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As is well-known, fasting is one of the 'Pillars of Islam'. It might therefore be expected that as such, it would already have been extensively investigated. But this is not the case, for, besides the many minor points of interest which still require elucidation, it is not an exaggeration to say that even the broadest facts about the beginnings and early development of the Islamic fast have not hitherto been conclusively established.

Theoretically, the fast is based in the Quran, yet part of the relevant section in the Quran is consciously ignored by most Muslims, while many of their conceptions as regards the rest are at best ill-founded. It should be stressed from the outset that there is no intention here of implying any conscious perversion in this; the reasons underlying the Muslim view of the fast are expounded later.

In theory too, one of the roles of the other main fount of Islamic science, namely the ḥadīth, is that of elucidating the Quran, but it will emerge from what follows that in the case of the fast, a great proportion of the material in the ḥadīth has little relation to the Quran. In the ḥadīth, we come as close as is possible to the fast as practised, but as will be shown, this is not very near. The present study, then, has as its principal concern the fast as depicted in the scholarly materials of Islam.

One of the main aspects of this concern, however, is the reappraisal of the true nature and worth of the stock-in-trade of Islamic traditional science, that is to say 'tradition' in its widest sense: in a way, the Islamic fast, although its centre and constant theme, is a secondary matter. The fast is for present purposes of interest only in so far as its treatment by the Muslims can be
examined and analysed as typical of their treatment of any subject. The fast was chosen specifically because it is fairly well defined and not too large a subject; it has not been much studied before, it contains numerous non-canonical and non-Quranic aspects, and it is an important part of the Muslim faith as classically conceived. It is thus well suited to represent in miniature the massive edifice of closely interrelated and interdependent disciplines that constituted Islamic science. Accordingly, the first chapters of this study will be devoted to an examination of 1) what the Quran has to say about fasting (not its 'meaning'), and its context, as shown from the Quran itself, and 2) what the Muslim commentators made of the Quran, and why they came to such conclusions as they did reach; 3) the development in thinking, differences of opinion, etc., and the forms that these took.

Subsequent chapters will examine the fast as it is treated in the hadith: this naturally overlaps, to a degree, with the former section, but many differences emerge also. Again, an attempt will be made to find out the considerations that led the fuqahā' to think as they did, and to suggest the origin of the many non-Quranic elements of fasting in classical Islam. This oversimplifies somewhat; however, it is convenient to group the materials available around these two bases, Quran and Hadith, and it is a fact that there is scarcely any material relating to the fast that is not capable of inclusion under one or other of these two headings. What might be called the 'general' literature\(^1\) of the classical period of Islam, is, as far as has been discovered in the preparation of the present study, not very expansive on the subject of fasting. Medical literature has proved unfruitful, and so has poetry\(^2\).

---

1 Works by Jāхиţ and b. Qutaiba, for example.

2 At least, such of the diwans as have been readily available for examination.
Broadly speaking, interest has been concentrated on the period when our written sources begin, from roughly 150 A.H., to the time when the Islamic sciences were more or less fully worked out, that is to say two or at most three centuries later. Materials after the 5th. century of the Hijra have been taken note of, however; this is especially the case with the later tafsirs. The later fiqh writers have been almost completely ignored; they are largely ruminative, bringing up no matters the broad details of which have not been settled for many years. Indeed, signs of the later rigour and sterility may be detected in the classical collections of hadith, where lively discussion already seems limited to the questions of the proliferating sunna fasts.

Fasting as actually practised has largely been ignored. This is to a great extent the result of force majeure: fasting practice, i.e. with any significant detail, is unrecorded, with one or two notable but nevertheless minor exceptions, until the advent of Western travellers and observers. Even then, these all too often record simply what the Muslim is enjoined to do, as an opportunity to display their own knowledge, instead of noting down what they see. This shortage of hard factual information for the early times especially is the more to be regretted, for it will be observed in the course of what follows that there is in many cases more than a suspicion that the fuqaha's conception of the fast is rather different from the actual practice, a suspicion which is tantalisingly supported by such deviations from the 'norm' as modern travellers have noted. It should also be borne in mind that the sources at our disposal are almost entirely orthodox Sunni works. It could be argued that the question of fasting practice has anyway no place in the present study, as in a way the Muslim discussions are entirely theoretical, except perhaps in the earliest stages of the legal literature: although the problems, or some of them at least, were
rooted in practical issues, such as the question of fasting while sick or travelling, the criteria involved in their solution were theoretical, and the solutions themselves appear often to have been quite divorced from real life.

Having demonstrated the scope of the present enquiry, it should, it is hoped be clear what the aims are: to point out aspects of the structure of classical Islamic science, to show their internal relations, to analyse these, and make conclusions about the nature of the whole, as reflected in the example of the fast.

Fasting as an Islamic institution has not hitherto been treated in a monograph. There have of course been a number of articles and sections of longer works tackling certain aspects of the matter. These have been principally 1) the origin of Ramaḍān as a fast¹, and, by some connected with this, 2) the Jewish-Muslim parallels in the Islamic fast². Another group of articles contains descriptions of Ramaḍān as observed in different times and places, but these are not of direct interest to the present investigation.

Apart from these articles, there is the published version of the Amsterdam University thesis of K. Wagtendonk, entitled 'Fasting in the Koran'. This latter work has an entirely different approach to that of the present study. Starting with 'the phenomenology of fasting', as observed in all areas and periods of history, Wagtendonk proceeds to an assessment of the 'meaning of fasting' and its occurrence, together with that of related religious observances, in pre-Islamic Arabia. A summary of preceding theories on the origin of the fast of Ramaḍān is followed by an exposition of Quran 2/183-7,

¹ Jacob, p.5; Torrey, p.131ff.; Goitein, pp.90-106; Gerlitz, p.120; Katsh, pp.128-9.

² Vajda, HUCA, pp.367-385; Katsh, pp.128ff.
in which is grounded the basis of his own theory of the origin of Ramadan. As his fourth chapter shows, this theory endeavours to relate the original Ramadan fast with the dates of Muhammad's revelation, Lailat al-Qadr, conceptions of the New Year, and Badr; this is followed by an attempt at the chronology of the first ten years of the Hijra. Fasting in rest of the Quran is then dealt with, and in conclusion, Wagendonk assesses, again phenomenologically, the 'meaning' of fasting in the Quran.

It will be apparent that Wagendonk's study has two broad aims: the establishing of the meaning of the Quranic fast, and that of the origin of Ramadan. Without wishing to appear carping, it should be asked whether these aims are quite proper: on the question of the meaning of the Quranic fast, it appears that beyond a certain amount of reasonable conjecture, it is not worthwhile trying to assess in detail something such as the original Quranic fast, on which we have nothing but the Quran itself, which contains very little beyond some few practical details deriving in large measure from polemic (Q2/183 to 187) and bare mentions, from which no more than the function can be derived (the rest of the fasting verses): we have absolutely no contemporary local background material that could either illuminate the circumstances of the Quranic fast or reveal it in practice. It is this same extreme dearth of potential corroborative material that renders categorical solutions of the second question, the origin of Ramadan, dangerous. If Wagendonk were dealing with facts, his conclusions would on the whole be reasonable, but too often, one chapter's 'facts' turn out to be the previous chapter's assumptions. As a result of this, the conclusion he does reach is unfortunately little more convincing than the many others

1 That is to say, the fast practised in the early Muhammadan community after the promulgation of Q2/183-7.
that have preceded it.

No attempt will be made to duplicate most of the areas covered by Wagendonk's study in the present enquiry. While the Quran will be used, it will be studied only in so far as it affects and has been affected by the Muslim views of their own history: the weighing of the Quranic fasts in abstracto will be left aside.

A further, major, difference from Wagendonk and all preceding writers on this subject will be in the attitude held towards the sources. Broadly speaking, no statement will be admitted to be valid for any period before that in which it is first recorded. It is a serious reflection on the present state of Islamic studies that such a declaration has to be made at all, yet it is entirely necessary. Its application to the various types of material used in this study will be explained in more detail at the appropriate points. It will also be noted that in contrast to previous works, the study that follows attempts to cover all the major material of a given period; while this involves the inclusion of some of the less directly interesting matter, it should produce a total picture, and avoid the dangerous eclecticism all too prevalent hitherto.
Chapter One

Quran 2/183-7

General Introduction

This chapter is devoted to a study of Quran 2/183-7, the group of verses dealing with the imposition of the fast of Ramadān. It will take the form of a commentary on the Quranic text, and an analysis of the relevant portions of a number of Muslim tafsīrs.

It is evident that a running commentary on Quranic material is not in itself an original venture; however, the principles involved in assessing the verses are largely novel, at least in their application to the present subject. A constant endeavour has been made to remove the layers of past thinking which have obscured a scientific appraisal of the Quran.

