

## 2.1.2.3 Qadarites

Whereas in Baṣra asceticism often based its legitimacy on the doctrine of the Qadariyya, i.e. on personal responsibility in human behaviour,<sup>1</sup> in Kūfa it was clear that one could manage perfectly well without this justification. Abū Nuʿaym incorporated many Murjīʿites into his *Hilya*; they were by no means minimalists. Qadarite ideas were welcome as long as they could be understood as protest against the Umayyad authorities;<sup>2</sup> but later when the discussion of faith moved into the foreground, they ended up being marginalized. The Qadarites who came to be recorded as such for Kūfa in fact belong in the later period; there is only a small number of them. They never constituted a group in their own right, and sometimes they were directly influenced from Baṣra, such as for example

Abū Khuraym (?)<sup>3</sup> Yūsuf b. Maymūn al-Ṣabbāgh,

a dyer who had studied with Ḥasan al-Baṣrī and Ibn Sīrīn,<sup>4</sup> but as a client was attached to a high-ranking aristocratic Kūfan family.<sup>5</sup> For this reason, one could not agree later whether he should be classified as a Baṣran or a Kūfan;<sup>6</sup> Ibn Ḥibbān simply assumed they were two separate persons.<sup>7</sup> But in Baṣra he had found confirmation for his Kūfan anthropomorphism; Ibn Sīrīn had passed on to him the *ḥadīth* that says if you see God in a dream, you will enter Paradise.<sup>8</sup> In the beginning, this probably only attested to Ibn Sīrīn's interest in dream interpretation;<sup>9</sup> but later when the mystics came up with the idea of claiming such visions for themselves, it turned into a problem.<sup>10</sup> – In Baṣra as well had also belonged

Abū ʿAbdallāh Muʿallā b. Hilāl b. Suwayd al-Ṭaḥḥān al-Juʿfī al-Ḥaḍramī,

1 See below Chpt. B 2.2.2.2.

2 See above pp. 185 and 204 f.

3 Thus according to Dawlābī, *Kunā* I, 167, l. 4 from bot.; otherwise mostly Abū Khuzayma.

4 *Mizān* no. 9889.

5 The family of ʿAmr b. Ḥurayth al-Makhzūmī, one of the Prophet's highly regarded Qurayshī Companions who had settled in Kūfa and had been Ziyād's representative when the latter resided in Baṣra (on him Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Istīʿāb* 1172, no. 1906; Ṭabarī, Index s. n.; also below p. 336, fn. 6)

6 Cf. *Mizān* and Bukhārī IV2, 384, no. 4309 with IAH IV2, 230, no. 960; on this TT XI, 426 f, no. 832.

7 Cf. *Majrūḥīn* III, 132, ll. 6 ff. from bot., with III, 134, ll. 1 ff.

8 *Mizān*, op. cit.

9 Ibn Fūrak, *Mujarrad maqālāt al-Ashʿarī* 86, l. 2 from bot.; on this Ibn Sīrīn, *Tafsīr al-manāmāt* 5, ll. 11 ff. In general EI<sup>2</sup> III, 948 a s. n. *Ibn Sīrīn*.

10 See below Chpt. B 2.2.2.2.3.

## 1.2 The Qadariyya

The first intellectual religious movement which stirred up emotions in Syria was the Qadariyya. However, we can scarcely establish when it became a political and social force in the true sense. And it now seems that such was not the case all that early on. Only in the caliphate of Hishām, in the period shortly before 110/729, can Qadarite ideas be documented with certainty in Syria. We do possess several reports about the time of ‘Abd al-Malik and above all for the brief reform caliphate of ‘Umar II; but the situation is obscured by the view of history of our sources which always only see the Qadariyya as a heretical “innovation” and for this reason search for its origin, i.e. “the first Qadarite”.

1.2.1 *The Question of Origin*

This model goes back to ideas which were developed to begin with by non-Qadarite intellectuals in Syria in the middle of the 2nd century. But at that time they still possessed no conceptual uniformity. Awzā‘ī (d. 157/774) saw Ma‘bad al-Juhanī as the source of all evil; according to Awzā‘ī, the latter was led astray by a Christian convert by the name of Sawsan.<sup>1</sup> Sa‘īd b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Tanūkhī, a decade after Awzā‘ī’s death, introduced another name into the discussion. He pointed out that Abū Idrīs al-Khawlānī (d. circa 80/700), a *qāṣṣ* and allegedly also *qāḍī* of Damascus during the period of ‘Abd al-Malik,<sup>2</sup> warned against attending the lectures of a certain Abū Jamīl because the latter did not believe in God’s predetermination of one’s destiny; immediately thereafter Abū Jamīl went off to Ḥims.<sup>3</sup> We may infer that by this “heretic” is meant the *tābi‘ī* Abū Jamīl Muslim b. Qurra al-Ashja‘ī, about whom we are told that he transmitted from ‘Awf b. Mālīk, a Companion of the Prophet residing in Damascus.<sup>4</sup> But Abū Jamīl has completely disappeared and the report of Sa‘īd b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz was forgotten. The thesis of Awzā‘ī is a different matter altogether; it was frequently repeated in the later literature.

