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Talal A. Maloush
ABSTRACT

This thesis focuses on the study and analysis of three main issues:

1. The role of the Qur’ān in the establishment of the Sunnah, and the affirmation of its status and the importance of acting in accordance with it.

2. The role of the Prophet in the propagation and preservation of the Sunnah.

3. The main evidence that is cited by Goldziher in support of his theory of the fabrication of Ḥadīth during the Umayyad period.

The thesis consists of an introduction, two parts and a conclusion. The introduction describes the motivation for choosing the above issues as the subject of the research and demonstrates the method followed.

Part One deals with the role of the Qur’ān and the Prophet in relation to the Sunnah and contains two chapters. In Chapter 1, attention is given to two issues: The clarification of the Qur’ān’s urgent requirement for the Sunnah from the revelation of the first verses onwards; and an examination of the Qur’ān’s detailed explanation of the importance of the Sunnah and of acting according to it. This chapter consists of six sections and a conclusion. Chapter 2 aims to present and discuss the various roles that were performed by the Prophet in the preservation and propagation of his Sunnah. This chapter consists of eight sections and a conclusion.

Part Two, which constitutes the main part of the study, undertakes a rigorous study of Goldziher’s main evidence regarding his theory of the fabrication of Ḥadīth during the Umayyad period. It consists of an introduction, five chapters and a conclusion. In the introduction, we give a general overview of Goldziher’s theory regarding the fabrication of Ḥadīth in the Umayyad period. Chapter 3 contains an analysis of the evidence he cites in support of his claim that the Companions fabricated Ḥadīth, and consists of five sections. Chapter 4 attempts an analysis of the evidence he cites in support of his claim that various ‘pious scholars’ fabricated Ḥadīth during the Umayyads’ rule, and consists of seven sections. Chapter 5 contains an analysis of his evidence regarding the Umayyads’ fabrication of Ḥadīth, and consists of five sections. Chapter 6 contains an analysis of his evidence regarding the fabrication of Ḥadīth by various theologians and consists of four sections. Chapter 7 contains a demonstration of the impact of Goldziher’s opinions on subsequent studies.

Finally, the Conclusion summarises the findings of the study.
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The transliteration of Arabic words is according to the following alphabetical substitution:

**A. Consonants:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Letter</th>
<th>transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>١</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٢</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٣</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٤</td>
<td>th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٥</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٦</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٧</td>
<td>kh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٨</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٩</td>
<td>zh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٠</td>
<td>dh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١١</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٢</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٣</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٤</td>
<td>sh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٥</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٦</td>
<td>ص</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٧</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٨</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٩</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٢٠</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٢١</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٢٢</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For h (ثلاث: thalāthah) except when muḍāf; then t (ثلاثة أفلام: thalāthatu aqlām)*

**B. Vowels and Diphthongs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short vowels:</th>
<th>Long vowels:</th>
<th>Diphthongs:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ḍ (fatḥah)</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ō (اوُل: awlā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḍ (dammah)</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ō (غَيْب: ghayb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḍ (kasrah)</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ō (مُعْتَفِق: muftī)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ABBREVIATIONS

#### i) Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Author/Editor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aghānī</td>
<td><em>al-Aghānī</em>, by Abū Ṣafāhānī, Abū al-Faraj.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āḥād</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baghdādī, Abū Bakr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Aṣâmī</td>
<td><em>al-Muʿjam al-mufahras li-alfāz al-Qurʿān</em>, by ʿAbd al-Baqī,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muḥammad Fuʿād</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿĀhār</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Studies in Early Ḥadīth Literature</em>, by al-Aʿṣāmī.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Aʿẓāmī</td>
<td><em>al-Āṣāmī 2 On Schacht's Origins of Muḥammadan Jurisprudence</em>, by al-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aʿẓāmī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basawī</td>
<td><em>al-Maʿrifah wa al-tārikh</em>, by al-Basawī.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayān</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Bayān Jāmiʿ bayān al-ʿilm wa faḍḥāh</em>, by Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr.</td>
</tr>
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<td>Bayhaqī</td>
<td><em>al-Sunan al-kubrā</em>, by al-Bayhaqī.</td>
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<td><em>Hadīth and Its Principles</em>, by Beyanouni, Fathiddin.</td>
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<td><em>al-Bidāyah wa al-nihāyah</em>, by Ibn kathīr.</td>
<td></td>
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<td>Bukhārī</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Shaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī</em>, by al-Bukhārī.</td>
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<tr>
<td>Buldān</td>
<td><em>Muʿjam al-buldān</em>, by al-Ḥamawi, Yāqūt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāraquṭnī</td>
<td><em>Sunan al-Dāraquṭnī</em>, by al-Dāraquṭnī.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāraquṭnī KD</td>
<td><em>Kitāb al-Ḍuʿaṭaʿa wa al-matrūkūn</em>, by al-Dāraquṭnī.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dārimī</td>
<td><em>Sunan al-Dārimī</em>, by al-Dārimī.</td>
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<tr>
<td>Dāwūd</td>
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Ibn Kathīr
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INTRODUCTION

In investigating early Islamic history, it is to ḥadīth literature, among other sources, that we should turn, as it constitutes a valuable source of information on this period. It permits us to understand the culture and social framework of the times, as well as the legal and religious stipulations that operated then. Ḥadīth literature is also the principal source of information regarding the Sunnah of the Prophet, which is second in importance to the Qur'ān as a source of Islamic law.

Western scholars and Ḥadīth

“Western scholars have taken an interest in the ḥadīth material for almost two centuries, making a welcome contribution by editing and sometimes translating many of the original Arabic works, and by the diligent preparation of concordances and indices. But while some have accepted the traditional canons of ḥadīth criticism as developed by the Muslim scholars themselves, others have offered alternative accounts of the subject. Orientalists of this school have raised some fundamental issues with regard to the literature, and attempted to address them according to modern Western canons of literary and historical criticism.”¹

The importance of Goldziher’s study

¹ Siddiqi, p 124.
"The first and the last significant attempt was made by Ignas Goldziher. He published the result of his research, *Muhammedanische Studien*, in 1890. Since then it has been the fundamental source for the study of Ḥadīth in the West. After the lapse of three-quarters of a century, Professor Schacht tried to investigate the legal aḥādīth. Apart from this there are some articles and a few books which have dealt with the subject."

---

2 Goldziher was born on 22 June 1850 in the town of Székesfehérvár in Hungary. He began his scholarly career at a strikingly early age. At five he was reading the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, at eight the Talmud; at twelve, he wrote and published his first monograph, on the origins and classification of the Hebrew prayers. At sixteen, while still a schoolboy, he attended courses in classics, philosophy, and oriental languages, including Persian and Turkish, at the University of Budapest, where he continued his studies after leaving school. With the help of his teachers, he obtained a scholarship from the Hungarian Minister of Education and embarked on a comprehensive program of study and research designed to equip him for a university appointment. His first period abroad was in Germany at the Universities of Leipzig and Berlin, where he took his doctorate at the age of nineteen. In the following year, he was approved as an occasional lecturer - Privatdozent - in the University of Budapest.

From Germany, he went to Holland and spent six months in Leiden, then the foremost school of Islamic studies in Europe. Goldziher's previous work in Hungary and Germany, though ranging widely, had been mainly in the fields of Judaic and Semitic studies, the latter of course including Arabic. His experience in Leiden, as he notes in his diary, made Islam in the broadest sense the main focus of his scholarly work. This new direction was confirmed when Goldziher went on his first and only trip to the Middle East, from September 1873 to April 1874. His time was spent mainly in Damascus and in Cairo, where he obtained permission - the first non-Muslim to do so - to enroll as a student in the mosque university of al-Azhar.

In 1874, after returning home, he published work in the proceedings of the Imperial Academy in Vienna. This marked the beginning of a career of outstanding distinction which brought him international recognition as one of the great masters of oriental scholarship and a founder of the modern science of Islamics. He was elected as an Extraordinary Member of the Hungarian Academy in 1876 and as an Ordinary Member in 1892, and was given the title of Professor in 1894, the year in which the legislative assembly formally recognized Judaism as equal to the three Christian denominations existing in the country. At this stage, he received only the title, without faculty privileges and without salary.

In 1889 the Eighth International Congress of Orientalists awarded him its gold medal for his scholarly publications, and that in 1894 he had received and refused an invitation to a chair at Cambridge University, in succession to W. Robertson Smith. Having no salaried academic appointment, he turned for his livelihood to the Jewish community, and for thirty years, from 1876 to 1905, served it as secretary. This was an exacting and sometimes disagreeable job, which left him only his evenings, job, weekends, and holidays for his scholarly work. It was not until 1904 that he was appointed to a genuine professorship in the University of Budapest, at first in Semitics, and then, from 1914, in the Chair of Muslim Law and Institutions in the Faculty of Laws. He died on 13 November 1921. For an extensive biography of Goldziher see Bernard Lewis’ Introduction to Goldziher’s *Introduction to Islamic Theology and Law*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1979.

3 “It was J. Schacht who set about the theoretical revaluation of the work, or actually reverted to Goldziher’s original concept. He reconstructed the development of Muslim jurisprudence on the basis of Goldziher’s work. (The theoretical clarification see in *A Revaluation of Islamic Traditions*, JRAS, 1949, pp. 143-154; his great work is *The Origins of Muhammedan Jurisprudence*, 1950.).” See Simon, p. 104.
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with the subject in passing.”

Simon also states that, “The theoretical significance of his work on Ḥadīth was forgotten nearly for half a century after the due appreciation of T. Nöldeke, Snouck-Hurgronje and C. H. Becker who were his greatest contemporaries. The outstanding researcher of the sources of Muslim jurisprudence, J. Schacht had to rediscover it in the middle of the century.”

The irony of it is that in the meantime everybody felt obliged to refer to the study as something fundamental and unmatched. If they quoted anything from Goldziher’s corpus that was some trivial part of it, insignificant without its original context.”

Denffer says, “Since then many more studies have appeared but no such remarkable work as Goldziher’s has yet seen the light of day.” Guillaume, in the Preface to his The Traditions of Islam writes that Goldziher’s Muhammedanische Studien, must form the basis of any work on the Ḥadīth literature, and indeed, the view of many orientalists regarding Ḥadīth appears to have been decided once and for all when Goldziher published his book. A large number of eminent Western scholars have praised Goldziher’s work and have paid very high tribute to him. “It is evident from contemporary book reviews and letters that every body suspected something of the epoch-making nature of Goldziher’s study. The novelty of the work was reflected by the fact that even the

---

4 Aʿzami, p. xvii.
5 “After that Goldziher’s works began to be published (in 1961) and translated again into foreign languages (in 1967 Volume 1 of the Muslim Studies, in 1971 Volume 2 of the same) and individual works were read in the light of his whole corpus rather than of obligatory references and uncritical admiration.” Simon, p. 97.
6 Simon, p. 97.
7 Denffer, p. 18.
8 Guillaume, p. 5.
9 However, there were, to some extent, exceptions: “Analysing some of Schacht’s more sweeping judgements, he [Robson] became convinced that the traditional Muslim account of Ḥadīth genesis had much to commend it, and had in some ways been misrepresented - or at least misunderstood - by Goldziher and Schacht.” See Siddiqi, p. 132.
greatest scholars declared themselves incompetent to judge the values of the study. This can be best exemplified by a quotation from the book review by T. Nöldeke, the greatest Semitic philologist of the time. Having declared that the contents of the second volume of the *Muhammedanische Studien* was even more unorthodox than that of the first, he went on like this:

> I would not review his work if I did not suppose that my fellow scholars were in a similar situation in that respect. (*Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, V, 1891, p. 43)

In his letter to Goldziher he put it even more plainly:

> Who on earth has a better understanding of Ḥadīth than you? Not even Snouck can compete with you. (See his letter of 24. Oct, 1890 and 13 Nov., 1890)

Even the greatest scholars needed some time to digest Goldziher’s radically new results. Nöldeke, for example, endorsed Goldziher’s standpoint in respect of the legal and dogmatic pieces of Ḥadīth but argued in favour of the historical ones for a while. (See: Nöldeke’s letter to Goldziher and his book review, p. 45) In his letter dated 20th Dec., 1892, he wrote jokingly:

> After all I must tell you that you are a terrible man. With all your doubts about the originality of the Ḥadīth you have awakened my suspicion too. Eventually, I will be more suspicious than you are! You have completely upset my simple soul.”

However, little attention seems to have been paid to the methodology employed by Goldziher in his research, or to the verification of his conclusions and references.

Scholars who have criticised Goldziher

---

Due to the great importance which Goldziher's theories have in the domain of Ḥadīth studies, he has been subject to academic criticism by various scholars of Ḥadīth, albeit in a brief and passing manner. In his Appendix II to Ḥadīth Literature, Its Origin, Development and Special Features, Siddiqi briefly mentions some of the shortcomings of Goldziher's work, providing a summary point-by-point response to Goldziher's main claims.  

Sezgin in his first volume of Geschichte des Arabischen Schrifttums has dealt with his weaknesses in more detail; he points out that Goldziher's scholarship is very poor as far as the Muslim science of Usūl al-Ḥadīth is concerned and that many of his conclusions about the transmission of aḥādīth are hence incorrect. Goldziher admits that it was a real fact that Ḥadīth were written down in suḥuf or ajzā' in the first decades of Islam when he says, "There is nothing against the assumption that the Companions and disciples wished to keep the Prophet’s sayings and rulings from being forgotten by reducing them in

---

11 Siddiqi, pp. 124-30. Siddiqi said, "Goldziher's main claims, as expounded in the second volume of his Muslim Studies, may be summarised as follows:

1. The Ḥadīth literature is largely based on mere oral transmission, which lasted for more than a century; and the extant Ḥadīth collections do not refer to any records of Ḥadīths which may have been made at an earlier period.

2. The number of Ḥadīths in the later collections is far larger than the number of those contained in the earlier anthologies or the early works on Islamic law. This, it is said, shows that many of the Ḥadīths are of questionable authenticity.

3. The Ḥadīths reported by the younger Companions are far more numerous than those related by the older Companions.

4. The isnād system was applied, arbitrarily, to Ḥadīth not earlier than the close of the first Islamic century, and does not furnish a proof of the genuineness of the tradition to which it is attached.

5. Many of the Ḥadīths contradict each other.

6. Definite evidence exists of the large-scale forgery of the isnād as well as of the texts of Ḥadīths.

7. The Muslim critics confined their criticism of the literature to the isnād alone, and never criticised the texts transmitted.

Many of these controversies have been discussed in detail by in Chapters 1, 6 and 7 of this book."

12 This refers to the Arabic translation of this book, Tārikh al-turāth al-'arabī, tr. Dr. Maḥmūd Fahmī Ḩijāzī, Riyadh, al-Imām University, 1983. The original was published in Leiden, E. J. Brill, in 1967.
writing." He supports this with a number of pieces of evidence.\textsuperscript{13} However, he believes that later the Muslims became reluctant to preserve the Prophet's sayings in written form.\textsuperscript{14} Therefore, he asserts that Hadith were first collected at the end of the second century AH and in the first half of the third century and that the compilers of the canonical collections did not select their material from the previously compiled existing literature; rather that they chose them from oral narrations throughout their extensive travels.

Sezgin criticises in detail Goldziher's opinion regarding the beginning of Hadith collection, while asserting that the writing down of Hadith continued throughout the second half of the first century AH and the first half of the second century with numerous pieces of evidence that contain descriptive expressions from the books of Hadith terminology, information and technical terms. He explains the manner in which those collections were written down, the materials that were used in their writing as well as giving the names of many scholars who kept written documents and books. He indicates that Goldziher fails to benefit from the books of Hadith terminology known to him; parts of these were still preserved in manuscript form in Goldziher's time. It is noteworthy that Sezgin reaches the following conclusions regarding the development of the compiling of Hadith:

1. The writing down of Hadith:

\textsuperscript{13} Goldziher, vol. 2, pp. 22-3, 181.
\textsuperscript{14} Goldziher, vol. 2, p. 22: "Rather can it be assumed that the writing down of the hadith was a very ancient method of preserving it, and that reluctance to preserve it in written form is merely the result of later considerations."; p. 183: "This dislike of writing was not there from the beginning, but was the result of prejudices which arose later."

6
Hadīth was written down in small booklets or pamphlets during the time of the Companions and the first Followers. A single one of those booklets was called saḥifah or juz'.

2. The collecting of Hadīth:

The scattered writings were brought together in the last quarter of the first century AH and the first quarter of the second century.

3. The classification of Hadīth:

At this stage the hadīths were arranged or classified according to their content, and had been since approximately 125 AH. At the end of the second century, however, another form of classification appears besides the first form. This form classifies Hadīth according to the names of the Companions (kutub al-masanād). In the third century, the early methodical books were edited and comprehensive books were compiled that have been called the 'authentic canonical collections' by modern researchers. Goldziher considers these collections to be the first methodical books on Hadīth.\(^\text{15}\)

It is worth mentioning that Sezgin has conducted a specialised scientific study of the sources used by al-Bukhārī for his book al-Jāmi‘ al-ṣaḥīḥ.\(^\text{16}\) From this study he concludes that al-Bukhārī, in fact, took his material from about two hundred books compiled by his shaykhs from the previous generation. This in effect reflects

\(^{15}\) Sezgin, vol. 1, pp. 115-52.

\(^{16}\) The original of this study was published in Istanbul in 1955 under the title of Buchari'nin kaynakları.
the extent of the development of compilation with regard to Ḥadīth. It refutes Goldziher’s previous allegation (see above page 6).

Also, Ḥamidullah in his introduction to the Sahifah Hamnam Ibn Munabbih has, without much reference to Goldziher, successfully challenged some of his notions. Al-Aʿzamī discusses Goldziher’s opinions in the form of an analysis of the theory he presents in Muslim Studies which asserts the Muslim community’s sheer ignorance of Islam as a religious practice as well as a dogma. It also depicts Islam as being unable to incorporate its customs within a systematic ideology.

More recently, a dense study entitled, “The Muṣannaf of ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Ṣanʿānī as a Source of Authentic aḥādīth of the First Century A.H.” by H. Motzki, criticizes the approach of Western scholars who have concentrated on the content of the text when judging the authenticity of a Ḥadīth, including Goldziher and Schacht. With regard to the former he says, “Ignaz Goldziher’s thesis that the traditions ascribed to the Prophet and the Companions (saḥāba) contained in the classical collections of aḥādīth are not authentic reports of these persons but rather reflect the doctrinal and political developments of the first two centuries after Muḥammad’s death is based primarily on analysis of the content of the Ḥadīth (mātīn) and not the transmitters.” Motzki addresses the source-analytical and tradition-historical approaches, while trying to show how we can ascertain whether, or to what degree,

18 Denffer, p. 17.
20 JNES 50 (January 1991): 1-21. The German version of this paper was presented at the Colloquium on Ḥadīth Historiography held in Oxford in September 1988.
the chains of transmission of *aḥādīth* are reliable. He undertakes a study of the authenticity of the *Muṣannaf* of ʿAbd al-Razzāq (d. 211/826) through an examination of the *isnāds* of his sources, and reaches the conclusion that, "...the theory championed by Goldziher, Schacht, and, in their footsteps, many others – myself included – which, in general, rejects *ḥadīth* literature as a historically reliable source for the first century A.H., deprives the historical study of early Islam of an important and useful type of source."\(^{22}\)

**The aim of this thesis**

To date a critical analysis of Goldziher’s evidence regarding the fabrication of *Ḥadīth* in the Umayyad era, the single most important issue that concerns us here in that it calls into question the basic veracity of *Ḥadīth*, has not been produced by Muslim, or indeed non-Muslim scholars.\(^{23}\) The present thesis seeks to address this deficiency.

**Goldziher’s theory**

Goldziher, in general terms, believes that the *Ḥadīth* are no more than a product of the development of the religious, historical and social dimensions of Islam during its first two centuries. He says, “We are unlikely to have even as much confidence as Dozy regarding a large part of the *Ḥadīth*, but will probably consider

\(^{21}\) Ibid., p. 1.

\(^{22}\) Ibid., p. 21.

\(^{23}\) A possible reason for the absence of a comprehensive appraisal of Goldziher’s theories until now is that an informed discussion of his opinions requires a great deal of background knowledge and hard work to check all his references, including an extensive knowledge about *Ḥadīth* and its science, and the historical events related to it. This has become clear to me through my study and discussion of his deductions, opinions, references and conclusions. I do not exaggerate if I say that sometimes several
by far the greater part of it as the result of the religious, historical and social development of Islam during the first two centuries.\textsuperscript{24}

His theory regarding the fabrication of Hadīth in the Umayyad era is based mainly on his assertion that:

1. The fabrication of Hadīth began after the death of the Prophet and that indeed, the first to fabricate Hadīth were the Companions themselves. He goes further and asserts that there was little confidence in the reliability of the transmitters of Hadīth that existed even in the earliest period of the formation of tradition.

2. There was great enmity that between the Umayyads and the pious scholars. He elaborates on the nature of this enmity with various statements, all of which portray the readiness of each side to fabricate Hadīth to the detriment of the other party and to bolster their own cause.

3. Theologians in official positions were used -or were willing, without outward pressure, because of their interest in the prevailing power- to put into circulation tendentious traditions.

Goldziher expounded his evidence at length, and we will present it at appropriate junctures in our discussion.

The examination of Goldziher’s conclusions and relevant references

In light of his high academic standing and influence in his field,\textsuperscript{25} it is important to examine Goldziher’s conclusions and relevant references, particularly

\textsuperscript{24} Goldziher, vol. 2, p. 19.
since any error he commits necessarily misleads a number of other scholars.\textsuperscript{26} This is especially true since his is the only serious work on \textit{Hadīth}, apart from Schacht's on \textit{Hadīth}.\textsuperscript{27} It is my intention to study his theory critically and in detail, including an examination, investigation and analysis of his main evidence as put forward by him in his book \textit{Muslim Studies} regarding the Umayyads' rule.

However, before embarking on this, we deem it necessary to talk about the role of the Qur'ān and the Prophet in establishing and implementing the Sunnah, an area that is neglected by Goldziher in his studies. This first thing which one notices

\textsuperscript{25} As we have indicated earlier that Goldziher's study is considered to be one of the most significant in the field of \textit{Hadīth} and has had and continues to have great influence on those who work in this important area; as such it merits close examination.

\textsuperscript{26} For example, see his remarks on al-Zuhri concerning the mosque of Jerusalem as well as diverting the pilgrimage from Makkah to Jerusalem, and their impact on the following writers:

- c) Buhl, F., art. al-Kuds, in \textit{EF}, ii, 1098.


1. Law as such fell outside the sphere of religion. The Prophet did not aim to create a new system of jurisprudence. His authority was not legal. As far as believers were concerned, he derived his authority from the truth of his religious message; skeptics supported him for political reasons.

2. The ancient schools of law, which are still the major recognized schools today, were born in the early decades of the second century A.H. By \textit{sunnah} they originally understood the “living tradition” (\textit{al-anur al-mujtamā’} ‘\textit{alaih}'), that is, the ideal practices of the community expressed in the accepted doctrine of the school of law. This early concept of \textit{sunnah}, which was not related to the sayings and deeds of the Prophet, formed the basis of the legal theory of these schools.

3. These ancient schools of law gave birth to an opposition party, religiously inspired, that falsely produced detailed information about the Prophet in order to establish a source of authority for its views on jurisprudence.

4. The ancient schools of law tried to resist these factions, but when they saw that the alleged traditions from the Prophet were being imposed more and more on the early concept of \textit{sunnah}, they concluded that “the best they could do was to minimize their import by interpretation, and to embody their own attitude and doctrines in other alleged traditions from the Prophet” - that is, they joined in the deception.

5. As a result, during the second and third centuries A.H. it became the habit of scholars to project their own statements into the mouth of the Prophet.

6. Hardly any legal tradition from the Prophet can, therefore, be considered authentic.

7. The system of \textit{isnād} (“chain of transmitters”), used for the authentication of \textit{hadīth} documents, has no historical value. It was invented by those scholars who were falsely attributing
about his research is that he does not refer to the role of the Qur'ān and activity of
the Prophet in relation to the Sunnah, despite the fact that this is a vital matter, the
most cursory examination of which brings to light evidence which calls into question
Goldziher's views. 28

In fact, a number of western studies let pass the role of the Qur'ān in
confirming and elevating the status of the Sunnah amongst the Muslims and in
urging them to follow and act in accordance with it. In addition, these studies do not
examine the Qur'anic events related to the disobedience of the Prophet and his
commands and prohibitions, and the impact of this on the first generation of Muslims
in particular. Furthermore, the Prophetic activity which confirmed and
complemented the role of the Qur'ān in the preservation and propagation of his
Sunnah is neglected, while the collections of Ḥadīth are full of descriptions of such
activity. Indeed, this trait is evident in a number of western studies related to Ḥadīth,
where the authors refer to and quote from the books of Ḥadīth in order to support
their conclusions, while at the same time disregarding many aspects of the same
books that contradict their theories, and Goldziher's work also exhibits this tendency.
In addition, regarding various topics, Goldziher neglects to refer to Ḥadīth sources at
all, even though they contain a great deal of essential information on the issue at
hand, and instead opts for a selection of historical works which he uses in support of
his contentions.

28 A'zami made a similar observation when he said, "The first drawback in the setting of this picture is
the complete omission of any reference which could shed some light on educational activities in [sic]
early days." See A'zami, p. 11.
In the light of this, this dissertation focuses on the study and analysis of three main issues:

A. The role of the Qur’an in establishing the Sunnah and affirming its status and the importance of acting in accordance with it.

B. The role of the Prophet in propagating and preserving the Sunnah.

C. Goldziher’s main evidence for his assertions regarding the fabrication of Ḥadīth during the Umayyad era.

Hence, this dissertation has been divided into two parts, along with an introduction and conclusion. In Chapter 1 of the first part, special attention has been given to two issues: First, a clarification of the Qur’an’s urgent requirement for the Sunnah since the revelation of the first verses is presented, and second; an examination of the Qur’an’s detailed explanation of the importance of the Sunnah and the importance of following and acting according to it. This chapter consists of six sections and a conclusion: Section 1 sheds light on the nature of the Qur’anic texts and their need of the Sunnah as well as providing an exhaustive or absolute study of one example of the Qur’anic texts in order to prove this point; Section 2 demonstrates that the term Sunnah in the sense of ‘Sunnah of the Prophet’ is not mentioned specifically in the Qur’an, but instead is indicated or referred to by terms such as ‘bayān,’ ‘al-rasūl,’ ‘ma’rūf’ and ‘ḥikmāh’ in a number of places. Section 3 presents a discussion of the Qur’an’s command to follow the Sunnah of the Prophet by obeying him. Section 4 presents a discussion of the Qur’an’s main approaches in encouraging the Companions to follow the Prophet’s commands, prohibitions and...
INSTRUCTION

Chapter 2 of the first part aims to present and discuss the theoretical and practical roles that were performed by the Prophet in order to preserve his Sunnah and spread it among the Muslims. This chapter consists of eight sections and a conclusion: Section 1 presents a discussion of the Prophet's explanation of the status of Sunnah through different forms and methods; Section 2 presents a discussion of the Prophet's exhortation and instruction to his Companions to memorize Hadith and the effect that this had on their behaviour; Section 3 presents a discussion of the Prophet's methods of urging and commanding his Companions to convey his Hadith and the regulations governing that conveyance; Section 4 examines the Prophet's permission and command to his Companions to write down Hadith, and their attitude towards that; Section 5 discusses the extensive efforts made by the Prophet in spreading and establishing the Sunnah in other regions by means of letters. This chapter also includes a more detailed discussion of a specific subject that was contained in a number of these letters; Section 6 discusses the efforts made by the

---

29 This is done through reference to the main books of Hadith which are considered to constitute one of the main sources, not excepting western scholars. Goldziher alleges the fabrication of Hadith, yet cites hadiths found in the books of Hadith such as al-Bukhari; Muslim; Abi Dawud; al-Tirmidhi; al-
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Prophet in the propagation of his *Sunnah* in other regions by means of envoys; Section 7 examines the nature of the incoming delegations and their instruction in the *Sunnah*; Section 8 presents a discussion of the Prophet's teaching of the *Sunnah* to his Companions, and the role this played in establishing it. In addition, an in depth examination of his teaching of one specific area will be presented. Finally, the conclusion summarizes the main points of the discussion and presents the findings of the study. 30

Part Two attempts a rigorous study of Goldziher's theory regarding the fabrication of the *Hadīth*, and consists of an introduction, five chapters and a conclusion: In the introduction, we give a general view of Goldziher's theory regarding the fabrication of *Hadīth* in the Umayyad era; Chapter 3 contains an analysis of the evidence he cites in support of his claim that the Companions had fabricated *Hadīth*, and consists of five sections; Chapter 4 attempts an analysis of the evidence he cites in support of his claim that pious scholars fabricated *Hadīth* during the Umayyads' rule, and consists of seven sections; Chapter 5 contains an analysis of his evidence regarding the Umayyads' fabrication of *Hadīth*, and consists of five sections; Chapter 6 contains an analysis of his evidence regarding the theologians' fabrication of *Hadīth* and consists of four sections; Chapter 7 contains the impact of Goldziher's opinions on subsequent studies, and is followed by the conclusion which includes the results of the study and an appraisal of Goldziher's methodology.

Nasā'ī; Ibn Mājah; Musnad Aḥmad; al-Muwaṭṭa'; al-Dārimi, etc., in support of his arguments, when these are the very sources that he is attempting to prove to be unreliable.

30 These two chapters could have been omitted had there existed a detailed study of the two issues that they deal with. However, modern researchers have failed to give due attention to these two vital issues.
Methodology and domain of the study

In Chapter One of the first part we attempt to analyse the nature of various parts of the Qur'ānic texts and to establish to what extent and in what ways they have a requirement for what is called Sunnah. We will also explore the Quranic texts which establish the status of Sunnah and the importance of following it and acting according to it.

In Chapter Two of the same part we attempt a study of some of the most important roles that were carried out by the Prophet, with a separate section allocated to each role. We will analyse and carry out a descriptive study of these roles and give as much evidence as we can in the main text. We will exert as much effort as possible to mention in the footnotes as many different sources as possible in which the evidence relevant to the issue under discussion is mentioned. This is to indicate that the evidence exists in a repeated form and has come through more than one chain of transmission (isnād).

Part Two consists of the study, evaluation and analysis of Goldziher's theories and opinions which requires patience, extensive reading, thorough scrutiny and the tracing of his evidence to its original sources. This is in addition to having a thorough understanding of the significance and implications of proof texts, while comparing them with the narrations and appraising them in the context of the events surrounding them, in order to arrive at what they, in reality, aim at. It lies outwith our aims and ability to discuss the entire contents of the second volume of Goldzihers'
book, *Muslim Studies*. We will confine ourselves to an analysis of the most significant evidence he provides relating to the fabrication of *Hadīth* during the Umayyad era, which he discusses in the first sections of his second chapter. In general, we will only study the evidence he cites as clearly indicating the fabrication of *Hadīth*, except where a wider scope is of benefit. Before discussing any claim made by Goldziher, we present it in his own words. We also present his sources within square brackets [ ]. Also, we have often found it useful to present the Arabic texts on which he bases his conclusions, in the original and in translation, so that they can be employed as references which indicate to what extent his understanding and deductions are correct. We will also present a number of items of evidence in the footnotes in their original language in order to enrich the discussion and to further illustrate essential aspects of various issues. On many points of discussion in this thesis, and in this part in particular, the presentation of one of the selection of evidences we have gathered in support of our arguments would be sufficient to establish their veracity. However, in many cases, we will, for the sake of comprehensiveness, present all of the available evidence.

As the aim of this part is to deal with the main issues discussed by Goldziher; it is noteworthy that there are issues raised by Goldziher, relating to the Umayyad era, which are not discussed here but which have been noted, as there may be an opportunity to consider them in the future. It seems, however, that the issues that are presented and discussed in this part are the most important ones and can be considered to constitute the premise on which other issues are based.

**Points to which attention should be drawn**
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1. The system of transliteration shown in the 'key to transliteration' is adopted throughout the thesis, with the exception of direct quotations. In general, an attempt has been made to translate the Arabic terms and give their Arabic form in brackets afterwards where this was felt necessary. However, some terms are used in their transliterated form after the English translation has been given. Certain well-known terms have been given in their Arabic form only. Such terms include 'Sunnah' and 'Hadīth'. Where necessary the English plural has been used for such words. Well-known place names have been given in their English forms, e.g. Egypt, Syria, Oman, with the exceptions of 'Makkah' and 'Madinah'. Other place names are given either fully transliterated or in a compromise form.

2. In quoting the Qur'ān, I am dependent on the revised edition of the translation of the meanings of the Qur'ān, by Dr. Muhammad Taqi-ud Din al-Hilali and Dr. Muhammad Muhsin Khan. Infrequently, I have found it favorable to amend the translation where it seems to me the meaning can be better reflected.

3. Regarding the hadīths, I have benefited from the following translations: Sahīh al-Bukhārī by Muḥammad Muhsin Khan; Sahīh Muslim by ‘Abdul Ḥamīd Siddīqī; Sunan AbīDāwūd by Aḥmad Ḥasan; incomplete translation of Sunan Ibn Mājah by Muḥammad Tufail Anṣārī; the first volume of Sunan al-Nasā’ī by Muḥammad Iqbāl Siddīqī and translations of al-Muwatta' by Mohammed Rahimuddin and F. Amira Zrein Matraji respectively.

4. Where texts are referred to in the footnotes, an abbreviation is given, and followed by a number or one or two letters when the author has more than one book quoted in
this thesis; this number or letter indicates the book cited, which can thus be readily
identified in the abbreviations list.

5. In the various editions of Šaḥīḥ al-Bukārī, Šaḥīḥ Muslim, Sunan Abī Dāwūd, Sunan al-Nasā‘ī, Sunan al-Tirmidhī, Sunan Ibn Mājah, Sunan al-Dārimī and Muwatta’ Mālik, the page, and sometimes the volume numbers, differ between the editions of a collection. Therefore, it is appropriate whenever we cite a certain text, to mention in footnote form the name of the Kitāb (book), the Bāb (chapter) number and the ḥadīth number (for example: Bukhārī, kitāb al-‘ilm, bāb no. 37, ḥadīth no. 104), and ignore the chapter numbers when we cite from Šaḥīḥ Muslim and Muwatta’ Mālik (for example: Muslim, kitāb al-imārah, ḥadīth no. 24). It will thus be easier to find the cited text in any edition. However, the reader is kindly requested to refer to the same edition that we have depended on, in the event of their wanting to check a ḥadīth that appears in the diagrams on pages 226-229. It is worth mentioning that the ḥadīth numbers cited in this thesis are sufficient only when the reader refers to the edition that we have used.

6. In some cases we find that it is appropriate to put some expressions between square brackets for clarity.

7. For the sake of abbreviation I have left out honorific, conventional statements, even in quotations, such as ‘Blessed and Exalted’ after the names of Allāh, ‘Peace be upon him’ after the names of the Prophets, and ‘May Allāh be pleased with him’ after the names of the Companions; Muslim readers are kindly requested to apply them as they read.
PART 1
THE QUR’ĀN AND THE PROPHET

Study And Analysis Of The Role Of The Qur’ān And The Prophet
Toward The Sunnah
The meaning of ‘ḥadīḥ’

The Arabic word ḥadīḥ (plural: ʾaḥādīḥ) literally means; ‘communication’; ‘speech’; ‘story’; or ‘conversation’, whether religious or secular, historical or contemporary. The word is employed in this sense in the Qurʾān and by the Prophet.

The use of the word ‘ḥadīḥ’ in the Qurʾān

The word ḥadīḥ is used in the Qurʾān in many different ways:

1. Speech

“...and of mankind is he who purchases idle ḥadīḥ (speech) to mislead (men) from the Path of Allāh without knowledge, and takes it (the Path of Allāh, the Verses of the Qurʾān) by way of mockery. For such there will be a humiliating torment (in the Hell-fire).” (Q. 31:6). See also: Q. 4:42; 4:78; 4:87; 4:140; 6:68 and 45:6.

2. Religious communication, message or the Qurʾān

“Perhaps, you, would kill yourself (O Muḥammad) in grief, over their footsteps (for their turning away from you), because they believe not in this Ḥadīḥ (the Qurʾān).” (Q. 18:6). See also: Q. 7:185; 39:23; 52:34; 53:59; 56:81; 68:44 and 77:50.

1 Whenever it is used as an adjective it means ‘new’.
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3. Historical story or tidings

"Has the hadith (story) reached you, of the honoured guests [three angels; Gabriel along with another two] of Abraham?" (Q. 51:24). See also: Q. 20:9; 79:15; and 85:17-18.

"Has there come to you the hadith (tidings) of the overwhelming (i.e. the Day of Resurrection)." (Q. 88:1) See also: Q. 12:111.

4. Current story of a secular, secret or conversation

"And (remember) when the Prophet disclosed a hadith (a secret) in confidence to one of his wives (Hafṣah), so when she told it (to another i.e. 'A'ishah), and Allah made it known to him, he informed part thereof and left a part. Then when he told her (Hafṣah) thereof, she said: 'Who told you this?' He said: 'The All-Knower, the All-Aware (Allāh) has told me.'" (Q. 66:3)

The use of the word ‘hadith’ by the Prophet

The word was used in the same sense by the Prophet as it is in the Qur’ān.

The following are a few examples:

1. Speech
Marwân and al-Miswar b. Makhramah reported that when the delegate of Hawâzin came to Allah’s Apostle, he got up and said to them, “... the most beloved hadîth (speech) to me, is the true one...”

Ibn ‘Abbâs narrated that the Prophet said, “Beware of transmitting my speech or action unless you know that I have said it or done it (ittaqû al-hadîtha `anni illä mà `âlimtum). For whoever tells a lie on me intentionally then (surely) let him occupy his seat in Hell-fire.”

2. Religious communication

Jâbir b. ‘Abd Allâh, says, “The prophet used to say in his khutbah..., ‘The most excellent hadîth is the book of Allâh, and the best guidance is Muḥammad’s guidance...’”

Narrated Abû Hurayrah I said, “O Allah’s Apostle! who will be the luckiest person who will gain your intercession on the Day of Resurrection?" The Prophet said, “O Abû Hurayrah! I have thought that none will ask me about this hadîth before you, as I know your longing for [the learning] of Hadîth (the sayings of the Prophet). The luckiest person who will have my intercession on the Day of Resurrection will be the one who said sincerely from the bottom of his heart: ‘None has the right to be worshipped but Allâh.’”

---

2 Bukhârî, k. al-Wâkâlah, ba. no. 7, h. no. 2308.
3 Tîrmidhî, k. al-Tafsîr, ba. no. 795; Musnad 1, vol. 1, P. 293,323; See also Ibn ‘Adî, vol. 1, P. 12; Mishkât, k. al-`Ilm, Chapter tow, h. no.232.
4 Musnad 3, h. no. 14022.
5 Bukhârî, k. al-Riqâ`î, bâ. no. 51, h. no. 6570; k. al-`Ilm, bâ. no. 33, h. no. 99; Musnad 3, h. no. 8641; Ibn Sa'd, vol. 2, p. 364; vol. 4, p. 330. When the Prophet remarked to Abû Hurayrah that he knew his anxiety about the Hadîth, he was referring to his own Hadîth.
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Zayd b. Thabit said, “I heard the Apostle of Allah say, ‘May Allah brighten a man who hears a hadith from us, learns it by heart and passes it on to others. Many a bearer of knowledge conveys it to one who is more versed than he is, and many a bearer of knowledge is not versed in it.’”

3. Historical story

Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī narrated that the Prophet said, “Narrate hadith from me and do not tell a lie about me for whoever tells a lie on me intentionally then (surely) let him occupy his seat in Hell-fire. You may narrate hadith from Banū Isrā‘īl.”

4. Current story, secret or conversation

Jābir b. ‘Abd Allah reported that the Prophet says, “If someone tells a hadith (secret) then goes his way, his words become a trust.”

Ibn ‘Abbās narrated that the Prophet said, “... One who tries to eavesdrop on the hadith (conversation) of the people when they dislike his doing so and want to keep away from him, in the Hereafter hot copper would be poured in his ear...”

The examples above indicate that the word hadith connotes ‘speech’, ‘story’ or ‘communication.’

Due to the profound influence of Islam, the broad meaning of hadith has changed. The Muslims, since the lifetime of the Prophet himself, have called reports

---

6 Dāwūd, k. al-‘Ilm, b. no. 10, h. no. 3660.
7 Musnad 3, h. no. 11032.
8 Tirmithī, k. al-Bīr ra al-ṣilah, b. no. 39, h. no. 1959.
9 Bukhārī, k. al-Ta’bīr, b. no. 45, h. no. 7042; Dāwūd, k. al-Adab, b. no. 96, h. no. 5024; Musnad 3, h. no. 3373.
of his sayings and actions ‘Hadîth’, and, over time, use of the word became increasingly confined to such reports.

The Prophet himself appears to have used the term in this sense as we have seen in some of the above examples, as did many Companions. ‘Ā’ishah meant the Ḥadîth of the Prophet when she said, “... the Apostle of Allâh never related the Ḥadîth so quickly as you do.”10 When he asked his companions not to narrate too many Ḥadîths, ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb was referring to the Ḥadîth of the Prophet.11 When Ibn ‘Abbâs informed his Companions that they used to memorize the Ḥadîth (kunna nafsâz al-Ḥadîth), he meant Prophetic Ḥadîth.12 Also, when he13 and Abû Sa‘îd al-Khudrî14 urged their students to revise the Ḥadîth, they also were referring to Prophetic Ḥadîth. Likewise, when Abû Mûsâ15 and Abû Sa‘îd al-Khudrî16 commanded their students to memorize the Ḥadîth, as they did in the time of the Prophet, they intended by that the Ḥadîth of the Prophet.

SUNNAH, ITS MEANING AND USAGE

The meaning of ‘sunnah’

---

10 Bukhârî, k. al-Manâqib, bâ. no. 23, h. no. 3568.
12 Dârimî, al-Mugaddimah, bâ. 38, h. no. 427.
13 Ibid., bâ. 51, h. no. 600.
14 Ibid., h. no. 595.
15 Bayân, p. 66.
16 Ibid., p. 64.
Arabic lexicographers define *sunnah* as follows: 'a way, course, rules, mode or manner of acting, or conduct of life.' \(^{17}\)

The word ‘*sunnah*’ occurs sixteen times in the Qur’ān; in every case in the sense of an established course of rule, a law, or mode of conduct. \(^{18}\)

**The use of the word ‘*sunnah*’ in the Qur’ān**

The word ‘*sunnah*’ is used in the Qur’ān in two forms:

1. The *sunnah* of Allāh with regards to the ancients (*sunnat al-awwālīn*)
   
   “And nothing prevents men from believing, (now) when the guidance (the Qur’ān) has come to them, and from asking Forgiveness from their Lord, except that the Sunnah (the way) of the ancients be repeated with them (i.e. their destruction as decreed by Allāh), or the torment be brought to them face to face?” (Q. 18: 55). See also: Q. 3: 137; 4: 26; 8: 38; 15: 13; 17: 77 and 35: 43.

2. The *sunnah* of Allāh (*sunhat Allāh*)
   
   “There is no blame on to the Prophet in that which Allāh has made legal for him. That has been Allāh’s Sunnah (practice; way) with those who have passed away of (the Prophets of) old. And the command of Allāh is a decree determined.” (Q. 33: 38). See also: Q. 17: 77; 33: 62**; 35: 43**; 40: 85 and 48: 23**

**The use of the word ‘*sunnah*’ by the Prophet**

1. Mālik b. Anas in his book *al-Muwatta’* states that the Prophet said, ‘I have left two matters with you. As long as you hold to them, you will never go astray. They are the Book of Allāh and the Sunnah of His Prophet.’ \(^{19}\) A similar statement is

---


\(^{19}\) Mālik, k. *al-qadar*, h. no. 3.
recorded in Ibn Isḥāq’s 

\[ \text{Sirāh}, \text{where Ibn Isḥāq (d. 151/768) mentions that the} \]

\[ \text{Prophet said in his sermon at the Farewell ḥaṭṭ,} \]

\[ \text{I c“Ical11LBýfi. a.; a:. ýýavlul=Scl IJ. f} \]

\[ \text{... I have left with you something which if you will hold fast to it you will never go} \]

\[ \text{astray, a plain indication, the book of Allāh and the Sunnah of His Prophet, so give} \]

\[ \text{good heed to what I say...} \]

\[ 20 \]

2. Ibn Isḥāq (d. 151/768) mentioned that, the Prophet sent Khālid b. al-Walīd to Banū al-Ḥārith b. Ka'b in Najrān in year ten. He ordered him to invite them to embrace Islam before he fought them. If they embraced Islam, then he should teach them Islam, the book of Allāh and the Sunnah of the Prophet. \[ 21 \]

Khālid wrote to the Prophet informing him that they had embraced Islam and that he had stayed with them to teach them the Qurʿān and Sunnah." \[ 22 \]

The Prophet subsequently asked him to come back to Madīnah in the company of their delegation. \[ 23 \]

When they left, the Prophet sent 'Amr b. Ḥazm as a replacement with the same task; to instruct them in religion and to teach them the Sunnah and the principles of Islam. \[ 24 \]

3. Al-‘Irbāḍ b. Sāriyah said, ‘One day the Apostle of Allāh led us in prayer, then faced us and gave us a lengthy exhortation at which eyes shed tears and hearts were afraid. A man said, ‘Apostle of Allāh! It seems as if it were a farewell exhortation, so what injunction do you give us?’ He then said,

\[ \text{“وَسَبِّحْنَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا بِاللَّهِ وَمَسَأَلَ عَنْهُمْ مَا كَانَ مِنْهُ وَسَلَّمْنَهُ وَسَلَّمْنَهُ مَنْ كَانَ مِنْهُ مَرَاحَا لَعِينًا كَبِيرًا وَقَلْبًا كُبْرَا فَعَلَّيْنَكُمْ بَيْنَكُمْ سَبِّحُنَا وَسَلَّمُنَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا بِاللَّهِ وَمَسَأَلَ عَنْهُمْ مَا كَانَ مِنْهُ وَسَلَّمْنَهُ وَسَلَّمْنَهُ مَنْ كَانَ مِنْهُ مَرَاحَا لَعِينًا كَبِيرًا.} \]

\[ 20 \text{Hishām 1, vol. 2, p. 604; Mustadrak, vol. 1, pp. 171-2.} \]

\[ 21 \text{Hishām 1, vol. 2, p. 592; Ibn Sa'd, vol. 1, p. 339.} \]

\[ 22 \text{Hishām 1, vol. 2, pp. 592-3.} \]

\[ 23 \text{Ibn Sa'd, vol. 1, p. 339; Hishām 1, vol. 2, p. 593.} \]

\[ 24 \text{Hishām 1, vol. 2, pp. 594-6.} \]
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'I enjoin you to fear Allāh, and to hear and obey even if it be an Abyssinian slave, for those of you who live after me will see great disagreement. You must then follow my Sunnah and that of the rightly-guided caliphs. Hold to it and stick fast to it. Avoid novelties, for every novelty is an innovation, and every innovation is an error.‘

4. He firmly objected to those who violated his Sunnah, even, as in this case, when the violation consisted of an excess committed with the intention of emulating him more closely. Anas b. Mālik said, "A group of three men came to the houses of the wives of the Prophet asking how the Prophet worshipped (Allāh). When they were informed about that, they considered their worship insufficient and said, 'Where are we in relation to the Prophet as his past and future sins have been forgiven.' Then one of them said, 'I will offer the prayer throughout the night forever.' The other said, 'I will fast throughout the year and will not break my fast.' The third said, 'I will keep away from women and will never marry.' Allāh’s Apostle came to them and said, 'Are you the same people who said so and so? By Allāh, I am more submissive to Allāh and more afraid of Him than you, yet I fast and break my fast, I do sleep and I also marry women. So he who turns away from my Sunnah, is not from me (i.e. not one of my followers).’

5. `Amr b. `Awf narrated that the Prophet said, "He who revives a sunnah of mine that was extinct after me, would also receive a reward the same as that of one of the people that acts upon it, without any diminution in people’s rewards...."

6. `Abd Allāh [Ibn Mas‘ūd] is reported to have said that the Prophet said, "After me the men in charge of your affairs will be those who will make extinct the Sunnah (practice of the Prophet), act upon an innovation ...."
7. Hudhayfah narrated, “Allâh’s Apostle related to us, two hadîths one of which I have seen fulfilled and I am waiting for the fulfilment of the other. The Prophet told us that: ‘The virtue of honesty descended in the roots of men’s hearts (from Allâh) and then they learned it from the Qur’ân and then they learned it from the Sunnah.’ The Prophet....”

8. Some desert Arabs clad in woollen clothes came to Allâh’s Apostle. He saw them in a sad plight as they had been hard pressed by need. He (the Prophet) exhorted people to give charity, but they showed some reluctance until (signs) of anger could be seen on his face. Then a man from the Anşâr came with a purse containing silver. Then came another one and then other people followed them in succession until signs of happiness could be seen on his face. Thereupon Allâh’s Apostle said,

“He who establishes a good sunnah (practice) in Islam, which is followed after him (by people), will be assured a reward like those who followed it, without their rewards being diminished in any respect. And he who establishes an evil sunnah (practice) in Islam which is followed subsequently by others, he will bear the burden like that of those who followed this (evil practice) without theirs being diminished in any respect.”

Thus, in all these quotations the word has been used in its literary meaning, and it appears in this sense in the Qur’ân. Any individual can establish a good or bad sunnah, as we have seen in the last example, if it is followed by others. The word sunnah as a term ‘sunnah of the Prophet’ came into common use during the life of the Prophet as used by him in the above examples and by Allâh when He ordered...
obedience to the Prophet as binding on the Muslims, and stipulated that they should take his life as an example.\textsuperscript{31}

In time, the term came to refer almost exclusively to the \textit{Sunnah} of the Prophet, so that, towards the end of the second century when it appeared in legal texts, it referred almost exclusively to the norms set by the Prophet or deduced from his behaviour or authentic \textit{ahādīḥ}.

The terms \textit{sunnah} and \textit{ḥadīḥ} were, to a large extent, used interchangeably despite the existence of a slight difference between their meanings: \textit{Ḥadīḥ} means ‘the narration of the life of the Prophet’; \textit{Sunnah} means ‘mode of life’; and the \textit{Sunnah} of the Prophet means ‘the mode of the life of the Prophet.’\textsuperscript{32} Nevertheless, a \textit{ḥadīḥ} may contain one or more \textit{sunnah}, but on occasion may contain none at all. However, to avoid confusion in this thesis, we shall use them as interchangeable terms, as has been the practice of the majority of Muslim scholars up until this day.

\textsuperscript{31} See Chapter 1 of the first part.

\textsuperscript{32} Al-Azami discusses the claim of various modern scholars that Shāfī‘ī was the first to define \textit{sunnah} as the model behavior of the Prophet. He says, “As I have mentioned earlier, the term \textit{‘sunnah’} as such is not restricted to the \textit{‘sunnah’} of the Prophet. Therefore we find this term sometimes used for others than the Prophet as well, which resulted in some misunderstanding by modern scholars. It is claimed by some modern scholars that Shāfī‘ī was the first to define \textit{sunnah} as the model behaviour of the Prophet. The problem would not have arisen if they had realized that the concept of \textit{sunnah} predated the definition of that term.

The powers of legislation, for example, are determined by the constitutions of modern states. When constitutions endorse the legislative powers and the range of their legislation, nobody can challenge them or claim rightfully that he is not to be bound by them. Thus - according to Islamic concepts - it is not for the lawyers but for Almighty Allah who is the Law-Giver to determine the legislative authority if there is any.

The Qur’ān never says that the source of law is \textit{sunnah} so that the early time of obedience to the Messenger of Allah, which is obligatory, and mentions his example which ought to be followed. Therefore, even if one agrees that the early scholars used this word or term in a broad sense, it should not create any perplexity because the source of law is not this particular ‘word’ or ‘term’ but the concept which derives its authority directly from the Qur’ān.

When we come to this concept, we find it is clearly endorsed by the Qur’ān, as we have seen earlier, and explicitly accepted by early lawyers. Hence we may conclude that the \textit{sunnah} of the Prophet is a must for Muslims, be they individuals, communities or states.” See Methodology, pp. 7-8.

\textsuperscript{30}
CHAPTER 1
THE QUR’ĀN AND THE SUNNAH

Study And Analysis Of The Role Of The Qur’ān In Establishing The Sunnah, And Affirming Its Status And The Importance Of Acting In Accordance With It

Section 1: The Qur’ān’s urgent requirement for the Sunnah.
Section 2: The Qur’ān and the term ‘the Sunnah of the Prophet.’
Section 3: The Qur’ān’s command to follow the Sunnah of the Prophet by obeying him.
Section 4: The Qur’ānic approaches to indicating the necessity of (e.g. targhib and tarhib) following of the Sunnah.
Section 5: The Qur’ān’s commanding to abide by what the Prophet has brought, abstain from what he has forbidden, and accept his judgement.
Section 6: A review of events described in the Qur’ān which demonstrate that obedience to the Sunnah of the Prophet is required of Muslims, which includes the following of his commands, prohibitions, judgements, decisions and instructions. Three examples are given below:

1. The punishment described in the Qur’ān as being inflicted on the believers who disobey the Sunnah of the Prophet (his order).
2. The objection stated in the Qur’ān to those who reject the Sunnah of the Prophet (his judgement or decision).
3. The acceptance described in the Qur’ān of the repentance of the three Companions who did not carry out the Sunnah (his command).

Conclusion: Presents the findings that the present chapter has reached.
SECTION 1

THE QUR'ĀN'S URGENT REQUIREMENT FOR THE SUNNAH

When explaining in what way the Qur’ān helped in the preservation and spread of Prophetic hadīths, it is useful to begin by posing the question, ‘Why refer to the Qur’ān?’ In other words, ‘Why consider the Qur’ān as an indisputable reference?’ The answer is simply that a scientific approach makes it incumbent on every researcher, regardless of his personal beliefs, to do so if the subject of his research is Islam, its Prophet or the Muslims. A non-Muslim may doubt the Qur’ān’s divine origin, but if Islam and its adherents fall within the scope of his research, he should also be able to approach it in the light of what Muslims unanimously assert; that the Holy Qur’ān is authentic and to be acted upon.

It might seem novel to say that the Qur’ān was one of the most important factors in necessitating the existence of Hadīth texts and their preservation and dissemination, and indeed, was so from the beginning of its revelation. On looking closely at the Qur’ān, we find that most of its rulings are of a general nature, and that there are various verses that require further elucidation regarding, for example:

A. Matters of creed, such as: belief in the angels; the Prophets; the Last Day; predestination; the straight path; the balance; judgement etc;

b. ritual questions regarding: purification; prayer; zākāh; fasting; ḥajj; umrah; and the slaughtering of animals;

c. business transactions including: buying and selling; usury; lending; mortgages etc;
d. questions of penalties, such as: those which pertain to physical or sexual assault; slander; or assault on property etc.

For this reason, the Qurʾān, on several occasions, entrusts the Prophet alone with the task of explaining and detailing the rulings made in those verses, including the following:

1. "We sent not a messenger except with the language of his people, in order that he might make (the Message) clear for them." (Q. 14:4)

2. "... And we have also sent down unto you (O Muhammad) the Qurʾān (al-Dhikr) that you may explain clearly to men (li-tubayyina li-l-nās) what is sent down to them, and that they may give thought." (Q. 16:44)

3. "Indeed Allāh conferred a great favour on the believers when He sent among them a Messenger (Muhammad) from among themselves, reciting unto them His Verses (the Qurʾān), and purifying them (from sins by their following him), and instructing them (in) the Book (the Qurʾān) and al-hikmah (the Sunnah of the Prophet i.e. his legal ways, statements, acts of worship), while before that they had been in manifest error." (Q. 3:164)

If we look closely at the text of the second verse, which is most relevant to the point in question, we find that the verse has not permitted the believers to exercise their personal thinking except after understanding the meaning of the Qurʾān. The task of explaining such meanings was entrusted to the Prophet himself; he was naturally the most knowledgeable of people regarding its content and language. Therefore, the Companions did not venture to interpret the Qurʾān by
themselves when something was unclear to them, referring the matter instead to the Prophet. There are numerous examples of this, such as:

a) On hearing the verse

“It is those who believe (in the Oneness of Allah and worship none but Him Alone) and taint not their faith with zulm. For them (only) there is security and they are the guided,” (Q. 6:82)

the Companions took the word *zulm* to refer to wrong-doing in general which includes every wrong, however minor. This created great difficulty for them, and they therefore asked the Prophet, “Which of us has not tainted his faith by committing some wrong?” He replied, “(The wrong which is referred to here) is not what you have in mind. Have not you heard what Luqmān said to his son:

‘... O my son! Join not in worship others with Allah. Verily joining others in worship with Allah is a great wrong (zulm) indeed.’ (Q. 31:13)"

b) When the Companions heard the verse

“... And eat and drink, until the white thread appears to you distinct from the black thread ...,” (Q. 2:187)

some of them took the terms ‘the white thread’ and ‘the black thread’ literally. As such, some people, when they wanted to fast, bound two strings about their feet, one white and one black and continued to eat until they could distinguish between them.
‘Adī Ibn Ḥātim used to place two threads under his pillow, one white and one black, by which he could tell the coming of fajr time. When he told the Prophet about this, the Prophet explained to him that the terms ‘black thread’ and ‘white thread’ refer to the brightness of day being distinct from the darkness of night.\(^2\)

The ‘tabyīn’ (explanation) mentioned in the verse: “that you may explain clearly to men” (li-tubayyina li-l-nās), includes two types of elucidation. The first clarifies how one recites the Qur’ān and conveys its message to other people, and this is what is meant by the verse: “O Apostle, proclaim (the message) which has been sent down to you from your Lord.” (Q. 5: 67)\(^3\) and the verse: “Recite (O Muḥammad) what has been revealed to you of the Book (the Qur’ān).” (Q. 29: 45)\(^4\)

The second sense is that of the explanation of the technical meaning of a word, sentence or verse which may need to be elucidated for people. This most often pertains to the verses which have a general meaning, in which case the Prophet’s explanation clarifies the specific, particularizes the general, qualifies the absolute and amplifies what is concise. This kind of explanation embraces the terms ‘Hadīth’ and ‘Sunnah’, with reference to the Prophet’s words, and ‘tabyīn’ or ‘bayān’ in Qur’ānic terminology.

\(^{1}\) Bukhārī, k. al-Tafsīr, s. no. 2, bā. no. 28, h. no. 4509, 4510-1, k. al-Šawm, bā. no. 16, h. no. 1916-7; Muslim, k. al-Šiyām, h. no. 33-35; Dāwud, k. al-Šawm, bā. no. 17, h. no. 2349; Nasā’ī, k. al-Šiyām, bā. no. 29, h. no. 2169, Tirmidhī, k. al-Tafsīr, bā. no. 3, h. no. 2970-1.

\(^{2}\) Bukhārī, k. al-Iḥānāt, bā. no. 23, h. no. 32, k. al-Anbiya’, bā. no. 8, h. no. 3360, bā. no. 41, h. no. 3428-9, k. al-Tafsīr, s. no. 6, bā. no. 3, h. no. 4629, s. no. 31, bā. no. 1, h. no. 4776, and other places; Muslim, k. al-Iḥānāt, 197-8; Tirmidhī, k. al-Tafsīr, bā. no. 7, h. no. 3067; Musnad3, h. no. 3589,4031 & 4240.

\(^{3}\) (نَّا أَوْحَيُ لِيُحِبَّنَ ۚ أَنْ أَلْقَيَتْنِي عَلَيْكُمْ رَبَّكَ)

\(^{4}\) (وَلَأَنَّا أَوْحَيْنَا إِلَيْكَ رَبَّكَ)}
In Qurṭubī’s *Tafsīr,* he states: “that you may explain clearly to men what is sent down to them,” the Prophet explains on behalf of Allāh the rulings of ṣalāḥ and zakāh, which He generalised in His Book, and other matters which were not mentioned in detail.”⁵ In *al-Khāżin’s Tafsīr,* it is stated: “that you may explain clearly to men what is sent down to them’, refers to the rulings of the Qur’ān that are general. The explanation of the Qur’ān is to be sought in the Sunnah and the one who explains that which is general is the Prophet himself.”⁶

Muslim scholars have stressed that the *Sunnah* of the Prophet is very important in its explanation of the meanings of the Qur’ān and its rulings. Those scholars include, among others: al-Shāfi‘ī;⁷ al-Shāţibi;⁸ Ibn Ḥazm⁹ and al-Marwazī.¹⁰

Let us now scrutinize these statements, with specific reference to the aspect of worship, and in particular the verses relating to ṣalāḥ which constitutes, for Muslims, one of the most important pillars of their religion. First of all, we find that the word

---

⁶ Vol. 4, p. 76.
⁷ Shāfi‘ī’s *R*, p. 22: “Bayān includes what Allāh ordained in His Book and explained in the Prophet’s words such as the number of prayers to be performed, the zakāh and its frequency and other ordinances contained in His Book.”
⁸ Shāţibi, vol. 4, p. 11: “Sunnah as has been shown, details the general statements in the Qur’ān, qualifies the absolute and particularizes what is general and thus it gives Qur’ānic phrasings meanings different from their apparent meaning in the language. Thus you should know that the bayān of the Sunnah refers to what Allāh intends from such expressions.”
⁹ Ibn Ḥazm, vol. 1, p. 121: “It is true that the Prophet was commanded to explain the Qur’ān clearly to men. The Qur’ān contains many general statements such as those regarding prayer, zakāh and ḥajj etc., from which we cannot tell what Allāh has ordained for us from the words used.”
¹⁰ Al-Sunnah, p. 31: “I have found that the fundamentals of all compulsory duties can not be interpreted or acted upon except through the explanation provided by the Prophet such as in the case of ṣalāḥ, zakāh, fasting, ḥajj and jihād.”
‘al-ṣalāh’ alone occurs sixty-seven times in the Qurʾān, and in total the verses which have to do with the topic of prayer number about one hundred. If we look at the subject matter of these verses, we find that generally speaking they deal with the following:

i) The ordination of ṣalāh for the believers;

ii) the commendation of those who perform ṣalāh;

iii) the reward for the performance of ṣalāh;

iv) giving warning against not performing ṣalāh regularly, and the consequences of not doing so;

v) reporting the attitude of previous peoples toward ṣalāh, whether negative or positive;

vi) the manner of performing ṣalāt al-khawf (i.e., ṣalāh performed when in face of danger in times of war);

vii) a description of the ṣalāh of hypocrites.

vii) In addition, we find the command for believers to:

- perform ṣalāh punctually;
- have humility in ṣalāh;
- seek Allāh’s help through ṣalāh;
- carry out physical purification in order to perform ṣalāh, etc.

If we look solely at the verses which talk about the ordination of ṣalāh for the believers, we find that sixteen verses (Q. 2:43; 2:83; 2:110; 2:238; 4:103; 6:72; 11:114; 14:31; 17:78; 22:78; 24:56; 29:45; 30:31; 33:33; 58:13; 62:9 and 73:20) contain what is in the main simply a general command for the believers to perform ṣalāh, with no specific instructions on how this should be done, or indeed on the number of ṣalāhs to be performed, the name of each ṣalāh, the specific times of

---

See Aljāz, entry: (și J ⬤).
Salaḥ, the duration of each salaḥ, the supplications to be uttered in salaḥ, what makes salaḥ valid, what invalidates it, and what a person should do to correct a mistake in salaḥ, or to make up an act of salaḥ which was forgotten. These questions, and many others besides, one might legitimately ask, but answers can not be found in the Qur’ān. However, they can be readily found in the sayings of the Prophet, his Companions and the Successors, which are recorded in Ḥadīth collections.

Every Ḥadīth collection contains tens, and some contain hundreds of hadīths which relate to the matter of salaḥ in one way or another, and it is inappropriate to cite all of the hadīths that relate to the question of salaḥ. However, by mentioning a few, in particular those where the times of the five salaḥs are specified, which are reported in various collections, we can clarify the role and necessity of such hadīths in explaining Qur’anic verses. Indeed, both hadīths that have a chain of narrators beginning with the Prophet and those that can be traced back instead to a Companion or a Successor of the Prophet serve this purpose.

* Mālik cites twelve reports in the Book of salaḥ, in the ‘Chapter on Times of salaḥ.\(^{12}\)

* Al-Shāfi‘ī cites in his Musnad eleven reports in the ‘Chapter on Facing the qiblah in salaḥ,’ hadīths no. 22-27 and 29-33.\(^{13}\)

---


\(^{13}\) Al-Musnad, pp. 26-29. The same hadīths are also cited in his book al-Umm, in the chapter Times of salaḥ, vol. 1, pp. 149-156.
PART I: Chapter 1

In Al-Shaybāni’s *Athār* there are seven reports. In the ‘Chapter on the Times of ṣalāh’ we find reports no. 65-67,¹⁴ dealing with this matter, and also related reports in the ‘Chapter on ṣalāhs that can be repeated and those which should not be repeated,’ namely reports no. 145, 148, 152 and 154.¹⁵

In Abū Yūsuf’s *Athār*, he cites eight reports, no. 90-92, 94-96, 98¹⁶ and 257.¹⁷

The above mentioned reports are either ḥadīths which have a chain of narrators beginning with the Prophet, or that can be traced back instead to a Companion or a Successor of the Companions. All of them have to do with explaining the beginning and end of the times of the five obligatory ṣalāh.

Thus we can conclude that various Qur’anic verses required ḥadīths to explain them from their time of revelation, and the Companions of necessity preserved them. This was because they were necessary in order for them to know how to perform their ṣalāh five times a day in its specifics as it was made compulsory for them from an early stage, and it is inconceivable that they performed their ṣalāh without first being aware of the right manner of doing so. In fact, they performed their ṣalāh in the manner of the Prophet, having learnt the entire format from him, to the extent that they have been described in the Qur’ān in the following words:

---

¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 29-31.
¹⁷ Ibid., p. 50.
Muhammad is the Apostle of Allāh; and those who are with him are severe against disbelievers, and merciful among themselves. You see them bowing and falling down prostrate (in prayer), seeking Bounty from Allāh and (His) Good pleasure. The mark of them i.e. of their Faith is on their faces (foreheads) from the traces of (their) prostration (during prayers).” (Q. 48:29)

A similar situation prevailed regarding the verses that deal with other compulsory acts of worship, such as those concerning ḥijāb, ḥajj etc. The same also applies to verses relating to doctrine and business transactions as well as to the question of penalties.
SECTION 2

THE QUR’ĀN AND THE TERM ‘THE SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET’

The term Sunnah is not mentioned specifically in the Qur’ān, but is referred to indirectly in a number of places using terms such as ‘tābīn, ‘al-rasūl, ‘ma’rūf,’ and ‘ḥikmah’.

1. The term ‘tābīn’ or ‘bayān’

“If we read closely the text of this verse, we find that the verse has not permitted the believers to reflect on a personal basis, except after having first understood the meanings of the Qur’ān. The task of understanding and explaining such meanings was entrusted to the Prophet himself, and he was naturally the most knowledgeable of people regarding its content and language. The explanation (tābīn) mentioned in the verse: “…that you may explain clearly to men (lī-tābīyīnā lī-l-nās) what is sent down to them, and that they may give thought.” (Q. 16:44)

If we read closely the text of this verse, we find that the verse has not permitted the believers to reflect on a personal basis, except after having first understood the meanings of the Qur’ān. The task of understanding and explaining such meanings was entrusted to the Prophet himself, and he was naturally the most knowledgeable of people regarding its content and language. The explanation (tābīn) mentioned in the verse: “…that you may explain clearly to men (lī-tābīyīnā lī-l-nās), as stated in the previous section, includes two types of explanation. The first is an explanation of how to recite the Qur’ān and convey its message to other people. The second is concerned with the explanation of the technical meaning of a word, sentence or verse that may need clarification. This is most often the case with verses which have a general meaning. Where this is the case, as was stated previously, the Prophet’s explanation clarifies the specific, particularizes the general, qualifies the
absolute and amplifies what is concise, embracing what is termed ‘Hadīṭh’ and ‘Sunnah’ in the Prophet’s words and ‘tabyīn’ or ‘bayān’ in the Qur’ānic terminology. In the previous section, we examined the opinions of a variety of Muslim scholars on what is meant by ‘tabyīn’ in the verse mentioned above, concluding that this verse contains a tacit command relating to the importance of following the Prophet’s Sunnah as it pertains to all of the Qur’ānic topics about which the Prophet talked and which are in need of some explanation by him.

