Değerlendirme Yazısı / Review Essay

The *Jāmiʿ* of Maʿmar b. Rāshid:
One of the Earliest Ḥadīth Anthologies
-A Source Critical Study-

Mohammad Saeed Mitwally Alrahawan*

Introduction:

This paper attempts to answer the question about the authenticity of sources upon whom Maʿmar b. Rāshid relied while compiling his well-known *al-Jāmiʿ*. It tries to answer the question to what extent the traditions narrated by Maʿmar b. Rāshid (d. 153/770) in the *Jāmiʿ* can be regarded as an authentic source of ḥadīth. The study used source criticism which is based on a statistical analysis of *isnāds* to verify whether the sources of Maʿmar are fictitious or genuine. It counters Joseph Schacht's (d. 1969) premise and generalized conclusion that most of the *isnāds* which extend into the first half of the second/eighth and the first/seventh century are, without exception, arbitrary and artificially fabricated.[1]

By a thorough analysis of Maʿmar b. Rāshid sources as found in his *Jāmiʿ* which was included at the end of ʿAbd al-Razzāq's *Muṣannaf*, and through the application of source criticism of the books' chains of authorities we can conclude that the sources of Maʿmar b. Rāshid formed independent individual profiles of their respective materials which precludes the possibility of having an organized arbitrary attribution of materials by Maʿmar. Similarly, his use of anonymous sources, broken *isnāds,* anomalous informants, indirect transmission and reports from very weak transmitters confirm the conclusion that it is hard to believe it is the work of a forger. One also can reach the same conclusion by reviewing the life and works of the author in Muslim biographical sources which confirmed,

---

* Associate Professor, Department of Islamic Studies in English, al-Azhar University, Egypt and the Department of Orientalism, Taibahu University, Medina, msaid42@hotmail.com, orcid.org/0000-0002-9240-0110.

1 Joseph Schacht, *Origins of Muhmmadan Jurisprudence,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975), 163.

through a separate evaluation of these sources, the results obtained from the work itself. Therefore, Maʿmar's sources are real sources. Maʿmar b. Rāshid must have received the materials from similar compilations that he received from his teachers.

1. The Question of Study and Research Method

Maʿmar's being the compiler and transmitter of the material contained in his *Jāmiʿ* does not guarantee the reliability of the materials contained in it. Therefore, the main question of this paper is to what extent the traditions reported by Maʿmar b. Rāshid in the *Jāmiʿ* can be regarded as an authentic source of ḥadīth. In other words, who are Maʿmar's sources? Had Maʿmar really received the material from the people he gave as his sources?

To answer these questions, we will investigate the sources of Maʿmar by using source based criticism, which attempts to extract earlier sources not preserved as separate works from the compilations we have at hand. It primarily focuses on certain transmitters rather than on *ḥadīth* clusters dealing with specific topics. Sebstian Günter defines source criticism as follows:

> Source criticism aims to determine those literary sources which as basic elements, make up the mosaic of the finished compilation in order to clarify their origin and the time when they came into being and to draw precise conclusions as to their nature, the ways and terms of their transmission and their value as sources of the literary work in question and finally to verify and evaluate the most important of these older literary materials as well as the individuals involved in their transmission.[2]

There are two well-known models for this methodology: 1) source criticism based on the analysis of *isnāds* of a compilation or the transmissions of one compiler. 2) *Isnād-cum-matn* analysis. This model employs intensive analysis of both *isnād* and *matn* to answer questions of the transmission history of a report or a number of reports by collecting all its/their transmission paths and relating isnāds to *matns.*

Both models have been used intensively in modern Western scholarship. The former, as Harald Motzki (d. 2019) remarks, became familiar in modern Western studies since the work of Julius Wellhausen (d. 1918).[3] Heribert Horst applied this method for checking the authenticity of al-Ṭabarī's (d. 310/923) transmission.[4] Similarly, G. Stauth adopted source-critical approach based on

---

2   Sebstian Günter, "Due Results in the Theory of Source-Criticism in Medieval Arabic Literature," *Al-Abḥath,* 16 (1994): 4,5.

