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INTRODUCTION: THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PAPYRI

A most significant feature of our fourteen papyri is their early date. The papyrus from the tafsīr works of Muqāṭil ibn Sulaimān (d. 150/767) is evidence of formal and written tafsīr in his day. The research that it entailed revealed the following significant factors in the rapid development of tafsīr literature: Written tafsīr existed from the time of Ibn ‘Abbās onward. Early tafsīr manuscripts were used and new ones produced by each succeeding generation of leading tafsīr scholars. Differentiation as to type of tafsīr began with the Companions of Muḥammad. All types were generally acceptable except those that involved speculation on the difficult and ambiguous passages in the Qurān. Muqāṭil ibn Sulaimān emerges as a leading and prolific Qurānīc commentator whose works, however, soon became controversial because he was suspected of heresy.

Very important are the clues provided by the thirteen ḥadīth documents, in their isnād’s as in their content (matn), for tracing the origin and early evolution of Tradition especially for determining the basis of selection of traditions for the standard collections of the second and third centuries. By contrast, the texts of both the tafsīr piece and the ḥadīth documents contain very little, beyond some rather minor textual variants, that was not already available to us in the rich heritage of tafsīr and ḥadīth literature. There are, however, some textual characteristics common to the ḥadīth documents, in addition to those mentioned in connection with the scripts as detailed on pages 87–91, which may be noted here.

The language of these documents is more colloquial than literary, even for the Prophet’s ḥadīth. Literal transmission and transmission according to sense were practiced concurrently, but the former was usually more closely associated with the Prophet’s ḥadīth. The isnād’s vary from predominantly complete ones for the sayings of Muḥammad to broken or abbreviated ones that cover the sayings or practices of the Companions and their Successors (see pp. 77 f.). Broken isnād’s, however, were used for ḥadīth al-Nabī in connection with certain extralegal, non-obligatory but edifying religious practices such as private prayers of adulation and other devotional exercises (e.g. Document 3). Family isnād’s emerged at the very beginning and were much in evidence thereafter for some of the most prominent traditionists as well as for some less well known and even quite obscure families. The documents give evidence of an editorial hand that went beyond routine manuscript corrections to explanatory comments, corroborative traditions, and critical evaluative judgment (see pp. 76 f.).

The distribution of the documents among the three major types of early ḥadīth collections is quite representative. The earliest type was the small private collection, mixed as to both source and content, made by many of the Companions. There was no call for emphasis on source until the First Civil War, which occurred in the fourth decade of Islām, and until the Successors were brought into the chain of transmission. The ‘ulamā’ or fuqahā’—terms applied interchangeably at first to all religious scholars—used and added to such collections until increasing volume and practical needs called for more systematic organization of the materials. At the same time the scholars were forming groups that were interested in one or more of the related yet differently oriented religious disciplines, such as the various branches of Qurānīc studies, of ḥadīth proper, and of law. Tradition, which was indispensable for the other disciplines, received a different literary treatment at the hands of members of the legal profession (fuqahā’) than it did at the hands of the traditionists proper (muḥaddithūn), both groups having leaders
in the front ranks of the 'ulama'. The traditionists, concerned primarily with the authenticity and acceptability of the isnād's, arranged their materials in the familiar form of the musnad, which consisted of a number of individual collections each of which traced back to a given Companion or Successor. They paid little attention to thematic organization, though occasionally clusters of thematically related traditions appear in some of the individual musnad’s as preserved in the multiple-musnad works of Ṭayālīṣī and Ibn Ḥanbal, the earliest such works extant. On the other hand, the members of the legal profession, which included many leading traditionists, needed readily usable materials for their arguments relative to a given practical situation or hypothetical legal question. Lawyers, judges, and jurists soon reshuffled the available hadith collections and recast the contents under legal headings, in a sense following the practice of Muhammad himself and of the first four caliphs, who found it necessary to issue oral and written instructions on such matters as general taxation, alms, inheritance, and the conduct of war. As the legal profession soon split into two factions—the ahl al-hadīth, or those who stressed Tradition, and the ahl al-ra'y, or those who stressed also private opinion and judgment—and as the nascent religio-political parties of the end of the first century cited traditions in their controversies and rivalries, the traditionists proper, caught in these developments, found the thematic arrangement convenient and adopted it alongside the earlier musnad form and thus gave rise to large hadith collections arranged by legal headings (hadith muḥāwātāb ʿalā abwāb al-fiqh). On the whole, the traditionists, especially the pious ones who refused to serve the government as judges, paid greater attention to the isnād’s than did the rank and file of the legal profession and the rank and file of the historians.

Our hadith papyri reflect the developments outlined above as they crystallized during the second century under the leadership of Abū Ḥanīfa of Ṭirāq and Mālik ibn Anas of Medina. Of the thirteen hadith documents, six (Nos. 5, 8–11, 14) represent the earliest type, the unorganized hadith collection, which was most widely used among the rank and file of traditionists. Five of the documents (Nos. 2–4, 12, 13) represent collections organized by subject matter. The remaining two (Nos. 6–7) represent the musnad type that traces back to a given Successor and, significantly enough, are from the musnad’s of the judge and traditionist Ibn Shihāb Muḥammad ibn Muslim al-Zuhrl (d. 124/741) and the contemporary judge and jurist Yaḥyā ibn Saʿīd al-Anṣārī (see pp. 193–97). I suspect that the absence of a document representing the musnad of a Companion is accidental, owing in part to the hazards of survival and the small size of this collection of papyri. For the earliest literary works, several of which—such as the Tabaqāt of Ibn Saʿīd, the Tarākh of Bukhārī, and the Musnad of Ibn Ḥanbal—are contemporary with these very documents, and some that are only slightly later—such as the Jarḥ wa al-taʿdīl of Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī and his son ʿAbd al-Raḥmān—confirm the early currency of the collections of such prolific Companions as Abū Hurairah, Ibn ʿAbbās, ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, and ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ from the second half of the first century onward.

Analysis of the content and the chains of transmission of the traditions of the documents and of their available parallels in the standard collections, supplemented by the results of an extensive study of the sources on the sciences of Tradition, ulūm al-hadīth, lead me to conclude that oral and written transmission went hand in hand almost from the start, that the traditions of Muḥammad as transmitted by his Companions and their Successors were, as a rule, scrupulously scrutinized at each step of the transmission, and that the so-called phenomenal growth of Tradition in the second and third centuries of Islam was not primarily growth of content, so far as the hadith of Muḥammad and the hadith of the Companions are concerned, but represents largely the progressive increase of parallel and multiple chains of transmission.

1 Manaqīb, pp. 23–25; Suyūṭī, Tabyī ʿal-ʿahlfah . . . (Haidarābād, 1334/1915) p. 36.
PART I

THE EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF ISLĀMIC TRADITION
EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF WRITTEN TRADITION

I

THE present writer has for some time accepted the possibility that Arabic scripts were used in literary works in pre-Islamic times, especially among the Christian Arabs of Iraq and Syria and among the Arabic-speaking Christian and Jewish colonists in Arabia itself. Furthermore, the possibility that even the pagan Arabs had some sacred or wisdom literature in circulation on the eve of Islam cannot be altogether excluded.

Regardless of whether there was or was not a pre-Islamic translation of large portions of the Bible, there is considerable evidence of the penetration of biblical ideas into the ranks of the pre-Islamic poets, pagan or otherwise. The case of Muhammad's opponent the poet and would-be prophet Umayyah ibn Abī al-Ṣalt, who was credited with "the study of books" and who had some knowledge of biblical angels, comes to mind. Another opponent of Muhammad, the Quraishite Nadr ibn al-Hārith, who fell at Badr, was a man who sought religious information from Jews and Christians and was given credit for insight into the books of the Persians. As for prose, there is reason to believe that some wisdom literature had taken form around the name of Luqmn the Sage and that some of it was in circulation in Muhammad's day. For not only does Luqmn receive considerable attention in the Qur'an in a Surah titled after him (31:12–19), but early Islamic literature has a number of specific references to manuscripts containing some of his wisdom (ḥikmah). The most intriguing of these references centers around Suwaid ibn Šāmil of the tribe of the Aws, who was known as a kāmil or perfect one, that is, one whose talents included a knowledge of writing. Muhammad, while he was still in Mecca in the early years of his mission, invited Suwaid to embrace Islam. The latter refused and informed Muhammad that he had in his possession the Majallat Luqmn, that is, a manuscript of the wisdom of Luqmn, whereupon Muhammad asked him to read it out to him. Suwaid did so and was told by Muhammad that he had something more precious, namely the Qur'an. The Majallat Luqmn continued to circulate throughout the first century, for the well known scholar

---

1 See Vol. I 40 f., 46–50; OIP L 5–7. See also p. 141 below.


4 Jābih, Al-khayawan, ed. Abd al-Salām Harūn, I (Cairo, 1356/1938) 320. See also p. 141 below and GAL S I 55 f.

5 See e.g. Strah I 191 f., 235 f., 458; Anasāb I 139 f.; ΚAnonymous ἅρβτι ἀντικείμενοιν οἰστεν τοῖς χρόνοις ἑλπίζων τῆς γλώσσας μητρώου.

6 For the legend of Luqmn and the several phases of its development see Bernard Heller in EI III (1936) 35–37; for samples of the fables attributed to him see Jose Benoliel, Fabulas de Luqmn (Lisboa, 1898), and René Basset, Luqmn berbère avec quatre glossaires et une étude sur la légende de Luqmn (Paris, 1890) esp. pp. xli–liv. See also GAL II 62 f. and GAL S II 65.

7 For other Qur'ānic references to the inspired wisdom of pious men and prophets see e.g. Sūrahs 12:22, 21:74, 26:20, 28:13, 45:15–16; see also Geo Widengren, Muhammad, the Apostle of God and His Ascension (Uppsala, 1955) pp. 129 f., 130.

8 See e.g. Ibn Sa'd III 91; Futūh al-baladān, p. 474, which adds a second kāmil (Hudhāir): Aghānī VI 165.

9 For the currency of the term majallah and its plural (majall) for manuscript scrolls or books in pre-Islamic and early Islamic times is discussed in Vol. I 48. See also Khātāb VIII 259; Taqyld al-ilm, pp. 95 f.

10 Strah I 283–85; Tahārī I 1208; Tafsīr VII 78; Tafsīr (1963) XXII 39–50; Istrāb II 578; Usf III 378; Isābah II 306.
Wahb ibn Munabbih reported that he had read numerous chapters or parts of it. The legendary Luqman shares honors with the historical Aktham ibn Ša'īf, known as the "Sage of the Arabs" (ḥākim al-ʿArab). Though no specific reference to a pre-Islamic manuscript collection of his wisdom has been noted so far, aphorisms attributed to him are numerous, and the eleventh-century Ṭūrṭūshī refers to several compositions covering his wisdom. Incidental references by some of the Companions to unidentified wisdom manuscripts (kitāb and ẓahīfah) could apply as well to Aktham as to Luqman.

The small group of Arab monotheists, either set apart as ḥanīfīs or claimed by Jews or Christians, are generally associated with some sort of Hebrew, Syriac, or Arabic manuscript. That Muhammad considered the ḥanīfīs and their claimed source of inspiration, Abraham, as good Muslims is too well known to detained us here, as is also the fact that he learned something of the "people of the Book" and their Scriptures from Waraqah ibn Naufal, "a reader of books." And one should not completely overlook the Sabians and their books and the definition of ẓābī as "one who reads or writes books" and the fact that Muhammad himself was at first called a ẓābī. I do not intend here to enter into the controversy of whether or not Muhammad was literate. I am persuaded that he, like ʿĀishah and Ḥafiẓah, could read and that he probably could write also, at least at the time of his mission in Medina (see p. 257).

It would seem therefore, even from the foregoing brief survey, that sacred prose literature written in Arabic was in no way strange to the Arabs on the eve of Islam. Furthermore, the familiar argument that the paucity of literate Arabs and the peculiarities of the Arabic script

11 Maḏrīf, p. 27. Numerous and varied lists of wisdom attributed to Luqman are to be found in early Islamic literature and are relayed by later authors; see e.g. Bukhārī II 364 f.; Ṣa’dī I 106 f.; Ibn Nūsaim II 283, III 337, VI 320, VIII 17, IX 55; Ṣayyid ibn Shāh Wāli (Cairo, 1377/1958) pp. 252-55. See also n. 6 above.

12 Abū Ḥātim al-Sijistānī, Kitāb al-muṣammātīs (Ignaz Goldziher, Abhandlungen zur arabischen Philologie II (Leiden, 1899) pp. 9-18, covers some of Aktham's legendary activities as leader and sage before Islam and credits him with literary correspondence with the Arab kings of Hira and Syria. See also Maḏrīf, pp. 37, 153, 274; Ibn Qutabah, Ṭawīl musāhib al-Qur'ān, ed. Ahmad Saqū (Cairo, 1377/1954) p. 62; Ṣa’dī II 160; Usd I 112 f. Sūrah 4:100 is supposed to refer to Aktham and to others who, like him, were overtaken by death while they were on their way to Muhammad (see Ansāb I 265 and Tafṣīr IV 112-22). Ṣa’dī I 301 refers to a Sāḥib ibn Ṣa’īf whom Muḥammad addressed as "my partner in the jāḥīfah." See Hamdānī, Al-ḥikr, ed. Oscar Lōfgren ("Bibliotheca Ekklesiastica" LVIII [Uppsala, 1954]) p. 17, and Edward William Lane, An Arabic-English Lexicon (London and Edinburgh, 1866-93). See also R. Paret, "Umrnū," in EI IV (1934); Torrey, The Jewish Foundation of Islam, pp. 3 f. and references there cited.

13 For samples of Aktham's sayings see e.g. Ṣa’dī I 137, according to which Shumailah's love messages, written in the sand, led to her immediate divorce and her subsequent marriage to Ibn ʿAbbās.

14 E.g. Imrān ibn Ḥusain (d. 52/672) and Būshair ibn Kaḥīr (n.d.); see Ṣa’d VII 1, p. 102; Bukhārī IV 139; Bukhārī, Tafṣīr I 2, p. 152, and II 2, p. 308; Ṣa’dī II 55, 388. In addition to these better known cases and the various lists of Muḥammad's scribes and of the few women

15 Kaḥilīkānī, Qisas al-adab fi al-Ḥijāz (Cairo, 1377/1958) pp. 252-55.
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deterred the rapid development of written Tradition is no more applicable to Tradition than it is to the Qur'an, which was standardized in less than a quarter of a century after Muḥammad's death. In fact, the reasons for the comparative delay in the development of a body of more or less standardized traditions were, in part at least, quite the opposite. Traditions were already being written down by quite a few even in Muḥammad's day. It was the rapid growth of both oral and written hadith following Muḥammad's death and not any lack of literate Arabs equal to the task of recording hadith that alarmed ʿUmar I and a few other Companions.21

No doubt among the reasons for their fears was the possible confusion of Tradition with the Qur'ānic text, especially because the latter was as yet neither too familiar in the newly conquered provinces nor standardized in its homeland. Valid as this reason seems, it was not the decisive one. For confusion of texts could have been prevented or eliminated by the simultaneous standardization of both hadith and Qur'an. ʿUmar, who was responsible for the first "edition" of the Qur'an, did indeed consider the parallel recording of sunnah, which Tradition necessarily overlapped, but rejected the idea after a month's deliberation.22 What ʿUmar feared most was not ignorant or innocent confusion of texts but the potentially dangerous, even if not deliberately contrived, popular competition that the Prophet's hadith and sunnah, both oral and written, could pose for the Qur'ān. This fear is clearly indicated in the instructions that ʿUmar gave his emissaries to Kūfah, warning them against letting their prestige as Companions tempt them to relate too many of the Prophet's traditions to the distraction of people zealously preoccupied with the recitation of the Qur'ān.23 Zuhri, among others, reported on the authority of Abū Hurairah that so long as ʿUmar was alive the people dared not say "the apostle of Allah said" for fear that ʿUmar would have them flogged, imprisoned, or otherwise punished.24 By denying Tradition the authority that went with sacred records ʿUmar meant to forestall the danger of competition between hadith and the Qur'ān.25 ʿUmar's own perceptive mind may have alerted him to this danger. Nevertheless he was undoubtedly strongly influenced by his general knowledge of the role of extrabiblical sacred literature among the "people of the Book," particularly the Jews. For ʿUmar, it seems, was more familiar with local Jewish ritual and literature than has been hitherto recognized. We know from the Qur'ān that Muḥammad at first discoursed freely with Christians and Jews about their Scriptures (Sūrahs 10:94, 17:101). And his early eagerness and credulity did not escape his not always sincere

21 See e.g. Ibn Saʿd V 139–43; Jāmī I 71, II 120.
22 See e.g. Ibn Saʿd III 1, p. 206; Jāmī I 64. ʿUmar did not limit his own opinions and actions to conform with those of Muḥammad and Abū Bakr but rather consistently exercised his own judgment as the situation demanded. In one of his later speeches he claimed the merit of having clearly established the farāʾid and the sunan; cf. Ibn Saʿd III 1, p. 242.
23 Ibn Saʿd VI 2; Ibn Majah I 9; Jāmī II 120 f.; Kifayah, pp. 8–12.
24 Mustadrak I 110 f.; Nubalāʾ II 433 f. See also Dhahabi I 71 f.; Concordance I 435 f.; Ansāb I 183; Jāmī I 130.
25 Cf. Ibn Saʿd III 1, p. 207. ʿUmar's fear of such competition could have involved what has come to be known as hadith qudīṣ, particularly the traditions that start with "God said" or "God says" whether their substance (but not their form) was derived from the "book of Allāh," including the Old and New Testaments (see e.g. Bukhārī II 316, 369; Muslim XVII 165 f.; Ibn Ḥanbal II 313; Concordance I 47, II 48, (ex Text), or from new revelation and inspiration received by Muḥammad in addition to the Qur'ān (see e.g. Bukhārī IV 231; Muslim XV 116–18; Ibn Ḥanbal II 162; Concordance I 183 f., and I 9–11) (in several places). Muḥammad's comments on and explanation of Qur'ānic texts, considered as hadith or taṣfīr, have some relevance in this connection (see e.g. Itqān II 174, 176, 184) as does his insistence on the authority of his sunnah (see p. 23, n. 179). Divine inspiration was likewise credited to a few of the Companions, such as ʿUmar himself (see e.g. Muslim XV 166; A. J. Weninek, A Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition [Leiden, 1927] p. 234, col. 2) and the poet Ḥassān ibn Ṭabīb (see e.g. Mustadrak II 457). Such material could have presented a challenge of the first magnitude to the as yet unstandardized Qur'ān, but at present little is known of its early development and role (see e.g. Ignaz Goldziher, "Kämpfe um die Stellung des Hadīth im Islam," ZDMG LXI [1907] 963–65). Completion of the Concordance
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informants (Sūrah 9:61–62). That his disciples likewise discoursed with Christians and Jews is implied in the later repeated injunctions against engaging in arguments or debates with the “people of the Book,” which meant, for the most part, with the members of the large and aggressive Jewish community in Medina. Furthermore, it is specifically stated that Muḥammad, Abū Bakr, and ‘Umar personally visited the Jewish Midrash in Medina. All three of them, among others, had serious discussions elsewhere with Jews and Jewish converts, while both Muhammad and ‘Umar were on more than one occasion in possession of Jewish manuscripts. Certainly ‘Umar must have assumed that at least a few prominent Companions had some knowledge of the role of the Mishna in Judaism when he cited that very role in justification of his negative decision on the recording of Tradition. And his fears in this respect proved not to have been exaggerated.

Biblical and extrabiblical literature was aggressively publicized even in the first century by such literate Jewish converts as Ka'b al-Aḥbār, who was patronized by ‘Umar, his stepson Nauf al-Bakārī, and Wahb ibn Munabbīh. Because of the Companions’ interest in such men and their manuscripts, which were eagerly sought and appropriated by contemporary leading traditionists, Islāmic Tradition did indeed come to resemble the Mishna more than any other sacred literature of the “people of the Book.” Among prominent Companions known to have shown considerable interest in Jewish books and ideas may be mentioned ‘Ālī, Salmān al-Fārīstī, ‘Abd Dharr, and Zaid ibn Thābit, who is said to have learned Hebrew in a Jewish midrash and later became the editor-in-chief of the ‘Uthmānic edition of the Qur’ān. But Abū Hurairah, Ibn ʿAbbās, and ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAmr ibn al-Āṣ must be placed in the front
ranks of early traditionists and Qur'anic commentators—the latter leaned heavily on Tradition—who through their persistent exploration of the practices, the ideas, and, in the case of the last two named, the books of the scripturians, influenced the tone, part of the content, and the literary form of Islamic Tradition. Ka'b al-Aḥbār bore testimony to the illiterate Abū Hurairah's surprisingly extensive knowledge of the Torah. Ibn ʿAbbās, known as the father of all tafsīr works, was an assiduous collector of ḥadīth and akhkhār not only from the Ansār but also from Jews and Christian Arabs. ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ is reported as reading Syriac and as given to intensive study of the books of the scripturians and to doctrinal discussions with converted Jews such as Ka'b al-Aḥbār and Nauf al-Bakāl. His knowledge of the Mishna and of its association with Islamic Tradition is attested by Ṭabarī and in the writings of Ibn ʿAṭīyah (d. 542/1147). 147

Moving close to the end of the first century we find others who carried on this interest in non-Islamic sacred books. There was, for instance, Abū al-Jald of Baṣrah, who alternated between recitation of the Qurʾān and the Torah, using manuscripts of the latter, and read other, similar, books that were in his possession. Ibn ʿAbbās is known to have written to him for information and to have transmitted ḥadīth from ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ and many others. There was also the stationer and Qurʾānic copyist Mālik ibn Dinār (d. 130/748), who read the Bible and whose literary Arabic citations from both the Old and the New Testament reveal a remarkable degree of textual accuracy and of familiarity particularly with the Psalms, the Proverbs, and the first three Gospels.

The early Muslims' preoccupation with non-Islamic thought and literature was reflected in the subsequent negative approach to such questions as whether it was permissible for Muslims to read such books and to transmit akhkhār and ḥadīth from the "people of the Book" and,  

Gospel citations: Matt. 10:8 and 15:7–8 (pp. 220 and 362), Mark 11:15 (p. 383), Luke 7:32 and 19:45 (pp. 358 and 383). It should be noted that Abū Nuʿaim's work, like that of the earlier Ibn Qutaibah, is unusually rich in biblical citations (e.g. Abū Nuʿaim VIII 140–61, with some dozen references) and should not be overlooked by those particularly interested in the early history of the Arabic Bible. Among the more interesting recent articles on this subject may be mentioned W. Montgomery Watt, "The early development of the Muslim attitude to the Bible," The Glasgow University Oriental Society, Transactions XVI (1955–56) 50–62, and Gérard Lecomte, "Les citations de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament dans l’œuvre d’Ibn Qutayba," Arabica V (1958) 34–46; see also EI I (1960) "Arabiyya" (p. 564), which bears on this subject as well as on other aspects of the early Muslims' interest in non-Islamic sacred books, and n. 25 above with references there cited. Ibn Qutaibah's familiarity with biblical texts is fairly well known. Biblical citations are to be found in most of his works. Some of these are introduced with statements that indicate his personal study of the written texts (see e.g. Taʾwil, pp. 171 and 183). For recent and instructive treatment of the general subject by Muslim scholars see Ahmad Amin, Dāḥiq al-Īlam d. 1361/1943) 327 f., 343 f.; Kattānī II 425–32.

"See e.g. Bukhārī IV 495; Jamʿī II 40–43, 48; Kifāyah, pp. 75 f. See also Taʾṣīl 270–74; Kattānī II 428 f.

"See Kifāyah, pp. 76 f.; Taqyid al-Īlam, pp. 140 f.; Abū Nuʿaim V 52.
conversely and logically enough, whether Islamic literature, particularly the Qurʾān, should be taught or even exposed to the "people of the Book." The comparatively tolerant attitude that characterized the first century yielded—for all but the very few liberals—first to caution, then to avoidance, and finally, by about the middle of the second century, to all but complete prohibition of all three practices. Then such Ḥaṭṭāʾi leaders as ʿAmāsh (d. 148/765) and Sufyān al-Thawrī (d. 161/778) were credited with socio-political discrimination and religious bigotry in their relations with the "people of the Book." This development was tacitly frowned on by the cosmopolitan Shaḥbī (d. no later than 110/728) among others and publicly repudiated by the more tolerant and humane Awwāṣī of Syria (d. 157/773).

It thus seems clear that it was not illiteracy nor failure nor even general reluctance on the part of the Companions to write down ḥadīth that forestalled the early standardization of Islamic Tradition. It was rather ʿUmar’s fear of a development in Islam, parallel to that in Judaism and Christianity, but particularly in the latter, of a body of sacred literature that could compete with, if not distort or challenge, the Qurʾān. Such literature was in fact beginning to take shape even in ʿUmar’s day and under aggressive literary leadership by the "people of the Book." This leadership the early Muslims at first acknowledged and admired but soon came to resent and challenge. The challenge, however, had not sufficient force to overcome the trends already set in motion, trends that had deep roots in a common Semitic cultural heritage reinforced by long sustained contact and association.

ʿUmar’s decision against the recording of Tradition was backed by a very small minority of his contemporaries, though, after he burned or otherwise destroyed such ḥadīth manuscripts as he could uncover, many Companions refrained from arousing his wrath by avoiding public enthusiasm for either oral or written Tradition. Actually, only a few Companions opposed written ḥadīth from strong personal convictions, giving as their chief reasons Muḥammad’s occasional disapproval and the desire not to accord ḥadīth the same treatment as the Qurʾān. The Companions most frequently mentioned as holding to their convictions against written ḥadīth to the very end are ʿAbd Allāh ibn Masʿūd, Zaid ibn Thābit, and Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī, whose death dates range from 32/653 to 74/693. Ironically enough, ʿUmar’s son ʿAbd Allāh, who approved of his father’s decision and abided by it for the most part, is reported to have weakened at the end and tacitly permitted or actually instructed his pupils to write down Tradition. There were, on the other hand, some Companions who at first ignored ʿUmar’s decision but eventually, on the approach of death, decided to destroy their manuscripts for fear that they might be misused. Among these were Abū al-Dardā’ (d. 32 or 34/646).
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652 or 654) in Syria\textsuperscript{46} and ʿAbdah ibn Qais (d. 72/691–92) in Kufah.\textsuperscript{67} But for the most part the Companions who at first refrained from writing, either for some personal reason or out of deference to ʿUmar, eventually took to recording ḥadith. Among these were Ibn ʿAbbās, whose ṭafṣīr and ḥadīth materials were written down by several of his pupils,\textsuperscript{68} and Abū Hurairah, who though himself illiterate and at first opposed to the writing-down of his ḥadīth did in the end have others write it down.\textsuperscript{69} A great many of the Companions resolved the controversy for themselves by considering their manuscripts as aids to memory.\textsuperscript{70} Some, possessing only a few traditions, made temporary notes which they destroyed once they had memorized the content. Others, fewer in number but more ambitious for sizable collections, made records that were meant to last for their own lifetime, but some of these records actually survived their first owners. Besides, even if the original manuscripts were destroyed, copies made from dictation were not necessarily destroyed at the same time or later. There were even instances of pupils or relatives of aid-to-memory writers who somehow managed to save the manuscripts of a teacher, as did Saʿīd ibn Jubair for Ibn ʿUmar,\textsuperscript{71} or of a parent, as did the son of ʿAbd Allāh ibn Masʿūd.\textsuperscript{72}

Nevertheless it was not the partially accidental survivals that were to supply the main foundation for the first deliberate attempts at comprehensive recording of Tradition. That basis was supplied by the comparatively few Companions who proved to be determined and insatiable collectors, recorders, and transmitters of the ḥadīth and sunnah not only of Muḥammad but also, though to a lesser extent, of some of their fellow Companions, especially those known to have been close, in any capacity whatsoever, to Muḥammad and to the members of his family. Foremost among these were Anas ibn Mālik, ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ, Ibn ʿAbbās, and Abū Hurairah.\textsuperscript{73} But the list can be readily doubled by addition of the names of determined collectors and writers of ḥadīth who were not so insatiable as these four. Among this group was ʿAmr ibn Ḥazm al-Anṣārī (d. 51 or 53/671 or 673), who started his collection of the sunnah and ḥadīth with the written instructions on alms, blood money, inheritance, and other topics that he received from Muḥammad at the time of his appointment in the year 10/631 to Najrān to instruct the people and collect the alms tax.\textsuperscript{74} There was also Abū ʿl-Yasar Kāʾib ibn ʿAmr (d. 55/675), whose servant accompanied him carrying his manuscripts (see p. 188) and whose materials were written down by others. Again, there was the judge and traditionalist Masrūq ibn al-Ajdaʿ (d. 63/682), who is said to have been adopted by ʿAṣīrah and who traveled widely in search of ʿilm, which he wrote down.\textsuperscript{75} One may mention, finally, the Yemenite ʿAmr ibn Maimūn al-Awādī (d. 74/693), who, though he was converted during Muḥammad’s lifetime, did not actually meet Muḥammad but made numerous pilgrimages and transmitted from ʿUmar, ʿAlī, ʿAbd Allāh ibn Masʿūd, and others. He settled in Kufah and

\textsuperscript{46} See e.g. Taqyīd al-ʿilm, pp. 117 f.

\textsuperscript{47} See e.g. Ibn Saʿd VI 62 f.; Taqyīd al-ʿilm, pp. 45 and 61; Jāmīʾ I 67. See also pp. 12, 58, and 111, n. 139, below.

\textsuperscript{48} See e.g. Taqyīd al-ʿilm, pp. 42 f.; Jāmīʾ I 65; p. 157 below.

\textsuperscript{49} Taqyīd al-ʿilm, pp. 33–55 and 41 f.; Jāmīʾ I 66, 70, 72, 74. See also pp. 61, 87, and 140 below.

\textsuperscript{50} Taqyīd al-ʿilm, pp. 33–55 and 41 f.; Jāmīʾ I 66, 70, 72, 74. See also pp. 61, 87, and 140 below.

\textsuperscript{51} See e.g. A. Sprenger in Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal XXV (1856) 309–29 and 375–91. This article, as any other on the subject, shows that those in favor of writing down ḥadīth, either as an aid to memory or for later use, greatly outnumbered those who objected to written tradition.

\textsuperscript{52} See e.g. Jāmīʾ I 66; Taqyīd al-ʿilm, pp. 43 f. and 102 f.; Abū Nuʿāmī IV 276.

\textsuperscript{53} See e.g. Jāmīʾ I 72; Taqyīd al-ʿilm, p. 39.

\textsuperscript{54} See Bukhārī I 40 f.; Abū Dāʾūd III 318 f.; Jāmīʾ I 70–73; Taqyīd al-ʿilm, pp. 65–74, 74–84, and 91–97.

\textsuperscript{55} See Jāmīʾ I 71; Taqyīd al-ʿilm, p. 72; Isḥāq II 437; Ḩaḍāth II 332. See also p. 24 below.

\textsuperscript{56} See Jāmīʾ I 66, 94; Taqyīd al-ʿilm, pp. 39 f. and 88 f.; Shirzād, Ṭabaqāt al-juʿfahāʾ (Baghdād, 1356/1937) pp. 10, 12 f., 15, 17, 59. See also p. 187 below.
wrote on historical subjects, and Ibn Ishaq of Sirah fame drew freely from his works. More names could be mentioned, as can readily be discovered from the pertinent sections of Jami and Taqyid al-ilm, particularly the latter, which is so aptly titled. Enough have been presented here, however, to correct the widely held notion that only a few prominent Companions were engaged in serious literary activities.

As a result of the events leading into the second half of the first century two major obstacles to increased interest in both oral and written Tradition were overcome. The dreaded 'Umar was dead, and the 'Uthmanic edition of the Qur'an had been completed and thus some of the fear of confusion between hadith and the Qur'an had been eliminated. In the meantime a number of political, social, and cultural trends involving the rapid development of administrative, educational, and literary institutions had been set in motion. In every one of these fields the hadith and sunnah of Muhammad and of a few of his closest and most prominent associates came to be considered second only to the Qur'an in importance. But Qur'anic priority held only when the Qur'an itself was explicit on a given subject or situation; otherwise the Prophet's Tradition was supreme, though not for long. For the legalist, faced with new problems and challenges, soon introduced well considered personal opinion (ra'y), consensus (ijma'), and analogy (qiyas) to supplement both the Qur'an and Tradition.

The initial and necessary interaction of law and Tradition, organic though it had to be, was by no means the only major stimulus to the early development and growth of the science of Tradition. For a simultaneous and parallel interaction developed between Tradition and the various early Qur'anic sciences, particularly Qur'anic readings (qir'at) and commentary (tafsir; see Document 1). Furthermore, the image of Muhammad gained in stature in direct proportion to the astonishing early successes of Islam as a creed and a state. Consequently, an increasing number of his enthusiastic followers of the second and third generations sought and used the hadith and sunnah of the Prophet. Among these were pious men who sought traditions for personal edification, religious leaders who used them for public instruction and exhortation, hard-headed men of practical affairs who used them to further their personal ambitions or to improve their social standing. As a result of the combined activities of these variously motivated groups religious education and learning, covering at least some knowledge of the Qur'an and of Tradition, became a sine qua non for the average Muslim layman in good cultural and social standing. The popular view—still held, particularly among Western scholars interested in Islamic law—that interest in Tradition was first stimulated by members of the legal profession distorts the picture of this first and basic phase of Islamic cultural development in the religious sciences.

With the foregoing outline as a background we may fill in some details for the field of Tradition proper, particularly for the period of Zuhri's pivotal activities and the first comprehensive record of Tradition. Though 'Umar's attempt to prevent Tradition from competing with the Qur'an failed, his official stand against the recording of Tradition nevertheless cast a shadow on his successors, who let matters take their course without official interference. Hence the collecting and recording of Tradition became a matter of private concern and scholarship. Several of the Umayyad rulers came to play a private role in this development, though there was an official attempt on the part of 'Umar II (see pp. 18–31).

---

76 See Ibn Sa'd VI 80; Bukhārī, Tārīkh III 2, p. 367; Abū Nu'aim IV 148–54; Dhahabi I 61. See also our Vol. I 25, 98.
77 The phrase appears in the work dozens of times, frequently cast in the imperative, with only one real variant, tashbith bi al-kutub (see Taqyid al-ilm, p. 82).
78 See e.g. Ibn Qutaibah's list of readers (Ma'drif, pp. 262–64), which largely duplicates his list of traditionists (ibid. pp. 251–64).
Of the small group of Successors who objected to written *hadith* only a few conservatives are said to have held out to the end. The two best known are the Basran Muḥammad ibn Širīn and the Medinan Qāsim ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr. But story has it that Qāsim and his fellow Medinan Sālim ibn Ābū Allāh ibn Ūmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb were shamed into dictating a large portion of their knowledge (ʿilm) to the resourceful Tunisian visitor Khālid ibn Abī Ṭmrān (d. 125 or 127/743 or 745), who threatened to return home and publicize the refusal of these scholars of the city of the Prophet to make their knowledge available for the benefit of his countrymen (see p. 214). Other leading objectors weakened in the end, permitting and in some cases even urging their students to write down their materials. The most prominent of these were Sālim ibn Ābū Allāh ibn Ūmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb (see pp. 111, 157, 180, 198), the Medinan Saʿīd ibn al-Musayyib (see pp. 202 f.), son-in-law of Abū Hurairah, and the Kūfī Nakhaṭ—all three of whom appear frequently in our documents largely because, despite their initial personal stand, the bulk of their materials came to be written down by their less conservative younger contemporaries.

The Mosque of the Prophet at Medina, like the synagogue and the church for the “people of the Book,” became Islām’s first center of religious education for young and old alike, and this education was free. For, while Muḥammad expounded his mission, conducted public worship, and dictated the Qurān, schoolmasters took the young in hand and zealous Companions instructed the adult “guests of Islām,” as the poor (ahl al-ṣuffah) were called, in the new faith and taught those who wished to read and write as well. The mosque, as the leading institution of religious and cultural life, became the center of each new Islāmic community within and without Arabia. As military camps were augmented by civilian settlements which presently gave rise to metropolitan centers, old mosques were enlarged and new ones were built. Thus, while the young continued to be taught in neighborhood mosques, the cathedral mosques of cities such as Mecca, Medina, Damascus, Ḥims, Basrah, Kūfah, Jerusalem, and Fustāt became centers of public communication and of secondary education, courts of justice, and meeting places for visiting scholars, pilgrims, and tradesmen. Yet, though the mosque was an institution, it had no monopoly on any of its functions except as the place of public congregational worship and the accompanying speech of caliph or governor. Scholars and judges held sessions at home; legal opinions were given and even sentences passed in the market place. Evening sessions for religious discussions soon supplemented those of pagan times when battle days and poetry stirred memories and stimulated the imagination.

The earliest references to men of religious learning and understanding (ʿulamāʾ and fuqahāʾ), apart from the leaders in Mecca and Medina, involve groups of emissaries who were sent by

19 *Jāmiʿ* I 67; *Taqyīd al-ʿilm*, pp. 45 f. and 60 f. See also pp. 257 f. below.

20 *Jāmiʿ* I 67; *Taqyīd al-ʿilm*, pp. 46 and 52. See also pp. 111 and 191 below.

21 *Jāmiʿ* I 73; *Taqyīd al-ʿilm*, p. 94.

22 *Jāmiʿ* I 69 f.; *Taqyīd al-ʿilm*, pp. 47 f., 58 f., 108 f. See also pp. 149 f., 157, and 276 below. It is interesting to note that most of the conservatives among the Companions and Successors mentioned in this section as being opposed to the writing-down of Tradition were likewise opposed to the introduction of orthographic signs, Ṣūrāh captions and endings, and punctuation devices in Qurānic copies. Again many of them finally compromised, and these practices became widely accepted (see Ḫūṭtbān ibn Saʿīd al-Dānī, *Al-muḥkam fi al-naqī al-maṣāḥif*, ed. ʿIzzāt Ḥasan [Damascus, 1379/1960] pp. 3 f., 10–17, 42, 196.)

23 See e.g. Vol. 1 28 and Bukhārī I 30.

24 See Vol. I 78.

25 See e.g. Bukhārī I 47, IV 430.

26 Akhṭār al-qudūt, for example, gives numerous instances of judicial activities in a variety of places (see e.g. Vols. I 145, 275, 316, 339, 341, II 412, and III 306 f., which cover the mosque, the space outside the mosque, the market place, and the home.

27 See e.g. Bukhārī I 41, 158; Ḥanbal I 389, 410. See also *Concordance* II 535 and our Vol. I 10.

28 See *Jāmiʿ* I 105 and Nuwairī, Nihāyat al-arab fi funūn al-adab XV (Cairo, 1369/1947) 338; see also Akhbār al-qudūt III 19.
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Muḥammad or by the caliph to military camps on the borders and to newly conquered or founded cities to instruct the people in the faith and its religious laws. Many of these emissaries had, besides their more-or-less propagandistic mission of teaching and preaching, some other official function such as collector of the alms tax or judge. Because of the public character of their duties, references to their activities, which took place usually but not always in the mosque in the earliest times, are more numerous than references to the activities of teachers in elementary schools in or adjoining the neighborhood mosques or to those of private citizens seeking or imparting knowledge (ʿilm) on their own initiative. The ʿilm of the earliest period was integral but composite. It drew on the Qurʾān, hadith and sunnah, and law and custom without any clear differentiation between ʿilm al-Qurʾān and ʿilm al-hadith and ʿilm al-fiqh, each of which was later to develop into various branches. Many of the early emissaries went armed with oral and written instructions which formed part of the basis of their ʿilm. Among these were ʿAmr ibn Ḥāzm, active in the Yemen (see p. 11), and Muḥammad ibn Jabal (d. 18/640), active in the Yemen and later in Syria, where he discoursed with groups, consisting at times of some thirty adults, in the mosques of Damascus and Ḥīmṣ. The religious lecture and the seminar (majlis), with their rather select audience and circle (halaqah), soon became institutions in their own right as popular means for both public and private instruction. The numerous sessions of Abū Ḥurairah, Ibn ʿAbbās, Abū Ḥāmid ibn Ḥabīb, and Saʿūd ibn al-Musayyib in Medina and those of Ibn ʿAbbās, Abū ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ, and Mujāhid ibn Jabr (see p. 98) in Mecca, though exceptionally important, were by no means the only sessions held in these cities, particularly in Medina, by the Companions and Successors. Among other official or prominent educators were ʿUbādah ibn ʿĀṣim (d. 34/655–56), who taught the Qurʾān and writing to the ahl al-ṣuffah in the Mosque of the Prophet at Medina and later held hadith sessions in the mosque of Ḥīmṣ, ʿAbd Allāh ibn Masʿūd in Kūfah, and ʿImrān ibn Ḥusayn (see p. 211) in Basra.

It is not likely that the earliest schoolteachers took an active enough interest in hadith to teach it to their young charges even though some of them may have written down what they themselves had heard from Muḥammad and their fellow Companions. But, as the second half of the first century progressed, teachers who not only eagerly collected hadith but taught some traditions to their pupils are mentioned in increasing numbers. Other early groups of religious significance were the preachers and storytellers, who in a sense took Muḥammad for their model and renewed their inspiration from the stories in the Qurʾān and other books of Allāh. While the preacher (waḍāʾiq) concentrated on moral exhortation and the dreaded Day of Judgment, the storyteller (qāṣṣ), with much the same object in mind, fashioned tales with a moral

---

89 He initiated the practice when he sent Muḥshid ibn Umar to instruct the Anṣār before he himself migrated to Medina, as he later sent a missionary expedition that met with foul play at Būr Maʿmah (see Vol. I, Document 5).
90 See e.g. Ibn Saʿd III 1, pp. 201 and 258; Yaʿqūbī II 72 f., 75, 242–44; Dhadhib I 48. See pp. 108 f. below for ʿUmar’s concern with the possibility of unorthodox ideas gaining currency in military camps.
91 See e.g. Yaʿqūbī II 114–28.
92 See Sirah I 961; Fudūth al-balštān, p. 70.
93 See e.g. Sirah I 157; Mawṣura II 953 f.; Abū Nuʿaim V 121, 130; Dhadhib I 19. See also p. 259 below and references there cited in n. 21.
94 After ʿUmar I’s death Abū Ḥurairah concentrated on hadith (see e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal II 275; Istiḥlāl II 697; Mustadrak I 108, III 512; Dhadhib I 31–35; Nubalāʾ II 433 f., 436, 440, 443 f.; Yaʿqūbī I 276).
95 See e.g. Khatīb I 175. Cf. also Bukhari, Taʾrīkh III 1, pp. 3–5.
96 See e.g. Ḥusain al-mukhāṣṣarah I 107 f.
97 See e.g. Ibn Saʿd V 96, 98.
98 See e.g. Ibn Saʿd IV 2, p. 12.
99 See e.g. Kifāyah, p. 385. See also pp. 48 f. below.
100 See Ibn Saʿd III 2, pp. 93 f.; Ibn Ḥanbal V 315, 328. See also pp. 187 f. below.
101 See Ibn Saʿd III 1, p. 110.
around biblical and Qur'anic stories and legends, in which the stories of the prophets loomed large, supplemented by other legends from ancient story and folklore. Such storytellers, both Arabs and mawālī, appeared on the scene spontaneously and informally and were readily accepted by the community. Before long the best of them functioned also as preachers, and a few combined with their earlier duties those of judge. Mu'rāwiyyah ibn Abī Sufyān while he was governor of Syria, is credited with formalizing their position, and the caliph 'Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān (65–86/685–705) is credited with confirming their official position and further regulating the activities of the officially appointed qussās in the mosque services, though not without being accused of religious innovation (bid'a).

The activities of these early and reputable preachers and storytellers are of significance to us for two reasons. They accelerated the popularization of the emotion-laden theme of reward and punishment (targhib wa tarhib) in the here and the hereafter. Much of the material on this theme was soon incorporated into the as yet quite fluid body of Tradition. Again, though as a group the storytellers wrote down their tales, these tales for obvious reasons were not cast in the form of content and source (matn wa isnād) currently coming into use among traditionists. Later, as we shall see, some qussās who aspired to being traditionists also compiled regular hadith collections that were not necessarily limited in content to the themes of the professional storyteller. This type of material, however, though it too came to be cast in the form of traditions, seldom if ever had acceptable isnād's. This fact was soon recognized by isnād critics of the second century who, on considering the nature of the content and the salutary purpose such material was intended to serve, overlooked for the most part the deficiencies of the isnād's.

All in all, therefore, the developments during the middle decades of the first century were such as to increase the demand for traditions for a variety of religious purposes, both private and public, and to lessen the opposition to written Tradition at the same time that literacy was increasing. By the end of the century, added factors had strengthened and accelerated these trends. The rapid increase in the Islamic population, by birth and by conversion, widened the base of public demand for traditions. In turn, there was an even greater rate of increase in the number of serious students and scholars, from whose ranks came the first leaders and rough molders of the various religious disciplines for which Tradition was becoming for the most part indispensable. Lending an even greater urgency to these religious and cultural developments was the acute sense of Arab racial and political pride already beginning to be challenged by the resentful yet ambitious non-Arab Muslim clients (mawālī). Smarting under political and social discrimination the mawālī, along with members of non-Islamic groups subject to dis-
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102 See e.g. Sūrah 7:176, 12:111; Ibn Sa'd IV 1, pp. 30 f., and V 341; Ma'dārif, p. 276; Darimi II 219; Abī Dā'ud III 323 f.; Ibn Mājah II 214; Jabār, Taqdimah, p. 144. See also Dihabī I 121 f. and Ibn Khaldūn, Muqaddimah, p. 242 (= Rosenthal's trans. III 156).

103 See e.g. Mustadrak I 128. For a list of early and quite remarkable qussās see Jāhūs, Kudāb al-khayān wa al-taḥyīn, ed. ‘Abd al-Samān (Cairo, 1366/1947) I 345–47, and Ibn al-Jauz, Tuhfa ibnāta (Cairo, 1347/1928) pp. 123–25.

104 Goldziher's inadequate treatment in several of his works of the earliest phase of the role and character of the qussās in contrast to their later degeneration (see e.g. Ibn Qutaibah, Tawātil Mukhtalif al-Hadith, pp. 356–62) has been remedied in more recent years (see our Vol. I 53 f. and references there cited).

105 See Kindl, pp. 313 f.; Futūh, pp. 235 and 239.

106 See Abū Shāmmah, Al-kirtah ala inkār al-bida': wa al-hawādith, ed. ‘Abd al-Mu'īz (Cairo, 1374/1955) p. 66; cf. Ibn al-Hājīj, Mukhāk ālū tammiyat al-‘amal (Cairo, 1348/1929) II 144 f.

107 See e.g. Ibn Sa'd VI 92; Tabarī II 881–86; Johannes Pedersen, "The Islamic preacher," Ignace Goldziher Memorial Volume, Part I, ed. Samuel Löwinger and Joseph Somogyi (Budapest, 1948) p. 239. See also pp. 76, n. 17, below.

108 See pp. 75 f., 111, and 144 f. for other instances of leniency in the matter of the isnād's of this and related types of subject matter.
crimination, entered into open economic and cultural competition with the Muslim Arab overlords. For aggressive clients, intellectual and non-intellectual alike, no field more readily offered richly rewarding opportunities, particularly on the social level, than did the field of the emerging religious sciences (ulum al-din) in a society that had already come to look on its religious scholars, the ulama, as heirs of the prophets in this and the next world as a result of the initial emphasis that Muhammad himself and most of his leading Companions had placed on sacred scriptures, prophecy, and literacy.

Under the influence of opinion that was thus so oriented toward acquisition of knowledge and toward race consciousness the second half of the first century saw more and more of the teachers, preachers, judges, and jurists join the ranks of the traditionists, already penetrated by the mawalli. More and more of the able, serious, and professionally minded among these groups went to writing down their materials for initial study and future reference. Among the teachers who wrote down and taught traditions may be mentioned 'Abd Salama 'Abd Allah ibn 'Abd al-Rahmân, one of the "seven fuqahâ" of Medina, who had even the schoolboys write down hadith from his dictation. Among other teachers were Dâhkhâb ibn穆âhîm of Kufâh and 'Aâtâ ibn Abi Ribâb of Mecca, both of tafsîr fame. There was also Qais ibn Sa'd of Mecca, whose hadith manuscripts were in circulation (see p. 161). And the more distinguished teachers who were employed as private tutors at court and in the homes of the rich and prominent should not be overlooked. For it was one of these, Qâbîsah ibn Dhû-rabîb, who served the caliph 'Abd al-Malik in several capacities and who was instrumental in bringing about Zuhra's entry to his court. Among the better known preachers with special interest in Tradition were Rajâb ibn Hâiwha (see p. 205), who brought about the succession of 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azîz to the caliphate (see p. 23), Thâbit al-Bunâni, who was associated with Anas ibn Malik for some forty years and had a collection of two hundred and fifty traditions (see p. 161), the Khurasanian Abû Rajâb Ma'tr ibn Ta'hân and became a qâsad and a warrâq or stationer, copyist, and bookseller and who had access to the manuscript collection of Abû Qilâbh, and Abû al-Šâm Darrâj ibn Sama'ân of Egypt, whose traditions were accepted only when they were actually corroborated by others (see p. 239).

Significant as was the interest of the teachers in Tradition, it was largely the avowed traditionists themselves and to a lesser extent the group with the closest relationship to them—the jurists—who established Tradition as a separate professional discipline and one that was of prime importance to the theory and practice of law. For in this early period, the jurists as a group were still largely counted among the ahl al-hadith in contradistinction to a rising segment of jurists soon to be known as the ahl al-ra'ay, the "people of reasoned opinion" (see p. 35). The latter, however, had not yet won wide public recognition even in 'Irâq, where their future leader, the Persian client Abû Hanifâh (80–150/699–767), was still a youthful scholar in search of preachers and their influence on religious legends see Vol. I 33 f. and pp. 13–15 above. Conscious resistance to personal opinion began with such Companions as Abû al-Dardâ', Ibn 'Umar, and Ibn 'Abbâs.
of a congenial profession among the already differentiated literary and religious disciplines. These included schooiteaching, language and poetry, Qur'anic studies, Tradition, and law. In Mecca and Medina, as in the leading cities of the provinces, the Companions and Successors who were either from the start eager to preserve the Prophet's Tradition in writing or were later convinced of the desirability of so doing introduced simultaneously the private written collection of hadith and the family isnād (see pp. 28–29 and 36–39) and instituted the circle of devoted Arab and non-Arab students. One need only mention the activities set in motion by Ibn ʿAbbās and Abū Hurairah, by Ibn ʿUmar and ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ, by Saʿd ibn al-Musayyib and ʿUrwa ibn al-Zubair to begin to appreciate the tremendous forces that were at work shaping the sciences of tafsīr, hadith, fiqh, and ta'rikh. It mattered little that some of these men, such as Abū Hurairah, were illiterate or that others, such as Saʿd ibn al-Musayyib, were opposed at first to written hadith or even, like Ibn ʿUmar, probably remained opposed to the end, since the great majority of their followers were not only literate but favored written Tradition. Abū Hurairah had ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Hurmuz al-Aʿraj (see p. 138) and Bashir ibn Nahik as pupils, Ibn ʿUmar had his client Nāfi', and Saʿd was to have his Zuhri. These, along with many of their fellow students, preserved most of their teachers' vast and fundamental collections in writing, though for the most part without systematically integrating their copies, and thus joined the ranks of the ahl al-kutub, that is, those who preferred to intrust their laboriously collected knowledge to writing rather than to memory. There were, oddly enough, occasional inconsistencies in the outlook of teacher and pupil. We find, for instance, that Muhammad ibn Sinn, the mawla of Anas ibn Malik, one of the staunchest advocates of hadith-writing, held out against written transmission of hadith. His traditionist brothers, however, did not, and it was one of them who preserved and passed on to his family a written collection from Abū Hurairah's hadith (see p. 87). On the other hand, Zaid ibn Thabit, a determined opposer of written Tradition, had as his client the young Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, whose father and mother were schoolteachers, who was to use hadith manuscripts freely, and whose own manuscripts were to be among the best known.

The very prominence of these traditionists and the great emphasis placed by scholars, early and late, on the size and significance of their contribution have cast suspicion, particularly among Western scholars, on the reliability of some of the earliest reports concerning them and their literary activities. Before embarking on these exhaustive studies, I shared more or less the same view but am now convinced that much of the suspicion is in fact unjustified. For not only was there a remarkable degree of unanimity among the admiring students and followers of these men and among like-minded traditionists concerning their over-all literary activity, but reluctant and at times censorious testimony by the opposition bears witness to this literary activity. Furthermore, as anyone who reads through the present volume will soon discover, there were literally dozens of their contemporaries scattered across the vast empire who were engaged in similar activities but who for one reason or another never received marked public attention even though they hold no mean place in Islāmic biographical dictionaries of scholars. Perhaps reference to a dozen or more of these less prominent men, who died during the last quarter of the first century or early in the second, will give a detailed enough picture of the literary activities of this group as a whole, a few of whom were also Qur'ānic commentators.
judges, or jurists. In any such list Medina will usually yield the most names. It produced Jābir ibn ʿAbd Allāh (see pp. 98, 215 f.), Abū Salamah ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (see p. 250), Sālim ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUmar (see pp. 111, 142, 198), Abū Bakr ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ḥārith (see pp. 136, 169), Sūlimān ibn Yāsir (see pp. 108 f.), and Muḥāwiyyah ibn Qurrah. 128 Mecca had Qais ibn Saʿd (see p. 161). Kūfah, a close second to Medina, produced Ibrāhīm ibn Yāṣir al-Taʿmī,134 Abū Burdah ibn Abī Mūsā al-Askarī,131 and Ḥakam ibn ʿUthābah.126 Başra had its Wāthilah ibn al-Asqa137 and Abū Qilābah (see pp. 230 f.), both of whom later went to Syria. Syria itself had Khālid ibn Maʿdān,142 Kathīr ibn Marrah (see p. 20), Wālīd ibn ʿUtbah (see p. 188), and Makhūl al-Shāmī (see pp. 241, 244 f.). The Yemen, Egypt, and the Jazīrah had fewer and slightly younger traditionists, such as Tārīṣ ibn Kaysān (see pp. 149, 161), Yāzīd ibn Abī Ḥabīb,139 and Maimūn ibn Mihrān (see pp. 161 f.) respectively.190 About fifty percent of these less prominent traditionists were non-Arab clients. All were known as reliable men who collected and transmitted many traditions. The great majority of them attended and held private and public lectures.131 All but two are known to have written down or dictated their materials. Sizable manuscripts of at least nine of them—Jābir ibn ʿAbd Allāh, Tārīṣ ibn Kaysān, Abū Qilābah, Khālid ibn Maʿdān, Kathīr ibn Marrah, Makhūl al-Shāmī, Qais ibn Saʿd, Ḥakam ibn ʿUtbah, and Yāzīd ibn Abī Ḥabīb—were already in production in their own time or even in circulation along with the manuscripts of the better known scholars of their day, such as Shaʿbī and Ḥasan al-Ṭabarī, and of the preceding generation, such as Ibn ʿAbbās, ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ, and Abū Hurairah.192

II

Despite reluctance on the part of many to credit the Umayyads with personal piety one can hardly deny the political sagacity of their numerous outstanding leaders. If natural inclination attracted them to secular cultural activities, prudence demanded that they keep abreast of developments in the nascent religious sciences as well, and for these sciences reliable traditions were fast becoming indispensable. An estimate of the remarkable cultural achievements of the Umayyads, beginning with the story of the Akhbar ʿUbayd and Muḥāwiyyah's sustained interest in poetry and history has already been presented.124 What follows here is a discussion in some detail of the activities of a number of leading Umayyads in the field of Tradition, again beginning with Muḥāwiyyah.

Muḥāwiyyah's idea of a liberal education that befitted a noble Quraishite included some knowledge of hadīth in addition to history, genealogy, and poetry.124 The extent of his own interest in hadīth is in a measure indicated by his relatively small collection as preserved in the Musnad of Ibn Ḥanbal135 and said to number some one hundred and sixty traditions. This figure, however, is deceptive, for it includes a great many traditions that are preserved through
numerous channels (\textit{turq}). The tradition that was said to be Mu'āwiya's favorite is cited at least fifteen times through eight different channels: "Allāh endows with religious understanding him for whom He wishes the best."136 Mu'āwiya apparently did not write down hadīth during Muhammad's lifetime, even though he served as one of Muhammad's numerous secretaries. He is known, however, to have begun to do so before he became caliph, though he respected the scruples of Zaid ibn Thābit against recording his hadīth.137 Mu'āwiya considered himself well informed in the hadīth and sunnah of Muhammad for the period during which he served Muhammad.138 Yet he did ask others, particularly those in his political camp, for Muhammad's sayings, perhaps with reference to the period preceding his own comparatively late conversion.139 For we find him writing to his governor of Kūfah, Mughīrah ibn Shu'bah, to send him such traditions as he himself had heard directly from Muḥammad. Mughīrah dictated to his client and secretary Warrād what seem to have been originally four such traditions. Two of these concerned prayer and its ritual, one dealt with some specific prohibitions such as female infanticide, and one involved three prohibitions of a general nature—wasting one's means, raising many questions, and gossiping.140 These four items or traditions seem to have been split up into at least seven entries in Ibn Ḥanbal's musnad for Mughīrah,141 through six different channels including ones that start with 'Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān and Shu'bah ibn al-Ḥajjāj as direct transmitters.142 The Concordance, it should be noted, gives references under the four separate themes to several other parallels coming through these and other channels.143 It is not surprising, then, to find Mu'āwiya listed among the Syrian traditionists with a respectable list of transmitters.144 His appreciation of the practical uses of hadīth is indicated by his personal choice and direct appointment of storytellers and judges for the provinces (see pp. 14 f. and 123), as also by his frequent use of Muḥammad's sayings in his speech (khūbat) at the Friday service, when he was governor and when he was caliph (41–60/661–80), and in his court gatherings (majālis), as one can readily infer from reading his short musnad.

Like Mu'āwiya, Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam took some interest in hadīth-writing long before he finally secured the caliphate for himself and his branch of the Umayyads. He, too, had to meet Zaid ibn Thābit's opposition to written hadīth and ra'y.145 He even resorted to trickery in order to have written down for him some of the hadīth of Zaid and of Abū Hurairah. He placed his
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136 Ibn Ḥanbal IV 93, 95–101. When the new edition, sponsored by the Sa'diana, of Ibn Ḥanbal's Musnad (begun by the late Ahmad Muhammad Shākir; Cairo, 1365/1946—) is finished it will make available more complete and reliable statistics. Among Mu'āwiya's other well known traditions are those that assign the caliphate to the Quraish (e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal IV 94), but these are counterbalanced somewhat by traditions emphasizing love for the Ansār (Ibn Ḥanbal IV 96, 100; see also p. 260 below). Interesting too is the practical administrator's impatience with the theorist's hairsplitting discussions (Ibn Ḥanbal IV 98).

137 Ibn Ḥanbal V 182; Jami' I 63. It seems that whenever Mu'āwiya heard some bit of poetry, wit, or wisdom that pleased him he had it written down (\textit{Iqd} II 144).

138 See Adab al-imāl, pp. 57 f., which reports that Abū Hurairah held a long evening hadīth session in one of Mu'āwiya's rooms.

139 See Vol. I 82, verso 1–2, and comment on p. 85.

140 Ibn Ḥanbal IV 245 ff., 254 f.; Bukhārī IV 256, 423. Warrād reports that when he visited Mu'āwiya later he heard him give orders that the prayer ritual reported by Mughīrah should be followed. Mughīrah transmitted the Prophet's Tradition during the caliphate of Abū Bakr, who asked for and received confirmation from a second Companion (see \textit{Murāfah}, p. 15).

141 Ibn Ḥanbal IV 244–55. For biographical references see e.g. Ibn Sa'd IV 2, pp. 24–26, and VI 12; Bukhārī, Tārīkh IV 1, pp. 316 f.; \textit{Ma'rifah}, pp. 150 f.; \textit{Jarh}, IV 1, p. 224; \textit{Tṣābih} I 290 f.; Khaṭṭīb I 207–10; Nawawi, pp. 572 f.; Jami' II 499; \textit{Usd} IV 406 f.; \textit{Iṣbāb} III 927–30.

142 Ibn Ḥanbal IV 245, 248, 249, 250, 251 (twice), 254 f. Bukhārī IV 256 and 423 covers all four items, but on p. 423 they are combined into one tradition.

143 See \textit{Concordance} I 225, II 384, III 526.
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144 See e.g. Ibn Sa'd VII 2, p. 128; Tabarī I 1, pp. 326–28; \textit{Jarh}, IV 1, p. 377; \textit{Ma'rifah}, pp. 177 f.; Nawawi, pp. 554–66; Jami' II 499 f.; \textit{Tṣābih} I 253 f.; \textit{Usd} IV 383–88; \textit{Iṣbāb} III 886–89.

145 See Jami' I 65 and cf. Jami' II 143 f.
secretary Abū al-Zaʾẕāʾah behind a curtain and then requested Abū Hurairah to relate traditions. The latter drew on his rich store, for the secretary reports that he wrote down that day many traditions, on which he tested Abū Hurairah a year later and found his memory perfect. The episode, perhaps too flattering to Abū Hurairah’s memory, must have taken place early in Marwān’s career. It may even have occurred during the reign of ʿUmar I, when Abū Hurairah’s reluctance to dictate traditions openly could have been due to either fear of or deference to that caliph, for we know that Abū Hurairah later dictated his ḥadīth and kept a copy in his possession for reference, a fact which indicates some loss of his once reliable if not perfect memory.

Two of Marwān’s sons, ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, who became governor of Egypt (65–85/685–704), and ʿAbd al-Malik, who became caliph (65–86/685–705), took an active interest in religious literature. The political rivalry between the two brothers is reflected in their competitive zeal in such matters. This is well illustrated by ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz’s wrathful reaction against his brother’s major-domo, Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf, who had dared to send to Egypt and the other provinces copies of the ʿUthmānic edition of the Qurʾān. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz thereupon commissioned a new copy of the Qurʾān for use in the congregational mosque. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz’s interest in ḥadīth was so direct and personal that he is regularly listed as a traditionist. He transmitted especially from his father and from Abū Hurairah, ʿUrwah ibn al-Zubair, and ʿUqbah ibn ʿAmir and to his son ʿUmar and to Zuhrī. He could, therefore, have been interested in Marwān’s collection of the ḥadīth of Abū Hurairah and could have supplemented it from Abū Hurairah himself. As his interest in recorded Tradition grew, he commissioned a well known Syrian traditionist, Kathīr ibn Marrah, reported to have met a great many Companions, to record their traditions, excepting only those of Abū Hurairah, which he said he already had. There is no record that this commission was or was not carried out. The probability is that it was not, perhaps because of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz’s death. Certainly its execution could hardly have escaped the attention of his son ʿUmar, the future ʿUmar II, or that of his brother ʿAbd al-Malik, who was then caliph in the imperial province of Syria. For both son and brother had an active interest in recording ḥadīth and sunnah, an interest that grew and lasted a lifetime for this uncle and nephew who were also father- and son-in-law and whose relationship was further strengthened when ʿAbd al-Malik appointed the young ʿUmar as governor of the important provinces of Mecca and Medina (86–93/705–12).

ʿAbd al-Malik’s talents for political administration and the advancement of cultural pursuits developed early. At the age of sixteen he was appointed by Muʿāwiyyah as chief of the administrative bureau, an office previously held by Zaid ibn Thābit. ʿAbd al-Malik applied himself so assiduously to the study of the Qurʾān, ḥadīth, and fiqh that he came to be ranked—along with Nafiʿ the client of Ibn ʿUmar, Shaḥīf, and Abū al-Zinād—with such leading Medinan scholars as ʿUrwah ibn al-Zubair, Saʿd ibn al-Musayyib, and Qabīṣah ibn Dhūʿaib. It was Qabīṣah ibn Dhūʿaib who brought ʿAbd al-Malik and Zuhrī together and who, like Zuhrī and
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146 There is confusion about the name, some of which seems to have arisen from the peculiarities of the unpointed Arabic letters (see Daʿullāh I 183 f.).
147 These are references in n. 148.
149 Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh V 33, No. 259; Mustadrak III 510; Ibrāhīm IV 388; Nuḥaḍ a II 431 f. See also pp. 511 f. below.
150 See Kindl, p. 315, n. 1.
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EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF WRITTEN TRADITION

Sha‘bi, served at one time as tutor in the royal palace, where maghāzi and ḥadīth books were available for the princes’ use.144 ‘Abd al-Malik’s patronage of ‘Urwah ibn al-Zubair and his use of ‘Urwah’s store of knowledge, quite frequently by correspondence, are well known.145 ‘Abd al-Malik’s genuine appreciation of true scholarship led him on more than one occasion, but unfortunately not always, to rescue from the dreaded and at times murderous wrath of Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf a scholar who had had the misfortune to clash with him on some administrative or political issue. Ibn ʿUmar, Ḥasan al-ʿAṣrī, and Anas ibn Mālik were among those so protected.146 Saʿīd ibn Jubair and Ibrāhīm ibn Yazīd al-Tāmī, on the other hand, were among those not so fortunate. Ibrāhīm died in prison, and Saʿīd, despite the fact that his Tafsīr was commissioned by ‘Abd al-Malik, fell in the end a victim to Ḥajjāj, but his Tafsīr survived in the court library of ‘Abd al-Malik.147

‘Abd al-Malik’s personal participation in the transmission of ḥadīth seems not to have been so extensive as that of his brother ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz since unlike the latter he is not regularly listed among the traditionists, though he is known to have heard ‘Abū Hurairah, Saʿīd al-Khudrī, and Ṣābir ibn ʿAbd Allāh.148 Ibn Saʿd, who recorded ‘Abd al-Malik’s patronage of scholars and his frequent sessions with them, noted that he transmitted few traditions (kāna qalīt al-ḥadīth).149 Ibn Saʿd also recorded ‘Abd al-Malik’s concern because of the appearance of unfamiliar or unknown traditions stemming from the eastern provinces—a concern that led him to warn the people against such traditions in a speech delivered during the pilgrimage of the year 75/695, when he instructed them further to hold fast to the Qurʾān and the farāʾīd and reminded them that both of these had been established by Zaid ibn Thābit under the initiative and patronage of the caliph ‘Uthmān.150

‘Abd al-Malik’s personal interest in scholars and in the religious sciences has been overshadowed by the fact that he was Zuhri’s patron. The problem posed by Yaʿqūbī’s reference151 to the youthful Zuhri’s visit to Damascus toward the end of the counter-caliphate of ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubair to reinforce ‘Abd al-Malik’s policy for the pilgrimage to the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem has been much discussed. Covering the grounds independently, I find myself in general agreement with Horovitz’s conclusions, namely that the event has been overemphasized if it did take place but that it seems improbable because of Zuhri’s youth at the time and because Zuhri was not the only one to transmit the tradition that refers to this mosque.152 Apart from this problem, there has also been some uncertainty as to a later date at which Zuhri did leave Medina for Damascus and gain an introduction to ‘Abd al-Malik, who then established their relationship of scholar and royal patron. It is possible now to establish that date as the year 82/701, since Zuhri himself states that his visit took place during the rebellion

144 See pp. 16, 181, 227, 228; Vol. I 16 f. ‘Abd al-Malik took a personal interest in both the secular and the religious education of the princes (see also e.g. Ḥadīth 1 272). Ḥadīth II 310 f. gives an obviously touched-up version of Zuhri’s meeting with ‘Abd al-Malik.
145 See Vol. I 16 f. and 36. See also Tābarī I 1180 f.; Tafsīr XIII 539–42. It is to be hoped that the work of the late Ahmad Muhammad Shakir on Tābarī’s Tafsīr will be carried on and that a fresh study will be made of ‘Urwah’s scholarly correspondence with ‘Abd al-Malik.
146 See e.g. Ibn Saʿd IV 1, p. 135, and V 170 ff.; Dhahabi I 35–37; p. 148 below and further references there cited. See e.g. pp. 172, 228, and 249 for other clashes and some rescues.
147 See Jahīz, Kitāb al-bayān wa al-tabyin (1366/1947) I 362; Masʿūdī I 303 f. See also pp. 97 and 98 f. below and Ibn Saʿd VI 178–87.
148 See Ibn Saʿd V 174; Masʿūdī I 266; see also Bukhari, Tārīkh III 1, pp. 429 f.
149 See Ibn Saʿd V 167.
150 Ibn Saʿd V 173. See p. 34 below for a similar view held by Zuhri.
151 Yaʿqūbī II 311.
of Ibn al-Ash'ath, which is placed in 81–82 A.H., and since it is also known that the visit took place during Hishâm ibn Ismâ'il's governorship of Medina, which began in the year 82/701.168 This date is further supported by the fact that among the causes which sent the extravagant Zuhri from Medina to Damascus was the economic distress caused by the widespread plague of the year 80 A.H.164 There are very few specific details concerning Zuhri's actual court activities during the last four years of 'Abd al-Malik's reign beyond his possible tutoring of the princes and his availability for consultation on legal matters, when he discouraged the raising of hypothetical questions.166 Zuhri bore witness to 'Abd al-Malik's urging of the public, in a speech from the pulpit for the Festival of the Breaking of the Fast, to spread such religious knowledge (ʾilm) as any of them had before its impending loss through the death of the aged or aging Companions who were his contemporaries.168 This was precisely what Zuhri himself was doing and was to continue to do for more than forty years of service under Umayyad patronage.167

The policies of Walid I (86–96/705–15) varied little from those established by his father, 'Abd al-Malik.168 Some scholars, such as Saʿīd ibn al-Musayyib, refused to be drawn into his circle.169 Others, such as Zuhri, 'Urwa ibn al-Zubair, and Ibn ʿUlaiyah, accepted his patronage and offered advice.170 He seems to have been particularly concerned with education and schools for his family as well as for the public. One of his sons, Bishr, won the reputation of being the scholar of the Umayyads,171 though apparently not as a traditionist. Walid's claim to attention here is his association with ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz, whom he retained as governor of Mecca and Medina.172

Sulaimân (96–99/715–17) as caliph seems at first to have followed the same pattern in relation to scholars as did Walid I and ʿAbd al-Malik. His interest in Tradition was steady to the extent that he, too, is listed among the traditionists.172 Several unconnected reports associate him with well known scholars such as the Yemenite Ṭâʾūs ibn Kaisân,174 Abû Ḥâzim al-Aʿraj175 of Medina, as well as Zuhri and ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz.176 But the theologian-traditionist who influenced Sulaimân most toward the end of his reign was Rajāʾ ibn Ḥaiwah (see p. 205), who, when the circumstances seemed so favorable, induced him to appoint ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz as his heir. It was Zuhri who, having first lauded Rajāʾ, Makhbûl al-Shâmî, and other ʿulamaʾ, read out to the people the deed of succession.177

If it was political sagacity more than personal piety that motivated most of these Umayyads, the role was reversed by ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz, who, like his father, is listed among the traditionists.178 His interest in the hadîth and sunnah started early and apparently remained a

---

168 For accounts of the meeting of ʿAbd al-Malik and Zuhri, varying in some details but not in significance, see Ibn Saʿd VII 2, p. 157, and Tabari II 1085, 1182. See also E. de Zambaur, Manuel de généalogie et de chronologie pour l'histoire de l'Islam (Hanovre, 1927) p. 24; Horovitz, op. cit. pp. 36 f. and references there cited.
169 Masʿūdī I 384; Abû Nuʿaim III 367–69; Dhabahi I 103.
170 ʿJamʿ II 143; Hamadhânî, Kitâb al-buldân, ed. M. J. de Goeye (BGA V [1885]) p. 91.
171 ʿJamʿ I 123.
172 ʿJamʿ I 124; Abû Nuʿaim III 366.
173 See Vol. I 17 f.
174 Yaʿqûb III 340; Zubairi, p. 371; Abû Nuʿaim III 366.
175 Tafsîr XIII 542; Abû Nuʿaim V 243 f.; Ibn Kathîr, Al-bîdâyah wa al-nîbâyah IX 341 f.
176 See Vol. I 17 f.
177 See Maʿrîf, p. 183, and Masʿūdî V 361, but the field of knowledge is not stated. We have already met (our Vol. I 12 and 16) Asad al-Sunnah (= Asad ibn Muna), another scholar who was a descendant of Walid; see also pp. 243 f. below.
179 Jarh II 1, pp. 130 f.; Bukhârî, Taʾrîkh II 2, p. 26; Dhabahi I 83.
180 Abû Nuʿaim IV 15 f.
181 Masʿūdî I 406 f.
182 Jarh II 1, pp. 130 f.; Abû Nuʿaim IV 15 f.; Masʿūdî I 412; Ibn Kathîr, Al-bîdâyah wa al-nîbâyah IX 341 f.
183 Masʿūdî I 417 f.
184 Ibn Saʿd V 242–302; Bukhârî I 34–37, 39; Al-Ṭâhir, Taʾrîkh III 2, p. 174 f.; Abû Nuʿaim V 359–64; Jarh III 1, p. 122; ʿJâmʿ I 339 f.; Dhabahi I 112–14; Nawawî, pp. 463-
fairly private matter until Walid I appointed him governor of Mecca and Medina (86–93/705–
12). In the year 91/710 he ordered some repairs in the Mosque of the Prophet at Medina and
added an inscription on the authority of Walid in which, in addition to several Qur'anic texts,
the general call to the "Book" and to the sunnah of the Prophet is twice repeated and is further
reinforced by specific reference to the just distribution of the state charitable funds to needy
kin, orphans, and the poor. He had ample opportunity during his governorship to become
acquainted with scholars from the various provinces as they made pilgrimages to the holy
cities. Umar himself led four pilgrimages, in the years 87, 89, 90, and 92 A.H. His associates in
Medina included most of the famed "seven" and "ten" scholars (ulama or fugah) of his
generation. In the first years of his governorship he called together "ten" of the scholars of
Medina, asked them to keep him informed of any oppression, and promised to consult them.
He appointed Abû Bakr ibn Muhammad ibn `Amr ibn Ḥazm al-Anṣâri to the judgeship of
Medina, an office that Abû Bakr held throughout and beyond the governorship of Umar.
When Walid, at the instigation of Ḥājjaj ibn Yûsuf, of whom Umar was severely critical,
called Umar from the governorship, Abû Bakr was left as acting governor until Umar's
successor arrived in Medina. Umar's long association with Abû Bakr and the experience
and knowledge he gained from his sessions with scholars, both during his governorship and
later when he was recalled to Damascus, not only led to his succession as caliph but laid the
foundation for the more dedicated and ambitious attempt that he made during his caliphate
(99–101/717–19) to restore and record the hadith and sunnah. For it was the religious scholars
led by Raja` ibn Ḥaiwah, Zuhrl, Makhlul al-Shaml, and others who influenced Sulaiman to
appoint Umar as his heir, and it was to Abû Bakr and Zuhrl, among others, that Umar as
caliph turned for the execution of his plans to record the hadith and sunnah.

In the meantime the stature of both Zuhrl and Abû Bakr had grown during the caliphate of
Sulaiman (96–99/715–17), at whose court in Damascus Zuhrl was well established. Zuhrl and
Umar may have had something to do with Sulaiman's appointment of Abû Bakr as governor
of Medina (96–101/715–20), an appointment that Umar confirmed for the whole of his short

72 Ḥum al-muhādharah I 145. Umar's personal collection (musnad), which draws on some forty
dozen traditionists, was edited two centuries after his time; see A. H. Harley, "The Musnad of
(1924) 391–488. (Arabic text on pp. 415–48.)

73 See Muhammad ibn Ahmad al-Fast, Shifār al-gharām bi akhbar al-balad al-ḥaram (Mecca, 1375/1956) II 373 for
full text of inscription and cf. p. 375. Emphasis on the Qur'ān and Muhammad's hadith and sunnah (see p. 7
above), it should be recalled, traces back to Muhammad himself; see Strack I 969; Mu'attal II 899. Tradition 3; Ibn
Majah II 134; but see Concordance I 270 ṣa`fūt.`A`li. 6636. For references in which the Qur'ān
alone is mentioned.

74 The several lists of the "seven" and the "ten" are remarkably stable, except for one or two of the names,
when one considers they reflect no more than the freely expressed personal opinions of scholars about fellow
scholars. For lists of the "seven," see e.g. Ibn Sa'd II 2, pp. 128–32; Iqd II 206; Mas'udi V 376; Aghâni VIII 90 f.; Mu'awiya
ibn Ṭabarak VI 51; Ibn Khallikân I 571 f. (= trans. I 582); Dhahabi I 228. The "seven" are occasionally
cited as summarized by four' (see e.g. Khaṭîb XI 172

180 Tabarî II 1182 f. names the ten scholars; see Ibn Sa'd V 245 f. and Abu Nu`aim V 555 f. for actual consultation.
181 Ibn Sa'd V 244; Tabarî I 1191, 1255; Akhbar al-qudât I 135.

183 Tabarî I 1254 f.
29–32 and 143 f.; Fragmenta historiorum Arabicorum, ed. M. J. de Goeje and P. de Jong, I (Lugduni Batavorum,
1869) 38–40.
caliphate.\textsuperscript{186} This was a precedent-breaking appointment because Abū Bakr was of the Anṣār, who were traditionally limited to judgeships while governorships and supreme rule were reserved for the Quraysh (see pp. 219, 259). The Anṣār (see p. 188) came early to be looked upon as a rich source of information on the hadith and sunnah of Muḥammad because of their long and close association with him in Medina. Abū Bakr’s grandfather ‘Amr ibn Ḥazm al-Anṣārī (d. 51 or 53/671 or 673) laid the foundation for a family of at least four generations of scholars when, in the year 10/631, Muḥammad appointed him to Najrān as instructor-propagandist and collector of the alms tax, with written instructions for dealing with this tax and with blood money, inheritance, and other sunnah.\textsuperscript{187} ‘Amr’s son Muḥammad transmitted hadith from his father to his son, the Abū Bakr under consideration (d. 120/738), who in turn transmitted to his two sons, Muḥammad (d. 132/750) and ‘Abd Allāh (d. 130 or 135/747 or 752), who became judge and traditionist-historian respectively.

A close analysis of the sources indicates that ‘Umar II was deeply concerned with restoring a just administration that would deal impartially with all, a goal which he considered his mission in life. To do this he felt a great need to avoid innovation (biḍ‘ah) and a greater need to revive and enforce the practices of Muḥammad and the rightly guided caliphas, especially Abū Bakr and ‘Umar I\textsuperscript{188}—practices that many members of the royal family and their protégés and officers had disregarded in order to gain wealth and power.\textsuperscript{189} He began his reign with almost feverish activity both at his own court and by correspondence with his officers in the various provinces in order to accomplish his objective, which involved obtaining the original letters of instructions issued by Muḥammad and the first caliphs and supplementation of these manuscripts by the collection and recording of the hadith and sunnah before death should overtake the last surviving Companions and the older generation of the Successors.\textsuperscript{190} The same urgency is reflected on the one hand by his encouragement of the older scholars to spread such religious knowledge as they possessed\textsuperscript{191} and on the other hand by his financial provision for the younger scholars so that they could devote their time to religious study, particularly of the Qurān and hadith.\textsuperscript{192} For ‘Umar considered the role of the religious scholar in the Muslim state second in importance only to that of the Qurān and the sunnah, a conviction that was implied by his meeting with the scholars during his governorship of Mecca and Medina, when he promised to consult them (see p. 23), and explicitly stated in his correspondence with ‘Urwah ibn al-Zubair in answer to the latter’s question as to the bases of jurisprudence.\textsuperscript{193} If ‘Umar as caliph found it so natural to consult with the ‘ulama’ it was because his close association and identifi-

\textsuperscript{186} Ibn Sa‘d V 251; Ṭabarī I 1305, 1346; Akhbār al-qudūt I 135, 141 f.

\textsuperscript{187} See Straḥ I 961; Ṣuḥ āt al-buldān, p. 70; Ṭamī‘ I 71; Ḩab al-Shāfi‘ī, pp. 338 f.; ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-Ja‘far, Ṭabagāt al-fuqāhā‘ al-Yaman, ed. Pu‘lā Sa‘yīd (Cairo, 1376/1957) pp. 22 f. For biographical entries on ‘Amr ibn Ḥazm, most of which report these facts, see e.g. Ibn Sa‘d, Index; Isṭī‘āb II 437 f.; Usd IV 98 f.; Isṭī‘āb II 532; Nawāwī, pp. 474 f.

\textsuperscript{188} See e.g. Ibn Sa‘d V 252 f., 277 f.; Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, Straḥ ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, pp. 37, 63, and 125. See also Mas‘ūdī V 42 f.; Abū Nu‘aym V 282 f., 297, 338; p. 27 f. and 73 below.

\textsuperscript{189} This theme is much elaborated in Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s Straḥ ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz and Abū Nu‘aym V 253–355. ‘Umar began by confiscating some of his own property and then confiscated that of other Umayyads (see e.g. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, op. cit. pp. 56–58, 62 f.; Abū Nu‘aym V 261 f., 275 f.), an act which brought him enmity strong enough to arouse suspicions that his death was caused by poisoning (see e.g. Ya‘qūbī II 262, 370; Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, op. cit. pp. 118 f.; Dhahābī I 114).

\textsuperscript{190} Shāhānī, p. 389; Zarqānī I 10 (for Zarqānī see GAL II 318, GALS II 430); Dārīn I 126; Ṭamī‘ I 123 and 124, where this motive is credited to both ‘Abd al-Malik and ‘Umar II. This theme is repeatedly encountered in ‘Umar’s biography as found in Ibn Sa‘d V 242–302, which is rich in references to and citations from his extensive correspondence (e.g. pp. 252–57, 263, 277 f., 280 f.). See also Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, op. cit. pp. 69, 79, 125; Abū Nu‘aym V 292 f.

\textsuperscript{191} Ṭamī‘ I 124; Ḩab al-imā‘ā, p. 44.

\textsuperscript{192} Ṭamī‘ I 166; Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, op. cit. pp. 80, 167; Ibn al-Jauz, Ṭārīkh ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb (Cairo, 1342/1924) pp. 60 f.

\textsuperscript{193} Ṭamī‘ II 24; Fragmenta historicorum Arabicorum I 63.
EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF WRITTEN TRADITION

With the foregoing analysis of the level of religious learning under the early Umayyads, of the part they played in the recording of hadith and sunnah, and of Umar II's own deep interest in religious study as background we may turn to the specific problems of Umar's commissions to Abū Bakr ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿAmr ibn Ḥazm and Zuhrī for the recording of the hadith and sunnah.

The first question to be considered is the time of the commissions. Though Umar could perhaps have set Abū Bakr to this task during his own governorship of Mecca and Medina, there is evidence that he did not do so. For all references to his commission to Abū Bakr begin with "Umar wrote (kataba) to Abū Bakr," and it would not have been necessary for Umar to write to his judge (see p. 23) if both were in Medina. On the other hand, all references to his commission to Zuhrī begin with "Umar ordered (amara) Zuhrī" and thus imply an oral command at a time when both Umar and Zuhrī were in Damascus. Since it is highly improbable that Umar would or could have issued a general commission of such significance to either Abū Bakr or Zuhrī when he himself, at the instigation of ʿAbd al-Rahmān ibn Yūsuf, had been abruptly removed by Walīd I from high office (see p. 23) and had remained out of such office throughout the caliphate of Sulaimān, there remains only the period of his own caliphate when he would have been in position to commission Abū Bakr by writing and Zuhrī by oral command.

The next question to be considered is that of the special qualifications of these two men for the project. By the time Umar came to the caliphate, both men had long been recognized as

---

184 See e.g. Dāhābī I 112 f.; Abū Nuʿaym V 331 f., in which Muṣāhim, Umar's trusted client, secretary, and advisor, relates the steps in Umar's development from a worldly prince to a mature and pious scholar.

186 See e.g. Jāmī II 106 f.

188 See e.g. Ibn Sād V 284; Jāmī III 339 f. See also Harley in Journal & Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, New Series XX 407 f., 431, and under separate names in Index (pp. 449–57).

190 Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh III 1, pp. 385 f.; Abū Nuʿaym V 340; Ibn Khallīkān I 341 (= trans. II 75 f.).


192 Umar transmitted from this Abū Bakr, for whom see p. 169; see also Harley, op. cit. pp. 424–31.

195 Jāmī I 180.

198 As confirmed in the case of Abū Bakr by Umar's own musnad; see Harley, op. cit. p. 441. See also Jarḥ, Taqdimah, p. 21.
leaders in religious scholarship, particularly in the related fields of *ḥadîth*, *sunnah*, and *fiqh*. But, whereas Zuhrî was in a sense an academic scholar engaged in collecting, sorting, and transmitting the *ḥadîth* and *sunnah*, Abû Bakr was a man of high public office, who as judge and then governor of Mecca and Medina was perforce concerned less with the theory than with the practical application of the *ḥadîth* and *sunnah*. ‘Umar, as we have seen, was interested in the *ḥadîth* and *sunnah* from both practical and literary points of view. He was interested in them, first, as means of religious guidance and edification for himself and his fellow Muslims and, second, as one of the historical bases of religious law as practiced from the very beginning of Islam. It is, therefore, as much in the careers of Abû Bakr and Zuhrî as in ‘Umar’s objective that one must look for the justification of the two concurrent yet closely related projects. My attention was thus centered on the specific wording, so far as it can be discovered, of ‘Umar’s instructions. The earliest and perhaps the best known report of his commission to Abû Bakr is that found in Shaîbânî’s recension of Mâlik’s *Muwattâ‘*, which reads:

Mâlik informed us (saying) Yahyâ ibn Sa’d al-Ansârî informed us that ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-Azîz wrote to Abû Bakr ibn ‘Amr ibn Ḥâzûm: ‘Look for what there is of the *ḥadîth* of the apostle and of his *sunnah* or of *ḥadîth* ‘Umar or something similar to this [last phrase obviously an editorial comment] and write it down for me for I fear the dissipation of (religious) knowledge and the passing-away of the scholars.’

Some doubts have been cast on the authenticity of this statement because it is found only in the Shaîbânî version of the *Muwattâ‘*. This fact does invite suspicion but actually provides no argument if one recalls that there are omissions and additions in all versions of the *Muwattâ‘* and that this particular report is technically a *khabar* (see pp. 138, 240, and esp. 145) and not a *ḥadîth*. Furthermore, research has revealed that Mâlik himself was fully aware of Muhammad’s written instructions to ‘Amr ibn Ḥâzûm, the grandfather of Abû Bakr, and that Mâlik transmitted in the vulgate version itself related materials from the two sons of Abû Bakr, ‘Abd Allâh and Muhammad. It should be noted also that Mâlik’s knowledge of ‘Umar’s order to Abû Bakr is confirmed, though indirectly, by Bukhârî and Tirmidhî. Again, Tirmidhî’s commentator, Ibn al-‘Arabî al-Ma‘âfîrî, in explaining the lack of a clear-cut statement by Mâlik about ‘Umar’s order to Zuhrî, gives a clue as to the reason for the vulgate’s silence also on his order to Abû Bakr, namely that Mâlik was using only manuscripts for the materials involved in ‘Umar’s order, which he reproduced in the vulgate, and this fact in turn explains why these materials are for the most part introduced by Mâlik without any *isnâd*’s and also why they are not repeated with an *isnâd* that includes Mâlik by either Muslim or Bukhârî.

Returning to the *isnâd* of Shaîbânî’s text we note that he uses the term *akhbaranâ* for his transmission from Mâlik and also for Mâlik’s transmission from Yahyâ ibn Sa’d al-Ansârî, with whom the *isnâd* stops. Thus it was necessary to discover Yahyâ’s source or sources and Mâlik’s fellow pupil or pupils transmitting from Yahyâ, as the plural *akhbaranâ* demands. Yahyâ’s immediate source was a client of Ibn ‘Umar, namely ‘Abd Allâh ibn Dînâr (d. 127/745; see pp. 148 and 152), from whom Mâlik at times transmitted directly. ‘Abd Allâh ibn Dînâr is the initial source for the correspondence between ‘Umar and Abû Bakr as reported by Ibn Sa’d and Dârimî, whose parallel statements reveal two cotransmitters from Yahyâ, above for the sons.


190 Mâlik’s *Muwattâ‘* I 199, 277 f. (No. 39).

191 Mâlik’s *Muwattâ‘* I 235 and 277, II 516 and 517; see p. 24 above for the sons.

192 Bukhârî I 37; Tirmidhî III 101.

193 See e.g. Mâlik’s *Muwattâ‘* I 257–59. Much of Mâlik’s material on the *ṣadaqah* and related subjects is without *isnâd*’s.

194 Tirmidhî III 105–10, text and commentary.


namely Anas ibn ʿIyād (d. 200/814)\textsuperscript{211} and Yazīd ibn Hārūn (118–206/736–821),\textsuperscript{212} and even a source parallel to Yahyā himself, namely ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ibn Muslim (d. 167/783–84),\textsuperscript{213} who, like Yahyā, transmitted his report from ʿAbd Allāh ibn Dīnār. Furthermore, there is still another independent source, Usamah ibn Saʿīd ibn Aslām, who reports ʿUmar’s order directly on the authority of Abū Bakr (see p. 30). There is thus no reason to question Shaibānī’s report, the substance of which was so well known and accepted by early traditionists, by claiming lack of supporting evidence. There is, however, reason to question the interpretation that Muslim and non-Muslim scholars have given to the Shaibānī passage. Taken at its face value and in isolation from significantly related materials, it has been interpreted to mean that ʿUmar II commissioned Abū Bakr to record the entire body of the hadith and sunnah, with emphasis on those of Muhammad—an enormous project that would have called for much if not, indeed, all the time and energy of Abū Bakr, who at the time was over sixty (d. 120/738 at the age of 84) and held the exacting office of governor of Medina.\textsuperscript{214} This interpretation is no doubt responsible, at least in part, for the skepticism accorded Shaibānī’s report by most Western scholars. That such an interpretation is untenable becomes apparent when the Shaibānī report is integrated with the large quantity of source material that bears significantly on ʿUmar’s objective of reviving the sunnah and recording religious knowledge (taqyīd al-ḥilm) for the benefit of his own and succeeding generations of Muslims (see p. 24) and on the steps which he took to accomplish this objective. Examination of a great deal of this source material has led me to the following conclusions. (1) The term sunnah, which frequently alternates with the plural sunan, is not limited to the example or conduct of Muḥammad but applies also to at least the caliphs Abū Bakr and ʿUmar I and to a number of outstanding men who held high office under these three heads of state. (2) The sunan in question refer not to general activities in any phase of life whatsoever but to specific fields of administrative and legal practices. (3) Official documents instituting these sunan in the newly conquered provinces were generally provided for the guidance of the administrative officers. (4) We must look to these documents and to reports of them for a clue as to the true nature and extent of ʿUmar II’s commission to Abū Bakr ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿAmr ibn Ḥazm. Fortunately Ibn Ishaq, the earliest source available, in his account of the written instructions given by Muḥammad to ʿAmr ibn Ḥazm, the grandfather of Abū Bakr, specifies the fields of zakāt, sadaqah, diyyāt, farāʿīd, and sunnah (see p. 24, esp. n. 187). In later reports the term zakāt alternates with or supplements sadaqāt, the two terms not being at first sharply defined. A reading of the twenty-four “books” listed under these five headings in the eight major hadith collections indexed by Muḥammad Fuʾād ʿAbd al-Bāqī\textsuperscript{216} revealed the following trends and facts. (1) Traditions that trace back to the Companions and even more so those that trace back to the Successors and contemporaries of ʿUmar II, Abū Bakr, Yahyā ibn Saʿīd, and Zuhrī are in evidence especially at the beginning of most of these books, urging the need and the duty to be informed about the particular theme treated and to be guided by the practices relating to it. (2) Each of the four specific themes has a special point of emphasis within the general category treated: the sadaqāt and zakāt concern primarily the Islāmic community, as do also the farāʿīd, under which, however, intercommunity inheritance practices are also stressed to some extent; the diyyāt, on the other hand, are more generally con-

\textsuperscript{211} Darimi I 126 (cf. Taqyīd al-ḥilm, pp. 105 f.); Dhahabi I 297.
\textsuperscript{212} Ibn Saʿīd VIII 353.
\textsuperscript{213} Darimi I 126.
\textsuperscript{214} ʿTabarī I 1346; see also p. 23 above.
\textsuperscript{215} Which, prior to my research in connection with the present study, I had little reason to question and therefore followed in Vol. I 18.
\textsuperscript{216} Taisir al-manṭfah (8 vols.; Cairo and Leyden, 1935–39).
cerned with the practices applicable to the "people of the Book," particularly the Jews, than with those applicable to the Muslims. (3) The sunnah, if we judge by the account of Abū Dā'ūd, who alone devotes a "book" to it,\(^n217\) had by the time of ʿUmar II come to stand against all forms of innovation (bidʿah) as opposed to the orthodox practices of departed leaders and of the acknowledged leaders of the day, al-sunnat al-maṣḥiyah and al-sunnat al-qādima. There was particular concern over unorthodox doctrine and new sects, special attention being given to the Khawārij, the ahl al-qadr, and the Jahmiyah.\(^n218\) ʿUmar II's concern over the Khawārij is well known, and we find, for instance, that he penned a long letter on qadr or free will;\(^n219\) elsewhere in these studies we have encountered his writing on the Jahmiyah.\(^n220\) The general impression one gains from reading all this material in the hadīth collections is that differences in practice and opinion had already developed to a considerable degree, particularly in the provinces, in respect to these themes, but more so in the overlapping ṣadaqāt and zakāt fields than in the others, and that ʿUmar II, though aware of the salutary role of legitimate differences of opinion among jurists (ikhšīf al-fuqahā’),\(^n221\) wished to restore a greater degree of uniformity of practice in the provinces and hoped to do so with the aid of original documents from the time of Muḥammad and the caliphs Abū Bakr and ʿUmar I.

Following ʿUmar II’s steps at closer range, we find that his order to Abū Bakr ibn Ḥazm was but one of several orders sent out to those who were in position to help recover these basic documents, which apparently were not deposited in any state archive but had remained in the families of the original recipients. The families most frequently mentioned are those of the caliphs Abū Bakr\(^n222\) and particularly ʿUmar I, for there seems to be general agreement that Muḥammad died before his written instructions on the ṣadaqāt were publicized, that the manuscript was kept and used by Abū Bakr, and that it passed on Abū Bakr’s death to ʿUmar I, who likewise used it in his administration, after which it remained in ʿUmar’s family.\(^n223\) References in this connection to the families of ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib\(^n224\) and ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ are almost as frequent because both of these men had manuscripts (ṣahīfah and kitāb) that were written down from Muḥammad’s dictates\(^n225\) and contained materials relevant to some of the themes listed above, particularly the ṣadaqāt, and these manuscripts remained in the possession of their families. The family of Anas ibn Malik in ʿIrāq comes into this picture

\(^n225\) See e.g. Bukhārī I 365–69; Abū Dā’ūd II 96 f., 98 f.

\(^n222\) See Vol. I 18 and 19. My earlier position that ʿUmar probably issued an order that Tradition be recorded and that the project was probably begun but shelved after ʿUmar’s death has now been expanded and clarified in the light of further research, so that “sunnah” must be substituted for “Tradition.”

\(^n224\) See e.g. Abu Da’ud IV 198 f., 223 f., 231, 241; see also Dārimī I 341 and p. 24 above and p. 73 below.

\(^n223\) See e.g. Bukhārī I 365–69; Abū Dā’ūd II 96 f., 98 f.

\(^n221\) See e.g. Abu Da’ud IV 198 f., 223 f., 231, 241; see also Dārimī I 341 and p. 24 above and p. 73 below.

\(^n219\) Umar’s dedicated concern for justice in his administration and his association with the Qādirīes Ghailān ibn Muḥammad al-Dimīshqī and Ḥasan al-Baṣrī led the Muʿtazilīyah to claim him as they came to claim several other early caliphs and many of the leading scholars of the day; see e.g. Ibn al-Muḍarrī, Ẓabāqat al-Muṭṭāzialah, ed. Susanna Diwald-Wilzer (“Bibliotheca Islamica” XXI (Beirut, 1961)) pp. 25 and 120–40, esp. pp. 120 f. and 136.

\(^n217\) Book 39 of his sunan (= Vol. IV 197–245 in the edition here used).

\(^n218\) See e.g. Abū Dā’ūd IV 198 f., 223 f., 231, 241; see also Dārimī I 341 and p. 24 above and p. 73 below.

\(^n219\) Abū Dā’ūd IV 202–4. ʿUmar’s dedicated concern for justice in his administration and his association with the Qādirīes Ghailān ibn Muḥammad al-Dimīshqī and Ḥasan al-Baṣrī led the Muʿtazilīyah to claim him as they came to claim several other early caliphs and many of the leading scholars of the day; see e.g. Ibn al-Muḍarrī, Ẓabāqat al-Muṭṭāzialah, ed. Susanna Diwald-Wilzer (“Bibliotheca Islamica” XXI (Beirut, 1961)) pp. 25 and 120–40, esp. pp. 120 f. and 136.

\(^n216\) See Vol. I 18 and 19. My earlier position that ʿUmar probably Issed an order that Tradition be recorded and that the project was probably begun but was never completed after ʿUmar’s death has now been expanded and clarified in the light of further research, so that “sunnah” must be substituted for “Tradition.”

\(^n215\) Dārimī I 151:}
because of the written instructions that Anas had received from the caliph Abū Bakr when he appointed Anas to administer the ṣadāqāt; this manuscript came to be in the possession of Anas' grandson Thumāmah.226

Knowledge of the possession of such manuscripts by these families led many jurists and traditionists of succeeding generations to seek them out for such materials. These they cast sometimes as a supplementary khabar, which needed no isnād in the early decades of Islam, and more frequently as a formalized hadith, transmitted as a rule with a family isnād.227 Some of these family isnād's continued unbroken for two or three generations beyond the reign of Umar II, by which time the hadith and sunnah had been combed and sifted as well as organized and reorganized. The latter process involved dividing lengthy original documents into separate items or sections of various lengths depending on the use to which a particular jurist or traditionist wished to put them under a given circumstance. If not fully comprehended this process would give the impression of a sudden huge increase in the number of traditions stemming from the pivotal member of each family at the time of the activities of Umar II and Zuhri.228

Viewed in this light, Umar II's correspondence with Abū Bakr229 represented no more than a fraction of his correspondence with members of the families mentioned above, all aimed at securing authentic copies of the original documents in their possession, if not the documents themselves, together with other sunnah and hadith associated with these families. Thus we see why some of his letters are said to have been addressed now to a specific individual, such as the well known Sālim ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb or Abū Bakr himself, now to a particular city, especially Medina, and again simply to a province.230 Umar's request of Abū Bakr for the hadith of Amrah bint 'Abd al-Rahmān, Abū Bakr's paternal aunt, is part of this picture along with his request for the ṣadāqāh document that belonged originally to Abū Bakr's grandfather. Amrah (d. 98/715 or 106/724) and an older sister lived for some time in Ḥishāh's home, but Amrah was more painstaking with hadith than her sister, especially with the hadith of both Ḥishāh and Umm Salamah. She transmitted to her nephew Abū Bakr and his son 'Abd Allāh,231 to Yahyā ibn Sa'd al-Anṣārī and two of his sons, to Zuhri and others and acquired a reputation for knowledge of hadith.232 But if Umar II sought only family documents and hadith from Abū Bakr, how does one explain his request for the hadith of 'Umar (1) as stated in the Shaibānī text (see p. 26)?233 Ibn Sa'd provides the answer, for his text reads not "hadith 'Umar" but "hadith Amrah,"234 which in the light of the foregoing considerations

---

226 See Bukhārī I 368, II 276 and 289; Abū Dā'ūd II 196 f.; Nasā'ī I 336–38, 340. See also Taqyīd al-ilm, p. 87. For a long list of men appointed by Muḥammad to collect the ṣadāqāt, some of whom served also under the caliphs Abū Bakr and Umar I, see Anṣāb I 529–31.

227 For the family of Ibn 'Umar see e.g. Bukhārī II 280, 284, 288, 290 and IV 319. For the family of 'Abd Allāh ibn Amr ibn al-ʿĀṣ see Abū Dā'ūd IV 178, 184, 189, 190, 195; Dārnī I 194 f., 392; Tirmidhī III 137, VI 165; Ibn Mājah I 85. For the family of 'Ali ibn Abī Tālib see Bukhārī II 270, 275, 276; Abū Dā'ūd III 125, 128, 129.

228 See p. 19 for an example involving the splitting-up of four traditions into seven.

229 His father, Muḥammad ibn 'Amr ibn Ḥāzin, was known to have had a Kitāb fi al-aqālīl, which was probably part of a sunan manuscript just as a similar kitāb was said to form part of the manuscripts in the possession of 'Ali ibn Abī Tālib (cf. Ibn Ḥanbal, Al-musnad II [1366/1947] 599; Bukhārī IV 289, 324).

230 See e.g. Dārnī I 381; Abū Dā'ūd II 98; Amwāl, pp. 358 ff. Umar II wrote Sālim for more information about the dispatches of 'Umar I and about Sālim's personal conduct (see Abū Nuʿaym II 194, V 284–86).

231 See e.g. Ṣaḥḥ I 35, 54, 698, 731 (= trans. pp. 28, 37 f., 408, 494); Tabarī I 1020, 1837.

232 For 'Amrah's biographical entries see Ibn Sa'd II 2, p. 134, and VIII 353; Jarḥ II 4, p. 337; Addā al-Shāfiʿī, p. 289, n. 3; Jamʿ II 610. See also Horovitz in Islamic Culture II 24; Guillaume, The Traditions of Islam, pp. 18 f., and his translation of Ṣaḥḥ, p. xvi.

233 Cf. Dārnī I 126.

234 Ibn Sa'd II 2, p. 134, and VIII 353.
THE EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF ISLAMIC TRADITION

must be correct. This is confirmed by Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī235 and by the text of the pertinent tradition in Bāghandi’s (d. 283/896) later version of the musnad of ʿUmar II,236 which explains further that what ʿUmar requested from Abū Bakr was a particular hadith that ʿUmar had heard Abū Bakr relate from ʿAmrah, namely ʿĀʾishah’s reference to Sūrah 6:139.227 This particular tradition comes through Usāmah ibn Zaid ibn Aslam, a client of the family of ʿUmar I, who reported it directly from Abū Bakr. It is a composite tradition with the three elements requested by ʿUmar II: a copy of the Companions, a copy (list) of the sadaqah administrators with their genealogies,228 and the hadith of ʿAmrah. The fact that the second item is not found in the earlier versions could imply that ʿUmar was asking Abū Bakr for a list of the names of those Companions who, like Abū Bakr’s own grandfather, had administered the sadaqah in the new territories, usually with the aid of such sadaqah documents.

There is still another point to explain: ʿUmar’s request of Abū Bakr for the hadith of Qāsim ibn Muḥammad239 the grandson of the caliph Abū Bakr. But even this request is not difficult to fit into the picture when one recalls that Qāsim was one of the very few scholars who consistently agreed with ʿUmar I in his stand against the recording of Tradition. It would take an order from the caliph, ʿUmar II, executed by Abū Bakr ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿAmr ibn Ḥazm as governor of Medina to persuade Qāsim to oblige by at least dictating his hadith, which as a rule he transmitted sparingly (see p. 13). However, there seems to be no record that Abū Bakr actually approached Qāsim nor any evidence, direct or indirect, that ʿUmar II received any hadith of Qāsim as a result of his request. Nevertheless, the request itself should not be lightly dismissed, since Qāsim was highly reputed for his knowledge of the sunnah and ʿUmar II held him in such esteem that, had he been free to do so, he would have nominated him as his successor to the caliphate.240

One more question remains: If ʿUmar’s request of Abū Bakr was only one of several similar requests of others, why has his name, more than that of others, been associated with ʿUmar’s project? The answer is that much of the emphasis on Abū Bakr’s role is comparatively recent and largely accidental owing to lack of early sources and in part to inadequate research in such sources as have been available. Nevertheless, apart from Abū Bakr’s long personal association with ʿUmar, his role does have a measure of prior claim on one’s attention. For, while he and his family were not the only source of the sunnah materials sought by ʿUmar, Abū Bakr alone, as a member of one of the families possessing such materials, was the governor of a province, and that province was Medina itself, still basking in the proud claim of being the home of the sunnah and hadith of the Prophet.

There is evidence that ʿUmar received copies of the materials he sought241 and that his next step was to assign Zuhāl the task of co-ordinating this particular sunnah material so that it

235 See Jarḥ, Taqdimah, p. 21, and Jarḥ IV 2, p. 337.
236 See Harley in Journal & Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, New Series XX 391–488 (Arabic text on pp. 415–48); for Bāghandi and the family isnād see pp. 408 f. G. AL-S. 1259 and 947 credits the son, Ibn al-Bāghandi (d. 311/923), with the work.
238 The text may be corrupt. ʿUmar II also wrote Abū Bakr to send him a list of Muhammad’s servants (see Ibn Sa’d I 2, pp. 179 f.); See Tabari III 1778–82, ʿAbdī, Al-ʿawāfi fi ʿal-waṣaṣ, ed. Hellmut Ritter (Wiesbaden, 1931) I 177 f., and Nuwairi, Nīṣābat al-arab fi funūn al-adab XVIII (Cairo, 1374/1955) 223–35 for lists of Muhammad’s freeborn servants and his mawālit. ʿUmar corresponded steadily with his governors and judges (see e.g. Muṣawwar I 243, 270, 277 f. and especially ʿUmar’s entry in Ibn Sa’d V 242–302, esp. pp. 252–57, 268, 270, 277 f.). Abū Nuwas’ V 253 ff. also makes numerous references to ʿUmar’s correspondence.
239 See Jarḥ IV 2, p. 337, where this request is linked with that for the hadith of ʿAmrah.
240 Ibn Sa’d V 140; Buḥkārī, Taqdimah IV 1, p. 157.
241 See Amwdl, pp. 358–61; Abū Daʿūd II 98 f. Copies of at least some of these manuscripts were available to others in Medina (see e.g. Amwdl, pp. 386 f. and 392 f.).
could be publicized in the provinces. This, rather than the tremendous task of recording all the 
*sunnah* and *hadith*, must have been the commission given by 'Umar II to Zuhrī. Zuhrī's parallel 
interests and activities, his previous service with the Umayyads, his presence at the Damascus 
court, and 'Umar's personal knowledge of his dedicated competence made him the obvious 
choice for the task. 'Umar, as one might expect, gave Zuhrī all the official and moral support 
at his command in order to further all of his scholarly activities. He ranked Zuhrī first among 
the *sunnah* and *hadith* scholars and urged all to heed Zuhrī and to aid him in the execution of 
his task.\(^{242}\) That Zuhrī did co-ordinate the manuscripts received by 'Umar, having first himself 
checked some of the original documents, particularly those possessed by the family of 'Umar 
I, which seem to receive more specific mention than do the others, is indicated by the great 
quantity of material in the chapters devoted to the *sunan* themes concerned as they are 
preserved in the standard *hadith* collections and in Abū 'Ubaid's *Kitāb al-amwāl*,\(^{243}\) which treats 
these very themes in great detail. Though Zuhrī's sources for these materials were not limited 
to the members of the families said to possess the manuscripts sought by 'Umar II, by far the 
greater part of his material does trace back to one or another of these families, particularly 
lengthy texts copied in their entirety (*alā al-wājih*) from those manuscripts. Without attempting 
to exhaust the available references, we may mention some of the members of these families 
from whom Zuhrī transmitted such materials. He transmitted directly from Thumāmah the 
grandson of the caliph Abū Bakr,\(^{244}\) from Sālim and 'Abd Allāh the sons of Ibn 'Umar,\(^{245}\) from 
'Ali ibn Ḥusain ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib,\(^{246}\) from Abū Bakr ibn Muhammad ibn 'Amr ibn Ḥazm\(^{247}\) 
and his two sons, 'Abd Allāh and Muḥammam.\(^{248}\) Zuhrī also transmitted a great deal of such 
material without indicating his sources,\(^{249}\) and he had, of course, no monopoly on the use of it, 
not even of the manuscripts that figured so prominently in the *sadaqāt*, which, as pointed out 
above, were available to others because copies of the originals were in circulation.\(^{250}\) 'Umar II 
apparently did not leave the process of editing, co-ordinating, and explaining\(^{251}\) entirely to 
Zuhrī, for there is considerable evidence of co-operation between the two,\(^{252}\) and Zuhrī was 
aware of the practices that led to 'Umar's steady stream of correspondence with his governors 
and judges in all the provinces.\(^{253}\)

The paper work involved in Zuhrī's task and the size of the final product must have been 
considerable, if we judge by the amount of material available, only a small part of which is 
indicated in the references here given. Zuhrī himself reported the completion of the task to his 
close associate Sa'd ibn Ibrāhīm and to his pupil 'Uqail ibn Khālid,\(^{254}\) when copies of the 
finished product, each constituting a *daftar*, were sent to the various provinces.\(^{255}\) I have not

---

180 See *Jārī* I, p. 18; Dāhābī I 102; Ibn Kāθīr, *Al-bidāyāt wa al-nihāyāt* IX 342; Ibn Khallīkān I 571 
(= trans. II 582).


182 *Bukhārī*, I 368 f., II 276; Abū Dā'ūd II 96 f., No. 1557. See Nasā'ī I 336-38 and *Amwāl*, pp. 365, 371, 376, 
and 388, for the family manuscripts.

360 f., 365, 387, 393.

184 *Muwaṭṭa* II 619; Bukhārī II 270, 275 f. and IV 290; Abū Dā'ūd III 125, 128 f.; Dārīmī II 370 f., 388; Tirmidhī 
VIII 257. The caliph 'All and the Shī'ites in general considered Zuhrī a major opponent; see e.g. Ibn Shurbāb, 

185 Dārīmī I 381, 383, 385 and II 188 f., 192 f., 194 f. 

186 See *Bukhārī* I 358, 365 f., 367. See also p. 24 above.

187 See e.g. *Dārīmī* II 359, 378, 386, 390, 393, 395; 

188 See e.g. *Amwāl*, pp. 361, 387 f., 392 f., 408 f.  

189 See e.g. *ibid.* pp. 382, 537.

190 See e.g. *ibid.* pp. 379, 384 f., 393, 355.

191 See e.g. *ibid.* pp. 347, 405, 416 f., 421, 423, 425, 476, 
494, 527, 534, 537, 538.

192 For Sa'd and his family of scholars see pp. 180 f. 

193 and for 'Uqail see Document 6, esp. pp. 168 and 172.

194 *Amwāl*, pp. 578-80; *Jarī* I 76: امّا عمر بن عبد 

195 الزبير بعج السَن ْ فَكَتَبَهَا دَفْرًا فَعَمَثَ الْقُلُب 

196 ارضَ لِهِ ْ عَلَيْهَا سَلَطَانَ دَفْرًا.
yet been able to discover any specific reference to the reception accorded these manuscripts in the provinces. One can speculate that they might not have been particularly welcome in 'Iraq, which was always more or less independent in following established local practices or in initiating new ones. There certainly was some excuse for variant practices, even as early as the time of the caliphs Abū Bakr and 'Umar I, as a result of local administrators' efforts to interpret and execute the original instructions, which apparently were neither explicit nor inclusive enough. One suspects, from the lack of comment about their reception, that the untimely death of 'Umar II and the indifference of his successor, Yazīd II (101-5/720-24), to administrative problems induced the administrators of the provinces to bypass the new regulations. In any case an opportunity to introduce more or less uniform practices in relation to these particular sunan throughout the empire was lost, and the chances for another such opportunity were slipping away rapidly. For the jurists' agreement, tacit at first, to disagree among themselves within certain orthodox limits, which had become evident before 'Umar II's time, was sanctioned and encouraged by 'Umar himself and by Qāsim ibn Muḥammad as a mercy from Allāh, and took firmer hold in the succeeding decades as the legal schools of Abū Ḥanīfah and Sufyān al-Thawrī in 'Iraq, Awaẓī in Syria, Mālik ibn Anas in the Hijāz, and Laīth ibn Sa'd in Egypt became established. But, if the administrators bypassed the new regulations, the academic jurists and traditionists did not do so. All of Zuhār's leading pupils (see pp. 176 ff.) and their leading contemporaries were familiar with the content of the new regulations if we judge by their transmission of these Zuhār materials that appear in the standard ḥadīth collections. Jurists and productive scholars—beginning with those of Zuhār's own generation—studied, dissected, and analyzed Zuhār's position, accepting some of his points and rejecting others, as is well illustrated in the works of Shāfiʿī and particularly in Abū ʿUbayd's Kītbāt al-amwāl. Almost half of the Amwāl is devoted to the practical and theoretical aspects of the ḥadaqāt, which, as we have seen (p. 30), loomed so large in the 'Umar-Zuhār project of recording and codifying the sunnah.

To recapitulate, 'Umar II issued no commission for the recording of the entire body of the sunnah, let alone the entire body of the sunnah and ḥadīth. On the other hand, his aim went beyond mere recording to recovering and codifying the large part of the sunnah that dealt with the fundamentals of much of the economic life of the people: taxes, blood money, inheritance, and especially the collection and disbursement of those peculiarly Islamic taxes the ḥadaqāt and the zakāt. The successful completion of this project was due to the co-operation of many of his governors, judges, and tax administrators, with whom he had a great deal of correspondence, to the grandsons of the caliph Abū Bakr, 'Umar I, Anas ibn Mālik, and 'Amr ibn Ḥazm, who collectively provided the needed documentary materials, and to the dedicated industry and talents of Zuhār. That 'Umar II himself did not live to see the enforcement of the resulting regulations was one of the many ironies of his life.

---

256 See Ibn Sa'd V 140; Jāmī' II 35, 78-92 (esp. pp. 78-80, where 'Umar II's position is detailed), and 167 f. The full legalistic development of the principle, one might almost any dogma, was left for Shāfiʿī (150-204/767-820); see Concordance II 67 f. خلفي and Shāfiʿī's Kītbāt ikhtilāf al-ḥadīth (on margins of Kītbāt al-umm VII) pp. 1 f.; Goldziher, Studien II 37-83; A. J. Wenckstern, The Muslim Creed (Cambridge, 1932) pp. 110-13; James Robson, "The material of Tradition," Muslim World XLI (1951) 169 f. Concordance I 329 رحمة stresses unity: 

الجماعة رحمة والفرقة عذاب. This principle was applied also to the differences between transmission by sense and literal transmission (see Jarḥ, Taqdimah, p. 253).