2. The term ‘al-rasūl’ (Apostle)

“O you who believe! Obey Allāh, and obey al-rasūl [Muḥammad], and those charged with authority among you. [And] if you differ in anything among yourselves, refer it to Allāh and al-rasūl, if you believe in Allāh and the Last Day. That is better, and more suitable for final determination.” (Q. 4:59)

What is meant by the above directive to refer matters to Allāh and al-rasūl is that Muslims should refer firstly to the Qur’ān, and, secondly, to the Prophet during his lifetime, or to his Sunnah after his death. In his Tafsīr, Ibn Kathīr states that Mujāhid (d. 102/720) and a number of the predecessors in their interpretation of, “… refer it to Allāh and al-rasūl,” state that this means the Book of Allāh and the Sunnah of his Apostle.19 In Tafsīr al-Jalālayn it is taken to mean that the matter should be referred to the Book of Allāh, the Apostle in his lifetime and his Sunnah afterwards.20

---

18 See page 36.
20 Şuyūṭī TJ, vol. 1, p. 111.
3. The term ‘ma‘rūf’

"O Prophet! When believing women come to you to give you the pledge (bay‘ah) that they will not associate anything in worship with Allah, that they will not steal, that they will not commit adultery, that they will not kill their children, that they will not utter slander, intentionally forging falsehood (i.e. by attributing illegitimate children to their husbands), and that they will not disobey you in any ma‘rūf, then accept their bay‘ah, and ask Allah to forgive them. Verily Allah is Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful." (Q. 60:12)

In interpretation of "... that they will not disobey you in any ma‘rūf," Ibn Kathir says that it refers to whatever good action (ma‘rūf) the Prophet enjoined them to do and whatever evil he forbade them from committing. One of the women who took the oath of allegiance to the Prophet said, "One of the oaths which the Apostle of Allah received from us about the ma‘rūf was that we would not disobey him in it (ma‘rūf): that we would not scratch our faces; nor wail; nor tear the front of our garments; nor dishevel our hair." Salmah bt. ‘Umays, one of the Prophet’s aunts, said, "... I came to the Prophet in the company of some Anšārī women and gave the oath of allegiance to him. When he laid down some conditions on us ... that we should not disobey him in any ma‘rūf, he said, ‘You should not deceive your husbands.’ We gave him our oath on that and then departed. I said to one of the women, ‘Go back to the Apostle of Allah and ask him what ‘deceiving our husbands’ means?’ He said, ‘That she takes his money and gives it for the benefit of someone

21 Ibn Kathir, s. no. 60, v. no. 12.
22 Dawud, k. al-Janā’iz, bā. no. 29, ḫ. no. 1331.
Also, 'A'ishah said, "Allāh's Apostle used to examine the believing women who migrated to him in accordance with this verse: 'O Prophet! When believing women come to you to give bay'aḥ ... .' And if any of the believing women accepted the conditions [specified in the above-mentioned verse], Allāh's Apostle would say to her, 'I have accepted your pledge of allegiance.' ..." It seems that the Prophet used to see that this oath of allegiance was carried out. Ibn 'Abbās said, "I witnessed 'Īd al-ḍīpr prayer with Allāh's Apostle, Abū Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmān, and all of them offered it before delivering the sermon. Once the Prophet [after completing the prayer and the sermon] came down, and it is as if I am now looking at him waving at the men with his hand to sit down, and walked through them until he, along with Bilāl, reached the women. Then he recited, 'O Prophet! When believing women come to you to give the bay'aḥ ... .' Having finished, he said, 'Do you still remain on that?' One lady, and she was the only one who replied to the Prophet, said, 'Yes, O Allāh's Apostle.' In the same fashion, the Prophet took the oath of allegiance from men as well, that they should not disobey him in any ma'rīf, as he did with the women. 'Ubādah b. al-Ṣāmit said, "While we were with the Prophet, he said, 'Will you pledge allegiance to me that you will not worship anything besides Allāh, will not commit illegal sexual intercourse and will not steal?' Then he recited the verse concerning women."
Thus we can say that the expression, “they will not disobey you in any *ma’rūf*,” is a directive that they should not disobey the Prophet in any *sunnah*, whether a command or prohibition. On this basis we can say that the Qur’ān indicates that the believers are obliged to act according to the *Sunnah* of the Prophet.

4. The term ‘*ḥikmah*’

“Similarly (to complete My Blessings on you) We have sent among you an Apostle (Muḥammad) of your own, reciting to you Our Verses (the Qur’ān), and purifying you, and teaching you the Book [the Qur’ān] and al-*ḥikmah* and teaching you that which you used not to know.” (Q. 2:151)

“Indeed Allāh conferred a great favour on the believers when He sent among them an Apostle (Muḥammad) from among themselves, reciting unto them His Verses (the Qur’ān), and purifying them, and teaching them the Book (the Qur’ān) and al-*ḥikmah*, while before that they had been in manifest error.” (Q. 3:164)

“He it is Who sent among the Unlettered ones an Apostle (Muḥammad) from among themselves, reciting to them His Verses, purifying them, and teaching them the Book (the Qur’ān) and al-*ḥikmah*. And verily, they had been before in manifest error.” (Q. 62:2)

The previous verses indicate a variety of the Prophet’s tasks among which are the following:

A. Recitation of the verses;

B. teaching the Book (the Qur’ān);
C. teaching *al-ḥikmah*. Ibn Kathîr said, "*Ḥikmah* means *sunnah*, as is related by al-Ḥasan [d. 110/728], Qatâdah [d. 117/735], Muqâtil b. Ḥayyân [d. before 150/767] and Abû Mâlik";\(^{27}\)

D. and purifying them. Ibn Kathîr said that, "This refers to the Prophet’s enjoining good on them and forbidding them evil so that their souls would be purified from the evil of the pre-Islamic era."\(^{28}\)

It is clear, therefore, the Prophet performed other functions besides reciting to them and teaching them what is contained in the Qur’ān, which is itself *al-ḥikmah*, including their purification and instruction in what they were previously unaware of. The acquisition of the previous four elements can only be attained through the *Sunnah* of the Prophet.

Thus we can readily appreciate the importance of following the Prophet, and therefore his *Sunnah* which, as we have seen, is evident from the previous verses.

---

\(^{27}\) Ibn Kathîr, vol. 1, p. 185.

\(^{28}\) Ibid., p. 425.
SECTION 3

THE QUR’ĀN’S COMMAND TO FOLLOW THE SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET BY OBEYING HIM

When we examine the verses of the Qur’ān that are related to obedience to the Prophet, we find that a considerable number of them clearly indicate this to be obligatory. The obedience rendered to the Prophet by his Companions, and required of those who come after them entails that his commands, prohibitions and instructions should be accepted, whether they are found in the Qur’ān or are Sunnah. Many of the Qur’anic verses indicate the role of the Qur’ān in urging the Companions to obey the Prophet, and indeed, made it incumbent on them to accept all of his commands, prohibitions and instructions. In fact, there are many verses that contain the plain order that the Muslims should obey the Prophet. The following examples manifest this:

1. “O you who believe! Obey Allāh and obey the Apostle (Muḥammad), and those charged with authority among you ...” (Q. 4:59)

2. “O you who believe! Obey Allāh and His Apostle (Muḥammad), and turn not away from him (i.e. Muḥammad) while you are hearing.” (Q. 8:20)

3. “Say (O Muḥammad): ‘Obey Allāh, and obey the Apostle (Muḥammad), but if you turn away, he (the Apostle Muḥammad) is only responsible for the duty placed on him (i.e. to convey Allāh’s Message) and you for that placed on you. If...” (Q. 3:36)
you obey him, you shall be on the right guidance. The Apostle's duty is only to convey (the message) in a clear way (i.e. to preach in a plain way).” (Q. 24:54).

For further examples see also: Q. 3:32; 3:132; 5:92; 8:1; 8:24; 8:46; 24:56; 33:33; 47:33; 58:13; 64:12 and 64:16.
SECTION 4

THE QUR'ANIC APPROACHES TO INDICATING THE NECESSITY OF (E.G. TARGHĪB AND TARHĪB) FOLLOWING OF THE SUNNAH

The Qur'an uses language which awakens desire (targhīb), and also fear (tarhīb), in order that all the Prophet's commands and the prohibitions are accepted.

A. The method of awakening desire (targhīb) for following the Sunnah

The Qur'an clearly illustrates that obedience to Allāh and His Apostle leads to an enormous reward and benefit. We find several verses that clearly indicate that obedience to Allāh and His Apostle will result in good news. There is no doubt that this encouraged the Companions to accept everything, whether large or small, that came from the Prophet. The following verses indicate that whoever obeys Allāh and His Apostle;

1. "...will be admitted to Gardens under which rivers flow (in paradise), to abide therein, and that will be the great success." (Q. 4:13)

2. "... will be in the company of those on whom Allāh has bestowed His Grace... And how excellent these companions are!" (Q. 4:69)

3. "... has indeed obeyed Allāh... " (Q. 4:80)

4. "... will be successful." (Q. 7:157)

5. "... Allāh will have His mercy on them." (Q. 9:71)

6. "... are the successful." (Q. 24:52)

7. "... shall be on the right guidance." (Q. 24:54)
8. "... has indeed achieved a great achievement (i.e. he will be saved from the Hell-fire and will be admitted to Paradise)." (Q. 33:71)

9. "...(Allāh) will admit him to Gardens beneath which rivers flow (Paradise)..."(Q. 48:17)

10. "... (Allāh) will not decrease anything in reward for your deeds." (Q. 49:14)

B. The method of inducing fear (tarḥīb) for the following of the Sunnah

There are many verses in the Qur’ān which talk about the grievous end that met previous nations who disobeyed their Apostles. Jules La Beaume in his book Le Koran Analyse, mentions hundreds of verses which relate to this matter, particularly in Parts Three and Five of his book. Together they constitute a clear indication to the Companions and to those who come after them that they should obey the Prophet and abide by all the instructions contained within the Qur’ān and Sunnah, so as to avoid the destruction met by previous nations. Due to the fact that these verses are not related to the Prophet Muḥammad himself, I will not detail them here despite their effective contribution in forging the Companions into a community that obeyed the Prophet. I will, however, mention the following verses that state the bitter end that the Companions were warned would befall them in case of their disobedience to the Prophet.

B1. The threat of the negation of their faith

"But no, by your Lord, they can have no (real) Faith, until they make you (O Muḥammad) judge in all disputes between them, and find in themselves no...

resistance against your decisions, and accept (them) with full submission.” (Q. 4:65)

**B2. The threat of their abiding in Hell fire forever and the humiliating torment therein**

“And whosoever disobeys Allāh and His Apostle (Muḥammad) and transgresses His limits, He will be cast him into the Fire, to abide therein; And he shall have a disgraceful torment.” (Q. 4:14)

“... And whosoever disobeys Allāh and His Apostle, then verily, for him is the fire of Hell, he shall dwell therein forever.” (Q. 72:23)

**B3. The threat of their going astray**

“... And whosoever disobeys Allāh and His Apostle, he has indeed strayed into a plain error.” (Q. 33:36)

**B4. The threat of fitnah and painful torment**

“Make not the calling of the Apostle (Muḥammad) among you as your calling one of another. Allāh knows those of you who slip away under shelter (of some excuse without taking the permission to leave, from the Apostle). And let those who oppose the Apostle’s (Muḥammad) commandment (among the sects) beware, lest some fitnah (disbelief, trials, afflictions, earthquakes, killing, overpowered by a tyrant) should befall them or a painful torment be inflicted on them.” (Q 24:63)
SECTION 5

THE QUR’ĀN’S COMMANDING TO ABIDE BY WHAT THE PROPHET HAS BROUGHT, ABSTAIN FROM WHAT HE HAS FORBIDDEN, AND TO ACCEPT HIS JUDGEMENT

The Qur’ān urges the believers to abide by the Prophet’s orders and abstain from what he has forbidden, as for example in this verse:

“And whatsoever the Apostle (Muḥammad) gives you, take it; and whatsoever he forbids you, abstain (from it). And fear Allah; verily, Allah is Severe in punishment.” (Q. 59: 7).

Despite this verse being revealed in the context of the distribution of booty (al-fay’), there is strong evidence to show that it covers the Prophet’s commands and prohibitions in general. The following evidence clarifies this: Sa‘īd b. Jubayr narrates that, “Both Ibn ‘Umar and Ibn ‘Abbās testified that the Prophet forbade: al-dubbā’, al-hantam, al-muzaffat and al-naqīr; [names for types of pots in which alcoholic drinks were prepared.] Then the Prophet recited: ‘And whatsoever the Apostle gives you, take it, and whatsoever he forbids you, abstain (from it).’”

30 The Prophet forbade them these because the nabādh that is prepared using these utensils is fermented quickly and rapidly becomes liquor. The Prophet, therefore, did not approve of this practice. Nabādh: is water in which dates and grapes are soaked, which can easily become fermented and therefore become unlawful to drink.

31 Musnad 3, ḥ. no. 3290; Nasā’ī, k. al-Asribah, bā. no. 36, ḥ. no. 5643. See also Muslim, k. al-Asribah, ḥ. no. 1997.
The Companions themselves understood from the previous verse that they should accept and abide by the Prophet’s orders and prohibitions in the same way as they did for Allāh’s commands. The following examples manifest this:

A. Asmā’ bt. Yazīd narrated from one of her cousins, Anas, who narrated that Ibn Abbās said, “Has not Almighty Allāh said, ‘And whatsoever the Apostle gives you, take it, and whatsoever he forbids you, abstain (from it)?’ I said, ‘Yes’. He asked another question, ‘Has not Allāh said, ‘It is not for a Believer, man or woman, when a matter has been decided by Allāh and His Apostle, to have any option in their decision?’ I said, ‘Yes.’ He then said, ‘I testify that the Prophet forbade: al-naqī, al-mugayyār, al-dubbā’ and al-ḥantām.”

B. ‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd said, “Allāh curses those women who practice tattooing and those who get themselves tattooed, and those women who remove the hair from their faces or eyebrows and those who make artificial spaces between their teeth in order to look more beautiful whereby they change Allāh’s creation.” His saying reached a woman from Banū Asad called Umm Ya‘qūb who came (to ‘Abd Allāh) and said, “I have come to know that you have cursed such-and-such (women.)” He replied, “Why should I not curse those whom Allāh’s Apostle has cursed and who are (cursed) in Allāh’s Book!” Umm Ya‘qūb said, “I have read the whole Qur’ān, but I did not find in it what you say.” He said, “Verily, if you have read it, you would have found it. Did you not read: ‘And whatsoever the Apostle gives you, take it. And whatsoever he forbids you, abstain (from it).’” She replied, “Yes, I did.” He said, “Verily, Allāh’s Apostle forbade such things.” She said, “But I see your wife doing

---

32 Nasā’ī, k. al-Ashribah, bā. no. 36, ḥ. no. 5644.
these things.” He said, “Go and watch her.” She went and watched her but did not see anything in support of her statement. On that he said, “If my wife was as you thought, I would not keep her in my company.”

Elsewhere the Prophet is described in the Qur’ān as a good example for the believers whose hope lies in ‘the meeting with Allāh and the Last Day.’ In the Qur’ān we find:

> “Indeed in the Apostle of Allāh (Muḥammad) you have a good example to follow for him who hopes for (the meeting with) Allāh and the Last Day, and engages much in the Praise of Allāh.” (Q. 33:21)

It is incumbent upon Muslims not only to act in accordance with the Prophet’s commands and prohibitions, but also to accept his judgements. Muslims are expected to hear and obey whenever they are invited to the judgement of Allāh and His Apostle:

> “The only saying of the faithful believers, when they are called to Allāh (His Words, the Qur’ān) and His Apostle (Mḥammad), to judge between them, is that they say, ‘We hear and we obey.’ And such are the successful.” (Q. 24:51).

Moreover, the Qur’ān states that they are not true believers unless they make the Prophet their judge and then unequivocally accept his judgement:

---

33 Bukhārī, *Tafsīr al-Qur’ān*, s. no. 59, bā. no. 4, h. no. 4886; Muslim, *al-Libās wa al-Zīnhah*, h. no. 2125; Dāwud, *al-Tarajjul*, bā. no. 5, h. no. 4169; Mājah, *al-Nikāh*, bā. no. 52, h. no. 1989; *Musnad* 3, h. no. 3935; Dārimī, *al-Isti’dhān*, bā. no. 19, h. no. 2647.
"But no, by your Lord, they can have no Faith, until they make you (O Muhammad) judge in all disputes between them, and find in themselves no resistance against your decisions, and accept (them) with full submission." (Q. 4:65).

They are further ordered to have recourse to Allâh and His Apostle in their disputes [i.e. for judgement on the issue in question]:

(And) If you differ in anything amongst yourselves, refer it to Allâh and His Apostle (Muhammad), if you believe in Allâh and the Last Day. That is better, and more suitable for final determination.” (Q. 4:59).

Above all, the Qur'ân plainly states that no one has the right to choose whether to accept or reject the Prophet's judgement:

“It is not for a believer, man or woman, when Allâh and His Apostle (Muhammad) have decreed a matter that they should have any option in their decision, and whoever disobeys Allâh and His Apostle, he has indeed strayed into a plain error.” (Q. 33:36)
SECTION 6

A REVIEW OF EVENTS DESCRIBED IN THE QUR’ÂN WHICH DEMONSTRATE THAT OBEDIENCE TO THE SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET IS REQUIRED OF MUSLIMS, WHICH INCLUDES THE FOLLOWING OF HIS COMMANDS, PROHIBITIONS, JUDGEMENTS, DECISIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS

Three examples are given below:

1. The punishment described in the Qur’ân as being inflicted on the believers who disobey the Sunnah of the Prophet (his order)


```
وَقَدْ صَدَقَكُمُ اللَّهُ وَعَدَكُمُ اذْهَابَ إِلَيْهِمْ لَا يُحِبُّ عَلَيْهِمْ إِذَا فَسَدُواُ وَلَا يُحِبُّ الأَمْرَ وَعَصَيْتُهُمْ مِنْ بَعْدِ ما أَرَاهُمَا تَجْهَيْبًا مَّنْ

تَرَى الدِّينَاءَ وَمِنْ بَعْدِهَا اذْهَابًا مَّنْ صَرَفْتُهُمْ عَلَيْهِمْ لَبِسْتُهُمْ وَبَدَأْ عَدَا عَنْهُمْ وَاللَّهُ يَعْفَ عَلَى الْمُؤْمِنِينَ
```

“And Allâh did indeed fulfil His promise to you when you were killing them (your enemy) with His Permission; until (the moment) you lost your courage and fell to disputing about the order,\(^{34}\) and disobeyed after He showed you (of the booty) that which you love. Among you are some that desire this world and some that desire the Hereafter. Then He made you flee from them (your enemy), that He might test you. But surely, He forgave you, and Allâh is most Gracious to the believers.” (Q. 3:152)

Al-Bârâ’ b. ‘Àzib narrates, regarding the previous verse, “The Prophet appointed ‘Abd Allâh b. Jubayr as the commander of the infantry men (archers) who were fifty on the day (of the battle) of Uhûd. He instructed them, ‘Stick to your place, and do not leave it even if you see birds snatching us, until I send for you; and if you see that we have defeated the infidels and made them flee, even then you

\(^{34}\) The order was not to leave the position and to strictly maintain discipline. The battle of Uhud was, to begin with, a victory for the Muslims. Many of the enemy were slain and were retiring, when a party of the Muslims, acting against orders, ran in pursuit, being attracted by the prospect of booty.
should not leave your place until I send for you.' Then the infidels were defeated. By Allâh, I saw the women fleeing lifting up their clothes revealing their leg-bangles and their legs. So, the companions of 'Abd Allâh b. Jubayr said, 'The booty! O people, the booty! Your companions have become victorious, what are you waiting for now?' 'Abd Allâh b. Jubayr said, 'Have you forgotten what Allâh's Apostle said to you?' They replied, 'By Allâh! We will go to the people (i.e. the enemy) and collect our share from the war booty.' But when they went to them, they were forced to turn back defeated. At that time Allâh's Apostle was at their rear and was calling them back. Only twelve men remained with the Prophet and the infidels martyred seventy men from us... ."35 In another narration it is stated, "... and (you) fell to disputing about the order, and disobeyed after He showed you (of the booty) that which you love," meaning that they had disobeyed the Prophet after Allâh had shown them the booty and the enemy defeated.36

In that punishment there was a very hard lesson for them; seventy Companions were killed after they had been victorious and had witnessed the defeat of the enemy with their own eyes. It was thought to be a disciplinary trial for them so that they would not repeat their disobedience to the command (amr) of the Prophet.

2. The objection stated in the Qur'ân to those who reject the judgement or decision of the Prophet in a matter

35 Bukhârî, K. al-Jihâd wa al-Siyar, bâ. no. 164, h. no. 3039; K. al-Maghâzî, bâ. no. 17, h. no. 4043; Dâwud, K. al-Jihâd, bâ. no. 116, h. no. 2662; Musnad 3, h. no. 18120.
36 Musnad 3, h. no. 18126.
A. ‘Urwah b. al-Zubayr narrated that, “An Anšārī man quarreled with al-Zubayr about a water-channels from the Ḥarrah which was used for irrigating date-palms. Allāh’s Apostle, ordering Zubayr to be moderate, said, ‘O Zubayr! Irrigate [your land] first and then leave the water for your neighbor.’ The Anšārī said, ‘Is it because he is your aunt’s son?’ On that the color of the face of Allāh’s Apostle changed and he said, ‘O Zubayr! Irrigate [your land] and withhold the water until it reaches the walls that are between the pits around the trees.’ So, Allāh’s Apostle gave Zubayr his full right. Zubayr said, ‘By Allāh, the following verse was revealed in that connection:

 فلا وَلَكُمْ لَا يُحْكَمَ مِنَ الْحُكْمَ إِلَّا أَنْ تُقِيِّمُنَّ الْحَرَّمَاتِ لَا تَحْمِلْ عَنْهَا أَجْرَاهَا لَا تُصَلِّ عَنْهَا وَاْسْتَمِعْ لِمَا قُلْتُ مَا فَتَابَ عَلَيْكُمْ كُلِّ سَلَامًا

‘But no, by your Lord, they can have no Faith, until they make you (O Muḥammad) judge in all disputes between them, and find in themselves no resistance against your decisions, but accept (them) with full submission.’ (Q. 4:65)”

It is clear that this verse warns that the faith of the believers is negated if they do not accept the judgement of the Prophet. Indeed, they have to accept his judgement, even if they deem it harsh. This is what is stipulated for them in the Qurʾān, as was mentioned previously: “The only saying of the faithful believers, when they are called to Allāh (His Words, the Qurʾān) and His Apostle (Muḥammad), to judge between them, is that they say, ‘We hear and we obey.’ …”

37 Bukhārī, k. al-Muṣāqqāh, bā. no. 8, h. no. 2362.
38 Ibid., h. no. 2362, bā. no. 6, h. no. 2360, bā. no. 7, h. no. 2361; k. al-Ṣulḥ, bā. no. 12, h. no. 2708; k. Tafsīr al-Qurʾān, s. no. 4, bā. no. 12, h. no. 4585; Muslim, k. al-Faḍā’il, h. no. 2357; Tirmidhī, k. al-Aḥkām, bā. no. 26, h. no. 1363; k. Tafsīr al-Qurʾān, bā. no. 5, h. no. 3027; Nasāʾī, k. Adīb al-Qudāḥ, bā. no. 19, h. no. 5407,5416; Dawūd, k. al-Aqḍiyāh, bā. no. 31, h. no. 3637; Májah, al-Muqadimah, h. no. 15; k. al-Aḥkām, bā. no. 20, h. no. 2480; Musnad 3, h. no. 1422,15684.
Since it is clear that those who reject the judgement of the Prophet in a specific situation are in a precarious position, there is no doubt that the situation of those who reject the commands and prohibitions of the Prophet is far more dangerous.

B. Ibn `Abbas said, "The Prophet proposed that Zaynab bt. Jahsh should marry his mawla, Zayd b. Harithah. She felt that she was high above him (in social position), and therefore, she disliked the idea and consequently refused to marry him. For this reason the verse was revealed:

(Q. 33:36) 'It is not for a believer, man or woman, when Alläh and His Apostle (Muhammad) have decreed a matter that they should have any option in their decision, and whoever disobeys Alläh and His Apostle, he has indeed strayed into a plain error.'

In another more detailed narration, "She refused, and so did her brother, 'Abd Alläh, because of her highly esteemed lineage in the Quraysh tribe. When that verse was revealed, her brother came to the Prophet and said, 'O Apostle of Alläh, order me to do whatever you like'. The Prophet said, 'Then give her in marriage to Zayd b. Harithah.' Her brother then accepted and gave her in marriage to Zayd.'

From the above we can understand that the believers have no right to exercise personal choice in any matter on which Alläh and His Apostle have passed judgement. They are, therefore, demanded to accept and implement all of the
judgements, decisions, commands and prohibitions of the Prophet. Ibn `Abbās took this verse to be a proof that the believers have to accept the commands and prohibitions of the Prophet, as in the following two examples:

A. Hishām b. Ḫujayr said, “Ṭāwus was praying two rak‘ahs after the ‘aṣr prayer when Ibn `Abbas said to him, ‘Do not pray these two rak‘ahs’... He then said, ‘It was prohibited that a Muslim should pray after ‘aṣr prayer. I do not know whether you will be punished or rewarded for your prayer (after ‘aṣr) because Allāh says, ‘It is not for a believer, man or woman, when Allāh and His Apostle (Muḥammad) have decreed a matter that they should have any option in their decision, and whoever disobeys Allāh and His Apostle, he has indeed strayed into a plain error.’”

B. We have mentioned before that Asmā’ bt. Yazīd narrated from one of her cousins, Anas, who narrated that Ibn ‘Abbās said, “Has not Almighty Allāh said, ‘And whatsoever the Apostle gives you, take it, and whatsoever he forbids you, abstain (from it)?’ I said, ‘Yes.’ He asked another question, ‘Has not Allāh said, ‘It is not for a believer, man or woman, when Allāh and His Apostle (Muḥammad) have decreed a matter that they should have any option in their decision?’ I said, ‘Yes.’ He then said, ‘I testify that the Prophet forbade: al-naqīr, al-muqayyar, al-dubbā’ and al-ḥantam [names for types of pots in which alcoholic drinks were prepared.]’”

3. The acceptance described in the Qur‘ān of the repentance of the three Companions who did not carry out the Sunnah (his command)

40 Dārimī, al-Muqadimah, h. no. 434.
41 See above, p. 53.
PART I: Chapter 1

"Alläh has forgiven the Prophet (Muḥammad), the Muhājirīn (Muslim emigrants who left their homes and came to al-Madinah), and the Ansār (the Companions of the Prophet from the inhabitants of Madīnah) who followed him (Muḥammad) in the time of distress (Tabūk expedition), after the hearts of a party of them had nearly deviated (from the Right Path), but he accepted their repentance. Certainly, He is unto them full of kindness, Most Merciful. And (He did forgive also) the three [who did not join the Tabūk expedition] whose case was deferred (by the Prophet for Allāh’s decision) until for them the earth, vast as it is, was straitened and their own selves were straitened to them, and they perceived that there is no fleeing from Allāh, (and no refuge) but with Him. Then, He forgave them (accepted their repentance), that they might repent [unto Him. 
] Verily, Allāh is the One Who accepts repentance, Most Merciful." (Q. 9:117-18)

The Apostle ordered his Companions to prepare for a raid on the Byzantines. He went forward energetically with his preparations and ordered the provision of money and mounts for the expedition. The wealthy men provided mounts, while ‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān spent an unprecedented sum. When the Apostle’s road was clear he determined to set off. There were a number of Muslims who were slow to make up their minds, so that they lagged behind without there being any thought of their having misgivings. They were Ka‘b b. Mālik, Murārah b. al-Rabī’ and Hilāl b. Umayyah, who were loyal men whose Islam was above suspicion. The above verses were sent down because of their disobedience to the Prophet’s command. The meaning of the previous verses becomes quite clear after we hear what one of them, Ka‘b b. Mālik, had to say. Ibn Ishāq narrates it:

43 Ibid., vol. 2, pp. 517-8.
“As for my news in this battle of Tabük, I had never been stronger or wealthier than I was when I remained behind the Prophet in that ghazwah. By Allâh, never had I two she-camels before, but I had them at the time of this ghazwah... . The Apostle made his preparations and the Muslims likewise, and I would go to get ready with them and return not having done what was necessary, saying to myself, ‘I can do that when I want to,’ and I continued procrastinating until the men had acted with energy and in the morning they and the Apostle had gone, while I had made no preparation. I thought that I could get ready a day or two later and then join them. Day after day passed and I had done nothing until the raiders had gone far ahead, and still I thought of going and overtaking, and I wish that I had done so, but I did not. ... When I heard that the Apostle was on his way back from Tabük I got immersed in my concern and began to think of false excuses, saying to myself, ‘How can I avoid his anger tomorrow?’ And I took the advice of wise member of my family in this matter. When it was said that Allâh’s Apostle had come near, all the evil false excuses left my mind and I knew that I could only escape by telling the truth. So I determined to do so. Allâh’s Apostle arrived in Madînah in the morning, and whenever he returned from a journey he used to visit the Mosque first of all and offer a two rak‘ahs prayer therein and then set down to speak to people... I came and saluted him and he smiled as one who is angry. He told me to come near, and when I sat before him he asked me what had kept me back, and had I not bought my mount. I said, ‘0 Apostle of Allâh, were I sitting with anyone else in the world I should count on escaping his anger by an excuse, for I am astute in argument. But I know that if I tell you a lie today you will accept it and that Allâh will soon excite your anger against me, and yet if I tell you the truth which will make you angry with me, I have hopes that Allâh will reward me for it in the end. Indeed, I have no excuse. I was never stronger and richer than when I stayed behind.’ The Apostle said,
'So far as that goes you have told the truth, but get up until Allāh decides about you.' ... Allāh’s Apostle forbade anyone to speak to the three of us out of those who had stayed behind, so people avoided us and showed us an altered demeanour, until the very land [where I lived] appeared strange to me and as if I did not know it. We endured this for fifty nights. As regards my two fellows, they remained in their houses, but I was younger and hardier, so I used to go out and witness the prayers along with the Muslims and roam about in the markets, but none would talk to me, and I would come to Allāh’s Apostle and salute him while he was sitting in his gathering after the prayer, and I would wonder if his lips had moved in returning the salutation or not. Then I would offer my prayer near to him and look at him stealthily. When I was busy with my prayer, he would turn his face towards me, but when I turned my face to him, he would turn his face away from me. When I had endured much harshness from the Muslims, I walked off and climbed over the wall of Abū Qatādah’s orchard. He was my cousin and the dearest of men to me. I saluted him and by Allāh, he did not return my salutation. So I said, 'O Abū Qatādah, I adjure you by Allāh, do you know that I love Allāh and His Apostle?' But he answered me not a word. Again I adjured him and he was silent; again and again I adjured him, then he said, 'Allāh and His Apostle know best.' At that my eyes swam with tears and I jumped up and climbed over the wall... . Thus we went on until forty of the fifty nights had passed, and then the Apostle’s messenger came to me and told me that the Apostle had ordered that I should separate myself from my wife. I asked whether this meant that I was to divorce her, and he said that it did not but that I was to separate myself and not approach her. My two Companions received similar orders. I told my wife to rejoin her family until such time as Allāh should give a decision in the matter. The wife of Hilāl came to the Apostle and told him that he was an old man, lost without a servant, and enquired if there was any objection to her serving him. He said there was not, provided that he did not approach
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her. She told the Apostle that he never made a movement towards her and that his weeping was so prolonged that she feared that he would lose his sight... . Ten more nights passed, until fifty nights since the Apostle had forbidden men to speak to us were complete. I prayed the morning prayer on top of one of our houses on the morn of the fiftieth night in the way that Allāh had prescribed [in the Qur’ān]. The earth, vast as it is, was straitened for us and my own self was straitened for me. I had set up a tent on the top of the mountain of Sal‘ and I used to stay there when suddenly I heard the voice of one who had ascended the mountain of Sal‘ shouting with his loudest voice, ‘O Ka‘b b. Mālik, be happy (abshir) [Due to the receiving of good tidings].’ I fell down in prostration before Allāh, realizing that relief had come. The Apostle announced the acceptance of our repentance by Allāh when he prayed the fajr prayer, and men went off to tell us the good news. They went to my two fellows with the news... . Then I set off towards the Apostle and men met me and told me the good news and congratulated me on Allāh’s having forgiven me. I went into the Mosque and there was the Apostle surrounded by people. Ṭalḥah b. ‘Ubayd Allāh got up and greeted me and congratulated me, but no other Muhājir did ... and Allāh sent down [the above verse].

It is clear that the Muslims themselves were the main participants and contributors to the events that constituted this incident. They abided by the Prophet’s order not to talk to the three Companions concerned, and indeed even their wives carried out the Prophet’s command. All of the inhabitants of Madīnah knew that the reason for the sending of the three Companions ‘to Coventry’ was their failure to carry out the Prophet’s orders, the requirement to do so becoming obligatory on them.

---

45 Ibid., pp. 531-36. See also Musnad 3, h. no. 26634; Bukhārī, k. al-Maghāzī, bā. no. 79, h. no. 4418; Muslim, k. al-Tawbah, h. no. 53; Tirmidhī, k. Tafsīr al-Qur’ān, bā. no. 10, h. no. 3102.
subsequent to their voluntarily entering the community of Muslims. There is no doubt that this incident in particular made it very clear to the Muslims that they should obey the Prophet, which includes his commands, prohibitions and instructions, and therefore his Sunnah.
CONCLUSION

A. From the above it should be clear that the Qur’ān contains statements that can be interpreted in various ways, which were subsequently clarified by Prophet, as well as general directives to which he gave practical elucidation. This was part of his role as stipulated in the Qur’ān, and as such they form complementary parts of a total science. The nature of these verses made it incumbent on the Companions that the Sunnah be taken to heart, both by them and those who followed them. It is clear, therefore, that the Qur’ān was one of the most important factors in necessitating the existence of Ḥadīth texts, and indeed, was such from the moment that it began to be revealed. This in turn requires that they should preserve and take care of it.

B. The verses that are cited above confirm that the commands of Allāh, as well as the commands of the Prophet, are entitled to the same high level of obedience from the Muslims. Indeed, the entire life of the Prophet is instructive to the Muslims, who are expected to emulate it as closely as possible; there should be no hesitation amongst the Muslims in carrying out the commands of the Prophet. In this context, ‘obedience’ means full and not half-hearted submission.

C. The above-mentioned verses are some of the many Qur’ānic verses which confirm the authority of the Prophet and emphasize the fact that his decisions, judgements, prohibitions and general commands have binding authority and ought to be followed in all spheres of life by Muslim individuals and communities as well as by Muslim states.
It is obvious that this authority of the Prophet did not hold sway over the commonality alone, but also extended over legal authorities, scholars and the founders of the schools of law, as is made clear by the Qur’ān.

D. The role of the Qur’ān in affirming the Sunnah and its sacred status is clear, and it was very effective in fostering an appreciation of the status of the Sunnah in the Companions of the Prophet who acted according to it. It must be remembered that these Companions had an extremely firm conviction that the Qur’ānic revelations came from Allāh, and as such they paid great heed to both the verses that praise the believers and promise them admittance to Paradise, and those that, on the other hand, rebuke the unbelievers and threaten them with admittance to Hell. There are also those that discipline and reprimand and in addition, remind of the punishment that can befall one in this world. The above-mentioned factors were very effective in confirming the importance of the Sunnah and preserving it in the hearts of the Companions and those who followed them. They had firm belief in the various Qur’anic verses which represent the essence of Islam, and make it absolutely incumbent on Muslims to act in accordance with the Sunnah, and following from this was a strong appreciation of the need for its preservation.

E. All of the activities of the Prophet, are encompassed by the term ‘Sunnah’ or ‘Sunnah of the Prophet’, which was, is, and will of necessity remain the main Islamic source, second only to the Qur’ān.

The aḥādīth of the Prophet are considered to be the main source of information about the Sunnah of the Prophet, and as such he found it necessary to ensure their diffusion in the Muslim community. We shall discuss this in the next chapter.
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THE PROPHET AND THE SUNNAH

Study And Analysis Of The Role Of The Prophet In Propagating And Preserving The Sunnah (Hadith)

Section 1: The Prophet’s clarification of the status of his Sunnah and his command to act upon it.

Section 2: The Prophet’s exhortation and instruction to his Companions to memorize Hadith.
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THE PROPHET'S CLARIFICATION OF THE STATUS OF HIS *SUNNAH* AND HIS COMMAND TO ACT UPON IT
PART I: Chapter 2

SECTION 1

THE PROPHET'S CLARIFICATION OF THE STATUS OF HIS SUNNAH AND HIS COMMAND TO ACT UPON IT

There are many hadiths which contain illustrations by the Prophet of the status of his Sunnah and his command to the believers that they should adhere to it. This illustration and command came in different forms including the imperative, and as an exhortation, a warning and through the awakening of hope, etc. The presentation of some of these hadiths will manifest the facts which underlie the Prophet's contribution to and role in the preservation of the Sunnah.

Mālik b. Anas in his book al-Muwatta' narrates that the Prophet said, "I have left two matters with you. As long as you hold to them, you will never go astray. They are the Book of Allāh and the Sunnah of His Prophet." Similar statement is recorded in Ibn Ishāq’s Sīrah, where Ibn Ishāq (d. 151/768) mentions that the Prophet said in his sermon at the Farewell ḥajj, "... I have left with you something which, if you will hold fast to it, you will never go astray, a plain indication- the book of Allāh and the Sunnah of His Prophet ... ." Also, al-'Irbaḍ b. Sāriyah said, ‘One day the Apostle of Allāh led us in prayer, then faced us and gave us a lengthy exhortation at which eyes shed tears and hearts were afraid. A man said, ‘Apostle of Allāh! It seems as if it were a farewell exhortation, so what injunction do you give us?’ He then said, ‘I enjoin you to fear Allāh, and to hear and obey even if it be an Abyssinian slave (who is your leader), for those of you who live after

1 Mālik, k. al-Qadar, h. no. 3.
me will see great disagreement. You must then follow my Sunnah and that of the rightly-guided caliphs. Hold to it and stick fast to it. Avoid novelties, for every novelty is an innovation, and every innovation is an error."

The Prophet made it clear to them that obedience to Allâh and admittance to His Paradise require that the believer should obey him. It has been narrated on the authority of Abû Hurayrah that the Apostle of Allâh said, “All my followers will enter Paradise except those who refuse.” They said, “O Allâh’s Apostle! Who will refuse?” He said, “Whoever obeys me will enter Paradise. And whoever disobeys me is the one who refuses (to enter it.)” In another narration, he says, “Whosoever obeys me obeys Allâh, and whosoever disobeys me disobeys Allâh. Whosoever obeys my commander obeys me, and whosoever disobeys my commander disobeys me.”

On another occasion he indicated to them that salvation from Hell can be attained only through obedience to him. Abû Mûsâ narrated that the Prophet said, “My example and the example of what I have been sent with is that of a man who came to some people and said, ‘O people! I have seen the enemy’s army with my own eyes, and I am the naked warner (al-nadhîr al-‘iryâni), so protect yourselves. A group of his people obeyed him and fled at night, proceeding stealthily until they were safe, while another group of them disbelieved him and stayed at their places until morning when the army came upon them, and killed and ruined them completely. This example refers to that

---

3 Dawûd, k. al-Sunnah, bâ. no. 6, h. no. 4607; Tirmidhî, k. al-Ilm, bâ. no. 16, h. no. 2676; Ibn Mâjah, al-Muqaddimah, bâ. no. 6, h. no. 42 & 44; Musnad 1, h. no. 16692 & 16694-5; Dârimî, al-Muqaddimah, bâ. no. 16, h. no. 95.

4 Bukhârî, k. al-l’tisâq bi al-Kitâb wa-al-Sunnah, bâ. no. 2, h. no. 7280; Musnad 1, h. no. 8511.

5 Muslim, k. al-Imârâh, h. no. 1835; Nasâ’î, k. al-Bay’ah, bâ. no. 27, h. no. 4193; k. al-Isti’dhâb, bâ. no. 49, h. no. 5510; Ibn Mâjah, al-Muqaddimah, h. no. 3.
person who obeys me and follows what I have brought, and the one who disobeys me and disbelieves in the truth I have brought.\textsuperscript{6}

The previous hadiths contain a command or implied command for the Companions to act in accordance with the instructions and prohibitions that originate from both the Qur'ān or the Sunnah of the Prophet.

Moreover, the Prophet was very keen that people should follow his Sunnah and warned them on various occasions against neglecting the commands and prohibitions which he brought in addition to and in elucidation of those contained in the Qur'ān. He himself was well-aware that controversial opinions would arise and hence gave a clear warning against them, as reported by 'Ubayd Allāh b. Abī Rāfī who narrated on the authority of his father that Allāh's Apostle said, "Let me not find one of you reclining on his couch when he hears something regarding me which I have commanded or forbidden, saying, 'We do not know. What we find in Allāh’s Book, we will follow that only.'\textsuperscript{7} Al-Miqdām b. Ma‘dī-karib al-Kindī also reports Allāh’s Apostle as saying, "Yet the time is coming when a hadīth of mine will be related to a person reclining on his couch who will say, ‘The book of Allāh, Mighty and Glorious, is (enough) between us and you. Whatever we find in it as halāl (lawful) we accept as halāl and whatever we find in it as harām (prohibit), we take as harām.’ Behold, whatever Allāh’s Apostle has declared as harām is just like that which Allāh has declared as harām.'\textsuperscript{8}

\textsuperscript{6} Bukhārī, k. al-I’tiṣām bi al-Kitāb wa al-Sunnah, bā. no. 2, h. no. 7283; Muslim, k. al-Faḍā’il, h. no. 2283.

\textsuperscript{7} Dāwūd, k. al-Sunnah, bā. no. 6, h. no. 4605; Ibn Mājah, al-Muqaddimah, h. no. 13; Tirmidhī, k. al-‘Ilm, bā. no. 10, h. no. 2663. See also Musnad 1, h. no. 23349.

\textsuperscript{8} Ibn Mājah, al-Muqaddimah, h. no. 12; Dārimī, al-Muqaddimah, bā. no. 49, h. no. 586; Tirmidhī, k. al-‘Ilm, bā. no. 10, h. no. 2664.
The Prophet further stated that he did not only bring them the Qur’ān but also something similar along with it which they should follow, thereby illustrating its exalted status. Similarly, Al-Miqdām b. Ma‘dī-karib narrates that the Prophet said, “Beware! I have been given the Qur’ān and something like it, yet the time is coming when a man replete on his couch will say, ‘Keep to the Qur’ān, what you find in it to be permissible treat as permissible, and what you find in it to be prohibited treat as prohibited.’ Beware! The domestic ass, beasts of prey with fangs, a find belonging to a confederate, unless its owner does not want it, are not permissible to you .”\textsuperscript{9}

On one occasion, the Prophet dispatched a messenger in order to convene an assembly in his presence so that he might illustrate this point to them. Al-‘Irbaḍ b. Sāriyah al-Sulami said, “We alighted with the Prophet at Khaybar,\textsuperscript{10} and he had his Companions with him. The chief of Khaybar was a defiant and abominable man. He came to the Prophet and said, ‘Is it proper for you, Muḥammad, that you slaughter our donkeys, eat our fruit, and beat our women?’ The Prophet became angry and said, ‘Ibn ‘Awf, ride your horse, and call loudly, ‘Beware, Paradise is lawful only for a believer,’ and order that they (the people) should gather for prayer.’ They gathered and the Prophet led them in prayer, then stood up and said, ‘Does any of you, while reclining on his couch, imagine that Allāh has prohibited only that which is to be found in this Qur’ān? By Allāh, I have preached, commanded and prohibited various matters as numerous as that which are found in the Qur’ān, or more numerous. Allāh has not permitted you to enter the houses of the

\textsuperscript{9} Dāwūd, k. al-Sunnah, bā. no. 6, ḥ. no. 4604; Musnad 1, ḥ. no. 167221.

\textsuperscript{10} A famous town situated about 200 miles north of Madīnah. It was the location of a great battle between the Muslims and the Jews in 7 AH.
people of the Book without permission, or beat their women, or eat their fruits when they have given you that which is imposed on them.”

Furthermore, he firmly objected to those who violated his Sunnah, even, as in this case, when the violation consisted of an excess committed with the intention of emulating him more closely (See above, p. 28).

He also made it known that attempting to bring something into Islam that is contrary to the Qur’an and Sunnah, is totally unacceptable, desiring by this that the Companions abide solely by what he had brought. ‘Amr b. ‘Awf narrated that the Prophet said, “... He who introduces an innovation that Allah and His Apostle have not sanctioned, would also incur punishment for the sin of one of the people that act upon it, without any diminution in the people’s punishment for their sins.”

In addition to this, in his resolve that the Sunnah should be kept alive and circulating among people after his death, he said, as narrated by the above Companion, “He who revives a sunnah of mine that was extinct after me, will also receive a reward the same as that of one of the people that acts upon it, without any diminution in the people’s rewards...”

It is clear from the previously cited hadiths of the Prophet, which contain his illustrations of the status of Sunnah, his command that it should be acted upon and his warning against neglect and contradiction of it, that it would certainly have provided significant motivation for the Companions in their preservation of the Sunnah as well as their abiding by it.

11 Dawūd, k. al-Kharāj wa al-Inmārah wa al-Fay', bā. no. 33, ḥ. no. 3050. See also Musnad 1, ḥ. no. 16743.
12 Ibn Mājah, al-Mugaddimah, bā. no. 15, ḥ. no. 210; Tirmidhī, k. al-‘Ilm, bā. no. 16, ḥ. no. 2677. See also Ibn Mājah, al-Mugaddimah, bā. no. 15, ḥ. no. 209.
THE PROPHET'S EXHORTATION AND INSTRUCTION TO HIS COMPANIONS TO MEMORIZE Hadíth
SECTION 2

THE PROPHET'S EXHORTATION AND INSTRUCTION TO HIS COMPANIONS TO MEMORIZE *HADĪTH*

A number of the Prophet's Companions reported that he would urge them to memorize *hadīth*. Zayd b. Thābit said, "I heard the Apostle of Allah say, 'May Allah brighten a man who hears a hadīth from us, learns it by heart and passes it on to others ..."."¹⁴ The same *hadīth* is narrated with a slightly different wording by 'Abd Allah b. Mas‘ūd, who reports that the Prophet said, "May Allah brighten a man who hears what I say, understands it, learns it by heart and passes it on to others. Many a bearer of knowledge conveys it to one who is more versed than he is...".¹⁵ The Prophet's exhortation of his Companions to memorize his *hadīths* is narrated on many different occasions, and expressed by him in various ways, such as, for example, in Abū al-Dardā"s narration, "May Allah brighten a man who hears a hadīth from us, passes it on to others exactly as he heard it...",¹⁶ and Anas b. Mālik's narration, "May Allah brighten a man who hears a hadīth from us, understands it and passes it on to others...".¹⁷ It is evident that the Prophet urged them to this on more than one occasion, particularly in light of the fact that most of the above narrations were given by more than one Companion, and, for example, 'Abd Allah b. Mas‘ūd narrates two accounts, both the first, namely Zayd's

---

¹² Ibid.
¹³ Dāwūd, k. al-'Ilm, bā. no. 10, h. no. 3660.
¹⁴ Tirmidhi, k. al-'Ilm, bā. no. 7, h. no. 2658.
¹⁵ Dārimi, al-Mugaddimah, bā. no. 24, h. no. 230.
¹⁶ Ibn Mājah, al-Mugaddimah, bā. no. 18, h. no. 236.
hadîh, and second narrations cited above. Furthermore, the Companion Abû al-Dardâ' states that the Prophet mentioned this matter in one of his sermons, while the Companion, Jubayr b. Muṭ'îm, states that the Prophet mentioned it in one of his sermons at Minâ, during a pilgrimage. All this serves to demonstrate that the Prophet stated this particular hadîh on several occasions, and that it was well known amongst his Companions from Madînah, not to mention the thousands of other pilgrims. Al-Suyûṭî considers it to be one of the mutawâtîr hadîh and quotes it in his book al-Âzâhâr al-mutanâthirah with narrations by more than thirty Companions.

The Prophet also requested those who came to see him from Bahrain to memorize his hadîhs. Abû Jamrah narrates, "... Once Ibn 'Abbâs said that a delegation of the tribe of 'Abd al-Qays came to the Prophet ... They said, 'We have come to you from a distant place and there is a tribe of the infidels of Muḍâr between you and us and we can not come to you except in the sacred month. So please order us to do something good (i.e. right action) of which we may also inform our people whom we have left behind [at home] and by which we may enter Paradise.' The Prophet ordered them to do four things, and forbade them from four things... The Prophet further said, 'Memorize these [instructions] and tell them to the people whom you have left behind.'"

This is a clear reference to the fact that the delegation from 'Abd al-Qays embraced Islam before the various other tribes from Muḍâr that were situated between them and

---

18 See Bayân, vol. 1, p. 40.
19 Dârimî, al-Muqaddimah, bâ. no. 24, h. no. 230.
20 Ibn Mâjah, k. al-Mu'ânik, bâ. no. 76, h. no. 3056; Dârimî, al-Muqaddimah, bâ. no. 24, h. no. 228; Bayân, vol. 1, p. 41.
22 Bukhârî, k. al-'Ilm, bâ. no. 25, h. no. 87; Muslim, k. al-Imân, h. no. 24; Tayâlîsî, h. no. 2747.
Madīnah. This is confirmed by Bukhārī’s narrating that Ibn ‘Abbās said, “The first Jumu‘ah prayer offered after the Jumu‘ah prayer at the mosque of Allāh’s Apostle was in the mosque of the tribe of ‘Abd al-Qays at Juwāthā in Bahrain.”23 It is well-known that the first Jumu‘ah prayer that was offered in the Prophet’s mosque took place during the first year of hijrah.24 As to the ḥadīth related by Jubayr b. Mu‘t‘im, in which he cites what the Prophet said in his sermon at Minā, it occurred at a later date. This therefore shows us the importance that the Prophet attached to the question of the preservation of his ḥadīths (sayings) from the time that he arrived in Madīnah until the time of his pilgrimage in the year 10.

It is natural, therefore, that we find the contents of these Prophetic instructions reflected in the behavior of some of the Prophet’s Companions. Abū Hurayrah tells us that he was always in the Prophet’s company and further states, “I used to attend that which they used not to attend and I used to memorize that which they used not to memorize.”25 ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar testified that Abū Hurayrah was a learned man and had a good memory when he said, “You, Abū Hurayrah, are the most knowledgeable amongst us about the Apostle of Allāh and you have memorized more of his ḥadīths than any of us.” He made this statement after he had objected to one of Abū Hurayrah’s narrations saying, “Check that what you are saying is correct.” Upon hearing this, the latter took him by the hand, led him to ‘Ā’ishah and asked her whether what he had said was correct, she answered, “Abū Hurayrah is right.”26 ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb indicated that the Companions

23 Bukhārī, k. al-Jumu‘ah, bā. no. 11, h. no. 892.
25 Bukhārī, k. al-‘Ilm, bā. no. 24, h. no. 118.
of the Prophet memorized his hadīths; he said, “One day the Prophet stood up amongst us for a long period and informed us about the beginning of creation [talking about everything in detail] until he mentioned the people of Paradise entering their places and the people of Hell entering their places. Some memorized what he had said, and some forgot it.”

Furthermore, Al-Barā’ b. ‘Azīb repeated some sentences which he had memorized directly from the Prophet, using one word which differed from what the Prophet had used and the Prophet corrected him. ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib complained to the Prophet that he had a poor memory and the Prophet told him how to overcome this problem. ‘Alī said “… I used to hear a hadīth and when I tried to repeat it I could not, but today, when I hear hadīths and relate them I do not miss a word.”

‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr b. Al-‘Āṣ used to memorize the hadīths by writing them down. He said, “I used to write down everything which I heard from the Apostle of Allāh. I intended (by this) to memorize it.” This is why Abū Hurayrah used to say, “There is none among the Companions of the Prophet who has narrated more hadīths than I except ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr (b. Al-‘Āṣ), who used to write them down, while I never did.” From the above statements, and others like them, it is apparent that the recording and memorization of the Prophet’s hadīths was regarded as an important undertaking by many of the Companions.

---

27 Bukhārī, k. Bad’ al-khalq, bā. no. 1, ḥ. no. 3192; Dāwūd, k. al-Fitan, bā. no. 1, ḥ. no. 4240; Muslim, k. al-Fitan, ḥ. no. 23.
28 Bukhārī, k. al-Wuḍū’, bā. no. 75, ḥ. no. 247; Muslim, k. al-Dhikr, ḥ. no. 56.
29 Tirmidhī, k. al-Da’awāt, bā. no. 115, ḥ. no. 3570; Akhlāq, vol. 2, p. 259.
30 Musnad 1, vol. 2, p. 162; Dāwūd, k. al-‘Ilm, bā. no. 3, ḥ. no. 3646; Dārimī, al-Mugaddimah, bā. no. 43, ḥ. no. 484.
31 Bukhārī, k. al-‘Ilm, bā. no. 39, ḥ. no. 113.
On the other hand, some of the Companions who disliked writing down the hadīths of the Prophet reported that they used to memorize them, and, as in the case of Abū Sa‘īd and Abū Mūsā, also encouraged their students to memorize hadīths and not to write them down. Abū Burdah said, ‘Abū Mūsā once narrated some hadīths to us, and when he noticed that we were writing them down, he asked us, ‘Are you writing down what you have heard from me?’ We said ‘Yes.’ He said, ‘Give it (the slat) to me,’ and requested some water to be brought to him, which he used to wipe out what we had written, and he said ‘Learn them by heart as we have done.’” Abū Naḍrah said, ‘I asked Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī, ‘Shall we write what we hear from you?’ He answered, ‘Do you want to turn it into Qur‘ān?! Your Prophet used to talk to us and we used to memorize what he said, therefore do as we did.’”

Due to their concern that the hadīths might be forgotten, and indeed that they themselves should forget what they had memorized, the Companions engaged in the study of Hadīth and urged others to do likewise in order to assist themselves and others in understanding and committing them to memory, and also with the intention of revising hadīths that they might have forgotten. It is worth noting that the Companions had no

---

32 Bayān, vol. 1, p. 66.
33 Ibid.
34 Darimi, bā. no. 51, ḥ. number:
need to make a specific effort to memorize accounts of the various events in which the Prophet was involved, which they themselves had witnessed, in addition to various of his more inherently memorable sayings, because, having witnessed them at first-hand they were naturally retained in their memories.

Some Companions excelled in memorizing hadīths (sayings and actions) with a particular theme while the Prophet was still alive, due to their special interest or concern with that area. Ḥudhayfah b. al-Yamān, for example, was very interested in the hadīths dealing with fitan, so much so that he became the authority on that subject. He said, “The people used to ask Allāh’s Apostle about the good, but I used to ask him about the evil lest I should be overtaken by it.” Other Companions also demonstrated a great depth of knowledge in a specific area: ‘Ā’ishah memorized more of the hadīths concerning women than any other Companion; Zayd b. Thābit was the most knowledgeable concerning the hadīths dealing with the rules of inheritance; Mu‘ādh b. Jabal of the hadīths dealing with what is lawful and what is prohibited; ‘Umar of hadīths dealing with financial matters; while ‘Āli was the most knowledgeable regarding the hadīths that deal with judicial questions.

The evidence supporting our proposition is too great to discuss exhaustively. That which has been cited above, which clearly shows that various Companions actively

468 See also Musnad 3, h. no. 15633:

And h. no. 15633.

Such as: afflictions; overpowered by a tyrant; killing; earthquakes; etc.

Bukhārī, k. al-Fītan, bā. no. 11, h. no. 7084; Muslim, k. al-Imārah, h. no. 51 & 52.
memorize ḥadīths while the Prophet himself was alive, and continued to do so after his death, is probably sufficient to demonstrate the strength of concern that the Companions had with the memorization of the ḥadīths of the Prophet in response to his wishes and directives, and for other reasons. 38

Thus, it is clear that the Prophet’s exhortation of his Companions to memorize Ḥadīth was a very important factor in their preservation.

Finally, the Prophet did not merely instill a desire for and recognition of the necessity for the memorization of Ḥadīth in his Companions, and supervise their efforts to achieve that goal, but he also urged them to convey to others what they had memorized. He said, “...whoever memorizes anything of what I say should convey it to others.”39 This act of conveyance will be examined in the next section.

37 See for example: Musnad 3, ḥ. no. 12493; Tabarānī MS, vol. 1, p. 355, ḥ. no. 556.
38 See Chapter 1 and the following Sections of this Chapter.
39 Musnad 1, vol. 4, p. 334.
THE PROPHET'S COMMAND THAT HIS COMPANIONS SHOULD CONVEY HIS *HADĪTH* TO OTHERS
SECTION 3

THE PROPHET’S COMMAND THAT HIS COMPANIONS SHOULD CONVEY HIS ḤADĪTH TO OTHERS

There were a number of approaches which the Prophet used in urging, and indeed commanding, his Companions to undertake the task of conveying to other people the message of Islam and the Ḥadīth (his sayings and actions) that they had heard from him. The Prophet did not shoulder the task of conveying the message alone, but rather he invited the participation of his Companions and others in this important endeavour. As such, we find a number of the Prophet’s Companions narrating that the Prophet would urge them to undertake the task of conveying to others the ḥadīth which they had heard from him.

1. Bahz b. Ḥakīm narrated from his father, on the authority of his grandfather,⁴⁰ that a man came to the Prophet asking him about the Islam which he had brought. The Prophet then told him about Islam as well as imparting some ḥadīth. At the end of his speech the Prophet said, “Let those who are present convey it to those who are absent”⁴¹

2. Asmā’ bint Yazīd al-Anṣāriyah narrated that the Prophet once told them in one of his gatherings about al-aʿwar al-dajjāl (the one-eyed impostor). He told them about the dajjāl and what he will do, and what will happen before and after his coming. Then the Prophet said at the end of his speech, “So whoever has attended this gathering and heard my

---

⁴⁰ He is Muʿāwiyah b. Ḥaydah al-Qushayrī. See Tahdīḥ, vol. 10, p. 205, no. 382.
⁴¹ Musnad 1, vol. 5, p. 4.
PART I: Chapter 2

speech let him convey it to those who are absent (فَمَنْ خَصَّرَ حُجَّةٍ وَسَمِّيَ قَوْلًا، فَلْيُنَبِّئِ الْخَالِبَ)."

3. After the conquest of Makkah, the Prophet, in his famous *khutbah*, which includes a number of famous *hadiths*, commanded his victorious Companions, who numbered several thousand, to convey to others what was contained in that *khutbah*. Abü Shurayh said, "When 'Amr b. Sa'īd was sending the troops to Makkah (to fight 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr) I said to him, 'O chief, allow me to tell you what the Prophet said on the day following the conquest of Makkah. My ears heard and my heart comprehended, and I saw him with my own eyes, when he said it. He glorified and praised Allāh and then said, 'Allāh, and not the people, has made Makkah a sanctuary... So let those who are present convey it to those who are absent.'"

4. In the Prophet's *khutbah* at Minā, which was delivered during ḥajj, a number of Companions, including Abū Bakrah, Ibn 'Abbās, and Abū Ḥarrah al-Ragāshī who narrated from his uncle and Abū Naḍrah, on the authority of someone who heard from the Prophet, narrated that the Prophet said, [to the thousands of people present], "Let those who are present convey it to those who are absent."

---

42 Ibid., vol. 6, pp. 456-7.
43 Bukhārī, k. al-ʿilm, bā. no. 37, h. no. 104; Musnad 1, vol. 6, p. 385; Muslim, k. al-Ḥajj, h. no. 446; Musnad 1, vol. 6, 385; Tirmidhī, k. al-Ḥajj, bā. no. 1, h. no. 809; Nasāʾī, k. al-Ḥajj, bā. no. 111, h. no. 2875.
44 Bukhārī, k. al-ʿilm, bā. no. 9, h. no. 67; Muslim, k. al-Qasāmah, h. no. 29-30; Musnad 1, vol. 5, p. 37**, 40, 45, 49; Ibn Mājah, al-Muqaddimah, bā. no. 18, h. no. 233; Dārimī, k. al-Manāsik, bā. no. 72, h. no. 1852.
45 Bukhārī, k. al-Ḥajj, bā. no. 132, h. no. 1739.
46 Musnad 1, vol. 5, pp. 72-3.
It is clear from the previous texts that the Prophet used to command his Companions to disseminate his hadiths after hearing them from him, and there is no doubt that the Prophet’s command to do so became well known among his Companions.

Furthermore, the Prophet commanded them to disseminate the hadiths using the verb ‘to narrate (حدث)’ as well as the verb ‘to convey (بلغ)’. Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī narrated that the Prophet said, “… narrate [the hadiths (my sayings and actions)] from me... (حدثوا)”; Abū Müsā also narrated that that the Prophet said, “…whoever learns by heart a hadīth from me, let him narrate it to others (ومن حفظ عني حديثًا فليحدثه).”

Another factor that stimulated people to undertake the essential task of conveying the hadiths was the Prophet’s prayer in which he asked Allāh to brighten those who convey his hadiths to others (See above, p. 74). He also encouraged them by drawing their attention to a very important aspect of the issue, which is the fact that the hadith may well reach a man who can understand it better than the one who conveys it to him. Zayd b. Thābit said that he heard the Apostle of Allāh say, “… Many a bearer of knowledge conveys it to one who is better versed than he is; and many a bearer of knowledge is not versed in it.”

48 Ibid., vol. 3, p. 39, 46, 56; Muslim, k. al-Zuhd, h. no. 72.
49 Musnad 1, vol. 4, p. 334.
50 Dāwūd, k. al-‘ilm, bā. no. 10, h. no. 3660. In this hadith the Prophet is narrated as praying for the prosperity of a man who transmits his hadiths to others and teaches the knowledge contained therein. He stated that on occasion the man who hears a hadith initially does not understand it in as much depth as the man to whom he transmits it; therefore, one should preach the knowledge of religion as much as possible.
We have seen that the same ḥadīth is narrated by 'Abd Allāh b. Masʿūd and Jubayr b. Mutʿim. The latter narrated it with slightly different wording who said that the Prophet mentioned it in his sermon at Mīnā (See above, pp. 75). We have also seen that al-Suyūṭī considers it to be one of the mutawātir ḥadīth (See above, p. 75).

In order to encourage those who did not know a great deal of the Qurʾān and Ḥadīth, we find the Prophet ordering them to convey even a single sentence: 'Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr narrates that the Prophet said, “Convey (my teachings) from me to the people even if it were a single sentence...”

From the evidence mentioned previously, it can be concluded that ensuring the correct conveyance and propagation of his ḥadīths and indeed of the entire message of Islam was given the greatest attention by the Prophet, from the beginning of his call to Islam up until his death. He once asked his Companions whether he had fallen short of conveying the message of Allāh to them, the Companions replied, “We testify that you have conveyed the message of Allāh, advised your ummah and performed the duty which was laid upon you.” Additionally, in order to make clear the importance of abiding by what he had conveyed to the Companions, the Prophet told them about the situation of those who did not abide by what he had conveyed to them: they will come to ask for his intercession on the Day of Judgement, but he will respond to every one of them saying, “I can not help you, for I have conveyed to you.”

51 Bukhārī, k. al-Anbiyā’, bā. no. 50, ḥ. no. 3461; Tirmidhī, k. al-‘Ilm, bā. no. 13, ḥ. no. 2669; Dārimī, al-Mugaddimah, bā. no. 46, ḥ. no. 542; Musnad 1, vol. 2, pp. 159, 202, 214-5.
53 Bukhārī, k. al-Jihād, bā. no.189, ḥ. no.3073; Muslim, k. al-Imārah, ḥ. no. 24.
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In order to safeguard his teachings, in their propagation by his Companions and others, from distortion, addition or reduction, the Prophet took the following precautionary measures:

**First:** He commanded them to only convey what they knew to be a *hadith* from him. Ibn ‘Abbās narrated that the Prophet said, “Beware of conveying *hadiths* from me except for that which you know to be a *hadith*."

**Second:** He prayed that Allāh would brighten those who accurately conveyed his *hadiths* without addition or reduction. ‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd narrated that he heard the Prophet say, “May Allāh brighten a person who hears any thing from us and conveys it to others exactly as he heard it.” Abū al-Dardā’ also narrated that the Prophet said very much the same in his *khutbah*. Anas b. Mālik narrated that the Prophet said, “May Allāh brighten a person who hears my speech and does not add anything to it, and then conveys it to someone who did not hear it.”

**Third:** He made a statement to the effect that lying about him is not like lying about anybody else in its consequences. Al-Mughīrah b. Shu‘bāh narrated that he heard the Prophet saying, “Lying about me is not like lying about anybody else.”

---

54 Tirmidhī, k. *al-Tafsīr*, bā. no. 1, ḥ. no. 2951; *Musnad* 1, vol. 1, pp. 293, 323; See also Ibn ‘Adī, vol. 1, p. 12; Mishkāt, k. *al-‘Ilm*, chapter 2, ḥ. no. 232.
55 Tirmidhī, k. *al-‘Ilm*, bā. no. 7, ḥ. no. 2657. See also Mishkāt, k. *al-‘Ilm*, chapter 2, ḥ. no. 230.
56 See above, pp. 74-5.
57 Bayān, vol. 1, p. 42.
58 Muslim, *al-Mugaddimah*, bā. no. 2, ḥ. no. 4; Ibn ‘Adī also mention it from the narration of Sa‘īd b. Zayd. See vol. 1, p. 9.
Fourth: He branded as a liar any person who narrates ḥadīths that are deemed false. Samurah b. Jundub and al-Mughirah b. Shu‘bah narrated that the Prophet said, “Whoever narrates a ḥadīth from me that is known to be false, is one of the liars.”

Fifth: On many occasions he made clear that those who lie about him would be in Hellfire. This has been narrated by ‘Alī b. Abī Tālib, Salamah, Anas b. Mālik, Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudri and ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr. Al-Suyūṭī considered it to be one of the mutawātir ḥadīth and quoted it in his book Qaṭf al-azhār with narrations by more than seventy five Companions.

In conclusion, it is apparent that the Prophet’s command to his Companions to convey his ḥadīths and the message of Islam properly and accurately, was in order that these ḥadīths would be preserved and so could be passed on to others, as has occurred ever since.

---

59 Muslim, al-Muqaddimah, bā. no. 1. See also Ibn Mājah, al-Muqaddimah, bā. no. 5, h. no. 38-41. He mentions it from the narration of ‘Alī b. Abī Tālib; Tirmidhī, k. al-‘Ilm, bā. no. 9, h. no. 2662.
60 Bukhārī, k. al-‘Ilm, bā. no. 38, h. no. 106; Muslim, al-Muqaddimah, bā. no. 2, h. no. 1.
61 Bukhārī, k. al-‘Ilm, bā. no. 38, h. no. 109; Ibn Mājah, al-Muqaddimah, bā. no. 4, h. no. 34.
62 Bukhārī, k. al-‘Ilm, bā. no. 38, h. no. 108;
63 Musnad 1, vol. 3, p. 93; See Muslim, k. al-Zuhd, h. no. 72.
64 Bukhārī, k. al-Anbiyā‘, bā. no. 50, h. no. 3461; Tirmidhī, k. al-‘Ilm, bā. no. 13, h. no. 2669.
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THE PROPHET’S PERMISSION FOR THE WRITING DOWN OF HIS ḤADĪTH
SECTION 4

THE PROPHET’S PERMISSION FOR THE WRITING DOWN OF HIS ḤADĪTH

Researchers on the subject of the recording of the Prophetic Ḥadīths find two groups of Ḥadīths, that address this issue: the first group allows and indeed commands the writing down of Ḥadīths, whereas the second group prohibits it. Before endorsing either of these two groups of Ḥadīths as abrogating the other, or indeed ascertaining their authenticity, it is necessary to study, in depth, the transmission of each Ḥadīth individually, in accordance with the methodology of the traditionists. We then have to identify the particulars of the subject at issue from the analytical standpoint of the authentic texts. The approach of the Companions, who were responsible for transmitting both groups, is crucial in determining the outcome of this discussion, while the chronological arrangement of the Ḥadīths may also help us to reach an accurate conclusion with regards to this issue.