3   Harald Motzki, "the Muṣannaf of ʿAbd al-Razzāq al-Sanʿānī as a Source of Authentic Aḥādīth of the First Century A. H.," *JNES,* 50 (1991): 1.

4   H. Horst, "zur Überlieferung in Korankommentar aṭ-Ṭabarī," *ZDMG,* 103 (1953): 290-

the transmission of Mujāhid's (d. 103/721) exegesis, mostly relying on isnād to establish his thesis.[5] It has also been used by ar-Rahawān[6] to check the reliability of ibn Abī Shayba's *Muṣannaf.*

I am also going to apply this model of source criticism based on *isnāds* found in Maʿmar b. Rāshid's *Jāmiʿ.*

2. A brief history of Maʿmar's life and his compilation of *al-Jāmiʿ*

His full name is Maʿmar b. Rāshid Abū ʿUrwa b. Abī ʿAmr al-Muhallabī al-Baṣrī. He was born at Baṣrah in 95/714 or 96/715 and died at Yemen in 153/770. He started his studies in 110/728, the year when al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī died[7]. Maʿmar was 14 years then.[8] He also attended the sessions of Qatāda b. Diʿāma al-Sadūsī (60/680-100H/719) when he was fourteen, i.e. in 110/728.[9]

Maʿmar travelled to al-Ruṣāfa, Kufa, Wāṣiṭ, Hijāz and Yemen.[10] He met with al-Zuhrī (58/678-124/742) at al-Rusāfah.[11] He was known for his long stay and companionship with al-Zuhrī.[12] Abū Ḥātim confirms Maʿmar's study for a long time with ʿAmr b. Dinār (d. 126/744) in Hijaz, Abū Isḥāq al-Sabīʿī (d. 129/747) and al-Aʿmash (d. 147/764) in Kufa, Qatāda b. Diʿāmah (d. ca. 113-119/-119/731-737) in Baṣra and Yaḥya b. Abī Kathīr (d. 132/750) in Yemen.

It is most probable that Maʿmar met with Yaḥya b. Abī Kathīr in Medina where he lived for 10 years.[13] Maʿmar has also stayed in Mecca where ʿAbdullah b. al-Mubārak (d. 181/797) attended his sessions.[14] He returned to Baṣrah to visit his mother. On his journey from Mecca, he accompanied Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī

306.

5   Stauth, *Die Überlieferung des Kommentars Mujāhid b. Gabrs*, (Gießen, 1969).

6   Ar-Rahawan, Muḥammad Said Mitwally, *Early Sources for Prophet Muhammad's Biography,* (Riyadh: IIPH, 2015.

7   al-Mizzī, Yūsuf b. al-Zakī ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Abū al-Ḥajjāj, *Tahdhīb al-kamāl,* ed. Bashshār ʿAwwād Maʿrūf (Beirut: Muasasat al-Risāla, Beruit, 1400/1980), vol. 11, p. 378.

8   Muḥammad b. Ismāʿil b. Ibrāhīm b. al-Mughīra al-Bukhārī, *al-Tārīkh al-kabīr,* ed. Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Muʿīd Khān (Hyderabad: Dāʾirat al-Maʿārif al-ʿUthmāniyya), vii. 378.

9   Ibid.

10   Ibn al-Jaʿd, ʿAlī b. al-Jaʿd b. ʿUbayd al-Jawaharī al-Baghdādī, *Musnad ibn al-Jaʿd,* ed. ʿAmir Aḥmad Ḥaydar (Beirut: Muassasit Nādir 1410/1990), 350.

11   al-Fasawī, Abū Yūsuf Yaʿqūb b. Sufyān, *al-Maʿrifa wa al-tārikh,* ed. Khalīl al-Manṣūr (Beruit: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya 1419/1999), i. 639.

12   Abū Zurʿa ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAmr b. ʿAbdullah b. Ṣafwān al-Naṣrī, *Tārīkh Abū Zurʿa,* ed. Shukrullah Niʿmatullah al-Qawjānī (Damascus: Majmaʿ al-Lugha al-ʿArabiyya), i. 437.

13   al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl,* xxxi. 510.

14   al-Fasawī, *al-Maʿrifa wa al-tārikh,* ii. 199.

