either extremely rigorous or more tolerant in their judgement. In the first period there are Shu'ba and Sufyān al-Thawrī, the first being even stricter than the second; and in the second period Yaḥyā al-Qaṭṭān was the representative of the strict school and Yaḥyā b. Mahdī representative of the tolerant group; in the third period Yaḥyā b. Mu'īn adhered to rigorous standards, whereas Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal was a more tolerant critic. Finally in the fourth period Abū Ḥātim is even stricter than al-Bukhārī. Al-Nasā'ī then says: 'I do not condemn a tradition until all critics are in agreement about its worthlessness. If Yaḥyā al-Qaṭṭān rejects it but Ibn Mahdī

[1] Cf. Ibn Hishām, II, p. xviii, 4 and note. An example is also found in al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, fol. 38b top [ed. Hyderabad, p. 134] where Ibn 'Uyayna is cited to the effect that from Baqiyya one must not hear *mā kāna fī sunna* but one may hear *mā kāna fī thawāb wa-ghayrihi*, i.e. legal in contrast to ethical and historical ḥadīths. Sunna, in contrast to *zuhd* and *adab*, *Fak. Huff.*, VI, no. 37, see also p. 73 above.

[2] Because agadic and dogmatic ḥadīths are not strictly excluded; to cite but Abū Dāwūd, in II, pp. 168–208, many ḥadīths are collected which do not quite belong to the system of the sunna, e.g. p. 175 about *qadar*; p. 180 *fī khalq al-janna wa'l-nār*; p. 174 has a chapter with the heading *al-dalīl 'alā al-ziyāda wa'l-nuqṣān* on the dogmatic argument whether the terms 'more' or 'less' are applicable to faith.

[3] Introduction to *Maṣābīḥ al-Sunna*; *akthar al-aḥkām thubūtuhā bi-ṭarīq ḥasan*.

accepts it, I accept it, since it is known how strict that theologian was in his judgement.'[1]

But it was the other pupil of Abū Dāwūd, al-Tirmidhī, who chose the most practical point of view of all collectors. He accepts any tradition which is known to have served as proof or argument for a lawyer in legal practice, in other words, every sentence to which at any time reference had been made. If the authors of these collections were more liberal in their acceptance of ḥadīths than the authors of the two *Ṣaḥīḥs*, they had at the same time a further task. It must not be thought that they registered the collected traditions as perfectly equal and indisputable material for Islamic law. At every step—and no page of these collections is without this—we find remarks, added by the collector to the ḥadīth cited, that in the *isnād* one or another of the informants was weak, that improbabilities or impossibilities occur in it in so far as the transmitters mentioned as contemporaries did not live at the same time or could not have been in touch with each other, etc. [251]

A few examples will show the way in which these collectors add their criticism to the collected material:

*Abū Dāwūd*, I, p. 20. This is an objectionable (*munkar*) ḥadīth; nobody has transmitted it but Yazīd al-Dālānī from Qatāda (from Abū'l-'Āliya) . . . Shu'ba said: Qatāda has obtained four ḥadīths from Abū'l-'Āliya[2] . . . Abū Dāwūd says: I have shown the ḥadīth of Yazīd al-Dālānī to Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal but he rebuked me[3] since he considered it as an obvious fake; he said: What does Yazīd al-Dālānī do amongst the companions of Qatāda; he was not concerned about the ḥadīth—p. 107. A.D. says: Ṭāriq b. Shihāb saw the Prophet but heard nothing from him—p. 138. A.D. This ḥadīth is not strong (qawī), Muslim b. Khālid is weak (*ḍa'īf*)—p. 185. A weak informant, both ḥadīths are false (*wahm*)—p. 197, after an *isnād*: *al-Ḥajjāj 'an al-Zuhrī*: This is a weak *ḥadīth*, al-Ḥajjāj never saw al-Zuhrī and never heard from him, Ja'far b. Rabī'a also never saw al-Zuhrī and only corresponded with him—p. 221 (al-Awzā'ī: 'Aṭā: Aws): 'Aṭā' never saw Aws who was one of the warriors at Badr and died early; the ḥadīth is *mursal*.

II, p. 30. A.D. says: This is an objectionable ḥadīth, I have heard that Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal rejected it strongly (*yunkir*

[1] Al-Bajama'wī's introduction to al-Nasā'ī (Cairo, 1299), p. 3.

[2] The four sayings are quoted here but the one in question is not among them.

[3] *Istaharuut isti'ẓāman lahu*, cf. Dozy, s.v. 'azm X. Cf. also from IV: B (ed. Krehl, II, p. 313, 1): *man za'ama anna Muḥammadan ra'ā rabbahu faqad a'ẓama*.

*hādhā'l-ḥadīth inkāran shadīdan*). p. 41. Abū Ṣāliḥ inserted between himself and Abū Hurayra an informant Isḥaq Mawlā Zā'ida. p. 92. This ḥadīth Ja'far never heard from al-Zuhrī; it is objectionable.[1]

[262] Such remarks are even more frequent in the later *Sunan* than in Abū Dāwūd and the critical remarks of the authors of such collections may be regarded as the first literary witnesses of what is called criticism of traditions. We find in al-Tirmidhī for the first time a classification of the traditions which he collected by giving each of them the determination *ṣaḥīḥ*, *ḥasan*, or *ḥasan ṣaḥīḥ*,[2] according to their value.

Whereas, by the limitations which al-Bukhārī and Muslim imposed on themselves by their strict *shurūṭ*, the area of the *ṣaḥīḥ* is much reduced for them, the authors of *Sunan* works acquire large number of traditions which they can utilize in the chapters of legal science. This is most clearly seen when one considers that, while Muslim stressed that he did not even incorporate all the sound ḥadīths but his scruples omitted some material of this kind whose authenticity was not confirmed by the *ijmā'*,[3] the *Sunan* works quote many traditions the weak authority of which they themselves had to attest. Thus whereas the old *muṣannafāt* found it hard to compile sufficient traditions for the chief points of legal life—so that, for example, al-Bukhārī was unable to adduce traditions for some rubrics of his scheme (see above, p. 217)—the second layer of works on tradition shows an attempt to find traditions even for the minutest details of religious laws. This could easily be achieved by authors who showed great tolerance for traditions which they themselves called objectionable or 'weak'. Al-Nasā'ī in particular extended his collections to the finest subtleties of every legal point, and in the ritualistic chapters he exults in pedantry. All *du'ās* (silent prayers) which are to be said between the single *rak'as* are textually quoted.[4] All these different formulae—fourteen texts in one case—are linked
[253] to the authority of the Prophet. He even adduces a great number of

[1] Abū Dāwūd therefore at the repeated examination of his materials did not reintroduce any of these objectionable traditions, e.g., I, p. 91, Abū 'Alī (the editor) says: A.D. did not read this ḥadīth at the fourth *'urḍa*; II, p. 30 the same in respect of the second *'urḍa*, referring to the tradition quoted in the text.

[2] *Taqrīb*, fol. 36b [*naw* 2, transl. *JA*, XVI 1900, pp. 501–2] points out that these determinations were confused in the various Mss. of al-Tirmidhī so that only by collating reliable Mss. (*bimuqābalat aṣlihā bi uṣūl mu'tamada*) can one refer to such determination of traditions by al-Tirmidhī.

[3] Muslim I, p. 10: *laysa kullu shay'in ṣaḥīḥin 'indī waḍa'tuhu hāhunā wa-innamā waḍa'tu hāhunā mā ajma'ū 'alayhi*.

[4] Al-Nasā'ī, I, p. 79, the rules on the Friday—*khuṭba* are given in minutest detail, pp. 124ff.

traditions for the more popular manifestations of religious feeling; see for example the many paragraphs on various *istiʿādhāt*.[1] On the purely legal side it may suffice to mention in this connection that, in the chapters on various contracts, the formulae for promissory notes, dissolution of partnership (*tafarruq al-shurakā*), divorce bills, documents of manumission of slaves (of all three types: *ʿatq, tadbīr, mukātaba*) are alike given *in extenso*.[2] There are probably no older formulae for this type of legal transactions,[3] as in general the written formulation of contracts was only regulated in Islam at a late date (see above, p. 215 note 4). During al-Maʾmūn's times written documents concerning the buying and selling of slaves were not yet generally used.[4]

Since in these works everything that seemed applicable in any way was collected, it is not surprising, considering the nature of the material, that within one and the same chapter the sayings used may contradict one another. In fact these *Sunan* collections frequently quote a series of traditions in which a strict norm is established in conformity in different versions; this is then followed by another flow of opposite traditions in favour of a more lenient practice (*rukhṣa*) in respect of the same legal question. Representatives of the opposing teachings thus had a repertory for their opinions in traditions which presumably originated when these teachings required a traditional support to authenticate them.

Al-Nasāʾī has the advantage of offering us in the diversity of his material some idea of the extent to which the fixing of ritual and legal norms in the schools had grown by the third century and of showing how firmly certain customs, habits, superstitious observances connected with religion, had been established. Al-Tirmidhī on the other hand gives us an opportunity to learn of the divergencies of the *madhāhib* in respect of the most important points of religious practice. Al-Tirmidhī proves to be a true continuator of the tendencies of his teacher al-Bukhārī. Al-Bukhārī as we have seen collected and arranged the ḥadīth from the point of view of his system of *fiqh*; al-Tirmidhī went further than that. He notes down, for each [254]
tradition, which *madhhab* teaching it is intended to support, and what the opposing *madhāhib* could use to counter it. In this respect al-Tirmidhī is one of the oldest, and amongst those available surely the oldest, source for comparative research into the divergencies of orthodox *fiqh* schools,[5] and he must be added as such to the literary

[1] Ibid., II, pp. 245–255.
[2] Ibid., pp. 95–7.
[3] In al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 229, the introduction to a document is given which is made out at the sale of a slave (by the Prophet!).
[4] *Aghānī*, XVIII, p. 181, bottom.
[5] *Cf. ZDMG*, XXVIII, pp. 671ff.

history of this branch of the study of Islam. It should be noticed that in this comparative representation almost no regard is paid to Abū Ḥanīfa. T. often shows himself in his work as an opponent of the Aṣḥāb al-Ra'y, but nowhere more clearly than in the passage where, with reference to a given text, he contrasts the *bid'a* of the advocates of *ra'y* with the sunna by citing Wakī'.[1] The *Sunan* works seek to exhibit the *fiqh* of the Aṣḥab al-Ḥadīth, those *fuqahā'*—as al-Tirmidhī himself says on one occasion—that best understand the sense (i.e. the application) of ḥadīths.[2]

## XII

We must anticipate here the historical development of the literature of tradition in order to describe, for the sake of gaining a better understanding of the position and influence of the works on tradition so far mentioned in the religious and scholarly life of Islam, the high rank accorded to the *muṣannafāt* characterized in the preceding sections.

The two *Ṣaḥīḥs* occupy a quite exceptional place. When they first appeared the two works had to compete for first place in public preference, and in different provinces and circles of Islam sometimes the one and sometimes the other of the almost contemporary works were preferred. Muslim was praised (the Maghribīs showed an inclination to this) for his better arrangement, al-Bukhārī for his greater care over his *shurūṭ* and perhaps also the greater usefulness of his work for practical purposes. Public opinion eventually declared for the pre-eminence of al-Bukhārī. In the fourth century the Khurāsānī Shāfi'ite Abū Zayd al-Marwazī (d. 371) makes the Prophet in a dream vision in Mecca expressly call the *Jāmi'* of Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl (al-Bukhārī)[3] *his* book, and with the passing of time this veneration increased to such an extent that al-Bukhārī became almost a hallowed person in Islam. Pilgrimages were made to his grave in order to gain help in difficulties, his *Ṣaḥīḥ* became a
[255] sacred or at any rate privileged book[4] on which—especially in North African Islam[5]—people swore as otherwise only on the Koran.[6]

[1] Al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 171, 20.

[2] Ibid, p. 183, 5: *al-fuqahā' wa-hum a'lam bi-ma'ānī al-ḥadīth.*

[3] *Taʾrīkh*, p. 720, bottom.

[4] Special prayers are prescribed for the completion of the reading of this book which, like the *khatma* of the Koran, is customary on solemn occasions: *duʿāʾ khatm al-Bukhārī*, Cairo Cat. II, p. 135, 17.

[5] Walsin Esterhazy, *De la domination turque dans l'ancienne régence d'Alger* (Paris, 1840), pp. 213, 222 [cf. also the references in *G.A.L.S* I, 261].

[6] The oath on the *muṣḥaf* itself only became usual in later times. It is not found in old formulae of oaths which occur in abundance in historical writings. The oldest available reference is that al-Shāfi'ī mentions the usage of pro-

People read it in times of tribulation in the hope of finding deliverance from their difficulties; they believe that a ship which has it on board is safe from sinking, etc.[1] Though Muslim's book was never thus honoured and though no superstitions regarding special privileges became attached to it, both books are counted equal as sources of law and are collectively referred to as *al-Ṣaḥīḥān*. At first the *Sunan* work of Abū Dāwūd, which appeared simultaneously with the two *Ṣaḥīḥs*, might have been a serious rival. The author appears himself to have been the first to trumpet forth its fame, extolling the virtues of his book. A letter exists[2] which A.D. addressed to the theologians in Mecca in order to characterize the critical principles of his collection and explain the points of view which he followed in his choice. In this epistle he says: 'I know no book, apart from the Koran, which it is as necessary for men to study as is this book. Likewise no one need acquire any book in addition to this. He who reads and studies the book and endeavours to assimilate its contents thoroughly will grow to understand its value.'[3] This judgement of his own achievement[4] is echoed by younger contemporaries and later successors who already had the [256] two *Ṣaḥīḥs* at their disposal. His pupil Zakariyyā al-Sājī (d. 306) says: 'The Book of God is the foundation of Islam and the *Sunan* book of Abū Dāwūd is the supporting pillar.'[5] Even more extravagant is al-Khaṭṭābī from Ceuta[6] (d. 388). He says: 'Know that this is a noble book, the like of which does not exist in the field of religious law. It was accepted by the people and became the arbiter between opposing parties, and schools of scholars and lawyers. Islamic science in 'Irāq, Egypt and the Maghrib, and many other regions of the world is founded upon it. Before Abū Dāwūd people wrote *jāmi'*s and *musnads* and the like; these books contain, apart from the sunna and the law, tales, accounts and exhortations and material relating to good habits. But, as regards the mere *Sunan*, none of Abū Dāwūd's predecessors collected them and put them together

[1] Ḥ. Kh., II, p. 520, 2.

[2] The same is also cited by Ibn Khaldūn, *Muqaddima*, p. 261, 8: *fī risālatihi al-mashhūra*.

[3] *Mukhtaṣar* of the commentary of al-Suyūṭī (Cairo, 1298), p. 3.

[4] Al-Tirmidhī is also said to have recommended his own book in similarly boastful terms: 'He who has this book in his house is in the same position as if he had harboured a real prophet.' Ḥ. Kh., II, p. 548, bottom.

[5] *Ṭab. Huff.*, IX, no. 66.

[6] [Al-Khaṭṭābī is not from Ceuta, but Bust in Sijistān; the error is no doubt due to the similarity in Arabic script of al-Bustī and al-Sabtī.]

vincial judges (*ḥukkām al-āfāq*) who administer the oath *'alā'l-muṣḥaf*. Reference to a similar action by Ibn al-Zubayr can hardly be considered, Ibn Khallikān, no. 732, ed. Wüstenfeld, VIII, p. 106, cf. Usāma b. Munqidh, ed. Derenbourg, p. 18, 14: *ma'staḥlafahum bi'l-muṣḥaf wa'l-ṭalāq*.

so completely and nobody was able to offer them so concisely from so many extensive traditions as Abū Dāwūd intended to do and in fact did. Therefore his book is regarded as a wonder of the world by the greatest authorities of the science of tradition,[1] and therefore long journeys were undertaken in order to study it.'[2] Abū Dāwūd's work did not however succeed in gaining preference over the two *Ṣaḥīḥs* in the eyes of the public.

It would be wrong to think that the canonical authority of the two *Ṣaḥīḥs* is due to the undisputed correctness of their contents and is the result of scholarly investigations. The authority of these books has a popular basis and holds good in spite of the free scrutiny of individual paragraphs. Nor does it refer to an indisputable correctness of the contents (the details of which may always be and have been, the subject of criticism), but to the obligation to consider the contents of the *Ṣaḥīḥs* as authoritative in religious praxis (*al-'amal*).[3] The popular basis for this authority is the *ijmā' al-umma*, the unanimous collective consciousness of the Islamic community (*talaqqī al-umma bi'l-qubūl*), which elevated these works to the heights which they attained.[4] Despite this general recognition of the
[257] *Ṣaḥīḥān* in Islam, the veneration never went so far as to cause free criticism of the sayings and remarks incorporated in the collections to be considered impermissible or unseemly.

There is quite a body of literature of criticism against the *Ṣaḥīḥs*. Abū' l-Ḥasan 'Alī al-Dāraquṭnī (d. 385) wrote a book, *Criticism and Investigation* (*al-Istidrākāt wa'l-Tatabbu'*), in which weaknesses of two hundred traditions incorporated in the *Ṣaḥīḥs* are proved. Free utterance of critical doubts concerning some passages of the canonical collections of traditions is very common. We have already seen (p. 104) an example of what ruthless expressions pious and reverent theologians use to condemn a ḥadīth accepted by al-Bukhārī. Whereas this was concerned with a question of no importance for religious practice, we can point to a ritualistic ḥadīth in al-Bukhārī[5] which through mediation of al-Awzā'ī is referred back to a Companion ('Amr b. Umayya). Al-Aṣīlī, *qāḍī* of Saragossa (d. 390), says of this ḥadīth that it is an erroneous report which is not mentioned at all by reliable informants.[6] It is less surprising that philosophers like

[1] *ǧalla*, instead of *jalla* of the edition.
[2] *Taḥdhīb*, pp. 710, 712.
[3] Ibid., p. 95, 1.
[4] Cf. esp. al-Nawawī, introduction, pp. 13ff, Ibn Khaldūn, *Muqaddima*, p. 371.
[5] *Wuḍū'*; no. 30 (ed. Krehl, 49); this concerns a report whereby the Prophet recognized the use of a head-cover as substitute for head washing, as is usual in the case of *masḥ al-khuffayn*. The Ḥanbalite rite recognizes the practical validity of this; al-Ṣafadī, *Ḥasmat al-Umma*, p. 8.
[6] Al-Qasṭallānī, I, p. 325.

the Ash'arite al-Bāqillānī, followed in this by Imām al-Ḥaramayn, al-Juwaynī, and al-Ghazālī, reject a ḥadīth recorded by al-Bukhārī[1] and label it as untrue.[2] This free attitude towards the contents of the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* lasts right into the time when veneration of it, particularly of the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of al-Bukhārī, exceeded by far the reverence shown to the other highly respected works. Ibn al-Mulaqqin (d. 804) did not hesitate to remark of a passage in al-Bukhārī:[3] 'This is a strange saying; if al-Bukhārī had spared his book this, it might have been better,'[4] nor was any pious person likely to take umbrage of such language. Veneration was directed to this canonic work as a whole but not to its individual lines and paragraphs. This reverence had its root in the *ijmā' al-umma*[5] and it is very characteristic of the [256]
authority of the *ijmā'* that orthodox theology also asked for recognition by the *ijmā'* in regard to details of this work before accepting them as sound. 'The shaykh (i.e. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, d. 643) teaches that what is transmitted by both or one of them is absolutely right (*maqṭū' bi-ṣiḥḥatihi*) and that apodictic knowledge (*al-'ilm al-qaṭ'ī*) follows from it. But seekers for the truth, and most scholars, contradict him in this respect and say that only presumed knowledge (*al-ẓann*) is involved as long as its recognition is not confirmed by the *tawātur* (uninterrupted recognition by all generations).'[6] These words by al-Nawawī[7] characterize the point of view of Islamic orthodox theology towards these highly esteemed works, whose absolute unimpugnability men attempted to establish as law, as can be seen from this citation.

## XIII

The veneration of Muslims extends, in addition to the two *Ṣaḥīḥs*, also to the above-mentioned four *Sunan* books. Under the name *al-kutub al-sitta*, 'the six books', they comprise the canonical ḥadīth literature and as such form the main sources for traditional law. It is likely that in the days when general need produced these six books other similar books were written. But these could not establish themselves in use, or if they continued to circulate they did not attain the same authority. This last statement is true, e.g. of the *Sunan* work of Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh al-Dārimī al-Samarqandī (d. 255), which is also called *Musnad al-Dārimī*[8] in the ex-

[1] *Tafsīr*, no. 115, to Sūra 9:81.
[2] Al-Qasṭallānī, VII, p. 173.
[3] *Nihāya*, no. 24.
[4] Al-Qasṭallānī, VIII, p. 40.
[5] Cf. Ibn Khaldūn, *Muqaddima*, p. 260, 5 from below.
[6] Cf. Schreiner *ZDMG.*, XLII pp. 630ff.
[7] *Taqrīb*, fol. 36a [*naw* 1, transl. *JA.* XVI (1900), pp. 493–4].
[8] *Abū'l-Maḥāsin*, II, p. 23, 4, 6 from below. [For al-Dārimī cf. *GALS* I, p. 270.]

tended sense of *Musnad* discussed above, p. 213. This is a book that by its plan and tendency belongs completely to the series of those *Sunan* works which we discussed before (p. 229), the only difference being that al-Dārimī, who was also concerned primarily with promoting legal knowledge in accord with the views of the Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth, endeavoured to foster this tendency by premising a few general chapters on traditions and the science of traditions in which he adduces arguments for the defence of his views.[1] In accepting ḥadīths al-Dārimī also did not keep to the strictest 'conditions' which guided his contemporaries, the authors of the *Ṣaḥīḥs*, but like the authors of other *Sunan* works he added a criticism of the degree of their credibility.[2] In the subjective use which he makes of the ḥadīths he recalls al-Bukhārī, as also because he often appears in the role of guide for the practical use to be made of the ḥadīths.[3] The glosses to the various traditions frequently contain the remark that the law expressed there is not obligatory but merely facultative;[4] in this case he usually says *huwa al-adab* or *laysa bi-wājib* or words to this effect.[5] Such remarks he probably made orally to his hearers when he taught them his book. This is borne out by the often repeated gloss in al-Dārimī's *Sunan*: Abū Muḥammad or 'Abd Allāh. (i.e. the author) was asked: 'Do you observe (in legal practice) this ḥadīth (*taqūl bihī* or *ta'khudh bihī*)?' To this he occasionally answers in the affirmative[6] but often also in the negative[7] or evasively: e.g. *qawm yaqūlūna*, 'there are people who observe it.'[8] In the same manner he points out for single ḥadīths the differences concerning them between Ahl al-'Irāq and Ahl al-Ḥijāz or other groups.[9] Like other authors of *Sunan* he quotes the contrasting ḥadīths[10] and makes his own decision—often quite independently and in contradiction of recognized authorities—for or against them: 'Abū Muḥammad (the author) says: "Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal has declared the ḥadīth of 'Amr b. Murra correct, but I decide for the ḥadīth of Yazīd b. Ziyād." '[11]

[289]

[1] Ed. Cawnpore pp. 1–87.

[2] Al-Dārimī, p. 60, Jarīr'an'Aṭīm: I do not think that J. heard this from 'Ā.; p. 91: 'Abd al-Karīm is similar to *matrūk*; p. 359: 'Uthmān b. Sa'd is *ḍa'īf*. Often he himself points out that informants of the *isnād* chain were not in communication, pp. 315, 331, 358. He draws attention to differences in the *isnād* and sometimes corrects its errors or discusses its uncertainties, pp. 261, 265, 326, 338, 432.

[3] Ibid. p. 90: *fa-dalla fī'l rasūl Allāh* etc., cf. pp. 253, 255, 262, 266.

[4] *Zāhiriten*, pp. 70ff.

[5] Al-Dārimī, pp. 90, 91, 284.

[6] Ibid., pp. 114, 196, 197, 230, 250, 254, 351, *fa'awma'a bi-ra'sihī*, p. 349.

[7] Ibid., p. 11, 98, 116, 156.

[8] Ibid., pp. 342, or he said *lā adrī*, p. 101.

[9] Ibid., pp. 118, 244.

[10] Ibid., Esp. p. 177 gives an example of this.

[11] Ibid., pp. 152.

It would be very difficult and also useless for our purpose to try to understand today the taste of oriental theologians in order to find out why the *Sunan al-Dārimī* did not find the same esteem as the other four *Sunan* works. It is likely that part of the explanation [260] for this neglect is to be sought in the fact that, owing to hesitant attitude of the author towards his material—as we have seen from the points illustrated for this purpose—the work was more suited to become a source for the opinions of his time than an authoritative *codex traditionum*. A further factor is that the codex of al-Dārimī is less exhaustive and offers little of the minute details which Abū Dāwūd and al-Nasā'ī supply. Although its bulk is hardly a full third of that of other *Sunan* works, this codex deals also with the non-legal chapters of the ḥadīth[1]—that is why it is occasionally called *Jāmi'* (see above, p. 213)[2]—and from this the limited size of the part concerned with the large field of law can be deduced. Thus the limitation of the material, as well as the plan of the book, are likely to have contributed to the fact that al-Dārimī's book was, in contrast to the works of his younger contemporaries, neglected and not put by the *ijmā'* of the Islamic world on the same level as those authorities.

At least the *Sunan al-Dārimī* were not forgotten; they were studied and much cited, and even in modern times it was felt necessary to publish an edition of these *Sunan*. At the period of the *muṣannafāt*, however, there appeared books which were completely ousted by the influence that the 'six books' obtained in the Islamic world, and which were totally forgotten and not taken account of, even in learned circles, unlike al-Dārimī's. To mention but one example: at that time a traditionist of Christian descent[3] trained in oriental Islam named Baqī b. Makhlad al-Qurṭubī (d. 276) in al-Andalus composed a *muṣannaf* of a particular type. His work is at the same time a *muṣannaf* as well as a *musnad*, or rather an attempt at a transition from the latter to the former. *Isnād* authorities are, as with Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, the starting point (he mentions no less than 1300 Companions)[4] but the traditions of each of these authorities are arranged according to the chapters of the law.[5] It is not surprising that such a collection was superseded by the more practical 'six [261] books', even in its homeland. Another reason for its lack of success was possibly that Baqī had no good reputation with his colleagues, owing to his independent attitude in the theological issues of his

[1] Ibid., e.g. the introductory chapter, further pp. 272ff., 363ff., 422ff.,

[2] Thus the title of the Leiden Ms. of al-Dārimī is: *K. al-Musnad al-Jāmi'*, *Cat. Lugd. Batav.*, IV, p. 49.

[3] Cf. Dozy, *ZDMG*, XX, p. 598.

[4] From Abū Hurayra he has 5374 traditions, al-Nawawī, I, p. 37.

[5] Ibn Bashkuwāl, no. 227, p. 516.

times; like every independent thinker he suffered a great deal from the theological clique.[1] It seems that for a short time his work was studied: Ibn Akhī Rāfi' (d. 318) wrote a compendium of it[2] and, probably following this example, Abū' l-'Abbās al-Nīsābūrī (d. 313), Abū Isḥāq al-Iṣfahānī (d. 353) and al-'Assāl (d. 349) compiled *musnad* collections which were arranged according to the contents.[3]

Of all the literary products of the third century belonging to this group, only the 'six books' achieved canonical recognition. These books are used as reference in order to find out the traditional teaching about a given question. If in the field of tradition one speaks of *muṣannifīn* and *muṣannafāt* one has the two *Ṣaḥīḥs* and those *Sunan* works and respectively, their authors in mind. Al-Nawawī writes for example in connection with the decision about a ritual question: *huwa ṣaḥīḥ fī madhhab al-Shāfi'ī bi-'ttifāq al-muṣannifīn*, i.e. 'this is right according to the school teaching of al-Shāfi'ī in agreement with the authors'—after having referred to al-Bukhārī, Abū Dāwūd and al-Tirmidhī.[4]

We cannot establish with chronological accuracy the date which brought the *concensus publicus* for the two *Ṣaḥīḥs* to maturity or the date when the favour of the *ijmā'* was extended to the 'six books'. Nevertheless we think that for answering the second question there are two data, a positive and a negative one, which may be used as chronological starting points: Firstly, that the general recognition of the 'six books' had not yet prevailed in the first half of the fourth century. This is evident from the fact that Sa'īd ibn al-Sakan (d. in Egypt 353), who was of great theological renown (he was called *al-ḥujja*, 'the proof'), when asked to point out the most important
[262] things in the accumulated mass of religious literature, brought four bundles from his house saying 'these are the foundations of Islam: the book of al-Bukhārī, that of Muslim, of Abū Dāwūd and Nasā'ī.'[5] Thus there was a tendency even at that time to extend the circle of canonical collections of traditions beyond the two *Ṣaḥīḥs*, but it did not yet include all the 'six books'. Secondly, that at the end of the fifth or beginning of the sixth century al-Tirmidhī and Ibn Māja were already included in this group. Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456) still had some doubts about al-Tirmidhī. Doubts were maintained longest about Ibn Māja because of the many weak (*ḍa'īf*) traditions which he incorporated into his *corpus traditionum*. About that time the

[1] *K. al-Bayān al-Mughrib*, II, pp. 112 f. [Cf. also *GAL S* I, p. 271.]
[2] *Ṭab. Huff.*, XII, no. 11.
[3] *ṣannafa al-musnad 'alā'l-tarājim*, ibid., no. 25; *al-musnad 'alā'l-abwāb*, ibid., no. 4; Ḥ. Kh., V, p. 334, no. 11997.
[4] *Manāsikāt*, fol. 8a.
[5] *Ṭab. Huff.*, XII, no. 38.

first attempts are made to award recognition for these two collections, which up to then had not been considered as fully valid. Such attempts were made, however, in isolation and there are signs that doubts about Ibn Māja remained alive for yet another century. The Spanish scholar Razīn b. Mu'āwiya from Saragossa who lived in Mecca (d. 535) wrote a compendium of the six *ṣaḥīḥ* books[1] but Ibn Māja was not used as a source for his work; the author used the *Muwaṭṭa'*, in addition to the five books. Also Muḥammad 'Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Azdī, called Ibn al-Kharrāṭ, from Seville (d. 581) allotted no place to Ibn Māja among the sources of his compilation *al-Aḥkām al-Kubrā*, which he based on the recognized canonical collections.[2] Muḥammad b. Abī 'Uthmān al-Ḥāzimī from Hamadān (d. 584) only knows *al-a'imma al-khamsa*.[3] The attempt to gain a place amongst the canonical authorities for Ibn Māja had already been made at that time; it was instigated by Abū'l-Faḍl Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir al-Maqdisī (d. 507)[4] but met with only partial success. Whereas the summarizing works of that time which we have just mentioned do not yet consider Ibn Māja, and the strict 'Irāqī scholar Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597) does not, even much later in his *Musnad Collector* [263] (*Jāmi' al-Masānīd*),[5] take into account suggestions since made for the recognition of certain traditions, we learn from al-Baghawī (d. 516) that he did take notice of Ibn Māja among the sources of his famous compilation *Maṣābīḥ al-Sunna*, also called *Maṣābīḥ al-Dujā*,[6] and even included among his authorities al-Dārimī. A further attempt to give a firm position to Ibn Māja in canonical literature was made some decades later by 'Abd al-Ghanī al-Jammā'īlī (d. 600)[7] in his work *al-Ikmāl*, or more correctly *al-Kamāl fī Ma'rifat al-Rijāl*,[8] where the authorities of the 'six books' are considered. This renewed attempt at making the *Sunan* of Ibn Māja equal to the canonical writings appears to have met with greater success than the preceding ones. This is shown by the fact that subsequently the 'six books' are generally given consideration in literature. Ibn al-Najjār (d. 643) subsumes the *rijāl al-kutub al-sitta* under a uniform

[1] Ḥ. Kh., II, p. 129; III, p. 132. *tajrīd al-ṣiḥāḥ al-sitta*. The book of Razīn is much used by the author of the *Madkhal*.

[2] Cat. ar. Br. Mus., p. 712b, no. 1574; cf. al-Kutubī, *Fawāt al-Wafayāt*, I, p. 248.

[3] In Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat. II, p. 40, no. 1141, 13.

[4] *Tab. Ḥuff.*, XV, no. 21 mentions a Ẓāhirite; cf. *Ẓāhiriten*, p. 118, note, 4. For the incorporation of Ibn Māja: preface to al-Dārimī, p. 7 (after Ibn Ḥajar), Ḥ. Kh., V, p. 175, 1, Ahlwardt, op. cit., p. 95, no. 1254; for Abū'l-Faḍl cf. also Yāqūt, IV, p. 602, top.

[5] He speaks this himself in his book *K. al-Quṣṣāṣ wa'l-Mudhakkirīn*, fol. 179; cf. Cat. of the Leiden Library, IV, p. 320, 1.

[6] Loth, *Cat. Ind. Off.*, p. 35, no. 49.

[7] Al-Bajma'wī, *Ajlā Masānīd*, p. 30, 3ff.; about this work see above, p. 180.

[8] Yāqūt, II, p. 113, 17.

category.[1] Ibn Taymiyya (d. 652) bases his *al-Muntaqā fi'l-Aḥkām*[2] on the 'six books', including Ibn Māja,[3] Najīb al-Dīn ibn al-Ṣayqal (d. 672) collects the ḥadīths of those *rijāl* who are quoted as authorities by the 'six *imāms*'.[4] Likewise Shams al-Dīn al-Jazarī (d. 711) is a summarizing work of his acknowledges Ibn Māja as an undisputed authority together with the authors of the other five books.[5] Yūsuf al-Mizzī (d. 742) also treats the *aṭrāf al-kutub al-sitta* together.[6] We may therefore conclude that the bracketing together of the 'six books', as it is still recognized in Islam today, penetrated the collective consciousness of Muslim theologians in the seventh century.

Despite the fact that from now on these works were considered as the most important sources for religious teaching, public opinion
[264] still put the two *Ṣaḥīḥs* on a higher plane than the other four books. The two always eclipse the others, as is evidenced by the literary habit of speaking, al-Bukhārī and Muslim apart, of the 'four' (*al-arba'a*) as a special group.[7] The two remain *al-Shaykhān* par excellence,[8] to whom a special position is allotted amongst the *al-a'imma al-sitta*[9] with whom they are bracketed together for practical purposes.

Though the recognition of the 'six books' as a canon took place in the course of the seventh century, in a large part of the Islamic world it would nevertheless be wrong to say their canonical importance, as it exists later and up to the present day, was generally admitted from the beginning. It must be taken into account that the endeavours which originated in Syria only gradually reached the whole of the Muslim theological world and that these endeavours at first had their basis merely in the individual judgements of particular scholars. There always remained independent minds who did not allow themselves to be influenced by the lumping together of the 'six books' but who further nourished the scruples against Ibn Māja which had existed earlier, and did not wish to accept equal recognition of this book and the other *Sunan* works. This explains the fact that in the seventh century Abū 'Amr 'Uthmān ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (d. 643), the

[1] Ḥ. Kh., I, p. 290, 1.

[2] *Cat. ar. Br. Mus.*, p. 540b, no. 1192.

[3] This work has another title: *al-M. fi'l-Akhbār*, this is the title in the printed edition, Būlāq, in seven vols., *Annual report DMG*, 1879, p. 148, no. 75.

[4] Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat. II, p. 258, no. 1577.

[5] Ḥ. Kh., V, p. 175.

[6] Ahlwardt, l.c., p. 175, no. 1375.

[7] *Tab. Huff.*, VIII, nos. 76, 92, 100; IX, no. 50; *al-Bukhārī wa'l-arba'a* or *Muslim wa'l-arba'a*, ibid., nos. 2, 14, 53, al-Kutubī, I, p. 209, penult. If in *Tab. Huff.*, VIII, no. 103, IX, no. 11 *al-a'immat al-khamsa* is spoken of, this means al-Bukhārī plus *al-arba'a*.

[8] Ibid., VIII, no. 61.

[9] Ibid., nos. 77, 90, 95, 96, 99, 104, 105, 114, 119.

author of the isagogical work *'Ulūm al-Ḥadīth*,[1] speaks of five basic works, excluding Ibn Māja,[2] and that al-Nawawī after him (d. 676), who edited the work of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, just mentioned, and used it copiously also in his other works, only recognizes 'five books' (*al-kutub al-khamsa*) and expressly places the *Sunan* of Ibn Māja on the same plane as the *Musnad* of Ibn Ḥanbal.[3] Even later authorities, who wished to keep to the number six, substituted Mālik's *Muwaṭṭa'* or al-Dārimī's *Musnad* for Ibn Māja.[4] As late as the eighth century, [288] at the time of the writing of the *Mishkāt al-Maṣābīḥ* by Sheikh Walī al-Dīn Abū 'Abd Allāh (d. 737), this uncertainty about the 'sixth of the six books' is stated, but the author of this compilation decided in favour of Ibn Māja,[5] whereas Ibn Khaldūn (d. 808) only speaks of *al-ummahāt al-khams*, i.e. the five basic works, without even mentioning Ibn Māja by name.[6] The attempt to show reverence to Mālik and his work by adding it as a seventh to the canonical 'six books' and reference to *al-kutub al-sab'a al-ḥadīthiyya*, seem of a more recent date.[7]

## XIV

It cannot be overlooked that the canonical bracketing together of the 'six books' was the work of eastern Islam. In the Maghrib, at the time when this view took hold in the East, an even more extensive recognition of the tradition literature which had greatly grown in the meantime—see next section—established itself. Here, towards the end of the sixth century, there is talk of *al-muṣannafāt al-'ashara*, the ten *muṣannaf* works, as of one closed canon. These are the ten works which, according to the account of the contemporary 'Abd al-Wāḥid al-Marrākushī, the third Almohad prince, Abū Yūsuf Ya'qūb, made the basis of a compilation which he appointed as the law book of his empire after eliminating all derived *fiqh* works (*furū'*).[8] Apart from the five books it contains: (6) the *Muwaṭṭa'*, (7) the *Sunan* of al-Bazzār (d. 440), (8) the *Musnad* of Ibn Abī Shayba (d. 264), (9) the *Sunan* of al-Dāraquṭnī (d. 385) and finally

[1] See above, p. 175.

[2] *Taqrīb*, fol. 35a [*naw.* 1, transl. *JA*, XVI (1900), p. 485], Ḥ. Kh.' V, p. 174ult.

[3] Introduction to Muslim, I, pp. 5, 70; cf. Fleischer *Leip. Cat.*, p. 485b, bottom; Loth's *Cat. Ind. Off.*, p. 862, top.

[4] In Salisbury, p. 137, Risch, p. 38, top.

[5] Harrington, 'Remarks upon the authorities of Musulman Law,' *Asiatic Researches*, X, (Calcutta, 1808), p. 477, note.

[6] *Muqaddima*, p. 370, 8.

[7] 'Abd al-Ghanī al-Nābulusī, *ZDMG*, XVI, p. 666, no. 58 (cf. ibid, no. 50: *al-kutub al-sitta wa-Muwaṭṭa' Mālik*). The modern Muslim writer al-Bajama'ī also groups together *al-uṣūl al-sab'a* in this sense, *Masānid*, p. 14.

[8] *History of the Almohades*, ed. Dozy, 2nd ed., p. 202.

(10) the *Sunan* of al-Bayhaqī (d. 458). The *Sunan* of Ibn Māja is not included. That, in the Maghrib, the canonical sanctioning of the 'ten books' was generally accepted in Abū Yūsuf's time is seen from the fact that the Andalusian scholar Abū'l-'Abbās Aḥmad ibn Ma'add[1] al-Tujībī from Iqlīsh (d. about 550) based his work on the
[266] 'famous collections, i.e. the ten books'; but instead of al-Bayhaqī he used the work of 'Alī b. 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Baghawī.[2] But in the Mashriq also they did not stop at the canon of six books after the seventh century. The 'six books' were generally recognized as the chief works of ḥadīth but with the reverence paid to the *'Ulamā' al-umma* it would have been considered as an injustice not to award part of the honour accorded to the *muṣannafāt* of the third century to the old *musnads* which until now had not had a fair share of it. Whereas, in the Maghrib, the canonization of the ten books was due to an endeavour to find the best sources for practical law, in the East it was merely the result of the effort to rehabilitate, at least in a literary sense, the venerated authorities of the past whose works were not considered within the *sitta*, also for practical reasons. Therefore this canon of ten books did not gain established authority in the East as it did under official sponsorship in the West. The selection of the ten works is also not unalterably fixed but left to subjective inclinations. Here they are not met with before the eighth century. At that time the traditionist Shams al-Dīn al-Ḥusaynī from Damascus (d. 765) wrote a book entitled *al-Tadkhira fī Rijāl al-'Ashara*, in which all the informants occurring in the *isnāds* of the 'ten books' were to be dealt with in the same way as earlier literature on traditions had occupied itself with the treatment of the *rijāl* of the two *Ṣaḥīḥs*, and later with the *rijāl al-kutub al-sitta*.[3] The ten books here are chosen quite arbitrarily and comprise in addition to the six books: (7) the *Muwaṭṭa'*, (8) *al-Musnad* (perhaps that of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal?), (9) the *Musnad* of al-Shāfi'ī, (10) that of Abū Ḥanīfa.' The well-known Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī also summarized 'ten books[4] in one of his works, *'Aṭrāf al-Kutub al-'Ashara wa'l-Musnad al-Ḥanbalī*.'[5] *Aṭrāf* means the beginning and end of the *isnāds*, the companion to whom the tradition is related back and the most
[267] recent authority who transmits it. Since 'ten books and the *Musnad* of Ibn Ḥanbal' are referred to here rather than eleven books, it must be presumed that the ten refers to a number of ḥadīth works that in some way belong together.

[1] In Yāqūt, I, p. 339, 8, *Ma'rūf*.

[2] *Cat. Lugd. Batav.*, 2nd ed., I, p. 211 = 1st ed., IV, p. 76; cf. also p. 101, Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat. II, p. 123, no. 1298.

[3] *Tab. Huff.*, XXI, no. 9, al-Dhahabī.

[4] Ibid., XXII, no. 8. The combination (of the six books?) is unintelligible; ibid., XXIV, no. 10.

[5] Ibid., no. 12.

XV

The apogee of Islamic literature was of very short duration. Its fresh immediacy decayed as quickly as it had developed in all its branches from its beginning into astonishing richness, giving way to dry and lifeless compilation. A few great writers who stand out as exceptions show up the general level of intellectual production even more. In the fifth century of Islam, the literature, especially in the religious field—al-Ghazālī is the last author with independent ideas—shows few original concepts or independent attitudes; compilation and writing of commentaries and glosses is in full swing. Several old books are worked into a new one or a large work is epitomized (*mukhtaṣar*); this characterizes with but few exceptions the literary activity of the subsequent era.

When an Arab critic points to the tenth century as the period in which there are hardly any more authors but merely copyists[1] he is too lenient towards the preceding five hundred years. Al-Muqaddasī (fourth century) was already able to say that some of his predecessors were but compilators and to consider himself as a laudable exception to the general trend of literary work by mentioning as a particularity of his book that offered only new, hitherto unheard of, material.[2] Compilation increases gradually, passing through different stages up to al-Suyūṭī (d. 911), who represents the peak of the later Islamic literature,[3] and this development shows a steadily decreasing original productivity and an increase in the most superficial kind of book making which can hardly be distinguished from plagiarism. Even a relatively early writer, al-Ḥuṣrī (fifth century), is a real literary magpie and confesses to the principle: 'In compiling my book I claim no more glory than that of the best selection, since selecting is part of one's intelligence.'[4] In the tenth century a historical writer characterizes the literary circumstances of his time with the words: 'Authorship nowadays is but collecting what is scattered and glueing together what has crumbled.'[5] In the course of this literary decay it came to this, that even the loose stringing together of gleanings without any guiding principle—as for example in the *Kulliyyāt* of Abū'l-Baqā' or the *Safīnat al-Rāghib* [268]

[1] 'Umār b. Maymūn al-Maghribī, *ZDMG*, XXVIII, p. 318.

[2] Al-Muqaddasī, ed. de Goeje, p. 241.

[3] Al-Sakhāwī (in Meursinge, *Ṭab. al-Mufassirīn*, p. 22, 10) has correctly characterized the plagiarism of this writer, for whose compilations we must nevertheless be grateful since they preserved many remains of lost and rare books. Yet it is al-Suyūṭī who wrote a *maqāma* on 'the difference between author and plagiarist' (*Cat. ar. Lugd. Batav.*, I, p. 237. In the lithographed edition of al-Suyūṭī's *maqāmas* s.l., 1275) this is not included.

[4] *Zahr al-Ādāb*, I, p. 4.

[5] Ibn Ẓuhayra, *Crom. Mekk.*, II, p. 328, penult.

(Būlāq, 1253)—was called literature and the collector was the more highly praised the more volumes he filled with his collectanea. The collectanea of Bahā' al-Dīn al-'Āmilī—which are so relished by orientals[1]—are overshadowed by similar works which were written earlier. The Andalusian historian Abū'l-Ḥasan b. Sa'īd, who is well known to readers of al-Maqqarī, wrote under the name of *Marzama*[2] a collection of belletristic and historical notes, the volume of which is said to be a camel load.[3]

Oriental authors always accepted much latitude in respect of literary ownership. An index of plagiarists would contain many important names. This bad custom began early in Islamic literature.[4] We have shown elsewhere in detail how piratical was the behaviour of, for example, al-Tha'ālibī (d. 430).[5] In the seventh century 'Imād
[269] al-Dīn b. al-Athīr simply copied the historical commentary of Ibn Badrūn and passed the work off as his own without even mentioning the true author.[6] Without giving it much thought 'Umar b. al-Mulaqqin plagiarized in the eighth century: a biographer reports that the largest part of his three hundred works were thefts from other authors.[7] That the famous al-Maqrīzī had few scruples in this respect we learn, in regard to his great historical book, from the biography of al-Sakhāwī, who accuses him of having simply made his own the work of his predecessor (al-Awḥadī),[8] and this accusation appears more credible when it is known that the same al-Maqrīzī coped Ibn Ḥazm literally without even once mentioning him.[9]

The science of tradition also was past its prime with its first classics. With the closing of that literature which we have just described as the canonical one, boundless compilation began to gain ground. It is true that ḥadīth literature in its very nature could be little else but the fruit of collection and compilation. But it has been evident from what has gone before that the independence of the classical collectors is seen in their following their own principles

[1] *Literaturgesch. der Shī'a* p. 27.

[2] Bundel. Collectors loved such titles for their works. Bahā' al-Dīn calls one of his works 'nosegay' (*mikhlāt*).

[3] Al-Maqqarī, I, p. 640. A collection of fabulous extent is mentioned by Ṭāshköprüzade in his history of Ottoman scholars, *al-Shaqā'iq al-Nu'māniyya* (Ms. Kaiser. Hofbibliothek, Vienna, H.O., no. 122), I, fol. 105a. The author is Mawlānā Mu'ayyad-zāde, beginning of the tenth century.

[4] Al-Mas'ūdī accuses Ibn Qutayba of stealing the contents of the work *al-Akhbār al-Ṭiwāl* (ed. Guirgass) and claiming it as his own, H. Kh., II, p. 105.

[5] *Geschichte der Sprachgelehrsamkeit*, III, pp. 29ff.

[6] Dozy, *Commentaire historique sur le poème d'Ibn Abdoun*, introduction, p. 31.

[7] Al-Sakhāwī (Ms. Kaiser. Hofbibliothek, Vienna, Mixt. no. 133), fol. 117a [*al-Ḍaw' al-Lāmi'*, VI, p. 103].

[8] Quatremère, *Histoire des Sultans Mamlouks de l'Egypte*, I, p. xii.

