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The Jurisprudence of Ibn Ṣihāb az-Zuhrī. A Source-critical Study

by Harald Motzki (Nijmegen)

I

What do we know about the legal doctrine of Ibn Ṣihāb az-Zuhrī, one of the leading scholars in Medina during the first quarter of the second century A.H.? Joseph Schacht wrote about the issue in his epoch-making work The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence: “Those cases in which Mālik explicitly states that he asked Zuhrī or heard Zuhrī say something can unhesitatingly be regarded as genuine.” Schacht based his conclusion on Mālik’s Muwatta’. He continues: “There are other opinions ascribed to Zuhrī which are obviously authentic.” As a source where these opinions are to be found, Schacht mentions the Muwatta’ again and Sahnūn’s Mudawwana. Then Schacht states: “But towards the end of the second century A.H., Zuhrī had already been credited with many spurious and often contradictory opinions, and his name inserted in isnāds of traditions which did not yet exist in his time and from which fictitious statements on his supposed doctrine were abstracted.” In Schacht’s opinion, these fictitious transmissions from Zuhrī are to be found for example in Saibāni’s recension of the Muwatta’, in Ṣāfi’ī’s treatises and in the Mudawwana.

In view of this presentation one would expect Schacht to exclude Mālik’s Muwatta’ from the suspicion of containing forged Zuhrī traditions. That is not the case, however, as other parts of his Origins make clear: Although referring to “the end of the second century” as the time in which fictitious Zuhrī traditions were circulated, Schacht actually thinks that they were fabricated during the entire second half of the second century and that they are found in all sources of this period, in-
cluding Mālik’s *Muwāṭṭa*. Earlier sources were not available to Schacht. He assumes that only a part of what Mālik in his *Muwāṭṭa*, as transmitted by Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā al-Laḥī, claims to have received from Zuḥrī actually comes from him. As the only evidence of authenticity, Schacht accepts Mālik’s own statement that he asked or heard Zuḥrī’s opinion on a subject. Yet these texts are quite rare in Mālik’s Zuḥrī transmission. Most consist, instead, of simple sayings and traditions, i.e. texts in which Zuḥrī appears only as transmitter. In these cases, Schacht decides the question of whether Zuḥrī really was – or at least could have been – Mālik’s source for a text by placing the content of the text in the general context of legal developments as he himself had reconstructed them.

Schacht’s ideas concerning the development of Islamic jurisprudence were deeply affected by his appreciation of the sources. He maintains that, generally, traditions referring to the generation of the so-called Successors (*tābi‘ūn*) represent the earliest stage in the process of projecting the legal development of the second century back into the first century; Companion (*ṣaḥāba*) texts are a younger level; and the traditions of the Prophet are the youngest element in this chain. Zuḥrī traditions, in which he is only Mālik’s informant for doctrines of earlier authorities (Successors, Companions, the Prophet), cannot be accepted, therefore, as authentic elements of Zuḥrī’s legal teaching. “He appears as the common link in the *īsnāds* of a number of traditions from the Prophet, from Companions and from Successors; Zuḥrī himself was hardly responsible for the greater part of these traditions.”

Schacht regards even Zuḥrī texts referring to *tābi‘ūn* as fictitious, i.e. not really going back to Zuḥrī and by no means to the alleged Successor. “This makes it impossible to regard information on the Medinese lawyers in the time of the Successors as genuine, unless it is positively shown to be authentic. It would be rash to exclude this possibility a priori, but as far as I have been able to investigate the development of the Medinese doctrine, I have not found any opinion ascribed to one of these ancient lawyers which is likely to be authentic.”
Until recent times Schacht’s work on the origins of Islamic jurisprudence has deeply affected research into the history of Islamic law. It influenced especially western scholars, but a few Muslim ones as well. Yet Schacht’s assumptions are not as plausible as they appear at first sight. To start with, one can ask: Where does he derive the certainty that, on the one hand, Zuhri’s legal opinions which Mālik reports he asked Zuhri about or heard from him (for example with the formula “an Ibn Šihāb annahu sami‘tu yaqūl”, i.e. from Ibn Šihāb, that he heard him say)⁸ are really authentic, whereas, on the other hand, ra‘y which Mālik introduces with, for example, “‘an Ibn Šihāb annahu qāla: sami‘tu ‘Abū Bakr b. ‘Abdarrahmān yaqūl” (from Ibn Šihāb, that he said: ‘I heard Abū Bakr b. ‘Abdarrahmān say)”⁹ do not derive from Ibn Šihāb and by no means from his authorities? Could a forged legal case not be given the form of question and answer or of a “heard” tradition just as well as the form of a simple saying? Moreover, the method of placing a text in the historical development of legal doctrine by following in the first place the text (matn) and taking the isnād only secondarily into account depends on certain premisses and subjective considerations which are not necessarily shared by everyone. The results of this method are not always tenable, as I have shown elsewhere.¹⁰

For this reason it is not advisable to follow Schacht’s method of collecting the traditions concerning individual legal topics, then comparing their texts, ordering them chronologically according to criteria of content and, only then, evaluating the transmission lines (asānīd) and quality of the collections in which the traditions are found. In the following, the reverse procedure has been chosen. My investigation focuses on the issue of the sources that could be used as a basis for a reconstruction and critical evaluation of Zuhri’s legal doctrines and traditions.

Schacht had only Mālik b. Ṭanṣūṣ (d. 179/795) Muwatta’ as an early source for Zuhri’s jurisprudence (fiqh) at his disposal, preserved in the two recensions by Yahyā b. Yahyā and Muḥammad aš-Šaibānī. Nowadays we can refer to more early text corpora. I would like to mention only two of them which are particularly im-
portant, both because of the large number of Zuhrī texts they contain and because of their age, for they originate from before or, at least, the same period as Mālik’s *Muwaṭṭa*’. I am referring to the transmissions of Maʿmar b. Rāṣid (d. 153/770) and ‘Abdalmalik Ibn Ġuraiğ (d. 150/767) contained in ‘Abdarrazzāq aṣ-Ṣanʿānī’s *Muṣannaf*. As I have shown elsewhere in more detail, their transmissions are old and genuine and were originally contained in the written works of these scholars. ‘Abdarrazzāq received their material when studying with the two scholars and later integrated it into his much larger compilation of traditions.11

In biographical literature Maʿmar and Ibn Ġuraiğ are known, like Mālik, as Zuhrī’s students. Yet this is no reason for accepting all their transmissions from him as authentic Zuhrī material, as Schacht’s evaluation of Mālik’s Zuhrī material shows. To answer the question whether Maʿmar’s and Ibn Ġuraiğ’s Zuhrī texts are genuine or not, I did not follow Schacht’s method of proceeding from hypotheses about the early development of Islamic jurisprudence which are based on Šāfi’ī’s treatises and information deriving from the second half of the second century A.H. and later. Rather, I have studied, first, the early compilations which contain large numbers of texts attributed to Zuhrī with the aim of finding out whether their authors should be regarded as forgers of the material that they present. Only then have their Zuhrī traditions been analysed.
Among the three corpora most of the Zuhri texts are to be found in Ma’mar b. Rāšid’s corpus, which can be reconstructed on the basis of the asānīd, i.e. the transmission chains, in ‘Abdarrazzáq’s Muṣannaf. When we classify the persons from whom Ma’mar says he derived legal opinions or traditions according to their frequency, a remarkable picture emerges: Most often, he mentions the Medinan scholar Zuhri (28%),12 followed by the Baṣran Qatāda (25%). He reports much less from the Baṣran Ayyūb [b. Abî Tamîma] (11%), even less from the Yemenite Ibn Ţāwūs (5%), the Baṣrans Yaḥyā b. Abî Kaṭîr (3%) and Ḥasan [al-Baṣrî] (3%), the Medinan Hišām b. ‘Urwa (2%), and the Küfans Ḥammād [b. Abî Sulaimân] (1%) and al-ʿAmaš (1%). He reports from more than 75 other people only sporadically (less than 1%). Besides these, a relatively high percentage (7%) of anonymous traditions is to be found, i.e. traditions in which Ma’mar does not mention his direct informant.

These percentages do not match the assumption that Ma’mar generally fabricated his transmission data to ascribe his own legal opinions to earlier authorities or to provide traditions circulating anonymously with asānīd. A forger moved by such goals would have proceeded otherwise, either more unsystematically or more systematically, by ascribing all of his texts to only a few important informants instead of to a large number of – partly unknown – people. Anonymous traditions, gaps in the asānīd and, moreover, texts reflecting Ma’mar’s own ra’y do not match at all with the picture of a presumed forger. If Ma’mar really had been a forger of transmission data, one could also ask what induced him to choose a Medinan scholar as one of his main authorities although he generally preferred scholars from Basra. After all, he originated from Baṣra and later moved to Yemen to become a teacher there.

On the basis of these considerations the hypothesis that Ma’mar forged his traditions appears very unlikely. The percentages of Ma’mar’s informants can more
plausibly be explained by historical circumstances: In his hometown Baṣra he mainly studied with Qatāda, but occasionally also with other scholars, and he continued his studies in Medina, mainly with Zuhrī and sporadically with other Medinan scholars. He may have obtained his materials deriving from other centres of jurisprudence during his trips or his stay in the Ḥiḡāz hearing pilgrim scholars. The doubts about the forging hypothesis deepen when comparing the text corpora of Maʿmar’s two main informants: Zuhrī and Qatāda.

Two thirds of Maʿmar’s Zuhrī texts reproduce his personal opinion (raʾy) and only one third traditions (âtâr, ahâdît), in which Zuhrī only posits as transmitter. In these transmissions four tābiʿûn from Medina prevail: Saʿīd b. al-Musayyab (19%), Sālim b. ʿAbdallâh b. ʿUmar and ʿUrwa b. az-Zubair (13% each) and ʿUbaidallâh b. ʿAbdallâh b. ʿUtba (8%). Other known tābiʿûn from Medina like Sulaimân b. Yasār, Abū Salama b. ʿAbdarrahmân, al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad and Abū Bakr b. ʿAbdarrahmân, or Syrian ones like Qabīṣa b. Duʿaib appear much more rarely. It is remarkable that the material of three of Zuhrī’s four main authorities consists exclusively of traditions transmitted by them from earlier authorities; only the Ibn al-Musayyab texts contain his personal raʾy as well as traditions at approximately the same rate. The predominance of traditions over raʾy in the texts of Zuhrī’s informants is typical in Maʿmar’s material. Even so, asānid are not given regularly. 40% of Zuhrī’s transmissions from other persons lack information on the informants or chains of transmitters. This is not only the case for the ṣahāba-traditions, but also for those from the Prophet. Precedents or legal opinions of ṣahāba are mentioned twice as frequently as those of the Prophet and three times more frequently than those of tābiʿûn. Among the ṣahāba, ʿUmar is the most prominent, followed in frequency at some distance by his son ʿAbdallâh, then by ʿUṯmân, ʿĀʾiša, Ibn ʿAbbās and Zaid b. Ṭābit.

Maʿmar’s Qatāda texts consist – like the ones he ascribes to Zuhrī – mainly of Qatāda’s raʾy (62%) and only to a lesser extent of traditions that Qatāda transmits
Differently from Zuhri, they are dominated by only two tabi’ûn: al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (31%) and, at some distance, the Medinan scholar Saʿîd b. al-Musayyab (20%). Other tabi’ûn like the Kūfīans Ibrāhīm an-Naḥaʾī and Šuraiḥ or the Baṣran Abū ṣ-Ṣaʿīd b. Zaid appear rather rarely. Contrary to the comparable Zuhri traditions, the texts which Qatāda transmits from tabi’ûn usually reproduce their raʿy; 84% of the texts attributed to Ḥasan al-Baṣrī consist of his legal opinions and those referring to Ibn al-Musayyab contain no transmissions from other authorities at all in the sample analysed here. In Zuhri’s Ibn al-Musayyab material, on the contrary, there is — as mentioned above — a balance between raʿy and traditions.