(d. 131/749) which means that Maʿmar stayed with him in Mecca.[15] According to al-Mizzī, Maʿmar took tradition from 57 scholars[16] while al-Bukhārī and Ibn Abū Ḥātim mentioned a further 44 teachers from whom Maʿmar received traditions. Additionally, some of Maʿmar's teachers, such as Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī (66/684-131/748), ʿAmr b. Dīnār and Abū Isḥāq al-Sabīʿī also reported ḥadīths from him. Moreover, some of his colleagues such as Sufyān al-Thawrī (d. 161/778), Shuʿba (d. 160/777) and Saʿīd b. Abū Arūba (d. 156/782) also reported from him.

Maʿmar also had many students who studied and took ḥadīths from him, including some renown scholars such as Ismāʿīl b. ʿUlayya (d. 194/810), Rabāḥ b. Zayd al-Ṣanʿānī (d. 187-803) and ʿAbd al-Wāḥid b. Ziyād (d. 176/792). Two of his students were known for their long-standing companionship with him, i.e. Muḥammad b. Ḥumayd al-Yashkurī (d. 182/798) and ʿAbd al-Razzāq b. Hammām al-Ṣanʿānī (d. 211/826). ʿAbd al-Razzāq b. Hammām al-Ṣanʿānī studied seven to eight years with Maʿmar, from 145/762-63 until his death in 153/770.[17] Maʿmar died in Yemen.[18]

3. External Criteria of Authenticity

By external criteria, I mean those which confirm the authenticity of Maʿmar's traditions. These criteria include an analysis of all the *aḥādīth* found in his compilation with reference to his teachers and their percentages. Based on the distribution of the *aḥādīth* found in his *Jāmiʿ*, we would be able to conclude whether Maʿmar forged these *aḥādīth* and attributed them arbitrarily to his sources or not.

3.1. The Volume of Maʿmar's Corpus

The number of ḥadīths found in Maʿmar's *Jāmiʿ* is 1614.[19] The majority of those reports were taken from four key sources who are scholars of the highest calibre in the field of ḥadīth and known for their reliability among all ḥadīth scholars, these are:

al-Zuhrī: 16%

Qatāda: 13%

---

15 Abū ʿAbdullah Muḥammad b. Saʿd b. Manīʿ al-Hāshimī, *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubra,* ed. Iḥsān ʿAbbās (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir 1968), v. 546.

16 al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb al-kamāl*, xxvii. 304-5.

17 Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī, al-Jarḥ wa al-taʿdī, iii. 38; al- Dhahabi, Shams al-Dīn Abū ʿAbdullah Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. ʿUthmān, *Tadhkirat al-huffāz,* (Hyderabad, 1375), i. 364.

18 Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī, *al-Jarḥ wa al-taʿdīl,* viii. 256.

19   I referred to both the edited version of ʿAbdur-Razzāq's *Muṣannaf,* ed. Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān al-Aʿẓamī, vols. 10 and 11 (Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islami 1403/1983) and to Fayzullah manuscript of ʿAbdur-Razzq's *Muṣannaf,* no. 541.

Ayyūb: 12.5%

Ibn Ṭāwūs: 6.2%

Their reports make us a 47.7% of his *Jāmiʿ*. Moreover, 14% of the book has been reported through five other scholars but who does not reach the standard of the first five scholars mentioned above, these are Abū Isḥāq al-Sabīʿī, Hishām b. ʿUrwa, al-Aʿmash, Zayd b. Aslam and Yaḥya b. Kathīr.

There follows in the list of frequency a group of fifteen people with a total share of 7.8%. The quota for individual reporters lies between barely 2 and 0.5%: Hammām b. Munabbih, al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, Abān b. ʿUthmān, ʿAṣim b. Sulaymān b. Abī al-Nujūd, ʿAṭāʾ b. Yazīd al-Laythī, Manṣūr b. al-Muʿtamir, ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Jazarī, Abdul-Karim al-Jazarī, Suhayl b. Abī Ṣāliḥ, Saʿīd al-Jarīrī, Ismāʿīl b. Umayya, Saʿīd b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Jaḥshī, Jaʿfar b. Burqān, Abu Hārūn al-ʿAbdī, ʿAbdullah b. Khuthaym. The remaining 34% come through 94 narrators.