A. Ḥadīths that allow writing

The permission to allow the writing down of Ḥadīth is understood from the following Prophetic Ḥadīths:


66 The following discussion deals only with the Ḥadīths ascribed to the Prophet.
67 Every Ḥadīth has two elements; the isnād (the chain of transmitters) and the matn (text). Each of these two parts is of equal importance to a scholar. The latter, as a report of the sayings or doings of the Prophet, forms the basis of the Islamic rituals and laws; and the former constitutes the credentials of the latter. In order to verify the authenticity of a Ḥadīth, the traditionists analysed both the matn and the isnad using a highly developed science.
68 Mustadrak, vol. 1, p. 188; Rāmhurmuzī, p. 365, ḥ. no. 318; Taqyīd, p. 69; Bayān, vol. 1, p. 73.
69 Rāmhurmuzī, p. 368, ḥ. no. 327; Taqyīd, p. 70; Bayān, vol. 1, p. 72.
A2. Rāfi‘ b. Khadij asked the Prophet, “We hear some things from you, shall we write them?” The Prophet said, “Write (them) down and it is not sinful to do so.”

A3. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr said, “I used to write down everything that I heard from the Apostle of Allāh. I intended (by that) to memorize it. The Quraysh prohibited me saying, ‘Do you write everything that you hear from him while the Apostle of Allāh is a human being; he speaks in anger and in pleasure?!’ So I stopped writing, and mentioned it to the Apostle of Allāh. He signaled with his finger to his mouth and said, ‘Write, for by Him in whose hand lies my soul, only truth comes out from it.’”

A4. Abū Hurayrah said, “When Allāh gave victory to His Apostle over the people of Makkah, Allāh’s Apostle stood up among the people and, after glorifying Allāh, said, ‘Allāh has prohibited fighting in Makkah and has given authority over it to His Apostle and the believers, fighting was not legal for anyone before me, and was made legal for me for a part of a day, and it will not be legal for anyone after me. Its game should not be hunted, its thorn bushes should not be uprooted, and picking up its fallen things is not allowed except for one who makes a public announcement, and he whose relative is murdered has the option either to accept a compensation for it or to retaliate.’ Al-‘Abbās said, ‘Except al-idhkhir, for we use it in our graves and houses.’ Allāh’s Apostle said, ‘Except al-idhkhir.’ Abū Shāh, a Yemenite, stood up and said, ‘O Allāh’s Apostle! Get it written for me.’ Allāh’s Apostle said to his Companions, ‘Write it for Abū Shāh.’”

---

71 Tāqyīd, p. 73; Rāmhurmuzī, p. 369, h. no. 331.
72 Dāwūd, k. al-‘Ilm, bā. no. 3, h. no. 3646; Musnad 1, vol. 2, p. 162, 192; Dārimī, al-Muqaddimah, bā. no. 43, h. no. 484; Tāqyīd, p. 80; Akhlāq, vol. 2, p. 36; Mustadrak, vol. 1, pp. 186-7; Bayān, vol. 1, p. 71; Rāmhurmuzī, 336, h. no. 321.
73 Bukhārī, k. al-Lugatah, bā. no. 7, h. no. 2434; Muslim, k. al-Ḥajj, h. no. 447; Musnad 1, vol. 2, p. 238; Dāwūd, k. al-‘Ilm, bā. no. 3, h. no. 3649; Tirmidhī, k. al-‘Ilm, bā. no. 12, h. no. 2667; Bayān, vol. 1, p. 70; Tāqyīd, p. 86; Rāmhurmuzī, pp. 363-4, h. no. 314.
A5. Both Abū Hurayrah⁷⁴ and Anas b. Mālik⁷⁵ narrate that a man of the Anṣār said to the Prophet, “Oh Prophet of Allāh, I hear from you ḥadīths and I am afraid that I may lose them!” The Prophet replied, “Seek help in your right hand [i.e. write them down].”

An examination of the transmission of the above permitting ḥadīths

First: An examination of the transmission of the first ḥadīth (A1) narrated by ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr, Anas b. Mālik and Ibn ‘Abbās
The famous modern traditionist, Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī, in his book *Silsilat al-aḥādīth al-ṣaḥīḥah*, vol. 5, pp. 40-44, has exhaustively examined the above chains of transmission and established their authenticity in their collective narrations, concluding that, "There is no doubt that this hadīth is authentic according to the aggregate number of its transmissions."\(^{82}\)

**Second:** An examination of the transmission of the second hadīth (A2) narrated by Abū Rāfī`

---

We should note that the first chain of transmission is incomplete (*maqṭū‘* or *mungati‘*); due to the fact that Yaḥyā b. Ḥamzah did not hear from ʿAbāyah, whereas the second and third chains of transmission are on the authority of Abū Mudrik. Al-Dhahabī

---

81 *Taqyād*, p. 69.
82 We refer the reader to his exhaustive examination.
83 Rāmhurμuzī, p. 369, no. 330.
says, “Al-Dāraquṭnī says, ‘Abū Mudrik is *matrūk.*”<sup>86</sup> Therefore, no reliable evidence can be derived from his narration according to the above chains of transmission.

**Third:** An examination of the transmission of the third hadīth (A3) narrated by ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ

None of the above transmitters is found to be unreliable except Duwayd al-Khurāṣānī whose name we could not trace in any of the traditionists’ references regarding

---

<sup>84</sup> Taqyīd, pp. 72-3; Rāmhurmuzī, p. 369, no. 331.
<sup>85</sup> Taqyīd, p. 73.
<sup>86</sup> Mzān, vol. 4, p. 571, no. 10589.
<sup>87</sup> Musnad 1, vol. 2, p. 162; Mustadrak, vol. 1, p. 187; Dārimī, k. al-Muqaddimah, bā. no. 43, [h. no. 484; Dāwūd, k. al-‘ilm, bā. no. 3,  h. no. 3646, Bayān, vol. 1, p. 71; Akhlāq, vol. 1, p. 36, no. 1109; Musnad 1, vol. 2, p. 207.
<sup>88</sup> Rāmhurmuzī, p. 366, no. 321.
<sup>89</sup> Musnad 1, vol. 2, p. 215.
<sup>90</sup> Ibid., p. 215.
<sup>91</sup> Ibid., p. 207.
al-jarḥ wa al-taʿdīl (Criticism and justification).\textsuperscript{92} Ahmad Shākir reports that this man is unknown.\textsuperscript{93} Accordingly, this specific transmission would be considered to be tenuous (daʿīf). However, the other chains are credible as, for example, can be seen in the following table in which, by referring to the judgements of the specialized scholars in \textit{Tahdhib al-tahdhib} and the judgement of Ibn Ḥajar in \textit{Taqrib al-tahdhib}, we can authenticate, for instance, the first chain of transmitters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Abd Allāh b. 'Amr</td>
<td>Taqrib al-tahdhib</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>Tahdhib al-tahdhib</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yūsuf b. Māhik</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Walīd b. 'Abd Allāh</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ubayd Allāh b. al-Akhnas</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahyā b. Saʿid</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{92} Such as: \textit{Meān; Nubalāʾ; Ḥāim; Majrūḥīr; Tahdhib; Bukhārī DS} and \textit{Nasāʾī ḫ.}

\textsuperscript{93} \textit{Musnad} 2, vol. 11, p. 213, no. 7018. Also, Ahmad Shākir has exhaustively examined the chains no.'s I, IV and V, and proved their authenticity in vol. 10, p. 15-7, vol. 11, p. 214 and vol. 11, pp. 157-8.
Forth: An examination of the transmission of the fourth Ḥadīth (A4) narrated by Abū Hurayrah
An examination of the above chains of transmission would be very difficult in practice. However, the verification of al-Bukhārī’s and Muslim’s narrations, referred to in the above diagram in figures (I), (III) and (IV), gives us a good idea as to the credibility or otherwise of the transmission process. The scholars specialising in the criticism of Ḥadīth approved of the transmitters of those narrations, as can be seen from their judgements in *Tahdīb al-tahdīb* and in addition, from the judgement of Ibn Ḥajar in *Taqrīb al-tahdīb*:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abū Hurayrah</td>
<td>Taqrīb al-tahdīb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tahdīb al-tahdīb</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>1216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Salamah</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahyā b. Abī Kathīr</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaybān</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Nu`aym</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Awzā`ī</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>1064</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Walīd b. Muslim</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahyā b. Mūsā</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuhayr b. Ḥarb</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, in the final analysis, all of these transmitters are trustworthy and credible; and therefore their narrations are deemed to be authentic and admissible.

**Fifth:** An examination of the transmission of the fifth Ḥadīth (A5) narrated by Abū Hurayrah and Anas b. Mālik.\(^\text{104}\)

---

\(^{103}\) Dāwūd, *k. al-`Ilm*, bā. no. 3, ḥ. no. 3649.

\(^{104}\) *Taqrīb*, pp. 65-8.
All of these chains of transmission are objectionable and are inadmissible owing to the unreliability of the transmitters. For instance al-Khaṣīb b. Jaḥdar has been criticized as a liar and is therefore classified as a blameworthy narrator. Yaḥyā b. Saʿīd al-ʿAṭṭār and al-Khalil b. Murrah were also criticized as weak. Abū al-Faḍl is described as unknown. Accordingly the ḥadīth in question is inadmissible according to all the reliable critics of Ḥadīth.

108 Taqyīd, p. 67.
In conclusion, we have ascertained that all of the Prophetic hadiths permitting the writing down of hadiths are authentic and reliable except the second (A2) and fifth (A5), which were narrated by Rāfi‘, Abū Hurayrah and Anas b. Mālik respectively, owing to the unreliability of their chains of transmission as shown above.

B. hadiths that prohibit writing

B1. Abū Sa‘īd Al-Khudrī reported that Allah’s Apostle said, “Do not write down anything from me, and he who has written down anything from me, except the Qur’ān, should efface it; and narrate from me, for there is no harm in that and he who attributes any falsehood to me (and Hammām said, ‘I think he also said, ‘deliberately’) will find his abode in the Hell-Fire.”

B2. Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī said, “We asked the Prophet to allow us to write down his hadiths but he did not allow us to do so.” Some narrations report that Abū Sa‘īd personally sought the Prophet’s permission but failed to gain it.

B3. Abū Hurayrah narrates, “The Prophet came to us when we were writing his hadiths. He prevented us from doing so …”

B4. Zayd b. Thābit reports that the Prophet prevented His Companions from writing His hadiths. Other narrations said that Zayd b. Thābit entered upon Mu‘āwiyyah and asked

---

109 Muslim, k. al-Zuhd wa al-ragā‘iq, h. no. 72; Musnad 1, vol. 3, p. 12**, p. 21, 39 and 56; Dārimī, al-Muqaddimah, bā. no. 42, h. no. 450; Taqyīd, pp. 29-32.
110 Tirmidhī, k. al-Ibn, H. no. 11, b. no. 2665; Taqyīd, p. 33; Dārimī, al-Muqaddimah, bā. no. 42, h. no. 451; Rāmhurmuzī, p. 379, h. no. 362.
111 Ibid., pp. 32-3.
112 Ibid., pp. 33-5.
113 Ibid., p. 35.
him about a *ḥadīth*. He ordered a man to write it. Zayd said, "The Apostle of Allāh ordered us not to write any of his *ḥadīths.*" He then erased it.\(^{114}\)

**An examination of the transmission of the above preventive *ḥadīth*\(^{114}\)**

**First:** An examination of the transmission of the first *ḥadīth* (B1) narrated by Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī

![Diagram](image)

The specialist scholars of *Ḥadīth* differ regarding this particular *ḥadīth*: Some say that it only goes back to Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī, while the others trace it back to the Prophet himself. Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAṣqālānī reports that many of the authorities on this science, including al-Bukhārī and others, consider this *ḥadīth* to merely be a statement by Abū

\(^{114}\) Dawūd, *k. al-ʿIlm*, bā. no. 3, ḥ. no. 3647; *Taqyīd*, p. 35.

\(^{115}\) Muslim, *k. al-Zuhd*, ḥ. no. 72; *Taqyīd*, p. 29-31; *Mustadrak*, vol. 1, p. 127; *Musnad 1*, vol. 3, p. 12\(^{**}\), 21, 39 and 56.

\(^{116}\) *Taqyīd*, p. 33.

\(^{117}\) Ibid.; Rāmhurmuzī, p. 379, ḥ. no. 362.
Sa‘īd al-Khudrī.  

Besides, al-Khaṭīb certifies that it was widely known that this ḥadīth went back to Abū Sa‘īd and no further. It can then be said that the ḥadīth reported by Abū Sa‘īd which prohibits the writing of ḥadīths is a controversial ḥadīth because the scholars are in doubt of whether its source is in fact the Prophet or Abū Sa‘īd.

Second: An examination of the transmission of the second ḥadīth (B2) narrated by Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī

---

A. An examination of the first and second transmissions

---

118 *Fath*, vol. 1, p. 208.
119 *Taqyīd*, p. 32.
120 Ibid., pp. 32-3.
121 Ibid., p. 33; Rāmhurmuzi, p. 379, no. 362.
122 Dārimi, k. al-Mugaddimah, bā. no. 42, h. no. 451.
The critics of Ḥadīth almost all agree on the unreliability of 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Zayd and maintain that his narrations are unacceptable. For instance, al-Bukhārī says in his book al-Duʿafāʾ al-Qāhir that 'Alī b. 'Abd Allāh had very much discredited 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Zayd. 124 Also, al-Nasāʾī concludes in his book al-Duʿafāʾ wa al-Matrūkün that 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Zayd is ṣaʿīf (weak). 125 The same opinion is expressly held by Ibn Ḥiibbān who accuses 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Zayd of altering the content and chains of transmission of his narrations to such an extent that he merits the designation al-tark (one whose Ḥadīth is left aside as invalid.) He also mentions the assessments of various other critics, saying that Yahyā b. Maʿīn, the famous traditionist, is of the opinion that 'Abd al-Raḥmān, 'Abd Allāh and Usāmah, the sons of Zayd b. Aslam, were all discreditable transmitters of Prophetic Ḥadīths. It is reported by al-Shāfiʿī that Mālik was once told a Ḥadīth, which he found suspicious. Mālik commented, "Go to 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Zayd who would ascribe it to his father on the authority of Noah!" Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal agrees with the above opinions on 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Zayd. 126 Al-Dhahabī mentions all of these opinions, adding to them al-Shāfiʿī's description of an incident where a man asked 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Zayd, "Did your father tell you that the ark of Noah came and circumambulated the Kaʿbah and prayed two rakʿas behind the maqām?" He replied, "Yes." 128 'Abd al-Raḥmān was also discredited by many others, such as Abū Ḥātim al-

123 Tirmidhī, k. al-'Ilm, bā. no. 11, ḥ. no. 2665.
124 Bukhārī Dṣ, p. 245.
125 Nasāʾī B, p. 294.
126 Majrūḥān, pp. 57-8.
127 The place where Prophet Ibrāhīm stood while he and Ismāʿīl were building the Kaʿbah in Makkah.
128 MEṣʾīn, vol. 2, pp. 564-6, no. 4868.
Rāzi, Abū Zur‘ah al-Rāzi\textsuperscript{129} and Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī.\textsuperscript{130} Therefore, ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Zayd’s narration of the Prophetic ḥadīth at issue seems to be unacceptable and thus can not be used in support of a credible argument.

B. An examination of the third and fourth transmissions

The third chain of transmission is on the authority of Sufyān b. Wāki‘, who, it is claimed, is a discreditable transmitter because he used to rely on an untrustworthy scribe. Therefore, he was discredited in this regard as a matter of precaution.\textsuperscript{131} As far as the fourth chain of transmission is concerned- it is on the authority of Abū Ma‘mar who is a trustworthy, credible transmitter.\textsuperscript{132} In addition, no one else in this chain of transmitters is found to be discreditable.\textsuperscript{133} Accordingly, this narration seems to be sound by this chain and can be regarded as legitimate evidence in elucidating the matter under discussion.

\begin{footnotesize}

\textsuperscript{129} Ḥātim, vol. 2, p. 233.
\textsuperscript{130} Taqrīb, vol. 1, p. 480, no. 941.
\textsuperscript{131} Ibid., vol. 1, p. 312, no. 323; Tahdhīb, vol. 4, p. 123-4, Ḥātim, vol. 4, p. 230, no. 991.
\textsuperscript{132} Taqrīb, vol. 1, p. 65, no. 475; Mīzān, vol. 1, p. 220, no. 844.
\textsuperscript{133} See for example: Mīzān; Ḥātim; Nubalā‘ and Tahdhīb.

\end{footnotesize}
Third: An examination of the transmission of the third hadith (B3) narrated by Abū Hurayrah

The narrations reported by Abū Hurayrah can hardly be accepted in this context owing to the fact that they were reported on the authority of 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Zayd.

As can be seen from the above, 'Abd al-Rahmān's narrations are widely criticized by the specialists. Al-Dhahabī goes so far as to rule that Abū Hurayrah's narration which is reported by 'Abd al-Rahmān is hadīthun munkar (a hadīth narrated by only one discredited narrator.) This opinion was further supported by Abū Hurayrah himself who said, "There is none among the Companions of the Prophet who has narrated more hadīths

---

135 Taqyīd, p. 34.
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138 Ibid., p. 33.
139 See pp. 99-100.
than I except ‘Abd-Alläh Ibn ‘Amr Ibn Al-‘As, who used to write them down while I never did.’\textsuperscript{141} In addition, it was Abû Hurayrah who reported the hadîths involving the case of Abû Shâh who asked the Prophet to write down his hadîths for him; the Prophet accepted Abû Shâh’s request and asked someone to write them down for him.\textsuperscript{142}

**Fourth:** An examination of the transmission of the fourth hadîth (B4) narrated by Zayd b. Thâbit

Al-Khaṭîb al-Bağhdâdî reports the hadîth narrated by Zayd b. Thâbit on the authority of three transmitters, all of them on the authority of Kathîr b. Zayd on the authority of al-Muṭṭalib b. ‘Abd Alläh b. Ḥanṭab on the authority of Zayd b. Thâbit.\textsuperscript{143}

\begin{enumerate}
\item[141] Bukhari, k. al-‘Ilm, bā. no. 39, ḥ. no. 113.
\item[142] See above, p. 88.
\item[143] Tagyîd, p. 35.
\end{enumerate}
By examining this chain of transmission it becomes clear that:

Firstly, the critics of Ḥadīth differ in their appraisal of the credibility of Kathīr b. Zayd— a section accredit him, while others do not. For instance, al-Nasā‘ī in his book al-Ḏu‘afā’ wa al-matrūkīn describes Kathīr b. Zayd as weak (da‘ī). Al-Dhahabī, in his famous book, Miẓān al-l‘tīdāl, mentions various critical assessments of Kathīr saying, “Abū Zur‘ah said, ‘He (Kathīr) is always truthful but is tenuous in respect of the Ḥadīth (ṣadūqun fihi lim).’ Al-Nasā‘ī said, ‘He (Kathīr) is da‘ī.’ Ibn al-Dawraqī quotes Yaḥyā who said, ‘There is no harm in him (laysa bihi ba‘s).’ Ibn al-Madīnī said, ‘He is a good man but not strong (ṣāliḥun wa laysa bi-al-qawī),’ which is not very high praise. Yaḥyā, on the authority of Ibn Abī Maryam said, ‘He is reliable (thiqah).’ Ibn ‘Adī said, ‘I do not see much harm in his narrations (lam ara bi-Ḥadīthi Kathīr ba‘s).’ Ibn Ḥibbān comments on Kathīr b. Zayd saying, “His narrations, though few, involved a lot of mistakes. I do not like using his narrations when they are reported solely by him (kāna kathīra al-khata’ ‘ala qillati riwāyatihi, lā yu‘jibunī al-iḥtijāju bihi idhā infarad).” Consequently, Kathīr b. Zayd’s narrations should be treated with care.

Secondly, al-Mutta‘alib b. Ḥanṭab, a transmitter in the chain of narration of the Ḥadīth at issue, did not actually hear any narrations from Zayd b. Thābit. Ibn Abī Ḥātim says, “He (al-Mutta‘alib) did not hear from Jābir, or Zayd b. Thābit, nor from ‘Umrān b. Ḥuṣayn. He was also not contemporary to any Companion except Sahl b. Sa‘d and those who lived as long as him.” Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Aṣqalānī says, “The majority of his narrations

144 Nasā‘ī D, P. 302.
147 Tahdīb, vol. 10, p. 179.
Accordingly, the chain of transmission or isnād of the ḥadīth at issue is munqatī' and as such appears to be discreditable.

Having examined the chains of transmission of the prohibiting ḥadīths, it is clear that they are not authentic, with the exception of the two narrations from Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī (B1&B2). It is noteworthy that the specialists in the science of Ḥadīth differed on the first of these two narrations: Some of them trace it back to Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī; and others to the Prophet himself.

Conclusion of the examination of both transmissions

After the examination of the transmission of both groups, it can be seen that there are various authentic ḥadīths that allow their being recorded in written form, while there are nevertheless two authentic ḥadīths which prohibit this.

An analysis of the texts of the permitting and prohibiting ḥadīths

First of all, we should note that the narration of 'Abd Allāh b. 'Amr does not imply his knowledge of any Prophetic prohibition in this respect, if this had been the case he would not have written anything down. On one occasion, the Quraysh rebuked him for writing, and accordingly he abstained, while it is more than likely that he would have been strict in obedience to any Prophetic prohibition in this regard, had there been one. The Quraysh are not reported to have had any knowledge of a prohibition, and had they known of one, they would simply have informed him of it, and would not have sought to justify their position by stating that the Prophet is, '...a human being who speaks in anger and in pleasure.' Furthermore, the Prophet, when 'Abd Allāh b. 'Amr b. al-'Āṣ told him of the

\[148\] Ibid.
Quraysh's opinion, instructed him to write, without prompting any inquiry from the Companions regarding this, contrary to their behaviour when they had been faced with other sudden changes in the past. Moreover, the sahīfah of ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr gained fame amongst the Companions without at any point being challenged or rebuked. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr's regard for his sahīfah is reflected in his naming it the veracious (al-ṣādiqah).

Secondly, when the Prophet told his Companions to write for Abū Shāh, he said, "Write for Abū Shāh (uktubū li-abi Shāh)," putting his command in the plural form, thus opening the way for any number of those present to record the ḥadīths for Abū Shāh. This command was issued among a vast gathering of Muslims at the time of the conquest of Makkah, yet none of those present enquired about the reason for this order coming after a previous prohibition, thus putting in question the assertion that one actually existed at all.

These instances demonstrate that knowledge of the permissibility of writing down the Prophetic ḥadīths was wide-spread among the Companions during the life-time of the Prophet. The following story of ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb provides additional proof. ‘Urwah reports that ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb wanted to write down the sunan (the sayings and actions of the Prophet). He consulted the Companions who gave him their approval. He then made istikhārah, and continued this for a whole month, until one day he told the Companions, "I wanted to write down the sunan but I remembered the nations before you who wrote some books and devoted their time and lives to them and neglected the Divine Revelation sent to them by God, I am not going to mix anything with the Book of Allāh." On

149 Tagyīd, pp. 84-5.
150 ‘Asking favors.’ Seeking Allāh to guide one to the right concerning an important endeavour or decision. A two rak‘ah prayer is offered for this purpose and certain invocations are read after that.
151 Bayān, vol. 1, p. 64.
assumption that this story is authentic, it supports the validity of the assertion that the
permissibility of writing down Prophetic _hadîths_ was known widely among the
Companions. Otherwise, it is unlikely that ‘Umar would have consulted them in the first
instance, and they would certainly not have given him their consent. Also, we should
notice that ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb only intended to compile the _sunan_, as had already been
done with the Qur‘ān. However, he retracted his intention, owing not to a Prophetic
prohibition, but rather due to personal misgivings.

Thirdly, notwithstanding the above, there remains the important issue of whether it
is possible to reconcile the two narrations of Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī with the previous
evidence which affirms the validity of writing down the Prophetic _Hadîth_. The available
evidence indicates that these two _hadîths_ were among the earliest _hadîths_, including the
fact that Abū Sa‘īd was resident in al-Madīnah from the time of the Prophet’s
migration.\(^{152}\) On the other hand the authentic permitting _hadîths_ narrated by Abū
Hurayrah and ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ were late _hadîths_. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr
embraced Islam late and migrated to al-Madīnah in the seventh year of _hijrah_,\(^ {153}\) while
Abū Hurayrah embraced Islam between the events of _al-Ḥudaybiyah_ (the _al-
Ḥudaybiyah_\(^ {154}\) covenant was concluded at the end of the sixth year of _hijrah_)\(^ {155}\) and the
conquest of _Khaybar_\(^ {156}\) at the beginning of the seventh year.\(^ {157}\) With regards to Abū

\(^{152}\) _Isābah_, vol. 2, p. 32, no. 3196.

\(^{153}\) _Nubalā‘_, vol. 3, p. 60.

\(^{154}\) A well-known open space located 10 miles from Makkah on the way to Jeddah, that is famous for being
the place where a truce was reached between the Muslims and the pagan Quraysh.

\(^{155}\) _Hishām_ 1, vol. 2, p. 308.

\(^{156}\) For the definition of _Khaybar_, see page 72, footnote no. 10.

\(^{157}\) _Isābah_, vol. 4, p. 203; vol. 3, 328.
Shāh’s story, the event described took place during the conquest of Makkah which happened in the seventh month of the eighth year of *hijrah*.  

It would seem that the Prophetic prohibition was made owing to the following considerations:

First: In order that the first Companions should not be preoccupied with anything besides the Holy Qur’ān, and in avoidance of the *sunan* taking a position equal to that of the Holy Qur’ān: This possibility was the main reason that ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb refrained from compiling the *sunan* of the Prophet, and it was for the same reason that ‘Urwah erased all that he had written, though later he regretted it.

Second: Al-Bukhārī and various other leading traditionists report the statement of Zayd b. Thābit who was trusted by Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq with the task of collecting the Holy Qur’ān. Zayd was required to exert great efforts in this respect as the Qur’ān was written on primitive materials such as ‘*usub, likhāf*, *riqā’, *aktāf, niḥāf* and others. These materials were evidently the only ones available for the recording of Prophetic *ḥadīths* and this may have lead to some confusion, resulting in a prohibition against writing *ḥadīths* at that time.

However, this prohibition was not in effect for a lengthy period, and before long they were allowed to write down texts besides the Holy Qur’ān, i.e. *al-tashahhud* (an
invocation which is recited in the ritual prayers). After that, recording of Prophetic hadīths was tacitly and generally permitted, inasmuch as Abū Sa‘īd himself, who reported the first Prophetic ban on writing, relates that, “We were not previously allowed to write anything except the Qur’ān and tashahhud.”164 Furthermore, it is unrealistic to suppose that the Prophet should issue an absolute ban on writing down his hadīths because encouragement of the pursuit of knowledge by all possible means is central to the Islamic ethos,165 indeed, writing is recommended in certain areas, such as the documenting of debts.166 Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī argues that since debts are to be documented by being written down, lest they should be disputed or forgotten, the recording of hadīths becomes more urgent still, since they are generally more susceptible to the vicissitudes of memory.167 Also, a permanent Prophetic ban on the recording of his hadīths would be grossly impractical since many of them explain and elucidate Qur’ānic texts, rules and principles that were, and remain, utterly necessary to the lives of the Muslims. Moreover, the Prophet himself instructed his Companions, when he was close to death, to bring him a kitāb (something to write on), so that he might dictate to them.168 In fact, there is much evidence of the Prophet’s dictation: Umm Salamah, the Prophet’s wife, said, “The Prophet called for a skin to be brought, and

---

164 Dāwūd, k. al-‘Ilm, bā. no. 3, h. no. 3648; Taqyīd, p. 93.
165 Q. 58:11 & 9:122.
166 Q. 2:282:
167 Taqyīd, p. 71.
168 Taqyīd, p. 71.
‘Ali was sitting with him. The Prophet carried on dictating to ‘Ali until the face and back of the skin were filled.”169 Consequently, the practice of writing hadīths became widespread. Even Goldziher says, “Many a companion of the Prophet is likely to have carried his sahīfah with him and used it to dispense instruction and edification to his circle.”170

The practical stance of the Companions regarding the writing down of the Hadīth

The practical stance of the Companions gives one the impression that the writing down of hadīths was a very common and valid practice, inasmuch as even those who narrated the prohibition, if indeed that is verified, practiced the writing down of hadīths themselves. It also gives us some indication as to what action in actual fact resulted from the previous debate.

First: The stance of those who narrated the Prophet’s permission to write:

1. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Amr b. al-'Āṣ:

'Abd Allāh b. 'Amr b. al-'Āṣ is understood to have written down a great many hadīths171 and was proud of his sahīfah.172 This sahīfah was so famous that al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī allocated a whole section of his book to its discussion,173 and Abū Hurayrah

---

168 Bukhārī, k. al-'Ilm, bā. no. 39, h. no. 114.
169 Imlā’, p. 12.
171 See above, p. 77.
172 Taqyīd, pp. 84-5.
173 Ibid.
also attested to the existence of this document. Moreover, it was reported that 'Abd Allah b. 'Amr b. al-'As would dictate hadīths to his disciples. Abū Sabrah said, "'Ubayd Allah b. Ziyād used to ask about the ḥawḍ (basin) of the Prophet Muḥammad and rejected its existence, after asking Abū Barzah, al-Barā' b. 'Āzib and 'Ā'idh b. 'Amr and another man." As a result, Abū Sabrah said [to 'Ubayd Allāh], "I am going to relate to you an account (ḥadīth) which will remove your doubts. Your father [Ziyād] once sent some money with me to Muḥāwiyyah. I met 'Abd Allāh b. 'Amr who told me about what he had heard from the Prophet. He dictated it to me and I wrote it down. I did not add or remove a letter ..."

2. Anas b. Mālik:

Al-Naḍr and Mūsā, the sons of Anas b. Mālik, narrate that their father told them to learn and write down the sayings (ḥadīths) and actions (sunan) of the Prophet. He said, "We did not appreciate the 'knowledge' of those who did not write their knowledge down." Anas’s disciples also used to take dictation from him. Ibn Sinān said, "I came in a delegation from Anbār to al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf in order to complain against his governor Ibn al-Rufayl. I entered his dīwān, where I saw an old man amongst a group taking dictation from him. I enquired and I was told that he was Anas b. Mālik."

3. Rāfi' b. Khadijī:

174 See above, p. 77.
175 Musnad 1, vol. 2, pp. 162-3. Ahmad Shākir has exhaustively examined it, and further, proved its authenticity beyond reasonable doubt in al-Musnad (Musnad 2), vol. 10, pp. 20-3.
176 Taqvīd, p. 96. See also Muslim, k. al-Imām, h. no. 54.
177 Taqvīd, p. 96.
178 A seated teaching area.
179 Baghdad, vol. 8, p. 259.
Rāfi‘ mentions that he had written ḥadīths in his possession, however, he did not identify the writer of these ḥadīths. Nāfi‘ b. Jubayr reported that Marwān b. al-Ḥakam addressed people and made mention of Makkah and its inhabitants and its sacredness, while making no mention of Madīnah, its inhabitants and its sacredness. Rāfi‘ b. Khadīj called to him and said, “What is this, that I hear you making mention of Makkah and its inhabitants and its sacredness, but you did not make mention of Madīnah and its inhabitants and its sacredness, when the Apostle of Allāh also declared sacred [the area] between its two lava lands? And we have a record of this with us written on khawlānī leather. If you like, I can read it out to you.” Thereupon Marwān became silent, and then said, “I too have heard some part of it.”

4. Abū Hurayrah:

Some reports say that Abū Hurayrah had a compilation of ḥadīths. Al-Fudayl b. Ḥasan b. ‘Amr b. Umayyah on the authority of his father narrates that his father mentioned a ḥadīth in the presence of Abū Hurayrah, who denied it. The narrator told Abū Hurayrah that he had in fact heard it from him. On hearing this, Abū Hurayrah asked him to come to his house where he kept his collection of written ḥadīths: They checked this collection where they found the ḥadīth at issue. Al-Jahmad Ibn Ḥanbal propounds a good argument for the assertion that the disciples of Abū Hurayrah contributed to writing his collections of ḥadīths.

Second: The Stance of those who narrated the prohibiting ḥadīths:

---

180 Muslim, k. al-Ḥajj, h. no. 457; Musnad 1, vol. 4, p. 141; Taqyīd, pp. 71-2.
1. Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī:

It is reported that he recorded various things besides the Holy Qurʾān. Abū al-Mutawakkil reports that Abū Sa‘īd said, “We did not write anything except the Qurʾān and al-tashahhud.”\(^{183}\) Al-Khaṭīb says that there is no difference between al-tashahhud and other knowledge, which therefore, by implication, broadens the scope of permissible writing to include the Ḥadīths.\(^{184}\) It seems that Abū Sa‘īd also wrote a Prophetic Ḥadīth and sent it to Ibn ‘Abbās. Muslim reports in his Sahīh that Abū Naḍrah narrated, “I asked Ibn ‘Abbās about gold and silver. He asked, ‘Is it hand to hand exchange?’ I said, ‘Yes,’ whereupon he said, ‘There is no harm in it.’ I informed Abū Sa‘īd about it, telling him that I had asked Ibn ‘Abbās about it, and that he said, ‘Is it hand to hand exchange?’ and that I had said, ‘Yes,’ whereupon he had said, ‘There is no harm in it.’ Abū Sa‘īd then asked, ‘Has he said that? I will soon write to him, and he will not give you this ḥuwāḍ (religious verdict).’”\(^{185}\) It would appear that, had Abū Sa‘īd written to him, he would have quoted some of the Prophetic Ḥadīths regarding this matter in his support.

2. Abū Hurayrah:

His stance has been previously discussed.\(^{186}\)

3. Zayd b. Thābit:

He was the first Companion to write a book concerning the law of inheritance (fī ṭā’īḍ). Al-Zuhri said, “Had Zayd b. Thābit not written the book on the law of

---

\(^{183}\) Dāwūd, k. al-‘ilm, bā. no. 3, ḥ. no. 3648; Taqyīd, p. 93.

\(^{184}\) Taqyīd, p. 93.

\(^{185}\) Muslim, k. Al-Musāqāth, ḥ. no. 99.

\(^{186}\) See above, p. 111.
inheritance (*al-farāʾīd*), people would have lost knowledge of it."\(^{187}\) The introduction of this book is still preserved in al-Ṭabarānī’s *al-Mujām al-kabīr*.\(^{188}\) This book was also narrated by his son, Khārijah b. Zayd b. Thābit, and is also one of Ibn Khayr al-Ishbīlī’s narrations.\(^{189}\) Zayd also wrote about the inheritance of a grandfather in accord with the instructions of ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb,\(^{190}\) and it seems that Zayd allowed his disciples to write down his narration. Kathīr b. Aflāḥ said that, “We used to write at Zayd b. Thābit’s residence,”\(^{191}\) indicating that Zayd did not object to this practice.

Such cases, especially those involving narrators of the prohibition, show that the practice of writing *ḥadīths* was widely accepted and practiced by Companions, all of which supports the case for its permissibility.

It can thus be concluded that the Prophet’s instructions in this regard did play a significant role in the preservation of his *Ḥadīth*.

\(^{187}\) *Nubalā’*, vol. 2, p. 436.

\(^{188}\) *Ṭabarānī MK*, vol. 5, p. 134, no. 4860.

\(^{189}\) Ishbīlī, p. 263.

\(^{190}\) Dāraquṭnī, *al-Frāʾīd*, vol. 4, p. 46, b. no. 4095.

\(^{191}\) *Taqyīd*, p. 102.
THE PROPHET’S LETTERS THAT WERE WRITTEN TO ASSIST IN ESTABLISHING THE SUNNAH IN OTHER REGIONS
SECTION 5

THE PROPHET’S LETTERS THAT WERE WRITTEN TO ASSIST IN ESTABLISHING THE SUNNAH IN OTHER REGIONS

In the previous section, we discussed the Prophet’s permission, and indeed instruction, to his Companions to write down his hadiths. We concluded by clarifying the impact of this on the Companions and its result, which was the widespread practice of recording hadiths, to the extent that some of them compiled books. In this section we shall discuss another approach that was adopted by the Prophet in order to spread and preserve his Sunnah, namely the dispatching of letters to various regions outside of Madinah. These letters contain numerous explanations of the rulings of the Prophetic Sunnah regarding, for example, ritual questions, business transactions, legal penalties, the propagation of Islam, etc.

The Prophet’s letters to various leaders and communities are generally considered to be an important aspect of the propagation and establishment of the Prophet’s Sunnah outside Madinah. The principal books, including books of Sira and Islamic history contain many details of the Prophet’s letters, including, for instance, Ibn Ishaq’s account (d. 151/768), in which he mentions many letters. Al-Qaṣim Ibn Sallam (d. 224/838) does the same in his book al-Amwāl, Ibn Sa’d (d. 230/844) reports more than a hundred letters that were directed from the Prophet to various kings, leaders and communities, as does al-Ṭabarî (d. 310/922) who mentions various letters in his book Tārikh al-umam wa

---

193 Amwāl, pp. 28-32, 35, 39, 244-64 & 447-50.
al-muṭṭak\textsuperscript{195} Beside these, we find other scholars\textsuperscript{196} writing on the same topic. Furthermore, principal books of Ḥadīth are unanimous in mentioning the Prophet's letters, for instance Musnad ʿĀmad,\textsuperscript{197} Saḥīḥ al-Bukhārī,\textsuperscript{198} Saḥīḥ Muslim,\textsuperscript{199} Sunan Abī Dāwūd,\textsuperscript{200} Sunan al-Nasāʾī,\textsuperscript{201} Sunan al-Tirmidhī,\textsuperscript{202} Sunan Ibn Mājah,\textsuperscript{203} etc. Yet the attention paid to the Prophet's letters goes back to the period of the Companions and their followers. ʿAmr Ibn Ḥazm al-Anṣārī d. 50/670\textsuperscript{204} compiled some of the Prophet's letters in a book.\textsuperscript{205} Ibn ʿAbbās d. 68/687 collected some copies of the Prophet's letters along with their replies.\textsuperscript{206} ʿUrwah Ibn al-Zubayr d. 94/712 attempted to collect the Prophet's letters, some of which are mentioned in Abū ʿUbayd al-Qāsim b. Sallām's book.\textsuperscript{207} Marsden Jones states, "We do not have evidence that ʿUrwah wrote a special book on the Prophet's biography. However the numerous citations from ʿUrwah in the books of Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqīdī definitely prove that he was the first one to record the Prophet's biography in the form in which it was later known."\textsuperscript{208} Finally, Ibn Isḥāq said, "Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb al-Miṣrī told me that he found a book in which was a memorandum containing the names of those


\textsuperscript{197} Musnad 1, vol. 1, p. 262 & vol. 4, pp. 74-5.

\textsuperscript{198} K. Badʾ al-waḥī, bā. no. 6; k. al-Maghāzī, bā. no. 82; k. al-Tafsīr, s. al-ʿImrān, bā. no. 4.

\textsuperscript{199} K. al-Jihād wa al-siyār, bā. no. 26, ḥ. no. 74, bā. no. 27, ḥ. no. 75; k. al-Libās wa al-zīnāh, bā. no. 13, ḥ. no. 56-8.

\textsuperscript{200} K. al-khāsām, bā. no. 1, ḥ. no. 4214-5.

\textsuperscript{201} K. al-Zīnāh, bā. no. 47, ḥ. no. 5201.

\textsuperscript{202} K. al-Istīʿdāh, bā. no. 23-5, ḥ. no. 2716-8.

\textsuperscript{203} K. al-Zakāh, bā. no. 9, ḥ. no. 1798; bā. no. 11, ḥ. no. 1801; bā. no. 13, ḥ. no. 1805.

\textsuperscript{204} Uṣd, vol. 3, p. 711-2.

\textsuperscript{205} This book was narrated by his son and printed with Ibn Ṭūlūn's book Iṭlām al-sāʾīlīn ʿan kutub sayyid al-mursalān, PP. 143-54.

\textsuperscript{206} Zaylaʾī, vol. 4, p. 420.

\textsuperscript{207} Amīrī, p. 246-54 & 257-60.

\textsuperscript{208} Wāqīdī, vol. 1, p. 21.
whom the Apostle sent to the countries and kings of the Arabs and non Arabs and what he said to his Companions when he sent them. I sent it to Muḥammad b. Shihāb al-Zuhārī [51-124 AH] and he recognized it.”

On further scrutiny of the texts of the letters mentioned in the books just cited, we find them serving a mixture of purposes including: calling to Islam; proposing a covenant; explaining the creed of Islam and the Sunnah, etc. The main reason for the gathering of the letters of the Prophet by the above mentioned scholars was simply that frequently these letters were official documents written at the Prophet’s behest.

Therefore, this section will involve a search of the relevant Islamic literature for the letters which illustrate the extent of the Prophet’s endeavours in the preservation of his Sunnah by its propagation and establishment outside Madīnah, and their examination.

The letters related to this issue are too numerous to mention here. However, we can usefully confine ourselves to discussing a relevant cross-section of the Prophet’s letters, which clarify for us his role and contribution in the preservation of his Sunnah, as for example, is the case regarding his letters relating to zakāh.

The order to pay zakāh occurs in the Qur’ān in many different places, though simply in the form of a general command. In other words, no specific instructions are given regarding the time of payment, the amount to be payed and the different types of zakāh such as gold, silver, crops and animals. There are other questions which one might

---

210 See Alfaţ, entry: ( )
ask, but one can not find answers to them in the Qur’an. Thus it was incumbent on the Prophet himself to illustrate zakāh in detail, not only in Madīnah, but by sending letters to other regions and countries outside al-Madinah regarding this matter. The letters related to zakāh can be described into three types:

A. The letters the contents of which are known and are related to zakāh, as well as to other Islamic teachings such as the Creeds of Islam, sunan, etc.

B. The letters the contents of which are known and which are specifically related to zakāh.

C. The letters which are only briefly referred to and the contents of which are unknown to us.

Below is an alphabetical list of the names of the places and tribes to which the Prophet sent letters:

1. Bahrain.\(^{211}\)
2. Dabā’. (located between Oman and Bahrain according to Ibn Sa’\(d\)’s report.\(^{212}\) However, today it is located on the coast of the united Arab emirates.\(^{213}\)
3. Dümat al-Jandal.\(^{214}\)
4. Ḥadramawt.\(^{215}\)
5. Ḥīmyar. (to the kings of Ḥīmyar).\(^{216}\) Al-Bayhaqī narrated the same letter with some additional information.\(^{217}\)
6. Al-Sif and al-Sahl.\(^{218}\)
7. Tribe of Banū Aslam.\(^{219}\) (in al-Kūfah).\(^{220}\)
8. Tribe of Bāhilah (in Bīshah).\(^{221}\)
9. Tribe of Banū al-Ḥārith b. Ka’b.\(^{222}\)
10. Tribe of Banū al-Ḥurqah from Juhaynah.\(^{223}\)
11. Tribe of Banū Judhām.\(^{224}\)

\(^{211}\) Ibn Sa’\(d\), vol. 1, p. 263, vol. 4, p. 360.
\(^{212}\) Ibid., vol. 7, p. 101.
\(^{213}\) Warthā’i, p. 164.
\(^{214}\) Ibn Sa’d, vol. 1, P. 355.
\(^{215}\) Ibid., P. 287. See also Miṣbāḥ, P. 397.
\(^{216}\) Hishām 1, vol. 2, p. 589.
\(^{217}\) Bayhaqī, vol. 4, pp. 89-90.
\(^{218}\) Ibn Sa’\(d\), vol. 1, p. 354.
\(^{219}\) Ibid.
\(^{220}\) See Ibid., vol. 4, p. 302; p. 309.
\(^{221}\) Ibid., vol. 1, p. 284; Miṣbāḥ, p. 383.
\(^{222}\) Hishām 1, vol. 2, pp. 594-6.
\(^{223}\) Ibn sa’\(d\), vol. 1, p. 271-2.
In addition to the above, there is an important letter the Prophet was planning to send to all of his governors before he died. ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Umar said, “The Apostle of Allāh wrote a letter about *sadaqah (zakāh)* but it was not sent to his governors as he died before this was accomplished. He kept it in the sheath (*ghimd*) of his sword. So Abū Bakr acted upon it until his death, and then ‘Umar acted upon it until he too died. It contained, ...”

---

224 Ibid., p. 270.
225 Ibid., p. 271-2.
226 Ibid., p. 335.
227 Ibid., p. 327. See also Hishām 1, vol. 2, p. 583; Ibn Sa’d, vol. 6, p. 68.
228 Ibn Sa’d, vol. 1, p. 327. See also Hishām 1, vol. 2, p. 583.
229 Ibn Sa’d, vol. 1, p. 270.
230 Dārimī, *al-Tahārah*, bā. no. 1, h. no. 656.
231 Ibn Sa’d, vol. 1, p. 327. See also Hishām 1, vol. 2, p. 583.
233 Dāwūd, *al-Zakāh*, bā. no. 4, h. no. 1568; Tirmidhī, *al-Zakāh*, bā. no. 4, h. no. 621; Ibn Mājah, *al-Zakāh*, bā. 7, h. no. 1798, bā. 13, h. no. 1805.
A table of a brief account of what is contained in the above letters:

1. Zakāḥ on grazing camels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The nişāb</th>
<th>What is due</th>
<th>Glossary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>1 shāh</td>
<td>1 ewe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>shāṭān</td>
<td>2 ewes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>thalāthu-shiyāh</td>
<td>3 ewes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>arba‘u-shiyāh</td>
<td>4 ewes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 35</td>
<td>1 Ibnat-makhād  If there is not, then Ibn-labīn</td>
<td>a she-camel in its second year a male-camel in its third year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 45</td>
<td>1 Ibnat-labīn</td>
<td>a she-camel in its third year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 60</td>
<td>1 ǧīqāh</td>
<td>a she-camel in its fourth year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - 75</td>
<td>1 jadha‘</td>
<td>a she-camel in its fifth year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 - 90</td>
<td>2 Ibnatā-labīn</td>
<td>two she-camel in their third year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 - 120</td>
<td>2 ǧīqatān</td>
<td>two she-camel in their fourth year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any number above 120</td>
<td>1 Ibnat-labīn for every forty camels or ǧīqāh for every fifty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Zakāḥ on grazing sheep:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The nişāb</th>
<th>What is due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 39</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 120</td>
<td>1 shāh     (1 ewe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 - 200</td>
<td>shāṭān     (2 ewes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 - 300</td>
<td>thalāthu-shiyāh (3 ewes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any number above 300</td>
<td>1 shāh for every one hundred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Zakāḥ for Cows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The nişāb</th>
<th>What is due</th>
<th>Glossary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On every 5 cows</td>
<td>1 shāh</td>
<td>ewe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>1 tabf</td>
<td>a cow in its second year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1 musinah</td>
<td>a cow in its third year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any number above 40</td>
<td>1 tabf for every forty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The zakāḥ on agricultural produce:

A tenth is payable on produce watered by rains, springs or any other natural means, and a twentieth on produce watered by irrigation, if the total quantity is five awsuq (wisq
or wasq: camel-load\textsuperscript{235} or more. If it does not reach the amount of five camel-loads, no zakāh is due on it.

5. The zakāh on gold and silver coinage:

\textit{Zakāh} is due on twenty dinārs (of gold coin in weight), as it is due on five awāq (two hundred dirhams of silver in weight). When the former reaches twenty, half a dinār is payable. When the latter reaches two hundred, five dinārs are payable.

6. Other instructions given by the Prophet in his letters:

- \textit{Zakāh} is the obligation of Allah, which Allah has imposed on the Muslims.
- \textit{Al-sadqah} (zakāh) is not lawful to be paid to Muḥammad and his relatives. However, it is lawful for the poor of Muslims and \textit{Ibn al-sabīl} (a traveler whose money has run out).
- No zakāh is due on house goods.
- If any one wants to pay more than is stipulated, that is good for him.
- An old sheep, one which has a defect in the eye or is thin and male goats are not to be accepted as zakāh unless the collector wishes.
- Those animals which are in separate flocks are not to be brought together, and those animals which are in one flock are not to be separated out of fear of paying more zakāh on them.\textsuperscript{236}
- Regarding property belonging to two partners, they can make claims for restitution from one another with equity.\textsuperscript{237}
- Zakāh is to be collected from the place where the property is normally present.

\textsuperscript{234} The minimum quantity for the payment of zakāh.

\textsuperscript{235} Ibn Manzūr, under the article (v j ).

\textsuperscript{236} A man, for instance, has forty goats in one flock, and forty in another flock. Thus one goat is payable on each of these flocks. If when the collector comes, he combines both the flocks, and therefore pays only one goat, this would be deception and is, therefore, forbidden. This is an example of combination. It is also prohibited to separate them when combined together in one flock. For instance; two partners have two hundred and one goats in one flock. Thus three goats are payable; when collection falls due, they separate the goats and thus each of them pays only one goat.

\textsuperscript{237} For instance; two partners have forty sheep in one flock, each owning twenty sheep, and the collector takes one sheep on the forty. The price of the one sheep is divided between them equally.
There is to be no collecting of zakāh from a distance, nor must people who own property remove it far away.\textsuperscript{238}

It should be noted that all of the above instructions and commands that are mentioned in the Prophet's letters, are considered to be Sunnah. Further, we should bear in mind that the above summary does not include all the details relating to zakāh because the letters that have been mentioned are intended to be no more than examples. It is also worth adding, that the above details do not contradict what is mentioned regarding zakāh in the principal books of Hadīth, such as Sahīh al-Bukhārī, Sahīh Muslim, Sunan Abī Dāwūd, Sunan al-Nasā'ī, Sunan al-Tirmidhī, Sunan Ibn Mājah, Sunan al-Dārimī, Muwatta' Mālik and Musnad Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal.

It can thus be concluded that these instructions regarding zakāh came to prevail and to be followed in a variety of regions. Furthermore, since these letters not only contain many of the hadīths pertaining to zakāh, but also include hadīths relating to many other aspects of Islamic teaching, including: fasting; pilgrimage; doctrine; business transactions; the question of penalties etc., a similar conclusion can be drawn regarding their prevalence.

In conclusion, the letters of the Prophet were clearly a factor which played a significant role in preserving the Sunnah, inasmuch as they enabled the people to attain a clear understanding of what is required in zakāh and to fulfill its obligations correctly.

\textsuperscript{238} The original Arabic words are ًّ\textsuperscript{238} 'to pull' and ًّ\textsuperscript{238} 'to be at a distance'. This means that the collector of zakāh should not stay at a considerable distance from the animals, and, in addition, he must not make people bring their animals to him -he must go to the owners of the animals in order to collect zakāh. Similarly, the people must not remove their animals to a distance when they are aware that he is coming to collect zakāh. This hadīth in effect insists that the collector of zakāh should not put the people to hardship, nor should they hamper him; both parties should give due consideration to the other.
THE PROPHET'S DISPATCHING OF EDUCATIONAL MISSIONS FOR THE PROPAGATION OF HIS SUNNAH IN OTHER REGIONS
SECTION 6

THE PROPHET’S DISPATCHING OF EDUCATIONAL MISSIONS FOR THE PROPAGATION OF HIS SUNNAH IN OTHER REGIONS

In the previous section we mentioned examples of the Prophet’s letters to neighbouring towns and regions that contain several examples of the teachings of the Sunnah. Those who bore these letters were not ignorant of the Prophetic teachings and instructions that they contained. Indeed, they were expected to possess sufficient knowledge to be able to clarify what was contained in these letters and to answer any questions that might be raised by those to whom the letters were sent. In this regard, they resembled the envoys and ambassadors of the present. This was particularly important due to the content of the letters being general and brief on occasion, and as such demanded explanation and clarification by the messengers, who were in fact teachers as well. This being the case some of the letters mentioned in the previous section can serve as useful examples in this section.

The Prophet was very keen to propagate the teachings of the Qur’ân and Sunnah, and sent a number of messengers to neighbouring towns and regions in order to instruct people regarding these key sources. Some of the Companions complained to him of the bad treatment which they suffered on arrival, but the Prophet insisted that this was not to deter them: ‘Uqbah b. ‘Amir narrates that he said to the Prophet “You send us out and it happens that (on occasion) we have to stay with such people as do not entertain us. What do you think about this?” He said to us, “If you stay with some people and they entertain you as they should a guest, accept their hospitality, but if they do not, take the right of the
guest from them."239 He also endeavoured to make this process successful insofar as he
would order the people to whom his messengers were dispatched to obey them and offer
their support. For instance, he wrote a letter to the people of Hajar which runs as follows,
"... When my messengers reach you, you should obey them and offer them support in the
matter (concerned) and the way of Allāh ... ."240 He also recommended that his
messengers should be treated well. Ibn Sa'd narrates that, in the letter that the Prophet
wrote to the people of Yemen he not only informed them about the teachings of Islam and
the zakāh of cattle and money, but also recommended them to treat his Companions and
messengers well.241

This enthusiasm on the part of the Prophet for the dispatching of messengers did
not begin at the time of his arrival in Madinah, but was already in evidence during his time
in Makkah. When Islam spread amongst the Anṣār households, they sent a man to the
Prophet with a letter which read, "Send to us a man who can teach us about religion and
how to recite the Qur'ān." The Prophet sent Mus'ab b. 'Umayr.242

After his emigration to Madinah, the Prophet continued to pursue his endeavour in
an expanded form. He would send messengers to teach people in answer to the demands
made by Muslims who had newly embraced Islam, and were thirsty to learn the Qur'ān
and Sunnah and also purely of his own volition. The following cases are examples of this:

239 Bukhārī, k. al-Mażālim wa al-qhaṣb, bā. no. 18, h. no. 2461; Muslim, k. al-Luqātah, h. no. 17; Dāwūd,
k. al-‘Itimah, bā. no. 5, h. no. 3752; Ibn Mājah, k. al-‘Adab, bā. no. 5, h. no. 3676; Munṣad 1, vol. 4, p. 149.
241 Ibid., p. 264.
242 Ibid., vol. 3, p. 118.
1. A delegation from Banū Kilāb visited the Prophet and said, “Al-Ḍāḥḥāk b. Sufyān came to us with the Book of Allāh and your Sunnah, which you ordered him to do ...”

2. A group of people from ‘Aḍal and al-Qārah arrived in Madīnah in the third year, after the battle of Uhud, and said to the Prophet, “O Apostle of Allāh, we are a people who have embraced Islam, so send with us some of your Companions to teach us about our religion, teach us how to recite the Qur’ān and inform us about the teachings of Islam.” The Prophet sent six of his Companions, namely: Marthad b. Abī Marthad al-Ghanawī, Khālid b. al-Bukayr al-Laythī, ‘Āṣim b. Thābit b. Abī al-Aqlah, Khubayb b. ‘Adī, Zayd b. al-Dīthinnah b. Mu‘āwiyah and ‘Abd Allāh b. Ṭāriq. Although the word Sunnah is not actually used, the ‘teachings of Islam’ that are referred to obviously include the Sunnah.

3. It has been reported on the authority of Anas b. Mālik that some people came to the Apostle of Allāh and said to him, “Send with us some men who may teach us the Qur’ān and the Sunnah.” Accordingly, he sent seventy men from the Ansār, who were called the Reciters and among them was my maternal uncle Ḥarām, with these people, but they fell upon all of them and killed them before they reached their destination. In face of this tragedy Allāh’s Apostle recited qunūt for a period of one month, invoking Allāh to punish them.


---

243 Ibid., vol. 1, p. 300.
244 Hishām 1, vol. 2, p. 169.
245 Muslim, k. al-Imārah, h. no. 147; Musnad 1, vol. 3, p. 270.
246 Bukhārī, k. al-Witr, bā. no. 7, h. no. 1002.
him (in order for him) to teach people about religion and to teach them the Qur’ān.”

It is noteworthy that the teaching of the Qur’ān entails that the Sunnah also be taught, as was discussed in the first section of the first chapter.

5. Anas b. Mālik reported that a group of people of Yemen came to the Prophet and said, “Send with us a man who will teach us the Sunnah and Islam.” Whereupon the Prophet caught hold of the hand of Abū ‘Ubaydah and said, “He is the man of trust of this ummah.”

At a later date, the Prophet sent Mu‘ādh b. Jabal and Abū Mūsā to Yemen.

Some Companions of Mu‘ādh b. Jabal said, “When the Apostle of Allāh intended to send Mu‘ādh b. Jabal to Yemen, he asked, ‘How will you judge when the occasion of deciding a case arises?’ He replied, ‘I shall judge in accordance with Allāh’s book.’ He asked ‘(What will you do) if you do not find guidance in Allāh’s book?’ He replied, ‘(I will act) in accordance with the Sunnah of the Apostle of Allāh.’ He asked, ‘(What will you do) if you do not find guidance in the Sunnah of the Apostle of Allāh and in Allāh’s book?’ He replied, ‘I shall do my best to form an opinion and spare no pains (ajtahidu rayī wa lā ālū).’ ...”

Furthermore, Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr states, as narrated by Ibn Ishāq, “The Prophet sent Mu‘ādh b. Jabal as a judge over al-Janad in Yemen, and to teach people the Qur‘ān and the teachings of Islam ... .”

Al-Ṭabarī, on the authority of al-Laythī, states that, “The Prophet, after his arrival from ʿɪţajj, divided Yemen into a number of regions and

---

248 Muslim, k. Faṣā’il al-Saḥābah, h. no. 2419.
249 Musnad 1, vol. 4, p. 397.
250 Dāwūd. k. al-Aqḍiyah, bā. no. 11, h. no. 3592-93; Tirmidhī, k. al-Aḥkām, bā. no. 3, h. no. 1327-8; Dārimī, al-Muqaddimah, bā. no. 20, h. no. 168; Musnad 1, vol. 5, pp. 230, 236, 242.
appointed rulers over it ..., Mu‘ādh was the teacher who traveled around in the regions of Yemen and Ḥaḍramawt.”

6. The Prophet also sent al-‘Alā’ b. al-Ḥaḍramī to the people of Oman after they had embraced Islam with the task of instructing them in the teachings of Islam.253

Even the military commanders that were sent by the Prophet to propagate Islam and fight the enemy, were also ordered by the Prophet to teach people the Qurʾān and *Sunnah* at the same time and indeed, as a prelude to any engagement. (See above, p. 27, no. 2, under the title of ‘The use of the word ‘*sunnah*’ by the Prophet’)

The teaching of the Qurʾān and *Sunnah* was not a task that was restricted to messengers dispatched by the Prophet: the delegations which came to Madīnah would usually stay there for some days, and as such had the chance to learn the Qurʾān and *Sunnah* from the Prophet and his Companions. Following this, they would return to teach their people what they had learnt, in addition to the Prophet’s specific recommendations, as evidenced by the following:

1. Dimām b. Tha‘labah returned to his people after he had been taught by the Prophet, and informed them of the orders and prohibitions of the Prophet.254

2. Salamah al-Jarmī embraced Islam and stayed with the Prophet for some time. When he went back to his people, he taught them what he had learnt from the Prophet. He said, “He orders you to do such and such a thing and prohibits you from doing such and such a thing.”

---

252 Ṭabari, vol. 4, p. 38.
253 Ibn Sa’d, vol. 1, p. 351.
254 Ibid., p. 299.
When the time for prayer comes up, one of you should call the *adhän*, and the one among you who knows the most Qur'ān should lead you in prayer.

3. As mentioned above, the Prophet ordered the delegation of ‘Abd al-Qays to do four things, and forbade them from four things, he further said, “Memorize them and tell them to the people whom you have left behind.”

4. Mālik b. al-Ḥuwayrīth said, “I came to the Prophet with some men from my tribe and stayed with him for twenty nights. ... When he realised our longing for our families, he said to us, ‘Go back and stay with your families and teach them ... ’”

It is clear that these messengers who were sent by the Prophet played an important role in spreading and establishing his Sunnah far afield.

---

255 Ibid., p. 336.
256 See p. 75.
257 Bukhārī, *k. al-Adhān*, bā. no. 17, h. no. 628.
THE PROPHET'S TEACHING OF THE INCOMING DELEGATIONS AND THEIR INSTRUCTION IN THE SUNNAH
SECTION 7

THE PROPHET’S TEACHING OF THE INCOMING DELEGATIONS AND THEIR INSTRUCTION IN THE SUNNAH

In the section dealing with the Prophet’s exhortation and instruction of his Companions to memorize Hadīth, we concluded that the delegation of ‘Abd al-Qays embraced Islam early, and that the delegation came to Madīnah in the first years of the Prophet’s residence there. In addition, Ibn Ishāq mentions the delegation of Muzaynah which arrived in the fifth year of hijrah. However, not many delegations came to Madīnah until after the conquest of Makkah in 8 AH. ‘Amr b. Salamah says, “... The Arabs [other than the Quraysh] delayed their conversion to Islam until the conquest of Makkah. They used to say, 'Leave him [i.e. Muhammad] and his people Quraysh. If he overpowers them, then he is a true Prophet.' So when Makkah was conquered, every tribe rushed to embrace Islam... .” Ibn Ishāq says, “The Arabs were waiting to see what the reaction of the Quraysh towards Islam would be and what the Prophet would do in response. This is because the tribe of Quraysh was the leading tribe and a source of guidance to the people, the custodians of the holy house of Allāh and the pure descendants of the Prophet Ismā‘īl b. Ibrāhīm. The leaders of the Arabs did not deny these facts. Quraysh was also the tribe that declared war on the Prophet. When Makkah was conquered, the Quraysh surrendered and embraced Islam, and as a result, it was clear to the other Arabs that they had no power to fight the Prophet or to even harbour any hostility against him, thus, they entered into Islam, as Allāh said, ‘in crowds,’ from all directions.

258 See above, pp. 75-6.
Allāh said to his Apostle, ‘When there comes the help of Allāh and victory, and you see that the people enter Allāh’s religion in crowds, so glorify the praises of your Lord, and ask His forgiveness.’ Indeed, 9 AH was subsequently named the ‘year of the delegations’.

It seems that the number of these delegations was very high as is clear from both the astonishment expressed by ‘Urwah b. al-Zubayr and the suggestion made by ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb. The former said to ‘Ā’ishah, ‘... I am indeed astonished at your knowledge of medicine, how is this and where did you get it from? ‘Ā’ishah tapped him on his shoulder and said, ‘The Prophet used often to be ill in the final years of his life, and the Arab delegations used to come to him from all directions and prescribe treatments for his illnesses. It was I who would prepare these medicines for him.’ The latter saw a silken cloak being sold at the gate of the Mosque and said to Allāh’s Apostle, “I wish you would buy this to wear on Fridays and also on occasions of the arrivals of the delegations.”

Ibn Sa’d mentions in his *Tabaqāt* that more than seventy delegations came to the Prophet. Ibn Hishām narrates in his *Sīrah*, on the authority of Ibn Ishāq (d. 151/768), which precedes Ibn Sa’d’s work, detailed accounts of a number of the delegations.

---

262 Ibid., pp. 559-60.
263 Hishām 1, vol. 1, pp. 291-359.
266 Hishām 1, vol. 2, pp. 560-98.
The delegations would take residence in different locations in Madinah. Furthermore, the delegations would stay in Madinah for widely varying periods, in order to learn from the Prophet and his Companions. Some of these delegations arrived in obedience to a command from the Prophet, as was the case with the delegation of 'Abd al-Qays and also that of al-Harith b. Ka'b.

The delegations would occupy a considerable portion of the Prophet’s time, to the point that he was, on occasion, delayed from performing the prayer at its appointed time. Umm Salamah said, “O Allāh’s Apostle, I have heard you forbidding the offering of these

---

267 For instance: the delegation of Ghāmid resided at Baqi’ al-Gharqad (Ibn Sa’d, vol. 1, p. 345); the delegation of Daws at Ḥarrat al-Dujaj (Ibid., p. 353); and the Prophet received Banū Mālik, from the delegation of Thaqqīf, in his tent (Dāwūd, k. al-Ṣalāḥ, bā. no. 326, h. no. 1393; Ibn Sa’d, vol. 1, p. 313; Ibn Mājah, k. Igāmat al-Ṣalāḥ, bā. no. 178, h. no. 1345). A number of delegations took residence in the houses of the Companions of the Prophet, which enabled these delegations to learn from the Companions, and this will be illustrated in greater detail later. Examples are plentiful: The delegation of Thaqqīf took residence in the house of al-Mughirah b. Shu‘bah (Ibid.); the delegation of Bahrā’ at the house of al-Miqdād b. ‘Amr (Ibn Sa’d, vol. 1, p. 331); the delegation of Yalī at the house of Ruwayfi’ b. Thābit (Ibid., p. 330); and the delegation of Najrān resided at the house of Abū Ayyūb al-Anṣārī (Ibid., p. 358). It seems that the house of Ramlah bt. al-Ḥarith was used as a residence on a permanent basis as is apparent from the considerable number of delegations that stayed there (Such as: Delegation of Muḥarrīb, Kilāb, ‘Abd al-Qays, Taghlib, Ḥanīfah, Khawālīn, ‘Udhrah, Ghassān, al-Rahāwīn, al-Nakha’. See Ibid., pp. 229, 300, 315, 316, 316, 324, 331, 338, 344, 346 respectively). It is also clear that this house was spacious enough to accommodate a large number of people: the last delegation to reside there numbered two hundred (Ibid., p. 346). It is not unlikely that there was a residence that was allocated exclusively to the delegations; indeed, as one narration indicates, the Prophet said to Thawbān, “Take this delegation to where the delegations reside” (Ibid., p. 332).

268 Some of the delegations did not consist of more than ten individuals (Such as: Delegation of Banū Kīlāb, Tha’labah, Banū ‘Abs, Asad, Muḥārīb, Ghāmid. See Ibid., pp. 304, 298, 295, 292, 299, 345 respectively. See also Dāwūd, k. al-Ṣalāḥ, bā. no. 229, h. no. 1096); others numbered twenty (Such as: Delegation of Fizārah, Murah, Kīlāb, Thaqqīf, Kindah. See Ibn Sa’d, vol. 1, pp. 297, 297, 300, 313, 328 respectively); while yet others exceeded one hundred men, as was the case with the delegation of Bajilah which consisted of one hundred and fifty men (Ibid., p. 347); the delegation of al-Nakha’, the last delegation to visit the Prophet, numbered two hundred men (Ibid., p. 346); the delegation of al-Ādhamiyūn numbered two hundred and fifty (Ibid., p. 347); and the delegation of Muzaynah, the first delegation to come from Muḍar, which comprised four hundred persons (Ibid., p. 291).

269 The delegation of Yalī had stayed three days and ‘Abd al-Qays had stayed ten days. See Ibid., pp. 330, 315. Also, the delegation of Mālik Ibn al-Ḥuwayrīth had stayed twenty days. See Bukhārī, k. al-Adhān, bā. no. 18, h. no. 631.

270 Ibn Sa’d, vol. 1, p. 314.
[two rak‘ahs after the ‘asr prayer] but I have seen you offering them.’ When he had finished the prayer he said, ‘... The people of the tribe of ‘Abd al-Qays came to me and made me busy and I could not offer the two rak‘ahs after the zuhr prayer. These are for those [missed] ones.’  