The thickest of these layers is of course tafsīr. Like the hadīth, this material can in no way be taken as a reflection of either facts or opinions of the lifetime of the Prophet. What exegesis we have is basically second-century material, mostly in the form it had assumed by the third century or later, and as such, it naturally reflects the considerations and prejudices of those times. The appeals made in the tafsīr to past authorities, often the same

1 'The hadīth will not serve as a document for the history of the infancy of Islām, but rather as a reflection of the tendencies which appeared in the community during the maturer stages of its development.' (Goldziher, Nah. Stud. II, p.19.) 'Le hadīth est toujours suspect.' (Vajda, JA 1937, p.59.) There is no reason to differentiate between hadīth material and tafsīr in this respect; they are both products of the same time and tendencies.
authorities as those of the hadīth proper, must be considered to be in large measure spurious, and the further back these appeals claim to reach, the less they may be trusted. In many instances, the same problems are dealt with in an identical manner in both tafsīr and hadīth, and it is clear that in many respects these two terms represent not separate fields, but merely different facets of the same whole, namely the business of clarifying what Islam consisted of, and the accompanying documentation.

This outward authoritativeness is perhaps the least immediately obvious defect of the tafsīrs, but is a major one nevertheless. Combined with it is an approach which, to the modern Western mind, displays an almost complete lack of subtlety. By this is referred to the need felt to fill in every hole, to comment conclusively on every word, which so often results merely in a fanciful extrapolation of the text, representing nothing more in fact than the fruits of pious speculation.

A further defect is the fragmented nature of Muslim commentary, which is the product of several considerations:

1. The most notorious example being that of b. cAbbas.
2. As instances of the more absurd of their claims, we may note that according to Qatāda (Tab., p.130), God prescribed Ramadān for all peoples; that according to b. cAbbas (Tab., p.134), part of Q2/184 was abrogated, while elsewhere (Tab., p.136), the same figure maintains that no abrogation occurred. Of course, not all the tafsīr material is so obviously untrustworthy, but nevertheless, the only safe procedure is to assume that the whole is impugned by the weakness of the part, until the emergence of proof to the contrary.
3. The best examples involving fasting are the fidya and cāshūrā.
4. See e.g. below, pp. 34,99.
1) The Arab/Muslim tendency to regard special texts as being
outwith normal semantic rules, each verse or phrase constituting
a separate and independent unit, whose position as regards its
neighbours is often arbitrary. In the case of the Quran, this is
because

2) the text has to bear meanings both different from and
greater in number than what was originally intended. As a result,
the concept of context breaks down. The pressure of selective inter-
pretation, designed to support doctrines often not rooted in the
Quran, leads to

3) a failure to grasp, or refusal to admit, the essential
nature of the Quran, that is to say an intelligible coherent book,
produced by a single mind with a constant, if developing, purpose.
This results in a further artificial division of the text, and ill-
founded interpretations.

The second of the above considerations introduces what is at
one and the same time the tafsirs' biggest fault, from a scientific
point of view, and their greatest feature of interest: that while
attempting to give historical explanations, which, given the
methods outlined above, would have been hard to achieve under the
most favourable conditions of availability of data, they reveal
the thinking and preoccupations of their own times. Part of the
basic working apparatus of most orthodox Muslims after the begin-
nning of the third century was the quadripartite system of usul al-
fiqh elaborated by Shāfiʿī. Associated with the dominance of his
theories, and in part the cause of their emergence, was the

1 Principally Quran and poetry.
2 Thus Torrey, p.92, observed that the Quran was 'a true corpus
vile', and that the Arabs themselves have been the worst of those
who have cut it about.
increasing importance of the Quran as a theoretical source of law, and the necessity of harmonising existing law with scripture led to the rapid spread and almost universal acceptance of the principle of abrogation.

The device of abrogation, which allowed the Quran to be cut about in an otherwise quite unjustifiable manner, was one of the foremost tools of the exegetes. So convincingly was it deployed, that any awareness that there had been no such concept as abrogation until more than a century after the Hijra disappeared, and the principle of abrogation continues to be upheld to a greater or lesser degree by all commentators on the Quran, in both East and West. The normal expectation, that a book should be readable and coherent, within limits, passed into abeyance, with the result that conflicting doctrines could with a little dexterity be accommodated side by side, or if necessary be effectively expunged altogether. These conflicts could be of an internal Islamic nature, such as questions of law or ritual, or might arise on the wider front of religious polemic.

The second of the obscuring layers is the Western attitude to the tafsīrs. Again, a parallel may be drawn with hadīth studies, where scholars have seen that all is not credible, but have generally failed to draw the only safe conclusion, that none is

---

1 The position is summed up vividly by Maracci, p.73: 'Per hujus modi abrogata, et abrogantia, salvant Moslemi omnia absurda, et universas contradictiones Alcorani, nihil curantes, quod post abrogatum immediate sequatur abrogans: vel etiam quod abrogans praececat abrogatum: quo nihil stultius dici potest, vel cogitari'. It should however be stressed that despite first appearances, the Muslim doctors were acting in perfect good faith.
There is in the hadīth literature no 'unanimously reported reliable hadīth', and the same is true of the tafsīr. A failure to accept or even appreciate this has resulted in a further selective interpretation of such of the Muslims' 'facts' as fit the current Western theories, with the convenient dismissal of the rest. Perhaps there are genuine reports from the time of the Prophet - if any they are undoubtedly extremely few indeed - but at the distance of more than thirteen centuries it is no longer possible to determine which they are. Consequently, in order to see clearly the foundations, that is the Quran itself, we must ignore the superstructure of the tafsīr, as being with very limited exceptions of much later date.

Obviously, we too have to extrapolate in order to draw conclusions, and this is where the third layer of obscurity lies: in a faulty view of the Quran and Muhammad. Western scholars have hitherto generally accepted the Muslim views concerning the Quran as a text, i.e. that crudely speaking it is a scrapbook, compiled from a mass of more or less disjointed units, often contradictory, and certainly not to be understood without the help of much exegetical material. This, as was suggested above, is the result of forcing the Quran to stand as evidence of ideas that considerably post-dated it. That such a view is completely erroneous will be demonstrated by the resume of Sura 2 which follows shortly; instead of revealing inconsistencies and awkwardnesses, it in fact shows that with the absolute minimum of outside data, the Quran can be made to speak for itself, revealing a text that is by and large both logical and coherent, for which no apologies or pleas for special treatment need be made. What applies to Sura 2, it is maintained, can be

1 In spite of the convincing arguments of Goldziher on this matter in Muh. Stud. II. Cf. the pertinent comments of Schacht, Origins, p.4.
demonstrated to be equally true of the rest of the book.

Having set aside the myth of the Quran's being a special text virtually unintelligible except after long initiation, it becomes easier to appreciate the true character of Muhammad, its author. Not having any longer to wonder what kind of mind could have produced such inspired confusion, we can now take the Quran and see it for what it is - in large measure the coherent record of the developing aims and achievements of an able and rational politician, and emphatically not the work of an epileptic charlatan¹ or even a missionary with an idée fixe.

Most Western interpreters have failed to perceive the extent to which their views of the Quran and its author are conditioned by received Muslim notions. All have accepted the principle of abrogation as classically elaborated², though of course not always endorsing every instance of its implementation. This is a good example of the unacceptable eclecticism so widely practised - taking one hadith as 'genuine', discarding another, upholding one third-century theory as first-century fact, rejecting another. Because of their own background interests in religion, and the tendency to regard any 'religious' work as Scripture³, most have erred towards the mystical in trying to reach the spiritual or socio-religious 'meaning' of the various parts of the Quran. In the case of the fast, such a quest is doomed to failure, if one is thinking strictly in Quranic rather than Muslim terms, for as will be shown, Muhammad's

¹ As Watt, Muhammad, Prophet and Statesman, p.3, observes, the influence of mediaeval misconceptions of Muhammad persists today, albeit in an attenuated form.

² For example, no-one has disputed that Ramadān abrogated or in some other way superseded an Islamic fast of Ǧaḥīrāʾ.

³ Exemplified in the title of Jeffery's 'The Quran as Scripture'.
motive in mentioning the fast at all was solely polemic; though he may have been concerned for the spiritual welfare of his followers, there was no need for him to introduce and promote the idea of fasting to a people already well acquainted with it. It is necessary then to beware of over-endowing the text with latent meaning, and of over-estimating its intent. It is because the attitudes referred to above have prevailed so long, and, which is the greater pity, have remained largely unperceived, that a new interpretation becomes necessary. The only monograph particularly devoted to fasting in the Quran, a recent work 1, unfortunately typifies most of what is wrong with current Western attitudes: although sound in detail, there is a general tendency to take more or less of the information surrounding the Quran as being as dependable as if it were in fact part of the Quran, and with this is combined a general lack of scepticism.