257 See e.g. Bukhari II 270-88 (13 times), IV 282-92 (12 times) and 314-25 (6 times); Muslim XI 51-61 (5 times); Abū Dārūd III 121, 125, 130 (4 times); Tirmidhi VIII 240-63 (10 times); Dārimi II 348-51 (12 times).
Zuhri lived and carried on his literary activities for almost a quarter of a century after the death of Umar II. Did his patron’s death alter his outlook enough to give a different bent to these activities? There is reason to believe that Zuhri realized the futility of any effort to impose uniform regulations on all the provinces, particularly Medina, for he advised Yazid II’s newly appointed governor of that province to follow the consensus of his people since “they reject everything contrary to their practice.” Zuhri’s new patrons, first Yazid II (101-5/720-24) and then Hishâm (105-25/724-42), made special demands on his time and knowledge. Yazid appointed him judge and Hishâm intrusted him with the education of the princes and consulted him on legal questions and historical events. Zuhri’s versatility led others, including Khalid al-Qasrawi, Hishâm’s governor of ‘Iraq (106-20/724-38), to demand or request genealogical and historical works from him. On the whole, however, he seems to have been allowed to follow his own scholarly inclinations. The latter, as we have seen, included an abiding interest in the hadith and sunnah—an interest that was reinforced by Hishâm’s marked concern for the preservation of this fundamental body of knowledge. For it is now well established that it was neither Abd al-Malik nor Umar II but Hishâm who finally induced Zuhri to commit the hadith and sunnah to writing, for the benefit of the young princes and several enterprising court secretaries who made copies for themselves as well as for the enrichment of Hishâm’s library. Zuhri’s accomplishment did not escape the envy nor the admiration of the scholars of his own generation, including his friend Sa’d ibn Ibrahim (see p. 31), his fellow courtier Abû al-Zinâd, and his fellow searcher after knowledge Salih ibn Kaisân, who had served for a while as tutor to the sons of Umar II. It would nevertheless be erroneous to conclude that royal pressure alone led Zuhri step by step from the dwindling number of those who were opposed to the recording of Tradition to writing rough notes which he memorized and then destroyed, to making permanent records for himself and his royal patrons, to urging his own students to record his materials, and finally to encouraging the general public to acquire through both the oral and the written method an adequate knowledge of the hadith and

1 Horovitz in Islamic Culture II 38-50 gives for this period of Zuhri’s life an account that is especially useful for its reproduction of Arabic texts from the sources.
2 Tabari II 1452.
3 Ma’rîf, p. 239 see also Horovitz, op. cit. p. 38.
4 See Dhahabi I 103 and references in nn. 5-6 below.
5 Ma’rîf, pp. 185 and 203; Aghânî XIX 59.
7 See Taqyld al-sîm, pp. 107 f. and reference there cited. Bukhârî, Ta’rîkh III 2, p. 196, merely lists Hishâm among the traditionists, while others give him no entry at all. Hishâm seems to have been especially interested in traditions bearing on the ‘Ali vs. ‘Uthmân polemics; see Ibn al-Imâd, Shadhahat al-dhahab I (Cairo, 1350/1931) 221.
8 See e.g. Jâmî I 76 f.; Abû Na’ûm III 361. See also our Vol. I 24 f. and p. 177 below. In Taqyld al-sîm, p. 107 and the editor’s note 224, the many references to the royal pressure exerted on Zuhri are brought together. The hasty assumption by Sprenger and Muir, followed by Guillaume (The Traditions of Islam, pp. 49-50) and others, that Umayyad pressure forced Zuhri to large-scale forgery of hadith should be definitely and finally abandoned.
9 Dhahabi I 103 f. cites laudatory contemporary opinions of Zuhri; cf. Horovitz, op. cit. p. 45.
10 Jâmî I 73, 76.
11 See e.g. Ibn Sa’d II 2, p. 135; Jâmî I 76; Taqyld al-sîm, pp. 106 f.
12 See e.g. Abû Nu’aim III 366: حضور المجلس بلا: نسخة ذل Zuhri required his students to bring their inkwells too (see Adab al-imlâ, p. 155).
sunna\textsuperscript{h}. An equally decisive factor in this progression was the growing strength, as seen above, of variant practices in the provinces, whence came, particularly from the eastern provinces, unfamiliar and, to Zuhr\texttextipa{f} at least, unacceptable traditions. "Were it not for this," he is reported as saying, "I would not write Tradition nor permit its writing."\textsuperscript{13} Another contributory factor was Zuhr\texttextipa{f}'s realization that even the best memory was inadequate for the full preservation of a people's cultural and historical heritage, and the versatile Zuhr\texttextipa{f} had a keen and proud sense of history. Again, Zuhr\texttextipa{f} as an Arab of the Arabs,\textsuperscript{14} like many of his time, became increasingly alarmed at the growing participation of the non-Arab Muslims, particularly the Persian maw\texttextipa{d}li from the eastern provinces, in the cultural life of Isl\texttextipa{m}. Many of the maw\texttextipa{d}li developed a determined avidity for the learned professions, both secular and religious, as a sort of open sesame to social recognition and a counterbalance to the racial discrimination to which they were subjected despite the theoretical equality of all Muslims.\textsuperscript{15} It is not necessary to go into the details of the early phases of the racial tension between Arab and non-Arab Muslims that presently came to be known under the name of the shu\texttextipa{b}\texttextipa{b}iyah and was incited largely by the Persians, who aimed first for equality with the Arabs but later boldly proclaimed racial and cultural superiority over their resented conquerors.\textsuperscript{16} It is enough to note that some tension existed from the beginning, that one of its earliest victims was 'Umar I, and that Mu\texttextipa{r}awiyyah at one time considered taking drastic measures against non-Arabs and even against people of mixed blood.\textsuperscript{17} Nor is it necessary to dwell on the growing list of successful maw\texttextipa{d}li scholars in the various provinces with whom Zuhr\texttextipa{f} did not come into personal contact\textsuperscript{18} but many of whom are represented in the isn\texttextipa{d}.'s of our had\texttextipa{th} documents (see e.g. pp. 211, 229). Zuhr\texttextipa{f} in his younger days recognized the maw\texttextipa{d}li's scholarly achievements and the accompanying privileges, even though the situation disturbed 'Abd al-Malik as he questioned Zuhr\texttextipa{f} about the leading scholars of the day.\textsuperscript{19} Though Zuhr\texttextipa{f} did transmit had\texttextipa{th} from such maw\texttextipa{d}li scholars as Ar\texttextipa{raj}, N\texttextipa{f}\texttextipa{f} the client of Ibn 'Umar, and Mak\texttextipa{h}ul al-Sh\texttextipa{h}\texttextipa{m} (see p. 241), he was accused of transmitting only from Arab scholars,\textsuperscript{20} a charge which he answered by explaining that he did transmit from the maw\texttextipa{d}li but only when he could not find the materials with either the Quraish or the An\texttextipa{s}r.\textsuperscript{21} He later found himself in professional and personal rivalry with two leading Medinan scholars, Ab\texttextipa{b} al-Zin\texttextipa{d} (see pp. 139, 178) and Rab\texttextipa{b}ah al-Ra\texttextipa{f} (see pp. 122, 125), both of whom were maw\texttextipa{d}li who rose to power, the first along with Zuhri himself at the

\begin{itemize}
  \item\textsuperscript{13} See Taq\texttextipa{y}d al-\texttextipa{ilm}, pp. 107 f. and references there cited. See p. 21 above for similar concern on the part of 'Abd al-Malik.
  \item\textsuperscript{14} He was so conscious of being a Quraishite that he would not transmit traditions even from the An\texttextipa{s}r until 'Abd al-Malik pointed out his error. He then sought the An\texttextipa{s}r and testified to their possession of 'ilm; see 'Abd All\texttextipa{h} ibn Zahr al-Rab\texttextipa{b} (d. 379/989), Al-muntaqa min akh\texttextipa{b}r al-Asma\texttextipa{'}, ed. 'Iz\texttextipa{z} al-Din al-Tanukhi ("Publications de l'Acad\textsuperscript{e}mie arabe de Damas," No. 7 [Damascus, 1355/1936]) p. 19.
  \item\textsuperscript{15} See e.g. Ibn Sa\texttextipa{d} II 1, p. 103, and V 222; Dar\texttextipa{f} II 443. For the racial origins and the legal categories of the maw\texttextipa{d}li of the period, see W. Montgomery Watt, "Shi\texttextipa{a}m under the Um\texttextipa{y}y\texttextipa{d}e," Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1960, pp. 158-72, esp. pp. 163 f. and 172.
  \item\textsuperscript{16} The basic study of this movement is still that of Goldziher in Studien I 147-76; but see also Sir Hamilton Gibb, "The social significance of the shu\texttextipa{b}\texttextipa{b}iyah," Studia orientalia Ioanni Pedersen septuagenario (Hauniae, 1953) pp. 105-14. For a recent general account from an Arab point of view of the far-reaching influence of the movement see 'Abd al-Asiz al-D\texttextipa{r}i, Al-judhur al-ta\texttextipa{q}\texttextipa{b}iyyah li al-shu\texttextipa{b}\texttextipa{b}iyah (Beir\texttextipa{t}, 1382/1962).
  \item\textsuperscript{17} See e.g. Iqd II 270, 334.
  \item\textsuperscript{18} See e.g. Fut\texttextipa{h} al-bul\texttextipa{d}an, pp. 246 f.; Mar\texttextipa{f}ijah, pp. 196-202; Mandqib, p. 502. See also our Vol. I 28 f.
  \item\textsuperscript{19} See Mar\texttextipa{f}ijah, pp. 196-202, esp. pp. 198 f., for a long list of maw\texttextipa{d}li and the role they played. For the relationship of Zuhr\texttextipa{f} and 'Abd al-Malik see pp. 21 f. above. 'Ur\texttextipa{w}ah is said to have pointed out that the Israelites did not go astray until the sons of foreign captives who grew up among them expressed their own opinions (Jar\texttextipa{h}, Taq\texttextipa{t}imak, p. 254).
  \item Dhahabi I 94.
  \item Ibn Sa\texttextipa{d} II 2, p. 135.
\end{itemize}
court of Hishām22 and the second at the court of the ‘Abbāsids.23 The Persian and other mawdūt who, unlike the Arabs, had as a group no inordinate pride or faith in memory, took to recording their hadith and fiqh materials. They profited from the labors of the early Arab scholars and became in time the proud and almost sole possessors of unique and rare copies of the collections and works of many an Arab traditionist and scholar encountered in these pages.24 Furthermore, it was largely this group that produced the leaders of the people of reasoned opinion (ahl al-ra'y)—witness the roles of Rabī‘ah al-Ra‘ī and Ḥammād ibn ʿAbū Sulaimān, the teacher of ʿAbū Ḥanīfah25—as against the supporters of Tradition (ahl al-hadith). This situation no doubt irked Zuhrī and played a part in his decision to record the hadith and sunnah, as a safeguard against such intellectual and literary competition. When Zuhrī finally retired from the court he preferred not to settle in Medina. Taken to task for thus leaving “the scholars of Medina orphaned,” he replied that Medina and its people had changed and that the city had been spoiled for him, in particular by ʿAbū al-Zinād and Rabī‘ah.26 Once convinced of the need to record the hadith and sunnah, Zuhrī concentrated all his energies on the task and put writing and manuscripts to their fullest use (see e.g. Document 6). Though not the originator of the ʿarḍ method of transmission, whereby the student read back his manuscript (written from dictation or copied from an authenticated manuscript) to the teacher, nor the muḥātah method, whereby manuscripts were received by correspondence, nor the munāwalah method, whereby manuscripts exchanged hands with no accompanying oral reading, nor the ājdah method, whereby the teacher certified that a given student was permitted to transmit the teacher’s materials (usually specified) regardless of the methods by means of which the student acquired copies of them, Zuhrī adopted all these practices without reservation. Yet he seems to have dispensed with some form of oral transmission only after a scholar or student had demonstrated his competence and trustworthiness. Despite some criticism27 from the conservatives, Zuhrī and his pupils established these practices so firmly that they became known as “people with books” (aṣḥāb al-kutub).28 Very soon thereafter those who insisted on the priority of oral transmission became such a small minority that by the third decade of the second century, which saw the transition from the Umayyad to the ʿAbbāsīd caliphate, the Zuhrī period came to be generally recognized as the age of the manuscript in all branches of the religious and related sciences.29 Confirmation of this development is repeatedly evidenced by the practices of the great majority of the leading scholars, representing most of the provinces, whose names appear in the insād’s of our papyri. Adequately represented are most of the best known men such as Anas ibn Mālik, ʿAbū Hurairah, and Ibn ʿAbbās as well

22 See e.g. Aḫbār VI 106.
23 Jāmiʿ II 144 f.
24 See e.g. Ma‘rīfah, pp. 164 f., for a list of early Arab scholars whose works were mostly in the possession of Persians.
25 Khatīb XIII 323 f.; Ma‘rīfah, p. 240; Abū Yūsuf, Kūṭub al-abār, ed. Abū al-Wafā’ al-Afghānī (Haidarābd, 1355/1936) p. 3 of Intro. and references there cited. Ḥammād did not hesitate to belittle the scholars of the Hijāz (Jāmiʿ II 152 f.) any more than Zuhrī hesitated to belittle those of ʿIrāq (cf. p. 140 below). See Ma‘rīfah, pp. 248–51, and Jāmiʿ II 133–50 for the people of reasoned opinion and the role of opinion in law. Zuhrī himself permitted limited use of opinion (see e.g. Jāmiʿ II 10 f.). Racial rivalry expressed in verse at ʿĪshām’s court led Ḥishām to exile the offending poet (Aḫbār IV 125).
26 Jāmiʿ II 152 f., 200. Resentment of the mawdūt’s invasion of the learned professions persisted well into ʿAbbāsīd times, and instances of it are known from the reigns of Mānsūr, Māhid, and Hārūn al-Rašīd (see e.g. ʿIqd II 90 f.). Jāmiʿ II 161 and Abū Nūʿaim VI 369 report Sufyān al-Thaurī’s strong aversion to the entry of non-Arabs and the lower classes into the learned fields. Awaqūf’s often quoted regrets that writing had replaced oral transmission must not be divorced from the rest of his statement, namely that writing made hadīth available to those who would be apt to misuse it (see e.g. Ibn Sa‘d II 2, p. 135; Dārīmī I 121; Taqqid al-imām, p. 64; Jāmiʿ I 68). See e.g. Dhahābī I 104.
27 See Document 6 (esp. pp. 181, 182, 184) and Ibn ʿAshākīr VI 379.
28 Dhahābī I 149–51.
as the many prominent transmitters from Ibn ¢Umar and ¢Abd Allâh ibn ¢Amr ibn al-¢Äš and others among Zuhrî’s teachers such as Makhût al-Shâmî and A’raj along with their contemporaries such as Abû Qilâbah of Document 10. There are also Zuhrî’s own contemporaries such as Yahyâ ibn Sa’îd al-Ansârî of Document 7 and Abû al-Zinâd. Finally, dozens of the less famous scholars and many more comparatively obscure men appear in the thousand or so links of the isnâd’s of our thirteen ḥadîth papyri and the isnâd’s of parallel traditions.

Three inescapable conclusions result from the study of these practices. The first is that the family isnâd emerged earlier and persisted on a much larger scale than has hitherto been recognized (see pp. 17, 28–29). The “family” in this connection includes both blood members and intimate mawâlî such as Nâfî the client of Ibn ¢Umar and Muḥammad ibn Sîrîn the client of Anas ibn Mâlik. Family isnâd’s that start with famous Companions and continue for three generations, usually with the formula “so-and-so on the authority of his father on the authority of his grandfather,” are most frequent. Sometimes a family isnâd skipped a generation, when an older traditionist found a grandson eager to follow in his footsteps or crossed over to a collateral branch when a nephew proved to be an apt pupil. Such relationships are usually indicated in the isnâd. But with clients the relationship, as a rule, has to be discovered independently of the wording of the isnâd itself. A number of family isnâd’s that traced back to prominent Companions such as Anas ibn Mâlik, Zaid ibn Thâbit, Ibn ¢Umar, ¢Abd Allâh ibn ¢Amr ibn al-¢Äš, Ibn ¢Abbas, and Urwah ibn al-Zubair very early became greatly respected and remained so through the centuries in the Muslim world, where traditions with authentic and reliable family isnâd’s came to be listed among the five most acceptable categories. However, the family isnâd as such has come under suspicion as a result of Western scholarship. Some suspicion may be justifiable in specific instances, but to cast suspicion on a large part of the materials transmitted through such isnâd’s seems unwarranted. The comparatively large number of traditions transmitted through these families should not be dissociated from the fact that written transmission (see below) was advocated from the start by all of the above-mentioned Companions except Zaid ibn Thâbit and Ibn ¢Umar, and even these two lived to see their sons and clients take to recording Tradition, including the materials they had at first received orally from them. And it is not surprising to find that, though some half-dozen of Ibn ¢Umar’s sons were respected traditionists, his clients, especially Nâfî and Sâlim, were actually more devoted to the profession. Thus they and a few others, such as ¢Ikrimah the client of Ibn ¢Abbas, were setting the pattern whereby the mawâlî could climb the ladder of learning toward economic and social equality with the Arabs, particularly in the emerging religious disciplines (see pp. 16 and 34). Viewed against this background the doubts that Schacht, among a few others, has cast on the institution of the family isnâd in general and on isnâd’s in which Nâfî and Sâlim are central figures in particular do not seem as categorically justifiable as he seeks to make them. Family isnâd’s stemming from other Companions were numerous, as illustrated by the dozen or more encountered in our few fragmentary papyri. They meet the eye frequently in the voluminous works of Ibn Sa’d and Bukhârî and subsequent biographical literature and appear again and again in the standard ḥadîth collections.

The second inescapable conclusion is that there was early and direct relationship between

---

30 See e.g. Jâmî II 178, 185, 195–97 and references in n. 31 below.

31 See Madkhâl, pp. 17–20 (= trans. pp. 20–22), where other family isnâd’s are added. See also Tadrîb, pp. 220–23.
the family isnād and continuous written transmission of hadith through several generations. Keeping an eye on the transmitting families that most frequently came to my attention, I discovered first that the over-all success of such families, as measured by the number of successive generations of transmitters and as roughly gauged by the relative volume of the materials they transmitted, depended on whether or not they were hadith-writing families that preserved their manuscripts and passed them from one generation to the next. It is no accident that the families of Anas ibn Malik and ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ practically head the list, though exact ranking is difficult. Anas’ family had several direct and collateral generations of writers who cherished the documents that had been received by Anas, at least one of which was in the possession of his grandson Thumāmah (see p. 29) when ʿUmar II was seeking original documents preliminary to the codifying of the sunnah by Zuhrī. There was also Anas’ hadith as he himself wrote it, and he encouraged his family to write down hadith also.34 Again, the sources are unanimously emphatic that ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ (see p. 28) from the start recorded hadith and sunnah. His family isnād covered four generations of writers,35 and there is some evidence of manuscripts being found (wijādah) after the death of the author, beginning with ʿAbd Allāh’s original ẓahifah, which was among the family possessions and copies of which were sent to ʿUmar II for Zuhrī’s use. The illiterate Abū Hurairah established no genuine family isnād, but several of his immediate transmitters who recorded his hadith did so. Among these is Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam, whose family isnād extended to his son ʿAbd al-ʿĀzīz to the latter’s son ʿUmar (see pp. 19–20). The isnād of the family of ʿUbādah ibn al-Ṣāmīt al-ʿAnṣārī represents three generations of writers (see pp. 187 f.).

As we move into the second generation of Muslims, both Arabs and mawdūt, we find an even greater number of traditionists who established the first link of family isnād’s that usually continued for three generations. So far as I have been able to discover, the sources are sometimes silent on some of these family isnād’s, but those that were better known and most frequently used seem to represent almost without exception literate families. Attention is here drawn to instances that I encountered in the course of editing our documents, such as the families of Saʿd ibn Ibrāhīm,36 Ṭaḥṣīs ibn Kaisān the Yemenite commentator and traditionist,37 Bukair ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-ʾAshajj, Abū ʿAṭīf Zuhraḥ ibn Maʿbad (see pp. 201 f., 207), and Ḥumaid al-Ṭawīl (see p. 159). Family isnād’s of several generations of literate traditionists imply continuous written transmission, an implication that is reinforced by the large number of traditions accredited to the members of such families and by the appearance of clusters of such traditions in the standard collections. These traditions are best illustrated in the musnad’s of the founders of such family isnād’s as are recorded by Ibn Ḥanbal, who himself was grateful that his predecessors had recorded Tradition. He wrote down all his materials, which as a rule he transmitted only from his manuscripts. He urged his sons and pupils, to whom he left his manuscripts, to follow the same practices and thus established a family isnād of three very active generations of traditionists.38 Ibn Ḥanbal knew whereof he spoke when he described his own Musnad as “the exemplar” (al-imām) for the guidance of future generations. Though what he had in mind was only the substance of isnād and matn, Ibn Ḥanbal actually “builted better than he knew” because of the wealth of information, both implicit and explicit, that he scat-

34 See e.g. Vol. I 48 and p. 249 below.
35 See e.g. Taḥṣīs, pp. 287 f.; Tirmidhī III 137. See also Jāmiʾ I 70 f., 76; Taqād al-ʿilm, pp. 74 ff.
38 His methods were followed by later Ḥanbalites as well (see e.g. Jāmiʾ I 75; Adab al-ʿilm, pp. 47 and 167; Abū Naṣrʾīm IX 164 ff.).
tered through his Musnad about the methods of transmission of individual and family-group traditionists. For many of the families listed above there is the added evidence of father dictating to son and of family manuscripts exchanging hands or being willed to some member of the family (wasīyah) or just being found (wijḍah) in the effects of the author soon after his death or among the family possessions at some later time.  

However, the literate families of several generations had no monopoly on continuous written transmission. Zuhri, for example, established only a short family isnād through his nephew, but his non-family transmitters established in turn their own family isnād’s and thus preserved in writing the great bulk of the master’s original materials. The literary activities of Zuhri’s leading pupils are fully detailed in the discussion of Document 6 and elsewhere in these pages to illustrate the point under discussion and need not detain us here. Attention should be drawn, however, to the fact that what Zuhri and his immediate group were doing in the way of continuous written transmission was, except for the amount of material involved, no different from what many of their contemporaries were doing. Good examples of such continuous written transmission are that from Abū Hurairah to A’raj and from the latter to Zuhri, Abū al-Zinād, and Mālik ibn Anas, and that from Zuhri to Ma’mar ibn Rāshid to ‘Abd al-Razzāq ibn Hammām and from ‘Abd al-Razzāq to Sufyān ibn ‘Uyainah, Ibn Ḥanbal, Bukhārī, and others (see e.g. pp. 43 f., 180). Family isnād’s continued to be established in the post-Zuhri period, when written transmission may be taken for granted. For thereafter controversy centered around the methods of written transmission (see p. 35)—mukātābah, munawalah, ijdāh, and wijḍah, the last two having yet to be accepted.

Widespread and acceptable as the family isnād and written transmission had become, individual family isnād’s were scrutinized by second- and third-century critics who acted on the principle that an isnād was no stronger than its weakest link and accordingly disregarded a family isnād once they were convinced that it contained a weak link, as is illustrated in the case of the family isnād of Rishdin ibn Sa’d of Document 8, which was characterized as the worst isnād to come out of Egypt (see pp. 201, 206 f.). The family isnād of Ibn Ishāq was severely criticized by some, and in Zuhri’s own case his nephew and his clients hover dimly in the background while his leading pupils loom large in any sizable individual musnad or standard collection of hadīth, as demonstrated in Document 6 (see esp. pp. 176 ff.). The hadīth critic ‘Alī ibn al-Madīnī (see p. 80) listed some very prominent men, beginning with the Companions, whose traditions, though not to be rejected completely, were not to be used as conclusive evidence. Ḥākim al-Nisābūrī picked up the idea and listed the sons and grandsons of several prominent traditionists of the first and second generations to whom he applied this reservation not because they were untrustworthy but because they were too preoccupied with affairs other than hadīth. Instances of continuous written transmission through several generations of scholars, with or without the benefit of a family isnād, occur repeatedly in all of our thirteen hadīth documents. Pride in the profession of one’s family was encouraged in all fields of scholarship. Families which aspired to successive generations of traditionists or other professional scholars had first to win their reputation and thereafter beware of resting on their
laurels. Inclination and sustained effort usually gave out by the third or fourth generation, by which time the original family manuscripts very likely would be worn out or subject to neglect and possible destruction.

The development of the family isnād and continuous written transmission lead to the third inescapable conclusion (see pp. 36 f.), namely that the bulk of the hadith and sunnah as they had developed by about the end of the first century was already written down by someone somewhere, even though comparatively small numbers of memorized traditions were being recited orally. The writing was done on various scales and in various forms. There were at first the sheets, pamphlets, rolls, and books of the pious traditionist, which had little or no intended organization. Very soon, however, the musnad of an individual traditionist took form against a background of collections that were heterogenous as to both content and source. A third form, parallel to the musnad's, was the hadith mubawwab or the hadith musannaf, which developed largely as a result of the activities and needs of the early Qur'ānic commentators, jurists, and historians, who depended so heavily on hadith that not only the fiqh but the tafsīr, the ta'rikh, and particularly the maghāzī can be described as the fruits of Tradition (see pp. 2 f., 11 f., 16 f.), as is so well illustrated by the activities of Zuhri himself as traditionist, jurist, and historian. The next step—the forming of a collection of individual musnad's or the sorting and reorganizing of the contents according to an individual scholar's purpose and needs—was taken by the post-Zuhri scholars of the second century: commentators such as Muqātil ibn Sulaimān of Document 1, historians such as Ibn Ishāq, and jurists such as Abū Ḥanīfah and Sufyān al-Thawrī in 'Irāq, Awzā'ī in Syria, Mālik ibn Anas in Medina, and Laith ibn Sa'd in Egypt, who represented local practices and founded their own schools. All of these scholars and many others have repeatedly come to my attention in the texts and isndd's of our documents or in the research that they entailed. The contributions of the succeeding generations of traditionists and jurists—beginning with Tayālīsī, Shāfī, and Ibn Ḥanbal, who were followed by Muslim, Bukhārī, and their contemporaries and successors who have left us the familiar standard collections of hadith—consisted not so much of discovery and first recording as of elimination and reorganization. Ibn Ḥanbal's voluminous Musnad was the imām (see p. 37) not for the discovery of new materials but for the recovery of old materials of varying degrees of acceptability, all of which he brought together for ready availability and reference. He was hampered not by lack of materials but by an overabundance which involved the arduous task of accepting and rejecting and of determining priority. His younger contemporaries Muslim and Bukhārī, faced with the same problems, narrowed the choices further, each according to his own set of rules as to what was adequately representative of sound Tradition as against an exhaustive collection. Their Sahihain therefore had much in common yet left opportunities for their successors to make in part duplicate and in part new collections.

The fact that parallel oral and written transmission continued to be demanded and practiced by some scholars should not be construed to mean that the content of the great body of the hadith and sunnah was still generally fluid. Parallel oral and written transmission served, as checks one upon the other, to fix the meaning as against the literal wording (ma'na vs. harf) of a given tradition, and both served as checks on deliberate, meaningful, and purposeful interpolations or forgeries of content. No theologian or scholar of the crucial second century was blind to the fact that in the fields of politics, new dogma, eschatology, and hell-fire preaching there was still room for such interpolations and forgeries. This awareness and the counter-activities of opposed groups made it extremely difficult for forged content, apart from forged isnād's, to win general acceptance. On the other hand, once a forged tradition did for one
reason or another gain acceptance, it was absorbed into the main body of Tradition, though it was never to be quite free of suspicion, as the subsequent literature in the fields of hadith criticism and history of dogma shows. The early fixity of the content of Tradition which culminated in Zuhrî’s literary activities was essential to and largely responsible for this later development. So convinced am I of the basic role of recorded Tradition in the age of Zuhrî and continuously thereafter—as detailed elsewhere in the present study for the schools of Ibn Iṣḥāq, Abū Ḥanîfah, Mālik ibn Anas, Laith ibn Sa‘d, and others among their contemporaries—that it seems superfluous to follow in detail the recording activities of the major traditionists from Ibn Ḥanbal (see pp. 37, 39) to Nasrî (d. 303/915), by whose time the existence of permanent records cannot be questioned. Furthermore, M. Fuad Sezgin of Ankara University has published a painstaking and effective piece of research on Bukhārī’s written sources.⁴⁵ On the other hand, all supplementary evidence of the great quantity and widespread use of manuscripts during the period ending with Zuhrî still needs to be noted and analyzed.

II

The institution of the journey in search of knowledge, the riḥlah, paradoxical as it may sound, actually contributed to the recording of Tradition. The riḥlah receives considerable attention in the sources⁴⁶ as well as at the hands of modern scholars.⁴⁷ Yet, overemphasis of its later development and neglect of practices closely associated with it from the start have served to distort its role in the recording of hadith. Modern, particularly Western, accounts of this institution dwell more on its flôruit, from about the middle of the second century until the end of the fourth, than on its origin and earlier development. These accounts and earlier studies all but axiomatically equate the riḥlah with oral transmission. It is not necessary for our present purpose to retrace in full the history of this institution, for famous journeys of the second and third centuries that hold clues to the identification and transportation of a number of our papyri are mentioned in connection with the documents concerned (see e.g. pp. 143 f., 163 f.). It is necessary, however, to focus attention on the hitherto neglected factors that clarify the role of the riḥlah in the recording of hadith. The first of these factors is the pre-Islamic origin of the riḥlah. At least half a dozen individuals in the hanîf group are said to have “roamed the earth in search of knowledge among the ‘people of the Book’ and other religious denominations.”⁴⁸ Some combined business with their search. However, the classic stories of Salmān al-Fārisī’s extensive journeys in search of the right faith and Muḥammad’s own journeys in search of such knowledge, even though we concede the probability that they were touched up later, do nevertheless reflect a practice rooted in the cultural and spiritual stirring among the Arabs on the eve of Islam. Muḥammad not only encouraged the search for knowledge but practically instituted the riḥlah in Sûrah 9:122, which urges representatives from each community to go forth in search of religious knowledge and to return and teach their respective communities what they had learned.⁴⁹ This, it should be noted, is in fact a description of what happened when representatives of the various tribes came to Muḥammad, learned from him,

⁴⁴ Bukhārī’nîn.

⁴⁵ The chapters devoted to iḥâm in the standard hadith collections usually have a section on the riḥlah. See also Concordance II 506 and IV 8–11; Ibn Qutaibah, Ta‘wil mushkil al-Qur’ān, p. 88; Jâmi‘ I 32–39, 92–95; Madkhal, p. 42; Ma‘rifah, pp. 7–9 and 27.

⁴⁶ Goldziher, Studien II 175–78; Robson, “Tradition: investigation and classification,” Muslim World XLII 99 f., 104.

⁴⁷ Nubâla‘ I 86: فخروا بطلبي، ويسرّون في الأرض، بلّمسون أهل الكتاب من اليهود والنصارى والملل كلها طلبون الحنفیة.

⁴⁸ Ma‘rifah, pp. 7 f. and 27.
and returned to teach their respective peoples. And even at this early stage some of these travelers wrote down what Muhammad had taught them, the *hadith al-nabi.* To acquire some of the 'ilm or opinion of 'Umar I was the purpose of the *rihlah* of many of the Companions, within and without Arabia; and, though 'Umar was extremely cautious with *hadith al-nabi,* he related his own experience and expressed his own opinion to the point of laying down the law. Older Companions such as `Ali ibn Abi Talib, Ibn Abi Merirah ibn Jabal, and Abū al-Dardā were likewise sought out for their knowledge. The Anṣār, both those remaining in Medina and those who settled in the provinces, very early were visited by scholars who were eager to transmit from them directly. Some of the younger Companions undertook journeys or were themselves sought out. Ibn 'Umar traced in person Muhammad's movements in order to gather all available information concerning the events of Muhammad's life that were associated with various localities. Masrūq ibn al-Ajda', freedman of 'Āishah, traveled back and forth among the provinces in search of knowledge. Sa'd ibn al-Musayyib, Zuhri's revered teacher, reports that he traveled nights and days in search of a single tradition. Jābir ibn 'Abd Allāh traveled for a month, likewise in search of a single tradition. Curious or serious Başrans were on the move in search of knowledge almost from the time their city was founded, as the case of Šabīgh ibn 'Isāl clearly shows (see pp. 107–9). Other Başrans journeyed to Mecca to hear 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Amr ibn al-`Āṣ. Abū al-`Āliyāh speaks of Başrans who, not content with the versions of *hadith* heard from the Companions who had settled in Başrah, journeyed to Medina to hear the same traditions. Arāj, Qur'ān copyist and famed teacher of most *hadith*-writers from the time of Zuhri to that of Mālik ibn Anas, traveled from Medina to Syria to Egypt. He settled finally, in his old age, in Alexandria. Wherever he went his materials were written down through one method or another (see pp. 124, 139). In the case of Ikrīmah, client of Ibn Abi Merirah, whose *rihlah* was undertaken for the purpose of spreading rather than acquiring knowledge, we find that younger scholars such as Ayyūb al-Sikhtiyānī were willing to trail him from province to province. Makḥūl al-Shāmī describes his *rihlah* as covering the whole earth. Zuhrī's repeated trips to Medina and neighboring towns were also made in search of knowledge, as was the *rihlah* of Ibn Iṣḥāq to Yazīd ibn Abī Ḥabīb in Egypt in the year 115/733 (see p. 218). The list can readily be increased by anyone who cares to go through the references already cited and follow the activities of the Khāwārij, among whose journeys the *rihlah* of the poet-traditionist `Imrān ibn Ḥittān (d. 84/703) is about as well known as those of Ikrīmah and Makḥūl.

The *rihlah* was at first a more or less personal affair, with one scholar seeking another usually for a specific piece of information, but by the end of the first century a second practice evolved, whereby the traveling scholars were sought by or presented to the learned community in the cities which they visited. 'Umar II presented Abū Qilābah, who was himself seeking knowl-
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edge and who usually wrote down his traditions. The Syrian 'Abd al-Rahman ibn 'Aidh visited 'Irāq during Hishām's reign, when both Basrans and Kūfans wrote down his hadīth. The prevalence and general acceptance of the riḥlah by the close of the first century is reflected in several statements of Sha'ībī, who was himself a veteran traveler. While relating a tradition in 'Irāq on the authority of Abū Burdah on the authority of Muḥammad, he pointed out his own generosity in giving the tradition freely when a man had traveled to Medina in search of a less important tradition. Again, he is reported as saying that a journey from northern Syria to the southern Yemen in search of a word of wisdom was not a lost effort. These limits represented the extent of the empire from north to south at the time that it extended also from North Africa to China. The famous tradition, attributed to Muḥammad, to "seek knowledge even into China" may well have originated in the same period.

It has been pointed out that the institution of the riḥlah played a significant role in unifying Islamic culture, though the third and fourth centuries have been stressed more than the second century, let alone the first. Actually, this significant role began with Muḥammad, and part of its effectiveness was due to the fact that traveling scholars usually wrote down for safekeeping and future reference that which they sought while at the same time their hosts wrote down, likewise for safekeeping and future reference, such knowledge as the visitors could impart. Oral transmission may have sufficed for a person-to-person exchange of a specific item or a small number of traditions, but oral transmission alone would have defeated the very purpose of a scholar who sought a large body of traditions—whether it was the musnad of a given Companion or a comprehensive collection of traditions bearing on one theme or a group of related themes—to transmit or to recast as his own collection. These aspects of the riḥlah were already evident in the last half of the first century and accelerated rapidly during the first half of the second century. We do not, of course, have to depend on deductive reasoning alone for this conclusion because various tangible illustrations confirm it. The transporting of manuscripts in quantities large enough to require containers began at least as early as the time of Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, when there was brought to him a sackful of Jewish manuscripts for his inspection. Hāfṣah's copy of the Qurān, called simply a saḥīfah, was returned to her by Ibn 'Umar in a humah. Abū al-Yasar Ka'b ibn Amr carried his manuscripts (suhuf) to the southern Yemen in search of a word of wisdom was not a lost effort. These limits represented the extent of the empire from north to south at the time that it extended also from North Africa to China. The famous tradition, attributed to Muḥammad, to "seek knowledge even into China" may well have originated in the same period.
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70 Jāmiʿ II 58 explains that when Abū Hurairah expressed his own opinion in answer to questions he would add "this is from my kīs," using the term figuratively for his store of knowledge other than the hadīth of Muḥammad. The figure of speech boomeranged when some of his contemporaries gave it a different twist, whether deliberately or not is hard to tell. See also Goldziher, "Neue Materialien zur Literatur des Uebelrichtungswesens bei den Muhammedanern," ZDMG L (1896) 488, 506.
71 Abū Nuʿaim I 381.
72 Ibn Hanbal II 228-541, which represents about one-twelth of Abū Hurairah's vast collection. This ratio of survival seems to be sustained in later comprehensive collections such as the Musnad of Yaʿqūb ibn Shaibah; see Dahabi II 141 and Yaʿqūb ibn Shaibah, Musnad . . . Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, ed. Sāmī Haddūd (Beirut, 1359/1940) pp. 12-19, esp. p. 14.
Abū Hurairah's traditions turned up in the possession of the family of Muḥammad ibn Ṣīrīn in ʿIrāq (see p. 87), while Maʿmar ibn Rāshīd's copy of Hammām ibn Munabbīh's transmission from Abū Hurairah traveled with him to the Yemen. When Abū Qilābāh left ʿIrāq to settle in Syria he took his manuscripts with him, and after his death a saddlebag was required to transport those willed to Ayyūb al-Sikhtiyānī back to ʿIrāq (see p. 231), perhaps in the company of another traveling scholar. We have seen (p. 13) that the Tunisian Khalīd ibn ʿImrān (see p. 214) induced conservative Medinan scholars who were opposed to written Tradition to dictate ḥadīth to him, and he took his manuscript back with him to North Africa. It will be seen in the discussion of Document 1 that Muqāṭil ibn Sulaimān al-Balkhī and several of his younger contemporaries wrote down their materials and took their manuscripts with them on their travels and that some early tafsīr manuscripts found their way to Spain (see pp. 102f.). This activity took place in pre-Zuhri and Zuhri times. Thereafter, with the riḥlah fast becoming a sine qua non for all professional traditionists, references to manuscripts that were copied during a journey and taken back on the return trip were even more numerous, and rarely did a ranking scholar return from an extensive riḥlah without manuscripts to show for it. The activities of the Basran Ḥammād ibn Salmāh ibn Dīnār (d. 167/784) were considered typical for first-class scholars. The ḥadīth critic Ibn Ḥībān describes them in this significant order: “He was among those who traveled and wrote and collected and composed and memorized and discoursed.” When a traveler lost his manuscripts at sea, or in any one of several other ways, his reliability was questioned. The research entailed by our papyri revealed many instances of the association of the riḥlah with the accumulation of manuscripts. These involve leading traveling scholars from all the provinces and from the time immediately following Zuhri to that of Bukhārī and later. As in earlier times, a visiting scholar of repute was called upon to hold private or public sessions and to dictate his materials. For an Ibn Ḥanbal returning with a sackful of manuscripts from his visit to ʿAbd al-Razzāq ibn Hammām in the Yemen, we have an Ibn Lahfah with his satchel for manuscripts hung around his neck seeking out visiting scholars and writing down their materials (see p. 219). As the age of the manuscript and the institution of the riḥlah became firmly established, traveling scholars found it practical to use small scripts in order to reduce the bulk of their manuscripts (see pp. 89, 234). Even the names of the containers used to transport or store the accumulated manuscripts at this time reflect the wide geographical extent and the colorful linguistic variations of the early ‘Abbāsid Empire.

A factor indicating that sizable manuscripts were being produced was the development of the practice of making complete (ʿalā al-wajh) copies of a given scholar's collection as against
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77 Madkhal, pp. 42-44 ( = trans. pp. 41-43). See also p. 56 below.
78 The list reads like a Who's Who of early Muslim scholars (see e.g. pp. 98 f., 142 f., 161, 163, 173, 176 f., 179). See Abū Nuʿain VI 374, 377 f. and VII 4, 21, 25, 46 f., 80 for the travels of Sufyān al-Thaurī.
79 See Maṇaqīb, pp. 28 f., and p. 180 below.
80 The more than two dozen container terms that I encountered, some with their plurals, are here listed in alphabetical order: إِضَبِرَةٌ تَأْبِي ٍ تَلِسِّبُ جِبَالٍ جِبَالٍ حَقَّةٌ حَقَّةٌ حُرْمَةٌ حُرْمَةٌ نُصْمُ جِبَالٍ صَنَاحَةٌ صَنَاحَةٌ نُصْمُ جِبَالٍ قِطَعَةٌ قِطَعَةٌ كَزْمَةٌ كَزْمَةٌ طَيْضٌ. See pp. 160 f. below for Ḥammād.
the practices of writing down sections or writing down only a few traditions from it. All three practices were current by Zuhri’s day, but it was Zuhri himself, with his avowed policy of recording everything within sight and hearing, who placed the making of complete copies on an equal footing with the other practices in so far as professional traditionists and jurists were concerned. The earliest production of sizable manuscripts representing a single source would have been by the family-ismād group of ḥadīth-writers discussed above (pp. 36–39). There are some indications that others besides family members produced sizable unit collections of ḥadīth and akhbār from one or more of these writers. These collections include such episodes as the assassination of ʿUmar I from the account of ʿAmr ibn Māmūn al-Awdī (d. 74/693) and the story of the miʿrāj from the account of Anas ibn Mālik. Abū Qilābah’s manuscript collection would seem to have contained copies of the manuscripts of ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz (see p. 230). A number of Zuhri’s teachers and some of their contemporaries wrote down large collections from a single source, for example Nāfīṭh on the authority of Ibn ʿUmar, Aʿrāf on the authority of Abū Hurairah, and Hammām ibn Munabbih on the authority of Abū Hurairah. These collections kept their identity as units until the time of Khaṭīb. Hishām ibn Yusuf (d. 197/813) wrote down ʿalā al-wajh the traditions of Ibn Jurajj of Mecca (d. 150/767) and Maʿmar ibn Rāshid (d. 154/771) and then loaned his manuscripts to Muṭṭarīf ibn Māzin. Others of the same period, such as Ḥasan al-Baṣrī and Ḥakam ibn ʿUtābah, wrote down sizable collections, but from varied oral and written sources, that kept their identity as units at least as long as the above-mentioned collections of Nāfīṭh etc., for copies of some of these works were to be found in Khaṭīb’s library. Zuhri’s activities and those of his pupils during and after the reign of Hishām are fully detailed in the discussion of Document 6 as are those of his contemporary Yahyā ibn Saʿīd al-Anṣārī in the discussion of Document 7. But for the unfortunate fate which befell Zuhri’s library at the hands of the vengeful, sacrilegious, and shortsighted Walīd II, there would have been more references to specific works of his. As it is, there were more references to specific “books” or unit ḥadīth collections of his several pupils before some of his materials were recovered and references to the “Zuhriyāt” appeared. But, despite the misfortune, Zuhri’s example was effective, for his fellow Medinan ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, who outlived him into the early years of Mansūr’s caliphate, refused to have any of his transmitters copy selected parts of his own manuscript (ṣabīfah), saying: “You either copy all of it, or copy none of it at all.” Certainly, in the post-Zuhri period there were more specific and implied references to the copying of a collection or work ʿalā al-wajh. We read, for instance, that Zuhri, Yahyā ibn Saʿīd, and Ibn Jurajj were the leading traditionists of the Hijāz because they presented the ḥadīth in its totality (ʿalā wajhīthā), which could only mean totality of content (see pp. 193, 196). The practice of
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collecting parallels, with variants of main or isnād, for a given tradition or group of traditions was also current around the end of the first century, as specific instances in connection with Wāthilah ibn al-Asqā (d. 83/702) and Abū Qilābah indicate. Complete recording and copying increased during the second and following centuries, even though the phrase ‘alā al-waṣj was not always used when complete copies of manuscripts were made. Shu`bāh ibn al-Ḥajjāj made a practice of acquiring such copies from outstanding traditionists, for example the four thousand traditions he wrote down from Ṭālḥah ibn ʿAmr (d. 152/769) which served his fellow pupils Maʿmar ibn Rāshīd, Sufyān al-Thauri, and Ibn Jurayj. Shu`bāh’s faithful transmitter Ghundir, in turn, made full and accurate copies of Shu`bāh’s hadith which were later made available to Ibn Ḥanbal and his colleague Yahyā ibn Maʿīn (d. 233/848). To these same two scholars Zakarīyā ibn ʿAbī dā (d. 212/827) dictated ‘alā al-waṣj the book of ʿUbaid Allāh ibn ʿAmr (101–80/719–96). The books of Sufyān al-Thauri were transmitted ‘alā al-waṣj by at least one traditionist, while those of Shaibānī were copied in full by many. Mālik ibn Anas and Laith ibn Saʿd both acquired complete collections and many of their pupils did the same, as did the numerous transmitters of Mālik’s Muwatta and the works of Abū Ṣāliḥ the secretary of Laith. A traveling Khaṭṭābīan scholar was able to buy complete copies of the hadith of Iṣmāʿīl ibn ʿAyyāsh (see p. 178). Ibn Ḥibbān made a special trip to Ḥims, where he sought out Baqīyah ibn al-Walīd’s hadith, already in writing, and made his own complete copies. There were many others who followed this practice (see e.g. pp. 51 f.). As with the units mentioned above, their manuscripts did not all have the same opportunity for long survival. Nevertheless quite a few of these and others of the second and third centuries did survive as units into Khaṭṭābī’s time.

Closely related to the accelerated activity of producing and copying manuscripts was the finding (wijādah) of manuscripts and books after the author’s death. The use of such manuscripts on their own authority was frowned on completely at first. But as time went on and more and more books were produced, thus increasing the chances of books being found, a distinction was made in favor of books that were found by members of the author’s family or by his leading pupils. While all other such books continued to be frowned on, their use was not actually eliminated in the field of Tradition and related literary pursuits. Examples of the finding of early manuscripts in the family of the author have been given in connection with the discussion of the documents sought and used by ʿUmar II and Zuhrī (pp. 28–30) and in connection with the development of the family isnād (pp. 36–38). Instances of early manus-
scripts being found in Zuhri's own day are also known. Noted below (see e.g. pp. 175, 221, 235) are several instances of both family and non-family manuscripts being found in the post-Zuhri period when the use of non-family documents was apparently on the increase. Abū Ḥanīfah and later Wāqīdī were well known for their free use of non-family manuscripts, while Ibn Ḥanbal’s family illustrates well the use of the more acceptable family documents.

The finding of non-family manuscripts was, naturally enough, closely associated with the warrāq or stationer-copyist, who soon developed into the bookseller. Two points need to be stressed in this connection. First, Muhammad knew of this trade among the “people of the Book” and Islām can be said to have adopted the profession with the issuance of the ‘Uthmānīc Qurʿān, since the earliest known warrāqūn were Qurʿānic copyists. Second, some Qurʿān copyists expanded their activities to include the copying and selling, at least for a nominal fee, of other religious materials much earlier than has been hitherto recognized. In ‘Abbasid times the trade expanded and flourished, and some warrāqūn apparently specialized in certain fields. All of the known first-century warrāqūn were either traditionists or closely associated with traditionists. Anas ibn Mālik, who carried on the trade in Baṣrah, had teachers and secretaries among his transmitters and was the most outspoken of the early defenders of recorded ḥadīth. He may well have been among the first, if not indeed the first, traditionist-warrāq. Zuhri’s teacher A’raj was a Qurʿān copyist. In literary Baṣrah there were groups of warrāqū’s who were active also in the field of ḥadīth at about the same time, such as the trio comprising Abū Rājd Maṭr ibn Ṭahmān (see p. 229), client of Abū Qilābah, Mālik ibn Dīnār (see p. 9), and Maṭl ibn Maimūn. Masāwir al-Warrāq moved in the circles of Ḥasan al- Başri, Shaʿbī, and Abū Ḥanīfah. And one should not overlook the group of earlier Qurʿān copyists that Ḥajjāj ibn Yūṣuf employed to make the exemplars he sent to the provinces (see p. 20). Several warrāqūn of the post-Zuhri period were associated with leading traditionists from whom they transmitted, though some, such as Abū ʿAbd Allāh of Wāsit (d. 159/775), are specified as weak. Yaḥyā ibn Saʿd al-Anṣārī transmitted to the Kūfī warrāq Saʿd ibn Muṣṭammad, who in turn transmitted to Ibn Ḥanbal and others. This same warrāq transmitted through Thaur ibn Yazīd (d. 153/770) the materials of Khalīd ibn Maḍān

---


105 See Miṣān II 286 f., No. 2274, for transmission from discarded manuscripts.

106 See e.g. Kīfīyah, p. 231.


108 Sirāh 3:77. See also our Vol. I 24 and references there cited.

109 Portions of the Qurʿān were of course written down from Muhammad’s secretaries by several Companions for private or family use. In addition to Ḥafṣah’s Qurʿān, copies were made for ʿUmm Salamah and ‘Ā’ishah by clients in the family, one of whom, ‘Amm ibn Rāfī, apparently became a professional copyist (see Bukhārī, Taḥrīr III 2, p. 330; Taḥfr 1 178, 205, 209 f.). Both ʿUmār I and ʿAmm ibn Abī Talib took an interest in Qurʿānic copies and encouraged the use of large formats for the books (Ibn Ḥanbal IV 206, V 216; Abū Nuʿaim IV 105 and 203, IX 35; OJP L 54). Mālik ibn Anas is reported to have possessed a family Qurʿān, written, he said, at the time that the caliph ʿUthmān standardized the text (ʿUthmān ibn Saʿd al-Dālī, Al-muṣākham ʿf al-naqīf al-masāḥif, p. 17). Qurʿāns in codex form were available before the mid-1st century when a group in a particular location in Medina came to be known as ḥākbī al-masāḥif (Ibn Saʿd V 293; Ibn Ḥanbal I 415, 434; Abū Nuʿaim I 67). Some specialists in Qurʿānic readings kept a supply of Qurʿāns on hand, as did ʿAbd al-Rahmān ibn Abī Lailā, who was free with the use of orthographic signs (ʿUthmān ibn Saʿd al-Dālī, op. cit. p. 13).
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CONTINUOUS WRITTEN TRANSMISSION

(d. 104/722)—a fact that indicates continuous written transmission since all three were recorders of hadith. Abū al-ʿAtīf al-Jarrāḥ ibn al-Minhāl (see p. 162) transmitted to Abū al-Mundhir al-Warrāq. Muḥammad ibn Ṣāḥīh ibn al-Sammāk (d. 183/799) had two warrāq’s who are sources of information about him. Sufyān ibn ʿUyainah (107–98/725–814) transmitted to two warrāq’s, Hilāl and Saʿīd ibn Ṣuṣayr. Abū al-ʿRāhmiḥ ibn Mahdī (135–98/752–814) transmitted to ʿAbbās ibn Ghālib al-Warrāq. The muṣannaf of the Shīʿite Wakiʿ ibn al-Jarrāḥ (129–97/746–812) of Kūfah was transmitted by ʿAbbās al-Warrāq. Shaibānī and Shāfiʿī had their warrāq’s who made copies of Shaibānī’s works for Shāfīʿī. Ibn Ḥanbal, as a needy young student, earned his expenses by writing letters for the ladies and copying hadith manuscripts for the men. Later, as a scholar, he exchanged hadith with at least four warrāq’s, who no doubt had a hand in copying some of the books in his large library. Yaʿqūb ibn Shaibān (182–262/798–876) kept forty copyists busy in his home to make the final fair copies of his exhaustive Musnad. Yaʿqūb’s contemporary Dāʾūd ibn ʿAlī al-Ẓahiri, founder of the Ẓahiriyyah School, had his needed warrāq’s too. Abū al-Qāsim al-Baghawi al-Warrāq claimed he made copies for sale of the materials of a thousand shaikhs which included, besides his father’s and his grandfather’s manuscripts, the Maghāzi of Yahyā ibn Saʿīd al-Umawī on the authority of Ibn Ishaq and some of the materials of Ibn Ḥanbal, Yahyā ibn Maʿīn, and ʿAlī ibn al-Madīnī. The foregoing list of traditionists from whom warrāqān transmitted is by no means exhaustive. The practice itself extended well into the fourth century for hadith and other fields, as is illustrated by the cases of Khaṭīb and the Egyptian traditionist warrāq Abū Ishaq al-Ḥabbāl, who kept multiple copies of his hadith for the use of his pupils. But enough evidence has been given to show the close relationship that developed between the two professions once the age of the manuscript was in full flower, owing partly to Zuhri’s efforts. This development is reflected by Samʿānī’s definition of a warrāq as “one who writes Qur’āns and writes the hadith and other (literature) and one who sells warrq, which is kāhīd (i.e., paper).” The activities of the warrāq’s of the fourth century extended to the related fields of ṭafsīr, tahrīkh, and linguistics and even to poetry, which so frequently found its way into such works.

See Abū Nuṣair V 214 and p. 295 below.
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Ibn ʿSād VII 2, p. 98. The books of Wakiʿ were in circulation, and some of them were carried back to Cordova by the Spanish traveler Muhammad ibn ʿAbād in the year 179/795 (Revista del Instituto egipcio de estudios islamicos en Madrid II (1954) 104 [Arabic section]).
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Ibid., pp. 33 f., 40, 415, 418, 439, 503.
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See Vol. I 93 f. for Yahyā’s Maḥāzīr, which was transmitted by his son Saʿīd.

Khaṭīb X 113 f.; Dhahabi I 274 ff.

Dhahabi III 361 ff. mentions 20 copies of the same manuscript in use at one hadith session. For other instances see e.g. Khaṭīb X 113 f., XIII 291; Maṣʿūdī VII 236, 374; Fīhrīst, pp. 146 f. It was not long before some warrāqān became authors in their own right (see e.g. Fīhrīst, pp. 35, 36, and 79; GAL III 955).

Samʿānī, folio 549b.

Among the scholars associated with warrāq’s were Ibn Ishaq, Waqqāt, Muḥammad ibn ʿSāib al-Kalbi and his son Hishām, Khaṭīb, Yahyā ibn Ziyād al-Farrāʿ, Aṣmaʿ, and Abū ʿUbaidīyah. See also Fīhrīst, pp. 35, 56, 79, 138, and 264; Khaṭīb II 177, X 235 and 313, XIV 150; Irshad V 421, VII 276 f. Poets who frequented the bookshops included Abū Nawās, Abū al-ʿAtābihīyah, Dāʾūd, and Amr ibn ʿAbd al-Malik, who was himself a warrq; see e.g. Maruzānī, Muṣjam al-shawārūd (Cairo, 1354/1935) p. 218; Yaqūt II 701; Aḫūt XX 87–89.

For example the Ṣāḥib and to a lesser extent the works of Ibn Qutaibah and Ṭabarī. See also our Vol. I 14 f.
Furthermore, the warrāqūn, as also the general public, were not limited to direct personal association with famous scholars in order to produce and circulate copies of these scholars’ works. In early Islamic education, and particularly religious education, was free. The scholar’s circle (halaqah) or session (majālis), held frequently in the court of the mosque but sometimes at his home or place of business, was open to all. In the time of the Companions and the senior Successors the attendance was still small enough to allow personal contact. The older men among the early scholars mentioned on page 18 held small sessions, but many of the younger ones had such large audiences that later personal contact was not possible.135 The more serious students usually took the initiative and attached themselves to the scholar of their choice to form his inner circle. As even the inner circles grew with each generation of traditionists, the scholars themselves used various devices to weed out the less desirable members, though at the same time they were eager for large audiences at their public lectures. The estimated number of auditors progressed from the tens at first (see references in n. 135), to the hundreds in the time of Zuhūr,136 to the thousands and tens of thousands later in the second and in the third century.137 Master traditionists used as private secretaries their brightest pupils, who acted also as teachers by dictating or hearing recitations or checking and correcting fellow pupils’ manuscripts. A few of these remained long years in the service of outstanding scholars of the caliber of Mālik ibn Anas and Laith ibn Sa’d.138 But the popularity of the public lecture and the size of the attending crowds soon gave rise to a new profession, that of the dictation master (mustamli), to whose qualifications, duties, and actual practices Ṣamʿānī devoted most of his Adab al-imlāʾ wa al-istimālāʾ.139 One of the mustamli’s qualifications was a good, strong voice with lasting and carrying power. But when an audience was too large to be reached by one human voice, no matter how powerful, successive relays of dictation masters were placed at regular intervals among the encircling multitude.140 One can imagine the bookseller-copyists seeking the best position within hearing of the first dictation master, since they had a reputation to guard as reliable copyists and, in fact, as “publishers.” For “publishing” was one way of keeping their bookshelves well stocked with “originals” on the strength of which they solicited orders for individual private copies.141 Some may have been generous with their stock, since it is known that their shops became the rendezvous of all types of scholars, and may even have been moderate in their prices for religious works such as the

134 For sessions and lectures of some of these men see e.g. Ibn Sa’d V 96 and VII 1, pp. 88 and 123; Adab al-imlāʾ, p. 13; Nawawi, pp. 389 f.; Dhaḥabi I 124 f.

135 For example, his contemporary Abū al-Zīnāď had an audience of 300 (Yāṣīr I 273 f.), and Ḥātim ibn Qatādah had a sizable audience in the Damascene mosque for his strāh and haddith sessions (August Fischer, Biographien von Gewahrtenmännern des Ibn ʿIṣḥāq [Leiden, 1890] p. 22).

136 See Adab al-imlāʾ, pp. 15–24, pp. 18–23 being devoted to the “Abbasid caliphs (from Mansūr to Mutasāwakkīl) who patronized and participated in haddith sessions.

137 Nearly every first-class traditionist had at least one kāṭīb, “secretary,” and many of them needed the services of a professional dictation master (see e.g. Adab al-imlāʾ, pp. 15 ff.).

138 Ably edited by Max Weisweiler with a German abstract entitled Die Methode des Disputationisten (Leiden, 1952); see also Weisweiler’s earlier study “Das Amt des Mustamli in der arabischen Wissenschaft,” Orients IV (1951) 27–57.

139 Adab al-imlāʾ, pp. 50 f., 88 f., and 96 f. See also Khaṭīb XIV 24 f., where Abū Naṣīr Fadl ibn Dukān (see our Document 14) advises Hārūn al-Mustamli to seek a less crowded and cheapened profession than the study of haddith.

140 Since the rate of pay was usually by the folio or page, some copyists used large scripts to increase their fees; but when a fixed sum was stipulated for a copy, they were apt to use smaller scripts to save paper (see e.g. Ibn Ṭaniḵīr IV 352 and Dhaḥabi III 157; see also Nabīa Abbott, “A nineteenth-century fragment of the ‘Thousand Nights,’” JNES VIII [1949] 147, and our Vol I 4 and references there cited). Yet, it was not so much such tricks as the prostitution by the few of their literary and intellectual gifts that presently gave the profession a bad name (see e.g. Khaṭīb XII 108; Ḥaḍāth V 421; Ṭaḡīb al-Ṭabaḥānī, Mudaḥjarāt al-udabāʾ [Cairo, 1287/1870] I 63).
Qurʼan and hadith. Yet there were some who were not above attempting to corner the market, as was tried when Yahyā ibn Ziyād al-Farrāʾ (d. 207/822) dictated his Kitāb al-maʿānī.\(^{12}\)

The increased literary activity among scholars during Zuhri’s time and immediately thereafter, together with the rapid increase in student population, led to the development of a thriving book market. The stationer-copyist—partly for profit and partly by scholarly inclination—soon became a promoter and patron of learning, with his well stocked shelves of books available for browsing scholars and students who sooner or later bought the books in stock or ordered copies for their own libraries. The emergence and growth of court and private libraries under the Umayyads, from the time of Muʿāwiyyah onward, has already been touched on.\(^{14}\)

The still more rapid growth of both types of libraries under the early ʿAbbāsids is generally known\(^{14}\) and need not detain us here. But we do need to consider the size of the scholar’s library and the purposes it served for his own research and for the scholarly community, with special emphasis on the libraries of scholars in religious fields from the time of Zuhri to that of Bukhārī.

The references available indicate that just before and during the early Zuhri period a traditionist’s “library” was small enough to be stored or transported in a single bag, the terms most frequently used for the containers at this time being kis and jarrāb. In the later Zuhri period and just after, the libraries of such leading scholars as Abū Qilābah and Zuhri were large enough to be stored or transported in a number of boxes, cases, or camel loads, the terms most frequently used being the plurals of gandūq, qimāt, ʾiddl, and hîml (see e.g. p. 43), and the number of containers needed increased progressively to judge by the data I have encountered so far. References to the full size of the libraries of Zuhri’s younger contemporaries who dominated the fields of hadith and fiqh in the second quarter of the second century and who stabilized the methods of written transmission advocated and practiced by Zuhri (see e.g. pp. 196 f.) are comparatively rare. Nevertheless, there are other types of references which when co-ordinated yield a fair idea of the probable size of the libraries of these scholars. The first factor to be considered is that in their youth they had all traveled in search of knowledge and had in turn become the goal of similar journeys undertaken by their younger contemporaries. The second factor is that they wrote down or copied much of the material at the disposal of the scholars whom they sought during their travels, particularly material in their specialty, which was usually the musnad of a given first- or second-generation Muslim and preferably the musnad of a Companion transmitted in its entirety or in large sections by a given Successor. When we read, therefore, that Ibn Juraij of Mecca (d. 150/767) had a saddlebag (haqībah) full of the hadith of Nāfiʾ on the authority of Ibn ʿUmar and that Sufyān al-Thaurī of Kūfah (d. 161/778) had a saddlebag (khūrj) full of manuscripts on the authority of Ibn Juraij\(^{14}\) and that Sufyān’s library was packed in nine book-cases (qimāt) piled one upon another and reaching up to a man’s chest,\(^{14}\) we can gauge the cumulative results of several journeys that involved the writing-down or copying of at least some manuscripts in full (ʿalā al-wajh; see pp. 43–45).

Ibn Juraij (see pp. 98, 99, 112) had several such unit manuscripts, as did many of his con-

\(^{12}\) Khāṭib XIV 149 f.; Irshād VII 276 f. See also our Vol. I 22, n. 5.

\(^{14}\) Vol. I 20, 23 f., 29. Also to be noted is Khālid ibn Yazdī’s statement that he strove to collect books and that although he was not a ranking scholar yet he was not an ignorant man (Jāmiʿ I 132).

\(^{14}\) See Kūrkhāʾ ʿAwwād, Khaṣaʾīn al-kutub al-qudūmah fi al-Irāq (Baghdād, 1367/1948) pp. 191 ff.

\(^{14}\) Khāṭib X 404–6. Ibn Juraij’s foremost pupil, Ḥajjāj ibn Muḥammad (d. 206/821), had made direct copies of all Ibn Juraij’s books except the Tafsīr, which was written down from dictation (Dhahābī I 315).

\(^{14}\) Jarḥ, Taqdimah, p. 115; Khāṭib IX 161; Abū Nuʿaim VII 64; cf. Kūrkhāʾ ʿAwwād, op. cit. pp. 191 f.
temporaries. Furthermore, his books were considered so trustworthy that his younger contemporaries preferred copying them to hearing Ibn Juraij himself in oral transmission. Thus copies of his unit collections went to increase the collections of his contemporaries and successors. The Başran Shuʿbah ibn al-Ḥajjāj (d. 160/776), who likewise followed the practice of acquiring complete copies (see p. 45), had among his unit collections a sackful of rare Ālid traditions received from Ḥakam ibn ʿUtaibah (d. 117/735) on the authority of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Lailā on the authority of ʿAli ibn Abī Ṭalib on the authority of the Prophet.149 When the Syrian Awzāʾ (d. 157/773), who had two secretaries,150 lost his books by fire following an earthquake, one of his pupils came forward with complete and corrected copies to replace the loss. A third factor we may consider in gauging the size of leading scholars' libraries is the number of traditions they are said to have written down, not all of which they transmitted. The numbers began to multiply rapidly in the first half of the second century (see pp. 66–68). This increase, in turn, helps to explain the larger libraries of scholars who flourished during the second half of the second century and thereafter. The central provinces—that is, the ʿHijāz, the Yemen, Syria, and Egypt—continued to produce outstanding scholars, but they were now outnumbered by scholars from ʿIrāq and farther east. This shift in the literary balance was brought about in part deliberately by the ʿAbbāsids, who enticed to their court such Medinan scholars as Yaḥyā ibn Saʿd al-Anṣārī, ʿAbū al-Zinād, Ṭalḥah al-Raʾf, and ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Mājishūnī152 and in part by the emergence of new centers of learning in ʿIrāq and the Jazīrah to share, if even in a comparatively small way, the literary honors long enjoyed by Başra and Kūfah. Wāṣīṭ in the south contributed the famous Hushaim al-Wāṣīṭ (see p. 163), and Ḥarrān in the north contributed the traveling Abū Ṣāliḥ ʿAbd al-Ghaffār ibn Dārūd al-Ḥarrānī (see pp. 163 f.). From farther east the thriving centers of Islamic learning—Rayy, Nisāʾpur, Bukhārā, and Balkh—and even less famous places of Khurāsān sent an increasing stream of students and scholars who combined a pilgrimage with a riḥlah and lingered in the imperial province of ʿIrāq on the way out and on the way back. At this time the ʿHijāz in general and Medina in particular were, with Mālik ibn Anas as their chief advocate, defending their position and reputation as the “home of Tradition.” These developments account in part for the more readily available information on the probable size of the libraries of Mālik and the Yemenite ʿAbd al-Razzāq ibn Ḥammām. For we can gauge that of Mālik from the fact that he had seven boxes full of manuscripts of Zuhārī’s materials which he had not transmitted and an unspecified number of boxes of the ḥadīth of Ibn ʿUmar (see p. 126). One of Mālik’s leading pupils, the Egyptian ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Qāsim, is credited with some three hundred “volumes” (jīld) of Mālik’s materials relative to legal questions (see p. 128, n. 60). Again, we can gauge the size of ʿAbd al-Razzāq’s library from the fact that it included the collection of Maʿmar ibn Rāshīd—the main reason that Ibn Ḥanbal (see p. 180)

147 See Maʿārif, p. 246, Aḥkām al-qudāt I 253, and Khaṭṭīb XIV 369, according to which Ibn Jurfūṣ and others received unit collections from Ibn Abī Sabrah (d. 162/779) by means of the muḍawarih method.

148 Khaṭṭīb X 405 f.

149 Jarḥ II 1, p. 370; Khaṭṭīb IX 239 f.; Abū Nuʿaim VII 157; Dhahabi I 110 f. Shuʿbah transmitted from ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Lailā, who passed his ḥadīth to his son Muhammad (d. 148/765), who is credited with a work on muṣannaf (Ibn Saʿd VI 75, 249, 261 f.). Ḥakam ibn ʿUtaibah handed his written ḥadīth to Ḥasan ibn ʿUmārah (d. 153/770); see Khaṭṭīb VII 348 and p. 106 below.

150 Dhahabi I 262; Mizān II 94; Lisan VI 628 f.


152 See Jāmiʿ I 97 and pp. 122, 139, 187 below.

153 ʿIrāq had challenged the ʿHijāz earlier (Jāmiʿ II 152 f.).

154 Mālik was very careful in selecting his ḥadīth and frequently revised his transmission as his knowledge increased. He expressed regret for having transmitted even a few faulty traditions (see Maʿārif, p. 61).
and Yahyā ibn Ma‘in traveled to the Yemen to hear ‘Abd al-Razzāq, Ibn Ḥanbal returning home with a sackful of manuscripts (see p. 43). Furthermore, it is significant to note that of the few scholars who wrote down everything because they firmly believed it was necessary to have available all the information relating to a given position, scholar, or event, Ibn Ḥanbal had a library that filled twelve and a half camel loads (see p. 47, n. 126) and Yahyā ibn Ma‘in’s filled a hundred and fourteen book-cases (qimāt) and four large jars (hibāb). The library of Bishr ibn al-Ḥārith, their contemporary and colleague, filled eighteen book-cases (qimāt) and baskets (gauṣarah). Again, though I have thus far come across no specific references to the full size of the libraries of the ‘Irāqīs Abū Ḥanīfah, Shābānī, and Abū Yūsuf nor to that of Shāfī‘ī, references to the quantity of Shāfī‘ī’s manuscripts give some idea of the probable size of the libraries of these three closely associated scholars of ‘Irāq. For Shāfī‘ī, having exhausted what Mālik and the Ḥijāzī had to give, which was enough to crowd his house with pottery jars full of manuscripts, traveled to ‘Irāq and copied a camel load of the manuscripts of Shābānī, and he continued to add to his library during his final stay in Egypt. Similarly, the size of the libraries of Ismā‘īl ibn ‘Ayyāsh (see p. 178), the leading scholar of Syria, and Ibn al-Mubārak (see pp. 54, 68), the leading scholar from Khurasan, can be gauged from the fact that both men devoted their lives to literary activities. The size of the libraries of the Egyptian Laith ibn Sa‘d, represented directly and indirectly in our papyri, and his friend and colleague Ibn Lahfah can be roughly gauged from the fact that when the latter’s library was destroyed by fire Laith sent him the generous sum of three thousand dinars with which to buy papyrus for use in replacing it. The largest figure for the second century, six hundred large boxes, refers to Wāqīdī’s library. Moving into the third century, we find that the libraries of Muslim, Bukhārī, Ibn Sa‘d, Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī, and Abū Zar-ah grew with the demands of the times and are more than adequately reflected by their voluminous surviving works that are so usefully listed in Brockelmann’s indispensable Geschichte der arabischen Literatur.

Scholars, beginning with the earliest, were more or less generous with their manuscripts, particularly in loaning them out, as indicated in the present study in connection with such men as Ibn Jura‘īj and Ma‘nar ibn Rāshīd (see p. 44), Fazārī and Ibn al-Mubārak (see pp. 231 ff.), Shābānī and Shāfī‘ī (see p. 47). In addition we read that Ḥāfiz ibn Sulaimān (d. 131/748-49) borrowed the books of Shu‘bah ibn al-Ḥajjāj among others and copied them, that ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Mahdī (d. 198/814) borrowed the books of Sufyān al-Thaurī, and others.

166 Ibn Ḥanbal, Al-munad I (1365/1946) 56 f.; Khāṭib I 43; Dḥahabī II 16 f., 65 f.; Jarḥ I 1, p. 62, and II 1, p. 277. See also pp. 57-59 below. Ibn Ḥanbal, like several others, drew the line at writing only when in his opinion the transmitter was a professed heretic (see e.g. Tafsīr VI 245, X 533; Jarḥ IV 1, p. 348). This more liberal approach became more and more acceptable in the 2d and 3d centuries as traditionists, jurists, and historians began to think of themselves less as compilers and more as authors whose duty it was to present all sides of a question (see Akhbaar al-qudār III 188 f.; Maṣūdī III 322).

164 See op. cit. p. 3, for his houseful of ḥadīth manuscripts.

165 Ibn Hanbal, Al-munad I (1365/1946) 56 f.; Khāṭib I 43; Dḥahabī II 16 f., 65 f.; Jarḥ I 1, p. 62, and II 1, p. 277. See also pp. 57-59 below. Ibn Ḥanbal, like several others, drew the line at writing only when in his opinion the transmitter was a professed heretic (see e.g. Tafsīr VI 245, X 533; Jarḥ IV 1, p. 348). This more liberal approach became more and more acceptable in the 2d and 3d centuries as traditionists, jurists, and historians began to think of themselves less as compilers and more as authors whose duty it was to present all sides of a question (see Akhbaar al-qudār III 188 f.; Maṣūdī III 322).

166 See e.g. Khāṭib XIV 183; Ibn Khalīlīn II 284 f.; Kūrīkīs ‘Awwād, op. cit. pp. 196 f.

167 Khāṭib VII 71; Tafsīr al-‘ilm, p. 63.

168 See Abu Yūsuf, Kitāb al-ahār, Intro. p. 3, for his houseful of ḥadīth manuscripts.
that Ibn Ḥanbal regularly borrowed the books of Wāqīḍī from Ibn Saʿd168 and later loaned his own books to Abū Zaydah.169 Some of the loaned books were never returned, as in the case of some of Shuʿbāh's books, while others were even stolen.170 In most such instances the "borrower" wished to make or own a complete copy of a given collection or work. On the other hand, most leading scholars made their manuscripts available to their leading pupils for copying or collation.171 These widespread practices are fairly well known and need not detain us further.172 Other fairly widespread practices, which are not so well known, involve the uses that scholars made of their libraries in their own private study and teaching and in their direct personal relationships with fellow scholars.

If the initial writing-down of small groups of traditions was justified as being temporary and merely an aid for memorizing the material, it was not long before the retention of the memoranda for longer periods was justified on the basis of their serving to refresh the memory. The next step was the more permanent record that was intended to last for a lifetime.173 The more pious writers destroyed such records in their old age, while others left instructions that their manuscripts be destroyed after their death (see p. 62). But, in the meantime, those who had advocated permanent records from the beginning passed their manuscripts on to their pupils or to members of their families. The majority of these men were no longer so much concerned with refreshing their memories as with preserving the true hadith and sunnah to combat the encroachment of heresy and religious innovation (bid`ah).174 This stage reached its climax during the reign of Umar II (see pp. 25–32). Thereafter, owing to the practices of Zuhri and his leading pupils, one can discern that the roles of oral and written transmission began to be reversed, though the two methods continued to be employed side by side. Accurate manuscripts intended for permanent use were now openly acknowledged and sought after. Nevertheless, students were urged to memorize their materials, and teachers—especially famed scholars—were expected to be able to recite from memory at any given time sizable portions of their collections. Apparently Shuʿbāh and the young Sufyān ibn Uyainah,175 for instance, were able to do this, though recitals by Sufyān were preferred because he checked his recitals with his manuscripts.176 Pride in memory was still strong, and those who could actually demonstrate that they possessed outstanding, and particularly photographic, memories were held in high esteem. But men with such extraordinary memories were rare, and some of the most reputable of them were under constant pressure to demonstrate their gift or were even tricked with memory tests. In the first century we find ʿĀʾishah testing the memory of ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ,177 Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam testing that of Abū Hurairah (see p. 20), and Saʿd ibn al-Musayyib testing that of Qatādah ibn Diʿāmah.178 A little later we find Zuhri's memory (see p. 175) being tested in Hishām's court. Still later, Yazīd ibn Hārūn (d. 206/821), Abū Nuʿaym Faḍl ibn Dukain (d. 219/834), Ishāq ibn Rāhawī (d. 238/852), and even Bukhārī

168 Ḍahabī II 12.
169 Jarḥ, Taqdimah, p. 330. Abū Zaydah borrowed other books during his rihlah and copied them ʿald al-wuḥj (ibid. p. 343). Books he in turn loaned to others were retained sometimes for as long as six months and returned with the borrower's supposed corrections, all of which he successfully refuted (ibid. pp. 332 f.).
170 See e.g. Jarḥ, Taqdimah, p. 140; Jarḥ IV 2, p. 129; cf. Khatlī VIII 165.
171 See e.g. Adab al-imām, pp. 175 f.: إِعَاْرَةُ الْكِتَابِ. . . غُلَلَ الْكِتَابُ حِبْسًا عِلَى أَصْحَابِهَا.
172 See Taqyīd al-rīm, pp. 146–50, on the generous loaning of books.
173 As in the case, for example, of Ibn ʿAbbās and Abū Qilābāh (see Tirmidhi XIII 326 and p. 230 below).
174 For Ibn Ḥanbal's view on this matter see Manāqib, pp. 183 and 185 f., also pp. 156 f., 176, 192, 194, and 356.
175 See Khatlī IX 179, according to which Sufyān wrote down only what he had memorized; i.e., he wrote for future reference in case of loss of memory. See also p. 179 below.
176 Abū Nuʿaym VI 360.
177 Bukhārī IV 429.
178 See Abū Nuʿaym II 333 and p. 198 below.
CONTINUOUS WRITTEN TRANSMISSION

(d. 256/870) were subjected to tricky tests, a device that seems to have been popular with the leading critic of the day, Yaḥyā ibn Maʿṣīm (see p. 277).

The small number of traditionists with extraordinary memories could no doubt be matched with a list of those whose memories were exceptionally weak were it not for the fact that traditionists as a group were slow to acknowledge this handicap. Nevertheless, there are a few cases on record, such as Zāʾidah ibn Qidāmah (d. 161/778) and Jarīr ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd (d. 188/804). Rivals and critics, on the other hand, were not slow to detect nor reluctant to expose a weak memory and not always objectively, as is so copiously illustrated in the biographical works of Ibn Saʿd, Bukhārī, and Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī.

On the whole, however, the picture that is reflected is that the average traditionist with an average memory developed his memory to the point where he could detect interpolations in his own collection or works and could cite specific traditions or passages on occasion but stopped short of total recall. There were comparatively few dishonest and unscrupulous men responsible for an occasional deception or forgery or, as is alleged particularly in the case of sectarians, for wholesale fabrications. The average traditionist recognized the limitations of his memory and therefore when transmitting a sizable collection orally either dictated from his manuscripts or had his pupils read out their previously prepared copies, which were either corrected during the reading or later collated with a copy approved by the teacher. This, of course, was the ʿard method, which in the early days was probably mostly oral (ʿard min al-bāḥīṭah) but which soon gave way to reading back from a manuscript (ʿard al-kitāb) after the fashion, it is said, of Muḥammad's scribes reading back their Qur'ānic manuscripts to him. As will be seen below (e.g. pp. 139, 181, 197, 217), the ʿard method was much used by Zuhrī and his school as well as by others.

The comparatively few scholars with prodigious memories continued to display their powers, to the astonishment and the admiration of the many, though even they had constant recourse to their libraries. The case of Ṭayālīṣ (d. 204/818) is quite instructive in this respect. While on a visit to Isfahān he recited one hundred thousand (sic) traditions from memory. On returning to Baṣrah he, presumably after checking his manuscripts, sent back to Isfahān, in writing, the corrections for the errors he discovered he had made in seventy of the traditions.

With the solid accomplishment of the school of Zuhrī (see esp. pp. 175, 184) as a foundation, the reversal of the roles of oral and written transmission was accomplished within a few decades after Zuhrī's death. Among the leaders who helped in the process of reversal by precept or example—in addition to Zuhrī's pupils such as Ibn Juraij, Shuʿbā ibn ʿAbd al-Rahmān ibn Mahdī, Marwān ibn Anas, and Sufyān ibn ʿUyainah—may be mentioned Sufyān al-Thaurī, Shaibānī, and Ibn al-Mubārak. Sufyān's manuscripts containing the traditions of Aḥmad of Mārūj were considered so trust-

179 See e.g. Khaṭṭīb VI 352 f., XII 353 f., XIV 340; Ibn Khalikān I 516 f. (= trans. II 597). See Khaṭṭīb II 20 f. and Daḥḥāk II 123 for the manner in which the young Bukhārī demonstrated his phenomenal memory to the envy and admiration of his fellow students. Among other scholars with remarkable memories were Saʿd ibn Abī ʿArābīh, Ibn al-Mubīrak, Abī ʿAbd al-Rahmān ibn Mahdī, Marwān ibn Muʿāwiyah al-Bīzārī, and Ṭayālīṣ (see Daḥḥāk II 5 f., Khaṭṭīb X 165, Khaṭṭīb X 240 f., p. 267 below, and Miṣān I 413 respectively). The list could be extended for the 3d and 4th centuries.

180 Jāmiʿ I 117; Daḥḥāk I 200; p. 151 below.

181 See also Jāmiʿ II 150–63 and Kifāyah, pp. 107–9 and 142, for lack of objectivity.

182 See e.g. Maḍkhal, pp. 25–45, for classification of forgeries of both isnād and main; Maʿrifah, pp. 103 ff.; Kifāyah, pp. 101–15; Miṣān II 78, 186.

183 For 2d-century examples see e.g. Kifāyah, pp. 120–25; Abū Nuʿaym IX 33; Yaḥyā II 138 f.; Tadrīb, pp. 130–33 and 143 f.; Goldziher, Studien II 131–33, 160; Ahmad Amlī Ḍuḥāʾ al-ʾIslām I 150. See also p. 224 below.

184 Adab al-imālāʾ, pp. 77–79.

185 Miṣān I 413. Cf. Khaṭṭīb IX 26: "كان أبو داود حدث من حفظه وتحفظ خوان فكان يغلط خوان." Cf. also p. 56, n. 211, below and see Surah 22:38 for use of خوان.
worthy that even the hadith critic Yaḥyā ibn Saʿīd al-Qaṭṭān preferred using them to hearing the traditions directly from Aʾmash. Shaibānī depended so heavily on manuscripts and written transmission that his fellow Ḥanifite Abū Yūsuf al-Qaḍṣī took him to task for it, but Shaibānī justified his practice by citing the example of those who had gone before. Abū Yūsuf’s practice was to memorize quickly some fifty to sixty traditions and then dictate them to the people. Nevertheless, he cherished his own manuscripts, from which he instructed his son, who finally inherited them. This same Abū Yūsuf, who was so proud of his memory, once found his knowledge of history challenged by Yaḥyā al-Barmakī, who wished to use this deficiency to exclude Abū Yūsuf from the court. The latter stayed home for a month studying his history books and then returned to confound Yaḥyā with his vast knowledge of history. The direct use that Shāfiʿī made of Shaibānī’s manuscripts, especially his fiqh materials from Abū Ḥanīfah, is another instance of the free use of manuscripts. Shāfiʿī’s reference to studying the books of the followers of Abū Ḥanīfah may have included Shaibānī’s works. The Khurāsānian scholar Ibn al-Mubārak, whose first riḥlah to ʿIrāq and beyond took place in the year 141/758, made copies of the materials of Abū Ḥanīfah, who had impressed him very favorably. On hearing Awzāʾī’s criticism of Abū Ḥanīfah, Ibn al-Mubārak went home and studied for three days. Then he extracted from his copies of Abū Ḥanīfah’s manuscripts a number of legal questions which he wrote down, starting each with “qāla al-Nuʿmān” instead of with “qāla Abū Ḥanīfah,” and returned with the manuscript to Awzāʾī, who fell into the trap and praised its contents. Ibn al-Mubārak found favor also with Ibn Juraij, who was willing to let him use his books. Moving on to Egypt, he sought and gained access to the originals in Ibn Lahfah’s library (see p. 220). Not only did Ibn al-Mubārak’s library grow steadily, but the quality of his collections and the accuracy of his manuscripts were such that Yaḥyā ibn Adam (d. 203/818) looked for elucidation of finer points in Ibn al-Mubārak’s books, convinced that if they were not there they would not be anywhere.

The practice of using manuscripts was endorsed and followed by Ibn al-Mubārak’s immediate contemporaries and by the younger generation. Among the former were the hadith critics Yaḥyā ibn Saʿīd al-Qaṭṭān and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Maʿīn, perhaps the greatest and certainly the most quoted hadith critic, and his colleague Ibn Ḥanbal. Yaḥyā ibn Saʿīd al-Qaṭṭān followed the example of Shuʿbah and Sufyān al-Thawrī. Though he used both oral and written transmission, he used them selectively depending on his personal knowledge of the source or of the recipient. Āḥmad al-Raḥmān ibn Maʿīn for the most part preferred written transmission and reading back his manuscripts to his source. His criticism of Shaibānī once led the latter to delete several folios

---

186 Abū Nuʿaim VI 359. See Ibn Saʿīd VI 239 and Khaṭīb IX 10 f. for the excellent quality of Aʾmash’s collection, which pleased even Zuhri, who questioned whether ʿIrāq could produce a good traditionist.

187 Ibn Saʿīd VII 2, p. 74; Akhbār al-qudāt II 51, III 255. He was also known to alternate the recitation of ten traditions with the recitation of ten opinions (Khaṭīb XIV 255). Abū Yūsuf’s knowledge of both hadith and ṭabīʿ is stressed in Dhaḥabī I 269 f.

188 Akhbār al-qudāt III 255, 257. See also our Vol. I 92 f.

189 Akhbār al-qudāt III 263.

190 Khaṭīb XIII 410. Shāfiʿī examined a manuscript of some 130 folios and found 80 of them to be contrary to the Qurʾān and the sunnah!
from one of his manuscripts.196 Ishaq ibn Rahawaih was such an assiduous collector of manuscripts that he is said to have married a widow because her deceased husband’s library contained the works of Shafi’i.197 and when he acquired these works he made them available to other scholars.198 So well did he himself use his library that he is said to have based his Jami’ al-saghir on the works of Shafi’i and his Jami’ al-kabir on those of Sufyan al-Thauri.199 His photographic memory and constant use of his library enabled him to cite a work from memory by page and line, which could be checked with the manuscript.200 Yahya ibn Ma’in and Ibn Hanbal will be encountered frequently below in the discussion of our documents (see pp. 112, 159, 178, 275, 277), and their lifelong commitment to writing and to the accumulation of the manuscripts that built up their large libraries are mentioned in their many long and detailed biographies.201 Despite their common literary interests, their long-standing friendship202 cooled off as the result of Ibn Hanbal’s trial on the question as to whether the Qur’an was created or uncreated.203 One of Yahya’s teachers, Hisham ibn Yusuf (see p. 44), who tried him out for a month before he fully accepted him as a student, made his library available to him. The slave girl in charge of Hisham’s books brought them out one at a time to Yahya, who studied them and copied all he needed.204

Ibn Hanbal’s use of his manuscripts and library involved also his use of the libraries of a number of his contemporaries and vice versa and thus serves to indicate the practices of his period, which overlapped that of Muslim and Bukhari. He began to collect manuscripts early in his career, and some of his fellow scholars, particularly ‘Affan ibn Muslim (see pp. 211 f. and 217), demonstrated the value of accurate manuscripts. Ibn Hanbal’s habit of writing down everything lasted throughout his life, for wherever he went his inkwell went with him and he seized every opportunity to correct his manuscripts.205 His practice was to provide a separate container for each of the individual musnad’s he was collecting as the basis for his final musnad compilation. Abu Zar’ah, who studied these separate musnad’s later, states that they contained no identification of their immediate sources because Ibn Hanbal carried the biographical information in his head and could match each section with the correct transmitter.206 Ibn Hanbal’s consistent practice of what he advocated, namely the permanent recording of Tradition as of other materials, led other scholars, including ‘Ali ibn al-Madini, to follow his example and to cite him as their model.207 When Muhammad ibn Muslim ibn Warah returned from Egypt without having made complete copies of Shafi’i’s books, Ibn Hanbal’s reproach so shamed him that he returned to Egypt and came back with copies of these works, which, incidentally, contained many of Ibn Hanbal’s materials and views though they were not always openly acknowledged.208 As old age approached, robbing Ibn Hanbal of some of the keenness of his

196 Abū Nu‘aim IX 10.
197 Ibid. pp. 102 f.
198 See e.g. Subki, Ṭabaqāt al-Shafi‘iyah al-kubra II (Cairo, 1324/1906) 42 f.
199 Ibid. See GAL S I 257 for the works of Ishaq ibn Rahawaih.
200 See e.g. Khatīb VI 345-55, esp. p. 353; Dhabab II 20 f. The fiqh book involved in these references belonged to a fellow student who had received it from his grandfather. Either the original or a copy of it was available for use in the court of ‘Abd Allah ibn Tahir (d. 230/844-45), Ma’mun’s governor of Khurasan.
201 See GAL I 106 and GAL S I 166 and 299 for Yahya, GAL 1 182 and GAL S I 309 for Ibn Hanbal.
202 See e.g. Khatīb XIV 181-83. See Goldziher, Studien II 160, for an instance where a sharp qasqāh capitalized on the reputations of Yahya and Ibn Hanbal.
203 See e.g. Mīzān III 304.
204 Jarh, Taqdimah, p. 316. For another instance of a girl secretary see Dhahabi II 89 and Khatīb VI 94.
205 Manāqib, pp. 21, 190, 246, 266 f.
206 Jarh, Taqdimah, p. 296; Manāqib, pp. 60 f. Ibn Hanbal could detect interpolations in the manuscripts of others as well (Abhār al-qaṭāf III 314).
207 Jarh, Taqdimah, p. 295; Manāqib, pp. 109 f. and 260.
208 Abū Nu‘aim IX 97; Manāqib, pp. 499 f. and 502. For this Muḥammad see e.g. Jarh IV 1, p. 79.
memory while at the same time his library was growing larger and larger, his earlier habit of not identifying each volume or container caused him some embarrassment. Once he asked his son ʿAbd Allāh, the major transmitter of his Musnad, to bring him a certain book. When ʿAbd Allāh had difficulty in finding it, Ibn Ḥanbal himself entered his library, but it took him a long time to locate the particular tradition he sought.169 It was this same son who reported that his father, despite his excellent memory, related less than a hundred traditions from memory. The significance of this statement can be gauged when it is related to the statement that the traditions in Ibn Ḥanbal's Musnad numbered, in round figures, thirty thousand and that the traditions in his Tafsir were extracted from one hundred and twenty thousand.210 Finally, when Ibn Ḥanbal was restored to royal favor after his trial, the caliph Mutawakkil, who strongly upheld the authority of Tradition, wished him to instruct the princes. Ibn Ḥanbal, always anxious to avoid involvement with royalty, was happy to be able to excuse himself by saying "I do not memorize and have not my books with me."211

In view of the developments outlined above, it is now possible to trace the progress of the recording of Tradition. Before the reign of ʿUmar I no stand was taken in regard to the recording of hadith. ʿUmar I was the first to oppose it but could not impose his decision on the entire community (see p. 10). In the half-century following his death each side sought to universalize its position, but those who were opposed to the recording of hadith constantly lost ground not only because of their failure to gain young adherents but also because of the defection of some of their own older adherents. This period has yielded many reports of conservative teachers who washed out or destroyed their students' sheets or notebooks and urged them to memorize the hadith even as they themselves memorized it212 and of others who, nearing death, destroyed their own manuscripts by burying, burning, or drowning them (see p. 52).213 The last quarter of the first century saw at least a tacit victory for those who favored recorded Tradition as written collections of sizable individual musnad's or groups of musnad's or heterogeneous materials began to appear. Thereafter, the continued socio-economic ambitions of the mawāliʿ, the constant threat and fear of heresy and religious innovation (bidāʾ), the firm establishment of the family isnad of several generations, the increase in the student population, the progressive lengthening of the isnad,214 the expansion of the riḥlah and of the profession of the warrāq all contributed steadily to the increased production and use of recorded Tradition.215 It was at this time that, though some conservatives were still inclined to destroy their manuscripts (see pp. 62 f.), instances of transmission from memory alone or the loss of his manuscripts exposed the traditionist to the charge of inaccuracy and weakness despite his acknowledged honesty and sincerity.216 The recording of hadith was generally accepted before Mālik, Shafiʿi, and Ibn Ḥanbal by their precepts and example made the practice all but universal in the second half of the second century, which in turn accounts for the rapid increase in the number and size of

166 Manāqib, pp. 189 f.
168 Manāqib, p. 385. See also Adab al-imāl, pp. 46 f., which states that several of Ibn Ḥanbal's leading contemporaries refused to dictate or recite except from their manuscripts: لَا يُحَدَّثُ إِلَّا مِنْ كَنَّاءِ فَانَحْفَظُ صَوْتَهُ. Cf. ibid. p. 53, n. 185, above.
169 See e.g. Ibn Saʿd IV 1, p. 83; Jāmī I 63-70; Taqād al-imāl, pp. 36-44. See also p. 231 below.
170 See e.g. Ibn Saʿd V 133, VI 63 and 86.
171 See Adab al-imāl, p. 147, for a general statement, and Jarḥ II 2, pp. 248 f., where careful attention to isnad's is definitely associated with writing in the case of Yūnus ibn Yazīd (d. 149/766), one of Zuhri's leading pupils (see pp. 176 f. below).
172 See e.g. Dārīmī I 123.
173 Ibn Saʿd VI 255 f. For Shafiʿi's views see e.g. Risālah, p. 53. See also Jāmī II 169: مِنْ كَبْرِ حَدِيثِ وَمَنْ كَتَبَ غَيْرَ عَلَى مَنْ هُمُّ مَلَكُوهُ وَلَا أَصْلُ صَحِيحَة. Ibn Nuṣayr VI 350; Khāṭib IX 83; Madkhal, pp. 42-44 (= trans. pp. 41-43).
the private libraries of traditionists and jurists alike. Oral transmission continued in the meantime to be desirable. But instead of manuscripts being recommended as an aid to memory, memory itself was now recommended as a check on one's manuscripts and a safeguard against either innocent error or malicious interpolation, while at the same time every device was used to insure the accuracy of one's precious manuscripts in case of the ultimate failure of memory itself (see pp. 52 f.).

III

It seems necessary, in view of the developments delineated above, to look into some of the factors that have contributed to the general overemphasis placed on the role of oral transmission in early Islam, particularly with reference to the second century, in spite of the fact that the evidence of early and continuous written transmission is so well documented in the earliest literature on traditionists and the science of Tradition.

As already indicated in Volume I, part of the trouble lies in semantics. The Arabs, in making their successful transition within a short time from a protoliterate to a fully literate society, borrowed many terms from their non-Arab neighbors. These terms are mostly substantives that indicate materials and tools rather than verbs that describe the process of acquiring, creating, and preserving a body of literature. Thus, while borrowing such terms as qalam, hibr, qirtas, daftar, and mushaf, to name but a few, they used the verbs sami'a, 'ara'a, kataba, amla, nawa'a, etc. and their derivatives in reference to the actual processes of learning and of the production of manuscripts. Inevitably some of the borrowed words acquired new connotations, which Western scholars have tended to ignore, and hence they have led to some degree of confusion that is not readily overcome.

In the course of my research I noted the occurrences of several key terms, borrowed or otherwise, indicative of the size and permanency of manuscript collections in an effort to recapture their meaning in the contexts of their historical setting and literary usage and to establish, where possible, their interrelationships. The terms sahifah, suhuf, and mushaf, generally translated "sheet (of writing material)," "sheets," and "book," particularly the Qur'an, respectively, will serve to illustrate one phase of the problem. To thus translate these terms consistently is one way of going astray and this way has been too frequently taken by Western scholars, beginning with Sprenger, particularly in connection with the recording of Tradition. For it can be shown that there are instances in the earliest Islamic literature in which the term sahifah implies something more than an ordinary single sheet, even a large one, of writing material. The sahifah, regardless of size, was frequently carried or stored in the form of a scroll (darj) which consisted more often than not of at least several sheets and sometimes of a large number. Some of these early rolls, to judge from information on the nature and extent of their literary contents, were quite sizable. There were, for instance, the sahifah of the caliph Abū Bakr which contained Sūrah 9 and covers twenty-five pages of the 1928 Cairo edition of the Qurʾān and the sahifah of Fatimah, sister of ʿUmar I, which contained Sūrah 20 and covers...
fourteen pages of the same edition of the Qur'an. Again, there was the *saḥīfah* of Ḥafṣah (see p. 42), wife of Muḥammad and daughter of ʿUmar I, which must have contained the greater part of the Qurʾān since it formed the basis of ʿUmar’s “edition” of the Qurʾān, which preceded the ʿUthmānic edition. This *saḥīfah* was based on an earlier collection of Qurʾānic texts made for Abū Bakr by Zaid ibn Thābit, chief editor of the ʿUthmānic edition. Similarly, the several *ṣuhūf* that contained the tax directives of Muḥammad and the first four caliphs may have been written originally on fairly large single sheets or small scrolls, to judge both by the all but laconic brevity of most of the official correspondence of the period and by the probable size of these various documents as reconstructed, co-ordinated, and classified by Zuhri into a single *daftar* or manuscript.

In the second half of the first century we find the shadow of ʿUmar I retreating from the midst of the aging Companions and the younger generation of traditionists, who were aware of the need to “chain down” their traditions for the benefit of the members of their own immediate circles if not for posterity. Furthermore, they began to travel far and wide to ascertain the accuracy and authenticity of what they were so eager to chain down, and more and more of them began to swell their initial collections of a limited number of traditions by copying in full (ṣalā al-wajh) the collections of others. It seems therefore reasonable to assume that in this period, when the term *saḥīfah* was used to indicate a given traditionist’s collection, it could have referred to a sizable and permanent manuscript instead of to a temporary memorandum sheet as hitherto generally supposed. In fact, this general supposition is not always necessary even for the first few decades of Iṣlām, since the Qurʾān itself speaks of the books (*ṣuhūf*) of Abraham and Moses. The *saḥīfah* of ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ (see p. 37), who wrote down everything he heard from Muḥammad with the latter’s permission despite the protest of some of the Companions, could hardly have been a single sheet or even a small roll, since it is said to have contained a thousand traditions. Again, the entire *Ṭafsīr* of Saʿīd ibn Jubair, written for the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik and preserved for several generations, was also called a *saḥīfah* as was a collection of three hundred traditions of Zuhri. In other words, these and the few other instances that have so far come to my notice of early *ṣuhūf* whose approximate or probable sizes are indicated, such as those of the Syrian Khālid ibn Maʿdān, Khālid ibn Abī Imrān al-Tunūsī (see p. 214), Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, Wahb ibn Munabbih, Ḥumaid al-Ṭawfl, and Zuhri, instead of being considered rare exceptions could just as well be considered representative of the *saḥīfah* collections of their time, particularly in the growing community of hadith scholars who as a group advocated and practiced the recording of Tradition. It should be noted further that the sources seem to imply that the average size of a *saḥīfah* and of a *daftar* was taken for granted, since in most of the instances mentioned above the size of the *saḥīfah* is incidental to the main report or anecdote.

The idea of comparative permanency that was implied by the term *saḥīfah* when it was used to describe a scholar’s collection of hadith is brought out by contrast with the term *lūḥ* (pl. *alwāḥ*), translated “tablet,” which referred to a comparatively bulky hard-surfaced material such as shoulder blades in earlier times and wooden tablets of varying sizes soon thereafter.

---

223 Both of these are early Meccan Sūrahs except for a few verses (see *Kifayah*, p. 313, and *Ṣirah* I 225 f. respectively).
224 See Bukhari III 393; *Ṭafsīr* I 50-61; Abū Nuʿaim II 50 f. See also *Concordance* II 260-63 صفح.
225 Sūrah 87:18.
226 Ibn Ḥanbal II 162 f.; *Ṭaqyid al-ʿilm*, pp. 79 and 84 f.
227 "Uṣd" III 233 f.
228 *Jarḥ* III 1, p. 332.
229 Khāṭīb XIV 87; *Ṭaqyid al-ʿilm*, p. 108, n. 245.
Alwāḥ were commonly used in elementary schools and by young traditionists. Even older traditionists used them in the initial process of note-taking and ḥadīth-collecting prior to committing the material to a more permanent record in a special ṣahīfah or daftar. Such use is illustrated in the case of Zuhrī, who, before his decision to record Tradition, went to his teachers without writing materials and relied on his good memory while his fellow pupils wrote down from dictation. However, when a lengthy tradition was involved while he was listening to A‘rāj—and some traditions are long indeed—Zuhrī took a sheet (waraqah) from A‘rāj’s supply of writing materials and wrote down the tradition, which he memorized and then he tore up the sheet. Later, when he was anxious to record everything he heard, he is described as making the rounds of ḥadīth scholars carrying with him alwāḥ and ṣuhuf, the former for on-the-spot note-taking and temporary use, the latter no doubt for recording lengthier materials for future use. As we move farther into the second century we find that the term ṣahīfah (pl. ṣuhuf) was used less and less in connection with note-taking while lūḥ and alwāḥ continued to be so used but were increasingly supplemented by the terms waraqah and riq‘ah, a sheet and a small piece of writing material respectively. On the other hand, ṣahīfah and ṣuhuf continued to be used in connection with larger and more permanent manuscripts but were supplemented by the terms daftar (pl. daftār) and kurrāsah (pl. karārīs) to such an extent that some lexicographers sensed that the terms kitāb, ṣahīfah, kurrāsah, and daftar were similar if not identical in meaning. The term daftar has already been discussed at some length, but a few more instances of its use in the fields of Tradition and law have since been encountered and should be noted. The most interesting of these instances are those that indicate comparative permanency. We read, for instance, that Abū Ubaidah had in Kaisān an incompetent dictation master and secretary who erred in four different ways: “He (Kaisān) understands something other than what he (actually) hears, writes in the alwāḥ something other than what he understands, transfers from the alwāḥ to the daftar something other than what he wrote, and then reads from the daftar something other than what is in it.” There is still another indication of the prestige and permanency of the daftar. We are familiar with instances of young, especially poverty-stricken, pupils who collected or bought discarded documents or papers with largely blank versos on which they wrote their traditions and also with instances of the use of the blank reverse of a letter for the same purpose (as in Document 9) or to rebuke or even insult the letter-writer. Hence, anything said to be written “alā zahr al-qirās or ‘alā zahr al-kitāb came to indicate something of little permanent value. In direct contrast, we read that only the very best is written on the back of a daftar.
The 
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The kurrāsah, like the daftar, implied prestige and permanency, having become early associated with the sections or quires which were used for the copies of the Qurān (kurrāsah al-masāḥiḥ). It seems that those who advocated the recording of Tradition soon began to use kurrāsah for hadīth manuscripts and drew thereby a protest from Nakha’ī (see pp. 149 f.), who had reluctantly taken to writing down hadīth as he grew older. He belonged to the group that opposed written Tradition out of zeal for the unique authority of the Qurān, a sentiment which likewise affected hadīth-writers, such as Dāhḥāk ibn Maẓāḥīm, who disliked having a hadīth manuscript placed on a reading stand (kursī) because the Qurān usually was so placed. Unfortunately, the size of the kurrāsah used in the first and second centuries is nowhere specified so far as I have been able to discover, and for later times the number of folios or pages to a kurrāsah varies from eight to twenty-four. To judge by the range of the number of traditions to a folio, as illustrated in our documents, such kurrāsah could well have contained early collections varying from the two hundred to the five hundred traditions so frequently referred to in the sources.

The initial fear (raḥbah) of the Prophet’s hadīth, best expressed by the attitude of Abū Bakr and ‘Uthmān, who avoided all but strictly literal hadīth, had given way to reverential awe (haḥībah) and pious pomp and glorification (taʿzīm al-hadīth) before the end of the first century (see pp. 90 f.). Such sentiments began at the latest with Sa`īd ibn al-Musayyib and his younger contemporaries and were held by representatives of the succeeding generations such as Mālik ibn Anas, Ibn Wahb, Ibn Ḥanbal, and some less prominent scholars. These sentiments were reflected in the attempt to treat hadīth manuscripts in a manner befitting the Qurān by the use of Qurānic scripts and format and by the use of reading stands.

Reverence for the Prophet’s hadīth carried over eventually to the most outstanding traditionists, some of whom were not averse to being counted among the asḥāb al-kurāsah, that is, among the high and mighty, partly after the fashion of religious leaders in other faiths and partly in imitation of secular leaders in Islamic society itself, in which a chair literally raised the occupant above his companions who were seated on mattresses and cushions or bare mats on the floor and figuratively clothed him with might and power. The desire for such prestige

Khālid al-Barmakī introduced the daftar in codex form, as against the earlier rolls, for use in the administrative bureaus:


See Jāmi‘ I 67; Taqīqī al-a‘um, pp. 47 f. See also p. 13 above.

Ibn Abī Dā‘ūd, Kitāb al-masāḥiḥ, pp. 134 f.; Iṣā‘ār II 172. The Qurān of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz was also carried in a wooden box (Ibn Sa‘d V 270). The general association of the Qurān with the kursī as a mark of awe and honor is reflected in an incident reported of the Barmakī waṣir Yaḥyā. He so admired the Rasūl al-a‘um of the administrative secretary and literary stylist ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Kāṭib (d. 132/750; see GAL S I 165 and our Vol. I 29, n. 5) that he placed the work, written in a large volume (daftar kabīr), on a kursī, much to the surprise and pleasure of the secretary’s son, who assumed the volume to be a Qurān (cf. Abū al-Qāsim ‘Abd Allāh al-Baghdādī, Kitāb al-kutub, ed. Dominique Sourdel, in Bulletin d’études orientales XIV [1952-54] 149).

157 Cf. Nawawī’s commentary on Muslim I 95.

158 In paper-making terms a kurrāsah is a quire or onetwentieth of a ream of 480 or 500 sheets of paper laid flat or folded once.

159 See Ibn Sa‘d III 1, pp. 39 and 210. For other early instances of this attitude see e.g. Ibn Sa‘d III 1, p. 110, and IV 1, p. 106.

160 Ibn ‘Asākir IV 351 f.

161 Ibn al-Ḥājī, Mudkhal ilā tamnīyat al-amal I 135.

162 Manāqib, pp. 180 and 203 f.


164 See e.g. Abād al-imlā‘, pp. 27-38, for early and later practices.

165 See e.g. Tirmidhī X 16.

166 The well known Qurānic “Verse of the Throne,” aṣā‘a‘at al-kurāsah (Sūrah 2:255), which refers to the “Throne of God,” and its commentators give both the literal and the figurative sense of the phrase aṣā‘a‘at al-kurāsah. Hārūn al-Rashīd sat on a golden throne (kursī min dhahab) yet
CONTINUOUS WRITTEN TRANSMISSION

was frequently accompanied by pride in memory, which helps to explain the overemphasis that has been given to the role of oral transmission.

Admirers who reported that they never saw a book in the hands of a given leading traditionist who is known to have had large written collections at home referred only to his recitations; yet the phrase has come to be interpreted, too frequently, as implying opposition to written Tradition. Scholars who were not likely to be seen writing down traditions nor with a book in hand would have been the illiterate or semiliterate and the blind or nearly blind. The illiterate Abū Hurairah was in a class by himself because of his long association with Muḥammad and the large volume of his musnad. A few other illiterates who made a virtue of their deficiency and exercised their memories are not associated with large numbers of traditions; these include such men as Abū Mūsā al-Ashʿarī, who learned the rudiments of writing at a mature age, Jaʿfar ibn Barqān, who transmitted from Zuhrī, and Ḥammād ibn Khalīd, who sat at Mālik’s gate. On the other hand, Abū ‘Awānah al-Waḍādī ibn Khalīd (d. 170 or 176/786 or 792), who could read but not write, sought help with his manuscripts, which were carefully pointed and voweled so that he would be able to read them easily and correctly. He was considered acceptable only when he was transmitting from such reliable manuscripts. As for the blind or nearly blind, of whom there were apparently quite a few, the case of Aḥmad, whose very name emphasizes his misfortune, is illustrative. He started by opposing recorded Tradition but in the end dictated his collection to others.

Another deceptive phrase is ḥaḍith (‘un), which has been frequently, though erroneously, taken to mean that no writing was permitted by the teacher nor practiced by the pupils. It is used, for instance, in connection with Yaḥyā ibn Saʿd al-Anṣārī as teacher and Aḥmad and Ḥammād ibn Salamah ibn Dinār as pupils in contexts that do not permit any confusion between ‘an (‘un) and ‘ind (‘ind). For the students concentrated on memory work in the teacher’s presence (‘ind), then usually had a memory drill among themselves, and finally rushed home to write down the day’s quota of traditions preparatory to later collation.

Still another phrase that is subject to misreading and misinterpretation is ḥaḍith (‘un), which could be voweled to read “he does not write his hadith” or “his hadith is not to be written down,” both of which could imply oral transmission. However, works on hadith criticism such as the Jarḥ wa al-taʿlīl of Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī and his son ‘Abd al-Rahmān, ‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn Mahdī, Ḥanbali (who frequently relied on Yaḥyā and Ibn Mahdī), and the severest critic of them all, Yaḥyā ibn Maṭn (see pp. 53, 54), show an early turning point when the phrase began to emphasize the role of written transmission as against oral. Read in the active voice, the phrase implies a...
degree of unreliability. Read in the passive voice, it is a formula for outright rejection of a particular traditionist. \(^\text{266}\) It was frequently used to reject Abū Ḥanīfah as a weak traditionist, even though he was said to have written down a large number of traditions some of which were later used by his leading pupil, Abū Yusuf the chief justice for Ḥārūn ar-Rashīd. \(^\text{267}\) A less critical position is indicated by the phrase "his hadith may be written down (for reference and comparison) but should not be adduced as proof." \(^\text{272}\) Finally, full approval is expressed by the phrase "he is authoritative, his hadith may be (is to be) written down," which was used in reference to most recognized authorities. It is evident that, whichever way the phrase was used or read, it testifies to the universal demand for and acceptability of recorded Tradition in the professional circles of the second and third centuries.

Another cause of the overemphasis on the role of oral transmission was the scholar’s practice of destroying his manuscripts in his old age. Most of the early cases of such destruction stemmed from the motive that led Abū Bakr and ‘Umar I to destroy hadith manuscripts (see p. 60). The impression one gains at first is that most of the second-century instances were sincerely motivated. That some hadith manuscripts were either erased or destroyed is not to be questioned. \(^\text{268}\) But these acts took place for a variety of reasons, some of which were quite unrelated to the motive of ‘Umar I. Books were destroyed because they wore out, or because their owner had no trustworthy heir (see p. 10), or because of fear of the authorities, or because of anger or bitterness. Fiqh scholars, especially some of the ahl al-ra‘y, suffered qualms of conscience toward the end of life and therefore sometimes destroyed their own works and more often their copies of works dealing with doctrines verging on heresy. All in all, hadith manuscripts seem to have suffered no more, if as much, in this respect than any other legal or sectarian works. Some scholars who buried their books out of fear of the authorities recovered them when the danger had passed, as was the case with Sufyān al-Thaurī and his books. \(^\text{269}\) And, again, books that had been lost or buried for some time, by accident or otherwise, were discovered accidentally and rescued, as was the case even with Ṭabarī’s Ikhtilāf al-fuqahā’, which was found buried after his death. \(^\text{270}\) The loss of books, from the time of ‘Urwah ibn al-Zubair onward, was belatedly regretted and always considered a calamity conducive to the unfortunate traditionists’ sudden loss of authority and influence (see p. 56). During the second century most traditionists frowned on the practice of destroying manuscripts. Thus while the ascetic scholars Dā‘ūd al-Tā‘ī (d. 165/781-82) \(^\text{271}\) and Bishr al-Ḥāṭem \(^\text{272}\) destroyed their books, Ibn Lahrīrah, though suspect in some respects, was helped to replace his library, which had been destroyed by fire, and Ibn Ḥanbal expressed displeasure at the willful destruction of books. \(^\text{273}\) Furthermore, the destruction of a scholar’s collection of hadith manuscripts and

\(^{266}\) See e.g. Jarḥ, Taqdimah, p. 322, and Jarḥ I 2, p. 513, rejecting the weak traditionist Ṣa‘d ibn Sa‘d of our Document 8; Lisan VI 232 f., rejecting Abū al-Bakhtarī of our Document 10. For other 2d-century instances see e.g. Jarḥ III 2, pp. 242 f.; Khaṭṭīb XIV 330; Kifāyah, p. 22; Muṣān I 175.

\(^{267}\) Ibn Sa‘d VI 256; Jāmi‘ II 145; Khaṭṭīb IX 11. For a fair treatment of Abū Ḥanīfah as a traditionist see Yūnus ibn al-Asshah, Al-Khaṭṭīb al-Baghdādī (Damascus, 1346/1945) pp. 238-42.

\(^{268}\) As in the case, for example, of Baqṭīyah ibn al-Walīd and Yūnus ibn Bukair (Jarḥ II 2, pp. 154 and 227, and IV 2, pp. 127 f.).
books late in his life seldom resulted in a total loss except in the physical sense. For the aged scholar had in all probability disseminated their contents in part or in whole to at least a few deserving and able transmitters who had already either absorbed these contents into their own hadith collections or had preserved copies of some of the destroyed originals (see e.g. pp. 49–52).

Finally, the isnād terminology itself is misleading, developing as it did during a period when oral transmission was greatly emphasized. Not only do the basic verbs qāla and samī'a imply oral communication, but the rest of the isnād terms—ṣan'ānah, akhbara, anba'a, ballagha, haddatha, dhakara, za'amah—all connote primarily speech rather than written communication, though they as readily convey the latter sense in a society that has long been literate. The primarily oral connotations of these terms carried over into the succeeding periods even though oral transmission itself was fast losing ground, for early Islam made literacy and intellectual endeavor two of its chief characteristics. Since hadith soon became basic to all religious studies, its methodology, as this evolved and became comparatively stable, was borrowed in principle though not to the same degree of precision and consistency for the related sciences, especially for Qur'ānic commentary, law, and history (tafsīr, fiqh, and tārīkh).274 Some of the earlier terms, such as balagha, dhakara, and za'amah, that soon lost favor with the traditionists, continued in freer use in these other fields though not without some implied suspicion.275 The traditionists in the meantime strove for greater precision in the isnād terminology, so that the fleeting use of the passive voice of the verbs haddatha and akhbara276 gave way to the active transitive haddathani and akhbarani. The traditionists' real problem, however, was to evolve an isnād terminology precise enough to distinguish adequately between the two current and frequently concomitant methods of transmission—the oral and the written. How they went about this task and the limited degree to which they succeeded is detailed in connection with the discussion of Documents 6 and 7 and need not detain us here. But it should be noted that since Zuhri and his followers insisted on the use of the isnād277 and at the same time encouraged written transmission278 the oral connotations of the isnād terms, which he and his students used and to a degree stabilized, more often than not camouflaged written transmission in the guise of oral transmission.

A question must be raised at this point. In view of the considerable amount of hadith-recording in the second half of the first century and the phenomenal acceleration of literary activity and development of literary forms in the time of Zuhri and immediately thereafter, why do modern scholars still lean heavily toward the view that, until well into the third century, oral communication was the main channel for the transmission of Tradition? The answer lies partly in the history of Islamic studies, particularly in the West, in the nineteenth and

274 See Documents 1, 6, 7; see also Vol. I 5–31.


276 Used by Ibn Juraij in his collection of the hadith of Ibn 'Abbas, which Ibn Juraij brought to Mansūr's attention in the hope of a reward that never materialized. Mansūr heard the recitation of the collection (size not indicated) with appreciation but disapproved of the isnād padding: " قال المنصور ما اختص به لا هذا الحشو يعني: بالغى وحديث (see Khatīb X 400, 404). Khatīb's entire entry (ibid. pp. 400–407) on Ibn Juraij reflects the latter's constant preoccupation with hadith-writing and manuscripts.

277 See Adab al-imlā', pp. 5–8, where the role of the isnād is indicated by means of several picturesque figures of speech.

278 See e.g. Jarh, Taqdimah, p. 117; Jāmi' I 73, II 177 f.; Adab al-imlā', p. 155; Abu Nu'mām III 366: حضور المجلس بلا نسخة ذل.
THE EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF ISLAMIC TRADITION

twentieth centuries. Giants pioneering in the field—Nöldeke, Wellhausen, Wüstenfeld, Caetani, De Slane, Muir, Sprenger, Wensinck, Goldziher—broke fresh ground in studies of the Qur’ān, the life of Muḥammad, and the history of early ʿIslām. Practically everything they touched brought them up against Tradition and the distracting problems it poses. Yet they stopped only long enough to clear a narrow path to their own particular goals, ignoring the wide field of Tradition itself, until Goldziher changed this pattern and plowed into the whole field of Tradition. That he was able to accomplish so much in his day, when a great deal of the source material was still unpublished and some important early sources were yet to be discovered, gives eloquent testimony to his great energy and broad vision. That even he over­ooked certain phenomena and was misled by later ʿIslāmic interpretation of early ʿIslāmic cultural history is thus understandable. He, like most of his contemporaries, minimized the tangible cultural developments of the ʿUmayyad period and continued therefore to stress the role of oral transmission and to consider all early literary records as temporary aids to memory and thus fixed the pattern for the next generation of students of Tradition, most of whom seldom ventured beyond the paths already traced. A high plateau having been reached, most scholars were content to rest there until, first, Fück, Horovitz, and Rudi Paret struck out on their own and, more recently, the veteran scholar James Robson devoted his mature years to a new approach to the science of Tradition. While not one of these scholars undertook a thorough analysis of the methods and means of transmission of ḥadīth, they all converged toward the general conclusion that the vast body of orthodox Tradition was more or less fixed by around the end of the first century. More recently, ʿIslāmic scholars, aware and appreciative for the most part of the West’s pioneering in the study of ʿIslāmic culture, have begun to delve with increasing vigor and curiosity into the early cultural history of ʿIslām and are discovering the speedy development of its first religious sciences and their close interrelationships. As a result, such scholars as Ahmad Amin, Kattānī, Kurd ʿAlī, and Jawād ʿAlī, whose research covers a wide scope of cultural history, as well as those who like Yūsuf al-ʿAshsh and ʿSezgin (see e.g. p. 46) concentrate more on Tradition and law, are more willing to concede a higher cultural level not only to the pre-ʿAbbāsid period but also to the pre-ʿIslāmic Arabs. By according to both a greater degree of literacy than that permitted by the popular traditional picture of the ʿUmayyads and of the jāḥilīyah, they help to counteract the overworked argument for complete or exclusive orality in Tradition.

It would, of course, be absurd to equate oral transmission with excessive fluidity of either form or content, with the usually accompanying implication of conscious or unconscious fabrication, and it would be equally absurd to equate literary record with complete fixity of form and content implying thereby the exclusion of the probability of fabrication. But it would likewise be absurd not to concede that oral transmission is indeed more conducive to fabrication than is literary fixity. Therefore, the marked degree of early literary fixity indicated in the present study should to that degree clarify some of the issues in the great controversy over the authenticity of ʿIslāmic Tradition.

See especially his introduction to Taqyid al-ʿilm.
GROWTH OF TRADITION

The controversy over the authenticity of Islamic Tradition is intimately associated with the rapid growth of hadith during the first two centuries of Islam, when as a result of the initial caution exercised by the Companions and older Successors relative to the isnād biographical science ('ilm al-rijāl) was formalized by such scholars as Ibn Ju'ayj, Shu'bah ibn al-Ḥajjāj, and Wuhaib ibn Khālid al-Ṭabīrī and further refined under such critics as 'Abd al-Rahmān ibn Mahdī and Yaḥyā ibn Sa'īd al-Ṭaṭṭān to become a sharp tool, the jarh wa al-ta'dīl, in the hands of such master hadith critics as Yaḥyā ibn Ma‘īn and ʿAlī ibn al-Madīnī. Major hadith collectors who were active around the end of the second century, of the caliber of Ibn Ḥanbal, Bukhārī, and Muslim, used fully this indispensable tool of all traditionists who were more than passive channels of transmission. Ibn Ḥanbal, who had the most inclusive collection, transmitted, like Sufyān ibn ʿUyainah before him, traditions of varying degrees of soundness along with some that were faulty and pointed out that were he to transmit only such traditions as he considered sound his musnad would shrink to a small part of its volume. Muslim and Bukhārī, like Ibn Ḥanbal, had enormous hadith collections with many sound but many more unsound traditions to draw on. Unlike Ibn Ḥanbal, however, they limited themselves, each according to his own set of rules, to traditions they considered sound (ṣaḥīḥ) and proved Ibn Ḥanbal's point by the relatively small size of their Sahihain, though it must be pointed out that neither of them claimed to have exhausted all the sound hadith. Despite their different objectives and standards of selection, all three of these hadith collectors emphasized the fact that their finished compositions constituted but a small fraction of the materials available to them, the greater part of which each judged to be unfit for use. To the uninitiated in the field of Islamic Tradition such an assertion seems not only alarming but almost absurd, especially coming from Ibn Ḥanbal and others who confessed that they included unsound traditions in their selections. But it posed no problem for the critics who, like the collectors, took down everything in order to be familiar with the true as well as the false traditions and not to mistake one for the other. Ḥākim al-Nisābūrī, for instance, estimated the number of traditions in his first category of sound traditions at less than ten thousand. Nevertheless, even the initiates in the field of Islamic Tradition, hypnotized by the great disproportion between the so-called sound and unsound traditions, are preconditioned to look upon Islamic Tradition as having been a vehicle of large-scale fabrication before the leading traditionists of the third century took it in hand to separate the few grains of wheat from the mounds of chaff. It is therefore necessary to examine in detail so-called sound and unsound Tradition.

1 For early hadith critics and for surveys of the development of hadith criticism see Tirmidhi XIII 304-39; Ṣaḥīḥ, Taqdimah, pp. 1-11; Ṣaḥīḥ IV 2, pp. 34 ff.; Ḫāmi’s II 150-63; Kifayah, pp. 101-20; Marifah, pp. 52-58; Madkhal. For lists of works on hadith criticism see e.g. Sakhawī, Al-ṭalāb fi al-taḥāth li man ḫama al-tawārīkh (Damascus, 1349/1930) pp. 109-18; Taḥāth, p. 281; Ḫāji Khalfah II 300-02; GAL II III 873.

2 Ḫāmi’s I 76.

3 Ibn Ḥanbal, Al-musnad I (1365/1946) 56 ff. See also pp. 50 ff. above.

4 See Madkhal, pp. 8-10 (= trans. pp. 12-14) for this point of view and the many leaders who adopted it.

5 Ibid. p. 11. This is the category to which the Sahihain of Muslim and Bukhārī are assigned. Ḫākim al-Nisābūrī (Madkhal, p. 24 [trans. p. 26]) comments on the small ratio of doubtful (less than 2,000) and unsound (226) traditions among some 40,000 listed in Bukhārī’s Taḥāth.

6 See e.g. Guillaume, The Traditions of Islam, pp. 28 ff.; Robson, “Tradition, the second foundation of Islam,” Muslim World XLI 100 f.
The isnād, to which the Arabs lay proud claim, was bound to get out of hand as in every generation the number of traditionists and would-be-traditionists at least doubled, to estimate conservatively. Since a tradition, though consisting of two parts, the substance (matn) and the chain of authorities (isnād), came to be identified primarily by its isnād, it could multiply without any basic change in substance into as many “traditions” as the number of its progressive transmitters. The majority of the older Companions, it can be safely assumed, each transmitted but a few traditions from Muhammad. The younger Companions, once 'Umar I was gone, made up for such restraint. The large collections of some of them, for example Abū Hurairah (5,374 traditions), Ibn 'Umar (2,630), Anas ibn Mālik (2,286), ʻA-ʻishah (2,210), and Ibn Abbās (1,660), no doubt raised the average for the Companions as a group. The Successors proved even more eager to collect traditions of the Prophet, and it is entirely possible that the desire, one might almost say the fashion, to acquire “forty traditions” of Muḥammad originated with this group and gained full momentum later. Still, this desire seems but a slim foundation, on first thought, for the hundreds of thousands of traditions that were emerging around the end of the second century. In an effort to gauge, even if only roughly, the rate of this growth, I made note of the references to the number of traditions that individual laymen and scholars were said to have collected or transmitted. The recording of specific numerical data, it should be noted, was largely incidental, especially for the earliest period, when the quantity of traditions in a collection was usually expressed in terms of “few traditions” or “many traditions,” qalīl al-hadīth or kathīr al-hadīth (see pp. 20, 21). At times when numbers are mentioned they are contradictory, though not so often as they seem to be. Nevertheless, analysis of such data as are available indicates certain trends that deserve at least some consideration. The average illiterate layman, even in the Hijāz and Syria, in Zuhār’s day had 1–5 traditions, which whenever possible were “intrusted” to Zuhār lest they be forgotten. Literate laymen of the first century had their suhūf, which, as noted above (pp. 57–59), varied in size. Doubtless many of these suhūf consisted of no more than a single or a double sheet containing anywhere from a few to the familiar “forty traditions,” depending on the length of the traditions and the size of the sheet. A few of the better known scholars (ʻulamā‘ or fuqahā‘) of this early period are credited with 100–300 traditions, but for the most part their collections are described as “large.” Ubayy ibn Ka‘b, who died late in the second decade of the first century, and Jābir ibn Samurah (d. 66/686) are both credited with 164 traditions of the Prophet, while Jābir ibn ʻAbd Allāh (d. 78/697), who is counted among those who had large collections, is credited with 1,000 traditions; the number credited also to ʻAbd Allāh ibn ʻAmr ibn al-ʻĀṣ (see p. 58). Qāsim ibn Muḥammad (see p. 13) is credited with 200 traditions.

References to specific numbers increased during the first half of the second century, the period of intense activity for Zuhār and his pupils and for many of his contemporaries. At the same time the numbers themselves grew progressively larger, varying as a rule from a few hundred to a few thousand. Abū ʻṣāliḥ Dhakwān (d. 101/719) transmitted 1,000 traditions to A‘mash,

---

1 See e.g. Jāmi‘ II 120 f.; Mustadrak I 110 f.; Dhahabi I 71 f.
2 The numbers are those of Tadrib, p. 205.
3 See e.g. Jāmi‘ I 43 f. and cf. Ibn al-JauzI, Kitab al-adhkhiyār (Cairo, 1306/1887) pp. 72 f. The Concordance gives no tradition on this theme. Early Muslim scholars vigorously refuted the idea that 40 traditions made a scholar and won him rewards in heaven, as the references in Jāmi‘ I 43 f. make very clear. See also Khaṭīb VI 322 and Ibn ʻAbd al-Barr, Al-intiqāl fi faḍā’il al-thalāthah al-fuqahā‘ (Cairo, 1350/1931) p. 18.
4 Nawawī, pp. 141 and 184 f. Nawawī frequently indicates how many traditions of a given collection have survived in either Bukhārī or Muslim or both. The ratio of survival is as a rule very small (see e.g. ibid. pp. 260, 304, 353, 370, 449, 638).
5 Uṣd III 233 f.
6 Dhahabi I 90 f.
who was credited with a collection of some 1,300.\(^{13}\) Zuhrî, we read, was once cornered into reciting “forty traditions.”\(^{14}\) The manuscript of his pupil ‘Uqail ibn Khâlid (see p. 168) included some 200–300 traditions.\(^{15}\) Mâlik ibn Anas sent Yaḥyâ ibn Sa’d al-Anṣârî 100 traditions (see p. 193) from his own collection of Zuhrî’s hadîth. The book that Zuhrî dictated at Hishâm’s court for the use of the young princes (see pp. 33, 181) contained 400 traditions.\(^{16}\) At another time it was estimated that Zuhrî’s court collection included at least 1,700 traditions.\(^{17}\) He is also said to have seen a collection of A’mash (see p. 140) which numbered 4,000 traditions,\(^{18}\) but A’mash’s entire collection was later estimated at 70,000 (sic\(^{19}\)) traditions. ‘Amr ibn Dinâr (d. 126/744), usually reluctant to transmit many traditions, over a period of time related 100 traditions to Shur‘bah.\(^{20}\) On the other hand, Abân ibn Abî ‘Ayyâsh (d. 128/746) transmitted some 1,500 mostly unfounded traditions from Anas ibn Mâlik, and Abân’s two sons each transmitted 500 traditions from Abân (see p. 226). Thâbit al-Bunâî (d. 123 or 128/741 or 746) recited 90 traditions at one of his sessions and transmitted to Ḥammâd ibn Salamah ibn Dinâr (see pp. 160 f.) a collection of 250.\(^{21}\) The collection of Ayyûb al-Sikhtiyânî was estimated at about 800 traditions.\(^{22}\)

The acceleration in numbers was even more marked as younger scholars who died during the fifth and sixth decades of the second century reached their peak, many of them becoming the outstanding traditionists or jurists of their day. Abû Ḥanîfah had a large collection of hadîth and though he was considered a weak traditionist is yet said to have rejected 400 traditions on the basis of their substance (matn).\(^{23}\) Mis‘ar ibn Kidâm (see p. 272) transmitted a collection of 1,000 traditions to one of his pupils.\(^{24}\) Ibn Jâraij transmitted 1,000 traditions from Abû Bakr ibn Abî Sabrah, who himself eventually declared he had a full collection of 70,000 dealing with the lawful and the unlawful.\(^{25}\) Shur‘bah, who was one of the few called amîr al-mumârin fi al-hadîth,\(^{26}\) normally limited himself to relating 3–10 traditions a day. Yet he crammed six months’ output into two when he exchanged traditions with the visiting Baqîyah ibn al-Walîd from Syria (see pp. 232 f.). Some of Shur‘bah’s other transmitters wrote down up to 10,000 of his traditions.\(^{27}\) Sufyân al-Thaurî dictated 300 traditions in one session.\(^{28}\) Tayalisî is said to have heard a total of 6,700 traditions from Shur‘bah.\(^{29}\) Sufyân al-Thaurî, who stated that he transmitted but one out of ten traditions in his enormous collection, had a student who wrote down 20,000 and another who wrote down 30,000 of his traditions.\(^{30}\) On the other hand, Abû Nu‘aim Fażîl ibn Dukain (see Document 14), who presumably took the “one out of ten” that Sufyân spoke of, collected only 4,000 of the latter’s traditions.\(^{31}\) Abî al-Razzâq ibn Hammâm’s written collection from Ma‘mar ibn Râshîd (d. 154/771) consisted of 10,000 traditions.\(^{32}\) Ḥammâd ibn Salamah ibn Dinâr (d. 167/784) counted among his

---

\(^{13}\) Ibn Sa’d VII 2, p. 38; Jamîc II 179; Kattâni II 319. Some of the other scholars who were so called, sometimes with slight variations, are Abû al-Zinâd (see p. 139 below), Sufyân al-Thaurî (Khaṭîb XII 347 f., 353 f.), Sufyân ibn ‘Uyайнâh (Khaṭîb IX 180; see also p. 160 below), Ibn al-Mubârak (Nawawi, pp. 366 f., and p. 222 below), Abû Walîd al-Tayalisî (Dahâbî I 346 f.), and Yaḥyâ ibn Ma‘ân (Kifâyah, pp. 146, 217 f., 230 f., 362, 382). See Jarh, Taqdimah, pp. 118, 282, and 254, for the distinction between leadership in the field of hadîth and in the field of sunnah, with Sufyân al-Thaurî as imâm in both.