some of them are famous scholars such as Abu al-Zinād, Yaḥya b. Saʿīd, ibn Abī Dhiʾb, ʿAṭā al-Khursānī,

1.   a few are unknown,

2.   There are also some anonymous traditions and

Finally, it contains some of Maʿmar's own views.[20]

The above distribution of the sources of Maʿmar's traditions clearly refutes the assumption that Maʿmar projected his own ideas and the ideas of those of his time on earlier authorities. Why should Maʿmar take the risk of quoting unknown sources? Similarly, why does he quote those renown sources like al-Zuhrī, Qatāda and al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī very frequently if he is a forger? The materials of these renowned scholars were known and widely circulated within ḥadīth circles of their times and this would clearly expose his weakness if there were any. However, this was not the case. The variety and the proportion of ḥadīth reported by him from his teachers reflect what has already been maintained in the brief history about Maʿmar in which his teachers were highlighted.

al-Zuhrī seems to be Maʿmar's main teacher over a relatively long period of time since, measuring by date of death, he was the eldest of Maʿmar's top three significant authorities -he died in 125/734. He met with al-Zuhrī in Madina.[21] During this period, Maʿmar was a slave and worked as a merchant for his master.

---

20   These calculations were based on the 1614 traditions which represent the whole book of *Jāmiʿ*. According to the *Muṣannaf* edition of Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān, the book of *Jāmiʿ* extends from number 19419 through 21033 of the *Muṣannaf* numbering.

21   Ibn ʿAsākir, Abū al-Qāsim ʿAlī b. al-Ḥasan b. Hibatullah, *Tārīkh Dimashq,* ed. ʿAmr b. Gharāma al-ʿAmrawī, (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr wa al-Ṭibāʿah, 1415/1995) 59, 393.

Also, the considerably high percentage of Qatāda (13%) shows Maʿmar's early connection with him since both are from Baṣra.

Moreover, the high number of Maʿmar's teachers can be explained by his wide range of travels throughout the Muslim world and also by his long stay in Mecca which, as a place of pilgrimage, offered him the opportunity to meet with scholars from all corners of the Islamic world. He met with Ayyūb in Mecca and accompanied him on his journey to Baṣra. This clearly explains Ayyūb's high percentage of traditions reported by Maʿmar from him in his *Jāmiʿ* (13%). The frequent appearance of scholars of Medina with Maʿmar would be attributed to his stay in Medina. Due to his long stay in Yemen, where he died, he met many of his teachers there, such as Hammām b. Munabbih.

3.2. Indirect transmissions

If Maʿmar's authorship of texts were wholly or partially forged, it would not be expected that he would frequently report his well-known authorities indirectly to confirm that he learned them by way of a third party. This is very common throughout the *Jāmiʿ* book. Most frequently he directly quotes Abān b. Abī ʿAyyāsh (d. 140/757) as in *aḥādīth* 19466, 19624, 19635, 19648 and 20212. In other cases he quotes him through an intermediary as in ḥadīth 19794 where the isnād goes as follows: Maʿmar – Wuhaib b. al-Ward – Abān.

Most frequently, Maʿmar quotes his main authorities directly. In some other cases, he quotes them through an unusual intermediary. If he is a forger, why should he take the risk of adding a strange name to the chain of his authorities? He is an admitted student of Qatāda. Why should he run the isnād atypically as follows:

> Ma mar from someone who heard Mujāhid and Qatāda saying, "When you enter a house where no one is in it, you should say, 'Peace be on us an on God's righteous salves,' because the angels answer your greeting."[22]

Such is the case of Maʿmar's transmission of Hammām b. Munabbih. Most frequently he quotes him directly. In some occasions, he reports his traditions through a third party as in ḥadīth 19762, where ʿAqīl b. Maʿqil is the connection between Maʿmar and Hammām.[23] A forger would easily attribute all information to his immediate informant without giving an intermediary. Indeed, it speaks for Maʿmar's precession and credibility, because he could have eliminated the shorter version of his source in favour of his own.