The Quranic context of the fasting verses

Put at its simplest, Q2/183-7 firstly prescribe what was to become the Islamic institution of the fast, and secondly give some of its details. However, this is a potentially misleading simplification, since it tends to the assumption that without these verses, the Muhammadan community would have felt no obligation to fast. A suitable corrective is the study of the context of the verses. Such a study is further desirable for the reasons developed below.

An attentive and unbiased reading of Sura 2 will reveal that it is a complete unit, of definite purpose and having a planned development. Although it is naturally unalterably Quranic/Muhammadan in style, it is yet quite free of the fragmentedness persistently attributed to the Quran by the great majority of both Muslim and

1 See Introduction, p.ix.
Western scholars. It is clear that, because the sura forms a coherent whole, the fasting pericope cannot properly be treated in isolation, and that where it apparently admits of more than one interpretation, in fact only that interpretation which most closely agrees with the context may be adopted. In other disciplines, this would be standard critical procedure, and scarcely worthy of special mention, but in dealing with the qur'an, such a practice has never been consistently adopted. As has been pointed out above, this is not so much the result of academic irresponsibility, the picking up of the qur'an and the establishing of an attractive hypothesis based on certain of the more interesting features with a disregard for the rest, but is rather the legacy of the traditional Muslim approach to the qur'an, that is to say treating it in effect as what it historically was, a secondary source which had to be made to comply with existing ideas. This has the inevitable result that an unbiased assessment of whole or part becomes an impossibility.

A résumé of the content and motifs of Sura 2 now follows.

Vv.1-39 contain basically one message, that those who reject (v.6) the true religion, consisting of belief in revelation and the Last Day (v.4), by which Muhammad refers elliptically to himself and his message, are doomed to hellfire (vv.24,39). Contrasted with this is the more fortunate lot of the believers (vv.5,25). The fate of the rejectors is dwelt on to a much greater extent than that of the believers, and it is clear that Muhammad intends this address for a specific body of people, rather than that he is preaching to a heterogeneous mass. The rejectors are termed rejectors (vv.6,24) rather than unbelievers because they were once favoured by God and were on the right path, but subsequently they deliberately strayed and broke the covenant (v.27). For Muhammad's purpose this is an advantage, since by pointing out the sins of these others in failing
to follow God's commands (vv. 21-2, 28-9), their authority will be
tessened. At the same time, he acquires righteousness himself, and
any retribution or attack falling on his opponents will appear the
more justified. There can be no doubt that these rejectors are a large
proportion of the Jewish community in Medina (see ahead, v. 105), that
is to say the rabbinate (possibly the andād of v. 22) and many of the
lay members; the whole of the passage recalls and itemises Old
Testament ideas and events, and the identification is confirmed by
the forthright address of v. 40.
The next section, vv. 40-105, consists largely of an elaboration
of the misdeeds of the Jews - they have enjoyed the favour of God
(vv. 40, 47, 64), but continually abused it (vv. 51, 52, 55, 61, 74, 85) and
broke the covenant (vv. 40, 83-4, 93, 100) he made with them. The theme
of rejection is pursued (vv. 64, 87, 89, 99): continually God forgave
them after these misdeeds, pointing out anew the right path, through
the medium of His prophets, the greatest of whom was Moses, who came
with Book, signs and Furqān (v. 53; cf. v. 87). Even Moses was spurned
by the Jews, and here the Biblical situation is presented in such a
way that the intended parallel with Muhammad, also bearing a message,
also rejected by the Jews, becomes unavoidable. Muhammad further
aligns himself on the side of right by enjoining in his message the
conventional pieties of prayer and charity (vv. 3, 43, 45): his message
is up to now technically unexceptionable to the Jews, and easily
comparable with the scathings of Old Testament prophets. By placing
himself in the long line of rejected prophets, Muhammad advances his
own authority, at the same time seeking to establish that like that
of Moses and others, his message is divine in origin (v. 97). This
had also been asserted at the outset, vv. 1-2. His argument is as
appealing as it is false: the Jews reject prophets with messages;
they reject me and my message, therefore I am a prophet. However,
this argument, rhetorically embellished, does not have to convince
the Jews as a whole, but only those who follow him already: it is clear from his persistent attacks on Jews of both past and present that at this stage he entertains no hopes of further converts from their number. The major objection of the Jews (and although not explicit, it is major, for he returns to it repeatedly), that Muhammad is not a Jew (vv. 111-2, 272) is rejected not by argument but by assertion, the strength of which is reinforced in that it is placed in the mouth of God (v. 105).

Muhammad's position being now assured, at least in the eyes of his followers, he can now assert, though naturally indirectly, through the agency of God, his power (and intention) to modify past revelation (v. 106). His opponents will not of course admit that God is making these modifications, and Muhammad safeguards himself by again mentioning the parallel case of Moses (vv. 107-8). Having made the dramatic arrogation of authority in v. 106, Muhammad effects a strategic pause. He returns to the less controversial matter of the common religious observations (v. 110). The Jews are accused of denying some the right to participate in these (v. 114), and the authority of the rabbinate is attacked. This serves to establish once more the supremacy and sufficiency of God's word, of which Muhammad claims to be the sole present day mediator and interpreter. The theme of favour and rejection is again invoked, and Muhammad proceeds with his attack, claiming to remove divine favour from the Jews by genealogical means (vv. 127ff.). The Arabs are now upheld as the true recipients of the patriarchal tradition stemming from Abraham, and are, like him, separate from all other 'sects'.

Now (v. 142) Muhammad introduces the qibla change, which can be seen as principally a test of his followers, a symbolic move by which the weaker brethren may be weeded out. It is evidently a major step, the first implementation of the authority invoked in v. 106, and accordingly provokes an extensive rationale. One of the things
that this move conclusively proves is that a significant proportion of Muhammad's Medinese followers were of the Jewish tradition, which is tantamount to saying that they were Jews. The implementation of the powers embodied in v. 106 is a sign of recognition that the split with mainstream Judaism had become inevitable, and there is little doubt that Muhammad had become resigned to abandoning any hope of further conversions of Jews. The qibla change having been made, it is now Muhammad that is the subject of the divine ni'ima (v. 152). The common rituals are again re-affirmed, unchanged, and so is the fate of the rejectors. Muhammad has removed, to his own satisfaction at least, the authority of his opponents, and established his followers in the path of divine favour; he now launches into the legislative 'meat' of the sura, exercising fully the rights implicit in v. 106.

Having disposed of the rejectors, and cut his followers off forever from their previous way of life, leaving them in a somewhat insecure position, Muhammad is obliged to give them a foretaste of the heavenly rewards he has long promised the believers. These take the form of various measures, religious and social, all of a common theme: the alleviation of burdensome duties, or social improvements. There is no wholesale abandonment of institutions, which would anyway presumably be quite unacceptable, but merely attractive modifications. Thus are dealt with the questions of food restrictions (v. 172), qisas (v. 178), wasiyya (v. 180), fasting (v. 183) and arbiters (v. 188). Muhammad in his isolated situation has to fight for solidarity, and constantly reverts to military phraseology (vv. 190ff, 208). More prescriptions follow (to v. 220), all of the same nature.

After this comes a large section (up to v. 242) on matters connected with women, and this differs from the preceding types of prescription in its being relatively comprehensive, and apparently
dealing with a situation where some form of legislation was actually necessary rather than merely polemically desirable. This perhaps reinforces the conviction that Muhammad's community was cut away from its family roots, and that in order to survive it had to draw its women from other groups, probably non-Jewish, and in such a situation an entirely new code of practice would become necessary.

This dealt with, Muhammad reverts to exhortations to his followers to fight on. The supremacy of God, and the fact that Muhammad's orders and message stem directly from God, are constantly reiterated; having made the break, Muhammad is clearly fighting now for his whole political future.

The sura ends with a prayer, and suggests that the parting of the ways of good and evil is emphasised by the lighter load allotted to the good, an echo of the general theme of alleviation of burdens (takhfīf; specifically mentioned at e.g. v. 179, on qisas), and the rationalisation of the changes introduced in the legislation of this sura.

Muhammad's policy of takhīf is not intended to win new converts, nor is it derived from laxity, but rather it is designed to reward those already on his side. Their solidarity is all-important, and to gain solidarity, they must be irretrievably cut off from the opposition whence they draw their cultural origins: a subsidiary role of the legislation then is to make visible differences between the old and the new communities, so that there can be no possibility of a middle way.