[9] *Ẓāhiriten*, p. 202.

in their collecting, and in their critical evaluation and practical application of what they had collected; this is increasingly so the nearer we get to the beginning of this literature. Already the later parts of the 'six books' show the decay of literary power, which from the fifth century sank right down to the level of exercises in compilation.[1]

It must be stressed, however, that even the later literary representatives of the science of tradition have in their compilations certain purposes in mind and intended to serve the study of the ḥadīth by practical contributions. This purpose is achieved by various means. Firstly they aim at working canonical books together, either just the two *Ṣaḥīḥs* (*jam' bayn al-ṣaḥīḥayn*), as, for example, the two Andalusian theologians, al-Ḥumaydī from Majorca (d. 488) and Ibn al-Kharrāṭ from Seville (d. 582);[2] or they extend the work to the whole of the six canonical books, sometimes adding one or other renowned work (*Musnad Aḥmad* or al-Dārimī). The more the development of literature advances the more extensive becomes the material used for these compilations. In the eighth century, 'Alā' al-Dīn al-Shaykhī from Baghdād (d. 741) based his work on compilation (called *Maqbūl al-Manqūl*), in addition to the six books, also on the *Musnad* of Aḥmad, *al-Muwaṭṭa'* and al-Dāraquṭnī,[3] and in the ninth century al-Suyūṭī extended the field even further in his compilation all existing collections from new points of view in his *Jam' al-Jawāmi'*.[4] By inventing new, even if incidental, principles of dividing the material this great compiler attempted to give his works the flavour of novelty. Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥusayn b. Mas'ūd al-Baghawī (d. ca. 510) appeared earlier in the field with a certain critical system in his *Maṣābīḥ al-Sunna*. He produced a collection compiled from seven basic works whose material he classified according to fixed principles by quoting first in each chapter the passages from the two *Ṣaḥīḥs* as *ṣaḥīḥ*, i.e. as perfectly sound ḥadīths, then giving a number of *ḥasan*, i.e. 'beautiful ḥadīth'—as he calls those taken from the *Sunan* works—and finally adding from time to time quite uncertain traditions as *gharīb* [270]

[1] The last original ḥadīth work to be adapted and studied later (though not too often) was the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Ibn Ḥibbān (died 354) which was known because of its artificially detailed disposition under the name of *al-Taqāsīm wa'l-Anwā'*, a Ms. of a later adaptation of this work with glosses by Ibn Ḥajar is in the *Cat. ar.* Brit. Mus., p. 709b, no. 1570, a fragment in Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat. II, p. 106, no. 1263. In the *Asānīd al-Muḥadditsīn* one can find a description of the arrangement of this ḥadīth work. [See *GAL* I, 172, *S* I, 273.]

[2] Cf. Cairo Cat. I, p. 214; *Cat. ar. Br.* Mus., no. 1563, p. 705 a.

[3] Cairo Cat. I, p. 316.

[4] Ḥ. Kh., II. p. 614; cf. for the two great collections of s. (*Jam' al-Jawāmi'* and *al-Jāmi' al-Ṣaghīr*), Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat. II, p. 155, no. 1351; p. 157, no. 1353.

(strange) or even *ḍa'īf*. He was preceded in this work of classification by al-Tirmidhī who was the first to distinguish the 'beautiful' ḥadīths.[1] Al-Baghawī however lucidly arranged the variously qualified sayings according to their grades of authenticity and therefore his work, thanks to its completeness and practical usefulness, enjoyed great popularity among the Muslim people up to
[271] quite recent times, especially in the adaption made by Walī al-Dīn al-Tabrīzī in the eighth century (*Mishkāt al-Maṣābīḥ*). For Muslims, especially the half-learned, this book replaces all those older collections from which it was compiled; it avoids all the inconvenient display of *isnāds* and, as the author admits in his preface, aims less at scholarly pedantry than at edification: 'I have collected these ḥadīths for those who dedicate themselves to the service of God, so that this work may give them, together with the Book of God, some portion in the *sunan* and may support them in their intention of leading a life pleasing to God.' Though every legal chapter of ḥadīth is represented, a preponderance of the ethical and edifying parts is evident.

A second motive obtaining among the later collectors is the attempt to confine their compilations to a particular sphere of the *aḥādīth* collected in the books of traditions, limited by its contents. Ḥadīths are collected from the point of view ethical behaviour under the title of *al-Targhīb wa'l-Tarhīb*, such as that by the Nisābūrian theologian al-Bayhaqī (d. 458) or later that of Zakī al-Dīn al-Mundhirī (d. 656), who does not confine himself to moral sentences only.[2] Other authors stressed legal traditions. The famous Ibn Taymiyya (d. 652) selected the *aḥādīth al-aḥkām* from the six books and the *Musnad Aḥmad*[3] and he was preceded in this by the Andalusian Ibn al-Kharrāṭ al-Azdī (see above p. 241) and his Ḥanbalite comrade al-Jammā'īlī. (p. 241).[4]

The third motive was the entirely formal endeavour to summarize the most important ḥadīths in an easily accessible compendium, so that every saying could easily be found. This led, apparently from the fifth century onwards, to an alphabetical arrangement of the sayings,[5] whether by the names of informants or by initial

[1] Above, p. 232. What is described as *gharīb* in his model Bagh. included as such, e.g. the tradition of the bird (above, p. 113), II, p. 200, 1.

[2] Ms. of the Br. Mus. *Cat. ar. Br. Mus.*, p. 720a; Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat. II, p. 141, nos. 1328ff.; cf., the collection of al-Nawawī, ibid. p. 145, no. 1334.

[3] Cf. above, p. 242.

[4] Cairo Cat. I, pp. 249, 254, 261, 318; Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat. II, p. 126, nos. 1304ff.

[5] E.g. Warner no. 355, of the Leiden Library, Cat. IV, pp. 65–74; Ms. no. 1575, *Cat. ar. Br. Mus.*, p. 713a; Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat. II, p. 111, no. 1278, p. 123, no. 1298. The works mentioned in Brill's *Cat. period.*, nos. 345, 450 are also of this kind.

words of each saying.[1] With this the various points of view from which traditionists of later Muslim generations approached the [272]
repeated elaboration of the vast ḥadīth material are by no means exhausted. Some of these new collections were guided, as was true also of some of the compilations previously mentioned, by the general intention to extend the field of traditions and to vindicate, as a religious source, sayings which were formerly rejected by a stricter school as not trustworthy or as insufficiently authenticated. To make extensions in this direction was most difficult in the legal field; the greatest liberality was shown (following here older views)[2] in paraenetic and legendary traditions. Here large numbers of traditions were interpolated which at the time of the six books had been rejected or in part had not even been in existence then. The inclination to expunge manifest falsifications of earlier and later times disappeared, and strict zealots such as al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (d. 463) and Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597) the most zealous persecutor of forgeries, who wrote a large number of books on *mawḍū'āt* and *mudallisīn*, preached to the deaf. A whole series of refutations[3] were intended to weaken the castigations of the intolerant Ibn al-Jawzī, and the public was eager for the rescue of all kind of condemned ḥadīths, which were to be restored to an honourable position.

The attitude of pious Muslims of this period towards the rejection of traditions is evident from various signs. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Idrīs al-Rāzī (d. 327) wrote in the fourth century his work *al-Jarḥ wa'l-Ta'dīl*, which was concerned with the evaluation of critical objections to suspect authorities of traditions and suspect sayings. This work exists in the Cairo Library in six volumes and in a few incomplete copies.[4] Once a pious companion entered the lecture room of the author while he was busy reading out his work. 'What are you reading?' asked the guest, Yūsuf b. al-Ḥusayn al-Rāzī, of the lecturer. He answered: 'It is entitled: *al-Jarḥ wa'l-Ta'dīl*.' 'And what does this title mean?' 'I examine,' replied the author, 'the circumstances of scholars, which of them can be considered as trustworthy and which not.' Then Yūsuf replied: 'Are you not ashamed before Allāh to slander people who were received into Paradise some hundred or two hundred years ago?' 'Abd al-Raḥmān wept and said: 'O, Abū Ya'qūb, if this speech had reached my ears before I began writing this work, verily I would never have written it.' The book [273]
fell from his hands and he was in such a state of excitement that he could not continue the lecture.[5] These were the feelings of even

[1] Al-Suyūṭī also followed alphabetical order.
[2] see above, pp. 145ff.
[3] Cf. Ḥ. Kh., VI, p. 264 for the refutations of Ibn al-Jawzī's criticism.
[4] Cairo Cat. I, p. 124 [*GAL S* I, pp. 278–9, Hyderabad 1941ff.]
[5] Abū'l-Maḥāsin, II, p. 286.

critical minds when reverence for the tradition overcame them. This report is an actual illustration for the statement by al-Tirmidhī that there were people who condemned the critical evaluation of the trustworthiness of the *rijāl*.[1]

From such motives later traditionists re-established what former stricter research had thrown out from the material of tradition. This tendency was at work soon after the general dissemination of the *Ṣaḥīḥs*. Al-Ḥākim from Nīsābūr (d. 405),—'the great *ḥāfiẓ*, the imām of transmitters' as al-Dhahabī calls him—wrote a *Mustadrak 'alā al-ṣaḥīḥayn* in which he defended several traditions against the two *Ṣaḥīḥs* and, more especially, endeavoured to prove that the two sheikhs had unjustly suppressed many traditions which by their own *shurūṭ* ought to have been regarded as fully valid. He fortified himself with *Zamzam* water in order to be strengthened by the blessing of this holy drink in his pious intention.[2] What kind of traditions he defended against unjust condemnation can be seen from the following examples. There we find silly fables of the meeting of the prophet Ilyās (who is described as three hundred *dhirā'* high) with Muhammed and his companion Anas b. Mālik. The Old Testament man of God embraces the Prophet of Islam, converses with him and they share a meal at a table which descends from heaven. After this meeting Elijah vanished into the sky upon a cloud. Al-Ḥākim adds to this account that this is '*ṣaḥīḥ*', i.e. bears
[274] the mark of undeniable truth. It is to the credit of the independence of mind of Muslim scholars that the spreading of this legend, which has for it an authority like that of al-Ḥākim from Nīsābūr, was energetically rejected by Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī (d. 748). This Dhahabī followed in the eighth century in the footsteps of those who in former times exposed the *ḍu'afā'*, i.e. unreliable transmitters. Amongst others he wrote a book entitled *al-Mīzān fī-l-ḍu'afā'*.[3] In this book he dares to make the following remark against this fable: 'Was not al-Ḥākim afraid of Allāh in giving to such an account the seal of truth?' The same scholar also wrote a compendium of the *Mustadrak* with refuting glosses. Here he adds the follow-

[1] Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 332.

[2] *Tab. Huff.*, XIII, no. 32 we often encounter in biographies the belief in the efficacy for scholarly undertakings of Zamzam water. Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, who has so been often mentioned in this study, drank of the sacred water with the intention of participating in the blessing of being buried next to the holy Bishr al-Ḥāfī, and further that his historical work might be read in the mosque at Baghdād and that he himself might lecture in the Manṣūr mosque. (Ibn al-Mulaqqin, Leiden Ms. Warner no. 532, fol. 36a): The well-known polygraph Ibn Ḥajar drank the water in order to become as learned as al-Dhahabī (*Tab. Huff.*, XXIV, no. 12). Abū Bakr ibn al-'Arabī gives a characteristic account about the efficacy of the Zamzam drink, al-Maqqarī, I, p. 487. Ink with Zamzam water: Ibn Bashkuwāl, p. 501, no. 111.

[3] *Tab. Huff.*, XXI, no. 9.

ing words to the passage in question: 'Verily, this is invented; may God make ugly the man who made this lie; I never dreamt and would not have believed it possible that al-Ḥākim was ignorant to such a degree as to believe such things to be true.'[1] Among the traditions excluded by the *Ṣaḥīḥs* which al-Ḥākim re-introduces is a tradition about the Mahdī in which an exact description of this saviour is given; the author of the *Mustadrak* thinks that the *isnād* of this ḥadīth entirely corresponds to the *sharṭ* of Muslim.[2] Al-Ḥākim also included the *ḥadīth al-ṭayr* (see above, p. 113) in his *Mustadrak*—he seems to have had Shi'ite inclinations—and what orthodox theologians thought of this is seen from this remark by al-Dhahabī: 'I thought for a long time that al-Ḥākim would not dare to include in his *Mustadrak* the "bird tradition", but when I studied this book I was really frightened by the many apocryphal traditions amassed in this book.'[3] Another specimen of al-Ḥākim's attempts at rescue is the fact that he claimed that the ḥadīth praising the 'scholar of Medina' (Mālik b. Anas)[4] was entirely in agreement with the *shurūṭ* of Muslim, on account of which he considered it as one of the *ṣaḥīḥ* traditions.[5]

[1] Both passages in al-Damīrī (s.v. *al-ḥūt*), I, p. 336, top.
[2] In Ibn Khaldūn, *Muqaddima*, p. 263, 10.
[3] Al-Damīrī (s.v. *al-wuḍḍāḥ*), II, p. 400.
[4] See above, p. 142.
[5] Al-Damīrī (s.v. *al-Maṭiya*), II, p. 382.

# VENERATION OF SAINTS IN ISLAM

# VENERATION OF SAINTS IN ISLAM[1]



I

LIKE any other religious system that sprang from a process of historical evolution and was subject to many contacts, Islam too at the time of its maturity is no longer a pure product of the inner development of its own original concept. It is rather the result of several factors, the chief two of which are: the development of its own particular basic ideas, and the influence of old existing ideas which were outwardly conquered and pushed aside but in fact were unconsciously transformed by it and assimilated to its own essence.

During this evolutionary process Islam was also forced, by the influence of the inherited instincts of the believers, to leave in many respects the line which was traced at the beginning for its belief and its practice. In no other field has the original doctrine of Islam subordinated itself in such a degree to the needs of its confessors, who were Arabs only in a small minority, as in the field which is the subject of the present study: the veneration of saints.

In ancient Islam an insurmountable barrier divides an infinite and unapproachable Godhead from weak and finite humanity. The helpless creature looks longingly to the limitless heights, to the realm of infinity and fate which is unattainable to it. No human perfection can participate in the realm of infinite perfection, no supernatural gift of a privileged individual can mediate between the two spheres, which are linked only by the relations of causality and dependence. No creature has part, even in a finite and qualified

[1]The following short list contains works on the Islamic cult of saints which may provide further illustrations for the phenomena discussed by Goldziher: R. Kriss and H. Kriss-Heinrich, *Volksglaube im Bereich des Islam*. I: *Wallfahrtswesen und Heiligenverehrung*, Wiesbaden, 1960 (mainly Egypt and Syria); T. Canaan, *Mohammedan Saints and Sanctuaries in Palestine*, London 1927; E. Doutté, 'Les Marabout,' *RHR* XL–XLI (1900); E. Montet, *Le culte des saints musulmans dans l'Afrique du Nord*, Geneva, 1909; E. Dermenghem, *Le culte des saints dans l'Islam maghrébin*, Paris, 1954, and some of the articles listed in J. D. Pearson, *Index Islamicus*, 1906–1955, nos. 2666–2751. Articles published by Goldziher on the subject after the *Mohammedanische Studien* are 'Aus dem muhammedanischen Heiligenkult in Agypten,' *Globus* 71 (1897), pp. 233ff. and 'Nouvelles contributions à l'hagiologie de l'Islam,' *RHR*, XLV (1902), pp. 208ff.]

measure, in the might which pertains to God; there is no creature which owing to its perfection deserves even a shadow of the veneration due to God; there is no cult conceivable which is directed
[278] towards other objects than Allāh, no call for help, no recourse in misfortune is thinkable, except to Allāh. Even the most perfect human being, whom God chooses to teach all mankind, is as weak and transient as other men, he is mortal and full of passion as they are. He cannot influence the course of nature, he works no miracles and knows no mysteries—since only God can do these things—and only the word of God which emanates from his mouth is of unattainable perfection. He himself is merely 'the first who confessed Islam' (Sūra 6:14), 'a beautiful example to all who put their trust in God,' 'a shining torch' for them (Sūra 33:31, 45). He even rejects the title 'father of true believers:' he is God's envoy and the end of the prophets (v. 40). He does not know what is hidden and himself proclaims this to those whom he wishes to gain for himself: 'If I knew what is hidden I should acquire much good and nothing evil would touch me' (Sūra 7:188, cf. 6:50). God does not reveal the secrets of the future even to him, and he firmly denies such knowledge. He says: 'They will ask you for what time the arrival of the hour (of judgement) is fixed; tell them 'Knowledge of this is with God only' . . . They ask you this as if you knew; tell them only God knows' (Sūra 7:185–186).[1] Only God has the right to the title of 'Knower of the hidden and present' (*'ālim al-ghayb wa'l-shahāda*). When asked to work miracles Muhammed has but one answer: 'Praise be to my God! Am I anything but a man, an envoy?' (Sūra 17:95, 96), a description which occurs repeatedly in the Koran. The same concept of Muhammed's office and of his relation to other men is also expressed in the oldest documents of the Muslim community, the old *ḥadīth*. It is often repeated that the founder of Islam does not wish to be distinguished more than other prophets;[2] the *khaṣā'iṣ al-nabī* in their older version[3] do not concern particular miraculous powers of the Prophet but points in religious and social life in respect of which certain limitations are waived for him, or they deal with favours which God showed to him before all other men. There
[279] are only two points concerning his personal capacities: that in contrast to other prophets he was not sent to only one nation but to mankind as a whole, and that he alone could be intercessor with God on behalf of his believers.[4] He is explicitly made to protest against

[1] Perhaps here an influence of Matt. 24:36 is to assumed?

[2] B. *Tafsīr*, nos. 91, 97, etc.

[3] B. *Ṣalāt*, no. 56, five *khaṣā'iṣ*; cf. above p. 31. Later this field was extended and particularly the Shī'ites stressed it; cf. Querry *Droit musulman; recueil de lois concernant les Musulmans shyites* (Paris, 1871–2), I, p. 644.

[4] With special reference to Sūra 2:256, 17:81.

his personal character being described in the same way as Christians describe the person of Jesus.[1] 'Do not praise me as Jesus, son of Maryam, is praised, but say "the servant of God and His envoy"'; this sentence is said to have been originally in the Koran but to have been omitted later.[2] In many traditional utterances he is shown as equally determined to reject claims to know secret things as in the Koran,[3] and in the same sense 'Ā'isha is made to say: 'There are three things: who maintains them maintains a serious lie in respect of God; he who thinks (*za'ama*, see above p. 58) that Muhammed has seen his God; . . . he who thinks that Muhammed kept anything secret of what God revealed to him (see above p. 114) . . . and he who thinks that Muhammed knew what would happen the next day.'[4] Even in his capacity of judge, Muhammed is made to decline any claim to deeper illumination or insight; he is as liable to subjective errors in weighing the arguments of the parties, as any other human judge.[5] There is a well-known manner in which he is made to reject challenges to work miracles, alter the course of nature, revive dead persons, by pointing out that all this was not his mission.[6]

Islamic dogmatics thereby gained a welcome idea[7] and did not omit to elaborate it in its scholastic manner. It is thus enabled to teach, in agreement with the most ancient manifestation of Muslim prophetism, that the fact of election to the office of prophet is not due to the perfection of the individual concerned, nor can such perfections be acquired by spiritual endeavour; the prophet's appointment is merely an arbitrary action of God which turns towards whomsoever God elects, even if such an individual shows little personal preparedness for so exalted a calling.[8] The prophet is no more perfect than any other man, but is human as everybody else, and only God's arbitrary grace makes an unworthy person the interpreter of His will. To let the prophet touch the borders of the divine and supernatural would be *shirk* ('association')—a technical term which in Islam embraces, at least in theory, a wide field.[9] [280]

[1] B. *Muḥāraba*, no. 17 [—ed. Krehl, *Ḥudūd*, no. 31].

[2] Is not included, however, in the usual list of such passages (cf. Nöldeke, *Gesch. des Qor.*, pp. 174ff. [2nd ed., I, pp. 234ff. The tradition also occurs in B. *Anbiyā*, no. 48; Dārimī, *Riqāq*, no. 68; Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, I, pp. 23, 24, 47, 55; al-Tirmidhī, *Shamā'il al-Muṣṭafā*, II, p. 148. It is nowhere stated, however, that it was part of the Koran; the fact that it sometimes follows the *āyat al-rajm*—for which cf. Nöldeke, I, pp. 248ff.—may have caused the error.]

[3] B. *Tafsīr*, no. 83, to Sūra 5:101.

[4] Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 179.

[5] B. Aḥkām, nos. 29, 29, c.f. Maẓālim, no. 16.

[6] Ibn Hishām, p. 189, 5.

[7] Cf. al-Ghazālī, *al-Munqidh min al-Ḍalāl*, *JA*, 1877, I, p. 47.

[8] *Al-Mawāqif*, ed. Soerensen, p. 170.

[9] Cf. *ZDMG*, XLI, p. 69. In the teachings of the ḥadīth every kind of super-

People who nursed and assimilated in their heart the monotheistic concept of Islam with all its consequences have extended this idea to its limits. During the fifth century of the Hijra, when the veneration of saints with all its excesses dominated the world of Islam, there lived a Muslim mystic called Samnūn and surnamed al-Muḥibb, the loving one, i.e. he who is sunk in the love of Allāh. Samnūn once officiated as *mu'adhdhin* and when he reached this passage in his text: 'I confess that there is no god but Allah, I confess that Muhammed is God's apostle'—of which combination it was in fact said that here God 'joined his name with that of the Prophet'[1]—he said: 'O God, if not Thou Thyself hadst ordered the recitation of these words I would not mention Thy name in one breath with that of Muhammed'.[2] Such expressions of the exclusive monotheistic conscience also occur in circles which are far removed from the pantheistic impulses of mysticism; in another place many of these have been collected.[3]

[231] It may be easily understood that Muhammed was led to deprecate his own gifts by more than his lofty concept of God. This was for the clever man an easy way to avoid the danger of risking his prestige by unsuccessful attempts at miracles. With his typical lack of consequence, which is here shown by his recognition of older stories of prophets, he had at every turn to reconcile the miraculous gifts of the old prophets with his own teaching, and occasionally he was forced even to raise them to a much higher position than he claimed for himself (particularly Jesus, 3:43 ff., 5:109–110).

After all this there is no need to explain in detail that within Islam in its original form there was no room for the veneration of saints as it so largely developed later. The Koran itself polemizes directly against the veneration of saints in other confessions which

[1] *Khizānat al-Adab*, I, p. 109, 24 Hassān n. Thābit [not in the Dīwān]; *wa-qamma'l-ilāhu'smaʾl-nabiyyi illā'smihi/idhā qāla fi'l-khamsi'l-muʾadhdhinu ashhadu*.

[2] Al-Biqā'i, fol. 15a.

[3] In the article 'Le monothéisme dans la vie religieuse des musulmans,' *RHR*, XVI (1887), pp. 157ff. To examples mentioned there for avoiding the word Allāh in compound proper names may be added 'Abdān (= 'Abd Allāh) Abū'l-Maḥāsin, II, p. 204. On the other hand the names from the second century, Li'llāh and Bi'llāh (the names of the two daughters of the poet Abū'l-'Atāhiyya), deserve mentioning, *Agh.*, III, p. 170, 4.

---

stition, belief in omens, wearing of amulets, and use of magic formulae, is called *shirk*: Abū Dāwūd, II, pp. 100, 103; cf. al-Tirmidhī; I, p. 304; II, p. 83, al-Dāmirī (s.v. *al-ḥiḍḍa*), II, p. 374. Hypocrisy (*riyā'*) is also called *shirk*, *Tabākāt*, p. 504; in another passage it is called the 'little *shirk*' (*al-sh. al-aṣghar*), *al-'Iqd*, II, p. 369, cf. Ibn Māja, p. 296, *inna yasīra'l-riyā'i shirk*. Already Luqmān is made to warn his son of *shirk* in his *waṣiyya*, al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 179.

consider their *aḥbār* and *ruhbān* as *arbāb*, divine masters (Sūra 9:31). Saintly men and women, who by their endeavour to renounce wordly goods, to live for God's sake, and to give willingly their life as martyrs for Him, rise above the masses, could still be recognized from this point of view, and are therefore objects of admiration and emulation, the Koran itself mentions them and prefers them to all others. They have the first places in Paradise and supermundane delights await them. But they are no mightier than others while amongst the living, and after their death they cannot be efficacious in God's stead or claim superhuman honours. They are nothing but dead people who obtain their reward from God 'because He delights in them and they in Him.' But they achieve blessedness only for themselves through Allāh's mercy; they have nothing to offer or to grant to the survivors, and like everyone except God 'cannot be useful or do harm.'

There is an enormous gap between this concept held by early Islam and the position which the veneration and invocation of saints everywhere occupies shortly after the spread of the new religion. Within Islam as well, the believers sought to create, through the concept of saints, mediators between themselves and an omnipotent Godhead in order to satisfy the need which was served by the gods and masters of their old traditions now defeated by Islam. [262] Here too applies what Karl Hase says of the cult of saints in general: that it 'satisfies within a monotheistic religion a polytheistic need to fill the enormous gap between men and their god, and that it originated on the soil of the old pantheon.'[1]

It became possible to ascribe to men supernatural attributes which participated in the divine powers only after the complete transformation of the Islamic doctrine about prophecy. It would have been impossible for the idea of supernaturally gifted men to develop alongside the figure of a prophet such as that presented by Muhammed to his people. The prophet had after all to be above the crowd of *awliyā'*, the head of which he was destined to become in the course of the development of the cult of saints. In effect the attitude of people who turned to Islam favoured the extension of the attributes of supernatural powers and gifts to chosen men. Even the Arab contemporaries of the Prophet, friends as much as foes, showed little understanding of an apostle of God who did not surpass ordinary folk in supernatural power and secret knowledge. They said: 'What manner of apostle is this? He eats food, and walks the streets. If only there were an angel with him with whom he would be a preacher of morals, or if he were given a (secret) treasure or owned a (miraculous) garden with fruits of which he enjoyed the benefit' (25:8f9). They will not believe him unless he makes springs

[1] *Handbuch der protestantischen Polemik*, 1st ed., p. 326.

gush forth from the earth or darkens the sky, owns a golden house, is given a book from heaven in their presence. The Prophet counters: 'God forbid, am I other than human, an envoy?' People were hindered from belief, after true guidance had come to them, by the saying: 'Has God sent an ordinary human being as envoy?' (17:92-96).

In the same way as his foes demanded from him supernatural acts, the performance of miracles, and transcendental knowledge (2:112, 6:109, 124, 7:198—88, 10:21, 13:8. 27, 20:133, 21:5, 29:49
[283] etc.),[1] his friends credited him, despite his assiduous denial that he possessed such gifts, with the knowledge of hidden things. 'I have knowledge of today and yesterday, but I am blind to the knowledge of that which will happen tomorrow': this was easily believed of an ordinary poet[2] but of the Prophet such limitation was unacceptable. How should the Prophet not be equipped at least with the gifts of which sages, fortune-tellers and *kāhins*[3] could boast among the pagan Arabs of his times?[4] His own protestations were of little avail. The Arabs who were devoted to his cause combined their acknowledgement of him with a belief in his higher abilities. Such people could not imagine as other than omniscient a man who pretended to have been sent to them by God.[5] There are several contemporary testimonials for this, of which the first two are likely to be authentic. The pagan poet al-A'shā calls Muhammed, on the occasion of his conversion to Islam, 'a prophet who sees what you (ordinary people) do not see;'[6] and another contemporary poet calls him flatly 'knower of the secret things' (*'ālim al-ghayb*).[7] The Prophet paid a visit to the Anṣārī woman Rubey' bint Mu'awwidh after her marriage; the young woman was surrounded by girl singers who were singing a dirge for their fathers fallen at Badr, and recited the following words: 'Amongst us was a prophet who knew what would happen tomorrow (in the future).' It is true that the Prophet firmly declined this praise.[8]

[1] According to the practice of Muhammed of attributing to the opponents of the old prophets the objections which the Qurayshites brought against himself (cf. Part 3, p. 19), this argument is also put in the mouth of the opponents of Moses, 9:129. Such passages are collected, though in a rather superficial and unsatisfactory manner, in the polemical book by the Abbé F. Bougarde, *La clef du Coran* (Paris, 1852), pp. 26-40.

[2] Zuhayr, *Mu'all.*, v. 48, ed. Landberg p. 90. v. 3.

[3] An Arab *kāhin* is mentioned as late as the beginning of the second century, al-Ṭabarī, III, p. 21, 9.

[4] Wellhausen, *Reste arab. Heidenthums*, pp. 130ff.

[5] Cf. Part I, p. 13, note 1.

[6] Ed. Thorbecke (*Morgenland. Forschungen*, p. 254) v. 14. [*Dīwān*, ed. Geyer, 17:14.]

[7] *Hudhayl.*, 126:3.

[8] B. *Maghāzī*, no. 12, *Nikāḥ*. no. 48.

The beginnings of the often described change in the concept of the Prophet, by which his figure was endowed with miraculous attributes, thus reach back into the earliest times of Islam. Already contemporary believers saw in Muhammed only the superhuman miracle man, whose death surprised even 'Umar as something impossible.[1] [284] He threatened everybody who believed in the death of the Prophet with cruel punishments.[2] And the 'Abd al-Qays Arabs in Baḥrayn turn away from Islam under the pretext that a man who is subject to death like all other men cannot have been a prophet.[3] Though the supposition of immortality had in the nature of things to be dropped soon,[4] the belief in the supernatural gifts of the Prophet while alive could take firm root. It is one of the most curious phenomena in the development of Islam to observe the ease with which orthodox theology also adapts itself to the needs of popular belief, though this entails open contradiction to the unambiguous teaching of the Koran. The power of *ijmā'* here scored one of its biggest triumphs in the whole system of Islam, insofar as the belief of the people succeeded in penetrating into the canonical conception of the Prophet and, so to speak, forcing it to make him into a fortune-teller, worker of miracles, and magician.[5] Without hesitation he is made to say that he had been given the key to all the treasures of the earth,[6] and he had need of it, too, in order to work the many miracles of feeding, quenching thirst and healing which were incorporated into his biography in order to satisfy the ideas of the believers.[7] The activities of biographers in the next generation contributed sufficiently to making the miraculous picture of the Prophet more and more rich and all-embracing. As early as the third century it was possible for the Andalusian theologian Ibn Ḥibbān (d. 312) to teach that the man, who never ceased to declare himself to be 'flesh' like the flesh of other men and to be perfectly *ὁμοιοπαθής* with them, was not subject to hunger and that any reports to the [285]

[1] *Faḍā'il al-Aṣḥāb*, no. 6.
[2] Al-Ṭabarī, I, pp. 1815f.
[3] Ibid., p. 1958, 15.
[4] In a panegyric to Muhammed ascribed to 'Umayya b. Abī'l-Ṣalt in his *dīwān* it is stressed with good reason: *yamūtu ḥamā mātā man qad maḍā/yuraddu ilā'-llāhi ḥāri'l-nasam*, he dies as those died who have vanished, he will be returned to God, the creator of souls', *Khizānat al-Adab*, I, p. 122, 18 [Whence F. Schulthess, *Umajja ibn Abi's-Salt*, Leipzig, 1911, 23:13].
[5] E.g., B. *Jumu'a*, no. 25; *Buyū'*, no. 32.
[6] B. *Maghāzī*, no. 29.
[7] Excursuses and Annotations, II, 1. Later, and especially polemical, theology even strives to prove, by comparing the respective miraculous stories, that the miracles of Muhammed were 'more exalted and enduring' than those told of Jesus, *Disputatio de religione Mohammedanorum adversus Christianos*, ed. van den Ham (Leiden, 1890), pp. 123ff., particularly pp. 125, 2; 127, 16.

contrary must be rejected as falsifications.[1] It did not take long before a thousand miracles of the Prophet could be listed.[2]

II

Thus the gap between the divine and the human was bridged. The way was free to equip humans with supernatural gifts. So now appear the saints with claims to veneration and invocation. Several psychological factors, which we shall discuss in detail later on, contributed to foster the development of this alien element in the soil of Islam and to make a necessity out of it. It succeeded in establishing itself firmly in popular religion and in competing with the exclusive cult of God. Side by side with the teaching—which remained always valid and was never disputed—that only God may be invoked and only in His name may an oath be sworn, the people invoke the saints[3] and swear by their names.[4] Puritanical followers of the *sunna* and sceptical people of enlightened views preach vainly against all this. The sheikh Ḥasan al-Ḥijāzī (d. 1131), a popular poet who not quite two centuries ago related the curious events of his time in popular poems, which were used by 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Jābartī in his historical work, ridiculed the population of Cairo who invoked all their saints when the Nile was late in its anxiously awaited rise.[5]

In order to be accepted alongside the veneration of God the cult of saints had to be attached to a word which even in the Koran described persons particularly favoured—though not equipped with *supernatural power*. Such a term could then be used in the extended
[286] meaning with which in course of time it became charged. This word served the purpose of being the bearer of the completely un-Islamic veneration of saints and the legends associated with it, also legiti-

[1] Al-Zurqānī, IV, p. 128.

[2] *Disput. relig. Mohammed.*, p. 242, 6. [For the development of the belief in Muhammed's miracles cf. T. Andrae, *Die Person Muhammeds in Lehre und Glauben seiner Gemeinde*, Upsala, 1917.]

[3] Cf. *Arabian Nights*, ed. Būlāq, 1279, II, p. 94, invocation of 'Abd al-Qādir Gīlānī and Sayyida Nafīsa in time of need, ibid., III, p. 320; five anonymous saints are mentioned through whose merit someone attempts to obtain from God release from need: *ya rabb bi'l-khamsat al-ashyākh tanqidhnī*; the 'five sheikhs' are presumably identical with the *panj pīr* of the Indian Muslims (Garcin de Tassy, *Mémoire sur les particularités de la religion musulmane dans l'Inde*, p. 16).

[4] It is well known that in different provinces of Islam the oath is made in the name of the respective local saints: *wa-ḥayāt sidnā Yaḥyā, wa-ḥayāt sidnā al-Badawī*, etc.

[5] *Merveilles biographiques et historiques* . . . traduits de l'arabe (Cairo, 1888), I, p. 71 [Arabic text, Cairo 1297, I, p. 30]; the biography of the poet ibid., pp. 181–195 [Arabic text I, pp. 75–83].

mized them in religious respect. We mean the word *walī*, plur. *awliyā'*. This word derived from a root which in the Semitic languages expresses the idea of adherence, attachment, and nearness,[1] means firstly: he who is close, follower, friend, relative,[2] and within this group of concepts particularly that blood-relation who in Arab custom has the duty of blood revenge for a member of the tribe who has been murdered. (Sūra 17:35, 27:50—cf. 8:73—19:23, 33:6)—the *gō'ēl had-dām* or *she'ēr* (=Arabic *thā'ir*)[3] of the Bible, or just heir in general.[4] In religious language this idea of nearness was extended also to the relation of man to God. The Jews—regarding whom Muslims (together with the Christians) are warned not to take them as *awliyā'*, 'since they are only *awliyā'* of each other, but if one of you considers them as friends, he belongs to them'[5]—are reproached for considering themselves as *awliyā'* of God to the exclusion of all other men, i.e. as the chosen people, as the pious *par excellence* who are certain of Paradise (Sūra 62:6); on the other hand Jews and Christian alike are reproached for thinking themselves to be children of God specially beloved by Him (Sūra 5:31 *abnā'u'llāhi wa'aḥibbā'uhu*). It is the pious who are in the relation of *walī* to God, 'they need not fear and be sad,'[6] i.e. they may feel secure from the horrors that Muhammed summoned against the unbelievers and profligates—since they would partake of the Kingdom of heaven. From the general meaning of 'someone who is close' in Old Arabic usage the word was extended to the protector, helper and patron,[7] curiously enough also applied to divinely venerated beings of whom man believes that they help those who [287]
venerate them. The venerations of such beings, by which often angels or even idols are meant, called *shufa'ā'* (sing. *shafī'*) by those who honour them, is sharply condemned in the Koran in many passages (Sūra 10:19; 13:17, 18; 39:44, etc.) and is branded as *shirk*; the objects of such veneration and involation are called *shurakā'*, like the gods of polytheism. 'Those whom they invoke in God's stead cannot create but are creatures themselves, they are dead not

[1] In this sense *walī* is usually paraphrased by the synonym *qarīn*, al-Baydāwī on 19:46; cf. *Mafātīḥ al-Ghayb*, V, p. 682.

[2] Like the word *mawlā* (derived from the same root) in its original use; see Part I, p. 101, note 3.

[3] Cf. Mordtman-Müller, *Sabäische Denkmäler*, p. 25 [Gesenius—Buhl, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch*, under *sh'r* II].

[4] Sūra 19:5, cf. *walī al-'ahd* = successor to the throne.

[5] Sūra 5:56; this is however extended to unbelievers in general, 3:27, 45:18.

[6] Sūra 10:63, common in the second Sūra, cf. 3:164, of those who fell in religious wars, 42:30, 43:68.

[7] In this sense, *walī* is also one of the names of God, Redhouse 'On the most comely names', etc. *JRAS*, XII, p. 67, no. 520ff., 3:61 (God is the *walī* of the believers), 42:27. In parallelism *walī* corresponds in this sense to *nāṣir* or *shafī'* (helper, intercessor, advocate), Sura 2:101; 4:47; 6:51, 69; 9:75, 117.

living, and know not when they will be resurrected' (Sūra 16:20–2), and that this refers to beings called *awliyā'* is evident from a threat referring to the same error: 'But do those who disbelieve think that they can regard my servants apart from me as *awliyā'*? Verily we have prepared hell for the deniers of God' (18:102).

The impulse for the veneration of saints must indeed have been very strong if it managed to attach itself to this very expression which was so much decried in the Koran from the point of view of the cult. *Walī*, the pious devout man[2] became the walī equipped with the attributes of miracle, the intermediary (*shafī'*) between God and man, 'those who are near to God through their obedience and whom God equips with the gift of his mercy (*karāma*).'[3] We will now examine how the Muslim peoples shaped the image of such persons.

## III

In the opinion of Muslims a *walī* is not made through his deep penetration into the divine secrets. Involuntary rapture, which is not prepared for by the person concerned through study and speculation, is the beginning and the visible sign of *walī*-ship. People partaking of such a state are called *majdhūb*. This word
[288] means etymologically the same as 'rapt' in its original acceptation: one withdrawn. Muslims call any person inspired by God whose ecstasy is due not to theosophical absorption but to spontaneous illumination, *majdhūb*. Thus a historian reports of Yūnus b. Yūnus al-Shaybānī, the founder of the Yūnusiyya order: 'He had no sheikh but was a *majdhūb*, he was rapt away (drawn away) to the path of good.'[4] The group of popular *walīs* designated by this name already during their lifetime is made up of such people. The Muslim *walī* is not canonized only after his death: during his lifetime he is recognized as such by the people and practises his miracles for all to see. The populace, realistically inclined, even finds it more likely that a living *walī* should be more able to work miracles than one who is dead. An Egyptian saint; Shams al-Dīn al-Ḥanafī (d. 847), teaches: 'When a *walī* dies, his power over nature with which he was able to lend help ceases. If however pilgrims to his grave nevertheless obtain help or achieve the fulfilment of their desires,

[2] In ancient linguistic usage *walī* in this context is the opposite of *kāfir*. A Khārijite poet says of the leader Qaṭarī: *wa'anta waliyyun ma'l-Mukallabu kāfirun*, *Abū Ḥanīfa Dīnaw.*, p. 286, 18. Ḥassān b. Thābit says of Hāshimite believers who fell at Mūta; *humā awliyā'u'llāhi*, Ibn Hishām, p. 779, 3 from the bottom.

[3] Al-Bayḍāwī I, p. 914 (on Sūra 10:63).

[4] Al-Maqrīzī, *Khiṭaṭ*, II, p. 435, 18: *bal kāna majdhūban judhiba ilā ṭarīqi'l-khayri*. [Cf. 'Madjdhūb' in *EI*.]

this is Allāh's deed wrought through the mediation of the respective *quṭb* who sends help to the pilgrim according to the degree of the saint's grave that was visited."[1]

We do not intend to repeat the teachings of the Muslim mystics on the hierarchy of the *awliyā'*, beginning with the *quṭb* (pole) down to the last cunning, begging dervish, since these ideas have often been described in European literature.[2] The *walīs* do not wait for the masses to sing their praise; they themselves lead the chorus of glorification. The boasts and self-praise of some of the more presumptious *walīs* are hardly credible. In order to base such behaviour upon a sacred tradition, they make 'Alī, a man particularly called *walī Allāh*, to whom one of the first places is assigned amongst the saints, say: 'I am the dot under the letter *bā'*, I am at the side of God, I am the pen, I am the well-preserved tablet, I am God's [289] throne, I am the seven heavens and the seven earths.'[3] Of Junayd (d. 297), a ṣūfī of the older school, the words are reported: 'God has given no knowledge to man and allowed them no entry to it without letting me participate in it,'[4] and this is a most modest claim compared to what later saints say of themselves. Ibrāhīm al-Dasūqī, one of the four *quṭbs* and a pre-eminent national saint of Muslim Egypt, says of himself: 'God showed me what is in the heights when I was seven; at eight I read the well-guarded tablet; at nine I solved the talisman of heaven and discovered in the first sūra of the Koran the letter which dismays men and demons; at fourteen I was able to move what rests and to make rest what moves, with the aid of God.'

> Muhammed has given me power over the whole world, over demons, over all bodies and devils,
> and over China and the whole East to the borders of God's lands my rule is justified;
> I am the letter which not all who see it can read; the whole world is subject to me on my God's order,
> All this I do not say for boasting, but it was permitted to me so that people may not be ignorant of my way.[5]

[1] Al-Sha'rānī, *Biographies of Ṣūfīs* (Ms. of Leipzig Univ. Library, no. 357), fol. 46b. [*al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*, Cairo, 1299 II, p. 138].

[2] Lane, *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, II, pp. 290ff.; Kremer, *Herrsch. Ideen*, pp. 172ff., Barges, *Vie du Abou Medien*, introduction; and lastly Vollers, *ZDMG*, XLIII, pp. 115 ff. [Cf. Goldziher's article 'Abdāl' as revised in the 2nd ed. of the *EI*].

[3] Al-Munāwī, fol. 18b.

[4] Abū'l-Mahāsin, II, p. 178.

[5] 'Alī Bāshā Mubārak *al-Khiṭaṭ al-Jadīda al-Tawfīqiyya* (Būlāq, 1306), XI, p. 8.

Poems are cited of Aḥmad al-Badawī, the saint of Ṭanta in Egypt, which remind one vividly of the vainglorious verses of the heroes in the romances of 'Antar and of Sayf. One of these poems begins thus: 'Before my existence I was a *quṭb* and *imām*, I saw the throne and what is above the heaven, and I saw God as He revealed Himself. I have no teacher and no example but the prophet Ṭā-Hā (Muhammed) . . . Nobody before or after me has obtained more than a mustard-seed of the fulness of my knowledge.'—'Abd al-Qādir al-Jīlī says of himself: 'Before the sun rises it greets me; before the year starts it greets me and reveals to me all that will happen during its course. I swear by God's majesty that the blessed and the damned are presented to me and that my eye rests upon the well-guarded tablet of fate. I dip into the seas of God's knowledge and have seen
[290] Him with my eyes. I am the living proof of God's existence. I am the Prophet's lieutenant and his heir on earth.'[1] It is possible that such vainglorious utterances were ascribed to the above-mentioned saintly by later biographers only, and that they themselves were innocent of such conceit. But that such a spirit predominates in the *walī* groups of later times is seen from a curious document of this literature, the autobiography of one of the most famous ṣūfīs: 'Abd al-Wahhāb Aḥmad al-Sha'rānī (d. 973). Under the guise of humble thanks[2] to God for being granted wonderful gifts of the spirit and sanctity—this is already inherent in the title of the book[2]—the author tells the strangest things about his wonderful qualities, his communication with God, the angels and the Prophet, about his ability to work miracles and to find out the secrets of the universe, etc. In the same way in which he describes the merits and miraculous deeds of his saintly teachers and contemporaries in his work *Lawāqiḥ al-Anwār* he talks about himself—in order to thank God for having considered him worthy of so many mercies.

In such circles the doctrine could easily arise that the *walīs* were greater even than the prophets; a doctrine which caused much argumentation in theological circles. It is hardly surprising that this conceit aroused the hatred of orthodox theologians for some representatives of this trend. The *fuqahā'* were not always prepared to put up with such presumption by the ṣūfīs. In Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's time there lived near 'Aynṭab in Syria, in the mountains outside the city,

[1] Al-Biqā'ī, III, fols. 19b, 31b, 35a.

[2] This was the excuse of all Muslim authors who sounded the trumpet of their own glory, as e.g. al-Suyūṭī, of *Sitzungsberichten der Kais. Akademie der WW. phil. hist.* cl. LXIX, (1871), p. 28 This was called: *al-taḥadduth bi'l-ni'am.*

[3] *Laṭā'if al-Minan wa'l-akhlāq fī bayān wujūb al-taḥadduth bi-ni'mat Allāh 'alā'l-iṭlāq*, Ms. of the Dresden Library, Fleischer, p. 65ff., no. 392; Hungarian Nat. Mus., no. XV of my description, cf. *ZDMG*, XXXVIII p. 679 [*GAL* II, p. 338, *S* II, p. 466, repeatedly printed].

an anchoret who was called 'sheikh of sheikhs' and to whom pilgrimages were made in order to be blessed by him. This sheikh once allowed himself the sentence that he was above Muhammed, who could not live without women, whereas he himself was celibate. This was too much for the *qāḍīs* of the four orthodox schools, whose names are given in our source; they summoned the anchoret before their court and condemned him to death.[1] This is but one of the many examples of conflicts between the followers of ṣūfism and the [291] representatives of canonical theology.[2] These conflicts, though unable to detract from the high opinion that the latter had of true saints, nevertheless filled the orthodox theologians with even greater loathing of the circles to which the aspirants to *walī*-ship belonged. The hostility between orthodox theologians and ṣūfīs had its reason partly in the unorthodox dogmatics and exegesis which developed within the ṣūfī schools, and partly in the way of life—unbridled by the ritual law and far from saintly—led by wandering dervishes who so often abused ṣūfīs.[3] There were at all times mystic orders who confessed the so-called *ibāḥa*,[4] whose rules state clearly that their members are completely free and exempt from religious law.[5] It is true that pious souls easily reconciled this contrast by denying their competence to judge the saints. 'As regards the armies of *sheikhs*, *walīs*, pious, and pure persons (May God give us the benefit of their merits and by the blessings of the love for God make us the servants of their thresholds) it is part of their character to be visible to men in very rare cases only. Many of them however are visible in order to guide God's servants—may God increase their number and work good through them. It is everybody's duty to believe in them and not to reject them. Even when we see things about them of which we disapprove, this must be accounted for by the circumstance that we are too short-sighted to be able to judge their condition. How many of them subject themselves to public disapproval in order to hide their true circumstances! Therefore it is better and more wholesome to interpret their deeds in a favourable manner. The great sheikh Muḥyī al-Dīn ibn 'Arabī at the opening of his *Meccan Revelations* says: 'The highest happiness of men is to believe in all those who ascribe to themselves a relation-

[1] Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, IV, p. 318.

[2] Cf. Ibn Khallikān, no. 850, a tendentious story about the theologians declaring the ṣūfīs to be heretics—al-Damīrī (s.v. *dhubāb*) I, p. 439.

[3] *ZDMG*, XXVIII, pp. 324ff.

[4] Cf. al-Ghazālī, *al-Munqidh min al-Ḍalāl*, *JA*, 1877, I, p. 76, [and *Die Streitschrift des Gazālī gegen die Ibāḥiyya*, ed. O. Pretzl, *Sitzungsber. der Bayerischen Ak. d. Wissensch.*, 1933, with the editor's introduction.]

[5] E.g. the so-called Ḥarīrī dervishes (sixth century), for the origin of which, see *Fawāt al-Wafayāt*, II, p. 42, and all orders which call themselves *Bī-shar'*, i.e. those exempt from the law, Sell, *The Faith of Islam*, p. 95.

ship with God, even if this claim were not justified.' We beseech
[292] God to assist us in the belief in His *walīs* wherever they may be; may He introduce us into their midst and keep us apart from those who slight them.'[1] These typical words by Quṭb al-Dīn al-Nahrawālī (tenth century) clearly show the relation of believing minds to wandering humbugs clad in the mantle of saintliness, and this point of view still dominates the thinking of the Muslim people even today.[2]

As regards the miracles ascribed to the saints, the conception of orientals of the figures of the saint is guided by their unbridled phantasy, by their desire to be edified by prodigies and entertained by impossibilities—none of which are restricted by the limits that art may set to the excesses of imagination. Their legends of saints are full of features which are nothing but the religious application of fairy literature of Indians and Persians. Only that here it is not fairies and *jinn*, 'children of the realm of lies,' which bring to life the most extraordinary combination, but the grace of God becoming manifest in favour of His chosen ones. What appears as romantic hyperbole in fairy tales becomes in the literature of the *walīs* a miracle worked through God's mercy. There are lost rings inside fish which give themselves up on the prayer of saints, visits of saints to the inhabitants of the bottom of the sea, and many other features well known to readers of the *Arabian Nights*. If it were not for the aura of saintliness which surrounds the heroes of these tales one would imagine oneself in the realm of Badr Bāsim and Aladin. There is the chief saint of Damascus, Raslān or rather Arslān (d. ca. 700),[3] who produced the change of the four seasons within the span of a small hour; there are men of God who are present at several places simultaneously or in contrast take different shapes at the same place, who change gold to blood in order to show vainglorious rulers what is the nature of this glitter for which they hunt. The earth folds up for them so that spacial distance disappears for the saints. A *walī* was in the mosque at Tarsus and
[293] while praying he was overcome with the desire to make a pilgrimage to the mosque of Medina; he put his head in the sleeve of his coat and when he took it out again he was in Medina. This is one of the most common occurrences to be met with in the biographies of

[1] *Cāron. Mekka*, III, p. 406.

[2] But not all theologians are so lenient. Cf. a remarkable statement by al-Qasṭallānī, VII, p. 295, on the conceit of the *walīs*; he finds that Sūra 24:11 applies to them.

