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I

What do we know about the legal doctrine of Ibn Šihāb az-Zuhrī, one of the leading scholars in Medina during the first quarter of the second century A.H.?\(^1\) 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.”\(^2\) Schacht based his conclusion on Mālik’s *Muwatta*'. He continues: “There are other opinions ascribed to Zuhrī which are *obviously* authentic.”\(^3\) 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.”\(^4\) In Schacht’s opinion, these fictitious transmissions from Zuhrī are to be found for example in Saibānī’s recension of the *Muwatta*', in Šafi’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.\(^5\) 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 *Muwatta*. Earlier sources were not available to Schacht. He assumes that only a part of what Mālik in his *Muwatta*, as transmitted by Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā al-Laiṭī, claims to have received from Zuhrī actually comes from him. As the only evidence of authenticity, Schacht accepts Mālik’s own statement that he asked or heard Zuhrī’s opinion on a subject. Yet these texts are quite rare in Mālik’s Zuhrī transmission. Most consist, instead, of simple sayings and traditions, i.e. texts in which Zuhrī appears only as transmitter. In these cases, Schacht decides the question of whether Zuhrī 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 (tābī‘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. Zuhrī 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 Zuhrī’s legal teaching. “He appears as the common link in the isnāds of a number of traditions from the Prophet, from Companions and from Successors; Zuhrī himself was hardly responsible for the greater part of these traditions.”

Schacht regards even Zuhrī texts referring to tābī‘ūn as fictitious, i.e. not really going back to Zuhrī 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 Śihāb annahu sami’tubu yaqūl”, i.e. from Ibn Śihāb, that he heard him say)⁸ are really authentic, whereas, on the other hand, ra’y which Mālik introduces with, for example, “an Ibn Śihāb annahu qāla: samitu ‘Abā Bakr b. ‘Abdarrāḥmān yaqūl” (from Ibn Śihāb, that he said: ‘I heard Abū Bakr b. ‘Abdarrahmān say)⁹ do not derive from Ibn Śihāb 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. Anas’ (d. 179/795) Muwatta’ as an early source for Zuhri’s jurisprudence (fiqh) at his disposal, preserved in the two recensions by Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā 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. Rāšid (d. 153/770) and ʿAbdalmalik Ibn Ğuraiḡ (d. 150/767) contained in ʿAbdarrazzāq 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. ʿAbdarrazzāq received their material when studying with the two scholars and later integrated it into his much larger compilation of traditions.

In biographical literature Maʿmar and Ibn Ğuraiḡ 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 Ğuraiḡ’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 Šafiʿī’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 Maʿmar b. Rāšid’s corpus, which can be reconstructed on the basis of the asānīd, i.e. the transmission chains, in ‘Abdarrazzāq’s Muṣannaf. When we classify the persons from whom Maʿmar 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 Basran Qatāda (25%). He reports much less from the Basran Ayyūb [b. Abī Tamīma] (11%), even less from the Yemenite Ibn Ṭawūs (5%), the Baṣrans Yaḥyā b. Abī Kaṭīr (3%) and Ḥasan [al-Baṣrī] (3%), the Medinan Hišām b. ‘Urwa (2%), and the Küfans Ḥammād [b. Abī Sulaimān] (1%) and al-Aʿmaṣ (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 Maʿmar does not mention his direct informant.

These percentages do not match the assumption that Maʿmar 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 Maʿmar’s own raʿy do not match at all with the picture of a presumed forger. If Maʿmar 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 Maʿmar forged his traditions appears very unlikely. The percentages of Maʿmar’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 (raʿy) and only one third traditions (ātār, aḥādīt), in which Zuhrī only posits as transmitter. In these transmissions four tābiʿūn from Medina prevail: Saʿīd b. al-Musayyab (19%), Sālim b. ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Umar and ‘Urwa b. az-Zubair (13% each) and ‘Ubaidallāh b. ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Utb (8%). Other known tābiʿūn from Medina like Sulaimān b. Yasār, Abū Salama b. ‘Abdarrahmān, al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad and Abū Bakr b. ‘Abdarrahmān, 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 raʿy as well as traditions at approximately the same rate. The predominance of traditions over raʿy in the texts of Zuhrī’s informants is typical in Maʿmar’s material. Even so, asānīd 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 ṣaḥāba-traditions, but also for those from the Prophet. Precedents or legal opinions of ṣaḥāba are mentioned twice as frequently as those of the Prophet and three times more frequently than those of tābiʿūn. Among the ṣaḥāba, ‘Umar is the most prominent, followed in frequency at some distance by his son ‘Abdallāh, then by ‘Uṭmān, ‘Āʾiṣa, Ibn ‘Abbās and Zaid b. Ṭābit.