‘Abd Allah b. ‘Umar said, “Once Allah’s Apostle was busy (because of a coming delegation), so that the [‘ishā’] prayer was delayed so much that we slept and woke up and slept and woke up again.” Indeed, the delegations would perform various acts of worship with him and he would correct them if he saw that they made any mistake. ‘Ali b. Shaybān, a member of one delegation, said, “... We took the oath of allegiance to him and observed prayer behind him and he glanced at a man from the corners of his eyes, who was not doing the prayer properly. When the Prophet finished his prayer, he said, ‘O assembly of the Muslims, the prayer is not valid for those who do not straighten their back in rukū‘ and sujūd.’” Moreover, various delegations performed the Friday prayer with the Prophet and listened to his khutbah and to the instructions and teachings it contained. Al-Ḥakam b. Ḥazm al-Kulafi said, “I came to the Apostle of Allāh in a delegation consisting of either seven or nine persons. ... We stayed there for several days and offered the Friday prayer along with the Apostle of Allāh ... .” This learning sometimes simply consisted of asking questions of the Prophet, and by this they acquired a great deal of knowledge of the Qur‘ān and the laws of Islam. Examples of this are: the

---

272 Bukhārī, k. al-Saḥāb, bā. no. 8, h. no. 1233; k. al-Moghāfīrī, bā. no. 69, h. no. 4370; Muslim, k. Ṣalāḥ al-Musāfīrīn, h. no. 297; Dāwūd, k. al-Ṣalāḥ, bā. no. 298, h. no. 1273; Dārimi, k. al-Ṣalāḥ, bā. no. 143, h. no. 1436; Musnad 1, vol. 6, pp. 293 & 304.
274 Bukhārī, k. Mawāqūf al-Ṣalāḥ, bā. no. 24, h. no. 570; Muslim, k. al-Masa‘id wa mawāqūf al-Ṣalāḥ, h. no. 221; Dāwūd, k. al-‘Aṭārah, bā. no. 80, h. no. 199.
275 Ibn Mājah, k. Iqāmat al-Ṣalāḥ, bā. no. 16; Musnad 1, vol. 4, p. 23.
276 Dāwūd, k. al-Ṣalāḥ, bā. no. 229, h. no. 1096; Musnad 1, vol. 4, p. 212.
PART I: Chapter 2

delegation of 'Udhrah that came to the Prophet to ask about various religious matters; the delegation of Yalā that had specific queries regarding the entertainment of guests and various other matters; the delegation of Bahrā' that learned al-farā'iḍ; the delegation of al-Rahāwiiyyin that learned the Qur'ān and al-farā'iḍ; the delegation of Salāmān that questioned the Prophet regarding the prayer, the laws of Islam and al-rugyah. It is worth mentioning that despite the fact that the word Sunnah itself is not used in the above examples, an understanding of the Qur'ān and the laws of Islam of necessity requires the learning of the Sunnah, as has been discussed previously, and indeed there are many examples that illustrate the delegations learning of the Prophet’s Sunnah in particular:

1. As noted earlier, the delegation of 'Abd al-Qays came to the Prophet and asked him about the permissibility of certain beverages, and was told what things were prohibited. The Prophet said, “I forbid you [to prepare nabīdhi282] in al-dubbā’, and al-ḥantam, al-naqīr and al-muqayyar ...”283

2. The delegation of al-Ṣadaf asked the Prophet about the times of prayer and he informed them.284

3. ‘Amr b. Salamah said, “When my father returned from the Prophet he said that, ‘... The Prophet commands you to do such-and-such a thing and prohibits you from doing such-and-such a thing, and orders you to offer such-and-such a prayer at such-and-such a time,

---

278 Ibid., p. 330.
279 Ibid., p. 331.
280 Ibid., p. 344.
281 Ibid., p. 332.
282 For the definition of nabīdhi, see Chapter 1, footnote no. 30.
283 Muslim, k. al-Āshribah, h. no. 33; Bukhārī, k. al-Imān, bā. no. 40, h. no. 53, k. al-Manāṣib, bā. no. 5, h. no. 3510.
and when the time for prayer becomes due, one of you should pronounce the *adhan*, and let
the one amongst you who knows the most Qurʾān lead the prayer."

4. ‘Uthmān b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Aws reports, on the authority of his grandfather Aws b.
Hudhayfah, “We came to Allāh’s Apostle as part of a delegation from Thaqīf and its allies
[from the Quraysh] and were given a place to stay in the house of al-Mughīrah b. Shu‘bah,
and Allāh’s Apostle accommodated Banū Mālik in a tent of his. He used to come to us
every night after ‘*ishā‘* and would stand talking with us for so long that he would ease his
weight by shifting from foot to foot. One night he came later than the time at which he
usually came to us. At this I said, ‘Allāh’s Apostle, you have come late to us this night.’
He said, ‘I remembered the practice [of reciting] from the Qurʾān and I disliked to go out
until I had performed this practice.’ Aws said, ‘I asked the Companions of Allāh’s Apostle,
“How did you divide the Qurʾān into sections [to facilitate recitation]?” They said, ‘Three
sūrahs, then five, seven, nine, eleven, thirteen, and ḥizb al-muflasal.’

5. Jābir reports that, “A person came from Jayshān, a town in Yemen, (in another report:
Abū Wahb al-Jayshāni came with a group of his people,) and asked Allāh’s Apostle
about a drink which was drunk in their land and which was prepared from millet and was
called *mizr*. Allāh’s Apostle asked whether it was intoxicating. He said, ‘Yes.’ Thereupon

285 Ibid., p. 336. See also Bukhārī, k. al-Maghiṣi, bā. no. 53, ḥ. no. 4302.
286 The first ḥizb (section) consisted of three sūrahs: al-Baqara, al-‘Imrān, and al-Nisā‘; the second ḥizb
consisted of five sūrahs- al-Mā‘ṣidah, al-An‘ām, al-A‘rāf, al-Anfāl and Barā‘ah; the third ḥizb consisted of
seven sūrahs- Yūnus, Hūd, Yūsuf, al-Ra‘d, Ibīrīn, al-‘Hier and al-Nasr; the fourth ḥizb consisted of nine
sūrahs- Banī Isrā‘il, al-Kahf, Maryam, Tāhā, al-Anbiyā‘, al-Ḥajj, al-Mun‘āfīn, al-Nūr and al-Furqān; the fifth
ḥizb comprised eleven sūrahs- al-Shu‘ārā‘, al-Naml, al-Qaṣaṣ, al-Ankabūt, al-Rūm, Luqmān, al-
Sajdah, al-A‘zāb, Saba‘, Fāṭīr and Yāsīn; the sixth ḥizb comprised thirteen sūrahs- al-Sāfīr, Sād, al-Zumar,
the seven sūrahs beginning with the letters Ḥāmīn, Muḥammad, al-Fāṭih and al-Hijrār; and the seventh
ḥizb contained *muflasal* i.e. from sūrat Qīf to the end.”
287 Ibn Mājah, k. Iqāmat al-Ṣalāh, bā. no. 178, ḥ. no. 1345; Dāwūd, k. al-Ṣalāḥ, bā. no. 326, ḥ. no. 1393;
Musnad 1, vol. 4, pp. 9 & 343.
Allāh’s Apostle said, ‘Every intoxicant is forbidden. Verily Allāh, the Exalted and Majestic, made a covenant that he would make those who drank intoxicants drink tīnāt al-khabāl.’ They said, ‘Allāh’s Apostle, what is tīnāt al-khabāl?’ He said, ‘It is the sweat or the discharge of the dwellers of Hell.’” 289

6. The leader of the delegation of Bajīlah pledged allegiance (bay’ah) to the Prophet on a number of matters including the giving of advice to Muslims and obedience to the ruler, even if he was an Abyssinian slave. 290

7. Laqīṭ b. Šabrah reports: “I was the leader of the delegation of Banū al-Muntafīq ... that came to the Apostle of Allāh. I said, ‘O Apostle of Allāh, I have a wife who has something [wrong] in her tongue (i.e. she was insolent).’ He said, ‘Then divorce her.’ I said, ‘Apostle of Allāh, she has been my companion and I have children from her.’ He said, ‘Then ask her [to obey you]. If there is something good in her, she will do so, and do not beat your wife as you would beat your slave-girl.’ I said, ‘Apostle of Allāh, tell me about ablution.’ He said, ‘Perform ablution in full and make the fingers go through the beard and snuff up water well except when you are fasting.’” 291

The task of teaching the Qurʾān and Sunnah to the delegations was not restricted to the Prophet alone, the Companions also used to contribute. For instance:

1. Ibn Saʿd narrates that, “The delegation of Khawlān came to the Prophet and asked him about various religious matters and he informed them [about them], he then asked someone to teach them the Qurʾān and sunan ... they accepted as prohibited what the Prophet
prohibited them to do and they accepted as lawful what the Prophet made lawful to them.”  

2. A man who came with the delegation of ‘Abd al-Qays said, “The Prophet asked the delegation of ‘Abd al-Qays, ‘How did you find the generosity of your brothers [al-Anṣār] and their hospitality to you?’ and they said, ‘They are the best of brothers; they provided us with comfortable beds and good food, and they taught us the Book of our Lord and the Sunnah of our Prophet by day and night.’ The Prophet was greatly pleased to hear this.”

The above indicates the vital role played by the Companions in the teaching of the Sunnah, which supported and complimented the work of the Prophet.

The Prophet himself, as we have seen, was very keen to teach the delegations. Indeed, on some occasions he asked them to make a presentation of what they had learned. A member of the delegation of ‘Abd al-Qays said, “... Then he approached us one by one and asked us to relate what we had learnt and understood. Some of us had learnt al-tahiyyāt and the Opening Chapter of the Qurʾān, and others had learnt one or two stūrahs and one or two practices of the sunnah (al-sunatu aw al-sunatayn) ...”

Moreover, the Prophet also drew their attention to the fact that they should, on their return, teach their people what they had learned from him and from his Companions. The evidence for this has been mentioned at the end of the section concerned with the Prophet’s dispatching of the educational missions.

---

293 Musnad 1, vol. 4, pp. 206-7.
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In summary, we can say that all of the above evidence indicates that these delegations heard hadīths from the Prophet himself; learned from him and from his Companions; witnessed aspects of his conduct and example; and listened to his advice and instruction, all of which was integral to the preservation and propagation of his teachings.

It should be noted that all of the instructions and commands that were mentioned in the previous examples and which were learned by the delegations are considered to be Sunnah. The performance of these sunan that are related to the preparation of beverages, the times of prayer, who is most deserving of the īmāmah, the adhān, the dividing of the Qurʾān into sections, the ruling on intoxicating beverages, the giving of advice to Muslims, the stipulation of obedience to a Muslim ruler, the prohibition on hitting one’s wife, the performance of ablution (wudu’), etc., which are mentioned in the history of the delegations, are also narrated in detail by a number of Companions in the principal books of Hadīth, with each having been recorded under its relevant chapter heading.

295 See above, pp. 126-7.
THE PROPHET’S TEACHING OF THE SUNNAH TO
HIS COMPANIONS
SECTION 8

THE PROPHET’S TEACHING OF THE SUNNAH TO HIS COMPANIONS

The Prophet tells us that he was sent to mankind as a teacher, saying “Allāh did not send me to be harsh, but he has sent me to teach and make things easy.”296 Muʿāwiya b. al-Ḥakam said about the Prophet, “…I declare that neither before him nor after him have I seen a teacher who gave better teaching than he ….”297 It is clear that the Prophet took up the task of teaching personally. In this section we will be concerned with his efforts as a teacher.

It is clear from the dialogue which took place in Abyssinia between the Negus and the Muslims who took refuge in his country, that the Prophet, since his first call to Islam, personally practised the teaching of people. When the Muslims knew that the Negus had sent for them in order to be informed about their religion, they consulted among themselves about what they should say to him. Finally they said, “By Allāh! We will say to him what the Prophet taught and ordered us, whatever the consequences.” When the meeting took place, their representative, Jaʿfar b. Abī Ṭalīb said, “O king! We were plunged in the depth of ignorance and barbarism, we adored idols, we lived in unchastity, we ate dead carrion, we spoke abominations, we disregarded every feeling of humanity, and the duties of hospitality and neighbourhood were neglected, we knew no law but that of the strong, when Allāh raised among us a man, of whose birth, truthfulness, honesty, and purity we were aware, he called to the Oneness of Allāh and taught us not to associate anything with him. He forbade us the worship of idols, and he enjoined us to speak the

296 Musnad 1, vol. 3, p. 328. See also Muslim, k. al-Ṭalāq, ḥ. no. 29.
truth, to be faithful to our trusts, to be merciful and to regard the rights of the neighbours and kith and kin, he forbade us to speak evil of women, or to eat the substance of orphans, he ordered us to flee from vices, and to abstain from evil, to offer prayers, to render alms, and to observe the fast. We believed in him, and accepted his teachings and his injunction to worship Allāh, and not to associate anything with Him, and we allow what He has allowed, and prohibit what He has prohibited. For this reason, our people have risen against us, and have persecuted us in order to make us forsake the worship of Allāh and return to the worship of idols and other abominations. ..."298 His teaching, as can be seen from the above, contained a myriad aspects, both personal and social. This is further illustrated by the story of a man who said to Salmān al-Fārisī, with some sarcasm, "Your Prophet teaches you about everything, even about excrement." He replied, "Yes, he has forbidden us to face the qiblah at the time of easing or urinating, and cleansing with right hand, and cleansing with less than three stones, or cleansing with dung or bone."299

After the Prophet's migration to Madīnah he became ruler in both times of peace and of war, judge (muftī), deliverer of sermons, and the guide and teacher of his Companions. This gave him the power to convey his actions and sayings far afield and to legislate accordingly. He was very keen to instruct and narrate to his Companions, and did so at a wide variety of times and places. In this section we will restrict ourselves to mentioning only five situations in which this was practised by the Prophet:

A. His teaching in mosques,
B. His teaching in private houses,
C. His teaching in sermon form,

297 Muslim, k. al-Masājid, b. no. 33; Nasāʾī, k. al-Sahlī, bā. no. 20, h. no. 1218; Musnad 3, h. no. 23250; Dārāmī, k. al-Salāḥ, bā. no. 177, h. no. 1502.
298 Ibn Hishām, vol. 1, pp. 335-6; Musnad 3, h. no. 1742.
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D. His teaching by means of an announcer.
E. His teaching on an individual basis.

A. On his teaching in mosques:

The Prophet used to ask the Companions to assemble in their mosques so that he could address and teach them. Suhayl b. Dhirā' reported: “I heard Ma'n b. Yazīd or his father say that the Prophet said, ‘You should gather in your mosques. When a group of people have gathered, they should let me know.’ Ma'n (or his father) said, ‘We were the first people to gather. We came to him, and he came walking with us ... then he faced us, commanded us, spoke to us and taught us.’” 300

The Prophet, in fact spent a great deal of time sitting in the mosque with his Companions. Jabir says, “I saw the Prophet, more than a hundred times, sitting in the mosque with his Companions. ...” 301 Abū Hurayrah said, “The Apostle of Allāh used to sit with us in meetings (in the mosque) and narrate to us. When he stood up we also used to stand up until we saw him entering the house of one of his wives ...” 302 Anas narrates, “Whenever he sat they used to sit in circles,” and, “When they had prayed the dawn prayer they would sit in circles reciting the Qur’ān and learning the obligations and Sunan.” 303

Once, “While Allāh’s Apostle was sitting in the mosque with some people, three men arrived. Two of them came before Allāh’s Apostle and the third one went away. The two persons kept on standing before Allāh’s Apostle for a while and then one of them found a place in the circle and sat there, while the other sat behind the gathering. When Allāh’s

300 Muslim, k. al-Tahārah, h. no. 57; Musnad 3, h. no. 23193, 23207, Dāwūd, bā. no. 4, h. no. 7; Tirmidhī, k. al-Tahārah, bā. no. 12, h. no. 16.
301 Musnad 1, vol. 3, p. 470.
302 Dāwūd, k. al-Adab, bā. no. 1, h. no. 4775; Nasā'i, k. al-Qasāmah, bā. no. 23, h. no. 4776.
303 Zawā'īd, vol. 1, p. 132.
Apostle finished (his narration), he said, "Shall I tell you about these three persons? One of
them sought refuge with Allâh and Allâh gave him refuge and the second one felt shy and
Allâh showed kindness to his shyness (and so he was accommodated in that meeting),
while the third went back and Allâh turned away [His attention] from him." 304

Indeed, the hadiths which indicate that the Companions kept the company of the
Prophet, especially in the mosque, are very numerous. For instance, Dimâm b. Tha'labah
came to the Prophet to ask him about Islam, and he questioned him while his Companions
were in his company, 305 and it is narrated that a young man came to ask the Prophet’s
permission to commit adultery, again while he was in the company of his Companions. 306

In addition, a man came to tell the Prophet that he had had sex with his wife in the broad
daylight of Ramâdân, and he advised him in the presence of his Companions, 307 causing
the female Companions to request: "O Allâh’s Apostle! Men only benefit by your
narration, so please devote to us from your time a day on which we may come to you so
that you may teach us some of what Allâh has taught you ... ." 308

B. On his teaching in houses:

Ibn Mas‘ûd al-Ansârî said, “The Apostle of Allâh came to us when we were sitting
in the house of Sa’d b. ‘Ubâdah. Bashîr b. Sa’d said to him, ‘Allâh has commanded us to

304 Bukhârî, k. al-‘Ilm, bâ. no. 8, h. no. 66; Muslim, k. al-Salâm, h. no. 26, Tîrmidhî, k. al-Isti’dhân, bâ. no.
49, h. no. 2724; Musnad 1, vol. 5, p. 219.
305 Dûrîmî, k. al-Tâhârah, bâ. no. 1, h. no. 651.
307 Bukhârî, k. al-Sawm, bâ. no. 30, h. no. 1936.
308 Ibid., k. al-I’tîsâm bi al-Kîtâb wa al-Sunnah, bâ. no. 9, h. no. 7310; Muslim, k. al-Bîr r wa al-ṣilah, h.
no.152.
bless you, 309 Apostle of Allāh, but how should we bless you?” ... The Apostle of Allāh then said, ‘Say ...(to the end of the narration).’ 310 On another occasion the Prophet narrated to them about al-a’war al-dajjāl (the one-eyed impostor) at the house of Asmā’ bt. Yazīd al-Anṣāriyah and what he would do, and what would occur before and after his coming. 311 Moreover, he allocated specific days to the narration and instruction of women, saying to them, “Gather on such and such a day at such and such a place.” 312 They gathered and Allāh’s Apostle came to them and taught them some of what Allāh had taught him. He then said, “No woman among you who has lost her three children (died) but that they will screen her from the Fire.” 313

C. On his teaching in sermon form:

His sermons are considered to be one of the most important means by which the Prophet practised public teaching. ‘Iyāḍ b. Himār al-Mujāshi’ī reported that “Allāh’s Apostle while delivering a sermon one day, said, ‘Allāh was commanded me that I should teach you what you do not know and what He has taught me today.’” 314 The most important sermon that he delivered to the people on a regular basis was the Friday sermon, and the Prophet ordered that this sermon be delivered on a regular basis while he was still residing in Makkah. In this connection, he sent a message to Muṣṭab b. ‘Umayr, in Madīnah: “Look for the day before which the Jews raise their voices in prayer for their Sabbath (i.e. Friday),

309 This refers to the verse of the Qurān: “Surely Allāh and His angels bless the Prophet, O you who believe, call for blessings on him and salute him with a (becoming) salutation.” (Q. 33:56)
310 Muslim, k. al-Ṣalāh, h. no. 65; Tirmidhi, k. Tafsīr al-Qur‘ān, bā. no. 34, h. no. 3220; Nasā‘ī, k. al-Sahū, bā. no. 49, h. no. 1285; Musnad 1, vol. 5, pp. 273-4; Dārimī, k. al-Ṣalāh, bā. no. 85, h. no. 1343.
311 Musnad 1, vol. 6, pp. 455-6.
312 Bukhārī, k. al-Ịṣām bi al-Kitāb wa al-Sunnah, bā. no. 9, h. no. 7310; Muslim, k. al-Birr wa al-ṣilah, h. no.152.
313 Ibid.
when the sun has passed the meridian, come close to Allah by praying two rak'ah, and then deliver the Friday sermon."315 This is further confirmed by Ibn Ishäq who includes in his *Sīrah* a narration from 'Abd al-Rahmän b. Ka'b b. Mālik, who said, "I was leading my father Ka'b when he had lost his sight, and when I brought him out (to the mosque) for the Friday prayer and he heard the call to prayer he called down blessings on Abū Umāmah As'ād b. Zurārah. This went on for some time ... Then I asked him, 'O my father why, when you heard the adhān for the Friday prayer, did you call down blessings on Abū Umāmah?' He replied, 'O my son, that is because he was the first man to bring us together (for the Friday prayer) at Madīnah ...'316

Unsurprisingly, therefore, we find that the Prophet performed the Friday prayer upon his arrival in Madīnah. Ibn Ishäq also mentions the Prophet's performance of the first Friday prayer after his departure from Qubā'317 when he was on his way to Madīnah: "The Apostle stayed in Qubā' among Banū 'Amr b. 'Awf on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, and then he laid the foundation of his mosque. Then Allāh brought him away from them on the Friday. ... Friday prayer found the Apostle among Banū Sālim b. 'Awf and he prayed it in the mosque which is at the bottom of the Wādī Rānūnā'. This was the first Friday prayer that he prayed in Madīnah."318 In addition to this, Ibn Ishäq quotes the texts of the first and second khutbas delivered by the Prophet following his arrival in Madīnah and his building of the mosque.319

314 Muslim, k. *al-Jannah*, b. no. 63. See also *Musnad* 3, l. no. 1787, 17875-6 & 17035.
316 Hishām 1, vol. 1, p. 435.
317 A place 3 miles from al-Madīnah.
318 Ibid., vol. 2, pp. 495-6 & 500-1.
319 Ibid., vol. 2, pp. 495-6 & 500-1.
There is not a single statement to indicate that the Prophet abandoned, even once, the Friday sermon, whether he was at Madinah or on a journey—the Friday sermons that he delivered in Madinah after his arrival, number about five hundred and ten. Even if he only spoke for, say, five minutes, then the possible hadiths based on these words alone could well run into thousands.

**Other types of sermons:**

The Prophet did not mount the pulpit solely for the delivery of the Friday sermons, he also did so on numerous different occasions, including for the delivery of the sermons of ‘īd al-fitr,320 ‘īd al-aḍḥā,321 al-istisqā,322 al-kusūf,323 and on the conquest of Makkah.324 This is in addition to the sermons he delivered at the time of the pilgrimage such as his sermons on ‘Arafah and Minā.

He would also, on occasion, ascend the pulpit after one of the five prayers to address the assembled people. Anas says, "The Prophet led us in a prayer and then got up on the pulpit ... "325 He also says, regarding another occasion, "One day the Prophet led us in a prayer and then got up on the pulpit ... ."326

Moreover, he ascended it whenever he deemed it necessary to draw the attention of the Muslims to a significant matter. The following examples illustrate this:

---

320 The three-day festival of the Muslims that commences on the first day of the month of Shawāl, the month following Ramaḍān. Fitr literally means ‘breaking the fast.’ The Muslims fast during the whole month of Ramaḍān, the ninth month of the Muslim calendar, then when shawāl comes, they break their fasts.

321 The four-day festival of the Muslims starting on the 10th day of the month of Dhū al-Ḥijjah.

322 The collective prayer for rain which Muslims have been commanded to make, consisting of two rak‘ah, in times of drought.

323 Muslim, k. al-Kusūf, ḥ. no. 901. In Arabic the word kusūf is used to denote a solar eclipse, whereas the word khusūf is used for a lunar eclipse. At times both the solar and lunar eclipse are denoted by one word kusūf.

324 See above, p. 88.

325 Bukhārī, k. al-Salāh, bā. no. 40, ḥ. no. 419; Musnad 1, vol. 3, p. 228.

1. 'Ā'ishah said that Barirah came to seek her help in arranging her emancipation.327 'Ā'ishah said to her, "If you wish, I will pay your master (your price) and the right of inheritance (walā') will fall to me." When Allāh's Apostle came, she told him about it (because of her master refusal). The Prophet said to 'Ā'ishah, "Buy her (i.e. Barirah) and manumit her, for the walā' is for the one who manumits." Then Allāh's Apostle ascended the pulpit and said, "What about those people who stipulate conditions which are not in Allāh's Laws? Whoever stipulates such conditions as are not in Allāh's Laws, then these conditions are invalid even if he has stipulated a hundred such conditions."328

2. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Amr b. al-'As reported that someone from Banū Hashim had already entered the house of Asmā' bt. Umays when Abū Bakr entered. She was at that time his wife, and Abū Bakr disapproved of the incident and made mention of it to Allāh's Apostle, saying: "I did not see but good (in my wife)." ... Then Allāh's Apostle stood on the pulpit and said, "After this day no man should enter the house of another person in his absence, unless he is accompanied by one or two persons."329

3. Ya'lä said, "The Apostle of Allāh saw a man having a bath in a public place without a lower garment. So he mounted the pulpit, praised and extolled Allāh and said, 'Allāh is characterised by modesty and concealment: So when any of you is having a bath, he should conceal himself.'"330

4. Ibn 'Abbās reported that a man came to the Prophet and said, "O Allāh's Apostle, my master married me to his slave. He now wants to make separation between me and her."

327 The original word is kitābah or mukātabah, which here means: 'The contract of a slave with his master.' It stipulates that on payment of a certain sum, the slave has in effect bought himself from his master, and is thus free.
328 Bukhārī, k. al-Shurūf, bā. no. 17, h. no. 2735; Muslim, k. al-'Itq, h. no. 8.
329 Muslim, k. al-Salām, h. no. 22; Musnad 1, vol. 2, p. 186.
330 Dāwūd, k. al-Hammām, bā. no. 2, h. no. 4012; Nasā'ī, k. al-Ghusl wa al-tayammum, bā. no. 7, h. no. 406.
He (the narrator) said, Allah’s Apostle ascended the pulpit and said, “O people, what is the matter with a man of you? He marries his slave with his slave-girl and then intends to make separation between the two? Verily, divorce is (the right) of him who seizes the thigh.”

5. Narrated `Abd Allah b. `Umar, “The Prophet had a golden ring made for himself, and when he wore it, he used to turn its stone towards the palm of his hand, so the people too had gold rings made for themselves. The Prophet then ascended the pulpit, and after glorifying and praising Allah, he said, ‘I had it made for me, but now I will never wear it again.’ He threw it away, and then the people threw away their rings too.”

6. Abū Ḥumayd al-Sā’idī said, “The Prophet appointed a man from the tribe of Banū Asad, called Ibn al-Utabiyyah to collect the zakāh. When he returned (with the properties) he said (to the Prophet), ‘This is for you and this has been given to me as a gift.’ The Prophet stood up on the pulpit and said, ‘What is wrong with the employee whom we send (to collect zakāh from the public) that he returns to say, ‘This is for you and that is for me.’ Why did not he stay at his father and mother’s house to see whether he would be given gifts or not? By Him in Whose Hand is my life, whoever takes anything illegally will bring it on the Day of Resurrection carrying it around his neck ...”

Moreover, when the Prophet wanted to address the generality of the Muslims about an important issue, whether he was at Madīnah or on a journey, he would send some one to

331 Ibn Mājah, *k. al-Ṭalāq*, bā. no. 31, ḥ. no. 2081. The right to divorce the slave-girl is vested in the husband who is permitted to have sexual intercourse with her; the master of the slave-girl has no right to demand a divorce.

332 Bukhārī, *k. al-Libās*, bā. no. 53, ḥ. no. 5876; Muslim, *k. al-Libās wa al-ziyānah*, ḥ. no. 53; Tirmidhī, *k. al-Libās*, bā. no. 16, ḥ. no. 1741; Nasā’ī, *k. al-Ziynah*, bā. no. 81, ḥ. no. 5290; Musnad 1, vol. 2, pp. 119, 153.
call the people by saying ‘al-salātu ḫāmi‘ah’ (i.e. indicating that the people should gather together for prayer). When they were assembled, he would deliver his sermon, as was the case in the following examples:

1. Abū Qatādah said, “The Prophet sent out the army of al-umārā‘ (commanders). ... The army moved forward and stayed away for the period which Allāh willed, then the Prophet ascended the pulpit and ordered some one to call out ‘al-salātu ḫāmi‘ah’ ... .”

2. Fatīmah bt. Qays said, “... when my period of waiting was over, I heard the voice of an announcer making an announcement for ‘al-salātu ḫāmi‘ah’. So I set out towards the mosque and observed prayer with Allāh’s Apostle and I was in the row of women which was near the row of men. When Allāh’s Apostle had finished his prayer, he sat on the pulpit, smiling, and said, ‘Every worshipper should remain sitting in his place.’ He then said, ‘Do you know why I have asked you to assemble?’ They said, ‘Allāh and His Apostle know best’ ... .”

3. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ said, “I accompanied the Apostle of Allāh on a journey. We halted at a place. Some of us began to erect their tents, others began to compete with one another in target practice, and others still began to graze their beasts. Then an announcer of the Apostle of Allāh announced ‘al-salātu ḫāmi‘ah’ and we gathered around the Apostle of Allāh. He said, ‘It was the duty of every Prophet that has gone before me to

333 Bukhārī, k. al-Ahkām, bā. no. 24, h. no. 7174; Muslim, k. al-Imārah, h. no. 26, Dāwūd, k. al-Kharāj wa al-Imārah wa al-Fay’, bā. no. 11, h. no. 2946; Musnad 1, vol. 5, pp. 423-4; Dārimi, k. al-Zakāh, bā. no. 31, h. no. 1669.
334 Musnad 1, vol. 5, p. 299; Dārimi, k. al-Siyar, bā. no. 12, h. no. 2448.
335 Muslim, k. al-Fitan, h. no. 119; Musnad 1, vol. 6, pp. 374, 418.
guide his followers to what he knew was good for them and warn them against what he knew was bad for them ... ’”

When the Prophet ascended the pulpit it gave the Muslims an opportunity to ask him about various issues, ordinances etc.. The Prophet in his turn answered their questions and made clear before the assembly what is lawful and what is unlawful. The following examples illustrate this:

1. Ibn ‘Umar is reported to have said that the Prophet was asked, while sitting on the pulpit, about a man who had a wife but had divorced her. Afterwards, another man married her and divorced her before having sexual intercourse with her. He was asked, “Can she return to the first (husband)?” He replied, “No, not until he (the second husband) has tasted the sweetness of cohabitation with her.”

2. Ibn ‘Umar reported that a person asked Allāh’s Apostle, while he was seated on the pulpit, about eating lizard, whereupon he said, “I neither eat them, nor do I prohibit them.”

3. Ibn ‘Umar said, “While the Prophet was on the pulpit, a man asked him about how to offer the night prayers. He replied, ‘Pray two Rak‘ahs at a time and then two and then two and so on, and if you are afraid of the dawn (the approach of the time of the fajr prayer) pray one rak‘ah and that will be the witr for all the rak‘ahs which you have offered.’”

4. Durrah bt. Abī Lahab said, “A man stood up and went towards the Prophet while he was on the pulpit and said, ‘O Apostle of Allāh, who is the best among men?’ He said, ‘The

---

336 Muslim, k. al-Inārah, h. no. 46; Nasā‘ī, k. al-Bay‘ah, bā. no. 25, h. no.4191; Ibn Mājah, k. al-Fitan, bā. no. 9, h. no. 3956; Musnad 1, vol. 2, p. 191.
338 Muslim, k. al-Ṣayd wa al-dhabā‘ih, h. no. 41; Nasā‘ī, k. al-Ṣayd wa al-dhabā‘ih, bā. no. 26, h. no. 4314.
339 Bukhārī, k. al-Ṣalāh, bā. no. 84, h. no. 472; Musnad 1, vol. 2, p. 102; Nasā‘ī, k. Qiyām al-ayl wa taʃaww’ al-nahār, bā. no. 26, h. no. 1669.
best among men is the one who is best among them in reciting the Qur'an, fearing Allah, enjoining good and forbidding evil, and visiting his relatives."

5. It is narrated on the authority of Abū Qatādah that the Apostle of Allah stood up among his Companions (on the pulpit) to deliver his sermon, in which he told them that jihād in the way of Allah and belief in Allah were the most meritorious of acts. A man stood up and said, "O Apostle of Allah, do you think that if I am killed in the way of Allah, my sins will be blotted out from me?" The Apostle of Allah said, "Yes, if you are killed in the way of Allah, and were patient and sincere and always fought facing the enemy, never turning your back upon them ... (all your wrong actions will be forgiven you) except debt ... ."

D. On his teaching by means of an announcer:

In addition to his teaching of his Companions in houses, mosques and in sermons, the Prophet would also send announcers (munādīn) who were charged with conveying his instructions to the people. These typically included new legislation and ordinances so that the people would be updated with regard to any new situation.

Many Companions including Ibn ‘Umar, Usāmah b. ‘Umrayr b. ‘Āmir, Jābir b. ‘Abd Allāh, Salamah b. al-Akwa’, ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ, Fāṭimah bt. Qays, Anas b. Mālik, Ibn Abī Awfā, Zāhir al-Aslāmī and others use the following expressions in their narrations, which indicate that the Prophet used announcers:

"I heard the announcer of the Apostle of Allah... ."
“Then, the announcer of the Prophet announced...”  

“The announcer of the Apostle of Allah announced...”  

“Suddenly, the announcer of the Apostle announced...”  

“The announcer of the Apostle of Allah came out to us...”  

“The announcer of the Apostle of Allah used to announce...”  

“The Prophet ordered his announcer to call...”

The following narrations illustrate this further:

1. Abū Hurayrah said, “The Apostle of Allah commanded me to announce that prayer is not valid but with the recitation of fātihat al-kitāb and something more.”

2. Al-Rubayyi’ bt. Mu‘awwidh b. ‘Afrā’ said, “The Apostle of Allah sent [a person] on the morning of ‘āshūrā to the villages of the Anṣār [to convey this message,] ‘He who got up in the morning fasting should complete the rest of the day [without food].’”

3. Anas b. Malik narrated that, “The Prophet ordered Abū Talhah, during the military expedition of Khaybar, to announce to the people, ‘Allah and his Apostle forbid you to eat the flesh of domestic asses because it is impure.’ So, all the pots were turned upside down.”

344 Bukhārī, k. al-Jihād wa al-sharī‘ah, bā. no. 130, h. no. 2991.
345 Ibid., k. Fard al-khumus, bā. no. 20, h. no. 3155.
346 Ibid., k. al-Maghāzi, bā. no. 35, h. no. 4137; Muslim, k. al-Imārah, h. no. 46.
347 Muslim, k. al-Nikāh, h. no. 13.
348 Ibn Mājah, k. Ḥadīth al-Ṣalāh, bā. no. 35, h. no. 937.
349 Musnad 1, vol. 5, p. 75.
350 ‘The Opening One’; the first sūrah of the Qur’ān.
351 Dāwūd, al-Ṣalāh, bā. no. 135, h. no. 820; Musnad 1, vol. 2, p. 428.
352 The 10th of the month of Muḥarram, the first month in the Muslim calendar. It was the day when Moses and his people got freedom from the hands of the Pharaoh.
353 Muslim, k. al-Ṣiyām, h. no. 136; Bukhārī, k. al-Ṣawm, bā. no. 21, h. no. 1924, bā. no. 47, h. no. 1960; Musnad 1, vol. 6, p. 359.
354 For the definition of Khaybar, see footnote no. 10 above.
355 Musnad 1, vol. 3, p. 121.
4. ‘Abd Allâh b. ‘Amr b. al-‘Àṣ narrated that, “The Prophet sent an announcer to all quarters of Makkah to inform them that zakât al-fîl (alms given at the end of Ramaçân) is an obligation on every Muslim, male or female, freeman or slave, young or old. They were also informed that it should consist of two mudds356 of wheat or the equivalent of that, or a sa357 of food.”358

5. Ḥumayd b. ‘Abd al-Rahmân narrated that Abû Hurayrah said, “During that hajj (in which Abû Bakr was the leader of the pilgrims), Abû Bakr sent me along with the announcers on the day of sacrifice359 in Minâ to announce, ‘No pagans shall perform the hajj after this year, and none shall perform the tawâf around the Ka‘bah in a naked state.’” Ḥumayd b. ‘Abd al-Rahmân added, “Then Allâh’s Apostle sent ‘Ali b. Abî Tâlib [after Abû Bakr] and ordered him to recite aloud in public sûrat Barâ‘ah.” Abû Hurayrah continued, “So ‘Ali, along with us, recited Barâ‘ah (aloud) before the people at Minâ on the day of sacrifice and announced, ‘No pagan shall perform hajj after this year and none shall perform the tawâf around the Ka‘bah in a naked state.’”360

6. The Prophet ordered Bishr b. Suḥaym, during the days of tashrîq361 to call out this message: “None will enter Paradise except a believer. And these are the days of eating and drinking.”362

7. Mu‘âdh b. Anas al-Juhání said, “I fought along with the Prophet in various battles. The people occupied much space and encroached on the road. The Prophet sent an announcer

---

356 A measure equivalent to two third of a kilogram.
357 A measure for corn, etc. Equals four mudds or 2.2 pounds.
358 Tirmidhî, k. al-Zakâtî, bâ. no. 35, h. no. 674.
359 i.e. the 10th of Dhû al-Hijjah.
360 Bukhâri, k. Tafsîr al-Qur’ân, S. no. 9, bâ. no. 2, h. no. 4655.
361 i.e. the 11th, 12th and 13th of Dhû al-Hijjah
362 Nasâ’î, k. al-Îmân, bâ. no. 7, h. no. 4994.
to announce among the people, ‘Those who occupy much space or encroach on the road will not be credited with *jihād*.’”

**The Companions attitude towards the Prophet’s addresses and narrations**

It is evident that the Companions ascribed great value to attending to what they had heard the Prophet say. Abū Bakr and al-‘Abbās once passed by one of the gatherings of the Anṣār who were weeping. One of the two asked, “Why are you weeping?” They replied, “We are weeping because we remember the gatherings where the Prophet was with us.” So Abū Bakr went to the Prophet and told him of that. The Prophet came out, tying a piece of the hem of a sheet around his head. He ascended the pulpit, which he was never to ascend again after that day.

When the Prophet started to talk, they gave him all their attention. ‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd says, “When the Prophet sat on the pulpit we would all direct our faces towards him (i.e. we would listen attentively to what he said).” ‘Adī b. Thābit is reported to have said, on his father’s authority, “As the Prophet stood on the pulpit, his Companions directed their faces towards him.”

A number of them were very keen not to be ignorant of the content of any talk given by the Prophet, and thus took turns in attending the Prophet’s gatherings. ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb said, “I and an Anṣāri neighbour of mine from Banū Umayyah b. Zayd, who used to live in the ‘Awālī of al-Madīnah, would visit the Prophet in turns. He used to go one day, and I another day. When I went, I would bring him the news of what had happened that day regarding instructions and orders, and when he went, he would do the
same for me ...”367 Some Companions assigned the task of tending the camels on a rota basis, in order that each might have the opportunity of attending to the Prophet’s discourses. ‘Uqbah b. ‘Āmir said, “We served ourselves in the company of the Apostle of Allāh. We tended our camels in turn. One day I had my turn to tend the camels, and I drove them in the afternoon. I found the Apostle of Allāh standing addressing the people.”368

The Prophet’s teaching in its breadth of scope and variety of forms had a very significant impact on the Companions, and eventually rendered them sufficiently knowledgeable to give instruction to the people of neighbouring regions, other countries and the visiting delegations, as has been discussed above.

As such, the statement of ‘Amr b. ‘Anbasah in which he affirms that he heard one of the Prophet’s ḥadīths more than seven times is unsurprising, in view of the scope and frequency with which the Prophet taught: ‘Amr narrated a ḥadīth to Abū Umāmah regarding the reward for performing wuḍū’ (ablution). The latter said, “O ‘Amr b. ‘Anbasah, think about what you are saying, that such a great reward is given to a man in one place [i.e. in the act of ablution and prayer].” Upon hearing this, ‘Amr said, “O Abū Umāmah, I have grown old, my bones have become weak and I am at death’s door, what reason is there for me to attribute a lie to Allāh and the Apostle of Allāh? Had I heard it

367 Bukhārī, k. al-Mażālim wa al-ghaṣb, bā. no. 25, h. no. 2468; Muslim, k. al-Ṭalāq, h. no. 34; Tirmidhī, k. Tafsīr al-Qur’aṇ, bā. no. 66, h. no. 3318.
368 Dāwūd, k. al-Ṭahārah, bā. no. 65, h. no. 169; Muslim, k. al-Ṭahārah, h. no. 17; Musnad 1, vol. 4, pp. 145-6, 153.
from the Apostle of Allāh once, twice, thrice, four, five, six or seven times, I should have never narrated it, but I have heard it from him on more occasions than that. 369

It is also clear from the Companions’ use of the plural form in narrating the Prophet’s hadīths that he taught and narrated to them in groups. On numerous occasions we find them saying:

“The Prophet narrated to us . . .;”

“The Prophet told us . . .;”

“The Prophet taught us . . .;”

“The Prophet ordered us . . .;”

“The Prophet prohibited us . . .;”

“The Prophet addressed us . . .;”

“The Prophet used to teach us . . .;”

“The Prophet said, Shall I not teach you . . .;”

“The Prophet said, Shall I not tell you . . .;”

“The Prophet said, Shall I not narrate to you . . .;”

“The Prophet said, Did not you hear . . .;”

“We heard the Prophet . . .;”

“We saw the Prophet . . .;”

369 Muslim, k. Ṣaḥīḥ al-Musīṣīrīn, h. no. 294.
E. His teaching on an individual basis:

In addition to teaching people in groups, he would also teach individuals. Abū Maḥdūrah told 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥyarīz that “The Apostle of Allāh taught me the nineteen phrases of the adhān and the seventeen phrases in the iqāmah ...”371 'Adī b. Ḥātim says, “The Prophet taught me prayer and fasting. He said, pray in such and such a manner, and fast for thirty days unless you see the new moon.”372 Ka‘b b. ‘Ujrah mentioned that a man spoke to the Prophet and said, “O Apostle of Allāh, we know how to salute you, but how do we invoke Allāh for you?”373 The Prophet then taught him how to invoke Allāh for him. Abū Qatādah and Abū al-Dahmā’ said, “We came upon a bedouin, who said to us, ‘The Apostle of Allāh took my hand and began to teach me of what Allāh had taught him. What I learned by heart from him was that he said, ‘Whatever you leave for fear of Almighty Allāh, then Allāh will definitely bring you something better than what you have left.’”374 His teaching was not addressed solely to men, but also to women and children. As to the former, the Prophet taught Juwayriyah a glorification that is related to the glorification of Allāh,375 and said to Asmā’ bint ‘Umays, “May I not teach you phrases which you can utter in distress?”376 Further, he taught a Muslim woman how to wash

370 See Concordance.
371 Dawūd, k. al-Ṣalāh, bā. no. 28, h. no. 502&504; Musnad 3, h. no. 14956&18885; Tirmidhī, k. al-Ṣalāh, bā. no. 26, h. no. 192; Ibn Mājah, k. al-Adhān, bā. no. 2, h. no. 709; Dārimī, k. al-Ṣalāh, bā. no. 7, h. no. 1197.
372 Musnad 3, h. no. 18885.
373 Ibid., h. no. 17661. See also, Bukhārī, k. al-Tafsīr, s. no. 33, bā. no. 10, h. no. 4797.
374 Musnad 3, h. no. 20222. See also h. no. 20215.
375 Musnad 3, h. no. 26218; Nasā‘ī, k. al-Sahīh, bā. no. 94, h. no. 1352; Tirmidhī, k. al-Da‘awār, bā. no. 104, h. no. 3555.
376 Dawūd, k. al-Ṣalāh, bā. no. 361, h. no. 1525.
herself after menstruation, etc. Regarding the latter, Ibn Abbās said, “I was behind the Prophet (on a riding animal) when he said, ‘O boy, shall I teach you some words with which Allāh will benefit you?’ I said, ‘yes, … .’” The Prophet then taught him and recommended that he do certain things.378 When ‘Amr b. Abī Salamah was a child, the Prophet taught him what he should say at the beginning of a meal, with which hand he should eat and from what side of the plate he should eat. ‘Amr said, “Since then I have applied these teachings when eating.”379 Al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī said: “Allāh’s Apostle taught me some words to say during the witr [specifically, in the supplication of the witr prayer]”380

The Prophet’s teaching of individuals has many aspects, indeed, it is impossible in this section to list the totality of examples which depict its various facets. It is however useful to present an example of the Prophet’s teaching, and we have chosen his teaching of the glorification and invocation of Allāh by way of illustration. When one studies the books of the Sunnah, one finds hundreds of ḥadīths on this subject, though for the present purposes I will present only a cross-section which will indicate the scope of the Prophet’s teaching of the glorification and invocation of Allāh, and where specific mention is made of the Prophet being involved in teaching through use of the verb ‘‘allama’ (to teach).

1. A glorification which is better than having a servant:

It is reported on the authority of ‘Alī that, “Fāṭimah had corns on her hand from working at the hand-mill. Some captives were brought to the Prophet, and she came to him

377 Muslim, k. al-Ḥayd, h. no. 60.
378 Musnad 3, h. no. 2800; Tirmidhī, k. Šifat al-qiyāmah, bā. no. 59, h. no. 2516.
379 Bukhārī, k. al-ʾAtʿīmah, bā. no. 2, h. no. 5376; Muslim, k. al-ʾAshribah, h. no. 108; Ibn Mājah, k. al-ʾAtʿīmah, bā. no. 8, h. no. 3267; Musnad 3, h. no. 15897.
380 Dāwūd, k. al-Ṣalāh, bā. no. 340, h. no. 1425; Musnad 3, h. no. 1720; Nasāʾī, k. Qiyaṃ al-ḥayl, bā. no. 51, h. no. 1745-6; Tirmidhī, k. al-Ṣalāh, bā. no. 10, h. no. 464; Dārimī, k. al-Ṣalāh, bā. no. 214, h. no. 1591 & 1592.
but did not find him at home. 'Ā'ishah was present there, whom she told (of her desire for a servant). When the Prophet came, 'Ā'ishah informed him about Fātimah's visit.” ‘Ali added, “So the Prophet came to us when we had gone to our beds, and I wanted to get up but the Prophet said, 'remain in your place.' Then he sat down between us and I felt the coolness of his feet on my chest. Then he said, ‘Shall I teach you a thing which is better than what you have asked me? When you go to bed say, Allāhu-akbar thirty-four times, subḥān Allāh thirty-three times and al-ḥamdu-lillah thirty-three times, for that is better for you both than a servant.'”

2. A glorification from the treasures of Paradise:

Abū Mūsā narrated that the Prophet said, "0 'Abd Allāh b. Qays! Shall I teach you a sentence which is from the treasures of Paradise? It is 'there is neither might nor power except with Allāh (lá ḥawī lá walā quwata’ illā billāh).’" The Prophet also taught it to Abū Hurayrah.

3. A glorification to be said during times of distress:

Asmā' bint 'Umays said: "The Apostle of Allāh taught me some words which I should say during times of distress.” In connection with this, the Prophet also taught ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib another glorification.

---

381 Allāh is greater.
382 Holiness to Allāh.
383 Praise be to Allāh.
384 Bukhārī, k. al-Manāgib, bā. no. 9, h. no. 3705; Muslim, k. al-Dhikr wa al-du‘ā’, h. no. 81; See also Dārimī, k. al-Istī’āb, bā. no. 52, h. no. 2685.
385 Bukhārī, k. al-Qadar, bā. no. 7, h. no. 6610; Musnad 3, h. no. 19102; Tirmidhī, k. al-da‘awāt, bā. no. 3, h. no. 3374, bā. no. 58, h. no. 3461.
386 Musnad 3, h. no. 8980.
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4. An invocation to be said by those who have newly embraced Islam:

Abū Mālik al-Ashja'ī reported on the authority of his father that when a person embraced Islam, Allāh's Apostle used to teach him how to observe prayer and then command him to invoke using these words, "O Allāh, grant me pardon, have mercy upon me, direct me to the path of righteousness, grant me protection and provide me with sustenance."\(^{389}\)

5. An invocation to be said when the adhān is called for the sunset prayer:

Umm Salamah said, "The Apostle of Allāh taught me to say, when the adhān for the sunset prayer is called, 'O Allāh, this is the time when the night comes on, the day retires, and the voices of the summoners are heard, so forgive me.'"\(^{390}\)

6. An invocation made so that one may be free from care and clear of debt:

Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī said "One day the Apostle of Allāh entered the mosque. He saw there a man from the Anṣār called Abū Umāmah. He said, 'Why do I see you sitting in the mosque when it is not a time of prayer?' He said, 'I am entangled in cares and debts, Apostle of Allāh.' He replied, 'Shall I not teach you words by which, when you say them, Allāh will remove your care, and settle your debt?' He said, 'Yes,' … ."\(^{391}\)

7. An invocation to be said at bed-time:

---

\(^{388}\) Ibid., ḥ. no. 703.

\(^{389}\) Muslim, k. al-Dhikr wa al-du‘ā’, ḥ. no. 35.

\(^{390}\) Dāwūd, k. al-Ṣalāh, bā. no. 39, ḥ. no. 530.

\(^{391}\) Ibid., bā. no. 367, ḥ. no. 1555.
Al-Barā’ b. ‘Azib mentioned that the Apostle of Allāh said to him, “Shall I not teach you some words which you should say when you go to bed? ...”

8. An invocation to be said at times of alarm:

‘Amr b. Shu‘ayb, on his father’s authority, said that his grandfather reported that the Apostle of Allāh taught them the following words to be said at times of alarm, “I seek refuge in Allāh’s perfect words from His anger, the evil of His servants, etc.”

In fact, there are numerous Companions who mention that the Prophet taught them a glorification or invocation. These include, in addition to those already mentioned, ‘Ā’ishah, ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr, ‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd, Zayd b. Arqam, Zayd b. Thābit, Sa‘d b. Abī Waqqās, Shaddād b. Aws, and many others.

There are also numerous glorifications and invocations which appear in the Prophetic Hadith in which terms other than the verb ‘to teach’ are used. The scholars of Sunnah, including al-Bukhārī, Muslim, Ibn Mājah, al-Ḥākim and so forth, have devoted specific chapters to Prophetic glorifications and invocations. Of course, the Prophet’s teaching was not restricted to glorifications and invocations but also encompassed a great deal of personal, social and political life, as is clear from the conversation between Ja‘far b. Abī Tālib and the Negus, as well as from the narration of Salmān al- Fārisī, which we cited at the beginning of this section (See above, pp. 137-8).
It is clear that the intense commitment of the Prophet to the teaching of people, both young and old, male and female, in groups and individually, from the beginning of his call to Islam, contributed greatly to the preservation of the Sunnah among his Companions and the Muslims in general.
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CONCLUSION

The various tasks undertaken by the Prophet which have been discussed in Chapter 2 represent, in their entirety, a methodology which contributed very effectively to the preservation of the Prophet's teachings and resulted in the written collections of the Ḥadīth. This methodology, as we have seen, is characterised by a variety of techniques and approaches, each as important as the other, and indeed, mutually complementary to one another: The Prophet, throughout his life, urged his Companions, and also the delegations that visited Madīnah, to memorise his instructions, he utilized both private and public forums to urge them in a variety of ways to accomplish this, he did not neglect the need for the recording of his teachings, which he plainly allowed and even ordered them to do so at appropriate times, however, he was not satisfied that his Companions should restrict themselves to the memorisation and writing down of his teachings, he also ordered them to convey them to others. Whenever the Prophet had delivered an important teaching, he immediately ordered those present to convey to others what they heard from him, praying for those who undertook this task. To encourage the dissemination of his teachings, he drew their attention to the fact that it may be that the statement reaches someone who can understand its meanings better than the person who conveyed it. In order to ensure that his teachings was transmitted correctly, the Prophet took some precautionary measures: He warned them regarding the bitter end of those who deliberately distorted and misrepresented his sayings and, he struck terror into the hearts of the people regarding the bitter end of those who failed to act upon his sayings when they reached them. In this way, knowledge of the teaching would not be confined to the individuals present when it was given and to written records, rather, it would be effectively disseminated among the people.
In addition, the great care that he took in teaching people young and old, individually and in groups, whether they were resident in Madīnah or visiting from elsewhere, in mosques and houses, and in his various sermons as well as through an announcer, is evidenced by numerous narrations. Thus, the Companions also had ample opportunity to question and enter into a dialogue, in order to reach a firm understanding of the Prophet’s instructions.

He also paid great attention to teaching those who were outside Madīnah, both near and far. In this regard, he was unremitting in dispatching messengers to teach people the Qur’ān and Sunnah, while providing these envoys with letters that were complete with the minutest details regarding many issues of Sunnah.

Foremost in all this was his emphasis on the status and importance of Sunnah and the mandatory obligation on the Muslims to follow it without contradiction. He employed a wide variety of approaches in illustrating this point, as discussed above. He strove to make the Companions fully aware of the status, importance and role of the Sunnah in their lives, and in their destiny after death, and the evidence suggests that he succeeded resoundingly as the value of what he brought became apparent in the transformation that was wrought in the lives of individuals and the community. Hence the Companions preserved and acted upon Sunnah. This was very much the case when the Prophet had illustrated to them that obedience to Allāh and admittance to His paradise require that they should obey His Prophet and act in accordance with what he did and said.

It will be noted that each of the eight sections above contains substantial evidence in support of the assertions made in them. The connection between, and consistency of this evidence is clearly apparent and is in itself a strong indication of their veracity that casts
serious aspersions on claims that they are fabricated. Even if we accept, for the sake of argument, that there was an attempt to fabricate evidence with regard to a specific area it would be impossible to accept that all of the evidence discussed above is fabricated. The total number of items of consistent, mutually supporting evidence may well run into hundreds, where each is narrated by a Companion or a group of Companions, indeed, some of these pieces of evidences are narrated by up to thirty Companions individually.

Accordingly, the results of our research into a selection of the methods which the Prophet used, as mentioned in original Islamic sources, in preservation and propagation of the Sunnah, confirm that his teachings were widely disseminated and effectively preserved at the time of the Prophet and his Companions, leading us to agree to a large extent with Dozy’s opinion, who has much confidence in a large part of the Ḥadīth but in which Goldziher, however, places little trust:

“Closer acquaintance with the vast stock of ḥadīths induces sceptical caution rather than optimistic trust regarding the material brought together in the carefully compiled collections.”

By contrast, in light of the above, we would assert that close acquaintance with the vast stock of ḥadīths, accompanied by scientific rigour, is more likely to induce optimistic trust than sceptical caution. In Part Two, we will proceed to discuss the evidence for Goldziher’s view, which, as will be seen, stands in direct opposition to the conclusions that we have reached.

---

¹ Goldziher said, “We are unlikely to have even as much confidence as Dozy regarding a large part of the ḥadīth”. Goldziher, vol. 2, p. 19.
PART 2
GOLDZIHER AND THE ḤADĪTH

An Analysis Of Goldziher’s Main Evidence For His Assertions Regarding The Fabrication Of Ḥadīth During The Umayyad Period
The Banū Umayyah and the Umayyad Caliphs

The Umayyad caliphate established in 661 was to last for about a century.
INTRODUCTION
TO
GOLDZIHER’S THEORY OF THE FABRICATION OF
HADĪTH IN THE UMAYYAD PERIOD

In this introduction we will mention very briefly the broad outline of Goldziher’s theories regarding the fabrication of hadīths by the Companions of the Prophet, the pious scholars and the Umayyad authorities and their associates. Due to the fact that Goldziher expounds his evidence at length, we will present it in detail at each appropriate juncture in our discussion.

Goldziher, in general terms, asserts that the Hadīth are no more than a product of the development of the religious, historical and social dimensions of Islam during its first two centuries. In this regard, his opinion is contrary to that of Dozy, who has confidence in the larger part of the Hadīth. Goldziher says, “We are unlikely to have even as much confidence as Dozy regarding a large part of the Hadīth, but will probably consider by far the greater part of it as the result of the religious, historical and social development of Islam during the first two centuries.”¹

Goldziher holds the opinion that the fabrication of Hadīth began after the death of the Prophet and that indeed, the first to fabricate Hadīth were the

Companions themselves, as is made clear by his statement, “The Prophet’s pious followers have reverently repeated the enlightening sayings of the master and have endeavoured to preserve for the edification and instruction of the community everything that he said, both in public and in private, regarding the practice of the religious obligations prescribed by him, the conduct of life in general, and social behaviour, whether in relation to the past or the future. When the rapid succession of conquests led them to distant countries; they handed on these ḥadīths of the Prophet to those who had not heard them with their own ears, and after his death they added many salutary sayings which were thought to be in accord with his sentiments and could therefore, in their view, legitimately be ascribed to him, or of whose soundness they were in general convinced. These ḥadīths dealt with the religious and legal practices which had been developed under the Prophet and were regarded as setting the norm for the whole Islamic world. They formed the basic material of the ḥadīth ...”

Goldziher’s theory regarding the core factor underlying the fabrication of ḥadīth in the Umayyad era, is based mainly on his analysis of the great enmity that existed between the Umayyad dynasty and the pious scholars. He elaborates this enmity with various statements, all of which portray the readiness of each side to fabricate ḥadīths; either to the detriment of the other party, or to bolster their own cause.

\[2\text{ Ibid., p. 18.}\]
Goldziher’s open allegation that the pious men invented hadīths is evident from the following statements of his:

1. “The pious, however, endeavoured to demand adherence to a fixed sunna in the name of the Prophet and, when they found that the government did not support them in efforts which seemed unimportant to the latter, they produced the following Prophecy of Muhammed: ‘There will come emirs after me who will kill the salāt...”

2. “Pious people of Sa‘id’s kind frowned at the state of affairs under such rule; they decried the tyrannical government, defied it by passive resistance [which implies the fabrication of hadīths as will be noted in Chapter 4] and even showed their dissatisfaction openly, occasionally going so far as to refuse homage. In return they were hated and despised by the ruling circles.”

3. “Without paying any attention to reality these men founded the sunna of the Prophet upon which the law and jurisprudence of the Islamic state was to be based. The Companions and ‘followers’ living amongst them gave them the sacred material which formed the contents and basis of their endeavour.”

4. “Thus there arise new people to relate sayings ascribed to the Prophet, but some new things also came into being.”

5. “Anything which appears desirable to pious men [i.e. the Ulamā’] was given by them a corroborating support reaching back to the Prophet. This could easily be

---

3 Ibid., p. 40.
4 Ibid., p. 41.
5 Ibid., p. 42.
done in a generation in which the Companions, who were represented as the intermediaries of the Prophet's words, were no longer alive."\(^7\)

6. "The fact that by disseminating these teachings they thought they were working against the godless tendency of the time, quietened the conscience of the pious inventors of traditions, who related their own teachings and those of their immediate teachers back to the authority of the Master who was for all, including even the lax, an undisputable source of law."\(^8\)

7. "Since the pious opponents of the dynasty looked upon the 'Alid pretenders as the chosen saviours of the empire, a large part of these falsifications was dedicated to the praise of the Prophet's family without being a direct attack upon the Umayyads. But nobody could be so simple as not to recognize the negative implications."\(^9\)

8. "They [The ruling power] had to do what their opponents [the pious circles] did: invent, or have invented, ḥadīths in their turn."\(^10\)

9. "Thus the ḥadīth led in the first century a troubled existence, in silent opposition to the ruling element which worked in the opposite direction. The pious cultivated and disseminated in their orders the little that they had saved from early times or acquired by communication. They also fabricated new material for which they could expect recognition only in a small community."\(^11\)

---

\(^6\) Ibid., p. 42.
\(^7\) Ibid., p. 42.
\(^8\) Ibid., pp. 42-3.
\(^9\) Ibid., p. 43.
\(^10\) Ibid., p. 43.
\(^11\) Ibid., p. 43.
Regarding the other party, Goldziher also assumes that the Umayyad government, from its early days, played a significant role in the invention and dissemination of fabricated hadīths in order to serve its own purposes and to consolidate its political stance against the opposition parties. He said, “This must not lead us to believe that during this period theologians in opposition were alone at work on the tradition. The ruling power itself was not idle. If it wished an opinion to be generally recognized and the opposition of pious circles silenced, it too had to know how to discover a hadīth to suit its purpose. They had to do what their opponents did: invent, or have invented, hadīths in their turn. And that is in effect what they did. A number of facts are available to show that the impetus to these inventions and falsifications often came from the highest government circles; and if it is realized that even among the most pious of theologians there were willing tools to further their invention, it is not surprising that, among the hotly debated controversial issues of Islam, whether political or doctrinal, there is none in which the champions of the various views are unable to cite a number of traditions, all equipped with imposing isnāds.”

He goes on, “Official influence on the invention, dissemination and suppression of traditions started very early... The Umayyads and their political followers had no scruples in promoting tendentious lies in a sacred religious form, and they were only concerned to find pious authorities who would be prepared to cover such falsifications with their undoubted authority.” Elsewhere he refers to,

---

12 Ibid., pp. 43-4.
13 Ibid., p. 44.
"How the Umayyads made it their business to put into circulation ḥadīths which seemed to them desirable, and how people of the type of the pious al-Zuhri acquiesced in being their tools -though they certainly were not guided by selfish motives but merely by reasons of state expediency- is to be seen from evidence preserved by al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī which deserves to be considered in this context." 14 Further, "The official invention of ḥadīths under the Umayyads would be used even for such trivial purposes. Pious sayings were meant to break down the resistance of the pious and to disarm them." 15

In addition to the above he believes that theologians in official positions were compelled, or were willing, without external pressure because of their support for the prevailing power, to put into circulation fabricated traditions. 16

Hence, our attention in this part will be devoted to the presentation and discussion of those claims that Goldziher supports with evidence, with the exception of a handful of very significant statements which he does not support with any evidence. Besides these, we will restrict ourselves to discussing the most significant evidence cited by Goldziher which he suggests directly and clearly indicates the fabrication of Ḥadīth with regard to the Umayyad era in particular. This is mainly because that era was important in revealing the nature of the Prophetic Ḥadīth.

The discussion will be presented as follows:

14 Ibid., p. 46.
15 Ibid., p. 49.
Chapter 3: An analysis of the evidence he cites in support of his claim that the Companions fabricated Ḥadīth.

Chapter 4: An analysis of the evidence he cites in support of his claim that the pious scholars fabricated Ḥadīth during the Umayyad period.

Chapter 5: An analysis of the evidence he cites in support of his claim that the Umayyads fabricated Ḥadīth.

Chapter 6: An analysis of the evidence he cites in support of his claim that the theologians fabricated Ḥadīth.

Chapter 7: The impact of Goldziher’s opinions on subsequent studies.

Conclusion: The results of the study and an appraisal of Goldziher’s methodology.

16 See Ibid., p. 53.
CHAPTER 3
THE COMPANIONS AND FABRICATION

An analysis of the evidence Goldziher cites in support of his claim that the Companions fabricated Ḥadīths

Section 1: Goldziher’s Evidence regarding the Companions’ fabrication.


Section 3: ‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd.

Section 4: Abū Hurayrah.

Section 5: Goldziher’s stance regarding Abū Hurayrah’s Ḥadīths.
SECTION 1

GOLDZIHER'S EVIDENCE REGARDING THE COMPANIONS' FABRICATION

This section will be devoted to the presentation of his evidence regarding the role of the Companions in the fabrication of Ḥadīth.

It seems, according to Goldziher's allegation, that has been cited above, and is as follows: “... after his death they added many salutary sayings which were thought to be in accord with his sentiments and could therefore, in their view, legitimately be ascribed to him, or of whose soundness they were in general convinced,”¹ that many Companions were accused of fabrication. However, he did not provide us with evidence to prove his theory, with the exception of a few examples in which he presents the names of those Companions he alleges were involved. Among them are Muʿāwiyah b. Abī Sufyān, al-Mughīrah b. Shuʿbah, ‘Abd Allāh b. Masʿūd and Abū Hurayrah. He presents his evidence as follows:

1. Goldziher considers official influence on the fabrication of Ḥadīth to have began in earnest at the time of Muʿāwiyah b. Abī Sufyān, accusing him along with his governor, the Companion of the Prophet, al-Mughīrah b. Shuʿbah,

¹ See above, p. 166.
"Official influence on the invention, dissemination and suppression of traditions started very early. An instruction given to his obedient governor al-Mughirah by Mu‘āwiyah I is in the spirit of the Umayyads: ‘Do not tire of abusing and insulting ‘Alī and calling for God’s mercifulness for ‘Uthmān, defaming the companions of ‘Alī, removing them and omitting to listen to them (i.e. to what they tell and propagate as ḥadīths); praising, in contrast, the clan of ‘Uthmān, drawing them near to you and listening to them.’ This is an official encouragement to foster the rise and spread of ḥadīths directed against ‘Alī and to hold back and suppress ḥadīths favouring ‘Alī.’"²

2. Goldziher says,

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

In the footnote he says,

"In later days it was found objectionable that the Koran should be called ḥadīth and in this sentence ḥadīth was altered to kalām (speech)."⁴

² Goldziher, vol. 2, p. 44.
³ Ibid., pp. 17-8.
⁴ Ibid., pp. 17-8.
3. He goes further and asserts that there was little confidence in the reliability of the transmitters of Ḥadīth in general, taking Abū Hurayrah, the Companion of the Prophet, as an example of this alleged unreliability,

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

4. One of Goldziher's challenges to the authenticity of the traditions is based on his assessment of the position of Abū Hurayrah as an authority. Goldziher says,

"The inexhaustible stock of information which he always had in hand (the Abū Hurayrah Ḥadīths take up no less than 213 pages in the Musnad of Ibn Ḥanbal, ii. 228-541), appears to have raised suspicion of their trustworthiness in the minds of his immediate auditors nor did they hesitate to give utterance to their suspicions in ironical form (comp. Also Bukhārī, Fadā'il al-aṣḥāb, No. 11). He had several times to defend himself against the charge of idle talk. These facts give our criticism every reason to be prudent and sceptic."\(^6\)

---

\(^5\) Ibid., 2, p. 56.
\(^6\) EI, art. Abū Huraira.
SECTION 2

THE ALLEGED FABRICATION OF MUʿĀWIYAH IBN ABĪ SUFYĀN AND AL-MUGHĪRAH IBN SHUʿBAH

Goldziher says,

"Official influence on the invention, dissemination and suppression of traditions started very early. An instruction given to his obedient governor al-Mughirah by Muʿāwiyah I is in the spirit of the Umayyads: 'Do not tire of abusing and insulting 'Alī and calling for God's mercifulness for 'Uthmān, defaming the companions of 'Alī, removing them and omitting to listen to them (i.e. to what they tell and propagate as ḥadīths); praising, in contrast, the clan of 'Uthmān, drawing them near to you and listening to them.' [citing: al-Ṭabarī, II, p. 112.] This is an official encouragement to foster the rise and spread of ḥadīths directed against 'Alī and to hold back and suppress ḥadīths favouring 'Alī." \(^7\)

In the statement under discussion Goldziher plainly names the Companions whom he alleges to have fabricated ḥadīth, i.e. Muʿāwiyah b. Abī Sufyān and al-Mughirah b. Shuʿbah. We shall assess this allegation by examining the following:

A. The use of the text itself as a criterion;

B. the reaction of various observers to the disparagement of ‘Alī and his companions;

C. the accounts of this issue made by various historians;

D. Muʿāwiyah's stance regarding ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib;

E. Muʿāwiyah and al-Mughirah’s attitudes towards the fabrication of ḥadīth.

\(^7\) Goldziher, vol. 2, p. 44.
First of all, it is useful to subject to close analysis the evidence put forward by Goldziher and to present the original narration cited by him in translation, in the original Arabic as narrated by al-Ṭabarî. The narration runs as follows:

إن معاوية ابن أبي سفيان أتا ولى المغيرة ابن شعبة الكوفة في جمادي سنة إحدى وأربعين- دعاه، فحمد الله وآله عليه ثم قال: "... وقد أردت إيصاءك بأشياء كثيرة، فان تأركها اعتماداً على بصرف يссير، ويسعد سلطاني، ونصبح به رجعي، وست تأركك إيصاءك بخصيلة لاتحم عن شتم علي وذمه، وترحم علي عثمان والاستغفار له، والعب على أصحاب علي، والإقصاء لهم، وترك الاستماع منهم، وبإطاراً شيعة عثمان رضوان الله عليه، والإدانة لهم، والاستماع منهم ... "

When Mu‘āwiyah b. Abî Sufyân put al-Mughirah b. Shu‘bah in charge of al-Kūfah in Jumādā4 41 [AH], he summoned him. After praising and glorifying Allâh, he said, "... Although I have wanted to advise you about many things, I left them alone, trusting in your discernment of what pleases me, what helps my regime and what sets my subjects on the right path. I would continue to advise you about a quality of yours - do not refrain from abusing ‘Alî and criticizing him, nor from asking Allâh’s mercy upon ‘Uthmān and His forgiveness for him. Continue to shame the companions of ‘Alî, keep them at a distance, and do not listen to them. Praise the faction of ‘Uthmān, bring them near, and listen to them."  

According to the text just mentioned, we do not find any trace of the word ḥadīth or its plural form aḥādīth, and there is nothing to suggest the invention, dissemination and suppression of traditions whether officially or unofficially. As for

8 The fifth month of the Muslim calendar.
9 Ṭabarî, vol. 6, pp. 168-70.
the expression "(and do not listen to them)," it does not specifically indicate that al-Mughîrah should suppress the Prophetic *hadîths* narrated by the companions of 'Alî, or even that he should not listen to them. This was an instruction that referred to the counsel and opinions of the companions of 'Alî, and does not refer specifically to the Prophetic *hadîhs* narrated by them. It is more plausible that what Mu‘âwiyah intended was that al-Mughîrah should listen to the advice and opinions of the companions of 'Uthmân, and not to those put forward to him by the companions of 'Alî. This was a natural inclination for Mu‘âwiyah since governmental policy tends to favour supporters while exercising caution regarding opponents. This policy is very much more understandable when we take into account the feud between 'Alî and Mu‘âwiyah which ultimately resulted in an armed conflict. Even if we suppose that the expression came in the form, "(and do not listen to their *hadîhs*)," it is evident that the word *hadîh* in this context does not necessarily refer to anything other than the speech and opinions of 'Alî's companions.