Notably underdeveloped in comparison to the Zuhri texts is the use of the isnād in Qatāda’s traditions. In 60% of Zuhri’s traditions one comes across an isnād or information about an informant; in Qatāda’s traditions such texts amount to only 12%. Ma’mar’s Qatāda texts also differ from Zuhri’s in the distribution of the authorities mentioned: the older tabi’ûn dominate at the expense of the saḥāba. Also contrary to Zuhri’s saḥāba traditions, we find that in Qatāda’s texts ‘Alī and Ibn Masʿūd prevail over ‘Umar in frequency of quotations; Ibn ‘Abbās follows at a considerable distance, whereas other Companions are only sporadically mentioned. Traditions from the Prophet are quite rare in Ma’mar’s transmission from Qatāda, while Ma’mar transmits them from Zuhri five times more frequently. Finally, a difference in the terminology of transmission must be pointed out: Ma’mar often reproduces Zuhri’s raʿy in the form of an answer (responsum) to his own question, for example with the formula: “I asked Zuhri about ... He said...”13 This text genre occurs only very rarely in Ma’mar’s Qatāda material.14

The characteristic differences described above between the text corpora of Ma’mar’s two most important authorities for legal opinions and traditions render very unlikely the assumption — which could be made on the basis of Schacht’s theo-
ries – that Ma‘mar faked the origin of the texts in order to legitimate his own teachings through a Medinan and a Baṣran authority.

There are other indications to support this thesis: Ma‘mar often refers to the fact that Zuhri’s and Qatāda’s opinions agree on a legal problem. He usually introduces such a text with the words “‘an az-Zuhri wa-Qatāda, qālā” (from Zuhri and Qatāda, both said), or he sometimes puts a note at the end of a Zuhri text, such as “wa-qālabu Qatāda” (so said Qatāda [as well]), or “‘an Qatāda mišlabu” ([I transmit the same from Qatāda]). This means in fact that in those cases where he only quotes the Medinan scholar on a legal issue, Ma‘mar either did not know a relevant statement of Qatāda’s, or it appeared to him not worth mentioning, or, maybe, it was so different that it needed a separate text, or the Qatāda text was left out by ‘Abdarrazzāq. The same is true in cases where Ma‘mar only presents Qatāda’s opinion without mentioning Zuhri’s.

If one wishes to see in Ma‘mar’s method of quotation circumstantial evidence of forgery and if one wishes to claim that Ma‘mar tried in this way to create additional authorities for his own legal opinions, the question remains as to why he had not done it more often. Further evidence against the assumption of forgery is the fact that in some cases Ma‘mar explicitly refers to a difference of opinion between Zuhri and Qatāda without clarifying which of the two he prefers. Here are two examples:

‘Abdarrazzāq from Ma‘mar from Zuhri; he said: “When a man buys a divorce from his wife, it is ḥul‘ (ransom divorce).” Qatāda said: “It is not ḥul‘.”

‘Abdarrazzāq from Ma‘mar from Zuhri and Qatāda; both said: “Her right to divorce (am-rubah) is in her hand until she decides [on the offer of divorce].” Qatāda said [moreover]: “... Even if her husband has sex with her [aṣābahā], before she decides.”
In the first case we have contradictory opinions, in the second case we just see an extension or concretisation of the opinion ascribed to both Zuhri and Qatāda. In both cases it is not clear which opinion Ma‘mar himself favours. Why should Ma‘mar have falsely ascribed such cases of diverging opinions to his main authorities, of whom he more often reports agreement? It is even more difficult to defend the forgery thesis in view of texts in which Ma‘mar opposes the ra’y of his authority. An example:

‘Abdarrazzāq from Ma‘mar from Qatāda about a man, who gave his wife the right to divorce (amr) in her own hands. He [Qatāda] said: “If one of them dies before she has made a decision, neither of them inherits from the other. When he puts the power to divorce her in another man’s hands, and this man to whom the power of divorce has been given dies before deciding anything, he cannot marry her again until she has first married another man. If one of them dies before he [i.e. the one entrusted with the power of divorce] has made a decision, they cannot inherit from another.

Ma‘mar said: “I heard somebody say: ‘When the man into whose hands the power to divorce her has been put dies before making a decision, that is nothing [i.e. this should not be considered a divorce].’ I prefer this [opinion] to that of Qatāda’s.”

The circumstantial evidence presented above goes against the idea that Ma‘mar forged or invented his information on the origin of his texts. As a consequence, until the contrary is proven, we must consider his Zuhri and Qatāda texts as authentic, i.e. really received from the persons named. The attempt to avoid this consequence by assuming that a part of Ma‘mar’s material, e.g. the traditions from earlier authorities, is the work of anonymous forgers – as Schacht argued – is not convincing. These forgers would have been Ma‘mar’s contemporaries, i.e. active in the second quarter of the second century A.H., and they must have produced Zuhri and Qatāda traditions in huge numbers. These “workshops of forgers” could not have remained undetected by a long-serving student of Zuhri and Qatāda. There is, however no hint of such “workshops” either in Ma‘mar’s or in his pupil ‘Abdarrazzāq’s texts. Moreover, the asānīd in Ma‘mar’s Zuhri and Qatāda traditions are too
fragmentary. We would expect more sophisticated *asānīd* from professional forgers of this time.

The existence of Ma’mar’s Zuhrī and Qatāda texts should be interpreted, therefore, as follows: Ma’mar was for a longer period of time a student of both teachers. The large number of texts and the fact that he occasionally points to tiny differences in his teachers’ opinions certainly presuppose written notes made during or after the lectures as memory aids. The differences between both bodies of transmission reflect different circumstances in which the texts were received. For example, the fact that Ma’mar rarely transmits Qatāda’s answers to his own questions whereas he frequently does so in the case of Zuhrī may be a result of the fact that Ma’mar was still very young when studying with Qatāda and was therefore not allowed to ask questions. The situation changed when he later became a student of Zuhrī and was no longer counted as a beginner. Another explanation for the differences may lie in the two legal scholars’ different stages of development and in regional peculiarities in legal teaching in both centres of learning. This could explain, for example, the more frequent use of the *isnād* in Zuhrī’s traditions or the rarer occurrence of *ahadît* from the Prophet in Qatāda’s texts. Interpreted in this way, the texts transmitted by Ma’mar enable us to get detailed insights into the state of development that legal thinking and teaching had reached in the first quarter second century A.H.

For this reason Ma’mar’s Zuhrī transmission can be regarded as a useful source for the legal doctrines and traditions of this famous Medinan scholar. This conclusion does not exclude the possibility of Ma’mar’s having occasionally made mistakes when preserving or transmitting the material received from Zuhrī.

The conclusions drawn up to now are based solely on Ma’mar’s texts as contained in ‘Abdarrazzāq’s *Muṣannaf*. I did not refer to biographical traditions about Ma’mar, as this type of information about Islamic scholars living during the first
two centuries A.H. is regarded as generally unreliable by many non-Muslim scholars. However, the preserved biographical traditions about Maʿmar confirm the results obtained through our text analysis to a large extent. Let us have a look at the biographical material.

Maʿmar b. Rāšid, a maʊlā of the tribe al-Azd, grew up in Baṣra, where he began his studies – as he himself said – in the year when al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī died, i.e. in 110/728-9, when he was 14 years old. It is possible that he still heard him, but that is not confirmed in the biographical sources. Again according to himself, he then studied with Qatāda. He left Baṣra, where he had formed a close friendship with Ayyūb b. Abī Tamīma, either shortly before or after Qatāda’s death (117/735) and became a student of Zuhrī. He is indeed considered, along with Mālik b. Anas, as one of Zuhrī’s most important students. He occasionally returned to Baṣra for visits and took the opportunity to study with some of the scholars there. At an unknown date he moved to Ṣanʿā’, the centre of learning in Yemen, where he died in 153/770 or 154/771 (less probable alternatives given are 150 or 152) aged 57 or 58, surrounded by his students, among whom was ʿAbdarrazzāq.

Maʿmar belongs among the first muşannifūn, i.e. those who ordered their texts thematically. His muşannaf works do not seem to have been widely dispersed because their existence or their titles are rarely mentioned in the biographical sources. Yet one of his muşannaf works entitled Kitāb al-Ǧāmiʿ is preserved in the transmission of his disciple ʿAbdarrazzāq, and forms the last “book” of his Muşannaf. Maʿmar’s wider muşannaf compilation is probably preserved only in the (scattered) form in which ʿAbdarrazzāq integrated it into his own Muşannaf.

The evaluation of early Islamic scholars by the later Muslim ḥadīt critics and rijāl experts which developed after the second half of the second century is useful for historical research in many respects. Their results must be handled with great care, however, for they are strongly linked to later norms of ḥadīt transmission which
were not generally followed by the traditionists of the first half of the second century A.H., to say nothing of the early *fuqahāʾ* who mainly taught their own *raʾy*. Nevertheless, it is worth pointing out that Maʿmar’s transmission from Zuhrī is considered very reliable by the *ḥadīt* critics.

III

Another important early source for Zuhrī’s *fiqh* is the transmission of the Meccan scholar Ibn Ğuraḥ (d. 150/767). Like the one by Maʿmar it is contained in ‘Abdarrazzāq’s *Musannaf* and it can be reconstructed on the basis of the chains of transmission. Since I have already discussed the value of Ibn Ğuraḥ’s transmission elsewhere, I shall limit myself to the essential points which are important for the comparison with other early sources and for the Zuhrī texts. The Ibn Ğuraḥ transmission in ‘Abdarrazzāq’s *Musannaf* is *qua* extension only slightly inferior to Maʿmar’s and contains more than 5000 individual texts. As we have already seen, Maʿmar’s corpus is dominated by two authorities, including Zuhrī, whereas Ibn Ğuraḥ’s material presents only one main authority, the Meccan faqīh ‘Atāʾ b. Abī Rabāḥ. Nearly 40% of Ibn Ğuraḥ’s texts are ascribed to him. The rest are ascribed to a large number of informants (more than 100 persons), among whom five names are mentioned more frequently than others: the Meccan ‘Amr b. Dīnār (7%), the Medinan Ibn Sīhāb (6%), the Yemenite Ibn Ğawās (5%), the Meccan Abū z-Zubair (4%) and the ‘Irāqī ‘Abdalkarīm [al-Ǧazarī] (3%).

As in the case of ‘Abdarrazzāq’s Maʿmar transmission, I consider the strongly varying attribution of texts to informants which is found in Ibn Ğuraḥ’s corpus, along with the fact that it also contains legal opinions of his own and a conspicuous number of anonymous traditions, as evidence against the forgery theory. By forgery theory I mean the hypothesis that Ibn Ğuraḥ falsely ascribed his own legal opinions and those of other scholars at Mecca and elsewhere, as well as traditions (*āṭār* and *ahādīt*) circulating during his lifetime, to the previous generation of scholars. It
seems more plausible to explain the peculiar attribution of texts to informants found in Ibn Ğuraiğ’s material by historical circumstances during his lifetime. For example, the fact that he has only one main authority, ‘Atã’, may be due to the fact that ‘Atã’ was his most important teacher, with whom he studied the longest and from whom he learned the most.

Other arguments against the forgery theory can be found in a comparison of the texts ascribed by Ibn Ğuraiğ to different persons. A comparison between Ibn Ğuraiğ’s transmissions from ‘Atã’ b. Abi Rabâḥ and Zuhri, whom he usually calls Ibn Ĝihâb, will do as an example.