Maʿmar’s Qatāda texts consist – like the ones he ascribes to Zuhrī – mainly of Qatāda’s raʿy (62%) and only to a lesser extent of traditions that Qatāda transmits
from others. Differently from Zuhrī, they are dominated by only two tābiʿīn: al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (31%) and, at some distance, the Medinan scholar Saʿīd b. al-Musayyab (20%). Other tābiʿīn like the Kūfans Ibrāhīm an-Naḥaʿī and Šuraiḥ or the Bāṣrān Abū ʾSāʿīd Šāhī [Šābīr b. Zaid] appear rather rarely. Contrary to the comparable Zuhrī traditions, the texts which Qatāda transmits from tābiʿīn 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 Zuhrī’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 Zuhrī texts is the use of the isnād in Qatāda’s traditions. In 60% of Zuhrī’s traditions one comes across an isnād or information about an informant; in Qatāda’s traditions such texts amount to only 12%. Maʿmar’s Qatāda texts also differ from Zuhrī’s in the distribution of the authorities mentioned: the older tābiʿīn dominate at the expense of the saḥāba. Also contrary to Zuhrī’s saḥāba traditions, we find that in Qatāda’s texts ʿAlī and Ibn Masʿūd prevail over ʿUmar in frequency of quotations; Ibn ʿAbbās follows at a considerable distance, whereas other Companions are only sporadically mentioned. Traditions from the Prophet are quite rare in Maʿmar’s transmission from Qatāda, while Maʿmar transmits them from Zuhrī five times more frequently. Finally, a difference in the terminology of transmission must be pointed out: Maʿmar often reproduces Zuhrī’s raʿy in the form of an answer (responsum) to his own question, for example with the formula: “I asked Zuhrī about … He said…”13 This text genre occurs only very rarely in Maʿmar’s Qatāda material.14

The characteristic differences described above between the text corpora of Maʿmar’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 Basran 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-Zuhrī 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-qālhu Qatāda” (so said Qatāda [as well]), or “‘an Qatāda miṭlabu” ([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 (amr-rahbā) 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 ahādīt 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 maulā 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.\textsuperscript{26} 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.\textsuperscript{27}

Maʿmar belongs among the first musannifūn,\textsuperscript{28} i.e. those who ordered their texts thematically. His musannaf 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 musannaf works entitled Kitāb al-Ǧāmiʿ is preserved in the transmission of his disciple ʿAbdarrazzāq, and forms the last “book” of his Musannaf.\textsuperscript{29} Maʿmar’s wider musannaf compilation is probably preserved only in the (scattered) form in which ʿAbdarrazzāq integrated it into his own Musannaf.

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 fuqabā’ who mainly taught their own ra’y. Nevertheless, it is worth pointing out that Ma‘mar’s transmission from Zuhrī is considered very reliable by the hadīt critics.

III

Another important early source for Zuhrī’s fiqh is the transmission of the Meccan scholar Ibn Ğuraig (d. 150/767). Like the one by Ma‘mar it is contained in ‘Abdarrazzāq’s Muṣannaf and it can be reconstructed on the basis of the chains of transmission. Since I have already discussed the value of Ibn Ğuraig’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 Ğuraig transmission in ‘Abdarrazzāq’s Muṣannaf is qua extension only slightly inferior to Ma‘mar’s and contains more than 5000 individual texts. As we have already seen, Ma‘mar’s corpus is dominated by two authorities, including Zuhrī, whereas Ibn Ğuraig’s material presents only one main authority, the Meccan faqīh ‘Ātā b. Abī Rabāḥ. Nearly 40% of Ibn Ğuraig’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 Sihāb (6%), the Yemenite Ibn Tāwūs (5%), the Meccan Abū z-Zubair (4%) and the ‘Irāqī ‘Abdalkarīm [al-Ḡazarī] (3%).

As in the case of ‘Abdarrazzāq’s Ma‘mar transmission, I consider the strongly varying attribution of texts to informants which is found in Ibn Ğuraig’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 Ğuraig falsely ascribed his own legal opinions and those of other scholars at Mecca and elsewhere, as well as traditions (āṯār 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 Ġuraiği’s material by historical circumstances during his lifetime. For example, the fact that he has only one main authority, ‘Aṭā’, may be due to the fact that ‘Aṭā’ 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 Ġuraiği to different persons. A comparison between Ibn Ġuraiği’s transmissions from ‘Aṭā’ b. Abī Rabāḥ and Zuhrī, whom he usually calls Ibn Sihāb, will do as an example.

Let’s first have a look at the peculiarities of Ibn Ġuraiği’s transmission from ‘Aṭā’. The ‘Aṭā’ texts reproduce for the most part (80%) his ra’y. Only a fifth of them contain traditions from others in which cAtā5 is only the transmitter. The forms in which Ibn Ġuraiği presents ‘Aṭā”s ra’y are striking. Beside the usual sayings (dicta) we find an almost similar number of responsa, i.e. answers which ‘Aṭā’ gave to questions asked by Ibn Ġuraiği himself or, more rarely, by other people, known by name or not. When classifying ‘Aṭā”s atār and ahādīt according to the authorities to which they refer, we get the following result: He quotes the sahāba most frequently, the Prophet much less, and his contemporaries only sporadically. Furthermore, a large number of quotations from the Qur’ān are notable. Among the Companions it is Ibn ‘Abbās who clearly dominates. ‘Aṭā’ refers to him nearly three times more than to ‘Umar b. al-Ḥattāb, the second most frequently mentioned Companion, who himself is quoted three times more than ‘ʿAlī or ‘Ā’isha. The Companions Šābīr b. ‘Abdalläh, Abū Huraira, Ibn ‘Umar and others appear only rarely. The ahādīt of the Prophet are clearly outnumbered by ‘Aṭā”s references to Ibn ‘Abbās, but the Prophet follows in second place, ahead of all other sahāba. ‘Aṭā’ only sporadically gives his informants for the Companion traditions, and among his ahādīt from the Prophet only a quarter have a – partly incomplete – isnād.
In sharp contrast to his transmission from ‘Atä’, in which the latters’ ra’y dominates, Ibn Ğuraig’s transmission from Zuhrî consists mostly of traditions in which Zuhrî functions only as transmitter (58%). The texts which contain Zuhrî’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 Ğuraig’s responsa transmitted from ‘Atä’, where Ibn Ğuraig often asks the questions himself, his responsa transmitted from Zuhrî are only exceptionally of that type. Among Ibn Ğuraig’s traditions transmitted from Zuhrî, ‘Urwa b. az-Zubair is the most important informant of Zuhrî. In that function he clearly outdoes other Medinan scholars such as Abû Salama b. ‘Abdarrahmän, Sâlim b. ‘Abdalläh b. ‘Umar, ‘Ubaidalläh b. ‘Abdalläh b. ‘Utba, Sulaimän b. Yasär and others.