The purpose of the sura as a whole can thus be seen as the intended demonstration of Muhammad's authority as a prophet and leader/legislator; this is done in two ways: (i) the Jews are shown to be in the wrong and to be superseded; (ii) new 'revelation' is advanced to make permanent and uncrossable the breach thus created.
The whole sura is a work of polemic, giving the justification for, and the first concrete evidences of, Muhammad's claim to divine authority, from which stems the basis of his political power.

As for the verses on fasting, they stand in the middle of those instances of Muhammad's deliberate alleviation of the previous Jewish practice. While, as with most other institutions, Muhammad left fasting substantially unaltered, he made certain changes which can only be seen as alleviations of the previous régime, the clearest examples being in v.187. It is in this spirit of polemical attack embodied in the concessions to his followers that the pericope is uttered, and it is in this framework that it must be explained.

The context of the verses in the Qur'an having been dealt with, two more aspects of their background need to be discussed.

1) Their context in time

This cannot be absolutely defined, although this has not prevented the attempt to do so. The most that can safely be said is that, as suggested by the foregoing, the fasting and accompanying pronouncements in Sura 2 were made shortly after the decisive turning point in Muhammad's career crystallised in Q2/106, where he gives himself the justification and means for the setting up of a new community polemically opposed to that of the Jews in Medina. If, as seems reasonable, one equates the Furqan which is mentioned

---

1 See below, p. 89

2 Various calculations have been made, relying at least in part on traditionally received material, which, as has been explained, is not to be treated as historical fact. See e.g. Sprenger, vol.3, pp.54f. His views on this point are conveniently summarised by Wagtendonk, p.41. Similar attempts were made by Jacob, pp.4-6, and Wagtendonk himself, p.119.
(v.155) in the fasting section with Badr, then one may further suggest that the fasting verses came after Badr, an event generally regarded as belonging to 2 A.H. This naturally raises the question of whether the Muslims' claim that Badr took place in Ramadan is fortuitous or not, but this will not be dealt with here. Whatever the precise date of Badr was, it is clear that once arrived in Medina, Muhammad would not have taken long to realise firstly the intransigence of the opposition his call faced, and secondly the need to justify his anomalous position as a generally unwelcome agitator. Sura 2, which fills this need, must therefore have been relatively early among the Medinese compositions. The hadith concerning fasting while travelling, which is described as having taken place on the Badr raid, and which would imply a prescribed fast pre-dating Badr, may safely be dismissed from consideration here, reflecting as it does the pre-occupations of a later age.

2) The identity of those addressed by Muhammad

Again, precision is impossible. As was made clear in the résumé of Sura 2 just given, Muhammad was addressing people well grounded in the history and cult of Judaism, and this is almost inevitably equivalent to saying Jews, with a possible admixture of neophytes. From the evidence of the fasting verses alone, Muhammad must have been directing his message to people likely to be

---

1 See also 30/41; it seems clear that just as the splitting (f-r-q) of the Red Sea was Moses' greatest sign (according to the Quran), so Muhammad's Qurān was Badr, the victory that helped to make real his own split from the community of evil-doers.


3 See the hadith discussions of this, below, p.236.
impressed by an appeal to previous revealed religions (v.183), and the details that follow make it clear that of those, Judaism was the model. This belief is supported by the appearance of some Jewish features, and the deliberate suppression of others, in the Muslim fast as it appears in the hadith. The Quran as a whole is far more concerned with Judaism than with Christianity: the Old Testament weighs much more heavily with Muhammad than does the New. The information concerning Christianity seems entirely second-hand¹, and its influence is minimal, except in so far as Christ is set up as a fore-runner of Muhammad, in the long line of (rejected) prophets, and as such a case in argument against the Jews. This is comparable to the role of Moses in Sura 2.

The Jews directly addressed by Muhammad in this sura were already on his side; those indirectly addressed he had no hope of converting, as was elaborated above. His converts, attracted, it must be presumed, principally by Muhammad's reforming message, came from both inside and outside Medina, the latter being indicated by the phrase 'alladhîn hâjarû'. The possibility of non-Jewish Arabs being amongst his converts is not excluded, but there is no indication that at this stage they constituted a body of Muslims large enough to merit special attention in the Quran.

The treatment of the verses

The block 183-7 will be dealt with as follows: verse by verse,

¹ '...in the Koran itself there is no clear evidence that Muhammad ever received instruction from a Christian teacher, while many facts testify emphatically to the contrary.' (Torrey, p.7) 'We do not find a single ceremony or doctrine of Islam in the smallest degree muddled, or even tinted, by the peculiar tenets of Christianity!' (Muir, Life, I, p.239, quoted by Torrey, p.32).
and, where necessary, phrase by phrase, in Arabic and in translation, with exposition, accompanied where appropriate by observations on the Arabic usage and vocabulary, problems of comprehension, answers proposed by Muslims and others, and, where discernible, the motivation for these answers.

A phrase-by-phrase treatment tends towards the fragmentation which is prevalent in all tafsirs, and as such is undesirable, since it obscures a comprehensive view; however, it is here the only practicable way of marshalling the material of previous discussions.

Note on the sources for this chapter

The chief Muslim sources for Quranic exegesis are of course the tafsirs, but although they contain a great deal of material, they do have the drawback that relatively speaking, they are late works. Of the compendious tafsirs, the earliest is that of Tabari, who died in 310 A.H. This means that the bulk of our material represents the fully developed classical view, being roughly comparable with the canonical Six books of the hadith, and we have little that can be likened to the pre-classical hadith materials. However, there are some sources which, while nothing like so comprehensive as the later tafsirs, can offer some partial idea of the state of the Quranic debates at an earlier period. These can be divided into (i) separate works and (ii) quoted works. In the first class, two works have been found useful. One is the Naṣrī al-jum'ān of Farrā' (d.207), to a great extent concerned with grammatical points, but also containing exegetical material. The other is the tafsir of Mughatil b. Sulaiman or more accurately the abridgement known as Tafsir Khansmi'at Āyat min al-jum'ān. Mughatil died in 150 A.H. This work has not enjoyed a good reputation among the Muslims because of the author's alleged disregard for the proprieties of the science of hadith, but this disregard may
alternatively be taken as an indication of its genuine earliness. Certainly its reports do not always coincide with the canonical versions, but there do not appear to be any glaring anachronisms or other defects in the work which might show it to be not substantially the work of its author.

In the second class may be placed principally the work of Suddî (d. 125), which is quoted by Tabarî in such a way as to indicate that it is a genuine book that is being referred to, and not merely a received opinion bordering on hadith-type information. Unfortunately, this is not often quoted.

The characteristics of the later tafsîrs are generally well enough known not to require elaboration here.

There have been only two attempts at a more or less detailed exegesis of this passage made by Western scholars, those of Goitein and Vagtendonk. Some mention has already been made of the work of these two; their inadequacies will be dealt with in detail at the appropriate points in this chapter.

---

1 In spite of his reputation (on which see his notice in Menzahin), he is occasionally quoted by standard authors, such as Ibn al-Dawzî, p.187.
2 See above, p. ix.
General observations

Muhammad is not concerned in Sura 2 to overthrow Judaism as a way of life: he attacks none of the 'pillars of the faith'. An example of this is his re-assertion here of the importance, through its being divinely prescribed, of fasting as an institution. His pronouncement can be seen as serving several purposes: it tends to bolster his own standing as a bona fide prophet - his revelation duplicates and confirms the ordinance of a previous revelation, which is to be taken as an indication that his message is indeed divinely sanctioned; the fasting ordinance, concerning as it does an essential part of religion, as popularly conceived by the Semitic mind, tends to reassure his somewhat isolated followers; most importantly, by re-affirming the ordinance in general, Muhammad paves the way for the alteration of some of its details. This is the main reason for his present treatment of the fast. There can be little doubt that were Muhammad to have omitted mention of fasting in the Qur'an, it would nevertheless have formed an 'obligatory' part of the religious life of the community. There is also the likelihood that while perhaps classical Islam would not have made of it one of the five 'pillars', it would have gained, like for example circumcision, de facto recognition as an essential of religion.
In the tafsīr, this phrase provokes little comment, none of it going beyond the predictable: Tabarī for instance offers the usual synonyms for āmmānī. However, one may note Abū Hayyān's ingenious justification of a claim that the injunctions on qīnas, ṣafīyya and siyām are revealed in descending order of 'shiqqa'; a zealous attempt to see in the smallest details of the Qurān the mark of divine planning and signs of the divine rahma.