Let’s first have a look at the peculiarities of Ibn Ğuraiğ’s transmission from ‘Atã’. The ‘Atã’ texts reproduce for the most part (80%) his ra’y. Only a fifth of them contain traditions from others in which cAtã is only the transmitter. The forms in which Ibn Ğuraiğ presents ‘Atã’’s ra’y are striking. Beside the usual sayings (dicta) we find an almost similar number of responsa, i.e. answers which ‘Atã’ gave to questions asked by Ibn Ğuraiğ himself or, more rarely, by other people, known by name or not. When classifying ‘Atã’’s atâr and ahâdît according to the authorities to which they refer, we get the following result: He quotes the sahâba most frequently, the Prophet much less, and his contemporaries only sporadically. Furthermore, a large number of quotations from the Qur’ân are notable. Among the Companions it is Ibn ‘Abbâs who clearly dominates. ‘Atã’ refers to him nearly three times more than to ‘Umar b. al-Ḥaṭṭâb, the second most frequently mentioned Companion, who himself is quoted three times more than ‘Alî or ‘A’îśa. The Companions Ğabir b. ‘Abdallâh, Abû Huraira, Ibn ‘Umar and others appear only rarely. The ahâdît of the Prophet are clearly outnumbered by ‘Atã’’s references to Ibn ‘Abbâs, but the Prophet follows in second place, ahead of all other sahâba. ‘Atã’ only sporadically gives his informants for the Companion traditions, and among his ahâdît from the Prophet only a quarter have a – partly incomplete – isnâd.
In sharp contrast to his transmission from ‘Atā’, in which the latter’s *ra’y* dominates, Ibn Ġuraiğ’s transmission from Zuhrī consists mostly of traditions in which Zuhrī functions only as transmitter (58%). The texts which contain Zuhrī’s *ra’y* are fewer, but nevertheless noticeable in number (42%). The *ra’y* appears, in most cases, in the form of sayings (*dicta*) and seldom as answers (*responsa*). In striking contrast to Ibn Ġuraiğ’s *responsa* transmitted from ‘Atā’, where Ibn Ġuraiğ often asks the questions himself, his *responsa* transmitted from Zuhrī are only exceptionally of that type. Among Ibn Ġuraiğ’s traditions transmitted from Zuhrī, ‘Urwa b. az-Zubair is the most important informant of Zuhrī. In that function he clearly outdoes other Medinan scholars such as Abū Salama b. ‘Abdarrahmān, Sālim b. ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Utba, Sulaimān b. Yasār and others.

Most of Zuhrī’s traditions (*ātār* and *ahādir*) refer to individuals of the Companion generation as authorities. Only half as many of his traditions refer to Successors or the Prophet. Among the Prophet’s Companions ‘Umar is mentioned most frequently, followed by ‘Uṯmān, Ibn ‘Umar and ‘Ā’iša. Zaid b. Ṭābit, Abū Huraira, Ibn ‘Abbās and other, less famous, *ṣaḥāba* occur more rarely. If these authorities are ordered according to frequency, the Prophet is in first place, in sharp contrast to what we find in ‘Atā”s traditions. After the Prophet the second caliph ‘Umar comes only at some distance. Furthermore, it is remarkable that the caliphs are strongly represented, even the Umayyads like ‘Abdalmalik and ‘Umar b. ‘Abdal‘azīz. About half of Zuhrī’s traditions have an *isnād*, though not always a complete one; his traditions from the Prophet usually have an *isnād*.

The comparison of two of Ibn Ġuraiğ’s text corpora, the one transmitted from ‘Atā’ b. Abī Rabāḥ and the one ascribed to Ibn Šihāb (az-Zuhrī), shows that they are very different with regard to volume (i.e. absolute number of texts); importance of *ra’y*; text genres; use of *isnād*; authorities preferred etc. Ibn Ġuraiğ can hardly have fabricated both corpora. By fabricated I mean that he himself composed
the texts and supplied them arbitrarily with *asānid*. There is other evidence, which I have presented elsewhere,⁶² that supports the hypothesis that Ibn Ğuraiğ in fact acquired his ‘Aṭā’ texts from ‘Aṭā’ himself, for example: Ibn Ğuraiğ’s personal legal opinions; his comments on ‘Aṭā’’s texts; his conscious deviations from ‘Aṭā’’s opinions; occasional indirect transmission from ‘Aṭā’; and the reporting of different solutions of ‘Aṭā’’s to the same problem. Similar peculiarities can also be recognised in Ibn Ğuraiğ’s transmission from Ibn Šihāb, for example the indirect transmission from him,⁶³ or references to contradictory statements.⁶⁴ Finally, it is not easy to understand why the Meccan scholar Ibn Ğuraiğ, who mainly refers to authorities from this town, should have fabricated texts reproducing the *ra’y* and traditions of a Medinan *faqīh* and transmitter.

All this lends support to the hypothesis that the texts which Ibn Ğuraiğ reproduces really come from the persons indicated in the *isnād*. Alternatively we would have to imagine that Ibn Ğuraiğ received his material from anonymous forgers rather than from of the persons he names. Yet such an assumption means the problem would only be shifted to the realm of speculations which cannot be checked. It cannot be accepted as a scientifically permissible explanation for the differences between the two corpora.

To explain their respective peculiarities, we should consider, instead, different conditions as to how Ibn Ğuraiğ received his material, and different individual and/or regional peculiarities of ‘Aṭā’’s and Zuhri’s legal scholarship. The large number of *responsa* in Ibn Ğuraiğ’s transmission from ‘Aṭā’ may mirror the manner in which Ibn Ğuraiğ acquired his legal knowledge from this teacher. The predominance of *ra’y*, the high frequency of texts from Ibn ‘Abbās and the rare occurrence of *asānid* may be typical of ‘Aṭā’’s doctrine and/or that of the Meccan *fiqh* in general at the beginning of the second century A.H. On the contrary, the rare occurrence of direct questions put by Ibn Ğuraiğ to Ibn Šihāb and the only sporadic references to a *samā’* (hearing) from him may be circumstantial evidence that Ibn
\begin{quote}
\textbf{16}

Çuraiğ was not one of Zuhri’s regular students. He may have acquired a part of his Zuhri texts not by hearing, but by copying a written source which Zuhri or one of his pupils put at Ibn Çuraiğ’s disposal. In Ibn Çuraiğ’s Zuhri material, the predominance of traditions over his \textit{ra’y}, the higher frequency of informants given for traditions, and the eminent role played by the Prophet as a legal authority may be typical of Zuhri’s and/or Medinan jurisprudence in this period. Such a historical explanation does not lack plausibility – to my mind – and offers the advantage that it is falsifiable. For this reason we should maintain, until the contrary is proven, that the texts which Ibn Çuraiğ ascribes to Ibn Şihâb [az-Zuhri] do really derive from the latter.

This conclusion and our assumptions as to how Ibn Çuraiğ could have come by his texts are based so far exclusively on ‘Abdarrazzâq’s texts as preserved in his \textit{Muşannaf}. I have left aside biographical information about Ibn Çuraiğ for the reasons already mentioned above. This will be remedied now.\textsuperscript{35}

\textquoteleft\textquoteleft Abdalmalik b. \textquoteleft\textquoteleft Abdal’aziz b. Çuraiğ, a \textit{maulâ} of the Umayyad clan \textit{Âl Ḥâlid} b. Asîd, was born in the year 80/699, probably in Mecca, where he grew up. He started studying when he was 15 under the patronage of ‘Âtâ’ b. Abî Rabâḥ, the leading Meccan scholar of that time. He frequented his study circle for about 18 years but he separated from his teacher one or two years before his death in 115/773 to join the younger scholar ‘Amr b. Dînâr whose lessons he attended for about seven years. This information corresponds to the picture we found when investigating the frequency of transmitters in Ibn Çuraiğ’s corpus: ‘Âtâ’ is by far the most frequently quoted, followed by ‘Amr b. Dînâr.\textsuperscript{36} In this period Ibn Çuraiğ probably also studied with other scholars, for example, the Meccan Ibn Abî Mulaika (d. 117/735 or 118/736) and the Medinan scholar Nâfi’ (d. 118/736 or 119/737), the \textit{maulâ} of Ibn ‘Umar, who stayed at Mecca from time to time. All this information, transmitted by Ibn Çuraiğ’s students, is usually based on his own statements. He died in 150/767.
\end{quote}
Ibn Ğuraiğ is one of the first authors – if not the first – of books of traditions compiled in the *muṣannaf* style, i.e. ordered according to legal topics. His book was probably entitled “*Kitāb as-Sunan*”. Most of it must have been comprised of what his pupil ʿAbdarrazzāq transmitted from him in his *Muṣannaf*. His work had already become famous beyond Mecca during his lifetime and it probably gave an impulse to other scholars, such as Maʿmar b. Rāṣid, Sufyān at-Ṭaurī and Mālik b. Anas, to compose similar works.

In biographical literature, Ibn Ğuraiğ is considered an excellent *faqīh*, Qurʾān reciter and exegete. His disciples composed a “*Kitāb at-Tafsīr*” from his Qurʾān lessons. Yet the judgment of the ḥadīt critics on him was controversial. Some younger contemporaries like Mālik or Ibn Ğuraiğ’s pupil Yahyā b. Saʿīd al-Qaṭṭān already showed reservations concerning some parts of his transmission. His transmissions from ʿAtā’ b. Abī Rabāḥ, ʿAmr b. Dīnār, Ibn Abī Mulaika, Nāfī and some others, however, are usually excluded from the critics’ negative assessment. Criticism is directed mainly against certain forms of transmission used by Ibn Ğuraiğ which from the middle of the second century A.H. onwards came to be seen as inadequate. Criticism is also directed against the fact that he did not always make these forms of transmission clear in his transmission terminology. For example, Ibn Ğuraiğ used an informant’s written material which the latter had left to him or which Ibn Ğuraiğ had copied himself and which he had obtained permission to transmit, but which he had not personally “heard” or read out to the informant. In some cases, the manuscript Ibn Ğuraiğ had copied may have been only a collection of texts belonging to one of the informant’s students. This was a method of transmission widely use during the first half of the second century A.H. and not yet generally scorned. In this way, for example, Ibn Ğuraiğ obtained his *abādīt* transmitted from Zuhrī, as he himself is reported to have admitted. This corresponds to the results we obtained when analysing Ibn Ğuraiğ’s Zuhrī texts. In sharp contrast to his ʿAtāʾ transmission, we found in the corpus of Zuhrī texts hardly any *responsa* to Ibn.
őuraig’s questions or references to having heard Zuhri (samā’). But there are a few, as the following example shows:

‘Abdarrazāq from Ibn őuraig; he said: Ibn Šihāb transmitted to me, [when] I asked him about a man who divorced his wife three times while he was suffering pains (fi ṯarga’) [i.e. during an illness]: ‘How is it? Must she observe her waiting period when he dies, and does she inherit from him?’ He (Ibn Šihāb) said: ‘Utmān decided about a wife of ‘Abdarrahmān [b. ‘Auf], that she had to observe her waiting period and that she inherits from him. He let her inherit from him after she had concluded her waiting period. ‘Abdarrahmān had suffered pains for a long time.42

Texts such as this one show that one cannot generalise about the biographical reports about how Ibn őuraig received Zuhri’s ahādīt. Indeed it is also mentioned in biographical literature that Ibn őuraig had personal contacts with Zuhri. He was not one of his regular students, however. This latter fact does not exclude the possibility that he “heard” from him occasionally or asked him questions, maybe during one of Zuhri’s stays in Mecca for the ḥagg. This explains the occasional responsa to Ibn őuraig’s answers. It would be unwarranted to regard Ibn őuraig as unreliable or as a forger only because of a a few cases of contradiction between the information he is giving about his mode of transmission and the biographical information preserved about him. A historian need not necessarily share the hadīt critics’ reservations regarding Ibn őuraig’s Zuhri transmission. Even if Ibn őuraig received most of Zuhri’s “ahādīt” – that term does not necessarily include his ra’y – in written form, that is, without hearing them from him or reading them out to him, it does not mean that they should be considered as false or unreliable for that reason, but only that these sources do not meet the high standards of the later Muslim hadīt criticism. If the historian were only permitted to use sources which met these criteria, most of the sources on which historians of Islam rely would be unusable.