The implication of Goldziher’s statement is that not listening to the followers of 'Alî meant 'deliberately suppressing' Prophetic *hadîhs* in favour of 'Alî and disseminating Prophetic *hadîhs* in favor of 'Uthmân. Even if this is accepted, although it would provide marginal evidence for the suppression of *hadîhs* in favour of 'Alî, it is not evidence for the invention of *hadîhs*.
Al-Ṭabarī’s narration itself indicates that al-Mughīrah acted according to Muʿāwiyah’s recommendation that he disparage ‘Alī and his companions. The narration, however, does not indicate that al-Mughīrah rejected their ḥadīths, or banned or fabricated ḥadīths against ‘Alī. In addition, al-Mughīrah’s disparagement of ‘Alī and his companions was unacceptable to a large number of Küfah’s residents. Ḥujr b. ‘Adī, as recorded by al-Ṭabarī in the same source, repeatedly attacked al-Mughīrah in public, saying, “Indeed, Allah, Almighty and Great, says, ‘Stand out firmly for justice, as witnesses to Allah’ (Q. 4:135). I testify that the one you disparage and gibe is more deserving of merit, and the one you vindicate and extol is more entitled to blame.”

The narration also reveals that this situation had continued for a long period, “At the end of his governorship, al-Mughīrah arose and said what he used to say about ‘Alī and ‘Uthmān. At that, Ḥujr b. ‘Adī jumped up and let out a scream at al-Mughīrah that everyone both inside and outside the mosque heard. He then said, ‘You certainly do not understand what men burn for because of your senility, O man. Order our rations and stipends for us, for you have certainly withheld them from us, and that is not your right, and no one who preceded you has desired that. You have become passionate about blaming the Commander of the Faithful and praising the criminals.’ At that, more than two-thirds of the people stood up with him saying, ‘By

10 Ibid., p. 169.
11 ‘O God, have mercy on ‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān and do not punish him, but reward him for his best work. For, indeed, he acted according to Your Book and the example [sunnah] of Your Prophet. He united us and prevented our blood from being shed, and yet, he was wrongly killed. O God, have
Allāh, Ḫujr is right and honest. Order our rations and stipends for us, for this talk of yours does not do us any good, and it gives us nothing profitable.’ And they increased in this kind of talk. At that, al-Mughīrah descended [from the pulpit].”

When we bear in mind that more than two-thirds of those in attendance objected to al-Mughīrah’s disparaging remarks about ‘Alī, it would have provoked a confrontation if they had come to know that he had fabricated hadīth against ‘Alī or suppressed hadīth that were in his favour. Indeed, if that had been the case then we would expect to find at least some evidence indicating that ‘Alī and his companions had confronted that trend by, if not fabricating hadīths against the other party, then by rejecting and discrediting the fabricated hadīths. However, on the contrary, we find that, as recorded by Abū Ḥanīfah al-Dīnawarī (d. 282/895) in al-Akhbār al-tiwa, when it was revealed to ‘Alī that Ḫujr b. ‘Adī and ‘Amr b. al-Ḥamiq were publicly abusing Mu‘āwiyah and cursing the people of al-Shām, he sent an envoy to tell them to stop what they were doing. They subsequently came to him and said, “O Commander of the Faithful, are we not in the right and they are in the wrong?” He said, “Yes, indeed by the Lord of the Ka‘bah.” They then said, “Why then do you prevent us from abusing and cursing them?” He said, “I hated that you become a people who constantly abuse others and curse them. You should rather say: O Allāh preserve our lives and theirs, reconcile us with one another, and guide them to the mercy also on his adherents, supporters, friends, and those who seek vengeance for him.” He would also call for ‘Uthmān’s murderers [to be punished].

12 Ṭabarî, vol. 6, pp. 169-70.
right path so that those who were ignorant of the truth should come to know it and those who have strayed far into evil should repent.”\(^{13}\)

It is inconceivable that Mu'āwiyah and the governors that he had appointed would have compromised their position and subjected themselves to disgrace by forging or fabricating Prophetic \textit{hadiths} against 'Ali or anybody else. If they had, they would have undoubtedly been perceived as liars by the Companions of the Prophet and the Muslim community in general, mainly because they were bound to be accused by the opposing party. Goldziher also fails to show us where these alleged invented \textit{hadiths} against 'Ali appear in the core Islamic texts.

It is noteworthy that Mu'āwiyah himself did not deny the virtues of 'Ali, as is clear from the following narration: “When the people of al-Shām decided to support Mu'āwiyah, Abū Muslim al-Khawlānī came to Mu'āwiyah with a number of dedicated worshippers and said to him, 'O Mu'āwiyah, we were told that you were about to declare war against 'Ali b. Abī Ṭālib. How do you oppose him while you do not have the virtues which he has?' Mu'āwiyah said to them, 'I do not allege that I have the virtues which he has. However, do you not know that 'Uthmān was wrongfully killed?' They said, 'Yes.' He then said, '‘Ali should therefore hand over to us his assassins, at which point we would offer him our allegiance as caliph.'”\(^{14}\)

Moreover, on reading the accounts of the historians, (such as, \textit{Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī}, al-
Akhbār al-ṭwālī, Tārīkh Khalīfah Ibn Khayyat and others), we will find that the main area of contention between ‘Alī and Mu‘āwiya was as follows: Mu‘āwiya refused to pledge allegiance to the caliphate of ‘Alī until ‘Alī had surrendered the assassins of ‘Uthmān. This conflict did not require, at the stage in question at least, that certain hadīths should be fabricated against ‘Alī or certain hadīths in his favour should be suppressed.

In addition, Mu‘āwiya did not deny ‘Alī’s eminent status as a judge; indeed in one instance, when he was at a loss regarding a specific case, he sought the opinion of ‘Alī though he did so indirectly, “Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyib reported that a man from Syria (Ibn Khaybar) found a man with his wife and killed him or killed them both. Mu‘āwiya b. Abī Sufyān found the case hard to decide. He wrote to Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī requesting him to refer the matter to ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib. Abū Mūsā enquired of ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib who replied, ‘This incident has not happened in my land. I adjure you to speak the truth and tell me where it happened.’ Abū Mūsā said, ‘Mu‘āwiya b. Abī Sufyān has written asking me to refer the case to you.’ ‘Alī said, ‘I am Abū al-Ḥasan. If four witnesses are not brought, he should be headed.’”

In conclusion, we can say that the text cited by Goldziher in no way substantiates his opinion that official involvement in the invention, dissemination and

16 Mālik, k. al-Aqṣiyah, ḥ. no. 1447. It is well-known that ‘Alī was the most knowledgeable regarding the hadīths that deal with judicial questions. See Part 1, Chapter 2, p. 79.
suppression of traditions began early. In fact, the whole issue consists of no more than a series of disparaging remarks which do not substantiate the degree of invention or suppression of Prophetic *hadīths* that Goldziher alleges. There is no evidence given that certain *hadīths* were fabricated against 'Alī or that certain *hadīths* in his favour were suppressed.
SECTION 3

THE ALLEGED FABRICATION OF ‘ABD ALLĀH IBN MAS‘ŪD

Goldziher says,

"‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd says: ‘The most beautiful ḥadīth is the book of Allāh, and the best guidance is that of Muhammed’ [citing: B. I’tiṣām, no. 2]. It seems that this statement, which was gladly taken up and widely disseminated by the community of the faithful, was ascribed to Muhammed himself by making him say, in an exhortation to the community: ‘The most beautiful ḥadīth is the book of Allāh; blessed is he whose heart is adorned therewith by Allāh, he whom He has permitted to be converted to Islam from unbelief, and he who prefers it to all other ḥadīths of man. Verily, it is the most beautiful and perfect ḥadīth [citing: Ibn Hishām, p. 340].’

In the footnote he says,

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

Despite the fact that Goldziher did not directly accuse ‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd of inventing this statement, the reader is led to believe that this is the case from the sequence in which he presents his information. This is made particularly clear when we bear in mind two factors; the first is that there is no other name mentioned; and the second is that the ḥadīth that Goldziher cites from Ibn Mājah in the second quotation cited above shows that Ibn Mas‘ūd ascribed the statement to the Prophet.

18 Ibid., p. 18, footnote no. 4.
Therefore, it is useful to discuss this issue in order to ascertain whether the statement in question belongs to him or to the Prophet, before proceeding any further.

As far as the narration cited by Goldziher is concerned, we find that Ibn Mas‘üd did not, in fact, attribute that statement to himself. Indeed, we do not find a single testimony from any individual indicating that Ibn Mas‘üd attributed it to himself. The narrator of the ḥadīth, Murrah al-Hamadānī, simply stated, “‘Abd Allāh said...”19 Furthermore, in another narration Ibn Mas‘üd clearly states that he heard the statement from the Prophet himself, as is clear from al-Dārimi’s narration. Bilād b. ‘Iṣmāḥ said, “I heard ‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘üd saying, ‘When it was Thursday evening, and through to Friday night, the Prophet used to stand up and say, ‘The most truthful saying is Allāh’s saying, and the best guidance is that of Muḥammad...’”,20

In this regard, an important question poses itself; why did Ibn Mas‘üd not clearly indicate that this statement was from the Prophet? The answer to this question lies in a significant fact related to the Companions’ transmission of the Prophet’s ḥadīths: in narrating the ḥadīth, the Companion may or may not mention the Prophet’s name. In the first instance the ḥadīth is designated as marfū‘ (the Prophet’s name is explicit, i.e. saying traced back to the Prophet) and in the second it is mawqūf (the Prophet’s name is implicit, i.e. saying traced back to Companions)

19 Bukhārī, k. al-I’tisām bi al-Kitāb wa al-Sunnah, bā. no. 2, ḥ. no. 7277:
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according to the terminology of the scholars of Ḥadīth. Indeed, there are reasons for the Prophet’s name not being explicitly mentioned. Ibn Masʿūd may well have mentioned the ḥadīth in question intending to educate, exhort or as a reply to a question. In addition, this ḥadīth was well known and widespread among the Companions, as Goldziher himself indicates, and therefore, Ibn Masʿūd did not need, when reminding them of this ḥadīth of the Prophet, to say, “The Prophet said.”

There is another convincing reason for Ibn Masʿūd to keep the Prophet’s name implicit. The first words of this ḥadīth are those which are customarily used to introduce or begin a statement or sermon, and therefore, there was no need for him to explicitly mention the Prophet’s name. Ibn Masʿūd’s narration from al-Dārimī, which has been mentioned previously, also indicates that the Prophet used to regularly stand up among his Companions on that specific night and repeat that specific statement. This is further confirmed by the ḥadīth narrated by Jābir b. ‘Abd Allāh, where he says, “The Prophet used to say in his khutbah ..., ‘The most beautiful ḥadīth is the book of Allāh, and the best guidance is that of Muḥammad ...’”21

The ḥadīth narrated by Ibn Masʿūd is more akin to the khutbat al-ḥajjah (the sermon that is given in case of need) which the Prophet used to teach his

---

20 Dārimī, al-Mughaddimah, h. no. 207.
21 Musnad 3, h. no. 14022:
Companions. When relating it, the Companions did not need to say at the beginning, “The Prophet said (such and such),” thus, Goldziher’s claim that Ibn Ishāq’s statement, which was mentioned by Ibn Hishām in his book, was falsely attributed to the Prophet is erroneous. The truth of the matter is that it was made by the Prophet himself. This is particularly evident in light of the fact that Ibn Mas'ūd was not the only Companion who narrated this hadīth from the Prophet; Jābir b. 'Abd Allāh also did so.

In support of his view on the development of hadīth, Goldziher says, “In later days it was found objectionable that the Qur’ān should be called hadīth and in this sentence hadīth was altered to kalām (speech).” Goldziher then refers the reader to Ibn Mājah’s book. If we refer to Ibn Mājah’s statement, we do not find anything to indicate or suggest the alteration process Goldziher is talking about. Also, we do not find anything to suggest that any body objected to the Qur’ān being called hadīth. The narration simply states that 'Abd Allāh Ibn Mas'ūd, on the authority of the Prophet, said, “Verily, there are two things; al-kalām (the speech) and the guidance. The most beautiful speech is the speech of Allāh (fa-ahsanu al-kalāmi kalāmu Allāh), and the best guidance is that of Muḥammad ...” If we take the element of chronology into consideration, we find that Ibn Ishāq’s statement (d. 151/768), which is cited in Ibn Hishām’s book, in which the Qur’ān is referred to as ‘hadīth,’

22 Dāwūd, k. al-Nikāfī, bā. no. 33, h. no. 2118.
23 Musnad 3, h. no. 13924, 14022 & 14566; Muslim, k. al-Jumu'ah, bā. no. 13, h. no. 867; Nasā'i, k. Šalāt al-‘idayn, bā. no. 22, h. no. 1578; Ibn Mājah, al-Muqaddimah, h. no. 45.
came at a very early stage, while Ibn Mājah (d. 275/888), uses the word ‘kalām’.26
Thus, according to Goldziher the later use of the word ‘kalām’, in description of the Qur’ān, instead of ‘ḥadīth,’ constitutes an objection to the use of the word ‘ḥadīth’ in this context. This can be shown to be erroneous due to the following considerations:

First: In Ibn Isḥāq’s narration itself, which is cited by Goldziher, we find that the Qur’ān is also described as kalām. However, Goldziher cites the first part of the narration and disregards the second part, which runs as follows:

... ḥaša’ta la’ada tamallū kalām Allāhi..." 27

Second: In the books compiled by a number of the scholars of Ḥadīth who died after Ibn Mājah, we find that the Qur’ān is described as ḥadīth. For instance, Ibn Abī ‘Āşim, who died 12 years after Ibn Mājah, cites the ḥadīth with the following wording, “The most gracious ḥadīth is the Book of Almighty Allāh and the most

25 Ibn Mājah, al-Muqaddimah, h. no. 46.
26 Ibn Mājah himself narrated the same ḥadīth, in the same text, without mentioning the word ‘kalām.’ Jābir b. ‘Abd Allāh narrated that the Prophet used to say in his khutbah, “The most excellent thing is the book of Allāh (khayra al-umūri kitābī Allāh) and the best guidance is Muḥammad’s guidance ...” (Ibn Mājah, al- Muqaddimah, h. no. 45). If it were Ibn Mājah who made the alteration in the narration cited by Goldziher then he would also have made the same alteration in the ḥadīth narrated by Jābir in order to confirm and establish the meaning he had intended.
gracious guidance is that of Muhammad .” 28 Also, al-Nasā’ī, who died 28 years after Ibn Mājah, records two hadīths which were narrated by Jābir, the first of which isworded, “The most beautiful speech is the speech of Allah, and the best guidance is that of Muhammad,” 29 and the second of which is worded, “The most truthful hadīth is the book of Allah, and the best guidance is that of Muhammad ... .” 30 Furthermore, al-Bayhaqi, who died 138 years after Ibn Mājah, mentions the narration with the wording, “The most gracious hadīth is the Book of Allah ... .” 31 If Goldziher’s claim were true, then it would follow that all of these narrations ought to have disappeared, or that we would at least find an objection from the scholars of Hadīth to the Qurʿān being referred to as hadīth.

Third: Why should a Muslim object to the Qurʿān being described as hadīth when the verses of the Qurʿān in which the Qurʿān is referred to as ‘hadīth’ are greater in number than those in which it is referred to as ‘kalām’?

The Qurʿān is described as kalām in only two verses:

“And if anyone of the idolaters seeks your protection then grant him protection so that he may hear kalāma Allah, and then escort him to where he can be secure, that is because they are a folk who know not.” (Q. 9:6)

28 Al-Sunnah, vol. 1, p. 16, h. no. 24.
29 Nasā’ī, k. al-Sahw, bā. no. 63, h. no. 1311.
30 Nasā’ī, k. Ṣalāt al-‘Idayn, bā. no. 22, h. no. 1578.
31 Bayhaqi, vol. 3, 206, h. no. 5544.
Those who lagged behind will say, when you set forth to capture booty (in war), ‘Allow us to follow you.’ They want to change kalāma Allāh. Say: ‘You shall not follow us; thus Allāh has said beforehand.’ ...(Q. 48:15)

The Qur’ān is described as ḥadīth in many verses, of which the following are examples:

“There is no god but Allāh. Surely, He will gather you together on the Day of Resurrection about which there is no doubt. And who is truer in ḥadīth than Allāh?” (Q. 4:87)

“Do they not look in the dominion of the heavens and the earth and all things that Allāh has created, and that it may be that the end of their lives is near. In what ḥadīth after this will they then believe?” (Q. 7:185)

“Indeed in their stories, there is a lesson for men of understanding. It (the Qur’ān) is not a forged ḥadīth but a confirmation of the existing Books and a detailed explanation of everything and a Guide and a Mercy for people who believe.” (Q. 12:111)

“Perhaps, you, would kill yourself (O Muḥammad) in grief, over their footsteps (for their turning away from you), because they believe not in this ḥadīth.” (Q. 18:6)

“Allāh has sent down the best ḥadīth, a Book (this Qur’ān), its parts resembling each other in goodness and truth....” (Q. 39:23)
“Let them then produce a hadith like unto it (the Qur’an) if they are truthful.” (Q. 52:34)

“Do you then wonder at this hadith (the Qur’an)?” (Q. 53:59)

“Is it this hadith (Qur’an) that you (disbelievers) deny?” (Q. 56:81)

“Then leave Me Alone with such as reject this hadith (the Qur’an). We shall punish them gradually from directions they perceive not.” (Q. 68:44)

“Then in what hadith after this (the Qur’an) will they believe?” (Q. 77:50)

**Fourth:** There is no difference between the word ‘hadîh’ and the word ‘kalâm’ in the context of this narration; their meanings are interchangeable. For instance, in the following Qur’anic verses we find the word ‘hadîh’ retaining an identical significance to that of ‘kalâm’:

“And it has already been revealed to you in the Book (this Qur’an) that when you hear the Verses of Allâh being denied and mocked at, then sit not with them, until they engage in a hadîh (speech) other than that... .” (Q. 4:140)
“And when you (Muhammad) see those who engage in a false conversation about Our Verses (of the Qur’an) by mocking at them, stay away from them till they turn to another hadīth (speech)….” (Q. 6:68)

“And of mankind is he who purchases idle hadīth (speech) to mislead (men) from the Path of Allāh without knowledge, and takes it (the Path of Allāh, the Verses of the Qur’an) by way of mockery….” (Q. 31:6)

“O you who believe! Enter not the Prophet’s houses, except when leave is given to you for a meal, (and then) not (so early as) to wait for its preparation. But when you are invited, enter, and when you have taken your meal, disperse, without sitting for a hadīth (conversation). Verily, such (behaviour) annoys the Prophet, and he is shy of (asking) you (to go), but Allāh is not shy of (telling you) the truth….” (Q. 33:53)

“And (remember) when the Prophet disclosed a hadīth (speech) in confidence to one of his wives, so when she told it (to another), and Allāh made it known to him, he informed part thereof and left a part. Then when he told her thereof, she said: ‘Who told you this?’ He said: ‘The All-Knower, the All-Aware (Allāh) has told me.’” (Q. 66:3)

**Fifth:** The existence of narrations with the wording, ‘the most beautiful hadīth,’ and with the wording, ‘the most beautiful kalām,’ is mainly due to the numerous narrations given by the Prophet on various occasions32 of the hadīth in question. The Prophet used to mention it at the beginning of his khutbas, as was narrated by Ibn

---

32 See Section 8 of Chapter 2: ‘The Prophet’s teaching of the Sunnah to his Companions.’
Mas'ūd and Jābir. The Prophet may have said, ‘the most beautiful hadīth’ on one occasion and, ‘the most beautiful kalām’ on another, or he may have used both on the same occasion, as is the case in Ibn Hishām’s narration which is referred to by Goldziher, but which he does not cite in its entirety. For this reason we find that even the word ‘aḥsan’ (the most beautiful) in the expression ‘aḥsan al-hadīth’ appeared in other forms. For instance, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal narrates this hadīth from the Prophet in three forms:

"The most beautiful hadīth is the book of Allāh..."36

"The most truthful hadīth is the book of Allāh..."37

"The most gracious hadīth is the Book of Allāh..."38

All of these expressions are intended to convey the unique status of the Qur'ān.

Sixth: The wording ‘the most beautiful hadīth’ and the wording ‘the most beautiful kalām,’ are found from Ibn Mas'ūd in an early source, i.e. the Kitāb al-Jāmi' of Ma'mar Ibn Rāshid who died in 151 AH:

The first hadīth is cited as follows:

33 See above, p. 185.
34 See above p. 186.
35 The person who delivers the sermon should be able to select words and expressions which are stimulating for the audience.
36 Musnad 3, ḥ. no. 14022.
37 Ibid., ḥ. no. 13924. See also Nasā'i, k. Šalāt al-‘Ildayn, bā. no. 22, ḥ. no. 1578.
"Verily, there are two things; al-kalām (the speech) and the guidance. The most beautiful speech is the speech of Allah, and the best guidance is that of Muhammad ..."\(^{39}\)

The second hadīth is cited as follows:

\[\text{}`\text{Qāl Ibn Mansū'ūd: } \ldots \text{ أَصَدَقَ الْحَدِيثَ كِتَابُ اللَّهِ وَأَحْسَنَ الْهَدِيَّ حَدِيثُ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمُ ...'}\]

"The most truthful hadīth is the book of Allah, and the best guidance is that of Muhammad ..."\(^{40}\)

Thus, in the light of the above evidence we find it difficult to accept Goldziher’s argument.

---

\(^{38}\) Musnad 3, ḥ. no. 14566. See also Muslim, k. al-Jumu‘ah, bā. no. 13, ḥ. no. 867

\(^{39}\) Al-Jāmi‘, vol. 11, p. 117, ḥ. no. 20076.

\(^{40}\) Ibid., p. 159, ḥ. no. 20198.
SECTION 4

THE ALLEGED FABRICATION OF ABŪ HURAYRAH

Goldziher said,

"The possibilities which the Muslims admit themselves in this field are evident from a tradition in which the authorities seem to give away the secret quite unconsciously: 'The Prophet,' it says in a tradition in al-Bukhārī, [citing: Ṣayd, no. 6; cf. Ḥarth, no. 3; al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 281, 17.] 'gave the order to kill all dogs except hunting and sheep-dogs.' 'Umar's son was told that Abū Hurayra also hands down the words: 'but with the exception of farm dogs as well.' 'Umar's son says to this: 'Abū Hurayra owns cornfields,' i.e. he has a vested interest in handing down the order with the addition that farm dogs should be spared as well. This remark of Ibn 'Umar is characteristic of the doubt about the good faith of the transmitters that existed even in the earliest period of the formation of tradition." ⁴¹

First: Farm dogs, along with hunting and sheep dogs, were not only reported as excluded by Abū Hurayrah but also by 'Abd Allāh b. al-Mughaffāl and Sufyān b. Abī Zuhayr through different chains of transmission. The following chart illustrates this.

"He who kept a dog which is neither used for farmwork nor for guarding the livestock nor for hunting would lose one qirāṭ (of the reward) of his good deeds everyday."

**The narration of Abū Hurayrah:**

1. **Muḥammad 3, ḥ. no. 8342.**
2. **Muḥammad 3, ḥ. no. 7566.**
3. **K. al-Ṣaḥīḥ, bāb no. 1, ḥ. no. 2844.**
4. **K. al-Ḥikam wa al-fawā'id, bāb no. 4, ḥ. no. 1489.**
5. **K. al-Muṣāqāt, ḥ. no. 1575.**
6. **K. al-Ṣaḥīḥ wa al-Dhābiḥ, bāb no. 14, ḥ. no. 4289.**

**The narration of 'Abd Allāh b. Mughaffal which excludes the killing of farm dogs as well:**

1. **Muḥammad 3, ḥ. no. 20048.**
2. **Muḥammad 3, ḥ. no. 20053.**
3. **K. al-Ṣaḥīḥ wa al-Dhābiḥ, bāb no. 14, ḥ. no. 4288.**
4. **Muḥammad 3, ḥ. no. 20045.**

**The narration of Suḥayl b. Abī Zuhayr which excludes the killing of farm dogs as well:**

1. **K. Bad' at-Khaḍiq, bāb no. 17, ḥ. no. 3325.**
2. **K. al-Jāmi', ḥ. no. 1807.**
3. **K. al-Harīth wa al-Muṣārāt, bāb no. 3, ḥ. no. 2323.**
4. **Muḥammad 3, ḥ. no. 21406.**
Second: What did Ibn ‘Umar intend when he said, “Abū Hurayrah owns a cornfield”?

Ibn ‘Umar did not intend to accuse Abū Hurayrah or cast aspersions on his narration, as is alleged by Goldziher. In fact he intended to confirm Abū Hurayrah’s narration by giving the reason for Abū Hurayrah’s knowledge of the statement, which was that he owned a field, and thus had a specific reason to be aware of the Prophetic stipulations regarding farming: “The Muslim traditionists, however, have explained Ibn ‘Umar’s remark as meaning that Abū Hurayrah, being possessed of personal experience of the subject-matter of this hadīth, was in a better position to know exactly what its wording was.”42 What confirms this understanding is Ibn ‘Umar’s acceptance of this ‘extra statement.’ Ibn ‘Umar narrated the same hadīth excluding the killing of farm dogs as well in his narration. The following chart illustrates this.

42 Siddīqī, p. 128, citing: Tirmidhī, Jāmi‘ (with Tuhfah), II, 350.
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Ibn ‘Umar reported Allah’s Apostle as saying: “He who kept a dog which is neither used for farmwork nor for guarding the livestock nor for hunting would lose one qirāt (of the reward) of his good deeds everyday.”

Ibn ‘Umar reported Allāh’s Apostle as saying: “He who kept a dog which is neither used for farmwork nor for guarding the livestock nor for hunting would lose one qirāt (of the reward) of his good deeds everyday.”

Ibid., h. no. 5481.

Muslim, k. al-Musāqāh, ħ. no. 1574:
Third: Ibn ‘Umar’s opinion of Abū Hurayrah and the ḥadīths that he narrated.

Ibn ‘Umar testified that Abū Hurayrah was one of those closest to the Prophet and one of those most knowledgeable about his ḥadīth. Ibn ‘Umar gave this testimony after he had objected to one of Abū Hurayrah’s narrations, saying to him, “Look at what you narrate (نَظِرُ مَا نَحْدِثُ),” at which point Abū Hurayrah took his hand and went with him to ‘Ā’ishah in order to ask her about the matter. She said, “O yes,”46 in approval of Abū Hurayrah’s narration. Further, at Abū Hurayrah’s funeral, Ibn ‘Umar asked Allah’s forgiveness for him many times, saying, “He used to be one of those who took the responsibility for learning the ḥadīths of the Prophet by heart and teaching them to the Muslims.”47 Furthermore, when a man said to Ibn ‘Umar, “Abū Hurayrah narrated so many ḥadīths from the Prophet,” Ibn ‘Umar said to him, “I ask Allāh’s refuge for you from being in any doubt about what he narrates. He was daring [in asking the Prophet about things] while we showed cowardice.”48 On another occasion, Ibn ‘Umar was asked, “Do you look askance at what he (Abū Hurayrah) says?” He replied, “No, he dared and we showed cowardice.”49 When

---

46 Musnad 3, b. no. 4439; Mustadrak, k. Ma’rifat al-Ṣaḥābah, b. no. 1765.
48 Mustadrak, k. Ma’rifat al-Ṣaḥābah, b. no. 1763.
49 Dāwūd, k. al-Ṣalāh, bā. no. 293, b. no. 1261.
Abū Hurayrah heard about the question which Ibn 'Umar had been asked he said, “Where is my error if I memorized and they forgot?”

From the above, it would seem that Goldziher's assessment of ḥadīth is based on evidence that is in itself insufficient, while the texts he cites in support of his argument have been considerably mis-interpreted. In other words, it seems that Goldziher is making rather substantial inferences regarding ḥadīth based on very insubstantial evidence.

---

50 Ibid.
SECTION 5

GOLDZIHER’S STANCE REGARDING ABŪ HURAYRAH’S ḤADĪTHS

Goldziher says,

“The inexhaustible stock of information which he always had in hand (the Abū Hurayrah Ḥadīths take up no less than 213 pages [I believe it is no less than 313] in the Musnad of Ibn Ḥanbal, ii. 228-541), appears to have raised suspicion of their trustworthiness in the minds of his immediate auditors, nor did they hesitate to give utterance to their suspicions in ironical form (comp. Also Bukhārī, Faḍā’il al-āṣḥāb, No. 11). He had several times to defend himself against the charge of idle talk. These facts give our criticism every reason to be prudent and sceptic.”

Goldziher’s criticism of Abū Hurayrah’s traditions is based mainly on the following Ḥadīths that include those in which Abū Hurayrah “... had several times to defend himself against the charge of idle talk."

A. Abū Hurayrah said, “The people used to say, ‘Abū Hurayrah narrates very many Ḥadīths ṭanās ހآٓ ْتُقُبُّونُ أَكْثَرَ أَبُو ٌفُرْسَةَ.” In fact I used to keep close to Allāh’s Apostle and was satisfied with what filled my stomach. I ate no leavened bread and dressed in no decorated, striped clothes, and never did a man or a woman serve me, and I often used to press my belly against gravel because of hunger, and I used to ask a man to recite a verse of the Qur’ān to me although I knew it, so that he would take

51 Et¹, art. Abū Huraira.
me to his home and feed me. And the most generous of all people to the poor was Ja'far b. Abī Ṭālib. He used to take us to his home and offer us what was available there. He would even offer us an empty folded leather container [of butter] which we would split and then lick off what was in it.  

B. Saʿīd b. al-Musayyib and Abū Salamah b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. ʿAwf narrated that Abū Hurayrah said, “You people say that Abū Hurayrah narrates very many ḥadīths from Allāh’s Apostle (ﷺ) and you also wonder why the emigrants and Anṣār do not narrate from Allāh’s Apostle as Abū Hurayrah does. My emigrant brothers were busy in the market while I used to stick to Allāh’s Apostle content with what filled my stomach; so I would be present when they were absent and I would remember when they used to forget, and my Anṣār brothers used to be busy with their properties while I was one of the poor men of the sūfāh.  

C. Al-Aʿraj reported that he heard Abū Hurayrah saying, “You are under the impression that Abū Hurayrah transmits very many ḥadīths from Allāh’s Apostle (ﷺ); [bear in mind] Allāh is the ultimate One to be met (الْبَيْتُ إِلَى الْيَدِ). I was a poor man and I served Allāh’s Apostle being satisfied with

32 Bukhārī, k. Fadāʾil ashāb al-nabbī, bā. no. 10, ḥ. no. 3708.
33 A shaded place in the Mosque of the Prophet at al-Madīnah where poor people and emigrants used to take shelter.
34 Bukhārī, k. al-Biyūr, bā. no. 1, ḥ. no. 2047.
what filled my stomach, whereas the immigrants remained busy with transactions in the market, while the Anṣār were engaged in looking after their properties …”56

D. Al-A‘raj narrated that Abū Hurayrah said, “People say that I have narrated very many hadīths (اذن الناس يقولون أكثر أبو مُؤْرَة). Had it not been for two verses in the Qur’ān, I would not have narrated a single hadīth, and those verses are: ‘Verily, those who conceal the clear proofs, evidences and the guidance, which We have sent down, after We have made it clear for the people in the Book, they are the ones cursed by Allāh and cursed by the cursers, except those who repent and do righteous deeds, and openly declare (the truth which they concealed). From these, I will accept repentance. And I am the One Who Accepts repentance, the Most Merciful’ (Q. 2:159-60). No doubt our emigrant brothers used to be busy in the market with their business and our Anṣār brothers used to be busy with their properties. However I used to stick to Allāh’s Apostle contented with what would fill my stomach57 and I used to attend that which they used not to attend and I used to memorize that which they used not to memorize.”58

56 Musnad 3, b. no. 7648.
56 Muslim, k. Fadā‘il al-Ṣaḥābah, b. no. 2492; See also Musnad 3, b. no. 7233.
57 This does indicate that Abū Hurayrah spent all his time and energy in acquiring knowledge from the Prophet and led an austere and contented life, being satisfied for the most part with plain bread.
58 Bukhārī, k. al-‘ilm, b. a. no. 42, b. no. 118.
It is useful here to present a brief biography of this Companion and an account of his activity in relation to Ḥadīth before discussing Goldziher’s argument. In other words, it is beneficial to view his prolific transmission of Ḥadīth in the light of various features of his biography.

Abū Hurayrah embraced Islam at the hand of al-Ṭufayl b. ‘Amr in Yemen. Al-Ṭufayl had embraced Islam in Makkah, and the Prophet had subsequently asked him to return to his people and invite them to Islam, which he did. Initially, he made very few converts and returned to Makkah in order to consult the Prophet. The Prophet prayed for his people and then sent him back. On his return he made more converts, one of whom was Abū Hurayrah. Later, al-Ṭufayl led some of these converts, including Abū Hurayrah, to Madīnah, at the time of the conquest of Khaybar. They then covered the considerable distance to Khaybar and met the Prophet there. Since Khaybar took place in Safar in the seventh year of hijrah, while the Prophet died in Rabī’ al-Awwal in the eleventh year of hijrah, we can conclude that Abū Hurayrah accompanied the Prophet for more than four years. However, Abū Hurayrah himself states that he only accompanied the Prophet for

59 Mustadrak, k. Ma‘rifat al-Sahābah, h. no. 729; Hishām 1, vol. 1, pp. 382-5.
60 Ibn Sa‘d, vol. 4, p. 239.
61 Hishām 1, vol. 1, pp. 382-5.
63 For the definition of Khaybar, see Chapter 2, footnote no. 10.
64 Ibid., p. 353; Hishām 1, vol. 1, pp. 382-5.
65 The second month of the Muslim calendar.
66 The third month of the Muslim calendar.
three years. The reason for this was that Abū Hurayrah did not count the period during which he stayed in Bahrain, in the company of al-‘Alā’ b. al-Ḥadrāmī whom the Prophet had appointed as Amīr of Bahrain, and subsequently Abū Hurayrah traveled to various other places. It is likely that Abū Hurayrah closely followed news of the Islamic military expeditions and other important events that involved the Muslims before he met the Prophet. For instance, he asked the Prophet not to give Abān a share of the Khaybar booty because he had killed Ibn Qawqal at the battle of Uḥud.

Abū Hurayrah was a poor man and one of the people of suffah, he served the Prophet and loved him a great deal. He accompanied him on the majority of the military expeditions (ghazawāt) which the Prophet undertook, and was very

---

67 Bukhārī, k. al-Manāqib, bā. no. 25, h. no. 3591.
68 Bukhārī goes to Bahrain in the end of Dhū al-Qi’dah or Dhū al-Ḥijjah in the eighth year of the hijrah. See Dīfā’, p. 138.
69 Such as the Mu’tah expedition in Jumādā al-‘Ula, the fifth month of the Muslim calendar, in the ninth year of the hijrah (Waqīqī, vol. 2, p. 760 & 765), and his pilgrimage with Abū Bakr in the end of the ninth year of the hijrah (Bukhārī, k. Tafsīr al-Qur’ān, bā. no. 2, h. no. 4655).
70 A well known mountain about 3 miles north of Madinah where one of the greatest battle in Islamic history took place in the third year of hijrah; after a strong start, the Muslims ultimately lost.
71 Bukhārī, k. al-Maghāzī, bā. no. 38, h. no. 4238.
72 For the definition of suffah, see footnote no. 53 above.
73 Bukhārī, k. al-Biyū’, bā. no. 1, h. no. 2047.
74 Muslim, k. Fadā’il al-Saḥabah, b. no. 2492:
75 Mustadrak, k. al-Birr wa al-Silāh, h. no. 39; Musnad 3, h. no. 7873, 8096 & 10027.
76 Pl. of ghazwāt: a holy battle in the cause of Allāh in which the Prophet himself took part.
77 Such as: Khaybar, Fath Makkah, Ḥunayn, al-‘Tā’if and Tabūk.
close to the Prophet. Indeed in his opinion, the provision he received from the Prophet was sufficient in that he was close to the Prophet in order to hear and learn his words. The Prophet once offered him money, saying to Abü Hurayrah, "Do you not ask me to give you from this booty?" He replied, "All I ask you is to teach me

First: Fath Makkah (which took place in Ramaḍān, the ninth month of the Islamic year, in the eighth year of hijrah), see Muslim, k. al-Jihād wa al-siyar, h. no. 1780:

Second: Hunayn (which took place after Fath Makkah), see Bukhārī, k. al-Maghāzī, bā. no. 48, h. no. 4285:

Third: al-Tā'if (which took place in Shawwāl, the tenth month of the Islamic year, in the eighth year of hijrah), see Wāqidī, vol. 3, pp. 936-7:

Forth: Tabūk (which took place in Rajab, the seventh month of the Islamic year, in the ninth year of hijrah), see Jawānī, p. 249.

See also Muslim, k. al-Imān, h. no. 27; Musnad 3, h. no. 9170.

Some Companions used to ask the Prophet to give them a share of the booty even if they had not taken part in the expedition. See Dāwūd, k. al-Jihād, bā. no. 151, h. no. 2723:
what Allâh has taught you.” He accompanied the Prophet when he went out to the market place, toured the orchards and visited the sick. He would hold the halter of the Prophet’s she-camel with such regularity that the Prophet would inquire after him when he was absent.

Abû Hurayrah, as we have noted, was very keen to know the sayings and actions of the Prophet, whether regarding major or peripheral matters. A useful indication of his desire to acquire a highly comprehensive knowledge of the Prophet’s behaviour was his saying, “Allâh’s Apostle used to keep silent between the takbîr and the recitation of Qur’ân and that interval of silence used to be a short one. I said to the Prophet ‘May my parents be sacrificed for you! What do you say in the pause

81 Hilyat, vol. 1, 381; Bidâyah, vol. 8, p. 115:

وقال سعيد بن أبي هند عن أبي هريرة أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال له: “لا تأتي من هذه الغفاءات النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم إلا يقال: أصلحه؟” قلت: “اسأل من تعلم ما علمك الله.”

82 Bukhārī, k. al-Libās, bā. no. 60, ḥ. no. 5884:

خطابي إسماعي بن إبراهيم العطيلقي، أمرنا يحتفظ بي آدم حدائقنا ورفقنا بي غمر عن غمباله عن أبي بكر يغوص في بئر غنم أبي هريرة رضي الله عنهم قال: “لقيت مع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم في سوق عن أسماء المدينة فاصطفى فاصطفى...”

83 Musnad 3, ḥ. no. 8180; Muslim, k. Faḍā’il al-Ṣaḥābah, ḥ. no. 2421.

84 Ibn Mājah, k. al-Ṭib, bā. no. 18, ḥ. no. 3470; Musnad 3, ḥ. no. 9384; Mustadrak, k. al-Janā’iz, ḥ. no. 23.

85 Mustadrak, k. al-Jihād, ḥ. no. 109.

86 Dāwūd, k. al-Nikāh, bā. no. 50, ḥ. no. 2174; Musnad 3, ḥ. no. 10594:


87 Saying Allâhu akbar in the beginning of any prayer.
between the *takbīr* and the recitation?" On one occasion he asked the Prophet a question about intercession on the Day of Judgement, and the Prophet replied, "O Abū Hurayrah! I thought that none would ask me about it before you, as I know your longing for the [learning of] the *Ḥadīth*." Ubayy b. Ka'b said, "Abū Hurayrah was very daring (jarḍūn) in asking the Prophet about certain things his Companions did not ask him about."

He also habitually learned the words of the Prophet by heart. He said, "I do not know of any Companion of the Prophet who learned the *Ḥadīth* of the Prophet better than me." He also said, "I accompanied the Prophet for three years and all that I was interested in during those years was memorizing his *Ḥadīth*." In another statement he said, "I accompanied the Prophet for three years, and I was never so anxious in the rest of my life to understand the *Ḥadīth* as I was during those three years." In order to accomplish his goal, Abū Hurayrah allocated a part of the night

---

88 Bukhārī, *al-Adhān*, bā. no. 89, h. no. 744; Muslim, *al-Masājid wa mawādāt al-Ṣalāḥ*, h. no. 598; Nasā'ī, *al-Ifṭīṭāh*, bā. no. 15, h. no. 895; Dāwūd, *al-Ṣalāḥ*, bā. no. 123, h. no. 781; Ibn Mājah, *Iqrāmu al-Ṣalāḥ wa al-Sunnatu fīhā*, bā. no. 1, h. no. 805; *Musnad 3*, h. no. 7124, 10036; Dārimī, *al-Ṣalāḥ*, bā. no. 37, h. no. 1244.

89 Bukhārī, *al-'Iʿlām*, bā. no. 33, h. no. 99; *al-Riqāq*, bā. no. 51, h. no. 6570:

90 Mustadrak, *Maʿrifat al-Safiāmah*, h. no. 1764.

91 Dārimī, *al-Mugaddimah*, bā. no. 28, h. no. 284; Ibn Sa'd, vol. 4, p. 332.

92 Ḥumaydī, vol. 2, p. 455. See also *Musnad 3*, h. no. 7927.

93 Bukhārī, *al-Manāqib*, bā. no. 25, h. no. 3591; Ibn Sa'd, vol. 4, p. 327; *Musnad 3*, h. no. 9796.
for the memorization of Ḥadīth.94 Thus, when Marwān b. al-Ḥakam tested his memory of Ḥadīths, he found him to be very efficient. Abū al-Zu‘ayzi‘ah, Marwān’s scribe, said, “Marwān invited Abū Hurayrah and asked me to sit behind the bed. He started to question him, and I started to record his answers. A year later, he called on him to come again and asked him the same things. Abū Hurayrah gave him the same answers with no addition or deletion whatsoever.”95

As a natural result of the circumstances we have described, including Abū Hurayrah’s poverty, his close company of the Prophet during his residences and journeys, his daring in asking the Prophet questions, and his keenness to learn from the Prophet and memorize his words, he was well placed to be aware of a great deal of the Prophet’s sayings and actions that many other Companions were unaware of. It is therefore unsurprising that he narrated so many Ḥadīths from the Prophet, especially when we are aware that he himself taught the Prophetic Ḥadīths, saying, “...had it not been for two verses in the Qur‘ān, I would not have narrated a single Ḥadīth.”96 He would narrate in the Mosque before the Jumu‘ah prayer, and would sit down when he heard the door opening for the Imām to enter and give the sermon.97 He lived to old age98 and was in great demand for his knowledge in Madīnah, where

---

94 Dārimī, al-Muqaddimah, b. no. 27, ḥ. no. 264.
95 Mustadrak, k. Ma‘rifat al-Ṣaḥābah, ḥ. no. 1762; Bid‘yah, vol. 8, p. 109.
96 See above, p. 203.
97 Mustadrak, k. Ma‘rifat al-Ṣaḥābah, ḥ. no. 1771.
98 Abū Hurayrah died in one of the following years: 57, 58 or 59 AH. However, if he prayed at ‘A‘ishah’s funeral in 58, the date must be 58/678, or 59.
he was based and which was considered the centre for the dissemination of the Prophet's *hadīths*.

It is no wonder then that this man memorized *hadīths* which run to no less than 313 pages in the *Musnad of Ibn Ḥanbal*. In present-day Makkah and Madinah, there are institutes for the memorization of the Qur'ān where students graduate in two years or less. During the course, students may memorize all the contents of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* which contain a combined total of 14,838 *hadīths*,99 in addition to the Qur'ān. The number of *hadīths* which Abū Hurayrah memorized throughout the time he accompanied the Prophet is far smaller than that which students assimilate in the institutes of the present day,100 putting his nonetheless remarkable achievement into perspective.

We can conclude that, when viewed in the context of his life, the explanation that Abū Hurayrah frequently gave for the large number of *hadīths* that he reported is entirely reasonable and need, therefore, give us no cause to be prudent or sceptical.

**Discussion of Goldziher's argument:**

The fact that Abū Hurayrah narrated *hadīths* prolifically in comparison with other Companions, despite his belated embracing of Islam, was naturally a cause of inquiry amongst the Followers and Companions who lived away from Madīnan

---

99 This occurs, including repetitions, with the following frequencies: *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* - 7563; and *Muslim* - 7275, and without repetitions: Total 5,794; *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* - 2761 and *Muslim* - 3033. See *Fath*, vol. 13, p. 537; *Muslim*, vol. 5, p. 601; *al-Iḥṣāʿ fi ṭidhir al-ṣāḥib al-sīlah*, pp.175, 201 (by Siddīq Ḥasan (d. 1307/1889). Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-Ilmiyyah, 1905/1985).
society. These inquiries were not ironical as Goldziher alleges, but were in fact intended to establish the causes of this and thus remove any shadow of doubt regarding his narration. It is also fair to say that when Abü Hurayrah gave his explanation for the number of hadīths he reported, those who heard it were satisfied. In any case, if they had been seriously doubtful about his truthfulness, the reasons he gave would certainly not have been sufficient, and he would not have been permitted to continue to narrate hadīths from the Prophet. In addition, we would expect to find at least one statement accusing him of fabrication, particularly when we know that the number of those who narrated hadīth from Abū Hurayrah exceeds 800, including approximately 41 Companions. Indeed, 'Ṭalḥah b. 'Ubayd Allāh clearly stated that, "Not a single Companion among us accused him of fabricating hadīths and attributing them to the Prophet." Various senior Companions, including 'Umar, 'Uthmān, 'Alī, 'Ṭalḥah, al-Zubayr and so forth, used to consult with Abū Hurayrah regarding hadīth, and people would check with him regarding the soundness of various hadīths. When 'Abd Allāh b. Shaqīq al-ʻUqaylī heard Ibn 'Abbās state in his khutbah, after he had delayed the prayer, "I saw the Prophet combining the noon and afternoon prayers and the sunset and 'ishā' prayers," he said, "Some doubt was

---

100 Leaving aside the distinguished scholars who have very good memories.
101 Tahdīḥī, vol. 12, p. 265.
102 Dīfā‘, p. 109.
103 Mustadrak, k. Ma‘rifat al-Ṣaḥābah, h. no. 1770.
The question that poses itself here is whether what Abü Hurayrah claimed about the status of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār was true. Before we answer this question, we would add that Abü Hurayrah was not left alone to defend the large number of hadīths he narrated from the Prophet. Tālhah did so also. For instance, a man came to Tālhah and asked him, “O Abū Muḥammad, do you see this Yemeni (namely: Abū Hurayrah)? Is he more well versed in the Ḥadīth of the Prophet than you are? We hear him narrate more hadīths than you do, but does he fabricate hadīths and attribute them to the Prophet?” Tālhah replied, “As for his hearing more hadīths from the Prophet than we did, I have no doubt that that was the case because he was a poor man staying with the Prophet as his guest, whereas we had homes and businesses to go back to, and we only used to come to the Prophet in the mornings and evenings. Therefore, I have no doubt that he heard from him hadīths which we did not hear. We do not see anyone who is deemed to be a good man fabricating hadīths and then attributing them to the Prophet.”

105 Muslim, k. Šalāḥ al-Musāfīrīn, b. no. 705:

106 Tirmidhī, k. al-Manāgib, b. no. 47, h. no. 3837.
hadīths and attributing them to the Prophet.” Ṭalḥah’s statement would seem to indicate that what Abū Hurayrah claimed was true, as it also answers the previous questions as well. There are also statements from ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb and al-Barā’ b. ‘Āzib which further confirm this. The former said, “This hadīth [the hadīth regarding the requirement to take permission from the occupants before entering a house] of the Prophet remained hidden from me. Business in the market kept me busy.” The latter, who was an Anṣārī stated, “Not all of us heard all the hadīths of the Prophet. We used to have fields and businesses. However, people at that time did not lie and those who were present used to tell those who were absent about the hadīths.” This is an admission that they were busy for part of the time, and were therefore unable to attend all the Prophet’s meetings, which confirms Abū Hurayrah’s statement.

Abū Hurayrah mentioned another reason for his prolific narration. He mentioned on a number of occasions, using various expressions, that one reason was his powerful memory. He said to those who questioned him and those who were doubtful, “I learn by heart whereas they forget,” and also, “I attended the meetings that they did not attend and I learned by heart hadīths which they did not learn by heart.” In addition, he stated, “I used to be in the Prophet’s company for most of

107 Mustadrak, k. Ma’rifat al-Ṣaḥābah, h. no. 1770.
108 Bukhārī, k. al-I’tifām bi al-Kitāb wa al-Sunnah, bā. no. 22, h. no. 7353; Musnad 3, h. no. 19084.
109 Mustadrak, k. al-‘Ilm, h. no. 149.
110 Bukhārī, k. al-Biyū’, bā. no. 1, h. no. 2047.
111 Ibid., k. al-‘Ilm, bā. no. 42, h. no. 118.
The time, I attended his meetings when they were absent, and I learned the *ḥadīths* by heart while they forgot them.”

This is further confirmed by Muḥammad b. ‘Umārah b. ‘Amr b. Ḥazm’s description of Abū Hurayrah’s teaching circles. He reveals that he sat in a gathering where Abū Hurayrah, along with more than ten Companions of the Prophet, was present. Abū Hurayrah then started to narrate a certain *ḥadīth* from the Prophet; some of them initially failed to recognize it, but on reviewing the *ḥadīth*, many of them did. Then he told them of another *ḥadīth*, and as before some of those present failed to recognize it, again recognizing it after some thought. He did this time and time again. Muḥammad then said, “From that time, I knew that Abū Hurayrah was the best at learning by heart the *ḥadīths* from the Prophet.”

This evidence indicates the veracity of Abū Hurayrah’s claims. It also indicates that the Companions and Followers accepted his *ḥadīths*, including those who were initially sceptical.

---

112 *Musnad* 3, h. no. 7648.

113 *Bukhārī* *TX*, vol. 1, pp. 186-7 (article on Muḥammad b. ‘Umārah b. ‘Amr b. Ḥazm); *Nubalā’, vol. 2, p. 617.
CHAPTER 4
THE PIOUS SCHOLARS AND FABRICATION

An analysis of the evidence Goldziher cites in support of his claim that the pious scholars fabricated hadīth during the Umayyads period

Section 1: Goldziher’s evidence regarding the pious scholars’ fabrication.

Section 2: Discussion of Goldziher’s allegation that the pious scholars invented the hadīth, “There will come emirs after me who will kill (yumītūna) the Salāt ….”

Section 3: Discussion of the dissatisfaction of the pious scholars and their denunciation and defiance of the tyrannical rule of the Umayyads.

Section 4: Discussion of al-Ḥajjāj’s mistreatment of Anas b. Mālik.

Section 5: Discussion of Yazīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik’s alleged desire to execute al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī because of his pietistical opposition.

Section 6: Discussion of Ibn al-Musayyib’s refusal to pledge allegiance.

Section 7: Discussion of Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyib’s statement about Mu‘āwiyyah b. Abī Sufyān and al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī’s opinion on the issue of khilāfah.
SECTION 1

GOLDZIHER'S EVIDENCE REGARDING THE PIOUS SCHOLARS' FABRICATION

This section will be devoted to the presentation of Goldziher's evidence regarding the role of the pious scholars in the fabrication of Ḥadīth.

Goldziher's theory with regard to the fabrication of Ḥadīth is based mainly on the claim that there was a great enmity that existed between the Umayyads and the pious scholars. He elaborates this enmity a great deal, while emphasising the readiness of each side to fabricate ḥadīths, either to the detriment of the other party, or to bolster their own cause. We present his evidence, regarding fabrication by the 'pious scholars', below:

Goldziher says,

"At the time of al-Ḥajjāj and ‘Umar II people had no idea of the proper times for prayer and the most pious Muslims were unsure of the quite elementary rules. The pious, however, endeavoured to demand adherence to a fixed sunna in the name of the Prophet and, when they found that the government did not support them in efforts which seemed unimportant to the latter, they produced the following Prophecy of Muhammed: ‘There
will come emirs after me who will kill the salāt (yumūʿa) but continue to pray the salāt at the proper times all the same.”

Goldziher cites the same hadīth from Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 45, commenting,

“This does not mean those who abolish the institution of the salāt but those who yuʿakhkhirūna al-salāt, i.e. do not keep exactly to the times of the salāt-rite as decreed by the sunna.”

“‘Kingdom’ -al-mulk- this expression characterizes the trend of Umayyad rule. It was entirely secular, showing little concern with religious law as practised by the pious and laying no stress on the fact that it wielded a power which derived from the Prophet. The true followers of the Umayyads also felt no particular need to honour the founder of theocratic rule. It must have been the sneers of such people that stopped the Zubayrīd from giving the usual blessing on the memory of the Prophet in his speeches. The founder of the dynasty was the first who called himself king, and the pious Saʿīd b. al-Musayyib made this bitter comment: ‘May Allāh repay Muʿāwiyah, as he was the first who converted this condition (dominion over true believers) into mulk.’

Pious people of Saʿīd’s kind frowned at the state of affairs under such rule; they decried the tyrannical government, defied it by passive resistance and even showed their dissatisfaction openly, occasionally going so far as to refuse homage. In return they were hated and despised by the ruling circles. It is sufficient to consider the way in which al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf deals with Anas b. Mālik; he rebukes him like a criminal and threatens ‘to grind him as millstones would grind and to make him a target for arrows.’ The caliph Yazīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik contemptuously calls the pious Ḥasan al-BAṣrī a shaykh jāhil, a doddering old man whom he would like to kill because his pietistical opposition is repellent and

2 Ibid., p. 33.
inconvenient to him. This Ḥasan had said that the governor Mughīra had made a fateful step, in so far as he inspired the hereditary caliphate of the Umayyads, by arranging that homage should be paid during Muʿāwiyah's life to his son Yazīd; the pious preferred the electoral caliphate (shūrā) of patriarchal times. The aims of the pious were divorced from reality.

During the time when religious people were pushed into the background by the rulers, they, like the Jewish rabbis under Roman rule, occupied themselves with research into the law, which had no validity for the real circumstances of life but represented for themselves the law of their ideal society. The god-fearing elements of society looked upon these men as their leaders and even some lax persons occasionally approached them for guidance in casu conscientiae. Without paying any attention to reality these men founded the sunna of the Prophet upon which the law and jurisprudence of the Islamic state was to be based. The Companions and 'followers' living amongst them gave them the sacred material which formed the contents and basis of their endeavour. What these latter could not offer was looked for afar. People traveled to Medina, the place of origin of the ḥadīth, from where the religious stream flowed into the Muslim diaspora in those godless times....

Thus there arise new people to relate sayings ascribed to the Prophet, but some new things also came into being. Anything which appears desirable to pious men was given by them a corroborating support reaching back to the Prophet. This could easily be done in a generation in which the Companions, who were represented as the intermediaries of the Prophet's words, were no longer alive. The fact, that by disseminating these teachings they thought they were working against the godless tendency of the time, quietened the conscience of the pious inventors of traditions, who related their own teachings and those of their immediate teachers back to the authority of the Master who was for all, including even the lax, an undisputable source of law. Since the pious opponents of the dynasty looked upon the 'Alid pretenders as the
chosen saviours of the empire, a large part of these falsifications was
dedicated to the praise of the Prophet’s family without being a direct
attack upon the Umayyads. But nobody could be so simple as not to
recognize the negative implications.

Thus the ḥadīth led in the first century a troubled existence, in
silent opposition to the ruling element which worked the opposite
direction. The pious cultivated and disseminated in their orders the little
that they had saved from early times or acquired by communication.
They also fabricated new material for which they could expect
recognition only in a small community.3

3 Ibid., pp. 40-3.
DISCUSSION OF GOLDZIHER’S ALLEGATION THAT THE PIous SCHOLARS INVENTED THE ḤADĪTH, ‘THERE WILL COME EMIRS AFTER ME WHO WILL KILL (YUMĪTŪNA) THE ŠALĀT ... ’

Goldziher says,

“At the time of al-Ḥajjāj and ‘Umar II people had no idea of the proper times for prayer and the most pious Muslims were unsure of the quite elementary rules [citing: al-Nasā’ī, I. pp. 46-7]. The pious, however, endeavoured to demand adherence to a fixed sunna in the name of the Prophet and, when they found that the government did not support them in efforts which seemed unimportant to the latter, they produced the following Prophecy of Muhammed: ‘There will come emirs after me who will kill the šalāt (yumītūna) but continue to pray the šalāt at the proper times all the same’ [citing: al-Tirmidhī, I, p. 37].”

Goldziher cites the same ḥadīth from Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 45, commenting,

“This does not mean those who abolish the institution of the šalāt but those who yu’akihirūna al-ṣalāt, i.e. do not keep exactly to the times of the šalāt-rite as decreed by the sunna.”

---

4 This is the ḥadīth from al-Tirmidhī which is cited by Goldziher, k. al-Ṣalāḥ, bā. no. 129, h. no. 176:


6 This is the ḥadīth from Abū Dāwūd which is cited by Goldziher, k. al-Ṣalāḥ, bā. no. 10, h. no. 431:

7 Goldziher, vol. 2, p. 33.
Before discussing Goldziher's allegation that the pious scholars invented the hadīth, "There will come emirs after me who will kill (yumū'ūna) the salāt . . . ," which is our main concern in this section, it is worthwhile discussing his belief that people had no idea of the proper times for prayer at the time of al-Ḥajjāj and 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz. Goldziher cites the following narrations as his evidence:

1. Abū Umāmah b. Sahhl reported: "We offered the zuhr prayer with 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz. We then set out till we came to Anas b. Malik and found him busy in performing the 'asr prayer. I said to him, 'O Uncle! which is this prayer that you are offering?' He said, 'It is the 'asr prayer, and this is the prayer of the Prophet of Allah that we offered along with him.'"

2. Bashar b. Salām reported: "I and Muhammad Bāqir b. 'Alī b. Ḥusayn came to Jābir b. 'Abd Allāh al-Anṣārī during the reign of al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf and inquired from him about [the times of] prayer of the Prophet of Allāh. Jābir said, 'The Prophet of Allāh prayed the zuhr prayer when the sun had passed the meridian to the extent of the thong of a sandal; he prayed the 'asr prayer at the time when the shadow of a man was as long as himself; he prayed the maghrib prayer at the time when the sun had set; he prayed the 'ishā' prayer at the time when the twilight had disappeared; and he prayed the fājr prayer at the time when the dawn had appeared. On the following day he prayed the zuhr prayer when his shadow was as long as himself; he prayed the 'asr prayer at the time when his shadow was twice as long as himself and there was still enough time for a man to be able to go off after the prayer from Madinah and reach Dhū al-Ḥulayfah before sunset; he prayed the maghrib prayer at the time when the sun had sunk; he prayed the 'ishā' prayer at the time when about a third or middle . . . .

---

8 Nasā'i, k. al-Mawāqīf, bā. no. 8, ḫ. no. 509.
of the night had passed; and he prayed the *fajr* prayer when there was clear daylight.”

The *ḥadīth* narrated by Jābir b. ‘Abd Allāh himself (d. 74/693) clearly states that for every prayer there is a period in which it should be performed. Mujāhid b. Jabr said, “It is said that a prayer has a beginning and an end to its time.” Ibn ‘Abbās said, “Between every two prayers there is a specific time.” It was also narrated from Abū al-`Āṣba’ that he said, “I heard Ibn ‘Abbās saying many times, ‘The time of a certain prayer does not end until the next prayer is called.’” ‘Ikrimah said, “Between offering one prayer and the next one there is a specific time.” On this basis, some rulers used to offer the prayer at the end of its appointed time because it was legally permissible to do so. Therefore, regarding the narration cited by Goldziher, Abū Umāmah, along with his companions offered the *zuhr* prayer with ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-`Azīz at the end of its appointed time whereas Anas b. Mālik (d. 91/709) offered the *’asr* prayer at the beginning of its time. Moreover, Anas told them that this was the time in which the Prophet offered this prayer, i.e. that it was

9 Ibid., b. no. 524. Also, Ibn Abī Shaybah in his book *al-Muṣannaf*, vol. 1, p. 282, h. no. 3226, narrated it with the following addition:

```
فَقَلَنَا لَهُ كَيْفُ نَصْلِي مَعَ الحَجَاج وَهُوَ يُؤْخِرُ؟ فَقَالَ مَا أَصَلِّ لِلْوَقْتِ فَقَصْلُوا مَعَهُ إِذَا أَخْرُ فَقَصُلُوا لَوْقَتهُ وَأَجْعَلُوهَا مَعَ فَالْقُلْ.”
```

10 *Tirmidhī*, k. *al-Ṣalah*, b. no. 114, h. no. 151; *Muslim*, k. *al-Masājid*, h. no. 622; *Tirmidhī*, k. *al-Ṣalah*, b. no. 120, h. no. 160; *Dāwūd*, k. *al-Ṣalah*, b. no. 5, h. no. 413; *Musnad* 3, h. no. 11588, 12100 & 12518; *Mālik*, k. *al-Qur‘ān*, h. no. 46; *Muṣannaf* 1, vol. 1, p. 549, h. no. 2080.

11 *Muṣannaf*, vol. 1, p. 294, h. no. 3366.

12 Ibid., p. 294, h. no. 3369.

13 Ibid., p. 294, h. no. 3367.
the best time to offer it. Hence, it is clear that Goldziher’s assumption, that people had no idea of the proper times for prayer and that the most pious Muslims were unsure of the quite elementary rules, is based on a misunderstanding.

It is worth mentioning that ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz reversed his decision to pray at the end of the prayer time and confined himself to the beginning of the time in which the Prophet used to offer prayer. He did this after ‘Urwh b. al-Zubayr informed him of the best times to offer prayer, i.e. those in which the Prophet did so. Ibn Ḥajar mentions some evidence which demonstrates the commitment of ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz to keep uncompromisingly to these times.

As regards the question posed by the two followers, Bashīr b. Sallām and Muḥammad b. ‘Alī to Jābir b. ‘Abd Allāh, during the governorship of al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf, about the times in which the Prophet offered prayer, it was natural for the followers to have asked about almost everything regarding Islam. Besides, this question from only two people does not imply, in any way, that the majority at that time had no idea of the proper times for prayer, particularly when we know that Jābir was not the only narrator of the hadīth of the prayer times. In fact, a number of Companions narrated it, as is stated by al-Tirmidhī who mentions some of them by

---

14 In fact, Umm Farwah mentioned a hadīth regarding the best time of offering a prayer. She said, “The Prophet of Allāh was asked, ‘Which of the actions is best?’ He replied, ‘Observing prayer early in its period.’” See Dāwūd, k. al-Salate, bā. no. 9, ḥ. no. 426; Tirmidhī, k. al-Salāh, bā. no. 127, ḥ. no. 170; Musnad 3, ḥ. no. 26562, 26564 & 26930.
15 Dāraqūṭnī, k. al-Salāh, bā. no. 8, ḥ. no. 975; Mālik, k. Wugūr al-Salāh, ḥ. no. 1; Bukhārī, k. Mawqūf al-Salāh, bā. no. 1, ḥ. no. 521. See also Fatḥ, vol. 2, p. 4.
name, including: Abū Hurayrah, Buraydah, Abū Mūsā, Abū Mas‘ūd al-Anṣārī, Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī, ‘Amr b. Ḥazm, al-Barā‘, Anas b. Mālik,17 and ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar.18 Al-Daraqūṭnī narrates the same ḥadīth on the authority of another two Companions, namely Ibn ‘Umar19 and Mujammī b. Jāriyah.20 Al-Suyūṭī considered it to be a mutawātir ḥadīth, mentioning that it was also narrated by Ibn ‘Abbās and others.21

Goldziher’s allegation that pious people invented the ḥadīth, ‘There will come emirs after me who will kill (yumū‘na) the ṣalāt ... ‘:

Goldziher’s allegation that the pious invented the ḥadīth, “There will come emirs after me who will kill the ṣalāt (yumū‘na) but continue to pray the ṣalāt ... ,” as a result of the Umayyad government’s failure to support them in efforts which seemed unimportant to the latter, needs to be reexamined. It is the fact that it was not the wont of the Umayyads to have kept silent about anything that might have threatened their authority, that leads us to believe that they would have reacted in one way or another against this ḥadīth if it was intended to refer to them. However, there is nothing to prove that this was the case. If Goldziher’s allegation is true, then the ḥadīth would not have been disseminated more widely in the ‘Abbāsid era than

17 Tirmidhī, k. al-Ṣalāḥ, bā. no. 113, ḥ. no. 149.
18 Ibid., bā. no. 114, ḥ. no. 151.
19 Dāraqūṭnī, k. al-Ṣalāḥ, bā. no. 9, ḥ. no. 1007 & 1018.
20 Ibid., ḥ. no. 1013.
21 Suyūṭī QA, pp. 73-4.
under the Umayyads, since he makes it clear that the Sunnah found favour and official recognition under the Abbāsids,\textsuperscript{22} as can be seen from the following diagram (See page no. 226-9). Furthermore, there was in fact no reason to invent this hadrāh in disparagement of the Umayyads since the deferment of the prayer until the end of its time is legally permissible in any case.\textsuperscript{23} Finally, the way in which this hadrāh was presented by its narrators gives an indication of whether the pious invented it or not.

\textsuperscript{22} Goldziher says, "From the above account it is evident that the rule of the ‘Abbāsid dynasty favoured the development of religious law and the cultivation of public law in the religious spirit, during the time of its flowering as well as in the epoch of its decline when the troubled circumstances of the time gave more and more scope for the influence of pietist elements," and says, "The rise of the ‘Abbāsid dynasty is thus the time when the movement to establish the sunna as a science and as the standard of life received official recognition," and says, "Theologians now find the ground prepared to make accepted in practice the sunna which in the Umayyad period was pushed into the background and in part was still quite unknown." See Goldziher, vol. 2, p. 71, 75 and 76 respectively.

\textsuperscript{23} See the above narration by Jābir b. ‘Abd Allāh, page 221. In addition, the remainder of the hadrāh, which Goldziher cites, itself clearly states that the prayer of those who offer their prayer at the end of its appointed time is acceptable. Besides, if this hadrāh had been invented by the pious, they would, on its basis, have to have judged this prayer as invalid, and they would not have committed themselves to praying twice, once at the beginning of the prayer time by themselves, and again with the rulers at the end of its time.
PART II: Chapter 4

The Prophet

Abū Dharr M (d. 32)

'Abd Allāh b. al-Šāmit B (d. after 70)

Abū Na‘āmah ‘Abd Rabbih B

Abū al-‘Āliyah B (d. 90)

Ayyūb B (d. 130)

Budayl b. Maysarah B (d. 130)

Yūnus b. ‘Ubayd

Maṭar b. Ṭahmān B (d. 129)

Al-Mubārak b. Fuḍālah B (d. 166)

Khālid b. al-Ḥārīth B (d. 186)

Muḥammad b. Ja‘far B (d. 193)

Al-Naḍr b. Shumayl

Musnad 3, no. 20913

Musnad 3, no. 20967

Ibn Khuzaymah, no. 1639

Ibn al-Ja‘d no. 1178

Ziyād b. Ayyūb D (d. 252)

Zuhayr b. Ḥarb D (d. 234)

Bukhārī M, no. 954

Musnad 3, no. 20968

‘Aḥmad al-Zubayrī

Mu‘ādh b. Hishām B (d. 200)

Ṭabarānī MS, no. 604

Abū Ghassān al-Masma‘ī B (d. 236)

Nasā‘ī, no. 778

Muslim, k. al-Masjid, ḥ. no. 244

Muslim, k. al-Masjid, ḥ. no. 244

Nasā‘ī SK, no. 932; Nasā‘ī, no. 859

Musnad 3, no. 20908

Ṭabarānī MK, no. 1633

Hāshim b. al-Qāsim (d. 209)

Asad b. Mūsā

Abū Dāwūd

‘Abd al-Šāmad

Sahl b. Ḥammād

Abū ‘Amir

Khālid b. al-Ḥārīth B (d. 186)

Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm B (d. 247)

Yahyā b. Ḥabīb B (d. 248)

B. Resident in al-Baṣrah.

D. Resident in Baghdād.

H. Resident in Hînṣ.

K. Resident in al-Kufah.

M. Resident in Madīnah.

R. Resident in Marw al-Rawdh.

Names with Green colour who lived under the Umayyad rule.

Names with Blue colour who lived under the ‘Abbasid rule.

Names with Red colour who lived under both eras.