The identity of those here addressed has already been discussed.

kutiba ʿalaikum al-siyām

Siyām will for the moment be translated simply as 'fasting': some of the philological considerations attaching to the Qurānic derivatives of the root ʿ-ʿ-ʿ will be dealt with later. As regards the term kutiba ʿalā, one can scarcely argue with the muḥāfīz, who equate it with furīda ʿalā, although it must be noted that here their concern is to show unequivocally that this verse is the origin of the obligatory institution, and is not merely to comment at the simplest level. Only after the time of the Qurān did the term 'fard' become part of the muḥāfīz technical vocabulary, though the root often occurs in the Qurān with much of its later meaning, at e.g. Qurān 52/25, 33/506. Verbally there is very little difference between farada ʿalā and kataba ʿalā, both occurring in the Qurān. However, the extra force embodied in kataba ʿalā when Muḥammad uses it cannot be ignored. On the superficial level, Muḥammad's God is here 'prescribing' as he 'prescribed' in earlier revelation; on the subconscious level, every time this root is used, Muḥammad's claim

1 p.126 2 p.28 3 Above, p.14 4 See below, p.113
5 E.g. Tabarī, p.126, Ṭūsī, p.114.
6 The root also has other meanings in the Qurān, at e.g. Qurān 22/236-7.
to prophethood gains in authority, as his example of that great sign of prophethood, a divinely inspired 'kitāb', grows in substance.

Kataba c'alā is used six times in Sura 2, and each time it heralds the imposition of a duty. The sense of c'alā is such that to translate it as 'prescribed to you' or 'for you' is inadequate, while Nagtendonk's assertion that kataba li has the same sense as kataba c'alā is positively wrong: the two prepositions give two distinct and opposed meanings to the verb. c'alā suggests written against, imposed upon, while li suggests written for, in favour of. This is quite clear from the contexts: c'alā refers to liabilities, religious duties, li to advantages and rukhsas. The best contrast is offered by this verse and that which closely follows.

As for the Muslim commentators, again only Abu Hayyān produces any noteworthy comment. Presumably continuing his idea of 'shiqqa', he suggests that the passive rather than the active verb is used because God shrinks from associating himself with an unpleasant duty.

kāmā kūtiba c'alā alladhīna min qablikum

As will be elaborated below, the key word in this phrase is kūtiba. However, it is not kūtiba but alladhīnā min qāblikum ('a.m.q.') which has occasioned the most discussion. This understandable concern to establish Muhammad drew his inspiration in the matter of fasting is in turn based on misconceptions of the function of kāmā.

1 Cf. the case of Moses, 22/53. 2 Vv. 178, 180, 183(bis), 216, 246. 3 Nagtendonk, p. 46ff. 4 Bell, The Qur'ān, I, p. 25. 5 p. 49. 6 Cf. the idiom 'Zaid c'alaihi dain'. (Lane, sub c'alā). 7 V. 137, q.v. Another good example of the antithesis of c'alā and li occurs at 22/236. 8 See above, p. 19. 9 p. 28.
This has almost always been taken to indicate that the form or manner of the Muhammadan fast is modelled on the precedents of other revealed religions. Commentators in East and West have striven to specify these supposed similarities, and have identified a.m.q. accordingly. Disregarding the proper context of the phrase, they have tackled this last question from completely the wrong end, and very rarely with disinterest. Some practical similarities do exist between the Islamic fast and its counterpart in Judaism, but their existence is entirely irrelevant to this verse. The similarity indicated by kamā' lies in the fact that the fasts both of the Jews (a.m.q.) and the Muhammadan community are divinely prescribed. This explanation has the advantage of simplicity, accords with known fact, and is borne out by kutiba being repeated in both halves of the comparison.

There can be no doubt that the people referred to by a.m.q. are the Jews, and these alone: as has been shown, Muhammad is throughout Sura 2 addressing people of Jewish origin, and there could be no conceivable point in citing anything but Jewish precedent to a Jew. This in itself removes much of the support for the still popular idea that Muhammad was influenced by the Christian fast, and that in particular he modelled Ramadan on Lent.

Perhaps the greatest weakness of this theory is that it is

---

1 Wastendonk, pp. 52-3, also comes to this conclusion (though with a.m.q. identified as Ahl al-Kitāb, and not Jews) but then wrongly suggests that Muhammad'n motive in repeating the kutiba is to give 'the Arabs', hitherto unaccustomed to fasting, a convincing reason for their submission to this obligation.

2 I.e. the prescription of Yö Kippur at Leviticus 16:29.

3 First elaborated in the West by Spränger, III, p. 58f., who was followed by Jacob, p. 5, Torrey, p. 131, and Gerlitz, p. 54.
generally limited to this single alleged instance of borrowing from
the Christians, and not developed further. Muhammad may have deviated
from previous practice at several points, but he neither aimed at
nor did he achieve a synthetic religion, in which a rite might be
fashioned out of fragments from diverse sources. Sometimes taken
to support the Christian borrowing theory is the unwarranted de-
duction from the otherwise fairly unexceptionable equation a.m.q.
= Ahl al-Kitāb, namely that Ahl al-Kitāb always signifies in the
Quran both Jews and Christians, and these in more or less equal mea-
sure. The question of whether or not Muhammad knew anything of the
Christian fast is immaterial, both in this instance where kamā re-
fers to ḫutiba anyway, and in general, for there is no evidence in
the Quran¹ that he acted on any such knowledge, and there is no
evidence, either positive or negative, of any Christian influence
in the relevant sections of the hadīth literature.

The red herring of the 'traditional' meaning of kamā is so
persistent that it is worthwhile examining its origins and develop-
ment.

It is generally admitted² that Muslim theology derived a good
deal of its initial impetus from contact with scholars of other
religions, the best known example being that of St. John of Damas-
cus. The spirit of polemic engendered by such contacts not surpr-
singly manifested itself in the associated discipline of exegesis,
and when combined with internal debate, this inter-religious argument
resulted in polemical interpretations being laid upon a text that

¹ No reference to Christian fasting can be seen in the mention
of Mary's fast (Q19/26).
² E.g. T.J. De Boor, History of Philosophy in Islam, repr. London
1965, pp. 141–2; D.J. Macdonald, Development of Muslim Theology, Juris-
indeed contains many references to other religions. It was thus in a spirit of independence, backed by new usūli considerations, that the Muslim doctors sought to show that these references in no way implied dependence on outside sources, even if they sometimes might appear to, as in the present instance. This polemically defensive attitude was inherited by succeeding generations of commentators, and because of the tradition-revering tendency of Muslim scholarship, the assertions of the early apologetics and usūli theoreticians became the facts of those who followed them. A competent exegete, such as Tabari, applying himself to the elucidation of every conceivable point of 'ambiguity' in the text, and realising his duty to promote the faith, preserves all the polemical material with which the imagined reference to other religions is dressed, and by its very volume it tends to overshadow the brief and less colourful but nevertheless more accurate explanation. This is almost certainly what happened in the case of kamā: the ambiguous interpretation gives the mutassirs much greater scope for the practice of their craft, exposition, and is to them preferable on that account, as will be illustrated by the examination of what they have to say.

The great variety of the material, its inconsistency, and the fact that much of it is ultimately rejected by the Muslims themselves, all point towards its historical inauthenticity, and consequently it becomes more desirable to know the precise reasons for development, the general motive, external and internal polemical interests, being already established.

The two principal questions, namely the meanings of kamā and a.m.q., give rise to a number of basic alternative answers in the tafsīrs: the 'people' are Jews; Christians; Ahl al-kitāb; mankind since Adam. The similarity is said to lie in: the number of days to be fasted; the daily length of the fast; the mode of its fasting; its being prescribed. These two sets of possibilities are combined in almost every imaginable permutation.
The earliest tafsīrīs are almost unanimous in relating the phrase a.m.q. to the Christians. It is evident, however, that this is not the earliest stage of tafsīr, for already their assertions are backed up by the shaky rationale that appears in all later works: it seems that at the most primitive level of tafsīr, perhaps the mosque courtyard level, the question was posed, 'Who are referred to in this verse?' The answer, 'The Christians', tout court, seems a reasonable literal interpretation, free of polemic, of the phrase a.m.q., i.e. those immediately before the Muslims. Thus the first reference to another religion occurs; the tentative reference begins to assume the appearance of 'fact' when an answer to the next question, 'In what way did the fast of these former people resemble ours?' is sought. A crude analogy is made between Lent and Ramadān (kana being taken implicitly to = Ramadān), as they are both long periods of fasting. Such an explanation would presumably be sufficient at the popular level, but anyone with any familiarity with the Christian fast would soon raise the objection that the two periods are of different lengths. Thus we arrive at the polemical 'justification' of the difference, exemplified in a hadīth attributed to Shabbi, quoted by Farrā', which occurs in varying forms in most later works: 'Were I to fast the whole year, I would however break my fast on the yaum al-shakk, because the Christians were prescribed Ramadān as we were, and they changed it according to the season. Sometimes they fasted it in the hot season, and reckoned it

1 Suddī (Tab. p. 129), Mughātil, f. 22r, Farrā' ad Q2/183.
2 Cf. here Mughātil: kana kutiba ʿalā alladhīn min qablikum: yaʾnī ahl al-injīl, ummat ʿIsā', with no elaboration.
3 Gerlitz, p. 120, attempted, somewhat casuistically, to disprove this.
4 See below, p. 234. This first phrase may safely be disregarded here, as it is no more than an imperfect attempt at conflation.
as thirty days and in order (?) to make sure of it, a subsequent generation added a day at each end until, with the passing of time, they were fasting fifty days. This explanation is somewhat garbled, and owes something to another version in which the reason for the extension to fifty days was that they wished to compensate for shifting the fast to a more congenial part of the year than the hot months of summer. It is in this way that a simple misconception of the text, the mistaken referent of kānā', becomes fortified into a polemical allegation, the superficially convincing details of which effectively block for most investigators the true emphasis of the Qur'anic phrase.