\(^{14}\) Jarh I 2, pp. 140–42; Dahâbî I 183.

\(^{15}\) Jarh, Taqdimah, p. 66.

\(^{16}\) Mis‘ân I 413.

\(^{17}\) Abû Nu‘aim VI 368.

\(^{18}\) Khaṭîb XII 348.

\(^{19}\) Dahâbî I 179. See also pp. 178–80 below.
THE EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF ISLAMIC TRADITION

pupils Yahyā ibn Ma'in, who wrote down Ḥammād's entire Jāmi', some of it directly from Ḥammād and the rest from seventeen other traditionists; four other traditionists state that they wrote down about 10,000 of Ḥammād's traditions (see pp. 160 ff.).

In the second half of the second century, when the recording of Tradition had already become the general practice and when the numerous isnad's were still multiplying with each successive transmission, collections of traditions numbering in the thousands and presently in the tens of thousands became more or less the rule. Mālik ibn Anas had a collection of some 100,000 traditions, of which he used 10,000 at the most and incorporated only some 1,700 in his Muwatta (see p. 125); in addition, individual transmitters had comparatively small collections from him, such as Shaibānī's 700 traditions.33 Sufyān ibn ʿUyainah, who was at first reluctant to write down or dictate traditions, was once tricked into relating 100.34 His collection at one time was reported at 7,000 traditions (see p. 179). ʿIbrāhīm ibn Saʿīd (see p. 180) transmitted 17,000 traditions from Ibn Ishāq in addition to the latter's Maqāṣīd.35 Sharīk ibn ʿAbd Allāh, judge of Kūfah and tutor of Māhdī's sons, dictated 3,000 and 5,000–9,000 traditions to his various students.36 Hushaim al-Wāṣīṭī's collection is reported as consisting of some 20,000 traditions (see p. 163). ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Māḥdī is said to have transmitted 2,000 traditions from his colleague Yahyā ibn Saʿīd al-Qaṭṭān37 and to have dictated 20,000.38 Rauḥ ibn ʿUbādah, Basran transmitter of Mālik's Muwatta (see p. 117), wrote down a collection of 10,000 traditions which was copied by others.39 The Khurasanian Ibn al-Mubārik states that he wrote down traditions from 1,100 shaikhs,40 and the number of traditions which he in turn transmitted out of his vast collection is estimated by Yahyā ibn Ma'in at 2,000.41 The collection of the Syrian Ismā'īl ibn ʿAyyāsh (see p. 178) consisted at first of 10,000 traditions and increased to 30,000.42 The Egyptian Ibn Wahb is credited with 100,000.43

The first half of the third century saw the continuation of the increase in the number of traditions in the collections of leading scholars. Yazīd ibn Ḥarūn and Abū Nuʿaim Faḍl ibn Dukain are said to have written down "thousands of traditions."44 When figures are given for entire collections, they range from hundreds of thousands to an occasional million and a half. Yahyā ibn Ma'in wrote down from Mūsā ibn Ismā'īl al-Baṣrī al-Tabūdhkī (d. 223/838) about 30,000 or 40,000 traditions and collected 50,000 traditions of Ibn Juraij.45 Inasmuch as Yahyā, like other leading professionals, wrote down traditions from literally hundreds of traditionists, it is not surprising that his total collection is reported at a million traditions, a figure that would seem to be in keeping with the reported size of his library (see p. 51). The number of traditions in the entire collection of a younger contemporary, Abūmād ibn al-Furāt (d. 258/872), is given as a million and a half.46 Ḳāṭib ibn Rāhawaih, whose memory was photographic (see p. 55), is reported as dictating from memory at various times 11,000, 70,000, and 100,000 traditions.47 During his rihlah in ʿIrāq he along with Yahyā ibn Ma'in and Ibn Ḥanbal and their circle spent a great deal of time recalling among themselves tradi-

---

33 Ṭaftār X 14.
34 Akhbar al-qudat III 150 f., 161; Dāhibāt I 214; Ḳāṭib VI 320.
35 Ḳāṭib XIV 138.
36 Abū Nuʿaim IX 3.
37 Dāhibāt I 319.
38 Nawawi, p. 287. Ibn al-Mubārak is even credited with some verses urging Ḥammād ibn Zaid ibn Dirham to write down the hadith (Abū Nuʿaim VI 258).
39 Ṭaftār X 164; Dāhibāt I 254.
40 Dāhibāt I 234; Ḳāṭib IV 224.
41 Ḳāṭib VIII 227; Dāhibāt I 315.
42 Dāhibāt I 16 f.
43 Yāḥyā II 199.
44 Ḳāṭib VI 352–54; Madkhal, p. 13; Dāhibāt II 19–21.
The size of Ishaq ibn Rahawaih’s entire collection seems to be nowhere mentioned but can be judged on the basis of those of Yahya and Ibn Hanbal, his close associates and friendly competitors. The collections and libraries of a second pair of friendly scholars, Abu Zarrah and Abu Hazim al-Razi, tell the same story of tremendous growth in the number of traditions and in the diversified sciences of Tradition (‘ulum al-hadith), particularly the jarh wa al-ta’dir. Abu Zarrah’s collection contained 10,000 traditions each from Hammad ibn Salamah ibn Dinur and Musa ibn Ismail, 50,000 to 70,000 to 100,000 each from Ibrahim ibn Musa and Abd Allah ibn Abi Shaibah, and 80,000 traditions of Ibn Wahb of Egypt. Though specific figures for Abu Hatim al-Razi seem not to be as readily available, it is known that his collection of traditions, which he started in the year 209/824, grew steadily, that he wrote down some 14,000 from one shaikh, that he accumulated large quantities throughout his three long journeys and put them to good use in his critical works.

With the sizes of these collections in mind, we may conclude that the numbers of traditions, reflecting either partial or complete collections, credited to Ibn Hanbal, Muslim, and Bukhari were not exceptional but rather typical for their ranking contemporaries, especially when it is recalled that these three, honored as they were in their day, had not yet received the almost sacred halos with which they were later crowned. The totals credited to Ibn Hanbal vary from 750,000 to 1,200,000 traditions. Bukhari is said to have had a collection of 300,000 traditions, of which he had memorized 100,000 of the best, but the figure 600,000, of which he had memorized 200,000, is also given. The number of traditions that formed the basis of the Sahih of Muslim, said to contain some 12,000 traditions, is given as 300,000; his total, to which I have so far found no reference, can be gauged from this figure. With so little agreement on the total number of traditions in the surviving Musnad of Ibn Hanbal and in the Sahihain of Muslim and Bukhari the impossibility of discovering the totals of all the traditions of any of these three scholars and others is readily to be seen.

What, then, do these sometimes contradictory numbers mean? First of all, they alert us to the fact that no adequate contemporary or nearly contemporary statistics were kept and that they are but approximations to the nearest hundred or thousand etc. Nevertheless, they not only clearly indicate the fact of the steady growth of Tradition but also give some idea of the rate of growth. The rate is reflected by the increasing number of traditions transmitted by one scholar to another and also by the increasing number of transmitters. A famed scholar’s public lectures usually drew 10,000 scholars carrying inkwells, apart from the crowds of passive listeners. All of this indicates that the great majority of traditions in circulation were held, one might say, in common. The double acceleration is in turn reflected in the rate of growth of the number of traditions in the arsenal of such master traditionists as have come under
review above. The earlier ones were the vanguard of an army of traditionists, the *ahl al-hadith*, who were bracing themselves to meet the onslaughts of legal innovation and doctrinal heresy in their own orthodox Sunni ranks, not to mention the heterodoxies of growing sects that were producing their own traditions, some in quite large numbers. The latter were to be found mostly among the Shi'ites, the Qādirites, and especially the Kharijites, in whose ranks were several self-confessed forgers such as 'Abd al-Karīm ʿAbd Aqqās (d. 155/772), who claimed he had forged 4,000 traditions. The need to make exhaustive collections, to sort the sound from the unsound traditions, and to organize some of the materials into manageable form and size pressed heavily on the orthodox Sunni traditionists from the second half of the second century onward.

Inasmuch as the *isnād* was the main basis for judging the soundness or unsoundness of a tradition, a feverish search for the best and next best *isnād*’s of the various traditions was set in motion early and was reflected in the objective of many a *riḥlah*. Hence, the practice of writing down traditions with the same basic content but with variant *isnād*’s soon became an important factor in the rapid growth of Tradition. Again, in the course of successive transmission, written or oral, though more often in the case of oral, the original content was frequently changed in structure or occasionally acquired a different nuance of meaning or suffered some addition or subtraction. Such alterations occurred more frequently when transmission was according to the sense of the content (*maʾnawī*) than when it was strictly literal (*harfī*). Hence, the search for parallel but variant *isnād*’s was supplemented by the search for parallel versions of the same content, so that there was an increase in the total number of so-called versions, based on either *isnād* or content or both, of a given tradition. Because of aversion to traditions based ultimately on only one authority (*ḥadīth al-aḥād*) the search for a second, independent, *isnād* became the general practice and was extended to apply to each step of successive transmission, so that each generation of traditionists was urged to relate every tradition from at least two shaikhs. This practice explains why there are so many duplicate traditions in the individual standard collections and why the great majority of these collections repeat a given tradition only once, as is also the case in a number of our documents. However, master traditionists did not limit themselves to this minimum, as a sampling of the pages of the *Concordance* soon reveals. The *Concordance* reveals also that Ibn Ḥanbal’s ratio of multiple repetitions is greater by far than that of the other master traditionists whose works are there indexed. Hence his *Musnad* was the most useful for tracking down parallels to many of the traditions in our papyri (see e.g. Document 3).

49 *Maʾrifah*, pp. 135-50. *Madkhal*, p. 13, reports a Shi'ite collection of 300,000 traditions, while Muslim (Vol. I 84 and 102) refers to a collection of 50,000-70,000 traditions of the Shi'ite Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir (d. 113/721). See p. 30 above for Shu'bah’s traditions that traced back to ‘Ali ibn Abī Tallib and p. 229 below for the Shi'ite Imām Jafar ibn Muḥammad al-Ṣādiq (d. 148/765) as a traditionist. For other Shi'ite traditionists see pp. 18, n. 130, and 47 above and *Maʾrifah*, pp. 295 and 301. The development of early Shi'ite traditions, including those of the Zaidites (see *Fīrist*, p. 178), needs re-examination in a separate monograph. Many Shi'ites were early looked up to as men of knowledge (see e.g. Shirāzī, *Tabaqat al-fuqahā* [Baghādir, 1356/1937] 11).

50 For example, Ibrahim ibn Muḥammad al-ʿAṣam (d. 184/800), who was a faqīh and a muḥaddith and who is credited with a *Musnad* twice the size of that of Mālik (see Dhahabi I 227 and Goldziher, *Studien* II 220).

48 See e.g. *Madkhal*, p. 27; *Kifāyah*, p. 123; Abū Nuʿaim IX 39. For the intellectualism of the early Kharijites see e.g. Jahi, *Kitāb al-ṣaybān wa al-ṣābitān* (1366/1947) I 821 f. and II 226-28 (see also our Vol. I 7, 29).

51 Other sects, as they emerged, produced their own traditions as to both *isnād* and *maʾnawī*. The preoccupation of the orthodox with the detection and refutation of these traditions is reflected e.g. in *Taʾwīl*, pp. 88-104; *Taṣfīr* VI 187-89; Ibn Ḥibbān, p. 129, No. 1355; *Madkhal*, pp. 25-45; *Kifāyah*, pp. 120-25; Khaṭīb I 43.


52 See e.g. *Maʾrifah*, pp. 130-35.

53 See e.g. *Jaʿmī* I 78-81; *Kifāyah*, pp. 171 ff. and 198 ff. See also p. 256 below.

54 Even the mechanics of reporting multiple *isnād*’s were
GROWTH OF TRADITION

As with the references to numbers of traditions, I made note also of the references to numbers of channels (turq) that I encountered. Here, too, the data are scattered and limited but not without significance as to trends and rate of increase. Muḥammad ibn Sirīn, who belonged to the group which permitted transmission according to basic meaning after the analogy of the seven hurūf of the Qurʾān,47 is reported as saying, “I used to hear a tradition from ten (transmitters) with the same meaning but different words (lafẓ).”48 Sufyān al-Thaurī speaks of 7 turq for a given tradition transmitted according to sense. Ibn Ḥanbal made a practice of seeking at least 6 or 7 turq for a given tradition,49 as is certainly reflected in his Musnad. Yahyā ibn Maḥmūd put his figure at 30 according to one source and 50 according to another.50 Ibrāhīm ibn Saʿīd al-Jauhari (d. 249 or 259/863 or 873) set his figure at 100, so that the caliph Abū Bakr’s original 50 or so traditions increased presumably to about 5,000 in Ibrāhīm’s Musnad.51 Ibrāhīm’s contemporary Yaʿqūb ibn Shaibah (182–262/798–876) would seem to have had a large number of turq, though I have so far discovered no specific figure, to judge by the stated size and nature of his Musnad (see p. 47), of which only part of the section devoted to the musnad of ʿUmar I is available.52 Ḥamzah ibn Muḥammad al-Kinānī (4th/10th century) is said to have put his figure at 200, which number of turq was eventually considered excessive.53 Ṭabarī’s numerous turq, so well illustrated in both his Taʾrīkh and his Tafsīr, should cause little astonishment,54 since the use of numerous turq was a common practice among his older contemporaries to judge from the figures given above and from Ibn Qutaibah’s references to 2, 3, 4, 8, 10, 12, 19, 20, and 70 turq, though Ibn Qutaibah himself55 felt that consistent search for 10 and 20 parallels was a waste of effort.

The close interrelationship between a large number of traditions and a large number of turq is quite apparent even from such incomplete data. It is equally apparent that exhaustive collections could be made by only a small percentage of the extremely large number of traditionists, as was recognized by the Muslim scholars. Shaʿbī expressed it thus: “Knowledge is in three spans. He who attains the first span holds his head high thinking he has attained it all. He who attains the second span recognizes his personal limitations knowing that he has not attained it all. As for the third span, indeed no one attains it ever.”56 When the Kūfī Anāmash (60–148/680–765) was praised for his great service to (religious) science (ilm) because he attracted a large number of students, who would carry on in that field, he replied: “Do not be (too) impressed (by numbers). One-third will die before they finish (their studies), one-third will attach themselves to those in power and these are worse than dead, and of the last third only a small number will succeed.”57 One of his few students who did succeed

47 For typical arguments for this usage in the Qurʾān and hadīth see Tafsīr I 21–67 and Jāmī’ I 78–81; see also J. W. Sweetman, Islam and Christian Theology II (London, 1955) 133–36.
48 Ibn Saʿīd VII 1, p. 141; Jāmī’ I 79.
49 Abū Nuʿaym VII 72.
50 Manṣūq, p. 58. Yahyā reports one of Muʿāwiyah’s traditions at least 15 times (Ibn Hanbal IV 58, 93, 95–101). 51 Madkhal, p. 9; Khaṭīb VI 93–95, esp. p. 94; Dḥahibī II 17, 89.
53 See Jāmī’ I 132, where doubt is expressed as to this high figure.
54 Dḥahibī (Vol. II 253) expresses his own astonishment at the numerous turq used by Ṭabarī. For instances of exhaustive collections of main and turq for the Zuhriyyāt through the mid-4th century see pp. 183 f. below.
55 Taʾwil, pp. 78 f. and 96.
56 Māwardī, Adab al-dunyā wa al-dīn, p. 57.
57 Jāmī’ I 185. See ibid., pp. 163 f. and 178 f. for widespread distaste among the conservative traditionists for court service. Few traditionists were tempted or persuaded to fabricate hadīth to suit the rulers (Madkhal, pp. 28 f.). Nevertheless, many good traditionists did enter the caliph’s service (see e.g. Jāmī’ I 185 f. for an incomplete list that includes many leading scholars of the 1st and 2d centuries).
58 Even the masters could not, in the nature of things, attain complete success. ʿAbd ibn al-Madīnī boasted that he had all of the collection of Anāmash, whereupon ʿAbd al-Rāhmandīn ibn Maḥdī dictated to ʿAll 30 traditions of Anāmash that were not known to ʿAlī (Khaṭīb X 245; see also Surah 58:11).
was Sufyān ibn ʿUyainah (107-98/725-814), who in citing Aḥmash’s prediction estimated the small number of successes at the liberal figure of ten per cent.  
The Khurāsānian Ibn al-Mubārak (118–81/736–97), speaking from experience, tells us that of the sixty youths who headed west in search of knowledge (ʿilm) only he pursued the goal to the end, and he too was at one time a pupil of Aḥmash.

How does one, it is time to ask, tie up all these data into a consistent and intelligent formula that would adequately fit the facts and give a reasonable reflection of the rapid increase in the number of traditions? Let us return to the Companions for a starting point. Assuming that the average Companion transmitted one tradition to two Successors and that each of these two transmitted the same tradition to two transmitters of the next generation (see p. 70) and assuming that this series was continued to the fourth and eighth terms—which would correspond to the fourth and eighth ṭabaqāt of transmitters representing the generations of Zuhrī and Ibn Ḥanbal respectively—we would have a geometric progression whose fourth and eighth terms are 16 and 256 respectively. In other words, the average Companion’s original tradition could have been transmitted either literally or according to sense through 16 different isnād’s or ṭurq in Zuhrī’s time and through 256 in Ibn Ḥanbal’s time, if we assume that all the traditionists represented by the different links in these isnād’s attained their objective as transmitters of ḥadīth. This assumption, however, to judge by Sufyān’s estimated rate of ten per cent for successful survival of traditionists, is highly improbable, for the rate of isnād survival should be close to that for traditionists. If we extend our hypothetical series to the tenth term, or the tenth ṭabaqah, the probable number of isnād’s in the time of Ibn Ḥanbal and the next two generations of transmitters would be ten per cent of 256, 512, and 1024, that is, 26, 51, and 102 ṭurq respectively. These figures are remarkably close to the 30 or 50 ṭurq claimed by Yahyā ibn Maʿān and the 100 ṭurq claimed by Ibrāhīm ibn Saʿīd al-Jauharī (see p. 71).

We cannot countercheck the validity of these estimates by starting with the number of Companions and the average number of traditions originally transmitted by each because both figures are unknown and the available estimates vary so greatly that they are useless for any such purpose. However, using geometric progression, we find that one to two thousand Companions and senior Successors transmitting two to five traditions each would bring us well within the range of the total number of traditions credited to the exhaustive collections of the third century. Once it is realized that the isnād did, indeed, initiate a chain reaction that resulted in an explosive increase in the number of traditions, the huge numbers that are credited to Ibn Ḥanbal, Muslim, and Bukhārī seem not so fantastic after all. Fortunately a plateau was reached during the third century owing largely to the exhaustive activities of these men and their immediate successors.

79 Abū Nuʿaim VII 288. There seems to be some disturbance in the text, which gives not “thirds” but “threes” that make sense only when read “three out of ten will die, three out of ten will serve those in power, three out of ten will fail, leaving one to carry on.” Among the 90% with varying degrees and kinds of failure was, at the bottom of the list, Sufyān’s own nephew to whom Sufyān refused the hand of his daughter because he could not recite 10 verses of the Qurʾān, nor 10 traditions, nor 10 verses of poetry (see Abū al-Laith al-Samarqandi, Bustān al-ʿadrīfīn, on margins of his Tanbīḥ al-ghāfīlīn [Cairo, 1319/1902] p. 129).  
80 Abū Nuʿaim VII 369.

81 For various estimates and some attempted explanation of their differences see Madkhal, pp. 11–14 (= trans. pp. 15–17); Usd I 31, 11 f. See also Ibn al-Jaṣf, Taḥkīḥ fi ṭāʾfah al-ʿilm muṭaqāṣ ʿalā mā ṣawāṭir al-ḥadīth, nach der Berliner Handschrift untersucht von Carl Brockelmann (Leiden, 1892) pp. 19–20, and GAL S I 915, No. 6. The range of the more conservative estimates of the number of actual transmitters from Muhammad varies from 1,500 to 4,000. Extremists put the figure at over 100,000 (see e.g. Tudrib, pp. 205 f.).
SURVIVAL AND AUTHENTICITY OF TRADITION

I

With so much material available and so little of it usable or actually used, the problem of selection posed a number of questions at different professional levels. In the preliminary stage of collecting hadith the young scholar was largely guided by his seniors, among whom were the critics. Hadith critics began to appear around the end of the first century, when several trends reflected the need for a cautious approach to the materials in circulation. One of the major trends was the multiplying of sects, which in turn provided the first general basis for selectivity, the materials circulated by those outside one's own sect being rejected because it was argued that if these materials duplicated one's own materials they were superfluous and if not they were open to suspicion. This type of selectivity did not prove to be so exclusive as it might seem, especially in the case of the early Shi'ah, for many of the early traditionists were claimed by both the Sunnites and the Shi'ites and the materials of the latter, except those that bore at first directly on 'Ali ibn Abi Talib's political claims and later on Shi'ite doctrinal developments, were generally in accord with the Sunnite views. But such rejections presently proved more effective against the Kharijites (see p. 70). A second major trend that called for a critical approach was the rapid increase in the number of non-Arabs who were invading the ranks of the traditionists (see p. 18). These, apart from belonging to different sects, were suspect at first for language deficiency and presently for racial bias. Zuhrī's solution of bypassing the non-Arab mawālī proved impractical even in his own day (see pp. 34 f.).

Attention was at first centered on the qualifications of each individual traditionist within one's own particular religious sect and racial group. This was soon both intensified and expanded, for the critics of each generation had to scrutinize the mental and moral qualifications not only of the transmitters but also of their sources back to a Companion and the Prophet. That is, it was not only necessary for a critic to know each individual traditionist, but he had to know about each traditionist in a given isnād and thus supplement the 'ilm al-rijāl with knowledge of each isnād as a unit. Just as the traditionists were grouped in categories ranging from the least trustworthy, who were to be bypassed, to the completely trustworthy, who were the ranking authorities, so the isnād's, considered no stronger than their weakest link, were classified from the totally unacceptable to the most authoritative. Classification of the isnād's provided a more or less practical tool for elimination of some of the materials. But, even with this sifting, master traditionists were faced with an enormous mass of hadith. Furthermore, even when these several bases of selection had won a measure of acceptance, their

1 Tawwīl, pp. 102 f. The extremists looked on all innovation (bid'ah) as an evil to be shunned. Others, while condemning heresy, did nevertheless transmit the non-doctrinal hadith of some of its adherents but usually concealed the name (dālās) of the heretic, as Shafi'ī is said to have done with the hadith of the Qadirite Ibrāhim ibn Muhammad al-Aslamī (see p. 70, n. 60, above and Ya'qūbī II 116, 159). In time, however, bid'ah was treated in five classes that ranged from the forbidden heresy to the required changes in educational programs (see Abū Shāmāh, Al-bāيث ‘ala inkār al-bidā‘ wa al-hawādith; Abū Nu‘aim III 76 and 189, VII 26 and 33, IX 103 and 113). For a brief survey of the fluctuations in the precepts regarding bid'ah up to modern times, see Mohammed Talbi, “Les bidâ‘,” Studia Islamica XII (1960) 43–77.

2 For comparative evaluation of isnād's and some specific illustrations see e.g. Mārifah, pp. 10–12 and 52–58; Kifāyah, pp. 397–404. See also Goldziher, Studien II 247 and our Vol. I 47, 51 f.
application was largely subjective and defied general and widespread agreement. Thus, in the aggregate, the effectiveness of the isnad as the sole or even the prime criterion was nullified. Second- and third-century traditionists with large preliminary collections had to devise their own conditions of selection (shurūṭ) for the traditions to be included in their final and organized compositions. Some of these conditions depended on the individual traditionist’s major objectives, as seen in the cases of Ibn Ḥanbal, Muslim, and Bukhārī (p. 65). Yet even they were embarrassed by a wealth of materials that met their own conditions but had to be dropped because of sheer bulk.

What, then, were the factors, expressed or tacit, that were involved in the final stage of the series of tests that determined the selection of traditions and therefore a high probability of survival? The answer to this important question is nowhere pinpointed in the numerous sources at my command and, to the best of my knowledge, has been overlooked by modern scholars. This is not so surprising when one considers the high degree of subjectivity that was involved in all attempts at the evaluation and selection of hadīth. The early Muslims realized that in the final analysis all such judgments, despite the necessary groundwork to discover the biographical and in many instances the historical data, depended on ability acquired through long experience. The expert traditionist, they claimed, was like the experienced money-changer, who could as a rule readily detect the true from the false coin. To carry the comparison farther, the expert hadīth critic was admiringly called the “money-changer of Tradition” (ṣairafi al-hadīth or nāqīd al-hadīth). This expression gained currency in the second half of the first century, for it was applied to the Kūfān Nakhaḍī (d. 95/714) by his admiring pupil and fellow traditionist Aḥmad, who made a practice of checking the traditions he heard from others with Nakhaḍī. This use of the metaphor persisted into the third and fourth centuries with here and there another type of expert replacing the money-changer, such as the jeweler who could tell a real gem from a piece of glass or the physician who could distinguish between the sane and the insane. Such metaphors might be applied also to the diagnostic arts, which not only pinpoint the dividing line between the sound and the unsound but also indicate the varying degrees of soundness, for this was precisely the problem with which the ambitious and conscientious collector-composer of hadīth works was faced in the final stages of his literary activities. Like any professional diagnostician, the master traditionist had to use his own judgment and preferences in the final acceptance or rejection of a given tradition for any of his organized permanent works.

The knowledge-based judgment as to the final selection of a tradition was conditioned as frequently by the category of the maṭn as by that of the isnād. There was, to begin with, a certain measure of oral agreement on the bases for value judgments and on nascent editorial practices. These soon to be discussed in formal works on hadīth criticism. However, the earliest writers in this field concentrated on the individual men of the isnād’s, producing such biographical works as Bukhārī’s Ta’rīkh, Ibn Ṣa’d’s Ṭabaqāt, and the Jarh wa al-ta’dīl of Abū...
The role of the matn as the basis of acceptability has been generally represented as secondary to that of the isnād, but this view needs modification. To begin with, it was the matn alone that circulated among the Companions, who frequently compared and pooled their traditions, as is so well illustrated in the mosque session of 'Ubādah ibn al-Ṣāmit al-Anṣāri (d. 34/654). The early emphasis on the matn is reflected in the tradition attributed to Muḥammad which implies that the good and conscientious believers will readily distinguish his true sayings from those falsely attributed to him and in a tradition traced to 'All in which the role of the matn is placed ahead of that of the isnād. Again, what ʿUmar I objected to was not so much the "who" as the "what" of the increasing number of traditions circulating in his day. It was not until after the First Civil War of Islām that the Companions began to be questioned as to the content, for which the word kalām seems to have alternated with or perhaps even preceded the word matn. Sometimes the recitation of a tradition began and ended with the kalām, and the factors affecting it, and discussion of the various methods of transmission. Extant examples of the earlier of such expository and critical hadith works are Ḥākim al-Nīsābūrī's Maʿrifah and Madkhal, Khaṭib’s Kifāyah and Taqwīd al-ilm, and Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr’s Fāmī. The change occurred for a number of reasons, all of which have been considered works on the various aspects of the sciences of hadith came into being. These included, besides some treatment of the men of the isnād’s, classification of the isnād’s, consideration of the matn and the factors affecting it, and discussion of the various methods of transmission. Extant examples of the earlier of such expository and critical hadith works are Ḥākim al-Nīsābūrī’s Maʿrifah and Madkhal, Khaṭib’s Kifāyah and Taqwīd al-ilm, and Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr’s Fāmī.  


[10] See e.g. Tirmidhī XIII 305, 307, 330; Kifāyah, p. 121; Adab al-imālā, pp. 8 f.; Dhahābī I 10, 12.  


[18] Hātim al-Rāzī and his son ʿAbd al-Raḥmān. In the meantime, compilers of the standard hadith collections, from Ibn Ḥanbal to Nasāʾī, put together their ideas on such subjects largely for their own personal use, though some of these works eventually went into circulation for the guidance of others. It was considerably later that the more sophisticated and thematically
Zuhri found it necessary on several occasions to rebuke others because they omitted the isnād.15 Despite the fact that large numbers of traditions were already in circulation for which acceptable isnād's were not readily available, the matn was not ignored to the degree generally believed. For the technical terms that later came to be associated with hadīth criticism include a number that apply as much to the matn as to the isnād (e.g. gharīb al-sand, gharīb al-matn, maudū', mu'āllā, muṣāhha') and quite a few that apply primarily to the matn (e.g. ijmālī, shādhāḥ, mudraj, muḍāri, muḥkalīf, muṭāba').14 In selecting traditions, first the individual scholar and then the scholarly community not only heeded the isnād with its various degrees of refinement and acceptability but also evolved a series of rough dividing lines based primarily on the general nature of the content. Traditions that dealt with the lawful and the unlawful (al-ḥalāl wa al-ḥaraṣm) but had no acceptable isnād were rejected. Traditions that dealt with personalities, partisan politics, and sectarian views, even when presented with acceptable isnād's, were characterized as suspicious materials needing careful scrutiny and independent supplementary validation. Much of what goes under the headings manaqib, faḍā'il, and adāb and under fitan and malāḥim falls in this category. On the other hand, traditions that dealt with personal piety, private devotions, moral preachments, the Day of Judgment, and the world to come were frequently retained less through gullibility than through pious connivance and without much concern about the quality of the isnād (laaṣāḥul fi al-isnād) on the assumption that they were good for the religious and moral fiber of the community.17 It must be obvious, then, that both the matn and the isnād of the first category of traditions were subjected at every step to stricter scrutiny and more workable controls than could have been devised for the other categories. This factor, in turn, was responsible for a greater survival rate, in any highly selective collection of the second and third centuries, for traditions of the first category than for others. It is thus necessary to de-emphasize the role of the isnād as the main basis of selection, and therefore of survival, and to give due consideration to the concomitant roles of the initial source of a given tradition and the nature of its content.

Still other factors had some bearing on the selection of a tradition, namely the literary form of the content and the precision of the transmission terminology.18 During the second and third centuries the master collectors and organizers of Tradition and the composers of works based largely on Tradition had perforce to be literary editors of a sort. Of two isnād's with the same links, the one in which the names were spelled out in full or in which the verbal forms samo't, akhbarani, or ḥaddathani were used would be preferred. Of two matn's that conveyed the same sense but were expressed in different words the editor-collector would select the wording that best expressed his understanding of the tradition unless he had supplementary evidence that the transmitters of one of the matn's were better known for ḥarfi, that is, literal transmission, or for the accuracy of their books—factors that were usually decisive in such matters of choice. Some organizers felt free to break up long traditions that covered several themes and append the original isnād to that part of the text which was pertinent for their immediate purpose, bypassing the rest perhaps for use later under other headings. Others

16 Tirmidhi XIII 327 f.; Jarh, Taqdimah, pp. 6 and 20; Adab al-imāra, pp. 51 f.; Abū Nuʿaim III 365: إحاديث ليس لها خطم ولا امة.
17 See e.g. pp. 106 f., 110 f., 144. See also Muslim 169, 107-9, 123, 125 f.; Jarh, Taqdimah, p. 10; Kifayah, pp. 151-53; Mustadrak I 300. Traditions on some of these themes were sanctioned on the ground that similar materials were allowed in the Qurʾān itself. Ḥamīd ibn Ṣanjawah (d. 251/865) wrote a Kitāb al-larikūb wa al-larikib, a title that covers most of these themes (Dhahabi II 118 f.).
18 See e.g. Kifayah, pp. 189–94.
preferred not to break up a tradition but to use it in full whenever a part of it was pertinent, a practice which accounts for a great many repetitions. Both practices, of course, affected the statistics relating to numbers of traditions.

II

The trends and developments discussed above lend a particular significance to our hadith papyri, which stem from the period when the relatively simple biographical science (‘ilm al-rijāl) was well advanced in comparison with the more sophisticated and complicated branches of the sciences of Tradition (‘ulūm al-hadith), which were yet to be fully developed (see pp. 74 f.). For these documents present a cross section of the large preliminary collections that were being assembled approximately from 125/743 to 225/840 as well as specimens of final choices made by such leaders as Zuhrī and Yaḥyā ibn Saʿīd al-Anṣāri and by Mālik ibn Anas and Ḥaith ibn Saʿīd (see Documents 2, 3, 6, 7). Furthermore, analysis of those traditions of the papyrus texts that have survived in the standard collections, frequently in identical parallels and through multiple channels, and those which have not survived affords a double test of the basis of selection in this crucial period of the standardization of Tradition.

The most significant fact yielded by the extensive search for surviving parallels to the traditions contained in the papyrus texts is the far higher ratio for the survival of the hadith and sunnah of the Prophet than for the survival of the hadith and sunnah of the Companions and Successors. Roughly three-fourths of the traditions contained in the thirteen papyri relate to the Companions and Successors (see n. 19). But, while only a few of these have verbatim or even any parallels at all, more than three-fourths of the traditions of Muḥammad have either verbatim or almost verbatim parallels which as frequently as not come through multiple channels or ṭurq. Also significant is the relatively inferior character of the isnād’s of the traditions that relate to the Companions and Successors in contrast to the superior isnād’s that support the hadith or report the sunnah of Muḥammad. Again, even when the isnād’s were equally acceptable priority of survival is repeatedly evidenced for the traditions of Muḥammad. This priority holds even for a single but complex tradition in which the basic hadith or sunnah of Muḥammad was supplemented by a khabar tracing back to a Successor or even to a Companion, for the khabar was apt to be dropped while the basic tradition survived in the standard collections.

The high degree of consistency in the pattern of survival was so remarkable that after working on the texts of two or three papyri I was able to make a fair guess as to whether parallels to a given tradition would or would not be found in the indexed standard collections.

The isnād undoubtedly played a major role in the final stages of the selection of the traditions contained in these papyri, for the isnād’s of the traditions that report the hadith and sunnah of Muḥammad are generally clearly superior to the isnād’s of those that report the hadith and sunnah of the Companions and Successors in the three factors essential to the evaluation

19 The exact ratio cannot be stated since it is not always possible to determine the number of traditions contained in broken texts nor how many of them trace back to Muḥammad. Of the indicated total of 219 traditions in the papyri, 57 are definitely hadith and sunnah of the Prophet. Taken as a group, including the surviving parallels, complete and partial, literal and otherwise, the number of traditions analyzed runs to about 1,000.

20 See e.g. Document 2, Tradition 3, esp. p. 118; Document 3, Tradition 29, esp. p. 138. See also p. 244. The khabar section thus discriminated against in formal hadith collections was itself seldom lost since it found its way, as a rule, into related works on biography and history, especially the akhbar and athar varieties.

21 The Concordance was, of course, indispensable for this task, but, inasmuch as it is as yet incomplete, it was in numerous cases supplemented by material from chapters, particularly in the works of Muslim and Bukhārī, devoted to the general field to which a given tradition belongs.
of an isnād: the trustworthiness of the individual transmitters, the degree of completeness of the isnād as a unit, and the precision of the transmission terminology. There are, to be sure, some traditions of Muhammad in which the isnād is incomplete and the terminology leaves something to be desired. These, however, are exceptions made in favor of trustworthy traditionists whose authority was all but universally accepted, as illustrated by the marāṣil al-Zuhrī (see p. 174) and Mālik’s use of the questionable term balaghani (see p. 122). Inasmuch as attention is consistently drawn in the discussions of the individual documents to the priority of the Prophet’s hadīth and sunnah and the high ratio of their survival, all that we need here in order to appraise the cumulative results is the following list of cross-references to document numbers and pages: 2:120, 3:141–43, 4:147 and 155 f., 5:165, 6:173 f., 7:195 f., 8:207, 9:217, 10:230 f., 11:244, 12:256, and 13:268.

The papyri, supplemented by the parallels and closely related materials in the standard collections, amply illustrate all the editorial practices noted or discussed by the hadīth scholars and critics (see pp. 176 f.) as well as errors due to written transmission (see e.g. pp. 117, 119, 136) and confusion of names (see e.g. pp. 120, 252, 253). The papyri give evidence of transmission concurrently according to the letter and according to the sense, the latter on the analogy of the seven hurūf of the Qurʾān. This concurrency accounts for the irregular use of the tasliyah and other pious formulas (see pp. 88 f.), as for the interchanging of al-nabi and al-rasūl in references to Muhammad (see e.g. pp. 117, 212). Transmission according to sense coupled with transmission through multiple channels accounts for the liberal use of synonyms and variant verb forms (see e.g. pp. 135, 140, 170, 201) and the change from direct to indirect speech or vice versa (see e.g. pp. 120, 248 f.). Attempts to group traditions thematically were largely responsible for the frequent breaking-up of long multiple-themed traditions and for the less frequent grouping-together of shorter related ones (see e.g. pp. 120, 161, 204, 248). Again, the documents give evidence that scholars were aware of at least two or three channels of transmission for the same materials (see e.g. pp. 148, 154 f., 161) and of occasional expressions of doubt on the part of the transmitter-editor (see e.g. Documents 6, Tradition 5, and 7, Tradition 11). A few of the traditions, along with their parallels in the standard collections, give us such an insight into the patient, careful sorting and editing, particularly of the traditions of Muḥammad, during the second and early third centuries that we can follow the progressive steps of a given tradition toward its final literary forms (see e.g. pp. 120, 136–38, 145, 190, 250, 251). But most significant, perhaps, is the consistent lack of evidence of any deliberate attempt to tamper with a given tradition. It is true that occasionally the meaning seems to have been affected by the addition or omission of a phrase, but few such cases are significant enough or even certain enough to cause surprise or demand explanation (see e.g. pp. 120, 172, 202). There are, in fact, only two traditions which probably indicate deliberate tampering with earlier texts, namely Tradition 13 of Document 9, dealing with the division of the spoils of victory (pp. 213–15), and Tradition 2 of Document 12, relating to Muḥammad’s supposed reasons for instructing Zaid ibn Thābit to learn the writing of the “people of the Book,” especially with reference to the Jews (pp. 256–58).

The special attention to and extra care with Muḥammad’s hadīth and sunnah were stressed from the very beginning of the caliphate. Abū Bakr preferred to remain silent rather than relate on the authority of Muḥammad a tradition about which he had the slightest doubt.

---

22 See Kifāyah, pp. 189–94.
24 See also Ibn Ḥanbal IV 422; Jarḥ, Taqdimah, p. 314; Ibn Ḥibbān, Sahīh, pp. 115 f., Maṣāḥḥah, pp. 6 f. et passim; Ibn Khaldūn, Muqaddimah, p. 215.
Umar I was strict not only with his own transmission of the Prophet's traditions but also with that of others. Uthman, though he considered it a personal duty to transmit the sayings of Muhammad, was no less careful and is reported as saying that it was not permissible for anyone to relate traditions of the Prophet that he had not already heard in the time of Abu Bakr and Umar. The early emphasis on careful approach to hadith al-nabl was frequently dramatized with the censorious "I relate to you (a tradition) on the authority of the Prophet, and you proffer your own opinion!" Again, "I relate to you on the authority of the Messenger of Allah and you relate to me on the authority of Abu Bakr and Umar," said by Ibn Abbâs to Jubair ibn Mu'tim. Among other Companions and Successors involved in this sort of rebuke were Ibn 'Umar and one of his sons and Abû al-Dardâ and Mu'awiyah. A similar phrase was later used by Ibn Abi Dhîb (d. 158/775) to rebuke Abû Ḥanîfah. Such sentiments reflect the initial fear of hadith al-nabl and then the glorification, which was extended in the second half of the first century and thereafter to hadith manuscripts (see pp. 60-61). Our Documents 10 and 11 reflect the early practice of keeping the hadith al-nabl apart from other materials, as illustrated also by the practices of Zuhri and his companions, who even resisted at first the writing-down of anything but the Prophet's Tradition, and by the dispute between the two sons of Abû Bakr ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Amr ibn Ḥazm in which the traditionist Abd Allah rebuked the jurist Muhammad for his use of ijmâ', "consensus," to the neglect of the hadith al-nabl. Still later Malik ibn Anas, who championed the consensus of the Medinans (ijmâ' ahl al-Madinah) but strove to base as much of it as possible on the hadith al-nabl, which he collected assiduously, kept apart from other traditions, and recited, as did others before and after him (see e.g. pp. 90 f.), with ceremonious dignity.

The foregoing section points once again to our evidence that from the very start successful efforts were made, at least by a few zealous and far-sighted Companions, to gather and preserve the Prophet's Tradition and that such efforts were sustained by members, again comparatively few, of the succeeding generations. These significant few did not lose sight of the distinction between the hadith and sunnah of the Prophet and the "living sunnah" of the Companions and Successors, even when new emphasis was placed on the latter by Zuhri's insistence that it too be committed to writing. The Islamic community itself early recognized the important role of the few well trained and zealous scholars who labored in each generation to establish and sustain the religious sciences at the highest possible level, whether their initial inclination was toward Qur'anic readings and commentary or toward Tradition and law.

98 See e.g. Ibn Ḥanîfah I 66, 67, 70 (= Ibn Ḥanîbal, Al-musnad I [1365/1946] Nos. 469, 470, 477, 484, 507). Similar attitudes are reflected by the tradition that those who transmit falsified traditions of Muhammad will dwell in hell-fire (see Concordance I 229 and I 238). See Lewis Bevan Jones, The People of the Mosque (London, 1932), p. 76, quoting Wâqîdî, p. 168, without specification of title; the reference does not tally with any of Wâqîdî's works that are available to me.

100 Jami' II 195 f.

101 Jami' II 196; Shâfi'î, Kitâb ikhtilaf al-hadîth (on margins of Kitâb al-umm VII) p. 23.

102 Risalah, p. 62.

103 Tabari III 2505 f.; Akhbar al-qudat I 176. See also p. 24 above, with nn. 188-89.

104 See e.g. Jami' II 202; Akhbar al-qudat I 143 f., III 259 f. Mâlik's position is fully substantiated by his own usage as illustrated in his Muwatta', where his insistence on citing and following the practice of the Medinans is met repeatedly (e.g. Muwatta' I 271, 276, 280, 297, 299, 302, 309, 311, and 313 f., II 463, 475, 493, 503, 506, 511, 514 f., 517 f., and 521 f.). See Concordance IV 320 for the position claimed or held by Medinan scholars.
Masruq ibn al-Ajdac (d. 63/682), himself a seeker after religious knowledge (see p. 11), credited six of his contemporaries—Umar, ‘Ali, Ibn ‘Abbâs, Murâdh ibn Jabal (alternates with Ubayy ibn Ka‘b), Abû al-Dârâd (alternates with Abû Mûsâ al-Asîrî), and Zaid ibn Thâbit—with acquiring the ‘ilm of all the Companions.24

Contemporary opinions and classification of individuals or of groups of scholars became a common feature of Islamic literary criticism. This afforded the critics of each generation a series of earlier critical opinions to accept or dispute and to supplement with estimates of their own, a process which necessarily produced a variety of opinions, some of them quite contradictory, on the same individual or theme.25 Nowhere in the religious sciences is this phenomenon more in evidence than in the ‘ilm al-rijä’l, early conceived by the Muslims as basic to the sciences of Tradition. Hence a unanimous or even a nearly unanimous opinion calls for recognition. Such an opinion is that expressed by the Baṣrân ‘Ali ibn al-Madânî (161–234/777–848), pupil of the hadith critic Yahyâ ibn Sa‘îd al-Qâṭțân and teacher of Yaḥyâ ibn Ma‘în, Ibn Ḥanbal, and Bukhârî and himself an outstanding traditionist and hadith critic even though he, like most others, did not escape some adverse criticism.26 His opinion covers three generations of scholars representing various provinces of the empire and beginning with the generation of Zuhrî (which overlaps that of Masruq), who heads a list of six scholars. The other five are ‘Amr ibn Dînâr of Medina, Qatâ‘âdah ibn Dîrâmâh and Yaḥyâ ibn Abî Kuthair of Baṣrah, Abû Ishaq al-Sâbî’î and A‘mash of Kufah. His second list consists of twelve organizers (ašhâb al-aṣnâf): Mâlik ibn Anas, Ibn Jurâjî, Ibn Ishaq, and Sufyân ibn ‘Uyainah from the Hijâz; Shu‘bâh ibn al-Ḥajjâj, Sa‘îd ibn Abî ‘Arûbah, Ḥamâmâd ibn Salâmah ibn Dînâr, Ma‘îmân ibn Râshîd, and Abû ‘Awânah al-Wadidâb ibn Khâlîd from Baṣrah; Sufyân al-Thaurî of Kufah; Awzâ‘î of Syria; Husâím of Wâsit. His third list, which covers his older contemporaries, includes six names: the Baṣrân Yaḥyâ ibn Sa‘îd al-Qâṭîn and ‘Abd al-Rahmân ibn Mahîdî; the Kufans Wâkî ibn al-Jarrâb, Yaḥyâ ibn Abî Zâ‘îdah, and Yaḥyâ ibn Adam; Ibn al-Mubârâk of Khurâsân.27 The significance of these three lists of men whose activities fully justify ‘Ali ibn al-Madânî’s opinion is threefold. First is the element of continuity, which is especially stressed by this critic, who introduces the first list with “the isnâd (var. ‘ilm) revolves about these six,” the second list with “then the knowledge of these six passed to twelve,” and the third list with “then the knowledge of these twelve passed to six.” Second is the recognition that the leading scholars of the post-Zuhrî period were all writers, a conclu-

---

24 ‘Shîrâzî, ‘Tabâqât al-fuqahâ’, pp. 12 and 13; Dhaḥabi I 24. For other contemporary expressions of appreciation of the role of leading Companions, with some overlap of names, see e.g. Ibn Sa‘îd V 329 and ‘Shîrâzî, op. cit. pp. 21 and 25. It is interesting to note that the six fuqahâ’ accepted by Abu Ḥanîfah and his school are listed in two groups of three each: ‘Abd Allâh ibn Mas‘ûd, ‘Umar, Zaid ibn Thâbit (see Abu Yusuf, Kitâb al-ahâr, p. 212) and ‘Ali, Abû Mûsâ al-Asîrî, Ubaïy ibn Ka‘b (see ‘Shîrâzî, op. cit. pp. 10 and 12).

25 See e.g. Jâmi‘ II 150–66 for a wide variety of legitimate and not so legitimate factors that yielded such divided and contradictory opinions.

26 For biographical entries see e.g. Khaṭîb XI 458–73; Jâmi‘ I 356; Nawa‘î, pp. 443 f.; Dhaḥabi I 15 f.; Mīrâd II 229–31. See also pp. 100, n. 47, and 177 below and our Vol. I 83 and 92.

27 ‘Jarîh, Taqdimah, cites the third list in full or in part no less than nine times: on pp. 17, 55, 59 f., 129, 187, 220, 234 f., 252 f., and 264 f. See also Jâmi‘ I 117 f., where Isrâ‘îl is added as the 13th name of the second group; Khaṭîb IX 9 f. and X 401 for partial citations; Dhaḥabi I 328, which stresses ‘Ali ibn al-Madânî’s emphasis on the element of continuity. Khaṭîb XIV 178 and Ibn Khallîkân II 284 (= trans. IV 25) credit Yaḥyâ ibn Sa‘îd al-Qâṭîn with the ‘ilm of all of those whose names precede his in the lists. Other, more inclusive, lists lack ‘Ali ibn al-Madânî’s well placed emphasis on the element of continuity in the preservation of ‘ilm; see e.g. Hamadhânî, Kitâb al-buldân, p. 34; Risâlah, pp. 62 f.; ‘Jarîh, Taqdimah, pp. 315 and 319; Marîsîfah, pp. 240–49; Khaṭîb I 43 f.; Ibn ‘Ashîrî, Ta‘rîkh madînal Dimashq I 315–17; Dhaḥabi I 72; ‘Shîrâzî, op. cit., which is arranged by region and city. These lists are reflected in the bulbânîyât literature with its more comprehensive view of the resources, history, and culture of a given city or region.
sion thoroughly substantiated by the present study. The third significant factor, especially when it is related to the earlier statement of Masruq (see above), is that 'Ali ibn al-Madini's opinion mirrors the shift of scholarly leadership from the Hijaz in the earlier period to Iraq and points farther east in the later period, when Muslim and Bukhari were already at work on their Sahihain.

Despite the ingenious legalistic arguments of more recent times to discount the role of Mecca and Medina as the home of Tradition (dar al-hadith), the first-century Muslims conceded their priority as a matter of fact. True, Medina had a few zealots and moralists who denounced the growing worldliness of the community and the neglect of learning, but no outsider seriously questioned the religious leadership of Mecca and Medina until the Kufan Hammad ibn Abi Sulaiman (d. 120/738), pupil of Nakha'i and teacher of Abu Ḥanifah, challenged it in favor of his own city and province. Nevertheless we find that Abū Ḥanifah himself was anxious to acquire from a scholar returning from Medina a copy of the materials that he had received from Malik. Some Medinan scholars migrated, mostly to Syria and Egypt, around the end of the first century, since from the point of view of scholarship these provinces and the Yemen were in the orbit of the Hijaz. But a more significant exit of Medinan scholars took place after the fall of the 'Umayyads because of inducements resulting from the shift of the capital from Syria to Iraq and from the policies of the 'Abbāsids Saffah (132–36/750–54) and, in particular, Mānsūr. These founders of the “Blessed Dynasty” enticed and welcomed Medinan scholars into their courts and service. Mānsūr required the members of his family not only to attend hadith sessions but to write down hadith in his presence. Though Medina continued for a time to hold its ascendancy, especially under the leadership of the forceful Malik, it was nonetheless losing a slow race in which Egypt and particularly Iraq eventually proved to be the victors, though Iraq soon had to share its laurels with Persia and Khurāsān. Yet in Egypt, where Malik was challenged on the role of Medina first by his friend Laith ibn Sa'd and then by his pupil Shafi'i (d. 204/820), it was not until some time after Shafi'i's death that Malik's followers found acceptance along with the long-established followers of Shafi'i. Furthermore, though by the time of Ibn Ḥanbal, Yahya ibn Ma'en, and 'Ali ibn al-Madini scholarly leadership had already shifted to Iraq, these scholars and many others braved the hardships of long journeys to the Hijaz, the Yemen, and Egypt in order to secure, above all, the traditions of the early Medinas. Presently Bukhari was to follow in their foot-

---

18 See e.g. Si`ra I 1041 (= Ṭabarī I 1817); Jāmi` I 169; Marifah, pp. 25 f.; Shirāzī, op. cit. p. 10; Ibn Khaldūn, Muqaddimah, pp. 215 and 217 (= Rosenthal's trans. II 452 and 461). See also p. 41 above.

19 See e.g. Jāmi` II 200 f. But see also Shirāzī, op. cit. p. 10, where Masruq indicates that Medina's priority was accepted by 'Ali ibn Abi Ṭalib and his contemporary followers.

20 Jāmi` II 152 f. For biographical entries on Hammād ibn Abi Sulaiman see Ibn Sa'd VI 231 f. and VII 2, p. 2, lines 23 f.; Bukhari, Ta'rikh II 1, p. 18; Jarḥ II 1, pp. 146 f.; Jāmi` I 104 f.; Miftāḥ I 279.

21 Jarḥ, Taqdimah, pp. 3 f.

22 See Jāmi` I 97 and pp. 50 above and 122, 126, 193 below. For the early 'Abbāsids as patrons of hadith scholars see e.g. Adab al-imād`, pp. 10–23; see also pp. 105 and 122–24 below and our Vol. I 88–91.

23 Khaṭṭāb I 385–87.


25 The Kufan judge Ibn Shabrumah (d. 144/776), who spent 3 years in Mecca, found but little learning ('ilm) in Medina (see Akhbar al-quḍāt III 96).


27 For the correspondence between Malik and Laith on īmām `ahl al-madīna see e.g. Muhammad Yusuf Müsq, Muhaddithī fi ta`rīkh al-fiqh al-islamī I (Cairo, 1374/1955) 78–86 and 115–17. For other and later opposition to Malik's point of view see ibid. pp. 80–88 and 104–18 and references cited throughout.
steps and was to give prominence to early Medinan traditionists and their traditions by citing them ahead of all others in his Sahih.

The shift of the centers of religious learning from the Hijáz to ‘Irāq and points farther east was accompanied by a growing contest, not strictly limited to these geographical regions, between the ahl al-hadith, who looked to the Hijáz for their sources and inspiration, and the ahl al-ra'y, who stressed in varying degrees the role of personal endeavor, opinion, and reason and who looked to ‘Irāq for leadership and support. This new challenge tempted some of the more sophisticated among the ahl al-hadith to forge what they considered good constructive traditions in order to bolster their polemics and safeguard their position. Thus, in turn, an additional burden was put on the dedicated traditionists and jurists, who had to contend with these fabrications that had begun to circulate among their own followers. The task of the honest traditionists, difficult enough to begin with, now became arduous. This situation was reflected in Zuhri’s statement that Tradition was masculine and only masculine men desired it, while effeminate ones disliked it—an opinion that was approved and quoted by the ‘Abbāsid Maḥmūd and others. The ahl al-ra’y also were aware of the circulation of false traditions and deliberate forgeries, as was illustrated by Abū Ḥanīfah. Accused of being almost totally ignorant of Tradition, he retaliated by proclaiming the falsity of some four hundred traditions as justification for his emphasis on ra’y. The circulation of false hadith by various groups (see p. 70) continued in the second half of the second century but was not unchallenged among the critics. Yahyā ibn Sād al-Qaṭṭān accepted no traditionist on faith, while Hārūn al-Rashīd boasted that he had in his retinue two master traditionists, Ibn al-Mubārak and Fazārī (see p. 232), who could detect the cleverest forgeries. It must be pointed out, however, that at this time, though there was detection of false or faulty content (matn), especially in traditions circulated by politico-religious sects, by far the greater number of detections concerned the isnad only, and one unsound link was enough to cause suspicion of an entire isnad and therefore of a tradition.

The situation was no different for the master traditionists of the late second and early third centuries, for they had to sift and resift the mass of traditions that were in circulation in order to sort out the true from the false, with special emphasis on the Prophet’s Tradition as the deduced evidence of our documents indicates. Their exacting task would have proved impossible, as Ibn Ḥanbal pointed out (see p. 69, n. 50), but for the availability of earlier records. A number of these records were begun in the time of Muḥammad, and many others reached completion as a result of the literary activities of Zuhri and his pupils and numerous other scholars of their time. Thereafter, these materials were preserved continuously in writing, with or without editorial touches, as revealed again and again in the present study. Oral transmission, therefore, can no longer be construed to imply uncontrolled fluidity and thus to justify general distrust of the entire body of formal Tradition. The sources repeatedly indicate that oral and written transmission were used concurrently to safeguard the letter and the heads of state and their administrators likewise decreased progressively, but over a longer period. Ibn Khaldūn took note of this situation and offered a rationale for it in his Muqaddimah, pp. 15 f., 192, and 279 f. (= Rosenthal’s trans. I 60 f., II 334 f., and III 368–10). In contrast, a close relationship existed between ruler and scholar under ‘Umar II (see pp. 24 f. above).

Dhahabi I 97–101 and 150 f. and Ibn Taghribirdi I 387 f. reflect in brief summaries this development.
essence of significant texts from generation to generation. The following conclusions are therefore forced upon us. (1) Zuhrī and his contemporaries received from their predecessors a genuine core of the sayings and deeds of Muḥammad together with a genuine core of the sayings and deeds of the Companions and Successors along with some accretions that through human fallibility had been absorbed into both categories. (2) The greater part of this material received a fixed literary form during the age of Zuhrī and the later ʿUmayyads. (3) Thereafter, deliberate tampering with either the content or the isnād's of the Prophet's Tradition, as distinct from the sayings and deeds of the Companions and Successors, may have passed undetected by ordinary transmitters but not by the aggregate of the ever-watchful, basically honest, and aggressively outspoken master traditionists and ḥadīth critics. Shāfiʿī's insistence on the Prophet's traditions, therefore, does not argue for wholesale fabrication of this category in his day, as Schacht believes, but illustrates the high level of selectivity and priority for the Prophet's Tradition that had already been reached by that time. (4) These same master traditionists and critics, surveying the entire field of Tradition, openly excepted from their vigilance a growing body of traditions in the field of private devotion and public exhortation, in eschatology and some types of Qurʾānic commentary, and in partisan matters both personal and politico-religious. (5) To expect, finally, under all of the varied circumstances considered in the present study, a perfect record as to the authenticity of all the traditions selected at each step from the time of Muḥammad to that of Muslim and Bukhārī and thereafter is to expect the impossible—a consideration which, as seen above, was not lost on the Muslim ḥadīth critics of each successive period.

All in all, Islāmic Tradition, in the controlled size and nature of its content, is comparable to the literatures of its sister faiths, Judaism and Christianity. It surpasses them in the speed of its literary evolution. Like them it involves problems of interpolations and forgeries, inconsistencies, and contradictions. Numerous Muslim scholars have in the past grappled with these problems and a few are doing so today, as many Jewish and Christian scholars have done and are doing for their own comparable literatures. However, while Muslim scholars by and large have avoided and still avoid involvement in the study of comparable non-Islāmic literatures, Jews and Christians early found a certain fascination in the study of Islāmic Tradition but until quite recently approached it, for complex reasons, with pronounced prejudice. While this generally biased approach has not been entirely eliminated, it is encouraging to note increasing objectivity on the part of Western scholars in their study of comparative religions and cultures. If continued, this new phase in the study of Islāmic Tradition promises to be more fruitful than even Goldziher could have expected.

53 The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence, pp. 57, 77 f., and passim (see references given in Index under "Shaḥīṣh" and "Tradition").

54 Norman Daniel's recent work, Islam and the West: The Making of an Image (Edinburgh, 1960), presents in great detail the many complex factors that led Western scholars to create a false image of Islām and its religious sources. See the present writer's review of the work in JNES XXI (1962) 155-56.
PART II

THE DOCUMENTS
SCRIBAL PRACTICES AND SCRIPTS

The orthographic signs and other devices used in these papyri are detailed in connection with the description of each document. They are for the most part no different from those used in the historical papyri described in Volume I of this series, to which the reader is referred. Briefly, the following features are of particular interest in the present texts. Words are split at the ends of lines (Documents 8, 10). Diacritical points are used in all of the documents but fewer in some (Documents 3, 4, 7, 13, 14) than in others (Documents 2, 6, 9, 10). Of special interest is the careful pointing of proper names (Documents 6–8, 11, 13). Small letters are used under ha?, sin, and ‘ain to distinguish them from their sister letters in Documents 5, 6, and 12 only. Sin is further differentiated by the use of the muhmalah above it (Documents 6, 12) and by a row of three dots either above or below it (Documents 10 and 12 respectively). Vowels are very rarely used but occur more often than not with proper names, the fathah being usually the most common (Documents 6, 11–13). The sukūn is used only once (Document 13). The hamzah appears once, as a small circle (Document 2), and the shaddah is consistently lacking even in lill al-lāl = لَالِلِلِإِبَنِ (Document 13). The initial alif of ibn is omitted, as in ـبِنُ شَهَابُ, throughout Document 6 (see also Documents 3–5).

The familiar ha? as an abbreviation of intahā, “finished,” and the circle are used to mark off traditions or sections of the texts. One or the other is used in all but one (No. 10) of the documents, and sometimes both occur in the same document. Two or more circles are sometimes used to mark off larger sections or themes (Document 1). Occasionally dashes are used to mark off headings (Document 3). Red dashes appear at some of the headings in Document 11 and may indicate a particular source for a given tradition or group of traditions (see p. 237).

It has been generally assumed that the use of a dot within a circle in papyrus documents was a matter of choice with each scribe and therefore that the circle with or without a dot as well as certain related devices were punctuation marks. This assumption may be warranted for some non-literary documents for which duplicates or office copies were not required. However, I suspect that the use of the ha? and the circle for text division in ḥadīth and related manuscripts reflects an earlier usage in Qurānic manuscripts, whence they were adopted some time in the second half of the first century. In a copy of the ḥadīth of Abū Hurairah (d. ca. 58/678) which was in the possession of Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Rasād (d. 110/728) or his brother Yahyā and in a manuscript of Abū al-Zinād (d. 131/748) the circle, in the first with dots around it, is used at the end of each tradition. Qurānic manuscripts were collated from the

---

1 See Vol. I 92 and references cited in n. 3. See also Tādrīb, p. 153, which cautions against splitting compound names containing the word “Allāh” (“‘Le Taqrib de en-Nawawi’ traduit et annoté par M. Marçais,” Journal asiatique, 9th series, XVII [1901] 528).
3 See Tādrīb, p. 152.
4 For a representative collection of such devices see Adolf Grohmann, From the World of Arabic Papyri (Cairo, 1962) pp. 91 f.
5 See OIP L 22, 55 f., 61. See also Jeffery (ed.), Two
6 See OIP L 22, 55 f., 61. See also Jeffery (ed.), Two

---
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THE DOCUMENTS

start, beginning with Muhammad,7 and Hafṣah’s copy was used for this purpose during the reigns of ʿUmar I and ʿUthmān.8 The collation of hadīth manuscripts, at least orally, that is, by their being read back to the teacher, is associated with most of the leading Companions and Successors. The need to indicate collation in the manuscripts themselves may have developed among the latter, perhaps under the influence of Zuhri and his school at the time when written hadīth was fast becoming the rule.9 The practice of collating one’s copy with an approved manuscript soon followed. Extremely careful students and scholars combined oral and written collation.10

These practices, as described in the sources, are reflected in literary papyri. Since the use of the circle, differentiated in one way or another, to indicate collation has not hitherto been recognized, illustrative materials from the papyri of both Volume I and the present volume are noted here. The circle with a dot inside it is widely used (Vol. I, Documents 2 and 8; Documents 2, 5–7, 11, 12 below). A circle or a pear-shaped device with a line through it appears occasionally as an alternative (Vol. I, Document 4; Document 5 below).11 Another alternative seems to be a circle with a dot above or to the side of it (Vol. I, Document 6; Document 4 below), though I have found no example of this device in the sources. Two other devices, likewise not specified in the sources, call for some explanation. These consist of two concentric circles with a dot in the center (Document 3) and a single dotted circle with a stroke either tangential to it or intersecting its lower arc (Document 6). Such comparatively complex signs could hardly have been accidental when other signs were so carefully differentiated. I venture therefore to suggest that they indicate double collation, where the exceptional student or scholar combined written and oral collation in order to have as accurate a copy as possible. It is to be noted further that the two documents in which these devices appear are among the most carefully executed of the whole group, both in the calligraphy of the scripts and in the scribal practices and devices. Hadīth manuscripts from the seventh decade of the third century seem to indicate a distinctive use of the plain circle and the circle with a dot inside it. In the Jāmiʿ of Ibn Wahb (125–97/742–812), a papyrus codex, only the circle with a dot is used from page 85 onward. In the earliest extant manuscript copy of the Muwatta of Mālik ibn Anas, a paper codex in Maghribī script dated 277/890 (see p. 114), no punctuation marks are used between traditions but each tradition begins with “qala Mālik” or simply with “Mālik” written in a heavier, larger script. On the last page, however, the circle with a dot is used, and a marginal note toward the end states that the text has been collated.

Our papyri illustrate other practices of careful transcription and collation such as cancellation of erroneous text and interlinear marginal corrections and notations (see e.g. pp. 162, 191, 211).

The tasliyah, or formula of blessing, if not omitted, is generally used irregularly in the full and the short form in the same document. This irregularity reflects partly the early widespread flexibility, in speech12 as in manuscripts,13 in this matter and partly the transmitter’s or copyist’s literal faithfulness to the original text.

7 See e.g. Adab al-imla?, p. 77.
8 See pp. 46 and 58 and OIP L 49, 51.
9 For Zuhri’s practice see Jāmiʿ II 177. See also pp. 33 f. above and 174 f. below.
10 See Vol. I 93.
11 See e.g. Tadrīb, pp. 152 f.
12 See Sūrah 33:56; Concordance II 509, III 349 and 370; Musawwar I 165 f.; Bukhārī IV 230; Khāṣeb XIII 404; Abū Nuaim V 388. The early storytellers (quṣṣā) were negligent in the use of the formula, which, however, they sometimes used for the rulers. ‘Umar II is credited with correcting this situation (Ibn al-Jauzi, Mandāqīb ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, p. 136). For other examples of early practices see Tirmidhi, Al-Jāmiʿ al-ṣahih I, Intro. pp. 26–28.
13 The papyrus codex of the Jāmiʿ of Ibn Wahb illus-
The *basmalah*, or invocation of the name of Allah, is even less frequently used, occurring at the heads of sections in Documents 3 and 10. It is equally rare in the historical texts. The probability is that in both the groups of texts this formula headed large divisions that are not preserved in the fragments, if we judge by the great emphasis placed on its use in speech for numerous occasions, in Muhammad’s treatises and correspondence, in the Qurʾān, and later in a variety of literary and non-literary manuscripts, beginning with the earliest extant non-literary document.

Before considering the over-all significance of the scripts of these documents we should note the formats, which may have some bearing on the style and quality of the scripts. As in the case of the historical documents, they are not overly large and the square or nearly square format for book folios seems to have been preferred insofar as can be determined from fragments (Documents 1–4, 6, 13, 14). This format was widely used in Egypt, where most if not all of our documents originated or were transmitted.

The classification of literary scripts has already been discussed, and there is little to add here. The common, nondescript *mutlaq* variety is represented in Documents 8–10 and 12, at least two of which are rough sheets (Nos. 9 and 12), and the cursive slanting or *mālīl* script is used in Document 11. Otherwise, the book hand most frequently used, if we allow for local and personal tendencies, is the *naskhī*, with marked yet varying degrees of angularity (Documents 1, 2, 5, 13) or cursiveness (Documents 3, 6, 7, 14) and more schooled and better executed in some cases (Documents 1–3, 6, 13) than in others. The *mudawwar al-ṣaghīr* or *jāmi‘* script, specifically associated with literary manuscripts, is represented in Document 4.

The large proportion of documents with nondescript and poorly executed scripts would seem to be representative of the work of average traditionists of the second and third centuries. Among the many reasons for the use of such scripts were the large number of young students whose handwriting was not yet stabilized, the need for hurried note-taking in the classroom and at crowded public lectures, the preparation of rough copies (*musawwaddāt*) in which accuracy rather than the use of fine scripts was the prime objective. Frequently such rough copies were made during a *riḥlah* or journey in search of traditions and traditionists. For the professionals, whose search involved months and sometimes years of travel through the major provinces of the empire with an ever increasing load of manuscripts (see pp. 40–43), economy in writing materials was called for and also in the size of scripts, as specifically stated for many of these travelers, such as Baqīyah ibn al-Walīd (see p. 234) and Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī, and generally permitted for the traveling fraternity as a whole. Finally, there were professional copyists (see pp. 46–48) who more often than not sacrificed beauty and at times even accuracy to speed. These facts help to explain the lack of margins or the narrow margins in several of our documents as well as the poor quality and small size of some of the scripts. On the other
hand, a student's or scholar's final copy (mubaiyadah), made in comparative leisure and intended for lifetime use, as a rule had generous margins and carefully executed script (e.g. Documents 1-4, 6, 13 and the Jāmī of Ibn Wahh).

The ḥadīth literature gives ample evidence that the professional scribes were more concerned with the accuracy of their manuscripts (ṣibḥat kutub and ṣabīḥ al-kitāb) than with the style and beauty of their scripts, though they were by no means unappreciative of fine scripts, as illustrated by the manuscripts of Shu'ayb ibn Dīnār which he wrote down from Zuhri by order of the caliph Hishām (see p. 177).

Ḥadīth and related works with stylized and beautifully executed scripts may have come from the hands of palace secretaries who were carrying out royal orders, such as the secretary of Marwān I who was ordered to write down the hadīth of Abū Hurairah and the above-mentioned Shu'ayb ibn Dīnār, or from the hands of traditionists who were executing princely orders such as that of 'Abd al-ʿAzīz ibn Marwān to Kathār ibn Marrah. Or they may have come from the hands of the private secretaries who served such leading traditionists as ʿUqbah ibn ʿĀmir (see p. 202), Ibn ʿAbī Dārīb, Muhammad ibn al-Walīd al-Zubaidi (see p. 177), Awzā́f (see p. 134), Mālik ibn Anas (see pp. 125, 127), Laith ibn Saʿd, Ismāʿīl ibn ʿAyyāsh (see p. 178), and others.

The use of Qurānic scripts for other religious and for secular works was frowned upon from the start, though a number of instances of such use are known and a few specimens from both fields have even survived to our day. Pious and ascetic professional Qurānic copyists who were also traditionists, such as Aʻrāj (d. 117/735), Abū Rajāʾ Maṭr ibn ʿĪthnān al-Warrāq (d. 119/737 or 125/743; see p. 229), and Mālik ibn Dīnār (d. 130/748), may have been inclined to use Qurānic scripts for tafsīr and hadīth, especially the smaller varieties which tended to be of the composite Kūfic-naskhī styles. On the whole, though, the professional commercial copyists, who as a rule were paid by the page or the piece, were more interested in speed than in beauty of style. Furthermore, even within the learned community itself, except for the extremists among the ahl al-ḥadīth, there soon developed a reluctance to transfer to non-Qurānic fields any of the prestige-yielding practices and devices specifically associated with the dignity and sacredness of the Qurān. These practices included, almost from the very beginning of Islām, the use of large calligraphic scripts, the use of bookstands for the Qurāns, purification before touching or using the sacred book, solemn and dignified behavior at Qurānic sessions. As controversy developed over the role of Tradition relative to the Qurān on the one hand and to human reason and opinion on the other hand, those disinclined to magnify Tradition early cautioned against hadīth codices and the resting of such volumes on
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18 See e.g. p. 217, n. 4; Ḫaṭṭīb IX 168; Kifāyah, p. 223; Jarīḥ IV 2, p. 41; Dhaḥḥāḥ I 277; Irshād V 326; Ibn Ḫallikān II 458.
19 Muṣṭafadrakh III 510; Nubalāʾ II 431 f.; Ḫūṣūʾ IV 388.
21 See Ḥusn al-muḥāṣdarah I 144.
22 Ḥusn al-muḥāṣdarah I 157 f.
23 See Dhaḥḥāḥ I 262; Jāmī II 557; Lisān VI 628 f.
24 See e.g. Kifāyah, p. 125.
26 See Ḫaṭṭīb I 91 f. and p. 124, n. 31, below.
27 Vol. I 49. See also Abu Nuʿaim II 368 and III 88; Ibn Ḫallikān I 557 (= trans. II 549–51).
28 See e.g. Ḫaṭṭīb XIV 150; Irshād VII 276 f.
29 See e.g. Abū Nuʿaim IV 105 and 230, IX 35; cf. OIP L 54.
30 Straha 56, 77–79.
bookstands after the fashion of Qur'ān codices. Many of the ahl al-hadith, however, persisted in glorifying the Prophet's Tradition in these respects as also in the ceremony of purification preparatory to a hadith session and in studied dignity during the session. Awesome respect for the hadith al-nabī is reflected in the refusal of such pious scholars as Haiwah ibn Shuraih (d. 158/774 or 159/775) to use anything but the cleanest earth or sand for blotting freshly written manuscripts.39

When one considers the large and widespread body of hadith students at different stages of their religious education or scholarship and with primary interests that varied from hadith proper to fiqh to akhbār and relates their objectives to the known scribal practices and the motives behind them, one begins to understand the absence in our documents of regular Kufic scripts, large or small, and of the correspondingly large or small safinah format (i.e., with width tangibly greater than height), for these scripts and this format were specifically associated with early Qur'āns.40 One also realizes why in this small group of papyri of the second and early third centuries the best scripts and the largest format are for tafsīr (Document 1) and for hadith (Documents 3, 6) and hadith-fiqh (Documents 2, 4) that are in some way associated with such outstanding hadith scholars as Zuhri, Malik ibn Anas, and Laith ibnSa'd.

Nothing is known of the provenience of the fourteen documents beyond the fact that they came from Egypt. No comments can be added, in this respect, on Document 2, which belongs to the Erzherzog Rainer collection in Vienna, nor on Documents 13 and 14, which belong to the University of Michigan collection (see p. 276). The remaining eleven documents were bought by the Oriental Institute, in 1947, as part of a collection of 331 Arabic papyri.41 It is possible that Abū Ṣāliḥ the secretary of Laith ibnSa'd could have acquired Documents 3 and 9 (see pp. 144 and 221). Furthermore, strong circumstantial evidence points to Abū Ṣāliḥ as compiler or preserver of the nine remaining documents (see pp. 102–4, 156, 164, 173, 195, 207, 234, 244, 256 f.). It is, therefore, probable that the eleven Oriental Institute papyri came originally from the hand or library of Laith ibnSa'd or his secretary Abū Ṣāliḥ.

DOCUMENT 1


Fine dark brown papyrus, 31.5 × 17.5 cm. Much damaged upper halves of two joined folios (Pls. 1–2). The inner margins vary from 5.5 to 7 cm., and there are 11–13 lines to the broken page. To judge by the space required for the reconstruction of the text, the number of lines to the full page may have varied from a minimum of 17 to a maximum of 20. The full page would seem to have measured about 32 × 30 cm., the nearly square format which was often used in literary papyri.¹

Script.—Carefully executed semi-cursive book hand with well formed letters showing some resemblance to the script of the Oriental Institute Arabian Nights fragment (No. 17618).² The horizontal strokes are slightly wavy, after the style of early Arabic Christian scripts. Diacritical points are used for bāʾ and its sister letters fāʾ, šīn, nūn, and yāʾ. The hamzah is either replaced by yāʾ or absent. One to three circles are used for punctuation. The handwriting becomes a little smaller and the page a little more crowded as the work proceeds.

TEXT

Page 1

ابراهیم في رحب قلبه ونوده لا يهدى القوم الضالمين إلى الهد في نظيرها في براءة
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

الوجه الأول

الكفر بتوحيد الله الابن له فذلك قوله في البقرة أن الذين كفروا

وكان في الجح الذين كفروا وكتبنا بذلك قلبي مشروعة في المنتظرة

Page 2

1
2
3
4

وكان قوله في لفمان أن أشكر لله ومن شكر فنذاك لله غني حميد وكتب

النعمة فان الله غني حميد وكتب لفون لموسى في الشعراء وكتب

فملك الذين فعلوا وانت من الكافرين يعنى حين ربه وأسند عليه

وتحوى كثير الوجه الرابع الكفر يعني أبراهيم فذلك قوله
THE WUJUH WA AL-NAZÁʾIR OF MUQATIL IBN SULAIMAN

1. «كلنا بكم يعني تبآزنا منكم» [وكحلف في العنكبوتفليوم] 5
2. «أيكركم بعضكم يعني تبآزهم بعضكم» عن بعضهم [وكحلف البكر في سورة] 6
3. «أبهي من كفرت بما أكركم من قبل يعني تبآزهم ونهوى كثير» [باب الشرك] 7
4. «الوجه الأول» [الآسراء بالله يعني الذي] 8
5. «الله لا تشركوا به شيئا يعني لا تعدلوا به غيره» [وكحلف أن الله لا يغب في جهانين] 9
6. «من يعدل به غيره ونحوه في المائدة ومن شرك بالله يعدل به غيره فقده حرّم الله عليه الجنة» 10

Page 3

1. «وجه الأول» [سواه يعني عدل فذلك قوله في آل عمران تعلموا إلى كلمة سواه بينا وبينكم يعني] 1
2. عدل بينا وبينكم [وكحلف في حم سوآه للسائر يعني لم يسأل وكرحه] 2
3. في ص واهدى إلى سوآه الصبرأ يعني عدل [والوجه الثاني] 3
4. سوآه يعني وسط الجلاد [وكحلف في البلاء] 4
5. فذلك قوله في الصفات فرأ في سوآه [الجحيم يعني وسط الجلاد] 5
6. أيكركم فيما آلت إليه على سوآه يعني يعني امرأة يسأله ذلك] 6
7. «الوجه الثالث» 7
8. إلى سوآه الجحيم يعني وسط الجلاد [أيكركم فيما آلت إليه على سوآه] 8
9. وكرحه في البلاء وهو شرآه يعني شرآه سوآه» [ذلك قوله في الجحيم سوآه] 9
10. بما آلت إليه على سوآه يعني سوآه يعني امرأة يسأله ذلك] 10
11. سوآه يعني على امرأة يسأله ذلك] 11
12. شرآه سوآه [فذاك قوله في الصفات] 12
13. عسا رب أن يهدقهم سوآه السبيل يعني [قصد السبيل] 13

Page 4

1. «المرض يعني الجراحه فذلك قوله في النساء أن كنتم مرضاً أو على سفر يعني» [ان كنتم مرضاً أو على سفر ليس غيرهما] 1
2. «الوجه الرابع» [المرض يعني به جميع الإراماً فذلك قوله في البقرة من كان منتماً مرضياً يعني جميع] 2
3. «الوجه الخامس» [المرض يعني به جميع الإراماً فذلك قوله في البقرة من كان منتماً مرضياً يعني جميع] 3
4. «على الإهمي حرج ولا على الإعرج حرج ولا على المرأض حرج» [باب السماح على وجوه] 4
5. «الوجه الأول» [الفساد يعني المعاصي فذلك قوله في البقرة وأما قبل لهم لا تفسدوا في الأرض] 5
6. «الوجه الثاني» [الفساد يعني المعاصي فذلك قوله في البقرة وأما قبل لهم لا تفسدوا في الأرض] 6
7. «意味着 لا تفعلاً فيها بالمصالحة ونحوه] كبير] 7
8. «意味着 لا تفعلاً فيها بالمصالحة ونحوه] كبير] 8
DOCUMENT 7

Comments—Page 1:1–6. Last section on hudā, corresponding to Constantinople (Istanbul) manuscript ĔUmūmī 561 folios 7 recto to 8 verso (see Pl. 3). The papyrus has but 14 subdivisions for this section as against 17 in ĔUmūmī 561. Subdivisions 12, 13, and 14 of the papyrus correspond to subdivisions 12, 15, and 17 of ĔUmūmī 561. Note the form of the ordinal تلث in line 4, and presumably قر in line 5, which is sometimes found in early papyri (see Joseph Karabacek, “Kleine Mittheilungen,” Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes VIII [1894] 293 f.; Grohmann, From the World of Arabic Papyri, p. 96). The Qur’ānic passages referred to or cited in lines 1–3 are, in the order of the text, Sūrah 2:124, 9:19, and 62:5.

Page 1:7–10. See ĔUmūmī 561 folios 8 verso to 9 recto 6 (see Pl. 3) and note that this manuscript and the papyrus text each have four subdivisions under the heading kufr. The Qur’ānic references are to Sūrah 2:6 and 22:57. Reconstruction of the missing text of the papyrus would fill about 7 lines.

Page 2:1–7. Continuation of section on kufr, corresponding to ĔUmūmī 561 folios 10 recto to 11 recto 1 (see Pl. 4). The Qur’ānic references in lines 1–2 of the papyrus are to Sūrah 31:12 and 26:18–19, those in lines 4–7 in the order of the text are to Sūrah 60:3–4, 29:25, and 14:22.

Page 2:8–11. The section on shurk has but three subdivisions and corresponds to ĔUmūmī 561 folios 11 recto 6 to 12 recto 6 (see Pl. 4). Note the smaller script, the crowding of the lines, and the narrowing of all margins of the papyrus. With these features in mind, I found it possible to fill the ĔUmūmī text into 6 or 7 lines of the papyrus to make a page of 17 or 18 lines. The Qur’ānic references are to Sūrah 4:36 and 48 and 5:72.

Page 3. See ĔUmūmī 561 folio 12 recto for the beginning of the section, which continues to folio 14 recto 2 (see Pls. 4–5).

Page 3:1–3. Note the various names by which Sūrah 41 is cited. The Qur’ānic references are to Sūrah 3:64, 4:10, and 38:22.

Page 3:3–5. The citation from Sūrat al-dukhnān is missing in ĔUmūmī 561. The Qur’ānic references are to Sūrah 37:55 and 44:47.


Page 3:7–12. See ĔUmūmī 561 folio 13 recto (see Pl. 4). The Qur’ānic references in the order of the text are to Sūrah 22:25, 4:89, 30:28, and 16:71. Richard Bell (The Qurʾān, Translated with a Critical Re-arrangement of the Surahs I [Edinburgh, 1937] 255) seems to have had some difficulty with the meaning of the last two verses.

Page 3:12–13. See Sūrah 28:22. The papyrus text ends at ĔUmūmī 561 folio 13 verso 5 within the fifth subheading of the section. To crowd in the text of ĔUmūmī 561 folios 13 verso 5 to 14 verso 4 (see Pls. 4–5) calls for 9 lines in the missing lower section of the papyrus. This
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would give a page of 13 + 9 = 22 lines, which does not seem probable since pages 1–3 each call for only 17 or 18 lines. Nor does the slightly closer spacing of the lines on page 3 justify its projection to such length that it would contain the added 9 lines needed for the ʿUmūmī text. Seven additional lines at the most can be projected on this page. An effort was made to fit the missing text, in the style of the papyrus, into 7 lines. These lines would extend much farther into the outer margin than do the 13 preserved lines. Therefore I feel certain that here, as on page 1, some of the ʿUmūmī text was missing originally. It is, of course, impossible to know what part of the ʿUmūmī text was not in the complete papyrus. It could have been the sixth subdivision of this section (cf. missing subdivisions in section on hudā on page 1 of papyrus). Or it could have been some of the examples under any one of the subheadings appearing on folios 13 verso 5 to 14 verso 4 of the ʿUmūmī manuscript. This sort of discrepancy between the papyrus text and the ʿUmūmī text appears at several points, and collation of the two texts readily reveals.

Page 4: 1–4. See ʿUmūmī 561 folios 13 verso 4 to 15 recto 5 (see Pls. 4–5). If line 1 of the papyrus is to be reconstructed exactly as in the repetitious ʿUmūmī text, then it must be assumed that the ʿUmūmī word ʿuṣrā is an error for ʿjīra. On the other hand, if the repetition is eliminated, which is entirely feasible, then the papyrus text is correct as it stands. The second alternative is preferable because of the absence of repetitive phrases in lines 3 and 4 of page 4 and in lines 1 and 2 of page 1. The Qurʾānic references are to Sūrahs 4:43, 2:184, 9:91, and 24:61 respectively.

Page 4: 6–13. See ʿUmūmī 561 folios 15 recto 5 to 16 recto 3 (see Pl. 5), where the section on fasād has six subdivisions. The Qurʾānic references in lines 6–8 are to Sūrahs 2:11 and 7:56, in lines 9–11 to Sūrahs 17:4 and 21:22, in line 12 to Sūrahs 30:41, in line 13 to Sūrahs 7:127.

IDENTIFICATION, DATE, AND SIGNIFICANCE

That the papyrus text is an early commentary on the Qurʾān was evident at first sight. As a result of a preliminary survey of the development of tafsīr literature in the second century of Islam my attention was centered on such outstanding leaders in this field as Ismāʿīl ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Suddī (d. 127/744), Muḥammad ibn al-Sāʿib al-Kalbī (d. 146/763), and Muqāṭīl ibn Sulāmān al-Balkhī (d. 150/767). Each of the first two commentators seems to be credited with but a single tafsīr work that included, presumably in addition to linguistic explanations, considerable historic and legendary material. Since the papyrus text is purely linguistic I eliminated these two scholars as possible authors in favor of Muqāṭīl, who has several tafsīr works to his credit.3 Brockelmann supplied the first tangible clue in specifying that ʿUmūmī 561 is a copy of Muqāṭīl's Tafsīr fi mutashābīh al-Qurʾān and that it deals with Qurʾānic homonyms such as hudā and kufr—two of the terms treated in the papyrus text. I was fortunate in procuring a microfilm of ʿUmūmī 561 through the kind efforts of my colleague Hans Güterbock.

On the title page of ʿUmūmī 561 (see Pl. 3) the initial entry was . A later hand had deleted this and replaced it with . A third hand had tampered with the second entry to replace the word with . This last change, uncritically accepted, misled

3 See Fihrist, pp. 34, 36, 37, 179; Goldziher, Richtungen, pp. 58 ff. See also GAL S I 332. Birkeland, Opposition, pp. 26 f., was under the impression that Muqāṭīl “even composed a book on tafsīr,” whereas Fihrist, p. 34, and all earlier references are actually to Muqāṭīl’s Tafsīr itself.
first Joseph Schacht and then Brockelmann to list this manuscript as *Al-tafsīr fī mutashābīh al-Qur'ān*. The internal evidence, beyond that of the title page, definitely establishes it as a recension of Muqatil's *Al-wujuh wa al-nazārīr*. The opening sentence (see Pl. 3) reads *wajh* and its plural (*wujuh*) and the word *nazār*, singular of *nazārīr*, are used throughout and are technical words that indicate both the nature and the method of the work. Finally, the manuscript ends (folio 287) with *sam al-rujūn* and *al-nabāʾīr* (see Pl. 5).

The *Fihrist* of Muḥammad ibn Ishʿāq al-Nadīm credits Muqatil with no less than a dozen works, all of which fall under the general heading of *tafsīr* in its various branches. The four whose titles are listed below are of special interest because they are known or believed to be extant either in their entirety or in extracts quoted by later authors.

1. *Tafsīr khamsmiʿat āyah min al-Qur’ān* as transmitted by Maḥṣūr ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd al-Bawardi. British Museum Or. 6333 is a copy of this work and is dated 792/1390.¹
2. *Al-wujuh wa al-nazārīr* is represented by our papyrus and by the now correctly identified ʿUmūmī 561, which is an undated but comparatively late copy.
3. *Al-tafsīr fī mutashābīh al-Qur’ān* is believed to be extant in several manuscripts. However, more careful inspection of these manuscripts may prove all or some of them to be copies of No. 2, as in the case of ʿUmūmī 561, or sections from No. 4. An extensive extract of this work is extant in the *Kitāb al-tanbih wa al-rayd* of Malātī (d. 377/987).²
4. *Al-tafsīr al-kabīr*. Malātī gives extracts that are believed to be from this work or from No. 3 (see n. 6).

Reconstruction of the papyrus text and its collation with the text of ʿUmūmī 561 revealed that the latter tends to be slightly more verbose and that it has suffered an occasional omission though it is more apt to be expanded (see pp. 93 f.). The additional materials consist of either further examples under a given subheading or of further subdivisions and their examples. It was perhaps in recognition of these features of ʿUmūmī 561 text that its editor-transmitter, Abū Naṣr, used in his introductory sentence not the verb *rawa*, which emphasizes transmission of texts as such, but the verb *allafa*, which indicates original authorship but may imply abridgment, expansion, and compilation. It should be noted further that the concluding clause of the introductory sentence, namely *ṣam al-rujūn* and *al-nabāʾīr*, which implies literary extraction or elucidation, can have either Muqatil or Abū Naṣr for its grammatical as well as its logical subject, since the phrase is descriptive of the literary activities of both men.

It is quite evident that Abū Naṣr's text is later than that of the papyrus and that it represents an edited version or a recension of the *Wujuh wa al-nazārīr*. But it is impossible to know, from the evidence of the text alone, whether the papyrus represents Muqatil's original text or an intermediate version or transmission. In order to make a considered choice between these two alternatives, I searched the literary sources first for the identification of Abū Naṣr and second for more light on Muqatil's literary activities and practices.

¹ Einzelausgabe aus den Bibliotheken von Konstantinopel und Kairo I (Berlin, 1928) 58, No. 77.
² See GAL S I 332 and for "Or 8033" read "Or 6333." Goldziher, *Richtungen*, p. 58, n. 27, expresses some doubt as to the genuineness of this work without, however, stating a reason for his opinion (cf. Martin Plessner in *EI* III [1936] 711 f.).
³ Edited by Sven Dedering ("Bibliotheca Islamica" IX [Istanbul, 1936]); see p. 10 of Intro, and pp. 43-63 of text. For Malātī's extracts from unspecified *tafsīr* works of Muqatil see Louis Massignon, *Recueil de textes inédits concernant de la mystique en pays d'Islam* ("Collection de textes inédits relatifs à la mystique musulmane" I [Paris, 1920]) pp. 194-210, 218. The bringing-together, for reexamination and definite identification, of all the Muqatil manuscripts listed in GAL S I 332 should prove worthwhile for a young scholar.
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Dhahabi seems to be the first to provide a specific biographical entry on the one known transmitter of some at least of Muqatil’s tafsir works, namely Mansur ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd al-Bawardi, whose kunyah, however, Dhahabi gives as Abū Nuṣair.7 Ibn Ḥajar, who otherwise follows Dhahabi closely, gives the kunyah as Abū Naṣr.8 Though neither of these authors gives Mansur’s dates, their accounts nevertheless indicate that he was Muqatil’s contemporary. Khaṭīb’s entry on Muqatil reports ʿAli ibn al-Ḥusain ibn Wāqīd (d. 211/826)9 as saying that he heard Abū Naṣr (not Nuṣair) say that he was with Muqatil ibn Sulaimān for thirteen years and never in all that time did he once see him without a woolen undergarment (the mark of an ascetic).10 The biographical literature at hand yields no other Abū Naṣr who was in any way personally associated with Muqatil or with the direct or indirect transmission of any of his works. Nor does this literature add anything to our knowledge of Mansur ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd al-Bawardi. It thus takes little imagination to realize that the Abū Nuṣair of Dhahabi’s text is but a scribal error for the Abu Naṣr of Khaṭīb’s and Ibn Ḥajar’s texts—a type of error made commonly enough in the copying of Arabic manuscripts—and that all these references to Muqatil’s companion and transmitter involve the man whose full name is Abū Naṣr Mansur ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd al-Bawardi. He was, furthermore, Muqatil’s pupil for thirteen years and the direct editor-transmitter of his works. The identification of the Abū Naṣr of ʿUmūmī 561 as a younger contemporary of Muqatil allows for no lapse of time during which an intermediate version of Muqatil’s Al-wujuḥ wa al-naẓāʿir could have developed and thus points to the first of the above-stated alternatives, that is, to the conclusion that the terser text of our early papyrus represents the original text of the Wujuh wa al-naẓāʿir.

Still to be considered is the placing of the papyrus copy in its second-century setting. This calls for an examination of the scholarly practices of Muqatil and of his associates and contemporaries who likewise had a major interest in the creation and transmission of tafsir literature. Muqatil cited as his authorities such leading Qur’ānic commentators of the second half of the first century as the Meccan traditionist Mujāhid ibn Jabr (d. 104/722)11 and the Kufans Saʿīd ibn Jubair (d. 95/714)12 and especially Daḥḥāk ibn Muḥāshim (d. 105/723).13 He was frequently challenged for using these men as authorities because they died either before his birth or during his childhood. His answers were evasive, leaving room for the argument that direct personal contact with one’s authorities was not necessary. When pressed to be more specific about Daḥḥāk as his source he would say: “The door closed on us four

7 ʿAṣār I 197; see also GAL I 332, where, however, no kunyah is given. For the town of Baward see Yaʿqūbi I 485.

8 Lisan VI 97.

9 Järḥ III 179; Ṭabarī III 2512; ʿAṣār II 223; Ibn Ṭahhrībīrī I 618. The Ṭawāq family was interested in tafsir literature. Ḥasan (or Ḥusain) ibn Ṭawāq (d. 157/774) wrote a Tafsir (see Fihrist, p. 34; see also Yāfṣī I 334 f., which gives Ḥasan, and Ibn al-Imād, Shadharāt al-dhahab I 241, which gives Ḥusain).

10 See Ḥaṭīb XIII 169-69, esp. p. 162.


12 Ibn Ṣaʿīd VI 210 f. and VII 2, pp. 102 and 105; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh I 2, p. 256, and II 2, pp. 333 f.; Jārḥ II 1, pp. 398 f.; Tafsir ʿilam, pp. 19, 47, and 100 and reference there cited; ʿAṣār I 471. Ḥaṭīb IV 272 f. states that Daḥḥāk did not meet Ibn ʿAbbas in person but received the latter’s Tafsir from Saʿīd ibn Jubair. For coverage of these men and their roles in the field of tafsir see Theodor Nöldeke, Geschichte des Qordns (2. Aufl., bearb. von Friedrich Schwally) II (Leipzig, 1919) 167, III (1938) 165; Goldziher, Richtungen, pp. 59 f.; Heribert Horst, “Zur Überlieferung im Korankommentar ʿaṭ-Ṭabarīs,” ZDMG CIII (1933) 299-307, esp. pp. 296 and 303 f.; our Vol. I 4, 47, 52.
years.” His critics saw in this reply a veiled reference to the fact that Muqātil was born four years after the death of  Daḥḥāk.14 A veiled story is told of Muqātil’s younger contemporary Ibn al-Mubārak (118-81/736-97),15 a pioneer scholar in Khurāsān and ʿIrāq, who when asked with whom he had scholarly sessions in Khurāsān replied: “I have sessions with Shuʿbāh ibn al-Ḥajjāj [ca. 83-160/702-76] and Sufyān al-Thaurī [d. 161/778].” The narrator adds that this means “I study their books,”16 a needed explanation because these scholars were not of Khurāsān but of ʿIrāq, where Ibn al-Mubārak had sought them out in person.17 It is tempting to suggest that Muqātil’s cryptic answers mean that he had such “sessions” with the deceased  Daḥḥāk, that is, that he read and studied the latter’s books for four years. This suggestion gains support from the discovery that not only did  Daḥḥāk, who was a famous schoolmaster of  Kufah,18 write down his materials but that some of his manuscripts actually found their way to Muqātil, who in citing them in his own written works stated: “I read in the books of  Daḥḥāk after his death...”19 This bit of significant information comes from an Abu Ḥudai­fah who is not further identified by Maqdisī but who is most probably  Abū Ḥudai­fah Mūsā ibn Masʿūd al-Nahdī al-Baṣrī (d. 220/835), the stepson of Sufyān al-Thaurī. The latter is known to have questioned Muqātil on his materials from  Daḥḥāk, whose  Taḥṣīl Sufyān held in high esteem.20

Muḥāhid ibn Ḥabr (see p. 97) is said to have used the written materials of Jābir ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-ʿAṣṣārī (d. 78/697) even for the transmission of ḥadīth.21 Ṭabarī reports that Ibn ʿAbī Mulaikah (d. 117/735)22 was present when Muḥāhid put questions to Ibn ʿAbbās while a scribe wrote down the answers from the latter’s dictation until the entire  Taḥṣīl of Ibn ʿAbbās was completed.23 Qāsim ibn Abī Bazzah of Mecca (d. 124/742)24 is said to have been the only one who heard all the  Taḥṣīl from Muḥāhid and made a complete copy of it. His fellow pupil ʿAbd Allāh ibn Abī Naṣir (d. 132/749–50) heard only part of it from Mujāhid but copied the whole from Qāsim’s book. All other transmitters of Muḥāhid’s  Taḥṣīl, according to Yāḥyā ibn Saʿīd al-Qāṭṭān and Ibn Ḥibbān, made copies from Qāsim’s manuscripts but omitted his name and transmitted on the authority of Muḥāhid. The list of such transmitters includes Laitḥ ibn Abī Ṣalām (or Sulaim; d. 143/760) and the well known Ibn Jūṣrī and Sufyān ibn ʿUyainah.25

Saʿīd ibn Jubair was generally averse to writing down ḥadīth but nevertheless is known to

---

14 Khaṭṭīb XIII 163, 165; Mīzān III 197.
15 GAL S I 256. See also pp. 51, 53 f., 68, 82 above and 176, n. 31, below.
16 Abū Nuṣaym VIII 164. See Khaṭṭīb X 165 for Ibn al-Mubārak’s statement that he used written works of ḥadīth and Daulabī I 255 for evidence that he began collecting and memorizing books as a youth! Iṣḥāq ibn Rāhāwāh (161–238/777–852), who as a youth had recovered some traditions of Ibn al-Mubārak indirectly from the latter’s son, used (in the year 800 or later) Ibn al-Mubārak’s books directly and freely (see Ibn Ḥanbal, Kitaḥ al-waraʿ, p. 74; Khaṭṭīb VI 347). Iṣḥāq had a photographic memory and could cite books that he had studied as a youth by page and line, a fact which indicates the currency of authoritative and fixed manuscripts (see Khaṭṭīb VI 353; Daulabī II 20 f.; GAL I 157 and GAL VIII 257, 947).
17 See e.g. Khaṭṭīb X 152; Daulabī I 181 f., 190.
18 See e.g. Ibn Saʿīd VI 210 f.; Ibn Rustah, Kitaḥ al-adq al-nafsīa VII (in BGA VII [1892]) 216; Ḥaḥād IV 272 f.
20 Daulabī I 149; Ibn Saʿīd VII 2, p. 55; Bukhārī, Taḥṣīl IV 1, p. 295; Khaṭṭīb XIII 165; Itqān II 190. Ṭabarī cites  Daḥḥāk 670 times according to Horst, op. cit. p. 304, Inād 19.
21 Ibn Saʿīd V 344.
23 Taḥṣīl III 30; Jefferies (ed.), Two Muqaddimās, p. 193. For extracts from Muḥāhid’s  Taḥṣīl see Abū Nuṣaym III 280–300. Muḥāhid made his manuscripts available to others for copying (see Taḥṣīl al-ʿilm, p. 106).
24 Ibn Saʿīd V 352; Bukhārī, Taḥṣīl IV 1, p. 164; Jarḥ III 2, p. 122; Jamʿ II 420.
25 Ibn Ḥibbān, pp. 110 f.; Jamʿ I 61 f., II 431; Mīzān II 82 f., 360 f.
have written down tafsir and fiqh materials and to have dictated his own Tafsir, so that copies of it were in the hands of some of his pupils,\(^{26}\) no doubt including Daḥḥāk, who is said to have taken (akhkhad) the Tafsir from him.\(^{27}\) Furthermore, we read that Saʿīd’s Tafsir was commissioned by the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik, that the original was preserved in that caliph’s dīwān (see pp. 21, 58), and that it was seen there by the Egyptian ʿAtāʾ ibn Dinār (d. 126/744), who used the written text alone as the basis of his transmission.\(^{28}\) Similarly, Akhkhār ʿUbaid was found and used by Asad ibn Mūsā (132–212/750–827; see p. 243), who transmitted it on the basis of the manuscript.\(^{29}\)

Muqātil’s three authorities—Daḥḥāk, Muhājīd, and Saʿīd ibn Jubair—are mentioned along with most of the Qurʾānic commentators of the first and second centuries and are invariably associated with Ibn ʿAbbās (d. 68/668), who is considered the father of all commentators.\(^{30}\) Though there is, on the one hand, evidence that Ibn ʿAbbās left a large number of manuscripts,\(^{31}\) there is, on the other hand, evidence to indicate that he left no finally fixed texts and that the tafsir works which now go under his name include materials added from time to time by pupils, editors, and transmitters, almost all of whom committed their materials to writing.\(^{32}\)

Among the Qurʾānic commentators of Muqātil’s own day were some of the leading scholars who are known to have reached far and wide for their materials, utilized written texts, and committed their own works to writing with or without benefit of oral transmission. They include Suddī (d. 127/744–45), Muhammad ibn al-Saʿīd al-Kalbī (d. 146/763),\(^{33}\) and Ibn Iṣḥāq of Sīrah fame.\(^{34}\) The Meccan commentator Ibn Juraij (d. 150/767), acknowledged as a leader in many a scholarly activity and technique, was among those who used written hadīth materials without parallel oral transmission.\(^{35}\) The manuscripts of two outstanding scholars of ʿIrāq who were Qurʾānic commentators, Shuʿbah ibn al-Ḥajjāj\(^{36}\) and Sufyān al-Thaurī,\(^{37}\) were in circulation even in Khūrāsān (see p. 98).

\(^{26}\) See Ibn Saʿīd VI 179, 186; Taqīd al-ilm, pp. 102 f. and references there cited. For extracts from Saʿīd’s Tafsir see Aḥī Tawāṣ̄il IV 283–89.

\(^{27}\) See Ibn Saʿīd VI 210 and Ṣahih IV 272 f., neither of which use the noncommital akhkhad instead of the rasa generally used in oral transmission.

\(^{28}\) Bukhārī, Taqīd al-Ḥlm, d VI 179, 186; see Aḥī Tawāṣ̄il IV 283–89.

\(^{29}\) See references cited in n. 30. Further investigation of the extent and nature of Ibn ʿAbbās’s literary activity and of his influence on his successors in this field is not within the scope of the present study. The discovery of more tafsir papyri from the 1st and 2d centuries of Islam might well help in the solution of this controversial problem. More recent scholars tend to give a greater degree of credence than did earlier scholars to the idea that his literary activities were extensive and organized; see Nödeke, op. cit. Vol. II 163–70; Goldziher, Richtungen, pp. 55–58; Eugen Mittwoch, “Die Berliner arabische Handschrift Ahīwardī, No. 683,” A Volume of Oriental Studies Presented to Edward G. Browne (Cambridge, 1922) pp. 339–44; Laura Veccia Vaglieri in EI I (1960) 40 f. For the role of Ibn ʿAbbās and his transmitters as reflected in Tabarī’s Tafsir see Horst, op. cit. pp. 293–95, 302 f.

\(^{30}\) Fīhrist, p. 33. See also our Vol. I 45 and references there cited. For Tabarī’s free use of Suddī’s tafsir materials see Horst, op. cit. p. 302, and see Tafsir I 458–61 for examples.

\(^{31}\) See GAL S 1 190, 331; Itqān II 187–88; Hāji Khalīfah II 333. See also our Vol. I 45–47. Tabarī was very cautious in his use of Kalbī materials (Tafsir I 66, 76, 216–19 and XI 187 f.; cf. Jarḥ I 1, p. 432), but others made free use of them (see e.g. Jeffery [ed.], Two Muqaddimās, p. 197).

\(^{32}\) See GAL S 1 205 f.; Hāji Khalīfah II 332; Nödeke, op. cit. Vol. II 170. See also our Vol. I, references to Ibn Iṣḥāq in Index, esp. under “historical method.” For Tabarī’s frequent use of Ibn Iṣḥāq’s materials see Horst, op. cit. pp. 294 f.

\(^{33}\) GAL S 1 255; Ibn Saʿīd V 361 f.; Khaṭṭāb X 404 f.; Dhahabi I 160–62; Mīzān III 348 f.; Itqān II 189; Hāji Khalīfah II 346.

\(^{34}\) See GAL S 1 225; Ibn Saʿīd VI 259 and VII 2, p. 72; Fīhrist, p. 228; Khaṭṭāb IX 160 f.; Hāji Khalīfah II 357; Horst, op. cit. p. 296. Sufyān referred his questioners on the extraordinary to Muqātil (Aḥī Tawāṣ̄il VII 37).
Like these and other contemporary scholars Muqatil committed his works to writing. Sufyān ibn ʿUyainah (107–98/725–814), who began his scholarly career as a pupil of Muqatil, possessed a copy of the latter’s Tafsīr, which he did not transmit yet “studied for guidance and aid,” no doubt in connection with his own Tafsīr. Ibn al-Mubarak (see p. 98) was likewise familiar with Mujāhid’s Tafsīr, which he admired for its content but mistrusted for its authorities, since he insisted on oral transmission. The Kūfī traditionist Wakr ibn al-Jarrāḥ (129–97/746–812), who likewise insisted on oral transmission, advised a questioner not to look into Muqatil’s Tafsīr and to bury the copy in his possession. Shāfiʿī (d. 204/820) too had access to Muqatil’s Tafsīr, which he considered good (ṣāliḥ), and furthermore he acknowledged Muqatil without reservation as the leader in the field of tafsīr literature. Copies of Muqatil’s Tafsīr continued to be in circulation in the third century and were cautiously studied by such prominent scholars as Ibrāhīm ibn Isḥāq al-Ḥarbi (198–285/813–99) and Ṣālabī. The instances noted above do not exhaust the literary references to Muqatil’s written tafsīr sources, to the written Tafsīr’s of his contemporaries, and to copies of his own tafsīr works. They are, nevertheless, sufficient to establish the facts that are of interest at this point, namely that tafsīr books were available and used from the time of Ibn ʿAbbās onward and that copies of Muqatil’s several works were in circulation among his pupils and among trustworthy scholars of his day and of the succeeding generations.

The sources as a rule do not specify which of Muqatil’s several commentaries is under discussion. Though priority may be conceded tentatively to his chief work, the Tafsīr al-kabīr, the others, including the Wujūḥ wa al-naẓāʾir, should not be excluded. Suyūṭī and Ḥājjī Khalifah, citing Ibn al-Jauzi (510–97/1116–1200), give a concise summary of the nature and history of the ilm al-wujūḥ wa al-naẓāʾir as a branch of the science of Qur’ānic exegesis. As in all branches of tafsīr, the original inspiration and source is said to have been Ibn ʿAbbās, whose pupil ʿIkrimah (d. 105/723 or 107/725) is generally credited with the first work on this subject. Better attested, however, are the Wujūḥ wa al-naẓāʾir of the Syrian ʿAlī ibn Abī Tālīb (d. 123/741 or 143/760), of Muqatil himself, and of Ṣālabī ibn al-Ḥaḍr al-Anṣārī (d. 142 f. and Hajjl Khalifah VI 424 f. list some of the earlier works on al-wujūḥ wa al-naẓāʾir (see Goldscher, Richtungen, pp. 84 f. and 110 and references there cited).
THE WUJUH WA AL-NAZAIR OF MUQATIL IBN SULAIMAN

186/802 at the age of 81) of Mosul and Baṣra, all three of whom wrote down their materials. Because of the interest in and early production of this type of tafsir literature it is very likely that Muqatil’s own Al-wuṣūḥ wa al-naẓā’ir was known to scholars of the mid-second century who were interested in this type of commentary and aware of Muqatil’s reputation for extensive knowledge of the Qurʾān. In view of this general background it is not surprising that our papyrus is a fragment from Muqatil’s Al-wuṣūḥ wa al-naẓā’ir. And, inasmuch as the papyrus text is earlier than that of Abū Naṣr, Muqatil’s pupil and transmitter (see p. 97), we are forced to conclude that we have here a document that could have come from Muqatil’s own hand. At any rate, the fine quality of the papyrus, the liberal margins, and the elegant script all point to a scholar’s prized copy, whether that scholar was Muqatil himself or one of his contemporaries. Furthermore, since Egypt in the first half of the second century apparently produced no outstanding Qurʾānic commentator and since the paleography of the papyrus shows no marked affinity to the paleography of second- or even third-century literary papyri that originated in Egypt, it is probable that our papyrus came originally from either ʿIrāq or Syria. Though Muqatil’s scholarly career ran most of its course in ʿIrāq, he is known to have traveled as far west as Beirut in Syria.41

The early and subsequently widespread use of tafsir works, so copiously and specifically documented directly from some of the earliest representative literary sources, is reflected collectively and indirectly in Horst’s painstaking and valuable analysis of the isnād’s of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Ṭabarī’s Tafsir.42 There, along with literally thousands of isnād’s that appear 1–47 times, there are 14 that are repeated 52–86 times, 16 that are repeated 107–970 times, and 5 with about 1,000, 1,080, 1,560, 1,800, and 3,060 repetitions respectively. The thousands of isnād’s that occur less than 100 times no doubt reflect the activities of the average non-professional transmitters, whose numbers increased with each succeeding generation and who transmitted their bit of the “living tradition” orally with or without the aid of written memoranda. The 16 isnād’s that are repeated approximately 100–1,000 times would, then, represent the activities of several grades of early tafsir scholars such as Saʿīd ibn Jubair (Horst’s Isnād 17) and ʿAbd Allāh ibn Mālik ibn Ṭabarī (Isnād 19) and of somewhat later scholars whose interest in Qurʾānic commentary was secondary to their interest in other literary fields and who committed their materials to writing, for example Ibn ʿAbbās (Isnād 17)43 and Sufyān al-Thaurī (Isnād 18). Finally, the five most often repeated isnād’s reflect the activities of the acknowledged experts in the field of tafsir—men whose works were transmitted, in part or in whole, by each succeeding generation of tafsir scholars. It came as no surprise to this writer, long convinced of a greater degree of literary activity and progress under the Umayyads than most have been willing to concede, that these five isnād’s trace back to Ibn ʿAbbās, Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Ṭabarī (Isnāds 1–2, 6–8, 19), Qatādah ibn Diāmah (Isnād 14), Suddī (Isnāds 15–16), and Maʿmar ibn Ṭaḥṣīb (Isnāds 12–13)—commentators whose death dates are 68, 104, 117 or 118, 127, and 154 A.H. respectively and whose production and

42 ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Ṭabarī, in his Tafsir, frequently cites lengthy traditions and composite passages from Ibn ʿAbbās, most of which are found also in his Taʾrīkh and in his Strab though not necessarily as units. See e.g. Tafsir XIII 91–96, 390–401, 494–46; this volume covers Jewish history and legends and cites several quite lengthy accounts from Ibn ʿAbbās (No. 15019), ʿIkrīmah (No. 15272), Saʿīd ibn Jubair (Nos. 15014, 15026), Qatādah ibn Diāmah (Nos. 15017–18, 15132), and Suddī (Nos. 15016, 15069).
43 Mīdan II 19; Ḥājī Khālīfah VI 425.
44 Jarḥ IV 1, pp. 354 f.; Nawawi, p. 574; Ẓāfiṭ I 785, II 631.
use of written texts is copiously documented in the extant early literary sources. The main centers for the production of early taṣfīr studies were the Hijāz, Irāq, and Syria, where paper had not yet begun to replace papyrus for most purposes and where the soil was unkind to manuscripts. Loss was thus the usual fate of the original works themselves. Only those originals or copies that found their way to or originated later in Egypt, where the sandy soil was much kinder to manuscripts, had some chance of preservation. Muqātil’s Al-wujūh wa al-nazāʿīr was one of these, for it is to the Egyptian soil that we owe the preservation of our papyrus folio.

How, then, did the copy represented by our papyrus find its way to Egypt? There is, of course, the obvious possibility that it was taken west by traveling scholars and book collectors or traders. But from the Arabic literary sources with their multitude of detail can be pieced together some widely scattered items which suggest more specific agents of transportation. For instance, the Syrian ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭalḥah, regardless of which date is accepted for his death (see n. 49 above), could well have come into personal contact with Muqātil or his work during the latter’s visit to Syria. Be that as it may, we are on surer ground with ‘Alī’s direct transmitter Muqāṭiyah ibn Ṣāliḥ of Ḥims (d. 158/775), who transmitted ‘Alī’s voluminous Taṣfīr with an isnād said to trace originally through Muqāthīd back to Ibn ‘Abbās though the Muqāthīd link was omitted by ‘Alī. It is significant that Ṣabīrī uses this particular isnād no less than 1,530 times. Muqāṭiyah traveled westward to Spain before the entry of the Umayyad ‘Abd al-Rahmān I in the year 138/755 but joined that prince upon his arrival in Spain. Toward the end of his life Muqāṭiyah was sent back to Syria in the prince’s service. He extended his trip to make the pilgrimage of the year 154/771. In both Medina and Mecca he gave public and private lectures that were attended by scholars from all the provinces. Among those who “wrote down much knowledge” from him at that time were some of the leading and most promising scholars of Irāq and Egypt. The Egyptians included Laith ibn Sa’d (94–175/712–91) and his secretary and Ibn Wahb (125–97/742–812). Exchange of manuscripts between the aged Muqāṭiyah and any one of these Egyptian scholars could have taken place then or during one of Muqāṭiyah’s several passages through Egypt. On one of these occasions Laith and his secretary ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ṣāliḥ, known also as Abū Ṣāliḥ (138–223/755–838), had an oral session (simā’) with Muqāṭiyah, after which Laith instructed his secretary to seek the visitor again and take down the materials from his dictation. This the secretary did and then publicized the fact that he had heard these materials twice from Muqāṭiyah himself and then read them back to Laith. Early and independent confirmation of direct transmission by Abū Ṣāliḥ from Muqāṭiyah of both taṣfīr and ḥadīth materials is provided by Abū ʿUbayd (154–223/773–838), Bukhārī (194–256/810–70), and Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī (195–277/811–90), all three of whom traveled to Egypt in the second decade

References for Suddi and Maḥmar may be found through the index of our Vol. I. For a general list of leading commentators see Jeffery (ed.), Two Muqaddimas, p. 106.


Mīzān II 227 f.; Itqān I 106. See also GAL I 106; Dhahabi II 5 f.

Horst, op. cit., p. 293, Isnāds 1 and 2.

Ibn al-Faradī, loc. cit.

Amwāl, pp. 13, 116, and 127. See also GAL I 106; Dhahabi II 5 f.

Jami’ I 268 f. Bukhārī was in Egypt in the year 217/832 (Bukhārī, Ta’rīkh III 1, p. 121).

Jarḥ, Taqdīminah, pp. 357 and 359 f.; Jarḥ IV 1, p. 408. See also GAL I 16 f.; Dhahabi II 132–34. Abū Ḥātim made
of the third century and transmitted materials directly from Abū Śāliḥ on the authority of Muḥāwiyah on the authority of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭalḥah on the authority of Ibn ‘Abbās. That much of the material transmitted by Abū Śāliḥ from Muḥāwiyah consisted of ṭafsīr traditions is confirmed by Horst’s study of the isnād’s of Tābari’s Tafsīr, 62 which reveals 1,530 traditions whose isnād’s trace back to these four earliest links. Of these traditions, 970 were transmitted from Abū Śāliḥ to Tābari by ‘Alī ibn Dā’ūd al-Tamīmī (d. 262/876 or 272/885) and 560 by Muthannā ibn Ibrāhīm al-Amūlī, who was active in the first half of the third century. 63 Such large numbers of traditions with identical early isnād’s provide further evidence of the steady availability and use of written compilations of ṭafsīr traditions.

That Abū Śāliḥ did actually come to possess some, if not all, of the books of Muḥāwiyah is attested by Khaṭṭāb, 64 who, however, does not specify the time of acquisition nor the titles. Nevertheless it is certain that at least one original manuscript that was in the possession of Muḥāwiyah, namely the Tafsīr of his teacher ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭalḥah, did find its way into the hands of Abū Śāliḥ and that Ibn Ḥanbal thought it worthwhile for anyone to make a special trip to Egypt to acquire its contents. 65 The Wujūh wa al-naẓā’ir of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭalḥah as well as that of Muqāṭil could therefore likewise have come into the possession of Abū Śāliḥ. Be that as it may, the fact that Abū Śāliḥ possessed some of the books of Muḥāwiyah soon came to be widely known. He was sought out in Egypt early in the third century by the well-known Syrian scholar ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Ibrāhīm (170–245/786–859), 66 who made copies of the books of Muḥāwiyah on the authority of Abū Śāliḥ. 67

In the year 274/887 the Spanish scholar Ibn Ayman traveled east to ʿIrāq and was told by the ʿIrāqī scholar Muḥammad ibn Abī Khaṭṭāb (d. 297/910) of the importance of the originals (usūl) in the collection of Muḥāwiyah’s manuscripts. On his return to Spain Ibn Ayman searched in vain for such originals and credited their loss to neglect on the part of Muḥāwiyah’s comparatively unlearned Spanish contemporaries. 68 A better reason now would seem to be that they were not to be found in Spain simply because the author himself had taken them out of the country and disposed of them in Egypt, whether or not he himself returned finally to Spain and died there. If Muḥāwiyah actually died in Egypt, as Ibn Ḥi♭bān reports, 69 then Abū Śāliḥ in all probability acquired his collection of manuscripts at the time of Muḥāwiyah’s death or soon thereafter.

---

62 See Horst, op. cit. pp. 294 f. and 307. See also Birke­land, Opposition, pp. 18 f., and his The Legend of the Opening of Muḥammad’s Breast, p. 7.

63 See Horst, op. cit. pp. 293 and references there cited. For ‘Alī ibn Dā’ūd see also Jarḥ III 1, p. 185, and Mutfats I 224. Muthannā is still unidentified. Both men with this complete isnād are used sparingly by Tābari (Taṣrīḥ I 40, 44 f., 51, 53, 200).

64 Khaṭṭāb IX 478, 480, 481.

65 Iḫqān II 188. See also Goldziher, Richtungen, p. 78, and Birke­land, Opposition, p. 18—both without references. There can, of course, be no question that throughout the 3d century the importance of texts in literary transmission was recognized and that they were used in all fields of intellectual endeavor, as attested for the religious sciences by such outstanding leaders as Wāqīy and his secretary Ibn Sa’d, Ibn Hishām, Ibn Ḥanbal, Bukhārī, Tābari, and many more.

66 Bukhārī, Taṣrīḥ III 1, p. 256; Jarḥ II 2, pp. 211 f.; Khaṭṭāb X 265–67; Dhahabi II 58 f.

67 Khaṭṭāb IX 481. The traveling Kūfī traditionist Zaid ibn al-Ḥabbāb (d. 203/818) had earlier sought out Muḥāwiyah either in Mecca, as surmised by Khaṭṭāb, or more likely in Spain, as reported by Ibn Ḥanbal and the Spanish sources (Khaṭṭāb VIII 442–44; Dhahabi I 319 f.; Ibn al­Faruḍ, Taṣrīḥ al-ʿulāmāʾ I 185 f., II 138; Ḥumādī, Jashn al-muqtahās, pp. 203 f.).

68 Khaṭṭāb I 304 f.; Khushānī, op. cit. pp. 30 f.; Maqqarl, Naḏḥ al-ṭīb I (Leyde, 1271/1855) 492, 618.

69 See Ibn Ḥi♭bān, p. 144, No. 1530, as against Khusha­nī, op. cit. pp. 37 f., who says Muḥāwiyah died in Rabād, presumably in Cordova (Yāqūt II 750 f.). Since Khushānī adds that Prince Hishām attended the funeral. The rest of the sources do not mention the place of Muḥāwiyah’s death, though the still unpublished part of Ibn Ḥaṣṣīl’s Taṣrīḥ maḏahīt Dimashq may do so.
There is a second circumstance through which Abū Ṣāliḥ could have acquired Muqāṭīl’s work. In the year 161/778 he accompanied Laith ibn Sa’d on a trip to the eastern provinces. While they were in ‘Iraq they sought out several scholars and wrote down materials transmitted by them. Muqāṭīl’s works were no doubt in circulation in ‘Iraq at that time (see p. 101), so that Laith, the leading Egyptian scholar, and his secretary Abū Ṣāliḥ might well have obtained or made copies of them to take back to Egypt.

Again, our papyrus could have been taken to Egypt by Shāfiqi, who was familiar with Muqāṭīl’s work (see p. 100) and who settled in Egypt in the year 198/814. Abū Ṣāliḥ would have had an opportunity to acquire manuscripts from Shāfiqi or his companions or perhaps from Shāfiqi’s library after his death.

Undoubtedly the original or a copy of Muqāṭīl’s Al-wujūh wa al-naẓār, represented by our papyrus folio, is to be linked with Laith and Abū Ṣāliḥ through one of the three means detailed above in the order of probability. Moreover, the small group of contemporary and nearly contemporary literary papyri here published includes other documents that represent the works and collections of Laith and Abū Ṣāliḥ (e.g. Documents 5 and 6).

Muqāṭīl’s general practice of using written sources on their own authority detracted from his reputation as a scholar among his contemporaries who insisted on the direct isnād and oral transmission with or without benefit of accompanying written texts. This critical attitude was adopted by scholars of the next generation and is expressed in a terse statement by ‘Īsā ibn Yūnus (d. 187/803; see p. 160), who, when asked for his opinion of Muqāṭīl, swiftly replied ‘‘ibn diwān dawwan,’’ which in its context can only mean that Muqāṭīl used books as final authority in the production of his own manuscripts. Hudhail ibn Ḥabīb dictated an entire tafsir work of Muqāṭīl in Baghdād in the year 190/806. Some decades later Ibn Ḥanbal was asked for his opinion of Muqāṭīl and is reported to have answered: ‘‘He had books which he studied, but I see that he was learned in the Qur’ān.’’ Still later, Ibrāhīm ibn Isḥāq al-Ḥarbī, who studied Muqāṭīl’s Tafsir (see p. 100) though he would not transmit it, summed up his objection to Muqāṭīl as follows: ‘‘Muqāṭīl collected the commentaries of the people and made his (own) commentary without oral transmission.’’ This need not and does not mean that Muqāṭīl consistently ignored the use of hadith as a basis of tafsir, since there is evidence of his use of traditions, acceptable or otherwise (see p. 204), and since he did cite Daḥḥāk as an authority (see p. 97) and did claim transmission from Muḥammad ibn al-Sa’ib al-Kalbī. What it does mean is that Muqāṭīl copied materials, including traditions with or without isnād’s, from books without any sort of oral session (simā’) involving the direct transmitter. In other words, he did not conform to the standards of oral transmission of hadith that were current in his day and thereafter. Yet this defect did not induce Ibrāhīm ibn Isḥāq al-Ḥarbī to condemn Muqāṭīl outright. With an eye to his own professional reputation as an orthodox traditionist and a scholar, he refrained from transmitting Muqāṭīl’s Tafsir. But he studied the work in private with so much profit that he was forced to conclude that the severity of the criticisms voiced against Muqāṭīl stemmed from professional jealousy.