Most of Zuhrî’s traditions (ātâr and aḥādīt) 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 ‘Utmän, Ibn ‘Umar and ‘Ā’iśa. Zaid b. Täbit, Abû Huraira, Ibn ‘Abbäs and other, less famous, sahâba 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 ‘Atä’’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’azîz. About half of Zuhrî’s traditions have an isnâd, though not always a complete one; his traditions from the Prophet usually have an isnâd.

The comparison of two of Ibn Ğuraig’s text corpora, the one transmitted from ‘Atä’ b. Abî Rabâḥ and the one ascribed to Ibn Šihâb (az-Zuhrî), shows that they are very different with regard to volume (i.e. absolute number of texts); importance of ra’y; text genres; use of isnâd; authorities preferred etc. Ibn Ğuraig can hardly have fabricated both corpora. By fabricated I mean that he himself composed
the texts and supplied them arbitrarily with asānīd. There is other evidence, which I have presented elsewhere,\textsuperscript{32} 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,\textsuperscript{33} or references to contradictory statements.\textsuperscript{34} 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 Zuhrī”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 asānīd 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 sama” (hearing) from him may be circumstantial evidence that Ibn
Guraiğ 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 Guraiğ’s disposal. In Ibn Guraiğ’s Zuhri material, the predominance of traditions over his 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 Guraiğ ascribes to Ibn Šihāb [az-Zuhri] do really derive from the latter.

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

‘Abdalmalik b. ‘Abdal’aziz b. Guraiğ, a maulā of the Umayyad clan Āl Ḥalid b. Asid, 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 ‘Ātā’ b. Abī Rabāḥ, 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. Dīnār whose lessons he attended for about seven years. This information corresponds to the picture we found when investigating the frequency of transmitters in Ibn Guraiğ’s corpus: ‘Ātā’ is by far the most frequently quoted, followed by ‘Amr b. Dīnār.36 In this period Ibn Guraiğ probably also studied with other scholars, for example, the Meccan Ibn Abī Mulaika (d. 117/735 or 118/736) and the Medinan scholar Nāfi’ (d. 118/736 or 119/737), the maulā of Ibn ‘Umar, who stayed at Mecca from time to time. All this information, transmitted by Ibn Guraiğ’s students, is usually based on his own statements. He died in 150/767.

16
Ibn Ğuraig 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 Ğuraig is considered an excellent faqīḥ, Qurʿān reciter and exegete. His disciples composed a “*Kitāb at-Tafsīr*” from his Qurʿān lessons. Yet the judgment of the ḥadīt critics on him was controversial. Some younger contemporaries like Mālik or Ibn Ğuraig’s pupil Yahyā b. Saʿīd al-Qaṭṭān already showed reservations concerning some parts of his transmission. His transmissions from ‘Aṭā’ b. Abī Rabāḥ, ʿAmr b. Dīnār, Ibn Abī Mulaika, Nāfi’ and some others, however, are usually excluded from the critics’ negative assessment. Criticism is directed mainly against certain forms of transmission used by Ibn Ğuraig 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 Ğuraig used an informant’s written material which the latter had left to him or which Ibn Ğuraig 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 Ğuraig 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 Ğuraig obtained his ḥadīt transmitted from Zuhrī, as he himself is reported to have admitted. This corresponds to the results we obtained when analysing Ibn Ğuraig’s Zuhrī texts. In sharp contrast to his ‘Aṭā’ transmission, we found in the corpus of Zuhrī texts hardly any *responsa* to Ibn
'Abdarrazzāq from Ibn Ġuraiğ: he said: Ibn Șihāb transmitted to me, [when] I asked him about a man who divorced his wife three times while he was suffering pains (fi 'wağa) [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 Șihāb) said: ‘Uṯmān 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.’

Texts such as this one show that one cannot generalise about the biographical reports about how Ibn Ġuraiğ received Zuhrī’s ahādīt. Indeed it is also mentioned in biographical literature that Ibn Ġuraiğ had personal contacts with Zuhrī. 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 Zuhrī’s stays in Mecca for the hağg. This explains the occasional responsa to Ibn Ġuraiğ’s answers. It would be unwarranted to regard Ibn Ġuraiğ 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 Ġuraiğ’s Zuhrī transmission. Even if Ibn Ġuraiğ received most of Zuhrī’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 Ġuraiğ 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 Ḥaḡar’s Ṭahdīb, probably arose, at least partially, in that way. Thus, on the basis not only of Ibn Ḥūraḡ’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 Muwāṭṭa’. The Muwāṭṭa’ is basically a muṣan-naf work similar to those by Maʿmar and Ibn Ḥūraḡ, 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 Śīḥāb [az-Zuhrī] (21 %), who, for this reason, can be considered his main informant. Texts from Näfi’, the maulā of Ibn ʿUmar, and from Yaḥyā b. Saʿīd al-Anṣārī follow at some distance (14 % each). Rabiʿa b. Abī ʿAbdarrāḥmān, ʿAbdarrāḥmān b. al-Qāsim, Hiṣām 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 Muwāṭṭa’, the stock of anonymous traditions is much more substantial (18 %) than in the text corpora of Maʿmar and Ibn Ḥūraḡ.