1 More details on this in my contribution in: *Festschrift Meier* 61.

2 On him the extensive biography in the *Ta‘rikh Dimashq* s. n. ‘Ā‘idhallāh b. ‘Abdallāh (*Tarājim ḥarf al-‘ayn*, ed. Fayṣāl 485 ff., especially 514, l. 14, and 519, ll. 8 ff.); also HT and *Anfänge*, Index s. n.

3 M. Abyaḍ, *al-Tarbiya wa’l-thaqāfa al-‘arabiyya fī l-Shām wa’l-Jazīra* 348/*Culture et éducation* 263, following Ibn ‘Asākir.

4 Cf. Dawlābī, *Kunā* I, 138, l. 11, in combination with Fasawī I, 318, last l. f. Unfortunately Ibn ‘Asākir’s biography of Abū Jamīl, whom he lists under his *kunya*, is not accessible to me; I cannot verify whether my identification is correct. On ‘Awf b. Mālīk cf. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istī‘āb* no. 2003 and Ibn Ḥajar, *Iṣāba* III, 43, no. 6101; he belonged to the same tribe as Abū Jamīl and likewise is supposed to have settled in Ḥims.

I-Juwayriya: his name was ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd b. ‘Imrān and he was a Kufan living in Medina,<sup>3</sup> which is all we know about him. We do, however, know a certain Abū l-Ḥuwayrith or Abū l-Ḥuwayritha<sup>4</sup> whom Abū Dāwūd also listed among the “Murji’ites of Medina” and of whom Mālik did not approve; his name was ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Mu‘āwiya.<sup>5</sup> The *kunya* may simply have been misread.<sup>6</sup> It is furthermore not entirely true that no Murji’ites at all studied under Mālik,<sup>7</sup> but we can still say that their school did not have very many followers in Medina.<sup>8</sup>

#### 4.1.2.3 The Qadarites

The Qadariyya, on the other hand, had been established in the city for some time, and was reasonably well-respected. Ṣāliḥ b. Qaysān, who had taught ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz’ sons when he was governor, as well as supervising the construction of the prophet’s mosque, was said to have had ties to it.<sup>1</sup> He praised Ibn al-Ash‘ath’s followers for the courage they had shown at Dayr al-Jamājim;<sup>2</sup> in an account of the conquest of Ḥira he displayed the kind of egalitarian pathos expected of a client.<sup>3</sup> When Ghaylān al-Dimashqī accompanied the caliph Hishām on the pilgrimage in 106/725, he and Rabī‘at al-ra’y were said to have had a debate in Medina.<sup>4</sup> According to the account by Mālik, after the end of the debate Sa‘d b. Ibrāhīm, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘Awf’s grandson who held the office of *qāḍī* in the city at the time,<sup>5</sup> obtained the notes of Ghaylān’s

3 Dawlābī I 139, 8ff.

4 Regarding the latter form cf. Fasawī II 644, 12, and Dawlābī I 161, 2 (which has Abū l-Ḥuwayriya instead).

5 TT VI 272f. no. 539; regarding him cf. also ‘Uqaylī, *Du‘afā’* II 344f. no. 945, and *Mizān* no. 4979.

6 He is, however, believed to have died as early as 128/746 or 130/748 (TT, loc. cit.).

7 Cf. vol. I 159.

8 I do not know who the Murji’ite Ibn Abī Dāwūd was of whom Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna warned (‘Uqaylī, *Du‘afā’* I 62, 3f.).

1 TT IV 399, 4f. and TH 148, pu.; Ṭabarī II 1193, 15ff. Regarding his Qadarism cf. Ka‘bī 80, 10ff. > *Faḍl* 336, 7 > IM 134, 8; Suyūfī, *Tadrib* I 329, 1; *Mizān* no. 3823 (where the suspicion is rejected). According to Fasawī I 568, 6ff., he had already been ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz’ own tutor. For more information see TTD VI 378.

2 Ṭabarī II 1092, 1ff.

3 Ibid. I 2016, 15ff. and 2017, 9ff.; cf. also Abū Bakr’s speech transmitted by him, which he was said to have given on his deathbed (I 2139, 6ff.).