S. Resident in al-Shām.

Y. Resident in al-Yamāmah.
PART II: Chapter 4

The Prophet

'Abd Allāh b. 'Amr b. al-‘Āṣ (d. 63)
Abū Ṣayfāyīn B
'Abd Allāh b. al-Šāmit M (d. 34)
Abū Ubayy S
Abū Mūtammāl al-Ḥimṣī S
Abū al-Muthannā al-Ḥimṣī S
Abū Ḥāshim al-Za’farānī B
Abū al-Walīd al-Ṭayālīsī B (d. 227)
Abū Asmā’ al-Raḥbī S
Ismā’īl b. ‘Ayāsh S (d. 181)
Abū Ḥāshim al-Za’farānī B
Dāwūd, no. 434; Bukhārī TK, no. 781; Ibn Sa’d, vol. 7, p. 56
Bukhārī TK, no. 1622
Dāwūd, no. 432

'Abbās b. Mālik B (d. 91)
Sa’d b. Tāhmān
Shaib al-Raḥmān b. Sābit R (d. 118)
Yaḥyā b. Abī Ḥathīr al-Baṣrī Y (d. 132)
Yaḥyā b. Abī Ḥathīr al-Baṣrī Y (d. 132)
Al-Ṭalḥa al-Vaḥīṣah R (d. 118)
Dāwūd, no. 433

Ahū ṣhūr Uḥayy S

‘Amr b. Abī Ṣaḥīḥ R (d. 213)
Aḥmad

Arras h. Malik B (d. 91)

Abū Tālah Sūf yān al-Thawrī K (d. 161)
Sūf yān b. ‘Uṭayn K (d. 198)

Abū Ḥamīd al-Bīrānī M (d. 245)
Abū Tālah Sūf yān al-Thawrī K (d. 161)

Ibn Mājah, no. 1257

Muḥammad b. Sirīn B (d. 110)
Sālim al-Khayyāṭ B
Hilāl b. Yasāf K
Manṣūr b. al-Mu’tamīr K (d. 132)

Sūf yān al-Thawrī K (d. 161)

Wākid b. al-Jarrāḥ K (d. 196)
Muḥammad b. Bashshār B (d. 252)

Muḥammad b. Sulaymān N (d. 234)

Dāwūd, no. 433

From the previous chains (isnāds) we notice the following:

**First:** The ḥadīth was narrated by narrators residing in Baṣrah, Kufah and al-Shām. The invention of such a ḥadīth with identical words and expressions by narrators from the places just mentioned would require that they had conferred, or travelled a great deal from one place to another in order to introduce and propagate it, and there is no proof that this happened.

**Second:** When we look at the biographical history of these narrators, we do not find that any of them had any enmity against the Umayyads that might have urged them to invent this ḥadīth in order to take revenge, or simply degrade them. Moreover, the scholars of al-jarḥ wa al-taʿdīl did not judge any of these narrators to be an inventor of a ḥadīth or a liar. On the contrary, the vast majority of them were described as reliable authorities whose narration should be accepted.

**Third:** If we take the ‘aṣr prayer as an example, we find that a number of those who narrated this ḥadīth would frequently offer this prayer at the end of its respective time, including Ibn Masʿūd, al-Aswād b. Yazīd, ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. al-

---

24 Such as: Mān ; Nubalāʾ; Ḥātim; Majrūḥīn; Tahdīh; Bukhārī D and Nasāʾī D.
25 Muṣannaf 1, vol. 1, p. 551, h. no. 2089; Dāraquṭnī, k. al-Ṣalāh, bā. no. 8, h. no. 997:
26 Muṣannaf, vol. 1, p. 289, h. no. 3310.

See also Muṣannaf, vol. 1, p. 289, h. no. 3311:

عن إبراهيم قال: "كان ابن أخي الأسود مذموم فكان يعجل العصر، فقال له الأسود: 'نطعنا في أدناه أو نعتزل مذموماً."
Aswad⁷⁷ and Muḥammad b. Sīrīn.⁷⁸ In general, the pious who offered prayers at the end of their times were numerous. For instance, ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib⁷⁹ (d. 40/660), Abū Hurayrah⁸⁰ (d. 57/676), Ibn ‘Abbās³¹ (d. 68/687), ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar³² (d. 73/692), Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīyah³³ (d. 80/699), Ibrāhīm al-Nakha‘i³⁴ (d. 96/714), Abū Qilābah ‘Abd Allāh b. Zayd³⁵ (d. 104/722) and his son; Khalid,³⁶ Ṭāwūs³⁷ (d. 106/724), al-Ḥasan³⁸ (d. 110/728), Ibn Ṭāwūs³⁹ (d. 132/749), etc.

²⁷ Ibid., h. no. 3314:
²⁸ Musannaf 1, vol. 1, p. 551, h. no. 2088; see also h. no. 2087; Dāraquṭnī, k. al-Ṣalāh, bā. no. 8, h. no. 994:
²⁹ Musannaf, vol. 1, p. 288, h. no. 3308:
³⁰ Ibid., h. no. 3309:
³¹ Musannaf 1, vol. 1, p. 550, h. no. 2081:
³² Musannaf, vol. 1, p. 288, h. no. 3300:
³³ Dāraquṭnī, k. al-Ṣalāh, bā. no. 8, h. no. 995:
³⁴ see footnote no. 28.
³⁵ Musannaf, vol. 1, p. 289, h. no. 3312:
³⁶ And h. no. 3313:
³⁷ see footnote no. 28.
³⁸ Musannaf, vol. 1, p. 289, h. no. 3318:
³⁹ see footnote no. 28.
On the grounds of the above we can conclude that the assertion that the pious invented the *ḥadīth* in question is without foundation and should be firmly rejected.
SECTION 3


Goldziher says,

"Pious people of Sa‘id’s kind frowned at the state of affairs under such rule; they decried the tyrannical government, defied it by passive resistance and even showed their dissatisfaction openly [citing: al-Ya‘qubi, II, pp. 339, 340, bottom]. ... In return they were hated and despised by the ruling circles."\(^{40}\)

Before commenting any further on Goldziher’s theory, it is useful to present the relevant references provided by him:

The first text is as follows:

“Al-Walid appointed ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz as ruler of Madīnāh. He also ordered that Hīshām b. Ismā‘īl should stand before the people [in order for them to voice their complaints against him]. Hīshām b. Ismā‘īl al-Makhzūmī ill-treated people, made unjust verdicts and had prejudice against the family of the Prophet. When ‘Umar came to Madīnāh, Hīshām said, ‘I only fear ‘Alī b. al-Husayn.’ ‘Alī passed by Hīshām while he was standing. He [‘Alī] saluted him. Hīshām then said loudly to him: ‘Allāh knows best where He places His messages.’ Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyib did not take revenge from Hīshām, nor any of his relatives or supporters.”

The second text:

“... and wrote to ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz instructing him to demolish and rebuild the Prophet’s Mosque to include the surrounding houses and the dwellings of the Prophet’s wives. He demolished the dwellings and added their space to the Mosque. When he started demolishing the dwellings, Khubayb b. ‘Abd Allah b. al-Zubayr stood up to ‘Umar while the dwellings were being demolished and said, ‘I implore you by Allāh, O ‘Umar, not to eradicate a verse from the Book of Allāh.’ Allāh says, “Those who call you from behind the dwellings ...”’. He (‘Umar) ordered Khubayb to be whipped a hundred stripes and for cold water to be poured on him. It was a cold day and he died as a result. When ‘Umar became caliph and led a pious and ascetic life, he used to say, ‘Who can rescue me from Khubayb.’”
Al-Walid made the journey to hajj in 91 [AH] to have a look at the refurbishment of the Sacred Mosque in Makkah and the Prophet’s Mosque in Madinah. When he came close to Madinah, `Umar met him at the outskirts of Madinah. He entered the Mosque and started to look at it. The guards moved everybody out of the Mosque except for Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyib who neither left nor moved. Al-Walid started to tour the Mosque while Sa‘īd was sitting down. Then he said, ‘I believe this man to be Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyib.’ ‘Umar replied, ‘Yes, and he is such and such a man [speech abridged by narrator] except that he has poor eyesight.’ Al-Walid came until he stood near Sa‘īd and said to him, ‘How are you ayyuhā al-shaykh?’ Sa‘īd did not move a bit and said, ‘We are well, O Prince of the Faithful, and how are you?’ Al-Walid then went away saying to ‘Umar, ‘This is the remainder of the people who know about the dīn.'”

Goldziher’s claim regarding the dissatisfaction of the pious scholars and their denunciation and defiance of the tyrannical rule of the Umayyads is made with regards to the whole period of their rule, and also encompasses the entire Umayyad state which stretched from the western borders of China.
to the South of France. However, the texts which he cites are related to a specific period of time not exceeding five years in duration. This period extends from al-Walid b. ‘Abd al-Malik’s appointment of ‘Umar II as ruler of Madīnah in 87/705 to his performance of ḥajj in 91/709. In addition, his evidence relates to only one city of the Umayyad Empire, i.e. Madīnah.

We are ultimately confronted with three incidents:

1. The injustice and oppression under Hishām b. Ismā‘īl.
2. The whipping of Khubayb b. ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr on the orders of ‘Umar II.
3. The moving of people out of the Mosque and Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyib’s refusal to leave.

1. The injustice and oppression under Hishām b. Ismā‘īl:

It would seem that Hishām’s oppressive tendencies became evident only when he had Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyib whipped, i.e. shortly before the death of ‘Abd al-Malik. This is what was indicated by Ibn Ḥajar when he said, “… and people hated Hishām b. Ismā‘īl for that.” It can also be deduced from al-Ya‘qūbī’s statement, “Hishām b. Ismā‘īl became the ruler of Madīnah. He whipped Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyib

---

41 The Umayyad caliphate established in 661 was to last for about a century. In the Umayyad caliphate Islam had spread to three continents. Not only did the Islamic conquests continue during this period through North Africa to Spain and France in the West and to Sind, Central Asia and Transoxiana in the East, but the basic social and legal institutions of the newly founded Islamic world were established.

42 Ta’jil, p. 431.
sixty stripes and took him round the streets. ‘Abd al-Malik wrote to Hishâm and reprimanded him for that. Thus Hishâm’s reputation became bad and then he manifested his enmity to the Family of the Prophet.”

It would appear that Hishâm b. Ismâ‘îl’s oppression was prompted by personal motives, and not in service to the state or to further the interests of the Umayyads. Had it been otherwise, ‘Alî b. al-Ḥusayn and Sa‘îd b. al-Musayyib would not have forgiven Hishâm and recommended their closest relatives not to take revenge on him even by a single disparaging word, since it was viewed by them as a personal issue. In addition to that, had Hishâm’s unjust verdict been in the interests of, or represented the will of Umayyad rule, and had indeed been directed against the pious scholars as Goldziher claims, then the caliph, al-Walîd b. ‘Abd al-Malik, would not have sacked him and ordered him to stand for requital in public. As it was, such an incident was unprecedented, especially when we take into account two factors:

43 Ya‘qūbî, ol. 1, p. 280.
44 Ṭabarî, vol. 7, p. 328:
First: The close relation between Hishâm and the caliph – he was in fact the maternal uncle of Hishâm b. ‘Abd al-Malik, the brother of al-Walîd b. ‘Abd al-Malik45 – which lends gravity to his disciplining of Hishâm.

Second: The reason for Hishâm b. Ismâ’îl’s whipping of Sa’îd b. al-Musayyib was his refusal to pledge allegiance to al-Walîd b. ‘Abd al-Malik. It would have been, if this was the case, more appropriate for al-Walîd to reward Hishâm rather than to sack him and order him to stand before people for requital [in order for them to voice their complaints against him].

It should also be noted that the narrations of al-Ṭabari46 and Ibn Kathîr47 confirm that Hishâm’s injustice was general and a personal trait that was not simply employed in the interests of Umayyad rule.

When we approach his enmity against the family of the Prophet, we should not forget the high status given to this family by the people of

---

46 Ṭabarî, vol. 7, p. 328:
قال وحدثني محمد بن عبد الله بن محمد بن عمر عن أبيه قال: كان هشام بن إسحاق بن جوهرانة وذويه، وثقه مه علي بن الحسين أدي شديدًا، فلما عزل أمر به الوالي، أن يوقف للناس. فقال معاذ بن أبي سفيان، هم عند دمار وعزة. وكان علي قد تقدم إلى خاصته، ألا يعرض له أحد منهم بكلمه، فلما مر ناداه الله أعلم حيث يجعل رسالاته.

47 Bidâyah, vol. 9, p. 76:
(ثم دخلت سنة سبع وثمانين:) "وكتب الوالي إلى عمر بن عبد العزيز بأن يوقف هشام بن إسحاق بن جوهرانة عند دمار وعزة. وكان بيض الأصابع فييه – لأنه أساء إلى أهل المدينة في مدة ولايته عليهم. وعمر خُوّاً من أربع سنين، ولا سبباً من سببه، فقال للسيد بن الحسين. قال سعد بن السيد لا إنه وموالاه: لا يعرض منكم أحد هذا الرجل في تركة ذلك الله وله الرحم. وأما كلامه فلا أكمله يبدأ، و أما علي بن الحسين فإنه مرح على وهو موافق، فلم يعرض له. وكان قد تقدم إلى خاصته، أي لا يعرض أحد منهم له، فلما اجتاز به ناداه هشام: "الله يعلم حيث يجعل رسالاته.""
Madinah. Anyone who suffered an injustice would seek their help, especially that of `Alî b. al-Ḥusayn, and this was what created friction and conflict between `Alî b. al-Ḥusayn and Hishäm. Indeed, due to `Alî b. al-Ḥusayn's objections to the unjust verdicts made by Hishäm, Hishäm said to him, when `Umar II ordered Hishäm to stand before people for public requital, "Allâh knows best where He places His messages," meaning by this that Allâh had placed `Umar in authority over the people of Madinah, and not `Alî.

2- The whipping of Khubayb b. `Abd Allâh b. al-Zubayr on the orders of `Umar II.

The whipping of Khubayb is mentioned only briefly by al-Ya`qûbî, leading to the omission of a number of facts:

First: Khubayb's punishment was not merely due to his putting forward of his opinion, or his reminding `Umar II of a verse from the Qur'ân, as been indicated by al-Ya`qûbî. The matter went far beyond that: Khubayb objected to a policy which had been unanimously agreed by the scholars, shouted inside the Mosque, and alleged that a verse had been eradicated from the Qur'ân by the demolition of the dwellings of the Prophet's wives. Therefore, in view of the caliph, he deserved punishment for unruliness and false allegation.

48 'Uyûn, vol. 3, p. 4:
Second: The reading by ‘Umar II of al-Walid’s letter to the people of Madinah and their acceptance of the demolition. It is worth mentioning that since his arrival in Madinah, ‘Umar II took a pledge upon himself, before the pious scholars of Madinah, that he would not decide on any matter without consulting them first. This indicates the extent of the cooperation between this Umayyad ruler and the pious scholars. In fact, a number of distinguished and pious scholars took part in the demolition, including al-Qäsim b. Muḥammad, Sālim b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar, Abū Bakr b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Ḥārith, ‘Ubayd Allāh b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Utbah, Khārijah b. Zayd and ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar, who were among those before whom ‘Umar II took his pledge of consultation. Consequently, Khubayb deserved punishment for contradicting the consensus of the scholars of Madinah.

Third: The order for the whipping did not come from ‘Umar, it was issued by the caliph himself, i.e. al-Walid b. ‘Abd al-Malik. This was

49 Tabari, vol. 7, p. 335. See also Bidayah, vol. 9, p. 76.
50 Ibid., p. 327.
51 Ibid., p. 335.
52 Ibid., p. 327.
confirmed by al-Bukhārī,53 al-Ṭabarī,54 Ibn Ḥajar,55 al-Dhahabī56 and other scholars. Following the objection and allegation made by Khubayb, a letter was dispatched to al-Walīd. Al-Walīd then ordered ‘Umar to give Khubayb a hundred stripes and then pour a waterskin full of cold water on his head.57 Thus the whipping of Khubayb was ordered by the same person who put an end to the injustice of Hishām b. Ismā‘īl and ordered that he stand for requital [in order for them to voice their complaints against him], and it can be seen that both are indeed stamped with the same personality.

Thus it can be understood that the allegation and objection made by Khubayb as well as the way in which he made his point was genuinely inappropriate. As a result, he deserved discipline in the caliph’s view, and unfortunately met his death as a consequence.

53 Bukhārī TK, vol. 3, p. 208, no. 714:

"... كُتب الوليد إلى عمر وهو على المدينة أن يضرب خيّب بن عبد الله بن الزبير ...
"

54 Ṭabarī, vol. 7, 384:

"وفيها ضرب عمر بن عبد العزيز خيّب بن عبد الله بن الزبير بأمر من الوليد إليه، وصب على رأسه قربة من ماء بارد.
"

55 Tahdhib, vol. 3, p. 135, no. 257:

"كان الوليد بن عبد الملك كتب إلى عمر بن عبد العزيز وهو عامله على المدينة بأمره أن يجلده مائة سوط ...
"

56 Nubalā‘, vol. 5, 120:

"كتاب الوليد إلى عمر -وهو على المدينة- أن يضرب خيّب...
"

57 ‘Uyūn, vol. 3, p. 4:

"فَلما شرع عمر بن عبد العزيز وصغي الله عنه في ذلك، صاح خيّب بن عبد الله بن الزبير في سنة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وحج زوجاته لهدم: "اليوم مُهجّة آية من كتاب الله تعالى: وإن الذين يبدلون من وزاء الحجرة أكثرهم ليبغلوون!")، فكتب بذلك صاحب الوليد إلى الوليد بن عبد الملك. كتب الوليد إلى عمر بن عبد العزيز بأمره يجلد خيّب بن عبد الله مائة سوط وأن يصب على رأسه قربة من ماء بارد. فضربه في يوم بارد وصب عليه ماء فمات فكان عمر أبدا يقول: "ههني ضربت فلما صبت عليه آتاء البارد."
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3- The moving of people out of the Mosque and Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyib’s refusal to leave:

Regarding the moving of people from the Mosque, we do not find anything here to support Goldziher’s claim. The Islamic dominion had greatly expanded as we have previously indicated; and the office of caliph gained recognition over a great part of the world. It seems that the moving of people out of the Mosque was first of all a matter of organization, since it is likely that the caliph’s progress would have been impeded by well-wishers and curious onlookers, and secondly was intended to give the caliph a chance to fully inspect the radical changes that had been made in the Mosque. In order to affect these changes, the caliph wrote a letter to ‘Umar II instructing him accordingly and sent the provisions that he had received from the King of the Romans to finance the renovations. This is all the more likely to be the case when we take into account that the objective of al-Walid’s journey, besides performing the hajj, was to inspect the renovations.

58 Ṭabarî, vol. 7, p. 335:
"فذكر محمد بن عمر: "أن عبد بن جعفر اليّاء قال: "رأيت الرسول الذي عهد الوالي بن عبد الملك فقدم في شهر ربيع الأول سنة ثمان وثمانين ... فدخل على عمر بن عبد العزير يكتاب الوالي، يأمره بإدخال شجر أزواج رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم في مسجد رسول الله، وأن يشيّر ما في مؤخرته ونوافيه حتى يكون ماني ذراع، ويقول له: "قدم الجلالة إن قدرت، وأنت تقدر لك أخوالك، فإمام لا يخالفناك، فمن أي منهم فمر أهل المصر فليقوموا له قيمة عدل، ثم أهدفهم وادفع إليهم الأثمان، فإن لك في ذلك سلف صدق، عمر وعثمان."

59 Ibid., p. 336:
"قال محمد بن عمر الواقدي: "... وبعث الوالي إلى صاحب الروم بعلمه أنه أمر بدمج مسجد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، وأن يعيده فيه، فبعث إليه أغلب مقال ذهب، وبعث إليه إمالة عامل، وبعث إليه من الفسيفساء بأربعين خللاً، وأمر أن يبيع الفسيفساء في المداين التي خرتبها灰尘 إلى الوالي، فبعث بذلك الوالي إلى عمر بن عبد العزير.

Ya‘qūbī, vol. 2, 284:
that he had ordered in various Mosques, as is indicated by al-Ya‘qūbī’s statement. We should not forget that Hishām’s guards whipped Sa‘īd and took him round the streets of Madīnah in the manner of a monkey, thus, had there been a will they were more than capable of taking him out of the Mosque by force. However, despite Sa‘īd’s refusal to move, the narration itself indicates that al-Walīd praised Ibn al-Musayyib and acknowledged his virtues by saying to ‘Umar, “This is the remainder of the people who know about the dīn.”

An analysis of al-Ya‘qūbī’s narrations:

When we look closely at the style of al-Ya‘qūbī’s statements, it becomes clear that they were intended to denigrate the Umayyads.

His second statement strives to underline the harshness of ‘Umar II towards his opponents, though in fact, as we have seen, in sanctioning the whipping of Khubayb he was simply carrying out orders. The statement also disregards the real justifications for Khubayb’s whipping. Furthermore, it is alleged that ‘Umar did not feel remorse for the death of Khubayb except when he adopted an ascetic way of life much later, though by all accounts this was not true. When ‘Umar knew that Khubayb was suffering an increasing pain he became agitated to such a degree that he is compared by

"وروى الواقدي أن الوليد بعث إلى ملك الروم يعلمه أنه قد هدم مسجد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، فبعث إليه ألف متقفٍ ذهباً، ومانة فاعل، وأربعين حالة فسفسة، فبعث الوليد بذلك كله إلى عمر، فأصلح به المسجد، وفرغ من بنائه في سنة 90."
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witnesses to a woman in labour. He sent al-Majishun to see how Khubayb was getting on, and when he was told of his death, he fell to the ground out of fear and then raised his head saying, “Truly! To Allah we belong and truly, to Him we shall return.” (Q. 2:156). The impact of this incident remained with ‘Umar until he died. He even went so far as to ask the caliph to excuse him from being the ruler of Madinah.

The third narration has been edited by the narrator, apparently with the intention of removing various expressions that were used by the caliph in this exchange that indicate humility of bearing. When al-Walid said, “I believe this man to be Sa‘id b. al-Musayyib,” ‘Umar said to him, “Yes, and he is such and such a man though he has poor eyesight.” Al-Walid then said, “It is we who will go and greet him.” In addition, when Ibn al-Musayyib asked the caliph how he was, the caliph answered, “We are well, praise be to Allah.”

---

60 Kamāl 2, vol. 8, p. 223, no. 1677:

61 Kamāl 2, vol. 8, p. 223, no. 1677:

Tahdhib, vol. 3, p. 135, no. 257:
Finally, the narration does not mention the confirmation by ‘Umar II “O yes, Prince of the Faithful” which followed al-Walid’s praise of Ibn al-Musayyib when he said, “This is the remainder of the people who know about the *dīn*.” These expressions are mentioned in both al-Tabari\(^{62}\) and *al-‘Uyūn wa al-ḥadī‘iq fī akhbār al-ḥaqā‘iq*.\(^{63}\) We must bear in mind that the source of narration for all that was al-Wāqidi.

We should take into account that in fact most of the narrations about the Umayyads were written during the ‘Abbāsid era, where ill-opinion of the Umayyads was not uncommon. Therefore, it is the duty of a historian to be cautious when he writes on the Umayyads, as the entire literature available on the subject is the product of a period where anti-Umayyad sentiment ran high. In fact al-Ya‘qūbī was known as the “‘Abbāsid author” (*al-kā‘īb al-‘abbāsī*), and Goldziher should have been very careful in his dependence on al-Ya‘qūbī’s biased narrations. It is not exaggerating to say that he was a fanatical Shi‘ite who did not hesitate to mention without investigation any narration that denigrated the Umayyads.\(^{64}\) The conclusions we have reached from the evidence above is in conformity with that of Goitein when he says:

---

\(^{62}\) *Ṭabarī*, vol. 7, p. 367.

\(^{63}\) *‘Uyūn*, vol. 3, pp. 6–7.

\(^{64}\) We will see evidently his disparagement of the Umayyads when we discuss his account, which also Goldziher relies upon in accusing the caliph, ‘Abd al-Malik, of changing the site of the *ḥajj* to Qubbat al-Ṣakhrarah.
"This historian of definite Shi‘ite leanings strove to disparage the Umayyads."⁵⁶⁵

We can say that the evidence cited by Goldziher does not provide adequate support for his claim that the pious scholars "...frowned at the state of affairs under such rule; they decried the tyrannical government, defied it by passive resistance and even showed their dissatisfaction openly."

DISCUSSION OF AL-ḤAJJĀJ’S MISTREATMENT OF ANAS IBN MĀLIK

Goldziher says,

"In return they [pious people] were hated and despised by the ruling circles. It is sufficient to consider the way in which al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf deals with Anas b. Mālik; he rebukes him like a criminal and threatens ‘to grind him as millstones would grind and to make him a target for arrows.’ [citing: Abū Ḥan. Din., p. 327, 6 ff. A much extended version of this story is quoted by al-Damīrī (s.v. al-ṣāḏā), II, pp. 71 f., cf. al-ʿIqd, III, pp. 17 ff]."66

As for al-Ḥajjāj’s mistreatment of Anas b. Mālik; this incident can not be generalized as an indication of the character of all of the Umayyad caliphs. Al-Ḥajjāj was well known for his harsh treatment of all those who held a different opinion regardless of whether they were his enemies or not, and he was exceptional in this regard. Furthermore we have to indicate that Goldziher totally ignores the rest of the events constituting the story. He took from it only those elements which supported his theory and omitted to consider those that contradict it. The story in its entirety includes significant events that make clear that Goldziher’s citation was misplaced and improper. These events are:

A. Anas’s complaint to ‘Abd al-Malik and his demand that al-Ḥajjāj should be punished.67

B. ‘Abd al-Malik’s attitude towards what al-Ḥajjāj did is clearly reflected in the following points:

1. ‘Abd al-Malik was very angry with al-Ḥajjāj. He repreted him and disgraced him by mentioning that his mother used to soak her pudendum in raisin water in order to tighten her vulva. He also reminded him of the menial work that his forefathers did such as digging wells, building dams and carrying rocks on their backs.68

---

67 Tiwāl, pp. 323-4:

2- He reminded him of the stature and standing of Anas b. Malik and his status with the Prophet.69

3- He ordered him as soon as he received his letter to go on foot to Anas and apologize to him,70 and this was exactly what al-Ḥajjāj did.71

4- He ordered him to take a written statement from Anas to indicate that he was content and happy, and to send that to him.72 Again, al-Ḥajjāj complied in full.73

C. ‘Abd al-Malik’s letter of apology to Anas in which he promised that al-Ḥajjāj would never repeat his behavior, since any repetition would result in his being punished severely.74

D. Al-Ḥajjāj himself wrote a letter to ‘Abd al-Malik in which he apologized for what he had said to Anas. He revealed to him that he was greatly terrified and asked for his forgiveness so that he might enjoy some sleep and tranquillity.75

---

69 Ḥuwāl, p. 324:

70 Ibid., p. 324.
71 Ibid., p. 324; al-‘Iqd, vol., 5, p. 32.
72 Ḥuwāl, p. 324.
73 Ibid., p. 324.

75 Al-‘Iqd, vol., 5, pp. 32-3:
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From that time onwards, Anas was greatly revered and respected by al-\(\text{Hajjaj}\). This is further confirmed by Ismā'īl b. Abī Muhājir when he says, “Al-\(\text{Hajjaj}\) continued to revere and fear him until he [Anas] died.”\(^76\) We can conclude from this, that it is irrational to suppose that Anas, who enjoyed such high status and respect with ‘Abd al-Malik, would harbour enmity against the Umayyads, or indeed, sufficiently so to have contributed to the invention of *hadīths* against them.

\(^76\) *Al-\(\text{Iqd}, vol., 5, p. 32.*
SECTION 5

DISCUSSION OF YAZĪD IBN ‘ABD AL-MALIK’S ALLEGED DESIRE TO EXECUTE AL-ḤASAN AL-BAṢRĪ BECAUSE OF HIS PIETISTICAL OPPOSITION

Goldziher says,

“In return they [pious people] were hated and despised by the ruling circles. It is sufficient to consider the way in which al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf deals with Anas b. Mālik ... The caliph Yazīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik contemptuously calls the pious Ḥasan al-Baṣrī a shaykh jāhil, a doddering old man whom he would like to kill because his pietistical opposition is repellent and inconvenient to him [citing: Fragm. hist. arab., p. 66, 15].”

Regarding Yazīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik’s desire to execute al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī because of his pietistical opposition, we will present the text upon which Goldziher depends:


“Yazid wrote to Ziyad b. al-Muhallab while he was in Oman and ordered him to make a levy for people, so he made a levy for three thousand men from the people of Oman and appointed al-Mishmas b. Umar al-Azd as their leader, and then they all turned up before Yazid. Yazid said, on mentioning al-Hasan al-Basri, “I wonder why I spared his life. He is an ignorant old man and I was intending to beat him to death.” Then al-Mufaddal said to him, “May Allah make you a better ruler. He has a value, merit and respect in the region.” This deterred him from beating him [al-Hasan al-Basri].”78

The name ‘Yazid’ is mentioned three times in the previous text, but with reference to Yazid b. al-Muhallab (d. 102/720)79 and not Yazid b. ‘Abd al-Malik, as Goldziher understood to be the case, for the following reasons:

On page 37 the author of Fragm. Hist. Arab. [The original title of this book is al-`Uyün wa al-hadâ’iq fi akhbâr al-ḥaqâ‘iq] begins to discuss the rule (khilâfah) of ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Aziz. While doing so, he shifts to relating the story of Yazid b. al-Muhallab. On page 60, he once again resumes his account of the rule of ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Aziz, while promising the reader that he will continue the story of Yazid b. al-Muhallab when he discusses the rule of Yazid b. ‘Abd al-Malik.80 Then on page 64 he begins

78 ‘Uyûn, p. 66.
79 See Ibid., p. 74; Nubalâ’, vol. 4, 506.
80 The author said:
his account of the rule of Yazīd b. `Abd al-Malik. After less then seventeen lines he resumes the story of Yazīd b. al-Muhallab, drawing the reader’s attention to the fact by saying, “... here we come back to the story of Yazīd b. al-Muhallab.”\(^81\) Then he relates the stories that feature Yazīd b. al-Muhallab, including the previous text cited by Goldziher. From all this, it becomes clear that the name ‘Yazīd’ in the cited text refers to Yazīd b. al-Muhallab and not Yazīd b. `Abd al-Malik. What further confirms this understanding is our knowledge of the individuals Ziyād b. al-Muhallab and al-Mufaḍḍal who are also mentioned in the text: Both of them were Yazīd b. al-Muhallab’s brothers,\(^82\) and Yazīd had appointed Ziyād as the governor of Oman.\(^83\)

The story of Yazīd b. al-Muhallab and the reason behind his intention to beat al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī to death:

\(^81\) ‘Uyūn, p. 65:

\(^{\text{وسيأتي بمؤبد حدث يزيد بن المهلب مع ذكرنا خلافة يزيد بن عبد الملك. ثم رجعنا الفول إلى إمام حديث عمر بن عبد العزيز}}\)

\(^82\) See Ibid., p. 53. Also Bidāyah, vol., 9, p. 45:

\(^{\text{توفي المهلب [من أي صفرة] غازياً برو الورد وعمره ستة و سبعون سنة رحمه الله وكان له عشرة من الولد وهم: يزيد،}}\)

\(^83\) ‘Uyūn, p. 59.
Yazīd b. al-Muhallab was appointed as ruler of 'Iraq and Khurāsān by Sulaymān b. 'Abd al-Malik. When 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz became the caliph, he removed him from office, imprisoned him and replaced him with 'Adī b. Arṭa'ah. Following the death of 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz, Yazīd b. al-Muhallab held the opinion that he was more entitled to the caliphate than Yazīd b. 'Abd al-Malik. Therefore, 'Adī b. Arṭa'ah sent al-Ḥasan al- Başrī among a group of people to the family of al-Muhallab in order to convince them to renew their allegiance to Yazīd b. 'Abd al-Malik in return for an amnesty. 'Abd al-Malik and al-Mufaḍḍal, Yazīd's two brothers, accepted the offer while the others declined. Then a number of battles took place between 'Adī and Yazīd b. al-Muhallab until the latter took control of Başrāh. The people then pledged allegiance to Yazīd b. al-Muhallab. He appointed Muḥammad b. al-Muhallab as the governor of Persia, Hilāl b. 'Iyāḍ as the governor of Ahwāz, Ziyād b. al-Muhallab as the governor of Oman, al-Mīnḥāl b. 'Uayynah as the governor of Barkāwān Island, Ash'ath b. 'Abd Allāh as the governor of Bahrain, Mudrik b. al-Muhallab as the governor of Khurāsān and Wadā' b. Ḥumayd as the governor of Qandāyabil.

---

84 Nubalā', vol. 4, 503.
85 Ibid., p. 504.
86 'Uyūn, p. 65.
87 Ibid., pp. 53-4.
88 Ibid., pp. 54-60.
On ‘Īd al-(fh) Yazīd b. al-Muhallab went out to the place of the prayer. He renounced Yazīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik, abused the family of Marwān and asked the people to make amends and reconciliation with the Banū Ḥāshim. 89 On hearing of this, Yazīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik directed a huge army of eighty thousand men from Syria and the Peninsula towards him, under the leadership of his brother Maslamah b. ‘Abd al-Malik and al-‘Abbās b. al-Walīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik. 90 When Yazīd b. al-Muhallab got news of this, he ordered Marwān b. al-Muhallab to mobilize the people for war. Al-Ḥasan al-BAṣrī’s role was to discourage people from fighting alongside Yazīd b. al-Muhallab and to warn them against dissension and sedition. 91 Al-Ḥasan al-BAṣrī says, “... He [Yazīd b. al-Muhallab] alleges that he was inviting them [the people] to the Book of Allāh and the Sunnah of the Rightly Guided caliphs. The Sunnah of the Rightly Guided caliphs surely dictates that he should be shackled and sent back to the prison of ‘Umar [b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz].” 92

Here it becomes clear that the stance that was adopted by al-Ḥasan al-BAṣrī was in favour the Umayyads. For this reason Yazīd b. al-Muhallab wished to beat him to death.

89 Ibid., p. 65.
90 Ibid., p. 68.
91 Ibid., p. 69.
92 Ibid., p. 59. See also Nubalā’, vol. 4, 506.
DISCUSSION OF IBN AL-MUSAYYIB’S REFUSAL TO PLEDGE ALLEGIANCE

Goldziher says,

“Pious people of Sa‘īd’s kind frowned at the state of affairs under such rule; they decried the tyrannical government, defied it by passive resistance and even showed their dissatisfaction openly, occasionally going so far as to refuse homage. In return they were hated and despised by the ruling circles.”

In the footnote he says,

“In this context, too, we meet the same Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyib, Ibn Qutayba, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 224, I].

Regarding Ibn al-Musayyib’s refusal to pledge allegiance, Goldziher relies on the following text from Ibn Qutaybah’s book:

“Jābir b. al-Aswad was in al-Madīnah and he asked him [Ibn al-Musayyib] to pledge allegiance to Ibn al-Zubayr. He refused and as a result he was beaten sixty lashes.

---

Ibid., footnote no. 5.
He was also beaten sixty lashes and was taken around al-Madinah in a wool garment by Hishâm b. Ismā‘īl as a result of his refusal to pledge allegiance to al-Walid and Sulaymān.”

The previous account from Ibn Qutaybah was extracted from a very brief, one-page synopsis of the life of Ibn al-Musayyib, from his birth to his death. Ibn Qutaybah thus mentioned Ibn al-Musayyib’s story and his refusal to pledge allegiance very briefly, and thus depicted Ibn al-Musayyib as if he was a mortal enemy and refused to pledge allegiance altogether. However, the story is mentioned in greater detail by a number of other sources that reveal the following:

1. Ibn al-Musayyib did not refuse to pledge allegiance altogether. However, he refused to pledge two allegiances at the same time, the first to `Abd al-Malik and the second to his two sons; al-Walīd and Sulaymān: He did not see any reason why he should pledge a second allegiance when he had already pledged the first to `Abd al-Malik.

2. Ibn al-Musayyib gave the reason for his refusal; the Prophet prohibited the pledging of two allegiances.

3. After he had beaten and imprisoned Ibn al-Musayyib, Hishâm wrote to `Abd al-Malik. He related to him Ibn al-Musayyib’s attitude and the punishment he had incurred as a result. `Abd al-Malik wrote back to him in censure, stating, “By

---

95 Ma‘ārif, p. 249.
96 For instance: Ibn Sa‘d; Ḥilyat; Ibn ‘Asākir; Nubalā’.
97 Ḥilyat, vol. 2, p. 170: Ibn al-Musayyib said, “I will not pledge allegiance to two (rulers) as long as the day and night alternate.” See also p. 171; Nubalā’, vol. 4, p. 231.
Allāh, Saʿīd was more in need of your kindness than a beating. We know very well that Saʿīd was not a man of dissension or dispute.\textsuperscript{99} Thus, Ibn al-Musayyib did not curse ‘Abd al-Malik while in prison, but rather he used to say, "O Allāh, avenge me against Hishām."\textsuperscript{100} This was because Ibn al-Musayyib was aware that ‘Abd al-Malik respected him, and also that his beating and imprisonment were not in any way authorized by ‘Abd al-Malik.\textsuperscript{101}

Hishām regretted what he had done to Saʿīd and subsequently released him from prison,\textsuperscript{102} and it is reported, by al-Yaʿqūbī that "Hishām became infamous for what he did."\textsuperscript{103}

It seems that the basis for Ibn al-Musayyb’s refusal, besides what has been mentioned above, was his objection to the institution of an inheritable khilāfah, and thus that the people would not be able to choose their caliph after the death of ‘Abd al-Malik. The whole issue consisted of nothing more than his expressing disagreement with the situation, and did not reach the level of what could be called enmity.

In addition to the above, we note from the original text cited that Ibn al-Musayyib also refused to pay homage to Ibn al-Zubayr. If Ibn al-Musayyib had a

\textsuperscript{100} Ibn Saʿd, vol. 5, p. 126; Ṣubalā, vol. 4, p. 230.
\textsuperscript{101} Some sources mention that it was ‘Abd al-Malik who whipped Saʿīd. However, al-Wāqidī clarified this ambiguity. He stated that what was meant was that he was whipped during the rule of ‘Abd al-Malik.
\textsuperscript{102} Ibn Saʿd, vol. 5, p. 127.
personal vendetta against the Umayyads, then he would have pledged allegiance to Ibn al-Zubayr because of his opposition to the Umayyads. However, it seems that Ibn al-Musayyib’s refusal was based on fundamental principles, rather than partisan politics, as will be discussed again later.

Goldziher says,

"The founder of the dynasty was the first who called himself king, and the pious Sā'īd b. al-Musayyib made this bitter comment: ‘May Allah repay Mu‘āwiyyah, as he was the first who converted this condition (dominion over true believers) into mulk [citing: al-Ya‘qūbī, II, p. 276, 13 awwal man a‘āda hādhā‘l-amra mulkan].’

Pious people of Sa‘īd’s kind frowned at the state of affairs under such rule; they decried the tyrannical government, defied it by passive resistance and even showed their dissatisfaction openly, occasionally going so far as to refuse homage. In return they were hated and despised by the ruling circles. It is sufficient to consider the way in which al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf deals with Anas b. Mālik... The caliph Yazīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik contemptuously calls the pious Ḥasan al-Baṣrī a shaykh jāhil, a doddering old man whom he would like to kill because his pietistical opposition is repulsive and inconvenient to him. This Ḥasan [al-Baṣrī] had said that the governor Mughīra had made a fateful step, in so far as he inspired the hereditary caliphate of the Umayyads, by arranging that homage should be paid during Mu‘āwiyyah’s life to his son Yazīd; the pious preferred the electoral caliphate (shūrā) of patriarchal times [citing: al-Suyūṭī, Ta‘rikh, p. 79, bottom]. The aims of the pious were divorced from reality."104

He then presents his conclusion as follows:

"Without paying any attention to reality these men founded the sunna of the Prophet upon which the law and jurisprudence of the Islamic state was to be based. The Companions and ‘followers’ living amongst them

PART II: Chapter 4

gave them the sacred material which formed the contents and basis of their endeavour.”

As can be seen from the above allegation, Goldziher does not supply even a single invented hadīth to illustrate his allegation, which is surprising due to his mentioning by name the individuals he alleges to have been involved, including Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyib, Anas b. Mālik and al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī. If this accusation is true, then Ibn al-Musayyib is a prime candidate among those pious men who are accused of inventing Ḥadīth. Goldziher does not present us with those ḥadīths which were invented, even if attributable to just a single scholar. Thus he fails to grant us the chance to study and examine them in the way that he gives us the opportunity to do when he accuses Muḥammad b. Shihāb al-Zuhri, Rajā’ b. Ḥaywah and the other scholars who were connected in some way with the Umayyads (as will be discussed in Chapter 5).

Ibn al-Musayyib stated that Mu‘āwiyah was the first to turn authentic khilāfah into a monarchy. Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī stated that, had it not been for al-Mughirah’s arrangement for Yazīd to be the ruler after Mu‘āwiyah, khilāfah could have continued until the Day of Judgement. As far as the above two statements are

105 Ibid., p. 42.
106 Ya‘qūbī, vol. 2, p. 232:
107 Suyūṭī TK, p. 229:

كان سعيد بن المسيب يقول: "فعل الله جمعية وفعل، فإنه أول من أعاد هذا الأمر ملكاً.

قال الحسن البصري: "أقسم أمر الناس النان: عمرو بن العاص ... والمغيرة بن شعبة، فإنه كان عامل معاوية على الكوفة فكتب إليه معاوية: "إذا قرأت كاتب فاقي مزولاً، فابتث عنك، فلما ورد عليه قال: 'ما ابتث بك؟ قال: 'أمرك أوطئته وأهينته،' قال: 'وما هو؟ قال: 'لا بيعة لزيد من بعدك. قال: 'أوقد فلست؟ قال: 'نعم. قال: 'رجع إلى عملك.' فلا خرج قال لـه...
concerned, it is apparent that there is no evidence whatsoever in them to suggest the invention of Ḥadīth. Furthermore, they do not in any way indicate that these two scholars contributed to the invention of Ḥadīth against the Umayyads.

There is no doubt that there was discontent among scholars like Ibn al-Musayyib and al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī as a result of the Umayyads’ contravention of various legal stipulations, particularly in connection with the important issue of khilāfah. They held the opinion that the inheritance of khilāfah contradicts the practice that was dominant during the time of Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and ʿUthmān. However, from the existence of this discontent it does not by any means follow that they were forced to invent Ḥadīth, either directly or indirectly, for religious motives, or to the disparagement of the Umayyads. The matter was not as Goldziher claims in his statement: “Without paying any attention to reality these men founded the sunna of the Prophet upon which the law and jurisprudence of the Islamic state was to be based.” It is well known that Ibn al-Musayyib and al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī were not the only scholars of the time who took up the task of collecting, writing down and commenting on Ḥadīth. Other scholars who did so include Abū Bakr b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. al-Ḥārith b. Hishām al-Makhzūmī, ʿUbayd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUtbah, Sālim the mawlawī of ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar, Nāfi’ the mawlawī of Ibn ʿUmar, Sulaymān b. Yasār, al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr, al-Zuhrī, ʿAtā’, al-Shaʿbī, ʿAlqamah and other traditionists who preserved the hadīths, and were not accused of

١٢٣

اصحابة: "ما رواهذا؟ قال: وَضَعَتْ رِجْلًا مَعَاوَيَةَ فِي عُرَّةِ غَيْهِ، لا يَرَاي فِيهِ إِلَى بُوْمِ الْقِيَامَةِ، قال الحسن (البعضي): فمن أَجْلِ ذلك باب هؤلاء لأبائهم، ولولا ذلك لکايت شوری إلی بُوْمِ الْقِيَامَةِ."
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fabrication. Besides, none of these scholars were known to be enemies of the Umayyads, except for Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyib on account of his refusal to pledge allegiance to the two sons of ‘Abd al-Malik as discussed above. His refusal, however, was an isolated incident, and we are also aware of ‘Abd al-Malik’s attitude towards it. In fact, Sa‘īd’s refusal was motivated, in addition to the reason that he is cited as having given above, by his desire that the issue of khilāfah should be settled through a consultative process (shūrā) among the people. Had he dedicated himself to opposing the Umayyads, he could have pledged allegiance to Ibn al-Zubayr. However, he refused to do so for the same reason. His stance is made clear by his reply when Jābir b. al-Aswād asked him to pledge allegiance to Ibn al-Zubayr: “No, not until all people agree (lā ḥattā yajtami‘a al-nās).”108 When he was asked who was dearer to him, Ibn al-Zubayr or the people of Shām, he answered, “I make no preference.”109 Whenever he was asked about the Umayyads he used to say, “I say about them what Allāh has taught me to say, ‘Our Lord! Forgive us, and our brethren who have preceded us in Faith, and put not in our hearts any hatred against those who believe. Our Lord! You are indeed Full of Kindness, Most Merciful’ (Q. 59:10).”110

This evidence confirms that the main issue between Sa‘īd and the Umayyads did not go beyond his discontent over the issue of an inherited

الواقدي: حدثنا عبد الله بن جعفر، وغيره من أصحابنا، قلنا: “استعمل ابن الزبير جابر بن الأسود بن عوف الزهري على المدينة، فدعنا الناس إلى البيعة [لازب الزبير]، فقال سعيد بن المسبب: لا، حتى يجمع الناس...”

110 Ibid., p. 130.
khilāfah. Despite this, he was highly respected even by the Umayyads themselves and was known to be one of `Abd al-Malik’s friends, who would inquire after him and his affairs. Furthermore, despite Sa‘īd’s firmness and his refusal to answer the caliphs’ summons, largely out of self-respect, ‘Abd al-Malik used to hold him in regard and pray for him: raḥima Allāh ābā Mūḥammad. 113 “This is the remainder of the people who know about the dīn”, al-Walīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik certified to ‘Umar II after meeting with Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyib. Indeed, Sa‘īd was one of the scholars whom ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz used to ask for an opinion before he passed a judgement on any case. 115

We find that al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī was in a similar position. In other words, the problem between him and the Umayyads did not go beyond his discontent about their contravention of various legal stipulations, particularly with regards to the issue of the inheritance of the khilāfah. Had he been working against the Umayyads, either directly or indirectly, he might have found it politically advantageous to pledge allegiance to Yazīd b. al-Muhallab. This is because, as mentioned above, Yazīd had revoked his allegiance to ‘Abd al-Malik, abused and vilified the Umayyads, and asked

111 Ibid., p. 130.
112 Ibid., p. 123.
113 Ibid., pp. 129-30.
the people to seek the consent of the Banū Hāshim.\textsuperscript{116} In addition to this, historical narrations show that al-Ḥasan al-Brāhi was in fact pro-Umayyad. For instance, `Adī b. Arṭa’ah sent him as an intermediary between the Umayyad government and the family of al-Muhallab in order to convince them to re-pledge their allegiance to Yazīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik.\textsuperscript{117} Had there been anything between him and the Umayyads that amounted to enmity and the invention of Ḥadīth, he would not have accepted a mediating role with the aim of expanding their rule. Al-Ḥasan al-Brāhi had indeed put his life in danger as a result of his negative attitude towards Yazīd b. al-Muhallab. He used to discourage and dissuade people from following Yazīd\textsuperscript{118} to the extent that the latter contemplated beating him to death.\textsuperscript{119}

From the above, we conclude that these two scholars were not involved, either directly or indirectly, in a conflict of Ḥadīths against the Umayyads that involved the invention of Ḥadīths. Also, we can not consider Sa`īd b. al-Musayyib’s statement about Muʿāwiyah b. Abī Sufyān and his refusal to pledge allegiance to al-Walīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik and his brother Sulaymān while their father ʿAbd al-Malik b. Marwān was still alive, or indeed al-Ḥasan’s opinion on the issue of khilāfah, to be evidence of bitter enmity between the Umayyads and the pious men. The whole issue centres around their discontent about the issue of nepotism in the succession of the

\textsuperscript{116} ‘Uyūn, vol. 3, p. 65.
\textsuperscript{117} Ibid., pp. 53-4.
\textsuperscript{118} Ibid., p. 69; also see above, p. 225.
\textsuperscript{119} ‘Uyūn, vol. 3, p. 66.
khilāfah, and they clearly and courageously expressed their views on this matter, as we have seen, while accepting the facts of the existing situation, which was manifest in their dislike of stirring up problems that might lead to dissension and civil strife.
CHAPTER 5
THE UMAYYADS AND FABRICATION

An analysis of the evidence Goldziher cites in support of his claim that the Umayyads fabricated Ḥadīth

Section 1: Goldziher's evidence regarding the Umayyads' fabrication.

Section 2: Discussion of the first factor: Official influence on the invention, dissemination and suppression of Ḥadīths.

Section 3: Discussion of the second factor: The endeavours of the Umayyad governors to find pious and trustworthy authorities to cover such falsifications:

First: A discussion of his evidence in support of his accusation of Muḥammad b. Shihāb al-Zuhrī:
   A. Discussion of his first evidence.
   B. Discussion of his second evidence.
   C. Discussion of his third evidence.

Second: A discussion of his evidence in support of his accusation of Rajā’ b. Ḥaywah.

Section 4: Discussion of a Ḥadīth invented by the Umayyads, in the interests of the privileges claimed by them, which indicated that even ‘Alī had delivered the khutbah seated.

Section 5: Discussion of a Ḥadīth invented by the Umayyads, in the interest of the privileges claimed by them, which indicated that the Prophet used to sit in his khutbah.
GOLDZIHER’S EVIDENCE REGARDING THE
UMAYYADS’ FABRICATION

This section will be devoted to the presentation of his evidence regarding the role of the Umayyads in the fabrication of Ḥadīth.

Goldziher assumes that the Umayyad government, from its early days, played a significant role in the invention and dissemination of fabricated Ḥadīth in order to serve its own purposes and to consolidate its advantage against the opposition parties. He said,

“This must not lead us to believe that during this period theologians in opposition were alone at work on the tradition. The ruling power itself was not idle. If it wished an opinion to be generally recognized and the opposition of pious circles silenced, it too had to know how to discover a Ḥadīth to suit its purpose. They had to do what their opponents did: invent, or have invented, Ḥadīths in their turn. And that is in effect what they did. A number of facts are available to show that the impetus to these inventions and falsifications often came from the highest government circles; and if it is realized that even among the most pious of theologians there were willing tools to further their invention, it is not surprising that, among the hotly debated controversial issues of Islam, whether political or doctrinal, there is none in which the champions of
the various views are unable to cite a number of traditions, all equipped with imposing isnāds."¹

The above role according to his own point of view was clear from the following factors:

First: Official influence on the invention, dissemination and suppression of hadīths.

As we have already seen, Goldziher says,

"Official influence on the invention, dissemination and suppression of traditions started very early. An instruction given to his obedient governor al-Mughīrah by Muʿāwiyah I is in the spirit of the Umayyads: `Do not tire of abusing and insulting 'Alī and calling for God’s mercifullness for ‘Uthmān, defaming the companions of ‘Alī, removing them and omitting to listen to them (i.e. to what they tell and propagate as hadīths); praising, in contrast, the clan of ‘Uthmān, drawing them near to you and listening to them.’ This is an official encouragement to foster the rise and spread of hadīths directed against ‘Alī and to hold back and suppress hadīths favouring ‘Alī."²

Second: The endeavours of the Umayyad governors to find pious and trustworthy authorities to cover such falsifications.

Goldziher says,

"The Umayyads and their political followers had no scruples in promoting tendentious lies in a sacred religious form, and they were only

² Ibid., vol. 2, p. 44.
concerned to find pious authorities who would be prepared to cover such falsifications with their undoubted authority.”

Elsewhere he refers to,

“How the Umayyads made it their business to put into circulation ḥadīths which seemed to them desirable, and how people of the type of the pious al-Zuhrī acquiesced in being their tools, though they certainly were not guided by selfish motives but merely by reasons of state expediency, is to be seen from evidence preserved by al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī which deserves to be considered in this context.”

He also says,

“The official invention of ḥadīths under the Umayyads would be used even for such trivial purposes. Pious sayings were meant to break down the resistance of the pious and to disarm them.”

Goldziher gives two examples of those pious scholars who he alleges were used by the Umayyads for the invention of Ḥadīth. These two scholars are Muḥammad b. Shihāb al-Zuhrī and Raja’ b. Ḥaywah.

Evidence cited by Goldziher in support of his accusation of al-Zuhrī:

A. The fabrication by al-Zuhrī of the ḥadīth: “There are three mosques to which people may make pilgrimages; those in Makkah, Madīnah and Jerusalem.”

Goldziher says,

“When the Umayyad caliph ‘Abd al-Mālik wished to stop the Pilgrimage to Mecca because he was worried lest his rival ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr

---

3 Ibid., p. 44.
4 Ibid., p. 46.
5 Ibid., p. 49.
should force the Syrians journeying to the holy places in Ḥijāz to pay him homage, he had recourse to the expedient of the doctrine of the vicarious ḥajj to the Qubbat al-ṣakhra in Jerusalem. He decreed that the obligatory circumambulation (tawāf) could take place at the sacred place in Jerusalem with the same validity as that around the Kaʿba ordained in Islamic Law. The pious theologian al-Zuhri was given the task of justifying this politically motivated reform of religious life by making up and spreading a saying traced back to the Prophet, according to which there are three mosques to which people may make pilgrimages: those in Mecca, Madina and Jerusalem.6

B. The statement made by al-Zuhri to Ibrāhīm b. al-Walīd: “Who else could have told you the ḥadīths.”

Goldziher says,

“How the Umayyads made it their business to put into circulation ḥadīths which seemed to them desirable, and how people of the type of the pious al-Zuhri acquiesced in being their tools, though they certainly were not guided by selfish motives but merely by reasons of state expediency, is to be seen from evidence preserved by al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī which deserves to be considered in this context. Here we find an account which is handed down by various ways from ‘Abd al-Razzāq (d. 211), a disciple of Maʿmar b. Rāshid (d. 153), in the name of the latter; Maʿmar himself belonged to the group of the disciples of al-Zuhri. This account tells us that the Umayyad Ibrāhīm b. al-Walīd, it is not stated whether he was the subsequent ruler of this name (d. 126), came to al-Zuhri with a note-book he had written, and asked his permission to spread the sayings contained in it as ḥadīths communicated by al-Zuhri. The latter gave his permission easily: ‘Who else could have told you the ḥadīths?’ Thus the

Umayyad was enabled to circulate the contents of his manuscript as texts taught him by al-Zuhri. This account fully confirms the willingness of al-Zuhri (for which we have quoted an example above) to promote the interests of the dynasty by religious means. His piety probably caused his conscience to be troubled occasionally but he could not for ever resist the pressure of the governing circles.7

C. The statement made by al-Zuhri, “These emirs forced people to write ḥadīths.”

Goldziher said,

“The Ma’mar just mentioned preserved a characteristic saying by al-Zuhri: ‘These emirs forced people to write ḥadīths (akrayaḥā ‘alayhi ḥā’ulä‘i’l-umarä).’ This account can only be understood on the assumption of al-Zuhri’s willingness to lend his name, which was in general esteemed by the Muslim community, to the government’s wishes.”8

His evidence in support of his accusation of Raja’ b. Ḥaywah:

The substance of Goldziher’s claim is that Raja’ b. Ḥaywah fabricated a ḥadīth in which he revealed that ‘Uthmān used to stand during the first khutbah but delivered the second seated. Goldziher believes that the Umayyads endeavoured to achieve an effect at least outwardly corresponding to their position as rulers. Therefore, the first Umayyads introduced various alterations in the ceremony of the khutbah and its staging in such a way as to divest it of its ancient democratic

7 Ibid., pp. 46-7.
8 Ibid., p. 47.
character. However, Goldziher does not mention in his evidence any *ḥadīth* invented by the Umayyads in support of their practices regarding the various alterations in the ceremony of the *khutbah*, with the exception of the matter of the justification for giving the *khutbah* seated. He says,

“The official invention of ḥadīths under the Umayyads would be used even for such trivial purposes. Pious sayings were meant to break down the resistance of the pious and to disarm them. Here is an example of such a case. As is well known on Fridays the Imam makes two speeches (*khutba*) to the assembled community in the weekly general gathering. In early times this rite was carried out in the capital by the caliph himself. It is likely that the humble rulers of the patriarchal epoch fulfilled this function standing on a primitive platform (*minbar*); and it is hardly conceivable that of old it was so arranged that the speaker should remain seated during this liturgical speech before the community, but standing in front of the community was apparently not to the taste of proud Umayyad princes. They did, however, value highly ascending the *minbar* as head of the people, and considered this privilege as an important part of their dignity as rulers, as is evident from the panegyrics on the rulers of this dynasty. Muʿāwiya is praised as ‘rakūbuʾl-mannābīrī waththābūhā’ after his death. The same image, in which the pulpit figures as mount and the ascending prince as bold rider, appears in a poem which Yahyā b. Abī Ḥafṣa addressed to al-Walīd after the death of his father ‘Abd al-Malik: The pulpits mourned on the day that he (‘Abd al-Malik) died; the pulpits mourned the death of their rider; When al-Walīd ascended them as caliph, they said: ‘this is his son, in his image,’ and they were quietened; If after him (the father) another had knocked at the pulpits, they would have reared and thrown him.

9 Ibid., p. 50.
But their aristocratic arrogance – if the mind of those proud Qurayshites is pictured – seems to have revolted at the idea of standing like hired preachers before their subjects. It was also aristocratic arrogance, strengthened by the fear of assassination, which caused the first Mu‘āwiya to have boxes (maqṣūra) constructed beside the great mosques for himself and his court, contrary to custom, in order to avoid mingling with the people. This Umayyad institution was abolished under the first ‘Abbāsids, according to some as early as under al-Mahdī, according to others only under al-Ma‘mūn. The manner of the khūṭba was altered for the same considerations. The highest representative of power must be distinguished from paid khaṭībs and the dignity of the regent was to be displayed before the people even on this solemn occasion. The khūṭba itself gave them considerable uneasiness, though they did not wish to renounce the opportunity to parade at the head of the people. ‘Abd al-Malik is said to have given the reason for his early grey hair: ‘How can I avoid going grey if I have to expose my esprit to the people once a week.’ Thus they endeavoured to achieve an effect at least outwardly corresponding to their position as rulers. The first Umayyads therefore introduced various alteration in the ceremony of the khūṭba and its staging in such a way as to divest it of its ancient democratic character. Mu‘āwiya had some steps added to the minbar so that the representative of the ruling power should occupy, during the act which was solemnly symbolizing it, a more elevated place than was customary in democratic times. A Fine minbars, made even from metal, were constructed everywhere in order to give the caliph and his lieutenants more weight by a sumptuously set “stage” for the khūṭba. In former times things were kept more simple, and ‘Umar I destroyed a minbar which his governor ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ had built in Fustat. (Perhaps this is a polemical invention meant to protest against tendencies of a later time.) Originally the khūṭba was given after the general prayer. During the Umayyad period the caliphs began to give the khūṭba of the ‘īd before the ṣalāt on
the pretext that the people might disperse before hearing what they had to say to the congregation. It could have been considered as degrading for the government if the speech made from the pulpit by the ruler or his lieutenant was not as equally well attended as the liturgy itself. For prestige reasons the caliph was now to give one khutba seated. That this meant a change of the rite of the khutba is often confirmed by the historians. But this seems to have aroused the disapproval of pious people faithful to the sunna and an official theologian had to be found in order to instruct them: Rajāʾ b. Ḥaywah (d. II2), otherwise praised as a pious authority — who was considered a sort of adviser in matters of conscience in the court of several Umayyad rulers, asserted that one of the old caliphs, `Uthmān, upon whom the legitimacy of the dynasty was, as is well known, founded, also used to stand during the first khutba but delivered the second seated.¹⁰

**Ḫadīths invented by the Umayyads in the interests of the privileges claimed by them.**

“These circles said even of `Alī that he delivered the khutba seated. It is, however, interesting to observe that the significance of this account was already obliterated by the third century, when the victory of the sunna had rendered the stoutly independent attitude of the old Arab rulers no longer comprehensible, and that even al-Jāḥiz is only capable of giving a very naive explanation.”¹¹

He further states,

“How far reaching were the falsifications inspired by the Umayyads in the interests of the privileges claimed by them is evident from the fact that they not only cited `Uthmān, but even the Prophet as their examples,

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 49-51.

²⁷⁵
and that opponents of these falsifications make Jābir b. Samura, a Companion of the Prophet, conclude his description with the words: 'He who tells you that the Prophet delivered the khutba sitting is a liar.'\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., p. 51.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., pp. 51-2.
SECTION 2

DISCUSSION OF THE FIRST FACTOR: OFFICIAL
INFLUENCE ON THE INVENTION, DISSEMINATION AND
SUPPRESSION OF ḤADĪTHS

Goldziher says,

"Official influence on the invention, dissemination and suppression of traditions started very early. An instruction given to his obedient governor al-Mughīrah by Muʿāwiyah I is in the spirit of the Umayyads: ‘Do not tire of abusing and insulting ‘Alī and calling for God’s mercifulness for ‘Uthmān, defaming the companions of ‘Alī, removing them and omitting to listen to them (i.e. to what they tell and propagate as ḥadīths); praising, in contrast, the clan of ‘Uthmān, drawing them near to you and listening to them.’ [citing: al-Ṭabarī, II, p. 112]. This is an official encouragement to foster the rise and spread of ḥadīths directed against ‘Alī and to hold back and suppress ḥadīths favouring ‘Alī."\(^{13}\)

This factor has been previously discussed in Section 2 of Chapter 3 under the title: ‘The alleged fabrication of Muʿāwiyah b. Abī Sufyān and al-Mughīrah b. Shuʿbah’. The above allegation has been assessed by examination of the following:

A. The use of the text itself as a criterion;

B. the reaction of various observers to the disparagement of ‘Alī and his companions;

C. the accounts of this issue made by various historians;

D. Muʿāwiyah’s stance regarding ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib;
Finally, we conclude that the text cited by Goldziher in no way substantiates his opinion that official involvement in the invention, dissemination and suppression of traditions began early.

13 Goldziher, vol. 2, p. 44.
SECTION 3

DISCUSSION OF THE SECOND FACTOR: THE ENDEAVOURS OF THE UMAYYAD GOVERNORS TO FIND PIOUS AND TRUSTWORTHY AUTHORITIES TO COVER SUCH FALSIFICATIONS

First: A discussion of his evidence in support of his accusation of Muhammad b. Shihāb al-Zuhrī:

A. Discussion of his first piece of evidence:

Goldziher says,

"When the Umayyad caliph 'Abd al-Malik wished to stop the Pilgrimage to Mecca because he was worried lest his rival 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr should force the Syrians journeying to the holy places in Ḥijāz to pay him homage, he had recourse to the expedient of the doctrine of the vicarious hajj to the Qubbat al-ṣakhra in Jerusalem. He decreed that the obligatory circumambulation (tawwāf) could take place at the sacred place in Jerusalem with the same validity as that around the Ka'ba ordained in Islamic Law. The pious theologian al-Zuhrī was given the task of justifying this politically motivated reform of religious life by making up and spreading a saying traced back to the Prophet, according to which there are three mosques to which people may make pilgrimages: those in Mecca, Madina and Jerusalem [citing: al-Ya'qūbi, II, p. 311]." ¹⁴

We shall discuss this evidence in the light of the following points:

(i) To what extent is al-Ya‘qūbi's account credible?

¹⁴ Goldziher, vol. 2, pp. 44-5. Hitti follows the same line and accepts the view that the aim was to divert the pilgrimage from Makkah to Jerusalem. He said, "In 691 'Abd-al-Malik erected in Jerusalem the magnificent Dome of the Rock (Qubbat al-Ṣahrāh), wrongly styled by Europeans "the Mosque of
(ii) When did al-Zuhri invent this hadith?

(iii) Was the building of Qubbat al-Ṣakhrah considered sufficient reason for changing the site where the ḥajj is performed?

(iv) What would the likely attitude of the Umayyads' opponents have been with regard to the changing of the designated location for ḥajj?

(v) What was Ibn al-Musayyib's attitude towards al-Zuhri?

(vi) What does the text of the hadith tell us in real terms?

(vii) Is al-Zuhri the only traditionist to have reported this hadith and traced it back to the Prophet?

However, before proceeding, it is useful to present the original Arabic text upon which Goldziher depends in the original and in translation:

قُلْ: ﴿وَمَعَ عَلِيَّ الْمَلِكَ أَهْلِ الشَّامِ مِنَ الْحَجِّ، وَذَلِكْ أَنَّ الْبَيْرَ كَانَ يَأْخُذُهُمْ، إِذَا حَجَّوْا، بِالبِيْعَةِ،﴾

فَلما رأى عبد الملك ذلك منهم من الخروج إلى مكة، ففضّ الناس، وقالوا: "إنيا من حجَّ بيت الله الحرام، وهو فرّ من الله علينا، فقال لهم: "هذا ابن شهاب الزهرى يحذَّركم أن رسول الله قال: "لا تشد الرحال إلا إلى ثلاثة مساجد: المسجد الحرام، ومسجد بيت المقدس، وهو يقوم لكم مقام المسجد الحرام، وهذه الصورة التي يروى أن رسول الله وضع قدّمه عليها لما صعد إلى السماء، تقوم لكم مقام الكعبة، فإنن على الصورة قبة، وعلق عليها سورة الديانة، واقام لها مسجدة، وأخذ الناس بأن يطوفوا حولها كما يطوفون حول الكعبة، وأقام بذلك بنى أمية".

"Umar", in order to divert thither the pilgrimage from Makkah which was held by his rival ibn-al-Zubayr." See Hitti, p.220.
Al-Ya'qūbī said, “‘Abd al-Malik prevented the people of Syria from performing ḥajj. This is because Ibn al-Zubayr used to ask them whenever they performed ḥajj to pledge allegiance to him. When ‘Abd al-Malik saw this, he prevented them from travelling to Makkah. The people then protested loudly and said, ‘Do you prevent us from performing ḥajj to the sacred House of Allāh while it is an obligation from Allāh!’ He said to them, ‘Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhri narrates to you that the Apostle of Allāh said, ‘Journeys should not be made [to visit any mosque] except towards three mosques; al-Masjid al-Ḥarām [the sacred Mosque in Makkah]; my Mosque [in Madīnah]; and the Mosque of Bayt al-Maqdis [in Jerusalem].’ ‘Abd al-Malik continued:] So, this Mosque [in Jerusalem] represents al-Masjid al-Ḥarām for you and this Rock, which it was narrated that the Prophet set his foot upon it when he ascended into heaven, represents the Ka‘bah for you.’ [Al-Ya‘qūbī continues:] ‘Abd al-Malik then built a dome on the Rock, covered it with silk brocades, appointed custodians for it and ordered the people to go round it as they go round the Ka‘bah. He ['Abd al-Malik] established this practice during the Umayyad rule. 15

(i) To what extent is al-Ya‘qūbī’s account credible?

Al-Ya‘qūbī’s account, which Goldziher relies upon in accusing ‘Abd al-Malik of changing the site of the ḥajj to Qubbat al-Ṣakhrah and decreeing that the obligatory circumambulation (tawāf) could take place round al-Ṣakhrah instead of the Ka‘bah is the only recorded account of this that we can find. Therefore, one should treat this account with caution and not accept it before subjecting it to study, especially when we know that nothing was mentioned about this issue in the history books compiled by Ibn Sa‘d,

al-Ṭabarī, Ibn ‘Asākir, Ibn al-Athīr, Ibn Khaldūn, al-Dhahabī and others. The building of Qubbat al-Ṣakhrah to resemble the Kaʿbah so that people could make ḥajj to it and indeed perform tawāf around it, would no doubt rank as a major historic event and certainly would have been considered most significant. It is therefore inconceivable that these historians would pass over such an event without mention whereas many events of far lesser significance were duly recorded.

Further, al-Yaʿqūbī himself mentioned that the Umayyads took control of the ḥajj in 72/691,16 while the building of Qubbat al-Ṣakhrah had only just been completed in the same year,17 at which point one may legitimately ask why the Umayyads needed an alternative location for ḥajj.18 Al-Yaʿqūbī also indicated that the Umayyads took part in the ḥajj when he said, “In the year 68/687, four flag bearers stood on Ṭārāf: the flag of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīyyah and his companions [Shiʿah], the flag of ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr, the flag of Najdah b. ‘Āmir al-Ḥarūrī [the Kharidjite]

---

16 Ibid., p. 281.
17 Wellhausen said in his book The Arab Kingdom And Its Fall, p. 213: "There is no doubt that Abdulmalik tried hard to invest Jerusalem with greater splendour as a Muslim place of worship, for the tradition that he was the founder of its Dome of the Rock is certified by the inscription still preserved in the oldest part of the building. To be sure, the Abbasid Mamun is now named there as the builder, but de Vogue observed that this name has been falsified. The old date has escaped alteration, and the original purport of the words may therefore be accepted with certainty as follows: ‘The servant of God, Abdulmalik, the Emir of the Faithful, built this Qubba in the year 72.’"
18 It is highly unlikely that people would make a pilgrimage to an unfinished mosque. Therefore, the whole matter becomes highly questionable.
and the flag of the Umayyads ... ."\(^19\) Every flag bearer was very keen not to
instigate civil strife during the \(\text{ḥājj}\).\(^20\)

(ii) When did al-Zuhrī invent this \(\text{ḥadīth}\)?