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 Näfi’ as his main authority instead
of Zuhri? Why does he only quote Nāfiʿ as often as Yahyā b. Saʿīd, 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 Nāfiʿ: 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 (raʾy) is nevertheless considerable. Only little more than half of the raʾy 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 raʾy 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:

[Yahyā b. Yahyā] transmitted to me from Mālik that he had been told (balağahu) that Saʿīd 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 raʾy of late first century A.H. Medinan tābiʿūn are to be found in Yahyā b. Yahyā's recension of the Muwatta` in large numbers. They take the following form:

[Yahyā b. Yahyā] transmitted to me from Mālik that he had been told (balağahu) 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:
[Yahyā b. Yahyā] transmitted to me from Mālik from Ibn Šihāb, and that he had been told (balağahu) about [the Successors] X and Y that they used to say: ...

This more elaborate but more precise form of collective quotation occurs only occasionally. Mālik’s anonymous indirect reference to Ibn Šihāb in collective quotations should not be considered, therefore, as a real indirect transmission. Such examples do not prove at all that Mālik derives the major part of Ibn Šihāb az-Zuhrī’s ra’y from sources which he passes over in silence. Real indirect transmissions from Zuhrī are to be found in Mālik’s Muwatta’ only rarely. In them Mālik refers to Zuhrī 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 Mālik the ambition to relate directly all Zuhrī texts known to him, even those which he had not heard from Zuhrī himself, suppressing the names of the informants from whom he actually received the Zuhrī texts.

The āṯār and ḥadīts of Mālik’s Zuhrī transmission mostly refer to the saḥāba 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 Šihāb’s favourites among the Companions of the Prophet. Among the saḥāba 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 Mālik, who via Ibn Šihāb mostly refers to the saḥāba or to the Prophet, appeal to Ibn Šihāb’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 Nāfī’ transmission is totally different from his Ibn Šihāb az-Zuhrī texts. It generally does not contain traditions about Nāfī’ *ra’y*, but consists almost entirely of traditions which Nāfī’ 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. Nāfī’’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 Nāfī’ to questions asked by Mālik himself or indications that he heard him personally (*samā’*).

As in the case of Ma’mar and Ibn Ğuraiği, it is possible to explain – hypothetically – the astonishing differences between Mālik’s Ibn Šihāb [az-Zuhrī] and Nāfī’ 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 Nāfī’, may be the result of different forms of teaching. Nāfī’ 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 Nāfī’, may have similar reasons or – more likely – it may mirror the fact that Nāfī’ did not teach his own *ra’y* at all, but confined himself in his classes to the transmission and diffusion of traditions only.
The difference between Mālik’s transmissions from Ibn Šīhāb and Nāfi’ 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 (Nāfi’ and Zuhrī) during the first half of the second century. According to Schacht, Mālik adopted these fabricated texts – those connected with Nāfi’s name possibly from a manuscript – in good faith, thinking that they were genuine, but did not indicate that his transmission was indirect. 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 Ğuraïg.

Schacht gives several reasons for his aversion to the isnād “Mālik – Nāfi’ – Ibn ‘Umar”, considered by Muslims as particularly trustworthy: Firstly, the quantity of Mālik’s Nāfi’ traditions is too large for the marked difference in age between them – Nāfi’ died in 117, Mālik in 179 A.H. Secondly, the isnād “Nāfi’ ‘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 Nāfi’ traditions represent unsuccessful attempts at influencing the doctrine of the Medinese school.” “...These traditions are later than the established Medinese doctrine.”

These arguments are not convincing, however. First, according to biographical reports, Mālik was 23 or 24 years old when Nāfi’ died. This is certainly not an age that precludes the taking over of his Nāfi’ 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. 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 Muwattâ’, 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-Ḥaġġāġ], 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-Qattān, regarded their teacher as one of Nāfi’’s most important “transmitters” – and by this they mean pupils. Critical hadīt scholars, like ‘Alī b. al-Madīnī, Yaḥyā b. Ma‘īn and Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, belonging to the generation of the pupils of Mālik’s students, considered Mālik a student (ṣahīb) 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 (‘ardan), whereas he himself only took over material by listening (sama*), 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 Muwaṭṭa’ corroborates my assumption that Mālik’s Zuhrī traditions in the Muwaṭṭa’ 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 Ġuraiğ’s transmissions found in ‘Abdarrazzâq’s Msan-naf and Mâlik’s transmission in the Muwat’tâ 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, Mâlik and Ibn Ġuraiğ 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 Ġuraiğ’s and Mâlik’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. ‘Abdallâh 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 Ġuraiğ transmits many Ibn al-Musayyab traditions from other informants, like Yahyâ b. Sa‘îd, and many Ibn ‘Umar traditions from Nāfi’ and Mūsâ 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 Successors, 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 raʾy and his traditions. The question I will answer first is: How similar are the texts reproducing Zuhrī’s raʾy contained in the tree corpora?