Our investigation of the evidence concerning Ibn őuraig which can be found in biographical literature leads, on the whole, to a picture very similar to the one
that we could outline on the basis of his texts. This could lead to the supposition that the biographical traditions could have been extrapolated from the texts. However, there is hardly any evidence for such a claim. Only the later voluminous lists of teachers and pupils as we find them, for example, in Ibn Ḥāṯar’s Tahdíb, probably arose, at least partially, in that way.\(^4\) Thus, on the basis not only of Ibn Ğuraiḍ’s texts but also of the biographical information on him, which goes back for the most part to his students, we are justified in considering his Zuhrī transmission as authentic, in the sense that he in fact received the texts from Zuhrī.

### IV

The smallest but no less important of the three early corpora of transmissions from Zuhrī is that of Mālik b. Anas in his Muwaṭṭa’.\(^4\) The Muwaṭṭa’ is basically a muṣan-naf work similar to those by Maʿmar and Ibn Ğuraiḍ, but more fully amplified with annotations. If analysed according to the alleged origin of its transmissions, the following picture emerges: Mālik refers most frequently to Ibn Šihāb [az-Zuhrī] (21 %), who, for this reason, can be considered his main informant. Texts from Nāfi’, the maulā of Ibn ʿUmar, and from Yaḥyā b. Saʿīd al-Anṣārī follow at some distance (14 % each). Rabī’ā b. Abī ʿAbdrāḥmān, ʿAbdrāḥmān b. al-Qāsim, Hišām b. ʿUrwa, and ʿAbdallāh b. Abī Bakr are among the informants mentioned less frequently (4 – 2 %). They are all Medinan scholars. A large number of names appear only sporadically. In Mālik’s Muwaṭṭa’, the stock of anonymous traditions is much more substantial (18 %) than in the text corpora of Maʿmar and Ibn Ğuraiḍ.\(^5\)

Faithful to the method I have followed so far, I take this striking distribution of texts among Mālik’s informants as the first circumstantial evidence against the possible suspicion that Mālik forged his transmission. If he had wanted to hide or fake the real origin of his traditions and ascribe them to particularly important authorities instead, the question arises why he chose to do so in such an irregular distribution. Why does he not prefer the older Nāfi’ as his main authority instead
of Zuhri? Why does he only quote Näfi’ as often as Yahyä b. Saʿid, who is a generation younger? And, finally, why does Mālik fail to name informants for so many traditions?

A comparison of the texts which Mālik ascribes to his most important informants supplies further evidence in favour of my hypothesis. I shall limit myself to a comparison of the transmissions from Ibn Śihāb and Näfi’: The texts referring to Ibn Śihāb consist for the most part of traditions in which Ibn Śihāb is only a transmitter and Mālik’s informant for the legal opinions of earlier authorities (63%). The remaining part (37%) which contains Zuhri’s own opinions (raʿy) is nevertheless considerable. Only little more than half of the raʿy transmissions take the form of responsa to Mālik’s questions or point to a personal communication (samaʿ). Is the rest transmitted indirectly? Frequently Zuhri’s raʿy is introduced in the Muwatta’ in such a way as to suggest, indeed, an indirect transmission, i.e. by the mediation of an anonymous third person. For example:

[Yahyä b. Yaḥyä] transmitted to me from Mālik that he had been told (balaḡaba) that Saʿid b. al-Musayyab, Sulaimān b. Yasār and Ibn Śihāb used to say: ...⁴⁶

This occurs, however, only in collective quotations in which other earlier authorities are mentioned besides Zuhri. Such anonymous references by Mālik to the raʿy of late first century A.H. Medinan tābiʿūn are to be found in Yaḥyä b. Yaḥyä’s recension of the Muwatta’ in large numbers. They take the following form:

[Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā] transmitted to me from Mālik that he had been told (balaḡaba) that al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad...⁴⁷

Anonymous traditions like this one are usually not found transmitted from Ibn Śihāb alone in the Muwatta’. So we have to conclude that the anonymous reference to Ibn Śihāb in collective quotations is an inexact, because shortened, form of quotation which actually should run as follows:
[Yahyä b. Yahyä] transmitted to me from Mälik from Ibn Šihäb, and that he had been told (balagahu) about [the Successors] X and Y that they used to say: ...

This more elaborate but more precise form of collective quotation occurs only occasionally. Mälik’s anonymous indirect reference to Ibn Šihäb in collective quotations should not be considered, therefore, as a real indirect transmission. Such examples do not prove at all that Mälik derives the major part of Ibn Šihäb az-Zuhri’s ra’y from sources which he passes over in silence. Real indirect transmissions from Zuhri are to be found in Mälik’s Muswatta’ only rarely. In them Mälik refers to Zuhri through a third person called by name. Even if such indirect transmissions are quite unusual, their sheer existence shows that we can hardly impute to Mälik the ambition to relate directly all Zuhri texts known to him, even those which he had not heard from Zuhri himself, suppressing the names of the informants from whom he actually received the Zuhri texts.

The atār and hadīts of Mälik’s Zuhri transmission mostly refer to the sahāba generation; only half as many go back to the Prophet and the smallest number go back to the tābi‘ūn. Anyway, the Prophet is the most frequently mentioned among all single authorities; he occurs twice as often as ‘Umar or ‘Uthmān, Ibn Šihäb’s favourites among the Companions of the Prophet. Among the sahāba traditions, those with an isnād prevail over those without; among the traditions from the Prophet both types of transmission are even frequent, whereas the Successor traditions are for the most part anonymous, i.e. lack any isnād.

These findings generate several questions for the advocates of the forgery theory: Why does Mälik, who via Ibn Šihäb mostly refers to the sahāba or to the Prophet, appeal to Ibn Šihäb’s ra’y at all, if he wanted to base his own fiqh fictitiously on earlier and more eminent authorities? Does it make sense to assume that
Mālik invented Prophetic traditions with incomplete *asānīd*, lacking one or even two transmitters, as well as traditions with complete chains of transmitters?

Mālik’s Nāfi’ transmission is totally different from his Ibn Šihāb az-Zuhrī texts. It generally does not contain traditions about Nāfi’s *ra‘y*,59 but consists almost entirely of traditions which Nāfi’ transmits from other people. About two thirds of them relate to the *ra‘y* or the legally relevant behaviour of ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Umar who is counted among the *ṣaḥāba*. The rest refer to the Prophet, his wives, or to a Companion like Zaid b. Ṭābit, often in connection with a member of ‘Umar’s or Ibn ‘Umar’s family. Nāfi’’s informant is for the most part his patron Ibn ‘Umar, more rarely the latter’s wife Ṣāfiyya bint Abī ‘ Ubaid, his son Sālim or other family members. Generally, we find informants given in this material for traditions from the Prophet and Companions other than Ibn ‘Umar. There are hardly any *responsa* by Nāfi’ to questions asked by Mālik himself51 or indications that he heard him personally (*samā‘*).

As in the case of Ma‘mar and Ibn Ĝuraiğ, it is possible to explain – hypothetically – the astonishing differences between Mālik’s Ibn Šihāb [az-Zuhrī] and Nāfi’ transmissions by historical circumstances. For example: The fact that Mālik frequently transmits from Zuhrī *responsa* to his own questions as well as texts which Mālik explicitly says he heard from Zuhrī, whereas he hardly transmits any of these types of texts from Nāfi’, may be the result of different forms of teaching. Nāfi’ may have had his pupils only copy texts and read them out – or Mālik may have only attended such lessons – whereas Zuhrī may have held additional question times or discussions about legal topics. The finding that Mālik reports from Zuhrī many instances of his *ra‘y*, and, by comparison, almost none from Nāfi’, may have similar reasons or – more likely – it may mirror the fact that Nāfi’ did not teach his own *ra‘y* at all, but confined himself in his classes to the transmission and diffusion of traditions only.
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The difference between Mālik’s transmissions from Ibn Šihāb and Nāfī’ was noticed by Schacht as well. Yet he did not see in this difference any evidence of a possible authenticity of both text transmissions. On the contrary, he tried to solve the problem by postulating that one or more forgers had invented these texts and falsely ascribed them to both scholars (Nāfī’ and Zuhri) during the first half of the second century. According to Schacht, Mālik adopted these fabricated texts – those connected with Nāfī’s name possibly from a manuscript – in good faith, thinking that they were genuine, but did not indicate that his transmission was indirect.52 Schacht implies with this assumption that Mālik acted against the rules of the later science of hadīt and practised a method of transmission for which, according to biographical information, Mālik fiercely criticised others, for example Ibn Ğuraiğ.53

Schacht gives several reasons for his aversion to the isnād “Mālik – Nāfī’ – Ibn ‘Umar”, considered by Muslims as particularly trustworthy:54 Firstly, the quantity of Mālik’s Nāfī’ traditions is too large for the marked difference in age between them – Nāfī’ died in 117, Mālik in 179 A.H.55 Secondly, the isnād “Nāfī’ ‘an Ibn ‘Umar” is what he calls a “family isnād”, which must be generally suspected of having been fabricated. Thirdly, the traditions provided with this isnād reflect, in Schacht’s opinion, a secondary stage in legal development; he writes: “Many Nāfī’ traditions represent unsuccessful attempts at influencing the doctrine of the Medinese school.” “…These traditions are later than the established Medinese doctrine.”56

These arguments are not convincing, however. First, according to biographical reports, Mālik was 23 or 24 years old when Nāfī’ died.57 This is certainly not an age that precludes the taking over of his Nāfī’ tradition, which is not particularly large, by copying or reading it out. Secondly, it is not plausible that transmission from relatives and family members should be considered a priori as untrustworthy. On the contrary, we can imagine that they are especially reliable because of the longer and more intimate contact that had existed between the transmitter and his informant.58 Thirdly, Schacht’s last argument is part of a circular reasoning; he uses
hypotheses on the doctrine of a presumed old "Medinese school" which he himself constructed on the basis of conjectures which already contained his prejudices concerning the value of the asānid of the second century. Finally, we can question why Mālik should have faked a direct transmission from Nāfi', though he does not shrink from quoting him occasionally via a third person, for example, Nāfi'’s son Abū Bakr.59

Our comparison of the text corpora of Mālik’s most important informants leads to the conclusion that we must assume that Mālik’s transmissions from both Nāfi’ and Zuhri really derive from them, until the contrary is proven.

This conclusion, based only on Mālik’s Muwatta’, remains tenable even when we look at the biographical reports preserved about Mālik. Schacht has dealt with Mālik’s biography in detail.60 He thinks that we hardly have any reliable information about the period of Mālik’s studies. Schacht only accepts the report that Mālik studied fiqh with Rabī’ a b. Farrūḥ, though this information is only found in later sources. He seems to reject as untrustworthy other reports, even early ones, concerning other teachers of Mālik. Schacht emphasises that the fact of Mālik’s transmitting from Nāfi’ and Zuhri is not proof that he studied with the authorities in question.61

Schacht is surely right in being suspicious of the steady increase in teachers’ and pupils’ names in the biographical sources because they probably are based, at least partially, on the asānid known to their authors. Yet the reports about Mālik that go back to his immediate pupils cannot be rejected indiscriminately, as Schacht did. In doing so, he was guided by his prejudices concerning the state of development which Islamic fiqh had reached in the first quarter of the second century and he concluded from the content of the texts that they could not derive from the generation of Mālik’s supposed teachers. Some of the gaps in Schacht’s portrayal of Mālik’s biography will be filled in the following paragraph.
According to Mālik himself, as transmitted by his student Yaḥyā b. Bukair, he was born in 93/712. This date is preferable to all other dates for which no sources are given. That means that he was 23 or 24 when Nāfi‘ died. The ‘Irāqi scholar Šu‘ba [b. al-Ḥaḡgāḡ], a slightly older contemporary of Mālik’s, even reported that Mālik already had his own circle (ḥalqa) of students when he, Šu‘ba, came to Medina a year after Nāfi‘’s death. Mālik’s students, like Yaḥyā b. Sa‘īd al-Qaṭṭān, regarded their teacher as one of Nāfi‘’s most important “transmitters” – and by this they mean pupils. Critical ḥadīt scholars, like ʿAlī b. al-Madīnī, Yaḥyā b. Ma‘īn and ʿAḥmad b. Ḥanbal, belonging to the generation of the pupils of Mālik’s students, considered Mālik a student (ṣāḥib) of both Nāfi‘ and Zuhrī and the latter, i.e. Zuhrī, as his most important teacher. They probably obtained their information from their teachers, i.e. Mālik’s students, even in the cases when they do not say that explicitly. Among Zuhrī’s pupils they preferred Mālik to all others, mentioning besides him as important students his older contemporary Ma‘mar b. Rāṣid and – with reservations – the slightly younger Ibn ‘Uyaina. The latter reported that Mālik and Ma‘mar took over their material from Zuhrī by copying manuscripts and reading them out (ʾarḍan), whereas he himself only took over material by listening (ṣamā‘), possibly because he was, due to his age, only a novice in Zuhrī’s circle.