Historians differ as to when al-Zuhrī was born, though there is a
general consensus that it was between 50/670 and 58/678.\(^21\) When we take
into account that Palestine only came under the control of ‘Abd al-Malik in
66/686,\(^22\) which would have been the time when ‘Abd al-Malik cited al-
Zuhrī’s \(\text{ḥadīth}\) to justify his decree that the destination of \(\text{ḥājj}\) was to be
transferred to Qubbat al-Ṣakhrah, then al-Zuhrī would have been aged
between eight and sixteen at time. Is it conceivable then that al-Zuhrī, given
his age, was so renowned a scholar that ‘Abd al-Malik depended upon him
to change the destination of \(\text{ḥājj}\)? Had the caliph wished to find a \(\text{ḥadīth}\)
propagandist, he would probably have chosen someone more venerable and
established. In the meantime, al-Ya‘qūbī provides us with a list of the most
famous scholars during the caliphate of ‘Abd al-Malik (65-86/685-705) and
does not mention al-Zuhrī among them.\(^23\) However, he does consider him as

\(^{21}\) Tahdhib, vol. 9, p. 450.
\(^{22}\) Murūj, vol. 3, p. 106. See also Ya‘qūbī, vol. 2, 269.
a noteworthy scholar during the reign of `Umar b. `Abd al-`Azīz (98-101/717-20).\textsuperscript{24}

In addition to the above, al-Ya‘qūbī also states that Ibn al-Zubayr died in 73/692.\textsuperscript{25} Al-Layth b. Saʿd said, “In 82/701, Ibn Shihāb [al-Zuhrī] came to `Abd al-Malik.”\textsuperscript{26} Moreover, al-Zuhrī himself talks about his arrival in Damascus, saying, “I arrived in Damascus at the time of Ibn al-Ashʿath’s rebellion.”\textsuperscript{27} The year in which `Abd al-Rahmān Ibn al-Ashʿath started his rebellion was 82/701.\textsuperscript{28} Is it then conceivable that al-Zuhrī invented this ġadīṇ nine years after the death of Ibn al-Zubayr?

(iii) Was the building of Qubbat al-Ṣakhrah considered sufficient reason for changing the site where the ġa[ij is performed?

The pilgrims relation to the Kaʿbah when performing the ġa[ij rituals consists simply in the making of tawāf (circumambulation) around it for a period of time probably not exceeding one hour at most. However, the ġa[ij rituals, which people performed even in the pre-Islamic era, take place outside Makkah and last for several days. The Qurʾān indicates the places where the ġa[ij rituals have to be performed:

\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., pp. 308-9.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., p. 267; Ibn Mājah TK, p. 30.
\textsuperscript{26} Nubalāʾ, vol. 5, p. 328.
\textsuperscript{27} Bukhārī TṢ, p. 93; Nubalāʾ, vol. 5, p. 329.
It is clear that ‘Abd al-Malik would have been unable to create in Palestine places which would be valid substitutes for the specific geographical locations of ‘Arafāt, al-Mash‘ar al-Ḥaram, and Minā, let alone the two mountains of al-Ṣafā and al-Marwah where pilgrims perform the obligatory ritual of sa‘y by going between them.  

28 Ma‘ārif, p. 202. See also Bukhārī TŠ, p. 91.  
29 A well known place situated about 25 kilometres to the east of Makkah where pilgrims stay on the 9th day of Ḍu‘ al-Ḥijjah in the 10th month of the Islamic calendar.  
30 i.e. Muzdāli‘fah; a well known place between Minā and ‘Arafāt where pilgrims have to stop and stay for the whole night of the 10th of Ḍu‘ al-Ḥijjah, or a great part of it.  
31 A well known place situated about 8 kilometres from Makkah and approximately 16 kilometres from ‘Arafāt where pilgrims have to spend the 10th, 11th, 12th and 13th of Ḍu‘ al-Ḥijjah.  
32 Places where People should perform ḥajj:  
(i) They should go to Minā on the 8th of the month.  
(ii) When the sun rises on the 9th of the month, they should go to ‘Arafāt. And after the sun sets, they should go to Muzdāli‘fah.  
(iii) They should go to Minā on the 10th of the month. In the same day, they should go to Makkah and do tawfiq and sa‘y. Then, they should return to Minā and stay there for the remainder of the 10th and on the 11th, 12th and the 13th.  
33 Going 7 times between the two mountains of al-Ṣafā and al-Marwah; one of the essential rites of both ḥajj and ‘umrah.  
34 Q. 1.158:
(iv) What would the likely attitude of the Umayyads opponents have been with regard to the changing of the designated location for ḥajj?

There is not the slightest doubt that making a pilgrimage to any site than Makkah for ḥajj was and is considered a clear contravention of Islamic teaching throughout the Muslim world. Would 'Abd al-Malik then dare to attempt such a dangerous move? If he did, the first people to spread the news would be his opponents, and in effect, we would have heard about it from the history books. Had 'Abd al-Malik attempted to innovate something of this magnitude, it would have provided a great advantage to his opponents who would not have hesitated to present it as a serious indictment of his character. However, 'Abd al-Malik was not, in fact, so naive as to provide his opponents with such a golden opportunity.

(v) What was Ibn al-Musayyib's attitude towards al-Zuhri?

Al-Zuhri narrated this ḥadīth on the authority of his master, Sa'īd b. al-Musayyib, who died in 93/711, as Goldziher indicates. If we presume that al-Zuhri invented this ḥadīth in 66/685, as has been previously stated, was it then conceivable that the master’s attitude towards his disciple was a

---

"Verily! al-Ṣafā and al-Marwah are among the Symbols of Allāh. So it is not a sin for those who perform ḥajj and 'umrah of the House (the Ka'bah) to perform the going (tawāff) between them (al-Ṣafā and al-Marwah). And whoever does good voluntarily, then verily, Allāh is All-Recogniser, All-Knower."

negative one for all those years because al-Zuhri had misused his name just to please the Umayyads? This is highly unlikely, particularly in light of the fact that Ibn al-Musayyib was one of the distinguished scholars who was ready to oppose the Umayyads, as Goldziher himself confirms.  

(vi) What does the text of the hadith tell us in real terms?

The expressions of the actual hadith as communicated from al-Zuhri do not mention the relocation of the hajj, and certainly do not, in any way, state that the people should sanctify al-Ṣakhrah and make tawāf around it. Even if we accepted for the sake of argument that al-Zuhri had invented this hadith, he clearly did not state in the hadith that people should make the hajj journey to Qubbat al-Ṣakhrah and make tawāf around it. In fact, the text of the hadith aims to do nothing more than emphasise the special status of al-Masjid al-Aqṣā and indicate that it is permissible for Muslims to visit it, as well as the two other Mosques. It is well known that al-Masjid al-Aqṣā was the first qiblah (direction of prayer) and the place from which the Prophet Muḥammad ascended to heaven, as is written in the Qur’ān, and as such it is traditionally regarded as a sacred site.

36 Goldziher said, “Pious people of Saʿīd’s kind frowned at the state of affairs under such rule; they decried the tyrannical government, defied it by passive resistance and even showed their dissatisfaction openly, occasionally going so far as to refuse homage. In return they were hated and despised by the ruling circles.” See vol. 2, p. 41.
(vii) Is al-Zuhri the only traditionist to have reported this hadīth and traced it back to the Prophet?

Goldziher's theory is further weakened by the fact that al-Zuhri is not the only traditionist to have reported this hadīth and traced it back to the Prophet, as can be seen from the following diagram:
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"Journeys should not be made [to visit any mosque] except towards three mosques: al-Masjid al-Ḥarām [the sacred Mosque in Makkah]; the Mosque of Allāh’s Apostle [in Madina]; and the Mosque of al-Aqṣā, [in Jerusalem]."
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As can be seen from the diagram, this *ḥadīth* is reported in a great number of collections of *Ḥadīth*. Al-Zuhri always reports from Saʿīd b. al-Musayyib on the authority of Abū Hurayrah, while the only people to have transmitted the *ḥadīth* from al-Zuhri are Maʿmar and Sufyān. However al-Zuhri was not the only source for this *ḥadīth* in his time. A great number of transmitters report this *ḥadīth* and trace it back to the Prophet. We therefore wonder why both al-Yaʿqūbī and Goldziher chose to ignore all the many transmitters who reported this *ḥadīth*, and instead chose to focus their attention on al-Zuhri alone?

In conclusion, we can firmly state that both assertions: That there was an attempt to direct *ḥajj* to Qubbat al-Ṣakhrah; and that al-Zuhri was the inventor of that *ḥadīth*, can be unequivocally rejected in the light of the explanation above and the historical evidence highlighted in this section.
B. Discussion of his second piece of evidence:

Goldziher says,

"How the Umayyads made it their business to put into circulation hadīths which seemed to them desirable, and how people of the type of the pious al-Zuhri acquiesced in being their tools, though they certainly were not guided by selfish motives but merely by reasons of state expediency, is to be seen from evidence preserved by al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādi which deserves to be considered in this context. Here we find an account which is handed down by various ways from 'Abd al-Razzāq (d. 211), a disciple of Ma'mar b. Rāshid (d. 153), in the name of the latter; Ma'mar himself belonged to the group of the disciples of al-Zuhri. This account tells us that the Umayyad Ibrāhīm b. al-Walīd, it is not stated whether he was the subsequent ruler of this name (d. 126), came to al-Zuhri with a note-book he had written, and asked his permission to spread the sayings contained in it as hadīths communicated by al-Zuhri. The latter gave his permission easily: 'Who else could have told you the hadīths?' [citing: al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādi, fol. 73b [ed. Hyderabad, p. 266].] Thus the Umayyad was enabled to circulate the contents of his manuscript as texts taught him by al-Zuhri. This account fully confirms the willingness of al-Zuhri (for which we have quoted an example above) to promote the interests of the dynasty by religious means."³⁷

Ibrāhīm b. al-Walīd's coming to al-Zuhri with a note-book he had written and asking his permission to narrate it as hadīths he had heard from al-Zuhri was an established method of transmitting Hadīth at that time. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ said, "The fourth division of methods of transmitting Hadīth is handing in a written manuscript (munā walāh), and this is divided further into two types. The first type is handing over combined with permission (al-munā walāh al-maqrūnah bi al-ʾiżāzah). This is considered the highest type and takes a number of forms. One of these forms is as follows: a student may come to his master with a written manuscript or part of the hadīths communicated to him by the master and present that to him. The master who
is vigilant and well-versed will then cast a deep look at the contents of that book and hand it back to the disciple saying, "I have had a look at what you have written. It contains my narration from my masters, so you can narrate it to others." or "I give you permission to narrate it on my authority." A number of great traditionists called this form 'ard (showing).\(^{38}\) Al-Hākim said that a group of great traditionists considered this to be like samā' (reading by the teacher to students),\(^{39}\) including:

- A group of traditionists who belonged to the Madanian school, such as ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. al-Ḥarīth, ‘Ikrimah b. ‘Abbās, Muḥammad b. Shihāb al-Zuhrī, ... etc.

- A group of traditionists who belonged to the Makkan school, such as Mujāhid b. Jabr, Muḥammad b. Muslim al-Qurashi, ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Uthmān al-Qārī', ... etc.

- A group of traditionists who belonged to the Kufan school, such as ‘Alqamah b. Qays al-Nakha‘ī, ‘Alī b. Rabī‘ah al-Asadī ... etc.

- A group of traditionists who belonged to the Baṣran school, such as ‘Alī b. Dāwūd al-Nājī, Qatādah b. Di‘āmah al-Sadūsī ... etc.

- A group of traditionists who belonged to the Egyptian school, such as ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. al-Qāsim, Ashhab b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, ‘Abd Allāh b. Wahb ... and a group of Mālikīs after them.

- A group from both Syria and Khurasān.\(^{40}\)


\(^{38}\) Ibn al-Salb, p. 79; Ma‘rifat, pp. 256-7.

\(^{39}\) This method has the following features:

1. Oral recitation.
2. Reading from books.
3. Questions and answers.
4. Dictation.

\(^{40}\) Ma‘rifat, pp. 257-8.
In the light of the above, Goldziher’s assumption that the note-book which was written by Ibrāḥīm b. al-Walīd contained ḥadīths which he had invented and that al-Zuhrī gave him permission to propagate these as authentic ḥadīths which he had heard from him, needs close examination. The following points should be noted:

1. Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī mentions two narrations with two different isnāds, on the authority of Maʿmar, with regard to Ibrāḥīm’s request. The second narration, which Goldziher ignores, clearly states that what was written in Ibrāḥīm’s note-book was part of al-Zuhrī’s Ḥadīth (ʿilm).\(^{41}\)

2. Both narrations contain the word ‘arḍ which was one of the methods of receiving Ḥadīth as we have previously stated.

3. Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī mentions these two narrations in the context of those who considered ‘arḍ to be the same as samā’.\(^{42}\)

4. Ibn ʿAsākir clearly states that Ibrāḥīm b. al-Walīd was one of those who had heard ḥadīths from al-Zuhrī.\(^{43}\) This confirms that Ibrāḥīm presented to his master ḥadīths that he had heard from him. According to the narration of Ibn ʿAsākir with regard to Ibrāḥīm’s request, al-Zuhrī said to Ibrāḥīm after he asked his permission to disseminate the note-book he had written, "Wa man yuṣṭuka bihā ghayrī? (Who else other than me could give you the

\(^{41}\) *Kifāyah*, p. 302.
permission to communicate it?)\textsuperscript{44} This was said because, indeed, no
traditionist other than al-Zuhrî himself would have been able to give
permission to his disciples to communicate his own ărâdîh. On this basis we
have to understand the saying of al-Zuhrî as meaning, according to al-Khaṭîb’s narration, "Faman yuḥaddithukumuhu ghayr? (Who else other
than me narrated it to you?)" In other words, because I have narrated it to
you, you can go and narrate it to others. It certainly does not mean, or imply
by any stretch of the imagination, “Who else other than me could have given
you the authority to spread a fabricated ărâdîh?” as Goldziher understood.

In addition, al-Zuhrî’s permission to narrate the ărâdîh was not
restricted to the Umayyad, Ibrâhîm b. al-Walîd, but he also granted the same
dispensation to many of his disciples. Ma’mar himself said, “I learned ‘ilm
(ărâdîh) from al-Zuhrî and asked him, ‘Shall I communicate it on your
authority?’ Al-Zuhrî said to him, ‘Wa man ărâdîathaka bihi ghayr? (Who
else other than me narrated it to you?)’”\textsuperscript{45} Moreover, al-Zuhrî was not the
only traditionist who did this with his disciples -a number of others did so
also.\textsuperscript{46}

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., p. 298.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibn ‘Asâkir, vol. 7, p. 246.
\textsuperscript{44} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{45} Kifâyah, p. 302. See:
  i) The Life of az-Zuhrî and his scholarship in Qur’anic science and Tradition, p. 126 ff for
full information regarding al-Zuhrî’s methods of disseminating knowledge by means of
writing, and p. 215 ff for the methods used by al-Zuhrî in transmitting the ărâdîh.
  ii) Kifâyah, p. 355 ff.
\textsuperscript{46} See Kifâyah, p. 357 ff.
C. Discussion of his third piece of evidence:

Goldziher says,

"How the Umayyads made it their business to put into circulation *hadīths* which seemed to them desirable, and how people of the type of the pious al-Zuhri acquiesced in being their tools, though they certainly were not guided by selfish motives but merely by reasons of state expediency, is to be seen from evidence preserved by al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādi which deserves to be considered in this context. ... This account fully confirms the willingness of al-Zuhri (for which we have quoted an example above) to promote the interests of the dynasty by religious means. His piety probably caused his conscience to be troubled occasionally but he could not for ever resist the pressure of the governing circles. The Ma'mar just mentioned preserved a characteristic saying by al-Zuhri: ‘These emirs forced people to write *hadīths* (akrahanā ‘alayhi hā’ulā‘i’l-umarā‘)’ [citing: *JASB*, 1856, p. 326, no. 93. [=al-Khaṭīb, *Taqyīd*, 140]]. This account can only be understood on the assumption of al-Zuhri’s willingness to lend his name, which was in general esteemed by the Muslim community, to the government’s wishes.”

Al-Zuhri’s statement, “Akrahanā ‘alayhi hā’ulā‘i al-umarā‘,” was given in a context which is completely outwith the issue of the invention of *Hadīth*. The outcome is that Goldziher invests al-Zuhri’s saying with a meaning utterly other than what is intended. The complete text of al-Zuhri’s saying, as narrated by Ma’mar, is

“*Kunnā nakrah kitāb al-‘ilm ḥattā akrahanā ‘alayhi ha’ulā‘i al-umarā‘, fārā‘aynā an lā namna ‘ahu aḥadān min al-muslimīn* (We used to dislike writing down *Hadīth* (‘ilm), until these emirs forced us to write them down. So, we thought that we should not prevent any Muslim from doing likewise.)”

Thus, the text expresses al-Zuhri’s displeasure at writing down *Hadīth* and by extension, at other people writing down

---

hadiths that they had heard from him. This is further confirmed by Abū al-Malih when he says, "We did not wish to write down the Hadīth we had heard from al-Zuhrī until Hishām [the tenth caliph of the Umayyad dynasty], forced him, and he wrote them for Hishām’s sons. People then started to write down the Hadīth." Another narration states even more clearly that al-Zuhrī used to prevent them from writing down the Hadīth he communicated to them. However, he only gave his permission to people to write the Hadīth after Hishām had forced him to dictate to his sons. After he had finished dictating the Hadīth to the sons of Hishām, al-Zuhrī then summoned the traditionists and dictated the same hadiths to them.

We should also note Goldziher’s misinterpretation of al-Zuhrī’s saying, “akrahanā ‘alayhi ḥā’ulā’i al-umarā’.” The correct translation is, “These emirs forced us to write down the Hadīth,” and not, “These emirs forced people to write hadiths.” The former clearly refers to the writing down of the hadiths, whereas the latter insinuates the idea of invention.

---

51 Nubalā’, vol. 5, 334.
52 Ḥudūd, vol. 1, p. 110.
Second: A discussion of his evidence in support of his accusation of Rajā’ Ibn Ḥaywah:

Goldziher says,

“For prestige reasons the caliph was now to give one khutba seated. That this meant a change of the rite of the khutba is often confirmed by the historians. But this seems to have aroused the disapproval of pious people faithful to the sunna and an official theologian had to be found in order to instruct them: Rajā’ b. Ḥaywah (d. II2), otherwise praised as a pious authority, who was considered a sort of adviser in matters of conscience in the court of several Umayyad rulers, [citing: Fragm. hist. Arab., p. 7: anna R.b.H. rawā lahum ḥādhā fa-akhadīh bihi] asserted that one of the old caliphs, ‘Uthmān, upon whom the legitimacy of the dynasty was, as is well known, founded, also used to stand during the first khutba but delivered the second seated.”

The narration which Goldziher cites as evidence in accusing Rajā’ b. Ḥaywah of inventing ḥadīth is mentioned by al-Ṭabarī, Ibn al-Athīr and Abū al-Maḥāsin. All of these scholars, including the anonymous author of Fragm. Hist. Arab. [as we have indicated above, the original title of this book is: al-‘Uyūn wa al-ḥadāʾiq fī akhbār al-ḥaqāʾiq], have clearly stated, with the exception of Ibn al-Athīr, that the source of this narration was al-Wāqidi. When we compare the narration which Goldziher cites from al-‘Uyūn wa al-ḥadāʾiq with the other narrations we notice three things. Before we consider them, it is worthwhile presenting the original Arabic texts and their translation:

---

53 According to the above reference Goldziher should have said that “‘Uthmān used to sit during the first khutba but delivered the second standing.”
55 For al-Ṭabarī, see vol. 7, pp. 367, line no. 16; for Abū al-Maḥāsin, see vol. 1, p. 224, line no. 7; for the anonymous author of al-‘Uyūn wa al-ḥadāʾiq fī akhbār al-ḥaqāʾiq, see vol. 3, p. 4, line no. 18.
The narration by the anonymous author of *al-ʻUyūn wa al-Ḥadīʿiq*:

الواقيدي: "... قال اسحاق بن يحيى: "رأيت الوليد يخطب على منبر رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يوم الجمعة عام حج ... فخطب الخطبة الأولى وهو جالس، ثم قام فخطب الثانية قائمًا. قال اسحاق: "فلكيتي رجاء بن حيوة، زاهد بنن أمية، وهو معه، فقلت: هكذا تصنعون في خطبكم؟ قال: "نعم، وهكذا صنع معاوية، وهكذا صنع عبد الملك، قال [عبد الملك]: "وهكذا كان يخطب عامن، فقلت: والله ما خطب عامن إلا قائمًا. إلا أن رجاء بن حيوة روى هم هذا فأخذوا به."

Al-Waqidi said that, "... Ishāq b. Yahyā said, ‘I saw al-Walid delivering the *khutbah* on the pulpit of the Prophet of Allah, may Allah bless and preserve him, on Friday in the year that he made the pilgrimage ... He delivered the first *khutbah* sitting, then he stood, and delivered the second standing.' Ishāq continued, ‘I met Raja‘ b. Ḥaywah, the ascetic of the Umayyads, who was accompanying [al-Walid], and I asked him: Do you [always] do it this way in your *khutbahs*? He replied, ‘Yes. Mu‘āwiya did it this way, as did ‘Abd al-Malik. And ['Abd al-Malik] said that ‘Uthmān delivered the *khutbah* in this way.’ Ishāq replied, ‘By Allah, ‘Uthmān only delivered *khutbahs* standing up. However, Raja‘ had narrated this to them and they acted upon it.’"

The narration of al-Ṭabarī:

قال محمد بن عمر [الواقيدي]: "وجدتني اسحاق بن يحيى، قال: "رأيت الوليد يخطب على منبر رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يوم الجمعة عام حج ... فخطب الخطبة الأولى وهو جالس، ثم قام فخطب الثانية قائمًا. قال اسحاق: "فلكيتي رجاء بن حيوة، وهو معه، فقلت: هكذا يصنعون هم، قال: "نعم، وهكذا صنع...

56 Raja‘ b. Ḥaywah is not Ummayad, but was known as an ascetic of the Ummayads during their period of governance.

Muḥammad b. ʿUmar al-Wāqidi said, “Ishāq b. Yaḥyā narrated to me that he said: ‘I saw al-Walid delivering the khutbah on the pulpit of the Prophet of Allah, may Allah bless and preserve him, on Friday in the year when he made the pilgrimage … He delivered the first khutbah sitting, then he stood, and delivered the second standing.’ Ishāq continued: ‘I met Rajāʿ b. Ḥaywah, who was accompanying [al-Walid], and I asked him: Do they [always] do it this way? He replied, ‘Yes. Muʿāwiya did it this way, and so on.’ I said: ‘Are not you going to speak to him [about it]? He said, ‘Qabīsah b. Dhuʿayb informed me that he spoke to ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān [about it], and he refused to do [anything different], saying, “Uthmān delivered the khutbah in this way.”’ Ishāq replied: By Allah, he did not deliver khutbahs in this way; ‘Uthmān only delivered khutbahs standing up.’ However, Rajāʿ said, ‘This was narrated to them and they act upon it.’”

Additional words not existing the narration of the anonymous author.

Words omitted from the narration of the anonymous author.

This narration has been reported by Ibn al-Athīr59 and Abū al-Maḥāsin60 in exactly the same words as used by al-Ṭabarī.
First: The anonymous author presented the narration in an abbreviated way, and this has led to confusion and distortion in his narration. As a result of this, Goldziher assumed that the statement, “Uthmân delivered *khutbahs* in this way (هُكَذَا خَطَبَ عَطْمَانُ,) had been made by Rajā’ b. Ḥaywah whereas, according to al-Ṭabarî, Ibn al-Athîr and Abû al-Maḥâsin, it was actually made by ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān.

Second: As a result of this distortion it seems to state that Rajā’ b. Ḥaywah narrated this to the Umayyads and that they subsequently acted upon it (anna Rajā’ b. Ḥaywah *rawā* (روٰى) *lahum hâdhâ fa-akhadhû bihi.*) However, the same narration, as reported by the above-mentioned scholars, actually states that Rajā’ said, “This was narrated to them and they acted upon it (qâla Rajā’ b. Ḥaywah: *ruwiyâ* (روٰى) *lahum hâdhâ fa-akhadhû bihi.*)” We presume that the reason for this distortion is the omission of the word ‘qâla’ (said) from the text: “However, Rajā’ b. Ḥaywah said (لاَئَلَا أَنْ رَجِالٍ بْنِ حُبْسَةَ [قال])” When ‘qâla’ is restored, the word ‘rawâ’ (روٰى), meaning that Rajā’ b. Ḥaywah narrated, is read ‘ruwiyâ’ (روٰى), meaning that Rajā’ b. Ḥaywah said that this was narrated.
Third: We should also note that the statement in question was made by Rajā’ after a
dialogue had taken place between him and Ishāq b. Yaḥyā on the issue of sitting
during the *khutbah*, from which it is apparent that Rajā’ was not in favour of sitting.
The dialogue in question is given in all the narrations except for the abbreviated one
which Goldziher cites as his evidence.

In addition, this expression “This was narrated to them and they acted upon it
(*qāla Rajā’ b. Ḥaywah ruwiya (ṣūr) lahun ḥādhā fa-akhadhū bihi),” clearly means
that the Umayyads themselves had been previously informed that it was permissible
to sit in one of the two *khutbahs* and that they took that as evidence of its
acceptability. This is contrary to Goldziher’s understanding that Rajā’, or indeed
another party, had concocted it to support the Umayyads’ practice.61 As we have
seen, the context of the Arabic expression reveals that they had begun to sit in the
*khutbah* only after evidence concerning this issue had reached them.

It is clear from the above analysis that this particular narration from
al-Waqidi has been shortened, by the anonymous author, in a way that has resulted
in its distortion.

---

61 Goldziher said, “In Abū al-Mahāsin, I, p. 249 the matter is represented differently: it was not Rajā’
who invented the tradition; it was he who stated that other people made it up in order to support
Therefore, to accuse Rajā' b. Ḥaywah, or indeed another party of inventing a hadīth to the effect that ‘Uthmān used to stand in the first khutbah but delivered the second seated in order to support Umayyad practice is an invalid and unacceptable accusation.
DISCUSSION OF A ḤADĪTH INVENTED BY THE UMAYYADS, IN THE INTERESTS OF THE PRIVILEGES CLAIMED BY THEM, WHICH INDICATED THAT EVEN ‘ALĪ HAD DELIVERED THE KHUṬBAH SEATED

Goldziher says,

"These circles said even of 'Ali that he delivered the khutba seated. It is, however, interesting to observe that the significance of this account was already obliterated by the third century, when the victory of the sunna had rendered the stoutly independent attitude of the old Arab rulers no longer comprehensible, and that even al-Jāḥiz is only capable of giving a very naive explanation [citing: Bayān, fol. 20a, [i, II8]: yurūdu biqawlihi qā'idan khutbat al-nikāḥ; here it is related on the authority of al-Haytham b. 'Adī that the khutba was never given seated]."\(^{62}\)

Goldziher’s claim that these circles said even of ‘Alī that he delivered the khutbah seated, needs close examination. The evidence he mentions in support of his claim, namely a statement by al-Haytham b. ‘Adī, is incomplete. A more comprehensive appraisal of the matter follows:

Al-Jāḥīẓ said, “Abū Mikhnaf narrated on the authority of al-Ḥārith b. al-A‘war [d. 65/684] who said, ‘By Allāh, I saw ‘Ālī deliver his khūṭbah seated as if he was standing and I saw him waging war as if he was a man of peace.’ He meant *khūṭbat al-nikāḥ*. Al-Haytham b. ‘Adī [d. 207/816] said, ‘Speakers never give their khūṭbahs seated except when they deliver *khūṭbat al-nikāḥ*.’”

It can be seen from the above text that al-Jāḥīẓ, after he mentions the saying of al-Ḥārith b. al-A‘war: ‘By Allāh, I saw ‘Ālī deliver his khūṭbah seated as if he was standing …,’ goes on to explain what is meant by ‘seated.’ He says, “He [al-Ḥārith b. al-A‘war] meant *khūṭbatu al-nikāḥ* [the khūṭbah of the marriage ceremony].” Al-Jāḥīẓ then cites al-Haytham b. ‘Adī’s statement to support his explanation; he says, “Al-Haytham b. ‘Adī said, ‘Speakers never give their khūṭbahs seated except when they deliver *khūṭbat al-nikāḥ* (lam takun al-khūṭabā’ takhṭubu qu‘ūdan illā fī khūṭbatī al-nikāḥ).’” However, Goldziher quotes al-Haytham’s statement without mentioning the exception, saying, “Here it is related on the authority of al-Haytham b. ‘Adī that the khūṭbah was never given seated.”

Thus, al-Jāḥīẓ’s explanation was not a naive one. Al-Haytham’s statement supplies evidence in support of the coming section’s conclusion;

63 *Tabyīn*, vol. 1, p. 118.
that the caliphs only delivered the *khutbah* seated when they had to, indeed, al-Shafi‘ī held the opinion that it is permissible for a person who is sick to deliver the *khutbah* seated.⁶⁵ Therefore, Goldziher’s observation that, “...the significance of this account was already obliterated by the third century, when, the victory of the sunna had rendered the stoutly independent attitude of the old Arab rulers no longer comprehensible,” results from a combination of misunderstanding of the material and sheer imagination.

⁶⁵ Shāfi‘ī *U*, vol. 1, pp. 342-3:

"إِنْ خَطِبَ [الإِمَام] جَالِسًا مِنْ عِلَاءٍ أَجْزَاهُ ذَلِكَ، وَأَجْزَاهُ مِنْ خَلْفَهُ، وَإِنْ خَطِبَ جَالِسًا وَهُمْ يَرْوَهُ صَحِيحًا، فَذَكَرْ عِلَاءٍ فَهُوَ أَمِينٌ عَلَى نَفْسِهِ، وَكَذَلِكَ هَذَا فِي الصَّلَاةِ."
DISCUSSION OF A ḤADĪTH INVENTED BY THE UMAYYADS IN THE INTEREST OF THE PRIVILEGES CLAIMED BY THEM, WHICH INDICATED THAT THE PROPHET USED TO SIT IN HIS KHŪṬBAH

Goldziher says,

“How far reaching were the falsifications inspired by the Umayyads in the interests of the privileges claimed by them is evident from the fact that they not only cited ʿUthmān, but even the Prophet as their examples, and that opponents of these falsifications make Jābir b. Samurah, a Companion of the Prophet, conclude his description with the words: ‘He who tells you that the Prophet delivered the khutba sitting is a liar [citing: Abū Dāwūd, I, p. 109; al-Nasāʾī, p. 215: fa-man ḥaddathakum anna rasūlallāhi kāna yakhtubu qā'idan faqad kadhaba].’\(^{66}\)

As far as the statement of Jābir b. Samurah, “He who tells you that the Prophet delivered the khutbah sitting is a liar,” is concerned, this statement is not necessarily an answer to or a refutation of a ḥadīth invented by the Umayyads which indicated that the Prophet used to sit in his khutbah. If evidence of this really existed where is it? Why did the Umayyads not reveal it in public? Would the first Umayyads then dare to invent a ḥadīth that the Prophet used to sit in his khutbah while his Companions who lived with him and witnessed his khutbahs were still alive? Again, would they dare to contradict the actual action of the Prophet that is described in the
Qur‘ān.⁶⁷ In addition, Jābir died in 74/693⁶⁸ and there is ample evidence, which will be given shortly, to confirm that the most prominent Umayyad caliphs, who were Jābir’s contemporaries, used to deliver the *khutbah* standing, only sitting down when they had to. For instance:

‘Uthmān used to deliver the *khutbah* standing until he became old and was afflicted by a body tremor.⁶⁹ Ibn Jurayj said, “I asked ‘Aṭā’, ‘Who was the first to sit in the *khutbah*?’ He said, ‘It was ‘Uthmān in his last days when he had become old and a tremor had afflicted him. He used to sit down for a while and then stand up and resume his *khutbah*.’ I asked him, ‘Did he speak while sitting?’ He said, ‘I do not know.’”⁷⁰ This is further confirmed by the statement of Abū Qaza‘ah, “‘Uthmān was afflicted by a tremor; when he stood up to deliver the *khutbah* he used to rest for a while before standing up again to resume his *khutbah*.”⁷¹

Mu‘āwiyah, who died in 60/680 AH, also used to deliver the *khutbah* standing. When he became old, he only sat down for one of the *khutbahs* after getting permission from people, saying, “I have reached old age and I would like to sit during one of the two *khutbahs*.” As a result he

---

⁶⁷ See p. 309.
⁶⁹ Ṭuḥaf 1, vol. 3, pp. 187-9, ḥ. no. 5258 on the authority of Qatādah, ḥ. no. 5265 on the authority of ‘Aṭā’.
⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 189, no. 5266.
⁷¹ Ibid., p. 188, no. 5262. See also p. 187, no. 5258 on the authority of Qatādah.
delivered the first *khutbah* seated.⁷² Al-Sha‘bī gave a clearer reason for Mu‘āwiyah’s desire to sit, saying, “The first person to deliver the *khutbah* seated was Mu‘āwiyah when he became a corpulent old man with a big stomach.”⁷³ Abū Ishāq also says, “The first person to deliver the *khutbah* seated was Mu‘āwiyah, who apologized to the people saying that he had a sore foot.”⁷⁴

It is not mentioned whether Yazīd b. Mu‘āwiyah (d. 64/683), his son Mu‘āwiyah b. Yazīd (d. 64/683) and Marwān b. al-Ḥakam (d. 65/685) delivered the *khutbah* standing or seated.

‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān, who ruled from 65/685 to 86/705 AH, also delivered the *khutbah* standing. Sulaymān b. Mūsā says, “… the first person to deliver the *khutbah* seated was Mu‘āwiyah. When ‘Abd al-Malik became caliph, he delivered the *khutbah* standing. He kicked the pulpit with his foot and said, ‘This is the Sunnah.’ However, in the course of time it became hard for him and later he delivered the *khutbah* seated.”⁷⁵

Therefore, one can not rule out the possibility that the statement of Jābir may have come in answer to some people who thought that the

---

⁷² Ibid., pp. 188-9, no. 5264 from Ja‘far b. Muḥammad on the authority of his father.
⁷³ *Musannaf*, vol. 7, p. 247, no. 35724.
⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 260, no. 35881.
Prophet sat in the *khutbah* since they had seen a number of caliphs deliver one of the two *khutbahs* seated. This statement was made merely to clarify the truth for them and not in refutation of another *hadith* invented by the Umayyads, which stated that the Prophet sat in the *khutbah*. This understanding is further confirmed by the statement of `Abd Allāh b. `Umar, who died just one year before Jābir (namely, 73/692), when he said, “The Prophet used to deliver the Friday *khutbah* standing, then he would sit down for a while before standing up to resume his *khutbah*, as is the practice at present (*kamā yaqalūn al-yawm.*)”

In addition to the above, it is inconceivable that any caliph could, without encountering serious difficulties, contradict the verse in *sūrat al-Jumu`ah* which indicates the standing of the Prophet during his *khutbah*;

> “And when they see some merchandise or some amusement, they disperse headlong to it, and leave you [Muhammad] standing [while delivering the *khutbah* of Jumu`ah]...” (Q. 62:11)

75 *Muṣannaf* 1, vol. 3, pp. 187-8, h. no. 5259.
76 Muslim, k. al-*Jumu`ah*, h. no. 33; Tirmidhī, k. al-*Jumu`ah*, bā. no. 11, h. no. 506; Bukhārī, k. al-*Jumu`ah*, bā. no. 27, h. no. 920.
77 Also, see Muslim, k. al-*Jumu`ah*, h. no. 863:

> خذلًا عُلَّمًا بن أبي شيبة وَإِسْحَاقَ بن إِبْرَاهِيمَ كَبِيْهَا مَعِيٍّ جَعَرَ قال عُلَّمًا خذلًا جَعَرَ مَعِيٍّ مَعِيٍّ عَنِ الْرَّحْمَةِ عَن صَبْرِيٍّ عَن الْمَصَّمَمِ بن أبي الجُفَّادِ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ عَن الْمَعَادِ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَعِيٍّ غَيْرِي مَاكَ حَكِيمًا وَأَنَا نَزْلَتْ هَذِهِ الْآيةُ لِيُبَيِّنَ لَكُمُ الْكَلَامَ ۛ فَآمِنُواْ فَإِنَّكُمْ لَا تُؤْتُونَ رَجَاءٍ.}
In the light of the above evidence, we find that Goldziher uses an authoritative tone and a self-consistent but largely erroneous interpretation of selected material to lend credence to his sweeping claims. He says,

"... standing in front of the community was apparently not to the taste of proud Umayyad princes. They did, however, value highly ascending the minbar as head of the people, and considered this privilege as an important part of their dignity as rulers, as is evident from the panegyrics on the rulers of this dynasty."\(^7\)

And further,

"But their aristocratic arrogance – if the mind of those proud Qurayshites is pictured – seems to have revolted at the idea of standing like hired preachers before their subjects."\(^8\)

\(^7\) Goldziher, vol. 2, p. 49.

\(^8\) Ibid, p. 50.
CHAPTER 6
THE THEOLOGIANS AND FABRICATION

An analysis of the evidence Goldziher cites in support of his claim that the theologians fabricated *Hadīth*

Section 1: Goldziher's evidence regarding the theologians' fabrications.

Section 2: Al-Muhallab b. Abī Ṣufrah.


Section 4: Shahr b. Ḥawshab.
SECTION 1

GOLDZIHER’S EVIDENCE REGARDING THE THEOLOGIANS’ FABRICATION

This section will be devoted to the presentation of his evidence regarding the role of the theologians in the fabrication of Ḥadīth.

Goldziher says,

“If so much trouble was taken by authority to find theological support for such trivial ritualistic details, how much greater must have been the activity shown by the machinery of government in cases concerned with spreading among the masses traditional authority for political and dynastic interests. The greater part of the traditions invented for these purposes were probably due to official initiative and influence. It is expressly reported of the great general al-Muhallab, the scourge of the Khārijite dissenters (d. 83), that he was concerned with falsifying traditions to encourage his soldiers against these mutineers. Amongst high officials of the Umayyad dynasty there are several who are accounted as muḥaddithūn; to name only Ḥafṣ b. al-Walīd al-Ḥadrāmi (d. 128) and ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Khālid (d. 124). Amongst traditions which the mawlid Layth b. Sa‘d spread on the authority of the latter there are presumably many which were to benefit the prevailing political tendencies, because this ‘Abd al-Raḥmān was for years an important official of Umayyad princes. Al-Nasā’ī’s strict criticism is lenient towards him, which might not have been the case if al-Nasā’ī had been more closely acquainted with the circumstances. This fact is curiously
illuminated by an unintentional, and naive, saying of Ibn 'Awn (d. 151). This refers to Shahr b. Hawshab (whose date of death is uncertain; either 98 or 112); he was considered unreliable in his communications because he had accepted a government post. This view is telling evidence that tendentious traditions were smuggled in through official initiative.\(^1\)

He adds in the footnote that:

"Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal considers Shahr as not worthy of consideration."\(^2\)

He continues,

"Later the real understanding for this phenomenon was lost and al-Bukhārī declared Shahr to be worthy of credit since nothing bad was known about his character."\(^3\)

In the footnote he says:

"We find Shahr as an authority in innumerable hadīths."\(^4\)

He continues,

"People who were nearer to the conditions of the time could judge things differently, like Ibn 'Awn who lived but a few decades after Shahr and perhaps had proof that theologians in official position were used - or were willing, without outward pressure, because of their interest in the prevailing power - to put into circulation tendentious traditions."\(^5\)

\(^1\) Goldziher, vol. 2, p. 52.
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 52, footnote no. 5.
\(^3\) Ibid., p. 52.
\(^4\) Ibid., p. 52, footnote no. 6.
\(^5\) Ibid., pp. 52-3.
Goldziher says,

"If so much trouble was taken by authority to find theological support for such trivial ritualistic details, how much greater must have been the activity shown by the machinery of government in cases concerned with spreading among the masses traditional authority for political and dynastic interests. The greater part of the traditions invented for these purposes were probably due to official initiative and influence. It is expressly reported of the great general al-Muhallab, the scourge of the Khārijite dissenters (d. 83), that he was concerned with falsifying traditions to encourage his soldiers against these mutineers [citing: al-Mubarrad, p. 632, 14].

The judgement by al-Mubarrad (d. 286 AH) on al-Muhallab (d. either 82 or 83 AH) is unique to him, with no one else in concurrence, before or since. He made his judgement about 200 years after the death of al-Muhallab, and was not resolute in this judgement. He said, "[Al-Muhallab] may have fabricated ḥadīth (rubbamā ṣana‘a al-ḥadīth)." Here is the original text and translation:

"قال أبو العباس [المرد]: "فكان المهلب فيما صنع الحديث ليشد به من أمر المسلمين ويفضع من أمر الخوارج.""

Abū al-‘Abbās [al-Mubarrad] said, “Al-Muhallab may have fabricated ḥadīth in order to strengthen the Muslims’ case and weaken the Khārijites’ case.”

Thus Goldziher goes too far in stating definitively that al-Muhallab was concerned with falsifying ḥadīths. Other than the less than positive statement of al-Mubarrad, there is no other evidence; none of the ḥadīths in question have been identified, and al-Mubarrad himself does not mention any of them in his book al-Kāmil fi al-lughah. Al-Mubarrad was one of several scholars who relates al-Muhallab’s many encounters in his battle against the Khārijites. Despite this, we do not find a single instance in the accounts of these campaigns where a ḥadīth which was fabricated by al-Muhallab is mentioned. If al-Muhallab had falsified even a single ḥadīth, it seems likely that al-Mubarrad would have been very keen to reveal it due to al-Mubarrad’s inclination towards the Khārijite position.

There is no doubt that there is some evidence that al-Muhallab may have told lies. However, the statements in question concern the state of the war and have nothing to do with the Ḥadīth. In fact, many scholars have refuted the statements of those who have branded him a liar:

A. Ibn Qutaybah says, “Al-Muhallab’s only shortcoming with people who disapproved of him were his lies ... ” However, Ibn Qutaybah also says, “I say that al-Muhallab was one of the most pious people and was far above uttering lies, but he

---

8 See also Tahdhīb, vol. 10, p. 330.
was a man of war and the Prophet said, 'War is deceit.' To this effect, al-Muhallab employed allusion in his speech to intimidate the Khârijites."

B. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr says in al-Isti‘āb, "... al-Muhallab is a trustworthy person. There is no harm in him (laysa bihi ba‘s). As for those who blamed him for being a liar, we do not see any reason why they should do so. This is because a man of war like him was bound to use tricks and allusion. Those who do not know the truth about those tricks would consider them to be lies." 

C. Al-Zamakhsharî says in al-Mustaqṣâ, "Despite his lies he used to scatter the scalps of every liar and was very firm in rebuking and discrediting them."

D. Al-‘Abdari says in Timthāl al-anthāl, "Look at those who branded him a liar; they were either a group of his own people, who did so out of envy and hatred, or were Khârijites who, if they had been able to brand him as something worse than that, such as being an unbeliever, would not have hesitated to do so. In fact, the Khârijites think of al-Muhallab and all Muslims as unbelievers. If I intended to elaborate on what the scholars have stated regarding the refutation of, and apology

---

9 Ma‘ârif, p. 225.
10 See Bukhârî, k. al-Jihād, ba. no. 157, h. no. 3030. Also, al-Bukhârî narrated a hadîth as evidence that telling lies in war is permissible. See k. al-Jihād, bā. no. 158: telling lies in the war (al-kadhib fi al-barb), h. no. 3031. Moreover, al-Mubarrad presented three hadîths as evidence to confirm that telling lies in war is permissible. See Mubarrad, vol. 3, p. 318.
11 Ma‘ârif, p. 225.
12 Isti‘āb, vol. 4, p. 1692, no. 3046.
13 Mustaqṣâ, vol. 1, 291, no. 1246.
for, this matter [e.g. branding al-Muhallab as a liar] I could have given you a clear picture."\(^{14}\)

E. Ibn Ḥajar says, “He was an expert in war. Therefore, his enemies used to accuse him of being a liar.”\(^{15}\)

Thus, al-Muhallab was not accused of falsifying and inventing ḥadīths. None of the scholars of al-jarḥ wa al-taḍīl accuse him of doing so, and al-Mubarrad was certainly not a scholar in that field. On the contrary, as we have just seen, Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Ibn Ḥajar, and others such as Ibn Ḥibbān,\(^{16}\) state that al-Muhallab was a trustworthy and reliable authority.

There is also the possibility that al-Mubarrad may have employed the term ḥadīth, not in its technical sense, but in the general meaning of his ‘conversation or discussions.’\(^{17}\) In view of this, the fact that no ḥadīth in the technical sense are

---

\(^{14}\) Timthāl, vol. 1, p. 256.
\(^{15}\) Taqrib, vol. 2, p. 280, no. 1424.
\(^{17}\) See the above original text. What further confirms this view is that al-Mubarrad, just before what he said about al-Muhallab, presented three ḥadīths as evidence to confirm that telling lies in a state of war is permissible:

1. "Кто ввел ложь в дело, в этом не виноват, воин.
2. "Его слова тем более, что он есть тот, кто ввел ложь в дело.
3. "Как вы думаете, что будет в случае, если он ввел ложь в дело?"

- وقال عليه السلام في حرب من حربکة من حربکة من حربکة手续费.
- قال عليه السلام: "أنا الذي تدخل في حربك.
- فان كانو على المعهد فعليا بذلك. وإن كانوا قد تسبب ما بينا فان لاحقا في حربك.
- لا فاذا في أشتاق البنديلين، فدع saja

- يقتدر القوم فقالوا: "يا رسول الله، علائي والفلقة". قال: فالرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم للمسلمين: "أبشر هؤلاء المسلمين.
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mentioned would seem to indicate that Goldziher’s evidence for his assertion is weak, whether the technical meaning of *ḥadīth* is indeed meant or, as is more likely, simply his ‘discussions.’

Therefore, in *rubamā ṣana‘a al-ḥadīth* (may have invented *ḥadīth*) *ḥadīth* refers to ‘conversation’ or ‘discussion’. See Mubarrad, vol. 3, p. 318.
Goldzihcr says,

"If so much trouble was taken by authority to find theological support for such trivial ritualistic details, how much greater must have been the activity shown by the machinery of government in cases concerned with spreading among the masses traditional authority for political and dynastic interests. The greater part of the traditions invented for these purposes were probably due to official initiative and influence ... Amongst high officials of the Umayyad dynasty there are several who are accounted as muḥaddithūn; to name only Ḥaḍīṯ b. al-Walīd al-Ḥaḍramī (d. 128) and ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Khālid (d. 124) [citing: Abū al-Maḥāsin, I, p. 293, 309, cf. P. 325]. Amongst traditions which the mawla Layth b. Sa’d spread on the authority of the latter there are presumably many which were to benefit the prevailing political tendencies, because this ‘Abd al-Rahmān was for years an important official of Umayyad princes. A1-Nasāʾī’s strict criticism is lenient towards him, which might not have been the case if al-Nasāʾī had been more closely acquainted with the circumstances."18

Goldziher indicates that his theory is based on the statement of Abū al-Maḥāsin. Here, it is worth presenting and discussing this statement. Abū al-Maḥāsin, on the authority of al-Dhahabī, says:

Ibn Ma‘īn said, “He ['Abd al-Rahmān b. Khālid] used to have a book that contained two or three hundred ḥadīths narrated from al-Zuhrī. Al-Layth used to narrate those ḥadīths on the authority of 'Abd al-Rahmān.” Al-Nasā‘ī said [about 'Abd al-Rahmān], “There is no harm in him (Laysa bihi ba‘ṣ.)”¹⁹

It is clear from the previous text that the source of the ḥadīths spread by al-Layth was al-Zuhrī, and not 'Abd al-Rahmān. We have already concluded that al-Zuhrī has been falsely accused of inventing ḥadīths; in the previous chapter it was demonstrated that he did not invent Ḥadīth material in order to further the interests of the Umayyad government.²⁰ It is also noteworthy that the text does not indicate whether any of these ḥadīths were in the interests of the prevailing political tendencies. In addition, there is no evidence to suggest that the reason 'Abd al-Rahmān remained an official of the Umayyad dynasty was his role in the dissemination of such ḥadīths. In connection with this issue, it is legitimate to query Goldziher's failure to present at least one or two of the ḥadīths he refers to in order to support his theory. Since no evidence has been supplied, and furthermore no evidence has been found, Goldziher's assessment remains highly questionable.

'Abd al-Rahmān was not as important to the Umayyads as Goldziher depicted him to be when he said, “... he was for years an important official of the Umayyad princes.” In fact, his time of service did not exceed two years, seven months and five days. During the first two years he was

---

stationed as head of the Police Force in Egypt. He was chosen for this post by the ruler of Egypt, al-Walid b. Rifai‘ah (d. 117/735), who also appointed him as ruler of Egypt before his death. The caliph, Hisham b. `Abd al-Malik b. Marwan, upheld this appointment. However, ‘Abd al-Rahman did not last more than seven months and five days in his post, before he was dismissed for weak government by the caliph in 118 AH.21

With regard to al-Nasawi’s lenient criticism of ‘Abd al-Rahman, which Goldziher alleges was due to his not being closely acquainted with the circumstances in which the latter lived,22 it must be stressed that not one of the scholars of al-jarh wa al-ta‘dil had ever rejected the narrations of a specific narrator on the basis of his acceptance of a government post, though it must be admitted that some religious scholars were reluctant to accept government posts. If we go back to the books compiled by such specialist scholars, we do not find a single statement, by even the earliest scholars, which indicates that the acceptance of a government post by the narrators is a reason for the rejection of their narrations. Neither do we find any scholars, early or late, who reject ‘Abd al-Rahman’s narration and indicate his weakness. In addition, al-Nasawi is not alone in accepting his narrations: In fact, there are a number of scholars of al-jarh wa al-ta‘dil who mention him as a reliable authority in narrating Hadith. We present here some of their statements:

20 See Section 3 of Chapter 5: ‘First: A discussion of his evidence in support of his accusation of Muhammad b. Shihab al-Zuhri.’
A. Ibn Abī Ḥātim says, "My father was asked about him and he said that he was a righteous person (ṣāliḥ)." 23

B. Ibn Ḥibbān says, "He was one of the reliable old masters and authentic narrators of Egypt (min athbāt ahl Miṣr wa qudamā' mashāyikhiḥa wa mutqinī ahlihā)." 24

C. Al-Dāraquṭnī credits him as a reliable authority (thiqah). 25

D. Al-ʿIjlī credits him as a reliable authority (thiqah). 26

E. Al-Dhuḥali states that he was a reliable authority (thabt). 27

F. Abū Saʿīd b. Yūnus states that, "He was a reliable authority in the narration of the Ḥadīth (kān thabtan fi al-Ḥadīth)." 28

22 Goldziher meant because ʿAbd al-Rahmān had accepted a government post.
23 Ḥātim, vol. 5, p. 229, no. 1083.
24 Mashāhīr, p. 301, no. 1521.
25 Tahdīh, vol. 6, p. 166.
26 Ibid.
27 Ibid.
28 Kamāl 2, vol. 17, p. 76, no. 3805.
SHAHR IBN ḤAWSHAB

Goldziher says:

"Amongst high officials of the Umayyad dynasty there are several who are accounted as *muḥaddithūn*; to name only Ḥafṣ b. al-Walīd al-Ḥaḍramī (d. 128) and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Khālid (d. 124). Amongst traditions which the *mawla* Layth b. Saʿd spread on the authority of the latter there are presumably many which were to benefit the prevailing political tendencies, because this ʿAbd al-Raḥmān was for years an important official of Umayyad princes. Al-Nasāʾīʾs strict criticism is lenient towards him, which might not have been the case if al-Nasāʾī had been more closely acquainted with the circumstances. This fact is curiously illuminated by an unintentional, and naive, saying of Ibn ʿAwn (d. 151) This refers to Shahr b. Hawshab (whose date of death is uncertain; either 98 or 112); he was considered unreliable in his communications because he had accepted a government post [citing: In al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 117]. This view is telling evidence that tendentious traditions were smuggled in through official initiative."

He adds in the footnote that

"ʿAlḥmad b. Ḥanbal considers Shahr as not worthy of consideration, al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 16."

He continues:

"Later the real understanding for this phenomenon was lost and al-Bukhārī declared Shahr to be worthy of credit since nothing bad was known about his character."

In the footnote he says:

30 Ibid., footnote no. 5.
31 Ibid., p. 52.
“We find Shahr as an authority in innumerable hadiths,” e.g. al-Tirmidhi, I, p. 327, 352; II, pp. 11, 81, 88, 97, 210, 244, 260, 267, etc.\textsuperscript{32}

He continues:

“People who were nearer to the conditions of the time could judge things differently, like Ibn ‘Awn who lived but a few decades after Shahr and perhaps had proof that theologians in official position were used - or were willing, without outward pressure, because of their interest in the prevailing power - to put into circulation tendentious traditions.”\textsuperscript{33}

In order to support his assumption that those more contemporary to the narrators necessarily judged them differently to those of later periods, Goldziher cites evidence for a change in the judgement made on Shahr b. Hawshab, who, from being considered an unreliable authority, came to be seen as reliable. Before we embark on a discussion of this assumption, we present the text on which Goldziher bases his case:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Al-Tirmidhi says, “Muḥammad b. Ismā‘îl [al-Bukhārī] said, ‘Shahr was a man of good hadith (kān ḥasan al-hadīth),’ and [al-Bukhārī] considered his position strong. He then said that, ‘Ibn ‘Awn was concerned about him (takallam fīhi Ibn ‘Awn) and then later narrated from Hilāl b. Abī Zaynab on the authority of Shahr b. Hawshab.’ Abū Dāwūd al-Masāḥifī, Balkhī, related from al-Nāḍr b. Shumayl that Ibn ‘Awn said, ‘inna Shahrain tarākūhu.’ Abū Dāwūd said that al-}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., footnote no. 6.

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., pp. 52-3.
Nadr said, ‘tarakūhu (they had left him) means tā' anūfīhi (they discredited him).’ [Abū Dāwūd al-Mašāhifi commented], ‘They discredited him because he held a government post (innamā tā' anūfīhi li’annahu waliya amra al-sultān).’

From the previous text the following should be noted:

A. Al-Bukhārī was fully aware of Ibn ‘Awn’s discrediting of Shahr despite the fact that he accepted his Hadīth. Perhaps Goldziher did not notice that the individual referred to as Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl is al-Bukhārī himself. Various other scholars who gave credit to Shahr were also aware of Ibn ‘Awn’s discrediting of Shahr. Such scholars mention that they knew what was said about Shahr in their assessments, for example:

1. Ya'qūb b. Shaybah (d. 262/875) said, “He was a reliable authority, even though some people discredited him.”

2. Ya'qūb b. Sufyān (d. 277/890) said, “Despite Ibn ‘Awn saying that Shahr was discredited, he still remains a reliable authority.”

Thus, when they gave credit to Shahr b. Ḥawshab, al-Bukhārī (d. 256/869) and other scholars were fully aware that some scholars had discredited him, however they chose not to accept their judgement. Therefore, it is difficult to accept Goldziher’s saying that, “Later the real understanding for this phenomenon was lost.”

In fact, contrary to Goldziher’s assumption, many scholars continued to brand Shahr

---

34 Tirmidhī, k. al-Ist’dān wa al-ādāb, bā. no. 9, ḥ. no. 2697.
36 Ibid.
as a weak authority and reject his narrations at the time of al-Bukhārī and afterwards.

Here are some of their judgements on Shahr b. Ḥawshab:

1. Müsā b. Hārūn (d. 224/838) said, "He was a weak authority (ḍaʿīf)."

2. Ibn Saʿd (d. 230/844) says, "He was a weak authority in Ḥadīth (kān ḍaʿīf an fī al-Ḥadīth)."

3. Ibn Qutaybah (d. 276/889) says, "He was a weak authority in Ḥadīth (kān ḍaʿīf an fī al-Ḥadīth)."

4. Al-Nasāʿī (d. 303/915) says, "Shahr b. Ḥawshab was not that strong in [the narration of] Ḥadīth (Shahr b. Ḥawshab layṣa bi-l-qawī)."

5. Ibn Abī Ḥātim (d. 327/938) says, "His Ḥadīth can not be taken as an authoritative source (lā yuṭajju bi-hadnhihi)."

6. Ibn ʿAdī (d. 365/975) says, "He was not strong in [the narration of] Ḥadīth, he was among those whose Ḥadīth can not be taken as [coming from] an authoritative source (layṣa bi-l-qawī fī al-Ḥadīth, wa huwa mimman lā yuṭajj bi-ḥadīthihi)."

7. Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1063) says, "He was a man of disreputable character (sāqid)."

8. Al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1065) said, "He was a weak authority (ḍaʿīf)."

---

37 Kamāl 2, vol. 12, pp. 578f.
40 Nasāʿī Ḍ, p. 393, no. 294.
41 Ḥātim, vol. 4, p. 382.
B. The statement: “They discredited him because he [Shahr b. Ḥawshab d. 100/718] held a government post (innamā fa‘anūfīhi li‘annahu waliya amr al-sultan),” was not made by Ibn ‘Awn (d. 150/767), as Goldziher maintains, but probably by Abū Dāwūd al-Masāḥifi, who was a later scholar, dying in 238/852. With regards to the text which Goldziher has used, there is a possibility that the author was al-Naḍr b. Shumayl d. 203/818. However, in all other references to al-Naḍr’s explanation of tarakūhu no mention is made of this, and furthermore, none of the scholars of al-jarḥ wa al-ta‘dīl offer this explanation. It is interesting that we do not find any other scholar mentioning that Shahr b. Ḥawshab held a government post, and even if he had held one, we have already demonstrated that the acceptance of a government post is not usually considered one of the reasons for the rejection of a narrator.

C. Ibn ‘Awn did not abandon Shahr as an authority because the latter had accepted a government post. All that he said was, “They had left Shahr (inna Shahrān tarakūhu).” When Mu‘ādh b. Mu‘ādh al-‘Anbarī asked Ibn ‘Awn about Shahr’s

44 Tahdīḥ, vol. 4, p. 372.
45 See:
(iii) Kamāl 2, vol. 12, p. 578.
(iv) Tahdīḥ, vol. 4, p. 370.
(vii) Nubalā‘, vol. 4, p. 374.
(viii) Ma‘ārif, p. 254.
46 See above, p. 321.
Hadith, he said, “Shu‘bah had left Shahr (inna Shu‘bah qad taraka Shahran).”\(^{47}\)

Therefore, Ibn ‘Awn was simply following Shu‘bah in his judgement, while Shu‘bah himself declares clearly why in fact he had left Shahr. He said, “I met Shahr but I did not consider him to be an authoritative source (laqad laq[i] Shahr fā-lam a’tadda bihi).”\(^{48}\) If Shu‘bah rejected him because he held a government post, he is unlikely, if he regarded this as sufficient grounds for rejecting his Hadith, to have bothered to meet him at all for the purposes of listening to his narrations. This suggests that the reason for his rejection of Shahr’s Hadith was not his holding of a government post. Thus, it is difficult to accept Goldziher’s statement regarding Ibn ‘Awn: “Perhaps [he] had proof that theologians in official position were used – or were willing, without outward pressure, because of their interest in the prevailing power – to put into circulation tendentious traditions.”

With regard to al-Tirmidhi’s acceptance of the Hadiths narrated by Shahr, as indicated by Goldziher,\(^{49}\) this was because he asked al-Bukhārī about Shahr and the latter told him that he was a reliable authority.\(^{50}\)

---

49 Goldziher said, “We find Shahr as an authority in innumerable hadiths, e.g. al-Tirmidhi, I, p. 327, 352; II, pp. 11, 81, 88, 97, 210, 244, 260, 267, etc.”
50 Tirmidhi, k. al-Wasa'yā, ba. no. 5, ba. no. 2121:

\[\text{قال الترمذي: "رأسنت محمد بن إسحاق عن شهير بن حواشب قولته، وقال: "إني لننكمل فيكم ابن عزر.."} (Al-Tirmidhi said, “I asked Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl [al-Bukhārī] about Shahr b. Hawshab and he credited him as being reliable (fawathaqahu), he [al-Bukhārī] then said, ‘Ibn ‘Awn was concerned about him (immā yatakalamu fihi Ibn ‘Awn).”} \]
Though Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal states, “I do not bother with Shahr’s ḥadīths (lā uthāl bi-ḥadīthi Shahr),” as Goldziher states on the basis of al-Tirmidhī’s account,\(^{51}\) it is apparent that this statement from Aḥmad was not final, because he accepted Shahr’s ḥadīths that were narrated by ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd b. Bahram. Al-Tirmidhī himself indicates this,\(^{52}\) and later Aḥmad accepted his ḥadīths; the ḥadīths which he narrates on the authority of Shahr in his book al-Musnad, which amount to 194 altogether,\(^{53}\) stand as proof of this. In addition to this, it was widely known in scholastic circles that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal gave credit to Shahr, and a number of scholars confirm this:

1. Ḥarb b. Ismāʿīl al-Karmānī reports that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal said, “How good were his ḥadīths! (mā aḥsan fi-ḥadīthahu)” Al-Karmānī continues, “And [Aḥmad] accredited him (wa waththagahu).”\(^{54}\)

2. Ḥanbal b. Isḥāq, on the authority of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, says, “There is no harm in him (laysa bihi ba’ṣ).”\(^{55}\)

---

\(^{51}\) Goldziher said, “Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal considers Shahr as not worthy of consideration, al-Tirmidhī, II, p. 16” See vol. 2, p. 52, footnote no. 5.

\(^{52}\) Al-Tirmidhī, in k. al-‘Iṣṭaḥān wa al-‘ādāb, bā. no. 9, ḥ. no. 2697, said, “qāl Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal: ‘lā ba’ṣa bi-ḥadīthi ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd b. Bahram ‘an Shahr b. Ḥavshab.’”

\(^{53}\) See Musnad 3, ḥadīth no.s: 98, 1699, 2175, 2467, 2510, 2915-9, 4987, 5537, 6517, 6832, 6913, 6917, 6964, 6975, 7684, 7890-91, 7895, 7942, 7990-91, 8002, 8108, 8136, 8442, 8454, 8466, 8883, 9153, 9168-9, 9177, 9236, 9715, 9962, 9981, 10073, 10261, 10549, 10984, 11061, 11215, 11305, 11431, 11473, 12815, 15537, 15972, 16173, 16573, 16575, 16685, 16690, 16716, 16918, 17048, 17210, 17211-7, 17299, 17459, 17529, 17530-34, 17536-7, 17615-21, 18942, 18945, 20784, 20860, 20886, 20961, 20991, 20994, 21030, 21217, 21517, 21519, 21526, 21539, 21543, 21546, 21558, 21568, 21573, 21576, 21587, 21597-8, 21601, 21609, 21617, 21628, 21658, 21667, 21670, 21703, 21707, 21720, 21750, 21764, 21772, 21778-9, 21807, 21866, 21923, 22284, 22386, 22389-91, 22399, 22404, 22406, 22409, 22687, 23321, 23371, 24231, 25969, 25979-80, 26010-11, 26036, 26057, 26094, 26139, 26180, 26192, 26206, 26298, 27012, 27014, 27016-8, 27020-5, 27027-9, 27031-2, 27036, 27040-42, 27044-7, 27059-64 & 27066-7.

3. Al-Dārimī says, “I was told that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal used to praise Shahr (balaghānī anna Aḥmad kāna yuthnī ‘alā Shahr).”\textsuperscript{56}

In addition, it must be noted that Goldziher, despite his laconic remarks, fails to cite one ḥadīth from Shahr which could be described as furthering Umayyad political interests.

\textsuperscript{55} Kamīl 2, vol. 12, p. 574f.; Nubalā’; vol. 4, p. 374.
\textsuperscript{56} Kamīl 2, vol. 12, p. 578f.
CHAPTER 7

GOLDSIHER AND HIS SUCCESSORS

The Impact Of Goldziher’s Opinions On Subsequent Studies

The aim here is to present an overview of the extent of the influence of Goldziher’s opinions, rather than to discuss or criticise the opinions themselves; however, a number of issues dealt with in the present chapter have been discussed earlier and various others have been dealt with previously by scholars in this field.

In this chapter, I will compare Goldziher’s views and conclusions on the origins of Ḥadīth with those of his successors, particularly Guillaume1 and Juynboll,2 thereby indicating to what extent they accord with Goldziher’s view concerning the subject under discussion and the field of Ḥadīth studies in general. We have selected these scholars as representing Goldziher’s theories in their respective times; Guillaume in the 1920s and Juynboll in the 1980s, thus providing an example of Goldziher’s influence at both the start of the century and in recent times. Each will be discussed in a separate section:

Section 1: Guillaume and Goldziher’s theories.

Section 2: Juynboll and Goldziher’s theories.

GUILLAUME AND GOLDZIHER’S THEORIES

Goldziher’s theory with regard to the fabrication of Ḥadīth is based on an assumption of great enmity existing between the Umayyads and the pious scholars. He elaborates this enmity with various statements, all of which portray the readiness of each side to fabricate Ḥadīth, either to the detriment of the other party, or to bolster their own cause.

This theory is heavily reflected in Guillaume’s study. He devotes a complete chapter to the same issue entitled: ‘The Umayyad period.’ We are not exaggerating in our saying that what he expresses in this chapter is not more than a reiteration of Goldziher’s beliefs. Guillaume might have been expected to refer back to the original sources from which the statements were cited in order to establish their veracity; it would also have helped him to understand Goldziher’s statements correctly. However, he is content with reiterating Goldziher’s theories while adopting his understanding of many statements and his conclusions. The following are a few examples:

(1) Goldziher says:

“The Umayyad rulers and their governors – who can hardly be said to have been Islamic minded – were not the people to promote a religious
and social life corresponding to the sunna. These rulers fostered sunnas of a very different nature.\(^3\)

He continues:

"They were little concerned about the religious life of the population. As true Arabs, they paid little attention to religion either in their own conduct or in that of their subjects. If a man was seen absorbed in devout prayer in a mosque it was a pretty safe assumption that he was not a follower of the Umayyad dynasty but, for example, an ‘Alid partisan. ‘Umar II who was imbued with pious Medinian ideas and who inaugurated the real era of religion which later flourished under the sponsorship of the ‘Abbāsids, had to send emissaries into the various provinces of his empire in order to teach his people how a Muslim, and a Muslim society, should order life."\(^4\)

Guillaume also asserts the impiety of the Umayyads as incontrovertible fact, with the same notable exception:

"It can hardly be denied that the policy of the Umayyads - always with the exception of the piously brought up ‘Umar b. ‘Abdu-l-‘Azīz - was dictated by considerations of a worldly rather than a religious nature. They had practically no interest in religious law, and no great veneration for the teaching of the prophet."\(^5\)

(2) Goldziher states that pious scholars invented hadīths in order to disseminate their own teachings:

"Thus there arise new people to relate sayings ascribed to the Prophet, but some new things also came into being. Anything which appears desirable to pious men was given by them a corroborating support reaching back to the Prophet. This could easily be done in a generation in which the Companions, who were represented as the intermediaries of the Prophet’s words, were no longer alive. The fact, that by disseminating these teachings they thought they were working against the godless tendency of the time, quietened the conscience of the pious inventors of traditions, who related their own teachings and those of their immediate teachers back to the authority of the Master who was for all, including even the lax, an undisputable source of law."\(^6\)

---

\(^3\) Goldziher, vol. 2, p. 38.
\(^4\) Ibid., pp. 38-9.
\(^5\) Guillaume, p. 41.
Guillaume, though he does not attempt a psychological analysis of pious in the manner of Goldziher, says the same, namely, that the pious put their teachings in ḥadīth form to lend them authority:

"During a long period of suppression the pious had to endeavour to form the religious life of the community. They had no official position under the government - with few exceptions - and the prophet's position as the seal of the prophets and the revealer of the will of God for all time effectually shut the door to any fresh revelation. Thus those who desired to secure universal recognition of their dogmas must perforce cast them into a form which would be regarded as authoritative by the community. There was only one way of doing this, namely, to throw the teaching it was desired to inculcate into the form of a hadith with an isnād reaching back to the prophet."