---

22 Maʿmar b. Abī ʿAmr Rāshid al-Azdī (d. 153), *al-Jāmiʿ*, (ed. Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān al-Aʿẓamī, (Pakistan: al-Majlis al-ʿIlmī and Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1403), x. 389.

23 Ibid, xi. 13.

3.3. Maʿmar's Uncertainties

Occasionally Maʿmar expresses uncertainty about his teachers. For example, He is uncertain whether Layth or Mughīra who received the report from Shaʿbī (ḥadīth 20201 and).[24] In ḥadīth 19513, he is unsure whether it was ibn Ṭāwūs who informed him or somebody else.[25] He did not provide the name of this probable alternative. Such is the case of ḥadīth 19514[26] and 19712[27] where he does not know whether Qatāda informed him or someone else he does not know. Sometimes he expresses his doubt about the name of his teacher's teacher as in ḥadīth 19599[28] where he quoted Zuhrī reporting ʿUbaidullah or ʿAṭāʾ b. Yazīd. ʿAbur-Razzāq confirms that this uncertainty comes from Maʿmar.[29] In some reports Maʿmar is not sure whether Qatāda, al-Ḥasan or both of them reported the ḥadīth[30] as follows:

Maʿmar – Abbān – Anas; Maʿmar – Wuhayb – Abbān; Maʿmar – Ismāʿīl b. Ibrāhīm – Abbān

Maʿmar-Layth – Mujāhid : Maʿmar – ʿUmar -Layth : Maʿmar – Jaʿfar b. Barqān – Layth.

3.4. Anomalous Sources

Maʿmar transmits materials from his sources by expressing direct reception through his using of the word *samiʿtu* (I heard), but this is very rare throughout the *Jāmi*ʿ. In most cases, he receives directly from unknown men such as in ḥadīth 19455[31], where he receives a report from a man from the peninsula named Dāwūd or in ḥadīth 19647[32], where he heard a man quoting the Prophet without even providing any isnād or even identifying the name of the man. In ḥadīth 19699,[33] he mentions a man whom he heard speaking to Hishām b. ʿUrwa. He introduces the dominant majority of his reports with the word ʿan (from), which does not decisively confirm that he has received those materials orally and directly from his teachers. So, if Maʿmar wishes to project his own statements or his own materials why should he provide them in uncertain terms. It would be better for

---

24 Ibid, xi. 161.
25 Ibid, x. 406.
26 Ibid.
27 Ibid, x. 462.
28 Ibid, x. 429.
29 Abū Bakr ʿAbd al-Razzāq b. Hammām al-Sanʿānī b. Nāfiʿ al-Ḥumayrī, *al-Muṣannaf*, ed. Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān al-Aʿẓamī (India: al-Majlis al-ʿIlmī and Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1403), x.349.
30 Maʿmar b. Rāshid, *al-Jāmi*ʿ, xi. 183.
31 Ibid, x. 390.
32 Ibid, x. 442.
33 Ibid, x. 459.

him to claim direct reception to lend more credence to his sources.

Moreover, Maʿmar frequently quotes anomalous sources. In almost 46 instances he quotes from a man whose name is not provided. Sometimes he provides the name of his tribe as in ḥadīth 19573[34] but in most cases, he does not provide any information about him. This is extended to his teachers too, i.e. Maʿmar sometimes does not know the informant of his teacher. He sometimes quotes al-Zuhri reporting a man such as in ḥadīth 19605[35] or Layth from a man as in ḥadīth 19636.[36] Occasionally, he credits his materials to a group of narrators without identifying their names as in ḥadīth 19495. In more than 35 cases he does not know whether he received his materials from one source or more than one source as in ḥadīth 19461. The question is: Would a forger projecting traditions that goes back to famous authorities rely on such insignificant details from almost unknown persons? This does not seem plausible.