[3] The legend of this Raslān is to be found in Kremer, *Mittelsyrien und Damaskus*, p. 156. A theosophical treatise (*risāla tawḥīdiyya*) by him in *Cat. ar. Brit. Mus.*, p. 400a, commentaries on it in Berl. Cat., II, pp. 563ff., cf. also D.C. no. 358 (fols. 44ff.) and 412 of Leipzig Univ. Library [*GAL* I, p. 589, *S* I, p. 811].

saints.[1] The saints cause animals and stones to be given the faculty of speech. The famous saint Ibrāhīm b. Adham sat in the shade of a pomegranate tree, when the tree said: 'O, Abū Iṣḥāq, do me the honour to eat of myfruit.' The *walī* accepted this invitation. The fruit which up to then had been rather sour became sweet and the tree produced two crops a year. This kind of pomegranate was then called 'pomegranate of the servants of God' (*rummānat al-'ābidīn*). Another *walī* once reached for a tree in order to pick its fruit, when the tree said: 'Do not eat of my fruit, because I belong to a Jew.' The saints cure sickness and their prayers are always granted, every saint is a *mujāb al-du'ā'*. God destroys those who intend them harm. Wild animals become tame at their bidding and subject themselves to their will. They ride on lions, 'the dogs of God' (*kilāb Allāh*). One of the most remarkable gifts of popular *walīs* is *taṭawwur*, i.e. the ability to take on various shapes. The miraculous ability often comes in useful in their conflicts with the legalism of ordinary orthodoxy. Qaḍīb al-Bān, a *walī* from Mosul, sheltered behind this ability when he was accused of never being seen in prayer. In front of the accuser he adopted various shapes and asked: in which of these shapes have you seen me neglecting my prayers?[2] Muslims develop the greatest sweeps of imagination in respect of this *taṭawwur*. The sheikh Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Qurashī had but one eye and was a leper, but he nevertheless won the love of a young girl who, despite her parents' protests, insisted on marrying the saint. He then adopted the guise of a beautiful youth and affirmed his identity with [294]
al-Qurashī. He kept this new shape in his dealings with his young wife but appeared as before to all the rest of the world in the form of an ugly cripple.[3] Near al-'Arā'ish in Morocco is the grave of a female saint of whom it is told that she insinuated herself into the service of the saint Bū Selham in the guise of an ugly negress in order to appear at his side at night as a beautiful girl.[4]

The ability to fly—this too in *taṭawwur*—is one of the commonest miraculous accomplishments of the *awliyā'*; it enables them to visit far distant places in the shortest of times in order to watch over the

[1] This presumably is based on Jewish sources: the *ṭayy al-arḍ* corresponds to *qefiṣath hā-'ares*, Tal. Bab., *Ḥullīn*, fol. 91b, *Sanhedrin*, fol. 95a. Ibn Ḥazm mentions in his *K. al-Milal* this legendary trait among the Jewish beliefs disapproved of by him (Leiden Ms. Warner no. 480, fol. 87b=Vien. Cat. N.F. no. 216, fol. 133b). [Cairo 1317, I, p. 218; read *li-skiddati sur'atihi li-anna'l-arḍa tawīgat laḥu*, omitting *la* before *li-anna*.] This feature is however also used by Muslims outside the legends of saints, Abū Dāwūd I, p. 255, Ibn Qutayba, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 9, 4, al-Qazwīnī, II, p. 115.

[2] Al-Munāwī, fol. 3, cf. al-Damīrī (s.v. *fā'ir*) II, p. 111, where a similar legend is told of 'Umar b. al-Fāriḍ.

[3] Al-Biqā'ī, IV, fols. 3b, 19b.

[4] G. Charmes in *Rev. d. deux mondes*, June 1886, p. 870.

interests of their disciples and adepts and to be present wherever they are required. There is a popular belief that specially inspired people are able to see above their heads, *walīs* riding in the air on noble horses (*majd'ib*), and satirical doubters used this belief for many amusing anecdotes.[1]—Amongst the other accomplishments of *walīs*, the ability to speak many languages deserves mention[2] as does the ability to move mountains,[3] etc.; a figure of speech in Jewish and Christian religious literature is thus made into a factual occurrence in these miracle tales and has also been incorporated even in ancient times into the biography of the Prophet.

Muslim hagiologists summarized the miracles of the saints in twenty categories,[4] at the head of which they usually mention *iḥyā' al-mawtā*, the power to revive the dead.[5] Apart from and also within these categories the provincial peculiarities of the legends of saints must not, however, be overlooked, since they are important for gaining insight into the ethnological factors responsible for the origin and development of the legends. It is, for example, a typically Maghribī feature that the saint wanders with his disciples through desolate areas and at one point sticks his staff into the
[295] ground, whereupon water springs from the ground and lush vegetation appears in the desert. The *zāwiya*[6] of the saint is then founded at such an oasis and brings blessing and salvation to later generations. This occurs frequently in the biographies of Maghribī saints which were collected and described by Trumelet.[7] The North African character of these legends is also seen in the fact that wherever we meet them outside North Africa[8] they are connected with Berber dervishes on the pilgrimage to Mecca. The cisterns of Yemen only produce drinkable water because two Maghribī saints were buried in that area.[9]

## IV

Before going further we should like to answer another question: 'What is the position of women in the hagiology of Islam?'[10] Because

[1] Al-Sharbīnī *Hazz al-Quḥūf* (lith. ed.), pp. 109, 120.
[2] Cf. *ZDMG*, XXVI, pp. 770ff.
[3] Abo'l-Maḥāsin, I, p. 429.
[4] Al-Munāwī, fol. 30b.
[5] Cf. *Disput. relig. Mohammed.*, p. 129.
[6] *Zāwiya* = Eastern *khānqa*, pl. *khawānīq*, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, I, p. 71 [cf. *EI*, s.v.].
[7] *Les saints de l'Islam. Legendes hagiologiques et croyances algériennes* (vol. I), *Les Saints du Tell*, Paris, 1881.
[8] Doughty, *Travels in Arabia Deserta*, I, p. 140.
[9] *Voyage de l'Inde à la Mekke par 'Abdoul Kérym*, ed. Langlès (Paris, 1797), p. 201.
[10] [For this chapter cf. M. Smith, *Rābi'a the Mystic and her Fellow-Saints in Islam*, Cambridge, 1928.]

of their treatment, Islam is held in such evil repute that we might easily assume that it assigns no place to women when the highest degree of human perfection is in question. Dr Perron, who has made the position of women amongst Arabs the subject of a detailed monograph, mentions only one woman saint; the famous Rābi'a al-'Adawiyya. This author sums up this phenomenon with the words: 'In Islam women rarely walk the path of saintliness. It is too difficult for them—at least this is what men think. All brilliance, merit and honour goes to the men. They have turned everything to their own advantage and privilege; they have taken for themselves and monopolized everything—even saintliness and Paradise.'[1] This statement agrees with the idea which is usually propounded of the position of women in Islam in respect of law and with regard to religious merit and religious responsibility. But in order to observe historical justice it must be admitted that degradation of women in Islam[2] is the result of social influences[3] for which the [296] principles of Islam are unjustly made responsible, but which were in fact the outcome of the social relations of the peoples converted to Islam. But even this must not be taken too far. It is true that Islam itself (though as regards the legal position of women it was an advance on the Jāhiliyya) placed women, as even its eager apologists must admit[4] far lower than men on the social scale;[5] women are called 'the majority of those in Hell,'[6] *nāqiṣāt 'aql wa-dīn*,' i.e. lacking in understanding and religion.'[7] This however does not exclude women from the spiritual endowments with which Islam intended to benefit all mankind. In the earliest times of Islam there are many proofs of the influence that women had upon the public affairs and political movements of the young Muslim community. There were not only pious women—presumably successors of the pre-Islamic *nāsiḥāt*[8]—who gladly proved their piety by services

[1] *Femmes arabes avant et depuis l'islamisme* (Paris–Algiers, 1858), p. 350.

[2] This is shown in principles expressed in a most noteworthy passage in *Agh.* X, p. 154, cf. also later hadīths in al-Damīrī (s.v. *al-ghurāb*), II, p. 205.

[3] Kremer, *Culturgesch.*, II, pp. 106ff.

[4] E.g. (van Bemmelen) *L'Egypte et l'Europe*, II (Leiden, 1884), p. 654, cf. Bosworth Smith, *Mohammed and Mohammedanism* (2nd ed., London, 1876), p. 242.

[5] This is not peculiar to Islam, cf. the commentary to Genesis 2:21 in de Lagarde, *Materialien zur Geschichte und Kritik d. Pentat.*, I, p. 31, 28ff.

[6] B. *Īmān*, no. 29 (ed. Krehl, no. 21).

[7] Muslim, I, p. 159.

[8] Labīd, ed. Huber 26:12; a hero who for the whole night crouches in ambush with ruffled hair and covered with dust is compared to *nāsiḥāt* waiting for the offering of the votive sacrifice. For the *māhināt* of the ancient Arabs see Kremer, *Stud. zur vergl. Culturgesch.* (1890), Part 2, p. 76. Perhaps the *shaykha ragud* in 'Abīd b. al-Abraṣ v. 39 (Hommel, *Aufsätze und Abhandlungen*, p. 60) [ed. Lyall, 1:36] also belongs to this context. It is not impossible,

rendered for the sake of the worship of God,[1] but there were also women who participated in the internal and external battles.[2] The [297] figure of the heroic Nuṣayba[3] does not emerge from a society in which women are considered similar to slaves; and the role of 'Ā'isha and her influence upon the affairs of the young state in its first gathering of strength must be viewed from other than the standpoint of a Turkish harem intrigue. After Snouck's demonstration[4] it is no longer necessary to refute in detail the mistaken assumption that the disguising and hiding of women and their separation from all social intercourse have their cause in the law of early Islam. In the earliest generation of Islam the wife of Muṣ'ab b. al-Zubayr (d. 72), who showed her face unveiled to all and sundry, could say: 'Allāh has blessed me with beauty and I love the world to look at it and recognize that I am superior to all and that there is no blemish in my beauty.'[5] To be sure, Islam does demand modest reserve from women, as was also required by good breeding under paganism—the chaste woman is in the *khidr*;[6] but this does not completely cut women off from the interests of the world. The earliest history of Islam has many examples of this.

The sympathy which the female sex showed to the unfortunate cause of Ḥusayn[7] and the 'Alids is truly remarkable. Women also have their share in inventing, elaborating, and circulating 'Alid

[1] Umm Milḥjān, *al-Muwaṣṣa'*, II, p. 11, Ibn Ḥajar, IV, p. 784.

[2] One should not, however, overlook al-Ṭabarī's remark, I, p. 1926, 1: that the Arabs did not like their women to be present at battles.

[3] Ibn Ḥajar, IV, p. 807; Sprenger, *Moḥammad*, III, p. 176.

[4] 'Twee populaire dwalingen verbeterd' *BTLV*, 3e volgr. I, pp. 10ff. of the offprint [*Verspreide Geschriften*, I, pp. 305ff.]. Cf. from an earlier date Hammer-Purgstall, *JRAS*, IV (1837), p. 172, note; D'Escayrac de Lauture, *Le Désert et le Soudân* (German ed., Leipzig, 1855), p. 63.

[5] *Agh.*, X, p. 54.

[6] Cf. Wellhausen, *Reste arab. Heidenthums*, p. 146; *rabbat al-khidr*, in Nöldeke, *Beitr. Poesie*, p. 85, 6—*Mufaḍḍal.*, 29:1, *bayḍatu khidrin*, *Imrq.*, *Mu'all*, v. 23. Plural: *bayḍāt al-khudūr*, *Ḥam.*, p. 250 v. 2. It seems however that these expressions refer in the first instance to unmarried girls (B. *'Idayn*, no. 15: *al-'awātiq ẓhawāt al-khudūr*, in a later poet: *'awātiqu lam takun tada'u'l-ḥijāla*, Dhū-l-Rumma, *khiz. Adab.*, IV, p. 107, 6 from below [ed. Macartney 57:6e] as well as *mukhaddha'āt*, Zuhayr, 1:36 (ed. Landberg, p. 139 v. 4); cf. *al-'adhrā'a fi'l-naṣīf*, Hudhayl., 237:14, 278:40 (for *naṣif*, B. *Jināḍ*, no. 5 *naṣīf* of the maidens of Paradise); *al-'adhrā'u fī khidrihā*, B. *Adab*, no. 76. See further references in respect of related expressions in *Oest. Monatsschr. f. d. Orient*, XI, p. 136, bottom. N.B. *Ḥam.*, p. 750 v. 1: *gharālun muqanna'u*, a veiled doer (of a young girl).

[7] Al-Ṭabarī, II, p. 459, the women from the tribe of Hamdān.

---

however, that *nāsikāt* means Christian women = *rawāhib*, sing. rāhika who dress in *musūḥ* (hair shirt), Ḥassān, *Dīwān*, p. 25, 7 [ed. Hirschfeld] and abstain from wine, Ḥumayd b. Thawr, *Kitāb al-Aḍḍād*, p. 224, 2ff. For the women of the Jāhiliyya cf. Aug. Müller, *Isl.*, I, p. 47.

legends. A number of these are told on the authority of al-Nawār bint Mālik, as for example a vision that celestial light surrounded the urn in which 'Alī's head was kept and that a white bird fluttered around it.[1] The anti-Umayyad conspirators at Baṣra held their meetings after the acession of Yazīd at the house of Maria bint Sa'd, a woman from the tribe of 'Abd al-Qays who was a zealous follower of the 'Alids.[2] Amongst the many moving episodes of the tragic and desperate fight carried out by Ḥusayn for the rights of his family, we hear how Umm Wahb, the wife of a zealous follower of the pretender, grabbed a tent-pole and stepping up to her husband addressed him thus: 'I offer my father and mother as ransom for you. Go and fight for the rights of Muhammed's descendants.' When her husband sent her back to the women she took hold of his dress saying: 'I shall not leave you but rather will I die with you,' and when he was killed in the battle she greeted his corpse with the words: 'May Paradise agree with you.'[3] This also calls to mind. Asmā', the daughter of Abū Bakr, who stood at the side of her son 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr and encouraged him during his struggle with al-Ḥajjāj, and who would not tolerate her son's wearing a mail shirt when going into battle, since this was unworthy of a man who fights for what he was convinced was a just cause. In the early period of Islam, women—who have been claimed as examples for some modern heroines of the Arabian desert[4]—vied with their heroic menfolk in their enthusiasm for the difficult wars to which they were called. When Ḥabīb b. Maslama al-Fihrī (d. 42) was about to leave on one of those expeditions which occupied most of his life, his wife asked him: 'Where do you go?' 'Either into the enemy camp,' replied Ḥabīb, 'or, if Allāh so wills, to Paradise.' 'At both places I wish to arrive first,' said his wife. In the event, Ḥabīb met her later in the enemy camp, which she had reached before him.[5] The murderer of the Khārijite chief Nāfi' b. al-Azraq faced a woman who challenged him to single combat in order to avenge Nāfi''s murder.[6] [298]

Apart from participation in political affairs, we also encounter women as priests of humanity and philanthropy in the midst of the terrors of war. Ibn Sa'd tells of a woman of the Aslam tribe, Kulayba bint Sa'īd,[7] who, during the battle of Khaybar, first started a field [299]

[1] Ibid., II, p. 369.
[2] Ibid., p. 235.
[3] Ibid., p. 336.
[4] Burton, *Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina* (Leipzig, 1874), II, p. 237; cf. Didier [*Séjour chez le Grand-chérife de la Mekke*, p. 196, German transl.] *Ein Aufenthalt bei dem Gross-Scherif von Mekka*, p. 245.
[5] Al-Jāḥiẓ, *K. al-Bayān*, fol. 48b [II, pp. 167–8].
[6] *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, p. 92.
[7] Quoted in Ibn Ḥajar, IV, p. 763. [The correct form is Ku'ayba bint Sa'd, see Ibn Sa'd, VIII, p. 213.]

hospital[1] in the mosque where she tended the sick and wounded. The Koran itself contradicts the view that woman have no access to 'sanctity and Paradise'; it is enough to look at the many passages which refer to *mu'minūn* and *mu'mināt*, *ṣāliḥūn* and *ṣāliḥāt* in the same breath and presuppose their full equality (esp. Sūra 33:35).

This proves that neither the position of women in the oldest movements of the Muslim community nor the teachings of the founder of the new religion were—despite some theological limitations of entirely theoretical nature[2]—to prevent women from achieving, in inner religious life and in the consciousness of believers, the same importance as men, to prevent the veneration of the *awliyā'* (when it developed in Islam) from being extended to women[3] whom the consensus of the believers raised to that height. And in fact when informing ourselves of Muslim life at various ages and when looking in the cemeteries at the graves of saints, we realize that women occupied a rather different position from that stated by Perron. Much is heard of women saints (*shaykhāt*) from the earliest to the most recent times. Their names are known and their saintly life and their pious deeds and miracles (*karāmāt*) are spoken of with reverence. Theologians hostile to the excesses of the ṣūfīs declaim
[300] also against these female saints and the veneration which surrounds them.[4] Not long ago the oriental newspaper reported the impressive funeral of such a female saint, the Sheikha Amīna in Alexandria. There can be but few books on the biographies of saints which fail to mention a number of women saints under every letter of the alphabet, wondrous deeds are no less marvellous than those of the men dealt with in the same works. It is characteristic that some theologians name as the first representative of the dignity of *quṭb* (one of the most prominent in the hierarchy of the *awliyā*) a woman: Fāṭima.[5] There is full equality between the sexes in the field of saintliness. In the relevant literature there is even a special monograph about the biographies of women saints written by the sheikh Taqī al-Dīn Abū Bakr al-Ḥusnī entitled: 'Lives of believing and

[1] An institution which in later centuries became an established part of Muslim warfare, Ibn Khallikān, no. 367, al-Maqqarī, I, p. 548 [Ibn al-Qiftī, p. 405].

[2] For instance that women may not reach the grade of a *nabī*; after Muhammed, however, there are to be no more prophets in any case, even among men. But even in this point a theologian of the fourth century deviated from the usual doctrine and gained thereby the disapproval of the masses, Ibn Bashkuwāl, no. 1957, p. 479, bottom.

[3] The course of life broke through the barrier which later theology did not omit to erect; al-Bayḍāwī to Sūra 14:38 (I, p. 207, 22): *khuṣṣū (al-rijāl) bi'l-nubuwwa wa'l-imāma wa'l-walāya.*

[4] Muhammad al-'Abdarī, *al-Madkhal* (Alexandria, 1293), II, p. 18.

[5] Al-Munāwī, fol. 23a.

pious women walking in the path of God.'[1] The author intended, as he states in the preface to his book, that his female readers should take to heart the examples of piety and moral sanctity found in it. Therefore in drawing the moral he frequently addresses the women of his time in severe tones: *yā nisā' hādhā 'l-zamān*, 'Woe and woe again, O women of this age,' he says in the biography of the pious Ḥasana (fol. 45b); 'You are just her opposites. You delight in the sons of this world. If your husband is godless and indulges in intoxicating drinks and commits other sins you delight in him even though his behaviour rouses God's anger; and you avoid the pious man though he finds favour with God. A curse upon you! How little delight do you take in things that will bring you closer to Allāh.'

It is however not the warlike Islam, which employs measures of violence, the *religion d'hommes* as Renan calls it, that produced women saints; it is the Islam full of mystical and ascetic leanings that fostered these female saints,[2] those *zāhidāt* and *'ābidāt*, the accounts of which fill the Muslim books. There are also congregations of women which were the seminaries of female saints, convents for women. It may appear strange to hear of Muslim nuns and Muslim [301] convents, as if there could be even stricter and more extensive isolation of women than is inherent in the harem. Al-Maqrīzī, in his chapter on convents (*ribāṭ*) in Egypt, mentions an institution called Ribāṭ al-Baghdādiyya (convent of the Baghdād woman): 'this house was built by Madame (*khātūn*) Tadhkārpās, the daughter of Malik al-Ẓāhir Baybars in 684 A.H. for Zaynab, daughter of Abū'-l-Barakāt, which pious sheikha is usually called 'daughter of the Baghdād woman' (*bint al-Baghdādiyya*). In this institute the princess erected a house for this sheikha and other pious women. To this day the house is known for the piety of its inmates, who are always headed by a lady superior who provides religious teaching to the others and who leads them in pious exercises and instructs them in religious sciences. The last lady superior of the house known to us was the pious sheikha, mistress of the women of her epoch, Umm Zaynab Fāṭima of Baghdād, daughter of 'Abbās, who died in the month Dhū'l-Ḥijja of the year 714 aged above eighty. She was a scholarly woman who renounced all worldly goods, was satisfied with little, was God-fearing, and walked in God's way, zealous in furthering spiritual profit and devout exercises and of sincere piety. Many women from Damascus and Cairo were taught by her; she inspired trust in everyone and exerted great influence upon souls with her teaching. After her death all the lady superiors of this

[1] *Siyar al-Sālikāt al-Mu'mināt al-Khayrāt*, Ms. Leipzig Univ. D.C., no. 368 [*GAL* II, p. 117, *S* II, p. 112].

[2] Kremer, *Herrsch. Ideen*, pp. 63–5.

convent received the title 'the Baghdād woman.' Women who had been repudiated by their husbands used to retreat to this house and live there, in order to preserve their reputation also until they made a new marriage; for the house was under strict discipline, the inmates being always busy with religious exercises, and anyone who violated the rules of the house was punished by the superior. In consequence of the events of 806 the institute decayed. It is supervised by the chief *qāḍī* of the Ḥanafites'.[1]

Formerly there were women's convents also in Mecca; Muḥammad al-Fāsī (b. 775, d. 832 in Mecca), Mālikite *qāḍī* of the holy city, mentions in his history and topography of Mecca, among the foundations of the holy city, the convent of Bint al-Tāj. 'I do not know,' says al-Fāsī, 'who founded it; it is more than 200 years old (the book
[302] was finished in 819), and from an inscription on the gate it was founded for pious ṣūfī women[2] who wished to live in Mecca permanently.' Further he says: 'To these foundations belongs a convent, behind the convent of al-Dūrī, which is for women: this institution still existed in the middle of the seventh century.' Finally: 'There are two convents near al-Durayba, one is called Ribāṭ Ibn al-Sawdā', and in the inscription on its gate it is related that on Rabī' I, 590, Umm Khalīl Khadīja and Umm 'Īsā Maryam, both daughters of 'Abd Allāh al-Qasīmī, founded these two convents for pious Ṣūfī women belonging to the Shāfi'ite rite who vowed to lead a celibate life. The latter was also called the convent of Hirrīsh.'[3] There are Muslim nuns also in North Africa. Al-Bakrī mentions a place near Sūsa named Monastīr, remarking that this is a place for pilgrimage for women living like dervishes.[4]

We have seen that in Islam there was not only the possibility of the rise of the idea of women saints but that also the social consequences of this concept appeared here just as elsewhere. The female saints of Muslim legends are equipped with the same power to work miracles as the *walīs* and they partake, during their life and after their death, in the same honours. Though profound theological scholarship was, as we saw at the beginning of the previous chapter, not an indispensable attribute of saints, it is frequently emphasized in the biographies of the sheikhas as a special claim to glory; showing the widespread belief that Islam considers the cultivation of *'ilm*

[1] Khiṭaṭ, II, p. 428. Of the building no trace is left now, 'Alī Bāshā Mubārak, *Al-Khiṭaṭ al-Jadīda al-Tawfīqiyya*, VI, p. 53.

[2] The title Ṣūfiyya is often met with among pious women, e.g. Abū-l-Maḥāsin, II, p. 224, 4 from below, a saintly worker of miracles, Fāṭima bint 'Abd al-Raḥmān (d. 312). In Ibn Bashkuwāl, no. 1192, p. 537, a Ṣūfī is mentioned from the beginning of the fourth century who married a Ṣūfiyya whose mother also was a Ṣūfiyya.

[3] *Chron. Maṣḥ.*, II, pp. 114–15.

[4] [Ed. de Slane, p. 36, quoted by] Yāqūt, IV, p. 661.

as exclusively masculine prerogative to be exaggerated.[1] Ancient Islam made the study of religious science obligatory to all believers irrespective of sex,[2] and women had in earlier centuries a much [303] larger share in religious science than is usually appreciated.[3]

It is understandable that popular belief in Islam was most ready to call saints those women who were connected with the beginnings of Islam. The followers of the family of 'Alī are especially ready to elevate the women of this sacred family to the sphere of sanctity. Much as Islam attached to 'Alī's family the concept—raised to a mystical plane—of martyrdom, it also considered the women of this family from a higher viewpoint. Cairo is of all Sunnite cities the one most steeped in 'Alid reminiscences, as a result of the Fāṭimid rule there. This city harbours Ḥusayn's head and the grave of Zayd, the grandson of Ḥusayn, who fell victim in Kūfa to the Umayyad caliph Hishām but whose body miraculously reached Cairo. The graves of pious women of the family of 'Alī are also shown here, such as those of Umm Kulthūm, Sitta Jawhara, the servant of Sitta Nafīsa, as well as that of S. Nafīsa herself, who was a true saint.[4] The legends woven around her memory may give an indication of the Islamic concept of women saints. S. Nafīsa was a great grandchild of the caliph and martyr Ḥasan and daughter-in-law of the Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq. She was famous for her piety and zeal in religious practices; she made the pilgrimage to Mecca thirty times, she fasted most frequently and revived the nights (i.e. stayed awake in prayer and holy exercises), she prayed much and did penance, and ate only every third day and sparingly at that. She knew the Koran and its explanations by heart and was so well versed in religious knowledge that her great contemporary, the Imām al-Shāfi'ī, greatly admired her scholarship. She dug her own grave before her death, and when the pit was finished she sat in it reciting the Koran a hundred and ninety times; just as she was reading the word *raḥmat* (mercy) her soul left her body and sped to the Lord of Mercy.

Her miracles are without number. We will just mention a few of the most famous. When she moved from Arabia to Egypt she came

[1] The well-known Egyptian scholar sheikh Rifā'a al-Ṭahṭāwī (d. 1873) endeavoured, from an apologetic point of view, to disprove this opinion in a special treatise; cf. an extract from it in Jacoub Artin Pascha's *L'instruction publique en Egypte* (Paris, 1890), pp. 122ff.

[2] This is expressed in the ḥadīth: *ṭalab al-'ilm farīḍa 'alā kull muslim wa-muslima.*

[3] See Excursuses and Annotations.

[4] Cf. Mehren 'Revue des monuments funéraires du Kerafet ou de la ville des morts hors du Caire' (*Mélanges asiatiques tirés du Bulletin de l'Académie imper. des Sciences de St. Petersburg*, IV (1871) pp. 564–566 [L. Massignon, 'La Cité des Morts au Caire,' *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale*, LVII (1958), pp. 25ff.]

into the neighbourhood of a *dhimmī* family (Christian or Jewish)
[304] where there was a girl suffering from gout who was unable to move her limbs freely and had to lie quite still. Once her parents left their home in order to buy food in the market and they asked their pious Muslim neighbour to look after the unfortunate invalid during their absence. Nafīsa, full of love and mercy, accepted the task. When the parents of the sick child had left the house the saint performed her ritual ablutions and turned to Allāh with devout prayers for the recovery of the unconscious child. Hardly had she ended her prayers when the patient regained control of her limbs and hurried towards her returning parents. The grateful parents did not hesitate to become Muslims.

Once the Nile failed to rise and irrigate the dry land. The country was facing a terrible drought and famine. The people were desperate and all prayers and show of repentance were of no avail; the river remained obdurate. At that point Nafīsa handed her veil to the unhappy citizens so that they might throw it into the Nile. This was hardly accomplished when the level of the river began to rise and the people, terrified of death by hunger, saw abundance as rarely before. The people of Cairo regard the grave of this saint as a privileged place where prayers are said with certainty of fulfilment. The saintly woman, who during her life never refused to intercede on behalf of the unhappy and needy, still continues to do so even after her death, nor does God leave unanswered a prayer on behalf of which Nafīsa intercedes.[1]

The legends of Nafīsa represent a type of legend about women saints which are spread in the east and west of the Islamic world. We stress this geographical spread of such legends in order to forestall a prejudice which several ethnographical writers have recently expressed. A difference is established concerning women saints, expressed in a categorical form by Kobelt in his *Skizzen aus Algerien*: 'We never find women saints among the Arabs, only among the Berbers.'[2] It is true that the Maraboutism of women has strongly
[305] developed amongst the Berbers[3] and the reason for this—as well as for other phenomena of the cult of saints in the Maghrib—is found in the pre-Islamic antecedents of Maghribī Islam.[4] But to

[1] *Khiṭaṭ*, II, p. 441. We now have a detailed description of Sitta Nafīsa's grave and of her legend in P. Ravaisse, 'Sur trois miḥrabs en bois sculpté' in *Mémoires présentés et lus à l'Institut égyptien* [Cf. *EI*, s.v. 'Nafīsa'], II, (Cairo, 1889), pp. 661ff.

[2] *Globus*, 1885, no. 3, p. 40, cf. Trumelet *Les Saints du Tell*, I, p. XLVIII.

[3] One need only recall the cult of Lella Setti in Tlemsen (Barges, *Tlemcen*, p. 132), of Lella Minana in al-'Arīsh (Rohlfs, *Erster Aufenthalt in Marokko*, p. 367).

[4] Cf. *ZDMG*, XLI, p. 55, Procopius, *De bello vand.*, II, chap. 8, on women foretelling the future.

question the ability of Arabic Islam to conceive the idea of women saints is not justified.

V

We will not concern ourselves further in the present study with living *walīs* as the object of veneration. The above specimens taken from popular superstition (III) may be justified as oriental contributions to the knowledge of folklore, for the study of which material is at present being diligently collected in the most varied fields. We shall turn to the cult which is attached in Islam to dead *walīs*. This is usually connected with the graves of saintly persons and more rarely with the places which played some part in their lives.

(1)

Though already in the Meccan cult, as it developed during the early days of Islam, a prominent place was awarded to the sacred places taken over from pagan traditions transformed to link them with Ibrāhīm, it is nevertheless noticeable that in the most ancient times of Islam the tendency to attribute special efficacy to places which were connected with saintly persons did not yet prevail. The sacred memorial places of the Ka'ba associated with patriarchal times had their origin, like the whole Islamic cult of the Ka'ba, in the need to make acceptable to the new order pagan ceremonies which, because of the Arab character attached to ancestral tradition, were indispensable. We have no certain information whether and to what extent the area of sacred places was extended beyond these limits during the first decades. The fact that the Prophet's birthplace was used as an ordinary dwelling-house during Umayyad time and was made a house of prayer[1] only by al-Khayzurān (d. 173), the mother of Hārūn al-Rashīd, would suggest that the consecration of places associated with the legend of the Prophet did not date from the earliest period of Islam.[2] Probably the reports of the chroniclers who push back the consecration of the Islamic memorials to an early period prove only that the sanctity of such places was well established at the chronicler's time. Thus, for example, are to be understood the report of Wāqidī that mosques were erected[3] at places where the Prophet had prayed, or the communication of Ṭabarī, which has no *isnād* and is based on hearsay[4] only, that 'the house of Khadīja' where Muhammed lived with his first wife was made a sacred place as early as by Mu'āwiya. In effect, even Muslim [306]

[1] Ṭab., I, p. 968.
[2] Cf. Snouck Hurgronje, *Mekka*, I, p. 21.
[3] Wāqidī-Wellhausen, p. 208.
[4] *fīmā dhukira*, Ṭab., I, p. 1130, 3.

historians sometimes express doubts about the significance of some of these sanctuaries.[1]

With the successive elevation of the Prophet's character, which from popular belief also penetrated into doctrine, active reverence for such memorial places increased more and more. Even the minutest episodes of the Prophet's life were perpetuated topographically. Thus, for example, the place where his cooking pot stood, when in the first year of the flight he prepared food under a tree for himself and his companions, in Baṭḥā ibn Azhar, was pointed out.[2] Since the fixing of such memorial places had been neglected in the earliest times, it can be easily realized that their later perpetuation is devoid of all historical basis. People were not particularly worried about the credentials and the authenticity of the sacred places. Ṭāriq b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān reports that he passed a mosque on his pilgrimage in which he saw people praying. In reply to his question he was told that this mosque had been erected in memory of the 'homage under the tree' at the spot where it had taken place. Ṭāriq told this to Sa'īd b. al-Musayyib (d. 93), who said, 'My father, who himself was one of those who paid homage to the Prophet under the tree, could a year later no longer give the location of this event. The companions of the Prophet thus completely forgot the place of their submission: and now you say you
[307] have found it again and know about it.'[3] In the third century, in al-Azraqī's days, the 'mosque of the tree' already had another meaning. It no longer was meant as a reminder of the homage under the tree but of a legend of a miracle: at that spot was a tree which the Prophet asked about something, whereupon the tree is said to have moved to the Prophet, to have stood in front of him, and to have returned to its original place after the discussion was over.[4]

The further we move on in time the more richly blossoms the reverence towards holy memorial places. In Mecca itself the sacred graves are on the increase. It is claimed that ninety-nine graves of

[1] Cf. e.g. al-Azraqī, p. 425, to *al-multaḥā*.

[2] Ṭab., I, p. 1268.

[3] B. *Maghāzī*, no. 37: in al-Qasṭallānī, VI, p. 391 it is mentioned on the authority of Ibn Sa'd that 'Umār had felled the tree when he heard that prayers were said near it.

[4] Al-Azraqī, p. 424; cf. Snouck Hurgronje, *Het Mekkaansche Feest*, p. 123, note 2 [*Verspreide Geschr.* I, p. 82]. Later the memory of this sacred place disappeared al-Fāsī (eighth century) writes: al-Ḥudaybiya and the mosque (of the tree) are quite unknown today, *Chron. Mekk.*, II, p. 83, 6. I was unable to find out whether the veneration of the lotus of the Prophet near Ṭā'if (*Sidrat al-Nabī*, also called simply *al-Sidra*, al-Fākihī, *Chron. Mekk.*, II, p. 48, 3) which is connected with a miracle by the Prophet, still continues; it is still mentioned in the tenth century; *Disput. relig. Mohammed.*, p. 245.

prophets—especially from the time of the patriarchs—were found between the black stone and the Zamzam.[1] The stone upon which the Prophet rested on his return from his *'Umra* is pointed out, as is the stone in Abū Bakr's house which greeted the Prophet during the absence of the master of the house.[2] Naturally it is in Medina and its close environs that the oldest traditions of Islam are kept alive through local reminiscences, *mashāhid*. In the middle of the mosque at Qubā is shown the spot where the camel, on which the Prophet rode, knelt down, and in the courtyard of the same building there is a niche which commemorates the moment when the Prophet made his first *rak'a*. In Medina the sites of the houses of the first caliphs are shown and the cistern the water of which became sweet through the Prophet's spittle. Outside Medina the stone is shown from which dripped olive oil at the Prophet's order; a *qubba* is built over the stone and it need not be added that prayer at this sacred place and by the many graves of companions and helpers which are to be found in the territory of Medina is considered as particularly efficacious.[3] It is interesting that more important his- [308] torical moments, and not only personal associations, are also the occasion to declare certain spots sacred. During the reign of al-Ma'mūn a mosque was erected on the spot where the followers of Muhammed defeated the false prophet Musaylima, thus saving the whole of Islam from a grave danger.[4]

In the meantime veneration of saints was continuously advancing. The ideas growing from this new element of religious life led the mind of the believers to sacred places of a very different type. The graves of saints are visited as sacred places for worship or, as we shall see, old pagan sanctuaries are reinterpreted as Muslim graves of saints. A peculiar cult of graves develops in the forms of which the old pagan traditions of the people concerned often live on, but transferred to the veneration of graves of saints arising on Islamic bases. The original form of the veneration of such graves consisted in visiting the graves of martyrs in order to greet them. It was believed that the answering greeting on the part of the pious men they were visiting could be heard. Nobody liked the last resting place of such men to pass without showing his reverence.[5] As early as the second century a sort of cult was attached to this habit which grew out of simple reverence. We find energetic polemics against such a cult in the earliest ḥadīth (see the last section of this study).

[1] In al-Damīrī (s.v. al-*nasr*), II, p. 413, bottom.
[2] Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, I, p. 333.
[3] Ibid., pp. 286ff.
[4] Al-Balādhurī, p. 93.
[5] Cf. Wāqidī-Wellhausen, pp. 143f.

The visiting of these graves was motivated by more than just reverence for those resting in them, since it was believed that through the pilgrimage to the grave, prayers said there, and votive offerings, one could obtain the help of the saint, or, as this belief was attenuated to fit Islamic theory, that one could obtain his intercession on behalf of the petitioner, or in general *li'l-tabarruk*,[1] gain his blessing through pious remembrance of the saint and veneration of his memory. Belief in the efficacy of visits to graves was unshakeable among the people. A number of legends express the confidence of the people that saints whose graves were visited in times of utter distress will lend help by extraordinary means. Even the remission of debts may be obtained by the pious through the
309] intercession of the saint whose *qubba* he visits reverently. The legend of Layth b. Sa'd—called Abū'l-Makārim, i.e. father of mercy or the merciful one—resting in the Qarāfa of Cairo has been told elsewhere.[2] A man harassed by creditors found upon his grave a bird learned in the Koran, with which the poor man caused such a sensation in Cairo that the sultan bought this bird from him for a sum which was more than enough to help him out of his distress. It is not surprising that according to this and similar legends even the remission of debts is within the sphere of saints if it is borne in mind that the saint involved represents God in this case also. In some of the oldest Muslim prayers God is implored to remit debts. An old evening prayer runs: 'O God, master of heaven and earth who splittest the corn's seed and the kernel of the date, who hast revealed the Torah, the Gospel and the Koran, I seek refuge with Thee from the wickedness of all wicked men, whose forelock Thou holdest in Thy hands. Thou art the first; nothing was before Thee; Thou art the last; nothing is after Thee, etc. Pay my debt for me and let me not sink into poverty.'[3] And when the *khaṭīb* on Friday prays for all Muslims, for the caliph and his army, he never forgets to add the request *w'aqḍi al-dayn 'an al-mudayyanīn*, 'Settle the debts of those who are in debt.'[4] From this it is evident that payment of debt was included in the efficacy of supernatural power. 'Alī is made to say: 'The Prophet taught me some words: "If a debt oppressed you as much as might the mountain of Thabīr, God would settle it for you if you say these words (prayers)".'[5]

[1] Al-Qasṭallānī, II, p. 495.

[2] In my contribution to Ebers' *Aegypten in Bild und Wort*, I, p. 367. The literary source of the legend is Abū'l-Fatḥ al-'Awfī, fol. 98a.

[3] Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 247, top.

[4] Khutab Ibn Nubāta (d. 374), ed. Būlāq, 1286, p. 70, in the example for a *khuṭbat al-istiṣ'āl*; cf. also the Friday *khuṭba* quoted in Lane, *Manners and Customs*, I, p. 112. In the *khuṭba* quoted by Sell, *Faith of Islam*, p. 203, this passage does not occur.

[5] Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 274.

Thus the distressed man, the woman in her domestic sorrows, in illness, poverty, etc., turn the grave of the saint; the repentant sinner hopes to attain forgiveness through prayer at his grave.[1] Women have another cause to tell their anguish to the saint if they [310] are denied children. More especially in respect of warding off this evil, popular belief has ascribed special efficacy to certain graves, and almost every Islamic country has places of pilgrimage which are so privileged. Damascus has its Sittī Zaytūn, Egypt its saint Badawī at Tanta,[2] barren women in Algeria turn to the miraculous staff of Sīdī 'Alī Ṭālib in the Kuku mosque.[3] Clenier[4] tells us, a century ago: 'In the mountains not far from Fez is a saint whom Jews and Berbers alike venerate; in general opinion a Jew was buried here before the introduction of Islam. The wives of Berbers and Jews who desire children make pilgrimage on foot to the peak of the mountain where the grave of this saint is situated. Nearby is a bay-tree which for many centuries has put forth leaves again from its trunk, and this easily convinces these superstitious people that the saint has vitalizing powers.'

To some saints definite spheres of efficacy have been ascribed in the local cult of certain districts within which they are said to have special miraculous powers. In Islam too, patrons of special spheres of life developed.[5] Hammer-Purgstall listed after Ewliyā-Efendi the Muslim patrons of corporations and guilds in the districts with which he was dealing, and it must be assumed that the large number of special patrons in Constantinople came into existence as an after-effect of the Christian past of this town.[6] It is interesting that amongst these there are also some eponymous heroes[7]. These patrons are of only local significance. No generally admitted popular notion or belief about such patron saints developed in Islam. But the various [311] districts have their own superstitions in this respect, or at least had them in past ages. We shall quote an example of this: if one can

[1] This capacity of sacred places was transferred by the love poet Kuthayyir (d. 105) to the praying place of his 'Azza: 'Despair not of Allāh forgiving your sins if you pray at the place where she had prayed.' *Khizānat al-Adab*, II, p. 379 (version of Ibn Durayd).

[2] Women ascribe such power also to bathing in a cistern near Dayr al-Ṭīn. 'Alī Bāshā Mubārak, *al-Khiṭaṭ al-Jadīda*, VIII, p. 33.

[3] Daumas, *Moeurs et coutumes de l'Algérie* (Paris, 1853), p. 212.

[4] [*Recherches historiques sur les Maures, et histoire de l'Empire de Maroc* (Paris, 1787), III, pp. 154–5. German transl.] *Geschichte und Staatsverfassung der Königreiche Marokko und Fes* (Leipzig, 1788), p. 99.

[5] E.g. in Damascus the sheikh al-Cherkesi, patron of the wool-combers, Sīdī al-Sarūjī, patron of the saddlers; Kremer, *Topographie von Damascus*, vol. 2, pp. 11, 15.

[6] *Constantinopolis und Bosporus* (Budapest, 1822), II, pp. 399–534.

[7] E.g. nos. 474–5, p. 497, the saint Abū'l-Nidā (father of the cry) is patron of the public criers in the *Bezestān*.

speak of a general Muslim popular belief in a patron of the sea this must be Khiḍr, who is *mukallaf fi'l-baḥr*, in charge of everything to do with the sea. But belief in him did not take firm hold with the people. To guard against shipwreck and other mishaps at sea it was usually believed that the efficacious means was not to invoke a particular saint but to use an image of the Prophet's shoe as a symbolical preventive against the raging of the elements.[1] But in respect of some parts of the Islamic world there are accounts of patron saints against mishaps at sea. Yāqūt reports from Tunis of the saint Muḥriz,[2] whose grave is covered by a specially sacred mosque, that sailors swear by the name of this saint—who is also venerated by the Tunisians as their particular patron saint—and supply themselves with dust from his grave for their journeys by sea and make vows to him when in danger from heavy seas.[3] We hear of another patron saint of sailors from the far east of Islam. This is the saint Abū Isḥāq al-Kāzarūnī whose grave is venerated in Kāzarūn near Shīrāz. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa reports the following institution connected with his veneration 'Travellers on the China seas have the habit of making a solemn promise to Abū Isḥāq when they are afraid of adverse winds or pirates. Everybody making such a vow fills in a written pledge of the sum promised. On reaching the mainland they are awaited on shore by the servants of the *zāwiya* of the saint, who board the ship and collect all pledges written during the journey and levy the money. No ship returns from a voyage to China or India without yielding many thousands of dinars in votive fees. Poor people who beg for alms in the *zāwiya* are also furnished with drafts for specific sums which bear the seal
[312] of the head of the *zāwiya*. These drafts are honoured against a receipt by anyone who has made a vow to Abū Isḥāq and the receipt is marked on the back of the draft. Thus a queen of India once paid 10,000 dinars to the dervishes of the *zāwiya*.'[4]

Though in general the success of an appeal to the saints is not associated with particular times, popular belief and the custom, which gradually came to be accepted, have nevertheless devised for the local cults times at which a call to a saint has the greatest chance of success. These times may be anniversaries[5] (particularly the *mawlid* days of the respective saints) or certain days in the week.

[1] Cf. in Chap. IX of this study.

[2] The 'Sidi Mahrez' of tourist literature, e.g. Kleist and Notzing, *Tunis und seine Umgebung* (Leipzig, 1888), p. 41. [Cf. the note to al-Harawī, transl., quoted in the next note, and *Manāqib d'Abū Isḥāq Al-Jabanyānī . . . et Manāqib al muḥriz B. Halaf*, ed. H. R. Idris, Paris, 1955].

[3] [al-Harawī, ed. Sourdel-Thomine, p. 53, transl. p. 121, whence] Yāqūt, I, p. 899, 17. More on the vows of sailors in al-'Abdarī, *al-Madkhal*, III, p. 107.

[4] Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, II, p. 91.

[5] In Mecca this is called *ḥawl*, Snouck Hurgronje, *Mekka*, II, pp. 52ff.

Thus Sunday[1] is specially recommended for prayers by the grave of the great theologian and ascetic Abū'l-Fatḥ Naṣr al-Muqaddasī (d. 490), which is close to the graves of Mu'āwiya and Abū'l-Dardā in Damascus and much visited by pilgrims. It is said of the graves of pious men and saints in Baghdād that the inhabitants of the city fixed a day of the week for the visit to each of these graves[2] and the same is known to be the practice for visits to graves in Cairo.[3] In the Qarāfa, which is so rich in graves of saints, there are seven to which visits are said to be particularly efficacious and they are usually visited on Saturdays before sunrise.[4]

It is not only on his *mawlid* day that the grave of a saint is the goal of general pilgrimages. In public calamities the whole population turns to him in crowds for help through his intercession. The graves of saints are especially frequented in times of drought. The simple dignity of the ceremony of *istisqā'*, which, was meant to replace pagan magic rites,[5] was not sufficient for the people, especially since it often proved useless. Therefore they endeavoured to strengthen the remedies and to attain God's help with more powerful means. It is likely that from very early days men requested the intercession of saints in this matter or that they mentioned the saints in their prayers (see p. 106 above), and later living saints were also made to [31
intervene if there was lack of rain.[6] To justify the visit to graves of saints for the *istisqā'* and to prove its effectiveness, various evidence from earlier days was at the same time invented. Once, when the Medinians faced starvation because of lack of rain, 'Ā'isha advised them to make an opening towards the sky on the grave of the Prophet. Thus the sacred grave was brought into direct contact with the angry heavens. When the advice of the clever woman was carried out rain came immediately in plenty, the grass shot up and cattle thrived.[7]

This efficacy was transferred to the graves of the *awliyā'*. The expression *qabruhu yustasqā bihi*,[8] 'rain is prayed for by his grave,' is common in the biographies of pious men. There are examples of this from the most distant parts of the Islamic world. From the fifth century it is related that when severe drought prevailed in

[1] *Taḥdhīb*, p. 592.
[2] Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, II, p. 113.
[3] Muḥammad al-'Abdarī, *al-Madkhal*, I, p. 223, bottom, in respect of the women in Cairo.
[4] 'Alī Bāshā Mubārak, *al-Khiṭaṭ al-Jadīda*, VIII, p. 40.
[5] Part I, p. 40ff.
[6] Yāqūt, I, p. 418, bottom.
[7] Al-Dārimī, p. 25.
[8] Al-Maqqarī, I, p. 466, 3. of the grave of the theologian Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā, founder of the Mālikite rite in Cordova; Ibn Khallikān, no. 621, VIII, p. 6, of the grave of Ibn Fūrak (d. 406) in Ṭūs.

Samarqand and repeated *istisqā'* prayers had been of no avail, the *qāḍī* of Samarqand held a public rogation and made a pilgrimage at the head of his whole community to Khartank in order to pray at al-Bukhārī's grave. This pilgrimage is said to have been so successful that the people had to stay at Khartank for seven days before being able to set out on the return journey to Samarqand, because of the downpour.[1] When, in 711, Morocco suffered from drought, the prince Abū Sa'īd set forth in order to hold a ceremonial *ṣalāt al-istisqā'* at the head of the believers. This happened on a Wednesday. 'The following Saturday he went with his whole army to the grave of the saint Abū Ya'qūb al-Ashqar (who had died shortly before, in 687) and prayed there fervently. God listened to his prayer and had mercy upon him and his lands, and before they had returned a steady downpour revived the dry fields.'[2]

(2)

The belief in the particular sanctity of saints' graves is connected with a number of concepts about consecrated graves.[3] In Muslim
[314] belief 'God forbade the soil to consume the bodies of prophets buried in it,' i.e. to let them decay, and this belief was extended to the bodies of martyrs,[4] theologians and muezzins.[5] Desecration of a saint's grave is considered a crime which will be avenged by terrible divine punishment,[6] and exhumation—which is also disapproved of for ordinary human beings[7]—is considered as such a desecration; the Muslims have a number of legends which prove that every attempt at exhuming the bodies of pious men in order to transport them to other places of rest has been prevented by miraculous accidents.[8] We have already in connection with the pre-Islamic cult of the dead encountered (Part I, pp. 215–17) the belief that saints' graves were to be regarded as inviolable sanctuaries, a view which was generally accepted, particularly in the Maghrib.[9]

[1] Ibn Bashkuwāl, p. 578; cf. above, p. 106 ult.