The primitive tafsīr alluded to must have belonged to the first century of the Hijra, for we find that apart from Sha'bi's explanation of the 30/50 difference, the Christians already figure in the two other considerably earlier tafsīrs of Suddī (d. 128) and Huqūtil (d. 150), where they form an integral part of the elaborate hypothesis known as al-sawn al-awwal.

This latter device is intended to account for the apparent contradictions in the Qur'anic text which arise when abrogation is assumed to have taken place. Briefly, it is alleged that before

---

1 The mention of the hot season may be connected with the theory (see the lexica) that Ramadan is so called because originally it fell in the season of burning heat (root r-m-d).

2 E.g. Tabarî p. 129 (from Suddī). The extension story may have a grain of truth behind it: the Christian fast was originally of 40 hours, but was later extended to 40 days in imitation of Moses, Elijah and Christ (ref. from Westermarck, Principles, pp. 409-10).

3 It goes almost without saying that these stories entirely overlook the question of how Ramadan came to be imposed on a people with a different calendar.
Ramadan came down, or when the Ramadan fast was first introduced (the so-called 'first fast'), there existed the option of paying the fidya (v. 134) instead of fasting, and that the mode of fasting was different and more taxing. It is this last detail which was said to be a characteristic of the Christian fast. Returning to the previous hadiths, it is not apparent that there was any ulterior motive, such as a desire to counter any impression of dependence on the Jewish model, in considering the Christians as the fore-runners of the Muslims in this interpretation of the phrase a.m.q.

Tabari's several hadiths are arranged in an orderly fashion, and reveal a considerable development, which is not surprising in view of the lapse of at least a century. The 'Christian' hadiths re-appear, but now the similarities of time and manner are specifically said to be referred to by Usāma.

Also introduced in the opinion, preferred by Tabari, that the reference of a.m.q. is to Ahl al-Kitāb. This no doubt derives from the fact of the ordinances being written (kutiba), and would be reinforced by the common sense realisation that the Jews could hardly be denied their place alongside the Christians in the ranks of the fasting communities.

Thirdly there is the notion that fasting had been prescribed for all peoples, either in the form of Ramadan, or according to another for whom this was a nonsense, in the form of three days each.

1 As far as can be ascertained, the details supplied by the Muslims do not coincide significantly with historical fact. It may simply be that the Christians were known to be a community more given to fasting than the Jews, and were accordingly considered the closer parallel to the Muslims.  

2 pp. 128ff.

3 The fact that both views are attributed to Qatāda does not oblige us to try to harmonise them.
This identifying with all peoples may represent an entirely literal and cautious tafsīr of a.m.q., but it is also possible that it is the result of the now common tendency to deny any specific reliance on, or debt to, the Jews and Christians by antedating them both. This therefore can be seen as an appeal to the Abrahamic pure religion (on this, see e.g. Q2/135). It is interesting to note that Tabari’s preference for the interpretation ‘Ahl al-kitāb’ is based on an argument that depends on the notion of Abrahamic precedent. He considers the resemblance between the fast of the Muslims and that of the Ahl al-Kitāb to lie in the common prescription of Ramadan, which he ‘proves’ by arguing that

1. The Prophet was ordered to fast Ramadan (Q2/183-5).
2. The Prophet was given the same orders as Abraham (cf. Q3/67?). Therefore Abraham was ordered to fast Ramadan.
3. All those who came after Abraham were bound to follow his ordinances (cf. Q33/62, 48/23).

Therefore the Ahl al-Kitāb were also obliged to fast Ramadan.

Tabari never mentions the Jews by name here, and it may be that for him these are exclusively meant by the term Ahl al-Kitāb, the Old Testament being the Kitāb par excellence.

Tūsī’s only new contribution to the discussion is the Muqtazīlī

1 Widely advocated in the hadīth. Also, which is more relevant, said by some to be the ḫaṭṭā’ al-a’wal.
2 Several reports in b. Sa’d and elsewhere give ‘examples’ of fasting in biblical times, and are perhaps connected with this tendency, though possibly they are inherited from Jewish traditional literature. Surqūnī p.153 for instance gives a story tracing the origin of Ramadan back to events connected with Adam.
3 Cf. here a hadīth in Hilyat al-Auliya’, VI, 16-18, in which God tells Moses of the fadl of Ramadan and fasting.
that the previous fast, on the present one, was comprised of 'days'.

This non-committal opinion represents the furthest factually justifiable extent of the alleged similarity of style of fasting. It is possibly influenced by the 'ayyām ma'dūdāt' of the succeeding verse. Ṭūsī considers this the best view of the three he quotes, and refrains from attempting to identify a.m.q.

Besides the story of the Christian extension of Ramadān into a longer period of fasting in recompense for not observing it in the proper season of the year, there is introduced in the tafsīr of Baghawi another rationalization of the difference in length between the Christian and Muslim fasts. Although the new story is combined with the old in Baghawi's version, it seems likely that this is a later conflation. According to this account, after adding ten extra days in compensation for shifting it out of season, it happened that a king of the Christians fell ill, and it was revealed to him that a week's extra fast would cure him, and accordingly, the fast was extended to 47 days. The king was cured. After his eventual death, his heir decreed that a further three days should be fasted. From Kujāhid comes the apparently textually separate but nevertheless clearly related information that 'there overtook then (the Christians) two deaths, and they resolved to increase their fast, and added ten days to each end of it'.

As has been implied already, these explanations are nothing more than speculative attempts at rationalization, and no historical basis need be sought for them. However, it is interesting to note

---

1 p.115.
2 p.69.
3 On this, cf. IJU 2127.
4 No apparent close connection between this mention of the three days' fast and these more frequently encountered. See below, p. 38.
the common theme, that the increase in the fasting period is always seen in these accounts as propitiatory or as a kaffāra. Whether this reveals that for the authors of these accounts the original 30-day period was also of this nature is not clear. Certainly the Qurān offers several examples of minor fasts undertaken for the purposes of kaffāra1.

Maghāfi asserts, without attributing the idea to any source, that a.m.q. refers to (all) those prophets and nations (umām) that went before. Similarly Zamakhsharī’s opinion is that this phrase refers to fasting having been prescribed for prophets and nations since the time of Ḍa‘ud2, and he quotes a saying from Ālī that fasting is an ʿibāda qadīma asliyya, from which God has exempted no people3. This could represent the ultimate logical extension of the ‘Abraham’ tendency4, or may be a borrowing from Jewish folklore.5 A third possibility is that a comparison has been made between this instance of alladhīn min qablīkum and the verbally identical Q2/21; the latter can certainly be made to bear the meaning of ‘all mankind’ without difficulty.

1 Q2/136, H/92, 5/89, 5/95, 5/3-4. Kaffarā would arise if a ‘written’ fast were tampered with.

2 There exist some non-canonical reports concerning ʿAdam’s fast, and also Jewish traditions of similar substance. See below, p. 202.

3 Cf. perhaps a taṣaffir saying from the Prophet in Shawkānī: Siyāmu ṣumā’ katabahu allāhu ʿala al-umām qablakum, and Q22/34, dealing with the hajj, says: li-kulli ummatin jaalus qablakum. Although verbally dissimilar, this phrase has a marked likeness of sentiment to kamā’ kutiba ʿala alladhīn min qablīkum.