3.5. Unqualified Informants

Maʿmar does not only confine himself to renown and reliable transmitters. Thus, if one thoroughly analyses his informants, he can easily identify many unreliable and weak narrators from whom it is claimed that Maʿmar received a great part of his materials. For example, Maʿmar received 26 traditions which represent 1.7% of his materials from Abān b. Abī ʿAyyāsh who is graded by al-Nasāʾī[37] and Aḥmad as *matrūk* (whose traditions are rejected)[38]. Yaḥya b. Maʿīn labelled him as a liar.[39] He further reported from Jaʿfar b. Burqān al-Kilābī (d. 150/767), who is not trustworthy in transmitting the reports of al-Zuhri.[40]

The following informants of Maʿmar are labelled as very weak narrators: Suhayl b. Abī Ṣāliḥ, ʿAṭāʾ b. Abī Muslim al-Kurasānī (d. 135/752), ʿAbdullah b. Muḥammad b. ʿUqayl (d. after 140), Abū Hārūn al-ʿAbdi, Umārah b. Juwayn (d. 134/751). He has been accused of being a forger (al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb* 21:233), Maṭar al-Warrāq (d. 125/742), Jābir b. Yazīd al-Juʿfī (d. 128/746), Hārūn b. ʿUthmān (d. 150/767).

Additionally, some of his authorities are considered controversial among scholars, such as Hishām b. ʿUrwa (d. 145/762), al-Layth b. Abī Sulaym (d.

---

34 Ibid x. 434.

35 Ibid, x. 431.

36 Ibid, x. 440.

37 al-Nasāʾī, Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Aḥmad b. Shuʿayb b. ʿAlī al-Khursānī, *al-Ḍuʿafāʾ wa al-matrūkūn,* ed. Maḥmūd Ibrāhīm Zāyid (Ḥalab: Dār al-Waʿy, 1396), 14.

38 al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl,* ii. 21.

39 Yaḥya b. Maʿīn b. ʿAwn b. Ziyād Busṭām b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Murī (185/774-233/847), *Maʿrifat al-rijāl,* ed. Muḥammad Kāmil al-Qaṣṣār (Syria: Majmaʿ al-Lugha al-ʿArabiyya, 1405/1985), i. 64.

40 al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb,* v. 13.

148/765), Muḥammad b. ʿAjlān al-Qurashī (d. 148/765), ʿAbdullah b. Muḥammad b. ʿAqīl (d. 140/757).

Deficiencies in Isnāds

On many occasions, Maʿmar introduces his materials with incomplete isnāds. In ḥadīth 19859,[41] he introduces al-Layth b. Abī Sulaymān quoting ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb. Layth died in 148/765. Thus, there must be at least two or even three links between him and ʿUmar who died in 23. He also quoted al-Layth as directly reporting the Prophet without naming his informants, their teachers or even the companion who received it from the Prophet (ḥadīth 19903)[42].

Additionally, Maʿmar preludes some of his texts with the phrase, *balaghanī* 'it is reported to me' without verifying the reliability of his informants. In those *balāghāt,* Maʿmar directly quotes the Prophet without introducing any intermediaries as in ḥadīth 19511,[43] where he has omitted the entire *isnād*. The fact that Maʿmar's sources are mentioned with broken and incomplete isnāds does not give credence to the conclusion that incomplete isnāds were later completed and gaps in the chain have been filled at a later period since Maʿmar is considerably a later source. Had he been a forger, he would fill all those gaps and presents his materials in the most accepted and ideal manner in order to convince those who reported from him that his sources are, to a very great extent authentic and reliable.

4. Conclusion

By a thorough analysis of Maʿmar b. Rāshid sources as found in his *Jāmiʿ* which was included at the end of ʿAbd al-Razzāq's *Muṣannaf*, and through the application of source criticism of the books' chains of authorities we can conclude that the sources of Maʿmar b. Rāshid formed independent individual profiles of their respective materials which precludes the possibility of having an organized arbitrary attribution of materials by Maʿmar. Similarly, his use of anonymous sources, broken *isnāds,* anomalous informants, indirect transmission and reports from very weak transmitters confirm the conclusion that it is hard to believe it is the work of a forger.

One also can reach the same conclusion by reviewing the life and works of the author in Muslim biographical sources which confirmed, through a separate evaluation of these sources, the results obtained from the work itself. Therefore we can safely say that Maʿmar's sources are real sources.