19 Khatīb IX 478-81, XIII 3-5.

20 GAL 2:1 189.

21 The unwoveled lines of Khatīb XIII 165; see Buṭrus al-Bustānī, Muḥāj al-muḥājī I (Beirut, 1298/1887) 700, where diwān is equated with diwān. It was partly for the same reason that Sufyān ibn Uyainah would not transmit Muqāṭīl’s Tafsir (see p. 100 above).

22 Khatīb XIV 78 f.

23 Khatīb XIII 161.

24 Khatīb XIII 161: ‘‘كانت له كتب ينظر فيها إلا: اثني ارث كان له علم بالقرآن.’’

25 Ibd. p. 162: ‘‘جمع مقاتيل نفس الناس وessenger عليه: من غير سما.’’

26 Birkeland, Opposition, pp. 26 f., tends to give this impression.

27 Khatīb XIII 162 f.: ‘‘قلت لأبراهيم ما الناس يعطونه: على مقاتيل قال حسدا منهم لمقاتيل.’’
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Muqatil's relationship with Kalbí, the one contemporary scholar who could challenge his leadership in the field of *tafsir*, is also instructive. For, while Muqatil did not hesitate to use Kalbí's materials and to recommend them to his own pupils, Kalbí refrained from giving the same mark of approval to his equally talented but more generous rival.98 He once publicly challenged Muqatil's claim of having received traditions from him. Muqatil is reported to have answered: "Be silent, Abū al-Naḍr [Kalbí], for the ornamentation of the *ḥadith* consists, for us, in (citing) the men (as authorities)." 79 Kalbí must have considered silence at this point the better part of wisdom since he was open to the same type of criticism that was being hurled at Muqatil.80 Some of Kalbí's *tafsir* materials were so suspect that several of his pupils and contemporaries, including Ibn Ishaq and Sufyān al-Thaurī, went to some length to disguise the fact of their transmission from Kalbí.81 Sufyān reports that Kalbí himself acknowledged the falsity of his transmission from Abū Ṣāliḥ on the authority of Ibn ʿAbbās.82 Yet, though the *Tafsir*’s of Kalbí and Muqatil were frequently compared and as often as not declared of equal worth,83 Kalbí’s reputation among the orthodox was salvaged to a certain extent while that of Muqatil remained under a heavy cloud.84

Bukhārī declared Muqatil weak and worthless.85 Ṭabarī made use in his *Tafsir* of the biographical and historical materials of Kalbí and his son Hishām and of Wāqīdī, all three of whom were suspect as to *isnād*’s and oral transmission of *ḥadith*. Yet he consistently refused to use similar materials from Muqatil’s works86 and in his few references to him points out his untrustworthy practices.87 Ibn ʿAdī (d. 360/971 or 365/976), put his finger on the most significant factor that turned many fellow scholars against Muqatil and his works. In comparing Muqatil and Kalbí he says: "No one has a *Tafsir* that is longer and fuller than Kalbí’s. After him (comes) Muqatil ibn Sulaimān. But Kalbí is preferred because of Muqatil’s unorthodox doctrines.88 For Muqatil not only made free use of non-Islamic materials, especially from Christian and Jewish sources,89 but was, furthermore, a Zaidite with anthropomorphic leanings (see p. 100, n. 39).90 However, it should be noted that Ibn al-Mubārak, as orthodox a scholar as any and one even more opposed to the anthropomorphism of Jahm ibn Ṣafwān than to Christian and Jewish theology, did not accuse Muqatil of this widely current heresy.91

Because of his controversial techniques, his professional jealousy, and above all his religious bias Muqatil was consigned to the ranks of the untrustworthy. Yet, so strong was the impression that the man and his works had made on his contemporaries and on succeeding generations of scholars who used one or more of his several *tafsir* works that he was seldom men-

---

78 Khaṭṭāb XIII 167 f.
81 Ibn Sa’d VI 212 f.; Bukhārī, *Ṭarīkh* IV 1, pp. 8 f.; *Jarḥ* III 1, pp. 382 f.; See also *Tafsir* I 220 (No. 305).
82 Jāḥiṣ’s sweeping criticism of most Qurānic commentators was based largely on the linguistic and historical inaccuracies and the illogicality of their *tafsir* and *tawil* materials (see e.g. Jāḥiṣ, *Al-bayāḍa* [1356/1938] 343–45).
83 *Jarḥ, Taqdimah*, p. 81. For this Abū Ṣāliḥ, client of Umm Hīnī, see our Vol. I 46, n. 3.
84 Khaṭṭāb XIII 163: نسيب الكليبي مثل نسيب مقاتل: سواء.
87 *Irsād* VI 441. Naṣārī (d. 303/915) likewise avoided using Muqatil’s works (see Khaṭṭāb XIII 168).
88 *Tafsir* I 66, 76, 157, 216–19 and XI 187 f. The editors of *Tafsir* in their copious notes argue that some well known *isnād*’s, e.g. Ibn Ishaq–Kalbī–Abū Ṣāliḥ–Ibn ʿAbbās, are suspect for the simple reason that Kalbī is one of the links (cf. Bukhārī, *Ṭarīkh* II 2, p. 85; *Jarḥ* I 1, pp. 431 f., and III 1, pp. 270 f.; cf. also *Jarḥ, Taqdimah*, p. 81).
89 Quoted in *Iṣṭaḥnah* II 189 and Ḥājjī Khālīfah II 143. For Ibn ʿAdī see *GAL* I 167 and *GAL* S I 280.  
90 *Fihrist*, pp. 178 f.
tioned throughout the centuries without reference to his vast knowledge of and preoccupation with the Qur'ān and Qur'ānic commentary. It is true that such references are frequently accompanied by mention of the general untrustworthiness of his traditions, though even some of these were considered acceptable enough to be written down from him for transmission. That, under the circumstances, only a few of his traditions as such have survived is not surprising. Nor is it surprising that those of his Tafsīr works which have survived (see p. 96) are predominantly linguistic.

In view of this threefold prejudice against Muqatil one must view with suspicion the inane anecdotes reported about him, as also the charge that he offered to fabricate traditions in favor of Mansūr and the ‘Abbāsids. Anecdotes that illustrate Muqatil’s personal trustworthiness and courage deserve, under the circumstances, more credence. In the year 128/745, when he was still a young man, he was sought as arbiter in an important politico-military dispute because of his reputation as a man who not only studied but “lived by the Book of God.” Later, Mansūr was being annoyed by flies and asked Muqatil if he knew why God created them; he received with silence the pointed answer “to humble the mighty.”

Prince Mahdī patronized Muqatil presumably for his knowledge of tafsīr, though Mansūr stressed the prince’s studies with Ḥasan ibn ʿUmārah (d. 153/770) in fiqh and with Ibn ʿIṣḥāq in maḥāzi. Following in the footsteps of conservative and orthodox Islamic critics, whose bases for al-jarḥ wa al-taqlīd, “the impugnment and the vindication,” were primarily oral transmission and the unbroken isnād, Western scholars, except Massignon, have been content for the most part to stress Muqatil’s so-called weak points and to underestimate if not, indeed, to overlook his initiative and wide yet specialized coverage of his chosen field of study. The very existence of our papyrus and the study growing out of it offset the imbalance. For, Kalbī and his extensive Tafsīr notwithstanding, Muqatil with his several and varied tafsīr works emerges as not only the most prolific but also the leading Qur’ānic commentator of his day. His knowledge and initiative were put to use in the development of the various specialized branches in that field, and his works came to be widely used but for the most part without formal or public acknowledgment, largely out of deference to the sentiments of powerful orthodox circles.

THE EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF TAFSĪR

Birkeland contends that Goldziher has seriously misunderstood the sources which he cites in support of his conviction that there was tangible opposition to a certain type of tafsīr in the first two centuries of Islam. Birkeland’s own position is as follows: (1) There was no opposition to any kind of tafsīr until late in the first century. (2) Strong opposition to all

68 The earlier sources have been cited repeatedly and are reflected in such later sources as Dḥahabī I 165, Nawawi, pp. 574 f., Ibn Khalīkān II 147 f., and Yāfī I 309.
69 See Document 8, Traditions 10 and 12, and Vol. I 52.
70 Ibn al-Jauzī, who likewise wrote on al-wujūh wa al-naqīṣ (see Ḥāṣan I 142–46, II 189; Ḥāṣī Khallīfāh VI 424), may have had access to earlier works, including Muqatil’s, on that subject (see Ibn al-Jauzī, Al-mudhīṣḥ [Baghdād, 1348/1920] pp. 2–22, esp. pp. 10–22).
71 Ḥāṣī XIII 166 f.; Mīsdn III 197.
72 Ḥāṣī XIII 167.
73 Ṭabarī II 1917 f., 1921, 1931, 1933; Ibn al-Āthīr, Al-kāmil fi al-taʾrīkh, ed. C. J. Thornberg, V (Lugduni Batavorum, 1870) 454.
74 Ḥāṣī XIII 160; Yāfī I 309; Ibn Khalīkān II 148.
75 Akhīr al-qudūt III 248; Ḥāṣī VII 345. See also our Vol. I 88–91.
76 See his Recueil de textes inédits concernant de la mystique en pays d’Islam I 194–210, 219.
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types of \textit{tafsir} developed in the second century. (3) Thereafter, \textit{tafsir} brought into line with orthodox doctrine and subjected to strict methods of transmission received general acceptance, but opposition to heterodox \textit{tafsir} persisted.\textsuperscript{103} There is general agreement on the last point, which therefore need not be considered here. As for the other two points, Goldziher has indeed misunderstood some of the sources, but Birkeland too has been misled. We shall try to follow and enlarge on the salient points of this new controversy in order to indicate in bold outlines the history of the development of \textit{tafsir} and its literature in the first two centuries of Islam.

Goldziher\textsuperscript{104} cites as evidence of early opposition to \textit{tafsir} the severe punishment that the caliph 'Umar I inflicted on Ṣābiḥ ibn 'Isl for his preoccupation with the interpretation of the ambiguous passages (\textit{muwashābihāt}) of the Qur'an. Birkeland\textsuperscript{105} questions the validity of this evidence (1) by casting doubt on the identity of Ṣābiḥ, whom he considers legendary, (2) by arguing that the harsh punishment was not in keeping with 'Umar's known character, and (3) by pointing out that 'Umar, who approved of Ibn 'Abbās, the father of \textit{tafsir}, could hardly be assumed to have been opposed to \textit{tafsir}. Examination of these objections reveals that they were made without adequate research, and the collective evidence of the sources leads one in turn to question Birkeland's position on all three points.

Birkeland questions Ṣābiḥ's historicity on the strength of the different names by which he is referred to in the different sources: Ṣābiḥ ibn 'Isl and Ṣābiḥ ibn al-Mundhir. Ibn Duraid gives Ṣābiḥ's genealogy as Ṣābiḥ ibn Sharīk ibn al-Mundhir . . . ibn 'Isl . . . al-Yarbuṭ and mentions also his brother Rabī'ah ibn 'Isl al-Yarbuṭ, who appears in historical sources in military and civil capacities in the eastern provinces in the years 12–60 A.H.\textsuperscript{106} That Ṣābiḥ is referred to now by one and now by another part of his full name reflects a practice so common in Islamic literature that it cannot be used to question his historicity— a historicity that is confirmed by that of his brother, with whom he is at times associated in the literature.

Again, Ṣābiḥ is sometimes referred to as 'Abd Allāh ibn Ṣābiḥ. So far as I have been able to discover, this form of his name occurs only in reports of his meeting with 'Umar I, who asked Ṣābiḥ his name and received the reply: "I am 'Abd Allāh Ṣābiḥ." To this 'Umar replied: "And I am 'Abd Allāh 'Umar."\textsuperscript{107} The practice of prefixing "'Abd Allāh" to the caliph's name is said to have started in the year 16/637 when Mughirah ibn Shu'bah, 'Umar's governor of Başra, addressed 'Umar as "'Abd Allāh 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, Commander of the Faithful," instead of the clumsy "'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, Agent of the Agent of the Messenger of Allāh,"\textsuperscript{108} 'Umar approved the innovation, which soon became the general practice for official correspondence and administrative documents.\textsuperscript{109} It is entirely possible that the form "'Abd Allāh ibn Ṣābiḥ" is a creation of some later narrator or copyist who felt the need to supply what he considered a missing "ibn" in the original "'Abd Allāh Ṣābiḥ." This inference is borne out by the fact that of the many entries on Ṣābiḥ, Suyūṭī's much abbreviated ac-

\textsuperscript{103} Ibid. pp. 7 ff., 42. See also Birkeland, \textit{The Lord Guideth} (Oslo, 1956) pp. 6–13, 133–37.

\textsuperscript{104} \textit{Richtungen}, pp. 55 f.

\textsuperscript{105} \textit{Opposition}, pp. 13 f.


\textsuperscript{107} Dārimī I 54; Ibn 'Asākir VI 385.


\textsuperscript{109} See e.g. Grohmann, \textit{Allgemeine Einführung in die arabischen Papyri} ("Corpus Papyrorum Raineri Archiducis Austriae" III, "Series Arabica" I 1 [Wien, 1924]); George C. Miles, "Early Islamic inscriptions near Ṭabarī in the Hijāz," \textit{JNES} VII (1948) 236 f. The practice continued well into 'Abbāsid times.
count\textsuperscript{110} of the story is the only primary source that uses the form “\textsuperscript{3}Abd Allāh ibn Ṣābīgh.” Goldziher\textsuperscript{111} at first used only the form “Ṣābīgh ibn Ṣisl,” following his sources, then adopted the form “\textsuperscript{3}Abd Allāh ibn Ṣābīgh” and, finally, the form “Ibn Ṣābīgh,”\textsuperscript{112} which is not to be found in any of the Arabic sources. This usage no doubt confused Birkeland. Nevertheless, it must be clear that to consider Ṣābīgh legendary\textsuperscript{113} because of these several errors in his name or because of the use of alternative parts of the name is not justifiable.

We turn next to the severity of the punishment inflicted by ‘Umar on Ṣābīgh. Though the newly founded Baṣrāh was the seat of his family, Ṣābīgh is more frequently referred to as “the ḫIrāqī,” which could indicate that he moved about in the province of ḫIrāq. At any rate, he was apparently a restless man on the move. Like his brother Rabī‘ah he moved in military circles, though in what official capacity, if any, is nowhere stated. Late in the second and early in the third decade of Islām, religious information and instruction in the newly conquered provinces of ḫIrāq, Syria, and Egypt was to be had only in the large military camps and the newly established settlements, such as Baṣrah and Fustāt, where many of the Companions of Muḥammad, some of whom were eager to instruct the people, were to be found. Ṣābīgh, according to the earliest ḫIrāqī and Egyptian sources, sought out men in these provincial military camps and raised questions about the ambiguous (mutashābih) and difficult (mushkīlāt) passages of the Qur’ān in a foolish and stubborn way.\textsuperscript{114} This sort of questioning led him into serious trouble in Egypt, where he and his activities were brought to the attention of ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ, presumably during the latter’s first governorship of that province (21-25 A.H.). It is known that ‘Amr was energetic and a man of decision who took provincial matters into his own hands (see p. 109). That he did not do so in Ṣābīgh’s case but instead found it necessary to send the offender to ‘Umar in Medina and that ‘Umar readied the instruments of punishment even before he interviewed Ṣābīgh is indicative of the seriousness of the offense in the judgment of both ‘Amr and ‘Umar.

There are two early Medinan versions of the interview with ‘Umar and of the punishment which followed (see references in n. 114). A brief version, which traces back to Sulāmān ibn Yāsār (see pp. 213 f.), merely states that Ṣābīgh asked ‘Umar questions about ambiguous Qur’ānic passages, for which he was flogged. A longer version traces back to Nāfi‘ (d. 117/735). It gives examples of Ṣābīgh’s questions, details the punishment of two hundred strokes actually administered and states that a third hundred was averted, mentions Ṣābīgh’s ostracization, and finally describes Ṣābīgh’s repentance, pardon, and restoration to Muslim society. Later sources add details here and there from Sa‘īd ibn al-Musayyib (d. 94/712), Tā‘ūs ibn Kaisān (d. 106/724), Muḥammad ibn Šīrīn (d. 110/728), and others, details which do not alter the basic elements of the story, though Tā‘ūs adds that ‘Umar tore up Ṣābīgh’s manuscripts.\textsuperscript{115}

The incident must have been widely publicized from the start, for Mālik ibn Anas reports on the authority of Zuhri on the authority of Qāsim ibn Muḥammad (d. 108/726 at age 70 or 72) that once when a man annoyed Ibn ‘Abbāṣ (d. 68/668) by asking him repeatedly about the distribution of war booty the latter exclaimed in anger: “This man is indeed like Ṣābīgh whom ‘Umar flogged.”\textsuperscript{116} Ṣ̄abarī gives the same report almost verbatim, to which Tirmidhī’s com-

\textsuperscript{110} Itqān II 4.
\textsuperscript{111} Studien II 182.
\textsuperscript{112} Goldziher, Richtungen, p. 55, n. 3.
\textsuperscript{113} See Birkeland, Opposition, p. 14.
\textsuperscript{114} Futūḥ, p. 168; Dārimī I 54 f.; Ibn Duraid, Kitāb al-iḥtiqāq, pp. 130 f.
\textsuperscript{115} See e.g. Malātī, Kitāb al-tanbih wa al-raḍi, pp. 138 f.; Ibn Ansākir VI 384 f.; Isabah II 521.
\textsuperscript{116} Muwaffaq II 455.
mentator, Ibn al-ʿArabī al-Maṣūfī, adds that ʿṢabīḥ was flogged “with the ḍiʿrah until his blood streamed down his limbs.” 117 From Ibn ʿAsākir’s account we learn that the story of ʿṢabīḥ was recorded in his leading sources—Abū Nuʿaym, Dāraquṭnī, and Khaṭīb. 118 Dāraquṭnī questioned the version of Ibn Abī Saḥrah (d. 162/779), where ʿṢabīḥ’s questions seem to have been harmless enough for even ʿUmar himself to answer. Ibn ʿAsākir adds: “Reason does not accept that ʿUmar should flog a man who asks for comments on Qurʿānic verses other than the mutashābihāt and have him, furthermore, ostracized. Far be it from ʿUmar to reach this degree of severity, as is indeed confirmed by what follows.” 119 And what follows in Ibn ʿAsākir’s account gives the earlier versions of Sulaimān ibn Yasār and Nāṣir, where the emphasis is precisely on the mutashābihāt and where there is no comment on the severe punishment of two hundred strokes by any of its recorders.

Before we pass judgment on ʿUmar’s severity, it is fitting to consider not only the offense itself but also its probable consequences under the then existing religio-political situation. ʿṢabīḥ’s activity was not private or casual. Its extent and persistence presented a double threat. Theologically, it held the danger of spreading doubt, disbelief, and heresy. 120 Politically, it could, by undermining the new faith, undermine also the allegiance of the military forces whose loyal support was so essential to the success and stability of the newly established religio-political community. Sūrah 3:7 expressly condemns preoccupation with mutashābihāt al-Qurʾān for just such reasons. ʿṢabīḥ’s offense, then, seemed to his contemporaries and to the succeeding generations of Muslims far from the “innocent questions” that Birkeland 121 believed it to have been. Moreover, there were other instances in which ʿUmar’s severity and zeal exceeded his sense of justice, when he spared neither man nor woman, including the members of his own family.

Among the several stories told of ʿUmar’s zealous persecution of early converts to Islām is one in which he thrashed a slave woman who refused to renounce Islām “until his own strength gave out.” 122 His own conversion did not mellow him. He ordered Muslim women beaten for infractions of the divorce regulations and himself indulged in mild wife-beating for minor insubordination. 123

Again, one of ʿUmar’s sons, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, took an intoxicant while he was in Egypt with ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ, who punished him in private with the stipulated flogging. When ʿUmar heard of this he wrote to ʿAmr and took him to task for not punishing the unfortunate culprit publicly as he would have punished any other man’s son. He then ordered ʿAmr to send him the young man clothed in a single cloak and riding a pack-saddle in order to impress him with the enormity of his offense. When the son arrived in Medina his “just” father, ʿUmar, did not hesitate to have him punished a second time, and this time publicly, for the same offense. The ʿIraqīs said that the son was so severely flogged that he died under the lash; the Medinans denied this but added that he died after a month. 124

117 See Tafṣīr XIII 364 and Ibn al-ʿArabī al-Maṣūfī’s comment on Tirmidhī XI 204.
118 Ibn ʿAsākir VI 385.
119 See ʿIṣābāt II 6 f., where this danger is further detailed.
120 Opposition, p. 13.
121 Sūrah I 206; Jāḥiṣ, Al-Uṭmānīyāt, ed. ʿAbd al-Salām Hārūn (Cairo, 1374/1955) p. 34; Anṣāb I 195 f.
122 See e.g. Sūrah 4:34 and Tafṣīr VII 313–17; Mwaṭaqa? II 53 f.; Ibn Mājah I 33. It is generally well known that he was ever protesting against Muhammad’s leniency toward women (see e.g. Bukhārī III 359 and p. 135 below). In justice to ʿUmar it should be noted that he was not above accepting correction from a Qurʾān-quoting woman, as when he revised his decision on the limits to a woman’s dowry (see e.g. Ibn Hanbal I 41 and cf. Ibn al-Jauzi, Taʾrīkh ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭāb, pp. 150 f.).
123 Istābī II 392; Usd III 312; Īṣābāt II 992; Ibn al-Jauzi, Taʾrīkh ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭāb, pp. 236–38. ʿUmar expected the conduct of the members of his family to be exemplary, since the eyes of the public were upon them,
It should be pointed out that 'Umar's election to the caliphate was opposed because of his extreme severity, but Abu Bakr felt that such severity was justified by the difficult nature of the task to be accomplished, namely the stabilizing of the newly founded faith and state. Considering, then, the nature of Sabiğh's offense, the temper of the times, and the known character of 'Umar in matters of the faith and the state, the punishment he inflicted on Sabiğh was calculated to fit the crime. There is, therefore, no reason to conclude, as Birkeland did, that the 'Umar of the Sabiğh story "is not the historical 'Umar." The justice of religio-political zealots is seldom tempered with mercy.

It is instructive to note a second instance in which 'Umar took drastic action against pre-occupation with tafsîr. He once saw a Qur'an with an accompanying verse-by-verse tafsîr, whereupon he himself cut out the tafsîr and left the sacred text only. Any sizable portion of the Qur'an will contain ambiguous passages, if only the so-called mysterious letters heading the Sûras, and 'Umar may have eliminated commentaries on such passages. That his action did not stem from a categorical opposition to all types of tafsîr is suggested by the fact that 'Umar himself answered some of Sabiğh's questions and by the fact that 'Umar is known to have approved of Ibn 'Abbâs, the latter fact being cited in Birkeland's argument as stated above (p. 107). 'Umar not only tacitly approved of Ibn 'Abbâs but actually encouraged that young man on various occasions to match his talents against those of several older Companions in their comments on the Qur'an and to question him, 'Umar, about the Qur'an. Furthermore, 'Umar is quoted as answering questions on the Qur'an, mostly on the authority of Muhammad, on numerous other occasions. These questions and answers usually deal with variant readings, grammar, meanings, and the occasion for the revelation of a given Sûrah or passage, gîrîdÎ, idrîb, marînî, and tanzîl al-Qur'an.

Our study so far points to the conclusion that 'Umar was violently opposed to any commentary on the mutashâbîhât al-Qur'an but permitted and himself participated in other types of tafsîr and whenever possible quoted and stressed Muhammad's comments (tafsîr al-nabi). Our next question involves the extent to which 'Umar's attitude toward tafsîr represented that of the Companions and the Successors. Both Goldziher and Birkeland have attempted to reconcile the fact of widespread tafsîr activity with statements that a number of prominent Companions and Successors either opposed or disapproved of tafsîr and refused to participate in such activity. Goldziher believed the contradiction could be resolved by giving tafsîr as opposed by these men a special meaning. He based his argument on a statement transmitted by Ibn Ḥanbal that "three (types of) books have no foundation—magâhîz, malâkîm, and..." and warned them that should they disregard any of his prohibitions he would double their punishment (Khaṭîb IV 210). 'Umar is said to have been the first ruler to use the whip. For another case in which 'Umar is said to have punished a culprit twice for the same offense, this time for his second transgression of the same rule, see Al-Faruq (Cairo, 1364/1945).

\[\text{\footnotesize Document 1}\]

---
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118 See Itqân II 12, 180.

119 The context does not indicate that 'Umar opposed written tafsîr as such as he did the writing-down of hadîth.

120 See e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal I 33; Buhârî III 359; Yaqûb ibn Shâbah, Munad... 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭîb, pp. 86 f.; Khaṭîb I 173 f.; Jeffery (ed.), Two Magadiinas, pp. 52-53, 193, and 196; Itqân II 188.


124 See Itqân II 12-180.

125 The context does not indicate that 'Umar opposed written tafsîr as such as he did the writing-down of hadîth.

126 See e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal I 33; Buhârî III 359; Yaqûb ibn Shâbah, Munad... 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭîb, pp. 86 f.; Khaṭîb I 173 f.; Jeffery (ed.), Two Magadiinas, pp. 52-53, 193, and 196; Itqân II 188.

Judging the tafsir of this passage by its context Goldziher concluded that it was a special type that dealt with historical legends and eschatology. His next step in the argument was to equate this type of tafsir, on the basis of its supposed content, with the type to which some prominent early Muslims took objection. Birkeland has shown effectively that Ibn Ḥanbal had in mind not the content (matn) but the unsoundness or absence of isnād’s in such books, which were therefore suspect. Birkeland attempted to reconcile the above-stated contradiction by emphasizing disapproval of as against positive opposition to tafsir and attempted further to explain both attitudes on the basis of personal piety among a small group of ultraconservatives.

Ṭabarî lists the names of the comparatively few scholars who objected to or refrained from tafsir activity. Both Goldziher and Birkeland drew on most of these men for their arguments. A check of early reports on the activities of the key men in this list revealed that all of them actually either expressed opinions on tafsir or transmitted tafsir traditions originating with Muḥammad and the Companions. Those stated to have been positively opposed to tafsir are mentioned below with documentation for their tafsir activities as evidenced mainly from the materials provided by Shaibānī’s version of Malik’s Muwatta and by the chapters on tafsir in the hadith collections of Muslim, Bukhārī, and Tirmidhī. While this evidence is not exhaustive, it is substantial and representative enough to indicate that these men did in fact participate in tafsir despite sundry statements to the contrary. These key men are Saʿīd ibn al-Musayyib (d. 94/712), Sālim ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb (d. 106/725), Qāsim ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr (d. 108/726), and Shaʿbī (d. 110/728). The second significant fact to emerge from this evidence is that these men are invariably cited in connection with the linguistic and historical branches of tafsir and that the akhbār variety deals mostly with tanzil al-Qurʾān. There are no comments by these men on legendary campaigns and eschatology (maghāzī and malāḥim) nor on the ambiguous passages of the Qurʾān, the mutashābihāt. Furthermore, Qāsim ibn Muḥammad is repeatedly cited as the chief transmitter from ʿĀʾishah of Muḥammad’s express warning to leave the mutashābihāt alone. It is therefore obvious that the tafsir activities and attitudes of these first-century key men, who figure in the arguments of both Goldziher and Birkeland, were basically the same as those of ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb.

Our conclusions, then, as to the development of tafsir in the first century of Islam may be summarized as follows. Widespread tafsir activity was rapidly increasing. The hadith and personal opinions of second-generation Muslims far exceeded those of the Companions and the Prophet, especially tafsir al-nabī, as the bases of this activity.

---

111 Itqān II 178 f.
112 Goldziher, Richtungen, p. 57.
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114 Tafsir I 84–86; see also Jeffery (ed.), Two Muqaddimmas, pp. 183 f.
115 Shaibānī, p. 5; Bukhārī III 213, 217, 237, 255, 263, 305, 330; Tirmidhī XI 253, 290.
116 Bukhārī III 217, 239, 310, 357.
117 Shaibānī, pp. 5 f.; Bukhārī II 232 f., III 212; Tirmidhī XI 114–118.
118 Muslim XVIII 165; Bukhārī III 203, 235; Tirmidhī XI 92, 154, 286 and XII 76 f., 85, 87 f., 226; Tafsir VI 110 f., VII 71.
119 Some older contemporaries of these men were cautious rather than opposed in principle to tafsir, especially to the tanzil variety since those who knew the history of the tanzil had already died. Such seems to have been the case with ʿAbdād ibn Quṣā, who died in the year 72/691–92 (see Ibn Saʿd VI 62–64; Birkeland, Opposition, pp. 11 f.).
120 Strau I 404 f.; Bukhārī III 212; Dārimī I 54 f.; Abū Dāvūd IV 108; Tafsir VI 173 ff., 201 ff. and VIII 567 f. See also Baghawi, Maʿālim al-tanzil, ed. Muhammad Rashid al-Riḍā, II (Cairo, 1343/1924) 95–104.
121 Cf. Horst, op. cit. pp. 305 f. In later periods, collections of tafsir al-nabī and tafsir al-siyābah engaged the attention of scholars (see e.g. Hājjī Khalīfah II 368, 380; Itqān II 179, 183 f., 191–205, the last cited pages representing Suyūṭī’s collection of these materials).
tafsir literature appeared late. Strong opposition to tafsir mutashabih al-Qur'an definitely existed among the pious orthodox.

Tafsir literature increased steadily throughout the second century, acting on and being acted upon by the increasing interest in dialectical theology which resulted in "new orthodoxies" and in a number of heresies whose originators claimed that their position was based on the Qur'an as they understood and interpreted it. Critical attention was first centered in the first half of this century on the tafsir literature already in circulation and culminated in the critical activities of Ibn Juraij (70 or 80-150/689 or 699-767), who based his own Tafsir on the works of Ibn 'Abbâs, Mujâhid ibn Jabr, and 'Atâ' ibn Abî Ribâh (d. 114/732) but ignored those of the doctrinally suspect Daĥĥâk and 'Ikrimah.142 It was also in the first half of the second century that there was emphasis on the classification of tafsir into four main categories: legalistic tafsir, from the knowledge of which no one is excused; linguistic tafsir, based on the speech of the Arabs; the formal tafsir of scholars; and the tafsir al-mutashabihât, "which is known only to God."143 In the second half of the century, as earlier tafsir works became more readily available, the works of the leading early commentators began to be classified as "the best" and "the worst"144 and, by implication, "the good" or perhaps "the indifferent," the last being as a rule ignored. Among "the best" are listed the works of Ibn 'Abbâs,145 Mujâhid, Sa'd ibn Jubair, 'Ali ibn Abî Talhah, Ibn Ishaq,146 and 'Abd al-Razzâq ibn Hammâm. Among "the worst" are listed those of Daĥĥâk, Abû Šâli'h (client of Umm Hânî), Suddî, and Muḥammad ibn al-Sâ'îb al-Kalbi.147 Prominent among the critics of the second century, for hadith and tafsir transmission, were Yaĥyâ ibn Sa'd al-Qâṭṭân (120-98/738-813) and 'Abd al-Rahîm ibn Mahdî (135-98/752-814), whose opinions were more frequently than not accepted by Yaĥyâ ibn Ma'Rîn, Ibn Ḥanbal, and their contemporaries and successors.148

Preoccupation with the formal isnâd in the larger and more inclusive field of hadîth is reflected by greater emphasis on the isnâd in the field of tafsîr. But it was not the quality of the isnâd alone that determined the acceptability of tafsîr. The content of each type of tafsir continued to be taken into consideration. The commentaries of known heretics and the commentaries on the mutashabihât that had bearing on the widely current controversy over the attributes of God and the question of anthropomorphism and eschatology, such as appear in Malâ'tî's extracts from the Tafsir fi mutashabih al-Qur'an of Muqâtil ibn Sulaimân (see p. 96),
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142 Cf. Horst, op. cit. pp. 294 f., esp. Isnâds 4-6. Ibn Juraij seems also to have overlooked the tafsir works of his contemporaries Ibn Ishaq, Muṣâmmad ibn al-Sâ'îb al-Kalbi, and Muqâtil ibn Sulaimân, among others, but whether he did so deliberately is not yet clear. For references to Ibn Juraij see GAL S I 255.

143 Tafsir I 68 f.; Itqân I 198, II 82 f. and 360 f.; Mizan I 198, II 82 f. and 360 f.; Itqân II 178 f.

144 See Tafsîr I 29 f., which is freely drawn on and supplemented in Itqân I 178 and Ḥâjjî Khalîfah I 332 f.

145 The full extent of Ibn 'Abbâs' literary activities, especially in the field of tafsîr (see p. 99, esp. n. 32), is still uncertain despite all that has been written about them for over a century. Laura Vecchia Vaglieri's article in EI I (1960) 40 f. presents a fair summary of the nature of the problem.

146 Ibn Ishaq's attention to tafsîr is illustrated in the Sirâ where he gives a running comment on the numerous verses with special attention to the occasions that called them forth or led to their abrogation. See e.g. Sirâ I 24, 30, 36 f., 53, 58, 129 f., 151 f., 155 f., 161, 171, 187, 191 f., 194, 197, 235, 259, 356 f., 363, 399 f., 484. On pp. 404 f. special attention is given to the mutashabihât. Ibn Hishâm frequently supplements Ibn Ishaq's comments. See Horst, op. cit. Isnâd 17, for Tabari's use of Ibn Ishaq's tafsir materials.

147 For most of these men and their tafsîr works, a number of which have survived though as yet unpublished, see GAL I 190, GAL 2 I 203 f., GAL S I 237 and 330-93 and references there cited (esp. Fihrist, pp. 331 f.; Itqân II 187-90; Ḥâjjî Khalîfah II 334-37). Tabari, in his Tafsîr, used materials from most of the men in both lists, as Horst's study proves. Baghawi, Ma'dî'im al-tanzîl I (Cairo, 1343/1924) 4-7, lists these leading commentators but without any attempt to classify them.

148 See e.g. Mustadrak I 490; Nawawi, pp. 390-92 and 626 f.; Mizan I 198, II 82 f. and 360 f.; Itqân I 198, II 178 f.
continued to be rejected by most of the orthodox.\textsuperscript{149} It was not until the close of the second century that \textit{tafsīr al-mutashabīḥāt} was permitted to fully qualified religious scholars, who had to scrutinize the \textit{i̇smāʾīlī's} of such \textit{tafsīr} and of related traditions before they could transmit these materials.\textsuperscript{150} Thus was opened the way to the next easy step, namely transmission on the basis of scholarly consensus, as specifically stated by Shāfiʿī.\textsuperscript{151} As a corollary to this development came increasing opposition to any comment on the basis of opinion (\textit{tafsīr bī al-raʿy}). In this connection a word must be added concerning Aṣmaʿī, who is said to have refrained from \textit{tafsīr} activity out of piety—a motive accepted by many of the sources and by both Goldziher\textsuperscript{152} and Birkeland.\textsuperscript{153} There is, however, evidence to indicate that piety may not have been his prime motive and was certainly not his only motive. Abū ʿAlī al-Fārisī (d. 377/987 at age of over 90), himself a commentator, states that Aṣmaʿī's main reason was his acute personal and literary rivalry with the suspected Kharijite Abu ʿUbaidah (d. 210/825), who contrived to trap Aṣmaʿī into commenting on a simple Qurānic phrase and in turn condemned Aṣmaʿī's comment as \textit{tafsīr bī al-raʿy}.'\textsuperscript{154} Fortunately the \textit{Majāz al-Qurān} has survived. It is a linguistic commentary centering on vocabulary and grammar, \textit{muʿānāt, gharīb}, and \textit{i̇rāb al-Qurān}, and it is known that it was used by such orthodox commentators as Bukhārī and Tābarī.\textsuperscript{155} Aṣmaʿī's case, therefore, since it was so strictly personal, cannot be used as an argument that there was strong orthodox opposition to all kinds of \textit{tafsīr}.

During the third century, ways and means were devised by which the method and transmission of orthodox \textit{tafsīr} were regulated. Also, there evolved a rationale for not only the permissibility but the desirability of cautious commentary on the \textit{mutashabīḥāt al-Qurān}. Typical arguments for this stand are presented by Ibn Qutaibah, who devoted a chapter to this specific theme in a work that deals entirely with the interpretation of the difficult passages of the Qurān.\textsuperscript{156} Western research in the subsequent history of \textit{tafsīr} points to less controversial conclusions as far as the orthodox position is concerned.

\textsuperscript{149} See \textit{Sirāfī} I 404 f., where Ibn Iṣhāq represents the orthodox view.

\textsuperscript{150} See \textit{Iyān} II 6, which is based on the stand of such leading scholars from the various provinces as Mālik ibn Anas, Sufyān ibn al-Thaʿwrt, Shāhīn, Ibn al-Mubārak, Wā’iṭ ibn al-Jarrāḥ, and Sufyān ibn ʿUyainah.

\textsuperscript{151} \textit{Ibid.} p. 184.

\textsuperscript{152} Richtungen, p. 57.

\textsuperscript{153} \textit{Opposition}, pp. 15 f. and references there cited, to which should be added Abū al-Ṭayyib al-Lughawi, \textit{Murātib al-naḥwīyīn}, pp. 41 and 48. For Abū al-Ṭayyib see \textit{GAL} S I 190.

\textsuperscript{154} \textit{Irshād} III 22. For other anecdotes in connection with the rivalry of Aṣmaʿī and Abū ʿUbaidah see e.g. Ibn Khallīkān I 362–65, II 138–42 (\textit{=} trans. II 123–27, III 388–98).

\textsuperscript{155} \textit{Kitāb lughat al-Qurān} (\textit{Fihrist}, p. 35; Ibn Khallīkān II 139 \textit{=} trans. III 380).


\textsuperscript{157} Ibn Qutaibah, \textit{Tawālī mushkīl al-Qurān}, pp. 62 ff., esp. pp. 72–75. See also Ibn al-ʿArabī al-Maʿāfīrī in \textit{Tirmidhī} XI 48–51. Tābarī in his \textit{Tafsīr} I 30 f. gives his own classification and opinion. \textit{Fihrist}, p. 36, lists works on the \textit{mutashabīḥāt} including the \textit{Tafsīr fī mutashabīḥ al-Qurān} of Muqāṭīl. See also \textit{GAL} S I 178, 342.
DOCUMENT 2


Papyrus fragment, 18 × 18.5 cm. (Pls. 6–7). The reconstructed text points to a book page of about 21 × 21 cm., including margins, with 14 or 15 lines to the page. The lower part of the papyrus is lost, and what is left is badly damaged.

Script.—Early book hand carefully executed, especially on the recto. Note the angularity of the letters and the use of very early forms for some of them, such as the nun in min of recto 2, the final qāf with slight double loop of recto 5, the extended initial ayn of verso 5 and 12, and the ḥā’ with beam, which is characteristic also of its sister forms, as in recto 8 and 14 and verso 3. Diacritical points are used rather freely. The alif of prolongation is generally omitted. The vowels and hamzah are indicated only in the body of recto 9. A circle is used for punctuation; a dot within the circle indicates collation (see pp. 87 f.).

TEXT

Recto

[1] مالك عن عمه أبي سهل بن ملك عن أبيه عن أبيه هريرة أنه قال أثرئها حمرا

[2] كل كرم هذى التي تودأون أنها لا أشد سواءا من القار

[3] بأب الترغيب في الصدقة


[5] وسلم قال من تصدقد بصدقة من كسب طيب ولا يقبل الله إلا طيبا


[8] ابن أبي طالحة أنه سمع أنس بن ملك يقول كان أبو طلحة أكثر انصاره

[9] بالمدينة مالا من نخل وكان أحدهما اليه بيرجاء وكانت مستقبلة

[10] المسجد وكان رسول الله يدخلها ويشرب من ماء فيها طيب قالت انس


[12] رسول الله فقال رسول الله ان الله تعالى يقبل لـأ ن تناولوا البر حتى تلقوا مما

[13] تجوا وأن أحدهما اليه بيرجاء ونها صدقة الله امر برها وذخريا

[14] ان الله فضعها برسول الله حيث شئت فقال رسول الله يغ ذلك ملال راح

[15] ذلك مال راح قد سمعت ما قلت فيها واني ارى ان تجعله

Verso

[1] قلما الأقر颖 قال أبو طلحة اقبل برسول الله [أ] قلما الهما أبو طلحة في أقارب أبي

Comments.—The papyrus text is that of the vulgate version of the Muwatta’ as transmitted by Yaḥyā ibn Yaḥyā al-Laithī (d. 234/848). The earliest extant manuscript copy of this version is dated 277/890 but unfortunately does not include the section where our text would appear (see GAL S I 297). This section corresponds to Muwatta’ II 994–97 (see Zurqānī IV 234–39 for commentary and Tirmidhī III 163 f.).

Shaibānī’s version of the Muwatta’ (see GAL S I 298) does not include the papyrus text except for Tradition 7, which was received by Mālik from Zaid ibn Aslām (see p. 119). The young Shaibānī (131–89/749–805) studied with Mālik in Medina (Khaṭīb II 172 f.). His version of the Muwatta’ is therefore earlier than that of Yaḥyā. Because Mālik’s revisions, aside from reorganization of the text, resulted ultimately in more deletions than additions (Ibn Farḥūn, pp. 25 f.), Shaibānī’s version on the one hand includes passages that are not in the vulgate and on the other hand lacks some of the vulgate text. Most of Mālik’s additions were placed apparently either at the ends of chapters or sections or at the end of the entire work. The son of Zaid ibn Aslām noticed that Mālik was placing some of his father’s traditions in this fashion. He asked Mālik for the reason and was told that these traditions elucidated materials already included (Ibn Farḥūn, p. 26). Of the seventy-nine traditions that Malik received from Zaid, nine appear in succession on a few pages toward the end of the work (Muwatta’ II 986–1003), and these pages include the section covered by the papyrus text. Hence the discrepancies between the Shaibānī version on the one hand and the vulgate and the papyrus text on the other are readily understandable.

Islam strongly emphasizes faith, hope, and charity in their widest sense (Sūras 2:177, 58:12–13). Not strange to it is the teaching “freely you have received, freely give” nor the concept that “it is more blessed to give than to receive” nor that of not letting the left hand know what the right hand is doing in charitable giving nor yet that of giving the best (e.g. Muwatta’ II 952 f.; Muslim VII 124 f.; Ibn Ḥanbal IV 137; Tafrīr VI 16 ff.; Amwāl, pp. 349, 561–63, 585–89). Mālik, in adding sections on these themes at the end of the Muwatta’ though they had already been fully covered (e.g. under zakāt in Vol. I 245 ff., esp. pp. 257–72, and II 469; Shaibānī, pp. 174–76) was apparently reflecting this emphasis. For a brief treatment of

**Tradition 1.** The repetition of a word, as seen in lines 1 and 2 here and 6 and 7 below, is the main scribal error of the piece. The corrective deletions were made in the course of collation, as indicated by the dot placed within the circle used initially for punctuation. It is possible that the *alif* of *أَشْه٣* is a scribal error and that the sense of the passage is that the fire is blacker than pitch, as in the printed text.

Note the simple beginning of the *isnād* throughout the papyrus.

Mālik, like many a traditionist, drew on the knowledge of various members of his family, particularly his uncle Abū Suhaib Nāfī ibn Mālik. The *isnād* of this family is well established (see Bukhārī, *Taʾrīkh* IV 1, pp. 310 f., and IV 2, p. 86; Ḫarīṣ IV 1, pp. 204–6 and 453; *Tajrīd*, pp. 184 f.; Ǧamʿanī, folio 40a). Mālik himself became a link as his son and daughter transmitted the *Muwattāʾ* from him (see Ibn Farḥān, p. 18; Ṣurğānī I 5 f.).

Abū Hurairah (d. ca. 58/678), a controversial figure as a prolific traditionist, appears repeatedly in our documents (see pp. 42 and 133 for his role in connection with *ḥadīth* literature).

The *maqt* differs from that of the printed text, which reads أَتَرَىَنَّ حَمَراءُ كَنَّازِكُمُ هَذِهِ لَهِيَهَا. Abū Hurairah credits Muḥammad with a tradition whose burden is that hell-fire as it grows progressively hotter changes color at intervals of a thousand years from red to white to black (Tirmidhī X 59).

**Tradition 2.** Yahyā ibn Ǧāʿid al-Anṣārī (d. 143/760) was one of Mālik’s teachers and his direct source for many of the traditions that he incorporated in the *Muwattāʾ*. Famous as traditionist and jurist, Yahyā served as judge of Medina under the Umayyads and later as judge of Kūfah and Hāshimiyah, and possibly Baghdad, under the ‘Abbāsid caliphs Ṣaffāh and Maḥṣūr respectively (Akhbār al-qaḍāʾ I 178 f., III 241–45; *Tajrīd*, pp. 209–36 and 276–78; Bukhārī, *Taʾrīkh* IV 2, pp. 254 f. and 275; Maʿārif, p. 242; Ḫarīṣ IV 2, p. 147; Khaṭṭāb XIV 101–6; Nawāwī, pp. 624 f.; Dhaḥābī I 129–32; see also pp. 193 ff. below).

Ǧāʿid ibn Yāsār (d. 117/735) was a traditionist of Medina who was considered trustworthy and who transmitted some of his materials from Abū Hurairah (see Ibn Ǧāʿid V 209; Bukhārī, *Taʾrīkh* I 1, p. 476; Ḫarīṣ II 1, p. 72; Dāwâlīb I 143).

The content is identical with that of the printed text (*Muwattāʾ* II 955). Parallels are found in all the *ḥadīth* collections indexed in *Concordance* II 216 except that of Abū Dāwūd. All trace back to Abū Hurairah and others, but some are transmitted through channels other than Mālik (see Bukhārī I 357). Though the *maʿnā* or basic meaning of the tradition is clearly the same in all the parallels, the wording varies considerably. The variants are of familiar types and consist of changes in the order of words and phrases, additional explanatory words or short phrases, and here and there the degree of emphasis. Apart from the order of phrases, the most frequent variant is close to that of Muslim VII 98 f., which reads اِخْدَاءُ الرَّحْمَةِ بِمِئَاتِ الْمَارِيَاتِ وَإِنَّ كَانَتْ نَشَأَةُ فَرْوُ في كَفِ الرَّحْمَةِ حَتَّى تَكُونَ أَعْظَمُ مِنَ الْحَجِّ (cf. e.g. Tirmidhī III 163 f.; Ǧanṣīrī I 349; Ibn Mājah I 290; Ibn Ḫanbal II 381). In some of the variants أُحْدَى is substituted for أَخْدَاءُ (Dārīmī I 395; Ibn Ḫanbal II 404, which adds يُبْرَأُ الْقِيَامَةُ, and VI 251, which inserts بُصُورَ الْقِيَامَةِ). In others the phrase *تصدق بعدل نمرة* is found (Bukhārī I 357; Ibn Ḫanbal II 331). Ṭabarī in his commentary on Sūrah 2:276 (*Ṭaḥfīr* VI 16 ff., 587–92) reports a number of these parallels and related traditions and comments on the objections raised to the statement...
relative to anthropomorphism (see also *Amważ*, pp. 349 and 561).

Tradition 3. The final alif of ʾarjā in recto 13 is a scribal error. The reference in recto 11 is to Surah 3:92. For ʾarjā of recto 9 and its many different vocalizations see Ibn Ḥanbal III 285, Bukhārī II 191, and especially Yaqūt I 431 and 783 f.

Iṣaḥāq ibn ʿAbd Allāh (d. 134/751), a trustworthy Medinan traditionist, ranked high in Mālik’s opinion (Bukhārī, *Taʾrīkh* I 1, pp. 393 f.; *Jārīh* I 1, p. 226; *Talīd*, pp. 14–20). For his grandfather Abū Ṭaḥāḥ Zaid ibn Ṣahl (d. 34/654), with whom this tradition is concerned, see Ibn Saʿd III 2, pp. 64–66; Bukhārī, *Taʾrīkh* I 1, pp. 393 f.; *Jārīh* I 1, p. 226; *Īstāb* II 656 f.; *Iṣābah* I 52–54, where a variant is quoted. For commentary see Zurqānī IV 235–37.

The *matn* is identical with that of the printed text (*Muwaṭṭaʾ* II 995 f.; see also Abū Nuʿaym VI 338) except for omission in the papyrus text of the *tasliyah* and the phrase بارك و تعالى after ʾan ʾlāh of recto 12, where the available space does not allow for its inclusion. “Charity begins at home,” the burden of the tradition, is a familiar concept among Muslims. “Home,” however, includes all the members of a clan and charity begins with responsibility for one’s own needs, then extends to the immediate family and finally to the next of kin on both sides of the family (see e.g. Surahs 2:7 and 180, 16:92, 33:6; *Ṭayālīs*, p. 177; Bukhārī III 484 ff.; Muslim VII 83 ff.; Dārīmī I 289 and 397, according to which charity to relatives earns a double reward; *Ṭafṣīr* VI 587–92; Surah 17:29, which advocates moderation in all giving).

Of the many parallels, the version that is almost identical with the papyrus text is that of Muslim’s preferred transmitter of the *Muwaṭṭaʾ*, Yahyā ibn Yahyā al-Nisābūrī (d. 226/840), which is cited also by Bukhārī. Its one variation from the papyrus text is the omission of مال من النخل after ʾaḥrāf of recto 9. It should be noted that it too omits the phrase بارك و تعالى (Muslim VII 84 f.; Bukhārī II 66; Zurqānī I 6, 8; *Jamʿ* II 565 f.).

This tradition is cited no less than six times by Bukhārī. The versions next closest to our text are those of ʿAbd Allāh ibn Yūsuf (d. 227/842), an Egyptian whose transmission of the *Muwaṭṭaʾ* was generally preferred by Bukhārī (Bukhārī I 371; cf. Zurqānī I 6, 8), and ʿAbd Allāh ibn Maslamah al-Qānabī (d. 221/836), a leading—if not the leading—Medinan transmitter of the *Muwaṭṭaʾ* (Bukhārī II 194, IV 34; cf. Zurqānī I 6; Dāhābī I 348 f.; see also p. 125 below). Quite similar to these versions are those of Mālik’s nephew Iṣmāʿīl ibn Abī Uwais, who died in the year 226/840 (see Bukhārī III 216, where the ʿaʾl before ʾaḥl in line 16 should be deleted), and the Basran transmitter of the *Muwaṭṭaʾ*, Rauḥ ibn ʿUbādah, who died in 205/820 (Ibn Ḥanbal III 141; Zurqānī I 6). For Muḥammad’s use of the Persian expressions بَخْ يِن and بَخْ يِن see Ibn Saʿd IX 72 and Nawawī’s comments in Muslim VII 85 f. For his use of these and other Persian expressions see ʾṬafṣīr* II 12 and Abū al-Laiḥ al-Samarqandī, *Bustān al-dāʾīfīn* (on margins of his *Tanbih al-ghāfīlīn*) pp. 39 f.

The often repeated ʾaḥrāf for ʾaḥrāf of recto 14 indicates written as against oral transmission, since the error stems from an unpointed text.

There are such minor variants as the omission or inclusion of the *tasliyah*, the alternation of ʾarāʾ with ʾarāʾ and of ʾakhar ʾaṭsar with ʾakhar ʾaṭsar, but the one significant variant in this group is the reading ʾaḥrāf for ʾaḥrāf of recto 14 and the printed text. Dārīmī’s (d. 255/869) version, heard from Ḥakam ibn al-Mubārak, who died in 213/828 (Bukhārī, *Taʾrīkh* I 2, pp. 341 f.; *Mīzān* I 271), would seem to belong in this group. It retains the phrase of recto 14 but omits the unessential and repetitious phrases of recto 11–13, deleted probably by “editor” Dārīmī, whose text (Vol. I 390) reads simply...
The sixth version cited by Bukhārī is, again, one that was transmitted by Isma'īl, though it was received not from Mālik but from Mālik's older fellow scholar 'Abd al-‘Azīz ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Mājishūn (d. 164/780) on the authority of Ishaq ibn ‘Abd Allāh (Bukhārī II 191). This version, which is obviously one of the earliest transmitted from Ishaq, is longer than the others because it gives the details of the occasion on which the incident occurred, reports the actual division of the property involved between Ḥassān ibn Thābit and Ubayy ibn Ka'b, and concludes with an account of Ḥassān's subsequent sale of his share of the property, for a large sum, to Muʿāwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān. Thus we have here an account that consists of two kinds of historical reports or akhbar—a khabar that is at the same time a ḥadīth and a khabar that is news or history only. The composite account was in time split into its two components, quite obviously by Mālik himself since the ḥadīth element is very close to the Muwatta' text. Part of the historical element is reported by Ibn Ishaq (Sirah I 739). A second composite account of the incident, possibly the earliest transmitted by other than Mālik from Ishaq ibn ‘Abd Allāh, is shorter, and its ḥadīth element lacks literary polish though the basic meaning is unmistakable (Ibn Ḥanbal III 256). A third composite account has an isnād that bypasses both Mālik and Ishaq and a short text for both its khabar and its ḥadīth element. The brief unadorned ḥadīth element is again different yet adequately conveys the burden of the tradition (Ibn Ḥanbal III 285; Abū Dīfūd II 131 f.).

The revelation of a Qur'ānic verse, Muhammad's comment on it, and a Companion's generous impulse that ultimately involved several people and the transfer of real estate must have soon become common knowledge in Medina. The account, with its khabar and ḥadīth elements, was kept alive by an alert and interested eyewitness, Anas ibn Mālik al-Anṣārī (d. 93/712), Muhammad's personal attendant (Ibn Sa'd VII 1, pp. 10–16) and the original source of all the versions mentioned above. He was, furthermore, a relative of Abū Ṭalḥah Zaid ibn Shāh and seems to have been disappointed because he did not receive any of the distributed property, whose subsequent sale and further development he carefully reported (Ibn Ḥanbal III 285; Bukhārī II 191, III 216). Anas was himself literate and, moreover, a bookseller or warrāq (see p. 46). He encouraged his sons to “chain down knowledge by writing” (Ibn Sa'd III 1, pp. 12 and 14; cf. Jāḥiz, Kitāb al-bayan wa al-tabyin [1366/1947] II 22). To insure accuracy he wrote down his own materials for the use of his sons and pupils (see our Vol. I 48; see also Mustadrak III 573 f., where Ḥākim al-Nisabūrī quotes as final authority one of these pupils, Ma‘bad ibn Hilāl, for whose trustworthiness see Bukhārī, Ta'rīkh IV 1, p. 400, and Jarḥ IV 1, pp. 280 f.). It is therefore entirely possible that the detailed complex account was written down during Anas' lifetime. At any rate, it was kept alive in the related families of Anas and Abū Ṭalḥah until it passed from the latter's grandson Ishaq to Mālik, who was much too young at the time of Anas' death for direct transmission. Having once received the account from Ishaq (d. 134/751), Mālik as a traditionist separated the ḥadīth element, gave it a literary polish, and included it in his Muwatta'. Thereafter all three units—the earlier full account, the history of the property, and the ḥadīth proper—appeared in the sources, though in time the ḥadīth gained much wider circulation than the other units. The property apparently kept its historic identity and remarkable productivity down through the centuries (see Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Fāṣ [d. 832/1428], Shifa' al-gharām II 340).

Mālik's numerous transmitters and the famous compilers who followed him took further editorial liberties with the text, substituting a synonym here and there, adding pious phrases, inserting or deleting a gloss, and eliminating redundant phrases. Yet, despite all this editorial activity for two or more centuries, we today cannot cast a suspicious eye even on the alterna-
tion of the phrases حَيْثُ ارَّاكَ اللَّهُ and حَيْثُ شَئْتَ. For from the beginning of Muḥammad's mission until this day some of his followers have stressed his human character except in his role as revelator of the Qurʾān, while others have assumed he was under the constant direction of Allāh. Either of these two phrases, therefore, could have been the original one. In either case, history records that Muḥammad had a direct hand in the distribution of the property involved (Sūrah I 739), as it records another instance of property to be used or distributed by Muḥammad “as God directs him” (see Sūrah I 354, where the phrase used is يَضُرُّ فِيَّ اللَّهُ).

The conclusion is inescapable that we have here a family یِسَنَد for what proves to be ultimately a singleton tradition whose significant part has been transmitted with a remarkable degree of honesty and accuracy.

Tradition 4. Zaid ibn Aslam (d. 136/754), as stated above (p. 115), transmitted many traditions to Mālik (Tajrid, pp. 38-54; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh II 1, p. 354; Jarḥ I 2, p 555; Jamʿ I 144; Dhahabi I 124 f.). Among his traditions are a few more on the theme of almsgiving (see e.g. Muwāṭṭa I 269, 284). Zaid was a major transmitter of his father’s traditions (Maʿārif, p. 95).

The papyrus text, except for omission of the taṣliyah, is identical with the printed text. Its substance is that it is preferable to give whenever possible to those who ask no matter how rich they are or seem to be, for even the rich occasionally find themselves in need (Amwāl, p. 556).

The practice of charitable giving to anyone who asks reflects the pre-Islamic ideal of generosity and the Islamic teaching that the giver receives due credit from God regardless of the need of the recipient. Nevertheless, those who make unnecessary requests are frowned on by their fellow Muslims and are said to be held to account in the hereafter (e.g. Shaibānī, pp. 378 f.). See e.g. Zurqānī IV 237 f. and Tirmidhī III 148-56 for lengthy discussions on these points.

Traditions 5-6. Āʾishah as a source of traditions either from and about Muḥammad or about her own deeds appears frequently in our documents. These two traditions reflect her ever charitable inclination, even when she herself was poor (e.g. Bukhārī I 358 f.; Zubairī, p. 295). See Nabiya Abbott, Aʾishah, the Beloved of Muḥammad (Chicago, 1942) pp. 97 f. and 201-3, for Āʾishah's role as traditionist, and pp. 211 and 213, for her more outstanding charities when times were better.

The order of Traditions 5-7 in the papyrus differs from that of the printed text, in which the order is 6, 7, 5. The printed text has the advantage of being arranged so that traditions that derive from the same source are grouped together. The two that were received from Zaid ibn Aslam are followed by the two that go back to Āʾishah.

The comparatively long text of Tradition 5 in the papyrus is not quite identical with that of the printed text. The sentence فَلَمَا اسْتَيْنَا حَتَّى اتَّدَى لَنَا of verso 6 reads فَلَمَا اسْتَيْنَا حَتَّى اتَّدَى لَنَا in the printed text. The َكُنْتُها of verso 7, which refers to the cooking-pot in which the cooked meat came, appears as َكُنْتُها “food without salt,” in the printed text. The latter is obviously an error made in early copying (cf. Tradition 3), since the two dots of the َلَّا are clear in our reproduction of the verso (Pl. 7). The papyrus reading is, furthermore, confirmed in Zurqānī’s commentary (Vol. IV 238), where the word is by implication taken to mean “its cooking-pot.” The َكُنْتُها of verso 7 is omitted in the printed text, which on the other hand adds a redundant َتُقَالَاتُ َمَوْلاَةَ (for which there is no space in the papyrus) and a second هذا هذا هذا خير من قُصُصُك.
In Tradition 6 the one variant from the printed text is the addition in verso 10 of qāla before فجعل.

Zurqānī’s commentary (Vol. IV 238 f.) makes no reference to parallels to either of these two traditions from ‘Ā-‘ishah, in contrast to Traditions 1–4, which refer to Muḥammad and for which parallels are readily available in the standard collections (cf. pp. 77 f.).

Tradition 7. For Zaid ibn Aslam see Tradition 4. There is some confusion about the name Muʿādh ibn ‘Amr. The biographical sources and all but one of the several parallels, including the printed text (Muwatta II 931, 996), reverse the elements of the name and give ‘Amr ibn Muʿādh. The one exception is Shābānī’s version of the Muwatta (pp. 388 f.), which continues with the genealogy of the transmitter and reads معاذ بن عمرو بن سعد معاذ عن جدته أن رسول الله قال: سعاد عن معاذ سعيد عن جدته.

Space in the papyrus does not allow for the inclusion of the phrase عن جدته أن رسول الله . . . قال يا . . . while the latter reads عن جدته أنها قالت قال رسول الله . . . يا . . .

The “grandmother” is identified as Ḥawwā bint Yazīd. She and other members of her family were the first women of Medina to take the oath of allegiance to Muhammad (Ibn Saʿd VIII 6). There are but three traditions transmitted from her, all on the concept of charitable giving no matter how small the gift (Ibn Ḥanbal VI 434 f.).

The content of the tradition as twice transmitted by Mālik has several parallels. The papyrus text is identical with Muwatta II 931, which is also that of Shābānī’s version. The only difference between these and Muwatta II 996 is that the former read عن جدته أن رسول الله . . . while the latter reads عن جدته أنها قالت قال رسول الله . . .

The content of the tradition as twice transmitted by Malik has several parallels. The papyrus text is identical with Muwatta II 931, which is also that of Shābānī’s version. The only difference between these and Muwatta II 996 is that the former read عن جدته أن رسول الله . . . while the latter reads عن جدته أنها قالت قال رسول الله . . .

The biographical sources do not lead to a definite choice since they list no traditionist named ‘Amr ibn Muʿādh ibn Saʿd al-Ashhali nor one named Muʿādh ibn Saʿd al-Adh nor one named Muʿādh ibn Saʿd al-Adh. The latter substituting for which parallels are readily available in the standard collections (cf. pp. 77 f.).

A more pronounced variant, coming through channels other than Mālik, reads, with its early isnād links, عن سعد المتقرب عن أبيه عن أبيه هريرة عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم: قال يا نساء المسلمات لتقربن جاوة لجارية ولو فرس شاء أبو هريرة قال كان النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول . . .

Saʿd ibn Abī Saʿd al-Maqbūr (see p. 264) died in the year 123/741. Three of Mālik’s well
known contemporaries, Ibn Abī Dhīb (d. 158/775), Abū Ma‘shar Najīḥ ibn ‘Abd al-Rahmān (d. 170/787), and Laith ibn Sa‘d (d. 175/791), carried on the transmission from Sa‘d. Either they or their transmitters introduced at times a different word or an extra word of emphasis (Muslim VII 119; Ibn Ḥanbal II 264, 267, 432, 493). One of the variants combines the tradition with a tradition that is related to it (Tirmidhī VIII 292), while still another variant combines it with an unrelated tradition (Ibn Ḥanbal II 506).

These parallels fall into two distinct groups and seem to indicate that on at least two occasions Muḥammad encouraged women in charitable giving no matter how small the gift.

**DATE AND SIGNIFICANCE**

Karabacek, who was able to identify only Tradition 3, with its close parallel in the Ṣaḥīḥ of Bukhārī (194–256/810–70), assumed that the papyrus is contemporary with the latter. He dated it, therefore, to the third/ninth century and claimed that it was the oldest original ḥadīth text extant. The fact that the fragment is actually from the Muwaṭṭa of Mālik (93–179/715–95) gives it the distinction of being the first and earliest ḥadīth-fiqh manuscript extant but does not automatically date it to Mālik’s own day. The evidence provided by the script, the textual variants, and the transmission terminology and method must be weighed and the results checked with and supplemented by the literary sources before a piece that is potentially so significant can be definitely dated.

Attention has been drawn (p. 114) to characteristics of the script that indicate an early date. An early date is also indicated by the absence of glosses such as appear in later texts (see Tradition 1) and by the somewhat unsystematic order of the traditions (see p. 119). But the most significant internal evidence of an early date is the consistent use of the ‘an‘anah in the isnād’s together with the absence of any initial transmission formula such as qāla, akhbarani, ḥad-dathani, etc. at the beginning of a new section.

In the earliest stages of the development of the isnād, when frequently only the Companions and the older Successors—the first two generations of Islam—were involved, the use of ‘an, “on the authority of,” was generally accepted as equivalent to ḥaddathani, “he related to me,” and akhbarani, “he informed me” (these two terms being used interchangeably at first), that is, as evidence of direct transmission. The next step was acceptance of ḥadīth mu‘an‘an from contemporary traditionists who were known to have had personal contact with one another unless such traditionists were proved unreliable. The ḥadīth mu‘an‘an could be a ḥadīth musalsal, that is, a tradition with a complete chain of authorities reaching back to Muḥammad, or a ḥadīth mursal, that is, a tradition of Muḥammad with no isnād or with an incomplete one, samples of each of which appear in the papyrus fragment. What is significant is that the extension of the practice of shortcutting by use of the ‘an‘anah was early and readily adopted by those who, like Mālik, committed traditions to writing.

The only other transmission term used in the papyrus is balaghahu, “a report has reached him” (Traditions 5–6). The use of the first and second forms of this verb for transmission of news and other information was the general practice of Muḥammad and his Companions as

---

1 See PERF, No. 731.
2 The distinction of priority in the ḥadīth field proper would seem to belong to our Document 5.
3 See e.g. Risālah, pp. 52 f.; Muslim I 129 f.
4 See Muslim I 127–44 for the views of Muslim and Bukhārī on these developments; see also Madkhal, pp. 18 f. (= trans. p. 21); Marifah, pp. 34 f.; Kifāyah, pp. 384 ff.
5 See Kifāyah, p. 390 and also p. 330. It was later that a ḥadīth mursal mu‘an‘an became generally suspect as opening the way for a ḥadīth mudallas, i.e., a tradition falsely ascribed to an early authority or one that concealed one or more of the isnād links.
is amply illustrated in the concordances to the Qurʾān and Tradition. However, as the use of this verb unaccompanied by specification of the source gained wide currency, some early professional traditionists began to frown on its use for formalized hadith transmission. Thereafter its acceptance rested on the reputation of the user, as in the case of Mālik (see p. 78). Mālik used it freely in the Muwattaʾ (e.g. in Vol. II 984–1001) and almost exclusively in the Risālah fi al-sunan wa al-mawād-iq; which was addressed to Ḥārūn al-Rashīd. Mālik’s free use of the term apparently caused some comment among isnād critics, for Sufyān ibn ʿUyainah (107–98/725–814), himself an unquestioned authority, felt the need to state that “when Mālik says balaghanī it is equivalent to a strong isnād.”

The practice of transmitting individual traditions without an initial formula such as qāla, akhbaranā, or ḥaddathanā before the name of the transmitter appears to have been current during most of the second century to judge not only by the document under discussion but also by Documents 4, 5, 8, and 9.

The internal evidence, then, points to the conclusion that the papyrus text is in all probability contemporary with Mālik himself. However, before accepting this as definite or attempting to assign the papyrus to any specific period of Mālik’s life, we must review the biographical and literary landmarks of his long and active career.

Born in the year 93/712, Mālik began at an early age to study Tradition, which he soon utilized as a basis of his legal activities as a muftī, that is, an expert in Islamic law. His interest in Tradition as such and in criticism of its transmitters grew progressively and in time won him wide recognition as an outstanding leader in the field (imām fi al-hadith). His criticisms soon aroused the antagonism of his older contemporary and fellow Medinan scholar Ibn Ishaq, who counterattacked with criticism of Mālik’s books which had been in circulation for some time before Ibn Ishaq left Medina in the year 132/749. Mālik’s fame spread so fast that by about the year 130/748 his name was coupled with that of Rabī’ah al-Raḍ (d. 130/753–54), and they were considered the two leading Medinan jurists after Yahyā ibn Saʿīd al-Anṣārī left Medina to serve as judge of Kūfah under the ʿAbbāsid caliph Saffāḥ (132–36/750–54). Mālik’s inspiration for the Muwattaʾ came from his reading of the legal work of an older fellow jurist, ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Mājuṣhūn (d. 164/780), with whom he shared leadership in Medina in the next decade according to the testimony of the foremost Egyptian direct transmitter of the Muwattaʾ, Ibn Wahb (125–97/742–812). Mājuṣhūn had made no attempt to quote Tradition in support of his legal views. Mālik admired the work but decided to improve on it by composing a similar work that would at the same time be based on authentic traditions, of which he already had a sizable collection, including much of the material of Ibn ʿUmar and Zuhrī. There is no specific statement as to when Mālik actually

6 See e.g. Muwattaʾ II 902; Bukhārī I 288; Dārīmī I 132. See also Kīfayātah, pp. 413 f. Ibn Ishaq used this verb freely in the Sharḥ.
7 Published in Cairo in 1343/1924. Mālik’s authorship of this treatise is questioned, but the use of balaghanī in it conforms with his practice.
8 Ibn Farḥūn, p. 22. See pp. 100, 104, n. 72, and 113, n. 150, above for Sufyān’s high standards of transmission.
9 See GAL S I 297 for references to his numerous biographical entries.
10 See e.g. Jarḥ IV 1, p. 205; Fragmenta historiorum Arabicorum I 208; Ibn Farḥūn, pp. 20 f.
11 See e.g. Jarḥ I 1, p. 22, and IV 1, pp. 204 f.
12 Ibn Saʿd V 324; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh IV 1, p. 310; Jarḥ IV 1, pp. 204–6; Abū Nuʿaim VI 332; Dāhābī I 195; Zurqānī I 4.
13 Masʿūdī IV 116; Khatīb I 223 f.; Jamīʾ II 156; Dāhābī I 164; Irfād IV 400; Ibn Khalikān 161 f.
14 Akbār al-qadāt III 242 f.
15 Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh III 2, p. 13; Jarḥ II 2, p. 386; Jamīʾ I 309 f.
16 See Khatīb X 436–39, esp. p. 437; Dāhābī I 197, 206 f. See also GAL S I 255 f. Mājuṣhūn later migrated to Bagdād in ʿAbbāsid service (Jamīʾ I 309).
17 Jamīʾ I 132, II 60 f.; Ibn Farḥūn, pp. 25 f.; Zurqānī I 8. See also p. 126 below.
began work on the *Muwatta*. But scattered bits of information, when fitted together, indicate that it was already in full progress in either 147/765 or 148/766, when the caliph Mansur while on a pilgrimage proposed to Malik that the *Muwatta* should be the one standard legal work throughout the empire. Malik is said to have discouraged the idea, pointing out that the provinces had already evolved their own legal practices and that ‘Iraq in particular would not be receptive to the theories and practices of the jurists of the Hijaz. That Malik had accurately estimated the provincial tempers in this respect was presently proved. For when Mahdi appointed Hanifite judges to Egypt and Basrah, which rivaled the Hanifite Kufah, he met with such sustained opposition that the judges were removed.

While the sources agree that Mansur led the pilgrimage of the year 147/765, there is considerable doubt that it was he rather than Ja’far ibn Mansur who headed the pilgrimage of the year 148/766 (see Ya‘qubi II 469; Tabari III 353; Mansudi IX 63–65; Ibn Qutaiba [pseudo], Kitab al-imdah wa al-sijarah [Cairo, n.d.] I 115, 121).

To what extent Mansur was actually influenced by the political views of the Persian scholar, convert, and administrative secretary ‘Abd Allah ibn al-Muqaffa’ (d. 142/759), who advocated a centralized state of the type of the Persian Empire, is hard to tell. The latter outlined his theory of government in his Risalah fi al-siyahah (see Kurd ‘Ali [ed.], Rasâ’il al-bulughah [Cairo, 1331/1913] pp. 120–31), where among other matters of policy he drew specific attention to the varied legal practices under the Umayyads and suggested a unified legal code (see ibid. esp. p. 120). For analysis of this important work by Ibn al-Muqaffa’ and the differing views of its modern interpreters, see S. D. Goitein, “A turning point in the history of the Muslim state,” *Islamic Culture* XXXIII (1949) 120–35, and Erwin Rosenthal, *Political Thought in Medieval Islam* [Cambridge, 1958] pp. 72 f. and references there cited; see also Dominique Sourdel, “La biographie d’Ibn al-Muqaffa’ d’après les sources anciennes,” *Arabica* I (1954) 307–23.

If Mansur ever toyed with the idea of a fully centralized empire, it was only to reject it; perhaps he was influenced by the excesses of the Persians who were involved in the Rawandiyah movement of 126–37 or 141 A.H. and that the practice was not initiated by Mansur as hitherto generally believed (see e.g. Zubairi, pp. 284 and 290; Abkhur al-qudat I 184; Khatib XIV 103). It was begun by Umar I and followed by ‘Uthman and ‘Ali (Abkhur al-qudat I 105–11, 270–74, 280 and II 188 f., 227) and also intermittently by Mu’awiyah and several other Umayyads (see e.g. Abkhur al-qudat I 110 f.; see also Kindi, pp. 301–3, 305, 311, 333, 337, and 340, mostly for the years 98–114/717–32). Furthermore, Mansur’s first judge, Yahyá ibn Sa’id al-Ansari, was appointed by Saffah and retained by Mansur (Abkhur al-qudat III 241–45). Mansur’s own practice varied. He sometimes accepted the governor’s nominee, and some of the judges he appointed were later removed from office by the governors (Abkhur al-qudat II 56, 80 f. and III 148–50, 153 f., 235 f.; Kindi, pp. 308 f.). There were also instances during the reign of the next five ‘Abbasid caliphs when the governors took the initiative in making the appointments, which were either specifically confirmed by the caliph or tacitly allowed to stand (see e.g. Abkhur al-qudat I 228 f., II 130, 256, 157, and III 149, 175, 177, 239, 313; Kindi, pp. 377, 385, 417).

These variant practices in the appointment of judges during the pre-‘Abbasid and early ‘Abbasid periods call for some explanation. On the basis of the foregoing brief survey it would seem that, as a rule, the caliph made the appointments if he was aggressive and exercised personal power in the administration or if a prospective judge already held one or more other offices in the province, including even the governorship (see e.g. Abkhur al-qudat I 270, 273, 280, 312–16, II 56, 84, 88 f., 91, 117, 122, 154, 157 f., and III 191). On the other hand, it would seem that generally the governor made the appointments if he was given great power by the caliph in times of trouble or if he was a powerful and trusted prince, as can be gathered from the references already given. The judgeships of Kufah and Basrah consistently received more attention than those of the other provinces, as reflected by the fact that Tabari as a rule includes one or both of these judgeships in the list of appointments given for most years (e.g. Tabari I 2481, 2647, II 67, 156 f., 188, 399, 537, 752, 854, 940, 1030, 1039, 1055, 1191, 1266, 1348, 1358, and III 71 f., 75, 81, 84, 91, 121, 124, 127, 129, 138, 333, 458, 469 f.). In view of these indications one wonders how these early authors were so misled as to assert that Mansur was the first caliph to appoint imperial judges for the provinces. The error would seem to be traceable to an initial confusion as to the meaning of ahrar al-qādi ilā min qarar al-hilīfa. If al-khalifah is given a generic meaning the passage can be read: “The first judge appointed by a caliph (to any one of the imperial provinces) was so and so.” But if al-khalifah is used specifically in reference to Mansur, as I believe it was, then the burden of the passage becomes: “The first judge appointed by the caliph (Mansur to such such a province or city was so and so).” This meaning alone accords with the above-noted practices as followed before, during, and after the reign of Mansur, the judges being appointed sometimes by the provincial governors and sometimes by the caliphs. See pp. 218 f. below for Mansur’s appointment of Ibn Lahab as judge of Egypt.

The earliest account of the episode traces back to Wazqid, who is quoted in Tabari III 2519 f., and to Wazqid’s secretary Ibn Sa’d as quoted e.g. in Abu Nu’aim VI 331 f. Cf. Jami’ I 132; Dhahabi I 195.

There has been a tendency to discredit Manṣūr’s proposal as wishful thinking on the part of Mālik’s followers because the sources credit the proposal concerning the Muwatta as sometimes to Mahdī and sometimes to Ḥārūn. It is entirely possible that Ḥārūn is erroneously credited, but the case for Mahdī seems to have considerable merit. For Manṣūr is said to have commissioned Mālik and Mahdī to execute the proposal. Manṣūr made another pilgrimage in the year 152/769 and Mahdī led one in 153/770, and both considered plans to establish the Muwatta as the standard legal work. Mālik may or may not have deliberately prolonged the completion of the work, which was still unfinished when Manṣūr died in the year 158/775. Mahdī’s personal interest in the work continued after Manṣūr’s death, for he had a copy of the Muwatta made for himself and his son Ḥādi. It was certainly the post-Manṣūr period of Mālik’s life that began to yield the ever increasing references to the transmission of the entire Muwatta in progressive versions, beginning with that of the youthful Shaibānī in the fifth and early sixth decades of the second century, continuing with that of Shāfi‘ī, and ending with the vulgate of Yaḥyā ibn Yaḥyā al-Laithī in the last year of Mālik’s life. Such transmission practices were responsible for the fifteen or more reported versions of the Muwatta that emerged from the hands of author and transmitters over a period of some twenty years. Mālik is reported to have said that it took him forty years to complete the work. This figure seems reasonable, for it would place the inception of the work in about 140/758, which in turn allows for the completion of the various “books” or sections that were seen and examined by Manṣūr in the year 147/765 or 148/766 and those heard and transmitted by Shaibānī in the next decade. Furthermore, the literary evidence indicates that, as with each passing decade Mālik’s fame continued to increase, copies of the Muwatta became available not only to his immediate circle of students and admirers but also to visiting scholars from the major provinces of the empire. Of great interest to us at this point are the details of the actual steps taken in the production of the authentic texts. A great many of Mālik’s famous teachers—Nāfi‘ (d. 117/735) the client of Ibn ʿUmar, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Hurmūz al-A raj (d. 117/735),21

9 Jarb, Taqdimah, pp. 29 f.; Ibn Qutaihah (pseude.), Kīthā al-imāmah wa al-wiṣālah, pp. 119–21. The latter source is confused on the dates of Manṣūr’s and Mahdī’s pilgrimages by a whole decade; see Yaʿqūbī II 460 and 485 for the pilgrimages led by either Manṣūr or Mahdī.

10 Ibn Farbūn, p. 25; Zurqānī I 8 f.

11 Zurqānī I 7; Muwatta, Intro. p. 7.

12 See e.g. Khaṭīb II 172; Nawawī, p. 104.

13 Fragmenta historicae Arabicae (Cairo, 1359 f.; Ibn ʿAsākir IV 352; Ḥusn al-muhaddarah I 165 f.; Ibn Farbūn, pp. 227 f.)

14 See Goldziher, Studien II 213 and 220–26 for the various versions of the Muwatta.

15 Ibn Farbūn, p. 25. Mālik is also reported as saying that he labored for 60 years on his lifework (Abū Nuʿaim VI 331; Zurqānī I 8). These approximations in round figures, made no doubt at different periods of Mālik’s life, must refer to different stages of his literary activities, going back to the ḥadīth source materials that he collected in his younger days—the books criticized by Ibn Isḥāq (see p. 122 above).

16 Shaibānī’s various works were early sought after even by his elders (see Vol. I 23). Among his younger contemporaries who studied his fīḥ books were Ibn Ḥanbal, Shāfi‘ī, and the ḥadīth critic Yaḥyā ibn Māṭin (see e.g. Khaṭīb II 172, 174 f., 176 f., 180).

22 For the long lists of students and scholars who came from the various provinces to study and acquire copies of the Muwatta see Zurqānī I 6–8 and Ibn Farbūn, passim.

23 The identity of the Ibn Hurmūz mentioned in later sources (see Ibn Rushd [d. 520/1126], Kīthā al-muwaddāmat [Cairo, 1325/1907] I 27; Ibn Farbūn, pp. 16 and 20) as Mālik’s teacher for many years has been questioned because several of Mālik’s older contemporaries were so named. Muhammad Fuʿād ʿAbd al-Baqī speculates on this question. He overlooks ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Hurmūz al-Araj and suggests that this Ibn Hurmūz was perhaps a certain practically unknown Abū Bakr ʿAbd Allah ibn Yaḥyā who died in the year 148/765 (see Muwatta, Intro. pp. 9 f.). A better guess would be that he was the client of Ibn ʿUmar, Nāfi‘ ibn Hurmūz, who figures in what Bukhārī accepted as “the soundest of isnād’s,” namely Mālik–Nāfi‘–Ibn ʿUmar (Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh I 2, pp. 84 f.; Nawawī, pp. 589 f.). Fortunately, however, Abū Bakr Muhammad ibn al-Hassan al-Zubaidī (d. 379/989), Ṭabaqāt al-naḥawīyin wa al-nabawīyin, ed. Muhammad Abū al-Fadl Ibrāhīm (Cairo, 1373/1954) pp. 19 f., definitely identifies Mālik’s shiṣīd as ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Hurmūz al-Araj of Medina (see p. 130 below). Their long association covered Mālik’s early youth, when he needed to be grounded in the fundamentals of the language and the faith so that he could proceed to the study, collection, and transmission of ḥadīth (see Ibn Farbūn, p. 20).
Zuhri (d. 124/741),22 Abū al-Zinād (d. 131/748),23 and Rablcah al-Ra‘ī (d. 136/753),24 to mention but a few—were foremost among the scholars who wrote down their materials and encouraged their students to do likewise, frequently allowing the ‘ārd and itjāzah methods of transmission to replace the samā’ method.25

Mālik himself began to write down hadīth at an early age and continued to do so for several decades. He is credited with having written down with his own hand some 100,000 traditions, many of which he would not transmit and only 10,000 of which he considered at one time or another for possible inclusion in the Muwaṭṭa, which finally contained some 1,720 traditions.26 His standards led him to be selective as to the transmitters27 from whom he would write down traditions for use or transmission, and he limited himself to those generally accepted as fully qualified traditionalists—men of the caliber of ‘Ubad Allāh ibn ‘Umar (d. 147/764) and Zuhri, that is, reliable scholars who persistently collected traditions and committed their materials to writing.28

As Mālik’s hadīth and fiqh materials accumulated and as his fame increased, the demand for his services as teacher and public lecturer grew rapidly. He made use of some members of his family and his pupils and also employed professional assistants. The names of two of his secretary-copyists have come down to us. Marzūq is specifically associated with the transmission of the Muwaṭṭa, and his son Ḥabīb (d. 218/833) functioned sometimes as secretary-copyist and sometimes as mustamīl or dictation master.29 The services of Ḥabīb were not always acceptable to Mālik’s serious pupils such as ‘Abd Allāh ibn Maslamah al-Qa‘nābī, who insisted on reading back the Muwaṭṭa to Mālik himself.30 A second dictation master was Ḥabīb’s father ‘Umar (d. 193/809), who later became a master traditionist.31 Talented pupil-teachers functioned as recitation masters, who with master copy in hand listened attentively for fellow pupils’ reading errors and acted at times as prompters when memory work was in progress. Mālik’s daughter Fāṭimah, who is listed among the many who transmitted the Muwaṭṭa, assisted her father by performing such duties.32 Mālik’s “classroom” techniques indicate that he, like most scholars in the religious field in his day, advocated the development and constant use of memory. However, unlike some of his fellow scholars, he did not consider oral aids better than visual aids as a means to this end but gave each due credit.33 His position as detailed by one of his leading students and transmitters of the Muwaṭṭa, Ashhab ibn ‘Abd al-Azīz (ca. 144-204/761-819),34 who later became leader of the Mālikites in Egypt, indicates

See e.g. Zurqānī I 17.

See e.g. ibid. and p. 139 below.


Mā‘rjāh, pp. 256 f.; Kifāyāh, pp. 305 f., 309, 313 f., 318, 326 f. See also p. 139 below.

See e.g. Jāmī’ II 74; Ibn Farḥūn, pp. 21 f. and 24 f.; Zurqānī I 8. Cf. Goldzaher, Studien II 218, n. 5.

Jarḥ IV 1, p. 204: اتقن ملک للرجال واعملهم: بناءً.

Jarḥ I 1, p. 22; Abū Nu‘aim VI 323; Jāmī’ I 74; Adab al-imām, p. 94; Dhadhī f 151 f.; Zurqānī I 4.

Futūh, p. 282; Abū Nu‘aim VI 330; Ibn Farḥūn, pp. 23 and 28. Ḥabīb later became a copyist and bookseller (warāqī) in Medina and in Egypt, where he finally settled. He took liberties with the materials he transmitted or copied and hence acquired a bad reputation (see Khaṭīb XIII 396; Mīzān I 210; Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Al-īnīqāfī f jaftār al-dhālahah al-fuqahā, p. 42). For Marzūq see Zurqānī I 6.

Dhadhī f 347.; Ibn Farḥūn, pp. 131 f. For biographical entries see Jarḥ II 2, p. 181; Jāmī’ II 407 f.

Fihrist, p. 370; Ḥabīb al-imām, p. 89; Weisweiler, “Das Amt des Mustamīl in der arabischen Wissenschaft,” Orients IV 52; Dhadhī f 296.

Ibn Farḥūn, p. 18; Zurqānī I 6.

He was not alone in this view (see Kifāyāh, pp. 220-23, 326-30, and 352-55; see also our Vol. I 25). Evidently some scholars recognized the fact that some people learn more quickly through the ear and others do better through the eye.

Jarḥ I 1, p. 342; Adab al-Shāfi‘ī, p. 71 and references there cited; Ḥusn al-muhādaraḥ I 166; Ibn Farḥūn, pp. 98 f.; Zurqānī I 6 f.
that while both the ʿsamʿ and ʿard methods were acceptable to Mālik, he came to favor the ʿard method and encouraged students to read back to him from their copies. However, a Khurāsānian who visited Medina in the third decade of the second century pointed out that Khurāsānian scholars were not satisfied with the ʿard method. After months of futile waiting to hear traditions directly from Mālik, this visitor complained to the judge ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. al-Muṭṭalib, who ordered Mālik to relate traditions to the visitor personally, and Mālik did so. But Mālik encouraged his pupils to memorize their materials, regardless of the method by which they were originally acquired, as a safeguard against intentional or accidental interpolation in the written text and as a guarantee of accurate transmission. This does not imply that the written materials were mere aids to memory consisting of rough notes or booklets which were neglected or destroyed once their contents had been memorized.

As one follows closely Mālik’s “classroom” practices, it becomes clear that, though he was flexible in his methods, there were times when either because of personal inclination or at the insistence of his pupils he emphasized now the ʿsamʿ method, now the ʿard method. At first he was apparently willing to heed a student’s desire to hear the Muwattaʿa directly and sometimes repeatedly from him, as in the case of Yahyā b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Bukair. At the height of his career and fame his students preferred reading back to him to hearing from others. Some, such as ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Mahdī, even preferred reading back to Mālik to hearing him. But when old age overtook him, his serious students, such as Yahyā b. Yahyā al-Laithī, once more insisted that Mālik himself read or dictate the Muwattaʿa to them.

It was probably during the last period of his life that Mālik made free use of the munāwalah and mukālabah methods, whereby he gave a pupil or scholar, in person and through correspondence respectively, a copy of his materials, along with the ʿijāzah method, whereby he permitted transmission of his materials with the use of the formula haddathānī or akhbāranī even though both the ʿsamʿ and the ʿard procedure had been omitted. But whatever method of direct transmission was employed it was sooner or later accompanied by authenticated written texts. Mālik himself preserved his fiqh compositions and hadith collections, and when questions of either ʿindād or ʿmatn arose he usually settled them by reference to his books. He is said to have left a sizable library, including several boxes containing his collection of the traditions of Ibn ʿUmar and seven boxes containing his collection of the traditions of Zuhrī, even though comparatively few of these materials were used in his Muwattaʿa or even transmitted in his hadith sessions.44

44. See e.g. Bukhārī I 24 f.; Kifayah, pp. 227, 300, and 323.
45. Akhbār al-qudāt I 205. For the judge see also Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh III 2, p. 21; Tabarī III 159, 198; Jāmiʿ I 312 f.
46. Jarḥ I 1, pp. 27 and 32.
47. See Zurqānī I 6-8 for specification of the method(s) by which the major transmitters of the Muwattaʿa received the text.
52. Jarḥ I 1, p. 17.
53. Ibn Farḥūn, p. 24. Obviously Mālik did not hear all of these texts directly from Ibn ʿUmar or Zuhrī, though there is evidence that such texts were in circulation in Zuhrī’s time (see Kifayah, pp. 305 f. and 318 f.; see also pp. 181 f. below).
It should now be clear that, so far as Malik and his own circle of leading teachers, scholars, and pupils were concerned, permanent manuscript texts of both hadith and fiqh materials were the rule rather than the exception. Our papyrus folio of fine quality with its wide margins and schooled hand and with its comparative freedom from linguistic and scribal errors undoubtedly stems from a scholar's prized copy of the Muwatta', comparable to the Wujūh wa al-naẓā'ir of Muqta'il ibn Sulaimān (Document 1) and the Ta'rikh al-khulafā' of Ibn Ishaq.55

Thus the paleography, the scribal practices, the text, the order of the traditions, and the insād terminology of the papyrus show a remarkable degree of conformity with the scholarly practices of Malik and his contemporaries. On the strength of this internal evidence the papyrus folio can be safely assigned to Malik's own day. It could have been produced by any one of his secretary-copyists, dictation and reading masters, advanced pupils, or admiring fellow scholars. As already pointed out, the text is not in the Shaibanī recension but is essentially that of the vulgate as transmitted by the Spanish judge and jurist Yaḥyā ibn Yaḥyā al-Laithī (d. 234/848), who heard the Muwatta' from Malik shortly before the latter's death in the year 179/795.56 The codex represented by our folio therefore originated sometime during the quarter-century or so that elapsed between the writing of the Shaibanī and the Laithī recensions and hence must represent one of the many lost recensions of that interval. Inasmuch as the papyrus text shows only minor variations from the printed text of the Laithī vulgate it is even possible that it represents the vulgate text as it was before it received, in the decades after Malik's death, editorial touches at the hands of either Yaḥyā himself or his transmitters.57

As papyrus was still in common use in the Hijāz, the papyrus codex represented by our folio could have belonged to the copy made by Malik's son Yaḥyā and could have found its way to Egypt in the company of Yaḥyā's son Muḥammad, who settled there.58 Or it could have originated with any one of three other transmitters of the Muwatta' who left the Hijāz and settled in Egypt, namely Malik's secretary-copyist Marzūq, Marzūq's copyist-bookseller son Ḥabīb (see p. 125), or Malik's most distinguished pupil, Shafi'ī.59 Finally, and perhaps

56 Maqqari, Naḥf al-ṭib I 465 f.; Ibn Farḥūn, p. 350; Żurqānī I 12; Goldziher, Studien II 221 f.; GAL S I 297. Spanish sources credit Yaḥyā with two visits to Malik in close succession. During the first visit he heard the Muwatta' directly from Malik, but he had previously heard it in Spain from Ziyād ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān (d. 264/879). On his way back to Spain he stopped in Egypt and, discovering that ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Qaṣim had written down Malik's Masdūl, he returned to Malik to do likewise but found Malik ill and remained with him until his death. He then returned to Egypt and wrote down the Masdūl from ‘Abd al-Raḥmān (see Ibn al-Faradī, Ta'rikh al-ulamā' II 176-78; Humaidī, Jadhwat al-muqtabis, pp. 202 f. and 359-61; Maqqari, Naḥf al-ṭib I 490 f., 467).
57 The Chester Beatty Collection of manuscripts contains an incomplete copy of the vulgate (A. J. Arberry [ed.], The Chester Beatty Library: A Handlist of the Arabic Manuscripts I [Dublin, 1955] No. 3001), which covers the middle third of the Muwatta' and was written in the year 277/890 by Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Aṭīfī for his personal use. It "is written on thick paper of good quality in a clear Maghribī script," as the late J. V. S. Wilkinson, who had the manuscript microfilmed for me, kindly affirmed in a letter. The script is not only clear and easily legible but has a definite calligraphic quality. The text is fully voweled and pointed. Though as a rule the individual traditions are not marked off with a punctuation device, some of the chapter or section headings have comparatively simple decorative devices (cf. p. 88). The order of the "books" or parts varies from that of the printed text. The insād, including those at the beginnings of sections, start, as in our papyrus (see p. 121), simply with قلائل مالك عن فلان in the greater part of the text and with قلائل مالك في اللون في العجب in the rest. This would seem to indicate that the 3d-century scholar-copyist was faithful to the master copy at his disposal, which itself reflected 2d-century usage for the most part. Laithī nevertheless does step into the manuscript text, though only as a commentator, usually at the end of a tradition. He introduces himself with such statements as "Yaḥyā said 'Malik said . . .' " and "Yaḥyā said 'I heard Malik say. . . ." " No doubt the initial insād, at the beginning of the complete codes, indicated direct transmission from Malik to Laithī. In any case, the marginal notations of the fragment frequently inform the reader that it is indeed Yaḥyā ibn Yaḥyā al-Laithī who is transmitting the text directly from Malik.
58 Ibn Farḥūn, p. 18; Żurqānī 1 5.
59 For their pupil-master relationship see e.g. Jarḥ VI 1, pp. 205 f.; Abū Nu'aim IX 69; Khāṣīb II 58; Ibn ‘Aṣākir IV 351 f.; Irshād VI 368-71; Ibtisam al-muḥādarāt I 165;
most likely, the codex could have originated with any one of several of Malik's devoted Egyptian students who transmitted the *Muwatta* and who gained wide recognition and became leaders in Malikite circles in Egypt, such as 'Abd al-Rahmān ibn al-Qāsim (d. 191/806), Ashhab ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz (d. 204/819; see p. 125), or Ibn Wahb (d. 197/812), sections of whose *Jāmi* have survived in a papyrus codex dated 276/889.

That in the twentieth century we are able to identify and date a single folio of a *hadith-fiqh* work from the eighth century is in no small measure due to the care with which Islam's earliest scholars sought and recorded a wealth of historical and cultural details. To the initial thrill of discovery and identification is added the satisfaction of seeing widely scattered details fall one by one into place to give the fragment over-all significance for the elucidation of scholarly techniques and practices of the second century of Islam—practices in which the written text played, from the start of that century, a major, if not indeed the major, role in the preservation of Tradition.

---

Ibn Farḥūn, p. 228; Zurqānī I 6, 9. Transmitters who remained in Medina or who lived in 'Iraq or farther east are less likely to have had a hand in our codex. The last direct transmitters of the *Muwatta*, Abū Muṣṭafī (150–242/767–856) of Medina and Abū Ḥudhāfah (d. 259/873) of Bagh-dād, are said to have included about 100 traditions that are not found in other transmissions of the work (Dhahabi I 60–62; Khaṭīb IV 22–24). For other *Muwatta* traditions that are not found in the vulgate see *Tajrid*, pp. 259–79.

60 Jarḥ II 2, p. 279, credits him with some 300 volumes (*jīld*) of Malik's *fiqh* materials. See also Jam' I 293; Ibn al-Farādī, *Tarīkh al-ulamāʾ* II 177; Dhahabi I 324 f.; Ibn Farḥūn, pp. 146 f.; Ibn Khallīkān I 366 f.


DOCUMENT 3
Oriental Institute No. 17622. Late second/eighth century.

Fine light brown papyrus, 26.5 × 25.8 cm., with 34 lines to the page (Pl. 8). The outer and lower margins measure 3.5 and 2 cm. respectively. The inner and upper margins are too broken for accurate measurement. The folio fragment is badly damaged with several large lacunae.

Script.—Small carefully executed book hand that is more cursive than angular. Diacritical points are for the most part sparingly used. Fā has a dot below it (verso 8), and qāf has one above it (verso 7). The dot of initial ghain is within the open loop instead of above it (verso 6, 11). The alif of prolongation is sometimes omitted as is the initial alif of ʿibn. The hamzah is not indicated and is frequently replaced by yāʾ. Punctuation and collation marks consist of two concentric circles with a dot at the center. Dashes are used to separate headings within a given section, and some sections are set apart by the space of a line (recto 27, verso 20 and 24). The line canceling the heading in verso 34 indicates that the scribe decided to start the section on ablution on the next page. Note the use of the basmalah and the ṭasliyah.

TEXT
Recto

[1] إلى رسول الله ﷺ
[الله ﷺ]
[4] عليه ﷺ (4) برغمًا عن ابن شريعة عن عبد الكريم
[5] بن الحارث قال فتح رسول الله صلى
[6] الله عليه وسلم فذكر ووصف وصلى وقال هذه المجالس التي كتبها صغت عليها واتاب
[7] بها واتاب اتبعها بها
[8] ... إلها فهي ناسًا أنا نجريها ولكننا نائبًا شغيل من شؤون الأسواق فقلت رسول الله إلا يصرح رجل
[9] يوماً ثم يومًا ثم يومًا
[10] إلى خمسة عشر يومًا فعند ذلك لم يترك الله له [حجاج] ولا خير من الدنيا والآخرة إلا فضاه ﷺ

(5) بلغتنا أن رسول الله قل لصحابه يوماً إلا أعلمهم دعاء من كلن دعاء به استجاب له قالوا

[13] فأستقبل رسول الله ﷺ حتى قام فتبعه سألًا من المسلمين فقال من يسال الله الدعاء الذي به
[14] استجاب فليس الله باسمه الأعظم ﷺ

(الله ﷺ) لا الله ﷺ لا انت سبحانك أوبحمدك وأستغفر الله المجرم ﷺ الحول (6) بلغنا أن رجل
[15] ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ 
[7] ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ
11 قال له ان تسامه الزواج في حسب وكونا الابناء البالغين
[مرة سابقا باذن الله تعالى.
[12 فان فيها شبهة لم يبتضد ويبتند.
[13 بلغنا ان قلها سبعه علما مرة.
[14 بلغنا أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال من صم.
[15 من قال ونكن على امامه فادها محافعة من الله ومن قرأ قل

هو الله احد

كبر يقول انا رجل إلى رسول الله تعالى رسول الله اى سبي حق

في سبيل

ذكَرَهُ إن لئِن لاحظ فضل على أحد الا فضل الصالح

 رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ان قال من [اصابته حاجة]

[16 الفني.] صلى الله عليه وسلم ان قال من [اصابته حاجة.


[18] صلى الله عليه وسلم ان قال من [اصابته حاجة.

32 من نزل به هم


[22] صلى الله عليه وسلم ان قال من [اصابته حاجة.

[23] صلى الله عليه وسلم ان قال من [اصابته حاعنة.


[26] صلى الله عليه وسلم ان قال من [اصابته حاعنة.

[27] صلى الله عليه وسلم ان قال من [اصابته حاعنة.

[28] صلى الله عليه وسلم ان قال من [اصابته حاعنة.

[29] صلى الله عليه وسلم ان قال من [اصابته حاعنة.


[31] صلى الله عليه وسلم ان قال من [اصابته حاعنة.


لولا يعلم أو يعلم ما في البر أو البحر وما سقط من ورقه لا يعلمهما ولا حية في طبقات الأرض ولا رطب

ولا بابس الا في كتاب مبين تكتب هذه الآية ثم تعلظ عليه فيرا باذن الله }
QUTAIBAH IBN SA'ID

33 (14) عن بني سبئ أن بنيت الأثئ قال من نزل فيه كرما أو خاف من الله أو تعاشه إما فليقل حسبى
الله ونعت الوكل في سمع الله من دعاه، ليس ورا الله مراما (15) عن أبي يرفع الحديث إلى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم [أنه قال]

VERSO

فقال [أنه قال]

... (1)

[كان له مثل ذلك] سبخان الله العظيم (16) عن عمارة بن نافع [أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم]

... (2)

[قال] في الصحب سبخان الله العظيم وبحمده ولا حuida ولا فائدة بالله تعالى العظيم [الحمد]

... (3)

[ثم خرجت برامهما [قال]]

... (4)

[ابن الخطاب] لما تقدم [أو غير بعث بك الله] الحماية (18) [ب]غنا ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم [ف]ان ماجأه ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم... (5)

... (6)

[ب]غنا ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم [ف]ان ماجأه ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم... (7)

... (8)

[ب]غنا ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم [ف]ان ماجأه ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم... (9)

... (10)

[ب]غنا ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم [ف]ان ماجأه ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم... (11)

... (12)

... (13)

... (14)

[ب]غنا ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم [ف]ان ماجأه ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم... (15)

... (16)

[ب]غنا ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم [ف]ان ماجأه ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم... (17)

[ب]غنا ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم [ف]ان ماجأه ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم... (18)

[ب]غنا ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم [ف]ان ماجأه ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم... (19)

... (20)

... (21)

[ب]غنا ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم [ف]ان ماجأه ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم... (22)

... (23)

... (24)

... (25)

... (26)

... (27)

... (28)
الصلاة

حديث في الصلاة

21 (ع) اخْرِنِي مَلَّك بن انس عن عمّه أبي سهيل بن مالك عن أبيه أنه قال سمعته طلحة بن عبيد الله يقول جاء رجل إلى رسول الله من أهل نجاشي ثائر الرأس.

22 فقيل [رسول الله خمس] صلوات

في [اليم و]الثَّلَاثة فقال هلا على غيرها قال لا إلا أن تطبع قال رسول الله وصيام شهر رمضان قال هل على غيره قال لا إلا أن تطبع قال فادير الرجل [وهو يقول] والله لا أزيد على هذا ولا أنقص مسجّنا.

23 (ع) واحذ أرانته [رسول الله صلى الله وسلم اقلع ان صدق ] (30) وإخْرِنِي ملك عن أبي [أثناء] عن الأعرج عن أبي [هَوَى] قال قال [رسول الله صلى الله وسلم الملايكة يتفاوتان] فيكم ملايكة بالثَّلَاثة والملايكة بالنهاز ويجتمعون

في صلاة]

[الفجر وفي] صلاة العصر ثم يخرج الله الدين بانو [ف] فيكم فيسالهم وهو أعلم بهم فقيل وكيف ترككم عباداً قلنا تزكّناهم

27 [وهم يصلون وثبتهم وهم يصلون صفوف الصلاة] (31) وإخْرِنِي ملك بن انس عن أبي النضر

28 مولى عمر بن عبد الله

29 [عن ملك بن أبي عباس] أن عثمان بن عفان كان يقول في خطبه قل ما يدع ذلك إنا خطب إذا قام الامام فاستمعوا له واصفاً


31 حذوَّة] مكتبوه وإذا كبر في الركوع وإذا رفع رأسه عن الركوع فهمه كذلك وقال سمع الله لمن حمده رتبنا ونكل

[الحمد و]كان لا يفعل ذلك [في السجود] بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم حديث في الوضوء

Comments.—Tradition 1. The šād of the anšar was first given the final instead of the medial form, but this scribal error was partially corrected by the joining of the šād to the following alif.

The protective and saving power of this basic article of the Islamic creed, “there is no god but the God,” alone or in combination with “and Muḥammad is his apostle,” is of course
constantly stressed in Tradition (e.g. Tayalisi, pp. 122, No. 899, 174, No. 1241, 316, No. 2403; Ibn Sa'd VI 39; see also Concordance I 78 f.). It is, however, especially invoked in connection with birth, sickness, and death. Closely related traditions for use on these occasions, particularly the last, are numerous (see Ibn Sa'd VI 39 and our Document 6, Tradition 12).

Tradition 2. The partly lost isnād traces back to ʿAbd Allāh ibn Masʿūd (d. 32/653). Daulābī lists nine traditionists and Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī lists six Companions named Abū Sinān. The only one who is linked to ʿAbd Allāh ibn Masʿūd, and therefore most likely the one referred to in the papyrus text, is Abū Sinān al-Asḥaf (see Tayalisi, p. 179; Daulābī I 37 f.; Istīʿāb II 694; Isābah IV 175).

Stinginess, particularly among the Muslims themselves, is generally deplored (Sūrahs 3:179, 7:37, 47:38). To be stingy with one's greetings is considered the worst form of miserliness, but it is equally deplorable to forsake a fellow Muslim. There seems to be no parallel, but traditions that are closely related to both themes are numerous (e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal III 328, V 364; Bukhārī IV 338; Concordance I 146 f. and II 15 f).

Tradition 3. This tradition is not found as such in the standard collections. However, a Muslim's responsibility to God for his own good conduct and for the welfare of the community is expressed in a number of related traditions, one of which reads: إصلاح نصح الدين الصريح لله ورسوله ولامة المسلمين, and the commentators equate إصلاح نصح with إصلاح (see Bukhārī I 23; Tirmidhī VIII 111-14 and Ibn al-ʿArabī al-Maʿārif's commentary).

Tradition 4. Abū Shuraiḥ ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Shuraiḥ (d. 167/783-84) was originally from Alexandria. He transmitted from the Egyptian ʿAbd al-Karīm ibn al-Ḥārith (n.d.; see Ibn Sa'd VII 2, p. 203; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh III 2, p. 89; Jamʿ I 284, 325). Most of the latter's traditions concern the First Civil War of Islam (Kindī, pp. 14, 22, 24, 28), when all the leaders, including ʿĀʾishah, were concerned with the general welfare of the community, which is in part the burden of this section of the papyrus text.

This comparatively long tradition is not found in the standard collections, though its separate themes are common. Public gatherings for the remembrance of God were commended by Muḥammad (Muwaṭṭa I 209; Bukhārī IV 209; Muslim XVII 14 f.; Ibn Mājah II 218; see also Concordance I 359 f. ذكر الله ومجلس II 181 182). The excuse offered by the people for not attending more such meetings was preoccupation with their business and property—a fact that Abū Hurairah cited later when some questioned the great number of traditions transmitted by him as against the comparatively few reported by most of the Companions (cf. e.g. Sūrah I 189; Ibn Ḥanbal II 3, 240, 274; Concordance III 145 f.).

Tradition 5. Though Muḥammad's followers are known to have asked him for instruction on various matters, he more frequently took the initiative and offered to teach them some specific thing, as in this instance (Muwaṭṭa I 161; Ibn Ḥanbal I 242, 258 and VI 134). A tradition without an isnād is not likely to be included in the standard collections, though variants are numerous. Recto 10 is reconstructed with the aid, for example, of Ibn Ḥanbal I 392, II 396, VI 77 and 230, and Bukhārī I 204. Several of these passages state that this particular invocation, with slight variations, was much used by Muḥammad (see also Mustadrak I 496 f., 502; Khaṭīb V 255).

Tradition 6. Here again no identical parallel is likely to be found because there is no isnād, but the formula is too familiar to detain us. Frequent repetition of this and similar formulas of praise or invocation seems to have become current in Muḥammad's day though the number of repetitions increases with time. The last sentence in recto 12 could be an editorial addition.
(see Ibn Sa'd IV 169; Bukhārī IV 209; Concordance I 532 under حَولُ and this formula). The numbers 3, 33, 99, and 100 are favored for the many formulas of praise to be said on different occasions (Concordance I 296–98; Abū al-Laith al-Samarqandi, Tanbih al-ghāfīlīn, pp. 82, 97, 136, 214–16, and Bustān al-‘arīfīn [on margins of Tanbih] pp. 213–15).

Tradition 7. There is enough space in recto 13 for a short isnād, but there was probably a brief heading instead, perhaps just the word الإيمان, since fasting, fighting, and declaring the unity of God comprise some of the themes of the tradition. The fourth element of the surviving text involves the precept that anything intrusted to one should be returned to the owner, and he who disregards this is counted among the munāfiqūn or hypocrites (Bukhārī I 16; see also Ibn Ḥanbal III 414 and Concordance I 118 أَمْنِ and 120). Again the tradition as a whole does not seem to be in the standard collections though its several surviving themes are readily met with.

Tradition 8. A short isnād is broken off here. If the unpointed first word is read كَبِيرُ the traditionist involved may be Yaḥyā ibn Kāthīr (or Kuthār?) of Baṣrah, who died sometime after the year 200/815 (Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh IV 2, p. 300; Jarḥ IV 2, p. 183; Jamʿ II 564). This interesting tradition is not found in the standard collections, but the part that equates all Muslims and accords distinction only to the righteous among them is basic to Islām and is reflected in numerous other traditions (see Concordance II 100 ff. خَيْارُ). The other part deals with the exchange of captives and seems to call for even exchange, but Dārīmī II 223 records a tradition that Muḥammad exchanged one prisoner for two.

Tradition 9. The name Yusair or Yāsir is fully pointed. The man is obviously a Companion and is in all probability the better known of the only two Companions so named, Yūsair (or Yāsir?) ibn ʿAmr (d. 85/704), who settled in Kūfah (Ibn Saʿd VI 101; Istīfa 133 f., II 616 f.; Usd V 126 f.; Isābah III 1411 f.).

Tradition 10. The Abū al-Nuʿmān of the isnād is either the Companion so named or, more likely, his grandson who had the same kunyah (Daulābī I 58, II 139; Isābah III 903, IV 372). This long tradition is not found in the standard collections. Its main theme seems to involve Muḥammad's courtesy to his Companions at all times but especially during the prayer service (cf. e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal V 54 ff. and 57 and see Concordance I 358 f. جَلِيسُ).

Tradition 11. The head of the first ʿaʾin is partly lost. The isnād is muʿānān. Space calls for a link between Awzāʿī and Mālik. Each of these famous traditionists transmitted from the other, though the older Awzāʿī (88–157/707–73) was Mālik’s teacher (Jarḥ II 2, pp. 266 ff.; Dhahābī I 168–72; Ibn Farḥūn, p. 29). This long tradition is not found either in whole or in its major parts in the Muwatta and the other standard collections, yet many of its phrases occur repeatedly in the extensive sections devoted to prayer and invocation (e.g. Muwatta I 212–17; Bukhārī III 242; Abū Dārūd II 85; Ibn Ḥanbal I 248, II 382, IV 177, V 196, VI 62; Ibn Mājah I 216; Tirmidhī II 261; Nasāʾī I 174; see also Concordance I 352 جَلِالَ and 524 حَاجة; Mustadrak I 320, 499). Some of the unexpected rewards or punishments are Qur’ānic (e.g. Sūrah 3:27 and 37, 59:2, 65:11).

Tradition 12. ʿUqail ibn Khālid (d. 142/759 or 144/761) was a major transmitter from Zuhri. For the isnād see Document 6. A similar tradition, with an isnād that goes back to Ibn ʿAbbās, is found in Bukhārī IV 195, 459; Muslim XVII 47; Tāyālisī, p. 346, No. 2561; Ibn Ḥanbal I 280 (see Concordance I 217 for related themes). Ḥākim al-Nisābūrī gives the content of the tradition, substituting عَالِم for عَلَم and III 77 f. شَدَّةً for related themes).
that traces back to ʿAlī ibn ʿAbī Ṭālīb, who states that Muḥammad himself taught him the tradition (Mustadrāk I 508 f.; see also Maṣāriḥah, pp. 201 and 219).

**Tradition 13.** It is not certain whether the ḵarāf of Tradition 12 was intended to go with this peculiarly stated content (cf. Traditions 17 and 18). The magical verse is found in Sūrah 6:59. Many traditions invoke protection against disease and madness (e.g. Ṭayālīf, p. 268, Nos. 2007–8; Ibn Ḥanbal I 89, 192, 302; Bukhārī III 27 f.). Fear here involves private situations as distinct from danger to the public, for which is provided the special invocation ṣalāt al-khāf (Ibn Saʿd II 1, p. 43; Muwatta I 183–85; Ibn Ḥanbal I 376; Muslim VI 124; Bukhārī I 239–41; Tirmidhī III 42; Mustadrāk I 335–37, III 30).

**Tradition 14.** Note the use of only one lām in ʿallā (recto 33, verso 23 and 26). The same usage I had assumed to be an error in the Oriental Institute Arabian Nights fragment (see JNES VIII 133). It was, however, borrowed from the Qurʾān and was permissible in secular works in early ʿIslām (cf. Ibn Qutaibah, Adab al-kāṭib, ed. Max Grüner [Leiden, 1900] p. 267).

Yūnus ibn Yazīd al-Aʿlī (d. 149/766, but see p. 176, n. 29) was, like his fellow citizen ʿUqail of Tradition 12, a leading pupil of and transmitter from Zuhrī (see pp. 176 f.).

**Tradition 15.** The Ubayy of the ḵarāf is obviously not the well known Companion Ubayy ibn Kaʿb (Dhahabī I 16). At least five other early scholars named Ubayy are known (Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh II 2, pp. 40 f.; Jarḥ I 1, pp. 290 f.), but it is not possible to identify any of them as the Ubayy of the papyrus.

The tradition, though the text is broken, obviously refers to the role of the two angels who confront the individual with his earthly record on the Day of Judgment (see p. 141). For other traditions on al-hashr, or the gathering on the Day of Judgment, see for example Bukhārī III 301 f., Muslim XVII 192–97, and Concordance I 470 (see also Mustadrāk IV 418 ff.).

**Tradition 16.** ʿUmar ibn Nāfī died during the reign of Maḥṣūr. He transmitted from his father, Nāfī, who was a client of and a major transmitter from Ibn ʿUmar (see Jarḥ III 1, pp. 138 f.; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh III 2, pp. 199 f.; Mizān II 272; Jamʿ I 342). Morning prayer forms the subject of many similar traditions (cf. Concordance I 128 and III 255). The belief that numerous repetitions of this and other formulas of praise would bring a variety of rewards seems to have become current early in ʿIslām, as indicated in Muwatta I 209 ff. The belief that one is protected while saying these formulas of praise is also reflected in Mustadrāk I 493 f.

**Traditions 17–18.** These two traditions are out of context. Their inclusion here would seem to imply their transmission by ʿUmar ibn Nāfī and his association with the family of ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, who is involved in both traditions.

Tradition 17 refers in all probability to the matter of permitting women to go to the mosque for prayer and other purposes (cf. e.g. Muwatta I 197 f.; Bukhārī I 221, 223; Muslim IV 161–64; Tirmidhī III 52). ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb preferred to have them stay at home but would approve their going to the mosque or to market or to visit relatives if their husbands gave permission. In Tradition 17 we have the stern ʿUmar disciplining a woman in public for the use of perfume. ʿUmar is known not only to have urged Muḥammad to permit the beating of women (e.g. Abū Dāʾūd II 244–46, esp. No. 2146; Dārīmī II 147) but to have done so himself on several occasions before and after his conversion (e.g. Sirāh I 206; Muwatta I 536; Ibn Mājah I 313; see also p. 109 above). Muḥammad eventually declared himself in favor of mild wife-beating (Sūrah 4:34; Sirāh I 969; Bukhārī III 447 f.; cf. Concordance III 503, 506). The last phrase of Tradition 17 is fully pointed, the ghain having the dot inside the loop.
Tradition 18 deals with the matter of appeals to Muhammad by women who opposed marriage arrangements that their fathers made without consulting them. Muhammad lent a sympathetic ear and as a rule arbitrated in their favor and sometimes suggested an appropriate alliance. His role as marriage counselor benefited many of the Companions, including 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, who later himself played a similar role (see Muwatta II 524 [= Shaibani, p. 243] and 535; Tafsir IV 552 ff.; Abū Nu‘aim VII 116; see also Gertrude H. Stern, Marriage in Early Islam [London, 1939]).

Traditions 19–27. It is not possible to tell exactly where some of these traditions begin or end in the text. The readings of a few words are perforce conjectural. These nine traditions yield such meager clues that identifications can hardly be expected. A check of some dozen words and phrases in the Concordance led nowhere. Yet each of the identifiable subjects in the papyrus fragment is treated in either the دعاء or the صلاة section of the standard collections. The اشتعال of Traditions 23 and 24, in view of the general character of the text, probably refers to some phase of intercession on the Day of Judgment rather than to intercession on earth (e.g. Tafsir II 32 f., 383 f.; Abū al-Laith al-Samarqandi, Tanbih al-ghafilln, p. 19) or to a prophet’s intercession for his people (e.g. Tafsir II 574; cf. Sweetman, Islam and Christian Theology II 213 and references there cited).

For the isnād in verso 9 see Tradition 12. The names in verso 11 and 13 could be either the given names of the traditionists or the last part of their full names. It would therefore be futile to attempt identification beyond pointing to the possibility that the ‘Abd al-Rahīm of verso 11 may be the ‘Abd al-Rahīm ibn Khālid of Tradition 28.

Note the incomplete tasliyah. Note also the frequent use of the term balaghand up to this point in the text.

Tradition 28. Zurqānī I 6 lists an ‘Abd al-Rahīm ibn Khālid among the Egyptians who transmitted the Muwatta from Mālik. Early biographers are silent on this traditionist. Later biographers mention an ‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn Khālid al-Ali whose trustworthiness was questioned by some and who transmitted materials from Yūnus ibn Yazīd al-Ali of Tradition 14 (Miscen II 124; Lisān IV 5 f.). He is possibly the same man.

Sumayyy (d. 131/749), the client of Abū Bakr ibn ‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn al-Ḥārith, transmitted comparatively few traditions to Mālik (see e.g. Muwatta I 160, 209 290 f., 297; Bukhārī, Tārīkh II 2, p. 204; Jarḥ II 1, p. 315; Tajrid, pp. 68–71, which credits him with 15 traditions that do not include the present one).

The tradition is found in Muwatta I 160 f. (= Shaibānī, p. 84). The papyrus text is identical with the Shaibānī version. The one difference between them and the printed text is that the latter omits the phrase الذي خرج منه of verso 19. For a commentary see Zurqānī I 290, where closely related traditions are cited (see also Mustadrak I 91). The Concordance (مسجد راح ؛ خرج) leads to closely related traditions in which either علم صلاته or دعاء is sought (e.g. Bukhārī I 171; Muslim VI 133–36; Ibn Mājah I 51, 134 f.; Tirmidhī III 83; Abū Nu‘aim VI 16).

Tradition 29. Space does not allow for the inclusion of the tasliyah in the reconstruction in verso 21. The parallels have نسم for the first word of verso 22 except that of Muslim, which reads نسم as in the papyrus text with its clearly dotted nūn. A variant for غيرة in verso 23 is غهن, as in the printed text of the Muwatta. Note the interlinear before صيام.

For the family isnād, used by Mālik, see Document 2, Tradition 1 (p. 116). Ṭalḥah ibn ʿUbaid Allāh (d. 36/656), the ultimate source of all the available close parallels of this tradi-
Qutaibah ibn Sa'id

was one of the ten leading Companions to whom Muḥammad promised heaven. He was also a member (absent) of the elective council appointed by ʿUmar I, a caliphal aspirant whose cause was sponsored by his kinswoman ʿĀʾishah, and one of the fallen at the famous Battle of the Camel (see Ibn ṣa'd III 1, pp. 152–61; Isḥābah II 584–88; see also Abbott, Aishah, the Beloved of Muḥammad). For his musnad see Tayalisi, p. 31, and Ibn Ḥanbal I 160–64. For those who transmitted his traditions, including Mālik, see Jarḥ II 1, pp. 471 f., Istiʿāb I 206–9, and Jamc I 230.

There are at least nine parallels for this tradition. Some are all but identical with the papyrus text, while others show marked textual differences. The isnāds of all nine go back to Mālik’s uncle Abū Suhail and Abū Suhail’s father, Mālik ibn Abī ṣĀmir, who transmits ʿAlḥāḥ’s account (see Jamc IV 1, p. 214; Ibn ᵣa'd V 45). From Abū Suhail the line of transmission branches out into two chains, headed by Ismāʾīl ibn Jaʿfar and Mālik ibn Anas, who in turn have three and six transmitters respectively, as detailed in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yahyā ibn Ḥassān (d. 208/823) (Darimi I 370 f.)</td>
<td>Ālī ibn Ḥujr (d. 244/858) (Nasāʾī I 297)</td>
<td>Qutaibah ibn ᵣa'd al-Balkhi (d. 240/854) (Bukhārī I 472)</td>
<td>Qutaibah ibn ᵣa'd al-Balkhi (Muslim I 166)</td>
<td>ʿAbd Allāḥ ibn Maslamah al-Qānabī (d. 221/836) (Abī Dāʾūd I 106)</td>
<td>ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Mahdī (d. 198/814) (Ibn Ḥanbal I 162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malīk ibn Abī ṣĀmir (n.d.)</td>
<td>Ismāʾīl ibn Jaʿfar (Bukhārī I 19 f.)</td>
<td>Qutaibah ibn ᵣa'd al-Balkhi (Muslim I 166)</td>
<td>Ismāʾīl ibn Abī Uwais (d. 226/840) (Bukhārī II 161)</td>
<td>Ismāʾīl ibn Jaʿfar (Bukhārī II 161)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talḥāh ibn ᵣaib Allah (d. 36/656)</td>
<td>ᵣaib Allah ibn ᵣaib Allah al-Lāṭifī (d. 234/848) (Musallī I 175)</td>
<td>Ismāʾīl ibn Jaʿfar (Bukhārī I 19 f.)</td>
<td>Qutaibah ibn ᵣa'd al-Balkhi (Muslim I 166)</td>
<td>ᵣaib Allah ibn ᵣaib Allah al-Lāṭifī (d. 234/848) (Musallī I 175)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is to be noted that Ismāʾīl ibn Jaʿfar transmits directly from both Abū Suhail and Mālik ibn Anas and that Qutaibah ibn ᵣa'd al-Balkhi transmits directly from both Ismāʾīl and Mālik.

Of the three transmissions from Ismāʾīl ibn Jaʿfar, Nos. 2 and 3 are all but identical, while No. 1 is a condensed version of the tradition. All three, however, adequately convey the sense of the tradition with its three basic themes—five daily prayers, the fast of Ramāḍān, and almsgiving—but the actual text and the word order differ considerably from those of the papyrus. All three add افعل ان صدقوا ان التوبة ان صدقوا at the end of the tradition, but No. 1 extends the reward to the man’s father.