4 See above, p. 27.

5 Cf. the story mentioned above connecting Ramadān with ʿAdam. The latter is also associated with the bid fast. See below, p. 202.
Rāzī observes (pp. 169ff.), concerning the report from ʿAlī, that its use consists in illustrating that a difficult thing (viz. fasting) becomes easier when it is made general. This is comparable to Baidawi's note (p. 38), seemingly applied to the whole verse, that it is 'tawḥīd li-ḥukm wa targīb li-ḥīf'il'. Rāzī appears to side with those who hold that kamā refers to the prescription's being written, and to reject the remaining standard hadīths, which he nevertheless lists in his usual thorough manner. His story of the alleged Christian tahwīl of Ramadān is an embellished version, containing the natural complement, the alleged Jewish tahwīl, which consisted of the reduction of Ramadān to one day, rather than extending it to 50.

The dissection of the possibilities contained in 'kamā' is conducted on a grammatical basis. If it is considered as a notional accusative, one may supply a masdar such as 'fardān'. If however one takes it as an accusative of hāl, then either tashbīh (similar-arity in detail of the facts) is implied, or it is a sīfa of a masdar mahdūf, such as Kitābatan'.

Rāzī was clearly embarrassed by the zeal of early polemicists in circulating unfounded reports about other religions, for he notes with approval the (anonymous) opinion that Ramadān was never obligatory for Jews and Christians, and that to hold so is an instance of the sort of attitude that deters those who would otherwise accept Islām.

---

1 This opinion is not encountered elsewhere. However, in Tūsī, p. 116, there occurs a report which can be seen as attempting to reduce the evident absurdity of the claim that Ramadān was prescribed for all peoples. It is said that Ramadān was obligatory for prophets but not their peoples, ʿUmmad's community being the first to be ordered to fast it.
Abū Jayyān (pp. 201ff) follows Rāzī in giving a comprehensive account of the points discussed by previous commentators, and introduces another version of the Christian king report, which does not mention the changing of the season. This version is possibly closer to the original; without the rather improbable juggling of the calendar involved in the other report, the story of the sick king becomes more credible, and for this reason may well have been intended to supplant the former tale.

The tafsīr of Shawkānī (pp. 156-7), which will be taken in the present study as representative of modern Traditional interpretations, adheres to the Tabarī view, rather than that of the more rationalistic Rāzī. It is characteristic of the Muslim tafsīrs that practically all the lively debate expressing itself in traditional material comes to an end by the time of Tabarī. This is in part due to the industry and comprehensiveness of the latter, but is mostly because the traditional explanations admitted no alternative style of exegesis. This in turn resulted from the tafsīr's being not a separate discipline, but a single component of the edifice of the Islamic sciences, and intimately related to the other components, such as law and grammar. To remove the traditional structure of the tafsīr along with its assumptions and preconceptions, would inevitably and irretrievably damaged the other sciences, and would have necessitated a rethinking of Islamic science as a whole. To show that such is the case is part of the concern of the present study.

---

1 Possibly alluded to by Sajīdāwī, under his discussion of ayyān maṣūdāt. See below, p. 37.
The only Western scholars to have considered Q2/183-7 in any detail, Geitzen¹ and Waadendonk², share the notion that in this first verse Muhammad is prescribing a fast for a community unused to fasting. This idea, part of the general postulation of a largely pagan Jahili group whose members are alleged to have formed the bulk of Muhammad's followers, has long prevailed in the West, yet its origins go back no further than the tafsîrs³, and it need not therefore be assigned historical validity.

Geitzen's identification of a.m.q. with the Jews is unfortunately based on Muslim traditions concerning ʿAshûrâ'; he gives the impression that these occur in the Muslim discussions of a.m.q., which is not in fact the case⁴. The ʿAshûrâ' traditions form part of the internal polemical discussions of whether this institution should be accorded a place in Islamic fasting, and if so, its status. Geitzen was led to bring these reports in here through not realising the true referent of 'kamā'.

Waadendonk avoided this error, but became troubled⁵ by the fact that fasting is prescribed here when the break with the Jews is apparently complete, since he accepts the tradition that ʿAshûrâ' was a prescribed Muslim fast before Ramadan came⁶, while Muhammad was still favourably disposed towards the Jews. He decided that this verse does not in fact refer to ʿAshûrâ'. By discarding the ʿAshûrâ' traditions, Geitzen, Studies, pp.99ff. ² Chapter 4.

¹ In the context of the fasting verses, the postulation is entitled 'al-sawm al-aqwal'; the mode of fasting now prevailing is known as 'al-sawm al-ṣafar'. The Sîra may be included with the tafsîr material.

² Geitzen, Studies, pp.99ff. ³ Chapter 4.

⁶ On the shabby assumption that 'If the tradition about the institution of ʿAshûrâ' by Muhammad in imitation of the Jews were not historical, then it would not have been mentioned at all in the Tafsîrs.' (n.2,p.48)
tradition as a later invention, there is for us no difficulty in accepting; the clear implication of the context that the break with the Jewish establishment was now intended to be seen as definite.\(^1\) Waqtendonk\(^2\) mentions this theory, held by Torrey\(^3\), but dismisses it, presumably as invalidated by association with his non-acceptance of another part of Torrey's theory.

According to Waqtendonk, a.m.q. refers to Ahl al-Kitāb\(^4\). Although a.m.q. and variations on this phrase (e.g. alladhīn ātū al-kitāb min qablikum\(^5\)) are fairly common in the Quran, they do not always refer to the same people. So to argue from other instances to that in Q2/133 is inconclusive; indeed it is not even necessary, for a satisfactory answer may be derived from the context.

\textit{la'allakum tattaqūna}

It is not possible to establish precisely the role of this phrase. It occurs elsewhere in the Quran as a rhyming verse-ending\(^6\), and being thus to a certain extent a cliche\(^6\), the force of its meaning is somewhat reduced. It occurs after a.m.q. also at Q2/21.

It may serve as a reminder of the seriousness of a 'written' obligation - 'so make sure you keep on the right side of the Lord' - or it may perhaps with greater likelihood be considered as a rationalisation, supplying a motive for fasting which further confirms that the Muhammadan fast is firmly in the tradition of its predecessors, in the matter of its heavenly purpose at least.

The \\textit{muṣaffirūn}, generally feeling the lack of a direct object,

\(^1\) See above, p.12. \(^2\) p.42. \(^3\) Jewish Foundation, pp.138ff.

\(^4\) p.52. This conclusion is apparently arrived at by extension from the k-t-b of kutiba. He does not further define Ahl al-Kitāb.

...on certain days. Any of you who may be sick or on a journey shall fast a number of other days, and those who can shall make compensation, food for a poor man. To volunteer a good thing is better. Fasting is a good thing for you, if you but knew.

(Note that this is a working translation. As will appear from what follows, a definitive interpretation of some of the phrases is virtually impossible.)

The previous verse was fairly straightforward: its main function was to prescribe fasting, its secondary function to place the novel Khuwasradan fast in that perspective of history which the Prophet was endeavouring to project. This verse is considerably more complex; it is longer, has more parts, whose inter-relation is...
sometimes ambiguous, and it offers problems of precise context which did not arise in v.183, the latter having a recognisable place in a sequence of similar general promulgations. These difficulties were naturally also experienced by the Muslim commentators, but such was the nature of their preconceptions concerning this verse that their solutions are practically useless to anyone attempting an unbiased exposition of the text, and indeed they hamper it considerably.

The principal tafsīr 'fact' which has to be vigorously expunged is that of abrogation, which is deemed to affect the whole or most of this verse, v.185 being the abrogator. The immediate cause of this was that the fidya 'allowed' in this verse, as it came to be viewed, was incompatible with the idea of the Islamic fast as it was later developed by the fuqahā', and it was therefore declared, by the majority at least, to be unacceptable and void. However, the Quranic text had to be accounted for, and this resulted in the elaboration of an alleged situation in which the fidya, along with various other things had briefly been permitted. The idea that in Muhammad's lifetime the fast prescribed in the Quran had passed through two (some claimed three) stages became firmly entrenched, and has remained so ever since the second century A.H. The need to rationalise the alleged change(s) in dispensation was met by positing a Muhammadan community composed of Arabs who were vaguely religiously inclined, but who were unused to the rigours of obligatory fasting, and needed therefore to be broken in gradually.

1 See above, p. 7.
2 See the mention of al-sawm al-awwal, above.
3 Ṭab. p.133: wa kānū qawman lā yata'awwadū al-giyām...wa kāna yashtadd alaihim al-sawm. See also discussion of previous verse.
However, as was indicated in the introduction to this chapter, the Quran, within certain limitations, is a coherent document, and if viewed as such from the outset, it becomes intelligible without the need for an elaborate superstructure for each verse. Devices such as abrogation cannot be used as aids to interpretation; in the present instance, the original use of abrogation was not to explain but to harmonise current legal theory and the text of the Quran, and it is noteworthy that in cases such as this, it is always the Quranic text which has to adjust to the legal doctrine, and never vice versa. It is to be hoped that the case for considering Muhammad's converts as primarily of Jewish stock was earlier made strongly enough for the notion of a Muhammadan community of recent pagans to be dropped along with that of abrogation.

