

01 Aralık 2019

SYRIA

155

1.2.9 *Umar II and the Qadariyya*

The text likewise shows once again how much one idealized 'Umar II in Qadarite circles.¹ Since this characteristic can be traced back to the Syrian Qadariyya, one must ask oneself whether the caliph really criticized the Qadariyya in the form he is meant to have done in an epistle that I have edited and translated.² The extensive biography that Ibn 'Asâkir composed concerning him contains nothing of this sort.³ The argumentation of the epistle relies heavily on the Koran; this is not compatible with what we have learned up to now about the religious climate in Syria. The opponents become restricted to an extreme standpoint: namely that God does not know in advance the actions of human beings and consequently cannot predetermine them either; the closest parallel to this is found among the followers of a Khârijite, Shabîb al-Najrânî, who is classified among the Bayhasiyya.⁴ This suggests a forgery; one would have selected the most radical model in order to allow 'Umar's authority to shine all the more brightly.

The text's authenticity which I have advocated has therefore been questioned on several occasions. But the discussion has not yet come to an end;⁵ the sceptics, moreover, do not present a unified standpoint. For M. Cook the attribution to 'Umar II took place relatively early, in any case not later than the end of the 2nd century; the passages in which non-Koranic arguments are found have been worked into the fabric of what was originally a purely Koranic train of thought. He has observed that the form of the epistle, if it had ever existed as such, has been tampered with at the beginning and the end, and he offers concrete suggestions about what to relegate within brackets in order to restore the original state of the text.⁶ F. Zimmermann, in a book review, has drawn attention to the fact that the proportion of Koranic materials is much higher than the explicit quotations would lead one to believe.⁷ In a conference paper presented in 1982, he attempted to prove that the original text was first expanded in the 3rd century by a reviser who was probably active in

1 In general on the image of 'Umar II now Crone/Hinds, *God's Caliph* 73 ff.

2 *Anfänge* 113 ff.

3 But also nothing about Ghaylân, whose relationship with 'Umar he treats in detail elsewhere (*Anfänge* 177; the section as an extract is now accessible in print in Ibn Manzûr, *Mukhtaşar TD* xx, 239 ff.). Since Ibn 'Asâkir here avoids mentioning anything about religious disputes, one may play with the idea that he does this on purpose.

4 *Anfänge* 129, on the Bayhasiyya see below Chpt. B 3.1.4.1.1.

5 Basically in agreement with my argumentation for instance Juynboll in: JSS 24/1979/304 ff. or Madelung in: O.L.Z. 77/1982/169 ff.

6 *Muslim Dogma* 124 ff.; sceptical about this Calder in: JSS 28/1983/184.

7 In IJMES 16/1984/437 ff., there p. 438.