The correspondence between early biographical traditions about Mālik and the results we obtained by investigating the Mālik’s transmission from his teachers as contained in the Muwatta’ corroborates my assumption that Mālik’s Zuhrī traditions in the Muwatta’ are genuine, i.e. their content really does go back to Zuhrī. They deserve our trust until the contrary is proven, not the opposite, as Schacht demanded.
As we have shown, the investigation of the three earliest corpora containing large numbers of Zuhri texts gives rise to the conclusion that the Zuhri transmission of all of them cannot be considered as fabrications of the compilators of these corpora, i.e. texts falsely ascribed to Zuhri. This does not exclude the possibility that they may contain errors which crept in during the process of transmission. If it is true that Ma'mar's and Ibn Ğuraiğ's transmissions found in 'Abdarrazzāq's *Muṣannaf* and Mālik's transmission in the *Muwatta'* independently go back to Zuhri, then we could expect that these three transmission stocks contain, at least partially, similar materials. Whether this is the case will be examined now.

To start with, we have to record that, on the face of it, there are similarities and differences between the three transmission corpora. For example, Ma'mar's contains many more texts than the other two, yet this does not necessarily mean that its additional material is fabricated. To explain the difference, we can imagine that, for some reason, Mālik and Ibn Ğuraiğ did not communicate everything they knew from Zuhri and/or that they had learned less from him than Ma'mar had, maybe because they did not study with Zuhri as long as Ma'mar did. The fact that in Ma'mar’s corpus Zuhri’s *ra’y* predominates, whereas in Ibn Ğuraiğ’s and Mālik’s corpora his traditions from earlier authorities are more frequent, may have similar causes or may mirror Ma'mar’s stronger interest in Zuhri’s *ra’y*. Likewise, we can explain the different distribution of Zuhri’s informants in the traditions of the three text corpora. The fact, for example, that Ibn al-Musayyab and Sālim b. ‘Abdal-lāh b. ‘Umar are more frequently mentioned in Ma’mar’s Zuhri traditions than in those of the other two can, perhaps, be explained by the observation that Ibn Ğuraiğ transmits many Ibn al-Musayyab traditions from other informants, like Yahyā b. Sa‘īd, and many Ibn ‘Umar traditions from Nāfi‘ and Mūṣā b. ‘Uqba (‘*an Nāfi‘). He may have been less interested in Zuhri’s transmission from them. Something
similar is true in Mālik’s case. In addition, it is important to bear in mind that Mālik often does not mention his informants for the traditions from the Sucessors, though, in many cases, Zuhrī probably is Mālik’s source for them.

A comparative analysis the texts (mutūn) contained in the three corpora will offer more substantiated conclusions. For the sake of clarity, I distinguish between Zuhrī’s ra’y and his traditions. The question I will answer first is: How similar are the texts reproducing Zuhrī’s ra’y contained in the tree copora?

If the Zuhrī transmission by Ibn Ğuraiği is compared to the one by Ma’mar from this point of view, the result is that more than half of all ra’y texts transmitted by Ibn Ğuraiği have a parallel in Ma’mar’s corpus. Most of them have the same content, i.e. differ only in the choice of words or in the fullness of the text; some texts are completely identical; others deal with a somewhat diverging point of the same legal issue; obvious contradictions are only rarely found. Here are some examples:

In his Muṣannaf ‘Abdarrazzāq often reproduces sayings (dicta) of Zuhrī which are transmitted by both Ma’mar and Ibn Ğuraiği in the same or very similar words by quoting only one text in full, as a rule that of Ma’mar, and giving from the other one only the isnād, for example “‘an Ibn Ğuraiği ‘an Ibn Šihāb” together with the remark “mitlabu” (the same).65

Examples of texts with the same content but different wording are:

a) ‘Abdarrazzāq from Ma’mar from Zuhrī: There is no objection marrying a free [woman] in addition to a slave woman, [but] it is not permitted to marry a slave woman in addition to a free [wife]. If [a man], married already to a free woman, marries a slave woman, he must be separated (furriqa) from the slave woman and he is to be punished. If he marries a free woman in addition to a slave woman while she knows that he is [already] married to a slave woman, she has the right to the same number (qisma) [of nights] and maintenance. [But] if she married [him] without knowing that he is mar-
ried to a slave woman, she has the right to decide: If she wants, she can separate from him or stay with him. 66

b) ‘Abdarrazzāq from Ibn Ġuraġ; he said: Ibn Šihāb transmitted to me about the free woman who is married [by a man] in addition to a slave woman: The sunna concerning the [woman] with whom a free man does that [i.e. marries her] is that the free man is not permitted to marry a slave woman if he finds the financial means (tut) to [marry] a free woman. 67 If he does not find the financial means, marriage with a slave woman is allowed. If he then marries a free woman in addition to her [the slave woman], he can do that provided that the free woman knows that he is [already] married to a slave woman. If she did not know, the free woman can choose between separation from him and staying with him for the same number (qisma) [of nights] and maintenance. [However,] if he marries a slave woman in addition to her [the free woman], she [the slave woman] will be taken away from him, and he will be punished. 68

Differences such as the large number of texts tallying only in content but not in wording show that the texts did not result from copying of manuscripts but from notes made during and/or after the lessons. Such a procedure appears to have been quite normal for the type of legal teaching in which questions were asked and legal problems were discussed (as opposed to hadît instruction where texts were recited or read out). The fact that occasionally a different point of a legal issue is emphasised may reflect different personal interests and individual students’ different background knowledge. Furthermore, we have to take into account that our three transmitters of Zuhri’s legal opinions (Ma‘mar, Ibn Ġuraģ and Mālik) probably did not study with him at the same time so that their different presentations of the material may be due to Zuhrī himself who, perhaps, did not always express his doctrines in exactly the same words.

The rare parallel texts in which obvious contradictions appear are not easily explained. An example:
a) 'Abdarrazzaq from Ma'mar from Zuhri about the one who gratifies his sexual desires with an animal (ya'ti al-bahimata). He said: “He must be flogged 100 times; it does not matter whether he is muḥṣin (ahsana, i.e. has been married before) or not.”

b) 'Abdarrazzaq said: Ibn Ėuraig transmitted to us; he said: Ibn Sihāb told about a man who cohabitates with a gregarious animal (yaqa'u 'alâ l-bahimati min al-an'am) the following: “I have not heard a sunna about it, but we consider him like the one who has illegitimate sexual intercourse [with a human being] (az-zānī); it does not matter whether he is muḥṣin (ahsana) or not.”

In the last text the punishment is not mentioned expressly, but we can infer it, for only the zānī who is not muḥṣin is flogged while the muḥṣin is stoned. Obviously, there is a contradiction between both texts. It is not easy to tell how this came about. We can imagine a change of mind on Zuhri’s part, which would not be at all unusual, or a misunderstanding by one of the pupils who transmitted the text.

When Mālik’s quotations of Zuhri’s ra’y found in the Muwatta’ are compared with Ma’mar’s and Ibn Ėuraig’s ra’y transmissions from Zuhri contained in the Musannaf, the correspondences are even higher (80%) than between Ma’mar and Ibn Ėuraig. Here, too, completely identical texts are rather unusual; the majority only have the same content; and we occasionally find contradictions as well. The causes of the sometimes smaller, sometimes bigger differences are probably the same as mentioned above.

An example of identical and similar texts:

a) [Yahyā] transmitted to me from Mālik from Ibn Šihāb that he said: “Every divorced woman has the right to an allowance (mut’a).”

b) ['Abdarrazzaq from] Ma’mar from Zuhri; he said: “Every divorced woman has the right to an allowance (mut’a).”
c) ‘Abdarrazzāq from Ibn Ḏuraiq from Ibn Šihāb; he said: “The allowance is the same for the woman who had marital intercourse and for the one who had not.” He said [moreover]: “They both have the right to allowance.”

An example of contradictory texts:

a) Yaḥyā transmitted to me from Mālik, that he asked Ibn Šihāb about the oath [of sexual abstinence] (īla‘) of a slave [concerning his wife]. He [Ibn Šihāb] said: “It is like the īla‘ of the free man; it is binding, [but] the īla‘ of the slave [covers only] two months.”

b) ‘Abdarrazzāq from Ma‘mar from Zuhrī; he said: “The slave’s oath [of sexual abstinence] to a slave woman [covers] four months.”

The facts that such contradictions are an exception and that the majority of the Zuhrī dicta expressing his ra’y correspond in content corroborate my conclusion that all three source corpora contain genuine traditions of Zuhrī’s ra’y. It is very unlikely that the three compilators – one living in Ṣan‘ā’, another in Mecca and the third in Medina – independently of one another can have ascribed arbitrarily so many similar texts to Zuhrī. In this case of forgery contradictions would occur more frequently. Another possible assumption, namely that all three scholars actually obtained their material from the same “counterfeit workshop” or fell victim to a wandering “pious swindler” who circulated fabricated Zuhrī doctrines, and that they then concealed the source of their material by suppressing the names of their informants in the asānid, is unconvincing as well. Schacht assumed this for a part of Mālik’s Zuhrī transmission, though he did not suspect Mālik of pia fraus expressly. The practical difficulties of this hypothesis apart, in such a case we could expect more correspondence in wording between the texts of the transmitters.

Perhaps, Schacht would have gone so far as to recognise as genuine the complete ra’y of Zuhrī as transmitted by Mālik, but in the case of his Zuhrī traditions from earlier authorities no compromise was possible for Schacht, for this would
have contradicted his ideas about the development of Islamic jurisprudence. What can be said about Zuhri’s āṭār and ṣaḥādīt in our three early sources? An extensive comparison of the numerous texts would be desirable but cannot be done in the framework of this essay. Such a comparison should consist of a synopsis of the traditions corresponding in content; it should underline the differences and suggest explanations for them. However, a few results of such an investigation will at least be presented and illustrated with examples.

Taking Mālik’s Muwattā’ as a starting point we can detect that for the majority (85 %) of his texts in which Ibn Šihāb functions as transmitter for earlier authorities there are parallel texts in the corpora of Ma‘mar and/or Ibn Ġuraiḡ. A minority of texts is transmitted only by the latter two or by one of the three scholars alone. The correspondence varies from identical texts to only a vague resemblance in content. I cannot detect any difference in variation concerning certain types of traditions such as those referring to the tābi‘ūn generation, the ṣaḥāba or the Prophet. From the point of view of literary genres, short legal maxims are found beside elaborated cases and detailed narratives (qiṣaṣ).

These facts provide evidence against the suspicion, held by Schacht and others, that the traditions labelled as Zuhri transmissions in the ḥadīt compilations emerged only after his death, and that they were falsely ascribed to him and happened to reach the authors of our three compilations by oral transmission – oral because of the many differences between the texts. Firstly, the body of Zuhri traditions is too large to fit this theory. Secondly, the period of time between Zuhri’s death (124/742) and the “publication” of our three authors’ compilations is too short. They probably composed their works some time before their deaths. Ibn Ġuraiḡ was already dead by 150/767 and Ma‘mar died in 153/770. Mālik’s Muwattā’ must have existed around 150 at the latest because Šaibānī, who was born in 132/750, probably received his version of the Muwattā’ as a young student of Mālik’s – according to biographical reports at the age of 20. The year 150 can be
considered, therefore, as the *terminus ante quem* of the existence of all three compilations; but most probably they had already been compiled much earlier. If this is accepted, it remains difficult to explain how the three authors, who lived far away from one another, came into possession of this huge number of texts, which are similar in content but often vary in wording, if one assumes at the same time that the texts were forged by others. Finally, it seems a very odd coincidence that each of the three compilers suppressed their real informant(s) or their common source(s) as if they had agreed to this fraud.