The six transmissions from Mālik are much closer to the papyrus text but fall into two groups. Nos. 5 and 6 omit من اهل البتر . . . حَتَى دَنَّا of verso 21–22 of the papyrus text, that
is, they omit the khabar element, which identifies and describes the Bedouin seeking instruction, and retain the hadith element, which specifies the instruction given him by Muhammad. Both omit also the phrase إلا أن تعلع after the simple negative لا. Their transmitters may be safely eliminated as likely authors of the papyrus text. The remaining four transmissions are all but identical with the papyrus text. Their slight variations consist of omission of a genealogical link, that is, the writing of Mālik instead of Mālik ibn Anas, the grammatical points noted on page 136 and an occasional alternation of قال and نقال, substitution of الصلة for الزكاة, omission of شهر after the simple negative (No. 2), before the phrase رمضان, addition or omission of a redundant inscribed letter (No. 3), a single slight change in word order (No. 3), and the haphazard use of the tasliyah in the papyrus text, which more frequently than not omits it. These variants could stem as well from oral as from written transmission, where the collector or copyist takes editorial liberties with the text. Thus it is not possible at this point to suggest the transmitter of any one of these four parallels as the most likely transmitter of the papyrus text though it is possible that one of them may, indeed, have been the compiler of the hadith collection it represents.

The relationship of the three transmissions from Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far to the six from Mālik ibn Anas is of interest. That all nine transmissions represent the same event is not to be questioned. The first group, however, represents a briefer, more direct, and simpler literary account than the second. Inasmuch as the direct source of all nine transmissions is Mālik's uncle Abū Suhail, it is entirely possible that it was Mālik himself who gave the tradition its most acceptable form before he included it in his Muwatta—the only form represented in the nine transmissions that found its way also into the Sahihain of Muslim and Bukhārī. The papyrus text is, therefore, the earliest extant version of this form.

Traditionists and commentators have generally yet erroneously identified the crude Bedouin who came to question Muḥammad as Ḍimām ibn Thašlabah, delegate from the Banū Sa'd ibn Bakr (see e.g. Muslim I 169–71; Istīlāb I 328; Isābah II 546 f.; Zurqānī I 320 f.). This Companion's trail led to another group of interrelated traditions that represent a single event, in this case reported in several versions by the three well known Companions Abū Hurairah (Bukhārī I 355), Anas ibn Mālik (Bukhārī I 25–27, in two versions; Muslim I 169–71; Ibn Ḥanbal III 149, 193; Dārimī I 164; Tirmidhī III 98 f.), and Ibn 'Abbās (Sirah I 943 f. = Ṭabarī I 1722–24 = Dārimī I 165 f. = Istīlāb I 328 = Uṣd III 43 f.; Ibn Sa'd I 2, pp. 43 f., a considerably condensed early form).

There are several notable differences between this group of traditions and the groups that trace back through Mālik ibn Anas and Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far to Ṭalḥah ibn 'Ubaid Allāh. Their isnād's are entirely different, their language is quite different, and their basic content has a wider range in both the khabar and the hadith element. The traditions that trace back to Ṭalḥah refer to an unnamed Najdian Bedouin and specify as Islām's requirements only the five daily prayers, the fast of Ramaḍān, and the giving of alms, whereas the others name Ḍimām ibn Thašlabah—whose tribe, to which belonged Muḥammad's foster mother Ḥalimah, lived in the Hijāzian desert—as Muḥammad's interrogator and specify two additional requirements, belief in the one God and in Muḥammad's mission and a pilgrimage for those who are able to make it. It would seem, therefore, that, despite some overlap in content, the group of traditions relating to the Ḍimām episode is not to be confused with the groups of traditions that trace back to Ṭalḥah, which specify only three of five requirements that are known as the "pillars of Islām." The Ḍimām episode, which is assigned by some to the year 7 a.h. and by others to the year 9, obviously represents a later development in the
instruction of would-be and new converts to Islam. The caliph Abū Bakr, in the year 8, gave
to another inquirer instructions on the “pillars of Islam” that were as complete as those re­
ceived by Dimām (Ṣīrah I 985 f.; Ibn Saʿd II 1, p. 94).

The fullest account of the Dimām episode is that transmitted by Ibn Ishaq (Ṣīrah I 985 f.)
on the authority of the little known Muḥammad ibn Walīd ibn Nuwaifa (n.d.; see Jarḥ IV 1,
p. 111; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh I 1, p. 258; Mizān III 146) and the well known Kūfīan Salamah ibn
Kuhail (d. 121/739; see Ibn Saʿd VI 221; Jarḥ II 1, pp. 170 f.; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh II 2, p. 75;
Jāmʿ I 190 f.) on the authority of Kuraib (d. 98/716) on the authority of Kuraib’s teacher
Ibn ʿAbbās. Ibn Ishaq’s account is repeated almost verbatim by Darimī and Ṭabarī (Darimī I 165 f.; Ṭabarī I 722–24). All the other Dimām traditions, however, show varying degrees
of stylistic deviation with a word or a phrase added or deleted here and there, and, unlike
Ibn Ishaq’s version, all omit the account of Dimām’s return to his people and their mass con­
version to Islam.

The Dimām traditions have become central to a number of doctrinal points which need
not detain us here, the most important being Islam’s minimum requirements for salvation.
They have also become central to two aspects of the sciences of Tradition. The first concerns
the validity of a singleton report such as the sole account of Dimām’s return to his people.
The second implies equal validity for transmission by reciting to (qaraʿ, ʿaraḍaʿ ʿalā) and trans­
mission by hearing from (samiʿa min) the teacher or authority, the latter instanced by
Dimām’s questioning of Muhammad. For more or less lengthy discussions of these points see
Bukhārī I 25, Muslim I 169–71, Tirmidhī III 97–100, Adab al-ilmāʾ, p. 77, and Zurqānī I
320 f. (see also e.g. p. 53 above).

Tradition 30. Abū al-Zīnād ʿAbd Allāh ibn Dhakwān (d. 131/748) had a large student
following for both secular and religious studies. He served as secretary to several Umayyad
governors and was financial administrator in Ḥiṣām under ʿUmar II and in Medina during the
reign of Hīshām. He was also an active and respected traditionist—one of the comparatively
few known as amīr al-muwʾminūn fi al-hadīth. As a scholar he was considered to be on a par
with Zuhrī, whom he accompanied in search of traditions. But unlike the latter, who wrote
down everything, Abū al-Zīnād wrote down only those traditions that dealt with lawful and
unlawful practices (al-ḥalal wa al-haram). He is specifically known as the “secretary and lead­
ing transmitter of Aḥrār,” kātib wa ṛawī al-Aʿrār (Zubairī, pp. 171 and 363; Maʿārif, pp. 235 f.;
Jarḥ II 2, pp. 49 f.; Jāmʿ I 73; Dhaḥabi I 103, 126; Mizān II 36 f.; Nawawī, pp. 718 f.; see
Ibn Ḥanbal I 483 f. and Tajrīd, pp. 92–99, for extracts from his hadīth collection).

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Hurmuz al-Aʿrār (d. 117/735) of Medina was a grammarian and a
Qurʾānic teacher who also wrote copies of the Qurʾān and was one of Mālik’s earliest teachers
(see p. 124, n. 31). Toward the end of his life he moved to the frontier at Alexandria. Many
a leading traditionist of the Hijāz and Egypt transmitted from him. He encouraged his stu­
dents to read back their materials to him and then permitted them in transmitting the same
traditions to others to say “ḥaddathānī ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Hurmuz,” that is, he held equally
valid the ʿard and samʿ methods of transmission long before his young pupil Mālik came to
be identified with them (Ibn Saʿd V 209; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh III 1, p. 360; Jarḥ II 2, p. 297;
Dhaḥabi I 91 f.; Nawawī, p. 392; see Tāyālīsī, p. 313, for some of the other traditions he trans­
mitted from Abū Hurairah).

The ʾiṣnād, used frequently in Mālik’s Muwaṭṭaʿ, was considered among the most acceptable
by both Muslim and Bukhārī (see Tajrīd, pp. 92–99, which cites 54 traditions with this ʾiṣnād;
Muslim I 86 f.; Jāmʿ I 288 f.).
All the parallels for this tradition (see Concordance I 367 and IV 116) trace back to Abū Hurairah. Six of them vary as to their isnād’s, which are all different from the isnād of the papyrus, though their main, except in one version (Ibn Ḥanbal II 344), is practically identical with that of the papyrus (Ibn Ḥanbal II 257, 312, 396; Muslim V 134; cf. Zurqānī I 309). One isnād starts like that of the papyrus but for Mālik substitutes the well known state secretary and traditionist Shu‘aib ibn Dīnār, known also as Shu‘aib ibn Abī Ḥamzah (d. 162/779), who wrote from Zuhri’s dictation and whose books were seen and used by Ibn Ḥanbal (Bukhārī II 310). For Shu‘aib and his literary activities in the field of hadīth see Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh II 2, p. 233, Jarḥ II 1, pp. 344 ff., Dhahabi I 205 f., and Ibn ʿAsākir VI 321 (see also p. 177 below).

In six other parallels the isnād is the same as that of the papyrus up to and including Mālik. From Mālik the isnād’s branch out through six different transmitters of the Muwatta’, who represent the provinces and leading cities of the Empire from Spain to Khurasan. They include the transmitter of the vulgate version of the Muwatta’ (Vol. I 170), the two transmitters of the Muwatta’ who were generally preferred by Muslim and Bukhārī (Muslim V 133 and Bukhārī I 148), and one of the transmitters to Ibn Ḥanbal (Vol. II 486). The remaining two transmitters are Mālik’s nephew Ismāʿīl ibn Abī Uways of Medina (Bukhārī IV 459) and Qutaibah ibn Saʿd al-Balkhi (Bukhārī IV 477; Nasāʾī I 84), both of whom transmitted Tradition 29 also (see table on p. 137). See Zurqānī I 68 for lists of traditionists from the various provinces who transmitted the Muwatta’ and see Zurqānī I 8 for the transmitter who was generally preferred by each of the compilers of the standard hadīth collections of the third century.

The textual variants in all the transmissions from Mālik, including the papyrus text, consists of omission or addition of explanatory words, changes in word order such as (verso 26–27) instead of (verso 27) instead of (verso 27) instead of (verso 27) instead of (verso 27) instead of (verso 27) instead of (verso 27) instead of (verso 27), slight variations in verb forms such as (verso 27) instead of (verso 27) instead of (verso 27) instead of (verso 27) instead of (verso 27) instead of (verso 27), Similar minor variations are found in some of the transmissions that do not trace back to Mālik (Ibn Ḥanbal II 257, 312 = Muslim V 134; Bukhārī II 310). It is therefore evident that Mālik’s role in this case was one of simple transmission of a tradition that had already acquired a fixed literary form, probably at the latest at the hands of Abū al-Zinād (d. 131/748), who, as stated above, specialized in traditions coming from Aʿrāj and is known to have written down his material, some of which was used by Ibn Isḥāq (see our Vol. I 53). In any case, two distinct literary forms of this tradition were current in the period immediately following the death of Abū Hurairah. The texts just cited represent the form transmitted by Aʿrāj and also by Hammām ibn Munabbīb, who is known to have made a written collection of traditions from Abū Hurairah (see p. 43). The second form is represented by transmission from Abū ʿAlī Dhakwān (d. 101/719) through the Kufan Aʿmash (60–148/680–765) and seems to have become current in ʿIrāq and Persia only (Ibn Ḥanbal II 396; see also Zurqānī I 309). Aʿmash (see p. 152) was nearly blind and did not himself write down his materials, but his traditions were written down by his pupils, and some of this written material was presented to Zuhri as proof that ʿIrāq too could produce first-rate hadīth scholars (Ibn Saʿd VI 239). It may be said that the first literary form, by far the most widely accepted, was aimed at literal transmission (harfī) and that the aim was accomplished—if we allow for the element of human error in both oral and written transmission in a manuscript age. The second literary form was, by contrast, aimed at preservation and clarification of the sense of the tradition (maṣnā), and this aim was undoubtedly accomplished despite the stylistic divergence from the literal form.
A third early form combines linguistic elements that are present in the other two. It was transmitted by Abū Rāfi‘, who died early in the last decade of the first century, and it was transmitted from him by Thābit al-Bunānī of Basrah, who died between 123/741 and 128/746. Though current while the two literary forms were becoming fixed and generally accepted, this earlier version survived only in Basrah (Ibn Ḥanbal II 344; Dhahābī I 65; Ibn Sa‘d VII 2, pp. 3 f.).

The concept of guardian angels reporting and recording the deeds of human beings is, of course, Qur'ānic (Sūrah 82:10). This is but one function of the angels, belief in whom is an article of Muslim faith (see e.g. Wensinck, The Muslim Creed, pp. 198 f.). The angels are particularly close at prayer times and at gatherings for the remembrance and praise of God, especially the Friday congregational prayers (see e.g. Muwatta I 160 f., 170; Ṭayālīf, pp. 293 and 314; Bukhārī II 308, IV 209; Tafsīr VII 26 ff.). Their role at death and on the Day of Judgment (see Tradition 15) is to confront the individual with the record of his deeds and speed him on to his final destination (e.g. Muwatta I 940; Tafsīr VI 114–21). The poetry of Umayyah ibn Abī al-Ṣalt, who vigorously opposed Muhammad, shows familiarity with many of the biblical roles of angels (see Henri Lammens, “La cité arabe de Taif à la veille de l’islam,” Mélanges de l’Université Saint-Joseph VIII [1922] 179–83, 187; see also p. 5 above). For a general account of the role of angels in Islam and the extent to which it reflects the biblical record see for example Sweetman, Islam and Christian Theology II 75–79.

 Tradition 31. The omission in verso 30 of the و and the حاءذل of و حاءذل is a scribal error, as is also the use of ٌ for ٌ in verso 31. Muwatta I 104 has instead of ٌ فِي خَيْرِ وْهَنَأ فِي خَيْرِ وْهَنَأ and for the last part of verso 29 reads َفَقَامَ الإِمَامُ يَخْطِبُ يُمِّمَ الجَمِيعَ فَأَصَامَهُ عِلْهُ لَوْ وَاتَنَأَّرَ. The transmitters in the isnād are identified in Zurqānī I 195. Abū al-Naḍr Sālīm ibn Abī Umayyah of Medina was the client and secretary of ʿUmar ibn ʿUbaid Allāh ibn Māʿmar, one-time governor of Basrah who died in ʿIrāq during the governorship of Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf (e.g. Istīʿāb II 405 f.; Zambaur, Manuel de généalogie et de chronologie pour l’histoire de l’Islam, pp. 39 and 46). Sālīm transmitted traditions of Ibn Abī ʿAwfī (d. 86 or 87/705 or 706) that had been conveyed in writing to ʿUmar (Jamʿ I 188 f.; Usd III 122). Sālīm was considered trustworthy, and Mālik’s Muwatta is credited with a number of other traditions from him (see Tajrīḥ, pp. 62–66 and 274). For other references to Sālīm see for example Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh II 2, p. 112, Jarḥ II 1, p. 179, Daulābī II 137, and Jamʿ II 479.

A full parallel to this tradition is found only in Muwatta I 104. The attempt to trace parallels (see Concordance II 539 f., III 322 f. and 392) revealed three distinct stages in the development of the tradition. The first stage involved many short traditions and parts of longer ones, coming from Anas ibn Mālik and numerous other scholars, that describe Muhammad’s insistence on the formation of straight lines for public prayer (e.g. Ṭayālīf, p. 266; Ibn Ḥanbal III 122, 177, 179; Bukhārī I 187 f.; Muslim IV 156) and on silence not only during the reading of the Qur’ān, as some claimed (Bukhārī I 199; Ibn Mājah I 144), but also during the entire exhortation. Both practices were current but controversial during the first century (e.g. Muwatta I 103 f.; Ibn Ḥanbal II 209 and 242, IV 8–10, V 75; Muslim VI 137–39; Ibn Mājah I 177; Tirmidhī II 298–301; Nasāʾī I 208 f.; Zurqānī I 193 f.). The second stage involved the development of two groups of traditions covering the practices of one or more of the first four caliphs with respect to one or the other of the two themes involved, namely ordering the lines (Muwatta I 158 = Shaibānī, p. 86; Tirmidhī II 25) and keeping silent (Muwatta I 103 = Shaibānī, p. 135). Some of the isnād’s in both groups feature the family of Mālik, beginning with his grandfather Anas ibn Mālik. Other isnād’s trace back to other
Companions but appear only in one or the other of the two groups. The third stage involved the combining of the traditions that covered 'Uthmān's practices in respect to both themes into a single tradition. Thus it is obvious that the final form of the tradition must have an ḵunād that traces through Mālik back to his grandfather and that it must also be unique in its content. That Mālik alone was responsible for this final stage is clear from the fact that, aside from the papyrus text, it is to be found only in the vulgate version of his Muwatta.

Once again we see a master traditionist at work at the tedious and exacting task of collecting and editing traditions. And once again we see that despite liberties taken in transmission and editing the essential elements of a group of traditions, evolving in an oral and a manuscript age covering some 150 years, have survived in a singleton tradition that involves a family ḵunād. That this family turns out to be Mālik's may be due in no small measure to that family's general practice of writing down their traditions from the time of Muḥammad onward.

**Tradition 32.** The vulgate version of the Muwatta contains at least 132 traditions received from Zuhrī, and nine of these have the same ḵunād as Tradition 32 (see Tajrid, pp. 116–55 and 262–65, esp. pp. 140–43).

Sālim ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb (d. 106/725) was a favorite son who transmitted numerous traditions from his father, Ibn ‘Umar, who died in 74/693 (see Ibn Sa’d IV 1, pp. 105–38, and pp. 148 and 180 below). Sālim himself won a reputation as an authoritative Medinan jurist and traditionist. The ḵunād Zuhrī on the authority of Sālim on the authority of his father was considered among the most acceptable by such Muslim scholars as Mālik, Ibn Ḥanbal, and Ishāq ibn Rāhawayh (Ibn Sa’d V 148; Nawawī, pp. 118 and 267 f.; Dhahabi I 82 f.; Jam’ I 188). See Tajrid, pp. 140–43, for Mālik’s use of this ḵunād. For further biographical references see Ibn Sa’d V 144–49, Bukhārī, Tarīkh II 2, p. 116, and Jarb II 1, p. 184.

In searching for parallels to this tradition (see Concordance II 279 f. and 299 f. [several entries]) I soon realized that all parallels and closely related traditions are involved in the following controversial features of the ritual of prayer: the times when the hands are lifted up to the side of the face so that the wrists are in line with the lower part of the ears, the times when the hands are not lifted so high, and the times when they are not lifted at all. Numerous traditions which originated with several Companions and branched out through several different ḵunāds clearly indicate that the practice of Muḥammad and the Companions varied. The early jurists did not attempt to enforce a uniform practice. When the second-century jurists were confronted with these varying traditions and practices they leaned toward the principle that it was better to err on the safe side by lifting the hands all the way up to the ears on all possible occasions.

That Mālik’s earlier position was no different is clearly indicated by Shaibānī’s version of the Muwatta: (p. 87), which reads:

"أَخْبَرَنَا مَالِكَ حَدَّثَنَا الْرَّحْمَيْنُ عِنْ سَالِمَ بْنِ عَبْدُ اللَّهِ بْنِ عَبْدِ اللَّهَ بْنِ عَبْدِ رَحْمَةِ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ اِذَا اَفْتَقَحَ الصِّلَاةَ فَرَغَتْ يَدُهُ حَدِيْئًا مَنْكِبَيْهَا وَاذَا كَبَرَ الْرَّكْعَةَ رَفَعَ يَدُهُ."

This is followed by a second tradition, which reads:

"أَخْبَرَنَا مَالِكَ حَدَّثَنَا نَافِعُ أَنْ عِبَادَ اللَّهِ بْنِ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ كَانَ اِذَا أَبَنَ اِذَا اَفْتَقَحَ الصِّلَاةَ لَهُ اِذَا رَفَعَ رَاسِهِ مِنَ الْرَّكْعَةِ رَفَعَ يَدُهُ ثُمَّ قَالَ يَسِعَ اللَّهُ لِمَنْ حَمِدَهُ ثُمَّ قَالَ رَبِّنَا لِكَ الْحَمْدَ.

Shaibānī (131–89/748–805) wrote down his materials during three years of study with Mālik in Medina and at the age of twenty was sought out by Kūfolans as an authoritative transmitter of Mālik’s traditions (Khaṭṭāb II 172–74; Nawawī, p. 104). Shaibānī’s version of the Muwatta, therefore, must be dated around the middle of the second century (see p. 124). That Mālik later shifted his position and eliminated some of the numerous liftings of the hands is clearly indicated by the vulgate.
version (see *Muwatta* I 75 and references there cited; see also *Zurqānī* I 144), which reads:

The search for parallels revealed that Ismā‘īl ibn Ja‘far, Ismā‘īl ibn Abī Uwais, and Qutaibah ibn Sa‘īd (see Traditions 29–30, esp. table on p. 137) transmitted related traditions through *isnād*’s other than that of the papyrus text (Nasā‘ī I 158, 186; Tirmidhī II 94; Ibn Ḥanbal II 134; Ṭajrīd, p. 140), but only Qutaibah ibn Sa‘īd has actual parallels. One of his two parallels substitutes Sufyān ibn ‘Uyainah for Mālik, has اذًا كَيْبَرْ في الركَعَةٍ اذًا رَكَع for اذًا كَيْبَرْ في الركَعَةٍ اذًا رَكَع of verso 33 of the papyrus text, and omits the last sentence of verso 34 (Nasā‘ī I 158; Tirmidhī II 56; see also Dḥaḥāḥīb I 29). The other (Nasā‘ī I 140) is identical with the papyrus text in *isnād* but likewise has اذًا كَيْبَرْ في الركَعَةٍ اذًا رَكَع for اذًا كَيْبَرْ في الركَعَةٍ اذًا رَكَع of verso 33 of the papyrus and its slight variant in Shaibānī’s version of the *Muwatta*.

The difference centers on the word كَيْبَرْ and involves the relative timing of the takbīr, the lifting of the hands, and the prostration during prayer (see e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal II 133 f. for the views of Zuhūrī and his nephew on this point).

**IDENTIFICATION AND SIGNIFICANCE**

This document gives no direct evidence of its authorship. Careful checking of the text led to many related and parallel texts for several of its traditions but yielded no identification of the whole with any known collection of traditions.

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Khālid of Tradition 28 cannot be the author because he does not appear in the sources as a transmitter of the other four traditions from Mālik (Nos. 29–32). The parallels to these four traditions suggested Mālik’s nephew Ismā‘īl ibn Abī Uwais and Ismā‘īl ibn Ja‘far, both of Medina, as possible authors. Ismā‘īl ibn Ja‘far settled eventually in Baghdād, and his collection of traditions, transmitted directly by ʿAlī ibn Ḥujr (d. 244/858), has survived.1 A more probable author would seem to be their younger contemporary Qutaibah ibn Sa‘īd, who alone transmitted from Mālik three of the papyrus traditions that are found in the standard collections of the second and third centuries and who appears repeatedly in these collections as transmitter of closely related traditions from Mālik and others. Furthermore, his actual parallels are on the whole closer to the papyrus text than such parallels as were transmitted by the other two traditionists under consideration. Finally, biographical data which show him to have been the only one of the three who visited Egypt support this conclusion—reached from study of the parallels—which narrows the limits of the probable date of the document.

Qutaibah ibn Sa‘īd al-Balkhī (148–240/765–854) was a wealthy and much traveled Khurāsānian who sought out the leading traditionists of the various provinces and made a practice of writing down his materials.2 He started on a grand tour (*riḥlah*) in search of traditions at the age of twenty-three, when he studied with Mālik in Medina and received the *Muwatta*2 from him.3 He continued his journey northward and arrived finally in Egypt in the year 174/1

---

1 See Max Weisweiler, *Istanbuler Handschriftenstudien zur arabischen Traditionsliteratur* ("Bibliotheca Islamica" X [Istanbul, 1937]) No. 37; *GAL* S I 235 f. See also p. 152 below.

2 Khaṭṭīb XII 466, 469; Dahahīb II 30.

3 Zurqānī I 6.
790 shortly before the death of Ibn Lahīfah, from whom he transmitted some traditions. During this trip he also wrote down traditions from many other traditionists, including Ḥamd ibn Jaʿfar of Medina and Laith ibn Saʿd of Egypt. On his way back to Khurāsān he attended the lectures of the leading Ḥarrāqī traditionists, including Ibn Ḥanbal and Yaḥyā ibn Maʿin. Qutaibah returned to Khurāsān and became one of its leading traditionists. He made a second trip to Ṣaʿd ibn Abī Waqqās in the year 216/831 to hear Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal and Yaḥyā ibn Maʿin among others. He devoted his long life to collecting and organizing his vast materials, all of which he committed to writing. His traditions were arranged thematically, as in the papyrus. He worked out a system of colored-ink devices to indicate his chief authorities—red for Ibn Ḥanbal, green for Yaḥyā ibn Maʿin, etc. He was sought out by such leading ḥadīth scholars as Muslim, Bukhārī, and Nasāʾī. Nasāʾī, when he was quite young, studied with Qutaibah, in the year 230/845, and he generally preferred Qutaibah’s version of the Muwatta. Thus Nasāʾī proved to be more important than others for our purpose because he has traditions transmitted directly from Qutaibah that are identical or nearly identical with several of Mālik’s traditions that are in both the papyrus and the Muwatta.

It is hardly possible that the papyrus folio represents a copy made by Qutaibah while he was in Egypt, since it is unlikely that he would have used the “western” system of dotting the ʾaʾ and the ʿaʾ (see p. 129) or that he would have left his personal copy behind. Equally remote is the possibility that the papyrus folio represents a copy of Qutaibah’s materials which found its way to Egypt in the possession of Nasāʾī, who eventually settled there in about 232/846. A more likely possibility is that it represents a scholar’s copy of Qutaibah’s materials made during his visit in the year 174/790 to Egypt, where the practice of writing ḥadīth books had already been adopted by such leading Egyptian traditionists as Ibn Lahīfah and Laith ibn Saʿd (see Documents 9 and 6–7).

It is to be noted that Traditions 28–32 begin with ḥaddathand or ʾakhbaran and thus specifically indicate direct transmission. In contrast to these, Traditions 11–16 begin with ʿan, which allows for the omission of a link in the isnād. The several men who head the isnād’s of Traditions 11–16 are well known traditionists of the Hijāz, Syria, and Egypt who died in the mid-second century, that is, contemporaries of such traditionists as Mālik, Ismāʿīl ibn Jaʿfar, and Ibn Lahīfah. Any one of these contemporaries could be the omitted initial link. The contrast represented by such omissions and the profuse use of balaghand in most of the remaining traditions as against the complete isnād’s of Traditions 28–32 can be explained by the difference in the standards relating to isnād usage for transmission of the various categories of traditions. Abd al-Rahmān ibn Mahdī (135–98/752–814), an early ḥadīth critic, reflected this difference in stating that when scholars transmitted traditions from the Prophet that dealt with the lawful and the unlawful they were very strict with the isnād and severely critical of its men, but when they transmitted materials dealing with good deeds, rewards, punishments, permissibles, and invocations they were less critical in respect to the isnād (see pp. 76, 112). These standards of isnād usage for the various categories of traditions are illustrated by the papyrus. Strong isnād’s were provided when called for, as in Traditions 29–32, but Traditions 1–28 represent a category for which inferior and drastically abbreviated isnād’s were tolerated. Traditions of this category were widely circulated in Egypt and for the most

---

4 Khāṭīb XII 46 f.; Dhahabi II 30, 242.  
5 Dhahabi II 241; Zurqānī I 8.  
6 Khāṭīb X 332.  
7 Dhahabi II 241.  
8 Khāṭīb XII 466; Dhahabi II 30.  
9 Nawawī, p. 391.
part bypassed by Muslim and Bukhari, as noted by Ḥākim al-Nasaburi. Hamīd ibn Zanjawaih (d. 251/865) devoted a volume to this category.

Our document reflects a practice that was responsible for a rapid increase in the number and variants of parallel and related traditions, namely the combining of parts of original traditions in various ways to form so-called "new" traditions. The reader is spared the details of the specimens tested but can make his own tests with the aid of the Concordance. In spite of the rapidly accelerating rate of increase in the number of traditions there was as a rule no significant change in the basic content of the initial traditions.

The numerous facts brought to light as a result of the study of this papyrus, especially in connection with traditions transmitted to and from Mālik, have a significant bearing on the evolution of hadith materials and on the method of their transmission during a period of about a hundred years preceding Mālik's death. Even from the few traditions of the papyrus text it is clear that the controversial practices and the contradictory traditions that reflected them and that were current at the beginning of the period were still current at the end of it. It is equally clear that the earlier form of a given tradition on a non-controversial theme continued to be current along with its later more-or-less edited forms. The survival of both the early and later forms makes it possible for us to observe authoritative second-century hadith collectors and editors at work on the matn of a given tradition. We see that they separated, whenever possible, the nonessential khabar element from the hadith proper. The hadith element sometimes emerged in a form that could be retained literally unchanged; but at other times grammatical and stylistic editing was required to safeguard its basic meaning. And, inasmuch as different editors seldom produce identical sentences, some of the familiar types of variants already noted appeared in subsequent transmissions of what was essentially one tradition.

As to the methods of transmission, other than the evolution of the isnād as such, our facts reveal that the sāmi and 'arg methods were both prevalent not only at the end of this period but also at its beginning (see Traditions 29 and 30). It must be noted, however, that it is not always possible to tell whether these methods were employed with or without the aid of written sources. That is, just as in the sāmi method a teacher could dictate either from memory or from his book, so also in the 'arg method a pupil or transmitter could recite back his materials to the authority either from memory or from his written copy. Our facts also reveal that many of the transmitters who appear in the complete isnād's (Traditions 29–32) were men who made a practice of writing down their traditions. This practice was sometimes followed by two or more generations of the same family, as in the case of Mālik's family. But, on the other hand, successive generations of transmitters from different families and sometimes from different localities who are also known to have committed their materials to writing are frequently found as consecutive links in an isnād, for example Zuhri-Mālik-Qutaibah ibn Sa'īd (Tradition 32). These facts reinforce those revealed by Documents 1 and 2 and indicate that permanent scholarly texts, as distinct from memoranda and pamphlets, existed and were used along with oral transmission and that these records played a much larger role in the literary form and ultimate survival of Tradition, during the hundred years or so under consideration, than has hitherto been realized (see also p. 70).

Mustadrak I 499, 512 f., 547, 549. Dhahabi II 118 f.
Oriental Institute No. 17623. Late second or early third/early ninth century.

Fine light brown papyrus, 25 × 20.4 cm., with 18 lines to the page (Pl. 9). The margins are wide, the upper right margin being lost. The recto and verso are badly peeled in horizontal sections.

*Script.*—Small well executed cursive *naskhī* book hand. Diacritical points are used sparingly for *bā*, *jīm*, *nān*, and *yā*. Some letters, especially initial *sād* and sometimes *ḥā* with the beam, tend to be more angular than others and approximate those of the Kūfīc script (recto 17, verso 17). *Alif* and *lām* are frequently hooked and occasionally wavy (recto 1, 8). Extension of letters is mostly at the ends of lines. The *hamzah* is not indicated. Carelessly executed circles, with or without a dot inside, are used for punctuation. A dot, probably to indicate collation (see pp. 87 f.), is sometimes placed near or outside the circle or at the end of a line (recto 4–5).

**TEXT**

**Recto**

[1] او كان يقول في الحصا لرِبِي الجَمَار مِن حَصَا الخَدْف

[2] المسبب عن عَبْد اللّه بن عَمَر عن نافع أن ابن عمر كان يغتسل إذا رَمَّاُ الجِمَار

عَن عَبْد اللّه

[3] لا يرد بذلك ياسا (4) المسبب عن عَبْد اللّه عن عَطْهان أنه قال لا يحل رَمَّاُ الجِمَارَ بِمِن مَا يطَف

[4] البيت حتى صدر إلى قصره وَجَه واَصَاب النَّاس قال يازِيد بن الحمَّام بن عَطْهان قَالَ مَحَل وَعَطَاهَا لا يَهْدَى

[5] المسبب عن بِشْر الْيَتَّاء عَن عَبْد اللّه عَن مَجَاهِد وَعَطَاهَا وَطَاوَس وَسَعِيد بن جَرَبَان قَالَوا

[6] يوم النَّفْر وَقَوْف عَنْد شَيْ مِنِّ النِّجَالَا الَّذِي رَأَى فَامْضَى (6) المسبب عن عَبْد اللّه عَن عَطْهان

[7] فِي رَجْل وَرِمَّاُ جَمَارَ العَظِيمَ فِي الْيَمَان الَّذِي قال نَحْر بَهِ (7) المسبب عن عَبْد اللّه عَن عَطْهان

[8] نافع عن ابن عمر أنه كان يشيأ إذا رَمَّاُ الجِمَارِ ذَا حُنَّاء وَحِدْهَ (8) سَعْنَاذَ بَن خَالِد الْخَرَاسِانِ

[9] عن أبي بن نَبِيَّ عن قَدَاش بن عَبْد اللّه قال رَأَى رُسُول اللّه صَلِّي اللّه عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمُ عَلَى نَاقَة

[10] صَهُاءَ يَرِي جَمَارَ العَظِيمَ لَا ضَرَب لَا طَرَد وَلَا البَلَّة الْبَلَّةِ (9) سَلَّمَ (بِنَ صَالِح) عَن عَمْمَد


[12] عن [الإِبْرَاهِيْمَ]

[13] بنَ إِبْرَاهِيْمَ

[14] بِابِ في الاحْلَالِ

[15] (١٠) حمَّاد بن زَيْد عن يَاسِب عن نافع قال جَاهِر عَمَر النَّاس فَعلَمهم امِرُ منَاسِكَهُم وَلَوْ قَالَ اذَا رَمَّيَت

[16] الجَمَارُ فَقَدْ حَل لَكَ مِنْ كُل شَيْءِ الْإِنسَانِ الْأَطْلَابِ وَإِذَا زَرَّت الْبَيْتُ فَقَدْ حَل لَكَ كُلَّ شُيْر حَرْم

[17] عَلِيَّمَ (١١) جَرَبَان بن عَبْد الحَمَّام بن عَطْهان صَالِح بن صَالِح بن عَطْهان قَالَ كَانَ أَصْحَابًا

[18] لا يَطَأَسُونَ وَلَا بَلَّاءُنَّ بِثَيَابُ الْحَلِ فَحَتَّى يُزَوِّرَا الْبَيْتُ يومَ الْآفَاضِ
Comments.—Of the twenty-one traditions only Nos. 8 and 12, both of which describe Muḥammad’s practices, have close parallels for the *main* (see p. 78). The rest, which report a precept or practice of a Companion or a second-generation Muslim, have no parallels for either the *isnād* or the *main* in the standard collections. Yet the pertinent sections of these collections force one to concede that the papyrus text describes practices and records opinions that can be readily confirmed from the over-all subject content of these collections and also from early legal works.

For detailed descriptions of the ceremonies of the *hajj* or pilgrimage see e.g. Nawawi, *Mīnahāj al-talībīn*, ed. L. W. C. van den Berg, I (Batavia, 1882) 330–35; Maurice Gaudfroy-Demombynes, *Muslim Institutions*, translated from French by John P. MacGregor (London, 1950) pp. 81 ff.; *Worship in Islam*, being a translation, with commentary and introduction,

Tradition 1. The long extension of the last letter of recto 1 probably indicates the first tradition of a new section to judge by verso 13-14. It is probable that the isnād started with Musayyib and traced back to Ibn ʿUmar, as in Traditions 2, 3, and 27, and possibly back to Mūḥammad himself.

The burden of the tradition is that the pebbles used in the ceremonies of the pilgrimage preferably should be of the same size as pebbles used in slings, as established by the precept and example of Mūḥammad (e.g. Ibn Saʿd IV 2, p. 46; Muwaṭṭa' I 407, No. 214; Muslim VII 189 f., IX 27 and 47; Ibn Ḥanbal III 503, V 270 and 379; Baihaqī, Kitāb al-sunan al-kubra' [Haiderābād, 1344-56/1925-37] V 127 f.).

Traditions 2-4. Note the absence throughout of the initial alif of alif in the name Ibn ʿUmar. The ʿayn of recto 4 is clear, but ʾalif would be more appropriate. The khīṭmī, an herb dye, was used by Mūḥammad, Abū Bakr, and many others (Ibn Saʿd II 2, pp. 140-42, and III 1, p. 135; Ibn Ḥanbal IV 393, VI 78 and 261; Baihaqī, op. cit. Vol. V 64).

Of the several traditionists named Musayyib the one that best fits the isnād's of the seven traditions in which this name occurs (Nos. 2-7 and 16) is Musayyib ibn Shartkh (d. 186/802), who was generally considered weak though Ibn Ḥanbal accepted him (Ibn Saʿd VII 2, p. 75; Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh IV 1, p. 408; Jarḥ IV 1, p. 294; Khaṭīb XIII 137-41; Mizān III 171). He is known to have transmitted from ʿAbd al-Malik ibn Abī Sulaimān (d. 145/763) and Sulaimān ibn Mihrān al-Aʿmash (d. 148/765) of Traditions 6 and 16 respectively (see Ibn Saʿd VI 244 and VII 2, p. 75; see also p. 140 above). Musayyib's immediate source for Tradition 5 is not as yet identified, since the given name can be pointed to read in several ways. His source for Traditions 2-4 and 7 is the well known traditionist and descendant of ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, ʿUbaid Allāh ibn ʿUmar ibn Ḥāfṣ, who died in 147/764 (Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh III 1, p. 395; Jarḥ III 2, pp. 326 f.; Dhaḥabī I 94, 151 f.; Nawawī, p. 402). He was a major transmitter from Nāfīʾ (d. 117/735) the client of Ibn ʿUmar, both of whom dedicated their long lives to the collection and transmission of knowledge bearing on the life and sayings of Mūḥammad (Ibn Saʿd IV 1, pp. 105-38; Jarḥ II 2, p. 109; Istīḥāb I 368-70; Khaṭīb I 171-73; Dhaḥabī I 35-37; Nawawī, pp. 357-61; Ibn Khallikān I 309 f.; Isābāh II 840-47; see also Ibn Ḥanbal II 1-158 for Ibn ʿUmar's musnad).

Ibn ʿUmar was considered the best informed about the main subject of this papyrus, namely the practices and ceremonies of the pilgrimage. His independence and his uncompromising attitude aroused the opposition of Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf, who was nevertheless restrained by the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik. The latter ordered Ḥajjāj to follow Ibn ʿUmar's lead in regard to the pilgrimage (Muwaṭṭa' I 333, 399; see also Jāmiʾ I 121; Ṭūrṭūshī, Sīrāj al-mulāk, p. 96). Ibn ʿUmar's views and practices were of great interest to the young Islāmic community (e.g. Bukhārī I 418; Kitāb al-umm VII 196 f.; Ibn Ḥanbal II 152, VI 78). Several of his sons as well as a number of his clients in addition to Nāfīʾ and ʿAbd Allāh ibn Dānār (see Tradition 13) transmitted much of his material to members of the succeeding generation. Two isnād's in particular won recognition and critical acceptance: Zuhrī on the authority of Sulīm ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUmar on the authority of his father (see e.g. Zubairī, pp. 357 and 360 f.; Dhaḥabī I 83) and Mālik on the authority of Nāfīʾ on the authority of Ibn ʿUmar (see e.g. Nawawī, p. 590; Dhaḥabī I 94; see also p. 124, n. 31, above).

For ʿAṭṣaʾ of Tradition 4 see following comment.

Tradition 6. The ʾayn of recto 7 may be an error for ʾayn.
The given name of Musayyib's source can be read as ^j or *j or Jtro or *j, none of which lead to positive identification of the Zayyat involved, though a likely possibility is Abū Ya'qūb al-Zayyāt (Khaṭīb XIV 408). The only ʿĪsā associated with any of the four traditionists that follow in the text is ʿĪsā ibn Mahān (Khaṭīb XI 143). He heard ʿAtāʾ ibn Abī Rihāb (d. 114/732), who was famous for traditions concerning the pilgrimage and who is in all probability the ʿAtāʾ of Traditions 4, 6, and 18. For ʿAtāʾ ibn Abī Rihāb, Mujahīd ibn Jabr of Taḥfīr fame (see p. 98), and Tāṣūʿ ibn Kaisān (see p. 161), famous for traditions covering al-ḥalāl wa al-ḥarām, "the lawful and the unlawful," formed a trio that was surpassed only by their contemporary Sād ibn Jubair, said to have excelled in all three fields (e.g. Ibn Saʿd V 344 f.; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh IV 1, pp. 411 f.; see also pp. 97, 98 f., 112 above).

The length of the ṭuqāf seems to have varied (see e.g. Muwatta I 406 f. and Bukhārī I 438 for the practice of ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb and his son ʿAbd Allāh).

Tradition 6. For the isnād see comment on Traditions 2-4. ʿAbd al-Malik ibn Abī Sulāmān (d. 145/763) was known also as Ibn Maisarah, an authoritative traditionist of Kūfah. He specialized in collecting the traditions, through various turq, of the famous trio cited by ʿĪsā in Tradition 5 (see Ibn Saʿd VI 244; Khaṭīb X 393–98; Dhahābī I 146 f.; Ibn Ḥanbal I 286; Tirmīdī XIII 330–32). This activity called for some editing on his part, perhaps for deletion and addition of some phrases or separation of themes (see Khaṭīb X 406).

The relative timing of the slaughter of the sacrificial animal and of the other events of the Day of Sacrifice as reported by Ibn ʿUmar on the basis of the practices of Muḥammad among others seems not to have been rigidly fixed at first (e.g. Muwatta I 395 [= Shaibānī, p. 229]; Bukhārī I 44, 434; Muslim IX 47 f., 51–53).

Tradition 7. For the isnād see comment on Traditions 2-4. There was allowance for either riding or walking during the ceremonies of the throwing of the pebbles. The practice of Ibn ʿUmar is reflected in nearly parallel traditions from Nāfiʿ (cf. Muwatta I 407, No. 215; Ibn Ḥanbal II 114, 138, 156; Muslim IX 44 f.).

Tradition 8. Muʿādh ibn Khālid al-Marważī al-Khūrāsānī (d. 167/783) is nowhere reported as transmitting from Ayman ibn Nābil, whose dates are not known (Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh IV 1, p. 366; Jarḥ IV 1, p. 250). There was, however, a Muʿādh ibn Khālid al-ʿAsqalānī (n.d.) who transmitted from Ayman (Mīzān III 178; Lisān VI 722). There is thus a confusion of names, which may or may not have been deliberate. Ayman specialized in traditions received from the Companion Qudāmah ibn ʿAbd Allāh, whose dates are not known (Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh I 2, p. 28; Jarḥ I 1, p. 319; Mīzān I 131 f.; Isābāh II 452).

Ṭayālīsī (p. 190, No. 1338) reports directly from Ayman the closest parallel for this tradition, the only difference being that the phrase following the tasliyah reads ʿalā Nāṭaʿ āṣaḥa. Ibn Ḥanbal II 413 gives another, also slightly different, version that traces back to Ayman and Qudāmah. Abū Nuʿaim VII 118 and IX 17 cites Ṭayālīsī's version as transmitted from Ayman by Sufyān al-Thawrī and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Mahdī respectively; see Ṭabarī III 2401 for a closely related tradition with a different isnād. The tradition emphasizes Muḥammad's unostentatious mingling with the crowd.

Tradition 9. Note the blank space left in recto 11 for the completion of the name. This isnād, with nothing but given names, provided a test of the general adequacy of the biographical literature for its intended purpose in the field of ḥadīth—namely the identification and appraisal of individual transmitters. Inasmuch as the great majority of the traditionists named in the document were ʿIrāqīs, it seemed safe to assume that the Ibrāhīm of the isnād is most probably Ibrāhīm ibn Yazīd al-Nakhaʿī, who died in the year 95/714 (Ibn Saʿd VI
188–99; Bukhārī, Ta’rīkh I 1, pp. 333 f.; Jarḥ I 1, pp. 144 f.; Maʿārif, p. 236; Abū Nuʿaim IV 219–40; Dhahabi I 69 f.; Nawawī, p. 135; Jamʿ I 18 f.). Beginning with this assumption, I found that the biographies of the numerous traditionists named Ḥammad and Salamah yielded scattered clues that eventually fitted together like the pieces of a puzzle to reveal the identity of the men in the isnād. Ḥammad turned out to be Ḥammad ibn Abī Sulaiman (d. 120/738), who was a law student and a leading transmitter from Nakhaṣ and the teacher of Abū Ḥanīfah (Maʿārif, p. 240; Jamʿ II 153; Dhahabi I 69; Mizān I 279). The blank space in recto 11 should be filled in so that the full name reads Salamah ibn Salih. For this Salamah (d. 180 or 186 or 188/796 or 802 or 804), a judge in Wāṣit, transmitted on the authority of the above-named Ḥammad on the authority of Nakhaṣ, as in the isnād of the papyrus text (Khaṭīb IX 130 f.; Mizān I 406 f.).

The reliability of both Ḥammad and Salamah is questioned by some of the earlier critics. Salamah was ‘‘careless and inaccurate’’ according to Yahyā ibn Maṣʿūd (d. 233/848). But the later and more objective critic Ibn ʿAdi (d. 360/971 or 365/976; see p. 105) is more specific; he points out that Salamah may perhaps err but that the content of his traditions is good and acceptable (ḥadīth) and adds as further proof of Salamah’s reliability that his traditions were collected into a large volume (نسخة كبرى) by Muḥammad ibn al-ṣabbāḥ, who must be the ʿIrāqī authority of that name known as Dūlābī (d. 227/841; see Khaṭīb V 365–67; Mizān III 74). Ibn ʿAdi’s carefully stated judgment is borne out as much by the incomplete isnād of the papyrus as by the good and acceptable matn of the tradition quoted from Ibrāhīm, who is stated to have transmitted traditions according to their basic meaning (بِ الْمَعْنَى) as against their exact wording (Ibn Saʿd VI 190). For the essence of the papyrus text is that, of the two ceremonies specified, only the circumambulation of the baʿt or kaʿbah must be performed when one is in a state of ritual purity, though one may be in such a state during the other ceremony or ceremonies. As such, the tradition has specific as well as implied parallels in Muwatta’ I 271 f., Bukhārī I 413 ff., and Muslim IX 78 ff.

**Tradition 10.** The links of the isnād can be readily traced through Ḥammad ibn Zaid ibn Dirham (d. 179/795) of Baṣrah, who was a pupil of and transmitter from Ayyūb al-Sikhtiyānī (d. 131/748), a leading Baṣran scholar whose piety led him to make numerous pilgrimages (Ibn Saʿd V 392 and VII 2, pp. 14–17 and 135; Maʿārif, p. 238; Bukhārī, Ta’rīkh I 1, pp. 409 f.; Jarḥ I 1, pp. 255 f.; Abū Nuʿaim III 3–14; Dhahabi I 122–24; Nawawī, pp. 170 f.; Jamʿ I 34). Ayyūb inherited some of the manuscripts of his teacher Abū Qilābah (see p. 230), and he related traditions from Nāfīʿ. Ḥammad as a rule transmitted from memory but is known to have had access to the books of Ayyūb and to have had in his possession a copy of the “book” of Yaḥyā ibn Saʿd al-Anṣārī (see pp. 193 f.; see also Ibn Saʿd VII 1, p. 91, and VII 2, p. 4; Dhahabi I 214; Nawawī, pp. 217 f.; Jamʿ I 102).

The theme of what is permitted or forbidden at different stages of the pilgrimage looms large in the standard collections. Yet I have found no parallel for this entire tradition, though all of its parts appear either as separate traditions or as parts of related traditions. Confirmation of the statement that ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb instructed the people in the ceremonies of the pilgrimage and in other religious affairs comes from numerous sources (Abū Ḥanīfah, Musnad al-imām al-aʾṣam [Lakhnau, 1309/1892] p. 111; Muwaṭṭa’ I 410; ʿUmar’s musnad in Ibn Ḥanbal I 14–55 and IV 222; Abū Dāūd II 158 f.; Risālah, pp. 38 f.; Ibn al-Jauzi, Taʾrīkh ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, pp. 60–64 and 246 f.; Baiḥaqī, Kitāb al-sunan al-kubrā V 135 f.). The rest of the content of the tradition involves a controversy as to whether women alone or
women and perfume were forbidden to men until after the day's visit to the ka'bah. Ibn 'Umar held that both items were forbidden, while 'A'ishah and Ibn 'Abbās held that only women were forbidden (see e.g. Muwatta' I 328; Ibn Ḥanbal I 234, II 246, IV 143; Nasā'ī II 52; Abū Dā‘ūd II 202; Tirmidhi IV 148–50, esp. Ibn al-ʿArabī al-Maṣṭūrī's commentary; Tafsīr IV 225 f.; see also Jāmiʿ II 195–97).

Tradition 11. Jarīr ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd al-Ṭairī al-Dabbī al-Rāzī (110–88/728–804) spent a great deal of time in Kūfah and Baghdād (Ibn Saʿd VII 2, p. 110; Jarīḥ I 1, pp. 505–7; Bukhārī, Tārīkh I 2, p. 214; Khaṭṭīb VII 253–61; Dḥahabī I 250; Mizān I 182–84; Jāmiʿ IV 74 f.). He owned to a weak memory, wrote down his collection of ḥadīth, and would not transmit from it except by reading directly from his books, which were copied by others, including Tayālisī (Khaṭṭīb VII 256 f.). He transmitted from the Kūfī manṣūr ibn al-Muṭamīr (d. 132/749), who always recited from memory and who transmitted from Nakhaṭī (Ibn Saʿd VI 235; Jarīḥ IV 1, pp. 177–79; ʿṬabarī III 2504 f.; Dḥahabī I 134 f.; Nawawī, pp. 578 f.; Jāmiʿ II 495).

This tradition has no parallel for both its ʿisnād and maṭn, as is to be expected. It should be noted, however, that Nakhaṭī, who relied solely on his memory, transmitted with emphasis on the basic meaning rather than on the literal text (Ibn Saʿd VI 190; Bukhārī, Tārīkh I 1, p. 334). He and his followers in ʿIrāq and farther east adhered to the stricter rule of Ibn ʿUmar in refraining from both women and perfume (see Tradition 10).

Tradition 12. The most likely reading for the first name in verso 1 is ʿUqba or ʿUqba, but the sources yielded neither Maʿūn nor Maʿūn as a son of ʿUqba. Ayyūb ibn Mūsā (n.d.) was of the family of ʿAmr ibn al-Ṭāʾī. He transmitted from Nāfīʿ and had a written ḥadīth collection that he read to Zuhrī and later transmitted to ʿUbayd Allāh ibn ʿUmar ibn Ḥafṣ (Bukhārī, Tārīkh I 1, p. 422; Jarīḥ I 1, pp. 257 f.; Jāmiʿ I 34; see also Ibn Ḥanbal II 11 f. and p. 148 above). Ayyūb transmitted from Sufflyah bint Abī ʿUbayd (d. 45/665), wife of Ibn ʿUmar, who in turn transmitted from several of Muḥammad's wives, as in the papyrus, particularly from ʿĀishah, Ḥafṣah, and Umm Salamah (Ibn Saʿd VIII 303; Istīʿāb II 742; Isbāb IV 676 f.; Usd V 493; see also Masʿūdī V 189 f.).

Parallels and variants for this tradition are numerous, and all trace back to Nāfīʿ on the authority of Ibn ʿUmar on the authority of the latter's sister Ḥafṣah. Sufflyah likewise transmitted directly from Ḥafṣah (Isbāb IV 520–23). The tradition would seem to be a singleton preserved only by Ibn ʿUmar, members of his family, and his clients. Ibn Isḥāq (Ṣirāḥ I 966) provides the earliest extant version, which is quoted verbatim in Ibn Ḥanbal VI 285 and which is very close to the papyrus text but not identical. It is to be noted that this version, as also the papyrus text, does not specify which of Muḥammad's wives put the question to him. Parallels with more or less minor variants are found in Muwatta' I 394, Bukhārī I 397, Muslim VIII 211 f., Ibn Ḥanbal VI 283 f., Baihaqī, Kitāb al-sunān al-kubrā V 134, and Tafsīr IV 91, 104, 113. In most of these Ḥafṣah puts the question to Muḥammad, and fulānah, "so-and-so," is substituted in one variant.

Related traditions transmitted by Ibn ʿUmar and Nāfīʿ are also numerous (see e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal II 124, 139 f. and VI 36, 39; Muwatta' I 240–42, 394, 410 f. and references there cited to Muslim and Bukhārī; Tafsīr IV 91, IX 467–70, XI 22 and 94; see also Concordance I 304 f. إمرة (الإصرار والتفاوت)

The occasion was Muḥammad's last pilgrimage, with which was combined the "lesser pilgrimage" (ʿumrah). The burden of the tradition is that when the "greater" and the "lesser" pilgrimages are combined the requirements of the first hold in respect to the ritual of desanctification. This point is not to be confused with the controversy centering around the desirability
of combining the two types of pilgrimages (cf. e.g. TayalisI, pp. 16 and 232 f.; Ibn Hanbal I 52, 57, 60, 236 and IV 427; Muwatta I 335-37 and references there cited). Mas‘ūdi V 188-90 and Ma‘rīfah, pp. 122–24, throw some light on the origin of this controversy.

Tradition 18. Ismā‘īl ibn Ja‘far (d. 180/796) of Medina received traditions from Ibn ‘Umar’s client ‘Abd Allāh ibn Dīnār, who died in 127/745 (Jarḥ II 2, pp. 46 f.; Dhahabī I 118; Jam‘ I 250). He moved to Baghdad, where he became a tutor in high circles. He and his three brothers gained reputations as trustworthy traditionists. Ismā‘īl himself had a collection of 500 traditions, part of which came into the possession of Dhahabī and all or part of which has survived (see Dhahabī I 231 and pp. 137 f. and 143 above; for biographical references see Ibn Sa‘d VI 2, p. 72; Bukhārī, Ta‘rīkh I 1, pp. 349 f.; Jarḥ I 1, pp. 162 f.; Khaṭīb VI 218–21; Jam‘ I 24).

This tradition has no parallels as to both isnād and mant, but its burden is similar to that of Traditions 10 and 11.

Tradition 14. Marwān ibn Shujā‘ (d. 184/800) was a client of the Umayyad caliph Marwān II in ʿArraḥ. He was called “Khaṣṣīḥ” after Khaṣṣīb ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (see p. 153), an older Umayyad client and traditionist from whom he received much of his material. He settled eventually in Baghdad and became a tutor at the court of the ʿAbbāṣid caliphs Mahdī and Hādī and devoted some of his time to collecting ḥadīth. His materials were transmitted in writing (Jarḥ IV 1, pp. 273 f.). The sources do not link him with anyone named Ḥumaid, as he is linked in the papyrus text (Ibn Sa‘d VII 2, pp. 72 and 183; Bukhārī, Ta‘rīkh IV 1, p. 372; Khaṭīb XII 147–49; Dhahabī I 272).

The Ḥumaid of the papyrus text is in all probability the ʿBaṣrān Ḥumaid al-Ṭawīl (60–142/680–759; see Ibn Sa‘d VII 2, p. 17; Bukhārī, Ta‘rīkh I 2, pp. 345 f.; Jarḥ I 2, p. 219; Ma‘ārif, p. 243; Khaṭīb I 143; Jam‘ I 89; Abū Nu‘aim III 324–47). Ḥumaid al-Ṭawīl wrote down traditions, copied the manuscripts of Ḥasan al-ʿBaṣrī (Ibn Sa‘d VIII 1, p. 126, and VII 2, p. 20; Mīzān I 286), and is known to have transmitted from ʿIkrimah (d. 105 or 107/722 or 725), client and literary heir of Ibn ʿAbbās (Ibn Sa‘d V 212–16; Bukhārī IV 49; Ma‘ārif, pp. 231 f.; ʿTabarī III 2483 f.; Jarḥ II 2, pp. 7–9; Abū Nu‘aim III 326–47; Jam‘ I 82, 160; Dhahabī I 89; Jam‘ I 394; Irshād V 62–65; Nawawī, pp. 431 f.).

For Ibn ʿAbbās as a traditionist-jurist see for example Bukhārī, Ta‘rīkh III 1, pp. 3–5, and for his wider literary activities see our Vol. I 14 f.

The appended reference in the papyrus text to Ibrahim (see p. 149) and his view has not been here counted as a separate tradition. For general remarks largely applicable to Traditions 14 and 15 see comments on Traditions 10, 11, and 13.

Tradition 15. Muṣāb ibn ʿAbd Allāh[? ] is unidentified. It is difficult to tell which of several traditionists named ʿUmar ibn Qais is meant here (see e.g. Bukhārī, Ta‘rīkh III 2, p. 186; Jarḥ III 1, pp. 129 f.; Mīzān I 268). The earliest link in the isnād is illegible.

Tradition 16. For Musayyib ibn Sharīk as transmitter from Sulaimān ibn Mihrān al-A‘mash see page 148. A‘mash (60–148/680–765) was a leading Qur‘ān-reader and traditionist of Kūfah whose trustworthiness was generally conceded and who is known to have transmitted from Nakḥaf (Ibn Sa‘d VI 238–40; ʿTabarī III 2509; Bukhārī, Ta‘rīkh II 2, pp. 38 f.; Jarḥ II 1, p. 146; ʿAkbār al-ḡuḍāt III 186, 246; Abū Nu‘aim V 46–60, VIII 114–23; Khaṭīb IX 3–13, 126; Nawawī, p. 118; Jam‘ I 130 f., 185; Dhahabī I 145 f.; Ya‘farī I 305 f.; Jam‘ I 179 f.; see also pp. 151 above and 160 below).

Tradition 17. Note that this tradition and Tradition 20, unlike the rest, start with لآن. The last word in verso 10 can begin only with ُا or َاين or one of their sister forms, so that
seems the most likely reading. Another group of words met with in the sources is not here paleographically permissible. The next to the last word in verso 12 is not certain.

The Muhammad ibn al-Hasan of Traditions 17 and 20 is the well known jurist and judge Shaibani (131-89/748-805), whose version of Malik's Muwatta is repeatedly cited in the present study. He traveled to most of the provinces to study with their leaders (Tabari III 2521). He had the distinction of being the pupil of the ‘Iraqi jurist Abū Ḥanifah (80-150/699-767), pupil and fellow scholar of Baghdād’s chief justice Abū Yūsuf (d. 182/798), and teacher and fellow scholar of the even more famous Shāfi (150-204/767-820). For the literary activities and extant works of these scholars see GAL I 169 f., 179 and GAL S I 284, 288, 303.

This comparatively long tradition has no parallel that is complete as to itsnād and matn in either the standard collections or the available fiqh books of the above-named jurists. Nevertheless the basic meaning of its content presents nothing new. Perfume, gaming, and cupping were permissible to pilgrims once they had performed the rites of sacrifice and of clipping or shaving the hair (see Concordance I 429 i*t* and III 471 JI^j). For general discussions of these practices and the views of early jurists and traditionists regarding them see e.g. Muwatta* I 350 (= Shaibani, p. 202), 355 f., 385 f., 410, Muslim VIII 122 f., Abū Ḥanifah, Musnad al-imām al-‘āqam, pp. 114–17, Shaibani, Al-jami‘ al-saghir (on margins of Abū Yūsuf, Kitāb al-kharaj [Bulāq, 1302/1884]) pp. 25–31, Kitāb al-umm VII 197, 199 f., and Shāfi, Kitāb ikhtilāf al-hadith (on margins of Kitāb al-umm VII) pp. 287–92. References regarding the regulations of contacts between the sexes during the pilgrimage are given in the comment on Tradition 10. Traditions 11 and 13–16 also involve this theme. Tradition 17 provides further details which are found in part and in whole in, for example, Muwatta* I 384 f. (cf. Shaibani, p. 233), Bukhārī I 409, 448, and “Corpus iuris” di Zaid ibn ‘Ali, pp. 125 and 133 f.

Tradition 18. Mūsā ibn A‘yan (d. 177/793) was a client of the Umayyads from Ḥarrān (Ibn Sa‘d VII 2, p. 181; Bukhārī, Ta‘rīkh IV 1, pp. 280 f.; Futūḥ al-buldān, pp. 155 f.; Jam‘ I 484). He transmitted mostly from his fellow client and townsman Khaṣib ibn ‘Abd al-Rahmān (d. 137/754) of Tradition 14 (Ibn Sa‘d VII 2, p. 180; Jarḥ IV 1, pp. 136 f.). For Ayyūb al-Sikhtiyānī see Tradition 10. ‘Atā‘ is in all probability ‘Atā‘ ibn AbīRibāḥ of Tradition 5, who appears frequently in the sources in isnād’s of traditions related in content to Traditions 18–21.

The kiswa or covering for the ka‘bah was demanded in pre-Islamic times, it is believed, at least as far back as the early Himyarites and certainly under the Quraish. Various Yemenite fabrics were used (H. F. Wüstefeld [ed.], Chroniken der Stadt Mekka I [Leipzig, 1858] 174 f.; Ansāb I 133; Ma‘ārif, p. 277; Jarḥ, Taqdimah, p. 332). Muhammad continued the use of such fabrics, while some of the Successors used also rich brocades from the newly conquered provinces of Egypt and ‘Irāq (Wüstefeld, op. cit. pp. 175 f.; Futūḥ al-buldān, p. 47; Ya‘qūbī II 283). See Ars Islamica IX (1942) 64 and XIII–XIV (1948) 86 for the Egyptian coverings provided by the caliphs ‘Umar I and ‘Uthmān. The wealthier Companions threw expensive robes over the saddles of their sacrificial animals at the time of the pilgrimage, and some of them, including Ibn ‘Umar, donated these robes for use as coverings for the ka‘bah (e.g. Muwatta* I 379 [= Shaibani, p. 231]; Bukhārī I 428, 430 f.; Muslim IX 64–66). Soon the supply of robes exceeded the demand, and some of the used coverings were therefore burned or buried. But ‘Ā‘ishah expressed the opinion that it would not be sacrilegious to sell the richer coverings and distribute the proceeds to the poor along with the less sumptuous used robes. This practice was followed by ‘Umar I and Mu‘āwiyyah and periodically thereafter by others.
(see e.g. Wüstenfeld, op. cit. pp. 179–81; Ibn Ḥanbal, Kitāb al-wara', p. 21; Baihaqī, Kitāb al-sunan al-kubrā V 159 f.). Political significance was attached by the counter-caliph ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Zubair and by his conqueror, Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf, to the privilege or function of providing the ka'bah covering (Zubairī, p. 239; Mālikī, Kitāb riyāḍ al-nufus, ed. Ḥusain Muḥtisī, I [Cairo, 1951] 42 f.; Sīraḥ I 126). Thereafter the Umayyad caliphs provided the kiswah, but the thrifty ʿUmar II thought the practice was wasteful and considered that the expenditure would be better justified for feeding the poor (Futūḥ al-bulūd, p. 47; Abu Nuʿaim V 306). The coverings at times accumulated to such an extent that it was feared their weight would bring down the ka'bah. The caliph Mahdī had them all removed in the year 160/777 and provided new coverings, as did the ʿAlīd Ḥasan al-Aftas in the year 200/815 (see e.g. Yaqūbī II 477; Tabarī III 483, 988; Wüstenfeld, op. cit. pp. 179–84, esp. pp. 182 f.). To remove or not to remove the coverings and how to dispose of them if they were removed apparently involved differences of opinion among the early Islamic jurists. For a recapitulation of some of these practices and for still later developments see Muhammad ibn Ahmad al-Fāṣi, Shifā al-ghārām I 119–26 and II 376. For the religious significance and other details bearing on the kiswah see Gaufroy-Demombynes, “Le voile de la ka’bah,” Islamic Studies II (1954) 5–21.

Traditions 19–21. Infrared photography brought out the slight traces in the damaged parts of the papyrus that made possible the partial reconstruction of the three isnād’s. The earliest link in the isnād of Tradition 19 is probably either Ibn ʿUmar or Ibn ʿAbbās, for close parallels to these traditions trace back to both of them. Note that Tradition 20, like Tradition 17, starts with وَقَالَ. Adequate traces make the reconstruction of the full names certain. In Tradition 21 the blank space, as in Tradition 9, was left for a name to be filled in later.

The Concordance yielded no parallels under كمّة or كسوة, حجر, ثياب, تراب. The subject, however, is frequently discussed in legal works, which cite close parallels from Ibn ʿUmar and Ibn ʿAbbās and which indicate that Abū Ḥanīfah, unlike Shāfiʿī, permitted the removal of the items concerned from the sacred area (Abū Yūṣuf, Ikhtilāf Abī Ḥanīfah wa Ibn Abī Lailā, ed. Abū al-Wafāʾ al-Afghānī [Cairo, 1357/1938] pp. 139 f.; Kitāb al-umm VII 135; Baiḥaqī, Kitāb al-sunan al-kubrā V 201 f.).

IDENTIFICATION AND SIGNIFICANCE

Musayyib ibn Sharīk and his fellow transmitters were either native to or eventually settled in ʿIrāq. Their death dates, except that of the uncertain Muʿādh of Tradition 8, have the narrow range of 177 to 189 A.H. Their immediate authorities, all but two of whom have been identified, were likewise men of ʿIrāq as were a great many of the earlier and even the first links in the isnād’s. The papyrus obviously presents ʿIrāqī views and comes from the circle if not the hand of an ʿIrāqī traditionist or jurist, most probably a jurist since Musayyib, ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Zubair, and Abū Ḥanīfah (Tradition 20) were primarily professional jurists and judges rather than traditionists. Because Musayyib and ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Zubair were close contemporaries and there is

1 For recognition of this professional distinction in the time of Zuhhrī, see pp. 195 f. Both Abū Ḥanīfah and Shābhānī received qualified or adverse ratings at the hands of professional biographers and hadīth critics. For Shābhānī as a traditionist see e.g. Ibn Saʿd VIII 2, p. 78; Khaṭṭāb II 179–81; Jarḥ III 2, p. 227; GAL I 288. For Abū Ḥanīfah see Khaṭṭāb XIII 331 f., where Abū Ḥanīfah classifies himself as a jurist rather than a traditionist, pp. 402 and 416, where he realizes his own weakness in the field of hadīth, p. 346 for Shābhānī’s testimony to his leadership in the field of fiqh, and pp. 390, 510, 414–16, 419 f. for criticism of him as a weak and minor traditionist; but cf. pp. 340 and 419, where Abū Yūṣuf and Yahyā Ibn Maʿin credit him with insight for tafsīr al-ḥadīth and for the use of only such
no evidence that they exchanged materials, the compiler of the papyrus text must be drawing independently on both men. He is, however, citing Shaibāni and Abū Ḥanīfah only for corroborative and supplementary evidence on legal opinion—a fact that points away from the circle of Shaibāni to that of Musayyib, who is quoted more often than any other source in the papyrus text.

Inasmuch as the papyrus, despite its 'Iraqi isnād's, was found in Egypt, it was necessary to follow clues that pointed to jurists who not only transmitted from Musayyib and his contemporaries but also were associated with both 'Iraq and Egypt. A long and tedious process of elimination left two possibilities. The first and less likely is the famous Egyptian jurist Laith ibn Sa'd, who is known to have traveled, along with his secretary Abū Ṣalih, to 'Iraq in the year 161/778 (see p. 163) and is also known to have transmitted some materials from Musayyib. Nevertheless, other data point away from Laith, for, though he and his secretary sought out 'Iraq's outstanding jurists and traditionists, it is not likely and is nowhere stated that at this time they sought out either the younger Musayyib or his contemporaries that are named in the papyrus. Moreover, Laith does not appear in the isnād's of the comparatively few traditions found in the literary sources as parallel or related to the traditions of the papyrus.

The second and far more likely possibility is the comparatively obscure 'Iraqi traditionist and judge Fadl ibn Ghānim (d. 236/850), who not only transmitted from Musayyib but also served as judge in Egypt for almost a year (198–99/813–14), when many Egyptian scholars wrote down his materials. In Egypt at this time there were three active schools of jurisprudence: that of the followers of Laith ibn Sa'd (d. 175/791), whose secretary Abū Ṣalih survived him and was quite active as a transmitter of traditions and collector of manuscripts (see e.g. pp. 163, 164, 195), the well entrenched school of Mālik's followers, and the school of Shafi‘ī, who had recently settled in Egypt and won a large following. All three schools were at this time active centers for the production of scholarly books. The good quality of our papyrus, its book format with generous margins, and its carefully executed script all point to a scholar's fair and permanent copy. Inasmuch as the comparatively young Fadl would hardly have left his original copy behind him in Egypt, the papyrus very likely represents some Egyptian scholar's copy of Fadl's collection, perhaps that of Abū Ṣalih.

II

The reason for the scarcity of parallel or related materials, particularly for the isnād's, in the standard collections of either ḥadīth or fiqh works of the end of the second century and thereafter centers around the activities and character of Fadl ibn Ghānim. Morally loose, avaricious, and a religious opportunist, he lost position and friends and finally became involved in the religious testings and trials of Ma‘mūn's reign. Contemporary critics and nearly contemporary biographers were aware of these facts and were almost unanimous in dismissing Fadl as “weak, of no account, and one whose materials are to be ignored.” And ignored they were, if we judge by the complete lack of identical parallels—that is, for isnād plus maṭn—of individual traditions in the papyrus text and by the scarcity of other traditions transmitted

tritions as he had memorized. See also e.g. Jāmī‘ II 145-48; Kifāyah, p. 231; Ahmad Amīn, Fajr al-Īslām (Cairo, 1347/1928) pp. 256 and 293; GAL S I 284. Yusuf al-‘Aababah, Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, pp. 238–44, clarifies some of Khaṭīb’s views on Abū Ḥanīfah as a traditionist.

Khaṭīb XIII 138.

1 Khaṭīb XII 357–59.

4 See e.g. Kindī, pp. 240 f.; Ṭabarī III 1121, 1127 f.; Ibn Taḥrīrīdī I 639.

5 ضمی، (see e.g. Jārīh III 2, p. 66; Khaṭīb XII 357–60; Mizān II 332; Lisan IV 445–47.)
from Fadl. Furthermore, Musayyib ibn Sharlk, who is quoted seven times in the papyrus text, was considered weak and generally unacceptable as a traditionist (see p. 148). Assuming that we are correct in identifying Fadl as the compiler of the papyrus text, we could follow the critics of long ago and ignore him and his collection. But the critics' rejection of Fadl coupled with the absence of identical parallels for any of the traditions of our document is particularly significant for the evaluation of early methods and standards of transmission in the related fields of hadith and fiqh. For the papyrus can on its own evidence be considered representative of either a hadith or a fiqh work, since during the second half of the second century the production of muṣannafat or sizable collections of traditions grouped according to subject matter (hadith mubawwab) was generally widespread in both fields without, however, displacing the early musnad or collection of traditions that were unorganized but derived as a unit from a particular ultimate authority, usually a first- or second-generation Muslim. Considered as a collection of traditions organized by subject headings but with several weak links in its isnād's, the papyrus text would be rejected by major hadith collectors. For its subject matter could readily be found in the collections of trustworthy professional transmitters (see p. 147) as against those of practicing lawyers or judges who as a class were not considered on a par with the professional traditionists or theoretical jurists on whom they depended for authentic traditions and authoritative legal opinion. The average lawyer or judge with utilitarian objectives was neither able nor expected to concern himself with the "science of hadith" as such, a science that had become so complex and exacting (see pp. 65, 68 f., and esp. 73-77) that its demands were too great even for such major jurists as Abū Ḥanīfah and Shaibānī and to a lesser extent Shāfiʿī (see p. 154, n. 1). Under such circumstances, though an aspiring law student or a practicing lawyer or judge may indeed have been interested in acquiring the collection of a fellow student or professional, even of a suspect one, for personal reference, he would hardly have exerted himself to transmit it to others. The survival of a folio from an Egyptian’s copy of such a work is, I strongly suspect, due to Abū Ṣāliḥ the secretary of Laith ibn Saʿd, who appears so frequently in these studies (see p. 91) in his multiple role of secretary-copyist and scholar-transmitter of tafsīr, hadith, and fiqh materials and collector of manuscripts.

III

In the course of identifying the forty or more transmitters involved in the isnād's of the papyrus text I was impressed by the rapidly mounting literary evidence of the availability of and the increasing reliance on written sources for fiqh and hadith materials in these early times. The leading productive scholars in both fields from the time of Mālik onward were associated with the production of sizable and permanent manuscripts, as fully recorded and appraised by the early Islāmic literary critics. Western scholars, however, have been of divided opinion as to the objectivity and hence the reliability of the evidence. The skeptics tend to discount the numerous statements about the masters’ prodigious literary activity as subjective exuberance and partisan exaggeration on the part of their pupils and followers. Study of the present document provides its share of convincing evidence that real credit for accelerated literary activity belongs indeed to such masters as Abū Ḥanīfah, Laith ibn Saʿd, Mālik, Shāfiʿī, and Ibn Ḥanbal, along with due recognition of the editorial and supplementary textual additions of their pupils and followers. Moreover, it was not only these leaders and their circles who were engaged in manuscript production, but their less well known and even obscure contemporaries had come to consider the production and possession of manuscripts as essential
to all levels of scholarly activity. Among the latter are the last-link transmitters mentioned in this document who are stated to have committed their materials to writing: Musayyib ibn Sharif, Salamah ibn Ṣāliḥ, Ḥammād ibn Zaid, Jarir ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd, Ismāʿīl ibn Jaʿfar, and Marwān ibn Shujāʾ of Traditions 2, 9, 10, 11, 13, and 14 respectively. Furthermore, all the isnād links back to the initial source of many of the traditions were men who are stated to have produced or used written collections, some of considerable size. These men include—among the contemporaries of Abū Ḥanīfa—Ḥumayd al-Ṭawil and Aʾmash of Traditions 14 and 16 respectively. A sizable collection of Aʾmash’s traditions was in circulation even in Zuhrī’s time. Moving closer to Zuhrī’s own generation we find Ayyūb al-Sikhtiyānī of Tradition 10 and Zuhrī’s written materials from Nāfiʿ the client of and Sālim the son of Ibn ʿUmar. There are also Zuhrī’s still older contemporaries Mujāhid ibn Jabr and Saʿīd ibn Jubair of Tradition 5, whose written tafsīr materials figured so largely in Muqatil ibn Sulaimān’s works (see Document 1), and Nakhaʾī of Traditions 9 and 11. Nakhaʾī, though he gave priority to oral transmission from memory and frowned at first on the writing-down of traditions because he realized that one invariably relies on one’s manuscripts, did nevertheless permit the use of manuscripts for those who could not rely on their memories and commended those “on whose clothes and lips were ink stains.” That his materials were available in manuscripts, perhaps in copies written down by his students, and that they were quoted directly from these manuscripts is indicated by the use of the terms “dhakara Ḫibrām” (Tradition 14) and “dhakaraḥu (Ḥammād) on the authority of Ḫibrām” (Tradition 9). We come finally to the two Companions who are the primary sources for most of the traditions in the papyrus text, namely Ibn ʿAbbas, whose personal manuscripts and copies made by ʿIkrimah and others of his pupils have been discussed elsewhere, and Ibn ʿUmar, who agreed with his father’s verdict against the writing-down of ḥadīth. Though it is said that Ibn ʿUmar stood by his convictions to the end, there is some evidence that at least some of his immediate transmitters took to writing down their materials at his request10 and later dictated them to others, as illustrated in the case of Nāfiʿ, whose materials Zuhrī wrote down. There can be little doubt that Zuhrī’s younger contemporaries who also transmitted from Nāfiʿ and are known to have written down their materials and composed some of the earliest works of ʾIslām were responsible for the preservation of whatever has survived of Ibn ʿUmar’s traditions and opinions. The list of such transmitters from Nāfiʿ includes, besides those already mentioned in connection with Document 4, such men as Ṣāliḥ ibn Kāsān, who was Zuhrī’s companion in writing down ḥadīth, Bukair ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-ʾAshajj (see p. 209), Yaḥyā ibn Saʿīd al-ʾAnsārī (see Document 7), and Mūsā ibn ʿUqbah.

In view of the amount of evidence that attests to the writing-down of ḥadīth and fiqh materials from the time of the Companions onward by students and scholars in general and by so many of the transmitters associated with our document in particular, it is entirely possible that manuscripts played a more important role than did oral transmission in the step-by-step evolution and the preservation of the collection represented by this papyrus.

---

6 See e.g. Ibn Saʿd VI 239; Khaṭīb IX 11.
7 Ibn Saʿd VI 189; ʿAbd al-ʿAqwān, Al-tarbiyah fl al-ʾIslām, pp. 39, 316, 354.
8 See Vol. I 13, 16, 22, 53, for the use of dhakara to indicate the independent use of written sources.
10 Darimī I 127 f.
DOCUMENT 5

Oriental Institute No. 17626. Last quarter of second/late eighth or early ninth century.

Medium quality papyrus, 16.3 × 11.5 cm., with 19 or 20 lines to the page as is (Pl. 10). There are practically no side margins. The fragment is either a loose sheet or part of a small roll; the verso is upside down in relation to the recto.

Script.—Poor semicursive naskhī script from a hand that was neither fully developed nor stable in its penmanship. Diacritical points are used for bāʾ and its sister letters and for nūn and yāʾ; ẓīm and kāʾ are sometimes dotted, and one hāʾ (first word of recto 3) has a small hāʾ below it; shīn is dotted occasionally, and ẓāʾ has a small shīn below it; fāʾ has a dot below it and qāf a dot above it. A fathāh and two dots for nunation seem indicated in ردا of recto 2. A dammaḥ is used in of recto 6. Circles, with or without dots, are used for punctuation and possibly collation. The pear-shaped device of recto 5 is due to an attempt to cover an error; the scribe, having started to write the ٣ of رائد, went over the two letters and made this punctuation mark.

TEXT

Recto

(1) وحدثنا النضر بن عربي قال رأيت على عمر بن
عبد العزيز قبض نبي ورد من بعرفان وسروايل بن عنه
حمرة قال أبو صالح يا أبا روح كيف سراله فقال كان
يزل من درجة مسم بيت العال فضرب الريح لثية فرائت

(2) والنصر بن عربي قال كان عمر بن عبد العزيز إذا رفع
سرائله ٠

(3) سفيان بن عبيد الله ويعيسى بن يونس عن الأشعري عن عمرو بن عمر

(4) حماد بن مسلم من ثابت البناني [عَذَّبَ إِلَى حميد عن انس بن مالك قال صليت

(5) خلف رجاء أو جزي في صلاة من رسول الله في قيام وكانت صلاة

(6) رسول الله متقاربة وصلاة أبي بكر متقاربة فلما كان زمان

(7) عمر بن الخطاب حد في الركعتين من صلاة الصبح وكان رسول

الله إذا قال سمع الله لمن حمده قام حتا تقول قد فهم ثم يسجد

وإذا رفع رأسه من السجود قعد حتا تقول قد فهم ثم يسجد

(8) [النصر بن عربي قال رأيت على طاسين ترضي بمشققين قال وكان

[بِجَلِي] فِيهِ الْحَرْمِ] (٦) والنصر بن عربي قال رأيت في/on oi.uchicago.edu
Comments.—Tradition 1. Note the transposition of the letters mīm and yā in (الدي) and of alif and yā in (الدي). The first word of recto 4 (الدي) was a scribal error and hence erased.

The sources confirm transmission by Abū Rauḥ al-Nāḍr ibn ʿArabi (d. 168/784 at an advanced age) from ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, who is the subject of Traditions 1, 2, and 9, from Mujāhid ibn Jabr of Traditions 9, 10, and 12, and from Māmūn ibn Mīhrān of Tradition 6, all of whom were at one time or another associated with ʿUmar. Critics disagreed on Naḍr’s trustworthiness as a transmitter, though he was acceptable to most of them, including Ibn Ḥanbal and Yaḥyā ibn Maʿīn (Ibn Saʿd VII 2, p. 181; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh IV 2, p. 89; Jarḥ IV 1, p. 475; Tafsīr II 230; Abū Nuʿaim V 289, 339 f.; Miṣāḥ III 235).

For Abū Ṣāliḥ, who appears also in Traditions 11 and 12, see pages 163 f.

Ibn Saʿd devotes considerable space to the personal appearance and dress habits of Islam’s
early leaders. His account of the clothing of 'Umar II is lost, but see Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam, 

No parallel for this tradition has yet been found.

Traditions 2–3. The stipulation that one must hold oneself completely erect between the 
various bowings of the prayer service is recognized by all. Though no parallel is available for 
Tradition 2, which concerns only 'Umar's practice, numerous parallels are available for 
Tradition 3, which traces back to Muḥammad. The second word of recto 7 could be read as 
"Utbah"; but, since the sources yield no Sufyān ibn ‘Utbah, the word must be a scribal error 
for "Uyainah."

Sufyān ibn ‘Uyainah (107–98/725–814; see pp. 179 f.) fled from Kūfah to Mecca in the 
year 122/740 but returned to Kūfah in 126. He made numerous pilgrimages to the holy cities 
and studied with the leading traditionists, including Zuhārī, so that he and Mālik, both of 
whom wrote down their materials, became known as the preservers of the hadith of the Hijāz 
(Jarḥ, Taqdimah, pp. 234 f.; Khaṭīb IX 179, 183). Both Sufyān and his fellow transmitter of 
this text, Ḥisā ibn Yūnus (d. 187/803; see Ibn Sa'd VII 2, p. 185, which gives his death date 
as 191/807; Jarḥ III 1, pp. 291 f.; Jam' I 392; Khaṭīb XI 152–56; Dhamābī I 257–59), were 
students of the Kufan Aḥmad (see p. 152). For Ḥamār ibn Aflamm see Bukhārī, Taḥrif III 2, p. 499, Jarḥ III 1, pp. 266, and Jam' I 396.

The biographical literature does not specifically substantiate direct progressive transmission 
for the three earliest links in the isnād, though place and time provided an opportunity 
for such transmission because all three men were Kufans of the first century. Individually 
they are listed among the trustworthy. They could have passed unnamed among the “and 
others” usually found at the end of a list of transmitters. ‘Umar ibn ‘Umar died sometime 
during Hishām’s reign (Ibn Sa'd VI 201), while Abū Maʿāmar died during the governorship 
of Ziyād ibn Abī Sīr (Ibn Sa'd VI 70). Abū Masʿūd ‘Uqbah ibn ‘Amr al-Badrī was a well known 
Companion and traditionist whose musnad is to be found in Ṭayālīṣī, pp. 85 f., and Ibn 
Ḥanbal IV 118–22. His death date is variously reported as about 40/660 to after 60/680 
(Ibn Sa'd VI 9; Jarḥ III 1, p. 313; Ṣīrāḥ II 658; Ḥṣabah II 1167 f.; Jam' I 380).

The tradition is widely known and is often repeated with very slight change in the word 
order of the content. Ibn Ḥanbal IV 122 carries the isnād forward to Ḥisā ibn Yūnus, and 
Nasārī I 167 carries it back to Muḥammad. In most of the other parallels the isnād branches 
out from Aḥmad (e.g. Ṭayālīṣī, p. 85, No. 613; Abū Dāūd I 226; Dārimī I 304; Ibn Mājah I 
147; Nasārī I 158; Tirmidhī II 65 f.). The sense of the content is frequently reported with 
different isnād's and sometimes in longer traditions describing Muḥammad's practices (e.g. 
Ṭayālīṣī, p. 217, No. 1547; Muslim IV 97, 213; Bukhārī I 202 f.; Dārimī I 305; Tirmidhī II 77; 
see also Concordance I 346 and III 333 صلب). 

Tradition 4. Ḥamād ibn Salamah ibn Dinār (d. 167/784 at age of ca. eighty), leading 
Basrān scholar and traditionist, was considered the most trustworthy transmitter of the hadith of Thābit al-Bunānī (d. between 123/741 and 128/746 in his eighties) and of that of his own maternal uncle Ḥumāid al-Tawāl (60–142/680–759). Ibn Ḥibbān describes his activi- 
ties as follows: “He was among those who traveled and wrote and collected and composed 
(sannaf) and memorized and discoursed” (see p. 43 above). He was inclined to bypass the 
suspect links of an isnād (tadlis), and hence some traditionists avoided his materials, but Ibn 
Ḥibbān (Ṣahih I 114–18, esp. p. 116) came to his defense and pointed out that his tadlis was 
to be trusted as was that of several other famous traditionists. He incumbered himself with 
few worldly possessions, but his Qurʾān and his books, carried in a knapsack, were always seen
with him (Nawawi, *Bustūn al-ṣārīfīn* [Cairo, 1348/1929] p. 32). Among his manuscripts was a copy of the book of the schoolteacher Qais ibn Sa'd of Mecca (d. 117/735 or 119/737; see Ibn Sa'd V 355; *Maʿārif*, p. 271; Bukhārī, *Tārīkh* I 1, p. 154; *Jarḥ* III 2, p. 99; Nawawi, p. 515; Dḥahābī I 190; *Mīzān* II 350). Ḥammād’s materials were sought by many of his own generation and by younger scholars who wrote from his dictation and from whom in turn the next generation of collectors made copies (Ibn Sa'd VII 2, pp. 39 f.; Bukhārī, *Tārīkh* II 1, pp. 21 f.; *Jarḥ* I 2, pp. 140–42; *Maṣūdī* VI 259 f.; Dḥahābī I 189 f.; *Mīzān* I 277–79; *Jamʿ* I 103). Such scholars include Sḥābawīh (*Maʿārif*, p. 252; Aḥb Ḫmraddīn Ḫbn al-Ḥrasīn al-Zubāïdī, *Tābāqāt al-naḥwīyyīn wa al-ḥaḍīthīyyīn*, p. 66). Ḥnmād ibn Ṣaʿīd al-Dārīs (Dḥahābī I 317), Ḥmr Ḫbn al-Dārīs (Dḥahābī I 317, where the “Abī” has dropped out, and II 289), Ḥbb al-Wāḥid Ḫbn Ghiyāth and Ḫbū Ḫbn al-Baṣīr al-Tāḥūkhī (d. 223/838), from whom Ḥmr Ḫbn Ḫmūd and Ḫbb Ḫary wrote down Ḥnmād’s materials (*Jarḥ, Ṭaqūdimah*, pp. 315, 329, 335; Dḥahābī I 357). The number most frequently mentioned for traditions dictated by or copied from Ḥnmād is 10,000, and some of these men add that they wrote down an equal number of traditions from Sufyān al-Thaurī.

Thābīt al-Būnānī (Ibn Sa'd VII 2, pp. 3 f.; *Maʿārif*, p. 241; Ṭabārī III 2500) was a Baṣrī ṣāḥī known for his piety and concern with the Qurʾān. He had a small collection of some 250 traditions, and a deliberate test by Ḥnmād ibn Ṣalāmah proved that he had memorized them well (*Jarḥ* I 1, p. 449; Dḥahābī I 118). Though he transmitted from several leading traditionists, his chief mentor was Anas ibn Ṭalīk, with whom he was associated for some forty years (Bukhārī, *Tārīkh* I 2, pp. 159 f.; Ḫbb Nuʿaym II 327; Ḫbn Ḫibān, p. 67). Some of his traditions from Anas and others are to be found in the *Ṣahihain* of Muslim and Bukhārī and other collections (*Jamʿ* I 65 f.; Ḫbn Ḫnbāl I 295 f., III 121–25 et passim; Ṭayālīsī, pp. 270–74; Ḫbb Nuʿaym II 227–33).

For Ḥmād ibn Ṭawīl see page 152, and for samples of his traditions see for example Ḫbn Ḫnbāl III 98–100, 103–9, and 190 f.

Parallels for this long tradition and its ṣināʿd are found in Muslim IV 189 and Ḫbn Ḫnbāl III 247. In both of these the first part is more nearly identical with the papyrus text (recto 10–13) than is the second part. Ṭayālīsī, p. 271, No. 2030, provides a close parallel to the first part, while in Ḫbn Ḫnbāl III 100, 182, and 205 there are parallels for recto 10–11 that come from Ḥmād. It would seem therefore that the compiler of the papyrus text combined several traditions transmitted by Thābīt and Ḥmād from Anas into a composite tradition—a practice that was followed by Ṭayālīsī for traditions of these and other pupils of Anas (Ṭayālīsī, p. 273, No. 2056). Related traditions from other sources are found for example in *Muwaṭṭa* I 75, *Risālah*, p. 36, Bukhārī I 205 f., Muslim IV 188 f., and Ḫbb Dāʿūd I 300 f.

Tradition 5. Ṭawīs ibn Kaisīn (d. 106/724 at age of over ninety) was a leading Yemenite traditionist whose position was comparable to that of Muḥammad Ḫbn Ṣirīn in Baṣrāh. He insisted on the literal transmission of ḥadīth. He died in Mecca on the last of some forty pilgrimages he is said to have made (Ibn Sa'd V 391–95; Bukhārī, *Tārīkh* II 2, p. 366; *Jarḥ* II 1, pp. 501 f.; Dḥahābī I 83 f.; *Jamʿ* I 235 f.). For samples of his traditions see Ṭayālīsī, p. 340, and Ḫbb Nuʿaym IV 16–23. For Ṭawīs as a Qurʾānic commentator see page 108.

Three parallels for this tradition, from three different sources, are found in Ibn Sa'd V 392, and two of them end with Ṣamṭīn Ṭbīn wa Ṣr, which suggested the reconstruction of the papyrus text.

Tradition 6. Māmūn ibn Miḥrān (40–117/660–735) was one of the leading jurists of the
Jazīrah. He served under ʿUmar II as financial governor and judge of that province but soon retired and devoted his time to scholarship and prayer. He and Ḥasan al-Ḥāṣṭī, Makhul al-Shāmī, and Zuhūrī came to be known as the leading scholars of Hishām's reign. Maimūn's transmission from Ibn ʿAbdūs and his excessive preoccupation with prayer accord with the text of the papyrus, for which, however, no parallel has yet been found (Ibn Saʿd VII 2, pp. 177 f. and 181; Maʿārif, pp. 288 f.; Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh IV 1, pp. 338 f.; Jarḥ I 1, pp. 233 f.; Abū Nuʿāim IV 82-97; Khaṭṭīb XII 188 f.; Dhaḥābī I 93 f.; Jaww 514).

Tradition 7. Since it is impossible to determine how many lines are lost at the bottom of the recto and the top of the verso, more than one tradition may be involved.

Tradition 8. This double tradition gives evidence, because of cancellation of text (verso 2), of copying or dictation from manuscript. The use of dhakara (verso 3) to start the second and corroborative tradition also indicates the use of manuscripts (cf. p. 157). This second tradition could be an editorial addition by either Abū Rauḥ al-Naḍr ibn ʿArabī himself (cf. Tradition 10) or by his transmitter. Abū al-ʿΑṭūf al-Jarrāḥ ibn al-Minhāl (d. 168/784-85) was from the Jazīrah, where he served as judge. He transmitted from several outstanding traditionists, including Zuhūrī, and among those who transmitted from him was Abū ʿSalīḥ ʿAbd al-Ghaffar ibn Dāʾūd al-Ḥarrānī (Jarḥ I 1, p. 522). Abū al-ʿΑṭūf was generally considered a weak traditionist (Ibn Saʿd VII 2, p. 182; Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh I 2, p. 228; Daulābī II 32; Mīzān I 180; Līsān II 99 f.).

ʿAbd al-Kārim Abū Ummayyah (d. 127/745) was originally from Baṣrah but settled as a schoolteacher in Mecca, where he transmitted from Saʿīd ibn Jubair (see pp. 98 f., 149) among others. He was considered weak by some critics, though Malik and Sufyān al-Thawrī were among his transmitters (Ibn Saʿd VII 2, p. 18; Jarḥ III 1, pp. 59 f.; Daulābī I 114; Dhaḥābī I 133; Mīzān II 144 f.; Jaww I 324).

No parallel has yet been found for the statement of ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. For the tradition as a whole there are numerous close parallels that trace back to Muḥammad through isnād's other than that of the papyrus (e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal III 140 f. and 150, IV 130; Abū Dāʾūd IV 332 f.). The burden of the tradition is that one should love one's neighbor as one's self out of love for God, a concept that is found repeatedly in the standard collections (e.g. Muṣāḥāt II 983 f.; Bukhārī I 11; Ibn Ḥanbal III 141, IV 70, and V 241, 239, 247; Dārīmī I 307; Abū Nuʿāim V 120-22, 129 f.; see also Concordance I 407 f.).

Tradition 9. For Muḥāṣib see page 98. The content has no identical parallels, but closely related traditions are available (e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal VI 20; Ibn Mājah II 109).

Tradition 10. The isnād links have been covered in the comments on preceding traditions. No parallel for Muḥāṣib's practice has been found, though Muḥammad and others are reported as doing the same (e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal V 338; Akhbār al-quḍāt I 194; see also Concordance II 56 تخلل الصف). Note Abū Rauḥ al-Naḍr ibn ʿArabī's editorial comment at the end of the tradition.

Tradition 11. The isnād has been covered. The complete tradition, that is, with both the isnād and the matn of the papyrus, does not seem to be in the standard collections. Closely related parallels on the authority of Abū Mūsā al-ʿAshʿarī (d. 42/662) are available (e.g. Muslim XV 52; Ibn Ḥanbal IV 393, 403; Tirmīzhī XI 212). The Qurʾānic passage is from Sūrah 8:33. Concordance IV 250, under عصمة, has references to the Qurʾān only as a saving guide. Ṭabarī (Ṭaʿfīr XIII 509-16) brings together traditions bearing on the theme. Ibn Kathīr (Ṭaʿfīr, ed. Muḥammad Rashīd al-Riḍā, IV [Cairo, 1346/1927] 53), however, cites the papyrus tradition
in full on the authority of the ʿAbd al-Ghaffār ibn Dāʿūd on the authority of Naḍr ibn ʿAdī (sic; error for عربى) with two variants, namely محاربين for امامين of verso 13 and امامين for امانتين of verso 12. He adds a comment that امانتين must be an error for امامين, as the papyrus text itself proves in verso 14. The two amān’s or safeguards are the Prophet and repentance (السي والاستغفار).

Note (verso 16) Abū Ṣāliḥ’s editorial comment mentioning ʿAmr ibn Jannāḥ ibn ʿIbrāhīm ibn Muslim, who has not yet been identified, as a witness to the transmission of the tradition. Note the use of شهادة and ذكراء (instead of the more familiar سمى or ذكرى) in verso 16 and 18 respectively, which suggests transmission from manuscripts.

 Tradition 12. This corroborative isnād for the preceding tradition, provided by Abū Ṣāliḥ, draws attention to Abū Ruḥ al-Nadr ibn ʿArabī’s bypassing (ذل) of Mujāhid, of whom Abū Ṣāliḥ himself approved (see pp. 73, n. 1, 173, 233 for other examples of the bypassing of names).

 IDENTIFICATION AND SIGNIFICANCE

I

The first clue to the identification of the transmitter from Abū Ruḥ al-Nadr ibn ʿArabī is provided by Abū Ṣāliḥ and his editorial comments in Traditions 1, 11, and 12. The best known Egyptian Abū Ṣāliḥ of the time of Naḍr and the following generation is the secretary of Laith ibn Saʿd (d. 175/791), who accompanied Laith on a visit to Baghdad in the year 161/778. Here they sought the leading ʿIrāqī scholars and wrote down a large number of traditions, including copies of sizable written collections such as that of Hushaim al-Wāṣiṭī (104–83/722–99), which is said to have consisted of some 20,000 organized traditions (ḥadīth mubawwab). There was thus a possibility that this rough sheet with its small format and few traditions found its way into Egypt in the company of this Abū Ṣāliḥ, who was in his early twenties at the time of his visit to Baghdad. But inasmuch as the biographical literature nowhere definitely links Laith and his secretary with Abū Ruḥ al-Nadr ibn ʿArabī, it became necessary to look for another contemporary Abū Ṣāliḥ who was associated with both the Jazārī and ʿIrāq since Naḍr and his fellow transmitters ʿIsā ibn Yūnūs, Sufyān al-Thaurī, and Ḥammād ibn Salamah came from these provinces. The man sought had to be associated also with Egypt, where the papyrus itself was found.

Daulābī supplied the next clue in listing Abū Ṣāliḥ ʿAbd al-Ghaffār ibn Dāʿūd al-Ḥarrānī (d. 224/839), that is, a man from the Jazārī. As this Abū Ṣāliḥ’s traces were followed, it finally became certain that he is the Abū Ṣāliḥ of the papyrus text. He was well acquainted with Naḍr, whose traditions he transmitted. He transmitted also from Ḥammād of Tradition 4. Furthermore, he settled in Egypt and transmitted from Laith ibn Saʿd. The final and certain touch was provided by Ibn Kathīr, who has preserved the one parallel that is so far available for Tradition 11 of the papyrus (see p. 162). His isnād reads: "Ibn Abī Ḥattīm said my father related to us (ذكرا أن) that ʿAbd al-Ghaffār ibn Dāʿūd related to them that Naḍr ibn ʿArabī (printed text has عدري, an obvious error for عربى) related to them saying, 'Ibn ʿAbbās said . . . .'” The main that follows repeats almost verbatim that of the
papyrus text. Ibn Abī Ḥatīm and his father, Abū Ḥatīm al-Rāzī, are the authors of the Jarḥ wa al-taḍālīl that is quoted so frequently in these studies. Abū Ḥatīm made a grand tour (riḥlah) of the provinces in the years 213–21/828–36 and wrote down thousands of traditions all along the way. He spent seven months in Egypt “seeking out the leading traditionists by day and spending the nights in copying and collating manuscripts.”6 At this time, then, he must have sought out Abū Ṣāliḥ al-Ḥarrānī, who had settled in Egypt and from whom he wrote down some materials, including the tradition under consideration, which he passed on to his son. The latter, in turn, quoted the tradition in connection with his comment on Sūrah 8:33 in his own Tafsīr,7 which was quoted by Ibn Kathīr and thus came to play a part in the identification of our document. Exactly when Abū Ṣāliḥ al-Ḥarrānī settled in Egypt is nowhere specifically stated. But, inasmuch as he transmitted from the Egyptians Laith ibn Saʿd and Ibn Lahiṣah, he must have settled there before the death of the latter in the year 174/790.

There still remains the problem of the approximate date of the papyrus. The use of the “western” method of dotting the faʾ and the qadr, with a dot below and above respectively, points to the Egyptian rather than the earlier-ʿIrāqī (“eastern”) period of Abū Ṣāliḥ’s activities. The complete absence of the tasliyah points to second- rather than third-century practice. The comparatively poor and uneven script and the several errors point to the hand of a young student rather than to that of a mature scholar. It therefore seems preferable to assign this small papyrus sheet or roll to the last quarter of the second century rather than to the first quarter of the third even though Abū Ṣāliḥ may have continued to have young Egyptian pupils until the end of his life in the year 224/839. That he did so seems very unlikely, however, since his biographical entries are few and brief and so far as I have been able to discover his transmitters (apart from some members of his family) include only three travelers from the east—Iṣḥāq ibn Ibrāhīm of Kūfah, Bukhārī, and Abū Ḥatīm al-Rāzī (for references see nn. 2–3).

In view of the conclusions outlined above, I venture to suggest that inasmuch as Abū Ṣāliḥ al-Ḥarrānī was no stranger to Laith ibn Saʿd and his secretary, also named Abū Ṣāliḥ, it is entirely possible that the preservation of our document is due to the secretary’s known practice of collecting tafsīr and hadith manuscripts, for the direct use of which he was condemned by the critics (see p. 173). He had repeated opportunities to acquire such manuscripts or copies of them from Abū Ṣāliḥ al-Ḥarrānī and from the latter’s son ʿAbd al-Raḥmān.

As for the family isnād, Abū Ṣāliḥ al-Ḥarrānī’s son ʿAbd al-Raḥmān was born in Egypt, where he wrote down traditions from Ibn Wahb and others of his generation, including Abū Ṣāliḥ the secretary, but later moved to Baghdād, where he died in the year 252/866.8 ʿAbd al-Raḥmān’s son Qāsim (d. 272/885) and his daughter Fāṭimah, who was over eighty when she died (312/924), were both of Baghdād but moved to Egypt. Qāsim made a trip back to Baghdād and wrote down traditions while he was there.9 Qāsim’s son ʿAbd al-Raḥmān and his grandson Aḥmad both wrote down traditions from the aged Fāṭimah, who had her father’s manuscripts in her possession and used them.10

---


7 A manuscript copy of this Tafsīr is in the Egyptian National Library in Cairo (see GAL S I 279).

8 Khaṭṭib X 270 f.

9 Khaṭṭib XII 433.

10 Khaṭṭib XIV 441. See ibid. p. 440 for an earlier instance of a woman traditionist who used the manuscripts of her father and grandfather in her transmission.
The significance of the content of this papyrus lies in the fact that only three traditions (Nos. 3, 4, and second part of 8) report with a full isnād the sayings or deeds of Muhammad and that they have identical or nearly identical parallels in the standard hadīth collections, while most of the traditions report the words or deeds of the Companions and Successors and have few or no close parallels. Yet these traditions that do not represent the main stream of hadīth offer nothing new as to the ideas and general practices current in the second century. The greater relative rate of survival of the sayings and deeds of the Prophet and their stability during the second century is thus as obvious as it is logical (see pp. 77 f.).

The terminology of the full isnād's gives evidence of both oral and written transmission. The biographical data on the successive transmitters reveal that most of them, beginning with the Companions, were known to have used written sources and to have written down their own materials. In chronological order these transmitters include Ibn ʿAbbās (Traditions 6, 11, 12), Anas ibn Mālik (Tradition 4), Mujāhid ibn Jabr (Traditions 9, 10, 12), Ḥumaid al-Ṭawil (Tradition 4), Ḥammād ibn Salamah ibn Dhīnār (Tradition 4), and Sufyān ibn ʿUyainah (Tradition 3). Thus we have evidence of correlation between the survival and stability of hadīth al-nabī and the continuous production of permanent written records from the time of Muḥammad onward.
Oriental Institute No. 17627. Late second or early third/early ninth century.

Good medium brown papyrus, 23.3 × 24.8 cm., with 19 or 20 lines to the page (Pls. 11–12). The margins vary from 1.5 to 3 cm. in width, the upper margin being the widest. Allowance of 1.5 cm. for the loss of the right margin yields a square format. The papyrus has been damaged by worms, is peeled and broken in spots, and has lost its upper right corner.

Script.—Schooled cursive book hand liberally dotted. A small ḥāʾ appears under the ḥāʾ of aḥrām in recto 15, and the muḥmilah appears over the sin of rasāl in recto 4. Fāṭḥah, kasrah, and dāmmah each occur once in recto 8, 10, and 16 respectively, and dāmmah occurs in verso 14 also. The reversed yāʾ is rare. The initial alif of ibn in Ibn Shihāb and similar name forms is omitted throughout. Letter extension for ḥāʾ and its sister forms is used occasionally and unevenly. The circle with a dot is used for punctuation and collation, though in recto 6, 8, 14 and verso 7, 14, 19 it has either a line through it or an adjoining arc below it; the significance of these devices is not yet clear unless they indicate double collation (cf. pp. 87 f.).

TEXT

Recto

1. (1) إبْحَيْنَ بْنِ يُكْبِرَ قَالَ ذَلِكَ خَبَرٍ يَصِيرُ لِمَنْ يَنْصُرُ فِيهِمْ الْحَزَابُ بَيْنِ وَكَانَ أَبِنْ شِهَابٍ يَرَدُّهَا
   خَبَرُ مِلَّيْبَتٍ وَخَبَرُ يَصِيرُ  َـَ َ~

2. ابن شهاب
   [قال الSpecifier] إسَنَ بْنَ مَالِكَ اسْتَرْجَعَهُ اللّهُ عَلیهِ الْسَلاَمَ قَالَ مِنْ احْبَاءِهِ لَمْ يَبْسُطَ لَهُ فِي رَضْوَانِهِ وَكَنَّ لَهُ فِي اَلْرَحْمَةِ
   وقال رحمه [3] وحدثني الليث قال حدثني عقيل عن ابن شهاب قال بلغنا أن رسول الله

3. قال إذا اخصرته [أ] الأراضي بعمَّارِكَ فاعظه حقة من الكلا وأما اجحدت الأراض فالمضا عليها بقتها

4. قال الSpecifier
   [اعرُوْغُنَّ بْنِ الزُّرَائِفَ عَلیهِ الْرَحْمَةِ رَبِّ الْعَالَامَانِ قَالَ لَمْ يُصِبْهُ الْسَلاَمُ كَانَ اَحْدَةَ مَدْجَدَهُ وَلَمْ يُصِبْهُ مِنْ هَذَا وَلَمْ يُبْحَثُ عَلَيْهِ]
   [جَمَاعَاتٌ أنَّمَلَ مَسْحُ وَهَمَّهَا عَلَى جَسَدِهِ] [5] قال وحدثني الليث قال حدثني عقيل عن ابن شهاب

5. قال بلغنا أن رسول الله عليه السلام صلا على المسلمين ثلة واستغفر لهم ثلا ثلة يشكو عقيل
   فكتب له [ب] قال وحدثني الليث قال حدثني عقيل عن ابن شهاب قال بلغنا أن رسول الله
   عليه السلام

6. كان يسال عن الرواية فبِيْجِهُ الرِّجْلِ قَالَ أَبَا بَسَالَهُم مَرَارًا قَالُوْهُ اِحْدَثُنِي بِمِنْ هَذَا
   فَأَطْفَاهُمْ قَالَ طَلَّتُ وَخَلَطَهَا وَغَشَّ فَقَالَ تَرَوْهُ وَتَرَوْانِ هَذَا فِي اَظْفَارِكَ [6]
   قال وحدثني

7. [أَلِيْثٌ قَالَ حَدَّثَني عَقِيلٌ عَنِ اِبْنِ شِهَابٍ قَالَ بْلَغَنَا أَنْ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ عَلیهِ الْسَلاَمُ كَانَ اَسْمَحَ الْخَامِسَ وَكَانَ]
[[آسِحَ ما يكون في رمضان (8) قال حدثني الليث قال حدثني عقيل عن ابن شهاب قال اخبرني
ابوكرب بن عبد الرحمن

ابن الحارث بن هشام عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال مالك الإجماع معرض

يا رب أذكروا إنما فضيت أبي امرئي ام سعيد فاضيط أبي امرئي

من سعادة ما هولاق حتى النكبة فيكفيها (9) قال وحديثي الليث قال حدثني عقيل عن ابن شهاب

قال اخبرني ابوكرب بن عبد الرحمن بن هنيدة مولى عمر عن عبد الله بشت مثل هذا الحديث (10) قال

حديثي الليث

قال حدثني عقيل عن ابن شهاب قال: اخبرني عروة بن الزبير أن عائشة كانت تقول قال رسول الله

ما من نبي يموت حتى يرا مقعدة من الجنة ثم يخرج قلما كان عند وفاته صلى الله عليه وسلم قال

نة الروق الأعلى]

فكان اختنا كلامه حتى في الأفق él الأعلى وهو ينتظر إلى السنة ثم يقول لله الروق الأعلى]

قالت عائشة إذا لا يحتارنا وعرفت أنه الحديث الذي كان يحدث به (11) قال (حديثي الليث)

قال حدثني عقيل عن ابن شهاب قال بلغنا أن رسول الله صلى الله وسلم قال لا ربا في الأعداء يلعن]

(12) قال حديثي الليث قال حديثي عقيل عن ابن شهاب قال بلغنا أن رسول الله صلى الله وسلم قال لقنا

لا الله إلا الله فإنها تهدم ما قبلها فقيل كيف هي للاحياء يا رسول الله فقال (الله عليه وسلم هي)

 dla الأحياء اهدم (13) قال وحديثي الليث قال حدثني عقيل عن ابن شهاب قال قد كان رجلا

[ ]

قيلنا مرتاحاً حتى اذا اغبارهم زعزعوه ولتفوه أياها حتى يموت (14) قال (حديثي)

لله قال حدثني عقيل عن ابن شهاب قال بلغنا أن رسول الله صلى الله وسلم قال اخبرنا عن الأبواب الجريرة]

فاخذ عمر بن الخطاب من موسى السواح يأخذ عثمان بن عفان (الله صلى الله وسلم)

(15) قال وحديثي الليث قال حدثني عقيل عن ابن شهاب قال اخبرني عبد الله بن مسعود

حديثي زيد بن خالد]

أن رسول الله صلى الله وسلم دعى إلى رجل من بن سلمة توفي قبل حضره سال عنه فأتي عليه

خيرا في عفانه وجواره من رجل كان صبياً يعني بيي خلا قال يا (بن سلمة) إني ذا أثلى]

من الشع فصلة على صاحبكم (16) قال وحديثي الليث قال حدثني عقيل عن ابن شهاب أنه

قال صمت

لرسول الله نفرة فلبها ثم خرج منزراً بها فقال وهو يضرب على يده ففجع بهمأ]

ابا بكر إذ قال رجل يا رسول الله اكنتها فذبحت قاترزز أئذى الذي كان أئذززه]

وخرج بها فمها بها إلى الرجل الذي كان ساله إياها قال (لا يامجعروا أئذى) عجب رسول الله

بها وتخليل أئذى ثم ساله فقال قاد ما كان قال ونوفع رسول الله الله نفرة قد نسج (له)
Comments.—Tradition 1. The surviving text is an editorial comment by the transmitter of this collection from Laith ibn Sa‘d.

Tradition 2. Laith ibn Sa‘d (d. 175/791), the Egyptian traditionist, judge, and jurist, met Zuhri during a pilgrimage in the year 113/732 and wrote down traditions from him. He transmitted also from a manuscript of Zuhri that was in his possession. Much of his Zuhri material, however, came to him through Zuhri’s leading pupils, including ‘Uqail ibn Khālid (Khaṭīb XIII 6; Abū Nu‘aim III 361; Ibn Khallikān I 554 f.; Dhahabī I 103 f.; Ibn Kathīr IX 342 f.). The isnad Zuhri–‘Uqail–Laith appears frequently in the standard hadith collections. Though ‘Uqail ibn Khālid (d. 142 or 144/759 or 761) transmitted from several traditionists, the bulk of his collection came from Zuhri (Ibn Sa‘d VII 2, p. 206; Bukhārī, Ta‘rīkh IV 1, p. 94; Dhahabī I 152 f.; Jam’ I 406). ‘Uqail died in Egypt, and Laith is reported as having the “book of ‘Uqail” in his possession, but it is not clear whether this was ‘Uqail’s original manuscript or Laith’s copy of it (Khaṭīb IX 480).

For Anas ibn Mālik see page 249.

The tradition has an identical parallel in Bukhārī IV 112, transmitted from Laith by Yahyā ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Bukair (154–231/771–845). A number of parallels are identical or nearly identical in content but have variants for the ‘Uqail link of the isnād. ‘Uqail’s fellow pupil Yūnus ibn Yazīd al-A‘lī is the source for some of these parallels (e.g. Būkhārī II 9; Muslim XVI 114; Abū Dā‘ūd II 132 f.). His only variant is for ‘Umar’s son. There are also parallels that convey the meaning but come from other than the Zuhri–Anas source (e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal III 156 and 266, IV 112, V 279; Būkhārī IV 112).

Traditions related to the Qur’ānic theme of charitable giving to relatives (Sūrahs 2:177, 33:6, 42:23) have been covered in the discussion of Document 2 (pp. 117 f.).

Tradition 3. No identical parallel seems available. Numerous related traditions convey the meaning but have different isnāds, most of them tracing back through Anas and Abū Hurairah to Muhammad (e.g. Muwatta‘ II 979; Ibn Ḥanbal II 337 and 378, III 305 and 382; Muslim XIII 68 f.; Abū Dā‘ūd III 28; Tirmidhī X 294 f.).

Tradition 4. No identical parallel has been found. Related traditions are numerous, for Muḥammad frequently breathed or spat on his hands before using them to bless or heal or even to ward off danger. A number of these traditions trace back to Zuhri–Urwah–‘A‘ishah (e.g. Muwatta‘ II 942 f.; Būkhārī III 401 and IV 61–64, esp. abwāb 32, 39, 41; Ibn Ḥanbal V 68, VI 379; see also Concordance I 273 f. (نقل).

Tradition 5. This seems to be a singleton tradition. However, since even God and the angels prayed over early risers (Ibn Ḥanbal III 12, 44), Muḥammad could have blessed his Companions or prayed for their forgiveness on the occasions when he had early breakfast with them (cf. Concordance II 435). The papyrus text makes it clear that ‘Uqail had doubts about the tradition and expressed them to Laith in writing.

Tradition 6. Note the cancellation of the last word in recto 11. The tradition has no parallel in the standard collections. There is, however, a tradition to the effect that dirty nails disqualify one for knowing the news from heaven: (Ibn Ḥanbal V 417; cf. ‘Alī ibn Rabban al-Ṭabarī, Kitāb al-dīn wa al-daulah, ed. A. Mīngana [Manchester etc., 1341/1923]
p. 27). The preoccupation of Muḥammad and his contemporaries with dreams and their interpretation can be gauged from references to these themes in the Qurʾān (e.g. Sūrah 12:35 ff., 37:103), in Sīraḥ (Vol. I 557, 873), and in the standard ḥadīth collections (see Concordance I 114 and II 199 ff., esp. p. 206, *رواية، رأي*). Muḥammad is known to have urged his followers to relate their dreams to him, though more often than not it was the people who asked him for interpretation of their dreams (e.g. Muwatta’ II 956 f.; Ḥanbal II 369, V 50; Abū Nuṣaim I 303; Concordance IV 117). Perhaps it should be noted here that Muḥammad himself is said, after his death, to have given news from heaven to his followers through dreams (e.g. Ḥanbal, Kitāb al-wara’, pp. 54 f.; see also our Document 9, Tradition 9). Any Islamic treatment of the subject of dreams draws attention to Muḥammad’s tradition that dreams are one of the forty-six signs of prophecy (see Concordance 1343; Abū al-Laith al-Samarqandi, Bustān al-ʿarifin [on margins of his Tanbih al-ghaṭfīn] pp. 33–36). The interpretation of dreams early became and has remained a legitimate theme for Muslim theologians and philosophers. Nathaniel Bland (“On the Muḥammedan science of ṭābīr, or interpretation of dreams,” Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society XVI [1856] 118–71) discussed the development of this literature. The attribution of the so-called earliest Islamic works on the subject to Muḥammad ibn Ṣrīn (d. 110/728) and the Šī‘ite Imam Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad al-Ṣādiq (d. 148/765) is suspect (see GAL I 102; Bland, op. cit. pp. 123 f.; Joseph de Somogyi, “The interpretation of dreams in ad-Damlī’s Ḥayāt al-Ḥayawān,” Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1940, pp. 1–3; M. Hidayet Hosain, “A treatise on the interpretation of dreams,” Islamic Culture VI [1932] 568–85). Though several Arabic works on dreams appeared in the third and fourth centuries, the earliest unquestioned extant work is that written by Abū Saʿīd al-Ḍīnawarī in the year 397/1006 for the Ṭabaṣṣid caliph Qādir (GAL I 244). For dreams and prophecy in the monotheistic Semitic religions see Bland, op. cit. and Sweetman, Islam and Christian Theology II 122–30. For a recent view of the interpretation of dreams among the Arabs as seen in the light of modern psychology see A. Abdel Daīm, L’Oniromancie arabe d’après Ibn Ṣrīn (Damas, 1958).

Zuhri’s source for this tradition was probably his teacher Saʿīd ibn al-Musayyib, who was known as an expert on dreams (Maʿārif, pp. 223 f.). Coverage of all the chapters on dreams in the standard collections brought two points to light. (1) Muḥammad ibn Ṣrīn is, indeed, quite prominent in these chapters and is frequently cited on the authority of Abū Hurairah. (2) Two Egyptian transmitters from Laith-ʿUqail-Zuhri are cited: Saʿīd ibn ʿUfair (146–226/763–840; see e.g. Bukhārī IV 354, 355, 356) and Yahyā ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Bukair of Tradition 2 (see e.g. Bukhārī IV 350, 353, 358, 362). For samples of Muḥammad ibn Ṣrīn’s interpretations see Abū Nuṣaim II 273 and 276–78.

Tradition 7. There is no identical parallel. Traditions that describe Muḥammad in superlatives are, of course, numerous and come from various sources. Those that specify that he was excellent in the month of Ramaḍān use the more inclusive word اجزاء أنجع instead of the اسمع of the papyrus text. A group of these traditions traces back to Zuhri through ʿUqail’s fellow transmitters (e.g. Bukhārī I 6 and 475, II 309 f., III 396; Muslim XV 68 f.).

Traditions 8–9. Abū Bakr ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ḥarīth (d. 94/713) of Tradition 8 was an ascetic and a leading scholar of Medina. He transmitted from several of Muḥammad’s wives. He was, like Zuhri, held in high esteem by the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik (Ibn Saʿd V 153 f.; Zubairī, p. 304; Jarḥ IV 2, p. 336; Abū Nuṣaim II 187 f.; Dhaḥabi I 59 f.; Jamʿ II 591 f.). The Abū Bakr of Tradition 9 seems to have no biographical entries, though his father, ʿAbd
al-Rahman, and his grandfather Hunaidah were well known (see e.g. Jarh II 2, p. 267; Iṣṭaba I 601; Usd V 73; Isabah III 1262 f.).

The tradition has no complete parallel—that is, of both isnād and matn—in the standard collections. But parallels for parts of it, some with very slight differences, are numerous as are also related traditions (e.g. Bukhari I 88, bāb 17, and II 232 f.; Muslim XVI 299 f.; see also Taḥāwī III 278–80).

 Tradition 10. The isnād ʿAṣishah–Urwah–Zuhri appears frequently, and its links are too well known to detain us. The content of the tradition is also well known and traces back through more than one Successor and one Companion to ʿAṣishah. Nearly identical parallels, though some are not complete, are found in Bukhari IV 232 f., which carries the isnād forward to Yahyā ibn ʿAbd Allah ibn Bukair as in Tradition 2, and in Muslim XV 209, which carries it forward to Shuʿāib ibn Layth ibn Saʿd. Slight variants are found in Ibn Saʿd II 2, p. 27, Bukhari III 191, and Ibn Ḥanbal VI 89 and 274; the last two, along with Ṣirah I 1008, are on the authority of Ibn Iṣḥāq on the authority of Zuhri. Variants that bypass Zuhri are found in Muwatṭa 238, Bukhari III 227, Ibn Ḥanbal VI 176, 205, 269, and Ibn Mājah I 254.

 Tradition 11. The reconstruction of the word ʿ-ammin is preferable to ʿ-amīn. The regulation is applicable to the sale of both slaves and animals (see e.g. Muwatṭa II 653, 689; Shābānī, pp. 239–53; Kitāb al-umm VII 204, 241; Bukhari II 41; Tirmidhi V 247; Jamʿ II 75; see also ʿSūrah 3:130, 2:278, 30:39). Muhammad’s real intention as to riḥāʾ, “usury,” seems to have confused administrators and commentators alike (as it still does), and ʿUmar I had reason to wish that Muhammad had been more explicit on the subject (see e.g. Tafsīr VI 7–9, VII 204, 441 f., 455 f., and IX 430–44; Taḥāwī IV 241 f.; Watt, Muhammad at Medina, pp. 206, 266, 296 f., 355, and 370 f.; Roberts, The Social Laws of the Korān, pp. 103–5; Sweetman, Islam and Christian Theology II 20 f., 208; A. I. Qureshi, Islam and the Theory of Interest [Lahore, 1946] esp. chap. ii).

 Tradition 12. Muhammad’s instruction that the formula of the unity of God should be repeated at every death scene is found in all the standard collections, as is also the emphasis on its great efficacy for every other occasion in life. The concept that what is good for the dying is even better for the living, ill or healthy, is also encountered frequently. Still, there is no identical parallel, that is, one of both isnād and matn. Related traditions with the variants ʿamīn instead of the ʿumm of the papyrus are found for example in Ibn Mājah I 227 f. and Abū Nuʿaim I 61. It should be noted that the papyrus text, like that of Muslim VI 219 f., Bukhari I 313, and Tirmidhi X 60, does not couple the formula with the mission of Muhammad as does Taʿālīṣ, p. 265. In other related situations these “two words,” the declaration of faith, are used together (e.g. Shurah I 957; Muhammad ibn ʿAbd al-Salāh, Sharḥ al-kitāb al-siyar al-kabīr li al-Shabānī, ed. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Munajjīd, I [Cairo, 1376/1957] 151 f.; Dhahabi II 37). According to Tafsīr XII 313 the smallest scrap of paper on which the formula of unity is written outweighs 99 volumes containing one’s sins and transgressions.

 Tradition 13. No complete parallels have yet been found. The insistence on disturbing the dying to repeat the formula of unity within their hearing or even to shout it into their ears was adopted because of the belief that the formula was the key to all the gates of heaven (see comments on Tradition 12).

 Tradition 14. Zuhri received close parallels from several sources and transmitted them to a number of his pupils. The papyrus isnād, ZuhriʿUqail–Laith, is found in Amwāl, p. 32, No. 80, where Laith continues the transmission through his secretary Abū Ṣāliḥ and his
pupil Yaḥyā ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Bukair. For other close parallels, see for example Muwaṭṭaʾ I 278 (= Shaibānī, p. 172) and Zurqānī II 73, Ibn Ḥanbal IV 137, 327, and Tirmidhī VII 94–96.