[2] *Al-Qarṭās*, ed. Tornberg, p. 276.

[3] For a special peculiarity which the graves share with other sacred places in popular belief, see Excursions and Annotations V.

[4] Cf. the Jewish legend that the bodies of the martyrs of Bether do not decay, *Tanḥūma*, ed. Buber, Numeri, p. 164.

[5] Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *Mafātīḥ*, III, p. 141, al-Dāmīrī (s.v. *al-dābba*), I, p. 397.

[6] Al-Munāwī, fol. 22b.

[7] *Al-Musmaṭṭa'*, II, p. 30, al-Zurqānī, ibid., p. 18, cf. Ibn Qutayba, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 30, 14.

[8] *Khiṭaṭ*, II, p. 436; al-Nābulusī, fol. 326 (cf. a similar legend in *Voyages du R. Petachia*, ed. Carmoly, Paris, 1831, p. 37).

[9] Cf. also Chenier, [*Recherches historiques*, III, p. 148=] *Gesch. Marokko u. Fetz*, p. 95.

The belief in the sanctity of these graves reaches its peak in the idea of the merit of pilgrimages to them (*ziyāra*), or even that the *ziyāra* to the graves of saints could replace the *ḥajj*. The possibility of supposing this is seen (for the fourth century) in a dirge by Abū'l-'Alā' (on the occasion of the death of two 'Alids): 'Two *takbīr* in front of your grave are considered equal to the *'umra* (small pilgrimage) and the *ṭawāf* around the Ka'ba.'[1] This belief does not hold for all graves of saints. Popular veneration has accorded this privilege only to some of them; for this matter too it was merely the popular suffrage, not that of the authoritative theologians, which was [315] able to effect in the various lands of Islam the circumvention of that canonic law of the *ḥajj*. On a high peak of the Atlas mountains (Gurāya) used to be the grave of the Marabūt Sīdi Bosgrī; the French later made this into a fort in 1883. A visit to this sacred place was a substitute for the pilgrimage to Mecca in the case of poor and weak people.[2] In Kalburga (India) is the grave of Benda Nuwāz; this saint declared during his lifetime that a visit to his mausoleum was a substitute for the pilgrimage to Mecca in cases where the performance of the *ḥajj* presented great difficulties.[3]

At other sacred places to whom such privileges were not explicitly given, the *ṭawāf* (sevenfold circumambulation) is carried out as at the Ka'ba and the pilgrimage to them is called *ḥajj*[4] like the Mecca pilgrimage, whereas normally visits to the graves of saints are merely called *ziyāra*. This is expressly stated of a mosque in al-Janad (southern Arabia) whose foundation tradition ascribes to Mu'ādh b. Jabal. People make pilgrimages the (*yaḥujjūn ilayhi*) in the same way as they do the sacred house, and people say to one another: 'Wait until the *ḥajj* is completed,' meaning the pilgrimage to the mosque at al-Janad.[5] A sevenfold *ṭawāf* is recommended also for the old mosque at Fusṭāṭ and is praised as highly efficacious. Al-Maqrīzī describes the stations of this circumambulation in detail, but it seems that it has not been practised for a long time.[6] Burkhardt observed the sevenfold *ṭawāf* by the grave of 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Kannāwī at Kenne (Upper Egypt) which every pilgrim carried out immediately after his arrival.[7] In this connection must also be mentioned the *ṭawāf* around the *ṣakhra* in Jerusalem which is

[1] *Saqṭ al-Zand*, II, p. 61, v. 3.
[2] Baude, *L'Algérie* (Paris, 1841), I, p. 119.
[3] Herklots, *Qānūn al-Islām*, p. 175.
[4] Perhaps Ḥasan's words in al-Ṭabarī, II, p. 143, 19, belong here? An 'Alid tradition makes Ḥasan say after the cruel execution of the 'Alids by Ziyād: *Ḥujjūūm* (do pilgrimage to their graves).
[5] Yāqūt, II, p. 127, s.v.
[6] *Khiṭaṭ*, II, p. 255.
[7] *Travels in Arabia*, I, p. 173; cf. regarding this saint (d. 992), 'Alī Mubārak, XIV, p. 133.

still practised by pious pilgrims. At this *ṭawāf*, however, pilgrims scrupulously avoid making it identical with the procession round the Ka'ba and take it in a different direction from that usual at Mecca.[1] Theologians opposed to *bid'a* felt called upon to declaim against the pilgrimage ceremonies practised at the *ṣakhra*.[2]

[316] From these examples it is evident that there is an endeavour to attribute the privileges of the sanctuary at Mecca to other sacred places also. This probably sprang partly from practical needs, because of fulfilment of the sacred obligation of the *ḥajj* is not possible for all Muslims and it was desired to provide the poorer sections of the population in outlying parts of the Muslim world with some substitute for this important religious function. It is unlikely that even orthodox theologians were greatly opposed to this, since the more responsible of them had at all times condemned the carefree trust in God which caused poor people to undertake the pilgrimage without sufficient means and thus to become beggars. Altogether, from the very first the pilgrimage was obligatory only to those *manistaṭā'a ilayhi sabīlan* (Sūra 39:1). In fact there arose in Islam a state which was described by a mischievous person as follows: The rich pilgrimage for pleasure, the middle classes for trade, the readers of the Koran from hypocrisy (to be heard and seen), the poor in order to beg, and thieves in order to steal."[3]

Every now and then there are attempts to diminish the great importance which the *ḥajj* has in the general consciousness and more especially to depreciate the value of the sanctimoniousness which manifests itself in it. The following saying is transmitted from a pious man of the older period of Islam (*al-salaf*): 'that many a man in Khorāsān is nearer to this house than those who actually accomplish its circumambulation,"[4] and this same view is echoed in many sayings by Muslim moralists.[5] The mystic al-Ḥallāj carried this view to its furthest conclusions. He taught: 'If someone is unable to accomplish the pilgrimage to Mecca in person he is to choose a clean part of his house and to keep it from all profanations in order there to observe at the time of the pilgrimages the same rites which are practised in Mecca. Thereafter he is to collect thirty orphans and to give them a splendid meal in this room and to provide them with clothes and seven dirhams each. This is counted for him as a proper *ḥajj*'. Al-Ḥallāj claimed to have obtained this

[1] *Quarterly Statement*, 1879, p. 21.
[2] *Al-Madkhal*, II, p. 91; III, p. 265 (*ṭawāf*).
[3] Aqḥiṣārī, *Majālis al-Abrār* (MX. Vien. Cat., Mixt. no. 154), fol. 74.
[4] Quṭb al-Dīn, *Chron. Mekka*, p. 21.
[5] Cf. Reinaud, *Monumens . . . du Cabinet de M. le Duc de Blacas*, II, p. 221, note 2.

teaching from work of the pious al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī.[1] All these are endeavours, undertaken from different points of view, on the one one hand to counteract sanctimoniousness and hypocrisy connected with the Meccan pilgrimage, on the other to provide a counter- [317]
weight to the difficulties caused to the poor if the pilgrimage is considered as an irremissible obligation. The people's veneration for some honoured graves of saints helped these theological endeavours.

The Muslims of North Africa, whose national saint up to the borders of the Sahara is Sīdī 'Abd al-Qādir, tell the following story of one of his miracles. There was once a poor, old, childless woman called Tuāja whose dearest wish it was to make the pilgrimage to Mecca prescribed by religious law before she died. Her poverty did not permit her to achieve this her dearest wish, since she was so poor that she could not even afford a rosary. In order to obtain this piece of religious equipment, which no pious Muslim can do without, she collected date-stones in which she made holes and then strung them together like a rosary. With this makeshift rosary in her hand she spent her days in a place dedicated to the memory of the holy marabut 'Abd al-Qādir,[2] praying fervently that God might not take her poverty for sin and would count the days spent at this sacred place in lieu of the pilgrimage. When this pious woman died, her rosary, as her only worldly possession, was put into the grave with her. The Prophet himself visited the grave and the tears that he shed at her grave fertilized the dry date-stones of the rosary so that they grew into palm-trees bearing the sweetest species of this fruit, known as the *deget* (=*deqlat*) *nūr* dates, the finest of the fifteen types of dates in North Africa.[3] This is reminiscent of analogous legends of antiquity and Christianity which talk of the fertilizing powers of tears or blood of mythical persons and saints.[4] Muslim legend also tells us that the rose came into being from drops of Muhammed's sweat.[5] *Nec rosarum folia humi jacere patiuntur* [318]

[1] Abulfeda, *Annales*, II, p. 341. [See L. Massignon, *La Passion d'al-Hallaj*, pp. 275ff. For the substitution of visits to saints or of charity for the pilgrimage cf. also F. Meier in *Asiatische Studien*, XI (1957–8), pp. 143ff.]

[2] Not his grave (the saint is not buried in North Africa where he is chiefly venerated), but a place where he lived and taught in Algiers, Trumelet, *Les Saints du Tell*, pp. 297, 304. Seven sanctuaries are dedicated to this saint in the environs of Algiers.

[3] H. B. Tristram, *The Great Sahara: Wanderings South of the Atlas Mountains* (London, 1860), p. 97.

[4] According to the Egyptian novel of the two brothers (Papyrus d'Orbiney) the blood of Batau, who had been turned into an Apis bull, blossomed into a tree.

[5] Cited as *ḥadīth mawḍū'* in al-Damīrī (s.v. *al-ward*), II, p. 463. In the *Manlehrāt al-Nawawī*, fol. 32b, the question is raised (and, of course, answered in the negative) whether this belief was founded on truth, and the sweat of Burāq is also mentioned, cf. al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 363.

(*Turcae*)—says Busbeck—*quod ut veteres rosam ex sanguine Veneris, sic isti ex sudore Mahumetis natam sibi persuaserint.*[1]

Much as the journeys of *ṭalab* in the field of scholarship, pilgrimages on the religious plane developed into a form of sport among pious circles. Many pious people—but also vagrants—add to the journey to Mecca visits to the holy graves in many countries: *ziyārāt*. Wherever they hear of a saint's grave they direct their steps to it. The journey of 'Abd al-Ghanī al-Nābulusī had no other purpose than to visit all the graves of saints in Syria, Palestine and Egypt. Muslims of conservative views and free from popular superstitions approve such pious journeys. Visits to these graves serve, according to them, at least *li'l-tabarruk*, by which they also mean 'inner religious strengthening.' Even where I live, pilgrims from Muslim countries are occasionally seen whose tour of *ziyāra* of many years' duration leads them to the *qubba* of the Turkish saint Gül Bābā, who is buried upon the 'Hill of Roses.' The pious pilgrims usually combine their journeys with the secular purpose of conducting a poor retail trade with the products of their country, thus defraying the cost of their travels. They used to say: *hem ziyāret hem tijāret*, 'partly pilgrimage, partly trade.' A large literature of *ziyāra* developed from such aims, books in which the places where saints' graves are situated are enumerated and described from the author's own experience for the use of those who wish to undertake a *ziyāra* journey.[2]

VI

[319] The primary function of the veneration of saints in Islam is to satisfy the instinct to look up to perfections within the human sphere which are worthy of veneration and admiration, and the

[1] ed. Elzevir (Leiden, 1633), p. 51.

[2] Some of such guides for pilgrims are mentioned in *ZDPV*, II, p. 14. Al-Harawī's work (cf. Bodl. Cat., Ms. no. XLV) has since been studied by Ch. Schefer in the *Archives de l'orient latin*, I, pp. 587–609 [*al-Ishārāt ilā Ma'rifat al-Ziyārāt*, ed. J. Sourdel-Thomine, Damascus, 1953. French transl. by same, Damascus, 1957]. A number of books on *ziyārāt* are also listed in al-Maqrīzī, *Khiṭaṭ*, II, p. 463. A *K. al-Mazārāt* by al-Sakhāwī (d. 902) is printed in vol. IV of the new Egyptian edition of al-Maqqarī (Cairo, 1304). A guide for the visit of the graves of saints on the Muqaṭṭam is the anonymous *Murshid al-Zuwwār* [it is in fact by Muwaffaq al-Dīn b. 'Uthmān] (up till the middle of the eighth century). *Cat. ar. Br. Mus.*, p. 687a, no. 1506; Kremer, *Samml. orient. Hschr.*, p. 31, no. 49. To this literature belong also the treatises contained in the Arabic Mss. D.C. nos. 146 [al-Zayyāt's *al-Kawākib al-Sayyāra*] and 317 of the Leipzig Univ. Library. A specially Shī'ite guide is the *K. al-Ziyārāt* by Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Dāwūd al-Qummī, extracts of which are to be found in the *Kashkūl*, p. 107. [Further details about these books, and the literature of the 'guides' in general, in the introduction to the French transl. of al-Harawī, pp. xxxff.]

possessors of which are not only exercising the highest virtue and sanctity but have also the power to do—on behalf of those who trust in them—things which appear impossible, things which we call 'miraculous', or as the Muslims put it, 'which break the habitual course.'

But the satisfaction of this need became, in Islam as well as in other religions, the frame for a religious development which differentiated the direction and content of this veneration in the vast area of Islam. Close study of the types of saint veneration and the trend of legends of saints in various parts of the Muslim world will reveal that, also in Islam, the cult of saints shows—in accordance with the old traditions of the nations whose religions were swamped by Islam—an unmistakable individual character which to this day the universalistic and levelling character of Islamic religion has been unable to stamp out. When considering legends of saints from various ethnographical layers, it would seem as if those legends and ideas which grew on Arab soil contain less wild imagination and exaggeration than those of the local saints of other races, that in fact they developed in another direction and that they are attached to a group of ideas other than the legends of the latter.

From all that we have previously said about the mentality and traditions of true Arabs, we shall understand that the cult of saints, in so far as under the influence of Islam it transformed the ideals of the Bedouins, was linked with the cult of *muruwwa*, which through the influence of the *dīn* took the form of religious veneration. The Bedouins too have their heroes whom they honour after death with a veneration which from the point of view of Islam must come into the category of the cult of the *walīs*.[1] But the traditions of these graves clearly show [320] the character of Bedouin ideas. A few examples will show what are the concepts about these truly Arabian *walīs*. To this day[2] the grave of the sheikh Zuwayd is extant near Za'qā by the Syro-Egyptian border not far from al-'Arīsh. This grave is revered by the local Bedouins as much as ever before. 'Abd al-Ghanī al-Nābulusī gave an interesting description of this place: 'The gate to the funerary chapel is never closed and it is believed that any goods deposited there will never be stolen[3] and that everybody finds safe protection and

[1] For the *walī*-cult of the Bedouins see Snouck Hurgronje, *Mekka*, I, p. 38, and the passages from Burckhardt's travels cited there.

[2] Cf. Schumacher, 'Researches in Southern Palestine,' *Quarterly Statement*, 1886, pp. 185ff., where there is a detailed description of this grave and the district: 'Alī Mubārak, X, p. 93.

[3] The religiously influenced Bedouins of the Sinai peninsula also transformed the tradition of the Arba'īn monastery in Wādī Lejā (devoted to the forty Cappadocian martyrs) into a legend whereby any theft committed there would immediately be discovered; see Palmer: *The Desert of the Exodus*, [I, p. 119. German transl. *Der Schauplatz etc.*,] p. 93.

complete sanctuary from persecutors at the grave of the saint.' This legend about the Bedouin saint is essentially different from the miraculous legends about the graves of the real saints of Islam. The saints of the Bedouins show no pietistic element. The legend praises such virtues of the deceased chief as constitute the religion of the desert dwellers, the *muruwwa*, which, just as it fills the whole soul of the son of the desert, does not cease to be effective at the grave of the dead tribal sheikh. He practises in afterlife only what he had done before death in his own tent and to practise which is the religion of the Bedouins: faithfulness towards the *jār* who enters his tent asking for asylum, even if it costs him his own life. The gates of his mausoleum are hospitably open in the same way as the entrance to a Bedouin tent is open to everybody.

Further north, in that part of the Ḥawrān which is called al-Ruḥba, another Bedouin *walī* represents the same idea. This is sheikh Serāq, who amongst the robber tribes of the Syrian desert is the invisible support of law and order and who according to popular belief kills men and animals on the spot if they dare to damage the crops of strangers. Wetzstein[1] relates: 'In the middle of
[321] the sown fields is the grave of the local saint sheikh Serāq surrounded by little flags. He is the invisible administrator of law and order amongst these robbers. He is very greatly feared . . . If an inhabitant leaves the country for any length of time he takes valuables, weapons, carpets, clothes and even cash to sheikh Seraq and is certain to find them untouched on his return. Towards the end of May or beginning of June, the Ruḥba and its surroundings are deserted by the inhabitants because of great heat and lack of water and green pasture; they move with their cattle to the eastern slopes of the Ḥawrān mountains. During that time they leave in all confidence their winter stores of corn in the caves near the white castle, knowing full well nobody would dare to steal things entrusted to sheikh Serāq'. The same is reported of other holy graves of the Bedouins in Transjordan. Amongst them a *walī* in the Wadi Yabis is prominent, in whose vicinity granaries are preferably kept, since the Bedouins believe that the saint protects the corn from thieves. They maintain: 'Nobody is able to steal any goods kept there,' i.e. nobody dares to do so for fear of the saint. On account of this belief the corn is as safe in this place as if it were kept locked up.[2]

The Bedouin saint is no *shafī'*, no intercessor for the sinners among those venerating him; neither does he work miracles, nor is

[1] *Reisebericht über Ḥauran und die Trachonen*, p. 31.

[2] Selah Merill, *East of the Jordan* (London, 1881), pp. 180 and 497, cf. the account of Schumacher, *Across the Jordan* (London, 1885), p. 5 which tallies with this. The Jews had a similar belief about the grave of the prophet Ezekiel, *Voyages du R. Petachja*, ed. Carmoly, p. 40.

he in close contact with Allāh like his proper Muslim counterpart. Rather is he the protector of property, avenger of false oaths, patron of hospitality and the right of asylums; and even entertains by his grave those who visit him; all this had been practised by the sheikh in his tent.[1] At the utmost, occasionally a Bedouin saint is heir of the *kāhin* of the desert and then the power to heal sick camels is ascribed to his tomb.[2] We shall therefore not be surprised to find, among the sacred places of the Bedouin, graves of historical heroes who illustrate the other side of Bedouin *muruwwa*: attacks on and plunder of alien caravans who stood in no relationship to the tribe, which was sanctioned by Bedouin customary law, that atrocious *muruwwa* the glorification of which fills the greater part [322] of the book of 'Antar which is typical for the description of Arab chivalry. The name 'Antar itself has been fixed in many places of the area through which Bedouins habitually wandered.

The modern Bedouins preserve a pious memory also of those heroes who excelled in murdering and robbing their enemies and who practised while alive the Bedouin view on mine and thine as regards strangers. The grave of Abū Gōsh is known. This Bedouin, who was executed like a common robber, remained an object of veneration among his tribe, who consider him a martyr of the *muruwwa*. The energetic administration of Ibrāhīm Pasha against the robber knights of the Jordan valley resulted in several places akin to the grave of Abū Gōsh. Near Mar-Saba is the 'sacred valley' where the dead robber knights of the Abū Nuṣayr tribe are buried. If an Arab passes that way he never enters the 'sacred valley' without saying: *dastūr yā mubārakīn*, 'With your permission, blessed ones,'[3] and continuing down the valley he kisses the memorials which mark the graves. Farther towards the Dead Sea, going to Engedi, just north of the spot which the English expedition recognized as representing this biblical place, are the graves of the heroes of the Rushdiyya tribe, which are given the same veneration by the Arabs. Also the sheikh Shible, whose chapel looks down from a high hill in the area of the biblical Dōthān, was a famous Bedouin chief and robber to whom, among others, Maundrell, a traveller in Palestine in the seventeenth century, fell victim.[4]

From these examples we see how the *'minimum de religion'* with which Islam influenced the Bedouins was transformed into a cult of saints whose starting-point is the *muruwwa* of the Arabs. The venera-

[1] Cf. Part I, pp. 213–14.

[2] Adolf v. Wrede, *Reise in Ḥaḍramaut*, ed. v. Maltzan, p. 72.

[3] One is involuntarily reminded of the brigands canonized by the populace in Sicily—called 'Beati' by the people—and 'the cult of executed bodies' which is described in detail by Woldemar Kaden in *Ausland*, 1881, p. 190.

[4] Conder, *Tent Work in Palestine*, I, pp. 20, 116; II, p. 289.

tion of saints in Arab circles, more penetrated by Muslim ideas than were the knights of the desert, also shows an essentially different character from that of Persians, Indian or Berbers, among whom mythological, religious and historical traditions of a different kind play a large role. The local saints of these last groups show—much more than those of the first—a tendency to be lifted into a super-
[323] natural, divine, sphere, and they cross the border between human and divine rather more easily.[1] The Persians especially have shown in their popular beliefs, as well as in the dogmatic doctrines concerning imāms, in the elaboration of which the Persian has, as is well known, had the greatest clear element, that they have advanced far along the road to deification of holy men, and they have expressed this tendency manifoldly in their legends about saints. But even popular phantasy was unable to go as far as endowing saints with physical immortality. But every effort is made to grant them privileges over everybody else in that direction as well. The bodily remains of saints are not subject to decay as are those of ordinary mortals.

In respect of particular saints their legend further elaborates this general point. Thus the legend of the holy sheikh Muḥammad al-Marzābī, called al-Damdakī, shows how far the credulity of pious people can go. This worker of miracles lived in the fifth century (d. ca. 430) in Marzāb near the Caspian Sea. Abū'l-Maḥāsin relates[2] that in his time the cave where the saint had lived in pious contemplation was visited by masses of people. The visitors could see the saint in the same position in which the credo was said during prayer. When during such a pilgrimage prayers for the Prophet were said in view of the remains of the saint, he used to bow his head. The saint sat before the pilgrims fully dressed in this manner. Every year the clothes deteriorated like those of a living person and they took care to give the saint new clothes every year, the worn garments being acquired by kings and princes. Every attempt to bury the saint Damdakī[3] failed and sometimes ended in the death of those who,
[324] thinking that Muḥammad Damdakī ought to be buried like the Prophet and other saints, went to lay him in a grave. Tīmūrlank is said to have been responsible for the death of many of his subjects

[1] The tendency to endow men with the attribute of immortality was effective in various ways within the veneration of imāms, and belief in this attribute manifested itself in various ways, e.g. the invocation to the hidden imām Muḥammad b. Ḥasan al-'Askarī of which Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, II, p. 98 gave a vivid description in the eighth century.

[2] *Al-Manhal al-Ṣāfī* (Ms. Imp. Libr. Vienna, Mixt. no. 309), II, fol. 351a.

[3] Damdakī means 'short time.' The teacher of the sheikh, Ibrahim, a saint himself whose blessing ensured the lasting vitality of his pupil after his death, used to visit him in his cave in order to call him to prayer. The holy pupil used to reply, 'Wait a little while'; hence his name.

who had similar intentions. Abū'l Maḥāsin reports all this in the name of eye-witnesses and ends with the remark that al-Maqrīzī, who refused to believe these tales, was later converted to belief in the legend of Damdakī after having made investigations, and that he devoted an article of high praise to the saint in his biographical work. Similar popular legends of immortal saints developed in such circles even in comparatively recent times. The Kurds in the eighth century believed that a sheikh whom they venerated as saint, al-Ḥasan b. 'Adī, called Tāj al-'Arifīn, who was executed by the emir Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu' in 644, had not died but would appear amongst them and against that time they dedicated gifts and votive offerings to him.[1]

Among those areas where the veneration of saints intensified into real anthropolatry the Berber form of Islam has a remarkable position. This characteristic of the African veneration of saints, which was pointed out already by Leo Africanus, did not escape European observers[2] and we have already attempted elsewhere[3] to find the explanation of this phenomenon in the pre-Islamic ideals of the Berber peoples. Chenier, for his time (1787), an excellent observer who was puzzled by the contradiction between this exaggerated cult of saints and the teachings of Islam, even conceived the odd idea that this type of veneration of saints could have been brought to the area from Spain[4] (through the Moors expelled from there). Though the literary expression of the veneration of saints lags behind the unbridled exaggeration of popular belief, because it comes from people who are schooled in the demands of theo- [325]
logical doctrine and the limitation imposed by it, the aforementioned intensification of the cult amongst the Maghribīs is nevertheless noticeable in a poetic prayer to which a princely pilgrim was moved when visiting the grave of the 'saint of Ceuta' (*al-walī al-Sabtī*):

> O Holy man of God, you are generous and the aim of our journey is your inviolate sanctuary,[5]

[1] Al-Kutubī, *Fawāt al-Wafayāt*, I, p. 124 [cf. also *RSO*, XIII (1932), pp. 416–8].

[2] Rohlfs, *Reisen durch Marokko*, p. 28; *Erster Aufenthalt in Marokko*, p. 336; Kremer, *Herrsch. Ideen*, pp. 172ff.; *Zeitschr. fur Ethnologie*, XX (1888), p. 191. On the position of the marabuts, Bargès, *Tlemçen*, p. 36, Dr. W. Kobelt recently (1885) made stimulating remarks about veneration of saints among the Kabyles of North Africa in his *Reiseerinnerungen aus Algerien und Tunis* ed. by the Senckenberg Society for Natural History (particularly pp. 231ff.); when writing the article mentioned in the next note I did not yet know of this work.

[3] *ZDMG*, XLI, pp. 43ff.

[4] [*Recherches historiques*, III, p. 146=] *Gesch. Marokko u. Fez*, p. 94.

[5] *Ibid.*, cf. Part I, pp. 214–15.

Fate has frightened us with its blows and we have come to ask for favour from your highness.
We open our hands to beseech you for the return of our happiness in reunion with our dear ones (in the distant homeland).
We use your pure dust for intercession and to serve to approach the Omniscient who hears all
Many strangers came to this place and achieved prompt favour (with God) and happiness.[1]

The saint who is addressed in this poem is Abū'l-'Abbās Aḥmad b. Ja'far al-Khazrajī from Ceuta. He lived in the sixth century in Morocco, where he was famous for his miraculous deeds and his grave became the goal of devout pilgrimages.

## VII

### (1)

One of the most fertile points of view in the study of religions is the observation of a phenomenon which can be found over the whole field of religious development, and which we want to examine in this chapter with special reference to its appearance in popular Islam: the reinterpretation of old traditions through new points of appreciation. A tradition exists in a circle in which it is transmitted from generation to generation for thousands of years; such a tradition is connected with a fixed place or it is activated at certain times and given commemorative significance. Then a complex of ideas arises which is hostile to this tradition and threatens its importance or even defeats and suppresses the old ideas. In such a conflict of ideas and tradition, the complex of ideas which has on its side the
[326] weaker external power will succumb, but it cannot be completely destroyed and obliterated. The old traditions are absorbed by the new elements and penetrate them, and while accommodating themselves to the latter they often become a formative power in them. In the course of this process of accommodation the old traditions are often altered beyond recognition, but the process still retains them as factors in the new development. Much depends on the subjective value of these old traditions and on the strength of their external and internal supports, how far they will be able to survive in the new formation, whether they will sink to become a vegetating rudiment or become a creative and active factor in the new complex of ideas. These phenomena, for which the ethnological studies of our times offer much material, are prominent in the

[1] Al-Maqqarī, II, p. 69.

whole field of religious development in which the traditions of antiquity are particularly preserved.

There is presumably no religion whose history lacks examples of this process. World religions yield a particularly rich crop in this respect since their wide diffusion obliged them to assimilate the most diversified national traditions. In respect of Christianity, Eastern[1] as well as Western, the data for the transformation and reinterpretation of old ideas in the most varied fields have been collected in easily accessible works, thus relieving us of the duty to prepare for the appearance of this phenomenon in Islam by giving special examples from that nearer field. Recently this field of research was much extended, as far as the history of the Eastern Church is concerned, through some remarkable contributions. Students of Egyptian antiquity and Coptic literature have turned their attention to the metamorphosis of ancient Egyptian gods into saints of Coptic Christianity[2] and have shown through pertinent examples the assimilation of Egyptian religious ideas among the Copts. In particular the French scholar Amélineau has in numerous studies described this phenomenon in its different aspects.

It must be expected that Islam, on account of its encounter with traditions, the elimination of which was its self-chosen historical task, would show evidence of this evolutionary process: the re- [327]
moulding of alien religious traditions and customs and their assimilation and reinterpretation in accordance with Islamic ideas. This in fact occurs very often where Islam met with alien ideas which were viable and whose guardians were subject to its spiritual and secular rule. Islam did not destroy these foreign ideas and customs but merely adopted and reinterpreted them to fit the new religion. Orthodox Islam, the scholastic Islam of the theologians, however, does not take this historical process into consideration. But a historical evaluation must differentiate between the theoretical teachings of the dogmatic theologians and the popular, living development of Islam within the circle of its believers. This development is differentiated through the different national traditions incorporated, and against it the theory of the theologians, supported by external force, is unable to hold its own. The place which the cult of saints was able to conquer for itself in Islam is the best proof for the power of surviving popular traditions versus the normalizing efforts of theological theory.

Islam appeared with the aspiration to abolish even the most trivial pagan usages, but the customs of the people were far stronger than this intention. The endeavour to do away with the customs and

[1] I would merely mention Fallmereyer, *Fragmente aus dem Orient* (Stuttgart, 1873), p. 243.

[2] *Actes du VIème Congrès des Orientalistes à Leyde*, IV, pp. 161ff.

usages of the Arab Jāhiliyya, or in general those of the pre-Islamic period of countries subjected to Islam, was not confined to customs which were related or could be related to religious concepts or with some part of ethics. The earliest teachers of Islam would have liked to abolish everyday popular customs, which were indifferent from a religious or ethical point of view, in order to make a complete break with the pre-Islamic past of its believers. Thus we hear, from the reign of 'Umar I, that when 'Abd Allāh al-Thumālī was chief of police in Emesa, he chanced upon a wedding procession when making the rounds of the city. Festive fires were burnt as was customary in that country. 'Abd Allāh dispersed the people with whips and the next day ascended the pulpit and said to the assembled community: 'When Abū Jandala (a companion of the Prophet) married Amāma he organized a festive banquet. May God have mercy upon Abū Jandala for this and show kindness to Amāma; but may He curse the
[328] married couple of yesterday who lighted fires of joy and imitated the unbelievers. Verily Allāh will extinguish their light.'[1]

But how little theological rulings and government edicts could eradicate popular customs which were deeply rooted amongst the people is seen from our study on dirges (Part I). Official Islam itself has proved from the moment of its inception that its continuation was dependent upon the reinterpretation and assimilation of existing pagan religious elements. What is true of the ancient Arab cult reinterpreted in a monotheistic and 'Abrahamic' manner in Mecca, also appears in the less important customs of paganism which found their way into official Islam by finding favour with theologians after they had been remoulded to fit monotheistic requirements. But the people, strangers to the theories of professional theologians, preserved much more than acquired official sanction; in its practice there were preserved, though in a rudimentary form, such survivals of the old religions as, owing to their manifestly pagan character, were incapable of monotheistic interpretations. Only recently Doughty has shown that the cult of the 'Uzza did not entirely disappear from Arabia, and to this day people (though 'only some accursed ones') make pilgrimage to a huge rock near Ṭā'if in order to obtain through the touch of the stone healing which is not expected from the mere invocation of Allāh.[2]

Bedouins and Fellāḥs everywhere keep tenaciously to the traditions and customs of antiquity, and these circles retain solemn practices belonging to the very distant past of the nation. Popular festivals which are not of a general character but are confined to restricted areas are usually remnants of pre-Islamic popular customs.

[1] Ibn Ḥajar, IV, p. 67. Neither could lights be carried at funeral processions, Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 42.

[2] *Travels*, II, p. 511.

This is particularly true of festive customs which Muslims observe in certain districts together with non-Muslims. The Ṭowāra Bedouins of the Sinai peninsula preserved a popular festival stemming from pre-Islamic times which survived in Islam by being connected with the alleged grave of the prophet Ṣāliḥ,[1] whom Allāh sent to the recalcitrant Thamūd. By the grave of this prophet—presumably [329] an ancient sanctuary—the Bedouins of the Sinai peninsula observe an annual feast with sacrifices and amusements such as camel races. After the races a procession around the prophet's grave takes place prior to leading the sacrificial animals to the gates of the sepulchral chapel where their ears are cut off and the posterns are smeared with the blood.[2] That this is not Islamic is particularly evident from the use made in this festival of the blood of the sacrificial animal. The pagan Arabs let the blood of their sacrificial animals run upon their *anṣāb*[3] and also sprinkled the walls of the Ka'ba with it.[4] The prophet Ṣāliḥ suggested himself to Arabs influenced by Islam as a point for attaching their pagan customs in much the same way as the Biblical patriarchs became the warrants for the pagan customs of the pilgrimage to the Ka'ba which Islam took over as its most important rites.

Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine furnish notable examples of such assimilation. Here common festivals, common places of pilgrimage and prayer, are not unusual. Jacob of Vitry, Bishop of Acre, already drew attention to miraculous image of the Virgin Mary four miles from Damascus at a place which he writes as Sardinia but which presumably is identical with Saydnāyā: *Ad hunc locum in assumptione et nativitate Beatae Virginis Mariae omnes Saraceni illius provinciae causa orandi confluunt et suas cerimonias et oblationes offerunt cum magna devotione.*[5] This relationship of Syrian Muslims to the religious traditions of Syrian Christianity continues to this day and Huart adduced some typical examples of it.[6] Even more noticeable is this phenomenon at sacred places which are common to even wider groups and presumably go back

[1] Graves of Ṣāliḥ are venerated elsewhere as well: in Qinnisrīn and Shabwān (Yemen), Yāqūt, IV, p. 184, 16. As is well-known, such doublets are frequent in Islamic grave cult; there are some data in al-Muqaddasī, p. 46, cf. also *Mythos bei den Hebräern*, pp. 340–1; Engl. ed., p. 282.

[2] Palmer, [*The Desert of the Exodus*, I, p. 264—] *Der Schauplatz der vierzigjährigen Wüstenwanderung Israels*, p. 204.

[3] Wellhausen, *Reste arab. Heidenthums* pp. 99, 113, top; Part I, p. 217; cf. F. Lenormant in *RHR*, III (1881) p. 37.

[4] Al-Bayḍāwī, I, p. 634, 9.

[5] *Gesta Dei per Francos*, p. 1126. [Cf. the bibliography in G. Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, I, pp. 256–7, and Kriss, *Volksglaube* pp. 232ff.]

[6] *J.A.* 1878, II, pp. 479ff.; Prutz, *Kulturgesch d. Kreuzzüge*, p. 65; cf. also the data collected by Elisée Reclus, *Nouvelle Géographie universelle*, IX, p. 417.

[330] to the pagan traditions of those countries. Yāqūt mentions a stone outside the Bāb al-Yahūd in Aleppo where the inhabitants used to offer votive sacrifices. Muslims, Jews and Christian made pilgrimages to this place in order to sprinkle the stone with rose-water and other aromatic liquids. It was said that under this betyl, which goes back to pagan times, a prophet was buried.[1] Near Nāblūs the Muslims together with the rest of the population pay honour to a rock Sitt al-Salamiyya and place the grave of the saint, of whom all kinds of miracles are told,[2] in a cave near the holy rock. It is likely that the 'cattle well' (*ayn al-baqar*) near 'Akka, for members of all confessions, is a similarly ancient sacred place. A Biblical legend has been ascribed to it: at this place the cow which Adam first used for ploughing is said to have appeared. The Muslims also added 'Alid elements and strengthened the Islamic character of the holy place by erecting a mosque.[3]

(2)

We see from these examples how popular Islam uses elements which belong to the new religion to serve for the reinterpretation of old ideas which derive traditions. The veneration of saints provided the cover under which surviving remnants of conquered religions could continue to exist in Islam. It is interesting to note that particularly the 'Alid legend—which gave the veneration of saints most of its vitality[4]—was suited to provide a framework for the survival of such residues and the assimilation and reinterpretation of elements incompatible with Islam. When the vizier Khālid al-Barmakī advised the Caliph al-Ma'mūn to spare the ruins of Persepolis
[331] (which the ruler wished to use for new buildings) 'because this place is a place of prayer (*muṣallā*) of 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib,'[5] he was (perhaps unconsciously) drawing up the scheme for saving by an Islamic justification the local traditions of the pre-Islamic past. Among the pretexts given for the celebration of the Persian *nawrūz* feast (cf. Part I., pp. 192–3) was the justification that on this day 'Alī was appointed by the Prophet as his successor—a Muslim

[1] Yāqūt, II, p. 308.

[2] Mills, *Three Months' Residence at Nablous and an Account of the Modern Samaritans* (London, 1864), p. 32.

[3] Al-Qazwīnī, *Āthār al-Bilād*, p. 149; Yāqūt, III, p. 759; cf. al-Harawī, ed. Schefer, p. 13 (= *Arch. de l'Orient latin*, I, p. 597) [ed. Sourdel-Thomine, p. 22, transl. p. 57 with note]. cf. also the 'Qubba of the Cow' which is mentioned in the village of Ṣafet near Bilbays in Egypt, al-Harawī p. 34, transl., p. 73, quoted in Yāqūt, III, p. 339.

[4] The partisan of the family of 'Alī thinks he can approach God through his love for them. *Agh.*, XV, p. 125, 12 (al-Kumayt, cf. *Khizānat al-Adab*, II, p. 207 [J. Horovitz, *Die Hāshimiyyāt des Kumait*, 2:6].

[5] *Fragm. hist. arab.*, p. 256, 13.

version of the Persian tradition of Jamshīds accession to the throne at the *nawrūz* day. Ancient mythological concepts were preserved in Islam—though only in Shī'a circles—under cover of 'Alīd legends. Thus 'Alī becomes a god of thunder: 'Alī is in the clouds and causes thunder and lightning[1]—the lightning is the whip which he swings[2]—a fable which Jābir b. Yazīd al-Ju'fī (cf. above, p. 120) claims to find expressed in the Koran. Just as mythology refers to the red evening sky as the blood of the boar killed by Adonis or as Aphrodite wounded by thorns,[3] in an 'Alīd legend the red of the evening sky is the blood of the slain Ḥusayn; before his death the sunset glow is said not to have occurred.[4] This legend is poetically used by Abū'l-'Alā al-Ma'arrī, who calls the red of the morning and evening sky respectively the blood of 'Alī and Ḥusayn.[5] Islamic legend transferred the miracle of the arrest of the sun in Gib'ōn to Muhammed: the late afternoon sun did not set until the Prophet captured a hostile town.[6] But in popular belief this legend was often related to 'Alī,[7] or at least makes him participate in the performance of the miracle.[8] It is interesting that such a legend was also suitable to preserve remains of ancient traditions in rudimentary form. A 'temple of the God Shamash' stood in ancient times in the area of the present Ḥilla in Mesopotamia. Under Islam there arose between Ḥilla and Kerbelā a 'mosque of the sun' (*masjid al-shams*), of which popular legends say that the Biblical wonder of the arrest of the sun [332] was repeated here by 'Alī.[9] The fable of the 'splitters of mountains' is common in North Africa, old traditions telling of national heroes strong enough to split mountains. The Kabyles assigned the role of these heroes to 'Alī. Not far from Ḥammām Līf there is a deep ravine between the Bū Qurnayn and the Rṣāṣ, which is now called Ḍarbat mtā' Sīdnā 'Alī. Encircled by a Christian army, 'Alī opened at this spot a miraculous passage by one stroke of his sword.[10] Thus 'Alīd fables provide the Muslim form for old local sanctuaries whereby they are preserved within an Islam which threatened them with destruction in their original shape. On the slopes of Mount Jawshan overlooking Aleppo from the west there used to be the monastery

[1] Muslim, I, p. 51.
[2] Ibn Khaldūn, *Muqaddima*, p. 165.
[3] Cf. J. G. v. Hahn, *Sagwissenschaftliche Studien*, p. 459.
[4] Ḥasan al-'Idwī, commentary to *Burda*, p. 131.
[5] *Saqṭ al-Zand*, I, p. 93 vv. 5, 6. The red of morning is also likened to 'dragon's blood' (*dam al-akhawayn*).
[6] Muslim, IV, p. 188.
[7] Conder, *Tent Works in Palestine*, II, p. 11.
[8] Muhammed makes the sinking sun stand still until 'Alī finishes his evening prayer, *Disput. relig. Mohammed.*, p. 243.
[9] Dieulafoy, *La Perse, la Chaldée et la Susaine* (Paris, 1887), p. 614.
[10] Cf. also Kobelt, p. 594.

of Mārat Marūthā with dwellings for male and female hermits. In Yāqūt's time[1] the traces of this place, venerated by the Christian population, had vanished but the Muslim Aleppins erected on the same spot a sanctuary of their own religion with the legend that Ḥusayn, 'Alī's son, had been seen there in prayer.[2] The Shī'ite saga of the march which the captured women and followers of Ḥusayn had to undertake from Kerbelā to the residence of the caliph assigns an important role to Mount Jawshan. There were copper mines there which since that time have yielded nothing: one of the wives of Ḥusayn was overtaken by birthpains opposite this mountain and when she asked the mine-workers for bread and water the uncharitable people did not grant her request but cursed and abused her. The wife of the martyr then cursed these cruel people, and in consequence the copper-mines of Jawshan ceased to be productive.[3]

This reinterpretation and preservation of old traditions in Islam gave an individual character to its various areas. The doctrinal system of the theologians, the catechism, is probably the same everywhere; the system of Islam in China[4] published by Dabry de Thiersant fits [333] the Islam of the Ḥijāz quite well: but the inner religious life of the people, as it is manifested outside the systematic teaching, differs according to the degree of combination of Islamic elements and existing pre-Islamic traditions and practices.

In much the same way as in respect of legal customs the *'urf* and *'āda* continue to be supreme in every country alongside the system of theoretical laws subtly thought out by theologians. So the pre-Islamic provincial peculiarities of religious life continue to be, after having been adapted to Muslim ideas, decisive elements in popular religion alongside the catechism of Islam which is taught everywhere in the same form. The popular cult of saints offered the model for the involuntary adoption of pre-Islamic elements for the religious life in Islam.

The consideration of the manifestations of Islam in India[5] yields the most unmistakable examples. The social institutions of the Muslims in that area are also strongly influenced by inherited

[1] In the edition l.c. should without doubt be read qāla (*Abū*) *'Abd Allāh* (i.e. the author himself). A. 'A. A. is the *kunya* of Yāqūt.

[2] Yāqūt, II, p. 692.

[3] Ibid., p. 156.

[4] *Le Mahométisme en Chine et dans le Turkestan oriental* (Paris, 1878), vol. II.

[5] Dutch scholars collected many data on such phenomena in the Indian Archipelago but while writing this I had access to but a few. Cf. the reference in Chantepie de la Saussaye, *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*, II, p. 398; and Snouck Hurgronje, *De beteekenis van den Islam voor zijne belijders in* Oost-Indië (Leiden, 1883), p. 15ff. [*Verspreide Geschr.*, IV/1, pp. 12ff.] and the contributions by J. L. van der Toorn in *BTLV*, Series 5, V, pp. 90ff.

traditions. For instance, the dislike of the remarriage of widows, which is entirely contrary to the spirit of Islam, found its way into Muslim society in that country, and only a few years ago social agitation had to fight these opinions which had acquired deep roots in Indian Islam.[1] Islam took an entirely indigenous and national form in India. There are examples of a true reaction of Islamic consciousness against native paganism by degrading gods to devils and demons,[2] but even these examples testify to the people's need to incorporate indigenous religious ideas. In numerous examples this incorporation in a changed form proves that alien religious concepts were assimilated by Islam. This resulted in common sanctuaries of both pagans and Muslims, the former praying to an Aryan god at the same place as the latter pay homage to a Muslim saint. On an island in the Indus near Sakkar is a temple surrounded [334] by slender palm trees. This temple is visited by Hindus as well as Muslims, who honour the prophet Khiḍr at this place whereas the Hindus pray to Chandapir.[3] From Garcin de Tassy's article on this subject[4] it is evident with what astonishing regularity Indian *deotas* become Muslim *pīrs* (=*walī*), how the veneration of the Muslim population unconsciously turns to figures which originally were not Muslim, and how this religious veneration finds expression in forms and feasts for which the Muslim element is but an outward factor under cover of which pagan traditions continue.

Here too the 'Alid legend proved a convenient carrier for non-Muslim ideas and practices. The Indian Durga festival on the tenth day of the month Katik became for Indian Muslims the memorial day for the martyrdom of Ḥusayn; instead of the Durga statue the coffin of Ḥusayn is thrown into the river, while all the pagan ceremonies are retained. Thus this pagan festival became a mourning ceremony with Islamic contents.

Localized practices are the strongest support for old traditions. There is the temple of a god to which people have made pilgrimages for many hundreds of years in order to worship and ask for help in need. Popular tradition does not forget the help which they sought and believed they obtained at these places. The temple becomes the grave of a saint, the god a *walī*. Syria and Palestine have many notable examples of this process too. Renan's remark applies to this 'that humanity from its beginnings always prayed at the same

[1] Cf. further in Garcin de Tassy's Report on the Hindustani studies in 1876, pp. 84ff.

[2] Herklots, *Qānūn al-Islām*, pp. 179ff.

[3] *Münchener Allgem. Zeitung*, 1888, no. 139, Beil., col. 2019a.

[4] *Mémoires sur les particularités de la religion musulmane dans l'Inde* (Paris, 1869), p. 7. [For the transformation of Hindu *tīrthas* (places of pilgrimage) into *ziyārāt* cf. T. W. Arnold's article 'India' in *EI*, section 'Relations to Hinduism.'].

place.'[1] Muslims with insight are aware of this. Yāqūt mentions a village of Nebo (Kafr Nabū), remarking that there is there a *qubba* which used in ancient times to be a temple dedicated to an idol.[2] An observant student of religious life in Syria describes the impression which this phenomenon of the mountains of Syria made upon him: 'After breakfast we went towards Safita. Do you see that snow-white cupola on the top of the hill and another on the neighbouring slope in the shadow of a huge oak, and then another one and another? These are called *ziyārat* or *walī*. Each contains the grave of one or more Nuṣayrī saints. Poor women pilgrimage to these graves, light lamps and make vows in honour of the saints whose graves are believed to be here. If they are crippled by the burden of life they step into the small hall under the white cupola and call: " O Ja'far al-Ṭayyar, listen to us! O Sheikh Ḥasan, listen to us!" ' In the same manner Canaanite women of antiquity visited sanctuaries upon high hills and under shady trees thousands of years ago, and these Nuṣayrites are thought to be descendants of the Canaanites.[3] Thus the grave of the *walī* sheikh Hilāl, i.e. 'new moon', in Dayr al-Mukarram not far from Damascus preserves the memory of a moon god whom the Muslim populations transformed into a *walī*.[4] Thus the grave of Sheikh Ma'shūq ('the loved one') near Tyre is the last survival of the Phoenician Adonis-Dido myth, as Movers and Ritter have already recognized and Renan argued in detail in his *Mission de Phénicie*.[5] The saint Abū'l-Nadā ('father of the dew'), whose sanctuary swathed in silken clothes is upon a mountain of the same name in Jōlān, must be understood as a relic of the old cult. Schumacher says: 'The population gratefully look up to the hill, which in their belief gives them the fertilizing dew.'[6] In this way there also came into being graves of Biblical prophets, graves of the same prophets being shown in various districts; new carriers were needed for the lost powers of antiquity and names were used which might not have much importance in religious consciousness, as e.g. Chām, Lamech, Seth, etc. Occasionally new prophets were invented[7] whose names sometimes show a relation to the old pagan nomenclature, as was conjectured by Ganneau[8] in respect of Nabī Ṣadīq or Ṣiddīq

[335]

[1] *Mission de Phénicie*, p. 221.

[2] Yāqūt, IV, p. 291.

[3] Rev. Jessup, *The Women of the Arabs* (London, 1874), p. 268.

[4] Palmer, 'Notes of a tour in the Libanon,' *Quart. Statement*, 1871, p. 107.

[5] Cf. Jules Soury, *Études historiques sur les religions, les arts et la civilisation de l'Asie antérieure et de la Grèce* (Paris, 1877), p. 132.

[6] Beschreibung des Dschōlān; *ZDPV*, IX, pp. 351f.

[7] For example, Nabī Zer or Se'ir whose legend is connected with the dolmens of 'Adlūn, van der Velde, *Reisen durch Syrien u. Palästina in den Jahren* 1851–2, I, p. 155.

[8] *Revue archéologique*, 1877, pp. 29ff.