In the following I shall present an example to show the differences between the Zuhri traditions in our three corpora and to clarify the conclusions reached so far.

a) [Yaḥyā] transmitted to me from Mālik from Ibn Šīhāb from Saʿīd b. al-Musayyab and Sulaimān b. Yasār, that Ṭulaiḥa as Asadiyya was married (*kāna taḥtā* to Ruṣaid at-Taqāfī. He divorced her and she remarried in her waiting period. "Umar b. al-Ḥaṭṭāb had her and her husband flogged (*daraba*) with an oxen scourge (*mihfaqa*) and he sentenced them to be separated (*farraqa bainahumā*). Then, "Umar b. al-Ḥaṭṭāb said: "If a woman (*ayyuma mraʿatin*) marries during her waiting period and if the man who married her has not consummated the marriage (*daḥala biḥāt*) [yet], both must be separated (*furriqa bainahuma*); she must [first] observe the remaining part (*baqiyya*) of her waiting period of [the marriage with] her first husband and then the second man can marry her again (*kāna ḥaṭīban min al-ḥuṭṭāb*). [However,] if he has consummated the marriage with her, both must be separated; she must observe [first] what remains of the waiting period of [the marriage with] her first husband, than the waiting period of the second one, and then both are forbidden to marry another again for ever (*la yaḡtāmānī*).

Mālik said: Ibn al-Musayyab said: "She [the woman in the last case] is entitled to her bride wealth [as a compensation] for what was permitted to him from her."[86] —[87]

In the notes, the differences found in Šāibānī’s *Muwaṭṭa*’ recension are given. These differences consist of additions, varying names, and variations in the text that
sometimes look like specifications and sometimes like errors. The omission or suppression of the words “qāla Mālik” before the Ibn al-Musayyab dictum, added at the end of the text, means that it is to be understood as a constituent part of Ibn Śihāb’s transmission. Originally this additional remark to the tradition from ‘Umar was probably anonymous, like so many of Mālik’s references to Ibn al-Musayyāb found in Yaḥyā’s Muwaṭṭa’ version. All in all, the correspondence between both variants of Mālik’s text is so close that it must have been recorded in writing. Let us have a look at the parallels:

b) ‘Abdarrazzāq from Ma’mar from Zuhri from Ibn al-Musayyab, that Ṭulaiḥa bint ‘Ubaidallāh married (nakāḥat) Rusāid at-Taqāfī in her waiting period. ‘Umar had them flogged (wālada) with a whip (dirra). He decided (qadā): “If a man (ayyūmā rağu-lin) marries a woman during her waiting period and consummates the marriage with her (aṣṭabah), both must be separated (yusfarraqu bainahumā); then, both are forbidden to marry another again (yağtami’ānī); she must complete (tastakmilu) what remains (baqīyata) of the waiting period [of the marriage with] the first [husband] and then turn (tastaqbilu) to her waiting period of [the marriage with] the second one. [However,] if he has not [yet] consummated the marriage with her (lam yusibha), both must be separated (yusfarraqu bainahumā) until she has completed (tastakmilu) what remains of the waiting period of [the marriage with] the first [husband]; then, he [the second one] can marry her again (yahṭubhū ma’a l-huttab).”

Zuhri said: “I do not know how many [lashes] that flogging amounted to.” He said [moreover]: “‘Abdalmalik had both of them flogged with 40 lashes in that [i.e. such a case]. Qabiṣa b. Du’aib was questioned on it ['Abdalmalik’s verdict]. He said: “If you had diminished it and flogged each of them with 20 lashes [, it would have been more appropriate].”

c) ‘Abdarrazzāq from Ma’mar from Zuhri from Sulaimān b. Yasār, that ‘Umar b. al-Haṭṭāb imposed her complete bride wealth on the one [who] had married her during her waiting period [as compensation] for the claim he had (istabaqa) on her [to sexual intercourse]; both must be separated (yusfarraqu bainahumā); both are forbidden to
marry again (yatanakabani) for ever, and she must observe her waiting period (ta’addu) of both [marriages].

d) ‘Abdarrazzaq from Ma’mar from Zuhri, that Sulaiman and Ibn al-Musayyab had different opinions. Zuhri said: [Ibn al-Musayyab said:]91 “She is entitled to her bride wealth.” Sulaiman said: “Her bride wealth goes to the treasury (bait al-mal).”

The comparison between the Muwatta’ text and Ma’mar’s version from Ibn al-Musayyab (text b), both of them certainly deriving from a common source, supports our hypothesis that some of Saibani’s deviations from Yahya’s text are specifications and others are mistakes. The original name in Zuhri’s traditions was certainly Tulaiha, perhaps even Tulaiha b. ‘Ubaidallah; “al-Asadiyya” seems to be an addition by Yahya; Saibani added the nasab (bint Talha b. ‘Ubaidallah).93 The problem is that the two notions are incompatible, for Talha b. ‘Ubaidallah was of Taim b. Murra, not of Asad. Ma’mar’s “Tulaiha bint ‘Ubaidallah” completes the confusion, but it is probably the original version because it is corroborated by another early tradition, that of ‘Abdalkarim [al-Ġazar] (d. 127/745),94 transmitted by Ibn Ġuraiq (here the woman is called “Tulaiha bint ‘Ubaidallah, the sister of Tulaiha b. ‘Ubaidallah”).95 Uncertainty about the reading of a hand-written text lacking diacritical points may have led to doubts about the correct name of the second husband (Ibn Munabbi or Ibn Munayyah) which appears only in Saibani’s version.

Ma’mar’s and Malik’s versions are hardly the result of copying the same manuscript. The differences not only in vocabulary but also in the sequence of the arguments are too great for such an assumption. That means either that one or both transmitters obtained the text by oral transmission – this does not exclude the possibility that also written notes were used as memory aids – or that Zuhri did not always tell the tradition in exactly the same form, or that both possibilities occurred at the same time.
Ma‘mar reports the caliph ‘Umar’s verdict in two very different versions from two different informants of Zuhri’s (Ibn al-Musayyab, Sulaimän b. Yasär), whereas Mālik gives only one text from the same two scholars. This suggests that the state of affairs offered by Ma‘mar is the more original one because it is not probable that two different persons told the same story in exactly the same words. The collective version of Ibn al-Musayyab and Sulaimän must have been created later, either by Zuhri himself or — more likely — by Mālik. It was probably Mālik as well who deleted Sulaimän’s opinion about the issue of who was entitled to the bride wealth due for the void marriage, because it neither corresponded to his own doctrine nor to that of Zuhri, as can be inferred from another tradition.96

Ibn Ǧūraḡ’s version of the story is as follows:

e) ‘Abdarrazzāq from Ibn Ǧūraḡ; he said: Ibn Ṣihāb transmitted to me from ['Ubaidallāh b.] Ḥtbā and Abū Salama b. ‘Abdarrahmān, that ‘Umar b. al-Ḥattāb separated (فارق البينة) a woman, who had married in her waiting period, from her husband. Then he decided (قادة): “If a woman (أعومة المرأة) marries in her waiting period [but] her husband did not [yet] consummate the marriage (لم يذلゅ biḥā), both must be separated (يفرق البينة); she must complete what remains of her waiting period (تتدد ما بقية); when it is finished, the second man can marry her [again] (حاتبا في البنت); if she wants she can marry him, if she does not want [anymore], she can abstain from it. [But] if he has consummated the marriage with her [already], then both are forbidden to marry (يغتامي الدني) another again for ever; she must complete [first] her waiting period of [the marriage with] the first [husband], then observe the waiting period (تتدد) of [the marriage with] the second one.98

In Ibn Ǧūraḡ’s transmission, ‘Umar’s dictum shows greater similarity in structure and vocabulary with Mālik’s version than with Ma‘mar’s, though there are also variations. The historical introduction is missing, as well as the names of the persons involved, and, most oddly, two other persons are mentioned as Zuhri’s informants of the case. Must we conclude from these facts that Ibn Ǧūraḡ shortened the original text and consciously changed the names of Zuhri’s informants? Or did
he forget the original version and then cover up the gap in his memory by producing arbitrarily two other names as informants? Such conclusions are not compelling. According to the biographical information mentioned above, Ibn Ğuraiğ obtained most of his Zuhři traditions not by hearing them from him or reading them out to him, but in written form – perhaps he even copied the manuscript of one of Zuhři’s students – together with an iğāza, i.e. a permission to transmit the material.99 If this was so, fading memory cannot have been the cause of the differences in his version. Furthermore, Ibn Ğuraiğ usually does not hesitate to admit memory gaps and mark them as such. If fading memory is not the cause, why then should he have fabricated the names? At least, this was not his habit, as I have shown elsewhere.100

If Zuhři knew two different traditions about ‘Umar’s judgment – Ibn al-Musayyab’s and Sulaimān b. Yasār’s – it is possible that the story of the case was more widely known and that other Medinan scholars commented upon it as well, for example, the scholars mentioned by Ibn Ğuraiğ. This is corroborated by the fact that the story is also reported from other people. Apart from Zuhři, Ibn Ğuraiğ transmits it from the ‘Irāqi scholar ‘Abdalkarīm [al-Ǧazārī], who had been for some time a student of Ibn al-Musayyab’s, and from the Meccan scholar ‘Amr [b. Dinār], who likewise had contacts with the Medinan fuqahā’, but Ibn Ğuraiğ does not give the informants from whom these scholars obtained the tradition. Ma‘mar quotes it in a short form through his Baṣrān colleague Ayyūb [b. Abī Tamīma] from the latter’s teacher Abū Qilāba, and Sufyān al-Ṭaurī transmits a reminiscence of it via Ḥammād from Ibrāhīm [an-Naḥā‘ī].101

It is not plausible to assume that Zuhři himself invented additional informants, for he could more easily have named them all in a collective isnād instead of fabricating special texts for them. At most, we can assume that Zuhři could not always correctly remember his sources when quoting the story from memory. Such a hypothesis, however, seems less plausible than the idea that several different versions
of one and the same case were in circulation. The peculiarity that Ibn Ğuraiği names informants other than Maʿmar and Mālik for Zuhri’s traditions can be explained, therefore, by the assumption that he reproduces variant traditions of Zuhri’s which are independent of those transmitted from him by Maʿmar and Mālik. The fact that the historical background of the case is lacking in Ibn Ğuraiği’s version may be in its favour as well.