(3) Goldziher says:

"Pious people of Sa'īd's kind frowned at the state of affairs under such rule; they decried the tyrannical government, defied it by passive resistance and even showed their dissatisfaction openly, occasionally going so far as to refuse homage. In return they were hated and despised by the ruling circles. It is sufficient to consider the way in which al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf deals with Anas b. Mālik; he rebukes him like a criminal and threatens 'to grind him as millstones would grind and to make him a target for arrows.'"

Guillaume is in precise accord with Goldziher here regarding the persecution of the pious and the role of al-Ḥajjāj:

"As sincere Muslims they risked their lives by refusing to do homage to the Umayyads; and it required the ferocity of the notorious Al Ḥajjāj to compel them to yield even lip service to his masters so deeply were their religious sentiments outraged."

---

7 Guillaume, p. 52.
9 Guillaume, p. 42.
(4) Goldziher is of the view that fabricated hadīths in praise of the Prophet’s family constituted, by implication, an attack on the Umayyads:

“Since the pious opponents of the dynasty looked upon the ‘Alid pretenders as the chosen saviours of the empire, a large part of these falsifications was dedicated to the praise of the Prophet’s family without being a direct attack upon the Umayyads. But nobody could be so simple as not to recognize the negative implications.”

Guillaume asserts precisely that they represent a veiled attack on the Umayyads:

“We may detect covert attacks on the Umayyad dynasty in the numerous hadith which extol the merits of the prophet’s family, whose representatives were, of course, the house of Ali.”

(5) Goldziher also assumes that the Umayyad government, from its early days, played a significant role in the invention and dissemination of fabricated hadīths in order to serve its own purposes and to consolidate its political stance against the opposition parties. He says:

“This must not lead us to believe that during this period theologians in opposition were alone at work on the tradition. The ruling power itself was not idle. If it wished an opinion to be generally recognized and the opposition of pious circles silenced, it too had to know how to discover a hadīth to suit its purpose. They had to do what their opponents did: invent, or have invented, hadīths in their turn. And that is in effect what they did. A number of facts are available to show that the impetus to these inventions and falsifications often came from the highest government circles; and if it is realized that even among the most pious of theologians there were willing tools to further their invention, it is not surprising that, among the hotly debated controversial issues of Islam, whether political or doctrinal, there is none in which the champions of the various views are unable to cite a number of traditions, all equipped with imposing isnāds.”

He continues:

---

11 Guillaume, p. 44.
“Official influence on the invention, dissemination and suppression of traditions started very early. An instruction given to his obedient governor al-Mughirah by Mu‘awiyyah I is in the spirit of the Umayyads: ‘Do not tire of abusing and insulting ‘Ali and calling for God’s mercifulness for ‘Uthman, defaming the companions of ‘Ali, removing them and omitting to listen to them (i.e. to what they tell and propagate as hadīths); praising, in contrast, the clan of ‘Uthman, drawing them near to you and listening to them’ [citing: al-Tabari, II, p. 112]. This is an official encouragement to foster the rise and spread of hadīths directed against ‘Ali and to hold back and suppress hadīths favouring ‘Ali.”

He also states:

“When the Umayyad caliph ‘Abd al-Mālik wished to stop the Pilgrimage to Mecca because he was worried lest his rival ‘Abd Allah b. al-Zubayr should force the Syrians journeying to the holy places in Hijāz to pay him homage, he had recourse to the expedient of the doctrine of the vicarious ḥajj to the Qubbat al-sakhra in Jerusalem. He decreed that the obligatory circumambulation (tawwāf) could take place at the sacred place in Jerusalem with the same validity as that around the Ka‘ba ordained in Islamic Law. The pious theologian al-Zuhri was given the task of justifying this politically motivated reform of religious life by making up and spreading a saying traced back to the Prophet, according to which there are three mosques to which people may make pilgrimages: those in Mecca, Madina and Jerusalem.”

In the footnote, he says:


Guillaume paraphrases Goldziher’s assertions regarding the readiness of each side to fabricate Ḥadīth; either to the detriment of the other party, or to bolster their own cause. He uses exactly the same evidence in support, namely that a ḥadīth was invented by al-Zuhri that sanctified the pilgrimage to Jerusalem as a valid ḥajj out of political expediency, and other evidence cited from al-Ṭabarī:

---

13 Ibid., p. 44.
"The reigning house could not afford to leave their opponents with the sole right of collecting and promulgating hadith: in fact, Tabari states that Mu'tawiya I ordered that all hadith favourable to the house of 'Ali should be suppressed, and the glories of the family of 'Uthman be extolled in hadith. The Umayyad hand is perhaps most clearly seen in the traditions which were forged to emphasize the sanctity of Jerusalem vis-a-vis Mecca and Medina. While his rival 'Abd Allâh b. Zubair was in possession of the holy places, and could bring pressure to bear upon the pilgrims who resorted thither, and seduce them from their allegiance to the northern house, the problem which confronted 'Abdu-1-Malik in Syria was not unlike that of Jeroboam the son of Nebat in those regions; nor was his countermove issimilar. Whereas Jeroboam provided within his own territory sanctuaries for the veneration of his subjects, 'Abdu-1-Malik hit upon the expedient of enjoining a pilgrimage to the mosque he built in Jerusalem instead of the orthodox journey to Mecca and Medina. All that was necessary was to declare that a circumambulation of the holy place at Jerusalem possessed the same validity as that enjoined at Mecca and to procure for his assertion a confirmatory hadith with an isnâd going back to the prophet himself. 'Journey only to three mosques, Al Masjidu-Harâm, the mosque of the Prophet, and the mosque of Jerusalem,' is the form this tendentious hadith takes in Al Bukhâri. The inventor is Al Zuhri, who fathers it on Abû Huraira."16

(6) Goldziher says:

"The Umayyads and their political followers had no scruples in promoting tendentious lies in a sacred religious form, and they were only concerned to find pious authorities who would be prepared to cover such falsifications with their undoubted authority."17

Elsewhere, he refers to:

"How the Umayyads made it their business to put into circulation hadîths which seemed to them desirable, and how people of the type of the pious al-Zuhri acquiesced in being their tools."18

He continues:

"The Ma'mar just mentioned preserved a characteristic saying by al-Zuhri: 'These emirs forced people to write hadîths (akrâhanâ 'alayhi

---

14 Ibid., pp. 44-5.
15 Ibid., p. 45, footnote no. 7.
16 Guillaume, pp. 47-8. Hitti follows the same line and accepts the view that the aim was to divert the pilgrimage from Makkah to Jerusalem. See above, Chapter 5, footnote no. 14.
17 Goldziher, vol. 2, p. 44.
18 Ibid., p. 46.
This account can only be understood on the assumption of al-Zuhri's willingness to lend his name, which was in general esteemed by the Muslim community, to the government's wishes.\textsuperscript{19}

Guillaume again cites the same argument supported with the same evidence as cited by Goldziher:

"If any external proof were needed of the forgery of tradition in the Umayyad period, it may be found in the express statement of Al Zuhri: 'These princes have compelled us to write hadith.' Undoubtedly the hadith exalting the merit of the pilgrimage to the qubbatu-l-Sakhra at Jerusalem is a survival of the traditions Al Zuhri composed."\textsuperscript{20}

We might mention in passing that James Robson\textsuperscript{21} follows roughly the same line as his predecessors and tends to accept this view without verifying their claims. He says:

"There can be no doubt that such traditions have been fabricated to support particular points of view. Al-Zuhri is said to have accused the Umayyads of compelling people to forge traditions, a statement which may possibly be quite true."\textsuperscript{22}

Due to his familiarity with the Arabic sources, Robson might have been expected to refer to the original source from which this statement is cited. However, he is content with quoting his predecessor, Guillaume, adopting his comprehension of such a statement, and is moreover inclined to accept its genuineness. In consulting the original sources, one discovers that there is no connection whatsoever between the statement of al-Zuhri and the forgery of hadiths, as has been shown above (see Chapter 5, pp. 295-96).

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., p. 47.
\textsuperscript{20} Guillaume, p. 50.
\textsuperscript{21} For an extensive criticism of Robson's studies see "Hadith and Its Principles in the Early Days of Islam, A Critical Study of a Western Approach," by Beyanouni.
Another area where Robson has reiterated the claims of his predecessors without verifying them is the association of many *hadīths*, particularly those that represent the Prophet as performing miracles, with the influence that Biblical stories had on some Muslims, and the specification of certain Biblical statements as a source of others, on the grounds that these *hadīths* express something to the same or similar effect to what is in the Bible. He states:

"While it is important to be careful about ascribing to New Testament sources everything that is reminiscent of the New Testament, there is no question that many traditions have no other sources."\(^23\)

He continues:

"It should be added that Tradition is also in debt to the Old Testament. Indeed, Goldziher has pointed out that not only the Old Testament, but anything which seemed worth while was turned into tradition."\(^24\)

It is noteworthy that Goldziher makes a long excursus under the heading: 'The Hadīth and the New Testament.'\(^25\) Guillaume also devoted a complete chapter to the same issue under the title of *Borrowing from Christian documents and tradition.*\(^26\)
This influence also accounts for the justification put forward by Robson concerning the invention of accounts that represent the Prophet as a miracle-maker. He says:

"It may be that stories of this kind developed as a result of contact with Christians, and out of desire to show that Muhammad was not inferior to Jesus in the performance of miracles." 27

This is almost the same idea as that suggested by Goldziher, who says:

"An unconscious tendency prevailed to draw a picture of Muhammed that should not be inferior to the Christian picture of Jesus." 28

The only difference between Robson and his predecessors is that when he deals with this issue, he expresses his uncertainty by qualifying his opinion, using the words: "may be," while his predecessors were more confident in their decisions.

(7) Goldziher is of the opinion that it was the ruling elite that were chiefly responsible for fabrication:

"The greater part of the traditions invented for these purposes were probably due to official initiative and influence. It is expressly reported of the great general al-Muhallab, the scourge of the Kharijite dissenters (d. 83), that he was concerned with falsifying traditions to encourage his soldiers against these mutineers. Amongst high officials of the Umayyad dynasty there are several who are accounted as muhaddithūn; to name only Ḥafṣ b. al-Walīd al-Ḥaḍramī (d. 128) and ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Khālid (d. 124). Amongst traditions which the mawla Layth b. Saʿd spread on the authority of the latter there are presumably many which were to benefit the prevailing political tendencies, because this ʿAbd al-Rahmān was for years an important official of Umayyad princes. Al-Nasāʾī’s strict criticism is lenient towards him, which might not have been the case if al-Nasāʾī had been more closely acquainted with the circumstances. This fact is curiously illuminated by an unintentional, and naive, saying of Ibn ʿAwn (d. 151). This refers to Shahr b. Ḥawshab (whose date of death is uncertain; either 98 or 112); he was considered unreliable in his communications because he had accepted a government post. This view is telling evidence that

tendentious traditions were smuggled in through official initiative. Later the real understanding for this phenomenon was lost and al-Bukhārī declared Shahr to be worthy of credit since nothing bad was known about his character. People who were nearer to the conditions of the time could judge things differently, like Ibn ʿAwn who lived but a few decades after Shahr and perhaps had proof that theologians in official position were used - or were willing, without outward pressure, because of their interest in the prevailing power - to put into circulation tendentious traditions. 29

Guillaume echoes Goldziher's opinion that so tendentious was the Umayyad regime, that the holding of a government post itself was cause for extreme suspicion, and again cites the same evidence as his forerunner:

"Ibn ʿAun, who died in the middle of the second century, refuses to credit traditions resting on the authority of Shahr b. Haushab because he had held office under the government. It is difficult to imagine a more telling accusation. Al Bukhārī a century later feels no compunction in including traditions in Shahr's name in the category of 'genuine', presumably because he knew little or nothing about the circumstances of the time in which Shahr lived, nor the pressure that was brought to bear upon him. And it is to be remembered that Shahr is by no means the only Muḥaddith whose name appears both in the canonical collections of tradition and in the roll of Umayyad state officials." 30

(8) Goldziher believes that the Umayyads endeavoured to achieve an effect at least outwardly corresponding to their position as rulers. Therefore, the first Umayyads introduced various alterations in the ceremony of the khutbah and its staging in such a way as to divest it of its ancient democratic character. 31 He says:

"For prestige reasons the caliph was now to give one khutba seated. That this meant a change of the rite of the khutbah is often confirmed by the historians. But this seems to have aroused the disapproval of pious people faithful to the sunna and an official theologian had to be found in order to instruct them: Rajā’ b. Ḥaywah (d. II2), otherwise praised as a pious authority, who was considered a sort of adviser in matters of conscience in the court of several Umayyad rulers, asserted that one of the

30 Guillaume, p. 50.
old caliphs, 'Uthmān, upon whom the legitimacy of the dynasty was, as is well
known, founded, also used to stand during the first khutba but delivered the second
seated. These circles said even of 'Alī that he delivered the khutba seated. It is,
however, interesting to observe that the significance of this account was already
obliterated by the third century, when the victory of the sunna had rendered the
stoutly independent attitude of the old Arab rulers no longer comprehensible, and
that even al-Jāḥiṣ is only capable of giving a very naive explanation [citing: Bayān,
fol. 20a, [i, 118]: yurūlu biqawlihi gā'idan khutbat al-nikāḥ; here it is related on the
authority of al-Hāfiz b. 'Adī that the khutba was never given seated]. How far
reaching were the falsifications inspired by the Umayyads in the interests of the
privileges claimed by them is evident from the fact that they not only cited 'Uthmān,
but even the Prophet as their examples, and that opponents of these falsifications
make Jābir b. Samura, a Companion of the Prophet, conclude his description with the
words: 'He who tells you that the Prophet delivered the khutba sitting is a liar.'

Guillaume, like Goldziher, discussed the example of the permissibility of sitting
down during the khutbah and ascribed the contents of later writings on the matter to
historical ignorance:

"It has been recorded as a heinous offence that the Caliph Mu‘āwiya sat
down to pronounce the Khutba (solemn oration); yet this posture while
giving public direction was common in the pre-Muhammadan era (jahiliyya), and Muhammad is said in the canonical traditions to have sat
down in the pulpit (minbar) while addressing the faithful. It is
undoubtedly due to later writers’ ignorance of the practice of antiquity
that they explain the references to 'Uthmān sitting in the minbar during
the Khutba to betrothals (khutbatu-l-nikāḥ)."

(9) In addition to the above Goldziher believes that theologians in official positions
were used, or were willing, without external pressure because of their support for the
prevailing power, to put into circulation fabricated traditions. He says:

"People who were nearer to the conditions of the time could judge things
differently, like Ibn ‘Awn who lived but a few decades after Shahr and
perhaps had proof that theologians in official position were used - or
were willing, without outward pressure, because of their interest in the
prevailing power - to put into circulation tendentious traditions."
And he also says:

"Pious sayings were meant to break down the resistance of the pious and to disarm them."35

Guillaume makes the same assertion that is found at the core of Goldziher’s argument, namely that the pious were responsible for fabricating hadiths out of political expediency:

"These were the men who by lending themselves to the government as instruments in the promulgation of hadith favourable to the powers that be did so much to keep down the rising tide of disaffection."36

35 Ibid., p. 49.
36 Guillaume, p. 45.
Like other modern Western writers on the subject of Ḥadīth, Juynboll demonstrates that he has been influenced considerably by his predecessors, namely Goldziher and Schacht, despite the fact that in the introduction to his book, Muslim Tradition, Juynboll declares that, in formulating his ideas regarding the origins of Ḥadīth, he has not exposed himself to the influences of his predecessors, and has done his research, as he says: “without constantly comparing my findings with those of either Oriental or Western scholars until after it was all over.” This influence can be seen in his consideration of a number of matters; the following are a few examples:

(1) Goldziher’s broad conception of the transmission of Ḥadīth is as follows:

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

---

37 For an extensive criticism of G. H. A. Juynboll’s theories see “The Origins of Ḥadīth: A Critical Appraisal of a Western Approach to the Subject,” by JarAllah.
38 Juynboll, p. 1.
material of the ḥadīth, which vastly increased during subsequent generations because of factors which will be described in the following chapters.

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

The ḥadīth will not serve as a document for the history of the infancy of Islam, but rather as a reflection of the tendencies which appeared in the community during the maturer stages of its development.”

Juynboll, like Goldziher, considers Ḥadīth transmission in general to be a result of the activity of various social and historical elements which led to what was to become the Ḥadīth literature. He says:

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

He adds:

“We have seen that the need for traditions traced all the way back to Muḥammad only began to be emphasized under ‘Umar II (reigned 99-101/717-20) and that only as a consequence of this emphasis what was known as reports containing the personal opinions of Companions or Successors became ‘raised to the level’ of a prophetic saying, no doubt in order to lend them more prestige. It is therefore impossible to dismiss the assumption that any ‘prophetic’ tradition from a canonical collection may

---

40 Juynboll, p. 71.
have started life as the personal opinion of a Companion or a later authority..."\(^{41}\)

'The earliest stages of *ḥadīth* transmission,' as conceived by Juynboll are described thus:

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

Parallel with this phenomenon we find *fuqahā‘* and also *ulamā‘*, the former formulating their own ideas about how life should be approached in the light of the new religion, the latter mainly pointing to formulations of this sort arrived at by others."\(^{42}\)

He goes on,

"The activities of *fuqahā‘* and *ulamā‘* also developed into what later came to be called *ḥadīth* transmission."\(^{43}\)

(2) It can not be coincidence that the two *mutawātir* *ḥadīths* - the *niyāḥah* *ḥadīth* and the *man kadhaba* *ḥadīth* - that are cited by Juynboll in support of his assertion that *tawātir* itself, "... is no guarantee for the historicity of a *ḥadīth*’s ascription to the prophet," were the same two that Goldziher points to as alleged forgeries that were fabricated in Iraq.\(^{44}\)

---

\(^{41}\) Ibid., p. 72.

\(^{42}\) Ibid., p. 74.

\(^{43}\) Ibid., p. 74.

\(^{44}\) For the *niyāḥah* *ḥadīth* see: Goldziher, vol. 1, p. 229 and for the *man kadhaba* *ḥadīth* see p. 127; see also Juynboll, p. 96f.
(3) The work of the quṣṣāṣ, consisting of a combination of faḍā’il wa mathāḥīb and tarḥīb wa ταγρηθ is considered to constitute the material preceding the transmission of Ḥadīth by Juynboll:

"The awā’il evidence collected here converges, I think, on one conclusion, that is that the earliest origins of standardized Ḥadīth cannot be traced back earlier than, at most, to the seventies or eighties of the first century. What had preceded this was, as we have seen above, still unstructured and still unstandardized material of edifying contents (quṣṣāṣ, tarḥīb wa-targhīb) or with a political slant (faḍā’il mathāḥīb)."\(^{43}\)

Ḥalīl wa ʿUlūm is thought to have been dealt with some time later:

"The likelihood that these qīṣṣas will have comprised also the genre of Ḥalīl wa-ʿUlūm is slight in view of the fact that legal thinking on the basis of individual judgement as well as precedent in Islam is a development of somewhat later times, as I shall try to show below."\(^{46}\)

Goldziher had reached very much the same conclusion before Juynboll, as is evident from his description of the circumstances that prevailed under the Abbāsids:

"The public recognition and stimulation of conduct corresponding to the sunna both in private life and in public administration and law was naturally accompanied by a freer development of the study of the traditions of the Prophet than was possible under the Umayyads. At that period such research was, so to speak, only in a latent state and was hardly in touch with everyday life. Only now was there an investigation on a large scale of the Ḥalīl wa-ʿUlūm, the allowed and forbidden, of the ritual and legal ordinances. An attempt was made to produce documents carrying the Prophet’s signature for all the details of the relations of religious and social life. Previously this had not been done to such an extent. Considering that Mālik b. Anas in the middle of the second century was able to produce only 600 sayings of the Prophet relating to legal life, it becomes evident how little was done in this direction under the Umayyads. It seems that the activities of the party of the pious were mainly concerned with the cultivation and production of moral and ascetic teachings as well as those sayings which stood in some relation to the political situation, their views about it, and their hope for a speedy overthrow of the existing godless circumstances. At least it appears as if

\(^{43}\) Juynboll, p. 23.

\(^{46}\) Ibid., p. 12.
sayings of this kind, more than legal traditions, were the ones to have penetrated to wider circles of the people."\(^{47}\)

(4) Goldziher states unequivocally that few reservations were held about the extension of the chain of transmission of a tradition, which in reality originated from a Companion or Successor, back to the Prophet himself:

"A phenomenon particularly worthy of notice shows how light-heartedly moral sayings which were not his were ascribed to Prophet. It is not at all rare in the literature of traditions that sayings are ascribed to the Prophet which for a long time circulated in Islam under the authority of another name. So-called \(\text{\textit{aḥālīḥ mawqūfū}}\), i.e. sayings traced back to companions or even successors, were very easily transformed into \(\text{\textit{aḥālīḥ marfū′u}}\), i.e. sayings traced back to the Prophet, by simply adding without much scruple a few names at random which were necessary to complete the chain. This was also often practised in the field of legal traditions."\(^{48}\)

Likewise, Juynboll holds that the \(\text{\textit{Hudūh}}\) originated in the opinions and sayings of the early \(\text{\textit{fuqahā′}}\) and \(\text{\textit{ulamā′}}\) which were then raised to the level of Prophetic sayings:

"\(\text{\textit{Hudūh wa-ṭurūm}}\), if any, must have been extremely limited in scope and were mainly the products of individual judgement on the part of the first legal minds Islam produced; later these juridical opinions seem to have been remoulded into \(\text{\textit{Hudūh}}\) going back to the prophet."\(^{49}\)

He adds:

"... it is more than likely that the bulk of traditions in the transmission of which these early \(\text{\textit{fuqahā′}}\) were supposedly instrumental started life as legal opinions of these \(\text{\textit{fuqahā′}}\) themselves who merely expressed their own personal judgement. These opinions or legal advices were in the course of time ‘raised to the level’ (in Arabic: \(\text{\textit{marfū′}}\)) of prophetic sayings, when the emphasis on the concept \(\text{\textit{sumat an-nabī}}\) had eclipsed \(\text{\textit{suman}}\) of Companions and Successors."\(^{50}\)

\(^{47}\) Goldziher, vol. 2, pp. 76-7. See, for Goldziher’s view on the \(\text{\textit{qussāf}}\) and their material, p. 151f.

\(^{48}\) Ibid., p. 148.

\(^{49}\) Juynboll, p. 17.

\(^{50}\) Ibid., p. 42.
We might mention in passing that Schacht goes further and asserts that in fact traditions from the Successors were the 'starting point', and that later these were projected back to the Companions then to the Prophet:

"In the course of polemical discussion, doctrines are frequently projected back to higher authorities: traditions from Successors become traditions from Companions, and traditions from Companions become traditions from the Prophet. Whenever we find, as frequently happens, alleged opinions of Successors, alleged decisions of the Companions, and alleged traditions from the Prophet side by side, we must, as a rule and until the contrary is proved, consider the opinions of the Successors as the starting-point, and the traditions from the Companions and from the Prophet as secondary developments, intended to provide a higher authority for the doctrine in question. When the opinion of a Successor coincides with a tradition, it would be unwarrantable to conclude, in the absence of an explicit reference or some other positive indication, that he knew and followed it."

In summation of his stance with regards to legal maxims he says:

"... as a rule they are earlier than traditions, and they gradually take on the form of traditions. They date, generally speaking, from the time of the first primitive systematization of Muhammadan law in the first half of the second century A.H., but often represent a secondary stage of doctrine and practice."

He goes on:

"The legal maxims reflect a stage when legal doctrine was not yet automatically put into the form of traditions." "I do not exclude the possibility that some legal maxims may be older than the second century A.H., or may even go back to the pre-Islamic period, but this cannot be assumed but must be positively proved in each case ..."

(5) Goldziher states:

51 Schacht, pp. 156-7.
52 Ibid., p. 188.
53 Ibid., p. 189.
54 Ibid., p. 189, footnote no. 1.
"The rise of the ‘Abbāsid dynasty is thus the time when the movement to establish the sunna as a science and as the standard of life received official recognition." 35

However, the Umayyad caliph, ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, is ascribed with the role of being the first to give official recognition to the sunnah:

"The rule of ‘Umar II, who had imbibed the spirit of the sunna in Medina, is but a short episode in the religious history of the dynasty to which he belonged. He might be called the Hezekiah of the Umayyad house. He attempted to give practical effect to the quiet work of theologians of the first century. The catchword sunna attained official importance during his rule and he endeavoured to give it recognition in the outlying provinces of the empire." 36

He gives great emphasis to the pious nature of ‘Umar II and his zeal for the sunnah, refering to:

"‘Umar, who was always zealous to establish the sunna in all matters ..." 37 and "‘Umar II who was imbued with pious Medinian ideas and who inaugurated the real era of religion which later flourished under the sponsorship of the ‘Abbāsids ..." 38

Juynboll also grants the same status to ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz as that given by Goldziher, describing him as:

"The first man to apply himself to the concept sunnah an-nabī more than to sunan ascribed to other persons or localities ..." 39

And refering to:

"The sunna of the prophet, a concept emphasized for the first time by ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz rather than by the prophet himself or his immediate followers ..." 40

and also saying:

36 Ibid., p. 43.
37 Ibid., p. 29.
38 Ibid., p. 39.
39 Ibid., p. 34.
"As mentioned above, ‘Umar II, more than any ruler before him, was determined on granting the *summa* of the prophet a position as guiding principle in importance only second to the Qur’an.”

(6) Goldziher’s idea that criticism of the *isnād* is applied to the *isnād* but not to the *matn* and his view on the chronology of the criticism is adopted more or less without alteration by Juynboll. Goldziher states that:

"Less attention is paid to the contents of the tradition itself than to the authorities in the *isnād*. Belief in the authenticity of a ḥadīth stands or falls with their reliability;" and, "traditions are only investigated in respect of their outward form and judgement of the value of the contents depends on the judgement of the correctness of the *isnād*." Also, "Nobody is allowed to say: ‘because the *matn* contains a logical or historical absurdity I doubt the correctness of the *isnād*.’"

And regarding the chronology of the criticism of the *isnād*, he says:

"It seems to have been in the time of Ibn ‘Awn (d. 151), Shu‘ba (d. 160), ‘Abd Allah b. Mubarak (d. 181) and others of their contemporaries that criticism of the authorities begins."

Juynboll, addressing this issue, states:

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

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

(1) *isnād*..."
(2) the near-absence of the application of suitable criteria for probing
muths."^{66}

(7) Prior to the commencement of *talab al-ilm*, *Hadīth* developed in each
administrative center independent of the others, according to Juynboll, then later
their geographically specific character disappeared. He states:

"It is hoped to demonstrate that during the last two or three decades of
the first century of the Hijra/the 7th-8th A.D. the interest for *Hadīth*
slowly increased in the separate administrative centres of the Islamic
city.

It is on purpose that these centres are referred to as 'separate'. One
overall characteristic of *Hadīth* evolution in its earliest stages deserves to
be emphasized before anything else. In the beginning there was little or
no contact between the centres especially if they were far apart. In other
words, in each centre there circulated different *Hadīths.*"^{67}

He continues:

"The proliferation, collection and codification of *Hadīths* in the different
centres occurred, at least during the first century, largely on a local scale.
Until the middle of the first half of the second century (about 740) the
centres were characterized by - among various other individual features -
an overall regionalism which, only with the onset of *talab al-ilm
journeys*, gradually disappeared."^{68}

Goldziher also asserts that *Hadīth* developed independently in various places, and
pinpoints the commencement of *talab al-ilm* while proposing that the local aspect of
early *Hadīth* was eroded by this phenomenon:

"In the beginning of its development the hadīth had local character. It
had its origin in Medina and from there was carried to all provinces of
Islam. On the other hand there is a large part of it which developed
independently in the provinces. The pious in all lands circulated sayings
of the Prophet, partly such as were current as prophetic teachings at the
cradle of the sunna and partly such as only developed in the provinces in
support for some doctrine which grew up in particular circles there. The

---

^{66} Juynboll, p. 75.
^{67} Ibid., p. 39.
^{68} Ibid., pp. 75-6.
Muslim critics themselves point out the local character of many hadith. If theologians of a particular province wished to fill the gaps in the tradition of their home, they had no other recourse but travel to gain the opportunity of becoming personally acquainted with the hadiths of other provinces.

He also says:

"These journeys also yielded important results for the practical development of the hadith in Islam. Because of the ever increasing amount of journeys for the ḫalab, theologians succeeded in inserting the particular provincial traditions into the general, more and more uniform, framework of the hadith."

With regards to the commencement of ḫalab al-ʿilm, Goldziher cites a story from a zealous man named Makhūl, who died in 112, regarding his extensive travels in several countries in search of an authentic statement on the naṣf of the distribution of war booty. He then concludes that, "These are the beginnings of the travels ḫṭ ṭalab al-ʿilm..." He thus indicates that these journeys commenced towards the end of the 1st Century AH, as is argued by Juynboll. Further, he considers this story to, "... give some idea of the extent of such journeys of enquiry during the first century."

(8) Goldziher identifies the phenomenon of the fabrication of Hadīth by various parties that adopted the guise of Companions in later ages. He says:

"Yet another sort of imposter must be mentioned in this context. This will show that Joseph Balsamo had predecessors some centuries before him in Asia. We are referring to the muʿummarūn, the long-lived ones. They belong to the chapter of the inner history of the hadith, for the

50 Ibid., p. 166.
51 Ibid., p. 42.
52 Ibid.
adventurers called mu'ammarīt recited traditions from direct contact with the Prophet. In this they had an easier task than other inventors of hadiths, who also had to invent an isnād which brought their saying into contact with the Prophet. The ‘long-lived ones’ pretended to be ‘companions of the Prophet’ and therefore had no need to devise connecting chains between their information and Muhammed’s communication. Thus they escaped fault-finding criticism if they were fortunate in obtaining credence for their claim of having had personal contact with the Prophet. We shall see that they often succeeded in finding gullible audiences for their swindle."

Juynboll, in turn, asserts that the majority of transmitters, dying at such advanced ages, practiced the same deception, only, this time, with regard to most of the Successors:

"The vast majority of transmitters, dying at such advanced ages, may have pretended to be much older than they were in reality in order to establish at least the probability that they could have met certain masters. In so doing, they were able to claim the coveted status of Successor rather than that of Successor of a Successor.

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

The preceding study, based upon on analysis and detailed study of the evidence, has shown that among that which Goldziher cites as testimony and which is the subject of this research, there is not a single piece of evidence to support his hypotheses of:

1. The involvement of the Companions of the Prophet in fabricating \( \text{Hadîh} \) and attributing them to him.

2. The existence of disputes between the Umayyads and the pious scholars.

3. The involvement of the Umayyads in the falsification of \( \text{Hadîh} \), or in the exploitation of certain pious scholars in order to justify what they sought to do, including the opposing of certain other pious scholars.

4. The involvement of Umayyad sponsored theologians or leaders in the fabricating of \( \text{Hadîh} \) to the benefit of the Umayyads or their governments.

5. The involvement of pious scholars in the fabrication of \( \text{Hadîh} \) in general and against the Umayyads in particular.

Hence, all of the people who are the subject of Goldziher's accusations are in fact innocent of those accusations.

This study also shows that no clear and succinct expression exists concerning the Umayyad era that demonstrates that a certain scholar or governor indeed
fabricated a *hadīth*. It shows that no clear statement from a pious scholar exists to the effect that the Umayyads fabricated a *hadīth*.\(^1\) We also do not find a single statement from an Umayyad ruler accusing a pious scholar of fabricating a *hadīth*. What we have from Goldziher are insubstantial conclusions drawn from a number of texts which are used by him in support of his hypotheses. Goldziher uses an authoritative tone and a self-consistent but largely erroneous interpretation of selected material to lend credence to his sweeping claims and theories.

It is strange that Goldziher only accused a limited number of pious scholars of the fabrication of *Hadīth*, and neglected to discuss the position of tens of other famous pious scholars, some of whom worked under Umayyad rule. We find for instance that al-Ya`qūbi, one of the most important of Goldziher's sources, at the end of his discussion of each Umayyad ruler, provides us with the names of the most famous scholars of his time, a source which Goldziher could readily have drawn upon.

Indeed, if we were to suppose that there did exist a ruler or pious scholar who was embroiled in the fabrication of a *hadīth* or *ahādīth*, then according to the academic methodology this could not be considered as a valid basis on which to draw conclusions regarding society at that time.

---

\(^1\) If any of them had been able to fabricate *hadīth*, the `Abbāsid caliph would have done so in the matter of the creation of the Qur'ān and he would not have been forced into despotism while he had an army of scholars and judges, and the theologians and the ranks of the Mu'tazila. Al-A'zāmī says, "As an example, I cite the case of Ibn Ḥanbal and his clash with the dogma and creeds of the Caliph and Mu'tazilah sect. He asked the Caliph to bring forward a single *hadīth* of the Prophet that supported the official view. But the Caliph with all his power and an army of learned scholars was
In our opinion, and as proven in our study, Goldziher provides us with nothing but erroneous opinions and conclusions. He strives to employ and emphasise certain actions of the Umayyads—which were not approved of by certain scholars—and the opinions and actions of certain scholars towards certain issues, the most important of which was the issue of the inheritance of the caliphate, to support his theory concerning the fabrication of Ḥadīṯ in the Ummayad era. So intent is he on proving this theory that he tries to bring forth any evidence he can, even if apocryphal. It is not impossible that his supposition of enmity between the Umayyads and the pious scholars is a reflection of his cultural heritage with regards to the state of the Jewish rabbis under the rule of the Romans. His depiction of what happened to the pious he himself likens to the situation of the rabbis when he says, “During the time when religious people were pushed into background by the rulers, they, like the Jewish rabbis under Roman rule, occupied themselves with research into the law, which had no validity for the real circumstances of life but represented for themselves the law of their ideal society.”

Our study also shows clearly that Goldziher did not delve very deeply into the study of Umayyad rule and the biographies of those rulers and their subordinates and the religious personalities which he charges with fabrication of Ḥadīṯ. The section that deals with these topics not only proves the points of weakness and defects in his theory and that the texts which he quotes do not accord with his conclusions, but

unable to produce one. The fact that it was impossible to fabricate a Ḥadīṯ on the authority of the Prophet that could go unnoticed by the scholars speaks for itself.” See Aʿẓami 2, p. 2.

CONCLUSION

more seriously than this, it proves that his method of research is not academically sound. This is clear from the following points:

1. Regarding some of Goldziher’s references:

Each subject has its own body of authoritative, original sources that should be consulted when dealing with it and various related matters. To ignore this fact would be to fly in the face of academic principles. Nevertheless, it seems to be the practice of some writers on Ḥadīth or indeed in other fields to consult various irrelevant works and those compiled by tendentious or even anonymous authors. As can be seen from the following, Goldziher was one of these:

(i) His neglect of the Qur’ān:

Goldziher does not display any awareness of the role of the Qur’ān in explaining the importance of the Sunnah and of acting in accordance with it on an individual and governmental level. Nor does he turn his mind to the relationship of the Qur’ān with the Sunnah, and the need of the Qur’anic texts for the elucidation of the Sunnah from the very first moment that they appeared. While he asserts that the greater portion of the prophetic Ḥadīth are nothing but a result of the religious, historical and social development of Islam, we find that the nature of the Qur’anic texts is such that they require further discourse and examples by way of illustration in order to explain them from their first appearance which led to the existence of a tremendous number of prophetic traditions.³ The fact that Goldziher neglects to refer

³ See above, Section 1 of Chapter 1. We have indicated in Section 8 of Chapter 2, ‘The Prophet’s teaching of the Sunnah to his Companions,’ that there is not a single statement to indicate that the Prophet abandoned, even once, the Friday sermon, whether he was at Madīnah or on a journey -the
to the texts of the Qurʾān leads him to grave error. For example, when he brings proof for his theory concerning the development of the Ḥadīḥ, specifically that there existed amongst later Muslims, opposition to ascribing the word Ḥadīḥ to the Qurʾān, we find that the Qurʾān describes itself as Ḥadīḥ in a number of places using this word.4 When Goldziher asserts that ‘Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwān wanted to transfer the Ḥajj from Makkah to the Qubbat al-Sakhrah in Jerusalem, he does not seem to be aware of the Qurʾān’s detailed description of the places outside Makkah where the Ḥajj is to be conducted.5

(ii) His neglect of the books of Ḥadīḥ:

Despite mentioning some source books on Ḥadīḥ in the preface of his book, Goldziher does not turn to them except when he wishes to support his own point of view, and remains blind to the hundreds of pieces of evidence which conflict with his opinions. These include those which evince the role and activities of the Prophet in preserving the Sunnah and publishing it on a wide scale so that it would be practically implemented amongst those who lived at his time,6 and amongst those who continued to live until the last third of the first century of the hijrah, and who

---

4 See above, pp. 190-91.
5 See above, pp. 284-5.
6 Al-Aʿzamī noticed this as well; he says: “The first drawback in the setting of this picture is the complete omission of any reference which could shed some light on educational activities in early days.” Aʿzamī, p. 11.
naturally passed the sayings and actions of the Prophet on to their sons—some of whom continued to live under ‘Abbāsid rule.\(^7\)

(iii) His reliance on books whose authors are known for their anti-Umayyad tendencies:

We should take into account that in fact most of the narrations about the Umayyads were written during the ‘Abbāsid era, where ill-opinion of the Ummayyads was not uncommon. Therefore, it is the duty of a historian to be cautious when he writes on the Umayyads, as the entire literature available on the subject is the product of a period where anti-Umayyad sentiment ran high. Goldziher, when dealing with the Umayyads and Ḥadīth has recourse to the unreliable works of Abū al-Faraj al-İsfahānī, al-Mas‘ūdī and al-Ya‘qūbī, who are considered, by Muslim scholars, to be tendentious, Shi‘ī authors, and as such can not be accepted as authoritative on matters related to the Umayyads. When writing about the Umayyad age or the first century of the hijrah, he should have been aware that academic methodology does not permit the use of these sources, let alone reliance upon them, except with great reservation because of the struggle that was taking place between the Shi‘ites and the Umayyads. Alfred Von Kremer, for instance, says, “We should not forget, indeed, that the historians whose works have come down to us lived at the

\(^7\) We may note also, his neglect of the books of Ḥadīth terminology:

Sezgin indicates that, “Goldziher fails to benefit from the books of Ḥadīth terminology known to him; parts of these were still preserved in manuscript form at that time.” Sezgin, vol. 1, p. 119. This result in the disappearance of a number of facts with respect to that the writing down of Ḥadīth continued throughout the second half of the first century AH and the first half of the second century.
time of the Abbasid, when it would have been dangerous to say anything good or honourable of the Omayyad dynasty."  

Among the sources which Goldziher relies upon in his accusation of a subordinate of the Umayyads of ḥadīth fabrication is the book *al-Kāmil fi al-lughah* by al-Mubarrad, which is primarily a book on linguistics. However, its author tended towards the ideas of the Khārijites, and it would have been better to preserve caution when relying on this source because of the intensity of the dispute between the Khārijites and the Umayyads which more than once resulted in war.

(iv) His reliance upon a source of unknown authorship:

He relies continuously upon the contents of *Kitāb al-ʿUyūn wa al-ḥadāʾiq fī akhbār al-ḥaqāʾiq* which is of unknown authorship. Academic research should not be based upon sources of unknown identity, and in any case it does not take long for the reader to realise that its author is very biased against the Umayyads. It is as if he had decided to amplify their vices and obliterate their virtues as far as possible. Additionally, this source is not mentioned, and as such can be taken to be of little worth, by Muslim scholars who specialise in history.

(v) His reliance upon literary sources:

8 Orient, p. 163.

9 We may also note, his reliance upon a source with no connection to the Umayyad age: Aʿẓamī states that, "J. Schacht says, 'Goldziher has pointed out that those traditions that were current in the Ummayyad period, were hardly concerned with law but rather with ethics, asceticism, eschatology, and politics' [citing: J. Schacht, *A Revaluation of Islamic Traditions*, J.R.A.S., 1949, P. 148]. This assumption, which was put forward by Goldziher and is accepted by Schacht and other scholars, is based on a misconception of the literary history of the Umayyad period, and perhaps the latter conception of Goldziher is based on the copy of Kitab al-Zuhd [Book of Asceticism] by Asad b. Mūṣā, which is mentioned by him, but which does not belong to the period referred to. Asad b. Mūṣā
Among the most important of this class of books that is relied upon by Goldziher, though having no connection with the disciplines of history or Hadith, is Kitāb al-Aghānī which is a literary book of the first order and more specifically one which is associated with the singing of songs. Its author never claimed to have compiled it as an accurate historical narrative. Customarily, in literary sourcebooks the author seeks a strong literary style and pleasing mode of expression, possibly at the expense of other things, including factual accuracy. Whoever relies on a book such as this will definitely produce distorted ideas. For this reason, the scholars of Islam who specialised in history do not consider it to be a historical source, nor do they cite it due to their knowledge that it is a book of literature or adab in which the author does not identify the texts which he draws upon. Ibn Hajar himself mentioned a number of scholarly opinions on this source which lead the majority of researchers to deal with this source with restraint and caution.  

This reliance on tenuous sources began to disappear gradually from the works of later western writers, as is evidenced by Robson’s writings on Hadith which show, to a great extent, a dependence on the original sources—a fact that gives his works more credibility. 

---


10 Lisān, vol. 4, p. 221, no. 584.
11 "(1) In his two articles devoted to an investigation of the material of Ḥadīth, he restricts himself to hadiths recorded in the six recognised books of Ḥadīth, and justifies this by pointing out that “they are the works which are most generally recognised and they provide a representative body of material”. It is also the case when he considers various reports pertaining to Jesus.

(2) Dealing with Ḥadīth related to the Prophet, he examines only those ones recorded by al-Bukhārī, who is, as Robson remarks, “generally considered the most reliable of all”.
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2. His conclusions are not arrived at by competent academic research.\(^{12}\)

(i) Though Goldziher points to the opposition of Muslims to the attribution of the word ‘ḥadīth’ to the Qur’ān, we find many transmitters of Ḥadīth relating a number of traditions in which the Qur’ān is described as ‘ḥadīth’.\(^{13}\) Similarly, we find that the Qur’ān describes itself in a number of verses with this very word.\(^{14}\)

(ii) Goldziher describes the arrogance of the Umayyad rulers, evidenced by their alleged repugnance at the idea of standing before the people during the *Jumu‘ah*

\(^{3}\) Considering recurrent forms in which ḥadīths are presented, he confines himself to Wali al-Dīn’s *Mishkāt al-Maṣābīḥ*, which provides a representative body of ḥadīths from the works of al-Bukhārī, Muslim and others.

\(^{4}\) As for dealing with the Principles of Ḥadīth, Robson usually consults recognised, original sources on the subject; his most common references are the following: *al-Jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl* of Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Ma’rifat ‘ulūm al-ḥadīth* and *al-Madhkhal ilā kitāb al-iklīl* of al-Ḥākim, *al-Kīfāyah* of al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī and *‘Ulūm al-ḥadīth* of Ibn al-Ṣālīḥ. For example, in discussing the different methods of receiving ḥadīths, he gives a brief account of Ibn al-Ṣālīḥ’s presentation of the issue, and in dealing with the different words which were used to report them, he represents the opinion of al-Ḥākim, al-Khaṭīb and Ibn al-Ṣālīḥ. To deal with the categories of transmitters whose transmissions may be accepted, and of those who are of a lower authority, he relies upon Ibn Abī Ḥātim’s classification in his *al-Jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl*, then he quotes Ibn al-Ṣālīḥ for other information on the subject. Elucidating the difference between the Qur’ān and divine ḥadīths, he depends on *al-Ḥadīth al-Qudsiyyah* of ‘All al-Qārī, *al-Itḥāf al-Saniyyah* of al-Madani and al-Tahānawi’s *Dictionary of technical terms*.

\(^{5}\) A quick comparison between Robson’s article on Ḥadīth in the new edition of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, and that of W. Juynboll under the same heading in the first edition of the encyclopedia, shows how the work of the former differs in terms of objectivity and references to a great extent - an example that suffices to indicate Robson’s dependence, as opposed to the latter, on the original sources.

Moreover, Robson occasionally includes a full translation of the original source, in order to clarify the matter in question; in one of his articles, he gives a full translation of a section, which pertains to the following of the Sunnah of the Prophet, of *Jawāhir al-Qur’ān* by al-Ghazālī, in order to demonstrate his insistence on the following of the Prophet in the most minute details.” See Beyounouh, pp. 283-5.

\(^{12}\) Sezgin also alludes to this when he says: “When a person discusses his research in detail and deals with it in a highly critical manner, he feels that he has not delved deeply into the issue.” See Sezgin, vol. 1, part 1, p. 120.

\(^{13}\) See above, pp. 188-9.

\(^{14}\) See above, pp. 190-91.
speech. However, it has become clear to us after careful study that they did not resort to sitting down except when there was an excuse.

(iii) When Goldziher points to the hatred that the Umayyad caliph Yazīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik allegedly had for Ḥasan al-巴ṣī, and his desire to kill him because his pietistical opposition to him was repellent and inconvenient to him. However, it appears upon investigation that the Yazīd that is dealt with in the text that Goldziher quotes is none other than Yazīd b. al-Muhallab, and not the Umayyad caliph. It appears also that the stance that Ḥasan al-巴ṣī took towards that event was in the interest of the consolidation of Umayyad rule.

(iv) Goldziher accuses al-Zuhrī of fabricating the ḥadīth about visiting the three mosques in order to realise the desire of ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān for the transfer of the ḥajj from Makkah to Jerusalem. However, after an analysis and examination of the texts, we find that it is impossible to ascribe this charge to al-Zuhrī. Likewise, this study shows that al-Zuhrī was not the only transmitter of this ḥadīth in his time. In fact, it was related by more than twenty of his contemporaries.

(v) When he accuses Rajā’ b. Ḥaywah of fabricating a ḥadīth to the effect that ‘Uthmān was of the habit of delivering the first khutbah standing and the second sitting,’ as a justification of the desire of the Umayyad rulers not to stand, a

---

15 He says, "... standing in front of the community was apparently not to the taste of proud Umayyad princes" See vol. 2, p. 49. And further, "But their aristocratic arrogance - if the mind of those proud Qurayshites is pictured - seems to have revolted at the idea of standing like hired preachers before their subjects" See vol. 2, p. 50.

16 See above, p. 307-8.

17 See above, Section 3 of Chapter 5.
comparison of the text which Goldziher quotes with other relevant texts demonstrates that this was one of the sayings of the caliph ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān, and was not in fact said by Rajā’.

(vi) While Goldziher is of the opinion that the pious fabricated the ḥadīth: ‘There will come emirs after me who will kill (yumiūna) the ṣalāt’ in an attack against the Umayyad rulers, we find this ḥadīth to have been propagated to a greater extent during the ‘Abbāsid era. If we are to accept Goldziher’s theory, that the ‘Abbāsid era favoured the Sunnah and the pious, this ḥadīth should have dwindled to obscurity.¹⁹

3. Generalising by taking a single or uncommon incident and enlarging it to cover the whole century as well as the entire Umayyad dynasty:

Goldziher cites three events in order to prove the dissatisfaction of the pious with the chaotic conditions under the Umayyad regime, their revulsion towards despotic rule and their challenge to it with a kind of negative resistance in which they demonstrated their aversion in an open manner. These events however, took place within a single city of the Umayyad empire, and only traverse a period of about five years and approximately the rule of one caliph. Goldziher capitalises on the events which took place in this city – despite the fact that they do not in reality uphold his conclusions – to support an allegation that this pious dissatisfaction was to be found throughout the Umayyad empire, which stretched geographically from the western

¹⁹ See above, pp. 224-9.
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borders of China to the south of France, and existed for a period of almost 100 years.\(^\text{20}\)

He also believes, despite the fact that on examination they do not support his viewpoint, that two examples of the Umayyad government’s enmity towards the pious is sufficient grounds for generalising about the empire as a whole.\(^\text{21}\)

As Aʿẓamī says: “If one were to utilize the technique of Goldziher’s research and his method of generalization, one might draw the following picture of 20th-century Europe:

1. Western Society is so corrupt that it uses holy churches for unholy purposes.\(^\text{22}\)

2. People are so demoralised that they force 8 to 10 year old girls to earn their living as whores.\(^\text{23}\)

3. There is no security, society being infested with gangsters and racketeers, and people live in constant danger to life and property.\(^\text{24}\)

4. They are so cruel that they practice infanticide.\(^\text{25}\)

The obvious absurdity of these conclusions is sufficient to demonstrate the invalidity of Goldziher’s technique of research and his method of generalization.

\(^{20}\) See above, Section 3 of Chapter 4.
\(^{21}\) See above, p. 217.
\(^{22}\) Drugs were passed at the meeting of church youth club. *Daily Mirror*, Apr. 17, 1967.
Even if we were to accept his generalization, it would be almost impossible to follow him to his extreme conclusions, because the references provided by him do not justify his assumptions. \(^{26}\)

4. Quoting a text and dispensing with the part that conflicts with his view:

Goldziher takes great pains to explain the first phrases of al-Ṭabarî's narration in order to prove that official encouragement on the part of the Umayyads for the invention, dissemination and suppression of traditions had begun at an early stage. This narration takes up nearly three pages that illustrate the real meaning of the initial expressions that appear in the narration and have nothing to do with the fabrication, propagation, and suppression of ḥadīths. Goldziher however, dispenses with the parts of the narration which contradict his point of view. \(^{27}\)

In order to prove the Umayyads' hatred of and aversion to pious scholars, he quotes an account of the threat made by al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf against Anas b. Mālik, and ignores the rest of the narrative which tells of the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik b. Marwān's censure and warning of al-Ḥajjāj; the subsequent apology that was given to Anas from the caliph and al-Ḥajjāj; and the respect that al-Ḥajjāj paid to Anas b. Mālik until his death. \(^{28}\)

\(^{26}\) Aʿżamī, pp. 11-2. H. Motzk-i also indicates that this is a recognised weakness in the work of Goldziher and Schacht, stating, “The source-analytical works of Heribert Horst, “Zur Überlieferung im Korankommentar at-Ṭabarî,” Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 103 (1953): 290-307; Georg Stauth, Die Überlieferung des Korankomentars Muğāhid b. Ėabars (Gießen, 1969); Fuad Sezgin, Buhārî'nin kaynaklart hakkinda ara ştîrnarlar (İstanbul, 1956); and others suggest that Goldziher and especially Schacht, viewed the Ḭsnād too skeptically and that they generalized too quickly from single observations.”

\(^{27}\) See above, Section 2 of Chapter 3.

\(^{28}\) See above, Section 4 of Chapter 4.
5. The reliance upon posthumous opinions:

It can be seen that Goldziher has based certain of his conclusions upon the posthumous opinions of certain scholars regarding people who lived some time before them. He should have been alert to the distance in time between these opinions and the people about whom they are intended, for example, al-Mubarrad’s opinion about al-Muhallab b. Abī Ṣufrāh, or the opinion of Abū Dāwūd al-Maṣāḥifī about Shahr b. Ḥawshāb. The first’s ruling about al-Muhallab came about 200 years after his death, and the second’s ruling about Shahr came about 138 years after his death.

6. Citation of the apocryphal:

The narration of al-Ya`qūbī which contains the report that the Umayyad caliph ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān wanted to change the ḥajj from Makkah to Qubbat al-Ṣakhrāh in Jerusalem and make the people circumambulate the rock instead of the Ka`bah, is considered to be an apocryphal narration from Islamic history and is not mentioned by any chronicler. Goldziher however, does not hesitate to cite it. Similarly, what was said about Shahr b. Ḥawshāb — namely that he was discredited as a narrator of tradition because he held a government post — is also considered apocryphal and is not spoken of by any of the scholars. The narration which Goldziher cites from Kitāb al-`Uyūn wa al-ḥadā’iq that states that Rajā’ b. Ḥaywāh

---

29 See above, p. 314.
30 See above, p. 327.
narrated hadith for the Umayyads in order to justify their sitting during the khutbah is also considered apocryphal because of the literary corruption which is present in it, and the fact that not one of the chroniclers mentions it.

7. Extreme interpretation of texts:

While al-Mubarrad said, "Al-Muhallab [b. Abi Ṣufrah] may have fabricated hadith in order to strengthen the Muslim’s case and weaken the Khārijites case," we find that Goldziher goes to an extreme in his understanding of this expression and says of al-Muhallab: "It is expressly reported of the great general al-Muhallab, the scourge of the Khārijite dissenters (d. 83), that he was concerned with falsifying traditions to encourage his soldiers against these mutineers."

He points to the fact that ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Khālid was for years an important official of Umayyad princes, and from this we are evidently to take that he was an figure of some importance for the Ummayads. However, we find that the complete period for which he occupied this position was two years, seven months and five days and that he was ousted for incompetence.

When Mu‘āwiyah ordered his governor al-Mughirah not to listen to the companions of ‘Alī, and to listen to and reconcile the companions of ‘Uthmān, we find that Goldziher interprets the text with an extremity that results in distortion of its

---

31 See above, pp. 281-2.
32 See above, p. 327.
33 See above, pp. 297-302.
34 See above, pp. 314-5.
35 See above, pp. 320-21
meaning. He takes it to mean that they refused to listen to the hadīths of the companions of 'Alī, and accepted the hadīths of the party of 'Uthmān. In fact, the whole issue consists of no more than a series of disparaging remarks which do not substantiate the degree of invention or suppression of Prophetic hadīths that Goldziher alleges.  

When Yahyā b. al-Ḥakam asks 'Abd Allāh b. Jaʿfar: "Have you come from khibthah (filth)?" meaning by this the city of the Prophet, we find that Goldziher takes this solitary report of the description of Madīnah in this way, and exaggerates it so that it becomes part of Umayyad terminology to call the city by this name: "The Umayyads called the Prophet’s city al-khabītha, the dirty one [citing: al-'Iqd, II, p. 140, 8 from the bottom]." This in addition to the fact that this is primarily a literary statement. 

---

36 See above, Section 2 of Chapter 3.
37 Al-'Iqd, vol. 1, pp. 3134:
39 We may add one further example: Yasin Dutton also noticed Goldziher’s exaggeration. He said, “In this connection we may note that Goldziher’s criticism that Mālik “cares little about the rijāl” since he “takes over and passes on unhesitatingly hadīths told by the erotic singer ‘Urwa ibn Udhayna” (see Muslim Studies 11: 135), is highly questionable. Firstly, that Mālik “cares little about the rijāl” runs counter to everything we know about Mālik’s strict standards of criticism of his authorities, which are readily apparent in the same source that Goldziher uses (see Tahdhib X: 5 ff), and we must therefore doubt very much whether Mālik took over and passed on any hadīth “unhesitatingly.” Secondly, he relates only one hadīth from Ibn Udhayna in the Muwatta’ (see Munw. I: 314; Zur. II: 333), and not “hadīths”. Thirdly, to describe Ibn Udhayna as an “erotic singer” is misleading, to say the least. The passage in Kitāb al-Aghānī to which Goldziher refers actually describes him as “one of the most respected love-poets of Madīnah, counted as a faqīh and a muḥaddith (shā'ir ghazal muqaddam min shu'arā’ ahl al-Madīnah wa-huwā ma’dīd fi l-fuqahā wa-l-muḥaddithīn)” and mentions also that his grandfather transmitted from ‘Alī (see al-Aghānī XXI: 162-3), to which al-Zurqānī adds that he was a man of good character (khayyir) and trustworthy (thiqa) (see Zur. II: 333). It is hardly blameworthy therefore that Mālik should transmit one hadīth from a man who was considered to be both a faqīh
8. Resorting to conjecture in the assessment of various issues:

At times, Goldziher resorts to employing conjecture in making judgements where the issues he is discussing are of such importance that this is not acceptable. He begins by establishing his certainty of the role of the Umayyads and their followers in fabrication of *Hadīth* when he says: “A number of facts are available to show that the impetus to these inventions and falsifications often came from the highest government circles ….”\(^{40}\) Subsequently, however, he dithers between doubt and certainty in his expressions. For example:

“We are unlikely to have even as much confidence as Dozy regarding a large part of the *ḥadīth*, but will probably consider by far the greater part of it as the result of the religious, historical and social development of Islam during the first two centuries.”\(^{41}\)

“The greater part of the traditions invented for these purposes [for political and dynastic interests] were probably due to official initiative and influence.”\(^{42}\)

“Amongst traditions which the mawlā Layth b. Sa’d spread on the authority of the latter there are presumably many which were to benefit the prevailing political tendencies, because this ‘Abd al-Rahmān was for years an important official of Umayyad princes.”\(^{43}\)

---

\(^{40}\) Goldziher, vol. 2, pp. 43-4.

\(^{41}\) Ibid., p. 19.

\(^{42}\) Ibid., p. 52.

\(^{43}\) Ibid., pp. 45-6.
"In general, all traditions dealing with the question of whether Syria or Medina had preference and answering it in favour of Syria are probably due to Umayyad influence." 44

"People who were nearer to the conditions of the time could judge things differently, like Ibn ‘Awn who lived but a few decades after Shahr and perhaps had proof that theologians in official position were used — or were willing, without outward pressure, because of their interest in the prevailing power — to put into circulation tendentious traditions." 45

Finally, after his extensive argument, Goldziher is left in the awkward situation of being unable to provide more than a small handful of allegedly fabricated ḥadīths, while if fabrication had been taking place with the ferocity that he alleges, there should have been a burgeoning body of examples from the period in question. He presents the following explanation: "The fact that, amongst the ḥadīths that have been handed on to us, in spite of their being of a preponderantly tendentious character, the Umayyad ones are not well represented is no proof that they did not exist in a much greater number than they are found in our various collections." 46

This is an inherently weak statement, for if the fact that they are not found in the various collections is no proof that they did not exist previously, which by no means follows, where is the proof that they did exist?

44 Ibid., pp. 45-6.
45 Ibid., pp. 52-3.
It should be clear from the above that the reliance on Goldziher accepted by so many Western scholars is foundationless and that his high reputation amongst such scholars should be reconsidered.

46 Ibid., p. 53.
GLOSSARY

The meanings and definitions given below are according to the context in which the words are used in this thesis.

adḥān: the call to prayer pronounced loudly to indicate that the time of praying is due.

ahādīh: see ḥadīth.

al-aḥzāb: 'the confederates'; parties; groups; the title of the 33rd surah of the Qur’ān; also, a name of an Islamic battle.

ajzā’: pl. of juz’. See juz’.

Anṣār: ‘helpers.’ The Companions of the Prophet from the inhabitants of Madīnah, who embraced Islam and supported him and who received and entertained the Muslim emigrants from Makkah.

Anṣārī: singular of Anṣār.

‘Arafāt: ‘the plain of recognition.’ A place situated about 25 kilometers to the east of Makkah, where pilgrims stay on the 9th day of Dhū al-Ḥijjah in the 10th month of the Islamic calendar.

‘asr: the mid-afternoon prayer.

Banī or Banū Isrā’īl: the children of Israel, i.e. the Jews.

Companion: one who saw the Prophet and believed in him; one of the Muslims living at the time of the Prophet.

Dhū al-Ḥulayfah: a place situated about 11 kilometers to the south of Madīnah, where pilgrims assume the state of iḥrām.

Dīn: religion brought by the Prophets of Allāh.

dirham: Islamic silver currency equivalent in weight to about 50 grains of barley.

fajr or al-fajr: the dawn prayer, early morning before sunrise.

farā’īḍ or al-farā’īḍ: an obligatory duty to Allāh; also ‘The law of inheritance’ which designates the shares given to the relatives of the deceased which are fixed and described in the Qur’ān 4.11, 12 and 176.

ḥadīth: every ḥadīth consists of two parts, the isnād (the chain of transmitters) and the main (text). Each of these two parts is of equal importance to a scholar. The latter as a report of the sayings or doings of the Prophet, forms the basis of the Islamic rituals and laws, and the former constitutes the credentials of the latter. According to Muḥaddithūn it refers to what was transmitted on the authority of the Prophet, his deeds, sayings, tacit approval, or description of his ʾṣfāl
(features), meaning his physical appearance. However, descriptions of this kind are not included in the definition used by the jurists.

Harrah: An area of land that is covered with black stones; it is well-known in al-Madinah.

Hijrah: The Muslim calendar is recorded from the year of the migration of Prophet Muhammad from Makkah to Madinah.

'Id al-Adha: the four-day festival of the Muslims starting on the 10th day of the month of Dhū al-Hijjah.

'Id al-Fitr: the three-day festival of the Muslims starting on the first day of the month of Shawwāl, the month following Ramaḍān. Fitr literally means ‘breaking the fast’. The Muslims fast during the month of Ramaḍān, then when Shawwāl comes, they break their fast.

Imām: a person who leads the prayer.

Imāmah: the station of Imām.

Ishā: the night prayer, the time for which starts between one and one half hours after sunset.

Ismā: the chain of transmitters. See Ḥadīth.

Ijtihād: criticism and justification.

Jihād: ‘an effort’ or, ‘striving’: Holy fighting in the cause of Allāh or any other kind of effort to make Allāh’s word (Islam) superior. Jihād is regarded as one of the principles of Islam.

Juz': a document containing Ḥadīth; can also refer to a section of the Qur’ān.

Ka’bah: lit. ‘the Cube’: A cube-like building built by Ibrāhīm and Iṣmā’īl in the center of the house of Allāh in Makkah towards which all Muslims turn their face in prayer.

Khilāfah: rulership.

Al-Khumus: one-fifth of the war booty that is given to the bayt al-māl, (public treasury). See Q. 8:41.

Khutbah: the sermon or oration delivered on Friday before the prayer or after the prayer at 'Id prayers and other occasions.

Kutub: book; writing material.

Kutub al-Masānīd: books containing the musnad of Ḥadīths. ‘musnad’ denotes a Ḥadīth which a traditionist reports from his shaykh from whom he is known to have heard aḥādīth at a time of life suitable for learning, and similarly in turn for each shaykh, until the isnād reaches a well-known Companion, who in turn reports from the Prophet. The term musnad is also applied to those collections of aḥādīth which give the aḥādīth of each Companion separately. The largest existing collection of aḥādīth of Companions arranged in this manner is that of Imām Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal.

Maghrib: the sunset prayer.

Maqtū’ or munqatī’: an isnād from which a name has disappeared.
marāsīl: pl. of mursal. If the link between the Successor and the Prophet is missing, the ḥadīth is mursal (hurried), e.g. when a Successor says, “The Prophet said ...

marfu': record of a word or deed of the Prophet reported by the Companion who heard or saw it.

matn: see ḥadīth.

matrūk: one whose ḥadīth is left aside, is invalid.

mawlā: manumitted slave; Master or Lord. Also used for a freed slave.

mawqīf: an isnād going back to the Companions, but stopping short of the prophet.

Minā: a valley outside Makkah on the way to ʿArafāt. It is five miles away from Makkah, where pilgrims stop for three days during the ḥajj, and about 10 miles from ʿArafāt.

minbar: raised platform in a Mosque from which the khutbah is delivered.

al-mufassal (ḥizb al-mufassal): last section of the Qurʾān containing the short sūrahs [i.e. from sūrat Qiyām to the end].

Muḥaddithūn or Muḥaddithūn: pl. of Muḥaddith: A narrator of Ḥadīth, a man learned in Ḥadīth.

musfī: a learned Islamic leader who gives or is qualified to give legal Islamic verdicts.

Muḥājir: any of the early Muslims who had emigrated to Madīnah in the lifetime of the Prophet, before the conquest of Makkah.

al-muʾminūn: the Believers.

mugāli': see maqṭū'.

al-Muqaddimah: introduction.

mutawātir ḥadīth: a ḥadīth which has been transmitted throughout the first three generations of Muslims by such a large number of narrators that the possibility of fabrication must be entirely discarded. Opinions differ on the number of transmitters necessary for tawātur to be attained during each of the three generations: some authorities fix it at seven, some at forty, some at seventy, and others at still higher numbers.

al-nahīr: the 10th day of the month of Dhū al-Ḥijjah on which all pilgrims slaughter their sacrifice.

nisāb: minimum amount of property liable to payment of the zakāt, e.g. nisāb of gold is 20mithqāl, i.e. approx. 94 Grams; nisāb of silver is 200dirhams, i.e. approx. 640 Grams; nisāb of food-grains and fruit is 5awsuq, i.e. 643.5 Kgms; nisāb of camels is 5 camels; nisāb of cows is 5 cows; and nisāb of sheep is 40 sheep, etc.

qiblah: the direction in which all Muslims must turn their faces in the prayer, i.e. towards the Kaʿbah in Makkah.

Qubbat al-Ṣakhrah: dome of the Rock.

qārāt: a special weight; sometimes a very great weight like ʿUḥud Mountain. 1qārāt = 1/2 Daniq & 1 Daniq = 1/6 Dirham.
qunūt: a special invocation offered in the *witr* prayer at night or after the second *ruku* in the *fajr* prayer.

Quraysh: one of the greatest tribes in Arabia during the pre-Islamic era, which had great powers spiritually and financially both before and after the advent of Islam. Prophet Muhammad, was born into this tribe which dwells in Makkah.

**rak'ah**: one cycle of ritual bowing and prostration in prayer.

**ruku'**: bowing in prayer.

**al-rasūl**: the Apostle of Allah.

**al-ruqā**: pl. of *ruqyah*: divine speech that is recited as a means of curing an illness in someone who is sick.

ṣadaqah: voluntary alms, a charitable donation which does not require offer and acceptance and which moreover always irrevocable.

Ṣahābah: pl. of *ṣahabī* i.e. Companion. See Companion.

ṣaḥīḥ: document; Booklet; a pamphlet.

ṣaḥīḥ: authentic.

ṣā'ī: going 7 times between the two mountains of al-Ṣafā and al-Marwah; one of the essential rites of both *hajj* and *‘umrah*.

Ṣalā: a well-known mountain in Madinah.

Ṣalāḥ: prayer. There are five daily obligatory prayers in Islam, consisting of fixed sets of standings, bowings, prostrations and sittings in worship to Allah. Besides these, there are two types of optional ṣalāḥ:

1. **ṣunna**: the optional ṣalāḥ that one does before and after the obligatory one. These voluntary ṣalāḥs fall into two categories:
   a. **ṣunna mu'akkadah** (confirmed). These types of ṣalāḥ were always regularly done by the Prophet.
   b. **ṣunna ghayr mu'akkadah** (not confirmed). These types of ṣalāḥ were often, but not always, practised by the Prophet.

2. Others; any other ṣalāḥ that one may wish to perform.

al-ṣalātu jāmi‘ah: a term used for calling people to the Mosque for prayer or an important issue. This term has been used before and after the establishment of adhān.

ṣawm: fasting, during the month of Ramaḍān or otherwise.

ṣūrah: an historical narration or biography.

ṣiyām: see ṣawm

ṣuḥuf: pl. of *ṣahifah*

ṣujūd: prostration.

shūrā: consultation, specifically between a ruler and his chief advisers.

ṣūrah: a chapter division of the Qur'ān, of which there are 114.

ṣūrat: see ṣūrah.
Tabūk: a valley about 700 miles north of Madīnah where a military expedition took place against the Romans. This battle which was attended by at least 40,000 people, was the last battle led by the Prophet himself.

tafsīr: commentary on and interpretation of the Qur‘ān.

al-tahiyyāt: the greeting (see al-tashahhud below).

tashrīq: lit. vb. ‘to dry meat in the sun.’ tashrīq days are the 11th, 12th and 13th of Dhū al-Ḥijjah on which animals are sacrificed as an act of worship and obedience to Allāh, as was done by Ibrāhīm.

al-tashahhud: refers to the words recited in the ritual prayers while seated that begin with ‘al-lahi ‘al-ḥamdu li-llāhi’. These words are recited while sitting after two rak‘ahs and at the final sitting before salutation in Prayer.

‘umrah: a nation; a people; a sect. Usually used to describe the Muslims.
‘umrah: a lesser ceremony than ḥajj in which a person comes to Makkah during or out of the season of ḥajj and performs ḥajj and sa‘ī.

witr: an odd number. Optional odd numbered rak‘ah prayers performed after ‘ishā’ prayer. Usually 3 rak‘ahs are performed, but any odd number is acceptable: 1, 5, 7, etc.

wudu: ablution made before saying the prayers in the traditional manner as described in Hadīth.

zakāt: lit. ‘purification.’ Obligatory charity which is one of the five major pillars of Islam. Zakāt is a definite portion of wealth which is given to needy at the turn of the year. E.g:
- zakāt on grazing camels;
- zakāt on grazing sheep;
- zakāt for cows;
- the zakāt on agricultural produce;
- the zakāt on gold and silver coinage.

zakāt al-fitr: an obligatory ṣadaqah to be given before the prayer of ‘Īd al-fitr. It is obligatory for every fasting Muslim.

zuhr: the noon prayer.
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