(between Tyre and Sidon), which is visited annually in the month of Sha'bān and where the grave of the saint of this name is said to be. Here we see the *bāmōth* of paganism transformed into Muslim [336]
*muqāms*, preserving the concepts connected in rudimentary form with the former. Conder[1] and Ganneau[2] have examined the Islamic *muqāms* from this point of view and have in this connection assigned to a number of saints' names occurring solely in this area their place in the development of religious ideas. It can also be seen how much information and material the popular phenomena of Palestine and areas bordering on it can yield for the religious phenomenon examined in this chapter. Despite some exaggerations in the details, the researches initiated and carried out by the collaborators of the Palestine Exploration Fund have shed much light on this field, and one wishes that the popular religion of Muslims in other areas could be more thoroughly scrutinized as to its relation to the pre-Islamic religious tradition—as has been done for Palestine and India.

(3)

Among the most instructive fields in this respect is the popular Islam of Egypt, where many elements of old traditions appear in still very vital form. This is all the more remarkable since the old concepts here—as well as in Palestine—had to pass through the mediation of Christianity first before they were combined with Islam. How tenaciously such very ancient ideas persisted, particularly in Egypt, and with what freedom they survived till modern times among other things from the fact that traces of ancient Egyptian legends can be demonstrated in modern Arabic popular tales.[3] Popular superstition proved of its universal rule in this [337]
field also to be a reliable depository of relics from paganism; theologians often feel called upon to warn of such popular ideas rooted in Old Egyptian beliefs and customs based upon them. There is a report from the seventh century of a popular belief of that time very strange indeed for Muslim circles.[4] When the sun enters the sign

[1] 'The Moslem Mukams,' *Quart. Statement.*, 1877, p. 101.

[2] 'The Arabs in Palestine,' ibid., 1875, p. 209, on the stratification of the elements of population in Palestine. [Cf. Canaan's work quoted above, p. 255, n. 1 and for the *ziyārāt* of the Nuṣayrī country J. Wenlersse, *Le Pays des Alaouites*, pp. 225–9].

[3] Loret 'Légendes égyptiennes' in *Bull. de l'Inst. égypt.*, series II, no. 4, (1883), pp. 100–105. Gabriel Charmes tried to find such ancient Egyptian elements, preserved, it is true in very altered form, in Spitta's *Contes arabes modernes*, (*Journ. des débats* May 9th, 1883); Spitta himself had already pointed out such traces. Recently Le Page Renouf, took up these investigations, and added important new observations, in his instructive article 'Parallels in Folklore' (*Proc. of Soc. Bibl. Archaeology*, 1889, pp. 177–189).

[4] Quṭb al-Dīn al-Qasṭallānī (d. 686), professor of the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Kāmiliyya in Cairo, declaimed against this superstition.

of Capricorn people should go to the Sphinx at Jīza, prepare incense from thorny plants,[1] stand before the face of 'the father of terror' (Abū'l-Hūl as the Sphinx is called) and say thirty-three times a certain traditional formula ending with: 'O Abū'l-Hūl, do this or that.' If these rites are observed the wish will be fulfilled.[2] Other superstitions practised by the Copts are also mentioned as being practised by Egyptian Muslims when the sun enters into the sign of Capricorn. An author of the eighth century condemns the custom that on that day people go out in large numbers to gather certain perfumed herbs;[3] during their culling formulae are murmured in a strange language and the herbs are preserved in gaily painted boxes as being particularly beneficial.[4]

Even in recent times some attention has been paid to pagan relics in Egyptian Islam[5] after some of the more obvious facts had been characterized in this context.[6] Particularly two customs related to Muslim life are mentioned in this group of 'survivals' and, though it may not be justifiable to claim certainty in judging them, it may at least be deduced from the fact that in Islam there is no sufficient reason for these isolated customs that they are likely to belong to the category we are dealing with here.

[338] A custom connected with the Egyptian *maḥmal* (the taking of a large number of cats to Mecca by the specially appointed 'father of cats') has often been referred to. Gentz has illustrated the office of 'father of cats' in Ebers' *Aegypten in Bild und Wort* (I, p. 103) and, the text explains the custom as follows: 'This strange custom was perhaps introduced in memory of the cats which were taken on the pilgrimages to the East to Bubastis.'[7] Whereas this example shows elements of the cult of the ancient Egyptians in its last stage of transformation into burlesque form, traces of the festival of Bubastis may have survived in more definite form. A pilgrim's feast of special importance for Egyptian Islam, which has almost as much provincial significance as the general *ḥajj* of Islam, is unlikely to be new and unconnected with the old customs of the country. It is true that the historical links cannot be established by which the popular Muslim pilgrimage to Ṭanta can be related to the journey to Bubastis known from Herodotus. But, on the basis of certain elements which appear

[1] *Shaḥā'* and *bādhāward* are specially recommended, Löw, *Aramäische Pflanzennamen*, pp. 195–6.

[2] *Famāt al-Wafayāt*, II, p. 181.

[3] These are called *ḥarḥaḥ* and said to be a species of *bābūnaj* (Löw, op. cit. p. 326).

[4] Muḥammad al-'Abdarī, *al-Madkhal*, I, p. 233, bottom.

[5] On relics of an old tree cult in Egypt, see Maspero, *RHR*, XIX, p. 5.

[6] Cf. Kremer, *Aegypten*, I, pp. 73ff., Lüttke, *Aegyptens neue Zeit*, II, pp. 327ff.

[7] [Cf. M. Gaudefroy—Demombynes, *Le Pèlerinage à La Mekke*, pp. 163, 165].

there and which are not rooted in Islam, it may be assumed that the customary Muslim pilgrimages of the Delta[1] are the last successors of those ancient Egyptian religious practices. If so, a much famed grave of a saint may be assumed to have provided in later centuries a local focus for the survival of the ancient Egyptian holy journeys to Ṭanta, and to have saved these customs from complete disappearance. Of the three annual festivals celebrated here, the *mawlid* at the time of the solstice is the most outstanding festival in honour of the saint Aḥmad al-Badawī[2] buried at Ṭanta. This saint, together with the saint Ibrāhīm al-Dasūqī, is the most outstanding figure in the pantheon of Muslim Egypt. A century and a half ago the people of Egypt could be made to believe that the end of the [339] world would inevitably come on Friday the 24th Dhū'l-Ḥijja, 1147. Everyone anticipated this event with terror and when the feared day passed as any other day, the *'ulamā'* said that God had granted a respite in the last minute because of the intercession of the patron of the country.[3] Amongst these Aḥmad has first place in popular consciousness. Just as in Syria people swear 'by the life of our lord Yaḥyā,' in Egypt the customary oath is, in addition to *wa-ḥayāt sīdnā Ḥusayn, wa-ḥayāt sīdnā Aḥmad*. Ignorant people after completing their regular prayers turn to the direction of the grave of saint Aḥmad and pray to him as to another god for the fulfilling of their special wishes.[4] In the Ḥusayn mosque in Cairo there is a pillar (near the *minbar*) which is called after this saint (*'amūd al-sayyid al-Badawī*), and it is believed that the saint on his frequent visits to the mosque is accustomed to stand before this pillar. Therefore people honour it as especially sacred, kiss it and pray and recite the *fātiḥa* in front of it. Al-Badawī, whom the Muslim populace considers to be the protecting force of the land—*walī Allāh waghayth hādhā'l-qaṭr*[5]—was born in the twelfth century in North

[1] From ancient times there has been another important place of pilgrimage in the Delta near Damietta: Shaṭā (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, I, p. 64). The annual *mawlid* there is for a saint who has been given the name of the place; sheikh Shaṭā ('Alī Mubārak, XI, p. 54). Yāqūt is not acquainted with this character of the place, only with its industrial importance (see also al-Ṭabarī, III, p. 1417, Ibn al-Faqīh, p. 252, 8: *al-thiyāb al-dabīqiyya wa'l-shaṭawiyya*). From the Delta materials were imported into Arabia, and in the old *ḥadīth* the cloth called *qaṭī* (after a place near Farama) is mentioned among forbidden clothing, *al-Muwaṭṭa'*, I, p. 151.

[2] From Egypt the veneration of al-Badawī seems to have spread northwards; we find *zāwiyat al-shaykh al-Badawī, sāqiyat al-sh. al-B.* in Gaza, *ZDPV* XI, pp. 152, 158. [Cf. also *EI* s.v. 'Aḥmad al-Badawī'.]

[3] Al-Jabartī, *Merveilles biographiques*, II, p. 12 [Arabic text, Cairo, 1297, I, p. 147].

[4] Al-Sharbīnī, *Hazz al-Quḥūf*, p. 111.

[5] Thus he is called in the description of the pilgrimage of the Ottoman Commissar Ghāzī Mukhtār Bāshā in the journal *al-I'lām bi-'Ulūm al-Islām* (Cairo, A.H. 1304, no. 154, c. 3).

Africa; accounts vary of whether in Fez or in Tunis. After accomplishing the *ḥajj* he settled at Ṭanta, where he soon became a much admired worker of miracles. Apart from his supernatural spiritual gifts his gigantic physical strength was much celebrated. People came to him from afar and he succeeded in gaining for himself in a foreign country the veneration of men customary in his North African homeland. His learned contemporary Abū Ḥayyān, a native of Andalusia (d. 745), described this kind of veneration as an eyewitness. 'The 'amir Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Jenkī,' says Abū Ḥayyan, 'asked me one Friday to accompany him on a visit to sheikh Aḥmad near Ṭanta. Before us appeared a slender man dressed in fine cloth with a tall woollen turban on his head. People approached him in great numbers. One of them called out: "O my lord, I commend my flocks
[340] to your protection"; others said: "I commend my children to your protection," others asked for their crops to be safe-guarded, etc. Meanwhile the time for the *ṣalāt* had come. We all went to the mosque. The preacher said the *khuṭba* and the liturgy was about to commence. Then we saw how, while the community were performing their prayers, the saint shamelessly indulged in the most unsuitable behaviour before all present.'[1] The saint who was suffered to commit such outrages became the subject of exaggerated beliefs after his death. A Muslim by the name of Sālim was taken prisoner by the Franks. A Frank threatened the captive Muslim, who always called upon saint Aḥmad in his need, with terrible torture if he called to the saint again. In order to prevent his prisoner from gaining his freedom through invocation of Aḥmad he put him into a box upon the cover of which—for security—the captor slept at night. In his distress the Muslim sighed 'O holy one, O Aḥmad, save me from the captivity of this cruel Christian!' Hardly had he ended his cry of distress when the box flew into the air with the Frank on its top, and in the morning unknown hands opened it and liberated the prisoner before the eyes of his captor. They were in Qayruwān, a good Muslim town. The Christian not only voluntarily became a Muslim convert but soon made the pilgrimage to Ṭanta to Aḥmad's grave. The face of the saint was always veiled and sudden death would have overtaken anyone who dared look him in the face. A certain 'Abd al-Majīd, who insistently beseeching the saint to lift his veil despite warnings of the danger, fell lifeless at the moment when he saw the saint's face.[2] Such were the legends told of al-Badawī. The Muslim population of Egypt and neighbouring countries

[1] Abū'l-Maḥāsin, *al-Manhal al-Ṣāfī*, II, fol. 30ba.

[2] Al-Biqā'ī, I, fol. 22ff. This attribute is called by Muslims *al-haybа*, the terror; it is also ascribed to Abū Yazid al-Bisṭāmī in his legend and is listed amongst the miraculous gifts of the saints in al-Munāwī (see above p. 270) as no. 18.

make the pilgrimage *en masse* to the mosque of saint Aḥmad's tomb, which has recently been elegantly decorated in order to celebrate the eight-day *mawlid*, which is combined with a fair. The sick and unfortunate expect cure and comfort at the grave of the doer of miracles. This sanctuary is also famed for another effect which is not, however, an exclusive privilege of the sacred place of Ṭanta among the graves of Muslim saints in general (see above, p. 283) [341] or of those in Egypt;[1] the granting of children to sterile women who do not omit to join the *ziyāra*. Travellers who have attended the great pilgrim festival at Ṭanta remark on how closely the women joining the procession of pilgrims resemble these women travelling to Bubastis described by Herodotus, II, chapter 6.[2] But there are also true survivals of pagan cults at the grave of the saint which were preserved in the immodest customs hallowed by popular superstition, customs the connection of which with religion and the dervishes[3] recall the lascivious religious customs of paganism, the last vestiges of which are preserved here at Ṭanta.[4] The other customs of Ṭanta are also shot through with pagan elements. The strangest of these is the superstitious custom that the people press round to compete in plucking hair from a donkey which the Shinnāwiyya dervishes bring to the sacred grave; these hairs are then kept as amulets.[5] The Egyptian concept of the Typhonic animal[6] found its last refuge in this custom of popular Islam.

Islam did not fail to enter the lists against the customs connected with the pilgrimage to Ṭanta. An Andalusian traveller was moved to remark on the goings-on which he observed when visiting Ṭanta:

[1] The grave of sheikh Shaḥḥāt to whom a miraculous spring is dedicated in the Akhmim valley in Upper Egypt. Maspero has described the remarkable cult of this saint, which is connected with an annual *mawlid*. He has shown that among the religious customs of this sanctuary there are relics of the Egyptian cult which was practised in the same valley in antiquity (stone circles, etc.). 'Rapports à l'Inst. égypt. sur les fouilles et travaux exécutés en Égypte pendant l'hiver de 1885–86' (*Bull. de l'Inst. égypt.*, series II, no. 7, 1886), p. 221.

[2] Cf. Ebers, *Das Alte in Kairo und in der arabischen Cultur seiner Bewohner*, Schottländer's Deutsche Bücherei, fasc. XXIX, p. 26.

[3] Cf. similar views prevailing in this circle in Leo Africanus, *Descriptio Africae* (Antwerp ed.), p. 135a; Schultz *Leitungen des Höchsten* (Halle, 1774), IV, p. 296; Radziwill *Peregrinatio Hyerosolymitana* (1753), p. 129; Chenier, [*Recherches historiques*, III, p. 152=] *Gesch. Marokko u. Fez*, p. 98.

[4] These things have been told often but never in more detail and with greater cynicism than in the malicious book of F. L. Billard: *Les mœurs et le gouvernement de l'Egypte mis à nu devant la civilisation moderne* (Milan, 1867), pp. 85–166.

[5] Cf. Dozy, *Essai sur l'histoire de l'islamisme*, p. 514.

[6] Pleyte, *La religion des Préisraëlites* (Leiden, 1865), p. 151, Robertson Smith, *Lectures in the Religion of the Semites*, p. 419.

[342] 'People introduced new things—do not practice them, I advise you; since the only praiseworthy gathering is one which has been taken over from pious forefathers.'[1]

This is what the pious foreigner thought of sacred practices at Ṭanta; from his point of view he condemned them as *bid'a*. But pious natives of the country also fought against these pilgrim festivals, though they did not in general condemn the veneration of saints. In 852 the *'ulamā'* and certain pious statesmen caused the sultan al-Malik al-Ẓāhir Jaqmaq to stop the Ṭanta pilgrimage by government edict, but our source goes on to point out that this measure met with little success since the populace was not to be deprived of their old customs.[2] At that time the theologians were not unanimous in their condemnation of the cult of al-Badawī. We hear that the sheikh Yaḥyā al-Munāwī zealously opposed the sultan when he was asked to sign the *fatwā* of the theologians, since he was of the opinion that it would be enough to forbid those elements attached to the pilgrimage which were objectionable from a religious view point, but that the pilgrimage itself ought to be left to the people. The misfortune which was said to have befallen many of those who signed the *fatwā* was later easily construed as a divine punishment for daring to oppose the veneration of the holy al-Badawī. The traditional saying was quickly applied to them: He who slights one of my saints, against him have I declared war. And who could wage war against God and his Prophet with impunity.[3] This intimidation appears to have been effective down to the most recent times. The author of the latest Muslim monograph on Egypt, an Egyptian statesman well acquainted with European culture and literature, omits in the description of Ṭanta, where he relates the history of the sanctuary in detail and has due regard for the *manāqib* of the holy Aḥmad, to mention the scandalous proceedings during the *mawālid*, obviously in order not to have to make critical remarks upon them.[4]

[343] There is also a trace of the old cult of snakes in the Muslim Egyptian veneration of saints.[5] We find the account, first from Paul

[1] Al-Maqqarī, I, p. 795.

[2] Al-'Awfī, *Ibtighā' al-Qurbā*, fol. 152a.

[3] Ḥasan al-'Adawī, *al-Nafaḥāt al-Shādhiliyya* (Cairo, 1297), pp. 111–13.

[4] 'Alī Bāshā Mubārak, *al-Khiṭaṭ al-Jadīda*, XII, pp. 46ff. On this occasion, a recent monograph on Aḥmad al-Badawī may be mentioned: 'Abd al-Ṣamad, *al-Jawākir al-Saniyya ma'l-Karāmāt al-Aḥmadiyya* (lith', Cairo). In it the attempts of the opposition are discussed at length (pp. 52, 81) and a black stone bricked in the sanctuary at Ṭanta is mentioned where people claim to see two footprints of the Prophet; the government vainly tried to remove the stone (p. 96).

[5] We may mention also the grave of the sheikh Rifā'ī in northern Arabia, guarded by snakes, of which there is a detailed report in Lady Anne Blunt, *Voyage en Arabie*, transl. M. Delorme (Paris, 1882), p. 348.

Lucas, who in 1699 travelled in the Orient by order of the king of France, that the Muslim populace in Upper Egypt venerate a snake able to perform miracles. This was confirmed by another French traveller, Granger, in 1745, who states that the snake performs under guidance of a sheikh. Richard Pococke visited, seven years after Granger, the home of the sacred snake, the village of Rayeyne near Girge, where in a mosque, containing the grave of a saint 'Heredy' to whom the people pay much honour, there is kept a snake which is considered as beneficient and believed to have been there 'ever since the time of Mahomet.' The people make sacrifices to this sacred animal and Pococke noticed much blood and entrails before the door. The traveller ends his detailed account: 'The stories they tell are so ridiculous that they ought not to be repeated, if it were not to give an instance of their idolatry, in these parts in this respect: though the Mahometan religion seems to be very far from it in other things. They say the virtue of the serpent is to cure all diseases of those that go to it, or of such as have it brought to them.'[1] The Muslim populace preserved here the tradition of the *ἱεροὶ ὄφεις* of old Thebes in vestigal form; the powers of the divine animal were connected with the grave of a Muslim saint who became the carrier of the cult. The veneration of the grave of sheikh Harīdī 'who performed his miracles with the help of a snake which heals all illnesses' continues to modern times.[2] 'Alī Bāshā reports that, annually on the Thursdays of the month Abīb, many people come there, and sacrifices are slaughtered for the saint who is believed to be a pious *jinn* (*min ṣāliḥī al-jinn*).[3]

(4)

The diverse character of popular Islam in different countries and among various peoples can be especially well observed in the very particular form which Islamic religion assumed in North Africa. The tenacious sense of freedom of the Berber population, their energetic resistance to the foreign religion thrust upon them, resulted in the old traditions of the Berber tribes exerting, even after the victory [344]

[1] Richard Pococke, [*A Description of the East*, London, 1743, I, 123=] *Beschreibung des Morgenlandes* (German transl. by Mosheim, 2nd ed., Erlangen, 1771) I, pp. 187ff.

[2] *L'Univers. Égypte moderne* (Paris, 1848), p. 159; Maltzan, *Meine Wallfahrt nach Mekka*, I, p. 49; Prokesch-Osten, *Nilfahrt* (Leipzig, 1874), p. 314.

[3] *Al-Khiṭaṭ al-Jadīda*, XI, p. 82. The snake is not mentioned here. [Cf. also E. Amelineau, 'Du Role des serpents dans les croyances religieuses de l'Egypte' *RHR*, LI (1905), pp. 335ff., and Kriss, *Volksglaube*, pp. 88ff. For the *mawlids* in Egypt in general cf. Kriss and J. W. McPherson, *The Moulids of Egypt*, Cairo 1941.]

of Islam, a powerful influence upon what they newly acquired.[1] In the Berber cult of saints which often veils the vestiges of old paganism, the elements of this paganism have frequently survived in a quite unmistakable manner. This is not surprising considering how long paganism survived unmodified in these countries in the midst of a dominant Islam. Al-Bakrī (d. 487) reports that in his time Berber tribes sacrificed to Roman monuments, where they also prayed for the healing of the sick and gave thanks for the thriving of their property.[2] In the days of Leo Africanus (fifteenth century A.D.) ancient, entirely pagan, festival customs are practised without any reinterpretation.[3] Even in modern times the remarkable Roman tomb Enjed es-Sufēṭ on a hill near Tripoli is venerated by the surrounding tribes.[4] Where a reinterpretation did take place, the archaic pagan basis which has been given an Islamic completion is very frequently still quite obvious.

From generation to generation the same holy place changes the name of its heroes; but it is only the names that change, the sanctity and the religious destination of the place survives 'through the ebb and flow of the tide of popular tradition' from earliest antiquity to most recent times. 'Upon a peak commanding the whole of northern Tunisia (Zaghwān) there is an ancient sacred spot. The pre-Phoeni-
[345] cian Zauekes already called to their gods from this place, and Ptolemy knows it as the mountain of the gods, *Διὸς ὄρος*. Later it became a favourite retreat of Christian hermits, and a heavenly messenger appeared on Mons Ziguensis when the Arian Hunnerich commenced the persecution of true believers. . . . Later pious Marabouts appear instead of the Christians and today the peak is dedicated to Sidi ben Gabrīn, whose *qubba* occupies the highest point.'[5]

Here again the new Muslim saints replaced the divine powers of antiquity. We will choose one element in the North African belief in saints to show how this change-over comes about. It has already been said (above, p. 270) that a peculiarity of North African legends of saints was to ascribe to the saint or his grave miraculous effects

[1] We refer to the study quoted above, p. 295 note *, for further elaboration of this point.

[2] *Description de l'Afrique, Not. et Extr.*, XII, p. 458 [ed. de Slane, p. 12 it is not said, however, that the idol is of Roman provenance; it is no doubt of Berber origin].

[3] In many places in his *Descriptio Africae*; a particularly interesting example in the Antwerp ed., p. 112b, which is quite correctly explained by the intelligent Leo: Mihi tamen magis huiusmodi sacrificium videtur quale solebant olim Africani peragere cum nullam adhuc haberent legem remansitque is mos illis in hodiernum usque diem.

[4] Barth, *Reisen u. Entdeckungen in Nord- u. Central-Africa*, 1849–1855, I, p. 39.

[5] Kobelt, *Reiseerinnerungen aus Algerien und Tunis*, p. 425; cf. Kleist and Notzing, *Tunis und seine Umgebung*, p. 183.

upon the springs of a certain locality. A pious Marabout caused the healing spring of Aquae Calidae in Algeria to gush forth and he still guards it, and keeps two thousand phantom camels underground who have to bring the wood needed for heating it.[1] A special point in this popular belief is the idea that certain springs and waters gained continued healing powers through the vicinity of a saints' grave. In such cases the saint is the *genius tutelaris* of the spring, heir of the *jinn* who lived in the spring according to ancient belief.[2]

This popular belief cannot have sprung from the religious views of Islam. A true Muslim properly disciplined in religious matters would explain the curative effects of a spring approximately in this manner: Allāh lends to the water, in each case of cure, the healing powers for that single case. He would hardly speak of an inherent natural power and even less of a healing influence generated by the presence of a saint. Thus one can but assume what we have to do with the old pagan belief (but a Muslim form by the popular view) in divine springs and water, marked out by the presence of the godhead.[3] Robertson Smith, in a special chapter of his *Religion of the Semites* [345] recently threw much light upon the wide diffusion of this belief in antiquity and upon its connection with the pagan ideas of god. The belief in divine healing springs has passed from generation to generation at places connected with it. The bath called Birkat al-Ḥabl in the Jōlān, whose efficacy is attributed to the holy *walī* Salīm whose tomb is close to the spring, is heir to an ancient Roman medicinal bath,[4] and the saint Salīm is probably the successor to a Roman *genius*.[5]

Though pagan traditions of sacred springs were preserved by the Islamic cult of saints in many areas, North African Islam is nevertheless its most outstanding home. The distinguishing characteristics of the sacred spring in the Maghrib will be evident from some examples derived from the accounts of modern travellers. A few hours to the west of the salt quarries near Fez are warm sulphur springs which are much visited by the sick and are believed to be beneficial in cases of cancer. These springs are dedicated to the saint Mullā Ya'qūb and the surroundings of the warm springs are thought

[1] Kobelt, op. cit., p. 54.
[2] Smith, *Relig. of the Semites*, pp. 128, 161.
[3] Cf. Baudissin, *Studien zur semitischen Religionsgesch.*, II, pp. 148ff.
[4] Schumacher, 'Beschreibung des Dscholān' *ZDPV*, IX, p. 295.
[5] On Roman spas and medicinal springs dedicated to gods see Göll in *Ausland*, 1885, no. 10, pp. 190ff. From the Romans the legend of demons living by springs found its way into Jewish legend, e.g. *Wayyiqrā Rabbā*, chap. 24, *Midrāsh* to Ps., 20:4. A demon of the bath at Tiberias is mentioned by name (*Bereshīth Rabbā*), chap. 63; Sachs, *Beiträge zur Sprachund Alterthumsforschung*, II, p. 115.

to be so sacred that non-Muslims are not allowed to enter them.[1] This restriction preserves for the sacred place the character of an ancient pagan *ḥimā*.[2] The excellent travellers' handbook by Piesse on the Muslim countries of North Africa[3] is full of descriptions of such sacred springs. The pagan origin of the cult and belief connected with such springs and waters is shown in the bloody sacrifices which are made there. On the route from Blida to Alma near the village of Sūma is a cascade about 900 feet above sea-level; natives stand under it in order to find cure from various ailments. The cascade is near the grave of Sīdī Mūsā, who is held responsible
[347] for its healing powers. After the invalid has let the water soak into him he slaughters a hen by the water's edge, or it may be a sheep or any other animal, which is presented to the offspring of the saint. Similarly Sīdī Slīmān is the patron of the medicinal spring at Ḥammām Meluān (etym. *mulawwan* = coloured). This is an important place of pilgrimage in the province of Algiers, to which many pilgrims turn after the end of the rains. The bath is a cubicle in the saint's *qubba*, which, according to popular belief, was not built by the hand of man. Here too sacrifices are made after the use of the bath. Usually a hen is slaughtered, and while the victim is still alive the liver and intestines are taken out and thrown into the brook. This is accompanied by other superstitious acts.

It is reported of one of the springs near the bath of Sīdī Mesīd near Constantine that every Wednesday the Jewish and Muslim women bathe there, make votive offerings, burn incense and sacrifice chickens. The most remarkable, however, are the rites and ceremonies, accompanied by sacrifices, and performed at the seven springs (*sab'a 'uyūn*) near Bāb al-Wād (Algeria), *'fontaines des genies'* as they have been called. Every Wednesday morning the women go there to the *qubba* of the local patron, Sīdī Ya'qūb. In truth however, the *jinn* (which of old lived in these springs) are to be invoked. Because of this, negresses must be present who are more versed in this art. Near one of the springs a negress lights a fire in a pan and burns some grains of incense or benzoin, the vapours must be breathed by the person making the incantation. Then chickens are slaughtered and thrown upon the sand. If the chickens, which are still alive and crawl away, reach the sea, this is taken to be a good omen for the fulfilment of the wish for which the sacrifice was made: the *genius* was pleased to accept the sacrifice. But if the chickens die on the sand and are unable to get to the sea the ceremony is repeated, since it is thought that the *genius* is not yet appeased. Chickens are sometimes replaced by sheep and more rarely by oxen,

[1] Oscar Lenz, *Timbuktu*, I, p. 153.
[2] Cf. Smith, op. cit., p. 140.
[3] *Itinéraire de l'Algérie de la Tunisie et de Tanger*, Paris, 1885.

in which case a male negro performs the sacrifice and the movement of the sacrificial animal is not taken into account.[1] It is interesting to compare these accounts with those of Leo Africanus, (referring to the same district):

> Est quoque huic oppido (Constantine) vicinum quoddam balneum aquae calidae, quae inter rupes fluendo diffunditur; hic maxima est testudinum copia quas ejus civitatis mulieres daemones dicunt[2] et quoties contigit aliquem corripi febre, aut alio quovis morbo, illud mox a testudinibus profectum putant. Huic autem rei hujusmodi repertum est remedium: Gallinam quamdam albam[3] mactant, et adhuc plumis vestitam in lance quadam reponunt, quam cereis circumcinctam ardentibus ad fontem deferunt: qua re a nonnullis animadversa, mox ad fontem taciti sequuntur, ac gallinas inde in suam culinam conferunt.[4]

From the above description it is quite evident that the connection established in Islam between the sacred springs and the marabouts is one which, though demanded by the new belief, is still very superficial. The pagan usage is the most obvious point in these ceremonies, which the Africans carried into Islam from their old paganism. Gods and *jinn* have, it is true, everywhere been replaced by saints, but these are, as one of the examples shows, merely like idle spectators at the pagan witchcraft. Occasionally the Berber population altogether failed to make the change from the old god of the spring to a Muslim saint. The Aït Hamid, a free Shelluh tribe east of Morocco, annually sacrifice to the god of their river, who lives in a deep basin underneath a waterfall, two animals and a large dish of couscous, in order to avert the fatal fever.

The most striking characteristic of these rites carried over from paganism is the sacrifice of chickens, which has no place in the pious rites of Islam and appears to be specifically African,[5] probably due to foreign influences.[6] The Baraghwāta sect, which contained pagan and Islamic elements, condemned the eating of chickens, which were neither to be killed or eaten. There half-Muslims gave as reason for the interdict that the cock was really the awakener

[1] Piesse, op. cit., p. 319.

[2] On the importance of shells in paganism see Baudissin, *Studien zur semit. Religionsgesch*, II, p. 182.

[3] There are however some superstitious cures and customs which use the eggs of black chickens; Al-Damīrī (s.v. *al-dajāj*), I, p. 445.

[4] Leo Africanus, *Descriptio Africae*, p. 217b.

[5] The Maghribi instructions for treasure-hunters (Ibn Khaldūn [II, p. 283] also reproduced in De Sacy's *Description de l'Égypte*, p. 560, 1) recommends the slaughter of a bird and smearing a talisman with its blood.

[6] The above *augurium* reminds one of what is related by Hehn, *Kulturpflanzen und Haustiere*, p. 283.

to morning prayer, and therefore a sacred animal.[1] This however
[349] was produced by their theologians, and the food tabu shows that great importance must have been attached to this animal in the rites of paganism which the sects continued,[2] in just the same way as other pagan peoples in antiquity invested the animal with a similar character[3] which was preserved in superstitions and popular customs up to modern times.[4] The ancient Arabs are also reported as having the superstition—which was no doubt imported together with the animal itself—that he who kills a white cock will be pursued, together with his family and property, by misfortune.[5] How tenacious such ideas are appears in the fact that Gallas settled in northern Arabia still consider chicken as forbidden food, though they are in a strange country.[6] Even on foreign soil they remained faithful to the superstitions of their African homeland.

The framework of the veneration of saints was not always needed to preserve elements of ancient religious traditions in Islam. Occasionally they were able to survive in popular belief without being tied up with Muslim ideas. African Islam has just shown us some such examples and they are not entirely confined to this area; they also appear in the veneration of sacred trees, which survives in Syria, Palestine and the Arabian desert and the importance of which in antiquity has been described in detail by Baudissin.[7] In the areas of northern Arabia crossed by Doughty, the Bedouins believe that some trees and bushes are *manhals*, i.e. places where angels and demons live. It is dangerous to damage such trees and bushes or to pick a branch of them, and terrible misfortune is predicted for anyone who dares to do so. The Arabs tell many stories from their
[350] own experience in order to confirm this superstition. The sacred trees are hung with bits of cloth and other stuff and sick people pilgrimage to them in order to sacrifice a sheep or goat, and sprinkle the tree with their blood. The meat is cooked and distributed to those present, while a part of it is hung on the branches of the beneficial tree. Afterwards the person seeking help rests in the

[1] Cf. *ZDMG*, XLI, p. 53.

[2] Cf. Robertson Smith, *Kinship and Marriage*, p. 308.

[3] De Gubernatis, *Die Thiere in der indogermanischen Mythologie*, transl. by Hartmann, p. 554. Other analogies to these facts, ibid., p. 561. The significance of these animals in the Ḥarrānian paganism is seen from Chwolsohn's work (index, s.v. 'Hahn', 'Hühneropfer'). Worthy of note also is *Midrāsh Tanḥūmā*, ed. Buber Num., p. 148.

[4] Cf. the building sacrifice of southern Slavs in Kraus, *Mittheil. der anthropolog. Gesell. in Wien*, 1887, p. 18.

[5] Al-Jāḥiẓ [al-Ḥayawān, II, p. 295, quoted] in al-Damīrī (s.v. *al-dīk*), I, p. 428, 19.

[6] Doughty, *Travels*, II, p. 187; cf. also Kremer, *Stud. zur vergl. Culturgesch.*, 2nd study, p. 13.

[7] *Studien z. semit. Religionsgesch.*, II, pp. 192–230.

belief that the angels will appear to him in dreams and issue directions to him regarding his cure. But only the sick are permitted to sleep in the shade of these trees, a healthy person would be harmed by such an attempt.[1] Sachau noticed in the rocky wilderness of Jabal al-'Āmirī south-east of Aleppo 'a small withered thorny tree of about the height of a man which was festooned all over with coloured rags; its trunk was surrounded with heaps of stones, and stones and pebbles had also been placed into the branches. Such a tree, called *za'rūr* (azerole), is the praying altar of the desert. If a woman wishes for a child, a farmer desires rain or the cure of a diseased horse or camel etc., they go to the *za'rūr*, tear a piece of their garments and hang it on one of the tree's thorns, or, if none can be spared of an already torn piece of shirt, they take a stone and deposit it at the foot of the *za'rūr* or try to fix it somewhere among its branches.'[2] It was in the areas on both sides of the Jordan in particular that veneration of sacred trees remained alive; it was practised here from time immemorial and called for the strict measures of Biblical legislation. The Rev. J. Mills[3] says: 'In no country are the people more awed by trees than in Palestine. There we meet with some sacred trees covered with bits of rags from the garments of pilgrims in honour of the trees. On others we meet similar assemblages of superstitious rags as charms. Some trees are the haunts of evil spirits; and, more curious still, wherever we meet with a cluster of young oaks, the place is generally devoted to a kind of being called Jacob's 'daughters'. Abbé Bargès mentions a lotus tree in the garden of an Arab at Jaffa which is particularly honoured by the inhabitants; on the branches of this tree hung [351] lamps and rags of many colours. The owner explained the veneration of this tree by saying that its seed had fallen from heaven. Therefore it is dedicated to the Prophet who visits the tree occasionally at night-time. All good Muslims honour this sacred tree.[4] The same phenomenon occurs in the Jōlān district. Here the people usually honour sacred terebinths. Schumacher recounts: 'The *buṭmi* are often found singly in fields shading the grave of some Muslim saint. In that case it is given the name of *faqīri* (poor) and by this protected from all outrage and allowed to reach a great age. No Muslim would dare to break a bough or even remove the dry twigs since the legend says that such an act would be revenged by severe divine punishment . . . branches are not even bent so that God's anger may not be awakened.'[5]

[1] *Travels*, I, p. 365.
[2] Sachau, *Reise in Syrien und Mesopotamien*, p. 115.
[3] *Nablous*, p. 54.
[4] *Vie du célèbre marabout Cidi Aḥou Médien* (Paris, 1884), p. 44, note.
[5] *ZDPV*, IX, p. 206.

Many variations of the tree cult in Islam could be mentioned here. Apart from a form of veneration which is still clearly pagan we have seen examples which show slight Islamic influence.[1] The sacred tree is associated with Muhammed or shades the grave of a *walī*.[2] The pagan form of the tree cult could survive without Islamic support in the desert but in Muslim towns it had, in order to survive, to refer to some saint who could ensure its continuation in an Islamic ambience. Without such an association the pagan cult would presumably have soon become the victim of destruction by
[352] force—of which we have a recorded example. In the mosque of Rabī' b. Khathyam in Qazwīn there was a tree which the common people believed to be sacred; under the caliph al-Mutawakkil the tree was ordered to be cut down 'so that the people would not be led into temptation by it.'[3] In strict Muslim surroundings therefore a saint had to be found to take over the veneration of the tree. If no grave is available it is said that the tree itself is *maskūn bi-walī*, i.e. the saint dwells within the tree.[4] At a street corner in Damascus there is an old olive tree called Sitti Zaytūn (the holy woman Zaytūn) to which especially women make pilgrimages. A dervish collects offerings from the crowd and prays on behalf of the pious donors.[5] A linguistic process here created a woman saint. The olive tree became a person by the name of 'olive tree'. The sacred tree became an individual; *zaytūn* became Zaytūn. Morocco has a 'Nôtre Dame l'Olivier' probably owing to the same development, in the shape of a huge tree personified as Lalla Gabūsha, which is a much favoured place of pilgrimage.[6] Even more clearly is this process (concerning the same object) brought out in a male parallel to the holy woman Zaytūn, the saint sheikh Abū Zaytūn whose grave is in Palestine near Bet 'Ur al-Fōqa.[7] In the same way Mus-

[1] Noteworthy among other data of an earlier period is the account of a great shady tree in Wādī al-Sirar (also Sarar) four miles from Mecca towards Minā, to which is attached by folk etymology the legend that under this tree—presumably venerated under paganism—'the navel-strings (*surra*) of seventy prophets had been cut,'; *al-Munmaqqa'*, II, p. 284, Yāqūt, III, p. 75, cf. *Khizānat al-Adab*, IV, p. 73. The 'Abbāsid 'Abd al-Ṣamad b. 'Alī, Governor of Mecca (149), erected a mosque at this place. The *sidra* mentioned above (p. 280, note 4) probably belongs to this group of sacred trees.

[2] Thus e.g. in North Africa (where tree cult is common, Kobelt, l.c., p. 253) · The trees surrounding a saint's grave are inviolate, anyone damaging or felling such a tree will be overtaken by misfortune; Trumelet, *Les Saints du Tell*, p. 279.

[3] Al-Balādhurī, p. 322, cf. above, p. 280, note 3.

[4] Remarkable examples from Egypt are mentioned in 'Alī Mubārak, IV, p. 100; XIII, p. 61. In one case it is an anonymous saint who dwells in the tree; in another it is a woman saint called 'Khiḍra.'

[5] Sprenger, *Moḥammad*, II, p. 10.

[6] Elisé Reclus, *Géographie universelle*, XI, p. 737.

[7] *Quarterly Statement*, 1872, p. 179.

lims turned a stone pillar much honoured by the inhabitants of Nablus into sheikh al-'Amūd. The sacred object was personified by being brought into association with a saint of whom even those who venerate it can give no explanation.[1]

VIII

The factor which Karl Hase called 'hierarchical intention' had little influence on the development of the Muslim veneration of saints. Islamic hagiology has popular roots and always remained a field in which the guiding forces of religious life exercise no sustaining influence. Muslim theology did not concern itself with the legends of saints, and did not feel called upon to attempt a theologico-critical evaluation through which in other fields the free play of popular fantasy might be limited. No *acta sincera et selecta* were collected and on the other hand no *sancti ignoti* were excluded. Nevertheless this latter category of Muslim saints can be recognized; and, sources for these are less ample than elsewhere,[2] their origin lies in causes similar to those giving rise to 'unknown saints' in other fields. From the various types of origin of the saint-concept that have so far been discussed it can clearly be seen that the saints in Islam are not necessarily historical persons of whom miraculous legends were told after their death. In the process of transforming pagan traditions there resulted names which were prefaced with the title of saint. Some owe their origin merely to place-names; the saint whose grave is pointed out at a certain spot is sometimes but the result of an anonymous grave having been given a name similar to its place of location. In the same way as the grave of Salmān al-Fārisī (a historical person this) was put upon Mount Salmon, a number of entirely unhistorical saints' names were due to the unconscious impulse to find personal subjects for venerated places: the place-name easily offered itself to the formation of the name of a saint which would give a meaning to the veneration of that place.[3] Thus at 'Akka there came into being the grave of a prophet named 'Akk, who is traditionally the founder of the city which harbours his bones.[4] Popular etymology also influenced the development of saints' graves. Thus Bēth Gubhrīn (B. Jibrīn) becomes the burial place of a Nabī Jibrīn, the prophet Gabriel.[5] Linguistic misunderstanding of another sort sometimes exerted influence. Al-Maqrizī, who as a [353]

[1] Mills, *Nablous*, p. 33.
[2] Cf. Jablonski, *Opuscula*, ed. Te Water, III, pp. 407ff.
[3] Many examples in *Quart. Statement*, 1877, p. 101.
[4] 'Alī al-Harawī's *Description des lieux saints*, transl. Ch. Schefer, p. 13 [ed. Sourdel-Thomine, p. 23, transl. p. 58, with the notes].
[5] Conder, *Tent Work in Palestine*, II, p. 149; cf. *ZVS*, XVIII, p. 80.

L

critical historian was unable to keep pace with the credulity of the people, conscientiously notes in his monograph on Egypt all traditions of saints' graves which are in the area he describes. At one
[354] point he feels compelled to censure severely the credulity of his compatriots. In the description of a lane opposite the Assuān street he says:[1] 'This street is also called *zuqāq al-mazār*, i.e. lane of the burial place, because the common people and ignorant men believe that a grave in the lane is the grave of Yaḥyā b. 'Aqb, said to have been the tutor of Ḥusayn. This claim is, however, a sheer lie and crass fiction, like the assertion that the grave in the Burjuwān street contains the worldly remains of the Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq and that another grave is that of Abū Turāb al-Nakhshabī. It is also a lie that the grave on the left of the exit of the Bāb al-Ḥadīd is the grave of the Companion Zarī' al-Nawā,[2] as are other invented places which they, on the prompting of their satans, selected for their idolatrous altars, in order to glorify them.'[3] There is an even more remarkable utterance by al-Maqrīzī, when in his work he comes to speak of the alleged tomb of Abū Turāb, mentioned above. It is certain that Abū Turāb, whose grave is pointed out here, did not die in Cairo since the city was founded roughly a century after his death, and he did in fact die in the desert where he was torn to pieces by wild animals. The historian gives the following information about this grave and its traditional connection with Abū Turāb:

> This place used to be covered by sandy hills. Once, when it was intended to build a house there, the ruins of a mosque were found. In Arab manner the people called the ruin 'Father of the sand' (*abū turāb*). In due course this was taken a personal name and thus sheikh Abū Turāb and his grave came into being. Not long afterwards sand again covered the ruins, until they were unearthed again in about 790. I saw on the marble architrave of the gate an inscription in Kufic letters which described it as the grave of the Fāṭimid Abū Turāb Ḥaydara and which was dated 400. In 813 certain ignorant people thought to approach Allāh more closely by reconstructing the mosque. Therefore they collected much money from the people. The beautiful old mosque was demolished and covered with seven ells of sand until it reached the level of the street. On this foundation the present building was erected. It was reported to me that the marble tablet mentioned above was fixed as epitaph over a tomb specially made in
> [355] the new mosque. I swear by Allāh, people were led into dire

[1] *Khiṭaṭ*, II, p. 45.

[2] There still exists a Jāmi' Zara' al-Nawā in the Ḥārrat al-Ghayṭ al-Ṭawīl in Cairo; cf. 'Alī Bāshā Mubārak, V, p. 3.

[3] With reference to the Koran, Sūra 19:84.

temptation by this and the other grave which is in the Burjuwān street and of which it is mendaciously said that it is the grave of Ja'far al-Ṣādiq. These graves are like the stone altars which were venerated by the ancient Arabs. To these ignorant people and women now turn in times of need, when only Allāh should be called upon, and they request from these graves what only Allāh should be prayed for. Of the graves they expect release from debt, their daily bread, here sterile women pray for children, here they make their vows and offerings of oil and other gifts in the belief that through these they will be delivered from their difficulties and brought into better circumstances.[1]

Just as al-Maqrīzī here reveals the history of the rise of the tomb of a particular saint, so the dates of dedication and of the first appearance of other graves of saints have also been preserved. The grave of Dhū'l-Qarnayn in the district of 'Asīr (S.W. Arabia) was discovered towards the beginning of the fourth century; that is to say, at that time the legend of the world conqueror was attached to some nameless grave.[2] Thus the well-known grave of Moses near the Dead Sea first appeared in this capacity in 600 A.H. The Arabs count, as a prophet who preceded Muhammed, a Khālid b. Sinān from the tribe of the 'Abs who in the generation prior to Muhammed fought paganism in the Ḥijāz.[3] It is remarkable that it was just the Berbers who adopted this saint.[4] The date is noted when the Maghribī Marabout 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Akhḍarī claimed that from the emplacement of a grave near Biskra in the country of Zāb a strong light shone for three days and then spread towards the sky. He then declared this to be the grave of the prophet Khālid who after his death was laid on the back of a camel, which was left to carry the body of the prophet to where it was to be buried. Since this revelation of al-Akhḍarī, the mosque which includes the alleged grave of the prophet became one of the foremost places for pilgrimages in the district of the Zāb.[5] But the grave of this prophet is also shown in Tebessa.[6] The inventors of graves paid no attention to historical likelihood—and even less the people amongst whom legends about such graves found an ever ready reception. Only very [356] rarely did Muslim historical science disturb the anachronisms and historical enormities of popular superstition.[7]

[1] *Khiṭaṭ* II, p. 50. The mosque of Abū Turāb is now called Jāmi' al-Atrabī, 'Alī Mubārak, IV, p. 54.

[2] *Jastrat al-'Arab*, ed. D. H. Müller, p. 118, 8.

[3] Cf., al-Damīrī (s.v. *al-'ayr*), II, p. 199, Wellhausen, *Skizzen*, IV, p. 140.

[4] Yāqūt, III, p. 193.

[5] *Voyages d'Al-'Ajdāshī*, transl. Berbrugger, pp. 140ff.

[6] Ibn Dīnār's *History of Tunis*, (French transl.), p. 27.

[7] An example, Yāqūt, II, p. 387, 11: *ma'l-tawārīkh ta'bā dhālika*.

IX

Much as in other hagiolatries the Islamic cult of *walīs* was accompanied by the veneration of relics. Though this was never so important in Islam as in other developed cults of saints, it is nevertheless manifest in the popular belief of Muslims through various forms. The biographies of holy men often carry notes that their *vestigia*, as Muslims call the relics,[1] are specially valued. Large sums are spent in order to obtain them.[2] The handwriting of venerated persons comes into this group of articles.[3] Such things are eagerly bought *li'l-tabarruk* (see above p. 290). The followers of 'Alī in particular value objects belonging to members of the hallowed family. In the third century the Shī'ites of Qumm offered 30,000 dirhams for an article of clothing of an 'Alid still alive.[4] The adepts of Ṣūfism religiously kept in the chapels of their orders the clothes (particularly the *khirqa*) or the *sajjāda*[5] and other utensils left by their founder, almost like a document of their legitimate connection with him. The cult of relics appears also in low fetishistic form amongst the common populace. In the fourth century old women in Syria wore shavings of a decayed coffin which had been dug up and was said to be the coffin of Joseph. It was thought that splinters of this sacred coffin were the best protection from ophthalmia, etc.[6]

[357] We cannot fail to notice that (with but a few exceptions which we shall discuss later) the veneration of relics as it appears in such examples is of an entirely private sort and is an expression of individual piety or superstition. The public, or, so to speak, official religious practice of the community, at least in the early centuries, does not recognize it at all and the veneration of relics is no element in the system of doctrinal Islam. Nevertheless we see also in this field of popular religion, though only in later centuries, that the dominant instincts of the people introduced the public recognition of the veneration of relics into the mosques in many parts of the Muslim world. Zealous theoreticians vainly condemned the *bid'a*, and, just as with the cult of saints in general, they eventually had to grant at least limited recognition also to this offshoot of the cult.

[1] *Āthār*: in Christo-Arabic terminology the relic is called *dhakhīra*, Petermann, *Reisen im Orient*, I, p. 133.

[2] Ibn al-Mulaqqin (Leiden Ms., Warner, no. 532.) fol. 190b: *ma-tabarraka al-nās bi-āthārihi fa-sharaukā bi-athmān ghāliya*.

[3] Cf. Lane, *Arabian Society in the Middle Ages*, p. 50, Ibn Khallikān no. 68, ed. Wüstenfeld, I, p. 95 (sixth century).

[4] *Agh.*, XVIII, p. 43, above.

[5] Lane, *Manners and Customs*, I, p. 305.

[6] Al-Muqaddasī, p. 46; *ZDPV*, VII, p. 227. Today the oil from the lamp in the Nafīsa mosque is used as medicine for eye diseases, 'Alī Mubārak, V, p. 135.