If the Zuhrī transmission by Ibn Ğuraiği is compared to the one by Maʿmar from this point of view, the result is that more than half of all raʾy texts transmitted by Ibn Ğuraiği have a parallel in Maʿmar’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 ʿAbdarrazzāq often reproduces sayings (dicta) of Zuhrī which are transmitted by both Maʿmar and Ibn Ğuraiği in the same or very similar words by quoting only one text in full, as a rule that of Maʿmar, and giving from the other one only the isnād, for example “ʿan Ibn Ğuraiği ʿan Ibn Śihāb” together with the remark “miṭlabu” (the same).65

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

a) ʿAbdarrazzāq from Maʿmar 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 Ğuraiġ; he said: Ibn Ţihāb 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 (tul) to [marry] a
free woman. 57 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. [How­
ever,] 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 hadīt 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 back­
ground knowledge. Furthermore, we have to take into account that our three trans­
mitters of Zuhri’s legal opinions (Ma‘mar, Ibn Ğuraiġ and Mālik) probably did not
study with him at the same time so that their different presentations of the material
may be due to Zuhri 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) 'Abdarrazzâq from Ma'mar from Zuhri about the one who gratifies his sexual desires with an animal (ya'ti al-bahîmata). 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) 'Abdarrazzâq said: Ibn Ğuraïg transmitted to us; he said: Ibn Sihâb told about a man who cohabitates with a gregarious animal (yaqa'u 'alâ l-bahîmati min al-an'âm) 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-zânî); 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 zânî 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 Ğuraïg’s ra'y transmissions from Zuhri contained in the Musannaf, the correspondences are even higher (80%) than between Ma’mar and Ibn Ğuraïg. 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 Ğihāb that he said: “Every divorced woman has the right to an allowance (mut'a).”

b) ['Abdarrazzâq from] Ma'mar from Zuhri; he said: “Every divorced woman has the right to an allowance (mut'a).”
c) ‘Abdarrazzāq from Ibn Ġurāī 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] (iqlā') of a slave [concerning his wife]. He [Ibn Šihāb] said: “It is like the iqlā’ of the free man; it is binding, [but] the iqlā’ of the slave [covers only] two months.”

b) ‘Abdarrazzāq from Ma’mar from Zuhri; 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 Zuhri dicta expressing his ra’y correspond in content corroborate my conclusion that all three source corpora contain genuine traditions of Zuhri’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 Zuhri. 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 Zuhri doctrines, and that they then concealed the source of their material by suppressing the names of their informants in the asānīd, is unconvincing as well. Schacht assumed this for a part of Mālik’s Zuhri 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 Zuhri as transmitted by Mālik, but in the case of his Zuhri 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 ātār and abādīt 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 Muwatta' as a starting point we can detect that for the majority (85 %) of his texts in which Ibn Śihāb functions as transmitter for earlier authorities there are parallel texts in the corpora of Ma'mar and/or Ibn Ġuraiğ. 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 šahāba or the Prophet. From the point of view of literary genres, short legal maxims are found beside elaborated cases and detailed narratives (qiṣas).

These facts provide evidence against the suspicion, held by Schacht and others, that the traditions labelled as Zuhri transmissions in the hadīt 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 Ġuraiğ was already dead by 150/767 and Ma‘mar died in 153/770. Mālik’s Muwatta’ must have existed around 150 at the latest because Šaibānī, who was born in 132/750,80 probably received his version of the Muwatta’ as a young student of Mālik’s – according to biographical reports at the age of 20.81 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) [Yahyä] transmitted to me from Mälik from Ibn Sihäb from Sa‘i’d b. al-Musayyab and Sulaimän b. Yasär, that Tulaiha as Asadiyya was married (käna tahta) to Rusäid at-Taqäfj. He divorced her and she remarried in her waiting period. ‘Umar b. al-Ḫaṭṭäb had her and her husband flogged (daraba) with an oxen scourge (mihfäqa) and he sentenced them to be separated (farräqa bainahumä). Then, ‘Umar b. al-Ḫaṭṭäb said: “If a woman (ayyuma mra‘atin) marries during her waiting period and if the man who married her has not consummated the marriage (dahala biha) [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 (käna hatiban min al-hüttäb). [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 (lä yağtami‘äni).”

Mälik 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.”

In the notes, the differences found in Saibäni’s *Muwatta’* 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 Muwatta’ 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 Ṣulaiḥa bint ‘Ubaḍallāh married (nakahat) Ruṣaid at-Taqaḍī in her waiting period. ‘Umar had them flogged (qalada) with a whip (dirra). He decided (qada): “If a man (ayyuma rağula) marries a woman during her waiting period and consummates the marriage with her (aṣṭabah), both must be separated (yufarāqu bainahumā); then, both are forbidden to marry another again (yaǧtama’ānī); she must complete (tastakmilu) what remains (baqiyyata) 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 yuṣībha), both must be separated (yufarāqu 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 (yahuṭubhu ma’a l-huṭṭāb).”

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. Yāsār, 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 (istahāqa) on her [to sexual intercourse]; both must be separated (yufarāqu bainahumā); both are forbidden to
marry again (*yatanākahānī*) for ever, and she must observe her waiting period (*taʿaddu*) of both [marriages].

d) ‘Abdarrazzāq from Māʿmar from Zuhri, that Sulaimān and Ibn al-Musayyab had different opinions. Zuhri said: [Ibn al-Musayyab said:]91 “She is entitled to her bride wealth.” Sulaimān said: “Her bride wealth goes to the treasury (*bait al-māl*).”