4 In more detail *Anfänge* 204ff. Regarding the date cf. ibid. 225; Hishām was in Medina during Muḥarram/May 725.

5 Wakī‘ I 150ff.: from 104/722 onwards with interruptions until his death in 127/745 (thus according to Wakī‘ I 164, 2f.) or 128/746 (thus after Khalīfa, *Ta’rikh* 577, 9).

One of Wahb's pupils named Abū l-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. al-Hayṣam b. Muḥammad al-Baghdādī composed a *K. al-mustaḍīr* one chapter of which is extant in the MS Selimağa 587, fol. 176a–177b; it concerns ‘Uzayr.

Ka'bī's counting Wahb among the Qadarites was based on Jāhiz; presumably his *K. al-amṣār*. Besides Wahb Jāhiz also listed his brother Hammām b. Munabbih (*Maq.* 85, 4f. > *Faḍl* 338, 16ff. > IM 135, 12ff.). However, it is not possible to put this information in more concrete terms. Some of the hadiths found in his extant *ṣaḥīfa* would later be drawn into the *qadar* debate (cf. HT 57f.), but this does not mean that he himself occupied a firm standpoint. The hadiths under discussion allowed different interpretations (e.g. the examples *ibid.* p. 101ff., p. 163, p. 99, and even p. 90), and the fundamental question to be asked would be whether material someone transmitted always had to reflect that person's own position. As we know, several divergent dates were transmitted for Hammām's death (GAS 1/86). However, the records of a later date, between 131/749 and 133/751, are more probable; according to a remark by Wahb's great-nephew Ghawth b. Jābir b. Ghaylān b. Munabbih Wahb was the eldest of four brothers, and thus not younger than Hammām, as claimed by Ibn Sa'd (cf. Ibn Ḥanbal, *Tal* 400, –5, and IS v 396, 8ff.; also Fasawī II 30, 2f.; Marzubānī, *Nūr al-qabas* 351, 8ff., according to which Hammām was the last of the brothers to die). The first Abbasid governor in Ṣan'ā' was said to have said the prayer of the dead over him (*Ta'rīkh Ṣan'ā'* 421, 2ff.).

#### 4.2.1.1 The Qadarites

The fundamental question to be asked when Wahb is described as a Qadarite is of course whether this is indeed a judgment on his person, or whether it relies mainly on the texts and traditions attributed to him. It is more than probable that, similar to the circle around Ibn Abī Najīh in Mecca, it is inferred mostly from this material, and consequently depends on its authenticity which, in fact, is anything but assured. The majority of Khoury's studies ran aground amid uncritical collector's zeal. The counter-traditions mentioned initially may well be directed against a personality who could already be a purely literary image. In that case they might have to be dated slightly later; they are probably not authentic in any case. Even so there are reasons why we should not embark on radical scepticism. We hear that according to Mu'tazilite tradition Wāsil's messenger to Yemen met with interest among certain of Wahb b. Munabbih's followers, who recruited themselves from among the *abnā'*.<sup>1</sup> The movement appears to have collapsed even before the Abbasid revolution; thus this is unlikely to be an image of history thought up by later Yemeni Mu'tazilites. Much

<sup>1</sup> See p. 354f. above.

110112 KĀDİRİYYE

## 2.2.2.1 The Qadariyya

When it came to hadith, Ḥasan al-Baṣrī had not exercised any particular care.<sup>1</sup> A gradual change took place over the following generations; among his pupils we already find some who would become indispensable to the science of tradition later. More than a few of them, possibly even the majority, were Qadarites like he; if this was known, they are mentioned as such in *rijāl* works. Until the third century they did not have to fear criticism in the city greatly. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal had no choice but to accept the Qadarites among his Basran authorities because, as he said, on closer inspection they made up around a third of the resident *muḥaddithūn*,<sup>2</sup> and Muqaddasī would write around 380/990 that the majority of Basrans were Shī'ites (sic!) and Qadarites.<sup>3</sup> In Kufa it was said that each of them claimed to provide his own guidance.<sup>4</sup> Nowhere else do we find *isnāds* that are Qadarite for generations;<sup>5</sup> and nowhere else do we hear so clearly that Qadarite traditionists were preferred to the "orthodox" colleagues<sup>6</sup> or that people had a great following whose reputation would later not be among the best.<sup>7</sup> Like the Murji'a in Kufa the Qadariyya in Basra was not really a "sect"; the Mu'tazila was the first to cause offence. It is remarkable that neither Ash'arī nor Baghdādī or Shahrastānī used the term as classifying criterion in their heresiographical works.