Also in this respect Shī'ism took a different line right from the beginning and thanks to special historical circumstances it succeeded in transferring (with lasting results) some elements of its mentality, which culminated in the veneration of men even into so-called Sunnite circles. In Fāṭimid Cairo it was possible to make a real cult from Ḥusayn's head, which had allegedly been brought to this city, and the after-effect of this cult is still distinctly evident in the Ḥasanayn mosque, which was built over this relic and considered as especially sacred.[1] Religious piety is most intensely concerned with the *āthār* of the Prophet. The assumption of supernatural powers which were more and more extravagantly ascribed to the Prophet could but lead to extraordinary valuation of his *āthār*. Even the oldest of the biographical accounts of the Prophet are permeated by belief in the beneficial powers of everything belonging to him or emanating from him.[2] It is frequently reported that the Companions highly valued the single hairs of the Prophet which they were able to obtain.[3] Abū Ṭalḥa is said to have been the first [358] to possess such a treasure.[4] The hero Khālid b. al-Walīd used to pin hairs of the Prophet to his cap when going to war, and he thought that their presence made him invincible.[5] During the Prophet's lifetime pieces of clothing which had been worn by him were used, preferably as shrouds,[6] and even Mu'āwiya I is said to have let himself be buried in a garment which he had obtained from the Prophet because he 'feared the things he had previously committed'; he also ordered that hairs of the Prophet were to be put into his nostrils, ears and mouth: 'perhaps this will help me.'[7] It is thus not surprising to learn that 'Umar II kept relics of the Prophet for a similar purpose.[8] For all that, the use that is made of these relics is characteristic of the significance which was ascribed to them.

[1] Many interesting details of this cult in 'Alī Bāshā Mubārak, IV, pp. 90ff., cf. Mehren 'Tableau général des monumens religieux du Caire' (*Mélanges asiatiques*, St Petersburg, VI) pp. 309, 338. During the second half of the Umayyad period the grave of Ḥusayn (as well as of Ḥasan) was visited at Damascus; see the verse by Ismā'īl b. Yasār (d. 110), *Aġ.*, IV, p. 123, 3 from below. Though al-Mutawakkil had this grave destroyed in 236 and used the ground as fields (al-Ṭabarī, III, p. 1401, 7, al-Mas'ūdī, VII, p. 302), we find that the *ziyārat qabr al-Ḥusayn* was permitted in 248, Abulfeda, *Annales*, II, p. 206. [Cf. M. van Berchem, 'La Chaire de la Mosquée d'Hebron,' *Festschrift Sachau*, pp. 298ff.; G. Wiet, in *Syria*, IV (1924), pp. 225–7].

[2] Cf. the passages from the ḥadīth quoted in *ZDMG*, XLI, p. 46, note 3.

[3] B. *Isti'dhān*, no. 41; *Libās*, no. 66; Wāqidī-Wellhausen, p. 259.

[4] B. *Wuḍū'*, no. 33.

[5] *Aġ.*, XV, p. 12.

[6] B. *Buyū'*, no. 31, cf. *Janā'iz*, no. 78, *Tafsīr*, no. 115.

[7] *Aġ.*, XVI, p. 24; another account, al-Ṭabarī, II, p. 201. Anas b. Mālik orders that after his death a hair of the Prophet is to be laid under his tongue, Ibn Ḥajar, I, p. 139.

[8] *Takdhīb*, p 472.

Even the Prophet's relics are not taken into the mosques and kept in public shrines, but are considered to be some sort of amulets which are collected and kept for private use: *li'l-tabarruk*.

Apart from this entirely private character of relics, however, clothes and utensils belonging to the Prophet were from quite early on acquired for the community in order to be permanently preserved. This appears to be a Muslim adaptation of the ancient Arab custom of keeping and transmitting through inheritance objects belonging to their heroes.[1] The custom survived from ancient paganism into the times of the caliphate. First of all people kept monuments from the glorious time of the first conquests. The most famous and venerated of these was the sword Ṣamṣāma, 'the sword of 'Amr (b. Ma'dīkarib) which never missed a stroke,'[2] and which was hallowed by the memory of the victories won through it by the hero Khālid b. Sa'īd who had taken the sword in booty.[3]
[359] The fate of this historic treasure can be traced right down to 'Abbāsid times. The caliph al-Mahdī bought the Ṣamṣāma from its then owner for the sum of one thousand and eighty (dirhams)[4] for the treasury. This precious relic from the first battles of Islam was in 231 used for the execution of the orthodox theologian Aḥmad b. Naṣr, who refused to conform to the rationalist court theology.[5] A little later the sword became unusable; it was ruined when the caliph al-Wāthiq wanted to have this ancient relic restored.[6] The sword of Abū Jahl also belonged to the long-kept trophies of the earliest period of Islam. But the thread of the authentication for this memorial was soon lost. In the second century two families competed in claiming that a sword adorned with silver in their respective possession was the true sword of Abū Jahl.[7] As late as the fourth century we still hear of the sword of the pagan hero Durayd b. al-Ṣimma; it was kept by the Bisṭām family of the Balḥārith tribe in Ḥaḍramawt[8] and was called Dhū'l-Jamr, 'the knotted'; compare the Dhū'l-Fiqār of 'Alī. This sword, which Muhammed had carried off from an infidel and had given to 'Alī,[9] was also inherited within the 'Abbāsid family for a long time.[10]

[1] Cf. Part I, p. 20, note 1; also *Mufaḍḍ.* 16:45 regarding old swords.
[2] *Ḥam.*, p. 397, v. 3.
[3] Al-Ṭabarī, I, p. 1997.
[4] [This would be cheap; rather dinars.]
[5] Al-Ṭabarī, III, p. 1348; here the state of the old sword at that time is also described.
[6] Al-Balādhurī, pp. 119f., tells the story of the Ṣamṣāma in detail.
[7] Wāqidī-Wellhausen, pp. 61–2.
[8] *Jamharat al-'Arab*, ed. D. H. Müller, p. 189.
[9] This must be distinguished from another sword of 'Alī's of which the Rawāfiḍ believed in the second century (al-Shaybānī, *K. al-Siyar*, fol. 122b) that it had been sent down from heaven; [ii, p. 15; it is, however reported there

The authenticity of all these memorials is likely to have been rather dubious, but the value attached to them in Arab society is typical of the trend of reverence in these circles. But not only objects of national and religious significance were considered worth keeping. Profane curiosities were also carefully preserved in the treasury. The beaker of the beautiful Qurayshite woman Umm Ḥakīm, the favourite of several Umayyad princes from 'Abd al-'Azīz on, is an example of this. Umm Ḥakīm was a renowned wine drinker[1] and her beaker despite its small artistic value achieved fame through its connection with her and reached the caliph's [306] treasury, where it could still be seen in Abū'l-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī's time. It was round and very large, made from green glass with a golden handle, and weighed three *raṭl*. Under the caliph al-Mu'tamid, its sale to relieve the needs of the empire was mooted.[2] It must be remembered that drinking circles of 'Abbāsid princes attached great individual value to certain beakers. A son of Hārūn al-Rashīd owned a crystal beaker[3] which he liked so much that he made it his namesake and called it Muḥammad. When at a drinking bout this beaker was broken the owner considered this to be an omen of the fall of the 'Abbāsid dynasty.[4] The beakers also offered opportunity for promoting artistic sense and endeavour, which show great change from the simplicity of old times.[5] Abū Nuwās in one of his drinking songs tells of a beaker on which was worked a likeness of the Persian king:

> If this Kisrā, son of Sāsān were to be animated again, verily, he would choose me for a drinking companion;[6]

in another song he describes the beaker:

[1] Her drinking was almost proverbial *Agh.*, XIII, p. 81, 7 from below; Ḥammād 'Ajrad (beginning of 'Abbāsid period) in a wine poem: '(we drink) from a Khosroan vessel, a sip from which is worth two of Umm Ḥakīm's.'

[2] *Agh.*, XV, pp. 50–1.

[3] A beaker of crystal (*billawr*) 'glittering like a star' was given to the caliph al-Mutawakkil by one of his favourite women as a *nawrūz* present, *Agh.*, XXI, pp. 183, 16; 184, 4.

[4] Ibid, IV, p. 189.

[5] *Dhāt asirratin* (striped) is said of the beaker in old times, 'Antara 21:44 (*Mu'all.*, v. 38); cf. the epithet of the cloud, *Imrlq.*, 50:9.

[6] Al-Mubarrad, p. 515.

---

that the Rawāfiḍ said of Dhū'l-Fiqār that it fell down from heaven; moreover, the passage seems to belong to the commentator rather than the second century author.] cf. *RHR*, XIX, p. 361.

[10] Schwarzlose, *Die Waffen der alten Araber*, p. 152; [cf. also below, p. 329].

the bottom of which shows Kirsā and on the sides are buffalo pursued by riders with bows in their hands.[1]

The decoration of beakers, at the very time when these poems were composed, was a feature of artistic production in 'Irāq. A certain Hamdān, a glass-grinder in Baṣra in the second century, is mentioned by name as buried with this art and we are told that he incised a flying bird on one of the beakers.[2] It was probably the influence of Persian art which was felt here, since they cultivated
[361] this kind of decoration—they represented for instance on beakers Bahrām Gūr seated on a camel.[3] Amongst the remarkable things preserved in the caliph's treasury should be mentioned a big ruby set in a ring. This was said to have come from the treasury of the Persian kings and to have been acquired by Hārūn al-Rashīd. It was called Jabalī and many miracles and superstitious details are told of it. It vanished in the days of the caliph al-Muqtadir,[4] under whose rule many valuables in the caliphal treasury were squandered.[5]

If these objects were kept because of their historical and artistic value it is obvious that minds turned to religious memories also sought for memorial which would recall the founder of the religion. 'Umar II was given a vessel before his accession of which it was said that the Prophet had drunk from it.[6] Al-Mutawakkil obtained a spear of the Prophet which was given to al-Zubayr b. al-'Awāmm by the Ethiopian king, and was ceded by Zubayr to the Prophet.[7] We have already mentioned (above, p. 61) that the staff and mantle of the Prophet were preserved as insignia of rule. But not only specifically Muslim relics were collected and preserved; Muslim society shows an interest in objects which had belonged to venerated persons from pre-Islamic sacred history and objects connected with the stories of the old prophets. In Mecca—we do not know at what period—the miraculous staff of Moses was kept as a sacred relic as well as the horn of the ram which served Ibrāhīm as a vicarious sacrifice. Both these sacred treasures were covered with gold and mounted with precious stones. The Qarmatians plundered these treasures in the sack of the city in 317 and they have not been seen

[1] Cf. Dozy, *Gloss. Baydn*, II, p. 27, note. The use of such points in his poetry is considered in the eyes of Arabic critics as a special merit of Abū Nuwās Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Mathal al-Sā'ir*, pp. 189ff.

[2] *Agh.*, III, p. 27.

[3] Ibn al-Faqīh al-Hamadānī, p. 178, 15.

[4] Al-Mas'ūdī, VII, p. 376.

[5] *Al-Fakhrī*, p. 305.

[6] *Tahdhīb*, p. 464.

[7] Al-Ṭabarī, III, p. 1437, ZDMG, XXXVIII, p. 385.

since.[1] To regain them was not so important for orthodox Muslims as was the restitution of the black stone.

Much unconscious self-deception and conscious fraud were [362] attached to the ever increasing veneration of the pious populace for the relics of the Prophet. The more the existence of such mementoes was valued, the more frequently they tended to appear. The vizier Tāj al-Dīn ibn Ḥinna (d. 707) bought from the family Banū Ibrāhīm of Yanbū' a whole collection of such relics for 100,000 dirhams and built for them the Ribāṭ Dayr al-Ṭīn south of Cairo, for the use and benefit of pilgrims.[2] In the eighth century various objects were shown there which the Prophet had used: a piece of his bowl, the pincette which he used when painting his eyelashes, the awl which he used for putting on his sandals, etc.[3] In later times these relics appear to be confined to 'one piece of wood and another of iron' which are objects of veneration in the still extant *'ribāṭ* of relics' (*r. al-āthār*) (*Yatabarrak al-nās bihā wa-ya'taqidūna al-naf' bihā*, says 'Alī Bāshā Mubārak).[4] How much of fraud was associated with such relics is seen from a characteristic anecdote in Barhebraeus's *Amusing Stories*.[5] In the seventh century, swindling with relics was one of the favourite tricks of the jugglers' companies which we have already met with (p. 155) as Banū Sāsān.[6] The populace up to modern times accepted every news of the discovery of relics without much scepticism and they were pleased to have their longing for local sanctuaries satisfied in this way. This can be seen from the account of al-Jabartī (under the year 1203) about the relics of the Prophet which were at that time suddenly discovered in the mausoleum of the sultan al-Ghūrī. Three objects are particularly open to such fraud, because it is in the nature of things that there could be numerous specimens of them: shoes, handwriting and hairs of the Prophet.

In the fourth century we hear of an authentic shoe of the Prophet's preserved by the imām of the mosque at Hebron.[7] A certain Aḥmad b. 'Uthmān in Egypt (d. 625), who was a descendant in the twelfth [363] generation of the Companion Sulaymān Abū'l-Ḥadīd, owned a shoe

[1] De Goeje, *Mémoires sur les Carmathes du Bahraïn et les Fatimides*, 2nd ed. p. 107.

[2] The place is also called 'Ma'shūq,' *Fawāt al-Wafayāt*, II, p. 191 (ed. in the year 1283; in the ed. used here, II, p. 153 erroneously: 'Ma'shūf'); by this is meant the Bustān al-Ma'shūq (near the Birkat al-Ḥabash) belonging to the vizier next to which the Ribāṭ of relics was built.

[3] Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, I, p. 95, cf. Trumelet *Les Saints du Tell*, p. 196, where Dayr al-Ṭīn is placed in the Ḥijāz.

[4] *Al-Khiṭaṭ al-Jadīda*, VI, p. 52; cf. XI, p. 71.

[5] *ZDMG*, XL, pp. 413, 426.

[6] Al-Jawbarī's 'Secrets Revealed,' *ZDMG*, XX, p. 493.

[7] Ibn al-Faqīh al-Hamadānī, pp. 101, 18.

of the Prophet which had allegedly been in his family for centuries and which was, as its owner claimed, originally acquired by his ancestor Sulaymān. This Aḥmad died without leaving any heirs and the Egyptian prince al-Malik al-Ashraf b. al-'Ādil confiscated his property, including this relic, in favour of the Ashrafī academy at Damascus which bears his name.[1] The existence of this relic is reported during the succeeding centuries by several historians, such as al-Dhahabī (d. 748) and Quṭb al-Dīn al-Ḥalabī (d. 735)[2]. Another shoe of the Prophet is traced back to Ismā'īl al-Makhzūmī, who is said to have obtained it from his grandmother Umm Kulthūm, the daughter of Abū Bakr. From this shoe derive those pictures which were put into circulation especially in the Maghrib, after an authentic pattern discovered in Fez.[3] This relic is also the subject of literary description[4] which was considered very necessary, since, if it was impossible to acquire the original, people liked at least to have a reproduction of the *na'l* in drawing, in order to partake through this pictorial surrogate in the blessing attributed to this relic by popular belief: it protected one's house from fire, caravans from hostile attack, ships from disaster at sea and property from loss.[5]

It can be imagined that autographs of the Prophet were much sought after. Such documents were often kept in families whose ancestors had been their recipients.[6] In the fourth century the tribe of the B. 'Uqaysh still owned a letter which the Prophet is said to have addressed to their ancestors.[7] A document in which the Prophet gives some Syrian places to Tamīm al-Dārī was kept in the family of Tamīm until the caliph al-Mustanjid acquired it and put it into the
[364] state archives at Baghdād.[8] In al-Ma'mūn's time Sa'īd b. Ziyād possessed an autograph of the Prophet which the caliph held to his eye with signs of deep emotion.[9] The letter of the Prophet to Heraclius was, according to Muslim accounts from the sixth century, kept by the Christian king Alfonso of Spain.[10] A large number of these

[1] For another version, after al-Nuwayrī, about the appearance of this relic see in Dozy, *Dictionnaire détaillé des noms des vêtements chez les Arabes*, pp. 421 ff., where there are also other details on *na'l al-nabī*.

[2] Ibn Ḥajar, II, p. 254.

[3] Cf. *Catalogue d'une bibliothèque privée à El-Medîna*, C. Landberg, no. 178, p. 47.

[4] Al-Maqqarī, I, p. 908; Cairo Catalogue I, p. 263.

[5] Reinaud, *Monumens arabes persans et turcs du Cabinet de M. le Duc de Blacas*, II, p. 321.

[6] Cf. above p. 58 note 1; and now also Wellhausen, *Skizzen*, IV, p. 91.

[7] Ibn Durayd, p. 113.

[8] Wüstenfeld, *Register zu den arab. Stammtafeln*, p. 442.

[9] Al-Ṭabarī, III, p. 1143.

[10] Al-Suhaylī, [*al-Rauḍ al-Unuf*, Cairo 1332, ii, p. 321, quoted] in al-Maqqarī, I, p. 684. [Cf. for further references M. Hamidullah, in *Arabica*, 1955, pp. 97–110].

autographs, of the Prophet as well as of the first caliphs[1]—the many 'Korans of 'Uthmān' in the East and West[2] also belong to this group—are still at present shown at various Muslim places. There were never many scruples about manufacturing relics or replacing lost relics with new ones. Much as the sacred tooth of the Buddha (Daladā) which the Portuguese destroyed in 1560 soon reappeared as the national palladium of the Ceylonese;[3] the *khirqa-i-sharīf*[4] is shown on the fifteenth Ramaḍān at Istanbul today, though even Muslim historians reported this relic (which was preserved in the treasury in Baghdād) as having been destroyed by the Tartars in 656.[5] Other lost holy relics were replaced with equal ease. It is for example expressly attested when and by what accident the sword of 'Alī, Dhū'l-Fiqār (see above p. 324) was lost.[6] Nevertheless the Fāṭimids girded themselves with this same sword in North Africa in the fourth century and this was the sword shown to the warriors by Ismā'īl al-Manṣūr in order to fire them with enthusiasm in the battle against the rebel Abū Yazīd.[7]

The relic most eagerly sought after is hair from the head or beard of Muhammed. Imitating the examples handed down from early times pious men have always been fond of wearing such relics as [365] amulets or have asked for them to be put into their graves.[8] Cunning speculators did not hesitate to profit from superstitions. 'Abd al-

[1] Berlin, in *JA.*, 1854, II, pp. 482ff., [letter to the Muqawqis; for this and other similar 'originals' of letters by the Prophet cf. M. Hamidullah, *Le Prophète de l'Islam*, Paris 1959, I, pp. 204–7, 212–6, 253–7, where their authenticity is defended!] cf. letters of Muhammed and 'Alī published by the Parsī Sohrabji Jamsetji, Bombay, 1851.

[2] On the various Korans in Syria and Egypt said to have belonged to 'Uthmān see 'Abd al-Ghanī al-Nābulusī, fol. 25a. On the Andalusian copy in Cordova which was brought to Morocco by the Almohad prince 'Abd al-Mu'min and transferred to Tlemçen after the fall of the Almohad dynasty, see Bargès, *Tlemçen*, pp. 379–83; other data in Ibn Khaldūn, *Histoire des Berbères*, II, p. 116, 316, Qarṭās, p. 265. On a Koran of 'Uthmān in Constantinople see Jahn, preface to Ibn Ya'īsh, p. 15. [For pretended copies belonging to 'Uthmān cf. Goldziher, *Richtungen*, p. 274; Nöldeke, *Gesch. des Qor.*, 2nd ed., III, p. 8.]

[3] *Annales du Musée Guimet*, VII, pp. 456ff.

[4] A mantle of the Prophet was shown in Ayla (on the Red Sea) in Yāqūt's time, Yāqūt, I, p. 423, 4.

[5] Cf. Aug. Müller, *Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendlande*, I, p. 161 [cf. *EI*, s.v. 'Khirka-i Sharīf'].

[6] Al-Ṭabarī, III, p. 247.

[7] *JA.*, 1852, II, p. 481 [= Ibn Ḥammādu's *History of the Fāṭimids*, ed. Vonddezheyden, p. 24. Dhū'l-Fiqār is often mentioned in the chronicle to be published by the editor in a volume *Chronicles of the Fāṭimids of North Africa*, see index.] This project was not completed.

[8] Al-Kutubī, *Fawāt al-Wafayāt*, I, p. 105; Ja'far b. Khinzāba, vizier of Kāfūr al-Ikhshīdī in Egypt, obtained three hairs *'bi-mā' 'asīm'*, kept them in a valuable container and ordered that after his death his body was to be brought to Medina and the three hairs placed in his mouth.

Ghanī al-Nābulusī in his book of travel gives details of the forms of this cult in later centuries. On his pilgrimage he met in Medina a learned Indian Muslim called Ghulām Muḥammad. The author relates:

> This man told me that people in Indian lands own many hairs of the Prophet; some have one single hair, others two to twenty. Whoever wishes full of reverence to see these relics is shown them. This Ghulām Muḥammed told me that one of the pious Indians publicly displayed such relics annually on the ninth day of the month Rabī' al-Awwal. On that occasion many men, scholar and pious people gather together, pray for the Prophet and perform the religious and mystical exercises. He also told me that the hairs sometimes move of their own accord and that they grow and increase on their own, so that one hair may give rise to many other new ones. All this—says the traveller—is no miracle since the blessed Prophet has a great and divine life which is effective in all his noble parts. A historian tells that the prince Nūr al-Dīn had a few hairs of the Prophet in his treasury. When the prince was approaching his death he ordered that the sacred relics be placed upon his eyes, where they are in his grave to this day. He (the historian quoted) also says that everyone who visits the grave of this prince must combine with his visit the intention to benefit by the blessing conferred by the sacred relics kept in the grave. This grave is with us in Damascus in the college which the prince had built.[1]

It is well known that one of the arguments for the legality of the caliphate of the non-Qurayshite sultans of Constantinople produced by its defenders[2] is that they own the sacred relics of Islam. Apart from the *khirqa-i-sharīf* just mentioned and 'Umar's sword preserved in the Ayyūb mosque, the hairs of the Prophet's beard belong to these relics. The quantity of these relics appears to be large considering that the sultan was able to hand out some to other cities as well. On the occasion of the building of the Ḥamīdiyya mosque, which the sultan now reigning had erected at Samsun, we
[356] learn from a Muslim newspaper that the sultan sent on a special ship to Samsun, apart from a number of copies of the Koran, 'hairs which belonged to the beard of the prince of the two existences and of the mercy of the world. There this gift of the caliph was received with extreme veneration. The cannons were fired from the citadel in honour of the hairs of the noble Prophet; the sharifs and

[1] 'Abd al-Ghanī al-Nābulusī, fol. 344a.
[2] Cf. W. S. Blunt, *The Future of Islam* (London, 1882), p. 66.

'ulamā' carried the treasure into the mosque."[1] From this we see how in the course of time the veneration of relics in Islam underwent a considerable change. Objects of individual piety, from the ownership of which the pious believer hoped to obtain blessings, became articles of public display, they were introduced into the mosque and thereby became part of the general religion.

The more the industry connected with the *sha'arāt al-nabī* is on the increase in recent times, the more are strictly thinking Muslims protesting against this superstition in the name of Islamic monotheism. Amongst these protestations we find an energetic declaration (dated 1292) by the Medinian theologian sheikh Amīn, who is well-known because of his personal attendance at the Sixth Congress of Orientalists in Leiden.[2] The sheikh thinks that the trade in the hairs of the Prophet 'in Indian and Turkish lands' belongs to the category of falsifications against which the Prophet pronounced the warning quoted above, p. 127. If true relics were found they ought in accordance with the sunna to be buried, not made subject of public veneration.

The report of 'Abd al-Ghanī showed that the mischief done with relics blossomed especially in India and here the change from the veneration of relics as a manifestation of piety into a real cult of them is most marked.[3] This is due to the peculiar character of Indian Islam. Here Islam is forced to compete with the native veneration of relics and could not avoid adopting some of the indigenous con- [367]
cepts in this field also. Typical of the nature of this process is the fact that Buddhist relics could simply be changed into those of 'Alī.[4] In India veneration of relics of all sorts, as for example of the footprints of the Prophet,[5] etc., found its way into the public cult

[1] *Al-I'lam bi'Ulūm al-Islām* (year 1304, no. 154, c.3); the sultan has since sent by a special emissary a similar gift to the town of Ḥalab (December, 1889).

[2] Cf. Snouck Hurgronje, *Het Leidsche Oriëntalistencongres. Indrukken van een arabisch congreslid* (Leiden, 1883), pp. 4ff. [*Verspreide Geschr.*, VI, pp. 245ff.].

[3] For Qadam-i-Rasūl and Āthār-i-Sharīf in India, cf. Sell, *Faith of Islam*, p. 245.

[4] *Annales du Musée Guimet*, VII, p. 434.

[5] In Egypt also many of these are shown. In the mosque of Sultan Qait Bey 'deux pierres noires qui portent l'empreinte d'une main et d'un pied', Mehren, *Revue des monumens funéraires* etc., p. 533, cf. 'Alī Mubārak, IX, p. 62. Burton says that popular belief in a footprint (*athar*) near Cairo arose through a popular etymology from *Athor* (*The Land of Midian*, II, p. 83, note). On the footprints of Muhammed in various parts of Islam see Reinaud, *Monumens*, etc., II, p. 322; *ZDPV* XII, p. 284 (the village al-Qadem south of Damascus). Theologians debate the admissibility of this popular belief, which is rejected by stricter elements, see Ahlwardt, Berlin Catalogue II, pp. 616ff., nos. 2595–7. On 'veneration of footprints' see *Academy*, 1886, Sept. 4ff. This cult is commonly found among barbaric peoples, see Stanley *Through Darkest Africa* (Germ. transl.), I, p. 380 (Uganda); Girard de Rialle, *La Mythologie comparée*, I, p. 197 (Bechuana).

of the mosque.[1] One of the richest treasuries of such precious objects is the Pādishāhī mosque at Lahore. I have in front of me a printed booklet with the title *List of the sacred relics kept in the Lahore Fort together with a brief history of the same*, by Faquir Saiyad Jamal al-Din (Lahore, *Civil and Military Gazette* Press, 1877, 7 pp.). This booklet contains a catalogue of the relics kept in the mosque at Lahore, seven of which belong to the Prophet himself, three are traced to 'Alī, including a *sipara* of the Koran written by 'Alī himself, two items are 'things belonging to the Lady of Paradise, the daughter of the Prophet,' five belong to the Imām al-Ḥusayn, three to Ghawth al-A'ẓam (evidently 'Abd al-Qādir Gīlānī); there follow eight items called 'miscellaneous' of which a tooth of Uways al-Qaranī (cf., above p. 140) is probably the greatest oddity. These sacred treasures, which are said to have been partly taken from the caliphal city by Tīmūr during the siege of Damascus in 1401 and partly given to him as presents by the emissaries of the defeated sultan Yildirim Bayazid, were taken to India by Tīmūr's great descendant Bābur. After the fall of the Mogul dynasty these relics came by sale into private ownership until they were bought in 1804 by the father of the famous prince Ranjit Singh who, though a
[388] member of the Sikh sect, held the relics in great respect. After the events of 1857 the treasure came into the possession of the British, who entrusted them to the mosque at Lahore. Many Muslims from India and other provinces of Islam make pilgrimages to these sacred objects. Popular belief confirmed the genuineness of the relics by the miraculous tale according to which, during a fire near the mosque, the sacred building was spared from danger (otherwise inevitable) because of the presence of these treasures. Thus India is a good market for relics of all kinds. On the occasion of the tour of the British viceroy in 1873 he was presented, amongst many other precious gifts, with a shirt of Muhammed. This shirt was acquired by a general (Tytler) during the siege of Delhi and his widow sold the curiosity in Calcutta, where ten thousand rupees were paid for it. Oddly enough this shirt of the Prophet is decorated with a large number of verses from the Koran.[2]

## X

Nothing could demonstrate the power of the *ijmā'* within Islamic religion so clearly as the veneration of saints. A cultic trend in direct opposition to the cardinal doctrines of Islam here succeeded in gaining a recognized position in normal, orthodox belief through the force of popular opinion. The theologians had nothing to do

[1] Garcin de Tassy, *Mémoire* etc., p. 14.
[2] *The Oriental*, I, no. 5 (1873), p. 624.

but look for arguments in favour of their enforced acquiescence in popular belief. The strict followers of the sunna did, of course, continue to oppose the excesses of the cult of saints, which ran counter to monotheism. But it is remarkable that they did not raise their voice against the idea of saints who can work miracles but only pilgrimages to their graves, the sacrifices and votive gifts offered to them and the prayers made on these occasions. The Wahhābite movement against this cult has its roots in the demonstrations of the strict adherents of the sunna as attested in previous centuries. Al-Maqrīzī's protests against the cult of the graves of saints (see above, pp. 320-1), which is still today earnestly opposed by some members of the orthodox camp,[1] only echo the views of the [369] faithful followers of the sunna in centuries past.[2] These people were on the alert to reject all forms which might endanger the purity of the original teachings of ancient Islam. Just as they were unable to reconcile themselves to a rationalistic sublimation of the personal God of the Koran,[3] so they fought all practical *shirk*. They commented even on the veneration of the 'black stone' at Mecca. They credit 'Umar I with the following speech addressed to the sacred stone: 'I well know that you are but a stone that cannot do good or harm—thus the Koran usually characterizes idols—and if I had not seen that the Prophet kissed you, I would certainly never kiss you.'[4] These circles also spread ḥadīth sayings in which a curse is pronounced upon all those who use graves as places of prayer.[5] At various times opposition is shown to the developing cult of graves and inanimate sanctuaries, a latent tendency which, as is known, came violently to the surface during the last century in the Wahhābism of Arabia and India and in parallel movements in North Africa.[6] Gradually the veneration of the black stone increased;

[1] A remarkable epigram by a poet of the beginning of the last century, which identifies the cult of graves as idolatry, in al-Jabartī, *'Ajā'ib al-Āthār fī'l-Tarājim wa'l-Akhbār*, under the year 1214.

[2] Ibn al-Athīr, VIII, p. 107; cf. a polemic writing against the misuses of the *ziyārāt*, Houtsma, *Cat. Brill*, 1889, p. 138, no. 399.

[3] Cf. *ZDMG*, XLI, p. 60.

[4] *Al-Muwaṭṭa'*, II, p. 211, Muslim, II, pp. 225-26, al-Dārimī, p. 238; Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 187; al-Nasā'ī, I, p. 264. Later elaborations of this story make 'Umar weep and credits a mystical reply to 'Alī who was present, explaining the significance of the black stone, al-Ghazālī, *Iḥyā'*, I, p. 231.

[5] See the passages in Part I, p. 232, note 5; also B. *Jamā'iz*, nos. 62, 96, *Libās* no. 19, cf. above p. 208. In other versions: al-Nasā'ī, I, p. 283, al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 66. In al-Baghawī, *Maṣābīḥ al-Sunna*, I, p. 37, this use of graves as places of worship is described in greater detail by stressing that lamps are lighted by the graves (*al-muttakhidhīna 'alayhā al-masājid wa'l-surūj*).

[6] The founder of the Senūsī order in North Africa originally intended to abolish the veneration of dead saints; Barth, *Reisen und Entdeckungen in Nord- und Central-Africa*, I, p. 193.

people were no longer satisfied with kissing it but prostrated themselves before it as they did before God, and they even considered
[370] this as a sunna.[1] Such circumstances not only roused the displeasure of free-thinkers like Abū'l-'Alā' al-Ma'arrī[2] but even caused doubts in the minds of the puritans of the old school. Occasional accounts show that these puritan circles attempted to protest against these practices despite the *ijmā'* for the cult of stones and graves.

In 414 A.H. the pilgrims who had forgathered at Mecca were witnesses of an exciting scene. A heretic—as an orthodox historian brands this fanatic—after the end of the public prayers ran towards the sacred stone, carrying a club in one hand and a sword in the other. Approaching the stone under the pretext of kissing it he began to belabour it, crying out: 'How long will you persist in worshipping stones and men, in calling to Muḥammed and 'Alī? Let no man dare restrain me or I will destroy this whole house.' This led to a great uproar in the crowd and the poor zealot was arrested and condemned to death[3] together with all those who had dared to take his side, for no other reason than that he had drawn the consequence of the teaching which four centuries before a citizen of the town had preached surrounded by similar dangers, on the very spot where he became the victim of blind popular rage. As late as the eighth century the old Ḥanbalite opposition against the cult of graves revives in the person of one of its most important exponents, Taqī al-Dīn ibn al-Taymiyya, who considers it forbidden to invoke the Prophet for help in need and to make pilgrimages to his grave at Medina.[4]

This shows that Wahhābism had its forerunners and that it only expressed in a corporate way what was also earlier the inner conviction of old traditional Muslims. From this point of view it would be of great interest for the cultural and religious history of Islam to collect all pre-Wahhābī manifestations of a monotheistic reaction in Islam against pagan survivals which it inherited from paganism or which infiltrated from outside, and to relate these manifestations to the surroundings which gave them rise. Apart from the older
[371] manifestations just mentioned it would be possible to list one which can probably be counted the latest: the scene which took place six

[1] Cf. al-Sha'rānī, *Mīzān*, II, p. 31.

[2] Kremer, *Über die philosophischen Gedichte des Abū-l-'Alā'*, p. 104, 6–8 [*Lazūmiyyāt*, Cairo, 1891, II, p. 353, 6–8].

[3] *Chron. Mekka*, II, p. 250. De Goeje, *Mémoires sur les Carmathes*, 2nd ed., p. 196, thinks that there is a connection with the contempt shown to the black stone by the Qarmatians; but the simultaneous protest against the invocation of 'Alī shows that the protest was not determined by Qarmatian views.

[4] See *Ẓāhiriten*, p. 189 [H. Laoust, *Essai Sur les doctrines sociales et politiques de Taki-d-Din Ahmed b. Taimiya*, Cairo, 1939, pp. 30, 334, 353].

decades before the beginning of the Wahhābite movement in 1711 in the Mu'ayyad mosque at Cairo. One evening in Ramaḍān the catechism of Birgewī was being interpreted when a youth—he is called a Rūmī—ascended the pulpit and preached passionately against the ever increasing cult of saints and graves, branding this degenerate form of Islamic worship as idolatry. He said; 'Who has seen the hidden tablet of fate? Not even the Prophet himself. All these graves of saints must be destroyed, those who kiss the coffins are infidels, the convents of the Mewlewi and Bektashi must be demolished, the dervishes should study rather than dance.' The zealous youth, who interpreted the *fatwā* issued against him in a derisive manner and who repeated his provocative speeches for several evenings, disappeared mysteriously from Cairo (*wa'l-wā'izu farra wa-qīla qutil*—says Ḥasan al-Ḥijāzī about this event in his doggerel verses, see above, p. 262). The *'ulamā'* do not cease to decorate the graves of their saints and to confirm the people in their belief in this nonsense.[1]

The isolated voices of opposition which we have met so far were attempts by traditionalists to fight a development of Islamic religious practice which was rooted in the collective consciousness of Muslim believers[2] as if it were a *bid'a*. They protested against an attribute of Islamic cult which grew out of the veneration of saints: the veneration of graves of pious people and saints. This met with little success in Muslim orthodoxy. From very early times a very serious effort was made to find for the veneration of graves a basis in the sunna[3] and it was not possible to list the *ziyārat al-qubūr* as a *bid'a*.[4] The power of this religious manifestation is seen from the fact that even the philosopher Ibn Sīnā[5] in the fourth century [372] felt called upon, in view of the general tendency of ascribing curative

[1] Hammer-Purgstall, *Gesch. des osman. Reiches*, IV, p. 120. The same event is related in detail by al-Jabartī, from the year 1123, *Merveilles biographiques et historiques*, I, pp. 116–20 [Arabic text I, pp. 48–50]. 'Alī Bāshā Mubārak, *al-Khiṭaṭ al-jadīda*, V, p. 130.

[2] Cf. also the proverb in Socin, *Arabische Sprichwörter und Redensarten* (Tübingen, 1878), p. 41, no. 565.

[3] Here belong *ḥadīths* produced as arguments again the passages quoted above, p. 333, note 5; Muhammed is made to retract all those warnings and to allow, and even recommend pilgrimages to graves. Cf. a collection of such sayings in de Sacy's Ḥarīrī commentary[2], p. 121.

[4] It is remarkable e.g. that al-'Abdarī, who fights every *bid'a* that he can ferret out, recommends the visiting of graves warmly, since the pious dead are intercessors (*al-wāsiṭa*) between God and his creatures,' *al-Madkhal*, I, p. 212; II, p. 17; cf. also III, p. 105 (*Ziyāra* travels).

[5] He wrote a letter to Abū Sa'īd b. Abī'l-Khayr about the visiting of graves, Ms. of the Bodleian, no. 980 (6).
[A.F. de Mehren, *Traités mystiques d'Abou Ali . . . b. Sina*, Leiden, 1894, pp. 25, 34–8].

effects to the pious visiting of graves, to find a psychological formulation for this superstition, and in this way to furnish a philosophical basis for the acceptance of the *ziyārāt*.[1]

Though such unsuccessful protests against the cult of graves are occasionally heard in orthodox circles, we can, on the other hand, make the observation that they do not touch at all the belief itself in the existence of privileged men, *awliyā'*, and in their power to help in need those who invoke them, and in their ability to perform miracles. This belief had too long been established in the conscience of the confessors of Islam, and the veneration of *awliyā'* was supported by Sūra 10;63 and in the well-known ḥadīth (which was, however, found deficient by some critics)[2] where God himself is made to say: 'He who appears hostile against a *walī*, on him I declare war,'[3] or 'he has openly declared war upon Allāh.'[4] Such sayings are intended to give support to the respect for such saints and their exceptional position in Muslim society and, as we have seen before in an example (p. 310), were meant to discourage opposition to the veneration of graves. Therefore orthodox believers in the sunna dared not doubt the miraculous gifts of these elect of God. They went so far as to assert that the extent of the saints' miraculous deeds differed in no way from those of the prophets and emissaries of God,[5] and, in order to keep up a distinction indispensable for dogmatic reasons, it was thought sufficient to introduce a terminological subtlety which theoretically distinguished the miracles of the [373] saints from those of the prophets, but which did nothing to alter the essence of the matter.

Muslims are very particular about not describing the miracles of the *awliyā'* by the words *āya* or *mu'jiza*, which are reserved exclusively for the miracles performed, by the prophets sent by God, in order to prove the truth of their mission. In distinction, saints' miracles are called *karāmāt*, i.e. mercies.[6] This expression shows some Christian influence: it is easy to recognize in it the *προφητικὰ χαρίσματα*. 'It is certain that the prophets work signs (*āyāt*) and that the *awliyā'* perform *karāmāt*. But the miraculous signs which are said in traditional reports to have occurred in favour of God's enemies, such as Iblis, Fir'awn and al-Dajjāl, are called neither

[1] See Mehren, 'Vue théosophique d'Avicenne' (Offprint from *Muséon*, Louvain, 1886 (pp. 605–6)), p. 14. of the offprint.

[2] In the *isnād* several suspect informers occur; al-Qasṭallānī, IX, p. 320.

[3] B. *Riqāq*, no. 38: *man 'ādā lī waliyyan fa-qad ādhantuhu bi'l-ḥarbi*.

[4] Ibn Māja, p. 296: *fa-qad bāraza'llāha bi' l-muḥāraba*ti. Suyūṭī wrote a treatise on these *ḥadīths*, Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat. II, p. 139, no. 1417 (*GAL* II, p. 188, *S* II, p. 185 (no. 77)).

[5] *Disput. relig. Mohammed.*, p. 147, top.

[6] In North Africa also *baraka*, particularly of inherited magical power which is possessed by selected families, Trumelet, *Les Saints du Tell*, I, p. 155.

*āyāt* nor *karāmāt* but serve merely the advancement of their needs (*qadā' ḥājātihim*) since God also looks after the needs of His enemies in order to punish them and to push them gradually into perdition (*istidrājan lahum*)[1] so that they increase in obstinacy and unfaithfulness."[2]

But nevertheless the belief in the miraculous powers of the saints met with some resistance in Islam. The rationalistic school led by the Mu'tazilites[3] and other free-thinkers[4] expressed their rejection of this belief. Thus this is not a case of the followers of the sunna protesting against the *bid'a* but rather of the defenders of reason attacking superstition. Of the Mu'tazilites, especially the teacher of al-Ash'arī, al-Jubbā'ī (d. 303) and his son Abū Hāshim (d. 321) [374] fought the doctrine of *karāmāt*. They sought to make up for this curtailment of miracles dear to the masses by raising the status of the prophets to that of infallible men.[5] Yet the Mu'tazilite school were not unanimous about this question and Mu'tazilites could be named who admitted the *karāmāt al-awliyā'*.[6] The rationalist trend is represented in exegesis by al-Zamakhsharī in his commentary to Sūra 72:26, 27: 'He acquaints with His secrets none but those who please Him as emissaries.' Thus in his view a share in the knowledge of divine secrets would be confined to prophets sent by God.[7]

The middle-road theology of the Ash'arites, who aimed at reconciling orthodox traditional and popular beliefs with the rationalism of the Mu'tazilites and who from the sixth century onwards had succeeded in asserting theirs as the only valid form of orthodox belief, also admitted the belief in miracles performed by saints.[8] This same mediating theology also lent itself to making credible the

[1] For the concept of *istidrāj* see *Mafātīḥ al-Ghayb*, V, pp. 683, 691ff.; Sūra 6:44 is connected with it. Al-Damīrī (s.v. *al-darrāj*), I, p. 418. In this connection we may refer to the Talmudic opinion that evil-doers are rewarded with luck and success in this world: *ḥedē le-ṭordān ūle-ḥoṭṭkān lammadrēgā ḥattaḥtiyyūnā*, 'in order to drive and force them to the lowest steps,' *Bab Qiddūshin*, fol. 40b; cf. *Jerus. Sōṭā* V,c. 6: *nāḥatīt lō sekhārō uphesaṭtīw min 'ōlāmī*.

[2] *Al-Fiqh al-Akbar* (Pertsch, Gotha Cat. II, p. 2, Ms. no. 641), fol. 26b [A. J. Wensinck, *The Muslim Creed*, pp. 193 and 224ff.].

[3] See Kremer, *Herrsch. Ideen*, p. 171ff.

[4] The physician Abū Bakr al-Rāzī (d. ca. 290–320) is said to have written against the belief in saints. The authenticity of this was doubted and the possibility was considered that enemies had attributed it to Rāzī in order to discredit him: Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, ed. Aug. Müller, I, p. 320, another datum to be added to those collected in *ZDMG*, XXXVIII, p. 681.

[5] Al-Shahrastānī, I, p. 39, top.

[6] Mafātīḥ, V, p. 683, names Abū'l-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī and Maḥmūd al-Khārazmī.

[7] Orthodox exegesis endeavours to disprove this consequence, al-Bayḍāwī to the passage al-Qasṭallānī, X, p. 411.

[8] [Cf. for the theological discussions also D. B. MacDonald's article 'Karama' in the *EI*.]

existence of magic and its efficacy, though with the stipulation that the sorcerer himself was an infidel whereas *karāmāt* could only be performed by true believers, and that this was the *differentia specifica* between *siḥr* and *karāmāt*.[1] In Ash'arite teaching, belief in the *karāmāt al-awliyā'* is easily reconcilable with the basic doctrines of Islam and is in fact one of its postulates. In earlier times we come across a few timid attempts in these circles at eliminating belief in miracles from orthodox theology. Abū Isḥāq al-Isfarā'īnī (d. 418)[2] and al-Ḥalīmī are mentioned as the sole followers of orthodox dogma who joined the more liberal trend in this respect. Such attempts, however, did not meet much success with public opinion and therefore the middle-road group had, as in many other fields, the task of codifying the people's superstitions and refuting and in-
[375] validating all dogmatic and philosophical scruples opposed to them. The followers of this school disagree only as to whether belief in *karāmāt* is necessary or merely permissible.[3] The profoundly pious al-Ghazālī, who represents the peak of Ash'arite theology, followed his teacher Imām al-Ḥaramayn al-Juwaynī[4] in this question and stood in the front row of all believers in saints;[5] and Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606) after him developed a whole arsenal of arguments in several detailed discussions of Koranic verses in which he found support for belief in the miraculous powers of saints.[6] Some of these arguments are probably calculated to gain popular applause rather than sharp dogmatic effect. Thus he says: 'We witness every day that a king grants special concessions, not granted to others, to his most intimate courtiers who are allowed free access to his person; also common sense demands that such proximity should also bring a corresponding amount of influence as a necessary consequence of the relationship. The greatest king is the master of the universe. If He selects a person for distinction by drawing him to the threshold of His service and the stairs of this grace, by revealing to him the secrets of His knowledge and by removing the partition of distance between Him and his soul, and puts him on the carpet of His vicinity, is it then unlikely that such a person should manifest some part of this grace already in this world? This world is after all a mere nothing in comparison to but an atom of that spiritual bliss and divine insight.' Here the theory regarding the various grades of purity of human souls, which are dependent upon the degree to

[1] Al-Damīrī (s.v. *al-kalb*), II, p. 336, gives an excursus on this subject.

[2] He also voiced many liberal thoughts in *fiqh*. I mention only one saying: 'The doctrine that every *mujtahid* reaches only the truth (*kull mujt. muṣīb*) originates in sophistry and leads to heresy' (Ibn al-Mulaqqin, fol. 25a).

[3] Cf. al-Ījī, *Mawāqif*, p. 243.

[4] Cf. M. Schreiner, in Grätz's *Monatsschrift*, XXXV, pp. 314ff.

[5] *Iḥyā'*, I, pp. 233ff.

[6] *Mafātīḥ*, II, pp. 541, 659; V, pp. 13ff. 682ff. (this is the principal passage).

which they can divest themselves of bodily weaknesses, stands him in good stead—a theory which had to help religious philosophers of the Middle Ages[1] in so many problems of religious life.

We will not burden the reader with a reproduction of the scholastic arguments of Fakhr al-Dīn and will by-pass his arguments and counter-proofs (to be found in the passages referred to in the notes). But we may stress here that it was typical of the level to which [376] Islamic philosophy had sunk in the seventh century that Fakhr al-Dīn uses among other fables the following 'fact' against the much more consistent al-Zamakhsharī. 'In the times of the Sultan Sanjar b. Malik Shāh a witch (*kāhina*) lived in Baghdād; she was called to the court of the sultan in Khurāsān and the ruler asked her about future events. All that she prophesied did in fact take place. Fakhr al-Dīn says: "I myself have met people well versed in philosophy who recounted what this woman had reported in detail about secret matters. All she predicted came true.' Abū'l-Barakāt in his book *Kitāb al-Mu'tabar* has given a detailed account of the information concerning this woman and says: 'For thirty years I have investigated this matter and I am finally convinced that the witch in fact told the truth about hidden things".'[2] This to Fakhr al-Dīn is a historical proof for the existence of such faculties in people who are not prophets, i.e. particularly in saints.

Thus the belief became an integral part of orthodox confession and almost every catechism of the Muslim religion contains a short paragraph on the saints and their miracles immediately after the teaching on prophecy. We merely mention the two most widely used catechisms of Islam. Abū'l-Barakāt al-Nasafī (d. A.H. 710) teaches: 'The karāma of saints is admissible, in contrast to the teaching of the Mu'tazila; it is admissible because of the well-known accounts and stories which testify to it . . . It is possible either that the *walī* has the consciousness of this rank of his or that the *walī* does not know of his dignity.[3] Not so of the prophet (who is always [377] conscious of his dignity).'[4] The most popular Muslim teacher Birgewī (d. A.H. 981) teaches in his short catechism: 'You must profess that the *karāmāt* of the *awliyā'* are true but that their rank does not reach that of the prophets.'[5] Even the Arab philosopher

[1] V, pp. 685ff. nos. 5 and 7 of the proofs.

[2] *Mafātīḥ*, VIII, p. 331 [referring to *al-Mu'tabar*, Hyderabad, 1358, II, pp. 433–4].

[3] This is an old controversial point between the earlier dogmatics. Abū Bakr ibn Fūrak (d. 406) taught that the *walī* must not know of his dignity, others taught the contrary (*Mafātīḥ*, V, p. 692).

[4] *Pillar of the Creed of the Sunnites*, ed. W. Cureton, p. 18 of the Arabic text.