The comparison between the *Muwatta‘* text and Māʿmar’s version from Ibn al-Musayyab (text b), both of them certainly deriving from a common source, supports our hypothesis that some of Šaibānī’s deviations from Yahyā’s text are specifications and others are mistakes. The original name in Zuhri’s traditions was certainly Tulaiḥa, perhaps even Tulaiḥa b. ‘Ubaidallāh; “al-Asadiyya” seems to be an addition by Yahyā; Šaibānī added the *nasab* (*bint* Ṭalḥa b. ‘Ubaidallāh).93 The problem is that the two notions are incompatible, for Ṭalḥa b. ‘Ubaidallāh was of Taim b. Murra, not of Asad. Māʿmar’s “Tulaiḥa bint ‘Ubaidallāh” completes the confusion, but it is probably the original version because it is corroborated by another early tradition, that of ‘Abdalkarīm [al-Ḡazārī] (d. 127/745),94 transmitted by Ibn Ǧuraīg (here the woman is called “Ṣulaiḥa bint ‘Ubaidallāh, the sister of Ṭulaiḥa b. ‘Ubaidallāh”).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 Munabbih or Ibn Munayyah) which appears only in Šaibānī’s version.

Māʿmar’s and Mālik’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, Sulaimān b. Yasār), 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 Sulaimān must have been created later, either by Zuhri himself or – more likely – by Mālik. It was probably Mālik as well who deleted Sulaimān’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 Ğuraig’s version of the story is as follows:

e) ‘Abdarrazāq from Ibn Ğuraig; he said: Ibn Șihâb transmitted to me from [‘Ubaidallāh b.]97 ‘Utba and Abû Salama b. ‘Abdarrahmān, that ‘Umar b. al-Haṭṭāb separated (farrāqa baina) a woman, who had married in her waiting period, from her husband. Then he decided (qadd): “If a woman (ayyumā marʿātin) marries in her waiting period [but] her husband did not [yet] consummate the marriage (lam yadhul bihā), both must be separated (yufarraqu bainahumā); she must complete what remains of her waiting period (taʿtaddu mā baqiya); when it is finished, the second man can marry her [again] (ḥaṭaba fi l-ḥutṭāb); 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 (yağtamiʿātīni) another again for ever; she must complete [first] her waiting period of [the marriage with] the first [husband], then observe the waiting period (taʿtaddu) of [the marriage with] the second one.98

In Ibn Ğuraig’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 Ğuraig 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 produc-
ing arbitrarily two other names as informants? Such conclusions are not compel-
ing. According to the biographical information mentioned above, Ibn Ġuraiğ ob-
tained most of his Zuhri 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
Zuhri’s students – together with an īgāza, i.e. a permission to transmit the mate-
rial.99 If this was so, fading memory cannot have been the cause of the differences in
his version. Furthermore, Ibn Ġuraiğ 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 else-
where.100

If Zuhri knew two different traditions about ‘Umar’s judgment – Ibn al-
Musayyab’s and Sulaiman b. Yasar’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 Ġuraiğ. This is corroborated by the fact
that the story is also reported from other people. Apart from Zuhri, Ibn Ġuraiğ
transmits it from the ‘Irāqi scholar ‘Abdalkarim [al-Ǧazari], 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 fuqaha’, but Ibn Ġuraiğ does not give
the informants from whom these scholars obtained the tradition. Ma’mar quotes it
in a short form through his Baṣran colleague Ayyūb [b. Abī Tamīma] from the lat-
ter’s teacher Abū Qilāba, and Sufyān at-Ṭauri transmits a reminiscence of it via
Ḥammād from Ibrāhīm [an-Naḥa’ī].101

It is not plausible to assume that Zuhri himself invented additional infor-
mants, 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 Zuhri could not al-
ways 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 Ğuraiğ names informants other than Ma‘mar 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 Ma‘mar and Mālik. The fact that the historical background of the case is lacking in Ibn Ğuraiğ’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-Ḫaṭṭāb 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 Šihāb 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 ihtilaf, 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).102 3) The story certainly goes back to the tabi‘īn 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 *tabī‘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 Šihāb, that (*annahu*)¹⁰¹ he was asked about the suckling of adults (*radā‘at al-kabīr*); he said: ‘Urwa b. az-Zubair transmitted to me:

³⁸
Abū Ḥudayfa 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 maula of Abū Ḥudayfa, just as the messenger of God (eulogy) had adopted Zaid b. Ḥārita. Abū Ḥudayfa 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. Ḥārita 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 (mawālī)” 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 Ḥudayfa’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 (zalad) 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 rada‘ī)!’” So he became prohibited [to marry her] through her milk and she regarded him as a “milk son” (ibnan min ar-rada‘a) and consequently he could frequent her without restrictions.

‘Ā’isha, 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-Ṣiddiq 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 permi-
sion of the messenger of God (eulogy) for the suckling of Sālim alone. No, by God! Nobody can come in to us by this [form of] suckling.”

This was the practice (‘alā hādā kānā) of the wives of the Prophet (eulogy) concerning the suckling of adults.