For Muḥammad and the Mūjūs, or Magians, see Sūrah 22:17. Traditions reflecting their status in respect to the jīzah tax are numerous (e.g. Ṭayālīṣ, p. 31; Ibn Saʿd IV 1, p. 82, and VII 2, pp. 26, 64, 120; Ibn Ḥanbal I 190 f., 194; Bukhārī II 291–93; Abū Dāʿūd III 168 f.; Dārīmī II 234; Futūḥ al-buldān, pp. 78 f. and 267; Ṭabarī I 1688). Legal opinions as to whether the Magians should be treated the same as the “people of the Book” for taxation are also numerous (e.g. Abū Yūṣuf, Kitāb al-kharāj, pp. 73–76; Muḥammad ibn ʿAhmad al-Sarakḥī, Sharḥ al-kitāb al-siyar al-kabīr li al-Shaibānī I 145–49; Rīḍālāh, p. 59; Shāfīʿī, Kitāb ʿikhtilāf al-ḥadīth [on margins of Kitāb al-umrn VII] pp. 21, 158–62; Yaḥyā ibn ʿAdam, Kitāb al-kharāj, ed. ʿAhmad Muḥammad Shākī [Cairo, 1347/1929] p. 73; Amwāl, pp. 31–36, 544–56; Tāḥāwī II 415; Kifayah, p. 27). For references to economic and social discrimination against the Magians specifically see e.g. Muwaṭṭaʾ II 541, 864, Jarḥ, Tagdimah, p. 170, Ḥsafārīnī, Musnad I 188, 212 f., and Nubalāʾ I 47. For comment on the religious views of the Magians see Tafsīr II 370 f. (on Sūrah 2:96) and Taqwīl, pp. 96 f. (where the Qādirītes are compared with the Mūjūs).


No parallel for the tradition has been found (see Concordance I 361 صلا). Muḥammad was often called to pray over the dead; he did so if the deceased had been of good character (Muwaṭṭaʾ II 458; Tirmidhī XIII 162 f.). Niggardliness was frowned upon, sometimes to the point of being equated with unbelief (Muwaṭṭaʾ II 999, No. 19; Tirmidhī VIII 141 f.), and Muḥammad is frequently quoted as being pained by it (Concordance I 146 f. بخل and III 71 f. شج). Related traditions involving Muḥammad’s refusal to pray over the body of a debtor are numerous. Several of these have the isnād links Zuhrī–ʿUqāl–Laith, and transmitting from Laith are his son Shuʿāb, his secretary Abū ʿAlī, and his pupil Yaḥyā ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Bukair (Bukhārī III 490; Tirmidhī IV 290 f.). There are also related traditions which have Zuhrī and his transmitters, other than ʿUqāl, in the isnād (e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal II 290; Ibn Mājah II 41; Nasāʾī I 278 f.; Amwāl, p. 220). Related traditions that bypass Zuhrī and trace back to more than one Companion are likewise available (see e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal II 380 and 399 and Concordance III 349; see also Watt, Muḥammad at Medina, p. 250). If someone assumed the dead man’s debt, Muḥammad then performed the prayers (Ṭayālīṣ, p. 233). Muḥammad’s attitude toward those who died in debt changed as his increasing revenue enabled him to assume the debts himself. His early practice is therefore said to be abrogated (see Ṭayālīṣ, p. 307; Abū Dāʿūd III 247; commentaries in Muslim VII 47 f. and Tirmidhī IV 290 f.).

**Tradition 16.** This long tradition combining two separate episodes has no identical parallel. Muḥammad’s inability to refuse a request (e.g. Ibn Saʿd I 2, pp. 92 f.; Muslim II 290) need not detain us. The episode of the striped garment and Muḥammad’s gift of it to the man...
who requested it is reported with slight variations in a number of traditions, all of which trace back to the Companion Sahl ibn Sa'd, whose death date is given as 88/707 or 91/710. He was arrested by Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf in the year 74/693 but was rescued by ‘Abd al-Malik. He is considered the last of the Companions who stayed in Medina. Many scholars transmitted directly from him, including Zuhri (Ṭabarī II 855; Jarḥ II 1, p. 198; Istīʿāb II 571 f.; Usd II 366 f.; Ḥāshibāh II 280). Most versions of this episode state that the garment was a gift from a woman who had herself woven it for Muhammad and add that the man who received it explained that he wanted it for his shroud, for which it was actually used (see Ibn Sa'd I 2, p. 150, Ibn Ḥanbal V 333 f., Bukhārī I 321 f. and II 14 f., Ibn Mājah II 192, and Nasaʿī II 298, all of which bypass Zuhri). It is interesting to note that one of these transmissions (Bukhārī II 14 f.) is that of Yahyā ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Bukair of Traditions 2, 6, 10, and 15.

The last part of the papyrus text, which refers to Muḥammad’s shroud, is not found in the standard collections though they dwell at length on the theme. A slight variant, also tracing back to Sahl ibn Sa’d, is reported by Muttaqī al-Hindī (Kanzal ‘ummal fī sunan al-aqwāl wa al-aqād [Ḥaḍarābād, 1312/1894–95] IV 42, No. 956) on the authority of Ṭabarī (presumably in his Taʾṣīr or his Ḥadīth collection since it is not in his Taʾrīkh). The section corresponding to the last sentence of the papyrus text reads

واَمَرَ بِمَثَلَّهَا لَنَفْرِي رَسُولُ اللّهِ صَلَّم وَسَلَّم

Quite obviously this singleton tradition from Sahl suffered a few additions and subtractions in the course of its multiple transmission. That the papyrus text as transmitted from Zuhri is the earliest extant if not, indeed, the original version is indicated by the presence of this second part of the tradition and of the nonchalant if not fatalistic phrase (verso 18) instead of the obvious attempt, as in all the other versions, to glorify the motive behind the man’s request for Muḥammad’s new and pleasing garment. For another gift of clothing to Muḥammad see Yāqūt I 422 f.

Tradition 17. This tradition, which traces back to at least two Companions, was transmitted by Ṭurwah ibn al-Zubair to Zuhri, who in turn transmitted it to several of his pupils, including Ibn Ishāq (Ibn Ḥanbal IV 323, 326) and Maʿmar ibn Rāshid (Ibn Ḥanbal IV 328, 331; Bukhārī II 181). Maʿmar incorporated it in long historical accounts of the Treaty of Hudaibiyah, at the time of which Umm Salamah’s calm advice averted trouble for Muḥammad (see Abbott, “Women and the state in early Islam,” JNES I [1942] 124).

Quite obviously Zuhri transmitted the tradition to another of his leading pupils, ʿUqail ibn Khālid of the papyrus text, which in all probability represents Zuhri’s original version.

IDENTIFICATION AND SIGNIFICANCE

I

Laith’s personal contacts with both Zuhri and Zuhri’s leading transmitter, ʿUqail ibn Khālid, have been noted in the comments on Traditions 2 and 5 respectively. The problem here is to identify the transmitter of the papyrus text from Laith. Preliminary elimination of Laith’s numerous direct transmitters narrows the choice to three possibilities: his son Shuʿaib (d. 199/814),1 his secretary Abū Saḥīḥ (d. 223/838), and his pupil Yahyā ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Bukair (d. 231/845).2 The literary evidence in favor of the first two is about equal since both are known to have transmitted the “book of ʿUqail” from Laith. Shuʿaib’s son ʿAbd al-Malik (d. 248/862)

1 Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh II 2, p. 225; Jarḥ II 1, p. 351; Ḥum al-muḥāḍarah I 164; Ibn Farḥūn, p. 23; Irshād II 370.
2 Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh IV 2, p. 285; Jarḥ IV 2, p. 165; Dhahabi II 8; Ḥum al-muḥāḍarah I 164; Ibn Farḥūn, p. 23; Irshād II 370.
transmitted the same book from his father in a written copy that began with ُلدثني أبي عن جددي عن عمه. This copy was known to Abū Śa‘īlīh. The cursive script and the use of copious diacritical points and some vowels in the papyrus text point away from Shu‘aib’s time to the later period of Abū Śa‘īlīh, Yaḥyā, and ʿAbd al-Malik. The evidence in favor of Yaḥyā is twofold. First, like Abū Śa‘īlīh, he is known to have transmitted Laith’s ‘Uqail–Zuhra materials, some of which are cited by Abū ʿUbaid (d. 223/838) and Bukharī, who visited Egypt in the years 213/828 and 217/832 respectively and wrote down materials from Abū Śa‘īlīh and Yaḥyā among other Egyptian scholars. Second, the papyrus text itself points to Yaḥyā, who alone provided a verbatim parallel to Tradition 2 and nearly identical parallels to Traditions 10 and 14. He, like Abū Śa‘īlīh and Shu‘aib, transmitted materials related to Tradition 15. Moreover, Yaḥyā is known to have expressed critical opinions such as appear in Traditions 1 and 5. Furthermore, it is known that he wrote down his materials and passed them on to others to copy but insisted on collation.

It therefore seems safe to give preference to Yaḥyā ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Bukair as transmitter of the papyrus text from Laith. The document itself could be his own copy or one written by any one of his many transmitters. On the other hand, it could well be that Abū Śa‘īlīh the secretary of Laith had a role in its preservation (see p. 91). In that case the absence of parallels transmitted by Abū Śa‘īlīh would be explained by the fact that his transmission from manuscripts was suspected by some scholars, so that Bukharī, who actually transmitted his materials, usually disguised and suppressed (dalas) the secretary’s name and stressed that of Laith instead.

The fact that repeatedly forces itself on our attention is the virtual absence in the standard hadith collections of complete parallels, that is, parallels that cover both the isnād and the matn, for this papyrus text that originated with the famous Zuhra and was transmitted by Egypt’s leading traditionist of the second century. Analysis of the contents of the traditions and of the terminology used in their transmission helps to explain this fact. Of the sixteen traditions whose contents are reasonably well preserved only five (Nos. 2, 8–10, 15) are hadith al-nabi with the complete isnād that is carried back to Muḥammad and uses the generally unquestionable terms haddathānī, akhbarānī, and qāla. It is hardly an accident that four of these five traditions actually have parallels, either identical (Tradition 2) or close (Traditions 8–10), in the standard collections. Traditions 3, 11, and 12 also are hadith al-nabi, but their isnād is incomplete (mursal) and omits the links preceding Zuhra, who uses the indefinite term balaghānā, which during the second century came to imply some uncertainty about either the source or the content of a tradition (see p. 122). Though no complete parallels—that is, of both isnād and matn—are available in the standard collections for these three traditions, traditions with different isnād’s but similar in content are numerous. These incomplete parallels are not strictly literal (harfi) but adequately convey the sense (marād) of the traditions. Of the eight remaining traditions, seven (Nos. 4–7, 14, 16, 17) are sunnat al-nabī, that is, they

---

3 Khatīb IX 480; see also Masʿūdī III 51, 54.
4 See Amwal, pp. 8, 10, 110, 117, 125, 134, 161, 167, and 202–7, for such materials transmitted through Abū Śa‘īlīh, and e.g. pp. 10, 18, 30, 202–4, and 430, for materials transmitted through Yaḥyā.
5 See GAL I 106 and GAL S I 166; Nawawi, pp. 118 f.; Jāmī’ I 268 f.; Ḥusn al-muḥādarah I 164.
6 Khatīb XIII 3–7; Dhahabī II 8.
7 Futūḥ, Intro. pp. 3, 6 f.
8 See Jarḥ II 2, pp. 86 f.; Khatīb IX 478–81; Dhahabī I 352; Miṣā’īn II 46 f.; Yaqūt I 748. See also pp. 195 and 221 below.
report exemplary acts or practices of Muḥammad rather than his sayings. Of these, only Tradition 4 has a full isnād with unquestionable terminology; though it has no complete parallel, closely related traditions are available. The other six traditions have the incomplete isnād that omits the links preceding Zuhrī, who in Traditions 5–7 and 14 uses the indefinite term balaghanaṯ. Tradition 5 was questioned even by ‘Uqail (see p. 168). Though the practices of Muḥammad that are reported in these six traditions are generally well known and accepted as such, none of the traditions has identical parallels in the standard collections. Finally, Tradition 13 has no direct reference to either Muḥammad’s words or his deeds but has the same incomplete isnād. It, too, has no complete parallels though the practice it reports, namely the recitation of the formula of the unity of God within the hearing of the dying, was universal in the Islamic community.

This analysis of the traditions of the papyrus text throws light on the bases for the selection of hadīth by the standard collectors of the second and third centuries, who were faced with an enormous amount of redundant material. They had first to choose what they considered adequately representative and then to condense it into a sizable yet manageable collection without, however, sacrificing a sufficiency of multiple sources to assure authenticity and accuracy as defined in their own terms in the science of hadīth criticism. Hence traditions with full isnād’s that traced back to Muḥammad received high priority, which accounts for their prominence and survival in the works of such leading jurists and traditionists as Mālik, Shāfi‘ī, Muslim, and Bukhārī. The high rate of mortality of all other types of traditions is illustrated by this folio as by other documents of our papyrus collection (see p. 78), which represents the period immediately preceding the production of the standard collections of the first half of the third century. One must therefore question sweeping statements that, toward the end of the second century, isnād’s that go back to Muḥammad were manufactured freely in response to Shāfi‘ī’s insistence on such isnād’s. For it seems much more likely that a strict process of selection rather than a wholesale fabrication of isnād’s accounts for the bulk of the hadīth al-nabī that has survived in the standard collections and particularly in the Sahihain of Muslim and Bukhārī.

The papyrus folio also confirms and illustrates Zuhrī’s activities and standards of hadīth transmission as they are reported in the literary sources. First, he wrote down the hadīth and sunnah not only of Muḥammad but also of the Companions and their leading Successors.9 Second, he insisted on a full isnād where the sayings of Muḥammad were being quoted as such,10 a precept which he himself practiced and which is so clearly illustrated in our folio. After the end of the first century the terms balaghanaṭ and balaghanaṯ were generally acceptable and used interchangeably with haddathanā and haddathanā (see pp. 121 f.), thus accounting for their liberal use by Zuhrī and his contemporaries. But they became increasingly suspect during the second century, so that professional traditionists not only ceased to use them but became suspicious of even their earliest use. Again, the half-century between the death of Laith ibn Sa‘d and that of his secretary Abū Ṣāliḥ was a time when Shāfi‘ī’s influence was predominant in Egypt, and Shāfi‘ī insisted on complete isnād’s for all traditions that reported the words and deeds of Muḥammad.11 Thus traditions with incomplete isnād’s (marāṣil) became increasingly questionable as the first standard collections were being produced.12 Shāfi‘ī himself, despite his wholehearted appreciation of the great service that Zuhrī through his energy and

---

9 See e.g. Ibn Sa‘d II 2, p. 135.  
10 See e.g. Abu Nu‘aim III 365, 367; Ibn Kathir IX 345.  
11 See e.g. Risālah, pp. 63 f.  
12 See e.g. Kifayah, pp. 384–86; Madkhal, pp. 21 f.
foresight had rendered in the preservation of hadith, at times cast suspicion on the marāṣil al-Zuhri\textsuperscript{13} though at other times he himself used some of them.\textsuperscript{14} Malik and Laith, on the other hand, generally accepted them, as indicated by the Muwatta\textsuperscript{11} and by our papyrus.

Initial doubts were cast on Zuhrī's incomplete isnād's by his younger contemporary Yahyā ibn Sa'īd al-Anṣārī (d. 143/760) on the grounds that Zuhrī transmitted from memory, mentioning only such names as he could recall and omitting the rest.\textsuperscript{16} This critical opinion may reflect Zuhrī's practices\textsuperscript{17} before he was persuaded by the Umayyad caliph Hishām to write down hadith.\textsuperscript{18} On the other hand, Yahyā's statement need only mean that Zuhrī recited or dictated not from his manuscripts but from memory—a memory of which he was quite proud.\textsuperscript{19} This method, as Yahyā's criticism correctly implies, left something to be desired even when used by traditionists as famous for their memories as Zuhrī. In any case, the wider implication of Yahyā's criticism is that by the end of the first century or the first quarter of the second century at the latest the best methods of transmission required written texts not only for the initial process of memorizing but also for the final process of transmission. In other words, the written record, though all phases of oral transmission had not been entirely dispensed with, had become essential and the only means for adequately “chaining down knowledge” as a safeguard against the inevitable lapses of even the best of memories.

The above analysis of the literary evidence, together with the very existence of this papyrus,\textsuperscript{20} leaves no reasonable room to doubt that there was continuous written transmission from Zuhrī to 'Uqail ibn Khālid to Laith to Yahyā ibn Bukair to Bukhārī and Muslim and their respective contemporaries. The stability and frequency of this isnād\textsuperscript{21} provide further evidence of written transmission. Spot tests of the stability of the parallel isnād Zuhrī-'Uqail-Laith-Abū Śālih-Dārimī pointed in the same direction.\textsuperscript{22}

III

The above conclusions, based mainly on a study of the literary activities of men mentioned in the isnād's of the papyrus text, are confirmed by a similar study of a second line of transmission of the “book of 'Uqail,” parallel to that of Laith and his immediate transmitters, whose links are 'Uqail-Salāmah ibn Rauh-Muhammad ibn 'Uzaiz. Salāmah (n.d.) was 'Uqail's nephew. References to his possession of the “sound books of 'Uqail” can mean either that he inherited his uncle's manuscripts or that he made his own copies of them with or without benefit of oral transmission. He in turn transmitted this material to his nephew Muhammad ibn 'Uzaiz (d. 257/871 or 267/881), who states that Salāmah transmitted the materials “on the authority of the book of 'Uqail” (حدثنا سلام عن كتاب عقيل). Visitors to Ailah,\textsuperscript{23} where 'Uqail's family lived, came to Muhammad in search of these manuscripts. Thus we have evi-

\textsuperscript{13} See e.g. Risālah, p. 64; Addāb al-Shāfi‘ī, pp. 82, 229; Kifāyah, p. 386; Subkī, Tabaqāt al-Shāfi‘īyah al-kubrā I (Cairo, 1323/1905) 7-10; Nawawī, p. 118.
\textsuperscript{14} See e.g. Risālah, pp. 56, 58 f., 74.
\textsuperscript{15} See e.g. Tajrīd, pp. 152-55.
\textsuperscript{16} Jarh, Taqdimāh, p. 246; Kifāyah, p. 386; Dhahābat I 104 f., 129-32. See also p. 193 below.
\textsuperscript{17} See e.g. Abū Nu‘aim III 363 f.
\textsuperscript{18} See e.g. Goldziher, Studien II 38 f.; Horovitz in Islamic Culture II 46-50. See also p. 33 above.
\textsuperscript{19} See Nawawī, pp. 118 f., where Bukhārī reports on the authority of Abū Śālih on the authority of Laith that Zuhrī said: اللبث عن الزيرو قال ما استودعت حفظي: شیعه فخاني.
\textsuperscript{20} See comments on Traditions 2, 10, 15, and 16.
\textsuperscript{21} See e.g. Bukhārī I 4, 50, and 64, II 321, 338, and 351, III 36-41 (the last a long continuous passage on the flight of Muhammad presumably from the “book of 'Uqail”); see also Buhārī'īn, pp. 60 f. and 297, Ismā‘īl 271.
\textsuperscript{22} See e.g. Dārimī I 194, 195, 274, 307, 328, 356 and II 8, 28, 72, 239, 319, 472.
\textsuperscript{23} On the border of the Hijāz and Syria (Yāqūt 1422 f.).
idence of continuous written transmission of the "book of 'Uqail" for at least three generations. 24

Zuhri's regular students, as distinct from pious or curious laymen who heard him at one time or another, numbered at least two dozen. The Egyptian scholar Ibn Wahb (125–97/742–812) met twenty of them25 and transmitted materials from some of them.26 Some half-dozen, including 'Uqail, acquired the reputation of being the best informed and most trustworthy authorities on Zuhri. Some were better known in some provinces than in others. They and the students or scholars who sought them out in their home towns or during pilgrimages were responsible for the circulation of Zuhri's materials throughout the learned world of Islam. Whether transmitting fiqh, hadith, or akhbār-magḥāṣī they apparently caught the spirit of dedication to a mission that motivated and sustained their teacher.27 Written texts loomed large in the professional activities of all of them. A collection of Zuhri's traditions, presumably of a legal nature, was written down by Mālik ibn Anas in Medina at the request of his teacher Yaḥyā ibn Sa'd al-Anṣārī, who wished to have it sent to him in 'Iraq (see p. 193).

Second among the five or six most authoritative pupils of Zuhri28 was Yūnus ibn Yazīd al-Aīfī (d. 149/76629), whose literary activities paralleled in many respects those of his fellow townsman 'Uqail ibn Khālid. He was closely associated with Zuhri for some ten years and was his host whenever Zuhri visited in Ailah. Like 'Uqail, Yūnus settled in Egypt and transmitted Zuhri materials to the leading Egyptian scholars such as Laith ibn Sa'd and Ibn Wahb. He frequently alternates with 'Uqail in an otherwise stable isnād, especially Zuhri–'Uqail or Yūnus–Laith–Abū Saʿlīḥ. Abū Saʿlīḥ, the secretary of Laith is credited with the statement that Yūnus was preferred above all others as an authority on Zuhri.30 This isnād appears with a variety of subject matter in the various fields of Zuhri's activities. It is found in some of the earliest works that have survived, not only in those of early Egyptian scholars such as Ibn Wahb but also in those of visiting scholars, who usually collected and wrote down Zuhri–Laith materials, for example Abū 'Ubaid, who visited Egypt in the year 213/827.31 The same isnād as carried forward by numerous transmitters from Laith, Abū Saʿlīḥ, and others appears in several of the standard hadith collections.32 Yūnus' strong point apparently was concentration on the isnād's, though his written texts showed that he was not always able to produce a


26 See references given under Ibn Shihāb in Index of Le djāmī d'Ibn Wahh, ed. David-Weill; Buhārīnīn, pp. 220, 232, 299.


28 See Jāmī II 41, 167; Ḥaṭṭīb IX 151; Jarḥ IV 2, p. 248.

29 Variant dates are 152/769 and 159/776 (see Ibn Saʿd VII 2, p. 206; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh IV 2, p. 406 [d. 149]; Jarḥ IV 2, pp. 247–49; Ibn Hibbān, p. 138; Dhahabi I 153; Jāmī II 584). See Kifāyat, pp. 104 f., for Zuhri's instructions to Yūnus.

30 Dhahabi I 153; see also Jarḥ IV 2, p. 249, where Ahmad ibn Saʿlīḥ (d. 248/862) repeats the same opinion.

31 See e.g. Aṣmāl, pp. 8, 10, 110, 117, 125, 134, 161, 167, 334 f., and rather long citations e.g. on pp. 202–7 and 578–80. See also GAL I 106 f. and GAL S I 166, 284. Th e earlier Ibn al-Mubārak (d. 181/797) is frequently cited on the authority of Yūnus (Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh III 1, p. 212). He too visited Egypt in the course of his extensive travels, studied many books, and wrote some (Jarḥ VI 2, p. 248; Jāmī I 177; GAL S I 256). Some of the material that Ibn al-Mubārak received from Yūnus found its way to Bukhārī (see e.g. Buhārīnīn, pp. 235 and 246, Isnād's 92 and 126).

32 See e.g. Muslim I 41; Bukhārī I 4, 50, 64, 291, 374, 404, et passim; Ibn Ḥanbal V 432 and VI 74 f., 80, 155, 233; Dārimī I 185, 194 f., 274, 322, 331, 352 and II 8, 28, 72, 93, 156, 186, et passim; Taʾṣāfīr V 9, 23, 50, 68, 73, 80, 94, 100, 128, 144, 150, et passim; Jāmī I 406, II 484; Jāmī II 94, II 41. See also nn. 21 and 31 above and references under 'Uqail and Yūnus in Index of Buhārīnīn.
complete isnād. Yūnus’ manuscripts were prized for their accuracy by such leading transmitters and critics as Ibn Wahb and ʿAbd al-Rahmān ibn Mahdī (see references in nn. 33–84). Shabīb ibn Saʿīd of Baṣrah while visiting in Egypt sought out Yūnus and made copies of his books. These copies were in turn used by transmitters of the next generation, including Shabīb’s son ʿAlī ibn al-Madīnī, who made his own copy of the collection. Once again, therefore, we have evidence of continuous written transmission of a single collection through several generations from Zuhrī’s time onward.

A third authoritative pupil of Zuhrī was Muḥammad ibn al-Walīd al-Zubaidī (ca. 80–148/699–765), who spent ten years with Zuhrī in Damascus. He became a judge in Ḥims and was considered, at least by some, the best informed of the Syrians in law and Tradition. He wrote down his transmission from Zuhrī, who bore testimony to his industry. The famous Syrian scholar and jurist Awzāʾī (88–157/707–73) considered Zubaidī the most authoritative on Zuhrī, though others point out that Awzāʾī’s judgment was based on insufficient evidence since he had not seen the books of ʿUqail, Yūnus, and Maʿmar ibn Rāshīd. Awzāʾī himself transmitted some traditions directly from Zuhrī. Zubaidī’s secretary, Muḥammad ibn Ḥarb (d. 194/810), who is known to have transmitted from both Zubaidī and Awzāʾī, may have had written Zuhrī materials from both. The Syrian scholar and man of affairs Baqīyah ibn al-Walīd (110 or 112–97/728 or 730–812) of Ḥims, who, unlike Awzāʾī, early co-operated with the ʿAbbāsid caliphs from Maṣṣūr to Hārūn al-Rashīd and dictated traditions to the latter, is known for his written copy of the Zuhrī–Zubaidī collection. Though his transmission from other than Syrian traditionists such as Zubaidī was as a rule suspect, people generally wrote down all his traditions but sought confirmation from others (see references in n. 40). His fellow townsman ʿAlī ibn al-Faraj (d. 271/883), who became the secretary of the caliph Hishām (105–25/724–42), the royal patron of Zuhrī. As court secretary ʿAlī ibn al-Faraj wrote down his transmission from Zuhrī’s dictation a tremendous amount of material for Hishām and made copies of at least some of it for his personal use. These copies were inherited by his son, who showed them to Ibn Ḥanbal, who praised the accuracy of their content, the careful pointing and voweling, and the beauty of the script. But, though the son inherited the manuscripts, Shuʿaib’s pupils had had the use

11 See e.g. Jarḥ, Taqdimah, p. 272; Jarḥ IV 2, pp. 248 f.
12 Jarḥ II 1, p. 359; Mīzān I 441; Jamʿ I 212.
13 Ibn Saʿd VII 2, p. 169; Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh I 1, p. 254; Ibn Ḥibbān, p. 138; Jarḥ IV 1, pp. 111 f.; Jamʿ II 452; Dhahābī I 153 f.; Samāʿī, folio 53a.
14 Jarḥ IV 1, pp. 111 f.; Dhahābī I 153 f.
15 Jarḥ, Taqdimah, pp. 204 f.; Jarḥ IV 1, p. 112; Dhahābī I 153. Awzāʾī is quoted as placing Qurrah ibn ʿAbd al-Rahmān above all of Zuhrī’s other pupils, which the critics explain by assuming that Qurrah was best informed on Zuhrī the man rather than on Zuhrī the scholar.
16 Yaʿqūb ibn Shaibān, Musnad . . . Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, p. 62; Jarḥ II 2, pp. 266 f.; Jamʿ I 61. For Awzāʾī’s literary activities and collection of manuscripts see e.g. pp. 35 (n. 26), 50, 54 above.
17 See e.g. Jarḥ II 1, p. 345; Ibn ʿAsākir VI 321; Dhahābī I 105 f. Zuhrī had two court secretaries at his disposal (Jamʿ I 77; Abū Nuʿaim III 361).
of them during his lifetime, for he is reported as saying to them: "These are my books; transmit them on my authority." The pupil who apparently made the most of this opportunity was Abū al-Yāmān al-Ḥakam ibn Nāfī (138-222/755-837), also of Ḥims, who availed himself of manuscripts handed to him (munāwalah) but claimed that he did not transmit any of their contents, that is, presumably he did not transmit without benefit of oral transmission at the source. He had, besides Zuhrī’s materials, copies of the large collection of Abū al-Zinād on the authority of Aḥraj on the authority of Abū Hurairah and that of Nāfī the client of Ibn cUmar on the authority of Ibn cUmar. His house adjointed that of the traditionist Ismā’īl ibn cAYyāf (ca. 106-81/724-97), and Abū al-Yāmān noticed that Ismā’īl interrupted his prayer service frequently. When he asked Ismā’īl about the interruptions, Ismā’īl answered that as he recited the service he recalled traditions bearing on each theme and stopped to enter them in his books under the proper headings (bāb min al-abwāb). Abū al-Yāmān then studied with Ismā’īl. He served as Ismā’īl’s secretary and was compared in this respect to Abū Ṣāliḥ the secretary of Laith. Master and secretary must have made several careful copies of Ismā’īl’s materials for the use of the pupils. For Ismā’īl’s method was to seat himself above his pupils, recite from memory some 500(!) traditions each day, and then hand the pupils his manuscripts, from which they were to make their own copies the next morning. Traveling scholars, including Ibn al-Mubāraḳ, also made copies of some of Ismā’īl’s traditions. A Khūrasānīan scholar wished to buy copies of Ismā’īl’s books and read them back to him. Abū al-Yāmān was persuaded to part with his personal copies of Ismā’īl’s books because the price would enable him to make a pilgrimage and because Ismā’īl promised to dictate them to him again on his return.

Abū al-Yāmān therefore sold his set, which was on papyrus, for thirty dinars and made the pilgrimage. On his return he made a fresh set that cost him only a few dirhams, presumably for a new supply of papyrus. Abū al-Yāmān’s collection of traditions from Shu’āib-Zuhrī and Ismā’īl circulated among scholars of the next generations, including the major critic Yahyā ibn Ma’in, Muslim and Bukhārī, and other ḥadīth collectors. Once again, therefore, a study of the serious literary activities of Zuhrī’s pupils and his first- and second-generation transmitters has revealed that they produced and used scholarly books as indispensable means for authentic and acceptable transmission of ḥadīth and fiqīh.

So far the locale of the literary activities investigated has been the somewhat closely related provinces, in respect to scholarship, of the Hijāz, Syria, and Egypt. We turn now, therefore, to some of Zuhrī’s pupils and their immediate transmitters who settled in the Yemen, cIRAq, and farther east. The written transmission of maḏāḥīf materials from Zuhrī to his Basran student Ma’āmar ibn Rāshid (96-154/714-71), who settled in the Yemen, where cAbul-
Razzāq ibn Ḥammām (126–211/743–826) studied with him for seven years and transmitted much of his material, has already been discussed.57 ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s Tafsīr,58 which is listed among the best of such works (see p. 112), and his large collection of ḥadīth and sunnah have survived in later transmissions.59 The Tafsīr has been published, and separate studies of the manuscripts of the ḥadīth collection of Ma’amr—’Abd al-Razzāq, the Jāmiʿ al-ḥadīth, have appeared recently.60

Ma’amr’s reputation as an authority on Zuhri was such that Zuhri’s young Kūfān pupil Sufyān ibn ‘Uyainah (107–98/725–814),61 whose family settled in Mecca and who, when he was but sixteen years old,62 heard Zuhri there in 123–24/741–42, made two trips to the Yemen, in 150/767 and 152/769, to hear Ma’amr’s collections.63 Sufyān himself came to be considered an expert on Zuhri, and some ranked him in this respect as the equal of Mālik and Ma’amr and even above Ma’amr.64

Sufyān’s collection consisted of some 7,000 traditions. He was proud of his memory and is frequently reported as having no books.65 Yet one reads, on Sufyān’s own authority, that he wrote down traditions at the age of seven,66 a fact which leads to the conclusion that he merely made memoranda. His pupils, however, did write down his traditions.67 Lists of his pupils68 include the most outstanding men of the second century, most of whom, such as his older contemporaries Shu’bāh ibn al-Ḥajjāj and Ibn Juraij and younger scholars such as Ibn al-Mubārak, Shāhīf, and Ibn Ḥanbal, became authors in their own right. We read, furthermore, that Sufyān declared: “I never wrote down anything whatsoever except that which I had already memorized before I wrote it.”69 It must be assumed, therefore, that at first Sufyān gave priority to memory yet did not exclude the use of texts but that later he saw the need of committing the memorized materials to permanent record as a safeguard against the loss of memory.70 Manuscripts that Sufyān wrote at this stage of his career were, I suspect, both selective in content and carefully written. And, in view of his reputation, it is not surprising that his original manuscripts soon became collectors’ items.71 At least some of his tafsīr72 and hadīth73 collections retained their identity through several generations of transmitters, even as did Ma’amr’s collections.74


59 See GAL II 333 and references there cited. See also Ibn Khair al-İshbili, Fihrist I 54 f., 127–31, 236; Kifayah, p. 214. For the leading roles of Ma’amr and ‘Abd al-Razzāq and an impressive list of prominent scholars who journeyed to the Yemen to meet them and study their materials see ‘Umar ibn ‘Ali al-Ja’di, ʻTabaqat ḥuqahā al-Yaman, pp. 66–68.

60 See e.g. Ibn Sa’d V 365; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh II 2, p. 95; Jarḥ, Taqdimah, p. 34. See also Akhbār al-qadīm I 166; Kifayah, pp. 60 f. Ibn Ḥanbal quotes at length from Sufyān’s materials on the direct authority of Zuhri on the authority of Sa’d ibn al-Musayyib on the authority of Abū Hurairah (see e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal II 238 ff.).

61 See e.g. Ibn Sa’d V 365; Tabarî III 2222.

62 Jarḥ, Taqdimah, p. 16; Jarḥ II 1, pp. 226 f.; Ḵaṭṭīb IX 151; Jāmīʿ II 167.

63 Ṭabarî I 2521; Fihrist, p. 226; Dhababī I 243.

64 Nawawī, p. 290; Dhababī I 243.

65 Ḵaṭṭīb IX 175.

66 See e.g. Ḵaṭṭīb IX 174; Nawawī, p. 289.

67 See e.g. Ḵaṭṭīb IX 170.

68 Vol. I, Document 5, pp. 75 f. See also Jāmīʿ I 195 f.; Dhababī I 242–44. See also pp. 47 and 122 above.

69 See e.g. Khatlīb IX 151; Jāmīʿ II 167.

70 See e.g. Khatlīb IX 174; Nawawī, p. 289.

71 See e.g. Khatlīb IX 170.

72 See e.g. Khatlīb IX 174; Nawawī, p. 289.

73 See e.g. Khatlīb IX 170.

74 See e.g. Ibn Sa’d V 365; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh II 2, p. 95; Jarḥ, Taqdimah, p. 34. See also Akhbār al-qadīm I 166; Kifayah, pp. 60 f. Ibn Ḥanbal quotes at length from Sufyān’s materials on the direct authority of Zuhri on the authority of Sa’d ibn al-Musayyib on the authority of Abū Hurairah (see e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal II 238 ff.).

75 See e.g. Khatlīb IX 174; Nawawī, p. 289.

76 See e.g. Khatlīb IX 170.

77 See e.g. Khatlīb IX 174; Nawawī, p. 289.

78 See e.g. Khatlīb IX 170.
Other scholars likewise sought out ‘Abd al-Razzāq in the Yemen especially for his Zuhri materials. Among these was Ibn Ḥanbal, who put himself to considerable trouble to make the journey.75 Yet he declared that it was indeed worth it because he was able to write down from ‘Abd al-Razzāq, on the authority of Ma‘mar ibn Rāshid, Zuhri’s hadith collection from Sālim on the authority of his father, Ibn ʿUmar, and Zuhri’s collection from Saʿd ibn al-Musayyib on the authority of Abū Hurairah.76 The aged ‘Abd al-Razzāq must have dictated from his manuscripts, since he states that Zuhri’s materials had escaped his memory and that he made a fresh collection which he showed to Abū Mushir (140–218/757–833).77 Anyone who has read extensively in the Musnad of Ibn Ḥanbal knows that he put both of these Zuhri collections to good use for the musnad’s of Ibn ʿUmar78 and Abū Hurairah,79 as he did also Ṣufyān’s collection from Zuhri among other Zuhriyyāt.80

Among those whom Zuhri sought out in Medina was Ibrāhīm ibn ‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn ‘Awf of the same tribe as Zuhri himself.81 Thus began a close association among several members of the two families, in the interest of scholarship. Saʿd ibn Ibrāhīm (d. 125/743 or 127/745), judge of Medina during the reign of ‘Abd al-Malik, was also a collector of traditions.82 He wrote down all that Shuʿbah ibn al-Ḥajjāj (d. 160/776) had to give despite the fact that Shuʿbāh was his junior.83 Saʿd and Zuhri seem to have exchanged materials, while Saʿd’s son Ibrāhīm (110–184/728–800)84 started early to collect Zuhri materials.85 This Ibrāhīm’s activities were extensive and varied as judge, scholar, and man of affairs who toward the end of his life migrated to Trāqī to be received by its scholars and favored by Hārūn al-Rashīd, who appointed him treasurer.86 His early interest in Zuhri and his awareness of Zuhri’s reputation led Ibrāhīm to ask his father why Zuhri surpassed him. Saʿd informed his son of Zuhri’s well known and vast activities which involved going everywhere and collecting information from all—men and women, old and young—who had it to give.87 Ibrāhīm augmented his own initial collection from Zuhri by that of his father and, directly or indirectly, from that of Zuhri’s nephew Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muslim.88 In the meantime Ibrāhīm was studying with Ibn Iṣḥāq, from whom he heard and transmitted the Maḥāzī89 and received a large collection of legal traditions.90 No doubt much of the material that Ibrāhīm received from Ibn Iṣḥāq came originally from Zuhri’s collection of manuscripts. It is no wonder that Ibrāhīm was known in Medina as a prolific traditionist and that Trāqī scholars sought him out specifically for his collection from Zuhri.91 The list of his pupils and fellow scholars who transmitted from

78 See GAL S I 309 for Ibn Ḥanbal’s journeys.
79 See e.g. Abū Nu‘ayn IX 184.
83 See e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal II 8 f., 11, 14.
84 Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh I 1, p. 295; Jarḥ I 1, p. 111.
85 Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh II 2, pp. 252 f.; Jarḥ II 1, p. 79; Abū Nuʿayn III 169–74.
86 Akhāṭur al-qudāt I 151. See Kīfūyāh, pp. 54–65, Abū Nuʿayn III 364, and Jāmiʿ I 102 f. for arguments concerning transmission by the young and for many early examples of their role in transmission.
87 Ibn Saʿd VII 2, p. 65; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh I 1, p. 288; Jarḥ I 1, pp. 101 f.; Fihrist, p. 92; Ibn Hibbān, pp. 106 f.; Khaṭīb VI 81–86; Nawawi, p. 134; Dhababi I 232 f.
88 Akhāṭur al-qudāt I 166; Khaṭīb VI 82.
89 See e.g. Khaṭīb VI 84; Nawawi, p. 134. See also our Vol. I 89, 91.
90 See e.g. Nawawi, Bustān al-arifīn, p. 41.
91 See e.g. Jāmiʿ I 76; Abū Nuʿayn III 364.
92 See Vol. I 89.
93 Khaṭīb (Vol. VI 83) and Dhababi (Vol. I 232) both estimated the collection at about 17,000 traditions. Some of them found their way into the standard collections (see Jāmiʿ I 16; Buhārīn, esp. p. 265, Isāfīd 183).
94 Khaṭīb VI 84. See also Hentai Khalīfah II 594, No. 4045, where “Saʿd” may be an error for “Saʿd.”
him reads like a Who's Who of the scholars of the leading provinces of Islam for the greater part of the second century since it includes men of the caliber of Shu'bah ibn al-Hajjaj, Sufyân al-Thaurî, Laîth ibnSa'd, Shâfi', and Ibn Hânbal.

Two of İbrahim's sons, Sa'd (d. 201/816) and Ya'qûb (d. 203/823), continued the scholarly tradition of this distinguished family and transmitted their father's collection from his books. The fact that the family's collection of Zuhri materials was in Ya'qûb's possession probably explains why Ya'qûb was more famous than his brother. However, Sa'd's three sons, İbrahim, Âhmad, and 'Ubaid Allâh, carried on as traditionists. 'Ubaid Allâh (d. 260/874) became especially concerned with the various collections received from his father and his Uncle Ya'qûb and is widely quoted in historical works and hadîth collections of the third century. Abû Hätîm al-Râzî and his son 'Abd al-Rahmân, whose Al-îrâh wa al-la'îdil is frequently cited in these pages, wrote down traditions directly from 'Ubaid Allâh.

It is hardly necessary to follow up here the intensive literary activities of Zuhri's other leading pupils. Some of them are met with elsewhere in these studies, especially Ibn Juraij and Malik ibn Anas, both of whom adopted from Zuhri the 'ard and munawalah methods of transmission. Fresh coverage of the earliest sources available leads one to the conclusion reached long ago by Muslim scholars whose comprehensive though loosely organized records led them to all but equate așhâb al-Zuhri and așhâb al-kutub.

It is interesting to consider the fate of Zuhri's manuscripts. In all probability Zuhri retained at least some of his personal copies when he retired. What disposition he made of any such manuscripts is not indicated in the sources, though family members and leading pupils would seem to be his logical heirs. Most of his manuscripts, however, were apparently left in Hishâm's court library. Whether or not Zuhri was apprehensive for the fate of his manuscripts, as he was for his own personal safety, in the event of Hishâm's death is not known. That his manuscript collection in the court library was a large one, even larger than was expected by his pupil Ma'mar ibn Râshid, who recorded its removal on the death of Walid II, is not surprising. It represented the accumulation of the forty to forty-five years during which Zuhri enjoyed Umayyad patronage, from the time of 'Abd al-Malik until his own death near the end of Hishâm's long reign.

The sources do not indicate whether the removal of the manuscripts from the court library involved mass destruction of the collection, nor yet do they mention any specific recipient or recipients. One is, therefore, left to assume that those who were interested in acquiring Zuhri's manuscripts would have tried to rescue the collection in part or in whole. These would have included members of Zuhri's family and his leading pupils. Ma'mar, who witnessed the removal of the several loads of manuscripts from the court library, no doubt availed himself of the opportunity to add to his personal collection of the master's

---

85 Mawâ'irî, p. 246; Kifâyah, p. 305, 326 f., 329.
86 See e.g. Jamê I 73; Khaṭîb IX 151; Ibn 'Asâkir VI 379.
87 See Aghânî VI 106, Fragmenta historiorum Arabico-Rum I 129, and Horovitz in Islamic Culture II 42 for the rift between Zuhri and Prince Walid.
88 Ibn Sa'd II 2, p. 136; Abû Nu'aim III 361; Dihâlab I 108. See also our Vol. I 23.
89 See e.g. Abû Nu'aim III 362. The date of Zuhri's entry into the service of 'Abd al-Malik is uncertain, but at the latest it was during Hishâm ibn 'âsâkir's governorship of Medina (82/86–701) (see Ibn Sa'd II 2, p. 135 and VII 2, p. 157; Abû Nu'aim III 367–69; Iqd I 205, II 310 f.).
works. There is some indirect evidence that some of Zuhri’s pupils who were not on the scene managed to acquire some of the manuscripts. Mâlik, for instance, is reported as saying that he had seven boxes full of Zuhri’s hadîth manuscripts which he did not transmit. These were brought to light on Mâlik’s death to the surprise of those who read them eagerly and then blessed Mâlik for their preservation.\footnote{Addâb al-Shâfi‘î, p. 199; Ibn Farîhûn, p. 24.} It is not likely that Mâlik acquired this large quantity of manuscripts, along with the sizable number of Zuhri traditions which he did transmit, from Zuhri himself. It is also possible that Zuhri’s older pupils, including Ibn Ishaq and Mûsà ibn ‘Uqba,\footnote{Cf. Vol. I 23, 75.} as well as those discussed above, augmented their collections at this time or later, perhaps even from the book market, a source that should not be overlooked. Ishaq ibn Râshid, who died during the reign of Mansûr, transmitted Zuhri’s traditions in distant Khurâsân. Asked if he had met Zuhri, he replied in the negative but added that while he was passing through Jerusalem a book of Zuhri’s fell into his hands.\footnote{Ibn ‘Asâkir II 438 f. For entries on Ishaq ibn Râshid see Bukhârî, Ta’rikh I 1, p. 386; Jarh I 1, pp. 219 f.; Jam‘ I 32; Mîzân I 89.} And where are passing travelers more likely to come across books than in the book market? Finally, there was Zuhri’s family, particularly his nephew Mu‘âammad ibn ‘Abd Allâh ibn Muslim (d. 157/774), who, I suspect, acquired the bulk of his uncle’s collection. The potentialities of this nephew as a practicing traditionist in his own right were small in comparison to those of Zuhri’s leading pupils. His father, ‘Abd Allâh ibn Muslim, and Zuhri are usually the only ones listed in his biographical entries or mentioned in hadîth literature as his authorities, and his transmitters for hadîth proper were few.\footnote{Bukhârî, Ta’rikh I 1, p. 131; Jarh III 2, p. 304; Zubairi, pp. 3 and 274; Mîzân III 78; Lisan VI 695; Yâfî I 354. Jam‘ I 440 f. is confused.} The biographical entries on his most frequently mentioned transmitter, Ma‘ân ibn ‘Isa (d. 198/814),\footnote{Ibn Sa‘d V 324; Bukhârî, Ta’rikh IV 1, pp. 396 f.; Jarh IV 1, pp. 277 f.; Jam‘ II 497; Dhahabi I 304; Ibn Farîhûn, pp. 347 f. Ma‘ân was one of the transmitters of Mâlik’s Musaîfî (Abû Nu‘aim VI 321).} do not even mention their teacher-pupil relationship though evidence of this relationship appears occasionally in hadîth literature.\footnote{Ibn ‘Asâkir II 16; Abu Nu‘aim III 364, 371.} Yet Mu‘âammad is known to have possessed “Zuhri’s books,” and the energetic collector of the Zuhriyat, Mu‘âammad ibn Yahyâ al-Dhuhi (172-258/788-872), listed him among the âshab al-Zuhri.\footnote{Jarh, Taqdimah, p. 260; Mîzân III 78.} Thus it seems possible that Zuhri’s nephew possessed a collection of original Zuhri manuscripts that was comparatively little used by professional traditionists\footnote{But Waqâîdî names the nephew third in his list of 24 sources from whom he wrote down the materials for his Maghazi and cites him frequently in that work on the authority of Zuhri.} until it was discovered by Dhuhi. Or it is possible that the nucleus of the nephew’s collection consisted of manuscripts that he produced or acquired during his uncle’s lifetime just as other pupils of Zuhri did.

The nephew’s case is, curiously enough, somewhat paralleled by that of one of Zuhri’s clients, Zakâryâ ibn ‘Isa (n.d.), who is said to have possessed a copy (nuskhah) of Zuhri’s collection from Nâfî, which he transmitted to an obscure ‘Umar ibn Abî Bakr al-Mu’ammal.\footnote{Tabârî lists him only once (Ta’rikh I 1176).} Biographical entries for Zakâryâ are few, and he is listed as untrustworthy.\footnote{Jarh I 2, pp. 597 f.; Mîzân I 349; Yâqût III 302.} Another of Zuhri’s close associates can almost be classed as a family member. Zuhri, like his patron the Calif Hishâm, had his headquarters at Riṣâfah, where he made his home for some twenty years with a family that was related to Hishâm by marriage. A member of this family, ‘Ubâd Allâh ibn Abî Ziyâd (d. 159/776), known also as Abû Manî, had a copy of Zuhri’s materials which toward the end of his life he transmitted to his son Yûsuf and his grandson Ḥajjâj.\footnote{Abd Allah ibn Muslim (d. 157/774), who, I suspect, particularly his nephew Muhammad ibn Ubâd al-Dhuhli (172-258/788-872), listed him among the ‘ashab al-Zuhri.}
The sources yield little information on 'Ubaid Allāh and even less on his son Yūsuf as traditionists. In fact, most of the information about both of them appears in connection with Ḥajjāj, who alone transmitted the Zuhrī materials of 'Ubaid Allāh. Ḥajjāj’s death date is not known, but he claimed that he was seventy-six in the year 216 A.H., thus indicating that his birth date was about 140/757. He was therefore an older contemporary of Dhuḥll, who made use of his copy of Zuhrī materials.113 Ḥajjāj’s activity and reputation as a traditionist seem to have been limited to and based on the Zuhrī materials in his possession, for his real interests lay in agriculture and certain branches of animal husbandry.113 Zuhrī apparently was a man of vision whose immediate family produced no one equal to sustaining, let alone furthering, the lifework of its gifted member.114 His heirs held on to their manuscript legacy, using it on occasion, until the Zuhrī specialist Dhuḥll sought them out and incorporated it in his own Zuhrīyāt, much as some of his predecessors and contemporaries, as already seen, had acquired a great deal of Zuhrī material from Zuhrī’s leading pupils.

Dhuḥll’s115 literary fame rests largely on his exhaustive Zuhrīyāt. A Khurāsānian by birth, he traveled the length and breadth of the eastern part of the Muslim world covering ‘Irāq, Syria, Egypt, the Hijāz, and the Yemen and made several special trips to Baṣrah in search of materials.116 He became a pupil of Ibn Ḥanbal and a teacher of both Muslim and Bukhārī.117 The critics of his day and later were unanimous in praising him as an authority on Zuhrī, for his aim was not only to collect but to organize and criticize Zuhrī’s materials.118 His activities took place at a time when he could capitalize on the existing copies of the several collections of Zuhrī materials, such as have been traced in the foregoing pages, none of which his avowed purpose would permit him to neglect. He is known to have transmitted from Abū Ṣāliḥ the secretary of Laith ibn Sa’d and from Ya‘qūb ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Sa’d ibn Ibrāhīm (see p. 181).119 His coverage of the Zuhrī material was so exhaustive that his admiring contemporaries assured him he was the real heir of Zuhrī.120

Dhuḥll’s Zuhrīyāt must have been put to good use in the fourth century by two more Zuhrī enthusiasts. One of them was Ibn Ḥibbān (274–354/887–965),121 prolific author and

113 Ibn Sa’d VII 2, p. 175; Bukhārī, Tarīkh I 2, pp. 376 f.; Ibn Āṣakir IV 82–84; Mīdān II 166 f.


115 The story that Zuhrī’s wife exclaimed that his preoccupation with his books was harder on her than three rival co-wives would be acquired significance in this context as further historical evidence of both Zuhrī’s many books and his family’s failure to appreciate his lifework.

The story has been suspected by some because of its late origin, Ibn Khallikān being the earliest authority cited for it (Ibn Khallikān I 571 [= trans. II 582]; cf. Horovitz in Islamic Culture II 49, where the wife’s statement is referred to as an “alleged pious exclamation”). Some two centuries before the time of Ibn Khallikān, however, Khatīb recorded in his Tarīkh a similar incident related by the still earlier Zubair ibn Bakkar al-Zubairi (ca. 172–256/ 788–870), who was, like Zuhrī, a Quraishite, a genealogist of the Qurainah, a tutor of royalty, and a man of many books (GAL I 141 and GAL S I 215). Zubair’s story, involving his own wife, ends with the saying that the wife—whom he called a ‘sūlah al-walad ilā shayju min shay’īn ṣawā’ir (Khatīb VII 471), thus giving the impression that wives of scholars had come, as a rule, to resent their husbands’ preoccupation with books. It therefore seems reasonable to accept the story of Zuhrī’s wife and to assume that her resentment of his books was no secret in either Quraishite harems or the evening sessions of the men, especially as one recalls that Zuhrī and his wife became the subject of a popular love story—one of 37 such tales listed in Fihrist, p. 307.

116 Jarh IV 1, p. 125; Khaṭṭīb III 415–20; Dḥahabī I 101–3; Jām’ II 465; Yaḥūnī I 169.

117 Khaṭṭīb III 419; Dḥahabī I 102.

118 Later Dhuḥll had a quarrel with Bukhārī which created an awkward situation for Muslim, who had to choose between the two. Muslim sided with Bukhārī and sent back to Dhuḥll everything he had written down from him—a porter’s full load (Khaṭṭīb II 30 f., XIII 103).

119 See e.g. Khaṭṭīb III 415.

120 Khaṭṭīb III 415, IX 478; Jarḥ IV 1, p. 125.


122 GAL S I 273 f.; Yafi‘I II 613–20, pp. 616–19 being devoted to a list of Ibn Ḥibbān’s works.
critic, especially in the fields of ḥadīth and fiqh, whose ʿIlaḥ ḥadīth al-Zuhrī is a critical study. But his contemporary Ḥusain ibn Aḥmad al-Nisabūrī, known also as Māsārisī (288–356/900–967), outdid even Dhuhlī and won the title “Zuhrī the Lesser” (Zuhrī al-saghr). His lifework was an enormous musnad collection, Musnad al-kabīr, consisting of thirteen hundred parts (ajza’) of which the comparatively meager musnad of the caliph Abū Bakr formed about ten parts. One wonders, then, how many parts were devoted to the vast musnad of Zuhrī.

The collecting of Zuhrīyat was not limited to these avowed specialists and their times. Perhaps distance and size worked against the widespread availability of such voluminous works. Certainly others in different parts of the Muslim world devoted a considerable part of their time and energy to a collection of Zuhrīyat of both ḥadīth and fiqh. The range and character of Zuhrī’s activities as student, collector-recorder, and editor-transmitter of Tradition indicate that the writing-down of ḥadīth was already a practice during his youth and that his own recording represented such an acceleration of this development that not only did his pupils become known as ʿashāb al-kutub, but the Zuhrī period itself was referred to as “the age of the manuscript.” A reversal of role is discernible. For if at first writing was used primarily as an aid to memory, memory itself was now being cultivated as a check on the accuracy of manuscripts.

The precise nature and significance of Zuhrī’s role in the mass recording of the ḥadīth and sunnah and in further developing the science of Tradition is becoming increasingly intelligible.

---

122 Ibn ʿAsākir IV 351 f.; Dhahabi III 165 f. Dhahabi I 100; Muḥammad al-Murī, Kitāb al-ḥabb al-Samiyyah fi al-maḥakim al-Islāmiyyah, ed. Alfredo Bustānī, 123 See e.g. Maqqārī, Nafḥ al-tib II (Leyde, 1861) 116 f.; 1 (Tetuan, 1951) 71 f.
DOCUMENT 7

Oriental Institute No. 17628. Late second or early third/early ninth century.

Fragment of rather poor quality brown papyrus roll, 27 × 20 cm. (Pls. 13–14). There are practically no side margins, but liberal spaces mark off page lengths with 23 lines each. The roll is broken at the top and considerably damaged in spots.

Script.—Small somewhat angular book hand more or less carelessly executed. Diacritical points are used only occasionally for the most part, as with the shin of recto 4 and the nun of verso 14, but appear frequently with the final ya of the names Laithi and even Yahya, where the two dots are placed within the loop of the letter to distinguish it from final nun. Plain circles are used for punctuation, and circles containing either a dot or a stroke probably indicate collation (see pp. 87 f.).

TEXT

Recto

[UP AJJI [JL? 4111 JL}»J C]£” CJI iijU- 01

لا شهدني على الله صلى الله عليه

ولم ليلة قالت: فقذرت فقذرت فقذرت يدي على قدميه وهو

ان محمد بن [أبراهيم النبي] ان عاشبة قالت كنت خائمة إلى جنب رسول الله صلى الله عليه

واعذ بك منك لا احصى منك ركش واعذ [بعنانك من عقوباتك]

2

واعذ بك منك لا احصى منك ركش واعذ [بعنانك من عقوباتك]

وعذر بك منك لا احصى منك ركش واعذ [بعنانك من عقوباتك]

3

والله صلى الله عليه وسلم فافخت يدي في شعره [ فقال] اقد جاك شيطان فقذرت

4

أملاك شيطان قال يابا ولكن الله اعنى عليه فاسم الله

5

عن بحبي بن ايسط بن محمد بن يحيى بن حبان عن وليه عن ابن صرم عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه

6

ولم قال من ضار اضر الله به ومن شاق شاق الله عليه (4) وحدثني عن اللب عن بحبي بن ايسط

7

انه قال لا تشرب فضل الغير ولا تشرب مائه (5) وحدثني عن اللب عن بحبي بن ايسط

8

البئس ان ابا هربه [ قال] ابى لا يشكون أحدكم ان يكون الموت احب الله من نفس بالماء البارد

9

في الثنية الجارية فلا يموت (6) وحدثني عن اللب عن بحبي بن ايسط عن سلم بن عبد الله

10

ان عمر بن الخطاب [ قال] من ولي هذا الأمر فليعلم ان سيئبه القريب والبعيد فاني ارا اذا لا اقاتل

11

الناس

12

عن نفسي قالنا ولو اتي اعرف مكان من هو اقوى على هذا الأمر مي لشت ان أقدم

13

فقضرب عن ألقائي احب [اني] من ان أليه (7) وحدثني عن اللب عن بحبي بن ايسط انه بلغه

14

ان ابا يزيد كان يقول

15

الحق او الزواج وشي من البيع والقصد بلغوا والقصد بلغوا (8) وحدثني عن اللب

185
16 عن يحيى بن سعيد عن أنس بن مالك يقول أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال: 
17 بخير دور الانصار أو بخير الانصار قال: لا يرسول الله يقول: بخير دور 
18 أن يهود بنو الأشهل ثم الدين يهود بنو الحصر ثم الدين يهود بنو ساعدة، 
19 ثم قال يهود قبض اصابعه ثم بسطهم قال: الرضا. فهذا قول في دور الانصار كالآخرين.

20 خبر (9) وحدثي عن الليث عن يحيى بن سعيد أن مما ينشيئه منه هب من رجل طعاما. 
21 Thus, he put his hand above him and neither he nor anyone else could let him put his hand above him. 
22 وبىأمن الذي رضيته به

Verso

1 (10) [وحدثي عن الليث عن يحيى] بن سعيد أنه قال: لا يباش بالسليف في البخ على قيمة معلومة.
2 ... أفر حنا صطلحتنا فلم تتطلعوا أهم شكاية فقد عدل
3 أصلح بكيم [أيبل] عن البخ عن قام شكاها (11) وحدثي عن الليث عن يحيى.

4 أن الاسم بن محمد قال: إن رجل سال (أ) عن عباس عن شاب عاد ببعهم قبل أن يشترتهم.
5 قال ابن عباس لا ترى ذلك إلا ذهبٌ. ولا ترى حنا تقبسها (12) وحدثي
6 شيخي عن يحيى بن سعيد بن عبد من السيب يقول: ما أشترتهم، من يتناول
7 فلا تغيبه ولا تقمبه ولم يذكر الحياح وقال يحيى بن سعيد وقد وقع في الكتاب.
8 هذا ما كان يقول ابن عباس في أمر الشاب (13) وحدثي عن الليث عن يحيى بن سعيد أنه قال.
9 كان يصيب بهما وعشرين إذا كان وزنهم واحد يزيد بما يزيد.
10 (14) وحدثي عن الليث عن يحيى بن سعيد أنه ربما اخر معيشة والضعف الأحراض
11 بالحج والعمرة حنا يجاور من الهزراء فرسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم الذي لم يزل لسانه.
12 (15) وحدثي عن الليث عن يحيى بن سعيد أن الرجل الذي وجب أمران له، ولكن لنا
13 س يختلفون فيهم من يقول البخ ومنهم من يقول واحدة (16) وحدثي عن الليث.
14 أنه قال إن وهبهم البخ لا يتظر راهب في البخ بUCKET تجاههما لهم.
15 ليربوف فيها باشهم حمارة على ما وضعوه عليه من دعاية أو طلابها (17) وحدثي
16 عن الليث عن يحيى بن سعيد أن الرجل إذا عتب على غلامه فرضه بحجر أو بصبه فقله فاته.
17 ربما ضرب الرجل بعصا فيري في يده فمات فليس عليه من السلطان عقوبة وارمه
18 إلى الله وله مسلم به أو قلة بسلاح فذلك يطالب السلطان ويدين عليه (18) وحدثي
19 الليث عن يحيى بن سعيد أن الرجل إذا كان له إربعة سنة فإنها أخذت من أمه تطلب
20 أو طلاقين ثم تزوج قبل أن يحب مرأة أنش طقات البطلة للكم حماه كان حماه على
21 حنا يخلها عدة الذي طلق (19) وحدثي عن الليث عن يحيى بن سعيد أن الرجل إذا كانت إمرائه له
22 يطاه فنججب بيثج حريرة فإن ادار بها الحرير [ لا يسفع ذلك
23 لأنه قد وظف امة (20) وحدثي عن الليث عن يِبِلَّصَي ك م بن سعيد أنه قال
Comments.—The original papyrus was obviously a roll of several page lengths marked off by wide blank spaces. Our fragment contains the last page on the recto and the first page on the verso. The text continues unbroken in theme because the verso is upside down in relation to the recto.

Tradition 1. The text for both isnād and matn was reconstructed with the aid of Nasāʾī I 169 and Tirmidhī XIII 28. Nasāʾī alone has the نّnette القبلة of the papyrus text. Tirmidhī’s complete parallel is transmitted from Laith ibn Saʿd by Qutaibah ibn Saʿd al-Balkhlī (see pp. 143 f.).

Yahyā ibn Saʿd al-Ansārī (d. 143/760), whose collection is represented here, is the well known jurist and judge of Medina and ʿIrāq who served under the later Umayyads and the first two ʿAbbasids (see p. 116). His literary activities are discussed below (pp. 193 f.). His literary activities are discussed below (pp. 193 f.).

Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Taimī (d. 120/738) was a leading Medinan traditionist whose materials are found in all the standard hadith collections. Both Zuhri and Yahya ibn Saʿd transmitted from him (Bukhārī, Taʾrikh I 1, pp. 22 f.; Jarḥ III 2, p. 184; Dhaḥābī I 117; Jamʿ II 434).

The tradition is widely known (see Concordance II 440 and add طَرْفَانُ ۱۳۱ [= Muwaṭṭaʾ I 214]) and traces back to either ʿAli ibn Abī Ṭalib or ʿAṭīshah. ʿAli merely reports that Muḥammad used this formula in his private prayers (Ibn ʿAbbaṣ I 96, 118, 150; Nasāʾī I 252; Abū Dāūd II 64; Ibn Mājah I 185; Tirmidhī XIII 72). ʿAṭīshah, on the other hand, gives the details found in the papyrus text. Her transmitters were ʿAbū Hurairah and ʿUrwhah ibn al-Zubair as well as the poet, judge, and traditionist Masruq ibn al-Ajdāʾ (d. 63/682), who is said to have been adopted by ʿAṭīshah and who wrote down his materials (Ibn ʿAbbaṣ VI 50–56; Bukhārī, Taʾrikh IV 2, pp. 35 f.; Jarḥ IV 1, pp. 396 f.; Dhaḥābī I 46 f.; Jamʿ II 516 f.). The versions transmitted by ʿUrwhah and Masruq (e.g. Nasāʾī II 322; Zūrqānī I 387) differ from those that come from Abū Hurairah in the phrases describing ʿAṭīshah’s actions and in the order of the words for the prayer. The rest of the parallels, presumably all transmitted from Abū Hurairah by Aʿraj (see p. 139), though it is not always so indicated in the shortened isnād’s, branch out into many lines of transmission other than those of Yahyā ibn Saʿd (Muwaṭṭaʾ I 214; Tajrīd, p. 224; Ibn Ḥanbal VI 58, 201; Muslīm IV 203; Nasāʾī I 38, 166, 169, 252; Abū Dāūd I 232; Tirmidhī XIII 28; Ibn Mājah II 225 f.). Though the texts covering ʿAṭīshah’s role in the tradition vary in terms but not in substance, Muḥammad’s prayer, with one exception, is reported almost verbatim, the only variation being the omission of the redundant second or third of the papyrus text. The one exception is the omission of بَلَّامِلِهِ in a transmission from Mālik ibn Anas (Tirmidhī XIII 28).

The tradition is significant for ʿAṭīshah’s role in it and for the bearing of her role on the efficacy of prayer in the presence of a woman (see Nawawī in Muslīm IV 203 f.; Tirmidhī XIII 72 f.; Zūrqānī I 387 f.). Note that the biblical David is said to have used this prayer (Nasāʾī I 197 f.).

Tradition 2. Note the superfluous punctuation mark in recto 5.

ʿUbadah ibn al-Walīd (d. during reign of Sulaimān) of Medina was a source of traditions for Yahyā ibn Saʿd (Bukhārī, Taʾrikh III 2, p. 94; Jarḥ III 1, p. 96; Jamʿ I 335). His biographies and those of his father, Walīd ibn ʿUbaḍah, are few and short in contrast to those of his grandfather ʿUbaḍah ibn al-Ṣāmīt (d. 34/655–56), who was a Khazrajī famous for his participation in the treaties of ʿAqabah and in Muḥammad’s campaigns. He was one of five said
to have brought together (jama‘a) the entire Qur’ān in Muḥammad’s day and to have taught the Qur’ān and writing to others (Ibn Ḥanbal V 315; Istidāb I 393). He served ʿUmar I in Syria as judge and educator (Ibn ʿSaʿd III 2, p. 93, and VII 2, p. 113; Bukhārī III 2, p. 92; Ma‘ārif, p. 131; Istidāb II 412; Isābah II 661–64; Usd III 106 f.). He became also an authority on ḥadīth, which he transmitted to his sons, including Wālid ibn ʿUbādah (d. during reign of ʿAbd al-Malik), and others (see Ibn ʿSaʿd V 57 f.; Jarḥ III 1, pp. 95 f.; Jamʿ I 334 f., II 536; Nawawī, pp. 329 f.). For his musnad see Ṭayālīṣī, pp. 78–80, and Ibn Ḥanbal V 114 and 313–30. His grandson and namesake ʿUbādah ibn al-Wālid, who is the source of this tradition, reports that he and his father, from whom he transmits (Ibn Ḥanbal III 441), set out “in search of (religious) knowledge” (natlub al-ʿilm) among the Ansār before the latter should perish (cf. p. 259). The first man they met was Abū al-Yasar Kahtar ibn Amr (d. 55/675; see Ibn ʿSaʿd III 2, pp. 118 f.; Jarḥ III 2, p. 160; Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh IV 1, pp. 220 f.; Istidāb II 700; Isābah IV 419 f.; Usd IV 245, V 323 f.), accompanied by a young servant with a container full of manuscript sheets or suhuf (Jamʿ II 430 f.). We have here a literate family of three generations whose members were familiar with both oral and written hadith.

This seems to be a singleton tradition. Its one identical parallel is transmitted from Laith ibn ʿSaʿd by Qutaibah ibn ʿSaʿd, as in the case of Tradition 1, with the slight variants بَيْلُ الكِتَابِ and لَعْلَ نَتْفِي of the papyrus (Nasabī II 160). There are, however, a number of traditions that dwell on ʿĀʾishah’s jealousy of her rivals in the harem and present closely related versions of this tradition (e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal VI 115; Muslim XVII 158). There are, in addition, later and slightly edited versions of the conversation between Muḥammad and ʿĀʾishah (Ibn al-Jauzi, Talbis iblls, pp. 33 f.; Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Taḥṭārī, Kīlat al-sinṭ al-thamīn fī manṣūb ummahāt al-mumīnīn, ed. Muḥammad Rāghūb al-Taḥṭārī al-Ḥalabī [Ḥalab, 1928] p. 80). The assignment for each soul of a good and an evil spirit is confirmed by the Qur’ān and numerous other traditions (see e.g. Surahs 6:112, 43:36; Concordance III 125 ff.). See page 141 for biblical roles of angels.

Tradition 3. Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā ibn Ḥibbān (ca. 47–121/667–739) of Medina transmitted from many Companions to such leaders as Yaḥyā ibn Saʿiḍ, Zuḥrī, Ibn ʿIshāq, and Mālik ibn Anas (Maʿārif, p. 239; Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh I 1, pp. 265 f.; Jarḥ IV 1, pp. 122 f.; Ibn Ḥibbān, p. 103; Jamʿ II 453; Taʿrīḍ, pp. 221 f.).

Luṭuʿah was a freedwoman of the Ansār. Her transmission of this tradition is repeatedly confirmed in the biographical references to Abū Širmah and in the parallels to the papyrus text. Abū Širmah al-Anṣārī (n.d.) participated in the conquest of Egypt, where he settled (Daulābī I 40; Istidāb II 667; Isābah IV 197; Usd V 229 f.; Jamʿ II 482).

The tradition has six nearly identical parallels, all but one of which (Daulābī I 40) are transmitted through Ṭayālīṣī. Of the five from Laith, one (Ibn Mājah II 30 f.) is transmitted from him by the Egyptian Muḥammad ibn Rumḥ (d. 242/856; see Jamʿ II 471; Jarḥ III 2, p. 254) and the other four by Qutaibah ibn Saʿiḍ (Ibn Ḥanbal III 453; Abū Dāʿūd III 315; Tirmidhī VIII 122 f.; Usd V 230). These parallels vary from the papyrus text only in the interchangeable use of the verb forms اشْتَقَّ شَافِعَاءُ and اضْرَبَضْ.
the right regardless of his status or age (see e.g. Muwatta? II 926 f. [= Shaibani, p. 373]; Ibn Hanbal I 367, 462, II 130, 154, 260, 515, and VI 2 f., 13; Nubala? II 427).

Tradition 5. Paleographically the 'ain of ٌ at the end of recto 8 and the kāf of ٥ in recto 9 are faulty because they look more like ٌ or one of its sister letters. Scribal carelessness is evidenced also by the omission of ۢ in recto 9 and of the last phrase of the tradition, which called for the interlinear insertion.

Zibirqan ibn 'Abd Allah al-Laithi (n.d.) was an obscure traditionist to judge by the paucity of information about him (Bukhari, Ta'rikh II 1, p. 397; Jarh I 2, pp. 609 f.). A Zibirqan ibn 'Abd Allah is mentioned as transmitting from Abu Hurairah, as is one whom Yahya ibn Sa'id defended and transmitted from (Jarh I 2, pp. 609 f.), but no Zibirqan who transmitted from Abu Hurairah to Yahya is specified in the sources.

No parallels have yet been found. A number of Companions were averse to the use of cold water in winter for the extensive ritual ablutions. Muhammad is reported as permitting the lesser ablution (tawaddar), though he himself practiced the extensive one (taghassul). Among those who avoided cold water for fear of catching cold were 'Amr ibn al-'As and 'Ammar ibn Yasar. Among those who insisted on the use of water, no matter how cold, for the complete ablution were 'Umar ibn al-Khattab and 'Abd Allah ibn Mas'ud, and Abu Hurairah belongs in this second group (see NasiI I 63). The theme is widely discussed, including the substitution of sand for cold water (cf. p. 264, comment on Tradition 3). According to Surahs 2:46 and 5:6 sand may be used when no water is available, that is, tayammum (see also Surahs 4:46, 5:9). Various opinions and practices prevailed among the followers of the several legal schools (see e.g. Ibn Hanbal III 348, IV 264 f.; Bukhari I 97; Muslim IV 10, 56-63; Abu Daud I 92; Ibn Majah I 105; Tahawi III 171-74). There are also a number of traditions against preferring death to any sort of trouble or misfortune (e.g. Bukhari IV 48, 410; Muslim XVII 7 f.; Ibn Hanbal II 316, 350). Some of these trace back to or are transmitted by Abu Hurairah.

Tradition 6. Note the omission of the first 'an in the isnād, in all probability a scribal error as are other indicated errors of omission. Note also the cancellation of the last word in recto 10 and the interlinear insertion in recto 11.

For Salim ibn 'Abd Allah (d. 106/725) see page 142.

The only parallel yet found (Ibn Sa'id III 1, p. 197, lines 10-15) has a different isnād, in which, however, Yahya ibn Sa'id transmits from Qasim ibn Muhammad (see p. 191) to Hammad ibn Salama ibn Dinur (see pp. 160 f.). This and the papyrus text, though not identical in wording, were undoubtedly meant to convey the same meaning. The one significant variant is the negative ِ in recto 11 of the papyrus for the positive ِ of Ibn Sa'id. Ibn al-Jauzi (Ta'rikh 'Umar ibn al-Khattab, p. 55) cites the part beginning with ِ from Ibn Sa'id with some slight variation. 'Umar's statement was provoked by the controversy that was generated when Abu Bakr nominated him as his successor to the caliphate (see Tabari I 2137-41).

Tradition 7. Note the break in the text, which cannot be due to the join in the papyrus and therefore is a blank space that was to be filled in later. Abu Yazzid is no doubt Suhail ibn Abi Salih, from whom Yahya ibn Sa'id is known to have transmitted and who, like Yahya, died during the reign of Mansur. He wrote down his collection of traditions, including those from his father, which he marked in order to distinguish them from traditions received from others (Bukhari, Ta'rikh II 1, pp. 105 f.; Jarh II 1, pp. 246 f.; Dhahabi I 129; Mizan I 432; Jam? I 207 f.). His father, Abu Salih Dhakwan (d. 101/719), was a well known transmitter from Abu Hurairah, and traditions transmitted from him by his son and others are readily
found (Bukhārī, Ta’rīkh II 1, p. 238; Jarḥ I 2, pp. 450 f.; Dhahabī I 83; Jam‘ I 132 f.). For some of Abū Ṣāliḥ Dhakwān’s materials see for example Ṭayālīḥ, pp. 316–20, and Ibn Ḥanbal II 230–32, 235 f., 246, 250–54.

This incomplete tradition obviously refers to the treatment of slaves, especially their manumission, marriage, and profitable transactions involving minors. These themes are covered in the standard collections especially in the chapters on nikāh and ʿaql. For traditions bearing on these themes see for example Muwattā’ II 776, Bukhārī III 416, 429, 434, 483, Muslim IX 206–8, Tirmidhī V 29, and Concordance I 215 and II 352.

Tradition 8. For Anas ibn Mālik see page 249.

The earliest and shortest tradition ranking the Ānṣār would seem to be the one that simply states خُبَرُ الْإِنْصَارِ يَوْمَ الْجُهَادِ. It originated with Abū ʿUsaid of the Banū Saʿīdah, a subdivision, like the Banū al-Najjār, of the Khazraj tribe (Bukhārī IV 125; Tirmidhī XIII 271; see also Akhbār al-qlāfū III 243 f.). The fuller tradition is widely known and is transmitted by several Companions in slightly varying forms (see e.g. Bukhārī III 7; Concordance II 159). Its earliest forms trace back to Abū Hurairah and to Abū ʿUsaid (Ibn Sa‘d III 2, pp. 102 f.; Isṭīḥāb II 621 f.; Isābāh III 694; Usd IV 279; Jam‘ II 478; Tirmidhī XIII 270 f.) and his fellow tribesman Abū Ḥumaid (Daulābī I 24; Isṭīḥāb II 635 f.; Isābāh IV 84; Usd V 174; Jam‘ I 282, No. 1063), both of whom are said to have died during the reign of Muḥāwiyyah. Though most of the lines of transmission trace back to Abū ʿUsaid, it is Abū Ḥumaid who links the origin of the tradition to the expedition of Tabūk (Bukhārī I 377; Muslim XV 43 f.). The earlier and simpler literary forms of the tradition omit the question-and-answer element (e.g. Ibn Hanbal III 496 f.; Bukhārī, Ta’rīkh IV 1, pp. 299 f.; Usd IV 279). Some versions retain Muḥāmmad’s initial question but omit the people’s answer: قالوا يَا رَسُولُ ٱللَّهِ (Ibn Ḥanbal I 56, III 105; Ṭajrīd, p. 277). In others Muḥāmmad repeatedly asks his question (Ibn Ḥanbal III 202) or the people repeatedly ask (Ibn Ḥanbal II 267).

The papyrus text itself has two complete parallels transmitted, like Traditions 1–3, from Laith ibn Sa‘d by Qutaibah ibn Sa‘īd. Their matn is identical with that of the papyrus text except for the use of the modus energeticus of the jussive mood— بلْهُمْ بِسْطَهُمُ َ—and the use of the plural— يِبَذَ يِبِيدَهُمُ (Bukhārī III 473; Tirmidhī XIII 270).

The tradition has historic significance because it singled out the Khazrajite Banū al-Najjār for the first place of honor among the Ānṣār and thus drew protests from some of the other tribes (Ibn Ḥanbal III 496; Muslim XV 43). Its real significance, however, is its bearing on the more widespread rivalry between the North Arab and the South Arab tribes. For, although the exact line of Muḥāmmad’s maternal descent is not known, the men of the Banū al-Najjār claimed and Muḥāmmad conceded that they were his maternal uncles. Certainly the early literature repeatedly emphasizes the role of both the men and the women of the Banū al-Najjār in the life and the political and administrative activities of Muḥāmmad (see Sirāh I 88, 107, 286–88, 296, 337, 345–47, 360, 362 f., 1007; Ibn Sa‘d I 2, pp. 43 f., 54 f., 76 f., III 1, pp. 38, 81 f., and III 2, pp. 48–72; see also Watt, Muḥāmmad at Medina, pp. 153 f., 165 f., 248, 288, and 399).

Traditions 9–13. These traditions are of the maqtū‘ variety, that is, their isnād’s do not extend back to Muḥāmmad. They report the practices of the Companions or Successors and have no parallels in the standard collections, though their themes are copiously treated in the latter (cf. comment on Tradition 4 and Concordance).
YAHYA IBN SA‘ID AL-ANＳARI

Sa‘id by Laith ibn Sa‘id, and in addition their isnāds extend back through alternate links to Muḥammad and forward to Qutaibah ibn Sa‘id (e.g. Bukhari II 19; Tirmidhī V 266; Nasā‘ī II 232). The main burden of such traditions is the avoidance of interest and usury (see p. 170), so generally condemned in Islam (see e.g. Sūrah 2:275, 3:130, 4:161; Sūrah I 759; Tirmidhī V 207; Concordance II 217 ٦٦٧). On the whole, the various practices accepted in such commercial transactions illustrate the workings of the dictum that “differences among jurists are a mercy from Allāh” (see e.g. Shaibānī, Al-asl I [Cairo, 1373/1954] 95, 221; Jāmī‘ II 78–92; Concordance II 67 f.).

Tradition 9 touches on three themes—disapproval of demand for the return of a gift (e.g. Tirmidhī V 301; Abū Dā‘ūd III 291), commercial loans with or without security (e.g. Muaṭṭā II 642, No. 46; Ibn Mājah II 9; Dārimī II 253; Nasā‘ī II 232), and stipulation of special conditions or reservations in a sale contract (e.g. Tirmidhī V 198; Nasā‘ī II 227).

Tradition 10 involves the sale of futures for a specified price and for advance payment (e.g. Muaṭṭā II 657 f., 680; Bukhari II 35; Abū Dā‘ūd III 275; Tirmidhī V 216) and the settlement of contract disputes (e.g. Abū Dā‘ūd III 273; Dārimī II 250 f.; Tirmidhī V 271 f.).

Qāsim ibn Muḥammad (d. 108/726) of Tradition 11 was a Medinan, the grandson of the caliph Abū Bakr. He was greatly preoccupied with ḥadīth and sunnah, especially the latter, but was averse to committing them to permanent record. That he transmitted from Ibn ‘Abbās and to Yahyā ibn Sa‘id is frequently indicated (Ibn Sa‘d V 139–43; Bukhari, Ta‘rīkh IV 1, p. 157; Jarḥ III 2, p. 118; Nawawi, p. 507; Dhaḥabī I 90 f.; Jāmī‘ II 419 f.; Ibn Khallikān I 528 f. [= trans. II 485 f.]).

The tradition involves trade in young slaves and specifically illustrates the general disapproval of unequal barter and the approval of barter in kind for both animate and inanimate categories (e.g. Muaṭṭā II 640; Bukhari II 21–24, 31 f., 41; Tirmidhī V 246 f.; Abū Dā‘ūd III 249; Nasā‘ī II 221–24, 226 f.). It illustrates also the general disapproval of the sale of anything not actually owned and possessed by the would-be seller (Muaṭṭā II 642, 675; Muslim X 168–72; Tirmidhī V 241; Abū Dā‘ūd III 276, 283).

In Tradition 12 Laith ibn Sa‘id is omitted from the isnād. The pupil-scribe is actually writing down the added comments of his shaikh or teacher-transmitter. For Sa‘id ibn al-Musayyib see page 202. The first part of the content is related to that of Tradition 11. The second part expresses Ibn ‘Abbās’ disapproval of pawning animals. The use of animals, pawned or given as security, was specifically regulated (e.g. Muaṭṭā II 468, No. 46; Bukhari II 116; Ibn Mājah II 44). Note that Yahyā ibn Sa‘id himself appended the comment: “(A marginal) note in the book reads ‘this is what Ibn ‘Abbās used to say about that which is given as security.’ ” This statement confirms directly that Yahyā possessed and used manuscripts, from one of which his comment is quoted.

Tradition 13 involves payment of debts. The chapters on sales (البيع) in the standard collections all stress the required giving of measure for measure as a principle in all financial and commercial transactions and suggest, in addition, voluntary giving of a little more than a full measure (e.g. Bukhari II 139; Muslim V 226; Nasā‘ī II 224; see also Concordance II 371 زاد and III 561 f. ضمین).

Tradition 14. The command to be considerate of and generous to the weak and the poor is found in Sūrah 6:25 (cf. Ibn Mājah II 275 f.). Many are the instances of Muḥammad’s consideration of women and of the weak among men during pilgrimages (see e.g. Bukhari I 422 f.; Muslim IX 38–42, with Nawawi’s commentary on legal differences of opinion in regard
to some of the points involved). Similar consideration extends to occasions other than the 
*ḥajj* (cf. *Concordance* I 76, II 397, and III 512 f. التوبة 

*Traditions* 15–16. Note the division of the word التاس by the end of verso 12. No close parallels 
have been found for these two closely related traditions. It is impossible to determine 
whether Ḣayyāb ibn Saʿūd was omitted from the *isnād* of Tradition 16 intentionally. It is pos-
sible that this tradition is itself an editorial supplementation by Laith ibn Saʿūd's immediate 
transmitter and that he added Laith's personal view on the subject.

Note the use of the euphemistic phrase “made a gift of his wife to her people” to imply repu-
diation. The main theme is fully covered in the standard collections. At issue is whether pro-
nouncement of the divorce formula thrice on one occasion constituted final divorce or whether 
pronouncement on three different occasions was required. The second and more humane 
practice, which gives tempers time to cool and foolish husbands a chance to redeem their 
folly, was intended by Muhammad. The question was widely debated by traditionists, jurists, 
and commentators (e.g. *Muwatta* II 550–53; Ibn Ḥanbal I 314; Bukhārī III 464, 480; Muslim 
X 61 f.; Abū Dāwūd II 255 f.; Tirmidhī V 131–34; Naṣār I 97; Ibn Mājī II 323; Dārimī II 
163; see also Wensinck, *Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition*, “Divorce,” and *Con-
cordance* I 141 f. ياب في الیة بت).

*Tradition* 17. No parallel is yet known. The sources caution repeatedly against physical 
violece to servants and slaves since such treatment, especially if undeserved, calls for their 
dismissal or manumission. That Muhammad's own forbearance toward his personal servants, 
freedmen, and slaves—even to “forgiving them seventy times a day”—gave way to less con-
siderate treatment is indicated by the papyruses and numerous related traditions (Ṣūrah I 
820; Ibn Ḥanbal II 45, IV 120, VI 31 f. and 229; Muslim XI 126–31; Abū Dāwūd IV 339–43; 
Tirmidhī VIII 126–31; Dārimī II 181; Khaṭīb VII 162; cf. Exod. 21:20). General disapproval 
of anger and rewards for controlling it are also stressed (e.g. Sūrah 3:134; *Muwatta* II 905 f.; 
Tirmidhī VIII 176–79; *Concordance* III 506 f. ضرب, IV 250 f. عاصم, IV 555 f.; *Watt, Muham-
mad at Medina*, pp. 68 and 321).

*Tradition* 18. No close parallels appear in the standard collections in the chapters on mar-
riage and divorce nor in the *Concordance*. The point at issue is that no divorce is legal until 
the *iʿdādah* or waiting period is completed, so that a man who divorces one of four co-wives 
and marries another before the termination of the *iʿdādah* has five wives instead of the legal 
limit of four. Hence the fifth marriage must be annulled until the *iʿdādah* of the wife being 
divorced is completed.

Muhammad did, on several occasions, annul a divorce or marriage entered into with un-
seemly haste. His motive was as a rule to safeguard women's rights as they were being estab-
lished during the transition from pre-Islamic to Islamic practices (see Sūrah 2:228; Bukhārī 
III 479 f.; Muslim X 67 f.; Wensinck, *Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition*, “Divorces”; 
*Concordance* IV 15 f.). The extent to which Muhammad arbitrated disputes between fathers 
and marriageable daughters and between husbands and wives is indicated in Gertrude H. 

*Tradition* 19. No parallel has been found. The point involved is no doubt related to the use 
of silk by free men and by women. As a general rule the use of silk was not approved for free 
mens but was permitted for women, though some think its use was limited to slave women. 
The tradition may deal with a specific exception involving a man and his slave woman caught 
in a silken situation (cf. *Concordance* I 441 f. خر و II 27 م Zub).
Tradition 20. Note the scribal error in the repetition of حديث. The space allowed for the rest of the tradition does not permit the extension of the isnad beyond Yahyā himself unless the main was very brief. It is probable that the main was related to that of Tradition 19, with a statement that may have read something like لا يس نذكك او لا يعمل بذلك or perhaps even ذكر فلا نذكك الحديث.

Tradition 21. Only the first two links of the isnad survive.

IDENTIFICATION AND SIGNIFICANCE

The papyrus represents the hadith collection of Yahyā ibn Sa'id al-Anṣārī as transmitted by Laith ibn Sa'd to an unnamed shaikh or teacher-transmitter from whom the writer of the manuscript itself received it.

Zuhrī, Yahyā ibn Sa'id, and Ibn Juraij (d. 150/767) won their reputations as the leading traditionists of the Hijaz partly because each attempted to make an exhaustive collection of hadith (الاال wahj).1 Yahyā’s list of pupils, like Zuhrī’s, included both Mālik ibn Anas and Laith. Some of his materials as transmitted by Mālik are found in the Muwatta2, while the papyrus text and the parallels cited illustrate some of his materials as transmitted by Laith. Laith’s direct association with Yahyā began during a pilgrimage in the year 113/732 when as a youth he wrote down traditions from Zuhrī (see p. 168) and Yahyā.3

Laith recorded Yahyā’s early reluctance to use written texts,4 and Mālik recorded his change of attitude. While he was still in Medina Yahyā regretted that he had not written down everything he had ever heard, though he was known for his good memory.5 His criticism of Zuhrī’s early transmission from memory (see p. 175) without the aid of manuscripts can only mean that Yahyā himself not only wrote down his materials but used his manuscripts in transmitting. By the time he wrote from ʿIrāq to his former pupil Mālik in Medina to send him a collection of Zuhrī’s traditions, written texts had come to play as important a role in his study and transmission as they had long done in the circles of Zuhrī, Laith, and Mālik.

Yahyā began collecting traditions while he was still in Medina, some of them by correspondence (مكث tabah) with, for instance, Khalīd ibn Abī ʿImrān (see p. 214), who flourished at the end of the first century.6 Yahyā supplemented this collection with about a hundred Zuhrī traditions that Mālik sent him in answer to his request soon after he took service under Saffāḥ as judge in ʿIrāq,7 where his collection continued to grow. It was sought after and circulated in part or in whole in manuscript form in both ʿIrāq and the Hijaz.8 That this growing collection acquired identity as a manuscript in Yahyā’s own day is evidenced by his younger contemporaries’ repeated references to it as Kitāb Yahyā ibn Sa'id. The increasing acceptance of written as opposed to oral transmission is further illustrated by the seemingly divergent accounts that describe the attitude of one of ʿIrāq’s leading scholars, Ḥammād ibn Zaid ibn Dirham (98–179/716–95), to Yahyā’s “book.” In one account Ḥammād, whose eyesight was

1 Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh IV 2, p. 276; Jaʿrī, Toqdimah, p. 43; Jaʿrī IV 2, p. 148; Khaṭṭīb XIV 104 f.; Dhahabī I 130; Nawawi, p. 625.
3 Ṭabarī III 2374; Khaṭṭīb XIV 101; Nawawi, p. 265.
4 Jamīʿ I 68.
5 Jamīʿ I 74; Ibn Sa’d VI 240; Khaṭṭīb XIV 105; Dhahabī I 130.
6 Ṭabarī III 2374.
7 Akhbār al-ṣuḥāṭ III 244; Kifāyah, p. 347; Mawrid, p. 259; Taqīd, pp. 262–65. See Khaṭṭīb XIV 104 and Dhahabī I 130 for Yahyā’s similar but secret request to Sulaimān ibn Bilāl for the hadith of Rabī’ah ibn ʿAbd al-Rahmān.
8 See e.g. Akhbār al-ṣuḥāṭ III 224; Khaṭṭīb XIV 104 f.; Dhahabī I 129, 132, 211 f.
poor, is reported as saying that he did not possess anyone's written material (kitab) but that were he to have any book at all he would be glad to have the "book of Yahyā." A second account states that Ḥammād did not have any book except the "book of Yahyā ibn Saʿīd." Obviously Ḥammād, like Yahyā and Zuhri before him, was at first reluctant to use written sources but relented later, at least to the point of acquiring the desired copy of Yahyā's book.

That Laith added to the initial groups of traditions that he had received directly from Zuhri and Yahyā would seem to be indicated by the statement that he collected the hadith of these two scholars and of a third Medinan scholar who was their contemporary, Bukair ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Ashajj (d. between 117/735 and 127/745). Bukair settled in Egypt and had a written collection of hadith, all or part of which he handed to Laith for copying and transmitting, a very early example of the mundūvalah method of transmission (see p. 209). We have seen (Document 6) that Laith added to his Zuhri collection through a number of Zuhri's pupils who had likewise settled in Egypt. Laith had the opportunity to add to his Yahyā collection through some of Yahyā's pupils in Medina or even from some of his ʿIrāqī pupils such as Ḥammād ibn Zaid or his authorities. For Laith made two trips to ʿIrāq. On his first trip, during the reign of Mahdī, he was accompanied by his secretary Abū Ṣāliḥ and both copied hadith materials, especially the vast organized collection of Hushaim al-Wāsīṭī (see p. 163). The second trip was made on the order of Hārūn al-Rashīd, who sought Laith's legal opinion, but no details are available of Laith's literary activities on this occasion. Laith had still another source, in Egypt itself, from which to collect traditions of Zuhri, Yahyā, and Bukair, namely, visiting scholars from the Hijāz, Syria, and ʿIrāq who, as Laith's fame increased, made a point of calling on him and usually exchanged materials with him.

Laith and Mālik were not the only ones who collected the hadith of Yahyā ibn Saʿīd. Ayyūb al-Sikhtiyānī, who admired Yahyā,14 reported both ʿAmr ibn Dinār (d. 126/744) and the youthful Sufyān ibn ʿUyainah to write down for him the best of Yahyā's hadith. Sufyān reports that he wrote some traditions for Ayyūb but heard later that the sheet (riqṭah) on which he wrote them was lost.15 Others in Medina, though not professional traditionists, were interested in collecting Yahyā's hadith from manuscripts without benefit of oral transmission. The Makhzūmite Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿAbbād (n.d.) had a collection of Yahyā's manuscripts from which he transmitted to Māʿmar ibn Rāshid (d. 154/771) while on a visit to the Yemen.16 Sufyān ibn ʿUyainah reports Jaʿfar's possession of these manuscripts but does not specify their source, though his use of the verbs wajada and jamaʿa strongly suggests the book market.

The fact that four of the traditions (Nos. 1–3 and 8) of our papyrus have identical or nearly identical parallels in the standard collections and the fact that all these parallels are transmitted from Laith by Qutaibah ibn Saʿīd point to Qutaibah as the transmitter of this document just as a similar set of facts points to his transmission of Document 3. But the biographical sources that report Qutaibah's transmission from Laith do not specify his transmis-

---

9 Dhahabi I 131.
10 Jarḥ, Taqdimah, p. 178; Dhahabi I 211 f.
11 Mīšān II 361.
12 See e.g. Khāṭib XIV 105.
13 Abū Nuʿaym VII 321–24. This trip is reported on the authority of Laith's secretary, who does not state that he accompanied Laith. The details of Laith's meeting with Hārūn, obviously edited, are provided by Hārūn's attend-
14 Dhahabi I 129.
15 See e.g. Khāṭib XIV 104.
16 Jarḥ, Taqdimah, pp. 38 f.; Jarḥ I 1, p. 487; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh I 2, pp. 198 f.; Mīšān I 192.
sion of the "book of Yahyā" from Laith. On the other hand, they do state that Abū Ṣāliḥ the secretary of Laith transmitted the "book of Yahyā" from Laith. The secretary's method of transmission from Laith has been questioned. He himself states that he did not hear (samʿ) from Laith any book except that of Yahyā ibn Saʿīd. Critics favorable to him, such as Yahyā ibn Maʿān, explain this as meaning that he read back (ʿard) his copies of other books or manuscripts to Laith. Less favorable critics accuse him of relying on written sources only, using neither the samʿ nor the ʿard method, for all of his transmission from Laith. These critics would seem to have reached the point of absurdity in assuming that during some twenty years that Abū Ṣāliḥ served as Laith's secretary he never attended Laith's classroom or public sessions when either the samʿ or the ʿard method had to be used.  

I am inclined to accept the statements of Abū Ṣāliḥ and Yahyā ibn Maʿān and therefore suggest Abū Ṣāliḥ rather than Qutaibah as the probable transmitter of our document. That no parallel traditions from Abū Ṣāliḥ appear in the standard collections may well be attributed partly to the above-stated criticism as reinforced by certain questionable circumstances. There is a report that Abū Ṣāliḥ's professional enemies or rivals, especially Khalid ibn Najlıh, a neighbor who had access to his manuscripts and imitated his handwriting, maliciously and surreptitiously introduced forged sheets and rolls into his collection (see p. 201), so that the aging Abū Ṣāliḥ, thus deceived, transmitted them as coming from Laith.  

Despite this shadow that was cast on Abū Ṣāliḥ, many who knew him well and trusted him continued to transmit from him. Others, however, especially scholars of the next generation, either bypassed him completely or, more frequently, used his materials but failed to mention him in the isndd or referred to him only as ʿAbd Allāh in order to hide his identity. Even Bukhārī indulged freely in these practices.

In view of the foregoing considerations it can be stated that the papyrus represents the "book of Yahyā" as transmitted by Laith probably to his secretary Abū Ṣāliḥ or perhaps to his pupil Qutaibah ibn Saʿīd. Any attempt to identify the next transmitter, the actual writer of the papyrus manuscript, would be futile. He must have been a younger contemporary of Abū Ṣāliḥ and Qutaibah. The manuscript itself, in view of the poor script, the scribal errors, the rather poor quality of the papyrus, and the lack of margins, indicates a student's working copy rather than a scholar's permanent record. It was in all probability written around the end of the second century or sometime during the first two decades of the third century at the latest. The roll form was still in use in the second century.

II

This document, like Documents 5–6, illustrates the relatively high ratio of survival in the standard collections of the ḥadīth and sunnah of Muḥammad as against those of the Companions and Successors, even of such renowned men of action as ʿUmar I (Tradition 6) or such famous scholars as Ibn ʿAbbās (Traditions 11–12), Saʿīd ibn al-Musayyib (Tradition 12), and Yahyā ibn Saʿīd (see comments on Traditions 4 and 9).

It is to be noted further that though both Yahyā and Laith were primarily judges and jurists they retained the collection represented by Document 7 in the early musnad form, that is, they did not organize the subject matter into legal and non-legal categories and arrange the
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17 Khatīb XIII 9.
18 Khatīb IX 478, 480, Dārīmī I 352 f., and Mīzān II 46 f.; credit Abū Ṣāliḥ with having heard a great many traditions from Laith.
19 Jarḥ I 2, p. 355, and II 2, p. 87; Mīzān I 302, II 47.
20 Khatīb IX 478; Dārīmī I 28 f., 49, 55, 73, 76, et passim (for Abū Ṣāliḥ's transmission from Laith and several of Laith's sources); Tābrīzī III 2574.
21 Khatīb IX 480; Mīzān II 47; Jamʿ I 268 f. See also p. 173 above.
former under appropriate legal headings (*abwāb al-fiqh*). This unquestionable evidence of successive transmissions of such a *ḥadīth* collection in its entirety (*‘alā al-va‘īh*), as also in the case of Document 6, can only reflect the importance that was early attached to the *ḥadīth* and *sunnah* as such and not merely as aids to the legal profession, which was, from the start, basically dependent on them. For Yahyā’s collection, like Zuhrī’s, can be classified as a *jāmi‘ al-ḥadīth*, which could in turn be classified by the next generation of transmitters of both of these units—such as ‘Uqail ibn Khālid and Laith—as partial *musnad*’s of Zuhrī and Yahyā.

The *isnād* terminology of Document 7 represents a stage between that of the extensive use of *‘an‘anah* (see p. 121) and/or the term *qāla* and that of the use of the doubly reinforced *ḥaddatha* plus *qāla* (see p. 173). This transition calls for some elucidation. Important as the time element was in the development of *isnād* terminology, it alone was not responsible for the variation in practice. The latter reflects also, on the one hand, individual preferences and, on the other, the increasing difference between the attitude of the judge and the jurist and that of the professional traditionist toward the *isnād* and its terminology.

Zuhrī and Yahyā ibn Sa‘īd began their student careers in the second half of the first century when there was as yet no sharp distinction between the jurists and the traditionists, both being generally referred to as *‘ulamā‘* or *fuqahā‘*—terms applied in their widest and non-technical sense to men of (religious) knowledge and understanding—from whose ranks were drawn all sorts of government officials, but especially schoolteachers, community educators, and judges. Owing in no small measure, but not entirely, to Zuhrī’s outlook and activities, there was during his and Yahyā’s lifetime an increasing awareness of the role that needed to be assumed and developed by a body of professional jurists (*fuqahā‘*) on the one hand and by the professional traditionists (*muḥaddithūn*) on the other hand. These two outstanding men of Medina traveled different roads to reach the top of these emerging professions. The Tradition-conscious Zuhrī became the first to undertake the major task of writing down all the traditions within his reach and found patrons in the Umayyads of Syria, while Yahyā was called by the first two ‘Abbāsid caliphs to judgeships in ʿĪraq. The unquestioned integrity of these two men accounts for their common emphasis on a sound *isnād* for the *ḥadīth* and *sunnah* of Muḥammad, while their high rank in public office accounts for the inclusion of their own deeds and opinions in their respective collections, which covered also the *ḥadīth* and *sunnah* of the first generations of Muslims down to their own day, as is so well illustrated by Documents 6 and 7 respectively. But despite insistence on the use of *isnād*’s, especially for the *ḥadīth* and *sunnah* of Muḥammad, there was not yet a set of clear-cut *isnād* terms carefully graded and defined to indicate the method of transmission used at each step. Early in the period of Zuhrī and Yahyā, when oral transmission alone was all but taken for granted, the verbs *‘araḍa ‘alā,* *samī‘a,* *dhakara,* *za‘ama,* *balagha* and *ballagha,* *qāla,* *akhbara,* and *ḥaddatha,* followed by *‘an* when called for, were used almost indiscriminately to indicate both direct and indirect oral transmission. But inasmuch as this was also the period during which written transmission began seriously to challenge and compete with oral transmission, the need was soon felt for terms that would indicate one or the other of these two types of transmission or a combination of the two. This problem, however, was never approached methodically, and even its partial solution was left to the slow processes of time and general usage. Owing to the usage of those who favored oral transmission the terms *balagha,* *dhakara,* and *za‘ama* gradually became suspect while the other terms gained approval. In the meantime, though the early protagonists of written tradition continued at first to use all of these terms, they gravitated toward a preference for the terms *qāla,* *akhbara,* and *ḥaddatha* and presently adopted and stabilized supplementary terms
to cover specifically three methods of written transmission, that is, the munawalah, ījāzah, and mukātābah methods (see p. 35), which, as these studies show, were sanctioned and used by Zuhārī, Yaḥyā, and their contemporary Bukair ibn ʿAbd Allāh (see p. 209).

To use suitable isnād terminology in the classroom was one thing, but to achieve its full and consistent use in the isnād itself was another. For with each new generation of scholars a new link was added to the lengthening chain of authorities and the methods of transmission increased, so that any attempt to specify this double growth and greater degree of differentiation at every step of the written isnād had to fall by its own weight. Inasmuch as the use of manuscripts alone was under suspicion, the hadīth-writer became concerned with a terminology that would indicate accompanying direct oral transmission. Hence there was greater emphasis on the term ḥaddathānā than on even akhbaranā, let alone qāla and ʿan. At first the use of ḥaddathānā and akhbaranā indicated the same method, whereby the master himself recited or dictated his materials. Presently, however, the hadīth-writers used both of these terms, as also ḥaddathānā and akhbaranā, to stress direct transmission without actually specifying the method of this transmission. The method could have been as frequently as not the ʿard, whereby the student read back to the master, or even the munawalah, ījāzah, or mukātābah, which stressed written transmission. It is well attested that Zuhārī made no distinction between the same and the ʿard method24 and that he sanctioned the use of ḥaddathānā and ḥaddathānā for the munawalah and ījāzah methods even though he, at the time of transmission, made no inspection of the manuscripts involved; it was assumed, however, that he was already familiar with their contents or had complete confidence in the ability and character of the student or scholar involved.25

That some of Zuhārī's pupils, including Ibn Juraij, Laith ibn Saʿd, Mālik ibn Anas, Sufyān ibn ʿUyainah, and others who advocated permanent hadīth records, followed Zuhārī's practices should not be surprising. Nor should it be surprising that the isnād's of Documents 6 and 7 so adequately illustrate both the progressive development and the relative non-fixity of the written isnād terminology. For the authors of both documents avoid all questionable terms in the isnād's of the hadīth al-nabī, generally use ʿanānah for the earliest links of the isnād's, and use the term ḥaddathānā exclusively for one (Document 7) or more (Document 6) of the later links of an isnād.24 Nevertheless, in neither document does the isnād terminology indicate the precise method of transmission for each link of the isnād's. Such information, when it is available at all, has to be ferreted out of biographical and critical works, as was done for these studies. It should be noted, furthermore, that these types of literature, which cover īlm al-jarḥ wa al-taqlīd, had barely begun to appear in Zuhārī's day. For the latter type in particular the critics were groping for adequately descriptive technical terms throughout the second century.

The evidence provided by the literary sources on the activities of the men of the isnād's of Document 7 indicates, as in the case of Document 6, continuous written transmission with and without accompanying oral transmission. Yaḥyā ibn Saʿd compiled his "book" from both oral and written sources (see p. 191). Among his contemporaries and even among his earlier authorities were a number of outstanding scholars who were definitely associated with extensive

---


24 The same usages are reflected, by and large, alike by collections of the 2d century—i.e., the Muwaṭṭa of Mālik ibn Anas, the Ḥadīth of Ibn Wahb, and Tayālīšī's Musnad—and the standard collections of the 3d century except for the more precisely differentiated use in the latter of the terms ḥaddathānā, ḥaddathānā, akhbaranā, and akhbaranā.
written hadith collections. These included, in addition to Zuhri and Malik, Abū Yazīḍ Suhail ibn Abī Šāliḥ (Tradition 7), Ibn ʿAbbās (Traditions 11 and 12), Anas ibn Mālik (Tradition 8), and members of the family of ʿUbadah ibn al-Walīd (Tradition 2). Among Yahyā’s authorities who did not at first write or sanction the writing of hadith but eventually encouraged others to write down from their dictation were Abū Hurairah (Tradition 5), Sālim ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb (Tradition 6), and Saʿīd ibn al-Musayyib (Tradition 12).25 Saʿīd ibn al-Musayyib even became concerned toward the end of his life when a promising pupil, Qatādah ibn Diʿāmah (d. 117/735 or 118/736), showed no inclination to write down from his dictation, and he asked: “Don’t you write (at all), or do you (already) have in hand something of what I am relating to you?” Qatādah then proved that his memory was reliable by reciting all that he had heard from Saʿīd over a period of four days.26 Of all Yahyā’s authorities that are mentioned in this document, only Qāsim ibn Muhammad (Tradition 11) is known to have held out consistently against the writing-down of Tradition. The practices of the few remaining, mostly obscure men, cannot at present be determined.

The following significant facts emerged from the detailed study of the isnād’s of Documents 6 and 7. (1) The great majority of the men named, even those of the early period which overlapped that of Zuhri and Yahyā ibn Saʿīd, advocated and produced permanent hadith records, sometimes of considerable size. (2) Both Zuhri and Yahyā drew freely on these records of their older contemporaries if not, indeed, on those of their predecessors. (3) The progressive transmission of the manuscripts represented by Documents 6 and 7 from Zuhri to ʿUqail ibn Khālid to Laith ibn Saʿīd and from Yahyā ibn Saʿīd to Laith respectively and of both works from Laith to several of his transmitters, such as his secretary Abū Šāliḥ and his pupils Yahyā ibn Bukair and Qutaibah ibn Saʿīd, clearly indicates continuous written transmission of sizable hadith collections in their entirety (ʿalā al-wajh). (4) While some form of oral transmission accompanied the written record at one or more of these stages of transmission, at other stages manuscripts exchanged hands to form the only basis of the transmission.

25 Jāmiʿ II 73; Mżdn II 102.
26 Abū Nuʿaim II 333; cf. Nawawi, p. 510. Qatādah had a phenomenal memory, but his eyesight was always poor.
DOCUMENT 8

Oriental Institute No. 17629. Late second or early third/early ninth century.

Coarse brown papyrus, 26.2 X 14. cm., with 26–28 lines to the page and practically no outer margins (Pis. 15–16). The inner margins of the two joined folios vary from 1.5 to 2 cm. in width. The inner margin and a few traces of the text are all that survives of the first folio. The papyrus is broken and peeled in spots.

Script—Small easily legible cursive script. The scribe, who was very saving of space, separated the conjunctive wāw from the following word (recto 11, verso 10) and split a number of words, including even the name Rishdin, at the ends of lines (verso 1, 6, 10). Diacritical points are used for bā and its sister letters and for shin, nun, and yā; they appear more frequently on the verso than on the recto and are carefully placed, especially in names (recto 8–9, verso 3). The circle without a dot is used for punctuation but is missing at the end of Tradition 10. Note that at the ends of lines the scribe separated the tradition from the circle that marks its end (recto 3, 14).

TEXT

Recto

(1) قال [حدثني] أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم مسح رأسه وذوا لله

وهو صلى الله عليه وسلم شرب من الحمالة على جميع أهل

(2) رضاني عابن ابي عقيل عن ابن عمله عن عقبة بن عامر عن النبي صلى الله

عليه وسلم أنه قال من توضأ فاحسن وضعه ورفع نظره إلى

السماء [فقد أتى الشهد] ان لا الله إلا [الله وحده لا شريك له وان

محمد عبد عاه ورسله فتحت له ثمانية أبواب من الجنة

(3) رشدين عن ابي عقيل عن ابنه عن أبي سعيد الخضرى قال

صلاة الور [كما صلة العصر] [4] رشدين عن أبي عقيل

عن سعيد بن المسبب انه كان يسلم عن يمينه وعن يساره

(5) رشدين عن أبي عقيل عن سعيد بن

السبب قال ما احب اذا احمرت بالصلاة ان افغ و

لا اسها عن شبا واذكر نعم الشرف قال قلت لم قال

(6) رشدين عن أبي عقيل قال رأيت سعيد بن المسبب

ابناباً بالحبيرة وانا رجل قال يتألخى ان ي أحرم

بالصلاة قال الرحمة تقع بين يديك فلا تحرك شباً

(7) ولا تمس [8] رشدين عن أبي عقيل عن ابنه عن عائشة
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RISHDIN IBN SA'D

21 قال ليجي عليّ [أ]م القيام اقوم على متابع من [أ]لو

22 بهم قضبان من نور بين ايدهم كمثال [أ]

23 الحلال الرؤوسي ويتأين ببعتهم الثمين و....

24 الصما قبل فُنهم يا رسول الله قال (أو)

25 لئن قوما جلسوا حين ذكر الله ل....

26 يجلسهم عليه صلة ارحام ولا 

Comments.—Tradition 1. The reading of the last word of recto 1 as ذراعية، which frequently occurs in the standard hadith collections, is not possible paleographically. The ritualistic washing of the entire head, including hair and ears, is a sunnah, but the word ذراعية does not appear in this connection (cf. Mawāqif I 31, 34 f.; Bukhārī I 59 f., 61; Muslim III 172 f., VIII 125 f.; Dārīmī II 30 f.; Ibn Mājah I 85–87; Nasā'ī I 27–32). The tradition in fact refers to Muhammad's practice and manner of blessing children presented to him, including his own grandsons (e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal I 215, II 101; see also Concordance II 170 ذراعية). The identity of the child involved in this instance became clear when the men in the isnād of Tradition 2 were identified. He is ʿAbd Allāh ibn Ḥishām ibn Zuhrah, grandfather of Abū ʿAqīl Zuhrah ibn Maʿbad of Traditions 2–9. Abū ʿAqīl must therefore be in the isnād of this first tradition and be reporting how his grandfather was blessed by Muhammad and describing how his grandfather practiced the sacrifice. Both of these events are detailed in the grandfather's biographical entries, which add that he was born in the fourth year of the Hijrah and lived into the caliphate of Muʿawiyah and is said to have moved to Egypt (Īstīfāb I 387; Usd III 270 f.; Iṣābah II 910 f.; Jarḥ II 2, p. 193; Jamʿ I 245). A variant in several of the sources just listed is يضحي بالشاة for ينحر بالهديدة of the papyrus text.

Tradition 2. Rishdīn ibn Saʿd (d. 188/804) was a well known Egyptian traditionist. He was generally considered a trustworthy but weak transmitter because he had a poor memory and made careless mistakes. More specifically, he was accused by his younger contemporary Qutai-bah ibn Saʿd al-Balkhī (see pp. 143 f.) of uncritical acceptance of any traditions that were presented to him: كلاً لا يبالي ما نَفَع اليه فقَرأ سَماء كان من حدثة أو من غير حدثه (see Ibn Saʿd VIII 2, p. 204; Bukhārī, Tārikh II 1, p. 308; Ibn Ḥanbal, Al-musnad VIII [1369/1950] 117 f., note on No. 5748; Tirmidhī II 301, X 53 f. and 63 f.; ʿHusn al-muḥādarah I 155). This criticism indicates that Rishdīn relied on manuscripts, which is not surprising considering his poor memory. In this respect Rishdīn can be compared with Abū Ṣāliḥ the secretary of Laith ibn Saʿd, who in his old age could not detect forged manuscripts, including some of the Abū ʿAqīl of this isnād, which had been surreptitiously introduced into his authentic collection (cf. p. 195). Rishdīn was considered weaker than Abū Ṣāliḥ, and his collection was almost entirely ignored though it was transmitted by his son Ḥajjāj (d. 211/826; see Jarḥ I 2, p. 160; Mizān I 214; Lisān II 22) and by his grandson Muḥammad (d. 242/856) and the latter's son Ahmad (d. 292/904) in a “large copy" (نسخة كبيرة). This family isnād from Rishdīn onward came to be known as the worst to come out of Egypt (Maʿrifah, p. 57; Mizān I 338, II 48). For Ahmad and Muḥammad see Jarḥ I 1, p. 75, and III 2, p. 230, Mizān I 63 and III 40, Lisān I 257 f. and V 118.

Abū ʿAqīl Zuhrah ibn Maʿbad (d. 122/470) is known to have transmitted to Rishdīn and to most of the leading traditionists of Egypt, including Laith ibn Saʿd and his secretary Abū
Šalih (e.g. Ṣa‘d b. Musayyib, as in Traditions 4–6, 8) and Muhammad b. Mukkādīr (as in Tradition 8). He transmitted also from several members of his family, including his father (as in Traditions 3, 7, 9) and especially his grandfather ‘Abd Allāh ibn Hishām ibn Zubrah (see p. 201) and a paternal cousin (as in this tradition) who remains unnamed (Daulūbī III 33; Ibn Sa‘d VII 2, p. 203; Bukhārī, Ta‘rīkh II 1, pp. 404 f.; Jarḥ I 2, p. 615; Ḥusn al-muḥāḍarah I 153). He was the sole transmitter from his father, Ma‘bad (Bukhārī, Ta‘rīkh IV 1, p. 399; Jarḥ IV 1, p. 279; Ẓi‘ān III 182).

ʿUqbah ibn ʿĀmir (d. 58/678), a Companion who settled in Egypt, served under Mu‘āwiyah as governor of Egypt and later in Mu‘āwiyah’s navy. He is considered a leading Egyptian traditionalist whose ḥadīth was transmitted by many outstanding scholars of his own and the following generation (Ibn Sa‘d II 2, p. 127, and VII 2, p. 191; Bukhārī, Ta‘rīkh III 2, p. 430; Kindī, pp. 7 f. and 36–38; Jarḥ III 1, p. 313; Istī‘āb II 489; Ḥisbāb II 1164 f.; Dhahābī I 40; Jam‘ I 381). For his musnad see Ṭāyālīsī, pp. 135 f., and Ibn Ḥanbal IV 143–59.

Nearly identical parallels for our text are available. The isnad is the same except that Rīshdīn is replaced by the Egyptian Śa‘d b. Ayyūb, who was born in the year 100/718 and whose death date is uncertain (Ibn Sa‘d VII 2, p. 203; Bukhārī, Ta‘rīkh II 1, p. 419, which gives death date as 149/766; Jarḥ II 1, p. 66; Jam‘ I 170, which gives death dates of 152, 161, and 166 with preference for 166/782). The only variant in the content is the phrase بصره يدخل من ابها يشاه at the end (e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal IV 150 f.; Jam‘ I 156, 170). The tradition is found as a part of a longer one (e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal I 19 f.; Dārimī 182) with the isnad of the papyrus except that Rīshdīn is replaced by the Egyptian traditionalist Ḥa‘wāb ibn Shura‘ī in 158 or 159/774–76; see p. 239). It is also found as part of a longer tradition whose isnad traces back to ‘Uqbah ibn ʿĀmir, ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, or Anas ibn Mālik (Ibn Ḥanbal IV 145 f., 153; Muslim III 118 f.; Tirmidhī I 71–74; Naṣārī I 35; Ibn Mājah I 83 f., 89 f.; Concordance II 113, III 221). For the seven heavens and the eight gates see for example Muwatta‘ II 469, Ibn Sa‘d VII 2, p. 145, Ibn Ḥanbal II 268, Tirmidhī XIII 136 f. and 139.

Tradition 3. Abū Sa‘d al-Khudrī (d. 74/693) of Medina was a prominent Companion who, like ‘Uqbah ibn ʿĀmir, collected Muhammad’s sayings. He transmitted them orally to scholars of his own and the following generation (Ṭabarī III 2338; Istī‘āb II 552 f.; Usd II 289 f., V 211; Ḥisbāb II 166–68; Jarḥ II 1, p. 93; Mustadrak III 563 f.; Dhahābī I 41; Nawawī, pp. 723 f.; Jam‘ I 158 f.). For his musnad see Ṭāyālīsī, pp. 286–97, and Ibn Ḥanbal III 2–98.

This short tradition seems to have no parallels in the standard collections. The brief statement is relative to two questions. (1) Is the witr-prayer, which is performed at night after the last and before the first of the five required daily prayers, obligatory? (2) Just what constitutes the witr-prayer? Both questions are argued at length in sections devoted to this prayer, in some of which Abū Sa‘d al-Khudrī is cited (Muwatta‘ I 63–66; Bukhārī I 252–54; Abū Da‘ūd II 61–67; Dārimī I 370–74; Tirmidhī II 240–56; Concordance III 385, 398, 403).

Abū Sa‘d al-Khudrī was opposed to the recording of Tradition, and his ḥadīth al-nabī is cited by others in support of this position (e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal III 12 f., 21, 39).

Tradition 4. Sa‘d b. Musayyib (d. 94/712) was the son-in-law of Abū Hurairah, from whom he transmitted the greater part of his collection. As stated above (pp. 201 f.), he transmitted to Abū ʿAql (Jarḥ I 1, p. 615). He served as judge in Medina but fell out of favor during the counter-caliphate of ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubair. Among his leading pupils were Makhūl al-Shāmī, Zuhri, and Yaḥyā ibn Sa‘d al-Anṣārī who, like the critics, were unanimous
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in praising him (Ibn Sa’d II 2, pp. 128-32, and V 88-106; Bukhari, Tarikh II 1, p. 467; Mar’ir, pp. 223 and 273; Jarh II 1, pp. 59-61; Ibn Hibban, p. 418; Dhahabi I 52 f.; Nawawi, pp. 283-86; Jame’ I 168 f.). He was one of the very few traditionists whose mardsil, or traditions with incomplete isnad’s, were accepted by Shafi’i (Risalah, pp. 58 f., 63 f., and 74; Adab al-Shafi’i, pp. 232 f.; Kifayat, pp. 404-6; Mar’ir, pp. 25 f.; Nawawi, p. 283). Though the papyrus text records Sa’d ibn al-Musayyib’s personal practice, the practice itself was nonetheless that of Muhammad and is reported for the latter in almost the same words as those used in the papyrus text (e.g. Ibn Hanbal I 186, V 86 and 338; Muslim IV 154; Concordance II 510).

For Sa’d ibn al-Musayyib’s initial stand against the writing-down of Tradition and his subsequent change of attitude see page 198.

Traditions 5-6. The last word of recto 11 could be read in several other ways, for example انفع or perhaps even with a miniature sād or ḍād to give انصح or انصح. The reconstruction of the first word of recto 15 was suggested by a possibly related case of عب اًالحصاء (Muwaṭta’ I 88) which has reference to playing with pebbles or to pelting with gravel and pebbles in the court of the mosque to express displeasure at something taking place there (see Concordance I 472 حرصاء and IV 103 عب).

These traditions report Sa’d ibn Musayyib’s own practices and opinions and seem not to have survived in the standard collections.

Tradition 7. For ‘A’isha as a traditionist see pages 119 and 187. The tradition seems not to have survived as a unit, but its essential parts appear frequently in related traditions. Two contradictory ideas are involved. Menstrual impurity nullifies the efficacy of prayer, and a believer who is in the act of prayer is thereby placed above all earthly impurity (e.g. Ibn Hanbal VI 214, 218; Muslim IV 17-26, 65-68; Bukhari I 80 f., 138 f., 316; Concordance I 113). The seven earths and the seven heavens are familiar concepts in Islam (e.g. Surah 65:12; Bukhari II 101 f., 303 f.; Tafsir VII 207-13; Maqdisi II 41-52 [= trans. pp. 37-52]; Concordance II 396 f.).

Tradition 8. Muhammad ibn al-Munkadir (d. 130 or 131/747-19) was a well known Qur’an-reader of Medina and a traditionist who seems to have escaped the barbs of the critics (Mar’ir, p. 324; Bukhari, Tarikh IV 1, pp. 97 f.; Jarh I 1, pp. 219 f.; Tabari III 2503; Ibn Hibban, p. 49; Abu Nu‘aim III 146-58; Dhahabi I 119 f.; Jame’ II 449).

The tradition does not seem to have survived, though consideration for others is generally stressed in Islam. Private prayer and worship, though acceptable, are nevertheless considered the least meritorious. It is better to pray in two’s or three’s and best of all in the large congregation of the Friday worship (see e.g. Muwaṭta’ I 129 and references there cited; Nasā’I I 134 f.). Muhammad urged those who had prayed privately to join any group that was engaged in worship and thereby win added merit (Abū Dāwūd I 157 f.; Nasā’I I 115; Concordance III 344 f.).

Tradition 9. Abu ‘Ubaidah, whose given name was Murrah, was the son of ‘Uqbah ibn Nafi‘ al-Qurashi, the well known conqueror of North Africa, who died in 63/682-83 (see e.g. Istīlāb II 490 f.; Usd III 420 ff.; Husn al-mubādarah I 126 f.). Abu ‘Ubaidah was involved in Egyptian administrative circles until about 100/718-19 (see Futūh, p. 84; Kindi, pp. 41 and 69) but seems to be little known as a traditionist (see Bukhari, Tarikh V 51, No. 446; Jarh
IV 1, p. 365, No. 1666). His son and his grandson were very active in the affairs of North Africa and Spain (see e.g. Futūḥ, pp. 212 f. and 217–21).

The tradition, though it deals with accepted ideas and familiar practices, has no parallel in the standard collections. Attention to personal grooming in preparation for the Friday worship and for festivals is generally stressed (e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal I 265, II 149, V 39 and 48 f.; Muslim VI 74; Nasāʾī I 100–102, II 75; see also Concordance II 368–70 in several places). The instruction to trim the mustache reflects the practice that Muḥammad adopted in contradistinction to that of the Persians and the "people of the Book." The practice of letting the beard grow was similarly motivated, as was also the manner of dyeing and dressing the hair (see e.g. Ṭayālīṣ, pp. 95, 285; Muwattaʾ I 278; Ibn Saʿd I 1, p. 52, I 2, pp. 132, 140–43, 146 f., and III 1, p. 135; Ṭabarî I 1573). As a rule, if no principle was involved, Muḥammad at first adopted the fashions, such as hair styles, of the "people of the Book" (Bukhārī III 52), but later he deliberately changed such visible personal grooming so that his followers could be distinguished from all others (e.g. Ṭayālīṣ, pp. 273 and 289; Ibn Ḥanbal II 240, 260, 262, 291, 309, 356, 366, III 132, 246, and V 264 f.; Concordance II 65 in several places). Muḥammad nevertheless retained a number of commendable and gracious personal practices of the pre-Islamic Arabs, including the trimming of the nails as in this tradition, some of which he credited to the biblical Abraham (see e.g. Muwaṭṭaʾ II 921 f.; Ṭabarî III 2387; Taʿwil, pp. 135–37).