[5] *Risāla Birgewī*, §22.

of history who is by no means credulous about the graves of saints,[1] speaks in favour of the miracles performed by saints. Ibn Khaldūn favours this belief in seveal passages of his *Muqaddima* and calls the stories about the pretended miracles of the adepts of sūfism, their prophecies and revelations and their power over nature 'a true and undeniable fact.' He considers Isfarā'īnī's objections as disproved and declares that saints work miracles not because of their desire to perform them; this power of theirs is due to a divine gift of which the saints are compelled to make use against their own will. He firmly rejects the explanation of these miracles as ordinary witchcraft.[2]

Thus the representatives and defenders of the belief in the *karāmāt al-awliyā'* could summon the two most important arguments in their favour: the *ijmā' al-umma* and the *tawātur*, i.e. the fact that such miracles were attested throughout the generations. Apart from these positive proofs they used to intimidate their sceptical adversaries by all kinds of threats (see above, p. 336). Many works on hagiography have an introductory chapter devoted to the dispute between Mu'tazilites and Ash'arites. Al-Yāfi'ī says, as we read in the ṣūfī biographies of al-Biqā'ī: 'I never cease to marvel at those who deny the miracles of the prophets and the *karāmāt* of the saints, when these are proved by verses in the Koran, authentic traditions and well-known sayings, profitable tales and innumerable examples . . .' Ibn al-Subkī said: 'We know of no theologian who disapproved of the ṣūfīs without that he was made to perish by Allāh and visited by severe punishment.' Muḥammad al-Sharīf (of the Mālikite school) said: 'The *karāmāt* of saints are true, those which are related as having been performed during their lives as well as those which they
[378] achieved after death.' Of the four orthodox schools none of significance voiced disapproval of this belief. Al-Suhrawardī even says that belief in miracles performed by deceased saints follows even more necessarily from the principles of religion than belief in the miracles of living saints, since only after death can their souls be quite free from all turbidity and temptations.[3] 'Abd al-Ra'ūf al-

[1] This is evident from his account of the graves of 'Uqba b. Nāfi', the conqueror of North Africa, and his companions. He says about this place, which is the object of special veneration by the Muslims of North Africa: 'The graves of these martyrs to the faith, 'Uqba and his companions are at this place in the Zab country. Above the grave of 'Uqba mounts (*asnima*) were made and later it was walled up and a mosque was built which has his name. It is one of the places of pilgrimage from which it is believed that blessings will occur (*mapānu al-baraka*). Verily, it is a more worthy place for pilgrimages than the graves of the plain because of the large number of martyrs who were companions and followers of the Prophet, *Histoire des Berbères*, I, p. 186.

[2] *Not. et. Extr.*, XVIII, pp. 78, 134, 144.

[3] Al-Biqā'ī, I, fols. 3–5, but cf. above p. 264.

Munāwī starts his biographical work with a detailed refutation of seven arguments which are used by the opponents of the *karāmāt*. That al-Isfarā'inī is numbered among the enemies of the miracles of saints while being a pillar of orthodox Islam is explained by him by the fact that 'views have mendaciously been attributed to him which he himself never uttered.'[1]

[1] Al-Munāwī, fols. 2–3, cf. above, p. 337, note 4.

# EXCURSUSES AND ANNOTATIONS

ONE

# THE UMMAYADS AS FIGHTERS FOR RELIGION



(Note to pp. 53-4)

IT will be possible to appreciate better the glorification, put into the form of a ḥadīth, of Khālid al-Qasrī as a support of the *dīn*, if in this connection it is considered that loyal poets glorify the Ummayads and their helpers, who are condemned by pietists as enemies of Islam, as representatives and protectors of the cause of Islam—just as it is done in the tradition alluded to in a religious form. The enemies of the dynasty were by this process to be branded as the enemies of Islam.

Thus the poet 'Udayl praises al-Ḥajjāj:

> that he erected the dome of Islam like a prophet who guides men, after their error, to the right path.[1]

The poet makes this Ḥajjāj, who to the pious is the prototype of a tyrant, appear as a person 'who unsheathed his sword for truth (*li'l-ḥaqq*).'[2] Even more distinctive of this tendency of poets is the character sketch which al-Farazdaq draws of the caliph Yazīd II:[3]

> If Jesus had not foretold the Prophet and expressly described his person, you would have to be taken for a prophet who calls to the light; though you are not the prophet yourself you still are his companion together with the two martyrs[4] ('Umar and 'Uthmān) and Ṣiddīq (Abū Bakr).

In connection with the subject discussions on p. 106, it may be pointed out that Jarīr praises the caliph 'Abd al-Malik because through him (presumably through his intervention) rain can be obtained.[5]

[1] *Agh.*, XX, p. 13, 7.
[2] Ibid., p. 18, 7.
[3] Khizānat al-Adab, II, p. 410.
[4] Above, p. 116.
[5] *Agh.*, X, p. 4, 5 from below, *Khalīfat Allāh* (cf. p. 67, note 2) *yustasqā bihi'l-maṭaru*.

TWO

[382]

# THE ḤADĪTH AND THE NEW TESTAMENT[1]

(Note to p. 149)

(1)

THE fact that Islam regarded Christianity as a religion from which something could be learnt, and did not disdain to borrow from it, is acknowledged by the Muslim theologians themselves,[2] and the early elements of Ḥadīth literature offer us a great wealth of examples which show how readily the founders of Islam borrowed from Christianity. We do not here allude to those vague borrowings which in the earliest times of Islam, through verbal communications with Christian monks or half-educated converts, helped in building up the form and content of the faith, and which appear in the form of isolated technical expressions, Bible legends, and so forth; but we mean those borrowings which are presented in a more definite shape, and evince a certain, if not a very extensive, knowledge of the Christian Scriptures.

The biography of the Prophet itself, consisting as it does of isolated features handed down by the theologians, is rich in elements borrowed from Christianity. An unconscious tendency prevailed to draw a picture of Muhammed that should not be inferior to the Christian picture of Jesus (above, page 261). And to this endeavour are to be traced, as has been often pointed out, those features in the life of the Prophet which are actually contrary to the intentions of Muhammed, those, namely, in which his admirers make him perform miracles such as are related of the founder of Christianity. The miracle narrated in John's Gospel (2:i–ii) has served as a pattern for a whole series of miraculous legends, which were inserted at an early date into the biography of Muhammed. The Prophet was able

[1] [Additions to this chapter are found in Goldziher's article 'Neutestamentliche Elemente in der Traditionsliteratur des Islam,' *Oriens Christianus* 1902, pp. 330–7.]

[2] Thus Ibn Ḥajar, I, p. 372, quotes ancient authorities who acknowledge the share which the communications of the Christian proselyte Tamīm al-Dārī had in the formation of Muhammed's eschatology. [Cf. 'Tamīm al-Dārī in the *EI*.]

to increase, in a super-natural manner, a supply of water, which in [383]
the natural course of things would have been insufficient for a large number of believers, either to quench their thirst, or—and this is a specifically Muslim feature—to serve for religious ablutions.[1] He performs the same miracle in reference to the increase of insufficient food. The biography of Muhammed offers many examples of this latter kind of miraculous power:[2] we may take as a sample the miracle of the increasing of food which is related in the tradition about the 'Battle of the Ditch' as the 'blessing of the food of Jābir'. A little barley and a kid, which the wife of Jābir had in store, sufficed not only for all the ravenous *Muhājirūn* and *Anṣār* who accompanied the Prophet, but to provide also an ample share for those of the Companions who were not present.[3] The Maghrībī Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ (fifth century) industriously collected and made a compilation of such narratives, and as though in his time some possibility of doubt as to their authenticity could have been expected he closes his statement with the remark that those facts were related by some ten Companions from whom they were taken over by double as many Followers (*tābi'ūn*); and after these countless men have handed them on, they are imparted in well-known narratives, and occurred in gatherings at which many witnesses were present. The communication of these occurrences must therefore rest upon truth, for those present would not have remained silent during the narration of things which ought to have been contradicted.[4]

The Muslim biographers of the Prophet try even more eagerly to emulate Christians in developing the miraculous feature of the healing of the sick on the part of the Prophet, and they represent that this took place through the efflux of a healing power which dwelt in his body, or in things that belonged to him; for in the absence of the Prophet the same healing power is attributed to certain of his possessions as is ascribed to his immediate presence and active intervention. For the sake of brevity I refer in the note[5] to the literature bearing on this subject, in which those of my readers [384]

[1] B. *Maghāzī*, no. 37; *Wuḍū'*, no. 46 (47).

[2] No less than eleven miracles having to do with food and three with drink are related by al-Wāqidī; Aug. Müller, *ZVS* XIV, p. 446.

[3] Ibn Hishām, p. 672; B. *Maghāzī*, no. 31.

[4] *Shifā'*, Constantinopolitan lithographic ed. I, pp. 243–52. [For miracles concerning food and water cf. T. Andrae, *Die Person Muhammeds in Lehre und Glauben seiner Gemeinde*, pp. 46–8; for miraculous healing, ibid., pp. 48, 88ff.]

[5] B. *Faḍā'il al-Aṣḥāb*, no. 10; *Maghāzī*, no. 40; *Libās*, no. 66; *Ṣalāt*, no. 17; *Manāqib*, no. 23; *Marḍā*, no. 5; *Wuḍū'*, no. 40 (41); *Da'awāt*, no. 33; cf. Ibn Ḥajar, I, p. 314; *Agh.*, XV, p. 137; al-Azraqī, p. 438, 15. Under this heading comes the miracle of the raising of the dead; for the traditions about it, see *Shifā'*, I, p. 268.

who are interested in the details can find the data for a comparative study of these miraculous legends.

Still more noteworthy, however, is the influence which the didactic utterances, to be found in the Gospels, have exercised on the development of Muslim doctrines in the ḥadīth. According to the method indicated above, page 149, such borrowings are brought forward as sayings of the Prophet. It is worthwhile for the theologian, and also for the historian of literature, to notice some specimens of this influence, although in several cases they show only a superficial adoption of some well-known utterances.

Among those whom God 'covers with His shadow in the day when there is no shadow save His' is mentioned 'the man who does a charitable deed and keeps it secret, so that his left hand does not know what his right hand has done.'[1] We also meet in Muslim tradition with the saying 'Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's' (Matt., 22:21), though with an ending quite different from that in the Gospel.[2] In a saying which belongs to the group discussed above, pages 93ff., Muḥammed is prophesying to his disciples that after his death times will come in which they shall see despicable things. They ask the Prophet how they are to comport themselves towards those in power; he replied 'Give them', i.e. those in power, 'what is their due[3] and ask God for that which is due to you.' The Gospel sayings about the blessedness of the poor, their being preferred before the rich, and the shutting out of the latter from the kingdom of Heaven, express a view directly contrary to that of the heathen Arab, but they find countless echoes in the sayings of Muḥammed and the earliest Muslim divines. Only a few examples can be given here. 'I stood,' said the Prophet, 'before the gate of Paradise, and observed that the greater number of those who gained admittance through it were the poor, whereas the
[388] well-to-do were turned away.'[4] In another tradition the same thought is expressed in the following manner. 'The rich will be admitted to

[1] *Al-Muwaṭṭa'*, IV, p. 171; B. *Zakāt*, no. 15, cf. 18; *Muḥārabūn*, no. 5; Muslim, IV, p. 188. Cf. also *Iḥyā*, II, p. 147, *wa-rajul taṣaddaqa bi-ṣadaqa fa-akhfāhā ḥattā lā ta'lama shimāluhu mā tunfiqu* (variant: *yamā'at*) *yamīnuhu*. [The saying is derived from Matt., 6:3.]

[2] B. *Fitan*, no. 2. *Addū ilaykim* (i.e. *ilā'l-umarā'*) *ḥaqqahum fī'as'alū'llāha ḥaqqakum*.

[3] Commentators remark that this refers to the payment of taxes.

[4] B. *Riqāq*, no. 51. Compare the account in *Agh.*, II, p. 191, 11, in which 'Abd Allāh b. Ja'far b. Abī Ṭālib instructed the teacher of his children not to make them acquainted with that *qaṣīda* of 'Urwa b. al-Ward in which the heathen poet says, 'Let me hunt after riches, for I see that the poor are the most miserable of men.' For the inquiry how far the Islamic conception gives the preference to riches or to poverty, materials may be found in al-Qasṭallānī to B. *Riqāq*, no. 16 (IX, p. 287). Men of letters also busy themselves much with this question, see *al-Mumarshā*, ed. Brünnow, p. 111.

Paradise 500 years after the poor.'[1] 'Once,' so another passage runs, 'some one passed by the Prophet. A Companion remarked, in reply to the inquiry of the Prophet, that the passer-by belonged to the most noble among men, with whom any one might be glad to be connected, and whose protection must be respected by all, so high was his position. The Prophet received this remark in silence. Then another man passed by, and the following information was given to the Prophet about his character. 'He belongs to the poor among the Muslims; should he sue for the hand of a girl, the father would be right to refuse him; should he give his protection to any one, it may be disregarded, and none need pay any attention to what he says.' 'Truly,' replied the Prophet, 'this same man is worth more than a whole world full of men like the other.'[2] Many a one who goes clothed in this world goes naked in the next.'[3] 'Abd Allāh b. Mas'ūd says; 'As though I beheld the Prophet of God imitating one of the most ancient prophets, who was tortured and beaten by his people, but only wiped the blood from his face, and said, 'God forgive my people, for they know not (what they do.[4])' Ḥanẓalī al-'Abshamī says: 'Never does a company sit together and make mention of the name of God, without a herald from Heaven calling [386] down to them, "Stand up, for I have forgiven you, and turned your misdeeds into good deeds."'[5] One cannot fail to recognize in this sentence the influence of Matt. 9:2–7.[6] Similarly, a likeness to the promise of blessedness for the 'poor in spirit' (Matt. 5:3) is found in the Muslim saying, 'The simple (*al-bulhu*), form the larger part of the

[1] In Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī *Mafātīḥ*, II, p. 538. The saying that 'it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for the rejector of revelation to enter Paradise,' is found in Sūra 7:38, and the same expression is repeated often in the Traditions in other connections: 'Among our Companions there are twelve hypocrites; among them eight who will find an entrance into Paradise, not more easily than a camel gets through the eye of a needle (*samm al-khiyāṭ*), etc., Muslim V, p. 345. 'To go through the eye of a needle' means in Arabic also to be clever or acute. *Al-Khirrīt*=the clever guide (B. *Ajāra*), no. 3; *Manāqib al-Anṣār*, no. 45. *al-mākir bi'l-hidāya* 'is derived from *khart al-ibra* needle's eye: that is, he is so clever that he can slip through the eye of a needle,' Ibn Durayd, p. 68. Al-Khirrīt was a nickname of Khālid b. 'Abd Allāh, *Agh.*, I, p. 67, 20; *XIX*, p. 55, 8, from below. Compare too the phrase, 'He required the people to lead a camel through the eye of a needle' (*Kallafa'l-nās idhkāl al-jamal fī samm al-khiyāṭ*), i.e. he demanded impossibilities from them; Ibn Ḥajar, *al-Durar al-Kāmina*, Ms. of the K. Hofbibliothek, Vienna, Mixt. no. 245, III, fol. 40.

[2] B. *Riqāq*, no. 10.

[3] B. *Fitan*, no. 6; al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 31.

[4] B. *Anbiyā'*, no. 54; *Istitāba*, no. 5. Commentators know so little about the matter that they mention Noah as the prophet whom Muhammed was supposed to be imitating. [Cf. Luke 23:34.]

[5] Ibn Ḥajar, I, p. 744.

[6] [Perhaps also Matt. 18:19, 20.]

dwellers in Paradise';[1] and a parallel to Matt. 10:16 is found in the tradition that certain Companions of the Prophet said, 'Be simple as doves (*kūnū bulhan ka'l-ḥamāmi*).' It is added that, in the time of the Companions, a current formula of blessing ran, 'May God diminish thy acuteness'[2] (*aqalla'llāhu fiṭnataka*). The philosopher al-Jāḥiẓ felt how foreign this view of things must seem to the circles to which it was presented; accordingly, he adds to his reproduction of these utterances the following remark: 'This is indeed in opposition to that which is related of 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb; if he was told that a certain person did not know what evil was, he would remark: "Then it behoves him to fall into it." '[3]

As one of the most remarkable examples of borrowing from the Gospels and attributing the borrowed text to Muhammed, we may take the use which is made in the ḥadīth of the Lord's Prayer. That the notion current in ancient Muslim circles of the origin of the prayer was extremely vague is shown by the fact that one part of it was regarded as dating from Moses.[4] Elsewhere it is related in the name of Abū'l-Dardā' that the Prophet said: 'If any one suffers, or if his brother suffers, he should say: "Our Lord God, which art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom[5] (is) in heaven and on earth; as Thy mercy is in heaven, so show Thy mercy on earth; forgive us our debts and our sins (*ḥawbanā wa-khaṭāyānā*). Thou art the Lord of the good (*rabb al-ṭayyibīn*); send down mercy from Thy
[387] mercy and healing from Thy healing on this pain, that it may be healed." '[6] It is remarkable that in this mutilated fragment the expression *ṭayyibīn* occurs. This probably tallies with the Christian word *ṭūbhānā*, so that in this dotology, as incorporated in the ḥadīth, the intercession of the saints would seem to be invoked.

Not only didactic utterances however, or (as shown in the last example) religious formulae, have come into Islam from the Gospels, but phrases also are frequently borrowed. It is worthy of note that the origin of such borrowed phrases has been entirely forgotten by Muslims. An example of this is the word *shahīd*, used in the sense of 'martyr.'[7] Doubtless this is a pure Arabic word; but its application to one who witnesses for his faith by the sacrifice of his life was derived from its use among Christians (the Syriac *sāhdā*, which is

[1] Al-Ya'qūbī, II, p. 115, 2, cf. *K. al-Aḍdād*, p. 214.

[2] From this point of view *al-ablahu* (the simpleton) may be considered an honourable designation; Muḥammad b. Ja'far, a great-grandson of 'Alī, is commended by this term, *Agh.*, VI, p. 72, 10.

[3] *K. al-Ḥayawān*, fol. 403b. [VII, p. 259; cf. III, p. 189].

[4] *ZDMG*, XXXII, p. 352.

[5] Here apparently the words 'come, Thy will be done' are left out.

[6] Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 101.

[7] [Cf. for the following also the article 'Shahīd' in the *EI*; Wensinck, *Handbook*, s.v. 'Martyr'.]

the invariable equivalent of the New Testament *μάρτυς*). This turn of meaning is certainly post-Koranic, for in the Koran itself *shuhadā* (even in those passages where the word to all appearances is used to designate a distinct class of pious confessors),[1] does not mean exactly martyrs, but confessors, i.e. those who testify for God and the Prophet.[2] The Muslim confession of faith is called witness (*shahāda*), and the formula begins with the word *ashhadu*, 'I bear witness,' i.e. 'I confess that,' and so on.[3] It is in fact required from the whole Muslim community that its members should be 'witnesses on behalf of God to man,' as the Prophet is the witness on behalf of God to men.[4] Here there is as yet no trace of the meaning 'martyr' which Muslim commentators try to make out in several of these passages.[5] Muhammed paraphrases the idea 'martyr' with a relative clause: 'those who are killed in the way of Allāh (3:163). The Christian influence, through which the meaning of the word *shahīd* was extended from 'witness' and 'confessor' to 'martyr,' made itself felt at a later date, and then the latter meaning soon became very general. But it is remarkable that the meaning of the word *shahīd* received an extension which is scarcely to be reconciled with the warlike tendency of Islām. To the Prophet is ascribed the [388]
saying[6] that not only those who are slain for the faith are to be regarded as martyrs. Seven other causes of death are enumerated which make the sufferers worthy of the honourable title of a *shahid*, and these are mainly calamitous or pathological causes, which have nothing to do with voluntary self-sacrifice for a great cause. In later times other causes have been added to these seven. He who dies in defence of his possessions,[7] or far from his home in a strange country; he who meets his death in falling from a high mountain; he who is torn to pieces by wild beasts, and many more, are to be counted in the category of *shuhadā'*. Sea-sickness is also mentioned in this list as a form of martyrdom.[8] In the third century, Dāwūd b. 'Alī

[1] 4:7; 39:69; and 57:18.

[2] Cf. Sprenger, *Moḥammad*, II, p. 194. In this sense also *shāhidūna* occurs in Sūra 3:46; 5:86.

[3] Cf. 3:16, 80; 6:19; 7:71; 63:1.

[4] 2:137; 4:134; 22:78. Cf. B. *Jamā'iz*, no. 86: *antum shuhadā' Allāh fi'l-arḍ*, 'Ye (the true believers) are the witnesses of God on earth.'

[5] For example 3:134, where some commentators understand by the term *shuhadā'* those who fell in the battle of Badr.

[6] B. *Jihād*, no. 29. Cf. Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 37.

[7] Al-Nasā'ī, II, p. 116; Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 184, al-Mas'ūdī, IV, p. 170, 3; Ibn Qutayba, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 164, 12. See the collection on al-Zurqānī, II, p. 22.

[8] *Al-mā'id fi'l baḥr alladhī yuṣībhu'l-qay' lahu ajr shahīd*, Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 247. In *K. al-Siyar*, fol. 11b [I, pp. 25–6] this ḥadīth is applied to those voyagers who go to sea for the purpose of *jihād*. Cf. *ZDMG*, XLIV, p. 165, note 3.

of Isfahan[1] transmitted, as a saying of the Prophet, that any one who died from love-sickness was to be counted as a martyr.[2] It appears that this extended conception of martyrdom was originally formed in opposition to the fanatical mania for rushing upon death which at one time became prevalent; it represents the reaction against *ṭalab al-shahāda*, 'seeking martyrdom.'[3] Muslim divines do not favour this kind of self-sacrifice; indeed, they teach that under some circumstances the pretended profession of a false creed is to be preferred to self-sacrifice.[4] The extension of the meaning of *Shahīd* serves to support this line of teaching.[5] It was to be shown that the Muslim idea of duty, soberly viewed, allows no merit to the fanatical
[389] endeavour of set purpose to attain a martyr's death,[6] and that the title of *Shahīd* can be won in other ways. An occasion for emphasizing their reaction against martyrdom was given by the conduct of the Kharijites and other insurrectionists, who, inspired by the prospect of the martyr's crown, resisted a government which in their eyes was godless, and rushed boldly to destruction, taking for their motto the words of Koran (9:112): 'Verily God hath purchased of the true believers their souls and their substance, at the price of Paradise, when they fight in the way of God; they slay or are slain.'[7] In these rebellious circles it was taught (see page 90) that one might gain the martyr's crown in battle against an unrighteous government. To counteract such a fanatical tendency the theologians of the moderate party demonstrated that a *jihād* waged out of opposition to authority had no claim to God's reward,[8] and that, on the contrary, the quiet private expression of devotional feeling and the carrying into practice of moral principles is to be preferred to the *jihād fī sabīl Allāh*, albeit that that was the primitive way of seeking martyrdom for the faith. He who reads the Koran for God's sake (*fī sabīl Allāh*)

[1] Al-Qasṭallānī, V, p. 67, quotes the saying from the son of Dāwūd.

[2] See *Ẓāhiriten*, p. 29, note 6; cf. *al-Mumashshā*, p. 74. [Muḥammad b. Dāwūd of Iṣfahan quotes the tradition in his *K. al-Zahra*, p. 66; cf. also L. Massignon, *La passion d'Al-Ḥallāj*, I, p. 174.] In al-Mutanabbī, I, p. 29, this thought is used poetically. The same thought appears constantly in the later erotic poetry of the Arabs and Persians; cf. Sheikh Muḥammad 'Alī Ḥazīn, translation by F. C. Balfour (London 1830), p. 89.

[3] Ibn 'Idhārī, ed. Dozy, II, p. 187.

[4] Set forth in detail by Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *Mafātīḥ* on Sūra 11:168, V, pp. 523ff.

[5] Of course the pedantry of the ritualists has not left undecided the question as to whether this extension of the *shahīd* idea applies also to the ritual privileges attaching to martyr's funerals. See *Dict. of Tech. Terms*, I, p. 740.

[6] A reaction against martyrdom, such as showed itself in the middle of the ninth century also among the Christians in Spain; Dozy, [*Histoire des Musulmans d'Espagne*, II, p. 134; German transl.:] *Gesch. der Mauren*, I, p. 330.

[7] Cf. Brünnow, *Die Châridschiten unter den ersten Omayyaden*, p. 29.

[8] *Al-Muwaṭṭa'*, II, p. 325 top; al-Dārimī, p. 318; Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 250.

is placed by God on a level with the martyrs.[1] The *dhikr Allāh*, i.e. the devout calling upon God, is, with not little emphasis, preferred to religious war;[2] the duty of religious war is said to be abolished by obligations towards parents.[3] The upright tax-gatherer is as he who for God's sake, goes out to fight for religion.[4] That the office of a tax-gatherer is regarded as a kind of martyrdom is due to the fact that these officials were exposed to real peril of their lives among the Arabs.[5] The 'ulamā' in their own interests composed a prophetical saying in which their merit is reckoned as higher than that of the *Shuhadā'*[6] and the ink which flows from the pens of the [390] learned is recognized to be of more value than the blood of martyrs shed in war for the faith.[7] The representatives of religious learning were glad to appeal to this saying.[8] He who travels to Medina to learn or to teach is counted equal to a warrior for the faith.[9] Another saying places the calling of the *mu'adhdhin* on a level with that of a warrior for the faith. Abu'l-Waqqāṣ is said to have handed down, in the name of the Prophet, the saying that the portion of the caller to prayer at the day of resurrection will be the same as that of the *mujāhidīn*; further, that the former, between the two calls to prayer (*adhān* and *iqāma*), will be counted equal to those who welter in their blood in the way of God.[10] It is interesting to compare the actual estimation in which the *mu'adhdhinīn* are held in everyday life with this high-sounding theoretical appraisement of their value by theologians. Al-Mu'taṣim punished a singer who had fallen into disgrace by making him one of the *mu'adhdhinīn*.[11] Certainly, these words of praise are not intended for paid mosque officials, but, as emphasized in earlier times,[12] for men who,

[1] *Musnad Aḥmad* [IV, 437, quoted by] al-Suyūṭī, *Itqān*, II, p. 178.

[2] Abū Yūsuf, *Kitāb al-Kharāj*, p. 4; al-Tirmidhī, p. 243; cf. p. 259.

[3] B. *Adab.*, no. 3; Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 250f.; al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 313. Cf. *Agh.*, XII, p. 40f.; XV, p. 60; XVIII, p. 157f.; XXI, p. 69.

[4] Al-Dārimī, p. 209; al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 126.

[5] Cf. Vol. I, p. 26, quote 6, beginning; p. 65, note 2. The poem of Qawwāl al-Ṭā'ī (at the close of the Umayyad period), *Ḥamāsa*, p. 315, is noteworthy as showing the resistance of the Bedouins to the payment of *ṣadaqa*.

[6] Ibn Ẓubayra [Cairo 1922, p. 10, 7], *Chron. Mekk.*, II, p. 333, 13, cf. [p. 11, 10] ibid., p. 334, 13, 'a mustard seed's weight of knowledge is more valuable than if an unlearned man took part for a thousand years in a war for the faith.' Cf. Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat., I, p. 41b.

[7] *Al-'Iqd*, I, p. 199. Cf. Kremer, *Herrsch. Ideen*, p. 428.

[8] Ibn Māja, p. 20, bottom.

[9] E.g. in Rosen, *Notices Sommaires*, I, p. 64, 14, *Mufaḍḍil midādahum 'alā dimā' al-shuhadā'*.

[10] Ibn Ḥajar, IV, p. 412.

[11] *Agh.*, XXI, p. 245.

[12] And also in later times; Leo Africanus (*Descriptio Africae*, p. 108b) says that at Fez 'qui interdiu a turri vociferantur, nihil inde lucri habent, quam quod ab omni tributo atque exactione liberantur.'

without payment, devoted themselves to this work so pleasing to God.[1]

Among the fanatical sectarians and dissenters who regarded the struggle against a government considered godless as a religious incumbent upon believers, *jihād* was insisted on as the most excellent method of bringing religion into practice.[2] Such ideas had to be combatted by belittling the worth of martyrdom as well as that of religious war, through which it could most easily be attained. Even the expression *sabīl Allāh*, 'the way of God,' underwent a corresponding change of meaning; originally identified with *jihād*, it was
[391] now connected by the peaceful theologians with every pious God-pleasing action, *fā'a*,[3] so that even the public well is called *sabīl*.[4] Hence it comes that the verbal root *sbl* II (*sabbala*), derived from *sabīl*, has acquired the general meaning 'to spend on pious purposes.'[5] This shifting of the conception of *shahīd* greatly assisted the tendency to loose the knowledge of the original meaning of the word. Even by the middle of the second century no Muslim knew that the 'martyr' was so called because he witnessed for the truth of his faith by laying down his life. At least there is no trace of such a conception to be found in the thirteen explanations into which Muslim philology and theology meander, in order to show the connection between the *shahīd* and the idea of testimony, and which have been simply copied, even by the modern Christian Arabic philologian,[6] without a thought being given to the right explanation that lay so near at hand. Even al-Naḍr b. Shumayl (d. 204), could give no better explanation than the following: that the hero of the faith was called a witness 'because his soul remains alive, and (straightway after his bodily death) beholds the dwelling-place of peace, and thus is an eye-witness of it, whereas the souls of others only attain to this vision on the day of resurrection.'[7] The remaining explanations are, if possible, still more meaningless.[8]

Some more examples of New Testament phrases, used as religious terms by the Muslims, may be added to those above mentioned. It has been pointed out in another place that the saying in Matt. 7:5 about the mote and the beam early became a part of Islamic

[1] *Agh.*, XI, p. 100.

[2] Ṭab., II, p. 544, 13. *fa-inna'l-jihāda sanām al-'amal.*

[3] More is to be found on this subject in the *K. al-Siyar*, fol. 398b [IV, p. 244].

[4] In accordance with the ancient idea that the giving of water is the most excellent *ṣadaqa*, Ibn Sa'd [III/2, p. 144] in Loth's *Klassenbuch*, p. 74 ult.

[5] Cf. *ZDMG*, XXXV, p. 775, below.

[6] *Muḥīṭ*, I, p. 1132b.

[7] al-Nawawī on Muslim, I, p. 209. These explanations are given more completely in al-Zurqānī, II, p. 22.

[8] Cf. some in al-Bayḍāwī, I, p. 37, 1.

literature.[1] The same applies to the utterances of the Prophet to his Companions (preserved in an apocryphal tradition). 'My Companions are in my community like salt in food; for without the salt the food is not fit to eat' (Matt. 5:13).[2] Similarly Abū Mūsā al-Ash'arī writes [392] from 'Irāq to 'Umar, 'Send me some of the *Anṣār*, for they are among men as salt in food.'[3] The saying, 'He who wastes knowledge on the unworthy is like one who binds pearls upon swine,' is an echo of Matt. 7:6;[4] and the expression Matt., 16:24 (which is not unknown in Rabbinical literature[5]) seems to have penetrated Muslim phraseology, if not the ḥadīth.[6] A specifically Christian expression which has penetrated deeply into Islamic literature is to do anything 'in God,' *fī'llāh* or *bi'llāh*. The Muslim interpreters of the traditions in which this expression occurs explain it generally in the sense of *fī sabīl Allāh*, i.e. in God's way or to the glory of God; Turkish translators (as for example the translator of the fifty-four duties, ascribed to Ḥasan al-Baṣrī) render it *Allāh ichūn*, 'on God's account, for God.'[7] The following are examples from the ḥadīth of the scope of the use of this expression, 'Two men who form a friendship in God,' or 'who love one another in God' (*taḥābbā fī'llāh* or *bi'llāh*). God says on the day of resurrection, 'Where are those who "in My majesty" (paraphrase for "in Me") have formed a friendship, that I may protect them with My shadow in that day when there is no shadow but Mine.'[8] Every wounded man who is wounded in God,[9] *fī'llāh*, appears on the day of resurrection with his bleeding wounds; their colour is the colour of blood, but their odour is the odour of

[1] *ZDMG*, XXXI, pp. 765ff.; *Agh.*, XIV, p. 171, 15; al-Damīrī (s.v. *al-ṣu'āba*), II, p. 70. It may here be added with reference to Aug. Müller's proof in *ZDMG*, XXXI, p. 52, that an echo of I Thess. 5:21 is to be found in al-Mubarrad, p. 409, 9.

[2] al-Baghawī, *Maṣābīḥ al-Sunna*, II, p. 194.

[3] Abū Ḥanīfa al-Dīnawarī, p. 125, 3; cf. Ibn Bassām in Dozy, Abbadid., II, pp. 224, 238. The expression 'as salt in food' is used also to denote a very small quantity, B. *Manāqib al-Anṣār*, no. 11; cf. al-Qasṭallānī, VI, p. 175.

[4] Ibn Māja, p. 20; cf. an epigram of al-Shāfi'ī in al-Damīrī (s.v. *al-ghanam*), II, p. 221.

[5] *Midrāsh Berēshīth R.* c. 56 *shshā ṣo-in ṣelābhō bi-khsthēfō*; cf. *Tankhūma* (ed. Buber) Gen., p. 114, *shshā yōṣē le-kissarēf we-'ēṣaw 'al Kethēfaw.*

[6] Di'bil, *Agh.*, XVIII, p. 30, 1, *a'hmil khashabī 'alā hīfī*, cf. ibid., p. 56 last line: *ḥamala jildā'ahu 'alā 'unuqihi.*

[7] *Al-Muntaẓam*, IV, p. 170. In this connection reference may be made to the remarkable statement that the caliph al-Mahdī made a brotherhood in God with his counsellor Ya'qūb b. Dāwūd (*ittakhadha Y. b. D akhan fī'llāhi*) and had a document drawn up regarding it, which was deposited in the archives of the state (*Fragm. Hist. Arab.*, p. 281).

[8] Muslim, V, p. 236, *al-mutaḥābbūna bi-jalālī.*

[9] Cf. *Taḥdhīb*, p. 338, s.v., 'Abd Allāh b. Jaḥsh, who received the surname *al-mujadhdhā fī'llāh.*

[393] musk.[1] The Prophet asked Abū Dharr, 'What is the firmest handle in religion?' When the latter asked the Prophet himself to reply, he received the following answer: 'Mutual protection in God, and anger (hatred) in God.'[2] 'God has servants who eat in God, drink in Him, walk in Him.'[3] The Imām 'Alī b. al-Ḥusayn Zayn al-'Ābidīn (d. 99) says that the protected of God (*jīrān Allāh*), are those 'who sit together in God, practise common devotional exercises in God, and together go on pilgrimage in God (*natajālas fi'llāh wa-natadhākar fi'llāh wa-nataziwar fi'llāh*).[4] One of the Prophet's forms of prayer is said to have run thus: 'We are in Thee and to Thee,'[5] the same words are said to have been used by 'Alī in a *khuṭba* at Kūfa;[6] and in imitation of a form of speech thus sanctified by the sunna, the Almohads, known as they are for their pettifogging zeal on behalf of the sunna, (cf. above, p. 33) have adopted the words into their Friday *khuṭba*.[7] The expression 'to love in Muhammed' belongs to this category. When the Shī'ite poet, al-Sayyid al-Ḥimyarī, was imprisoned in Ahwāz on account of night-revelling, he claimed the protection of the Shī'ite governor; and in addressing him spoke of himself as 'him whom thou lovest in Aḥmad (Muhammed) and his children (Ḥasan and Ḥusayn).'[8]

(2)

In the above remarks we have drawn attention to the influence exercised upon the early development of Islam by elements derived from the Gospel. But we must not overlook the reverse side of this relationship. Christianity, in the form in which it was known to Muhammed and his earliest disciples, taught an ascetic morality, a morality which turned away from earth towards the kingdom of heaven, one which did not favour the warlike tendency that early Islam had inherited from Arab mentality. Even before the time of Islam we hear of

'Christian spears which never were dipped in blood.'[9]

[1] B. *Dhabā'ib*, no. 51. Another reading is *fī sabīl Allāh*.

[2] Cf. *Mafātīḥ*, p. 185 (*fi'llāh*); also a communication of al-Jāḥiẓ in Al-Maydānī, II, p. 60. Al-Ash'ath al-Ṭammā' relates: 'Sālim b. 'Abd Allāh told me that he was angry with (hated) me in God (*wa-kāna yaghaḍunī fi'llāh*) etc.

[3] Al-Fashanī's *Commentary on the Forty Traditions*, Būlāq 1292, p. 52.

[4] Al-Ya'qūbī, II, p. 264, 5 from below.

[5] Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 109. Cf. al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 252.

[6] Abū Ḥan., p. 103, 7.

[7] Al-Marrākushī, *The History of the Almohads*, p. 250: *fa immamā naḥnu bihi wa-lahu. Bihi*, however, perhaps means in this place 'through him.'

[8] *Agh.*, VII, p. 19, 2 from below.

[9] *Mufaḍḍaliyāt*, 35:21. Noteworthy from the Umayyad period are the words addressed by Jarīr to the Christian al-Akhṭal in a *hijā'*: *Ibna dhāti'l-qalsi*, 'Son of a woman bearing the girdle' (*qals = zunnār*); *Khizānat al-Adab*, IV, p. 143, 3.

Islam could not accept this from Christianity; and also the [394]
systematic formulation of its later theology has followed in this respect the tendency of its early doctors. If the picture which a community draws of its founder is characteristic of its sentiments and ideas, and of its general view of life, we must give due weight to a trait of the Prophet which is mentioned in every description of his character—that he did not deny himself things which God allowed, and that he loved honey and sweet things.[1] 'He who goes forty days without meat,' so runs a saying of the Prophet, 'will deteriorate in character.'[2] On a certain occasion Muhammed bought jewels to the value of eighty camels, and justified this expenditure by saying that every one to whom God has given the blessing of means ought to make known this blessing by some outward sign.[3] Side by side with the sayings in praise of poverty which were borrowed from the earliest Christian documents, we hear in other accounts of prayers uttered by Muhammed in which he begs God not to send him poverty. It is obvious that harmonizing theologians would without difficulty reconcile this contradiction by applying Muhammed's prayer to the poverty of the heart.[4]

Ancient Islam was particularly opposed to the manner of life known as *al-raḥbāniyya*,[5] i.e. asceticism or monasticism. *Lā raḥbāniyya fi'l-Islām*, 'there is no monasticism in Islam;' this principle evidently expresses opposition to the view which prevailed among Christians.[6] 'The monasticism of this community is the *jihād*'[7] (others, more mildly disposed, substitute the *ḥajj* for the *jihād*).[8] 'The Muslim who mixes with his fellow men and patiently bears with their provocation is better than the man who never mixes with others, and who therefore has nothing to put up with from them.'[9] This contrast occurs specially in the opinions about unmarried life: *lā ṣarārata fi'l-Islām*, i.e. 'there are no celibates in Islam.'[10] Further, [395]

[1] Tahdhīb, p. 39.

[2] Al-Ṭabarsī, *Makārim al-Akhlāq*, p. 66.

[3] Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 115; al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 134; al-Nasā'ī, II, p. 228.

[4] Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal in al-Yāfi'ī, *Rawḍ al-Rayāḥīn*, Būlāq 1297, p. 14.

[5] But we meet with the term *rāhib Quraysh* as a title of honour. It was given to Abū Bakr b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Makhzūmī (d. 94 in the so-called 'year of the fuqahā') because he gave himself up unceasingly to prayer; *Tahdhīb*, p. 673.

[6] Sprenger, *Moḥammad*, I, p. 389. Cf. al-Ḥarīrī, *Maqāmāt*, ed. de Sacy, 2, p. 570.

[7] Al-Shaybānī, *K. al-Siyar*, fol. 9b.

[8] Tholuck, *Ssufismus*, p. 46.

[9] Al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 82.

[10] Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 173, cf. for the explanation of this phrase al-Jawharī, s.v. *ṣrr*; *al-Muzhir*, I, p. 142. Compare with *ṣarūra* (Nābigha 7:26) *dhāt ṣirār* —a woman who refuses her husband his marital rights, *Agh.*, IX, p. 63. Also the word *ḥaṣūr* is used for the celibate, ibid., IV, p. 14, 14; cf. al-Māwardī, ed. Eger, p. 29, 10ff. According to some Muslim exegetes (cf. Ms. of the K. Hofbibliothek in Vienna, Mixt. no. 145, fol. 7a) Sūra 5:89 is directed against the celibates; cf. above, p. 34, note 7.

a 'well-to-do man who does not marry does not belong to me.' 'Oh! how poor is the man who has no wife.' Such are the sayings which are attributed to Muhammed,[1] and at all events they express the general feeling of the Muslim community.[2] 'Two *rak'as* performed by a married man are more pleasing to God than seventy which are rendered by a celibate,' or they are more pleasing 'than watching through the nights and fasting through the days.'[3] Islam rejected the attempts to foster a spirit of asceticism among the faithful.[4] 'Impose no burden upon yourselves,[5] that no burden be put upon you; for other peoples have done this, and heavy was it made unto them. The remnant of them are in cells and closets, the *rahbāniyya* which they themselves invented and which we did not prescribe to them.'[6] The Prophet once observed, while he was speaking to the congregation, a man who was exposing himself to the rays of the sun. He was told that the man was a certain Abū Isrā'īl who had made a vow never to sit down, never to seek the shade, never to speak[7] and always to fast. 'Order him,' said the Prophet, 'to speak, to seek the shade, to sit down and to leave off fasting.'[8]

'Abd Allāh b. 'Umar relates that the Prophet once addressed him in the following words: 'Is it true, what they tell me of you, that you watch through the night and fast through the day?' When he answered in the affirmative, the Prophet admonished him to do this only with moderation, for, said he, 'Your eye has claims upon
[386] you, your guests have claims upon you,[9] your wife has claims upon you.' 'The dinar which you spend for your family is more pleasing to God than the dinar which you spend in the way of God (for pious objects).'[10] Sa'd b. Abī Waqqāṣ relates: "When the Prophet made his farewell pilgrimage to Mecca he paid me, as I was then ill, a visit. I bemoaned my sufferings to him, and said also that I was a rich man, and, except for a daughter, I had no heir to my fortune. 'Shall I now,' said I, 'will away two-thirds of my property for pious purposes to benefit the community?' 'No,' said the Prophet. 'Well then, at least half?' 'No' was again the Prophet's decision. 'Then perhaps a third part?' 'A third is too much,' the Prophet replied.

[1] Ibn Ḥajar, IV, p. 370.
[2] Cf., on marriage as a religious duty, *Zâhiriten*, p. 74.
[3] Al-Ṭabarsī, *Makārim al-Akhlāq*, pp. 80f.
[4] Kremer, *Herrsch. Ideen*, pp. 52ff.
[5] Cf. B. *Adab*, no. 79; *'Ilm*, no. 22; *I'tiṣām*, no. 61.
[6] Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 195.
[7] On silence as an ascetic practice see B. *Manāqib al-Anṣār*, no. 26 (ḥajjat muṣmitatan); *Aymān*, no. 29; al-Dārimī, p. 39; cf. al-Bayḍāwī on Sūra 19:27 (I, p. 580, 3).
[8] Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 52.
[9] B. *Adab*, no. 83.
[10] *Musnad Aḥmad* (II, pp. 475, 476–7; V, pp. 273, 284, quoted by) al-Qasṭallānī, II, p. 395.

'It is better that you should leave your heirs in opulence than that they should remain poor and hold out a begging hand to others.'[1] You make no outlay, in which you strive to please God, without receiving a reward for the same from God, even for that which you spend to put into the mouth of your wife.'' '[2] Even when any one in penitence had made a vow to devote all his property to pious purposes the Prophet declared the vow to be invalid.[3]

Generally speaking, we find in the more ancient Muslim teachings a consistent tendency to place the duties of a believer towards his family on a level with his duties towards the faith. Once when a man presented himself to the Prophet in order to take part in war against unbelievers, his offer was refused, and he was told that the religious duties which he had to fulfil at home to his parents were more important.[4] 'If a man has two daughters to whom he gives food, drink and clothing, and for whom he takes all care, they will be to him as a protecting wall against hell fire. If, however, he has three [397] daughters and bears the burden of them steadfastly, the tax of alms and the duty of religious war are remitted to him.'[5]

A contradiction to Matt. 5:29 seems to be intended in the following narrative of a later date. Muḥammad b. Sīrīn, a so-called follower (d. 110), relates that a terrified beast was raging in the streets of the place where he lived and was ready to kill any one who approached it. Then came a one-eyed man, and volunteered to go against the raging creature. Scarcely had the man come up to the animal, when the latter bowed its head before him so that he could kill it. When asked his history, the one-eyed man related that in his whole life he had only once fallen into sin, and in that case the temptation came through his eye; so he took an arrow, and shot the tempter to evil out of his eye-socket.' The Imām Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, one of the strictest teachers of Islam, accompanies this narrative with the following remark: 'Such an action was perhaps permitted by the law of the Israelites and of those who were before us (Christians), but our law does not sanction the plucking out of the eye, with

[1] B. *Zakāt*, no. 46; Abū Dāwūd, II, p. 9; compare al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 15. B. *Waṣāyā*, no. 15. It is said that Abū Ṭalḥa wanted to place Bīrḥā at the disposal of the Prophet for an object dear to him, but the Prophet would not take the gift and recommended Abū Ṭalḥa to present the property to his relatives.

[2] B. *Marḍā*, no. 16. Compare parallel passage in *Farā'iḍ*, no. 6. Some variants are found in *Waṣāyā*, no. 2, where Sa'd begins by saying he wishes to give up all his possessions for pious purposes. In this last passage the Prophet adds to his counsel the following wish: 'God grant that thou mayest be able to leave thy sick bed, so that mankind may receive some benefit from thy life, and that others (the unbelievers) may be hurt by thee.'

[3] Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 53.

[4] *Aghā.*, XV, p. 60.

[5] Ibn Ḥajar, IV, p. 245; cf. also ibid., p. 324.

which one has looked on a forbidden thing; rather do we teach that one should ask God for pardon, and afterwards take care to avoid the sin.'[1]

(3)

The moral philosophy of Islam has exhibited the relation of Islamic ethics to those of Judaism and Christianity in a scheme which is based on the Aristotelian doctrine of 'the mean,' and which is supported with no little acuteness by utterances of the Koran 2:137; 16:92; 41:3; 72:4; 118:4. It presents herein the same aspect as do the ethics of the Jewish religious philosophers, which are drawn from the same sources. They too have transferred the fundamental thesis of the Aristotelian doctrine of virtue into the ethical system of their religion, and professed to find it in Biblical verses
[398] and Rabbinical utterances.[2] The thesis referred to is the doctrine of the *aurea media* as the attitude most desirable, and the most pleasing to God, both in theoretical religion (i.e. in creed), and in practical piety (i.e. in the activities and renunciations of life). It is the mean between extravagant spirituality and extreme sensuousness in the conception of God; between exaggerated sentimentality and cold want of feeling; between immoderate self-abnegation and ruthless selfishness; between unbridled pursuit of pleasure and self-tormenting renunciation, between harsh justice and self-effacing placability. This golden mean is said to be the *ṣirāṭ al-mustaqīm* of the *Fātiḥa*, and it is this which Islām follows, thereby presenting in a higher form the extreme and mutually exclusive views of Judaism and Christianity. We find as early as Mālik b. Anas, according to the current interpretation, an echo of this principle. He relates a saying of 'Abd Allāh b. al-'Abbās to the effect that the keeping of the right mean (*al-qaṣd*), thoughtfulness and dignified conduct, form a twenty-fifth part of prophecy.[3] To this same Ibn al-'Abbās is traced the teaching of 'Umar, that one should preserve the *qaṣd* in the employ-

[1] Al-Damīrī (s.v. *al-dābba*), I, p. 395, quotes from *Musnad Aḥmad* and al-Bayhaqī. [The story is obviously quoted not from the *musnad*, but from some other work by Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal.] On the other hand the Muslim legend of a pious Medinite, Yūsuf b. Yūnus b. Ḥimās, who lived in the first half of the second century, relates how he once looked with pleasure at a woman and thereafter prayed to God to deprive him of his eyesight. God granted his request, but in consequence of a later prayer restored his sight to him again; al-Zurqānī, IV, p. 64.

[2] See Rosin, *The Ethics of Maimonides* (Breslau, 1876), p. 12, note 1; p. 14, note 3; p. 25, notes 2 and 28; and especially pp. 79–82, where the parallel passages from Aristotle are given. Cf. also Jacob Anatoli's *Malmad hat-Talmidim* (ed. Lyk, 1866), passim, e.g. pp. 98ff.; p. 146, etc. M. Grünebaum has more lately treated this subject, *ZDMG*, XLII, p. 285.