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 ‘Abdarrazzāq. 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 ‘Abdarazzāq’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 ‘Abdarrazzāq’s transmission, not marked in my translation of the text, concerns the isnād. Yahyā introduces the tradition with “‘an Mālik ‘an Ibn Šihāb...fa-qāla: abbarānī...”, Šaibānī has “abbarānā Mālik, abbarānā Ibn Šihāb...fa-qāla: abbarānī...” and in both cases the isnād ends with ‘Urwa b. az-Zubair. ‘Abdarrazzāq, on the contrary, has the isnād: ‘an Mālik ‘an Ibn Šihāb ‘an ‘Urwa ‘an ‘Ā’iša. This leads one to the conclusion that ‘Abdarrazzāq, who offers a more complete isnād from Mālik than Mālik’s two other students, is responsible for the addition “‘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 abādīt that ‘Abdarrazzāq transmits from the Prophet with a defective isnād. It is also difficult to imagine that ‘Abdarrazzāq has not noticed that the story
as a whole cannot possibly have been told by 'Ā'īša 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 show that it consists of four independent stories. The tradition starts with the story of Abū Ḥuḍaifa 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'īša, 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, Zuhri 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 Zuhri from 'Urwa from 'Ā'īša; she said: Sahla bint Suhail b. 'Amr came to the Prophet (eulogy) and said: "Sālim used to be called (yud'da) after Abū Ḥuḍaifa 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 (tahrumi) for him."

Zuhri said: Some of the Prophet's (eulogy) wives said: "We do not know whether this was only a permission granted for Salim alone (ḥassatan) [or not]."

Zuhri said [moreover]: Until she died, 'Ā'īša used to give the legal advice (tuftī) that suckling after weaning makes forbidden [for marriage]. 351
c) ‘Abdarrazzāq transmitted to us; he said: Ibn Ğuraiğ transmitted to us; he said: Ibn Śi­hāb transmitted to me (abbarant); he said: ‘Urwa transmitted to me from ‘Ā’iṣa: Abū Ḥudaifā adopted Śālim – he was a client (maʿula) 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 (maʿula) and a brother in faith. After it [the revelation] Sahla came [to the Prophet] and said: “Messenger of God! We were used to consider Śālim as [our] son (waḥad) 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 (ḥams raḍāʾī).” So he acquired the status of her “milk son”.

These two Zuhārī traditions, the one by Maʿmar and the other by Ibn Ğuraiğ, are undoubtedly parallel texts to Mālik’s. Ibn Ğuraiğ’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 Maʿmar, for example, the wives of the Prophet (apart from ‘Āʾiṣa) 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 Maʿmar did know the negative attitude of the other wives of the Prophet as well, as we shall see below. Ibn Ğuraiğ’s and Maʿmar’s versions tally with each other against Mālik’s in that they trace the Sahla story back via ‘Urwa to ‘Āʾiṣa. Since two students inde­pendently report this isnād from Zuhārī, 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 Zuhārī’s transmission the core of the tradition, the Sahla story, was originally ascribed to ‘Āʾiṣa, 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.\textsuperscript{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 Ġuraig who, as mentioned above, does not say anything about an opinion or practice of ‘Ä’iša in his Zuhri tradition, reports from his teacher ‘Aṭā’ b. Abī Rabāḥ the following:

I heard ‘Aṭā’ 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?” [‘Aṭā’] said: “No.” I said [to him]: “Is this your ra’y?” He said: “Yes.” ‘Aṭā’ said [moreover]: “‘Ä’iša ordered [to do] that to the daughters of her brother (kānat ‘Ä’iša ta’muru bi-dalika banāti ahīā).”\textsuperscript{154}

The last sentence is obviously a reference to the tradition about ‘Ä’iša as it is found in Mālik’s version of Ibn Šihāb’s ‘Urwa tradition concerning the suckling of adults. But who is ‘Aṭā’’s source for it? As ‘Urwa was an older contemporary of ‘Aṭā’’s and, explicitly, his informant for several traditions, we can assume that he was ‘Aṭā’’s source for this tradition as well, whereas we can exclude ‘Aṭā’’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 Wāqīdī 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 Suhaīl [alone].”\textsuperscript{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’iša’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’iša’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’iša.

Ma’mar’s version of the Sahla story reveals, finally, that it was Zuhri who had already put together the Abū Ḥudayfah-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 Zuhri thus leads to the conclusion that either Zuhri 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 Zuhri’s original text (apart from the isnād). By contrast, the versions of Ma’mar and Ibn Ğuraig look like abbreviated versions. One could also assume, of course, that Zuhri’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 ‘Atā’s reference to the story which shows that the report about ‘Ā’iša 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 Zuhri tradition, i.e. really goes back to Zuhri.

What should we think of Zuhri’s claim, however, that he obtained the Sahla story and the report about ‘Ā’iša’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 *ihlīlāf*, 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 *ahādīth* from the Prophet and ‘Ā’iša. It is hard to imagine that Zuhrī faked those *ahādīth* 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’iša 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’iša, 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 *hadīth* from the Prophet that contradicted his own legal doctrine so blatantly. Yet if he obtained the *hadīth* from somebody, the question arises as to whom he got it from. His aunt ‘Ā’iša 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’iša seems to be substantiated. That means that the *hadīth* 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’iša died 58/678). Probably this *hadīth* 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'ishā 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'ishā 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 Zuhri, had somewhat earlier been fictitiously ascribed to Ibn al-Musayyab and Urwa b. az-Zubair. In the forged ‘Ā’ishā 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, Zuhri, Ibn al-Musayyab and Sulaimān b. Yasār. Zuhri as transmitter of the tradition is, therefore, a fake and the argument based on the practice of ‘Ā’ishā must have emerged after Zuhri’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’ishā. This tradition must be somewhat later than that about ‘Ā’ishā. 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 Zuhri’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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Cf. the preceding note.