 Tradition 10. Note the division of the name Rishdīn at the end of verso 1 (see p. 199) and the omission of the ʾalif of prolongation of Khālid in verso 3. For the ʾunūn of the scribe in verso 10, the scribe first wrote ʾalif and then corrected it.

Abū al-Ḥajjāj al-Jarrāḥ ibn Abān al-Iskandarānī, who transmits Traditions 10–12, remains unidentified despite the availability of his full name in Tradition 11. His authority and fellow Alexandrian, Khālid ibn Ḥamīd (d. 169/786), was well known and was frequently quoted by Egyptian historians (see Futūḥ, Intro. p. 7) and traditionists. Among the latter are mentioned Abū ʿAqlī of this document and Abū ʿSālīḥ the secretary of Ḭaith ibn Saʿd (Bukhārī, Ṭaʿrīkh II 1, p. 133; Ṭarḥ II 1, pp. 325 f.; Ḥusn al-muḥāḍarah I 153). Alexandria under the Arabs continued to be a center of learning and produced a number of reliable traditionists in this early period (see e.g. Ḥusn al-muḥāḍarah I 151–56; Samāʿīnī, folio 35b).

For Muqāṭīl ibn Sulaimān see Document 1.

No parallel for this long tradition seems to be available in the standard collections, though traditions related to its several themes are numerous. The flying horses of heaven, with their non-earthly characteristics and their adornment of precious stones, are popular themes (e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal V 352, VI 281; Tirmidhī II 88, IX 12 f., XIII 222; Concordance II 104 in several places; Muḥāṣibī, Kitāb al-tawâkhhum, ed. Arthur J. Arberry [Cairo, 1356/1937] p. 53). The people of paradise, too, are described in terms similar to those of the papyrus text (e.g. Muslim XVII 171–74; Ibn Ḥanbal III 349; Ḫaṭṭīb XIII 197; Concordance I 274 and 377 in several places; Tafsīr I 395–97, on Sūrah 2:25). The grading of the different classes of the inhabitants of paradise is also a familiar theme (see e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal II 339, III 283, V 316 and 321; Bukhārī II 315, 331; Concordance II 118 f. in several places). The idea that entry into heaven and rank in heaven are conditioned by such deeds as are mentioned in the papyrus text is common (see e.g. Sūrah 10:26; Ibn Ḥanbal II 498 f., V 348; Muslim XVII 159 f., 174 f.; Tirmidhī X 5, 16, 34 f.). Rishdīn is cited repeatedly by Tirmidhī on the affairs of heaven and hell (see e.g. Tirmidhī X 11, 35, 50, 56, 63; Dārīmī II 335). But deeds are in turn judged by
the motive behind them (see e.g. Bukhārī I 14 and 22, III 412; Ibn Ḥanbal III 11; Concordance IV 380). The interrelationship of the doctrines of salvation by grace, faith, and deeds is covered in the chapters on faith, imān (see Document 3, Traditions 4 and 29), in the standard hadīth collections and in formal works on theology and need not detain us here.

**Tradition 11.** Note the omission of the circle of punctuation at the end of Tradition 10 and the absence of Rishdīn’s name at the head of the isnād of Tradition 11. There is, however, little doubt that Rishdīn is reporting a second tradition from Abū al-Ḥajjāj al-Jarrāḥ (see Tradition 10), from whom a third tradition (No. 12) follows immediately. The incomplete isnād’s of Traditions 10–12 and the use of the indefinite “some learned man related to me” in the isnād’s of Traditions 11 and 12 point to practices that no doubt contributed to the oblivion which seems to have overtaken Abū al-Ḥajjāj, though he may well be listed in works that specialize in weak and untrustworthy traditionists and that are not available to me. It should be pointed out, however, that for the categories of traditions that Abū al-Ḥajjāj is here transmitting—relating to strictly personal affairs and hell-fire preaching—imperfect isnād’s were more generally accepted (see p. 144).

Tradition 11, which is more of a khabar, has no parallel. Visiting the sick was considered obligatory by some (see e.g. Tayālīsī, pp. 101, 303, and 308 f.; Bukhārī IV 48; Jāmiʿ I 121) and meritorious by all (see e.g. Tayālīsī, pp. 132 f.; Ibn Ḥanbal II 344, 354). Muhammad himself followed the practice (Ibn Saʿd I 2, p. 95; Muslim VI 226; see Bukhārī IV 40–49 and Concordance III 366 for full coverage of the theme). Many of the traditions on the subject trace back to Abū Hurairah (d. 58/678 at age 78), and his biographers mention several cases of his own illness and devote considerable attention to his last illness and his death (Ibn Saʿd IV 2, pp. 61–63; Abū Nuʿaim I 383 f.; Usd V 315–17; Isābah IV 381–99, esp. p. 397; Nawawi, pp. 761 f.). Man is reminded not to be forgetful of death but not to wish for it as Abū Hurairah, who transmits such a tradition (e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal II 250), is said nevertheless to have done on some occasion (e.g. Ibn Saʿd IV 2, p. 61, and VII 2, p. 4; Ibn Ḥanbal II 316; Muslim XVII 7 f.; Abū Nuʿaim IX 13). The bleak surroundings and difficulties with his landlord mentioned in connection with that occasion suggest that it occurred during the earlier part of Abū Hurairah’s life, when he was poor and had long been one of the ahl al-suffah, or “guests of Islām” as Muḥammad preferred to call the poor. Later, Abū Hurairah became a political figure and served under ʿUmar I as financial administrator for Bahrain. He delivered such a large sum of tax money that ʿUmar at first could not believe the amount to be possible. Later, when ʿUmar removed him from office, he distributed some of Abū Hurairah’s personal fortune, as he did the fortunes of a few of his other newly rich administrators (Ibn Saʿd III 1, pp. 203 and 216; Yaʿqubī II 234, 283).

**Tradition 12.** Note the scribe’s correction of [temp] to جلسو in verso 25. The Muqāṭīl of the isnād is in all probability Muqāṭīl ibn Sulaimān of Tradition 10. Raḥīm is probably the well known Raḥīm ibn Ḥaiwah (d. 112/730 at an advanced age), the theologian-traditionist who engineered the succession of ʿUmar II to the caliphate (see p. 23) and who was at one time a qādis (Ibn Saʿd V 247 ff. and VII 2, pp. 161 f.; Maʿārif, p. 239; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh II 1, pp. 285 f.; Jarḥ I 2, p. 501; Abū Nuʿaim V 170–77; Ibn ʿAsākir V 312–15; Nawawi, pp. 245 f.; Dhahabī I 111; Jamʿ I 139).

Again the tradition as a unit has no parallel though its several themes appear in the standard collections. Raised seats and large tents made of jewels—pearls and rubies being especially favored—are among the promised heavenly rewards (e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal II 159; Tirmidhī IX 16;
Dārimī II 336; Concordance II 105 i^>-). Scepters resembling pillars of light and twigs and canes of gold are also envisaged (e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal I 398 f., II 160; Concordance V 404 jussan al-dhimm). Conduct deserving of such rewards includes the sacrifice of a healthy fatted lamb or some other acceptable animal (e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal II 489 f.). Remembrance of God and charitable giving to relatives, especially those of the maternal clan, are frequently urged on all Muslims (see e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal II 374, 484; Ibn Sa'd III 1, p. 44, where the caliph 'Uthmān seeks to justify his nepotism on this basis; see also Concordance I 357 1 juss and II 237 ñam and pp. 117 above and 254 below). The rights of maternal relatives were deeply rooted in pre-Islamic Arabian society (see e.g. W. Robertson Smith, Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia [Cambridge, 1885] p. 65; Asaf A. A. Fyzee, Outlines of Muhammadan Law [Calcutta, 1949] pp. 334-41, 403 f.; Watt, Muhammad at Medina, pp. 272 f. and 289 f.).

IDENTIFICATION AND SIGNIFICANCE

I

That the papyrus represents either Rishdīn ibn Sa'd's own manuscript of his ḥadīth collection or a contemporary copy of it seems to be indicated by the isnād terminology. There is, first, the consistent absence of initial ʿan or qāla or ḥaddathānī etc., which in itself does not necessarily indicate the compiler's original collection. For example, in Document 5 the isnād's start throughout with Naḍr ibn 'Arabī but other internal evidence points to a post-Naḍr transmitter. On the other hand, in Document 2 the isnād's start throughout with Mālik and all the other evidence points to Mālik himself as the author-compiler. In Document 8 there is no internal evidence to indicate a post-Rishdīn transmitter. For, in Tradition 11, whose isnād does not start with Rishdīn, it is apparent from the text that Rishdīn continues to transmit on the authority of Abū al-Ḥajjāj al-Jarrāḥ of the preceding tradition (see p. 205). Furthermore, the external evidence supports the conclusion that the papyrus represents Rishdīn's manuscript or an early copy of it rather than a manuscript of any one of his several transmitters except possibly his son Ḥajjāj. Significant in this connection is the lack of a complete parallel, that is, one identical in both isnād and matn, for any of the twelve traditions and the fact that in the one instance (Tradition 2) where there are identical or nearly identical parallels for the matn two of the isnād's replace Rishdīn with considerably older Egyptian contemporaries (see p. 202). Again, of the eight known direct transmitters from Rishdīn, not one seems to have transmitted a single tradition of the papyrus text. Thus it would seem that Rishdīn fared no worse than other honest but weak traditionists whose collections were bypassed as units at the same time that some of their traditions were known from external evidence to be authentic and therefore were accepted for transmission. Among the leading traditionists who recognized Rishdīn's weakness yet transmitted some of his materials were Ibn al-Mubārak,1 Qutaibah ibn Sa'id (see p. 201),2 and Ibn Ḥanbal.3

It was usually family interest alone that was responsible for the preservation of manuscripts of a weak or suspect traditionist. We have seen (p. 201) that Rishdīn's descendants to the third generation transmitted through an unbroken family isnād until close to the end of the third century. It is therefore possible that the papyrus represents the copy of Rishdīn's son Ḥajjāj or even of his grandson Muḥammad and that the ownership was indicated at its

1 See e.g. Tirmidhī X 35, 53 f., 63 f.
2 See e.g. Tirmidhī X 35, 53 f., 63 f.
3 See e.g. Bukhārī, Tārīkh II 1, p. 308; Jāḥiṣ II 2 p. 513; Ibn Ḥanbal II 222, III 247.
beginning. The script is of a poor and common variety that offers little help in dating. Though a scribal peculiarity which is usually associated with early manuscripts, namely the splitting of words at the ends of lines, appears in this document, it could stem from the scribe's desire to economize on space as evidenced by the narrow margins. It should be noted, however, that neither the size of the script nor the interlinear spacing suggest desire for economy.

Outside the family circle our sources lead us once more to Laith ibn Sa'd's secretary Abū Sāliḥ, who is one of the few scholars known to have transmitted directly from Rishdīn and who was also associated with Rishdīn's sources (see pp. 201, 204). The papyrus might represent either Abū Sāliḥ's own transmission from Rishdīn or a copy that he acquired for his library from Rishdīn's son Ḥajjāj or his grandson Muḥammad, who were his contemporaries. Furthermore, several of the documents in this small group of related literary papyri were associated in one way or another with Laith and his secretary (see p. 91).

II

Only five of the twelve traditions report either the sayings or the practices of Muḥammad (Traditions 1, 2, 7, 10, 12), while the rest reflect the practices or opinions of his Companions and their Successors. Thematically, nine of the traditions involve ritualistic practices, one deals with an illness of Abū Hurairah (Tradition 11), and two refer to the Day of Judgment and the life hereafter (Traditions 10 and 12), a field in which a great deal of leeway was permitted as to both matn and isnād (see p. 205). There is not, in all the twelve traditions, a single practice or idea that is inconsistent with the essential burden of the related traditions that have survived in the standard collections. Therefore the rejection of all twelve traditions, each as a unit of isnād and matn, was determined solely by their defective isnād's, the defect being the weakness of Rishdīn. Furthermore, when the matn was corroborated through an isnād that is the same except for the elimination of Rishdīn (see p. 202), priority for inclusion in the standard collections was given to traditions from or about Muḥammad, as seen repeatedly in connection with the early hadīth collections represented by our papyri (see p. 77).

The role that manuscripts played in the earlier evolution of Rishdīn's collection is not sufficiently clear. It is known that Abū Sa'd al-Khudrī was opposed to the writing-down of traditions (see p. 202) and that Sa'd ibn al-Musayyib eventually sanctioned the writing of hadīth (see p. 198). Specific information on the practices of the other early and intermediate men of the isnād's has not yet been located. It should be noted, however, that the isnād of the family of Abū ʿAqīl is predominant, that family collections have been proven in the great majority of cases to consist of manuscripts that passed from one generation to the next, and that manuscripts played the major role in Rishdīn's own transmission and in that of his family for three more generations.

*Mizān II 48.
DOCUMENT 9


Fine light brown papyrus, 26.8 × 2.4 cm. (Pl. 17). The piece is broken at the top and perhaps at the bottom also. Much of the upper and right parts is lost, and the rest is badly damaged. The vertically fibered surface of the papyrus was used first for a private letter. The hadith text was written later on the back of the discarded letter in a smaller script with less generous spacing. Errors, corrections, and spacing further mark it as a rough copy.

Script—Small cursive stable hand. Diacritical points are used frequently for bāʾ and its sister letters, nūn, and yāʾ and less frequently for šīn, dād, and ghain. Once each, fāʾ and qāf have a dot above and below respectively— in the words ُنُبَيْلَةَ and ُنُبَيْلَةُ of Tradition 11. The initial alif of Ibn Lahlūḥah is omitted throughout. Note the almost angular initial ‘ain of ُعَمَّارْ in Tradition 2 and of the first “Ammār” in Tradition 9. The circle is used for punctuation.

TEXT

Expand the text into readable form and translate it where possible.
Comments.—Traditions 1–2. The first tradition corroborates a preceding one which is lost with the top of the papyrus. Not enough significant text remains to justify an attempt at identification.

Abd Allâh ibn Lahâfah (96–174/714–90) was a well known Egyptian traditionist and jurist and a fellow student of Laith ibn Sa’d. He was appointed imperial judge for Egypt (154–64/771–80) by the ‘Abbâsid caliph Mansûr (Fundh, pp. 243 f.; Kindî, pp. 308 f.; Husn al-muhâdadarah I 164, II 117). For imperial appointments of provincial judges see page 123, note 19. Most of Ibn Lahâfah’s contemporaries and students held him in high esteem as a traditionist, but later critics were divided in their opinions as to his trustworthiness (see pp. 219–21).

Bukair ibn Âbd Allâh ibn al-Ashajj (d. between 117 and 127, 122/740 being most preferred date), Zuhâr, and Ya’lyû ibn Sa’d al-Ansârî were considered the most learned men of Medina. Bukair left Medina early to settle in Egypt, where he transmitted to a group of young scholars who later became famous. This group included Ibn Lahâfah and Laith ibn Sa’d. Laith’s transmission from Bukair was based on manuscripts, by the munâvwalah method (see p. 194) according to Abû Walî’d al-Tayâlîsî and by the âdîzâh method according to Ibn Hânbal (Ibn Sa’d V 185, 225; Bukhârî, Tarîkh I 2, p. 113; Jarîh I 1, pp. 403 f.; Tabarî III 2501; Ibn Hîbbân, p. 143; Nawâwî, pp. 175 f.; Dâhâhî I 150; Jamr I 58 f.; Husn al-muhâdadarah I 147, 162).
Tradition 3. The reconstruction in line 5 is based on the name Abū Qabīl in line 6. Note cancellation of text in line 6.

Abū Qabīl Ḥayy ibn Ḥanī al-Maṣāfīrī (d. 128/746) left the Yemen as a youth, late in the reign of Muʿawiyah, to settle in Egypt, where he later transmitted to many of Egypt's scholars, such as Bukair among the immigrants and Laith ibn Saʿd and Ibn Lahīḥah among the natives (Daulābī II 85; Ibn Saʿd VII 2, p. 201; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh II 1, p. 70; Jarḥ I 2, p. 275; Mīzān I 293; Ḥusn al-muhāṣarāh I 153, 154, 163; see also p. 213 below). Ibn Lahīḥah transmitted from Abū Qabīl to ʿUthmān ibn Ṣāliḥ (d. 219/834), who wrote down his materials. ʿUthmān lost his manuscript (kitāb) and was directed to a seller of sweetmeats who presumably had found it and probably was using it for wrapping. ʿUthmān made a purchase from the confectioner, but the source does not indicate whether or not he found his manuscript (Jarḥ III 1, p. 154). ʿUthmān is known to have used manuscripts and is an important source for Egyptian history (see e.g. Futūḥ, Intro, pp. 7 f.).

Abū Qabīl's source is in all probability Ḥamzah ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Khaṭṭāb (n.d.), who transmitted few traditions but was considered trustworthy. Other transmitters named Ḥamzah ibn ʿAbd Allāh (Ibn Saʿd V 150; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh II 1, p. 45; Jarḥ I 2, p. 212; Ibn Hibbān, p. 54) do not fit the context (see below).

Abū ʿAbd Allāh ibn Abī Māmūn remains unidentified. He could be the son of Abū Māmūn ʿUbayd Allāh al-Anṣārī (n.d.), whose clothing could be of interest in this context (see Daulābī II 136; Jarḥ II 2, p. 221; Mīzān II 168).

Qāsim ibn Muhammad (d. 108/726) was the grandson of the caliph Abū Bakr (see p. 191). Ibn Saʿd (Vol. V 141-43) devotes considerable space to his personal habits and clothing, which included several articles made of the popular khazz. Traditions 3–8 (and possibly some of the preceding lost ones) involve the wearing of garments made of khazz, a material woven either entirely of silk or a mixture of wool and silk (see Lane, Arabic-English Lexicon, ḥāzd; R. P. A. Dozy, Dictionnaire détaillé des noms des vêtements chez les Arabes [Amsterdam, 1845] p. 6; Ernst Kühnel, “Abbasid silks of the ninth century,” Ars Orientalis II [1957] 360–71). The all-silk variety was forbidden to free men (see p. 192), but the wool-and-silk mixture was thought to be permissible for them because Muhammad himself and some twenty Companions are said to have used it (e.g. Ibn Ḥanībal IV 233; Abū Dāʾūd IV 45 f.; Muwaṭṭa` II 912; Bukhārī IV 76 f.). Though some prominent Companions and Successors, such as ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb and his son ʿAbd Allāh, remained opposed to its use, it did come to be widely used in their time and after, as our document indicates, and even won the approval of theologians (see e.g. Ibn Saʿd III 1, p. 239; Concordance II 27 ḥāzd).

Tradition 4. Note cancellation of text at end of line 7. There are several contemporary traditionists named ʿUbayd Allāh from whom Ibn Lahīḥah did transmit or could have transmitted (see e.g. Futūḥ, pp. 231, 235; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh III 1, p. 376; Dḥahabī I 151 f.). The name is completed to read ʿUbayd Allāh ibn Abī Jaʿfar al-Miṣrī (d. 136/753–54) in line 7, where it fits well, on the strength of the statement that Ibn Lahīḥah transmitted from this ʿUbayd Allāh, who in turn had heard traditions from Ḥamzah ibn ʿAbd Allāh, probably he of Tradition 3 since both traditions cover the same theme (Ibn Saʿd VII 2, p. 202; Jarḥ II 2, pp. 310 f.; Jamʿ I 305; Dḥahabī I 128). Mīzān II 67 cites traditions whose isnād's include Ibn Lahīḥah–Bukair–Nāfīʾ and Ibn Lahīḥah–ʿUbayd Allāh ibn Abī Jaʿfar–Nāfīʾ.

Traditions 5–6. Tradition 5 is reconstructed to start with Ibn Lahīḥah (line 8) on the strength of Tradition 6, which corroborates Tradition 5 and starts with Ibn Lahīḥah. The space available at the beginning of line 8 allows for the reconstruction of Ibn Lahīḥah and
another name. The surviving final hop suggests Abū Imāmah ibn Sahl or perhaps Salamah ibn Makhramah, both of whom are known to have transmitted from the caliph ʿUthmān (Dhahabī I 8; ʿJarḥ III 1, p. 160; Ibn Ḥanbal I 58). ʿUthmān is credited by some with 146 traditions, only sixteen of which found their way into the Ṣahihain (Nawawī, p. 410). He was interested in the market place and questioned people about prices and news (Ibn Saʿd III 1, p. 40). A number of the Companions and many more of the Successors transmitted from him, so that his musnad must have been sizable (see e.g. Ibn Saʿd III 1, pp. 36–58; Maʿārif, pp. 99–102; ʿJarḥ III 1, p. 160; Nawawī, pp. 405–13; Dhahabī I 8 f.; ʿJamʿ I 347; Isābah III 1103 f.). Most of the works which deal specifically with the Companions have little to say of ʿUthmān as a traditionist. For his musnad see Tayalīsī, pp. 13–15, and Ibn Hanbal I 57–75 (= Ibn Ḥanbal, Al-musnad I [1365/1946] 323 to II [1366/1947] 16, where not 146 but 171 traditions are numbered).

The line crossing out the entire content of Tradition 5 is due to some error in copying, as also in Tradition 4. Nonetheless both ʿUthmān and ʿImrān ibn Ḥusayn (d. 52/672) wore clothing made of khazz, ʿImrān with Muḥammad’s specific approval (Ibn Saʿd III 1, p. 40, and VII 1, p. 5; Ibn Ḥanbal IV 488).

In Tradition 6, Ibn Lahiẓah is most likely supplementing Tradition 5 by indicating that ʿImrān also wore clothing made of materials for which Ḥamāh in Syria was known. When Baṣrah was founded ʿUmar I sent ʿImrān there to teach the people (Buhārī, p. 40). Later ʿImrān served as judge in Baṣrah (see e.g. Nawawī, pp. 484 f.).

Tradition 7. Mūsā ibn ʿAyān al-Ḥarrānī (d. 117/734) apparently moved in ʿIrāqī and eastern circles, since most of his authorities and transmitters were from those regions (see p. 153). Ḥammād ibn Salamah ibn Dīnār (d. 167/784) of Traditions 7–9 is the famous Baṣrān traditionist of Document 5, who used manuscripts and committed his own collection to writing (see pp. 160 f.).

This and the following tradition also involve clothing made of khazz. If we read لَوْ كُنْتُ in line 10 the sense would seem to be that wearing such clothing is of no particular significance, but if we read لَوْ كَرَضُ the sense could be that the wearer is not welcome under one’s roof.

Tradition 8. ʿAmmār ibn Abī ʿAmmār (d. ca. 72/691), a mawlūd of the Banū Ḥāshim, was a trustworthy traditionist of Mecca. He transmitted from Ibn Abī Ṭālib, Abū Ḥurairah, ʿImrān ibn Ḥusayn of Tradition 5, and others. Ḥammād ibn Salamah was one of a half-dozen well known traditionists who transmitted from ʿAmmār (Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh IV 1, p. 26; ʿJarḥ III 1, p. 389; Ibn Ḥibbān, p. 65; ʿJamʿ I 400). The sources do not carry ʿAmmār’s genealogy as far as the papyrus text does, for the word after the second “ʿAmmār” in line 10 is definitely not ابن but though only the dot of the hop is visible in the reproduction (Pl. 17) and the name following is not too certain. Concordance I 391 f. and II 336 f. do not seem to offer possibilities for identification of the tradition.

Tradition 9. The Ibn Abī ʿAbbās of the isnād is ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAbbās, who is seldom cited by his kunyah, Abū ʿAbbās (see Vol. I 104), and who was one of ʿAmmār ibn Abī ʿAmmār’s authorities (see above). Note the interlinear words and the use of the word لله for ʿAllah in line 13.

The tradition seems to be a singleton since all the many parallels originate with Ibn ʿAbbās and have the additional links ʿAmmār and Ḥammād as in the papyrus text. Three parallels are transmitted from Ḥammād by ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Mahdī (135–98/752–814; see Ibn Ḥanbal I 242 and Yāfīt I 134), ʿAffān ibn Muslim (134–220/752–835; see Ibn Ḥanbal I 283), and Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Khuzaʿī (n.d. and not further identified; see Khatīb I 142). ʿAbd al-Raḥmān’s version reads as follows:
Affân’s version in Ibn Ḥanbal’s text reads as follows:

 حدثنا عبد الرحمن ثنا حماد بن سلمة عن عمَّار بن أبي عماد عن ابن عباس قال رأيت النبي صلّم في الامام يصف النهاية أشعث أغبرية قارورة فيها مشفقًا أو يبتعد فيها شاً قال قلت يا رسول الله ما هذا قال دم الحسين وأصحابه لم أزل اتباعي وله من اليوم قال عمار أنفختنا ذلك اليوم فوجدنه فقلنا قتل ذلك اليوم.

Other parallels, with minor variants, are transmitted from Affân (e.g. Istī‘āb I 144, transmitted by Abū Bakr ibn Abī Shaibah [d. 235/946]; Usd II 22, which does not mention Affân though the text is his; perhaps also Isāḥāb I 687). Affân was a prominent Ḥanafī traditionist who moved from Basrah to Baghdād. He was an assiduous collector of ḥadīth, which he wrote down accurately and collated (ṣīlah; see Ibn Sa’d VII 2, p. 78; Khaṭīb XII 273 f.). He was for ten years the teacher and colleague of Ibn Ḥanbal and shared the views and trials of the latter on the question as to whether the Qurʾān was created. Ibn Ḥanbal, among others, preferred Affân to ‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn Mahdī, especially for his transmission from Ḥāmmād (Jarḥ III 2, p. 30; Khaṭīb XII 272, 274 f.), which explains the popularity of Affân’s transmission of this tradition (see Ibn Sa’d VII 2, p. 51; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh IV 1, p. 72; Maʿārif I, p. 261; Khaṭīb XII 269–77; Dāhābī I 344; Jamʿ I 407).

The textual differences among the parallels and between them and the papyrus text are mostly of familiar types that occur when transmission is not literal (ḥorfi): order of words and phrases, additions and omissions of words and phrases that are incidental to the basic meaning, interchanging of al-nabl and rasūl Allāh and of other words; inclusion or omission of the taṣlīyah, and variations in the use of direct and indirect speech. Despite these differences, the basic meaning of the tradition remains the same. There is, however, one perhaps rather significant difference between the papyrus text and all the parallels, namely, the actual time of ʿHusayn ibn ʿAlī’s murder. Whereas the papyrus text reads تلَك الليلة من الليلة in lines 14 and 15, all the parallels have تلَك الليلة من اليوم. In Tabari’s account ʿHusayn is described as making frantic preparations for defense all through the night before the morning of his death (Taʾrīkh II 323). This particular difference may reflect the belief that visions in daytime are more prophetic than dreams at night and that the time of a vision or a dream conditions the time of its fulfillment, and dreams in the early morning are expected to be fulfilled the same day (cf. p. 169). It is a day-and-night of twenty-four hours that is specified in all the accounts of ʿHusayn’s death no matter which terms are used.

The tradition has, so far as I know, no parallels in Shiʿite sources. Yaʿqūb II 292 tells an entirely different story, with no isnād, according to which Muḥammad while he was still on earth predicted ʿHusayn’s death. He gave his wife Umm Salamah, a staunch Alīd, a bottle filled with earth or sand and told her that when the earth turned to blood ʿHusayn would have been killed. When ʿHusayn’s trouble began in ʿIrāq she watched the bottle by the hour, and when she saw blood in it she realized ʿHusayn was dead and was thus the first to give the alarm in Medina. She is credited with a related tradition according to which she dreamed that Muḥammad had his head and beard covered with earth in mourning for ʿHusayn (Usd II 22).

Tradition 10. Dimām ibn Ismāʿīl al-Maʿārif (d. 185/801) was a well known Egyptian traditionist, the son-in-law of Abū Qabīl of Traditions 3, 4, and 11. He was generally accepted as
reliable and was sought out particularly for his traditions from Abū Qābil. Ibn Ḥanbal wrote down Dimām’s collection of hadith from one of Dimām’s direct transmitters, Suwād ibn Sa’īd (140–240/757–854), who had a collection of manuscripts (Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh II 1, p. 70, and II 2, p. 344; Jarḥ II 1, p. 469; Ibn Ḥiḥbān, p. 143; Mizān I 473; Ḥusn al-muhāḍarah I 154; Yāqūt II 224; see also p. 218 below).

No parallel has yet been located in the standard collections and biographical works. Around the death of Ḥusain there soon developed a body of traditions and legends, particularly among the Shiʿites, as seen in the comment on Tradition 9.

Tradition 11. As noted above (p. 210) Abū Qābil migrated from the Yemen to Egypt. The herdsman’s friend presumably was in Medina, or at least in the Hijāz, when ʿUthmān was assassinated, and he hastened to the Yemen with the disturbing news. The name may be read also as ʿābi al-ḵil or ʿābi al-ḡil. The letters of the last words in line 16 are clearly šād or ǧād, ʿayn or ʿuḏain, and ẓāl or ẓād but yield no personal name. They do yield several place names, the most likely of which is ʿṣūd (Yāqūt IV 388). Perhaps the word is meant for ʿṣūd in which case the woman is in some way concerned with the family collyrium box, perhaps as a means of identification.

The tradition has no parallels, and there is little reason for it to have found its way into the standard collections. However, Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh II 1, p. 70, has preserved an item that confirms the first part of the tradition: قال عمرو بن خدثنا ضمام بن أسمعيل عن أبي بيل قال ʿUthmān and Muʿāwiyyah (see Ibn Saʿd VII 2, p. 201, and Futūḥ, p. 234, and note the isnād 


The complete matn has only one parallel (Muwatāʾ I 11, No. 18), which reads يحيى بن مالك ابن بلغه أن أبي هريرة كان يقول من أدرك الركعة قد أدرك السجدة ومن أدرك قراءة آم القرآن فقد أدرك خير كثير.

In this version سجدة is substituted for صلاة, and the order of the two themes—presence at the initial reading of the Qurʾān and participation in the initial prayers—is reversed. No separate parallels for the first part of the papyrus text have been located, but parallels for the second part are numerous and for the most part trace back to Abū Hurairah (see e.g. Muwatāʾ I 5 f.; Bukhārī I 154; Muslim V 105 f., especially Nawawī’s comment; Ibn Ḥanbal II 241; Ibn Majah I 179; Mustadrak I 216, 274; see Concordance II 301 and III 404 and 406 for references to other parallels and related traditions).

Tradition 13. Sulaimān ibn Yasār (d. between 94 and 110, with preference given to 107/725, at age of 73) was counted among the seven leading scholars of Medina. So far as I know, he is the only initial source for this tradition, which is therefore a singleton. The expedition in which he participated, as stated here and in all the parallels, took place in the year 34/654 at the earliest or 50/670 at the latest. Though Sulaimān’s death date is uncertain, the range given above indicates that he was either yet unborn or not more than 13 years old at the time of the earlier expedition and that he was from 13 to 29 in 50/670. But Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, our earliest source, specifies the year 34/654 as the date of the expedition, thus casting doubt...
on Sulaimān’s participation in it and on the tradition itself. However, inasmuch as Sulaimān and his two immediate transmitters of this tradition—Bukair and Khalid ibn Abī Imrān—were all considered trustworthy, it is possible that the difficulty stems from the reading of the phrase in question, which may have been meant for the age of Sulaimān at his death, a type of error that is frequently encountered in Arabic manuscripts. At any rate, Sulaimān’s death date is too uncertain to allow us to deduce his age in the year 34/654. Furthermore, references to Arab boys in their teens going on expeditions are numerous. Still another alternative is to question the year 34/654 as the date of the expedition in favor of one early in the fourth decade (cf. Husain Mūnis, Fatḥ al-ʿArab li al-Maghrib [Cairo, 1366/1947] pp. 115–19, 136 f.; Ibn Saʿd V 130; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh II 2, pp. 42 f.; Jarḥ II 1, p. 149; Abū al-ʿArab ibn Tāmīm al-Tammāmī, Ṭabaqāt `ulumāʾ Iftīqiyah I 15 and 245, II 49 and 337; Dhahabī I 85; Nawawī, pp. 302 f.; Jamʿ I 177).

Khalid ibn Abī Imrān (d. 125/743 or 127/745) was a Tunisian ʿAlīd who journeyed on state business to the court of Yazīd II (101–5/720–24). He raised some legal questions and exchanged traditions with many of the leading scholars of the east, especially those of Medina. He had a large written collection (kitāb kabīr) of the traditions of Qāsim ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr, Ṣālim ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUmar ibn al-Ḵhaṭṭāb, and Sulaimān ibn Yasār. His transmitters included prominent Egyptians and men from the eastern provinces such as Ibn Lahiyyah and Yaḥyā ibn Saʿd al-Ansārī (see p. 193; Ibn Saʿd VII 2, p. 207; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh II 1, p. 150; Jarḥ I 2, p. 345; Ibn Ḥibbān, p. 143; Abū al-ʿArab ibn Tāmīm al-Tammāmī, Ṭabaqāt `ulumāʾ Iftīqiyah I 245–47, II 336–39; Mālikī, Kitāb riyāḍ al-nufūs I 103–6).

Muḥāwiyyah ibn Ḥudaij (d. 52/672) sided with Muḥāwiyyah ibn Abī Sufyān against ʿAlī ibn Abī Talīb and is credited with preventing a rift between Muḥāwiyyah and ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ. He served Muḥāwiyyah in Egypt as a general and later as a transient counter-governor. His military campaigns and political activities in Egypt were extensive (see e.g. Ibn Saʿd IV 2, p. 6, and VII 2, p. 195; Futūḥ, pp. 192–94 and 317 f.; Futūḥ al-balad, pp. 226–28; Kindī, pp. 15, 17–19, and 26–30; Ibn Ṭaghribīrīdī I 72, 106, 146, 155, 160; Isbāḥāb I 256 f.; Usd IV 383 f.; Isbāḥāb III 881–83).

Jabalah ibn ʿAmr al-Anṣārī (n.d.) was won over to the cause of ʿAlī and fought on his side in the Battle of Siffin in the year 37/657. He was considered a Medinan scholar although he settled in Egypt and is reported as transmitting from Sulaimān ibn Yasār (see Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh I 2, p. 217, and correct Ṣaʿd to Ṣād; Isbāḥāb I 92; Isbāḥāb I 465 f.; Ṭabarī I 2980 f.; Ḥusn al-muhādaṣarah I 109 f.).

Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam (d. 257/871) provides two versions (Futūḥ, pp. 193 and 317 f.) of the tradition. One of his versions is all but identical to the papyrus text, for it reads as follows:

بن لهلجة عن بكر بن عبد الله عن سليمان بن سبارق غزوة أفريقية بأبي حذيفة ومعنا من المهاجرين والأنصار بشر كثير فكنا ابن حذيفة النصف بعد الحسم فلم أراه أحد آخر كذك ذلك الجملة بن عمرو الإنصاري.

The second version reads

بن لهلجة عن خالد بن أبي عمران قال صنعت سليمان بن سبارق الغزوة أفريقية فأنا ابن حذيفة نفنا بأفريقيا النصف بعد الحسم ومعنا من أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم من المهاجرين والأنصار ناس كثير فاميل الجملة بن عمرو الإنصاري إن يأخذ منه شيء.

Note the use of either or or (for the papyrus text and the omission of the last sentence of the latter. It is significant that both of Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam’s versions and the papyrus text, which is of about the same date, specify the النصف بعد الحسم, while later versions of this originally singleton tradition specify the الثلث بعد الحسم (e.g. Abū al-ʿArab ibn Tāmīm al-Tammāmī, Ṭabaqāt `ulumāʾ Iftīqiyah I 15 f., II 49; Isbāḥāb I 457; Ḥusn al-muhādaṣarah I 109 f.).
The division of the spoils of victory is a theme that is much discussed in the several categories of early Islamic sources. Muhammad's practice varied from time to time since he left himself a free hand according to Surah 8, called al-anfal, "the spoils," which begins thus: "They will question you about the spoils. Say: 'The spoils belong to God and the Messenger.' "

Until the strong hand of 'Umar I took the reins of government (see Ma'rifah, Intro, p. 18), the early generals, such as Khalid ibn al-Walid (Zubair, p. 321), also were independent in this matter and at times were liberal with the soldiers. The varying and contradictory practices, along with Surah 8:1, soon came to be cited for or against numerous legalistic views that were rapidly evolving in Medina and the newly conquered provinces. There was no precise settlement of the question except for the stipulation that the state's fifth of the spoils was to be set aside before any division took place. Nevertheless, the following developments over a longer period are discernible. (1) Theoretically the caliph could dispose of the spoils as he wished, but actually the generals on the spot exercised their will and judgment. (2) Troops participating in exploratory raids or small expeditions shared more frequently and more liberally in the division of the spoils than did troops engaged in full-scale wars. (3) There was a persistent trend toward trimming down the soldiers' share, first, by exempting from the division certain categories such as slaves, mounts, and some types of arms and, second, by reducing the ratio of the soldiers' share to the whole after the deduction of the state's fifth. To justify such a reduction early traditions were evidently tampered with, as illustrated by the change from "the division of the half after the fifth" of the papyrus text to "the division of the third after the fifth" of the later versions (see e.g. Sirah I 456 f., 458 f., 476, 655, 692 f., 758 f., 773 f., 848, 880 f.; Tafṣīr I 102, IX 106–12, XIII 361–82; Muwaṭṭa II 450–56 and references there cited; Ṣaylāṣī, pp. 28 f.; Ibn Sa'd IV 1, p. 107; Ibn Ḥanbal I 181; Muslim XII 53–68; Abū Dā'ūd III 77–80; Ibn Mājah II 102; Tirmidhī VII 51–58, XI 201–7; Dārimī II 228 f.; Abū Yūsuf, Al-raḍḍ al-ʿalā siyār al-Awzāʿī, ed. Abū al-Wafāʾ al-Afghānī [Cairo, 1357/1938] pp. 45–49; Amwāl, pp. 279 and 303–34; Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Šarakhšī, Sharḥ al-kitāb al-siyār al-kabīr li al-Šaibānī II [1377/1958] 583–619; see also Robert Brunschwig, "Ibn ʿAbdalh'akam et la Conquête de l’Afrique du Nord par les Arabes," Annales de l’Institut d'études orientales VI [Paris, 1942–47] 108–55, esp. pp. 124–30, which treat the episode of Tradition 13).

Tradition 14. ʿAbd Allāh ibn Rawāḥah al-Anṣārī (d. 8/629) was one of the twelve negotiators of the treaties of ʿAqabah. He was an enthusiastic supporter of Muḥammad, in whose campaigns he participated and in whose cause he lost his life in the expedition against Mōtah. He was a poet and a leader whose verses and administrative ability served Muḥammad well (see e.g. Ibn Sa'd II 1, p. 88; Bukhārī I 291 f., III 135; Abū ʿUbайдah, Majāz al-Qurān I 20; Ṭabarī I 1460; Iṣṭīḥāb I 350 f.; Nubalāʾ I 166–73). He was literate, with some knowledge of arithmetic, and was therefore sent by Muḥammad in the year 7/628 to assess the produce of the palm trees of the Jews of Khaibar. The produce was divided into halves, and the Jews were given the choice of either half (see e.g. Sirah I 343, 413, 777, 779, 791–96; Wāqidī, pp. 285 f.; Ibn Sa'd III 2, pp. 79–82 and 142; Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Šarakhšī, Sharḥ al-kitāb al-siyār al-kabīr li al-Šaibānī I 18, 34 f.; Abū Yūsuf, Kitāb al-kharāj, p. 51; Ṭabarī I 1589 f.; Iṣṭīḥāb I 349–51; Abū Nuʿaim I 118–21, IV 335; Nawāʾī, pp. 340 f.; Iṣābāh II 748–51; Usd III 156–59).

Although most of the sources cited above refer to ʿAbd Allāh ibn Rawāḥah as an assessor for the Jews of Khaibar, none of them gives all the details of the papyrus text. Of the several professional traditionists who refer to this episode, only Mālik ibn Anas and Ibn Ḥanbal provide some of these details. Ibn Ḥanbal’s account (Vol. III 367), which traces back to Jābir ibn
Abd Allah al-Ansari (d. 78/697), retains the detail that Abd Allah ibn Rawahah disliked the Jews more than any other people and adds “because you (Jews) killed the prophets and told falsehoods about God,” but he makes no reference to any attempt on the part of the Jews to bribe Abd Allah. He gives more details of Abd Allah’s activity as an assessor, some of which may have followed our incomplete text. Maliki gives two accounts, each with a different isnad (Muwatta II 703 f.; Shaibani, pp. 145 and 355). In one, which he transmits from Zuhri on the authority of Sa’id ibn al-Musayyib, he does not mention Abd Allah’s aversion to the Jews and their attempt to bribe him. Malik’s second account, which traces back to Sulaiman ibn Yasir of the papyrus text, is closer to the papyrus text though not identical with it in either isnad or main. It reads as follows:

 حدثني محمد بن سليمان بن يسار أن رأى أن رسول الله صلّم كان يبعث عبد الله بن رواحة إلى خير في خرسان بنته وبين يهود خير. قال فجمعوا له حلياً من حلي ناسهم فقالوا له هذا لك وخفيف عنك وتجاوز في القسم. فقال عبد الله بن رواحة يا معشر اليهود والله انك لم تعف خلق الله إلا ما ذاك بعذابه على أن أحين عليك مما عرضت من الرشوة فإنك صحبت وأن أنت فملك. فقالوا بهذا قامتم المسمات والأرض.

Zurqani III 169 f. adds that Sulaiman ibn Yasir heard this tradition from Ibn Abibas, to whom some related traditions are traced, but gives no parallels. For related traditions and general treatment of the theme see for example Ibn Hanbal II 24, III 296 and 367, VI 163, Bukhari I 376 f., Abû Dâ‘ûd III 263 f., Ibn Mâjah I 286, Tirmidhi III 140-43, Concordance II 25, and Amwal, pp. 481-96, especially p. 482 for Abd Allah ibn Rawahah.

The survival of Traditions 12-14 is due to Ibn Lahfah’s close association with the practices and traditions of the Hijaz, to his wide coverage of all types of materials, and to his large collection of manuscripts.

IDENTIFICATION AND SIGNIFICANCE

I

That this document is not from the hand or personal collection of Ibn Lahfah is indicated by the fact that he heads only eight of the thirteen isnads's and that three of his contemporaries are cited as parallel authorities. Tradition 11 provides a clue to the identity of the compiler in the words “and then said Abû Šalîh: ‘I said to Dimâm,’” which clearly indicate that Dimâm was being questioned on the meaning of a word by his transmitter Abû Šalîh. This Abû Šalîh can only be one of two contemporary traditionists—the Egyptian Abû Šalîh (d. 223/838) who was Laith’s secretary or Abû Šalîh ‘Abd al-Ghaffar ibn Dâ‘ûd al-Harrâni (d. 224/839), who settled in Egypt. Both men have been fully dealt with in the discussion of Document 5, which indicates that they had opportunities to transmit from ‘Irâqi as well as from Egyptian traditionists (see pp. 163 f.). But, whereas their common transmission from the Egyptians Laith and Ibn Lahfah is repeatedly specified in biographical notices, only Abû Šalîh al-Harrâni is specified as transmitting also from his fellow Harrâni Mūsâ ibn A‘yan (Tradition 7) and the ‘Irâqi Ḥammâd ibn Salamah ibn Dimâr (Traditions 7–9). On the other hand, neither of them is specified as transmitting directly from Dimâm ibn Ismâ’il al-Ma‘âfiri. That one of them did is a fact for which, so far as I know, our document is the only evidence. It should be pointed out, however, that in none of the numerous biographical works was a list of transmitters to and from a given traditionist intended to be exhaustive. It seems reasonable to

1 Bukhari, Târîkh IV 1, pp. 280 f.; Jarh III 1, p. 54. 2 See Futuh, p. 139, for indirect transmission.
conclude, then, that the compiler of our document was in all probability Abū Ṣāliḥ al-Ḥarrānī, who was the compiler of Document 5 also (see p. 163). It is not likely that Document 9 is Abū Ṣāliḥ al-Ḥarrānī’s personal copy, because the “western” method of dotting the fā’ and the qāf was used. It must be a student’s rough copy made either from dictation or from manuscripts. The corrected errors indicate some manner of collation. The scripts of both the letter on the back of which Document 9 was written and the document itself suggest later hands than that of Document 5 and therefore point to a date toward the end of Abū Ṣāliḥ al-Ḥarrānī’s life for Document 9. It may well be from the hand of his son ʿAbd al-Rahmān. The family isnād has been discussed in connection with Document 5.

II

Most of the traditions involve the practices of the Companions and their Successors. Though their personal practices (Traditions 3–8) and recollections (Traditions 10–11) as reported in these traditions are generally confirmed in the biographical sources and some even in the standard hadīth collections, the traditions themselves as complete units have not survived in the standard collections. By contrast, the traditions that in any way refer to Muhammad (Nos. 9 and 14) and those that had wider significance for the religious (No. 12) and economic (Nos. 13–14) life of the community have identical or nearly identical parallels, which emphasize the master traditionists’ dual basis of selection—the isnād and the matn. Given traditions with the same content or basic meaning, they bypassed those that they judged to have weak links in the isnād’s in favor of those with sound isnād’s. Given traditions with equally acceptable isnād’s but different contents, they gave priority to those that traced back to Muhammad or referred in any way to him (see p. 77). Thus we find that a tradition which reports the words or deeds of Muhammad is likely to be preserved in many parallels through as many different channels (turq) as the variants in the isnād links permit.

III

The biographical data on the literary careers and practices of the men mentioned in the isnād’s of this document reveal that many of them had access to or themselves produced sizable hadīth collections, as did several of their immediate authorities and transmitters who are not involved in these isnād’s. The number of scholars specified as using and producing manuscript collections increases with each generation of transmitters. Several of the men of our isnād’s have been encountered in other documents. These include Ibn Ṭabbās (Tradition 9), Ḥammād ibn Salamah ibn Dīnār (Traditions 7–9), and Bukair ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Ashajj (Traditions 2–3, 12–14). The search for parallels revealed the Tunisian Khalīd ibn Abī ʿImrān (see p. 214) and the ʿIrāqī ʿAffān ibn Muslim (see p. 212) as assiduous collectors and accurate recorders of Tradition. Suwaid ibn Saʿīd (see p. 213) of ʿIrāq was suspected by some scholars, especially toward the end of his long life when he lost his eyesight. But his collection of manuscripts was sought by his contemporaries, including ʿAffān ibn Muslim, who transmitted from him a copy of the collection of Ḥāfṣ ibn Maisarah (d. 181/797) that he was not able to find elsewhere. Ḥāfṣī had a written copy of the collection of Zaid ibn Aslam (d. 136/753–54) which

---

1. It is even possible that some who are not so specified may indeed have belonged to this group, since they are not reported as being opposed to written Tradition and their close association with scholars who favored it indicates at least tacit approval of if not participation in the writing-down of hadīth.

2. See especially Khatīb XII 272–76 for ʿAffān’s use of the qurār method and the careful execution of his manuscript copies.

3. Ibn Ṭabbās (see especially p. 385 f.); Jamʿ I 92, 144.
he collated with Zaid. The evidence of large-scale continuous written transmission linking men in different cities and provinces is paralleled by evidence of continuous written transmission within families from generation to generation. The sources indicate such transmission probably in the family of Abū Qabīl Ḥāyy ibn Ḥānī al-Maʿāfīrī (see p. 210) and certainly in that of Bukair ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Asḥajj.

Abū Qabīl’s materials passed to his son-in-law Dimām ibn Ismāʿīl al-Maʿāfīrī (Traditions 10–11) to Suwaid ibn Saʿīd and Ibn Wahh to Abū Zaraḥ, all of whom are known to have committed their materials to writing.⁶

Bukair’s family was originally from Medina. His father, ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Asḥajj, journeyed to ʿIrāq, but little else is known of his activities except that he was eager for doctrinal argument and debate.⁷ ʿAbd Allāh’s sons Bukair, Yaʿqūb, and ʿUmar shared a good reputation and an interest in Tradition.⁸ Bukair himself settled early in Egypt (see p. 209) and transmitted materials from his father.⁹ His son Makramah (d. 159/776) was too young at the time of his father’s death to have heard much of his collection, but he possessed Bukair’s manuscripts and was later criticized for transmitting from them directly.¹⁰ I have been unable to ascertain, for lack of a complete genealogy, whether the well known Egyptian Ḥāyy ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Bukair (154–231/771–845)¹¹ was a grandson of Bukair ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Asḥajj, though I strongly suspect that he was. He is more often referred to as Ḥāyy ibn Bukair, even as Bukair is generally cited as Bukair ibn al-Asḥajj. The frequent omission of ʿAbd Allāh in both names indicates that neither man was primarily a traditionist, as is further indicated by the fact that the biographical sources give very little information about ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Asḥajj and bypass ʿAbd Allāh ibn Bukair. In any case, Ḥāyy, like Bukair, was interested in the hadīth of Dimām and Abū Qabīl² and moved in the circles of Laith and Ibn Lahīḥah, both of whom are known to have transmitted from Bukair (see p. 209) and to Ḥāyy.¹³ Furthermore, Ḥāyy ibn Bukair is widely and frequently cited for biographical items for both Laith and Ibn Lahīḥah.

The high points in the life and career of Ibn Lahīḥah are fairly well known.¹⁴ Here we concentrate on his professional interests, which frequently paralleled those of his lifelong friend Laith ibn Saʿīd. The freeborn South Arab Ibn Lahīḥah and the Persian muḥāṣar Laith were both pupils of Egypt’s first leading religious scholar, Yazīd ibn Abī Ḥabīb (53–128/673–746),¹⁵ whose reputation had attracted Ibn Ishāq to Egypt.¹⁶ Both developed an active interest in akhbār, particularly in relation to the history of Egypt, as fully illustrated by Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam’s and Kindī’s frequent reliance on their reports. Yet neither allowed his historical interest to overshadow his main intellectual activities as traditionist and jurist, so that both men came to be considered good candidates for the office of chief judge of Egypt. The ʿAbdāsīd caliph Manṣūr wished to appoint Laith to this office, but Laith excused himself and pointedly

⁴ See e.g. Jarḥ II 1, p. 240; Mīsdān I 434–36; Yaqūt II 223 f.
⁵ Abū al-ʿArab ibn Tamīm al-Tammānī, ʿIṣbāṭ ʿulamāʾ, Ḥiṣbīyat I 220.
⁶ See Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh IV 2, pp. 30 f.; e.g. Jarḥ III 1, p. 118, and IV 2, p. 209; Jamʿ I 590; Ibn Ṭābirī birdī I 255.
⁷ Istābī I 92.
⁸ See Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh IV 2, p. 16; Jarḥ IV 1, pp. 363 f.; Ibn Ḥībbān, p. 144; Jamʿ I 59.
¹⁰ Ḥiṣn al-muḥāṣarāh I 563; Futūḥ, p. 234; Kindī, pp. 182 and 310; Jarḥ IV 2, p. 267.
¹¹ Dhabahī II 8; Nawawī, pp. 364 f.
¹² See Kindī, Intr. pp. 31 f. and reference there cited.
¹⁴ Dhabahī I 121 f.; Jarḥ IV 2, p. 267.
drew Manṣūr's attention to the fact of his Persian descent and therefore of his client status. Manṣūr did not press the point, perhaps because of the prevailing tradition that judgeships were the prerogative of the Ānṣār and thus by implication of the South Arabs.

The eventual appointment of Ibn Lahīfah as judge in Egypt reflected certain political and economic trends that began with the successful ʿAbbāsid revolution. Stress and strain were occasioned by ʿAbbāsid desire for a greater degree of centralization in the imperial government as against the aspirations of the vigorous provinces with their vocal pride in their own identity and achievement, particularly in legal theory and practice. The appointment of an imperial judge to any of the provinces was therefore a delicate matter. It so happened that the chief judge of Egypt died while an Egyptian delegation was in Baghdād and that Manṣūr informed the delegates of their country's loss. Manṣūr then, according to Kindi, instructed his wasīr, Rabīʿ ibn Faḍl, to propose candidates, presumably non-Egyptians, for the vacant office. But ʿAbd Allāh ibn Ḥudaij of the Egyptian delegation protested that the appointment of a non-Egyptian would reflect adversely on Egypt since all the other provinces would conclude that Egypt could not produce a candidate fit for the office. Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam's earlier account, however, omits this protest, as do the other accounts. Manṣūr's choice fell on Ibn Lahīfah "despite his weakness." All of the accounts state (erroneously) that Ibn Lahīfah was the first judge in Egypt to be appointed by a caliph.

Another point to be noted in connection with Ibn Lahīfah's appointment is that all the sources agree that he received the highest salary—thirty dinars, or three times that of his predecessor—that had yet been paid to an Egyptian judge. It is true that good and willing judges were scarce in the early ʿAbbāsid period, but the tripling of the salary was no doubt called for partly by the economic prosperity and inflation throughout the empire since we find similar increases in the other provinces. The sum seems small enough in contrast to the vast wealth of Laith, whose gifts to needy scholars and friends, including Malik ibn Anas and Ibn Lahīfah, ran into thousands of dinars. Ibn Lahīfah held the office of chief judge for almost ten years (155-64/771-80). During this time his close association with Laith continued and found expression in their joint action in public matters, so that it came to be said that it was Laith who was indeed the ruler of Egypt.

The repeated references to Ibn Lahīfah's weakness as a traditionist call for an examination of his methods of transmission. Little is recorded of his earlier practices, though it would seem justifiable to assume that he wrote down his materials from the start because he acquired the nickname Abū Khārtātah, "He of the Satchel." He slung his "schoolboy's bag" around his neck and went out seeking newcomers and visitors, asking the older ones: "Whom have you met and from whom have you written down?" Then he wrote down what he heard from them. No doubt he, like Laith, whom he accompanied on the pilgrimage of the year 113/731,

\[17\] See e.g. Ahmad Amin, Duḥā al-Islām II 89; Abū Nuʿaim IX 109.
\[18\] See e.g. Akhbār al-qudāt III 243. See also p. 259 below.
\[19\] Kindi, p. 369.
\[20\] Futiḥ, pp. 243 ff.; Akhbār al-qudāt III 235; Ḥusn al-muhādārah II 117.
\[21\] Kindi (p. 369) alone adds "and his bad madhhab." Ibn Lahīfah was sometimes accused of being a Shiʿite (see e.g. Māqrīzī, p. 301, and Mīzān II 67; cf. Kindi, Intro. p. 32).
\[22\] Torrey noted this error (Futiḥ, p. 368, note). For a number of earlier judges appointed for Egypt by a caliph see Akhbār al-qudāt III 220 ff. and Ḥusn al-muhādārah II 113 ff. (see also p. 123, n. 19, above).
\[23\] Akhbār al-qudāt III 233, 235 f. Wākī usually mentions salaries and is aware of the general increase in this period.
\[24\] Ahmad Amin, Duḥā al-Islām II 89 ff.
\[25\] Akhbār al-qudāt III 243; Mīzān II 67; Ibn Taḡhrībīrī I 475; Kindi, Intro. p. 31; Ahmad Amin, Duḥā al-Islām II 90.
\[26\] Kindi, Intro. p. 31.
originals (usūl) of several compilers. Long before his appointment as judge, local and visiting scholars, such as Ibn Wahb and the Khurāsānian Ibn al-Mubārak, eagerly sought him out so that they could make copies of these originals, and he readily permitted them to do so.27 Sufyān al-Thauri is reported as saying that Ibn Lahfah possessed the usūl while he and others had only the furu',28 terminology which in any science contrasts basic "principles" with the "branches" derived therefrom. Sufyān may have been referring to Ibn Lahfah's expertness in fiqh, though his statement could also be interpreted to mean that Ibn Lahfah possessed originals of several complete hadith collections while he and others had only extracts. Ibn Lahfah did not limit himself to collecting from scholars whom he met in person, for he is known to have received traditions by correspondence (mukātabah) from Yaḥyā ibn Sa'īd al-Anṣārī,29 just as Mālik received Laith's risālah in Medina.30 Ibn Lahfah's zeal for collecting traditions and writing them down carefully, as Ibn Ḥanbal testifies,31 inspired confidence in his written collections, while his transmission from memory, especially in his old age, became suspect largely on the grounds that he omitted some links from some isnād's, though some say he did so intentionally.32 Many scholars turned away from him, however, because when non-Egyptian materials that were not his own were read to him and then transmitted as though they were his he neither corrected nor stopped the reader.33 This laxity alone may account for the large number of traditions in which he is mentioned in isnād's that are suspect. Those who were less critical excused some of his weaknesses on the grounds that they appeared only after his books were burned in the year 170/785–86, when he was in his mid-seventies. But others contested this statement, and some pointed out that his books, especially his collection of originals, were saved even though his house burned down (see references in nn. 31 and 33). Uthmān ibn Śāliḥ (see p. 210),34 who wrote down and transmitted a great deal of material from Ibn Lahfah, copied the book of 'Imarah ibn Ghazyah (or 'Azyah [d. 140/757])35 from Ibn Lahfah's copy after the fire and traced Ibn Lahfah's weaknesses to a paralytic stroke that he suffered in his old age.36 A sizable papyrus roll of traditions transmitted by this Uthmān from Ibn Lahfah has survived.37

A close check of the details of the various estimates of Ibn Lahfah as a traditionist revealed general but not complete38 agreement that he had a weak memory and relied chiefly on manuscripts. His contemporaries who knew him well considered him to be generally trustworthy. They included Egyptians and non-Egyptians alike. Among the former were Laith and Ibn Wahb. Rhuwun Guest counts Laith among Ibn Lahfah's critics and considers him, as the latter's countryman, well qualified to judge.39 Guest's statement is not specifically documented and, furthermore, is negated by statements to the contrary40 and by the fact that Laith and Ibn Lahfah were closely associated in private and public life and frequently transmitted traditions one from the other.41 So far as I can tell from the sources indicated by Guest,42 he was

---

27 Jarḥ II 2, p. 147; Sawrānī, folio 405b; Mīzān II 65; Nawawi, p. 365. See Khaṭīb X 157–59 and 168 for Ibn al-Mubārak's grand tour (riḥlah) of the provinces that began in the year 141/758.
28 Mīzān II 65; Nawawi, p. 364.
29 Amwāl, p. 395.
30 Mīzān II 65.
31 Dḥahaṭ I 220; Mīzān II 65.
32 A practice indulged in even by Bukhārī (see p. 173).
33 Ibn Ṣa'd VII 2, p. 204; Ma'ārif, p. 253; Jarḥ II 2, p. 146; Mīzān II 65.
34 See Kindl, Intro. pp. 26 f.
35 Ibn Ḥiibān, p. 102; Jarḥ III 1, p. 368; Mīzān II 248; Jamī' I 396 f.
36 Dḥahaṭ I 220; Mīzān II 64.
38 See e.g. Jarḥ II 2, p. 148.
39 Kindl, Intro. p. 32.
40 See e.g. Mīzān II 65, line 18.
41 See e.g. Nawawi, pp. 365 and 520; Ta'wil, p. 385.
42 Kindl, Intro. p. 31.
most probably misled by Nawawi, who states that Laith ibn Sa'd ibn Yahyā ibn Sa'id considered Ibn Lahfah weak. 43 As the full name of the famous Egyptian with whom we are concerned is Abū al-Harith Laith ibn Sa'd ibn 'Abd al-Rahmān, it is obvious that Nawawi refers to a different Laith. Unfortunately the biographical sources at hand do not lead to the identification of this second Laith, and I can only venture to suggest that he may have been a grandson of the 'Iraqi traditionist and critic Yahyā ibn Sa'id al-Qaṭṭān (see p. 112), who is known to have held an adverse opinion of Ibn Lahfah. 44 Among Ibn Lahfah's non-Egyptian contemporaries who considered him generally trustworthy, except during the last few years of his life, were Ibn al-Mubārak and 'Uthmān ibn Ṣāliḥ (see p. 220).

Ibn Lahfah's younger contemporaries who could have known him only in the last decade or so of his life were about evenly divided in their opinions as to whether or not he was completely trustworthy as a traditionist. By far the great majority of his transmitters, regardless of their age or province, esteemed him highly for his thorough coverage of Egyptian traditions and traditionists, which they compared to the coverage of Syrian men and materials by his contemporary Ismā'īl ibn Ayyāsh (see p. 178). 45 Ibn Lahfah's severest critics 46 were Sa'id ibn Abī Maryam (144–224/761–839) of Baṣrah, who suspected him of using entirely on their own authority manuscripts that were found (wijādah) after the death of the author, and Yahyā ibn Maṭn (d. 233/848) of Baghdad. 48 Very few traditionists escaped the criticism of Yahyā, whose opinions apparently were accepted by most of his successors. He himself was a large-scale collector of traditions, which he committed to writing. But, unlike Ibn Lahfah, he had a reliable memory and could easily detect error or fraud, so that none could interpolate or pass off others' materials as his. 49 However, neither he nor Bukhārī could resist the temptation to bypass suspect links of an isnād (tadlis), and both suppressed the name of Laith's secretary Abū Ṣāliḥ, from whom they wrote down Laith's collection of Zuhri materials. 50

Ibn Lahfah's materials having thus come to be suspected, especially by non-Egyptians, were nevertheless not bypassed. Although not accepted as sole proof, they were written down and studied by several generations of scholars. 61 But, no doubt because of their restricted use, there was apparently little effort to hold them together as a unit for long, except perhaps by a few Egyptians such as 'Uthmān ibn Ṣāliḥ and his son Yahyā, Abū Ṣāliḥ the secretary of Laith, and Abū Ṣāliḥ al-Ḥarrānī, who was probably the compiler of this document (see p. 217). The preacher 'Alī ibn Muḥammad of Baghdad (251–338/865–960) made a lengthy visit to Egypt and collected the traditions of Laith ibn Sa'd and Ibn Lahfah. 62

An essential practice of a great majority of the second- and third-century traditionists encountered in this study was the writing-down of their traditions. Standard phrases in the critics' terminology are “his hadīth is to be written down,” if the particular traditionist was judged to be trustworthy, and “his hadīth is to be written down but is not to be accepted as proof,” if he was considered weak (see p. 62). The writing itself was done sometimes from dictation but increasingly by the mukdtabah and munāwalah methods and by copying from manuscripts, authenticated or otherwise, that varied from single sheets to book-size collections.

43 Nawawi, p. 365.
44 Jarḥ II 2, p. 146; Bukhārī, Ta'rikh III 1, pp. 182 f.; Dīhābī I 220; Mitān II 65.
45 Dīhābī I 222; Mitān II 65.
46 See e.g. Jarḥ II 2, pp. 146 f.; Mitān II 64 f.
47 Dīhābī I 355; Futūh, Intro. p. 8.
48 Dīhābī II 16 f.; GAL S I 259.
49 See e.g. Jarḥ, Taqdimah, p. 314; Akhbār al-qudāt III 235.
50 Jam' I 286 f.; Yaqtīl I 748. Yahyā ibn Maṭn was in Egypt for over two years (Khaṭīb XIV 201 f.).
51 Jarḥ II 2, p. 147; Mitān II 65, 67.
52 Khaṭīb XII 75 f.
DOCUMENT 10

Oriental Institute No. 17631. Late second/early ninth century.

Medium quality brown papyrus, 20.4 × 15.6 cm., with 28 lines to the page and practically no margins (Pls. 18–19). The piece is broken at the top and bottom. The lower left section is lost, and there are several large breaks. It is difficult to tell whether it is a leaf from a book or a loose sheet (ṣahifah).

Script.—Poor semicursive book hand with slight variations between recto and verso. Dia­
critical points are used for bāʾ and its sister letters, nūn, yāʾ, and twice for khaʾ (in recto 10 and 13).
The shin has a row of three dots above it, and fāʾ and qāf have the regular one dot and two dots above them respectively. Words are broken at the ends of lines (recto 9, verso 11 and 21). There are no punctuation marks. New sections start with the basmalah as in Document 3.

TEXT

Recto

1 [بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم]
2 [حدثنا] أبو البتخري وذهب بن وهب القرشى عالِس
3 [أعلَى بن عباس قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم]
4 [قال اللهم فعَّم من أن قرأه أو ملَع نسيف رَابَ عَلَّم وَك من همزات السِّيمان]
5 شَي هاتَح ملك بك اعف وبُك أقر وبُك أجر وبُك اخذ وبِك أعتى
6 لا نرى كرامكت شى بها وصلان الصبر ثم قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه من
7 كان له من نفسه واعظ كان معه [ ينصف الناس ويامن]
8 أضمه كان له عند الله عزّ وجل قال شارل من الذين غذوا بالنهم
9 وربوا فيه ليس لهم همة إلا الدَّل القيم والشراب والقباس المشهد
10 قُين بالكَلام وخير أمتي الذين وَلدوا في الإسلام ان احسوا استبشروا
11 وإن أمَّاك اسْتَغْفِرْوا وإن سافروا انصرفوا وافترموا (8) وحدثنا
12 بعدة عن الحسن قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه ما خلق الله
13 مثل العقل (9) وحدثنا عن هشام بن الحسن قال قال رسول الله صلى الله
14 عليه من يضمن احذام ويبقى ذات عال [بقي خايفًا لهما (10) وحدثنا]
15 عن ابن جرير عن خالد بن معدان قال قال رَسُول اللَّه صلى الله عليه وسلم
16 ارشدكم الذَّاى] كان . . . . . . فَتَسْأَلَ يُخْبِرُكم (11) وحدثنا عن ثور عن
17 خالد بن معدان انه قال ان رَسُول اللَّه صلى الله عليه مرّ الجمعة فقلبى
18 لم قال ابنه فَتَشْعِي فاغفل له [فَقَالَ رَسُول اللَّه]
19 [ان يكون له من يبدأ ولا ينتهي عن ما [سـ]بلا فلا
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فل به ما كأن قال فقال له سلمى أو [الابن] عليه
[ إلى الخصى تدون فيه ما] هنلا ولا تعد
21
[ وحدثنا [ج] قال [رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم]
(6) [وحدثنا سفيان عن النبي ﷺ قال من كان في قلبه ثلاث خصال رقيق
22
[ في الجنة] واسفل سال اماتا من كان قائما بيام وبشير (8) وحدثنا
23
[ في الجنة] فقال بن فلان عن [ج] قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لا يدوم بالمعروف
24
[ وبنى بالذكر إلا] من كان جاهلا وفغير أمره والإيبر تحل فاما صاحب
25
[ وحدثنا عن أبي مخلد عن اسماعيل بن عبد الله عن بن
26
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Comments.—Tradition 1. The traces in recto 1 are well spaced for the basmalah, which probably starts a new section as in verso 15.

Abū al-Bakhtārī Wahb ibn Wahh (d. 200/815-16) was a Quraishite of Medina, who lived at one time in Syria and off and on in ʿIrāq. He died in Baghhdād at an advanced age. He served Harūn al-Rashīd as chief justice of Baghhdād in the year 182/798, succeeding the famous Abū Yūsuf in that office, but was soon removed and appointed governor of Medina (183-93/799-809; see Ṭabarī III 739, 937; Maʿārif, p. 258; Akhbār al-qudūt I 243, III 269; Zambaur, Manuel de généalogie et de chronologie pour l'histoire de l'Islam, p. 25). He was a man of varied literary activities who won recognition as jurist, genealogist, and historian (akhbārī) and is credited with six works (see p. 233) in these fields (see Fihrist, p. 100; Irshād VII 232 f.; Ibn Khallikān II 239 (= trans. III 677)). But he was condemned and shunned as a traditionist and accused of sitting up nights to write traditions fabricated as to both isnād and matn. The isnād Abū al-Bakhtārī-Ibn Juraij-ʿAtā-Ibn ʿAbbās, which may or may not be complete here, is specified as false in most instances (Khaṭīb XIII 454). Abū al-Bakhtārī's failure to identify his sources fully was also held against him. He displeased the critics further by his practice of combining unrelated or remotely related traditions (Lisān VII 234) as in the case of this tradition with its four distinct parts.

Because of Abū al-Bakhtārī's reputation I had little hope of finding complete parallels in the standard collections, even for his traditions that relate to Muḥammad, despite the more favorable verdict on his above-named sources and his use of the term hadithand. Since the search for parallels was, indeed, fruitless, we can do no more than indicate the related materials that were encountered.

The tradition consists of four parts that can be separated at jl of recto 4 and at J of recto 6 and recto 8. The first two parts are related in that they represent Muḥammad's invocations for various occasions such as the beginning of a night or a day journey (cf. Sūrah 23:97-98; Muwatta', I 215; Ibn Ḥanbal II 117, 401, and 433, III 29 f., IV 333; Abū Dārūd II 287; Darimī III 33; Tirmidhī XIII 3; Naṣṣār II 318 f.; Ibn Mājah II 232; see also Concordance II 467 (اعوذ بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم) and IV 425-27 (دعاء السفر)).

The third part (recto 6-8) has no parallel in the standard collections so far as I know. Yet
self-discipline and criticism based in part on Sūrah 2:44 are familiar in Islamic religious literature (see e.g. Jāmi‘ I 194 f.; Māwardī, Adab al-dunyā wa al-dīn, p. 330, in a passage which reads من لم بكن له من نفسه وأعظ لم تنفع المواعظ).

The fourth part (recto 8–11) has parallels for some of its phrases scattered in a number of related traditions (e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal II 369, IV 98 and 193–94, VI 129; Ibn Mājah II 222; Tirmidhī VIII 174 f.; Concordance I 202 in a passage which reads,...)

Tradition 2. The Hīshām of the isnād has to be Hīshām ibn ʿUrwah ibn al-Zubair (61–146/681–763), the famed scholar of Medina, from whom Abū al-Bakhtārī is known to have transmitted (see p. 224). Hīshām is presumably transmitting on the authority of Ḥasan al-Bāṣrī (see p. 17), whom he could have met either during a pilgrimage or in ʿIrāq. Hīshām left the ʿIrāq, visited Kūfah, and settled in Baghdād, where he was very active in the transmission of ḥadīth. In ʿIrāq, however, he was not so particular about his isnād’s as he had been in Medina, and the Medinans criticized him for such laxity. It is less likely that Hīshām is transmitting individually from Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī (d. ca. 50/670; see Ibn Saʿd VII 2, p. 67; Maʿārif, p. 115; Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh IV 2, pp. 193 f.; Jarḥ IV 2, pp. 63 f.; Ibn Ḥibbān, p. 60; Dhaḥābī I 136 f.; Nawawī, p. 607; Jamʿ II 547; Ibn Khallikān II 275 [= trans. III 606–8]). For Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī as a traditionist see Ibn Saʿd VII 1, p. 127, Istīʿāb I 139 f., Uṣūl II 10 f., Iṣābah I 674, Nawawī, pp. 204 f., and p. 226 below.

No parallel for the tradition is indicated under either ʿUqūl or خلقت or ʿArqūl in the Concordance.

Tradition 3. The reading زينت رأي is not certain; if it is correct, the ʾuḍ has its two dots within its loop. The Concordance has no parallel under رأي or ضمن.

Tradition 4. Ibn Jurayj (d. 150/767) of Mecca is generally recognized as one of the first scholars to give an organized literary form to his works, which included tafsīr and ḥadīth (see e.g. pp. 112, 181, 193).

Khālid ibn Maʿdān (d. 104/722) was one of the leading traditionists of Hīms. He collected traditions from a large number of Companions and committed them to writing in a book bound between two boards drawn together with clasps (see Vol. I 22 and correct "Maʿrān" to "Maʿdān"). His pupil Bahīr ibn Saʿd (d. 160/777; see Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh I 2, pp. 137 f.; Jarḥ I 1, p. 412; Dhaḥābī I 166; see also p. 233 below, with n. 16) apparently inherited the copy which he either loaned or passed on to Baqīyah ibn al-Walīd (Ibn Saʿd VII 2, p. 162; Taḥārī III 2482; Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh II 1, pp. 161 f.; Jarḥ II, p. 351; Ibn Ḥibbān, p. 85 [= p. 112 of 1959 ed.]; Ibn Abī Dāʾūd, Kitāb al-maṣāḥif, pp. 134 f.; Abū Nuʿaim V 210–31; Dhaḥābī I 87 f., 166; Ibn ʿAsākir V 87).

The text is too broken for identification of the tradition.

Tradition 5. The isnād is completed with the name Khālid ibn Maʿdān on the strength of the preceding isnād and of the statement that Abū al-Bakhtārī transmitted on the authority of Khālid ibn Maʿdān (Jarḥ IV 2, pp. 25 f.). Abū Nuʿaim’s entries on Khālid and his fellow citizen Thaur ibn ʿAzīz (d. 153/770) show that Thaur depended to a great extent on Khālid for his materials (Abū Nuʿaim V 210–21, VI 93–100), and thus it seems possible that Thaur too had a copy of Khālid’s collection of ḥadīth. Thaur moved about freely in Syria and died in Jerusalem. He was generally accepted as trustworthy, though suspicion that he was a Qādirī led one of his pupils to burn the traditions he had received from him. Among those who transmitted from Thaur was Baqīyah ibn al-Walīd (Ibn Saʿd VII 2, p. 170; Bukhārī,}
Note the extreme brevity of the tradition. No parallels are indicated in the Concordance under يُبْعَث، مَعْنَىٰ، and افْتَجَر، مَعْنَىٰ. Spot tests proved negative.

**Tradition 6.** The Anas of the isnād is in all probability Anas ibn Mālik, from whom several persons named Abān could have transmitted, but the one specifically associated with Anas ibn Mālik is Abān ibn Abī ʿAyyāsh of Baṣrah (d. 128/746), who is credited with transmitting some 1,500 mostly unfounded traditions. This Abān wrote down his materials, as did those who transmitted from him. Two of his transmitters state that they wrote down some 500 traditions from him, and Abū ʿAwānah al-Waḍḍāḥ ibn Khālid (d. 170/786 or 176/792; see Ibn ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. ʿAbd al-Wahhab, *Maʿārif*, p. 241; Bukhārī, *Taʾrīkh* IV 2, p. 218; *Jarḥ* IV 2, pp. 40 f.; Dhahābī I 218 f.) had a book-size collection of Abān’s transmission of the ḥadīth of Ḥaṭṭīl of Ḥasan ibn ʿAṭīr. “The book of Abū ʿAwānah” was still in circulation in ʿIrāq in the year 210/825 and no doubt for some time later (Ibn Saʿd VII 2, p. 19; Bukhārī, *Taʾrīkh* I 1, p. 454; *Jarḥ*, *Taqwīmah*, pp. 144 and 366; *Jarḥ* I 1, pp. 295 f.; *Mīzān* I 6–9; see also p. 61 above).

**Tradition 7.** The Saif of the isnād could be one of several contemporaries of Abū al-Bakhṭārī, though so far as I have been able to discover none of them is mentioned among his sources. One possibility is Saif ibn Abī Sulaimān of Mecca, who died sometime after 150/767 (Ibn ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. ʿAbd al-Wahhab, *Maʿārif*, p. 252; Bukhārī, *Taʾrīkh* II 2, p. 172; *Jarḥ* II 1, p. 274; *Jamʿ* I 207). A second possibility is a better known historian and traditionist, the mistrusted Saif ibn ʿUmar of Kūfah, who died sometime during the reign of Ḥārūn al-Rashīd (see e.g. *Jarḥ* II 1, p. 278; *Mīzān* I 437 f.; Jawād ʿAlī, “Mawārid Taʾrīkh al-Ṭabarī,” *Majjalah* III [1373/1954] 51 and references there cited).

No parallel for isnād and matn seems available through Concordance II 35 لَاتِ خُصْالٍ لَاتِ الْيَجَّاتِ لَاتِةً through the other key words of the surviving text, but أَحَلَّ الْيَجَّاتِ لَاتِةً leads to several short related traditions (e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal IV 162, IV 183; Muslim XVII 198 f., which helped with the partial reconstruction of recto 24). The admonition that one should seek guidance and protection from those who practice what they preach is widely encountered, as are other such traditions that specify three or more qualifications of the faithful (see e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal II 310 and 321, V 183; see also comment on our Tradition 8).

**Tradition 8.** The isnād, which is lost except for the name Anas, may have been the same as that of Tradition 6, which likewise traces back to Anas.

A possible alternative reading for the text of recto 26 is ثَلَاثُ خُصْالٍ. The tradition involves the Qurʾānic command that one should promote that which is good and prohibit that which is evil (e.g. Surahs 3:104, 110, and 113, 7:157, 9:71 and 112, 22:41, 31:17; see also *Tafsīr* VII 90–92, 100–106, and 130 f., IX 201, X 496, XIII 165). The command has very wide application as a socio-ethical precept with political overtones, though some would interpret maʿrūf to refer specifically to Islam and munkar to refer to idolatry (see e.g. *Iʿtīdāl* I 145).

No parallel has been found, but closely related traditions are numerous (e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal II 329, IV 299, V 390, VI 304; Abū Dāwūd IV 121–24; Tirmidhī IX 13–17; see also Concordance I 99 f.). Condemnation for those who do not practice what they preach is severe (e.g. Surah 2:44; Ibn Ḥanbal V 205–7, 209; Muslim XVII 117 f.; *Jāmiʿ* I 194 f.).

**Tradition 9.** There is a slight possibility that the text from recto 27 to verso 9 represents two traditions—a short one now lost with the broken-away part of the papyrus and a longer one whose isnād is lost. It is unfortunate that so much of the text is lost, for in all probability
it would throw light on the early history of the composition, preservation, sale, and final disposal of manuscripts containing various types of religious texts. The first word of verso 7, starting withブ, could refer to a cutting instrument; as it is read, an unintentional reversal of the letters لام and حاء must be assumed. Note also ان for إن in verso 8.

The text has either يو or يوو for the first link of the خا. The only known أبو ميلاز is the بازن لحذ ibn حامد, who died before Hassan al-باذر did and is therefore too early (cf. Ibn سد VII 1, p. 157, and VII 2, p. 102; دالابح II 2). The only أبو مكلل in the sources is أبو مكلل مهيد ibn غلب الأشامي al-باذر (n.d.), a minor traditionist about whom very little information is available. But his locality and time, as judged from the few خا's in which he is cited, allow for the possibility that he transmitted to أبو الفلكار (cf. دالابح II 109; بخاري, تارikh I, p. 137; جشر III 2, p. 310; ميزان III 80). Variant readings of the name, such as أبو مكالل etc., yielded no possibilities.

The اسمي ibn غبة الله of the خا could be one of several traditionists so named (see e.g. بخاري, تارikh I 1, pp. 336 f.; جشر I 1, pp. 182–83), most of whom are associated with the حيدز or سرية. The best known is اسمي ibn غبة (or غبة) الله ibn غبة مهيد (d. 132/749–50) of سرية, who was particularly concerned with the spread of الإسلام and the preservation of "the traditions of the Messenger of الله." He refused all fees for teaching the قران but served as tutor to the sons of غبة الألب and as governor of North Africa (99–101/717–19) under غبة II. He, along with a group of religious teachers sent out by غبة II, is given credit for the conversion of a large number of Berbers (see Ibn سد V 251; بخاري, تارikh I 1, p. 366; جشر I 1, p. 182; ibn حيبان, p. 136; فتاه al-balad, p. 233; ibn أشكاز III 25–27; جشر II 26; زامبار, Manuel de généalogie et de chronologie pour l'histoire de VIslam, p. 63; ملكت, Kitāb riyaḍ al-nufûṣ I 64–76; أبو غة الألب ibn غبة الألب تامم غبة, طاقة "علماء" إفرهيج I 20 f.; Ibn Khalidun, Kitāb al-‘ibar wa dīwān al-mubāda‘a wa al-khabar [Cairo, 1284/1867] VI 110).

It is possible that we have here references to the scarcity of writing among the Arabs (see recto 28) on the eve of الإسلام (see e.g. جشر I 69) and to the increase of writing and of قران manuscripts during the reign of غبة الألب (verso 2) and the subsequent problems of trade in such manuscripts and of their inheritance by family members (verso 3–4) or others (verso 5). Sons were usually given priority in the disposal of their fathers' books (see e.g. Ibn سد VI 132), though pupils seem frequently to have inherited their teachers' manuscripts. قرانes were expected by some to remain as family property rather than to be passed on to any one son. Yet, opinion and practice differed from province to province and even from city to city within a province.

Our text, beginning with verso 4, clearly indicates that a certain أبو غة أمريك is expressing himself on the question of the inheritance of manuscripts. Inasmuch as the name is quite common, this أبو غة أمريك was probably more specifically identified in the lost portion of the text. اسمي ibn غبة الله, who is not the earliest link in the خا, must have transmitted the information from an older contemporary who is in turn reporting the sought-after opinion of أبو غة أمريك. The latter would therefore have to be a recognized authority of the last half or the last quarter of the first century. The only أبو غة أمريك who was widely known as a leading scholar at that time was the كوفان أبو غة أمريك al-شاش (d. 110/728). He is on record as favoring the sale of قرانes since he, among others, considered the price paid as reimbursement for the outlay of materials and for the labor of copying (see e.g. Ibn أب غة السدع, Kitāb al-masākhīf, pp. 177 f.; أبو نعيم II 368; Itqān II 172). شاش, as stated elsewhere (Vol. I
22, 44), was proud of his memory yet urged his students to write down everything they heard from him. He, like most scholars who relied chiefly on their memories, transmitted not literally (harfīt) but according to the sense (manāwīt) of the tradition. For Sha'bi's memory was not photographic and, furthermore, was not so reliable in his old age as it had been in his youth when he was known to dictate at length from memory. He is reported as saying: "I have indeed forgotten enough knowledge to make of a man a scholar were he to memorize it" (Khaṭṭīb XII 229). He also made such statements as "the book is the register of knowledge" (Ja'īrī I 75) and "the best traditionist is the daftar" (Vol. I 22). Moreover, he eventually composed or compiled some books, for Abū Ḥasan 'Uthmān ibn 'Āṣim (d. 128/746), whom Sha'bi considered a sort of spiritual heir, reports that no books of Sha'bi were found after his death except the Parā'id and the Jarrāhāt (Ibn Sa'd VI 174, 224; Khaṭṭīb XII 232).

Sha'bi's association with the Umayyad court as tutor of the sons of Ābd al-Malik, his rebellion against the reconciliation with Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf during the latter's governorship of ʿIrāq, and his judgeship of Kufah during the reign of ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz reflect his sustained interest in the political and cultural activities of those who were in power during the stirring times when he lived. As ʿUmar II had a keen and active interest in religious literature and was even accused of writing books on free will (see Vol. I 18 f.), Abū ʿAmr ʿAmīr al-Sha'bi could have had some manuscripts—administrative or literary—that originated with or were acquired by ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz as did the Abū ʿAmr of the papyrus text (verso 5).

Again, the practices that Tradition 9 allows are those that were generally accepted in ʿIrāq around the end of the first century. They were, furthermore, frequently justified on the authority of ʿIrāq's two leading scholars of that time, Ḥasan al-BAṣrī and the Kufan Sha'bi. The pawning of Qur'āns (verso 3), for instance, was approved by Ḥasan al-BAṣrī (Ibn Abī Dāūd, Kitāb al-masāḥīf, p. 178). Even before the time of Ḥasan al-BAṣrī and Sha'bi, the ʿIrāqis disliked the idea of any one person inheriting a copy of the Qurān (verso 4) and expressly stated that the codex should be left for the use of all the members of a family (ibid. pp. 172 f.). Worn-out Qur'āns (verso 6-7)—and those which survived their owners were more apt to be worn out than not—were frequently burned so that they would not suffer desecration (ibid. p. 195); the instruction to put the worn-out pages in a bag and there cut them up into fragments before they were burned was merely an added pious precaution.

Controversy over the sale of knowledge (baiʿ al-ʾilm) at first involved fees for teaching and copying the Qurān and centered around Sūrah 2:79 and 3:184 (see Taʾṣīr II 270-74). The controversy was soon extended to cover all religious teaching and services, such as certain duties in the mosque and the services of judges (see e.g. Ibn Sa'd VI 212; Kifāyah, pp. 153-56), and the sale of all religious books. In most of the provinces there were scholars who favored and scholars who opposed any one of these practices (see Saḥnūn, Al-mudawwana al-kubrā III 396 f.). Walīd I (86-96/705-15) ordered state pensions for the sick and the blind and is credited also with being the first to order regular state provision for Qurān-readers and others who served in the mosque (see Thaʿālibī, Latāʾīf al-maʿārif, p. 18). His action no doubt was partly responsible for the widespread acceptance of the more liberal views on baiʿ al-ʾilm by the end of the first century, particularly in ʿIrāq, where such views were supported by both Ḥasan al-BAṣrī and Sha'bi (Ibn Abī Dāūd, Kitāb al-masāḥīf, pp. 177 f.) though some individuals, pious or conservative, continued to refuse fees for performing religious functions. For it was soon realized that reasonable fees for such activities were as a rule necessary and that, as pointed out in the papyrus text (verso 8-9), a small profit in trading in religious books was to be expected if that trade was to survive and flourish and thus serve the religious sciences.
The above considerations led to the identification of the Abū 'Amr of the papyrus as Abū 'Amr 'Amīr al-Sha'bī (Ibn Sa'd VI 171-78; Ma'arif, pp. 229 f.; Tabarī III 2486 f.; Bukhārī, Ta'rīkh III 2, pp. 250 f.; Jarḥ III 1, pp. 322-24; Ibn Ḥiibbān, p. 76; Abū Nu'aim IV 310-38; Khaṭāb XII 227-34; Ibn 'Asākir VII 138-55; Dāhābī I 74-82; Ḥamīd I 377; Ibn Khallīkān I 306 f. [= trans. II 4-7]; our Vol. I 11 f., 17, 21). They are supplemented by Tradition 10, which describes related opinions and activities of 'Īrāqī scholars who were contemporary with Sha'bī. For traditions bearing on these practices see for example Ibn Sa'd V 393, VI 119 f., Ibn Ḥanbal V 315, Abū Dā'ūd III 204. For the Mālikīs' stand on the questions involved see for example Saḥmūn, Al-mudawwannah al-kubrā III 396 f., and Zurqānī III 7. For more or less general treatment see for example Ibn Abī Dā'ūd, Kitāb al-maṣāḥif, pp. 143 and 157-78, Kifāyah, pp. 153-56, Goldziher, Studien II 181 f., and OIP L 54.

 Tradition 10. Ja'far ibn Muḥammad al-Ṣadīq (80-148/699-765), the Shi'a Imam and reputed man of learning whose over-all scholarly role is controversial, was nevertheless recognized as an active traditionist who transmitted from both Abū Ḥanīfah and Mālik ibn Anas and from and to many prominent scholars of the Ḥijāz and 'Īrāq, Shi'a and Sunnite alike. Abū al-Bakhāštī is known to have transmitted from him (see p. 224). Ja'far is credited with a large Musnad and a number of other works whose authenticity is questioned. Little beyond the fact that he wrote can be gained of his method of transmission (see e.g. Jarḥ I 1, p. 487; Adāb al-Shā'fī, pp. 177 f.; Bukhārī, Ta'rīkh I 2, p. 198; Tabarī III 2509 f.; Abū Nu'aim III 192-206; Dāhābī I 157; Ṣaḥīḥ I 192; Nawawi, pp. 194 f.; Ya'fār I 304; Fihrist, pp. 354 f.; Ibn Khallīkān I 130 [- trans. I 300 f.;] GAL I 220 and S I 104; see also p. 169 above). For Ja'far's supposed role as an alchemist see Julius Ruska, Arabische Alchemisten (Heidelberg, 1924) II. Recently Muslim scholars have begun to show interest in the man and his activities and are publishing some of his works, attributed or not, especially his Musnad (see e.g. Aḥmad Amīn, Zuhr al-Islām IV [Cairo, 1374/1955] 114-16; 'Āmilī, A'īyān al-shī'ah IV 1 [Damascus, 1954/1937] pp. 41 ff.; Muḥammad Riḍā al-Muṣaffar, Ḥayāt Ja'far al-Ṣadīq [2 vols.; Najaf, 1937/1951]; Sayyid al-Ḥāl, Ja'far ibn Muḥammad [Beirut, 1937/1954]; Ja'far al-Ṣadīq, Al-ḥikam al-Ja'farīyah, ed. ʿArif Tāmīr [Beirut, 1937/1957]; Randjān Lāwānd, Al-Imām al-Ṣadīq [2d printing; Beirut, n.d.] esp. pp. 101-6, where Ja'far is shown to have been a match for Abū Ḥanīfah).

The only Ḥāfṣ ibn Dīnār (n.d.) listed in the biographical sources at hand was an older contemporary of Ḥāmmād ibn Zāid ibn Dīrham (d. 179/795) of Baṣrah and therefore a contemporary of Ja'far. He fits also into the time and locality of the Abū Rajā' of the papyrus text. He was relatively unknown and considered weak by some critics. The sources name only Ḥāmmād ibn Zāid as transmitting from him (Bukhārī, Ta'rīkh I 2, p. 360; Jarḥ I 2, p. 172; Ṣaḥīḥ I 261; Līsān II 322).

The Abū Rajā' of the papyrus text is readily identified as Abū Rajā' Maṭr ibn Ṭāḥmān al-Warrāq (d. 119/737 or 125/743), who came originally from Khurāsān and settled in Baṣrah as the mawla of Abū Qilābah. He transmitted from Abū Qilābah, Muḥammad ibn Sīrīn, Ḥāsan al-Ṭāṣrīf, and others, and Ḥāsan al-Ṭāṣrīf is known to have transmitted from him. Abū Rajā' s transmitters include also Shu'bah ibn al-Ḥajjāj, Sa'yd ibn Abī 'Arūbah (d. 156/773), Ḥāmmād ibn Zāid, and Ḥāmmād ibn Sālamah ibn Dīnār. Though some scholars commented on Abū Rajā' s weak memory, most of his contemporaries recognized his devotion to religious work and study, which included recitation of religious tales in the mosque in his capacity as a qaṣṣāq and production and sale of Qurān copies in his capacity as a warrāq (see e.g. Ibn Sa'd VII 2, p. 19; Bukhārī IV 1, pp. 400 f.; Jarḥ IV 1, pp. 287 f.; Daulābī II 173 f.; Tabarī III
Abū Qilābāh ʿAbd Allāh ibn Yazīd al-Jarmī (d. 104/723 or 105/724) was a Basran scholar especially famed for his knowledge of the law. He disliked public office to such an extent that he fled in the year 95/713, or soon after, to Damascus in order to avoid serving as judge of Baṣrah. He was favorably received by ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-Azīz, who accorded him public recognition as a traditionist and scholar and even visited him when he took ill. Abū Qilābāh advocated writing, saying that he preferred it to forgetfulness (Jāmiʿ I 72; Taqyīd al-ʿilm, p. 103), and his books were available to his students and transmitters at one time or another. He settled in Dārayyā, near Damascus, where he died (Ibn Saʿīd VII 1, pp. 91 and 133–35; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh III 1, p. 92; Bukhārī IV 322–24; Darīmī II 409; Maʿārif, p. 228; Jarḥ II 2, pp. 57 f.; Ibn Ḥiyyān, p. 67; Ṣaḥḥār al-qaḍāʾ I 23, 306; Abū Nuʿaim II 282–89, V 355 f.; Samʿānī, folio 128a; Ibn ʿAsākir VII 426 f.; Dhahābī I 88 f.).

Ayyūb al-Sikhtiyānī (d. 131/748) has been encountered above (see pp. 150, 194). His close association with Abū Qilābāh is fully documented. Ibn Saʿīd’s entry on Abū Qilābāh is to a great extent derived from Ayyūb, who on numerous occasions received fatherly advice from Abū Qilābāh (e.g. Jāmiʿ I 87, 134, 164, 188 and II 10, 14, 45, 49; Maʿārif, p. 228; Abū Nuʿaim II 286). Ayyūb transmitted at first directly from Abū Qilābāh and later from the latter’s manuscripts, some of which he inherited. Ayyūb and three of his contemporaries report this inheritance and the safe delivery of the books (Ibn Saʿīd VII 1, p. 135, and VII 2, p. 17; Maʿārif, p. 228; Kifāyah, p. 352; Taqyīd al-ʿilm, p. 625; Dhahābī I 88). Their accounts confirm the details of the papyrus text except its reference to the division and classification of the manuscripts, namely the ḥadīth and sunnah of Muḥammad and the ḥadīth of the Companions that were sent to Ayyūb as against the ḥadīth of Muḥammad and some reports of the (Bedouin) Arabs that were sent to Bāiḥās (verso 11–13). Ayyūb reports that after he received Abū Qilābāh’s books he began to confuse traditions he had heard from Abū Qilābāh in person with those he found in these books (Maʿārif, p. 228; Kifāyah, p. 352). Ayyūb’s collection is said to have contained some 800 traditions (Dhahābī I 123; Yāfīt I 273). He approved the use of a teacher’s original manuscripts and also of transmission by the mukāṭābah method (e.g. Kifāyah, pp. 257, 343 f., and 352 f.), thus following Abū Qilābāh’s example. Ḥammād ibn Zād, who frequently transmitted from Ayyūb on the authority of Abū Qilābāh, also used the books of the latter (Ibn Saʿīd VII 1, p. 91; Darīmī I 45, 136, 253 and II 223, 236, 311, 434; Jāmiʿ I 34, 251). Much of Abū Qilābāh’s material that has survived was transmitted through Ayyūb to a number of outstanding traditionists of the next generation (see e.g. Darīmī I 7, 54, 286 and II 144, 344, 377, 468). Ayyūb was so sincere in his piety and asceticism that adverse critics apparently were silenced (see Massignon, Essai sur les origines du lexique technique de la mystique musulmane, pp. 168, 176, 197, and 201).

Bāiḥās al-Jarmī (n.d.) of the papyrus text (verso 13), a fellow tribesman of Abū Qilābāh, won recognition as a young man, along with Khālid ibn Maʿdān (Traditions 4–5), for scholarly leadership in Baṣrah. He participated in the wars of Muhallab ibn Abī Ṣufrāh against the Khawārīǧ and seems to be better known as a soldier and a poet than as a traditionist. This explains why Abū Qilābāh, according to the papyrus text, sorted out ḥāḍīth al-ʿArab and some of Muḥammad’s traditions to send to him, as it explains also the lack of confirmation in ḥadīth literature of this particular gift (Tabarī II 54; Mubarrad, The Kāmil, ed. W. Wright [Leipzig, 1864–92] p. 673; Aḥānī X 161, XIX 107–9; Ibn ʿAsākir III 323 f.).
The second half of verso 14 is reconstructed on the strength of Ḥammad ibn Zaid's close association with Ayyūb and the fact that Ḥammad is known to have transmitted from Ḥaš ibn Dīnār, the second link of the insād (verso 9). The use of dhakara to start this comment confirms what has become quite clear by now, namely that Abū al-Bakhtārī is making use of written sources.

Abū Qilābah doubtless made his plans for the disposal of his books during the last years of his life. The books willed to Ayyūb, contained in a side-load of a caravan camel, were delivered to Ayyūb after Abū Qilābah's death (Ibn ʿAsākir VII 427; Dhahābī I 88). There is, so far as I know, no record of the delivery of the books intended for Baiḥas, but it seems safe to assume that they made up the balancing side-load of the same camel.

Tradition 11. The basmalah begins a new section which in all probability consisted of a number of traditions transmitted from a traditionist whose name begins "ʿAbd Al. . . ." The rest of verso 15 and all of verso 16 are taken up with insād links which seem too numerous for a single insād ending with the period of Abū al-Bakhtārī. The likeliest probability is that we have here a double insād—a feature that was not uncommon (see e.g. Kifāyah, pp. 212–14)—and that the second insād starts with Fazārī, the first name in verso 16. Thus, study of the sources led to ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Mubārak (118–81/736–97) and Abū ʿIṣāq Ibīrahīm ibn Muḥammad al-Fazārī (d. 188/804), both of whom were outstanding scholars, at one time active in ʿIrāq, and known to have transmitted one from the other. Fazārī is known also to have transmitted from Thābit ibn ʿAjlān al-Ḥimṣī (n.d.), a fact which helped in the reconstruction of this name in verso 16. Furthermore, Abū al-Bakhtārī and Fazārī had at least two transmitters in common (see pp. 232–34 for details).

The text is too broken for complete reading with certainty. Nevertheless it is clear that parts of it are closely related to the themes of the two preceding traditions—the production, preservation, and disposal of sacred manuscripts. Someone may also be relating an episode involving Muḥammad in which two blood brothers or perhaps brothers in the faith, as verso 18 suggests (cf. Document 5, Tradition 9), took different stands on committing hadīth to permanent record; for one brother (verso 19–21) is tearing up or burning manuscripts and urging the other to memorize even as he does (see e.g. Jāmiʿ I 63–66 and Taqyīd al-ʿilm, pp. 36–44, esp. pp. 36 and 40, for similar instances, including even some of the phrases of the papyrus text, from the time of the Companions and the following generation). The early opposition by some scholars to permanent records did not apply, however, to the Qurʾān, which was to be memorized, written down and ornamented (verso 21–22), bound in leather and kept in a silk covering (verso 22–23). These practices, though controversial, were all well known in the second half of the first century (see e.g. Ibn Abī Dāʾūd, Kitāb al-maṣāḥīf, pp. 150–52; OIP L 54 and references there cited). It is not clear whether the ʿaḍ of verso 24 refers to the belief that Gabriel first recited the Qurʾān to Muḥammad from a book wrapped in silk, as ʿUbaid ibn ʿUmair (d. 74/693) tells it (Ṣīrah I 152), or to the practice of the Companions and Successors of reciting back the Qurʾān as they memorized it or collated Qurʾānic manuscripts with an authenticated copy (see e.g. Ibn Abī Dāʾūd, Kitāb al-maṣāḥīf, pp. 155–57; our Vol. I 99). Verso 25 would seem to refer to someone who is willing to pay the price of a Qurʾānic codex as a wāqf or gift in mortmain for some mosque or school, a practice which started very early in Islām (see OIP L 59 f.). Finally, the mention of poetic recitations is in keeping with the lighter literary activities of many religious scholars who were lovers of poetry also.
IDENTIFICATION AND SIGNIFICANCE

I

It is clear that the author-compiler of the document was contemporary with Abū al-Bakhtarī and Fazārī and transmitted from both of them. The sources have so far yielded two scholars who meet these requirements, Baqiyah ibn al-Walid (110 or 112–97/728 or 730–812) and Musayyib ibn Wādīh (d. 246/860 at age of over 90), both originally of Hīms. They both had the opportunity to meet Abū al-Bakhtarī, who lived for a time in Syria (see p. 224), and Fazārī, who settled and died there.

Beyond the fact that Musayyib transmitted from the two older men, little is known of his activities and of his relationship with Abū al-Bakhtarī. The most important of the few known details of his association with Fazārī is that he was one of three who possessed copies of Fazārī’s Kitāb al-siyar. The other two were Muṣawiyah ibn ʿAmr of Baghdad (d. 214/829), who was known as sāḥib or rawd al-Fazarī and whose copy was considered the best, and Maḥbūb ibn Mūsā of Antioch (d. 230/845), whose copy was preferred to that of Musayyib.

Fazārī’s interests centered on akhbār and siyar as well as on ḥadīth and fiqh. As a scholar he was classed with Awza’ī, who thought very highly of him. He traveled a great deal and was on several occasions at the court of Hārūn al-Rashīd, who considered that he and Ibn al-Mubārak could detect the cleverest forgery of any tradition. It was Fazārī’s zeal for Islām that led him finally to settle on the Syrian border and take part in border engagements. His piety and uprightness were extolled by all, as was his trustworthiness as a traditionist, though he did make mistakes.

Fazārī sought the collections of several leaders of the various provinces and is known to have written down traditions from Ibn al-Mubārak, whom he called imām al-muslimin but who wrote down traditions from Fazārī to such an extent that Fazārī came to be known as Ibn al-Mubārak’s shaikh. On the strength of this relationship I venture to suggest that the first name in the isnād of Tradition 11 (verso 15) was that of Ibn al-Mubārak. It should be further noted that this section of the papyrus text reflects the wide interests of both Ibn al-Mubārak and Fazārī in the literary developments and practices of early Islām. Abū Nuʿaim has preserved some of Fazārī’s traditions, many of which reflect his historical interests.

In the case of Baqīyah ibn al-Walid (see p. 177), as in that of Musayyib ibn Wādīh, little is known of his relationship with either Fazārī or Abū al-Bakhtarī beyond the fact that he transmitted from both of them. There is the added fact that Fazārī preferred Baqīyah to the well known Syrian transmitter Ismāʿīl ibn ʿAyyāsh (see pp. 178, 221), which could mean that Fazārī in turn transmitted from Baqīyah, since he instructed his students to write down Baqīyah’s ḥadīth. Baqīyah’s movements and literary activities are reasonably well documented. He was recognized as a leading Syrian traditionist who was more of an expert on the
traditionists of his own province than on those of the Hijáz and Irãq. He moved freely between Syria and Irãq and during an early visit to Irãq was appointed by the caliph Mansûr as surveyor for Damascus and its environs. He was again in Baghdád during the reign of Mahdí, when he sought out one of Irãq's leading traditionists, Shu'báh ibn al-Ḥajjáj (d. 160/776). This veteran scholar at first ignored the visitor from Syria. But Baqiyáh persisted and soon had an opportunity to impress Shu'báh when he came to the latter's rescue in a discussion at Mahdí's court. Thereafter Shu'báh was generous enough to permit Baqiyáh to write down 1,000 sound traditions from him, the work of six months being crammed into two. Shu'báh wrote down traditions from Baqiyáh and requested him on his return to Syria to send a copy of the hadîth collection of the Syrian traditionist Bahîr ibn Sa'd (see p. 225). Baqiyáh forwarded the requested copy, but Shu'báh had died before it reached 'Irãq.17

Still later, Baqiyáh was once again in Baghdád and presented himself at the court of Harûn al-Rashíd, who wrote down some of his traditions (see p. 177). Sometime during his visits to Baghdád, Baqiyáh met and exchanged traditions with Ibn al-Mubârâk, both writing down their materials. Ibn al-Mubârâk, like Shu'báh, requested from Baqiyáh a written copy of the collection of a Syrian traditionist, in this case that of Thâbit ibn 'Ajlân al-Ḥimsî (n.d.). Baqiyáh protested that he had no written copy and that Thâbit's materials were scattered. Ibn al-Mubârâk insisted on having the materials, whereupon Baqiyáh dictated what he could recall of Thâbit's collection and Ibn al-Mubârâk wrote it down. It is on the strength of these facts and the probability that both Ibn al-Mubârâk and Fazârî exchanged traditions with Baqiyáh that for the reconstruction of the second name in the isnâd of Tradition 11 (verso 16) I suggest Thâbit ibn 'Ajlân al-Ḥimsî.19

The most common criticism of Baqiyáh is that he transmitted indiscriminately from the weak, from the known and the unknown. His lack of discrimination induced him at times to tadlis. When taken to task by Shu'báh he defended himself adequately and cited examples of the carefully stated full names of his well known authorities in contrast to Shu'báh's own less complete statements. Nevertheless, suspicion continued to be cast on Baqiyáh's transmission from little known traditionists and through isnâd's with incomplete names and on his use of 'ar'ananâ rather than the more specific terms akhbaranâ and had-dathânâ.21

Abû al-Bakhtârî—like Fazârî, Ibn al-Mubârâk, and Baqiyáh—was an avid collector of information of all sorts and made a practice of writing down his materials. Like Fazârî and Ibn al-Mubârâk he was no mere passive compiler, since he is credited with six works (see p. 224) that, from their titles, can best be characterized as akhbar and siyar: Kitâb šifât al-nâbî, Kitâb al-fadâ'il al-kabîr, Kitâb ṣadûq al-Ansâr, Kitâb nasb wulî Iṣmâ'îl, Kitâb Ṭasâm wa Jadîs, and Kitâb al-râyât. It is to be noted that the contents of the papyrus text transmitted from him consist of hadîth proper as well as akhbar and siyar. The same is true of Tradition 11,

18 Khaṭîb VII 125; Ibn 'Aṣâkir III 276; Mīzân I 154, 157.
19 Ibn 'Aṣâkir III 273.
20 Ibid. pp. 274 f.; Jarîr I 1, pp. 433 f.; Mīzân I 154. Abû Nu'aim VII 149 cites Yahyâ ibn Sa'd al-Qattân, who estimated Shu'báh's daily transmission at about 3 to 10 traditions (see also Abû Nu'aim VII 154). Shu'báh was once credited with 2,000 traditions (Nawawî, p. 316).
21 Bukhârî, Ta'rîkh I 2, p. 137; Jarîr, Taqdimah, p. 135; Jarîr I 1, pp. 412 and 433 f.; Ibn 'Aṣâkir III 274 f.; Mīzân I 154, 156; Ma'rîfah, p. 261.
22 Jarîr I 1, p. 455; Ibn 'Aṣâkir III 369.
23 See e.g. Bukhârî, Ta'rîkh I 2, p. 166; Mīzân I 169 f.; Jarîr I 66.
24 Ibn 'Aṣâkir III 277; Mīzân I 158 f.
coming as I suspect from Fazārī and Ibn al-Mubārak, who in addition to being trusted tradi-
tionists were also compilers and authors of works of these other types.

It was no doubt the similarity in their wider interests that attracted Baqīyah to the mistrusted Abū al-Bakhtarī and the esteemed and trusted Fazārī. It should be noted that the āsād's of both sections of the papyrus text start with the term haddathāna and thus meet the requirements stipulated for acceptable transmission from Baqīyah. For most of his colleagues and critics agreed that his materials were to be accepted and written down by others only when he transmitted from well known traditionists and gave evidence of direct personal con-
tact with them by use of the terms akhbaranā and haddathānā.22 Sufyān ibn Ḥuyayn advised his friends not to rely on Baqīyah for traditions having the force of sunnah.23 Despite these restrictions Baqīyah was sought after, and his materials were written down or copied by others. Though the verdict of the majority was that his hadith could be written down but not adduced as proof,24 we find that Ibn Hibbān made a special trip to Syria in order to make complete copies of all of Baqīyah's hadith collections that were in circulation.25

Since all the men of the āsād's as well as all the men mentioned in the contents of the tra-
ditions of our document were from the Hijāz, Syria, and ʾIrāq, once more we must raise the question as to how a non-Egyptian document found its way into Egypt. And once more the sources lead us to Abū Šāliḥ the secretary of Laith, who seems to be the only Egyptian as yet known to have heard and transmitted materials from Baqīyah and to have done so in Baghdād, though the time when this took place is not specified.26 We know that Laith and his secretary were in Baghdād in the year 161/778 and that Laith, probably with his secretary, was again in Baghdād during the reign of Hārūn al-Rashīd (see p. 194). We know also that Baqīyah was not in Baghdād in the year 161/778, since he returned to Syria before Shu'bah's death in 160, and fortunately there seems to be no question about Shu'bah's death date. Therefore Abū Šāliḥ must have heard Baqīyah in Baghdād at the time of Baqīyah's last visit to that city, during the reign of Hārūn al-Rashīd (170–93/786–809), and hence must have accompanied Laith on his second visit to Baghdād.27 The famous and aged Laith would hardly be expected to seek out the suspect Baqīyah, but his ambitious and young secretary evidently did.

The sources supply one more detail of interest, namely that Baqīyah, who was willing to write and to supply copies of his materials and of others' collections on request, used a small script and papyrus of inferior quality,28 perhaps for the sake of economy or to limit the bulk of his manuscripts on his many travels. The size of the script of our document, but not the quality of the papyrus, would seem to indicate that it is not a hand copy of Baqīyah himself. There is, however, the possibility that Abū Šāliḥ could have acquired the document itself from a third party. But no matter when or how he may have acquired it, its presence among this group of related documents, several of which were associated in one way or another with Laith and his secretary, suggests that Abū Šāliḥ may have had a hand in its preservation (see p. 91).

The only other possibility is for us to assume that Musayyib ibn Wādiḥ (see p. 232) was

---

22 See e.g. Ibn Saʿd VII 2, p. 172; Jarḥ I 1, p. 435; Khaṭīb VII 124–26; Ibn ʾAsakir III 275 f.; Dhahabi I 266; Mtaʿn I 155.
23 See Mtaʿn II 46 for the general statement that Abū Šāliḥ accompanied Laith at home and on his travels.
24 Thabit ibn ʿAbd Allāh, Mtaʿn I 155.
25 Khaṭīb VII 123; Jarḥ I 1, p. 434.
26 Ibn ʾAsakir III 275. The term used is waraq, which frequently was applied to either papyrus or the later paper sheets.
the author-compiler of the document without offering any clues as to how it found its way into Egypt. Since Musayyib was over ninety when he died in the year 246/860, his transmis-
sion from Abū al-Bakhtārī (d. 200/815–16) and Fazārī (d. 188/804), must have taken place
at about the same time that Baqlyah (d. 197/812) and Abū Šalīḥ could have met in Baghda
d shortly before Laīth's death in 175/791. Therefore, if either Musayyib or Baqlyah was the
author of the document it can be safely dated to the last quarter of the second century at the
earliest and the first quarter of the third century at the latest. Internal evidence such as the
splitting of words at the ends of lines, the absence of punctuation, and the irregular use of
the tašliyah (used in recto 13, 15, 17, 25; omitted in recto 23, verso 11) favors the earlier
date. Thus from both the external and the internal evidence a dating in the late second century
seems reasonable.

II

There is a remarkable degree of agreement between the main evidence provided by the
papyrus text and the great majority of the literary sources that cover the same ground. The
agreement extends to Abū al-Bakhtārī's authorities and his tendency to combine unrelated
traditions (see p. 224), to his interest in both ḥadīth and akhbār (Traditions 9–10), and to the
fact that he was matrūk, that is, rejected by professional traditionists, since no parallels for
his traditions appear in the standard collections. Yet nothing in the contents of his traditions,
rejected because of the isndād's, conflicts with the general sense of similar and related traditions
with acceptable isndād's that do appear in these collections. Again, there is agreement on his
good reputation as an akhbārī since the sources confirm the papyrus text on the early practices
in Ḳirāq in connection with the production, inheritance, preservation, and disposal of
Qurāns and other religious manuscripts (Traditions 5, 9–10). The papyrus text supplements
the literary sources with the significant detail of Abū Qilābā's itemized division of his books
that were to be sent to Ayyūb al-Sikhtiyānī and Baiḥās al-Jarmī but does not record their
safe arrival at their destination (Tradition 10). Yet we do have evidence that they were in cir-
culation well into the third century since Yaḥṣūb II 3, 97, 523.

The papyrus does not have enough text from Fazārī to provide a test for its degree of corre-
lation with the literary sources. Yet the little that is preserved in Tradition 11 is in agreement
with the sources.

Even though there is a marked degree of agreement between what is in all probability a
late second-century text and the later sources, the temptation to assign the papyrus to a
somewhat later period must be resisted. Second- and third-century biographers of the caliber
of Wāqīḍī and his secretary Ibn Sa'd, Buhkārī, and Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī, and his son ʿAbd
al-Raḥmān of the invaluable Jarḥ wa al-taḍīl did use early written materials that were
authenticated at various stages through one method of transmission or another (ʿarḍ,
mukātahalah, munāwalah, or ʿiṣāḥ), and some, such as Wāqīḍī, even used unauthenticated
manuscripts that had been found (wijādah) after the death of the author (see pp. 45 f.) or
purchased from the book market. Such early practices go a long way toward explaining
the great measure of consistency in the vast field of early Islamic biographical and biblio-

19 Perhaps such clues may be found in the Musayyib entries in the still unpublished volumes of Ibn Ḥaṣākir's
Taʾrīkh.
graphical literature—a consistency that impresses one increasingly as one goes more deeply into this literature. It is true that this same literature presents variations and even contradictions. But the variations center mostly around uncertainties of birth and death dates, and the contradictions stem largely from subjective evaluation of contemporary and nearly contemporary professional rivals and colleagues. Twentieth-century scholars are not plagued with the uncertainties of dates, but surely they will always have contradictory opinions. One is tempted to say with the early Muslim scholars that honest differences of opinion among scholars are a mercy from Allāh.

III

Our document provides evidence of continuous written transmission of *ḥadīth* and *akhbār* in the *iṣnād’s* of Traditions 2–6 and 9–10, and most probably the complete *iṣnād’s* of the remaining four traditions would provide further such evidence.

The surviving *iṣnād’s* and text of the papyrus together with the supplementary data from the biographical sources as detailed on pages 225–31 yield the names of Anas ibn Mālik, Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, Khālid ibn Ma’dān, Abū Qilābah, Sha’bī, and ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, all of whom wrote down their sizable *ḥadīth* collections or had others make written collections for them or permitted their students to write down their materials. Since all of these men died just before or soon after the end of the first century, their literary activities can be safely placed in the last quarter of that century, though some of them are known to have been active from about the second quarter. Those who in turn transmitted *ḥadīth* and related materials in writing from the men of this group include their close contemporaries Abān ibn Abī ʿAyyāsh, Ayyūb al-Sikhtiyānī, Abū Rajāʾ Maṭr ibn Ṭalḥa, and Abū Ḥāṣīn ʿUthmān ibn ʿAṣim (d. 119 to 131 A.H.) and their younger contemporaries Ibn Jurayj and Thaur ibn Yaẓīd (d. 150 and 153 A.H. respectively). Transmitting from one or more of these six men were Hishām ibn ʿUrwaḥ ibn al-Zubair, Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad al-Ṣādiq, Saʿīd ibn Abī ʿArābah, Shurbaḥ, and Baḥr ibn Saʿd (d. 146 to 160 A.H.), all of whom are known to have written down their sizable collections with or without accompanying oral transmission. The transmitters of the next generation who are named in the papyrus text and those who are associated with them in the sources—Abū ʿAwānah, Ḥammād ibn Salamah ibn Dīnār, Ḥammād ibn Zaid ibn Dirham, Baqīyah ibn al-Walid, Ibn al-Mubārak, Fazārī, and Abū al-Bakhtārī Wahb ibn Wahb—all had written *ḥadīth* collections and some became authors in related fields.

Thus it is clear that our document and the research it entailed provide overwhelming evidence for the following conclusions. (1) Continuous written transmission of *ḥadīth* found practicing advocates in the second half of the first century, became widespread in the first half of the second century, and won general acceptance during the last half of the second century. (2) The number of book-sized collections increased with each generation of professional transmitters. (3) Written transmission, though accompanying oral transmission (sāmʿ or ʿard) was not completely dispensed with, did indeed during the course of this entire period come to be based increasingly on manuscripts alone through the *mukātabah, munāwalah, ijāzah*, and to a lesser extent even the *wijādah* methods.

Fine medium brown papyrus, 23.6 × 17.2 cm., with 18 lines to the page (Pls. 20-21). The piece is badly damaged, with large breaks down the center and loss of much of the inner margin.

Script.—The fair-sized book hand suggests a cursive variety of the māʾīl or slanting Medinan script (see OIP L 23 f.). Diacritical points are used at least once for all of the letters that call for them and especially in personal names (recto 2–3, verso 4 and 6), yet the text is far from being completely pointed. Vowel signs, definitely part of the original text, are used more sparingly, with fāṭhah appearing most often (recto 2 and 17–18, verso 1–2 and 5); kasrah appears thrice (recto 17, verso 6 and 12) and ʿaʾmāmah only once (verso 1). The hamzah is missing. The circle with a dot is used for punctuation and collation (see pp. 87 f.).

A heavy red dash appears at the head of Traditions 2–4 and 7. These may be original and may indicate a specific source (see p. 87). Marginal signs and notations, which appear only on the verso (Traditions 5 and 7), are in a different hand and a darker ink and probably indicate later collation.

TEXT

Recto

1 (1) في سبيل الله ومن دخله انعم الله كان ذلك لحظة الى ما لقيت له
2 قال حدثنا أبو عبد الرحمن قال حدثنا حيوة [قال] أخرينا سالم بن يحيى
3 أنه سمع دارجاً إيا السماح يحدث عن أبي الهلالي سلم عن أبي سعيد أنه سمع
4 النبي يقول إن الله إذا رضى عن [أدعى] [أذن] عليه لسعة أمعاف
5 من الخير لم يعمل وإذا سخط على العبد الثاني [ولي] عليه لسعة إصناف
6 ﴿الملح الشمر لم يعمل ﴾ قال حدثنا بن وهب بهذا الاستاذ قام به
7 (3) [قال] حدثنا أبو عبد الرحمن قال حدثنا حيوة [ قال ] حدثنا أبو
8 حيبان الخولاني أنه سمع إيا غلبان الرها [ظلم!] حيحيل عليه يقول سمعت عبد الله بن
9 ﴿عمر روي يقول صلى الله عليه وسلم ما من كان [ ] ﴾... في سبيل الله
10 ﴿إِنِمْ بِغَيْنِهِ الْأَبَدِيَّةِ أُمَّةٌ مَّنْ هُما وَلَهَا وَشَقَّ اْيَمَانٍ ﴾ [ ]
11 ﴿أَتَا بِمَثَلَهَا فَلَمْ يَسْتَعْلَى ﴾ غَيْنَةَ [ ]
12 (4) قال حدثنا أبو عبد الرحمن قال حدثنا حيوة قال
13 [حدثنا أبو بصائح أن رضى بن قطب حدثنا ابن داوود بن [عوان] بن سعلاء بن
14 ﴿أبو] وقص حدثه عن أبيه أنه كان قائداً علماً عبد الله بن سعلاء ان عمر اذ طلع
15 خياب صاحب المقصورة قال يا عبد الله بن عمر الا تسمع ما
16 يقول أبو هريرة أنه [سمع رسول الله يقول] من خرج مع جناتة من بيتها
Comments.—Tradition 1. The missing isnād probably started with the first two links common to the rest of the isnād’s of the document.

The standard collections yielded no parallels for the tradition, the reading of the last part of which is partly conjectural. However, the belief that voluntary charity for the cause of Allāh added to one’s list of merits was widely accepted (see e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal IV 190, V 455; Bukhārī III 42; Concordance II 404).

Tradition 2. Note the heavy red dash at the head of the tradition.

Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ‘Abd Allāh ibn Yazād al-Muqrī (ca. 120–213/738–828) spent the first part of his life in ‘Irāq, mostly in Baṣrāh, where he came under the influence of the Ḥanīfī legal system. He later settled in Mecca, where he spent more than thirty-five years. He transmitted from numerous widely accepted traditionists, including the Egyptians Laith ibn Sa’d, Ibn Wahb, and Ḥaiwah ibn Shuraih (see p. 243). He was himself highly esteemed as a traditionist and counted among his transmitters several well known Egyptians, including Asad ibn Mūsā (see p. 243) and Abū Șāliḥ the secretary of Laith, as well as the master traditionists
Ibn Ḥanbal, Muslim, and Bukhārī, all of whom quote him in their collections (Ibn Saʿd V 362; Jarḥ II 2, p. 201; Futūḥ, e.g. p. 278; Kindī, p. 302; Šamʿānī, folio 540a; Jamʿ I 262 f.; Dhahabi I 159, 334).

Ḥaiwah ibn Shuraih (d. 158 or 159/774-76) was an ascetic who refused the office of judge and, according to Ibn Wahb, leaned toward the Shīʿah. As a traditionist he was sought out by most of his younger Egyptian contemporaries, including Ibn al-Mubārak and Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Muqri. That Ḥaiwah wrote down his ḥadīth collection is implied by Kattānī (Vol. I 136), who states that the pious Ḥaiwah would not sprinkle just ordinary sand on his manuscripts for blotting but would go out to the desert for fresh clean sand which he pounded and sifted before using (Ibn Saʿd VII 2, p. 203; Jarḥ I 2, pp. 306 f.; Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh II 1, p. 111; Ibn Ḥibbān, p. 142; Futūḥ, e.g. p. 241; Kindī, p. 305; Akhbār al-qudāt III 232 f.; Jamʿ I 110 f.; Dhahabi I 174 f.; Ḥusn al-muḥādārah I 153, 163 f.).

Ṣālim ibn Ghailān (n.d.) was a comparatively obscure Egyptian traditionist who transmitted from Abū al-Samḥ Darrāj ibn Samʿān and whose pupils included Ḥaiwah and Ibn Wahb. Most of the critics considered him trustworthy (Jarḥ II 1, p. 187; Kindī, p. 319; Mīzan I 268; Ḥusn al-muḥādārah I 151).

Abū al-Samḥ Darrāj ibn Samʿān (d. 126/744) was an Egyptian qāṣṣ whose traditions were suspect except for those that were already known to be authentic through parallel traditions coming from others. He was closely associated with Abū al-Haitham Sulaimān ibn ʿAmr (Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh II 1, p. 234; Jarḥ I 2, pp. 441 f.; Mīzan I 326 f.). Some of his materials, frequently based on his authorities that are indicated in the isnād of this tradition, were transmitted by Ibn Lahīfah of our Document 9 (see e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal III 75 f.; Futūḥ, pp. 281 f., 284, and 301).

Abū al-Haitham Sulaimān ibn ʿAmr (Ibn Saʿd VII 2, p. 202; Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh II 2, p. 28; Daulābī II 156 f.) seems to be known primarily for his association with Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī (see p. 202).

The tradition, complete in isnād and matn, is transmitted directly from Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Muqri by Ibn Ḥanbal (Vol. III 38, lines 24-27), who substitutes رضي الله صلعم for the simpler ثي thiết of the papyrus text. Ibn Ḥanbal (Vol. III 40 and 76) provides other parallels which are almost identical with the papyrus text but transmitted to him by contemporaries of Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān who used most of the links of the papyrus isnād. The variants are linguistic and consist of the substitution of لبس عضاف احبه, 'ṣūba ʿūṣāf, رضي عن for سعة اضعاف, and إخض رعمله, احبه, اخض رعمله (recto 5) respectively of the papyrus text.