We have compared the variants of one single Zuhri tradition about a verdict of the caliph ‘Umar b. al-Ḥattāb as contained in three very early corpora of traditions. What is the final result of this comparison? 1) This tradition probably really comes from Zuhri. So the story already circulated in the first quarter of the second century A.H. 2) Ibn Śihāb hardly invented it himself or picked it up from someone whose name he concealed, naming other persons as his informants, since he reports also the ihtilāf, i.e. the differences of opinion of his informants, and he admits his ignorance concerning a detail of the story (the question as to how many lashes ‘Umar sentenced each of the culprits to). 3) The story certainly goes back to the tābiʿān generation, i.e. dates from the last quarter of the first century A.H. Having regard to the early date, it shows a considerably high level of literary skill and legal reflection. The story contains many formal elements that, according to Schacht’s criteria, are to be considered late or secondary: a. an introduction containing narrative elements (qiṣṣa) and names of the persons involved in the case; b. a very long and complex legal sentence which not only offers a solution in a concrete case – here, a marriage concluded during the waiting period – but also reflects hypothetical conditions which may be relevant in similar cases (the marriage during the waiting period with or without consummation). 4) The dictum, which in Mālik’s version consists of 47 words, is not in accordance with the short “legal maxims” which Schacht put at the beginning of the development of Islamic jurisprudence. Yet the dictum belongs to its beginnings. This shows that a reconstruction of the development of the fiqh that is based primarily on the text (matn) of the legal traditions does not lead to reliable results. 5) If it is true that the case and its solution by ‘U-
mar were transmitted in varying versions by different fuqahā' of the tābi‘ūn generation, the story must go back to a common source or have a historical core. Since there is no circumstantial evidence for a common source, we must assume a historical core, even if none of Zuhri’s informants can have really experienced the time of ‘Umar’s caliphate because of their age, let alone have witnessed the case in question. We can imagine that the tradition transmitted by Zuhri from Sulaimān b. Yasār (text c) relates the historical core, i.e. the concrete case and the caliph’s solution. The extension to the hypothetical cases of whether consummation occurred or not and the questions of how to deal with the waiting periods and whether remarriage is possible may be the result of the discussion that took place afterwards among the fuqahā’ who transmitted the case. We cannot be certain whether the concrete case was really solved by the second caliph in the form reported, since none of the transmitters was an eye-witness. But the possibility that ‘Umar dealt with such a case cannot be ruled out. In view of the early date of the tradition it is more than just a possibility.

VI

Our analysis of a Zuhri tradition about ‘Umar has shown that there are Companion traditions that can be dated to the last quarter or even the last half of the first century A.H., a possibility which Schacht categorically excluded. This is only one of several cases of early Companion traditions. But what should we think of Zuhri’s ahādīt from the Prophet which, according to Schacht, belong in principle to a still younger stage of legal development than the Companion traditions? This issue will be discussed in the following on the basis of another example.

a) Yahyā transmitted to me from Mālik from Ibn Śihāb, that (annahu) he was asked about the suckling of adults (rada‘at al-kabīr); he said: ‘Urwa b. az-Zubair transmitted to me:
Abū Ḫudzaifa b. 'Utba b. Rabi'a — he belonged to the Companions of the messenger of God (eulogy) and took part in the battle of Badr — had adopted Sālim, who was called Sālim, the maulā of Abū Ḫudzaifa, just as the messenger of God (eulogy) had adopted Zaid b. Ḥārīta. Abū Ḫudzaifa had married Sālim, whom he considered his son, with the daughter of his brother, Fāṭima bint al-Walid b. 'Utba b. Rabi'a. She belonged at that time to the first emigrants and to the noblest (min afdal) unmarried women of Qurais. When God (eulogy) revealed in his book what he revealed about Zaid b. Ḥārīta and said: “Call them after their fathers! That is more equitable in God's eyes. If you do not know their fathers, then [let them be] your brothers in faith and your clients (mawālit), every one of those [adopted sons] was traced back to his father; [but] if his father was unknown, he was traced back (rudda) to his patron (maulā).

Sahla bint Suhail — she was Abū Ḫudzaifa’s wife and belonged to the Banū 'Āmir b. Lu’ayy — came to the messenger of God (eulogy) and said: “Messenger of God! We considered Sālim as [our] son (wilad) and he was used to come in to me [even] when I was in underwear; we have only one house [in which we cannot live together since Sālim is not our son anymore]. What is your opinion about his case?

The messenger of God (eulogy) said to her: “Suckle him [i.e. give him from your milk] five times (hams raḍā‘āt)!” So he became prohibited (yahrūmu) through her milk and she regarded him as a “milk son” (ibnān min ar-raḍā‘ā) and consequently he could frequent her without restrictions.

‘Ā’iša, the “mother of the believers” adopted [that method] with the men she wanted to be able to come to see her, and she ordered her sister Umm Kulṭūm bint Abī Bakr as-Ṣiddīq and the daughters of her brother to suckle whichever men she wanted to come in to see her.

The other wives of the Prophet (eulogy) refused to let anyone come in to them on the basis of that [form of] suckling. They said: “No, by God! We consider that what the messenger of God (eulogy) ordered Sahla bint Suhail [to do] only as a permis-
sion of the messenger of God (eulogy)\textsuperscript{145} for the suckling of Sālim alone.\textsuperscript{146} No,\textsuperscript{147} by God! Nobody can come in to us by this [form of] suckling."

This was the practice (\textit{ālā hādā kāna})\textsuperscript{148} of the wives of the Prophet (eulogy)\textsuperscript{149} concerning the suckling of adults.\textsuperscript{150}

I have presented Mālik’s text in three versions: the one transmitted by Yahyā b. Yahyā and, in the notes, the differences of the transmissions by Šaibānī and ‘Abdarrazziq. The differences between the two latter versions and Yahyā’s may be summarised as follows: shorter text; some insignificant additions; a few other verbal forms which may be due to copyist errors; and other titles for the Prophet. Yahyā’s version seems to offer, to a large extent, the more original text, but it has additions in some places (for example, more complete names) where Šaibānī’s and ‘Abdarrazziq’s texts correspond to one another against Yahyā. In spite of the differences, the texts of the three variants correspond to such a high degree that they must be the result of essentially written transmission from a common source that can be identified as Mālik’s teaching. Whether the differences between the three versions, for example, the varying length of the quotations from the Qur’ān, are due to the students or to a varying transmission by Mālik himself, remains uncertain.

An important difference in ‘Abdarrazziq’s transmission, not marked in my translation of the text, concerns the \textit{isnād}. Yahyā introduces the tradition with “\textit{an Mālik ‘an Ibn Šihāb...fa-qāla: abbaru}...”, Šaibānī has “\textit{abbara}nā Mālik, \textit{abbaru}nā Ibn Šihāb...fa-qāla: abbaru}...” and in both cases the \textit{isnād} ends with ‘Urwa b. az-Zubair. ‘Abdarrazziq, on the contrary, has the \textit{isnād}: ‘\textit{an Mālik ‘an Ibn Šihāb ‘an ‘Urwa ‘an ‘Ā’iša}. This leads one to the conclusion that ‘Abdarrazziq, who offers a more complete \textit{isnād} from Mālik than Mālik’s two other students, is responsible for the addition “\textit{an ‘Ā’iša}”. For what reason can he have added it? To provide the tradition with an unbroken transmission chain? This seems doubtful in view of the hundreds of \textit{āḥādīt} that ‘Abdarrazziq transmits from the Prophet with a defective \textit{isnād}. It is also difficult to imagine that ‘Abdarrazziq has not noticed that the story
as a whole cannot possibly have been told by ‘Ā’iša because she is mentioned in it not in the first, but in the third person.

A first clue to the solution of this problem is offered by the analysis of the text which is, by the way, one of the most elaborate stories among Mālik’s legal traditions. By dividing the translation of the text into paragraphs, I have tried to show that it consists of four independent stories. The tradition starts with the story of Abū Ḥuḍaiṣa and his adopted son Sālim that is a sort of prologue for the following story about Sahla and the fatwa of the Prophet. Two reports about the practice of the Prophet’s wives are added; the first concerns only ‘Ā’iša, the second deals with the other wives of the Prophet. The composition is closed by a concluding sentence that recalls again the topic of the entire tradition.

In view of this skilful composition, the issue of authorship must be broken down into the question of who is the author of the entire composition and who are the authors of its different parts. The question whether it was Mālik, Zuhrī or ‘Urwa who tied the discrete traditions together cannot be answered on the basis of Mālik’s text. A comparison with other early versions of the tradition will take us a step further.

b) ‘Abdarrazzāq from Ma’mar from Zuhrī from ‘Urwa from ‘Ā’iša; she said: Sahla bint Suhail b. ‘Amr came to the Prophet (eulogy) and said: “Sālim used to be called (yud‘a) after Abū Ḥuḍaiṣa and [now] God (eulogy) has revealed in his book: ‘Call them after their fathers!’ He used to come in to me while I was in underwear (fudul) [and this was inevitable since] we live [together] in a flat (manzil).” The Prophet (eulogy) said: “Suckle Sālim [so that] you are forbidden (tahrumī) for him.”

Zuhrī said: Some of the Prophet’s (eulogy) wives said: “We do not know whether this was only a permission granted for Salim alone (ḥaṣṣatan) [or not].”

Zuhrī said [moreover]: Until she died, ‘Ā’iša used to give the legal advice (tuftī) that suckling after weaning makes forbidden [for marriage].\textsuperscript{51}
c) ‘Abdarrazzāq transmitted to us; he said: Ibn Ğurağ transmitted to us; he said: Ibn Şihāb transmitted to me (ahbarani); he said: ‘Urwa transmitted to me from ‘Ā’iṣa: Abū Ḥuadaifa adopted Sālim – he was a client (maula) of a woman from the Anṣār – just as the Prophet (eulogy) [adopted] Zaid. If someone adopted a man in the Ġahiliyya, people called him his son and he inherited from his inheritance. [This was the habit] until God (eulogy) revealed: “Call them after their fathers. If you do not know their fathers, then [let them be] your brothers in faith.” So they were traced back to their fathers [and] whoever’s father was unknown, [became] a client (maula) and a brother in faith. After it [the revelation] Sahla came [to the Prophet] and said: “Messenger of God! We were used to consider Sālim as [our] son (walad) who lived together with us and saw me in underwear (fudul). God has [now] revealed what you know.” The Prophet said: “Suckle him five times (hams radā‘āt).” So he acquired the status of her “milk son”.132

These two Zuhri traditions, the one by Ma‘mar and the other by Ibn Ğurağ, are undoubtedly parallel texts to Mālik’s. Ibn Ğurağ’s text is limited, however, to a shortened version of the Sahla story and its prologue and it ignores the reactions of the Prophet’s wives to his fatwa. The three texts correspond mainly in content, even though many correspondences in wording occur. There are also contradictions. According to Ma‘mar, for example, the wives of the Prophet (apart from ‘Ā’iṣa) confessed that they did not know whether the fatwa of the Prophet was meant generally, whereas in Mālik’s version they vehemently reject its general interpretation. This difference can be ascribed to an imprecise way of retelling the story, since Ma‘mar did know the negative attitude of the other wives of the Prophet as well, as we shall see below. Ibn Ğurağ’s and Ma‘mar’s versions tally with each other against Mālik’s in that they trace the Sahla story back via ‘Urwa to ‘Ā’iṣa. Since two students independently report this isnād from Zuhri, it must be his. This finding helps us to answer the question, asked above, as to why ‘Abdarrazzāq completed Mālik’s isnād. It seems likely that he did so because he realised that in Zuhri’s transmission the core of the tradition, the Sahla story, was originally ascribed to ‘Ā’iṣa, rather than because he wanted to fake an unbroken transmission chain for a hadīt of the Prophet.
In Ma‘mar’s version, Zuhri does not refer explicitly to ‘Urwa when reporting the legal opinions of ‘Ä’iša and the other wives of the Prophet.¹⁵³ We can only infer from Ma‘mar’s isnād of the Sahla story that ‘Urwa may be Zuhri’s informant for these parts as well. Yet there is a way to become certain about it. Ibn Ğurāğ who, as mentioned above, does not say anything about an opinion or practice of ‘Ä’iša in his Zuhri tradition, reports from his teacher ‘Aţâ’ b. Abī Rabāḥ the following:

I heard ‘Aţâ’ when he was being asked. A man told him: “A woman let me drink from her milk after I had become a grown up man. May I marry her?” [‘Aţâ’] said: “No.” I said [to him]: “Is this your ra’y?” He said: “Yes.” ‘Aţâ’ said [moreover]: “‘Ä’iša ordered [to do] that to the daughters of her brother (kānat ‘Ä’iša ta’muru bi-dālika banāti ḥišīḥa).”¹⁵⁴

The last sentence is obviously a reference to the tradition about ‘Ä’iša as it is found in Mālik’s version of Ibn Śihāb’s ‘Urwa tradition concerning the suckling of adults. But who is ‘Aţâ’’s source for it? As ‘Urwa was an older contemporary of ‘Aţâ’’s and, explicitly, his informant for several traditions, we can assume that he was ‘Aţâ’’s source for this tradition as well, whereas we can exclude ‘Aţâ’’s having heard it from the younger Zuhri, from whom, as far as I know, he did not transmit.