[3] Al-Muwaṭṭa', IV, p. 177.

ment of one's bodily powers, as being the best safeguard against excesses.[1] According to a ḥadīth of Jābir b. 'Abd Allāh, the Prophet once drew lines on the right and left. In the middle between these he then drew another line, and, pointing to it, he said: 'This (middle) line is the *ṣirāṭ al-mustaqīm*, the following of which he recommended to the faithful.[2] Muṭarrif b. 'Abd Allāh (d. 95) more consciously expresses the doctrine of the *μεσότης* as a principle of ethics,[3] but its clear exposition is connected with the name of al-Ḥasan-al-Baṣrī. A Bedouin went to this doctor of the faith, with the request that he would teach him a religion, which 'neither diminishes nor exaggerates.' 'Then,' said al-Ḥasan, 'you have desired the right thing; for the best among all things are the middle things' (*khayr al-umūr awsāṭuhā*). In this book too as frequently happens, a saying of later religious teachers soon comes to be accounted an utterance of the Prophet.[4] Still it is in the philosophical school that the Aristotelian [399] doctrine is first raised to the dignity of a central principle of ethics. We find as early as the old Mu'tazilite, al-Jāḥiẓ (d. 225), a clear indication in this direction, which shows that even in his time speculative theology had adopted this formula. 'All that oversteps the right measure is forbidden . . . the religion of God sanctions the procedure of him who neither does too little nor too much good.' (*bayn al-muqṣir wa'l-ghālī*).[5] The same thought also found a very early entrance into didactic poetry, and was expressed in a great variety of epigrams.[6] It had become so generally accepted that the sentences in which it was embodied soon became a 'winged word'[7] and favourite proverb,[8] which even now is often heard from the lips of Oriental Muslims.[9]

Ethics, as taught independently of theology, taking the views of Aristotle as its basis, has adopted the doctrine of 'the mean' as the starting-point of its systematic expression, and defines each individual virtue as the mean between two extremes, (*aṭrāf*), which as

[1] Yāqūt al-Musta'ṣimī, *Asrār al-Ḥukamā'*, Istanbul, 1300, p. 89, 8.
[2] Ibn Māja, p. 3.
[3] *Al-'Iqd*, I, p. 230; cf. *al-Muwashshā*, p. 27.
[4] Al-Mas'ūdī, IV, p. 172, 2. As to allusions to this in the Koran, cf. Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat. I, p. 179b. On the other hand it should be noted that very soon the boundary between ḥadīth and *mathal* was not preserved; as for example, Tha'lab (*K. al-Faṣīḥ*, ed. Barth, p. 41, 6 of the text) quotes a sentence as a proverb which is a ḥadīth, Al-Dārimī, p. 32 = *Zdhiriten* p. 213, 12. It is not surprising that suitable sentences from the ḥadīth were used later on as proverbs, e.g. al-Maidānī, I, p. 238. *al-dīn al-maṭīa* (*Arba'ūn*, no. 7, cf. al-Ya'qūbī, II, p. 115, 7, and many others.
[5] *K. al-Bayān*, fol. 34 [I, p. 202].
[6] In *Khiṣāṣ al-Adab*, I, p. 282.
[7] *Agh.*, XV, p. 100, 12.
[8] Al-Maydānī, I, p. 214; Landberg, *Proverbes et dictons*, I, p. 11.
[9] Snouck Hurgronje, *Mekkanische Sprichwörter und Redensarten*, p. 5.

such are *radhā'il*, i.e. vices. The ethical handbook of Ibn Miskawayhi (d. 421) affords the best instance of a practical employment of this scheme,[1] and his contemporary Ibn Sīnā takes it as representing the goal of moral life.[2] Among the Muslim theologians no one has explained this idea more fully or worked it out more systematically[3] (emphasizing especially its relation to other religions) than Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī. He appears to have regarded this exposition as a
[400] special service rendered by him to theology, and concludes one passage of his great work (on Sūra 16:92), in which this theory is expounded most thoroughly, with the following words: 'This is that whereunto my understanding and sentiment have attained, in respect of the interpretation of these words of the Koran. If it is right it is an inspiration of the All Merciful, if it is wrong may it be regarded as a suggestion of Satan in which God and His Apostle have no part.[4] Praise be to God who has distinguished us with such grace.' This conception of the relation of Islam to other religions passed, after his time, into the ordinary Islamic theology.[5]

[1] *Tahdhīb al-Akhlāq* wa-*Tafsīr al-A'rāq* (Cairo, marginal edition to al-Ṭabarsī, 1303), p. 26. On this work see Sprenger, *ZDMG*, XIII, p. 540.

[2] *Al-Shahristānī*, p. 392, 3. Mehren, *Les rapports de la philosophie d'Avicenne avec l'Islām* (*Muséon* 1883), p. 24 of the offprint.

[3] In many passages of his great exegetical work, specially *Mafātīḥ*, II, pp. 9, 149, 334; V, pp. 509ff.; VII, p. 369; VIII, pp. 319, 645.

[4] For this formula cf. above pp. 139.

[5] It would seem that Ibn 'Arabshāh (*Fākihat al-Khulafā'*, p. 224, who makes laudatory mention of the *Tafsīr Kabīr* of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (p. 225, 8), was led by him to lay stress on this particularly.

THREE

# IMITATIONS OF THE KORAN [401]

(Note to p. 191, n.5)

THE example mentioned here belongs to a number of manifestations which deserve notice from the point of view of cultural history. When Mu'tazilites and other free thinkers in 'Irāq began to undermine the old orthodox view about the miraculous nature of the Koran, the doctrine of the *i'jāz al-Qur'ān* (the impossibility of reaching the perfection of the Koran) was not only theoretically attacked or weakened through interpretations[1] in their circles but—much as this was done by polemists of other persuasions[2]—practical examples and attempts were cited which opposed the old orthodox view of the *i'jāz*. It is not incredible that Ibn al-Muqaffa' famed as a translator (d. 145) intended to imitate the Koran.[3] Pious legend lets the poet pass a boy who was reciting Sūra 11:46. The words, *yā arḍu'bla'ī mā'aki wa-yā samā'u aqli'ī*, impressed him so much that he destroyed his attempt at imitation with the words: 'Verily this is God's word which cannot be imitated.'[4] From the same time it is reported that as Baṣra a group of free thinkers, Muslim and non-Muslim heretics used to congregate and that Bashār b. Burd did not forego characterizing the poems submitted to this assembly in [402] these words: 'Your poem is better than this or the other verse of the Koran, this line again is better than some other verse of the Koran, etc.'[5] Bashār did in fact praise one of his own poetic products when he heard it recited by a singing girl in Baghdād as being better than the *Sūrat al-Ḥashr*. The way of expression of the Koran was criticized and the similes found wanting. Al-Mubarrad tells of a heretic who ridiculed the parable in Sūra 37:63 where the fruits of the tree Zakkūm in hell are likened to the heads of devils. The critics say:

[1] For the various views on this subject see Schreiner, *ZDMG*, XLII, pp. 663–75.

[2] The anti-Islamic writing of 'Abd al-Masīḥ al-Kindī (ed. Tien, London 1880, cf. *Wissensch. Jahresber. über d. morgenl. Studien im J.* 1881, p. 128), p. 87 quotes the old pseudo-Korans as arguments against the *i'jāz*. There is presumably no significance in that the author adds, 'I testify that I have read a *muṣḥaf* of Musaylima, etc.'; cf. J. Mühleisen-Arnold, *Isl.* (Germ. ed. 1878), p. 238. Samples of Musaylima's recitation al-Ṭabarī, I, pp. 1738, 1933f.

[3] *ZDMG*, l.c., p. 665, note 1.

[4] *Shifā'* quoted in al-'Idwī's Commentary to the *Burda*, II, p. 153.

[5] Abū'l-Maḥāsin, I, p. 421.

[6] *Agh.*, III, p. 55, 9.

'He compares the visible with the unknown here. We have never seen the heads of devils; what kind of simile is this?'[1] Another account says that this question was put to Abū 'Ubayda who was moved to write his book *On the metaphors of the Koran*. This book found no favour with al-Aṣma'ī who also in other matters opposed A.'U.[2] The philologist with pietistic tendencies[3] found in the defence of Koranic metaphors an arbitrary exegesis of God's word[4], which was a fault also committed by A. 'U. elsewhere.[5]

From these data and the ideas which form the background for these facts it is evident that in the third century the ground was well prepared in the east for the 'Shatterer of the Koran.' But in Western Islam there were similar occurrences. In the same century the Andalusian belletrist Yaḥyā b. al-Ḥakam al-Ghazal, called by his biographers the 'sage of al-Andalus, its poet and oracle,' dared to attempt to produce a pendant to Sūra 112 containing the Islamic credo. 'But he was overcome by terrible fear and shuddering when he embarked upon this work and thus returned to God.'[6]

[403] Kremer endeavoured to disprove in his latest writing about the noble free-thinkers,[7] and explain as a misunderstanding of later literary historians, the assumption that Abū'l-'Alā' al-Ma'arrī wrote an imitation of the Koran.[8] For the sake of completion it may be pointed out that al-Zamakhsharī also presupposes that Abū'l-'Alā' intended to imitate the Koran. It is likely that he has the title of Abū'l-'Alā's[9] work in mind when he says in the introduction to his *Kashshāf: wa-mayyaza baynahumma bi-fuṣūl wa-ghāyāt*. In his commentary to Sūra 77:30–3 he expresses the opinion that Abū'l-'Alā' wished to excel the beauties of this passage in a verse which he

[1] Al-Mubarrad, p. 485, endeavours to disprove at length the objections of the critic. Cf. al-Damīrī (s.v. *al-ghūl*), II, p. 228.

[2] Cf. Part I, p. 183.

[3] More on the pietist motives of the philological works of al-Aṣma'ī in al-Mubarrad, p. 449. Note also what al-Ṭabrīzī, *Ḥam*, p. 607, 11, says of al-Aṣma'ī.

[4] Ibn Khallikān, no. 741, ed. Wüstenfeld, VIII, p. 122.

[5] In Sūra 6:73 he explains *ṣūr* not with the traditional exegesis as trumpet but as plural of sūra; this is counted as falsification of God's word, *Mafātīḥ*, IV, p. 98. To Sūra 105:4 an exegetic remark of A. 'U. is mentioned in *Khizānat al-Adab*, II, p. 342 and described as *ta'assuf*.

[6] Al-Maqqarī, I, p. 633.

[7] See my article, *ZDMG*, XXIX, p. 640, cf. XXXII, p. 383. An author writing in Persia in the sixth century mentions Abū'l-'Alā's *Fuṣūl wa-ghāyāt* in an *index librorum prohibitorum*, *Cat. Lugd. Batav.*, IV, p. 211.

[8] *Über die philosophischen Gedichte des Abu'l-'Alā-'Ma'arry*, p. 91. If Abū'l-'Alā' had written a counterpart to the Koran it would have been impossible for the orthodox Qāḍī Kamāl al-Dīn ibn al-'Adīm to write an apology for the poet, al-Kutubī, *Fawāt al-Wafayāt*, II, p. 101. Abū'l-'Alā' himself wrote a poetic defence of his orthodoxy, Fleischer, Leip. Cat., p. 534a.

[9] *fuṣūl wa-ghāyāt*. In respect of this expression see the remarks in Thorbecke, *ZDMG*, XXXI, p. 176.

wrote in order to compete with God's word. In those verses of the Koran the infidels are addressed: 'Go then in the shade (of the smoke of hell) which rises in three columns, verily it is not shady there and there is no protection from the hell fire. Verily it throws sparks as big as palaces, as if they were reddish-yellow camels.' Abū'l-'Alā' in the verse in which he is said to imitate this passage of the Koran does not speak of the hell fire but of fires burning in hospitable houses in order to invite the tired traveller. Of this fire he says:

> A red one, with hair (rays) which float far in the darkness, and throws sparks as big as tents.

This verse is in fact contained in a dirge and consolation which the poet addressed to the family of the 'Alīd Abū Aḥmad al-Mūsawī after his death.[1] Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī reproves al-Zamakhsharī for suggesting that Abū'l-'Alā' intended this as an imitation of the Koran; but he declares that, as the parallel was suggested, he is obliged to show in how many respects the expression of the Koran is superior to that of the poet. After giving twelve proofs he con- [404]
cludes: 'These points came to me in a flash, but if we were to beseech God to help us in the search for more He would undoubtedly offer us as many more as we could desire.'[2]

As late as the sixth century a Muslim free thinker is mentioned in Mesopotamia called Muhadhdhab al-Dīn al-Ḥillī (d. 601) who with other heresies is accused of *mu'āraḍat al-Qur'ān al-karīm*.[3] But there is no detailed information about this attempt.

FOUR

[405]

# WOMEN IN THE ḤADĪTH LITERATURE

(Note to p. 227)

THOUGH the terminology of the science of traditions refers to the links in the chain of transmitters as *rijāl al-ḥadīth*, i.e. 'men of the tradition' we frequently meet in the *isnāds* women as authorities for many ḥadīths. The *liber classium virorum qui korani et traditionum cognitione excellerunt*, edited by Wüstenfeld, only lists seven women in all, but an examination of the ḥadīths from this point of view would yield a far greater number. It is not surprising that occasionally ḥadīths which were preserved by female authorities are passed on again by women. The sayings of the Prophet going back to Companion Salāma al-Fazāriyya, for example, are said to have been current mostly amongst the women of Kūfa.[1]

Two women transmitted from Mālik b. Anas, 'Ābida al-Madaniyya, the wife (originally slave) of the Andalusian scholar in tradition Ḥabīb Daḥḥūn,[2] and her grand-daughter 'Abda bint Bishr.[3] Women occupy an eminent place in the history of the transmission of the text of the Ṣaḥīḥ of Bukhārī. The most famous source of the text is a woman called Karīma bint Aḥmad from Marw (d. 462 in Mecca). No transmitter of the Bukhārī text could compete with her *isnād*.[4] Abū Dharr of Harāt (himself a great authority in *'ilm al-ḥadīth*) says of this woman before his death, 'Keep exclusively to Karīma, because she has acquired the knowledge of al-Bukhārī's work in the line of transmission (*ṭarīq*) of Abū'l-Haytham'.[5] It is in fact very [406] common in the *ijāza* of the transmission of the Bukhārī text to find as middle member of the long chain the name of Karīma al-Marwaziyya.[6] A contemporary of this Karīma was Fāṭima bint 'Alī (d. 480), daughter of a school teacher. She was famed as a calligrapher and expert in traditions.[7] Amongst the authorities to

[1] Ibn Ḥajar, IV, p. 634.
[2] Al-Maqqarī, II, p. 96. She is said to have possessed no less than 10,000 Medinian traditions.
[3] Ibid., I, p. 803.
[4] Ibn al-Athīr, X, p. 26.
[5] Al-Maqqarī, I, p. 876.
[6] E.g. in the *isnād* of Abū'l-Maḥāsin for the work of al-Bukhārī, II, p. 261.
[7] Ibn al-Athīr, X, p. 69.

whom the well known historian of Damascus Ibn 'Asākir owes his ḥadīths eighty women (as against 1300 sheikhs) are mentioned.[1] Study of the ḥadīth appears to have occasionally been indigenous to the women in one and the same family. We have an example that in one family three sisters were busy with collecting and spreading traditions.[2]

In Andalusia, where scholarly activity of women was quite accepted in some fields of knowledge,[3] we find Shuhda 'the writer' in the sixth century (d. 574 aged almost a hundred), who was occupied with lectures on al-Bukhārī[4] and other works.[5] Because of the excellent *isnāds* authenticating her traditions she collected a large number of listeners[6] and the fact that it was considered worth while to lie about having attended her lectures proves sufficiently how highly contemporaries valued the instructions of Shuhda.[7]

This age is particularly rich in female representatives of Islamic science. There is the learned Zaynab bint al-Sha'rī (d. 615) of Nisābūr who boasts a large number of *ijāza* diplomas from learned contemporaries (e.g. al-Zamakhsharī) and whose *ijāza* in turn was sought after by men like Ibn Khallikān.[8] When reading the great biographical work of Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī on the scholars of the eighth century we may marvel at the number of women to whom the author has to dedicate articles. Amongst others there is a certain Daqīqa bint Murshid (d. 746) who was the pupil of many learned women. One of her teachers, Zaynab bint Aḥmad from [407]
Jerusalem, called Bint al-Kamāl (d. 740) left a whole camel load of *ijāza* diplomas and pupils flocked to attend her theological lectures.[9] The authenticity of the Gotha Codex no. 590[10] rests on her authority. In the same *isnād* a large number of learned women are cited who had occupied themselves with this work. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa was able during his stay at Damascus (in 726) to enlarge his knowledge of ḥadīth from her and other learned women.[11] Her contemporary 'Ā'isha bint Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Hādī is called the great *musnida*.[12] It should not be overlooked that an author of the seventh century

[1] *Tab. Huff.*, XVI, no. 16.
[2] Yāqūt, II, p. 584, 8.
[3] Cf. Al-Marrākushī, p. 270, 3.
[4] Abulfeda, *Annales*, IV, p. 39.
[5] Thus for example the Kremer codex of the *Maṣābīḥ al-Ushshāq* by Abū Muḥammad al-Sarrāj (d. 500) is based on the transmission 'Of the learned sheikha, the glory of womanhood, Shuhda' *Samml. orient.* p. 73, no. 194).
[6] Ibn al-Athīr, XI, p. 185 (cf. also Yāqūt in index of personal names, s.v.).
[7] Al-Maqqarī, II, p. 96.
[8] Ibn Khallikān, nos. 250, 723, ed. Wüstenfeld, III, p. 59, VIII, p. 72.
[9] *Al-Durar al-Kāmina* (Ms. as above, p. 385), II, fol. 13b.
[10] Fol. 100b.
[11] *Voyages d'I. B.*, I, p. 253.
[12] Al-Qasṭallānī, I, p. 33, cf. above, p. 210.

whose description of morals mainly refers to Egypt mentions among the misuses of the *mawlid* festival contrary to the sunna that women gather round a Sheikha who has acquired knowledge in the explanation of the Koran; she lectures the women present on passages in the Koran and tells them legends of the prophet.[1]

*Musnidas* are common up to about the tenth century, and this title occurs very frequently in the lists of authentications in manuscripts and in *ijāzāt*.[2] In Egypt learned women gave *ijāzāt* to people listening to their lectures right up to the Ottoman conquest.[3] Amongst the learned members of the Ẓuhayra family there is a woman Umm al-Khayr whose *ijāza* is asked for in 938 by a visitor to Mecca.[4]

[1] Al-'Abdarī, *al-Madkhal*, I, p. 270.

[2] E.g. very common in *Asānīd al-Muḥaddithīn*. I only mention as examples: I, fol. 29b Bāy Khātūn bint al-Qāḍī 'Alā' al-Dīn; II, fol. 11b *al-musnida al-mukhira al-aṣīla* Umm Muḥammad Sāra bint Sirāj al-Dīn b. Qāḍī al-Quḍāt, etc. Ibid. *khātimat al-musnidīn* Umm al-Faḍl Ḥājar al-Qudsiyya; I, fol. 74b names the wife of Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī as transmitter: *al-shaykha al-ra'īsa al-aṣīla* Umm al-Kirām bint al-Qāḍī Karīm al-Dīn al-Lakhmī. Cf. also *ijāza* for Koran readings to a woman in Ahlwardt, Berl. Cat., p. 61, no. 165.

[3] Hammer-Purgstall, *Literaturgesch. der Araber*, I, p. XXIV.

[4] *Chron. Mekka*, II p. XXII.

## FIVE

# ORDEALS IN SACRED PLACES [408]

(Note to p. 286)

MUSLIM popular belief occasionally connects remarkable concepts to certain sacred spots. The most noteworthy of these beliefs is that the sacred place can give judgements on people whose character cannot be read by the limited knowledge of ordinary people. Such ideas, common to peoples of all races and religions[1] have sometime presumably been taken over by Islam from previously existing popular beliefs[2] and were then connected to places of religious veneration in the Islamic sense.

Thus the belief attaches to certain places that only selected persons of a given character can enter the place. The superstition connected to a pair of columns[3] in the mosque of 'Amr in Old Cairo (near the Northern gate) is well known: only true believers can squeeze through the gap and many people flock to the miraculous columns, particularly after the noon service of the last Friday in Ramaḍān, in order [409] to prove their virtue.[4] The door of the *qubba* of the Imām al-Shāfi'ī in the Qarāfa also opens only to true believers. By the grave of the saint 'Abd al-Salām in Tangier is a round plate of white marble, the so-called 'stone of the leap.' The pilgrim who is able to jump over this stone in one leap is considered to be specially blessed by God; godless people fall upon the stone or touch it with their feet. Near to this place is the 'rock of the mother's curse,' a narrow crack which falls vertically into unknown depths. He who can traverse the crack is specially blessed, but before the wicked the rock closes up and holds him prisoner until he is freed through prayers and

[1] Cf., for example, Kashmir belief in the 'stone of truth' which serves the population to distinguish truth and lies. In contested cases both parties go to the stone. The truthful man easily jumps from the south side to the north side but the liar is unsuccessful, *WJL*, CXII (1845), p. 81.

[2] The statue of Ammon in Thebes served as oracle against lying thieves (Pleyte, in *Proceedings of the Soc. of Bibl. Arch.*, X (1887), pp. 41ff.) The statue of Venus in Byzantium testifies against adulterers. It was destroyed under Justin, I, the Curopalate, because it had been impolite to the passing empress, *Theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1888, p. 288.

[3] Many miraculous tales were told of the columns of old mosques, cf. Academy 1886, col. 311.

[4] Cf. for this and also the marble column near the *minbar* which the people beat with sticks and shoes when leaving the mosque, 'Alī Bāshā Mūbarak, *al-Khiṭaṭ al-Jadīda*, IV, p. 9.

mystical formulae. The thinnest infidels are unable to pass through, whereas believers are in no way hindered by their fatness.[1] In Northern Arabia people believe that entry into the cave which harbours those companions of the Prophet who fell at Badr, and to which to the present day the inhabitants of the neighbourhood make a pilgrimage once a year, is possible only to those who are free of misdeeds and sins. In front of sinners the entrance of the cave becomes so narrow that they get stuck in it should they dare to try to enter despite their bad conscience.[2] In some sacred places the ordeal refers to the legitimacy of a birth. Such belief also exists of the entry to the cave which hid Muḥammed and Abū Bakr from the pursuing heathens (Sūra 9:40).[3] Only people of legitimate descent can enter the cave which narrows by itself at the approach of an illegitimately born person.[4] The same belief attaches to the cave of the seven sleepers near Baṣra of which many fables are told.[5] Here too there is a cleavage through which *awlād al-zinā* are unable to pass.[6]

[1] Drummond-Hay, *Marokko und seine Nomadenstämme* (Stuttgart, 1846) pp. 217, 219.
[2] Doughty, *Travels*, II, p. 160.
[3] [Ibn Jubayr, *al-Riḥla*, ed. W. Wright, Leiden 1907, p. 117.]
[4] Ibn Baṭṭuṭa, I, p. 399.
[5] Yāqūt, II, pp. 805ff.
[6] Usāma ibn Munqidh, *Autobiography*, ed. Derenbourg, p. 5.

# INDEX


'Abbās, 100, 102, 106, 107
Ibn 'Abbās, 39, 133, 141, 147, 154
Abu'l-'Abbās al-Nīsābūrī, 240
'Abbāsids, 27, 29, 39, 48, 50, 53, 54, 59–68, 71, 75, 76, 87, 97–101, 105–8, 110–12, 117, 119, 122, 123, 189, 192, 193, 324, 325
'Abd Allāh b. 'Amr b. al-'Āṣ, 23
'Abd Allāh b. Lahī'a, 126, 183
'Abd al-Malik, 44, 45, 49, 50, 60, 67, 117, 149, 186, 191, 345
'Abd al-Qādir, 289
'Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Mahdī, 25, 136, 168
'Abd al-Razzāq, 47, 151, 168
Abrogation, 32, 87, 88, 90, 141
*abwāb*, 214, 227
*'adl*, 136
Adonis, 301, 304
*aḥdatha*, 28
*aḥkām*, 230, 248
'Ā'isha, 28, 102, 109, 114, 122, 161, 257, 272, 285
Abu'l-'Alā' al-Ma'arrī, 132, 287, 301, 334, 364, 365
'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, 24, 27, 28, 44, 50, 51, 61, 90, 99, 100, 102, 103, 105, 106, 110–14, 116, 118, 120, 122–4, 134, 156, 161, 207, 208, 273, 277, 282, 300, 301, 324, 331, 332, 334, 356
'Alids, 39, 43, 54, 61, 92, 98, 99, 101–3, 105, 107–15, 118, 120, 123, 128, 272, 273, 287, 322
Almohads, 33, 243, 356
'Amr b. al-'Āṣ, 50, 157
'Amr b. Shu'ayb, 23, 184
*'an*, 228
analogy, 80, 178
Anas b. Mālik, 25, 31, 41, 58, 114, 117, 151, 250, 323
Anṣār, 17, 23, 40, 114, 347, 355
'Antar, Romance of, 37, 160, 266, 293
Aphrodite, 301
Arabs, 17, 25, 26, 38–40, 51, 59, 60, 65, 80, 97, 118, 122; their division into Northern and Southern, 57
*'arḍ*, 205
Arslān, 268
Ibn Abī *'Arūba*, 196, 197
Ibn 'Asākir, 174, 186, 367
asceticism, 356–8
*aṣḥāb al-ḥadīth*, 81, 82, 88, 215, 216, 220, 234, 238
*aṣḥāb al ra'y*, 78, 215, 234
Ash'arites, 337, 338, 340
Asmā' bint Umays, 22, 23
al-Aṣma'ī, 116, 160, 364
*athar*, 21, 36
*āthār*, 323
Ibn al-Athīr, 156, 173, 246
*aṭrāf*, 244
Ibn 'Awn, 52, 135, 154
Al-Awzā'ī, 25
*'ayn*, 21
al-Azhar, 167, 183

al-Badawī, 262, 266, 283, 307–10
Badr, 119, 193, 212, 231, 260, 351, 370
al-Baghawī, 241, 247, 248
Baghdād, 63, 64, 66, 69–71, 146, 151, 154, 158
Abū Bakr, 22, 58, 62, 92, 96, 98, 102, 105, 106, 111, 112, 156, 281, 345

Abū Bakr al-Ḥazmī, 195, 196
Baqī b. Makhlad al-Qurṭubī, 177, 239
Barmakids, 30, 63, 100, 300
*barzāmaj*, 173
Bashshār b. Burd, 150, 363
Baṣra, 39, 55, 82, 116, 122, 124, 154, 157, 165
Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, 210, 284, 367
*bayāḍ*, 219
al-Bayhaqī, 244, 248
al-Bazzār, 243
Bedouin saints, 291–3
Bedouins, 298, 353
Berbers, 283, 295, 311, 312, 315, 321
*bid'a*, 26, 28, 33–7, 43, 126, 136, 234, 288, 310, 322, 335, 337; distinction between good and bad, 36, 37
Birk al-Ghumūd, 165
Black Stone, 45, 333, 334
Bubastis, 306, 309
al-Bukhārī, 52, 54, 56, 120, 138, 144, 154, 168, 177, 213, 215–17, 219, 220, 222, 225–30, 232–4, 236–8, 240, 242, 286, 366, 367
*al-burda*, 60, 61
Byzantine law, 79

Camel, Battle of the, 122, 124
cats, 306
celibacy, 34, 357, 358
Christianity, 79, 346, 360; borrowings from, 346–62
Christians, 109, 111, 131, 263, 321, 347, 359
Companions, 22–5, 32, 38, 39, 42, 52, 53, 71, 96, 104, 127, 142, 158, 159, 161–3, 165, 182, 202, 211, 212, 222, 236, 239, 320, 327, 347, 349, 350, 355, 366, 370
convents, 275, 276
coin, privilege of caliph, 68, 69
Copts, 297, 306

*dābiṭ*, 136
*da'īf*, 137, 143, 144, 146, 231, 240, 248, 250
Damascus, 46, 63, 89, 159
*dār al-ḥadīth*, 174, 175
al-Dāraquṭnī, 236, 243, 247
al-Dārimī, 76, 140, 143, 148, 237–9, 241, 243, 247
al-Dasūqī, 265, 307
dates, origin of *deglet nūr*, 289
Abū Dāwūd, 25, 42, 122, 229–32, 235, 236, 239, 240
death penalty, 199, 200
dervishes, 265, 267, 276, 284, 318 335
al-Dhahabī, 162, 250, 251
*dhāhib al-ḥadīth*, 137
*dhawq*, 144
Ibn Diḥya, 172, 174
*ḍimār*, 21
*dīn*, 62, 82, 96, 121, 291, 345
Ditch, Battle of the, 162, 347
divorce, 217
Druzes, 111
*du'ā'*, 58, 232, 234, 269
Durayd b. al-Simma, 160, 234
Elijah, 250

Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, 111, 338, 339, 362, 365
Ibn al-Faqīh, 124
Fāṭima, 22, 102, 103, 110, 274
Fāṭima bint 'Alī, 366
Fāṭimids, 277
*fatwā*, 75, 178, 198, 310, 335
*fiqh*, 77, 78, 80, 83, 147, 174, 175, 193, 194, 197, 199, 203, 216, 217, 227, 233, 234, 243
*fitna* (*fitan*), 77, 95, 98
Followers, 38, 42, 122, 347
free thinkers, 128–30, 191, 334, 337, 363–5
fuqahā', 76, 78, 79

al-Ghazālī, 70, 104, 146, 172, 245, 338
*ghuluww*, 120
golden mean, 360, 361
Gospels, 111, 149, 282, 348, 350, 356
graves of saints, 281, 282, 285–7, 289–93, 299, 303–5, 307, 309, 311–13, 317, 319–21, 333–6, 340

*ḥadath*, 26, 34

*ḥaddathanā*, 176, 178
*ḥadīth*, 17–22, 24, 25, 29, 31–3, 37, 42, 43, 45, 47, 48, 53, 55, 56, 59, 76, 78–90, 93, 97, 101, 104–7, 112, 115, 117, 118, 120–3, 126, 128–37, 140, 145, 147–9, 154, 158, 159, 161, 164–6, 168, 169, 173, 174, 176, 178, 179, 181, 183, 185, 187, 192–8, 201, 202, 209–11, 215–17, 221–3, 227, 228, 230, 231, 233, 235, 236, 238, 239, 244, 246–9, 251, 256, 257, 281, 333, 335, 336, 345–62, 366–8; acceptance of rejected traditions, 249–51; *aḥādīth marfūʿa*, 148; *aḥādīth mawqūfa*, 148; canonical recognition of the 'six books', 240–4; classification of, 231, 232, 248; collections of, 194–8, 202, 203, 209–12, 214, 215, 226–32, 234–41, 243, 244, 247, 248; compilations of canonical books, 247; criticism and disparagement of, 124, 126–8, 130–6, 140, 141, 143, 145, 171, 236, 237, 249, 250; distinction from *sunna*, 24; dynastic, 99, 106, 107, 115; encouragement, suppression, etc. of tendentious traditions, 44, 46, 49, 53, 105; as entertainment, 150, 154, 156; generalization of local traditions, 166–8; *ḥadīth al-ṭayr*, 113; *ḥadīth muʿanʿan*, 228, 229; harmonization of conflicting, 85, 86, 141; inability to reverse prevailing usage, 87; interpolation, 115, 120, 127, 128, 131; invention of, 43–6, 50–2, 54, 56, 57, 74, 75, 78, 81, 82, 104, 106–8, 110, 112, 114, 115, 126–8, 134, 138, 140, 145–7, 150, 151, 154, 156–9, 162, 184, 249; legal ḥadīths, *see* literature, legal; less stringent criticism of ethical than of legal, 145, 146; local traditions, 123–5, 164; mediating, 93, 97; payment for, 169, 170; variant readings of, 221–6; women in, 366–8; writing down of, 181–8
*ḥāfiẓ*, 136
Haggādā, 131, 194
Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, 161–3, 221, 230, 244, 247, 250, 367
*ḥajj*, 44–6, 51, 150, 164, 165, 270, 277, 287–9, 306, 308, 357, 358
al-Ḥajjāj b. Yusuf, 24, 40, 41, 43, 47, 48, 89–91, 95, 107, 117, 273, 345
*ḥalāl*, 76, 77, 145, 230
*ḥamala*, 164
Ibn Ḥanbal, 24, 81, 140, 144, 151, 173, 185, 196, 197, 211, 216, 229–31, 238, 239, 243, 244, 359
Abū Ḥanīfa, 25, 72, 80–2, 110, 142, 147, 157, 193, 206, 207, 209, 213, 215, 244
*ḥarām*, 76, 77, 145, 230
al-Ḥarīrī, 124, 155, 159
Hārūn al-Rashīd, 61, 64, 65, 72–5, 83, 94, 100, 154, 200, 206, 277, 325, 326
*ḥasan*, 232, 247
Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, 41, 48, 138, 289, 361
Ḥassān b. Thābit, 28, 116
Ibn Abī Ḥātim, 138
Ibn Ḥazm, 240, 246
hereditary character of spiritual dignity, rejection of, 103, 104
Ibn Ḥibbān, 247, 261
*ḥifẓ*, 183, 186, 187
Ḥijāzī school, 82–5
*ḥikma*, 22, 190, 191
*ḥilm*, 149, 191
Hishām, 47, 131, 277
*ḥujja*, 136, 228
al-Humaydī, 168
Abū Hurayra, 17, 18, 56, 122, 125, 138, 142, 170, 182, 184, 208, 232
Ḥusayn, 103, 152, 156, 272, 273, 277, 301–3, 320, 323, 332

*ibāḥa*, 267
*ihlāl*, 30
*iḥyā al-mawtā*, 270
*iḥyā al-sunna*, 32, 33, 73
*iʿjāz*, 363
*ijāza*, 175–80, 205, 366–8
*ijmāʿ*, 36, 87, 88, 97–9, 101, 112, 116, 133, 134, 136, 198, 199, 20

*ijmā'*—*continued*
232, 236, 237, 239, 240, 261, 332, 334, 340
*ikhtilāf*, 199
*'ilal al-ḥadīth*, 141
'Imād al-Dīn b. Kathīr, 212
Imām, 60, 63, 64, 66, 69–71, 73, 80, 90, 92, 98, 101, 266
inheritance, 78, 98, 100, 101, 112, 139; of Prophet's property, 101, 102
innovation, 26–8, 33–5; *see also bid'a*, *ḥadath*
'Irāqī school, 82–5
*irjā'*, 92
*irsāl*, 210
al-Isfarā'īnī, 338, 340, 341
Abū Isḥāq al-Iṣfahānī, 240
Abū Isḥāq al-Kāzarūnī, 284
Ibn Isḥāq, 120, 131, 147, 190
*isnād*, 19, 22, 44, 55, 81, 128, 129, 132, 134, 135, 138–45, 151, 155, 157, 159, 161, 164, 166, 171, 179, 187, 189, 202, 203, 208, 211, 214, 218, 219, 227–31, 239, 244, 248, 251, 279, 336, 366, 367; criticism of authorities, 135–8, 140, 143, 250; interpolations, 138, 148; invention of authorities, 139, 140; priority over *matn*, 141; terminology, 19
*Isrā'īliyyāt*, 156
*istidrāj*, 337
*istiṣlāḥ*, 85
*istiṣḥāb*, 106, 285, 286
*istitāba*, 199, 200
*ittiṣāl*, 228, 229

al-Jābartī, 262, 327
Jābir al-Ju'fī, 110, 134
Jābir b. 'Abd Allāh, 23
Jāhiliyya, 25, 57, 160, 226, 271, 298
*Jam' al-Jawāmi'*, 247
*jāmi'*, 168, 213, 229, 234, 235, 239
al-Jammā'īlī, 241, 248
*al-Jarḥ wa'l-Ta'dīl*, 137, 249
Ibn al-Jawzī, 96, 124, 146, 156, 173, 174, 241, 249
Jerusalem, 44, 45, 51, 123, 287
Jesus, 257, 258, 261, 345, 346
Jews, 109, 111, 130, 131, 181, 263, 283
*jihād*, 352, 354, 357
Ibn Jurayj, 176, 184, 196, 197

Ka'ba, 30, 44, 141, 279, 287, 288, 299
*kāhin*, 260, 293, 339
*karāmāt*, 336–41
Khadīja, 104, 279
Ibn Khaldūn, 50, 67, 70, 133, 135, 143, 243, 340
Khālid al-Qasrī, 53, 82, 89
Ibn Khallikān, 178, 367
Khārijites, 48, 52, 90, 92, 115, 154, 273, 352
Ibn al-Kharrāṭ al-Azdī, 241, 248
*khaṣā'iṣ*, 31, 256
al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, 46, 146, 171, 172, 177, 185, 249, 250
Khiḍr, 154, 303
*khuṭba*, 27, 34, 49–52, 68, 69, 71, 98, 308, 356
*kitāb* (*kutub*), 22–4, 182, 191, 196, 197
Kitāb al-Kharāj, 72, 73
Koran, 17, 18, 31, 32, 40, 48, 56, 60, 64, 67, 71, 78, 82, 84, 90, 96, 100, 109–12, 114, 124, 128–31, 133, 136, 147, 148, 150, 153, 154, 158, 165, 169, 181, 182, 184, 185, 189, 191, 192, 215, 222–4, 234, 235, 256–9, 261–5, 274, 277, 282, 301, 329, 330, 332, 333, 340, 352, 362, 368; falsification of text, 109; imitations of, 363–5; tendentious exegesis, 110–12
Kūfa, 50, 55, 57, 58, 82, 95, 110, 116, 117, 134, 154

law, 71, 73, 74, 76–83, 87, 90, 92, 94, 100, 101, 130, 145, 167, 168
legitimacy, 97–9, 105, 112
lexicography, 155
*li'ān*, 33
literature, decay of, in 5th century, 245–7; development of religious, 189–93; legal, 193, 197–9, 203, 212, 216, 227, 230–3, 238
longevity, 159–63

Lord's Prayer, 350

*madkhab* (*madhāhib*), 70, 78, 83, 108, 174, 212, 217, 233
Madrasa, 174, 175
*maghāzi*, 147, 191–3
al-Mahdī, 50, 58, 63, 74, 100, 106, 324
*maḥmal*, 306
Ibn Māja, 229, 240–4
*majalla*, 190
*majdhūb*, 264
*majhūl*, 138
*makhraj*, 137
Makḥūl, 31, 42, 197
*malāḥim*, 77
Ibn Mālik, 187, 221
Mālik b. Anas, 25, 36, 72, 75, 76, 80, 83, 84, 88, 101, 125, 135, 140, 158, 176, 183, 192, 195–208, 212, 216, 223, 224, 243, 251, 360, 366
Ma'mar b. Rāshid, 47, 151, 168
al-Ma'mūn, 50, 54, 64, 65, 72, 99, 102, 154, 233, 281, 300, 328
al-Manṣūr, 63, 72, 119, 123, 191
al-Maqrīzī, 174, 246, 275, 287, 295, 319–21, 333
*maqtū'*, 202
marriage, 76, 83, 208, 209
martyr, 97, 351–4
Marwān I, 51, 152
*matn*, 20–2, 141, 187, 218; earliest occurrence in ḥadīth literature, 21
*matrūk al-ḥadīth*, 137
al-Māwardī, 71
*mawḍū'āt*, 146
*mawlā* (*mawālī*), 59, 80, 123, 161, 263
*mawlid*, 284, 285, 307, 309, 368
*mawqūf*, 202
Mecca, 17, 30, 44, 45, 150, 162, 168, 178, 235, 241, 270, 276, 277, 279, 280, 288, 290, 298, 306, 318, 326, 333, 334, 358, 368
Medina, 26–8, 33, 36, 38–40, 42, 43, 46, 49, 75, 80, 82–4, 87, 96, 116, 142, 150, 154, 158, 161, 164, 168, 198, 199, 202, 203, 206, 224, 251, 268, 334, 353
*minbar*, 49–51, 68, 69, 98
miracles, 256–8, 260–2, 264, 266, 268–70, 274, 276–8, 292, 294, 300, 301, 309, 311, 312, 330, 333, 336–8, 340, 346, 347; distinction between *āya*, *mu'jiza*, *karāma*, 336
Mishkāt al-Maṣābīḥ, 248
Mishnah, 194
Moses, 154, 321, 326, 350
Mu'āwiya, 38, 41, 44, 49–51, 54, 67, 90, 93, 99, 116, 118, 142, 152, 160, 190, 194, 279, 323
Muhammed, 18, 26, 34, 36, 40, 55–7, 59, 63, 83, 84, 88, 99–104, 110, 122, 124, 129, 140–2, 148, 149, 158, 162, 182, 191, 250, 256–61, 263, 265–7, 273, 279, 281, 289, 301, 321, 324, 332, 334, 335, 346–8, 350, 351, 356–8, 370; ascription of pagan sayings to, 148; autographs, 328, 329; footprints, 331; hairs, 323, 329–31; shoe, 284, 327, 328; will, 114
*muḥillūn*, 90
*muḥaww iz*, 159
*mulk*, 40, 43, 60, 63, 66, 121
*munāwala*, 176, 177, 205
*munkar*, 144, 231
al-Muqaddasī, 124, 245, 285
Murji'ites, 90–2, 136, 196
*murrawwa*, 149, 291–3
*mursal*, 202, 231
*musāmaḥa*, 145
*muṣannaf*, 168, 197, 214–16, 226, 229, 232, 234, 240, 243, 244
Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj, 142, 143, 213, 220, 224–9, 232, 234, 235, 240, 242, 251
*musnad*, 210–15, 235, 237–40, 243, 244, 247
*musnid(a)*, 210, 367, 368
al-Mu'taḍid, 54, 67, 98, 107
al-Mutawakkil, 34, 63, 64, 75, 100, 102, 106, 323, 325, 326
Mu'tazilites, 65, 71, 88, 222, 337, 339, 340, 361, 363
*mutqin*, 136
*Muwaṭṭa'*, 168, 177, 196–9, 201–6, 213, 220, 223, 224, 241, 243, 244, 247

*Muwaṭṭa' Muḥammad*, 206, 207
*Muwaṭṭa' Yaḥyā*, 205–8

*nafl*, 42, 99, 102
Ibn al-Najjār, 212
*al-Nasa'ī*, 52, 54, 135, 143, 229, 230, 232, 233, 239, 240
*nāsikāt*, 271
*naṣṣ wa-ta'yīn*, 112
al-Nawawī, 104, 146, 167, 175, 237, 240, 243
*niyya*, 167, 168
Anū Nuwās, 183, 325, 326

oaths, 79, 121, 167
obedience to unjust rulers, 93–7
Old Testament, 149
*opinio*, 79, 83
ordeals, 369, 370

patron saints, 283, 284
Persians, 59, 80, 109, 110; language, 153
pious opposition, 41, 47, 90–2, 345; emergence under 'Abbāsids, 75
plagiarism, 245, 246
preachers, 151, 153, 155, 156, 158, 159

*qadaḥa*, 137
Qadarites, 136, 196, 220
al-Qasṭallānī, 221
Qatāda, 23, 151, 185
*qawī*, 231
Qubbat al-Ṣakhra, 44, 45, 287, 288; comparison with Black Stone at Mecca, 45; extension of al-Aqṣā mosque to include, 45
Quraysh, 40, 50, 58, 62, 99, 107, 118, 218
*quṣṣāṣ*, 131, 150–9
Ibn Qutayba, 32, 86, 88, 130, 131
*quṭb*, 265, 266, 274

Raṭan b. 'Abd Allāh, 162, 163
*rāwī*, 21, 177
*ra'y*, 74, 79–83, 88, 110, 126, 140, 181, 201, 202, 211, 216, 234
relics, 322, 324, 326–32
religions, survival of old, 296–306, 309, 311, 312, 314–16, 334
*rijāl*, 135–7, 143, 214, 230, 242, 244, 250, 366
Roman law, 79
*rukhṣa*, 233

*sabīl*, 354
sacred springs, 313–15
sacrifices, 314, 315
Sa'd b. 'Ubāda 22
*ṣadaqa*, 43, 57, 102, 353
*ṣadūq*, 136, 144
*ṣaḥīfa*, 22–4, 58, 149, 182, 190, 194
*Saḥīḥ*, 123, 143, 198, 216, 217, 220, 221, 226–32, 234–8, 240, 242, 244, 247, 250, 251, 366
Sa'īd b. al-Musayyib, 41, 97, 125, 183, 280
saints, *see walī*, veneration, women, patron, graves, Bedouin
Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ al-Sharazūrī, 175, 242, 243
*ṣalāt*, 26, 32, 36, 39, 40, 51, 59, 61, 62, 73, 94
*ṣalāt al-jināza*, 118, 141
Ṣālih, annual feast at grave in Sinai, 299
*ṣāliḥ al-ḥadīth*, 136
al-Sayyid al-Ḥimyarī, 92, 118, 119
Senūsī order, 333
sermons, 146, 153, 156, 159
al-Sha'bī, 48, 157, 185, 192
*shafī'*, 263, 264, 292
al-Shāfi'ī, 32, 36, 86, 140, 149, 167, 193, 212, 240, 244, 277
*shahīd*, 350–2, 354
*sharṭ* (*shurūṭ*), 215, 228–30, 232, 234, 250, 251
*shawāhid*, 25, 221
Ibn Abī Shayba, 243
al-Shaybānī, 32, 65, 80, 94, 193, 196, 206–8
Shi'ites, 22–4, 27, 61, 67, 71, 102, 103, 108–11, 113, 117, 120, 122, 156, 162, 322, 323
*shirk*, 257, 258, 263, 333
Shu'ba, 76, 135, 170, 230
*silsila*, 19, 211, 228
*simā'*, 177
Ibn Sīnā, 335, 362
Sinai, 299

snakes, 310, 311
Sphinx, 306
*ṣūfism*, 147, 162, 266, 267, 274, 276, 322, 340
Sufyān al-Thawrī, 25, 55, 64, 187, 230
*sulṭān*, original meaning, 143
*Sunan*, 197, 229, 232–5, 237–44, 247, 248
*sunan al-hudā*, 31 223, 308
*sunna*, 24–38, 42, 43, 51, 63, 73–6, 83, 85, 87, 88, 94, 98, 106, 108, 109, 125, 126, 130, 134, 139, 145, 164, 165, 167, 177, 182, 191, 194–9, 202, 230, 235, 262, 331, 333–7, 356
Sunnites, 22, 23, 71, 102, 103, 106, 108, 110–17, 323
al-Suyūṭī, 74, 245, 247
swords, 324, 329
Syria, preference for Syrian shrines under Umayyads, 44–6

*ṭa'ana*, 137
al-Ṭabarī, 106, 158, 279
*tabarruk*, 282, 290, 322, 324
*ta'dīl*, 137
*tadlīs*, 55, 56
*tafsīr*, 110, 111, 147, 153, 192, 193
*talab al-'ilm*, 42, 165, 166, 169–77, 184, 290
Talmud, 85, 170, 337
Ṭanṭa, 307–10
*taraka*, 137
*ṭarīq* (*ṭuruq*), 202, 214, 227, 366
*tarjuma*, 216, 217
*tashayyu'*, 108, 120
*tashkīf*, 222, 223, 225
*taṭawwur*, 269
*tawāf*, 44, 287, 288
*tawātur*, 340
*ta'wīl*, 110
tax, 58, 72; *see also ṣadaqa*
*thabt*, 136, 173
Thawr, 27
*thiqa*, 134, 136, 227, 228
al-Tirmidhī, 123, 147, 229, 231–3, 240, 250
Torah, 46, 111, 142, 282
trees, veneration of, 316–18
Turābiyya, 117

Uḥud, 118, 119, 193, 226
'Umar, 27, 36, 38, 50, 58, 84, 92, 98, 101, 102, 104, 106, 113, 116, 124, 131, 138, 149, 152, 181, 195, 209, 261, 298, 333, 345, 350
Ibn 'Umar, 30, 56, 76, 78, 96, 118, 119, 125, 149, 184, 358, 360
'Umar II b. 'Abd al-'Azīz, 29, 32, 35, 39, 40, 43, 58, 60, 63, 78, 91, 102, 149, 195, 196
Umayyads, 24, 32, 38–54, 59–65, 67, 68, 72, 75, 76, 89–92, 98, 99, 101, 105–7, 111, 115–17, 121, 123, 152, 189, 191, 194, 273, 279, 325, 345
*'umra*, 281, 287
*'umrā*, 83, 87
*Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth*, 175
'Uthmān, 44, 51, 98, 99, 109, 115–20, 127, 134, 142, 161, 223, 224, 345; flight from Uḥud, 118, 119
'Uthmāniyya, 115–17

variants, 221–3
veneration of saints, 255–341 *passim*
vows, 284

Ibn Wahb, 204
Wahhābism, 34, 333–5
*wahm*, 231
*waḳy*, 20
*walī* (*awliyā'*), 259, 263–70, 274, 276, 279, 285, 291, 292, 295, 303, 304, 313, 322, 336, 339
Walīd I b. 'Abd al-Malik, 49, 107, 108
Walīd II b. Yazīd, 46, 65, 108
*waṣiyya*, 112
*wijāda*, 179
women, position of, 270–4
women saints, 274–8
written documents, forgery of, 57, 58, 76

Yaḥyā b. Mu'īn, 140, 143, 151, 202, 228, 230
Yaḥyā b. Sa'īd al-Anṣārī, 168, 196

Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā al-Maṣmūdī, 205, 206, 224
Yazīd I b. Mu'āwiya, 41, 46, 96, 273
Yazīd II b. 'Abd al-Malik, 41, 47, 102, 345
Yūnus b. Yūnus al-Shaybānī, 264
Abū Yūsuf, 25, 73, 74, 80, 94, 193, 200

*Za'ama*, 58, 59
*zahādī*, 39
al-Zamakhsharī, 178, 337, 339, 364, 365, 367
Zamzam, 45, 250, 281
*zāwiya*, 270, 284
Ziyād b. 'Abd Allāh, 55
*ziyāra*, 287, 290, 304, 309, 323, 335, 336
Ibn al-Zubayr, 41, 44, 96, 117, 142, 273
al-Zuhrī, 31, 44–8, 58, 81, 125, 182, 191, 195, 204, 231, 232