Outside of Ash'arite heresiographical tradition the term Qadariyya sometimes replaced the Mu'tazila entirely, thus e.g. in Abū Muṭī' al-Nasafī. Kulīnī, *Kāfī* I 351, –6 makes clear that both groups were still distinguished in Kufa after 150/767 (concerning the text see vol. I 403, n. 66 above). Regarding the origin of the word *Qadariyya* cf. HT 122ff. In fact, it did not refer to the school or "sect" only but also to the doctrine: cf. *qadariyyatī* "my Qadarite convictions" in TB VII 147, 15.

1 Ritter 2f.; 'Abbās 144ff.; Juynboll, *Muslim Tradition* 49ff.

2 TB XII 200, iff. and TT VIII 114, 11 with reference to Abū Qaṭan 'Amr b. al-Haytham who died 198/814 (see p. 84f. below).

3 *Aḥsan al-taqāsīm* 126, 13f. This raises the question of whether he included the Mu'tazilites among the Qadarites.

4 Ibn al-Faqīh, *Buldān* 168, 16f.; similar also Kardarī, *Manāqib Abī Ḥanīfa* II 85, 7ff. with reference to Ḥasan al-Baṣrī.

5 See p. 84f. below.

6 See p. 76 below.

7 See p. 80f. below. For general information cf. also HT 62ff.

and consequently expressed himself diplomatically in his *Tafsīr* (2xv 145, –10ff.; cf. Andrae, *Person Muhammeds* 270ff.); he felt compelled to publish a separate text stressing his orthodoxy (Yāqūt, *Irshād* VI 436, 2ff.; probably his *K. šarīḥ al-sunna*, ed. Sourdel in: REI 36/1968/177ff.). Shortly after his death in 317/929 there were riots in Baghdad fired by this issue (Goldziher, *Richtungen* 101f.; also Rosenthal in: *The History of al-Ṭabarī* I, Introduction 71ff. and 149ff.; and Gilliot, *Exégèse, langue et théologie en Islam* 250ff.). For later opinions cf. Huitema, *Voorspraak* 17, n. 6).

It may have been this matter that led to Mujāhid being accused of basing his teachings on the ideas of the “people of the book”. The OT has sitting on the throne together as a symbol of shared rule (Job 36:7; Ps. 110:1, quoted in Mt. 22:44); the son of man will sit on the right hand of “power” (Mt. 26:64). But the idea may just as well have come from Arab culture; we read repeatedly how a ruler or governor invites a pious man – the righteous man, in Biblical terms – to sit on the throne beside him (Balādhurī, *Ansāb* IV<sub>1</sub> 242, –6 ‘Abbās; Abū Nu‘aym, *Ḥilya* V 140, 5f.; Dhahabī, *Siyar* IV 461, –6f.).

#### 4.1.1.1 The Qadarites

Mujāhid imagined that when God “sealed” the hearts, he did so gradually and in the wake of human sin.<sup>1</sup> This idea was pleasing to Qadarite ears, and in fact Mujāhid was occasionally listed among the Qadarites,<sup>2</sup> as were several of his pupils and their pupils, the first of whom edited his exegetic lectures:

Abū Yasār ‘Abdallāh b. Abī Najīḥ Yasār,

d. before the great pestilence, in 131/748,<sup>3</sup> according to other sources in 132/749.<sup>4</sup> His father Abū Najīḥ (d. 107/727) had been a *mawlā* of the Thaḳīf,<sup>5</sup> while he himself moved his allegiance to the Makhzūm.<sup>6</sup> The family possessed some wealth and could allow themselves the luxury of scholarly activity. The father transmitted traditions and was close to Ṭāwūs b. Kaysān (d. 106/725 in Mecca).<sup>7</sup>

1 Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr* 31 258f. no. 300f.; Ibn al-Jawzī, *Quṣṣāṣ* 53f. no. 101.

2 *Faḍl* 338, 8 > IM 135, 9; but cf. his alleged criticism of Ghaylān al-Dimashqī (Ibn Waḍḍāḥ, *Bida’* IX 14).

3 IS V 355, 17f.; Khalifa, *Ṭab.* 707 no. 2561, and *Ta’rīkh* 603, 17.

4 IS 355, 18f.; Shīrāzī, *Ṭab.* 71, 1 after Wāqidī; Ibn Qutayba, *Ma’ārif* 469, 5.

5 IS 348, 22.f. More precisely, according to Bukhārī III<sub>1</sub> 233 no. 767, and IAH II<sub>2</sub> 203 no. 947: *mawlā* of Akhnas (b. Sharīq b. ‘Amr) al-Thaḳafī. Regarding him cf. Ṭabarī, Index s. n., and p. 169 above.

6 *Ma’ārif* 469, 1.

7 AZ 516 no. 1375.