Was ‘Urwa also Zuhri’s source for the opinion of the other wives of the Prophet? This cannot be ruled out completely, but it seems doubtful in view of a Zuhri tradition transmitted by Ibn Sa’d via Wāqidī from Ma‘mar:

Muḥammad b. ‘Umar transmitted to me; Ma‘mar and Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh transmitted to me from Zuhri from Abū ‘Ubaida from ‘Abdallāh b. Zama’a from his mother Umm Salama; she said: The wives of the Prophet (eulogy) refused to adopt that [what ‘Ä’iša was doing]. They said: “This is only a permission of the messenger of God (eulogy) for Sahla bint Suhail [alone].”¹⁵⁵

According to this report, Zuhri did not obtain his tradition about the opinion of the other wives of the Prophet from ‘Urwa, but from another informant.
(Abū 'Ubaida) who finally traces the story back to one of the wives of the Prophet, Umm Salama, an old opponent of 'Ā’iṣa’s. If this is true, we must conclude that Mālik omitted that particular isnād and ascribed all parts of Zuhri’s story to ‘Urwa. We do not know his reasons for doing so. Moreover, Mālik left out ‘Ā’iṣa’s name in the isnād. He had reasons to do that because she could be the source of neither the report about her own practice in which she is mentioned in the third person, nor the tradition about the objections of the other wives of the Prophet which is clearly critical of ‘Ā’iṣa.

Ma’mar’s version of the Sahla story reveals, finally, that it was Zuhrī who had already put together the Abū Ḥuḍaifa-Sālim-Sahla tradition with the reports about the practice of opinions of the Prophet’s wives, for Ma’mar’s and Mālik’s transmission coincide in this respect.

A comparison of the several variants transmitted from Zuhrī thus leads to the conclusion that either Zuhrī himself circulated the traditions about the suckling of adults at different periods of time in varying form, or that his students are responsible for the differences between the texts. If the latter hypothesis is correct, Mālik’s version must be considered the one that best preserved Zuhrī’s original text (apart from the isnād). By contrast, the versions of Ma’mar and Ibn Ğuraīġ look like abbreviated versions. One could also assume, of course, that Zuhrī’s original version was short and that Mālik expanded it, but this is less likely in view of the correspondence between Mālik’s version and ‘Aṭā’s reference to the story which shows that the report about ‘Ā’iṣa was already part of the original version. Whatever the case, the important result that our comparison of early variants of a Prophetical hadīt produces is that it is an authentic Zuhrī tradition, i.e. really goes back to Zuhrī.

What should we think of Zuhrī’s claim, however, that he obtained the Sahla story and the report about ‘Ā’iṣa’s practice from ‘Urwa b. az-Zubair (d. 93/711-2 or
There are several arguments against the assumption that Zuhrī invented the tradition about the suckling of adults himself. First, one can point to the fact that the tradition ends with an ihtilāf, a difference of opinion between the wives of the Prophet, which leaves open the question about the author’s own point of view. Secondly, we know from another early tradition, reporting Zuhrī’s ra’y, that he objected to the practice described in the ahadīt from the Prophet and ‘Ā’iṣa. It is hard to imagine that Zuhrī faked those ahadīt that were completely inconsistent with his own legal opinion, or that he would have accepted them from someone he did not know very well. Furthermore, the reference of the Meccan scholar ‘Atā’ to the practice of ‘Ā’iṣa suggests, as argued above, that ‘Urwa was the source of the tradition. This all tends to support the assumption that Zuhrī really received the tradition from ‘Urwa, as he claims in his isnād.

In ‘Urwa’s case we can ask the same questions. Is he the author of the texts? Did he actually obtain his information from ‘Ā’iṣa, as claimed in the isnād? We can only weigh the pros and cons of the evidence offered by the texts. There is an argument against the assumption that ‘Urwa invented the tradition in question: the fact that he himself and other Medinan fuqahā of his generation, such as the leading scholar Ibn al-Musayyab, disapproved of the suckling of adults and denied that it had any legal consequences. It does not seem reasonable to assume that ‘Urwa fabricated a hadīt from the Prophet that contradicted his own legal doctrine so blatantly. Yet if he obtained the hadīt from somebody, the question arises as to whom he got it from. His aunt ‘Ā’iṣa is a possible or even obvious source, but more convincing is the fact that he reports from her a practice that was rejected both by the other wives of the Prophet and the leading early Medinan fuqahā, himself included. So, ‘Urwa’s claim that he obtained the tradition from ‘Ā’iṣa seems to be substantiated. That means that the hadīt about the Prophet’s fatwā for Sahla is a very early one that can be dated to the first half of the first century A.H. (‘Ā’iṣa died 58/678). Probably this hadīt is not only early but is also an authentic tradition from the Prophet, i.e. it reports – decades later, it is true – an event that actually occurred.
during the life of the Prophet. Circumstantial evidence for this assumption may be that Umm Salama in the tradition transmitted from her does not dispute the event as such, which we would expect if ‘Ā’iša had invented the entire story.

The results of our source-critical analysis contrast sharply with Schacht’s ideas about this type of legal tradition. Schacht would not have accepted that Mālik’s hadīt about the suckling of adults is early because of its length; the narrative elements and the names contained in it; and, last but not least, because of the simple fact that it is a tradition from the Prophet. Schacht would have seen various tendencies at work in this tradition and would have argued as follows:

The part of the tradition which describes the practice of ‘Ā’iša is a product of the “traditionists” aimed at changing the doctrine of the old Medinan school of jurisprudence. This originally anonymous doctrine, that was probably advocated by Zuhrī, had somewhat earlier been fictitiously ascribed to Ibn al-Musayyab and ‘Urwa b. az-Zubair. In the forged ‘Ā’iša tradition, a typical tactic of the “traditionists” can be seen, namely, attributing their “countertraditions” to the same persons who are claimed by the “ancient schools” as representatives of their doctrine, in this case, Zuhrī, Ibn al-Musayyab and Sulaimān b. Yasār. Zuhrī as transmitter of the tradition is, therefore, a fake and the argument based on the practice of ‘Ā’iša must have emerged after Zuhrī’s death. The followers of the “ancient schools”, now on the defensive, struck back with a tradition saying that all other wives of the Prophet rejected the attitude of ‘Ā’iša. This tradition must be somewhat later than that about ‘Ā’iša. The “traditionist” reacted by producing the story about Sahla together with a fatwā of the Prophet himself. This tradition is, accordingly, the last link in the chain of arguments. Finally, the particular elements of the debate were put together in a single tradition which Mālik found, if he did not produce it himself. All these developments must have occurred between Zuhrī’s death and the compilation of Mālik’s Muwatta’. The origin of the tradition about the suckling of adults as
found in the *Muwatta’* must then be dated to around the middle of the second century A.H.

Schacht did not deal with this tradition as thoroughly as I did here in adopting his method of reasoning. He only gave hints as to how to interpret it. Yet whoever is familiar with his way of thinking will recognise it in my aforementioned summary. In view of the results gained by a source-critical study of the early transmissions from Zuhri in general and of two traditions transmitted from him in particular – one referring to ‘Umar, the other to the Prophet – Schacht’s method and his ideas about the origins of Islamic jurisprudence are questionable.

To summarise the arguments presented in this article let us return to the starting point. According to the view decisively shaped by the writings of Joseph Schacht and since then current among Western scholars of Islam, the number of reliable legal traditions going back to Ibn Šihāb az-Zuhri is very small. It must be limited to the information about Zuhri’s *ra’y* which Mālik in his *Muwatta’* explicitly says he heard himself or asked Zuhri about. This view has been challenged in this article. Apart from the *Muwatta’* other early sources have become available since the publication of Schacht’s *Origins* that can be used for a reconstruction of Zuhri’s legal doctrines and traditions. A source-critical study of the early sources now available shows that the number of texts that can be attributed to Zuhri is much larger than Schacht thought. A comparison of the Zuhri texts preserved in early sources leads to the conclusion that his legal teaching did not at all consist of *ra’y* alone, but also included – for an important part – traditions about the legal opinions and the practice of the preceding generations of Muslims, Successors, Companions and the Prophet. On the basis of the numerous legal texts that Zuhri’s students transmitted in their compilations, a detailed picture of his jurisprudence can be drawn. But
what is more, the state of development which Islamic jurisprudence had reached in
the first quarter of the second century A.H. can be reconstructed, and partly even
the preliminary stages of the first century. The sources are now available to venture
on such reconstructions.
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This does not preclude that Mālik, nevertheless, received the tradition from Zuhri.


This name was probably lost, as the context of the traditions show.


This element of the name probably was dropped by carelessness during the later transmission of the text or the editing process. As a rule Zuhri does not transmit from ‘Utba.

See above, p. 13.


‘Abdarrazzāq, *Muṣannaf*, 10541, 10542, 10543. In the first two texts “Ruṣaid at-Ṭaqafi” appears as the name of the second husband. This agrees with Ma‘mar’s version (see text b) and this was probably Ibn al-Musayyab’s text. Mālik’s version seems to be due to a mistake.

Cf. the text b of Ma‘mar on p. 26-27.

Š: ṣa. The translation is based on Yahyā b. Yahyā’s recension of the *Muwatta*’. The differences found in the versions of Saibāni and ‘Abdarrazzāq are given in the notes. The letters ‘A refer to ‘Abdarrazzāq’s ṣawāya from Mālik, the letter Š again to Saibāni’s text

Š: ṣa is missing.

‘A: wa-kānā min aṣ̄āḥāb ff. is missing.

Š: ṣa is missing.

‘A: wa-kānā Badriyyan instead of wa-kānā qad kabida Badraṇ.

‘A: ṭa-kanā (?) instead of tabannā.

‘A: kannā instead of tabannā. Š: kamā tabannā ff is missing.

‘A: “b. Ḥārita” is missing.

Š: both names are missing.

‘A: ibnāt instead of bint.

‘A: “b. Rabi‘a” is missing.

‘A: ya‘ma’idin is placed before min afdal.


Š: fi kitābihi is missing.


Š/ ‘A: fā-qāla is missing.


Š: abd instead of waḥīd.

Š: tubunnīya instead of min ulā‘ika. ‘A: siyy (?) is added.

Š: lam yakun yu’lām instead of lam yu’lam.

Š/ ‘A: mawālīhi.

Š: wa-hīya is missing.

Š: fī mā balağanā is added. ‘A: ilā rasūlī llāhī is missing.

Š: yā rasūla llāh is missing.

‘A: ana is added.

Š: mā instead of mādā.

‘A: fī ša‘nīhi is missing; qāla Zuhrī is added.

‘A: rasūla llāhī is missing.
Mālik, Muwatta’, 30:12; Muwatta’ (Ŝ), no. 627. ‘Abdarrazzāq, Muṣannaf, 13886. We must imagine the “suckling” of adults in the form of putting drops of mother milk into a dish or a drink.

‘Abdarrazzāq, Muṣannaf, 13887.


Cf. ‘Abdarrazzāq, Muṣannaf, 13908.

There is also a biographical report, preserved in a biographical lexicon of Andalusian ‘ulamā’, that Zuhrī transmitted traditions which run counter to his own legal doctrine; the isnād goes back through Andalusian and Egyptian transmitters to ‘Abdarrazzāq and via him to Ma‘mar. Cf. Hu-maidi, Ḏawwat al-muqtabis, ed. Muḥammad b. Tāwīt at-Tangī, Kairo n.d., p. 83 f. I owe the reference to M. Fierro.


A tradition transmitted by Ibn Ğura改革创新 from his Meccan teacher Ibn Abī Mulaika corroborates this conclusion. The latter reported that he obtained ‘A‘īsa’s Sahla-story from the Medinan scholar al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr. Cf. ‘Abdarrazzāq, Muṣannaf, 13884.

Cf. Schacht, Origins, pp. 48, 246 f.
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