---

41 Maʿmar b. Rāshid, *al-Jāmiʿ,* xi. 42.

42 Ibid, xi. 58.

43 Ibid, x. 405.

Appendix of Ma'mar's Informants and the Number of their Tradition as Appearing in the *Jāmi*'

Name	Number of Traditions
Muḥmmad b. Shihāb al-Zuhrī	311
Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī	202
Qatāda b. Daʿāmah al-Sadūsī	210
ʿAbdullah b. Ṭāwūs	101
Abū Isḥāq al-Sabīʿī	73
Hishām b. ʿUrwa	46
Sulaymān al-Aʿmash	41
Yaḥya b. Abī Kathīr	41
Zayd b. Aslam	41
Hammām b. Munabbih	31
al-Hasan al-Baṣrī	28
Abān b. Abī ʿAyyāsh	26
ʿAsim b. Sulaymān b. Abī al-Nujūd	21
al-Laythī b. Abī Sulaym	18
Manṣūr b. al-Muʿtamir	12
ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Jazarī	12
Ja'far b. Burqān	10
Saʿīd b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Jaḥshi	10
Suhayl b. Abī Ṣāliḥ	10
Saʿīd al-Jarīrī	10
Ismāʿīl b. Umayyah	10
ʿAbdullah b. Khuthaym	9
Abū Hārūn al-ʿAbdī	8
Yaḥya b. Saʿīd	8
Yazīd b. Abī Ziyād	7
ʿUthamān b. Yazdawayh	7
Zayd b. Judʿān	7
Aṭāʾ al-Khursānī	7
Thābit al-Bunānī	6
Muḥammad b. Ziyād	6
al-Mughira b. Ḥabīb	5
Abd al-Malik b. ʿUmayr	5

Muḥammad b. al-Munkadir	5
Ibn Abī Dhi'b	5
Ḥarām b. ʿUthmān	5
Abū Hārūn al-ʿAbdī	4
Jābir b. Yazīd al-Juʿfī	4
Budayl al-ʿAqīlī	4
Khallād b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān	4
al-Ḥakam b. Abān	4
Sulaymān al-Tamimī	4
Hārūn b. Ri'āb	4
Abū al-Zinād ʿAbdullah b. Dhakwān	3
ʿAbdullah b. Muslim	3
Simāk b. al-Faḍl	3
Hishām b. Hassān	3
Maṭar al-Warrāq	3
Khālid al-Ḥadhā'	3
Bahz b. Ḥakīm	3
Abū Hārūn al-ʿAbdī	3
Yūnus b. ʿUbayd	2
Ja'far al-Jazarī	2
ʿAbdullah b. Muḥammad b. ʿAqīl	2
ʿUthmān b. Zufar	2
Kathīr b. Ziyād	2
Muḥammad b. ʿAjlān	2
Isḥāq b. Rāshid	2
Abū Ḥāzim	2
Ashʿath b. ʿAbdullah	2
ʿAbdullah b. ʿAd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Husayn	2
Abū ʿImrān al-Jūnī	2
Uthman b. Zufar	2
Ibn Abī Ḥusayn	2
ʿAbdullah b. Muḥammad b. ʿAqīl	2
Abū ʿAmr al-Nadbī	1
ʿAwf al-ʿAbdī	1
Yaḥya b. Abī Yaḥya	1

Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Abī Layla	1
ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Jazarī	1
ʿUthmān al-Jazarī	1
Abū Naḍrah	1
Abū ʿAmr al-Nadbī Bishr b. Ḥarb al-Azdī	1
Wuhayb b. al-Ward	1
Abū Bakr b. ʿAyyāsh	1
Amr b. Abī Bakr	1
Abdullah b. Saʿid b. Abī Hind	1
Ismāʿil b. Sarrūsh	1
Ḥafṣ b. Sulaymān	1
ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Abī Rawwād	1
Saʿīd b. Hibbān	1
Aṭāʾ b. al-Saʾib	1
Ṣāliḥ b. Mismar	1
Muḥammad b. Muslim al-Taʾifī	1
Abu Hāshim al-Wāṣiṭī	1
Qurra b. Khālid	1
Yaḥya b. ʿAbdullah b. Raysān	1
Alī b. Badhimah	1
ʿAṣim al-Aḥwal	1
Muhammad b. Wāsiʿ	1
Zayd b. Rufayʿ	1
Mūsa b. Ibrāhīm	1
Ziyād b. Jīl	1
Farqad al-Sabkhī	1

Bibliography

ʿ**Abd al-Razzāq b. Hammām,** *Muṣannaf,* ed. Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān al-Aʿzam, India: al-Majlis al-ʿIlmī and Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1403/1983.