That Ibn Wahb transmitted this tradition with its full isnād (recto 6) is confirmed by Ṭahāwī, who specifies also that it was transmitted from Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān by one Egyptian, Ṣāliḥ ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (d. ca. 262/876), and indicates other parallel transmitters and, finally, discusses the theological implications of the tradition (Ṭahāwī I 388-90).

**Tradition 3.** Note the heavy red dash at the head of the tradition.

Abū Ṣakhr Ḥumaid ibn Ziyād (n.d.) was originally from Medina but settled in Egypt. That he transmitted from Abū Hānī Ḥumaid ibn Hānī al-Khaulānī and to Ḥaiwah ibn Shuraih is well attested. He was considered generally trustworthy by most of the critics (Ibn Saʿd V 324; Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh I 2, p. 348; Jarḥ I 2, p. 222; Jamʿ I 91, 111; Mīzan I 287; Ḥusn al-muḥādārah I 150).

Abū Hānī Ḥumaid ibn Hānī al-Khaulānī (d. 142/759) was an Egyptian traditionist whose
transmission from Abū Ḥabd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥubulī was generally accepted. Though he was considered weak by a number of critics, his materials were transmitted by such leading Egyptians as Ibn Lahiḥah, Laith ibn Sa’d, Ibn Wahb, and Ḥawaiḥ ibn Shuraih (Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh I 2, p. 350; Jarḥ I 2, p. 231; Futūḥ, pp. 4, 256, and 277–79; Jamʿ I 91; Mīzān III 385; Ḥusn al-muhḍarah I 150 f.).

Abū Ḥabd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥubulī (d. 100/718) was sent by Umar ibn Ḥabīl to North Africa along with the first group of scholars who went there to instruct the people in Islamic teachings and practices. He transmitted mainly from such leading Companions as ʿAbd Allāh ibn Ṣa‘d ibn ʿAbd al-Haqq, ʿAbd Allah ibn ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ (Ibn Sa’d VII 2, p. 200; Jarḥ II 2, p. 197; Jamʿ I 281; Ḥusn al-muhḍarah I 144; Mālikī, Kitāb riyd al-nufūs I 65–67). For another instance of Ibn Wahb’s parallel transmission see comment on Tradition 2.

The surviving text of the content of this tradition is not too clear. Such clues as it provides have not led to the identification of parallels (see Concordance V 10). The general theme seems to involve the reward or punishment, on earth and in the hereafter, for some specific act such as the just or unjust distribution of wheat acquired as spoils of war (cf. e.g. Concordance I 161 and IV 151).

Tradition 4. Note the heavy red dash at the head of the tradition.

Yazīd ibn Qusait (d. 122/740) was a trustworthy traditionist of Medina whose transmission from Dā‘ūd ibn ʿĀmir and to Abū Ṣakhr is specified in the sources (see Jarḥ I 2, p. 222; Jamʿ II 575; Mīzān III 314; Nawawi’s comment in Muslim XVII 158).

Dā‘ūd ibn ʿĀmir (n.d.) of Medina and his father, ʿĀmir ibn Sa’d ibn Abī al-Waqqāṣ (d. 104/722–23), who was an eager and trustworthy traditionist, are mentioned specifically for their traditions on funerals and burials, including this tradition (Ibn Sa’d V 124 f.; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh I 1, p. 212, and III 2, p. 449; Jarḥ II 2, p. 418; Jamʿ I 131, 376).

The Khabbāb (n.d.) of the story was a client of Fāṭimah bint ʿUqbah and seems to have been best remembered in connection with this particular tradition (Istlāb I 160; Iṣābah I 858; Usd II 108 f.; Jamʿ I 125).

Close parallels are transmitted through other isnād’s than that of the papyrus text but trace back nevertheless to Abū Hurairah. They are numerous and omit one or more of the details of the khabar element (e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal II 470, 498; Tirmidhī IV 261 f.). Still other close parallels trace back to Abū Hurairah and ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUmar and vary drastically in the khabar element. According to these versions, when ʿAbd Allāh heard Abū Hurairah relate this tradition he cautioned him about his too ready transmission of traditions from Muhammad, whereupon both men went to ʿĀ‘ishah for her confirmation or denial (for ʿĀ‘ishah as a traditionist see e.g. pp. 119, 151, 187). An added khabar is Abū Hurairah’s well known explanation as to why he heard so many more traditions from Muhammad than did most of the Companions, namely that he was poor and stayed close to Muhammad while the rest were preoccupied with their business in the market place and on their lands (e.g. Ibn Sa’d IV 2, pp. 57 f.; Ibn Ḥanbal II 2 f., 387; Mustadrak III 510 f.; Nubalāʾ II 443 f.).

Parallel traditions from varied sources that relate only the hadīth element and omit reference to ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUmar are even more numerous (e.g. Ṭayālah, p. 132; Ibn Ḥanbal IV 86, 294; Muslim VII 13–16; Tirmidhī IV 261, XIII 338 f.; Nasāʾī I 275; Ṭahāwī III 108–7; see also Concordance I 259 f. and 263). Several of these traditions explain what Muḥammad meant by ʿāqib, namely a reward (presumably not all monetary) as great as the mountain of Uhud (Bukhārī IV 408; Ibn Ḥanbal II 144, 475,
and 521, IV 131). Others report Muḥammad's wish that Uhud were a mountain of gold so that he could use it in the cause of Allāh (e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal V 149; Abū Nuʿaim IX 58; Khaṭṭāb I 148).

There is evidence that the basic content of this tradition was transmitted in writing at a very early date to the Yemenite Abū Tamīm al-Jaishānī (d. 77/696 or 78/697; see e.g. Ibn Saʿd VII 2, p. 200; Daulāb I 19, 65; Iṣṭiʿāb II 630; Usd V 152), who had already learned the Qurʾān from Muʿādh ibn Jabal (d. 18/640). That a double reward accrued to him who followed a bier and stayed through the burial service was generally accepted as approved by Muḥammad. The same cannot be said for the details that associate the cautious ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUmar with the tradition. This tradition, of course, relates to the unquestioned practice of paying each bier-follower who did not stay for the burial service only one qirāṭ for his time.

Tradition 5. The dotted circle in the margin indicates collation, but the “Abū” seems superfluous. The ghain is probably an abbreviation for غريب.

Makhūl al-Shāmī (d. between 112/730 and 117/735) as a young man fell into the hands of either ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ or his brother Saʿīd and was in turn presented to a woman of Hudhail who set him free in Egypt. He concentrated on Islamic learning, traveled to all the provinces in search of knowledge, and settled finally in Damascus. Zuhrī attested to his scholarship, classing him and Saʿīd ibn al-Musayyib of Medina, Shaʿbī of Kūfah, and Ḥasan al-Ḥāṣṣ as the four leading scholars of their time. Makhūl did not insist on literal (ḥarfī) transmission of hadith provided the basic meaning (maʿnā) was preserved. He had Qadirite tendencies and was considered weak by some of the pious traditionists who insisted on literal transmission (Ibn Saʿd VII 2, pp. 160 f.; Maʿārif, p. 230; Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh IV 2, pp. 21 f.; Jarḥ IV 1, pp. 407 f.; Fūhrīst, p. 227; Abū Nuʿaim V 177–93; Mustadrak III 569; Jāmiʿ I 87; Jamʿ II 526; Dhahabī I 101; Nawawī, pp. 283 f.; Ibn Khallīkān II 160 f. [= trans. III 437–40]; Ḥusn al-muhādarah I 162; see also pp. 244 f. below).

Abū Hind al-Dārī (n.d.), about whose given name there is some confusion, lived in Jerusalem and visited Egypt. His sons were the main transmitters of the few traditions with which he is credited. Yet, most of his biographical entries mention this particular tradition as having been transmitted from him by Abū Ṣakhir to Ḥaiwah ibn Shuraih, as in the papyrus isnād. It was also transmitted from him by the Egyptians Rishdīn ibn Saʿd and Ibn Lahījah and by others from various provinces (Ibn Saʿd VII 2, pp. 138 f.; Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh I 2, p. 146; Iṣṭiʿāb II 699; Isbāḥ IV 401 f.; Usd I 177 f.; Ḥusn al-muhādarah I 140 f.).

Ibn Saʿd (Vol. VII 2, pp. 138 f.) and Ibn Ḥanbal (Vol. V 270) transmit this tradition verbatim from Abū ʿAbd al-ʿRaḥmān al-Muqṭī. Neither of them has any other tradition originating with Abū Hind, a fact that accords with the collector-transmitter's comment in verso 8 that he wrote down no other tradition, presumably from Abū ʿAbd al-ʿRaḥmān al-Muqṭī, originating with Abū Hind. Another parallel is identical with our text but for the isnād, which stops with Makhūl (Usd I 177), while an almost verbatim parallel (Abū Nuʿaim V 187; Isbāḥ IV 402) is transmitted from Abū ʿAbd al-ʿRaḥmān al-Muqṭī by Ḥārīth ibn Abī Usāmah (186–282/802–95).

Related traditions that originate with traditionists other than Abū Hind and are transmitted by Makhūl are also found (e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal IV 229; Bukhārī IV 230; Abū Dāʿūd IV 270; see also Concordance II 541 [سُئِمْهِ]).

Tradition 6. The links of the isnād, except for Yazīd and Qais, have been covered. Of the several traditionists named Yazīd the two likely ones would seem to be Yazīd ibn ʿAbd Allāh
al-Laithī (d. 139/756–57; see e.g. Jarḥ IV 2, p. 275; Ibn Ḥībbān, p. 101; Jamʿ II 575) and the older Yazīd ibn Juʿdubah al-Laithī (n.d.; see Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh IV 2, p. 323; Jarḥ IV 2, p. 255), both of the Ḥiǧrāz.

Qais, a Companion of Muhammad, is not likely to be identified, since the sources mention some three dozen Companions who bore this name. The papyrus has either an alif or a lām about in the center of the last name of the father. But even this clue leaves a wide choice for the father’s name, as the lists of Companions named Qais readily reveal (see e.g. Ṣīlahāb, Index, and Ḫasābah III 483–535).

The tradition obviously refers to the spiritual or heavenly rewards of ceremonial or private prayer. It seems to involve some of Muḥammad’s instructions for the order of the various elements of the prayer service, such as the raising of the hands, the prostrations, and the salutation. These themes were not free from controversy, and the traditions that cover them are far too numerous to be checked for an identical or a closely related parallel, especially since the checking would have to be largely through the isnād because the matn is so damaged (see e.g. Concordance II 279 f., 301–3, 507 f., 576 f., and III 186 f., 192). The number of possibilities will no doubt be reduced when مُدَّمَدُ is indexed in the Concordance.

Tradition 7. Note the red dash at the head of the tradition. The ḥāʾ in the margin probably stands for صحيح, while سلم speaks for itself.

The isnād links have been covered. The matn was very brief to judge by the space available for it.

Tradition 8. Bashīr ibn Ḍī Amr al-Khulānī (n.d.) was a trustworthy Egyptian traditionist who transmitted to Ḥaiwāh ibn Shurābīh, Ibn Lāḥfāḥ, and Laith ibn Saʿd. His transmission from his fellow Egyptian Walīd ibn al-Qāṣīs (n.d.; see Ṣīlahāb II 606; Ḫasābah III 1317; Ḥusn al-muhādarah I 150) is also attested, as is Walīd’s transmission from Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī (see p. 239), though Walīd was considered a weak traditionist (Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh IV 2, p. 151; Jarḥ I 1, p. 377; Ḥusn al-muhādarah I 150).

Ibn Ḥanbal (Vol. III 38 f.) provides the only verbatim parallel for the part of the tradition that survives in the papyrus. Again, it was Ibn Ḥanbal (Vol. IV 156) who provided the one closely related tradition, which has, however, a different isnād that traces back to Ṭūqabah ibn Ṭūmār (d. 58/678).

IDENTIFICATION AND SIGNIFICANCE

1

The compiler of the papyrus text has to be a more or less younger contemporary of both Ibn Wahb and Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Muqṭī. The latter, unlike Ibn Wahb, is credited with no specific books though his materials are to be found in all the major hadīth collections.1 The biographical sources provide long lists of transmitters from both men but indicate that the lists are incomplete. Though authorities common to both men are readily spotted, the available lists specify no transmitters common to both. The sources indicate no direct contact between Ibn Wahb and any of the eight men who transmitted one or more of the papyrus traditions directly from Abū Ṭūqabah ibn Ṭūmār. Furthermore, all except the Egyptian Ṣāliḥ ibn Ṭūmār (see p. 239) were men of ʿIrāq and farther east, as were indeed the great majority of the transmitters from Abū Ṭūqabah ibn Ṭūmār. The latter spent the last decades of his life in Mecca (see p. 238) and therefore must have been in that city when Ibn Wahb re-

1 Dhababī I 334.
peatedly made long visits to Mecca and Medina during the twenty years preceding the death of Malik (179/795), whose Muwatāt: Ibn Wahb transmitted (see p. 122).

On the basis of these facts and because the script of the papyrus text suggests the māʾil or slanting Medinan variety (see p. 237), it seemed reasonable to suppose that some traditionist of Syria or the Hijāz transmitted from both Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān and Ibn Wahb and that somehow his manuscript reached Egypt. Thus Egyptian historical sources led to the most probable author of the papyrus text.

The center of attention now shifts to a scholar of Umayyad descent, Asad ibn Mūsā (132–212/750–827), known also as Asad al-Sunnah, who was born in the year of the fall of the Umayyad dynasty and grew up in fear for his life in the period of determined ʿAbdāsīd persecution of the members of the fallen dynasty. He made his way cautiously to Egypt sometime before the death of Ibn Lahiṣah and of Laith ibn Saʿd and found his way to Laith's home. Laith received him graciously and following their interview sent him a gift of money which Asad declined, saying that he carried a money belt with a thousand dinars. Laith explained that this was not charity but a personal gift and added that if Asad had no need for it he could distribute it among needy and deserving traditionists, and Asad did so.4

Asad established himself in Egypt and is counted among Egyptian scholars. He exchanged materials with most of Egypt's leading scholars and soon had a following of his own.5 His association with Laith and the latter's secretary Abū Ṣāliḥ is solidly established, as is also his transmission from Ibn Wahb.4 Asad's transmission from Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Muqri is established by Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, who throws further light on the wide circulation of the ḥadīth of Ḥaiwah ibn Shuraiḥ among contemporary Egyptian scholars such as Ibn Lahiṣah, Laith and his secretary, Ibn Wahb, and Asad himself.7 Furthermore, Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, who himself transmitted directly from Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, Asad, and Laith's secretary, provides evidence that Asad and Laith's secretary in transmitting directly from Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān used in some instances the two last isnād links common to all the traditions of the papyrus text, for Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam's isnād reads:حداثة أحمد بن موسى وعبد الله بن صالح قال (sic) حدثنا ...Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān's transmission from Ḥaiwah ibn Shuraiḥ is well established8 and occurs repeatedly in the papyrus text.

Though the non-Egyptian direct transmitters from Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān are numerous, only three of them transmitted parallels of one or more of the papyrus traditions: Ibn Saʿd (Tradition 5), Ibn Ḥanbal (Traditions 2, 5, 8), and the Kufan Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Numair (Tradition 4), who died in the year 234/848.10 Not one of the three is known to have transmitted directly from Ibn Wahb. Among the Egyptian direct transmitters from Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān the only one who transmitted a parallel of a papyrus tradition (No. 2) is Ṣāliḥ ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān,11 who died no earlier than the year 262/87612 and could not have

---

1 See e.g. Dhahabi I 279–81. Ibn Wahb is credited with 36 pilgrimages.
2 See Vol. I 12, 16. See also GAL I 66 and GAL 5 I 257.
3 Abū Nuʿaym VII 321 f.
4 See Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh I 2, p. 50; Ḥarḥ I 1, p. 338; Taḥārī, Index.
5 See e.g. Futūḥ, pp. 45 and 47.
6 See e.g. Futūḥ, pp. 45 and 47.
7 See e.g. ibid.; 87, 287, 290, 300, 310; Le d'jamāt d'Ibn Wahb, ed. David-Weill, I 4, 14, 24, 35, 62, 63, 98; Kindi, pp. 302 and 319.
transmitted from Ibn Wahb, who died in the year 197/812. There remain three Egyptian traditionists who are known to have been interested in the *hadith* collection of Haiwah ibn Shuraih and to have transmitted some of his materials directly from both Ibn Wahb and Abū ʿAbd al-Rahmān. The fact that they do not provide parallels to the papyrus text is not of major significance since the fragment contains only eight traditions. Of major significance, however, is the well established fact that all three of them—Asad ibn Mūsā, Abū ʿṢāliḥ the secretary of Laith, and Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam—used written sources and collected manuscripts. It seems logical to eliminate first the possibility that Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam was the compiler of the *hadith* collection represented by our papyrus because he is farthest removed from Abū ʿAbd al-Rahmān. He did transmit some of the latter’s materials directly but supplemented them from materials that the older Asad ibn Mūsā and Abū ʿṢāliḥ had received from Abū ʿAbd al-Rahmān on the authority of Haiwah and of Haiwah’s sources who are indicated in the papyrus *isnād’s*. Of the remaining two possibilities, Asad ibn Mūsā seems more likely than Abū ʿṢāliḥ for the following reasons. The papyrus preserves the text of the Egyptian Haiwah as transmitted by the non-Egyptian Abū ʿAbd al-Rahmān, which would therefore have been in greater demand by non-Egyptians than by Egyptians, who had ready access to Haiwah and his Egyptian transmitters. Thus Asad, before he took refuge in Egypt, would have had more reason than would Abū ʿṢāliḥ to seek out Abū ʿAbd al-Rahmān’s collection of Haiwah’s *hadith*. The pronounced slant of the script of the papyrus text implies non-Egyptian origin (see p. 243). After Asad settled in Egypt and became associated with Laith and his secretary he doubtless compared notes and exchanged some traditions, if not indeed manuscripts at least on a loan basis, with them. Since Asad died some dozen years before Abū ʿṢāliḥ, it is possible that some of his manuscripts passed into the hands of Abū ʿṢāliḥ and formed a part of his collection. Once again (cf. p. 91) circumstantial evidence strongly suggests that Abū ʿṢāliḥ had a hand in the preservation of one of our documents. In any case, the dating of the papyrus to the early third century at the latest would seem to be amply warranted.

II

All of the traditions of the document report *hadith al-nabi*, that is, the sayings as against the deeds (*sunan*) of Muhammad. It has been shown repeatedly in these studies that as a rule the traditions of Muḥammād have identical or close parallels in the standard collections (see p. 77). Because much of the *matn* of Traditions 1, 3, 6, and 7 is lost it is impossible to determine definitely whether parallels for these traditions exist. The basic content of the *hadith* element of Tradition 4 appears frequently in the standard collections, but parallels for the *khabar* element involve several variants with some additions and subtractions. Traditions 2, 5, and 8 have complete identical parallels in the *Musnad* of Ibn Ḥanbal. On the whole, therefore, the document provides further evidence of the high rate of survival of *hadith al-nabi*.

III

The earliest links in the *isnād’s* of the papyrus text name ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUmar (Tradition 4) and Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī (Traditions 2, 8), both of whom opposed the writing-down of Tradition. But these links also name ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAmr (Tradition 3) and Abū Ḥurairah (Traditions 4, 7), who from the beginning either wrote down their traditions or permitted others to do so. The links intermediate between these men and Abū Ṣakhir Ḥumaid ibn Ziyād name a number of comparatively obscure traditionists whose methods of transmission are not indicated in the sources. The one exception is Makḥūl al-Shāmī (Tradition 5), pupil of Anas
ibn Mālik and teacher of Mālik ibn Anas, who is known to have made an extensive tour in search of knowledge and to have written down his materials. He is credited with two works on *fiqh* for which he no doubt drew on his *hadith* materials.

Abū Ṣakhir (see p. 239), who transmits Traditions 3–8, shares the obscurity of most of his immediate authorities, and his methods of transmission are likewise not indicated. Nevertheless, he must be counted among those who at least permitted others to write down *hadith* from their dictation since Ḥaiwah ibn Shuraiḥ (see p. 239), who is his immediate transmitter of Traditions 3–8, is known to have written down his own collection of *hadith*. Ḥaiwah moved in circles in which the writing-down of Tradition was the rule. The papyrus itself, by its very existence and by the editorial comment in verso 8 (see p. 241), attests continuous written transmission of these materials.

It can be assumed, then, that at least some of these traditions, which trace back to Muḥammad, were written down from the beginning. We are on much surer ground for the later transmission because from Abū Ṣakhir to the compiler-transmitter we have three or four steps of continuous written transmission (see p. 243) that bring us into the active period of Ibn Sa'd and Ibn Ḥanbal, both of whom wrote down their *hadith* collections. It is not surprising, therefore, that they provide verbatim parallels for Traditions 2, 5, and 8—a rather large percentage in view of the fact that four of the other five traditions are either incomplete or too broken for identification.

13 *Fihrist*, p. 227.
DOCUMENT 12


Medium quality medium brown papyrus, 20 X 16.2 cm. (Pls. 22–23), originally used for either official or private correspondence by some well-to-do person to judge by the large script and lavish spacing. The one phrase of the original that has survived, aside from the basmalah, reads أَمْرُكُ اللَّهِ يَطَاعُهُ فُرِّقَتْ اللَّهُ وَيَارَآكَ حَمَّل طَاعَتِهُ. Related phrases such as اِكْرَمْكَ اللَّهُ يَطَاعُهُ are found in all sorts of correspondence from the third century. The generous unused spaces of the original document attracted the economical, or perhaps impoverished, hadith student whose sahifa or memorandum sheet this is. Since the zahr or reverse of such documents—usually bearing only an address—provided more space, it was used first. In this case the student began at the bottom of the reverse and continued on the top of the obverse. Documents written in such large scripts are usually large in area also, at least twice as long as our fragment, so that our traditionalist must have had more personal fadawi entries on his sheet than have survived. Aside from large breaks the papyrus is damaged mostly by peeling.

Script.—The script is the same for all the traditions, but two different kinds of ink were used. The light brown ink of the upper part of the recto has faded considerably, almost to the vanishing point in some spots, in contrast to the more lasting almost black ink of the rest of the text.

The script itself is a fairly fixed small cursive hand whose main characteristics are the use of large initial ‘ain and kāf. Diacritical points are used for all letters that call for them except jīm, kha, dād, and zāy. The pointing is not too liberal, though here and there an entire word is pointed, for example فَلَيْقُبَضُ لِيُصْفَحُ لَفْيَبْصَ لِيُصْفَحُ لِيُصْفَحُ لَفْيَبْصَ لِيُصْفَحُ لِيُصْفَحُ لَفْيَبْصَ لِيُصْفَحُ لِيُصْفَحُ لَفْيَبْصَ لِيُصْفَحُ لِيُصْفَحُ لِيُصْفَحُ لَفْيَبْصَ لِيُصْفَحُ لِيُصْفَحُ لَفْيَبْصَ لِيُصْفَحُ لِيُصْفَحُ لَفْيَبْصَ لِيُصْفَحُ لِيُصْفَحُ لَفْيَبْصَ لِيُصْفَحُ لِيُصْفَحُ لَفْيَبْصَ لِيُصْفَحُ لِيُصْفَحُ لَفْيَبْصَ لِيُصْفَحُ لِيُصْفَحُ لِيُصْفَحُ لَفْيَبْصَ لِيُصْفَحُ لِيُصْفَحُ لِيُصْفَحُ لَفْيَبْصَ لِيُصْفَحُ لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ لِيُصْفَحُ لَفْيَبْصَ لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ Llll لِيُصْفَحُ لِيُصْفَحُ Llll Llll Llll
[الله ان لي حوراء] قال ما هي قالت خادمك انس فما ترك خير لآخر ولا دنيا وقال اللهم ارزقه مالا
وولدا وبارك فيه فله لمن
[أكبر الانصار مالا وولدا ثم قال واخبرته ابتني امينة انه قد دفّن من صلبي إلى مقدم الحجاج البصرة
بضع وعشرين ومية
فضائل لزيد بن ثابت ـ 7
(2) حدثنا جرب بن عبد الحميد قال حدثنا الأعمش عن ثابت بن عبيد عن زيد بن ثابت قال
قال لي النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم
[أتهاني كتب لا أحب ان يقرأها أحد احسن السريانية فلت لا قتلهمما قاتل فتعلمتها في سبعة
اشتريحما ـ 8
(3) حدثنا موسى بن اسماعيل قال ان خبرنا حماد قال لما مات زيد بن ثابت جلستنا إلى ابن عباس
في ضل قصره وزيد بن ثابت
(4) حدثنا محمد بن عبد الله الانصارى قال حدثنا محمد بن عمرو عن رجل قد سمى عن ابن عباس
قال ابنه لزيد بن ثابت فأخذ بركاء [بها] فقال هكذا يا ابن رسول الله قال أنا هكذا نفعل بعلمائنا
وكثيرنا
فضيلة عمرو بن الدحداقة
(5) روى حدثنا هارون بن اسماعيل الخزاز قال حدثنا على بن مبارك قال حدثنا يحيى بن أبي كثير
قال بلغنا أن رسول الله قال ان الله
يأمركم بلغ الآية ان ترضوا من ما يكلمنكم يضاعفه لكم اضعا عاقبة كثيرة فقال عمرو بن الدحداقة يا
رسول الله لي مالان بالعالية
والمالى في ينظر فارسل إلى معر رضيت فروة بن عمرو فلقيضى علي خيرهما ابتغي بر الله والدار الآخرة
فقال له رسول الله انظر
خير مالك واقبض الآخر قال فروة ان رسول الله قد امرني ان اترك خير مالك قال عمرو وما كنت
لا فرض ربي شروما املك ولكي افرضه خير ما املك ولست اخفاف قبل قال رسول الله ربي عذب مدللا
(6) لا أبي الدحداقة في الجنة واهل المدينة يسرون النحل العذق

VERSO

1
فضيلة لأبي لبابة
(6) حدثنا عمار أبو النعمان عن متبرع بن سليمان عن أبي قال حدثنا الحسن ان اليهود استخاروا باب
لبة في أن ينزلوا عن حكم
رسول الله فقال لهم افعلوا وقد قال مرة أخرى نعم قال وشربنا إلى حلقة أنه الذي مجيءه قال أبو لبابة انا والله
الذي كنت الله رسوله قال فانطلق فلوائق نفسه بسارية من سواى المسجد فقال رسول الله
Comments.—Tradition 1. The two elements of this tradition, namely Muhammad's visit to the house of Umm Sulaim and her request that he bless her young son Anas ibn Malik, who was in Muhammad's service, were widely known and generally accepted by the early Muslims. Traditions that involve one or the other of these two elements trace back to several contemporary 'Iraqi transmitters from Anas himself, who had settled in Basrah (see e.g. Concordance I 173 and II 486). There are in addition a number of closely related traditions and nearly identical parallels to the papyrus text that trace back, through various isnāds', to the Basran Humaid al-Tawil (60-142/680-759; see pp. 152 and 160) on the authority of Anas ibn Malik (see e.g. Concordance II 542). It is difficult to tell whether the traditions that separate or those that combine the two elements of the papyrus text are the older since both the splitting-up of traditions and the combining of two or more short but related ones apparently started very early in Islam. However, I am inclined to think that the papyrus text represents a later combining of two earlier short traditions, perhaps at the hands of Humaid himself.

For the Najjarite Umm Sulaim of Medina was one of the most active and staunch supporters of Muhammad's cause, on and off the battlefield. Like her second husband, Abu Talhah Zaid ibn Sahl (see p. 117), and her son Anas she is accorded separate entries in the fadhl literature (e.g. Bukhārī IV 11 f.; Muslim XVI 10–13, 39–41), which together with the numerous biographical entries emphasize the repeated and openhanded hospitality of Abu Talhah and Umm Sulaim to Muhammad and his needy Companions without any reference to Umm Sulaim's request for a special blessing on her son Anas. For her musnad see Siychar I 847, Muhammad ibn Aḥmad al-Sarakhsi, Shahr al-kitāb al-siyar al-kabīr lī al-Shaibānī I 184 f. and 200, Muwatta' II 927, Bukhārī II 398, III 11 f. and 493 f., Muslim XIII 217–20, Ibn Ḥanbal VI 376 f., 430 f. For biographical entries see Ibn Sa'īd VIII 310–18, Istīqāb II 780, Abū Nu’aim II 57–61, Iṣābah IV 891–93, Usd V 591, Nawawī, pp. 863 f., Dhahabī II 75, Nubalāv II 18, and Jam' II 606 and 610.

The reconstruction of the missing links of the isnād presents more problems than does the reconstruction of the matn, since the variants found in the parallels are on the whole minor ones with no real significance for the basic meaning of both elements of the tradition. The standard hadith collections yielded four possibilities for restoring the missing links of the isnād: (1) Bukhārī (d. 256/870)–Muhammad ibn [ʿAbd Allāh] ibn al-Muthanā [al-Anṣārī] (d. 215/830)–Khālid ibn al-Hārith (d. 186/802)–Ḥumaid [al-Tawil] (d. 142/759)–Anas [ibn Malik] (d. 93/712) (Bukhārī I 494), (2) Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855)–Ubaidah ibn Ḥumaid (d. 196/812)–Ḥumaid–Anas (Ibn Ḥanbal III 188), (3) Ibn Ḥanbal–Ibn Abī ʿAbīd (d. 194/810)–Ḥumaid–Anas (Ibn Ḥanbal III 108), (4) Ibn Saʿīd (d. 230/845)–Muhammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh [ibn al-Muthanā] al-Anṣārī–Ḥumaid–Anas (Ibn Saʿīd VIII 314). The main variants in these non-verbatim parallels are the following: No. 3 reads, and was always said, as in the papyrus (recto 3), while the rest read...
and the rest read as in the papyrus; No. 1 reads Z>l*j jij^j **aj as in the papyrus (recto 6), while Ibn Sa'd has عشروين مَايِة and No. 2 has عشروين مَايِة ونفط. No. 3 has "نيِق على عشروين مَايِة. Anas is said to have been one of four Basrans who had a hundred children and grandchildren (Muhammad ibn Ḥabib, Al-kitāb al-μuḥābabbar, ed. Ilse Lichtenstädter [Haidarābād, 1361/1942] p. 189). The phrase A^ Ul^J (recto 4) is omitted by Ibn Sa'd and Bukhārī, while Ibn Hanbal I 108 substitutes /^^j JU* for hj^L* jJ> o%^> M^ai (recto 4).

After *IS (recto 4) all add C-Jl 4-^-U ,JI, which is missing from our text. Ibn Hanbal's text is not so close to that of the papyrus as are the texts of Ibn Sa'd and Bukhārī. Yet there is nothing in either of the latter two that offers a basis for a clear-cut choice between them since both transmit directly from a descendant of Anas ibn Mālik, the Basran Muḥammad ibn Ṭālūt Allāh ibn Muḥammad al-Anṣārī, who appears also at the head of the isnad of Tradition 4. For the most part the use of full names and the tasliyah are called for by the available space in the papyrus.

The Anas of this isnad is Anas ibn Mālik al-Anṣārī (see p. 118), who is the ultimate source of so many of the traditions of our documents. Because of his long association with Muḥammad as a personal servant and with many members of Muḥammad’s family and because he outlived most of the Companions he is one of the most prolific sources of Tradition. He settled in Baṣrah and at one time clashed with ʿIrāq’s governor Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf. He had a strong following, including his clients, among whom were Sirīn and his six sons. One of the latter, Muḥammad ibn Sirīn, served as Anas’ secretary. Anas insisted on writing down his traditions and had his sons, four of whom aspired to be traditionists, do likewise. Anecdotes about him and his enterprising mother, Umm Sulaim, are numerous (Ibn Sa'd VII, pp. 10–16; Ma‘ārif, p. 157; Bukhārī, Ta’rīkh II 2, pp. 28 f.; Jarḥ, Taqdimah, p. 144; Jarḥ I 1, p. 286; Ibn Ḥibbān, p. 66; Mustadrak III 573–75; Isābāh I 138–40; Usd I 127–29; Nawawī, pp. 165–67 and 863 f.; Dḥahābī I 42; Jam‘ I 35 f.). For his musnad see Tayālīsī, pp. 264–86, and Ibn Ḥanbal III 98–292. For faḍā’il and ṣanāqīb works credited to him or associated with him see Bukhārī III 11 f., Muslim XVI 39–41, and Tirmīzhī XIII 223–25.

Tradition 2. The contents of Traditions 2–4, devoted to Zaid ibn Thabit al-Anṣārī, are widely known. All versions so far discovered of Tradition 2 trace back to Zaid himself and share the earlier links of the family isnad, which is carried forward only by A‘mash (60–148/680–765; see e.g. pp. 70, 140). Yahyā ibn ʿĪsā al-Ramlī (n.d.), who transmitted a related version from A‘mash (Ibn Sa'd II 2, p. 115), was considered weak by many critics (see e.g. Jarḥ IV 2, p. 178; Mizān III 300; Jam‘ I 571). The only other known transmitter, also from A‘mash, of a nearly identical parallel is the trustworthy ʿIrāqī traditionist Jarīr ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd (110–88/728–804; see p. 151), who in turn transmitted it to several others, including an ʿIrāqī named ʿAlī ibn Ma‘bar who settled in Egypt (see Ibn Ḥanbal V 182; Taḥāwī II 421; Ibn Abī Dā‘ūd, Kitāb al-maṣāhīf, p. 3; Nubalī II 307). Ibn Ḥanbal’s text is identical with that of the papyrus except for the omission of the phrase (لا أحب أن يقراها أحد) that is reconstructed in recto 9, which appears in Ibn Sa'd’s otherwise considerably different text (Ibn Sa'd II 2, p. 115) and which is called for by the space available in the papyrus. For a discussion of Zaid’s knowledge of foreign languages see pages 257 f.

Thābit ibn ʿUbaid al-Anṣārī (n.d.) was a client of Zaid ibn Thābit. His transmission from Zaid to A‘mash is well attested. He is generally considered trustworthy (Ibn Sa'd VI 205; Bukhārī, Ta’rīkh II 2, pp. 165 f.; Jarḥ I 1, p. 454; Jam‘ I 67 f.).

Zaid ibn Thābit al-Anṣārī (d. between 45/665 and 56/676, with preference given to 45/665)
is the well known secretary of Muḥammad and the editor-in-chief of the ʿUthmānic edition of the Qurān. His other specialties in addition to Qurānic readings were the law of inheritance and other legal matters, his mastery of which led ʿUmar I to appoint him judge in Medina and to employ him as his deputy when he was out of the city. Like all the literate Companions of Muḥammad he became an important source of Tradition and law (for his musnad see Ibn Ḥanbal V 181–92; see also Ṭayālīṣī, pp. 84 ff., and Nawawī, pp. 259 f.). Zaid used writing in his several public offices but was himself, like ʿUmar I, opposed to the permanent recording of Tradition (see e.g. Ibn Saʿd II 2, pp. 112–17, and V 383; Abū Yūsuf, Kitāb al-athār, p. 212; Risālah, pp. 22 ff. and 80 f.; Bukhārī, Tarīkh II 1, pp. 347 f.; Jarḥ I 2, p. 558; Maʿārij, p. 133; Akhbār al-quḍāt I 107 f.; Ibn Ḥiḥbān, pp. 7 f.; Istīʿāb I 188; Iṣābāh II 40–42; Usd II 221–23; Nawawī, pp. 259 f.; Dhaḥabī I 29 f., II 240; Nubalāʾ II 305–16; Kattānī I 203–10).

Tradition 3. Reconstruction of isnād and matn is conjectural but based on the several variant parallels that are available. Ibn Saʿd (Vol. II 2, p. 117) transmits a close parallel from four of his sources, including Mūsā ibn Ismāʿīl al-Bāṣrī al-Ṭabūdhi (d. 223/838), who is cited by Bukhārī (Tarīkh II 1, p. 348) for an even closer parallel. Moreover, this Mūsā was widely known for his large collection of written hadīth from, among others, Ḥammād ibn Saḥāmah ibn Dīnār (see p. 160; Bukhārī, Tarīkh IV 1, p. 280; Dhaḥabī I 357; Jamʿ II 484), the first surviving link in the papyrus isnād. Sezgin (Buhārīn, p. 280, Isnād 223) shows that Mūsā transmitted 239 traditions to Bukhārī. Ḥammād’s source in all the available isnād parallels is ʿAmmār ibn ʿAbī ʿAmmār (see p. 211), who is omitted from the papyrus isnād. Textual differences are minor. For example, Ibn Saʿd has جلسنا إلى while Bukhārī has simply ضل قصره for ضل قصره of the papyrus (recto 10).

The content of the tradition seems to have gone through two stages. The briefer version of Ibn Saʿd, Bukhārī, and Mustadrak III 428 does not mention Zaid’s tomb. The papyrus text, however, includes this detail, which is found in later sources (e.g. a second version in Mustadrak III 428; Ibn ʿAsākir V 450).

The idea that knowledge decreased or disappeared when scholars died was widespread (see e.g. Ibn Hanbal II 203; Dārimī I 65, 73, 77–79; Concordance IV 320 and 331 ff. in several places).

Tradition 4. Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Muthanā al-Anṣārī (118–215/736–830) was a descendant of Anas ibn Mālik. He served as judge in Bāṣrāh and later in Baghdād until he was removed by Maʿmūn. He was considered a trustworthy traditionist and an authority on ʿilm al-rījāl, but he was not of the same caliber as his fellow Bāṣrān Yahyā ibn Saʿd al-Qaṭṭān. He was one of Bukhārī’s many sources (see Ibn Saʿd VII 1, p. 163, and VII 2, p. 48; Bukhārī, Tarīkh I 1, p. 132; Jarḥ II 2, p. 177, and III 2, p. 305; Maʿārij, p. 259; Ibn Ḥiḥbān, p. 123; Khaṭīb V 408; Yāfī I 62; Dhaḥabī I 337 f.; Jamʿ I 460; Buhārīn, pp. 34 and 261, Isnād 173).

Muḥammad ibn ʿAmr (d. 144/761) of Medina specialized in collecting and transmitting the traditions of Abū Salamah and was himself a source for most of the leading traditionists of the following generations (Ibn Saʿd V 43; Bukhārī, Tarīkh I 1, p. 191; Jarḥ IV 1, pp. 30 f.; Mizān III 114 f.; Jamʿ I 454 f.). His unidentified source in the papyrus text (recto 11) was, according to parallel traditions which give the rest of the isnād, the above-mentioned Abū Salamah, whose full name is Abū Salamah ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (d. 94/713 or 104/722) and who is listed among the “seven” leading jurists of Medina. He himself wrote down his collection of hadīth (Ibn Ḥanbal VI 413 f.; Dārimī II 135; Muslim X 99 ff., 105;
The tradition seems to have gone through three stages. The earliest version is the briefest, reporting only Ibn 'Abbās' act and words. It is transmitted by Ibn Sa'd from Abū Nu'aim Faḍl ibn Dukain (see Document 14) and traces back to ʿĀmir al-Sha'bī (Ibn Sa'd II 2, p. 116, lines 11–13; cf. Isābah II 42). To the second stage belongs the papyrus text and its several nearly identical parallels. This version adds Zaid's remonstrance and kissed it as an honor due to one of the Prophet's family (e.g. Ibn ʿAsākir V 448 f.). This addition was in all probability the work of an ʿAbbāsid partisan.

Honoring a leader by leading his mount was a common practice, and many were the instances in which Muhammad himself was so honored (see Concordance II 49 and II 342).

**Tradition 5.** Hārūn ibn Ismāʿīl of Baṣrah (n.d.) seems to have been known primarily for his transmission from ʿAlī ibn al-Mubārak (n.d.), whose traditions he wrote down (Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh IV 2, p. 226; Jarḥ IV 2, p. 87; Ibn Ḥibbān, No. 1251; Jamʿ I 355, II 551). ʿAlī ibn al-Mubārak, in turn, was a specialist in the ḥadīth of Yahyā ibn Abī Kuthair, which he wrote down in two books, one from Yahyā's dictation and the other copied from manuscripts but read back to Yahyā. Baṣrīs who insisted on oral transmission would transmit only the book written from dictation, while the Kūfīs accepted both books (Jarḥ III 1, pp. 203 f.; Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh III 2, p. 295; Yaʿqūb ibn Shaibah, Musnad . . . ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, pp. 50, 60 f., 158 f., and 178; Mīzān II 236; Jamʿ I 355; Buhārīʿīnīn, pp. 60 f.).

Yahyā ibn Abī Kuthair (d. 129/746 or 132/750) was originally of Baṣrah but settled in Yāmāmah. He was an ʿAlīd and critical of the Umayyads, who therefore persecuted him. His transmission from Anas ibn Mālik and other Companions was suspect because he was accused of omitting intermediate links of the ʿisnād's (dāls). His transmission from some of his contemporaries was also suspected by some scholars as being based on manuscripts alone. Transmission from manuscripts alone was probably responsible for his omission of intermediate links in some of his ʿisnād's, though in such cases he used balaghānī or balaghānā, as in the papyrus text, instead of the more specific term kaddāṭhanī. Nevertheless the great majority of traditionists considered him trustworthy and some classed him with Zuhārī, while Shuʿbī and Ibn Ḥanbal even preferred his versions that differed from Zuhārī's (Ibn Sa'd V 404 and VII 2, p. 185; Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh IV 2, pp. 301 f.; Jarḥ, Taqāīmah, pp. 156 f.; Maʿārif, p. 112; Taḥārī III 2503; Ibn Ḥibbān, p. 145; Abū Nuʿaim III 66–75; Dhahabī I 120 f.; Mīzān III 300 f.; Jamʿ II 566 f.; Buhārīʿīnīn, pp. 288 and 296).

The first word of recto 14 appears in the photograph (Pl. 22) to be encircled, but close inspection of the papyrus reveals that there is no circle. As read, the reversed separate yāʾ has two dots run together. Note also the use in recto 19 of the uncontracted ʾalāʾīn. The tradition has no complete parallel for either the ʿisnād or the matn, and the parallels that are available for parts of the content convey for the most part the meaning rather than the wording of the papyrus text. The following variant of recto 15–16, with additions, is noteworthy: (Taḥārī V 283). For these locations in...
Medina and for the Banū Zafar, who were obviously settled in the lower section of the city, see Ibn Duraid, *Kitāb al-īṣhtīqāq*, p. 187, Ṭabarī I 1901 and 1922, and Yaqūt III 592 f.

Farwah ibn 'Amr (recto 17), one of the negotiators of the treaties of 'Aqabah, could be intrusted with secret or private matters. Muhammad appointed him as assessor for Khābār. None of the citations given below associate him with the episode of the papyrus text nor with the other episodes involving Abū al-Dahdāhah. Farwah fought in all of Muhammad's battles but was on 'Ali's side in the Battle of the Camel. His death date is nowhere mentioned (see *Sirah* I 308, 335, 502; Ibn Sa'd II 1, p. 78; and III 2, p. 132; Ṭabarī I 1336; *Iṣāḥāb* II 518; *Iṣāḥāb* III 403 f.; *Usd* V 178 f.).

The last word of recto 19 reflects initial indecision as to the forms مدلل, مدلل, and the last being finally accepted. Wāqīḍī (p. 275) has رُبَّ عَذَق مدلل, while Ibn Ḥanbal (Vol. V 408) has كُم مِّن عذاق مدلل (مدلل, معقل, راح). All other sources have (e.g. Ibn Sa'd VIII 295; Ibn Ḥanbal III 146; Muslim VII 33; see also *Concordance* II 143 *دلل*, IV صلي رسل الله على ابن الحذاف 344 عذاق, and III 173 and editorial comments on *Tafṣīr* V 283 f.).

The practice of hanging branches of date clusters, especially after the date harvest, in the courtyard of the mosque for the use of the needy seems to have been common (see e.g. *Tafṣīr* XII 166 f.). Such freewill offerings were considered especially meritorious and deserving of greater rewards than the stipulated almsgiving (see e.g. Ibn 'Asākir VI 214).

Confusion in the sources concerning the full and correct name of the Companion involved in this episode has led some scholars to believe that there were two people with similar names — a Thābit ibn al-Dahdāh (or Dahdāhah) who fell in the Battle of Uhud and over whom Muḥammad prayed and an Abū Daḥdāh (or Daḥdāhah) whose given name was not known and who survived Muḥammad into the time of Muʿāwiyyah. Various similar episodes are reported in connection with these names, but some of the confusion can now be cleared up with the aid of the papyrus text. This text is related to Surah 2:245, which reads من ذا الذي يقرض الله قرضاً حسناً ففيضاعمه له اضعافاً كثيرة for the last three words. The early commentaries on these verses yield some clues as to the names in question. *Iṣāḥāb* IV 107–9 has two entries under Abū al-Daḥdāh(ah) and equates the second entry with Thābit ibn al-Daḥdāh(ah) of *Iṣāḥāb* I 388 but adds that Muqāṭil ibn Sulaimān says (presumably in one of his *tafṣīr* works discussed in connection with Document 1) that Abū Daḥdāh(ah)'s given name was 'Umar (عمر). This could well be a scribal error for the 'Amr (عمر) of the papyrus text (recto 13, 15, 17). The next commentary on the Qur'ānic verse appeared in the *Tafṣīr* of Abīl-Razzāq ibn Hammām, who explained that when the verse was revealed Ibn al-Daḥdāh (or Daḥdāhah) offered to donate his two properties to God. This was in turn cited by Ṭabarī (*Tafṣīr* V 283–86), whose editors decided that only one person was involved in the episode and, lacking the evidence of our text, accepted Thābit ibn al-Daḥdāh as the correct form of his name. Now, our papyrus text (recto 13, 15, 19), which is the earliest extant version of the episode, gives the full name as Abū al-Daḥdāhah 'Amr ibn al-Daḥdāhah.

The evidence so far available, however, does not preclude the possibility that a second person, whose full name may have been Abū al-Daḥdāh Thābit ibn al-Daḥdāh, was confused with the Abū al-Daḥdāhah 'Amr ibn al-Daḥdāhah of the papyrus text. If, however, we assume on the basis of the available evidence that only one person was involved, that person emerges as a well-to-do and ever generous man whose wife rejoiced in his charities and whose sole heir was his sister's son, the less charitable Abū Lubābah ibn 'Abd al-Mundhir of Tradi-
It should be noted here, as in the case of Abū Talhah Zaid ibn Sahl and his charities (see Document 2, Tradition 3), that Muhammad encouraged all forms of charity yet discouraged excessive giving that might result in hardship for the giver’s family.

Tradition 6. Ārim, whose full name is Ārim Abū al-Nuʿmān Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥadīl al-Ṣadūsī (d. 224/839), was a well known and trustworthy traditionist of Baṣrah who transmitted from Muʿtāmir ibn Sulaimān and others and to the younger leaders of his day, including Bukhārī. Abū Ḥātim al-Ṭāṣiʿi, who wrote down traditions from him in the year 214/829, states that he became confused toward the end of his life, after the year 220/835 (Maʿārif, p. 260; Bukhārī, Tarīkh I 1, p. 208; Jarḥ I 1, pp. 58 f.; Dhahābī I 370; Jamʿī II 448).

Muʿtāmir ibn Sulaimān (106–87/724–803) of Baṣrah was associated with trustworthy traditionists of that city and was generally accepted as trustworthy. His transmission from his father and from Ayyūb al-Sikhtiyānī (68–131/687–748) is frequently mentioned (e.g. Ibn Saʿd VII 2, p. 45; Bukhārī, Tarīkh IV 2, p. 49; Jarḥ I 1, pp. 402 f.; Ibn Ḥībbān, p. 161, No. 1271; Nawawī, pp. 566 f.; Dhahābī I 245 f.; Jamʿī II 520). His father (d. 143/759), who was at first opposed to writing down hadith, later advised Muʿtāmir to do so (Bukhārī, Tarīkh II 2, pp. 21 f.; Jamʿī I 58).

There is some uncertainty about Abū Lubābah ibn ʿAbd al-Mundhir’s given name. Some sources state that it was Bāṣhr and others that it was Rīfāʿah, so that entries for him are to be found under both of these names. Our papyrus text throws no light on the name, but, since he is generally referred to as Abū Lubābah, there is no confusion as to his identity. He was an Awsite and, like Farwāh ibn ʿAmr (recto 18), was one of the negotiators of the treaties of Āqabah. He seems to have participated in all of Muḥammad’s major campaigns except the Battle of Badr. On this occasion, as on two others, Muḥammad left him in charge in Medina. His death date is uncertain, being placed after the reign of either ʿUthmān or ʿAlī (Ibn Saʿd II 1, pp. 53 f., and III 2, p. 29; Maʿārif, p. 166; Iṣṭiʿāb I 63, II 655; Iṣābah I 323, IV 315 f.; Usd I 195 f., V 284 f.; Ibn Ḥanbal III 430; Bukhārī, Tarīkh II 1, p. 294; Jarḥ I 1, p. 375; Dhahābī I 44; Jamʿī I 55, 136).

No full parallel for either the isndd or the matn seems available, though the episode is reported in the historical sources and the standard hadith collections, as a rule in much greater detail than the report given in the papyrus text, with the addition of subsequent but related actions of Abū Lubābah that are not even mentioned in the papyrus text.

The Jews (verso 2) are the Banū Quraiṣah, who as a result of intrigue with the Meccans in the affair of the so-called Battle of the Ditch of the year 5/627 fell out of favor with Muḥammad and the Muslims of Medina. After a siege of several weeks they decided to surrender on terms similar to those that had been granted to the Jewish tribe of the Banū al-Naḍīr, that is, to go into exile with as much of their property as they could carry with them (see Vol. I, Document 5). Muḥammad, however, was not willing to grant such favorable terms and demanded unconditional surrender. The troubled Jews sought the advice of Abū Lubābah who, as stated in the papyrus text, advised unconditional surrender but indicated by running his hand across his throat that they would surely be massacred. The Jews, thus further agitat-
ed, were given a choice and accepted as their judge Sa'd ibn Mu'adh of the Aws tribe, with which they had long been in alliance. Sa'd's unmerciful judgment—confiscation of property, slavery for the women and children, death for the men—was harsher than Muhammad's would have been but he let it stand. Abū Lubābah regretted that he had led the Jews to believe that Muhammad would have had them executed, since such a belief indicated that he himself had underestimated the mercy of Allāh and of Allāh's Messenger, against which faithless attitude he and his fellow Muslims were cautioned in Sūrah 8:27 (see Sūrah I 686 [= trans. p. 462]; Wāqīdqī, pp. 373 f.; Ibn Sa'd II 1, pp. 53 f., and III 2, p. 19; Muwattī II 481; Ibn Ḥanbal VI 141 f.; Tafsīr XIII 481 f.; Watt, Muhammad at Medina, pp. 188 f., 214, and 234).

Abū Lubābah's sense of guilt on this occasion, as recorded by most of the sources, and on the occasion of his refusal, along with several others, to go on the expedition of Tabūk (Usd V 284 f.; Bukhārī III 177 f.) demanded not only repentance but also self-punishment. He therefore chained himself to the pillar of repentance in the Mosque of the Prophet (verso 4) to await forgiveness, which Muhammad said had to come from God. Muhammad expressed admiration of the repentant Abū Lubābah to one of his wives (verso 5), whom the sources identify as Umm Salamah. God's forgiveness was eventually announced in Sūrah 9:102-4, and Umm Salamah broke the glad news to Abū Lubābah, who would not move until Muhammad himself removed the chains. In gratitude for the forgiveness Abū Lubābah wished to donate his properties to charity, but Muhammad limited his gift to a third of them (e.g. Sūrah I 686 f.; Wāqīdqī, pp. 275 and 372 f.; Ibn Sa'd II 1, p. 54, and III 2, p. 29; Muwattī II 481; Ibn Ḥanbal III 452 f., 502; Dārīmī I 391 f.; Tafsīr IV 344 f., referring to Sūrah 2:219 and related verses; Mustadrāk III 632 f.; Usd V 285; Muhammad ibn Aḥmad al-Fasī, Shīfā al-gharīm II 367 f.).

Muḥammad's teaching that charity should begin at home and its application have been encountered above (pp. 117, 206, 253).

Tradition 7. 'Abd Allāh ibn Bakr al-Sahmī of Baṣrah (d. 208/823) was a well known traditionist who transmitted from Ḥumaid al-Ṭawfīl (d. 142/759), while those who transmitted from him included most of the outstanding traditionists of 'Irāq and farther east (Maḍārif, p. 258; Jarh II 2, p. 16; Khāṭīb IX 421-23; Ibn Ḥībbān, p. 123; Dhahābī I 313).

For Ḥumaid al-Ṭawfīl and his transmission from Anas ibn Mālik see page 248.

There are many parallels for this tradition (see Concordance I 53, II 554 سن al-arsh; see also under ودي/ديث when it is indexed), all of which share the papyrus iṣnād links "Ḥumaid on the authority of Anas," Anas being their only ultimate source though they have several transmitters other than Ḥumaid. Many of the parallels are identical to the papyrus text in meaning and almost so in wording except for the completion of proper names, the use of the taṣliyah, and a slight variation in word order. Of all the close parallels, only that of Bukhārī III 201 has the complete iṣnād of the papyrus text. Bukhārī received the tradition from 'Abd Allāh ibn Munīr (d. 241/855), who heard it from 'Abd Allāh ibn Bakr al-Sahmī, who heads the papyrus iṣnād. Other parallels are transmitted by Ibn Ḥanbal (Vol. III 167) and Bukhārī (Vol. II 168) directly from Muhammad ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Muthanā al-Anṣārī (see p. 249), who replaces 'Abd Allāh ibn Bakr of the papyrus iṣnād. The latter is replaced also by Ibn Abī 'Adī (Ibn Ḥanbal III 128).

Many of the traditions that concern Anas ibn Mālik (see p. 249 for references) or members of his family trace back to him through some of his descendants, as illustrated here and in Traditions 1 and 4. Rubaiyī and her brother Anas ibn al-Nāḍr, who rose to her defense, were
Anas ibn Malik's aunt and uncle (see e.g. Ibn Sa'd VII 1, pp. 139 f., and VIII 310; Isti'dab I 34 f., II 730; Isâbah I 144 f., IV 576; Usd V 422 f., 575; Nawawi, p. 840).

The *lex talionis* of the Old Testament (Exod. 21:23-25) and its practical modification in favor of less literal retaliatory punishment were taken over in principle by Islam (Sûrahs 2:178, 5:45). But actual settlements were adjusted to Arab standards and to local and individual conditions, as can readily be seen from the Qur'anic commentaries and the hadîth and *fiqh* literature. Settlements are indicated for specific injuries, including the loss of a tooth as in the present tradition (cf. e.g. *Tafsr* III 257 ff., X 358-72; *Concordance* I 53 ْلاَتِسَم and II 554 ٌمَعَةَتَا II 849 ff., 862; Abû Yusuf, *Kitâb al-khardj*, pp. 93 f.). For a brief treatment of the Islamic view of the *lex talionis* see Roberts, *The Social Laws of the Qur'an*, pp. 85-88.

**IDENTIFICATION AND SIGNIFICANCE**

I

The identification of the last transmitters named in the *ismâd's* revealed two significant facts, namely that these traditionists were all from Basrah and that their death dates range from 208 to 224 A.H. Again, the most fruitful authorities for parallels proved to be Ibn Sa'd, Abû Hâtim al-Râzî, Ibn Hanbal, and Bukhârî (Traditions 1, 4, 7). All four are known to have transmitted, sometimes directly and sometimes through one intermediate link, from Muhammad ibn 'Abd Allâh ibn al-Muthana al-Ansârî, whose name heads the *ismâd* of Tradition 4. But, since only Abû Hâtim al-Râzî and Bukhârî are known to have visited Egypt, whence the papyrus itself comes, we may safely eliminate the other two as not having had any direct connection with it. There is also the 'Iraqî 'Alî ibn Ma'bad who settled in Egypt and who transmitted a nearly identical parallel of Tradition 2 (see p. 249). Actually, two 'Iraqî traditionists who were so named settled in Egypt, though when they did so is not stated. 'Alî ibn Ma'bad ibn Shaddâd (d. 218/833 or 228/843)1 was called "the Elder," and 'Alî ibn Ma'bad ibn Nûh (d. 259/873), who was known as "the Younger," transmitted from him.2 It is possible that our papyrus text is from either the dictation or a manuscript of any one of these four traditionists who visited or settled in Egypt and would naturally have sought and been sought by Egyptian traditionists, mature scholars and young students alike. We have seen that such was the case so far as Laith ibn Sa'd and his secretary Abû Şâlih were concerned. Furthermore, we know that both Abû Hâtim al-Râzî and Bukhârî wrote down traditions from Abû Şâlih during their visits to Egypt in the second decade of the third century (see pp. 102 f. and 173). I have not been able to discover any such association between Abû Şâlih and either 'Alî ibn Ma'bad the Elder or 'Alî ibn Ma'bad the Younger, but there are numerous statements to the effect that many of the leading non-Egyptian and all of the Egyptian scholars transmitted from Abû Şâlih.3 Moreover, when leading traditionists from different provinces met, whether in Mecca and Medina or in the home city of any one of them, they usually exchanged traditions for their own collections and the visitors were invited to relate or dictate traditions to students and the general public. Thus both 'Alî ibn Ma'bad the Younger and 'Alî ibn Ma'bad the Elder, particularly the latter, whose dates indicate that he was contemporary with all the final transmitters named in the papyrus *ismâd's*, could have come in contact with Abû Şâlih (d. 223/838) and his circle of students. It is possible, therefore, that the preservation of the

---

1 *Jarh* III 1, p. 205; *Mizân* II 238; *Husn al-muhâdarah* I 156 f. See also *Adâb al-Shaôfât*, p. 87.
2 *Jarh* III 1, p. 205; *Kha'tîb* XII 109 f.; *Mizân* II 238; *Husn al-muhâdarah* I 160. See also our Documents 13 and 14.
3 See e.g. *Kha'tîb* IX 478; Dhahabi I 392.
DOCUMENT 12

papyrus was in some way associated with Laith ibn Sa'd and Abū Ṣāliḥ (cf. p. 91). Furthermore, both the large script of the earlier letter on which the fāḍīlī text was written and the smaller script of the fāḍīlī text itself point to the third rather than the second century. It seems reasonably safe, then, to assign the document to the first quarter of the third century.

II

Considering the general theme of the document—the virtues (fāḍīlī) of individual Anṣār—it is not surprising that the family of Anas ibn Mālik al-Anṣārī, Anas himself, who settled in Bāṣra, and his descendants and fellow Bāṣrans play such a predominant role in the isnād’s and matn’s of the traditions. Five of the traditions report the words and deeds of Muḥammad, and the remaining two (Traditions 3–4) those of Ibn ʿAbbās and Zaid ibn Thābit al-Anṣārī. For all of them close parallels, in full or in part, are found in the standard collections (cf. p. 77). All but Tradition 2 (see below) concern matters that were of prime importance to particular individuals rather than to the community as a whole. None of the traditions involves a command, though all of them treat practices that can be considered either permissible or commendable, since they relate to a mother’s concern for her son’s blessing (Tradition 1), the practical usefulness of learning a foreign language (Tradition 2), respect for scholars (Traditions 3–4), charity beyond the call of duty (Traditions 5–6), and voluntary moderation of the grim law of retaliation (Tradition 7). Thus it is not surprising that there was some carelessness in the transmission of the isnād’s, such as the omission of an intermediate link (Tradition 3) or the inclusion of an anonymous link (Tradition 4) or the use of incomplete names (Tradition 6). The matn’s, on the other hand, show remarkable faithfulness to the basic meaning and very frequently also to the literal wording of the available parallels, thus illustrating once more the common practice of simultaneous oral and written transmission of ḥadīth. It is to be further noted that the partial parallels and several variants of Traditions 5 and 6 (see comments) are more in the nature of akhbār than of ḥadīth proper and therefore display literal transmission to a lesser degree than do the parallels to the rest of the traditions. This reflects the practice of the early akhbārīs, both historians and biographers, who are known to have selected and adapted the available materials, oral and written, to their purposes.

The papyrus gives definite evidence of continuous written transmission (see comments on Traditions 4–6), for most of its earlier as well as most of its later transmitters are known to have written down their materials or to have had others do so and some are known to have possessed sizable ḥadīth collections. Many of the earlier transmitters who favored written transmission have been encountered, sometimes repeatedly, in our documents. They include Ibn ʿAbbās, Anas ibn Mālik, Abū Salamah ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, Ayyūb al-Sikhtiyānī, Ḥumayd al-Ṭawīl, Aʿmash, Ḥammūd ibn Salamah ibn Dīnār, and Jarīr ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd. To these can now be added, especially from the group of ḥadīth-writers whose careers ran their course mostly in the second half of the second century and the first quarter of the third (d. 187 to 224 A.H.), the following transmitters: Mūsā ibn Ismāʿīl (Tradition 3), Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Muthanā al-Anṣārī (Tradition 4), Ḥārūn ibn Ismāʿīl and ʿAlī ibn al-Mubārak (Tradition 5), Muʿtamir ibn Sulaimān and ʿĀrim Abū al-Nuʿmān Muḥammad ibn al-Faḍl al-Saḍūfī (Tradition 6).

It should be noted, however, that Zaid ibn Thābit himself, who employed writing in all of his several public offices and was editor-in-chief of the ʿUthmānic edition of the Qurʿān, belonged to that comparatively small group of Companions and Successors, such as Ibn ʿUmar,
Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī, and Muḥammad ibn Sirīn, who were opposed to the permanent recording of Tradition. They cited Muḥammad himself for their position but were countered by statements of Muḥammad in favor of recording his ḥadīth.¹

The search for parallels to Tradition 2 revealed two sets of traditions, with some variations in each group, that bear on the subject of Zaid and his learning to read and write other than the Arabic language. In the group of traditions that are closely related to the papyrus text (see p. 249) the two significant factors are that Muḥammad specified Syriac and, in some of the versions, gave a reason for wishing Zaid to learn Syriac: “Letters come to me that I do not like anyone to read” (recto 9). The two main variations within this group are the omission of a reason for Muḥammad’s request and uncertainty in a few instances as to the language he actually specified: العربية أو قال والسريانية. Zaid learned the language in seventeen days according to most of these traditions.²

The traditions of the second group have entirely different isnād’s, whose five earliest links are common to the whole group. These links are in progressive order Zaid ibn Thābit, his son Khārījah, Ḥālid b. al-Rahmān ibn Hurmuz al-Aṣrāj (see p. 139), Abū al-Zinād (see p. 139), and his son Abū al-Rahmān (100–174/718–90), who was considered a weak traditionist by most scholars.³ From Ḥālid b. al-Rahmān the isnād branches out into several ṭurq.⁴ In these traditions Muḥammad asks Zaid to learn the writing or script of the Jews (العبرانية أو قال السريانية); the language itself not being specified. Furthermore, Muḥammad’s reason for this request is said to be that he mistrusted the Jews (لا أسم يهود). Zaid learned the language in half a month or less.

The question is whether these two sets of traditions involve the same episode or two different occasions. Supplementary information leads one to think that the latter alternative is the more probable. Zaid when he was but eleven years old was presented, as an intelligent youth with a good memory, to Muḥammad soon after the latter’s arrival in Medina. He was therefore in Muḥammad’s service for several years before the latter asked him, in the year 4/624–25, to learn the writing of the Jews because he mistrusted them.⁵ Some of the Jews of Medina and of the other Jewish settlements in Arabia were undoubtedly at least bilingual and literate in Hebrew and Arabic and probably some were literate in Syriac also, Syriac being the language of the learned members of the Christian settlements in Arabia. That Muḥammad in his first years in Medina should wish the gifted young Zaid to learn Syriac, which could be useful in correspondence with both Christians and Jews, seems reasonable enough. Hebrew, on the other hand, took on great significance for Muḥammad after he realized that Jewish religious opposition to his teaching was unyielding and after the Jews began to cite the Old Testament and other Hebrew religious texts in their arguments with him and his followers against Islām.⁶ Bukhārī states on the authority of an isnād that traces back to Abū Hurairah

---

¹ See e.g. Abū Dāwūd III 318 f.; Jāmi‘ I 63, II 143 f.; Ibn Abī Dāwūd, Kitāb al-maṣāḥif, p. 4.
² In 19 days according to one version, a scribal error no doubt of “nine” for “seven,” which look very much alike in unpointed Arabic.
³ See e.g. Ibn Sa‘d V 307; Jarḥ II 2, pp. 252 f.; Mīzān II 111.
⁴ See e.g. Ibn Ṣalāḥ V 186; Abū Dāwūd III 318; Mustadrak I 75; Taḥāwī II 421; Dhahabi II 240; Nubalā‘ II 307.
⁵ Taḥāwī I 1460.
⁶ See e.g. Ṣaḥīḥ I 361 f., 381–83; Mursa‘alā I 108–10; Taḥāwī III 109–13, X 453 f., 473–77. Torrey not only expressed a strong conviction that Muḥammad was fully literate in Arabic and that he wrote all of the Qur‘ān with his own hand (The Jewish Foundation of Islam, pp. 31–41 and 93–95) but went so far as to argue the possibility that Muḥammad could read Hebrew and Syriac while he was still in Mecca (ibid. pp. 37, 39 f., 42, 47). He made no reference to Muḥammad’s desire to have Zaid learn these languages, a desire he would probably have explained on the basis that Muḥammad was busy rather than illiterate (cf. ibid. p. 31). Be that as it may, the point of interest is Torrey’s emphasis on the ease with which these languages could be learned in Mecca and Medina at that time. Noteworthy also is the fact that Torrey did not draw on Tradition because he considered it untrustworthy (ibid. p. 8).
that the “people of the Book” read the Torah in Hebrew and then translated it into Arabic for the Muslims. This procedure was very much in keeping with the earlier and widespread practice of Aramaic-speaking Jews who read the Hebrew Torah and then explained it to their own congregations in Aramaic. Furthermore, there is little doubt that many of the texts cited by both Jews and Christians in their arguments with Muḥammad and some of his Companions were either from the Aramaic Talmud, especially the Mishna (see pp. 8 f.), or from the non-canonical gospels, also written in Aramaic, that is, in Syriac. It seems reasonable to assume that some of the leaders and scholars of the Jewish community of Medina who had occasion to present written texts to Muḥammad were literate in one or the other, if not in both, of the languages that Muḥammad asked Zaid to learn—namely Hebrew and Aramaic (Syriac). It would seem therefore that Zaid acquired a working knowledge of both scripts so rapidly because he was familiar with the spoken languages just as he, indeed, was familiar enough with Persian, Greek, Abyssinian, and Coptic to act as Muḥammad’s interpreter for these languages. On the other hand, it is possible that Zaid learned so quickly because some of the Jews probably wrote Arabic in Hebrew characters, so that he actually learned not the written Hebrew language itself but only what the Arabic texts actually say: خط اليهود, the “writing” or “script of the Jews,” that is, the complexities of the written Hebrew alphabet. Such could well have been the case with rabbinical Aramaic (Syriac) also.

Later sources, mostly historical and biographical, in references to Zaid’s linguistic ability, frequently omit the isndād’s and combine the traditions of the two sets discussed above, Ibn ʿAsākir adding that Zaid did the actual learning of the written language in a Jewish midrash (miḥrāṣ). For learning to speak any of the foreign languages in use in Arabia, especially in Mecca and Medina, neither Zaid nor his contemporaries needed formal instruction. As these cities became increasingly cosmopolitan—with non-Arab converted clients, unconverted slaves, and concubines who were drawn from many races speaking different languages—more and more Arabs picked up at least a smattering of various foreign languages. Their free use of these languages so alarmed ʿUmar I that presently he forbade the Arabs to speak to foreigners in their own languages. The commentators explain that ʿUmar did so because these languages were used in the presence of some who did not understand them and because they were used even in the mosques.

Unfortunately the use of foreign languages, spoken and written, in the holy cities of Islām was to decrease in time because of ʿUmar’s exclusion of non-Muslims from Arabia and because of the increasing glorification of the Arabic tongue in Islām. However, outside Arabia and outside religious circles, the utility of foreign languages was recognized in administrative circles, for foreign correspondence, and in the secular sciences, as it is in our day even in Arabia.

18 Bukhārī III 198, IV 441 and 495; see also Concordance IV 118. Early in the 1st century Muṣḥ Ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Ẓabīrī would read the Qurʾān and explain it in Arabic to the Arabs seated on his right and in Persian to the Persians seated on his left, much to the wonder and admiration of all (Jahīz, Kitāb al-bayan wa al-tabyin I [1366/1947] 346). For Muṣḥ (n.d.), who was suspected of being a Qādirite, see Jarḥ IV 1, p. 146, and Mīzān III 211.

11 Tanbih, p. 283. For others in Medina who had at least a smattering of these languages see ʿIqd II 204, and for the multilingual household of ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Zubair see Kattānī I 207.

13 See e.g. Isnād II 188 f.; ʿIṣbāḥah II 40-42; ʿUṣd I 221-23; Ibn ʿAsākir V 443 f.

15 See Kattānī I 203-10 for the Islamic view and references to the sources.
It was Muḥammad who first stressed the virtues (fadāʿil) of the Ansār, without whose help his mission might well have failed. The Qurʾān places them on an equal footing with the Muhājirūn in their standing with God and their rewards in the hereafter. Numerous are the traditions according to which Muḥammad acknowledged their contribution, declared his affinity with and affection for them, defended them against their detractors, and even likened them to the salt of the earth. Nevertheless, the Ansār early sensed and resented Muḥammad’s leniency toward, if not indeed partiality for, the Quraish and did not hesitate to speak their minds. Muḥammad, however, was always able to justify his actions to them as a group and all but shame them into acquiescence with his policies, except for the disaffected among them who co-operated with his Jewish opposition.

The Ansār-Quraish rivalry was held in check by Muḥammad’s tactful handling of it but gained free rein with his passing. The political victory went to the Quraish, who not only claimed but took and kept the caliphate as their tribal monopoly. Partly by way of compensation for their political defeat the Ansār stressed not only their military but also their judicial and literary services to Muḥammad and sought to capitalize on them. Not content to point to such men as Zaid ibn Thābit, of this papyrus, and Hassan ibn Thābit, court poet of Muḥammad, and Muʿāṣār ibn Jabal, religious teacher in Mecca and judge for the Yemen, they stressed also their formal study and mastery of the Qurʾānic text and the sayings of Muḥammad and cited the latter as giving them priority for judicial appointments. Ibn ʿAbbās conceded that they were expert in the hadīth (ilm) al-nabi and, accompanied by one of them, sought out the Ansār, frequently writing down their materials. Their claim of expertness, allowing for some exaggeration, should not be lightly dismissed if we judge by the large number of traditions transmitted by the Ansār that found their way into the earliest extant hadīth collections of Tāwālīsī and Ibn Ḥanbal.

Such, then, was the background of Zaid ibn Thābit’s service as deputy and judge under ʿUmar I and as editor-in-chief of the ʿUthmānic edition of the Qurʾān and of Anas ibn Mālik’s prolific recording and transmission of hadīth.

Though the initial incentive for the emphasis on the fadāʿil of the Ansār reflected tribal glory and ambition, distinguished individual Ansār such as those named in the papyrus text received special mention both in support of the tribal claims and in their own right. Ḥassān ibn Thābit al-Ansārī tells of an early occasion during the reign of either ʿUmar I or ʿUthmān when Ibn ʿAbbās took exception to severe criticism of the Ansār by drawing attention to their...
services to Muhammad and by enumerating their virtues. The papyrus text (Traditions 3–4) describes Ibn ‘Abbâs as honoring Zaid ibn Thâbit as a scholar. The caliph Mu’âwiyyah transmitted Muhammad’s saying to the effect that God loves those who love the Ansâr and hates those who hate them. Thus praise of the Ansâr as a group and praise of their leaders in various fields emerged together, as was also the case with the faḍā’il of the Quraish.

With the First Civil War of Islam and the founding of the Umayyad dynasty the emphasis shifted somewhat from the Ansâr-Quraish rivalry to the feud between the ‘Alîids and the Āthmânîds, in which partisan stress on the faḍā’il of ‘Alî competed with partisan stress on the faḍā’il of Āthmân and presently of Mu’âwiyyah, the Ansâr usually siding with the ‘Alîid faction. The older Ansâr-Quraish differences were more or less replaced by opposition between the Ansâr and the Umayyads, which assumed serious proportions at times. For example, the Christian Ghiyâth ibn Ghâth al-Akhthal, poet laureate of the Umayyads, almost lost his tongue when he was ordered by Prince Yazid the son of Mu’âwiyyah to satirize the Ansâr because ‘Abd al-Rahmân ibn ʿAbd al-Zahir ibn Thâbit al-Ansârî derided Quraishite claims to the caliphate and satirized and wrote amatory verses about members of the royal harem. But presently, with the progress of the shu’â’iyyah movement, which involved tension between Arab and non-Arab Muslims, the Arab factions, particularly the Ansâr and the Quraish, closed ranks to some extent, so that in the faḍā’il literature emphasis was placed on Muhammad’s Companions, who represented all the Arab factions. By the time the different strands of a growing faḍā’il literature were brought together during the second century, the literary demarcation between the faḍā’il of the Ansâr and of the Quraish and to a lesser extent between the faḍā’il of ‘Alî and of Mu’âwiyyah had become somewhat blurred, as is amply reflected in Ibn Ḥanbal’s Faḍā’il al-ṣâḥibah and in the faḍā’il and manâqib chapters of the standard hadith collections.

Some of the well known traditionists, historians, and poets of the second century are known to have concerned themselves with the manâqib and faḍā’il literature. Among these was A‘mash, who dictated his ‘Alî materials to the Shi‘ite poet Sayyid al-Hâmyar (105–73/723–89) at the latter’s request. The poet augmented these, even offering to pay for materials turned over to him by the general public. He cast his collection of the faḍā’il of ‘Alî into verse, which his four daughters recited. Sufyân al-Thauri (d. 161/777), on the other hand, was impartial in the feud between ‘Alî and ‘Āthmân, praising the first in ‘Alîd Baṣrah and the second in Āthmânîd Kûfah. Again, Laith ibn Sa‘d (d. 175/791) acquainted the Egyptians with the virtues (faḍā’il) of ‘Uthmân, whom they had criticized severely, while Ismâ‘îl ibn ‘Ayyâsh (d. 181/797) acquainted the Syrians with the virtues of ‘Alî, of whom they had been equally

26 Tabari II 2336 f.; Mustadrak III 544 f.
27 See Ibn Ḥanbal IV 100, pp. 91–102 concerning the hadith of Mu’âwiyyah.
28 Aghani XIII 148 and 154, XIV 122; Ḥaqd III 140 f.
29 See Goldziher, Studien I, chaps. iii–iv.
30 See e.g. Ma‘mûn’s declaration of the year 211/826 against Mu’âwiyyah and in favor of ‘Alî (Ibn Ṭabarî’s II 617 f.). For a later development of the faḍā’il of Mu’âwiyyah see Charles Pellat, “Le culte de Muâwiya au IIIe siècle de l’hégire,” Studia Islamica VI (1956) 53–66. The traditionist and grammarian Abû ‘Amr al-Zâhîd (261–345/874–956), better known as Ghulâm Thâlab, insisted on reading aloud at the beginning of linguistic sessions a juz of the faḍā’il of Mu’âwiyyah (Khaṭṭîb II 357).
31 See Bukhârî II 382 to end, III 4–52; Muslim XVII 19–101; Tirmidhî XIII 201–303. Abû Dâ‘ûd’s Faḍā’il al-Ānârî, mentioned by Ḥâjî Maḥmûd ibn Ḥâfiz (Vol. IV 447), does not seem to have survived. Nasrî’s Faḍā’il al-ṣâḥibah is not available to me; Ḥâjî Maḥmûd ibn Ḥâfiz (Vol. VI 196) points out that it draws heavily on the Faḍâ’il al-ṣâḥibah of Ibn Ḥanbal. The Ansâr-Quraish rivalry at this time was in a measure a reflection of the persistent antagonism between the larger tribal groupings of the South and the North Arabs.
33 Abû Nu‘aim VII 26 f., 31 f.
critical. As the second century progressed, the number of faddā'il and manāqib works increased. There were, for instance, Yahya ibn al-Mubarak's Manāqib Banū al-Abbās, Abū al-Bakhtarī's Kitāb faḍā'il al-Anṣār and his more inclusive Kitāb al-faḍā'il al-ka'bīr (see p. 233), Wāqidi's Madā'ī Quraisī wa al-Anṣār and his contemporary Haitham ibn ʿAdī's several works in this general field.

Faḍā'il works of several categories continued to be produced throughout the third century not only by practically all the compilers of hadīth collections but by such scholars as ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad al-Madā'im and Abū ʿUbaid. There were also the Faḍā'il Rabī'ah and the Faḍā'il Kinānah of ʿAllān al-Shuʿūbī, who is better known for his Mathālib al-ʿArab, where he vents his resentment against the Arabs in excessively antagonistic criticism. As the third century progressed, still another category of faḍā'il literature appeared, namely that in praise of the founders of the legal schools.

Such, then, was the background for the literary activities of Zaid ibn Thābit al-Anṣārī and Anas ibn Mālik al-Anṣārī, both of whom—and their descendants—were involved in the transmission of our papyrus text. Rapid was the development of the faḍā'il literature of which our fragmentary papyrus is, to the best of my knowledge, the earliest extant example.

---

34 Khatīb XIII 7. See also Goldziher, Studien II 140.
35 See GAL S I 170.
36 See Fihrist, p. 99; GAL I 136 and GAL S I 207.
37 See Fihrist, pp. 99 f.; GAL I 140 and GAL S I 213.
38 See Fihrist, p. 101; GAL I 140 and GAL S I 214 f.
39 See GAL S I 167.
40 Fihrist, pp. 105 f.; see also GAL I 140. ʿAllān al-Shuʿūbī was not the first to write on mathālib. Ziyād ibn Abū Sulīfān (Ziyād ibn Abī Sulīf) is said to have composed such a work for the use of his sons, and Abū ʿUbaidah was a specialist in the field and also wrote Fadāʾil al-Furs (see Kūr ʿAll ed., Rasāʾil al-bulūgh, p. 271, and Fihrist, pp. 53 f.).
41 For these and still later faḍāʾil works see e.g. Khatīb IV 421; Hajji Khalīfah IV 449–51.
Michigan Arabic Papyrus 5608(a). First half of third/ninth century.

Medium quality medium brown papyrus, ca. 23 × 19.8 cm., with 19 or 20 lines to the page and fairly wide upper and lower margins (Pls. 24–25). The inner margin and about three-tenths of the text area are lost, and there are large breaks in the center of the folio.

Script.—Practiced book hand, easily legible for the most part. A broad-nibbed pen, qalam, and thick black ink produced a heavy script, though not a large one. There is, in fact, marked economy of size for some of the letters, especially for some cases of initial šād and ḍād and initial and medial sīn. Medial ‘ain is barely distinguishable from medial fāʾ or gāf except in recto 16 where the older open form is used. The almost Kūfic form of kāf prevails except in verso 4 where the upper stroke is omitted. Diacritical points are sparingly used in most of the text and only for bāʾ, tāʾ, thāʾ, nūn, and yāʾ, especially in proper names. Vowels are missing except for a fathah over the gāf of “Qais” (recto 1), which is accompanied by a sukūn that belongs with the following yāʾ. The shaddah, though not indicated, is called for because of the use of the older لليل, instead of الليل, in recto 11, 15, and 17. The circle is used for punctuation.

TEXT

RECTO

1 أحدثنا علي بن معبد قال حدادنا محمد بن الحسن عن اسماء بن زيد عن محمد بن قيس
كان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بعض يبي ابي سلمة فذهب
[ ]
2 . دخلت زينب ابنت أبي سلمة فأشار
البئر وقال هي اطيب 0 (2) أحدثنا علي بن معبد قال
3 حدادنا بن فلان عن [4] أراد بن الناس العبادى عن المقبرة عن ابي هريرة ان
[ ]
4 رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وضع يده السبنا على ركبته 0 (3) أحدثنا علي بن معبد
5 قال حدادنا يزيد مولى الاكعاع عن سلمة بن الاكعع صاحب رسول الله قال ثلة
6 لم يكن على الا تعمم واحد قال فا دره وان لم يجد الا
7 التراب قال فذاك 0 (4) أحدثنا علي بن معبد قال حدادنا بيكار بن عبد الله الريذي ع[ن] مأواصلي
8 بن عيدة
[ ]
9 [المزلا] بن زيد عن فلان بن فلان الفلاني علمنا ابي سلمة بن عبد الرحمن عن عابيشة زوج النبي انيها
10 قالت ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم كان اذا صلى بالنساء صلاة الليل اجتمع الى من في المسجد
11 فدخل البيت وناس تنشبت
12 [ ]
13 وكان رسول الله يأمرهم بما يطبقون فجعلوا يتحرمون ويبسكون فجرهم 0 (8) به
14 قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم اكفلوا من العمل ما يطبقون فان الله لا يفعل حتى تملوا
15 [ ]
16 [ ]
 Comments.—Tradition 1. The Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan of the isnād is in all probability Shaibānī (see pp. 115, 124, 142, 153). The reconstruction of the isnād is based on the isnād of Tradition 5, which names both Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan and ʿAlī ibn Maʿbad. The Usāmah of the matn is either Usāmah ibn Zaid ibn Aslām, who died during the reign of Maḥṣūr, or his contemporary Usāmah ibn Zaid al-Laithī (d. 153/770). Both of these traditionists were approved by some critics and rejected by others (Ibn Ṣaʿd V 305; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh I 2, pp. 37 f.; Jarḥ I 1, pp. 284 f.; Jamʿ I 41; Mizān I 82).

The sources mention a number of traditionists named Muḥammad ibn Qais, and it is not
possible to identify the one of the papyrus text. On the basis of time and place the judge Muhammad ibn Qais al-Zaiyat seems most likely (Ibn Sa'd VI 251; Jarḥ IV 1, p. 61; Bukhārī, Ta'rīkh I 1, pp. 210–12, esp. No. 666).

Zainab bint Abī Salamah was Muhammad's stepdaughter, who joined his household as a child when Muhammad married her widowed mother, Umm Salamah. Zainab transmitted from several of Muhammad's wives and acquired a reputation for religious learning, being known as one of the best fuquāh (Ibn Sa'd VIII 338; Istī'āb II 135; Usd V 468; Isābah IV 607 f.; Jam' II 607).

The tradition involves the ṣalāt al-wūr (see p. 202), in the performance of which a great deal of leeway was allowed. Several of Muhammad's wives are frequently cited in the chapters devoted to this theme, but no parallel for this tradition from Zainab has yet been found.

Tradition 2. ‘Alī ibn Ma'bad heads the isnād's of six of the ten traditions, and other factors suggest that he headed those of Traditions 1 and 4 also. It is very probable that he headed the two remaining isnād's (Traditions 6–7). He must be one of the two traditionists so named who are discussed in connection with Document 12 (see pp. 255, 267 f.).

The last letter of the first name in recto 5 can be read as ḏ, ḍh, ṛ, or ṭ, while the next to the last letter is either ā or ʾ. The third letter in the second name can be read as either ʿ or ʾ. Together the two words present more than a score of possibilities for the full name. Trial of such common names as Bashshār, Bakhār, ʿAmmār, Śiwār, Yāsār, Ḥammād, Saʿād, Šawād, and Khālid proved fruitless but led to the name ʿalāʾ ibn ʿalāʾ (see Ibn Durāid, Kitāb al-ṣīḥāq, p. 20; Ṭabarī I 1108; Dhahabī, Al-mushtabih, ed. P. de Jong [Lugduni Batavorum, 1298/1881] p. 551).

The Maqbūrī of recto 5 is Saʿād ibn Abī Saʿād al-Maqbūrī of Medina (d. 123/741), who is known to have transmitted from Abū Hurairah (Ibn Sa'd V 61 f.; Bukhārī, Ta'rīkh II 1, p. 434; Jarḥ I 2, p. 85; Jam' I 167; Dhahabī I 110).

The tradition refers to the placing of the hands on the knees during the several kneelings called for in the prayer service. Concordance II 296 f. ṭabākhīya and 298 f. ʿiṣṭāf yielded no references to possible parallels in Ibn Ḥanbal's musnad of Abū Hurairah (Ibn Ḥanbal II 228–541). A parallel may become available when ʾyā is indexed in the Concordance.

Tradition 3. The reconstruction of recto 7 is based on the space available, the surviving final separate ʿaʾīn, and the fact that Yazīd ibn Abī ʿUbad (d. 147/764; see Bukhārī, Ta'rīkh IV 2, p. 348; Jarḥ IV 2, p. 280; Jam' II 567 f.) was a client of Salamah ibn al-Akwa (d. 74/693), whose materials are known to have transmitted (Ibn Sa'd IV 2, pp. 38–41; Istī'āb I 567 f.; Usd II 333; Isābah II 226, 234; Jarḥ II 1, p. 166; Mustadrak III 562; Nawawī, pp. 295 f.; Jam' I 190). For Rabdah, on the Hijāz road between Faid and Mecca, see Yāqūt II 749.

The tradition refers to ritualistic purification through the use of acceptable substitutes for water such as sand, clean earth, or snow, a process usually treated in ḥadīth and fiqh works under the heading ʿawāqib, though the papyrus (recto 8) has ʿawāqib (see Sūrāh 4:43, 5:6; Tafsīr VIII 385–87; Concordance II 267 and III 312 ʿarāb, esp. Bukhārī I 97 f. and Nasāʾī I 70 and 73 f.; Kitāb al-umm I 39–44; see also p. 189, comment on Tradition 5).

Tradition 4. An isnād link preceding Bakkār is called for by the number of links in the isnād's of the other traditions and by the terminology, which requires ʿjuala ʿināna. The space available suggests that the first link was ʿAlī ibn Ma'bad.

Bakkār ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Rabdāḥ (n.d.) was discredited because, as in the papyrus text,
he transmitted mostly from his uncle Mūsā ibn ʿ Ubaidah al-Rabḍhī (d. 153/770), who was considered generally a weak traditionist (Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh I 2, p. 121; Ḥarīr I 1, p. 409, and IV 1, pp. 151 f.; Misān I 158 f., III 214; Līsān II 43 f.) Ṣamāʿīnī, folio 248 recto, and Yāqūt II 748 f. supply information on the various members of this family. For Abū Salamah (d. 94/713 or 104/722) see pages 250 f.

This long tradition has no complete parallel for either the isnād or the main, but some of its themes either are scattered through other long traditions or form separate short traditions (see Concordance). All of them trace back, as in the papyrus text, to Abū Salamah ʿ Abd Allāh ibn ʿ Abd al-Raḥmān on the authority of ʿ Aḥṣah. The main theme emphasizes the concept that neither God (Sūrah 2:285) nor Muḥammad (Bukhārī IV 411 f.) had any wish to overburden the believers with commands and duties beyond their abilities to obey and perform without great sacrifice for themselves and their families. We have seen (p. 253) that Muḥammad favored moderation in charitable giving, for the protection of the interests of the giver’s family and kin. This tradition specifically guards against excesses in night vigils and gifts and almsgiving. Related traditions are quite numerous (see Concordance I 27 and IV 55, esp. Bukhārī I 18 f. and 491; Muslim VI 70–74, VIII 38; Ibn Ḥanbal II 257, VI 84 and 128; Muwattaʾ I 18 f.; Tāyālīṣṭ, pp. 207, No. 1480, and 308, No. 2351).

Note instead of اللللل instead of الللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللللا

The reconstructions in recto 20 and verso 5 are conjectural. The text continues with the theme of moderation but with special reference to almsgiving, quoting Surah 58:12-13, which verses are said to involve abrogation of other verses (see e.g. Tirmidhi XII 184; Tafsir XXVIII 13–15).

Tradition 5. See Tradition 1 for Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan and Tradition 2 for ʿAlī ibn Maʿbad. For ʿIkrimah and Ibn ʿAbbās see pages 100, 101 (n. 53), 112, and 157.

The text is too broken to be of any use in a search for parallels. For the theme in general see Tirmidhi III 221 f. and Nasaʾī I 303 f. (see also Concordance I 478 and II 435 تأخير السحور and II 510 سلم على يمينه وشماله).

Tradition 6. The Yunus of the isnaḍ is undoubtedly the Kufan traditionist Yūnus ibn Bukair (d. 199/814), who is known to have transmitted from Aʾmash. He is known also as an akhbarī who transmitted from Ibn Isḥāq and is credited with a maghāzi-strah work. His transmission from Ibn Isḥāq was suspect according to Abū Dāʾūd because “he takes the speech of Ibn Isḥāq and joins it to the ḥadith” (Mizān III 336). Most of the critics wrote down his ḥadith but would not use it as proof. Some fragments of his work have survived (see Aḥmad Aʾmīn, Ḍuḥā al-Islām II 330; GAL S I 206, n. 2; Guillaume’s translation of Strah, p. xvii). For biographical entries see Ibn Saʿd VI 279, Jarḥ IV 2, p. 236, Jamʿ II 586, Dhaḥabi I 299, and Mizān III 336. See also Johann Fück, Muḥammad ibn Isḥāq (Frankfurt am Main, 1925) p. 44.

The ʿay and the alif of اصلی are clearly visible on the small fold. The last preserved word can be read ʿawā khi or preferably ʿawā khi. Though traditions that caution Muslims against worshipping in temples or churches are known, they are seemingly not so numerous as traditions that frown on worship at tombs and shrines, even those of prophets, including Muḥammad (Muwattaʾ I 172, II 892; Ibn Ḥanbal VI 275; Bukhārī I 118 f., 120 f.; Muslim V 2 f., 11–13; Ibn Mājih I 130; Nasaʾī I 115; Abū Nuʿaim IX 53; see also Concordance I 28 أخدموا and II 430 (مسجد).

Traditions 7–8. Despite the small fold in the papyrus, the first name in verso 12 is مخزومیة, the small rāʾ being visible on the fold. The broken word between ʿan and this name seems to be an insertion and can be read ʿawā khi or preferably ʿawā khi. The size of the alif or ʿawā khi being conditioned partly by the fact of insertion. The less likely reading ايمي was discarded because the biographical sources do not list an Abū Makhrāmah ibn Bukair but do list Makhrāmah ibn Bukair (d. 159/776) as a well known rāwī and traditionist. He transmitted from his father, as in the papyrus text, and most of the critics state that his father did not transmit orally to him but that for all his ḥadith he drew on his father’s books which had come into his possession, by will or by wijāda. We know that his father, Bukair ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Ashajj (see pp. 209, 218), did indeed collect and use manuscripts in his transmission (Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh IV 2, p. 16; Jarḥ IV 1, pp. 363 f.; Ibn Ḥibbān, pp. 105 and 144; Jamʿ I 59, II 510; Mizān III 155).

The ḥadīth in the standard collections have much to say about the floor covering Muḥammad and some of the leading Companions used when they were praying. Straw mats, small
rugs, fur pieces, and even outer clothing were used by different ones and at different times (see e.g. Ibn Sa'd I 2, pp. 159 ff.; Ibn Ḥanbal I 233 and 273, III 212, VI 106 and 179; Bukhari I 108 f.; IV 130 f.; Abū Nu'aym III 351, VIII 323; Concordance I 309, II 473 حصر، II 81 حصرة، III 400 خصر). Some argued for praying on bare ground except in very hot or very cold weather (see e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal III 217, 239, 242; Ibn Majah I 166).

Tradition 9. Marwān ibn Muʿāwiyah al-Fazārī (d. 193/809) was a cousin of ʿAbd Isḥāq Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad al-Fazārī of Document 10. Originally of Kūfah, he stayed at various times in Baghdaḏ, Damascus, and Mecca. He died in Mecca. He was known for his photographic memory, and his hadith was written down by most of his hearers, who included several of the leaders in the cities he visited. He was considered generally trustworthy except in his transmission from unknown men (Ibn Sa'd VII 2, p. 73; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh IV 1, p. 372; Jarḥ IV 1, pp. 272 f.; Ibn Ḥibbān, p. 130; Khaṭīb XIII 149–52; Jamʿ II 501; Dhahabī I 272; Mizān III 161).

Abū al-Walīd ʿUtbah ibn ʿAbd al-Sulāmī (d. 87/706 at age 94) is said to be the last Companion who died in Ḥimṣ, that is, in Syria. Khālid ibn Maḍān (see p. 225) was among his transmitters. The sources at hand do not state that ʿUtbah transmitted from any other Companion or from a Successor, yet the isnad indicates that he did. Clarification of his identity is called for because of confusion of his name with that of ʿUtbah ibn al-Nuddār al-Sulāmī (Ibn Sa'd VII 2, p. 132; Jarḥ III 2, pp. 521 f.; Istīlāb, p. 494; ʿIsābah II 1084, 1089; ʿUsd III 362 f., 367 f.).

The Concordance provides no fruitful clues, through the main words of verso 17–18, to a parallel or closely related tradition. Yet the performance and the regulation of congregational prayers are frequently mentioned and greatly stressed (see e.g. Concordance I 370 f. جماعة).

Tradition 10. ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Arqām al-Zuhrī (d. 35/656) is not to be confused with ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Arqām al-Makhzūmī, whose father's house (dār al-Arqām) in Mecca was put at Muḥammad's disposal during the earlier years of his mission. The marginal notation indicates that prayer is the subject of the tradition. The fragment of text in verso 19 fits well with the one widely known tradition on prayer that was transmitted by ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Arqām al-Zuhrī to ʿUrwah ibn al-Zubair, who transmitted it to his son Hishām, who transmitted it to a great many people. The text is completed on the basis of Ibn Ḥanbal III 483, which has a number of parallels with linguistic variants but with the same meaning (cf. Abū Dāʿud I 22; Dārīmī I 332; Tirmidhī I 233–35; see also Concordance II 78 خلاصة and Mustadrak III 335). The biographical entries, some of which cite this tradition, state that this ʿAbd Allāh served Muḥammad, Abū Bakr, and ʿUmar I as a scribe and that both ʿUmar and ʿUthmān appointed him to the public treasury (Ibn Sa'd IV 2, p. 33; Jarḥ II 2, p. 1; Istīlāb I 336 f.; ʿUsd I 60, III 115 f.; ʿIsābah II 672–74).

IDENTIFICATION AND SIGNIFICANCE

I

Since ʿAlī ibn Maʿbad heads the isnād's of the six traditions whose first link survives and since there is good reason to believe that two other traditions (Nos. 1 and 4) also started with him, there is a strong possibility that the partially preserved isnād's of the two remaining traditions (Nos. 6–7) began with him. Moreover, since the death dates of his immediate sources for the papyrus text range from 147 to 193 A.H. (see Traditions 3 and 9), he must be the older of the two ʿIrāqī traditionists so named who settled in Egypt (see p. 255), where the
papyrus was found, namely ʿAlī ibn Maʿbad ibn Shaddād (d. 218/833 or 228/843). The younger ʿAlī ibn Maʿbad ibn Nūḥ (d. 259/873) transmitted from "the Elder" and therefore could have been the transmitter or owner of the papyrus. This suggestion, of course, does not eliminate the possibility of some other Egyptian transmitter of about the first half of the third century.

II

The ten marginal notations of ṣalāt seem to be original though hardly needed since the entire folio deals with prayer and comes in all probability from an organized hadith collection (ḥadīth mubawwab). Considering the basic role of prayer and worship in Islam, it is not surprising that references to Muḥammad's practices predominate in the papyrus text. Six of the ten traditions either cite him or describe his actions, and it is possible that the lost text of Traditions 7 and 9 did likewise. Traditions 3 and 8 refer to the practices of his Companions.

Though much of the text is too broken to provide clues that might lead to parallels, it should be noted that such text as has survived does have adequate enough parallels and related traditions.

The isnād's are rich with the names of traditionists from the Companions onward who are known to have compiled or used written collections of ḥadīth and who have been encountered in several of the other documents. Quite a number of the isnād's, though broken, provide evidence of continuous written transmission for two or more steps in the early as well as the later links up to and including ʿAlī ibn Maʿbad. We have Ibn ʿAbbās and ʿIkrimah (Tradition 5), Ṭamāsh and Yūnus ibn Bukair (Tradition 6), Bukair ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Ashajj and his son Makhramah (Tradition 7), ʿUrwah ibn al-Zubair and his son Hishām (Tradition 10), Shaibānī and ʿAlī ibn Maʿbad (Tradition 5). It is my well considered opinion that if the isnād's were not broken the document would yield several instances of continuous written transmission for every step of several complete isnād's.
Michigan Arabic Papyrus No. 5608(b). First half of third/ninth century.

Fragment of medium brown medium quality papyrus folio whose original format works out to about 23 × 26.7 cm., giving it the same width as that of Document 13, with which it was found. The papyrus represents a book folio with 30–32 lines to the page. The greater part of the upper half of the piece is lost, and there are many breaks and several large lacunae in the lower half (Pls. 26–27). The upper and outer margins measure 1.6 and 2 cm. respectively, the lower margins are preserved to a width of 0.75 cm., and the inner margins are completely lost.

Script.—Small cursive book hand that is for the most part fairly legible. Diacritical points are on the whole sparingly used, mostly for bāʾ and its sister forms and for nūn and yāʾ and occasionally for jīm (recto 26), dhāl (recto 15), fāʾ (recto 26), and qāf (verso 11). The scribe lifted the pen in order to write ligatured horizontal strokes downward. The circle is used for punctuation.

TEXT

Recto

1 [ عن زرع ]
2 [ جدثنا ] (2)
3 [ أبنتهإلى ]
4 [ سكن فيه هناك ]
5 [ قال حدثنا فلان ]
6 [ حدثنا ابن نعم قال حدثنا علي بن شاداد الأكبر قال ]
7 [ قال كان لا يرنا ]
8 [ فقيل انصرفوا ]
9 [ مسافوا ] (8)
10 [ حدثنا ]
11 [ بن عند مطر كانت على ساقية ابن ال ]
12 [ المسلم ] (10) [ حدثنا زيد بن هروان عن إبراهيم وبنان عن ال ]
13 [ قال سمع [ نحن قالوا لا بالآخ على ذلك اسم ع } ]
14 [ [ حدثنا زيد بن هروان قال حدثنا سلام بن مسكن قال كنت اذهب أقرأ ]
15 [ عمرو العبدي قبل والهو تلك العلما في المدينة قال سبحانه الله يا علما } ]
16 [ فدبرهون العلما قال علي بعدها بحسن كل المراء ] (13) [ حدثنا ]
[زيّد قال حدثنا سلام بأن مسكن قال حدثني الشيخ [في المسجد الجامع قال سمعت ابن الزبير]

يسأل عنها]  

[18] رأى حدثته فقال ذلك [أنه قُدّ خرج من رحمة الله إلى غضبه]  

[19] [حدثنا أبو نعيم] قال حدثني ابن من صمحة عن جريبين عبد الحميد قال ناهي رسول الله عن ذلك  

[20] [حدثنا أبو نعيم قال: قال الحسن بن عبيد معطر قال: أنا مخبراً في حسبية فقال: يا ابن حنيبة  

[21] [ ... اثنان قال لا تأمن بذلك] [حدثنا يزيد قال: هي خبر حسان بن معد  

[22] [كان أن دقوا دار المعى فسمع قتله قتلت الياس كابن تر قالت صلاة النهار عجلة قال بي  

[23] [ ... وان رجل أصم فاهم أن سمع بشي] [حدثنا يزيد قال: خبر حسان  

[24] [قال لأن ولدك كتب حملة الجзнاء] [حدثنا أبو نعيم قال] [حدثنا سعفان عن الأعشم عُن]  

ابراهيم  

[النخلي قال: أبو نعيم] [أناس نبه] منع حد [حدثنا أبو نعيم قال] حدثنا شعبة عن  

الابن عن الابن  

[25] [هيم أنه قال: السفر بالشروع ( فطاع) في البحر] [حدثنا أبو نعيم قال حدثنا سعفان عن الأعشم  

[26] [ ... معلوم] [حدثنا أبو نعيم] [قال: قال سعفان عن الأعشم  

[27] [معر واسمه قائل يبين بعد اجمال فهرو] [حدثنا أبو نعيم قال] [حدثنا سعفان عن الأعشم  

عن إبراهيم] [عن إبراهيم قال لا باسل [بالبيع]  

[28] [قال لا باسل إذا بسعله] [السبيل] [في السبل] [السبيل] [السبيل]  

[29] [ ...] [ ...] [ ...] [ ...] [ ...]  

[30] قال هذا كقوله بكتابك  

[0]  

Verso  

[1] [حدثنا أبو نعيم]  

[2] قال حدثني سعفان قال حدثنا  

[3] أن يحسن إليه أ  

[4] في حجة بالبلاء  

[5] سعف عن الأعشم عن إبراهيم  

[6] الأعشم عن إبراهيم  

[7] يعني في الباب  

[8] حدثنا بدر بن مروان  

[9] [عن أبي حمزة عن إبراهيم قال: غربة الأولين]  

[10] [عن أبي حمزة أنه كسب من نُعم الصلاة تمة أو]  

[11] [أقرع ]
Comments.—Traditions 1–9. The ten marginal notations—ضلال (twice),  صلاة, طلاق, نكاح—against the first nine or ten lines of the recto suggest ten short traditions in about as many lines. Short traditions, some less than one line long, seem to be characteristic of the whole folio.

Lone and incomplete names appear frequently in the broken isnād's, for example Zarāḥ of recto 1. Where, in addition, the matn is lost to the point of providing no clues to possible parallels, it is usually impossible to identify these isolated though fairly common names. Note the reconstruction of the isnād of Tradition 5. The word الأكبر is clear enough, but...
the last three letters of \(\text{ذلاك} \) are crowded so that the alif overlaps the initial stroke of the second \(\text{د} \).

For \(\text{علي بن ماءبر ابن شداد} \) see pages 255 and 268. The \(\text{أبو نعـايم} \) who repeatedly heads the \(\text{إسنادات} \) is the well known \(\text{إيراق} \) traditionist \(\text{أبو نعـايم فاـذ Ibn Dukain} \) (130–219/747–834), whose literary activities are detailed on page 275.

Tradition 10. The \(\text{يـازد} \) who heads the \(\text{إسنادات} \) is no doubt \(\text{يـازد ابن هـارون} \) (118–206/736–821), who heads the \(\text{إسنادات} \) of Tradition 12 and appears repeatedly in the document. His literary activities are discussed below along with those of \(\text{أبو نعـايم} \). \(\text{يـازد} \) may have headed some of the lost or broken \(\text{إسنادات} \). The reconstruction of the beginning of such \(\text{إسنادات} \) is determined, where no other clues are available, by the space available for the writing of \(\text{أبو نعـايم} \), \(\text{يـازد} \), or \(\text{يـازد ابن هـارون} \). In any case, \(\text{أبو نعـايم} \) definitely heads most of the surviving \(\text{إسنادات} \).

No Ibrahim nor Bayan nor Bunan is specified in the available lists of traditionists from whom \(\text{يـازد} \) transmitted. Such lists, however, are seldom complete. In this case they state that \(\text{يـازد} \) transmitted from “others” and “many more.” Furthermore, there were several \(\text{إيراق} \) contemporaries of \(\text{يـازد} \) with these first names.

Tradition 11. One would expect the name of \(\text{أبو نعـايم} \)’s source to read \(\text{معـصر} \), for Misar ibn Kidam of Kufah (d. 152/769 or 155/772), from whom, according to the sources, both \(\text{أبو نعـايم} \) and \(\text{يـازد ابن هـارون} \) transmitted. Misar was known for his piety, and he was called \(\text{ملـعـجف} \) because of his accuracy with traditions. He had a collection of about a thousand traditions, which were written down by his pupil Muhammad ibn Bishr (see Ibn Sa’d VI 253 f.; Bukhari, Tarikh IV 2, p. 13; Ma’arif, p. 243; Jarh, Tadkimah, p. 154; Jarh IV 1, pp. 368 f.; Ibn Hibban, p. 118; Khatib XII 346; Abu Nu’aim VII 209–70, pp. 222–70 of which represent Muhammad ibn Bishr’s hadith collection; Jam I 219; Nawawi, pp. 547 f.; Dhababi I 177 f.). Paleographically, however, the name given here and repeatedly, if we assume that the same person is meant in recto 12, 24, 26, 28 and verso 5, 15–18, 21–22, is preferably to be read as the less common \(\text{شـقـير} \) or \(\text{شـقـير} \). For, though it is possible to read the last letter of the name as \(\text{nun} \), no likely names ending in \(\text{nun} \) have appeared. Furthermore, that letter is not much different from the \(\text{ر} \) in Zarah of recto 1 and \(\text{kabbar} \) of recto 22. The biographical literature yielded only one likely possibility, namely the Kufan Su’air ibn al Khims (n.d.), a contemporary of the Kufan \(\text{أبو نعـايم} \) and of \(\text{يـازد ابن هـارون} \), to both of whom he could have transmitted and actually did if the reading of the name is correct. The hadith critic Yabya ibn Ma’in considered Su’air trustworthy (thiqah), and Abu Hatim al-Razi permitted the writing-down of his traditions though not as independent proof (Bukhari, Tarikh II 2, p. 214; Jarh II 1, p. 323; Ibn Hibban, p. 167, No. 1332; Jam I 209). The fact that the sources do not specify that Su’air transmitted to either \(\text{أبو نعـايم} \) or \(\text{يـازد ابن هـارون} \) could be explained on the basis of Su’air’s comparative obscurity and because the sources specifically stress the large number of transmitters to \(\text{أبو نعـايم} \), who “wrote down traditions from over a hundred shaikhs,” and to \(\text{يـازد} \), who “transmitted from and to countless people” (Nawawi, p. 636; Dhababi I 292, 339; see also p. 275 below).

The \(\text{يـازد} \) of recto 12 could well be \(\text{يـازد ابن هـارون} \), since the exchange of materials was a common practice among traditionists. He could, on the other hand, be an earlier \(\text{يـازد} \).

Tradition 12. Salam (or ‘Sallam) ibn Miskin of Basrah (d. 164/781 or 167/784) was a trusted traditionist from whom both \(\text{يـازد} \) and \(\text{أبو نعـايم} \) transmitted (Ibn Sa’d VII 2, p. 40; Bukhari, Tarikh II 2, p. 135; Jarh I 2, p. 258; Ibn Hibban, p. 119; Mizan I 402). The ‘Amrah of recto 15 is in all probability an error for ‘Amr since men seldom bore the name ‘Amrah
It is not possible to determine whether any of the several men named ‘Amr al-‘Abdi is the one of this text.

Concordance II 107 f. and IV 172 yield no clues for parallels.

Tradition 18. The transmitter from Salām is either Yazīd or Abū Nu‘aim. The Ibn al-Zubair of the īsnād is most probably ‘Urwah ibn al-Zubair, although there is a slight possibility that he is ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubair, whose musnad is to be found in Ibn Ḥanbal IV 3–6.

Traditions 14–15. Tradition 15 is intended either to confirm or deny the burden of Tradition 14. So far as can be determined from the fragmentary text, these two traditions and Traditions 33 are the only ones that refer to the hadith or sunnah of Muḥammad.

Abān ibn Ṣam‘ah al-Anṣārī of Baṣrah (d. 153/770) apparently was not very well known (see Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh I 1, pp. 452 f.; Jarḥ I 1, p. 297; Ibn Ḥibbān, p. 115; Jamʿ I 41 f.; Mizān I 6).

Jarīr ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd (110–88/728–804) of Rayy and Kūfah had a written collection of hadith from which he read or dictated (see p. 151). Unless Abān was young when he died, we have here another case of an older man transmitting from a younger one (see p. 180).

The Abū Maṣhar of Tradition 15 is Abū Maṣhar Najīḥ ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān of Sind and Medina (d. 170/787), who was bought by the royal Umm Mūsā and who served the caliph Mahdī as jurist. He is known for a maghāzī work but was considered by many as a weak traditionist, particularly for his īsnād’s. However, he held hadith sessions and transmitted from and to many leading Medinan and ‘Irāqī traditionists, and a number of his transmitters wrote down his hadith (Ibn Saʿd V 309; Maʿārif, p. 253; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh IV 2, p. 114; Fihrist, p. 93; Jarḥ IV 1, pp. 493–95; Akhīrār al-qudūt III 256; Dāhibī I 216 f.; Mizān III 228 f.; Ibn al-Imād, Shadhārāt al-dhahāb I 278).

Traditions 16–17. ‘Ummār ibn Maʿbad cannot be identified from the sources at hand. He was probably a brother of ‘Alī ibn Maʿbad ibn Shaddād (see Tradition 5). The Kāb of Tradition 17 could be any one of several Companions or Successors. Muṭarrij is in all probability the Kūfān Muṭarrij ibn Yazīd, since the name is comparatively rare and Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī states that he knows of no other traditionist so named (Jarḥ IV 1, p. 409; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh IV 2, p. 19).

Traditions 18–30 (recto 24–verso 7). The numbering of these traditions is conjectural. For Suʿair see page 272. Aʿmash is known to have transmitted from Ibrāhīm ibn Yazīd al-Nakhrātī (see pp. 152, 157), who can therefore be identified as the Ibrāhīm of Traditions 18–30 and perhaps even of Nos. 31–32, as suggested by the Ibrāhīm of verso 9. Abū Unās is the Kūfān ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Juwaiyih (n.d.), a contemporary of and transmitter from the Kūfān Mughhrāh ibn Muqsim (d. 133/755–56), who also transmitted from Nakharatī (Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh III 1, p. 409; Jarḥ II 2, p. 345; Jamʿ II 499). Abū Nuʿaim and, to a lesser extent, Yazīd ibn Hārūn were both interested in Nakharatī and his hadith as Ibn Saʿd’s biography of Nakharatī (Ibn Saʿd VI 188–99) readily shows.

The Shuʿbah of Tradition 19 is Shuʿbah ibn al-Ḥajjāj (see pp. 99 and 233 for references), who appears again in Tradition 46. Since he is known to have transmitted from Aʿmash and since both Abū Nuʿaim and Yazīd ibn Hārūn are known to have transmitted from Shuʿbah, we have evidence of continuous written transmission, for these four scholars wrote down their collections. The reading of the content of Tradition 19 is conjectural, for many of the significant words can be pointed in several different ways. Space at the beginning of recto 28 does not permit the writing-down in full of the rest of the īsnād. The form of the reconstruction here given is familiar in hadith transmission.
Tradition 31. Badr ibn Marwān of verso 8 cannot be identified from the sources at hand. These, however, list a trustworthy Kufan, Badr ibn ʿUthmān (n.d.), a client of the family of the caliph ʿUthmān ibn ʿAffān, who could well be a link in these isnād’s because Abū Nuʿaim is known to have transmitted from him. Perhaps “Marwān” is an error for “ʿUthmān” (see Ibn Saʿd VI 247; Bukhārī, Taʿrīkh I 2, p. 139; Jarḥ I 1, p. 413; Jamʿ I 64).

Traditions 32–32a. Tradition 32a is longer than most of the traditions in the piece, and it is possible that another tradition begins about in the middle of verso 10. Furthermore, the appearance of new names in the broken isnād’s of Traditions 31 and 32a may indicate that it was not Abū Nuʿaim but Yazīd ibn Hārūn who headed these isnād’s, as he does those of Traditions 10, 12, 16, and 17 with their new links. For the reading عَزْبِي (Concordance IV 472). The unpointed word of the text can be read in several other ways of which عَزْبِي may be considered but is less likely.

Tradition 33. Muḥammad instructed several Companions to begin their worship by praising God, then to call down a blessing on Muḥammad himself (see pp. 88 f.), and finally to pray for whatever they wished for themselves or others. The papyrus text is related to but not identical with other versions of this theme (Ibn Ḥanbal VI 18; Tirmidhī III 75, XIII 20 f.; see also Concordance I 305).”
ibn Ṭahmān al-Warrāq (see p. 229). Dīnār is too common a name for any attempt at identification (see e.g. Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh II 1, pp. 223–26; Jarḥ I 2, pp. 429–34).

Abū Bakr Muṭṭarrīf (or Muṭṭarīf) of Tradition 46 is Abū Bakr Muṭṭarrīf ibn Ṭarīf al-Ḥarīthī (d. 141/758 or 142/759), who is known to have heard Ṣaḥīfī and to have transmitted to Ṣuʿbāh (Ibn Saʿd VI 241; Bukhārī, Taʾrīkh IV 1, p. 397; Jarḥ IV 1, p. 313). He is frequently confused with a fellow Kūfīan, Muṭṭarrīf ibn Ṭarīf al-Ḵhārīfī (d. 133/751), whose kunya is not Abū Bakr, as in the papyrus text, but Abū ʿAbd al-Ḵrahmān (see Ibn Ḥibbān, p. 126; Jamʾ II 503).

Verso 28–30 may involve two traditions instead of one.

IDENTIFICATION AND SIGNIFICANCE

I

That the compiler of the collection represented by this fragment moved at one time in the ʿIrāqī circles of Yazīd ibn Ḥārūn and Abū Nuʿaim Ṣadīq ibn Dukайн is obvious from the fact that these two are his often-cited sources. That he was closer in age to Abū Nuʿaim (d. 219/834) than to Yazīd (d. 206/821) would seem to be implied because he transmitted more traditions from Abū Nuʿaim and from some younger men. Just as Abū Nuʿaim and Yazīd had several well known ʿIrāqī authorities in common, as seen in the papyrus text and confirmed by the biographical sources, so they had several well known ʿIrāqī pupils in common. The literary activities of the pupils, however, centered in ʿIrāqī and farther east rather than in Egypt, where the papyrus was found. The sources do state that ʿAlī ibn Maʿbad ibn Nūḥ (d. 259/873) of Baghdād and Egypt transmitted from Yazīd ibn Ḥārūn, who transmitted in Baghdād, but do not specify that he transmitted from Abū Nuʿaim also. Nevertheless, the literary activities and the reputation of Abū Nuʿaim were such that it would be strange indeed if this ʿAlī did not hear him. For the Kūfīan Abū Nuʿaim, with his reputation already well established, visited Baghdād in the same year (204/819) that the caliph Maʾmūn returned to his capital and was promptly brought to the caliph’s attention. The scholarly world of Baghdād paid Abū Nuʿaim great honor. Traditionists and critics such as Ibn Ḥanbal and Yahyā ibn Maʿīn called on him, and Yahyā even tricked him with a memory test, much to the embarrassment of Ibn Ḥanbal and the indignation of Abū Nuʿaim. But Yahyā himself was delighted with the excellent results (see p. 277). A chair was set up for the distinguished visitor, who recited or dictated traditions to the public. In all probability the then youthful ʿAlī ibn Maʿbad ibn Nūḥ of Baghdād was among the listeners. It should be recalled once more that the lists of transmitters from prominent traditionists are seldom complete and usually end with “and others beside these” or “and more of their class (tābāqah)” or “and many people (ḥalq)”; the lists for both Abū Nuʿaim and this ʿAlī are no exceptions. It should be noted that the term haddathana, which is used throughout at the beginning of the isndd’s of our document, indicates that both Abū Nuʿaim and Yazīd were transmitting to a group of people, for the


3 Husn al-muhādharah I 160.

4 Khāṭīb XIV 337; Mandūqib, pp. 31, 66–68, and 309 f.

5 Khāṭīb XII 247, 250.

6 Ibid., pp. 350 f.
term *haddathan* had by their time come to imply, quite generally, private or person-to-person transmission. Perhaps Khāṭib did not specify that ‘Alī transmitted from Abū Nuʿaim because of ‘Alī’s youthfulness at the beginning of the third century and because of his subsequent migration to Egypt, where he no doubt met the older ‘Irāqī ‘Alī ibn Maʿbad ibn Shaddād, from whom he is known to have transmitted (see p. 255).

The close physical association of Documents 13 and 14, reflected by the fact that they survived together (and thus were assigned but a single inventory number by the University of Michigan), would seem to have been no accident but rather to have stemmed from the personal associations of two ‘Irāqī scholars who were fellow immigrants in Egypt. Document 14, therefore, like Document 13, is dated to the first half of the third century.

II

Unlike Document 13, which represents a collection of traditions organized according to subject matter, Document 14 represents an unorganized collection (*jāmiʿ*) in which, however, sizable units derived from the same traditionist were grouped together (see p. 274). Despite the loss of much of the *matn* of most of the traditions, the variety of subjects covered is indicated by the thirteen surviving marginal notations, which mention eight different subjects— the hunt, trade, worship, marriage, inheritance, divorce, virtues, and pilgrimages. The emphasis is on the opinions and practices of the Companions and the Successors rather than on the *ḥadith* and *ṣunnah* of Muḥammad (see p. 273). That traditions of the Companions and the Successors had rather small chance of appearing in the later standard collections (see p. 77) explains why no parallels were detected with the aid of the *Concordance*. The reconstruction of some of the contents of several traditions is necessarily conjectural, not only because the text is broken and rarely pointed but also because the papyrus itself was not available for repeated inspection.

The *isnād’s*, like those of Document 13, yield the names of a great many well known ‘Irāqī traditionists of the first and second centuries who either wrote down their collections of *ḥadith* or permitted their regular students and public audiences to do so. Many of these traditionists have been encountered repeatedly in these studies. They include Abū Hurairah (Tradition 15), Nakha ṭ (Traditions 18-30), and Shaʿbī (Traditions 35 ff.), all three of whom eventually permitted and even urged others to write down *ḥadith*. They include also traditionists who were from the start and consistently in favor of written *ḥadith*, such as Ibn al-Zubair (Tradition 13), Jarīr ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd (Tradition 14), Aʿmash (Traditions 18-30), and Shuʿbah ibn al-Ḥajjāj (Tradition 19). To these can now be added Abū Maʿshar Naṣir ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (Tradition 15) and in all probability Abū Isāq Sulaimān ibn Abī Sulaimān al-Shaibānī (Traditions 36-37), whose affinities were with the family of Ibn ʿAbbās, in which writing and written traditions were consistently favored. Though on the basis of paleography Misʿar ibn Kidām is excluded from the papyrus list, he was nevertheless one of this group of ‘Irāqī *ḥadith*-writers (see p. 272).

In the light of these facts, further analysis of the *isnād’s* points strongly to continuous written transmission for much of what has survived in this document, such as Tradition 15 with the *isnād* links Abū Hurairah–Abū Maʿshar and especially the groups of consecutive traditions that have the links Nakhaṭ–Aʿmash (Traditions 18-30) and Shaʿbī–Shaibānī (Traditions 40-42). Whatever reservations one may tend to have about the writing-down of *ḥadith* in the first century of Islām, there can be little doubt of the general prevalence of the practice by the
end of that century and of its wide acceptance in the first half of the second century particularly in 'Iraq, the home or adopted province of these hadith scholars.

Continuous written transmission beyond this early period, so far as the men of the papyrus isnād's are concerned, is indicated by the literary activities of both Yazīd ibn Hārūn and Abū Nuʿaim. Yazīd is said to have memorized thousands of traditions and to have transmitted from memory. That he did not always depend on memory is indicated by the fact that when in his old age his eyesight and memory failed he had a slave girl refresh his memory with the aid of his own books.6

Abū Nuʿaim was particularly interested in the hadith of 'Amash, Miṣʿar ibn Kidām, Shuʿbāh, and Sufyān al-Thaurī, all of whom had written collections.9 Like them, Abū Nuʿaim made his own written collection, for Ibn Ḥanbal reports him as saying that he wrote down hadith from over a hundred shaikhs whose hadith had been written down also by Sufyān al-Thaurī.10 When Abū Nuʿaim was sought for his hadith collection, he dictated it to his pupils, who wrote it down and from whom he demanded and received a fee for instruction.11 It is not stated whether he dictated from his books or from his memory, for which he was well known.12 However, in the 'Iraqi circles in which he moved no stigma was attached to dictation or recitation from manuscripts, as the following incident involving him and his "examiner," Yahyā ibn Maʿin, illustrates. Yahyā, wishing to test Abū Nuʿaim's memory and knowledge of his hadith, took a sheet (waraqah) and wrote down thirty-three traditions which, except for every eleventh tradition, were from Abū Nuʿaim's collection. Ibn Ḥanbal did not approve of the test but nevertheless accompanied the eager Yahyā on the visit to Abū Nuʿaim. When Yahyā had read out the first eleven traditions Abū Nuʿaim stopped him and told him to cross out the eleventh tradition because it was not one of his. Abū Nuʿaim responded in the same way to the second group of eleven traditions. But when the persistent Yahyā read the last of the three interpolated traditions Abū Nuʿaim lost his temper and actually kicked Yahyā out. Yahyā took this experience in his stride and went away pleased because he was convinced of the high quality of Abū Nuʿaim's memory and scholarship.13 Our papyrography provides evidence that yet another transmitter wrote down the materials of both Yazīd and Abū Nuʿaim. This conclusion should surprise no one, for Ibn Ḥanbal and Yahyā ibn Maʿin were not the only exemplary leaders who wrote down an enormous number of traditions with special attention to well known collections of earlier and contemporary scholars.

7 Khatīb XIV 339 f.; Nawawi, pp. 636 f.
6 Khatīb XIV 338 f.
9 See pp. 98 and 100 for manuscripts of Shuʿbāh and Sufyān. See Buhārīn, p. 237, Isnād 96, according to which Abū Nuʿaim transmitted to Bukhārī from 'Amash, Miṣʿar, and especially Sufyān al-Thaurī.
10 Dhahabi I 339.
11 Kifāyah, p. 156. See p. 228 above for a discussion of fees.
12 See e.g. Jarḥ III 2, pp. 61 f.
13 Khatīb XII 353 f.; Mandqib, pp. 79 f. See pp. 52 f. above for other tests.
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Muʿāwiyah ibn Qurrah, 18
Muʿāwiyah ibn Ṣāliḥ, 101-3
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Muṣā ibn Ayyān al-Ḥarrānī, 153, 211, 216
Muṣā ibn Iṣām al-Baṣrī al-Tubbāhī, 68, 69, 101, 250, 256
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