Cf. Schacht, Origins, p. 177, 178 f. G.H.A. Juynboll has expressed similar reservations about this isnād: “Very many forged traditions supported by this isnād probably originated during Malik’s lifetime (90-179/708-95).” Muslim Tradition, p. 143.


Cf. Schacht, Origins, p. 177.


See below p. 19.


Cf. ‘Abdarrazzāq, Muṣannaf, 12243; 12244; 13595; 13596; 13807, 13808.

‘Abdarrazzāq, Muṣannaf, 13095.

For this sentence there is also a special transmission by Ma’mar; cf. ‘Abdarrazzāq, Muṣannaf, 13081 (13080).

‘Abdarrazzāq, Muṣannaf, 13096.


‘Abdarrazzāq, Muṣannaf, 13500.

Cf., among others, the Zuhri texts collected by ‘Abdarrazzāq under the title “Bāb ar-raḡm wa-l-iḥsān”; Muṣannaf, vol. 7, pp. 315 ff.


Malik, Muwaṭṭa’, 29:46.

Lacking in the manuscript probably due to an transmission error.

‘Abdarrazzāq, Muṣannaf, 12238.

The text of the edition has Ma’mar, but this is certainly an error, for in Ma’mar’s asānid the name Zuhri is always used.

‘Abdarrazzāq, Muṣannaf, 12239.

Malik, Muwaṭṭa’, 29, chap. 7.

‘Abdarrazzāq, Muṣannaf, 13190.

Cf. the introduction by ‘Abdalwahhāb ‘Abdallāṭīf, the editor of Šaibānī’s Muwaṭṭa’ recension, p. 22.


Š: “the daughter of Talha b. ‘Ubaidallāh” instead of Țulaihya al-Asadiyya. The letter Š refers to Șaibānī’s riwāya of the Muwaṭṭa’

Š adds: Abū Sa‘id b. Munabbih or Abū Șulaym b. Munayya.

Š: lam yankahhā.

in Š lacking.

Š: from her vagina.

This does not preclude that Mālik, nevertheless, received the tradition from Zuhri.


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


Cf. 'Abdarrazzāq, *Musannaf*, 10551 (Ma'mar).

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, *Musannaf*, 10541, 10542, 10543. In the first two texts “Ruṣaid at-Ṭaqāfī” appears as the name of the second husband. This accords 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.

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

*S:* *wa* is missing.

‘A: *wa-kāna* min aṣḥāb ff. is missing.

*S:* *wa* is missing.

‘A: *wa-kāna* Badriyyīn instead of *wa-kāna* qad khādīya Badrīn.

*S:* *la-kāna* (?) instead of *tabannā*.

‘A: *kānā* instead of *tabannā*. Ṣ: *kamā* *tabannā* ff is missing.

‘A: “b. Ḥarīta” is missing.

S: both names are missing.

‘A: *ibn*nat instead of *bint*.

‘A: “b. Rabi‘a” is missing.

‘A: *yaumā'idūn* is placed before *min* *afdal*.

*S:* *ahad* instead of *wahid*.

*S:* *tubunniya* instead of *min* *ula'i*a. ‘A: *siyy* (?) is added.

*S:* *lam* *yakun* *yu*lam instead of *lam* *yu*lam.

*S:* *mawālīhi*.

*S:* *wa* *hiya* is missing.

*S:* *fi* ma *bala*āna* is added. ‘A: *ilā rasūli llahi* is missing.

*S:* *fi* *in* lam *ta*‘āmu ff. is missing. ‘A: *al-*āya instead of *huwa* *aqsātu* ff.

*S:* *aḥad* instead of *waḥīd*.

*S:* *tubūnniyya* instead of *min* *ulā*‘ika. ‘A: *siyy* (?) is added.

*S:* *lam yakun* *yu*lamu instead of *lam* *yu*lam.

*S:* *fī futūbihi* is missing.

‘A: *mawālīhi*.

*S:* *wa* is missing.

‘A: *fi* *sā*‘nīhi is missing; qāla Zuhrī is added.

‘A: *rasālu llabhī* is missing.
Mälik, Muwatta', 30:12; Muwatta' (S), no. 627. 'Abdarrazzāq, Mušannah, 13886. We must imagine the “suckling” of adults in the form of putting drops of mother milk into a dish or a drink.

'Abdarrazzāq, Mušannah, 13883.

'Abdarrazzāq, Mušannah, 13887.

He does not speak of a practice of ‘Ā’iša in Ma’mar’s version.


Ibn Sa’d, Tabaqat, vol. 8, p. 198.


Cf. ‘Abdarrazzāq, Mušannah, 13908.

There is also a biographical report, preserved in a biographical lexicon of Andalusian ‘ulamā’, that Zuhri 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. Humaidī, Gadwāt al-muqtabis, ed. Muḥammad b. Tawīt aṭ-Ṭangī, Kairo n.d., p. 83 f. I owe the reference to M. Fierro.


Cf. Schacht, Origins, pp. 48, 246 f.
Bibliography of literature quoted with short titles


— Id., *Kitāb Duwṭ al-islām*, 2 vols. in 1, Hyderabad 1918.


Ibn an-Nadim, al-Fihrist, Cairo n.d. [1929].