Fayzullah manuscript of 'Abdur-Razzq's *Muṣannaf,* no. 541.

Abū Zurʿa, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAmr al-Naṣrī, *Tārīkh Abū Zurʿa,* ed. Shukrullah Niʿmatullah al-Qawjānī, Damascus: Majmaʿ al-Lugha al-ʿArabiyya.

al-Bukhārī, Muḥammad b. Ismāʾīl b. Ibrāhīm b. al-Mughīra, *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr,* ed. Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Muʿīd Khān, Hyderabad: Dāʾirat al-Maʿārif al-ʿUthmāniyya.

al-Fasawī, Abū Yūsuf Yaʻqūb b. Sufyān, *al-Maʿrifa wa al-tārīkh,* ed. Khalīl al-Manṣūr, Beruit: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya 1419/1999.

Günter, Sebastian, "Due Results in the Theory of Source-Criticism in Medieval Arabic Literature", *Al-Abḥath,* 42 (1994): 3-15.

Horst, H., "zur Überlieferung in Korankommentar aṭ-Ṭabarī", *ZDMG*, 103 (1953): 290-306.

Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī, ʻAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Idrīs, *al-Jarḥ wa al-taʻdīl,* Hyderabad: Dāʾirat al-Maʻārif al-ʻUthmāniyya, 1271/1952.

Ibn ʿAsākir, Abū al-Qāsim ʿAlī b. al-Ḥasan b. Hibatullah (d. 499/1105-571/1176), *Tārīkh Dimashq,* ed. ʿAmr b. Gharāma al-ʿAmrawī, Beirut: Dār al-Fikr wa al-Ṭibāʿah, 1415/1995.

Ibn al-Jaʿd, ʿAlī b. al-Jaʿd al-Jawaharī al-Baghdādī, *Musnad ibn al-Jaʿd*, ed. ʿAmir Aḥmad Ḥaydar, Beirut: Muassasit Nādir 1410/1990.

Ibn Saʿd, Abū ʿAbdullah Muḥammad b. Saʿd b. Manīʿ al-Hāshimī, *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubra,* ed. Iḥsān ʿAbbās, Beirut: Dār Ṣādir 1968.

Maʿmar b. Rāshid, *al-Jāmiʿ,* ed. Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān al-Aʿzamī, Pakistan: al-Majlis al-ʿIlmī and Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1403/1983.

al-Mizzī, Yūsuf b. al-Zakī ʻAbd al-Raḥmān Abū al-Ḥajjāj, *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl*, ed. Bashshār ʿAwwād Maʿrūf, Beirut: Muasasat al-Risāla, Beruit, 1400/1980.

Motzki, Harald, "the Muṣannaf of ʿAbd al-Razzāq al-Sanʻānī as a Source of Authentic Aḥādīth of the First Century A. H.," *JNES,* 50 (1991): 1-21.

al-Nasāʾī, Abū ʻAbd al-Raḥmān Aḥmad b. Shuʻayb, *al-Ḍuʻafāʾ wa al-matrūkūn,* ed. Maḥmūd Ibrāhīm Zāyid, Ḥalab: Dār al-Waʿy, 1396.

ar-Rahawan, Muḥammad Said Mitwally, *Early Sources for Prophet Muhammad's Biography,* Riyadh: IIPH, 2015.

Schacht, Joseph, *Origins of Muhmmadan Jurisprudence,* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Stauth, G., *Die Überlieferung des Kommentars Mujāhid b. Gabrs*, Gießn, 1969.

Yaḥya b. Maʿīn, *Maʿrifat al-rijāl,* ed. Muḥammad Kāmil al-Qaṣṣār, Syria: Majmaʿ al-Lugha al-ʿArabiyya, 1405/1985.