Muhammad, then, having reaffirmed the obligation to fast, proceeds to outline some of the details. The fast is to be on certain specified days. Although it was shown previously that kamā did not refer to the similarity in style of the Muhammadan fast and that of its predecessor, it is nevertheless true that both the Jewish and Quranic fasts here have specific periods appointed for their performance.

Muhammad carries on to expound some of the regulations pertaining to fasting; the special position of the sick and the traveller, and the fidya. The generality of the two verses 183-4 as a whole should perhaps be noted, as it contrasts with the more specific nature of what follows. The question of the novelty, if

Abrogation in the Muslim technical sense at least. The changes brought about by Muhammad in the fasting verses may legitimately be regarded as examples of naslkh in the sense in which it is employed in Q2/106; that is to say, the naslkh of the pre-Muhammadan state of affairs.
any, of the regulations in v. 184 will be discussed below.

\[\text{annyārman ma}dūdātin ('a.m.')]\)

It is interesting that these two words apparently gave no trouble to the Muslim commentators until the time of Zamakhsharī; that is to say, their linguistic meaning, as opposed to what they refer to, was undisputed. Discussion of parallel Quranic usages will therefore be deferred, though one potential difficulty will be dealt with now. The sound feminine plural ending of ma\(dūdāt\) (cf. also Q3/24), apparently anomalous when joined as here to the (notionally fem. sing.) plural ayyān, is in fact accepted by the grammarians. This is indicative of the role of Arabic grammar as a whole—to reduce the language to a system, with the Quran as one of the principal source materials. Thus when the Quran departs from the usual 'rules' of the system, such departures are held to be permissible. In the present case, the connection and agreement of the two words is evident; its acceptance as idiom cannot therefore be avoided.

Initially two aspects of the words gave rise to comment:

1) Their being in the accusative.

2) The question of what they refer to.

Before discussing the first of these points, some brief mention should be made of the position of the words. It is evident that they cannot be separated semantically from the preceding verse. The present physical separation into two verses is unlikely to have been the result of any intention to alter the meaning of the text (this is neither explicit or implicit in any of the tafsūrās) but is rather the result of the post-Muhammadan division of the Quran into fixed numbers of verses. Given that the Quran as a recited work relies heavily on terminal rhyme, it is quite conceivable that words occurring in the middle of a verse (i.e. 183 + 184), as
la\textsuperscript{c}allakum tattaqūna may well have done, could by reason of being
stressed for rhyme purposes have come to be regarded as a verse
ending. We may note that in Q2/22, the first word, alladhī, is gov-
erned by the verb of 2/21, which also ends in la\textsuperscript{c}allakum tattaqūna.
That the sense of an utterance should over-ride verse endings with
no interruption in meaning is a common feature of the Quran; however,
it's justification is necessary here because in this instance it is
not universally accepted. At the simplest level, commentators supply
supposedly elided words in front of a.m. in order to make the verse
self-standing, and to complete its sense. This is in part due to
the atomistic methods of the mu\textsuperscript{c}assirūn. Less excusably, they take
advantage of its present physical separation from the preceding
verse to suggest that v.134 is now redundant, and that v.185 is
the proper sequel to v.183.

To return to the first point mentioned above; the grammatical
case of a.m. is variously explained. The only noteworthy difference
in the solutions offered is that the supposition of a suppressed
verb\textsuperscript{1} before the two words would enable the verse to stand by it-
self, while the others do not\textsuperscript{2}.

In Tabari\textsuperscript{3} we find already most of the arguments connected
with the second point. While an earlier exegete, Nuqātil, had been
content to gloss a.m. as Ramadān\textsuperscript{4}, continuing without interruption
from his commentary on the preceding words, we now find, ascribed
to Ṭabā"i, the opinion that there was imposed before Ramadān a fast
of three days, and that this is what a.m. refers to. The argument
behind this assertion runs: a.m. does not equal Ramadān; Ramadān

\textsuperscript{1} See e.g.: Sa\textsuperscript{c}idwārī, p.38.
\textsuperscript{2} Cf. Tab., p.116: It is either zarf, or in effect governed by
al-siyām.
\textsuperscript{3} pp.130ff.
\textsuperscript{4} fol.22r.
is now the sole obligatory fast in Islam; the three-day fast must therefore have been abrogated; therefore the words referring to the three-day fast, namely a.m., and the whole verse containing these words, must also be considered abrogated. What is not explicitly mentioned, but which this final conclusion is solely designed to support, is that by removing this verse, one also removes the controversial fidya clause. This tafsir is thus inspired by legal considerations, and is not simply expository.

The original assertion, that a.m. referred to a three-day fast, seems to have been able to gain credibility through the fact that such a fast is widely advocated in the hadith (it is also mentioned in the Quran) and was probably a common practice too. However, there is no evidence of it from the time of the Prophet as a regular annual activity. The motif as it occurs in the tafsirs is in all probability borrowed from the hadith literature. There remains the possibility that 'three days' is derived from a.m. itself, three being considered by many as the minimum plural. Ātā's report cannot be regarded as a hadith designed to counter a contemporary practice of fasting three days.

Another report, from b. Ābbās, elaborates the idea of abrogation implicit in the Ātā hadith, by stating that these three days were the sawm al-awwal, performed from matam to matam, i.e. without any prolonged nocturnal respite. This links the three days/fidya abrogation with the situation said to have prevailed before the revelation of v. 187. As suggested earlier, this combining of hypotheses under a convenient title, al-sawm al-awwal, made for neatness and the mutual strengthening of the component assertions.

1 Others would also consider this verse abrogated on grounds of repetitiveness, between it and v. 185.

2 See below, p. 200.
In a hadīth from b. Abī Lailā - Huṣayn b. Jabal, we find "Ashūrā" added to the three-day fact: by placing the disputed "Ashūrā" in the same position as the three days, it is conveniently disposed of when the latter are accepted as abrogated.

However, Tabarî now skilfully starts to turn the general drift of the argument towards his own way of thinking. He now mentions those who accept the existence of a previous three-day fact (to those versed in hadīth, this would have been quite reasonable, of course) but deny that it was ever obligatory. Naturally, a convenient hadīth is supplied - from b. Abī Lailā! This removes the possibility of a.m. referring to the three days, since a.m. can only refer to a prescribed fast. For Tabarî, then, a.m. equals Ramadan, partly on the basis of the "kamā equals Ramadan" idea established by him ad v.1831, and partly because he has no convincing hadīth against such a view: for him, the conflict2 of the b. Abī Lailā reports invalidates the three-day fast argument. Although a.m. is now shown to have a respectable meaning, Tabarî of course still maintains that the fidya clause is abrogated.

When the false trail of the three-day fast is ignored, there is no doubt that Ramadan is in effect indicated by a.m. This cannot however be proved from v.184 alone, as the muḥaddīs would prefer, but rather by considering the verse in context, and especially with v.185, where it may be seen that a definite injunction is given to fast the month of Ramadan. By implication, and not by strict grammatical parallel, Ramadan is the specification of a.m.

The weakness of the obligatory three-day fast reports is compensated for in Ṭabarî and other later writers by the introduction of a new argument in the attempt to show that the fidya clause

---

1 See above, p. 27.

2 Similarly, in Ṭālîqī, both sides are supported by b. ŠAbbās.
is to be disregarded. It is claimed on allegedly linguistic grounds that maʿdūdat can only refer to a small number, that is to say less than 29 or 30, the number of days in a month, and that therefore something other than Ramadān is referred to here. The examples adduced in favour of this argument are generally drawn from the Quran, and it will be as well to examine them here.

At Q2/80, it is said, referring to the length of the Jews' stay in Hell, 'lan tanassanā al-nār ʿilla ayyāmin maʿdūdatan'. There is no good reason to consider m. here as equivalent to 'numerically few': rather, 'relatively few' or 'a limited number' of days, i.e. not for ever. Wagendonk (p.57) says that Jewish estimates of the duration of Purgatory range between 49 days and 12 months - at any rate more than 30 days - though of course one cannot assume that Hijāzī of the seventh century A.D. would necessarily have had precisely the same notions as the authorities of the Talmud.

At Q2/203, we have the phrase 'wa adhkurū allāha fī ayyāmin maʿdūdatin' referring to part of the ḥajj rites. Again, although one may assume, with the muṣaffirūn, that the few days of tashriq are indicated here, the meaning of m. is more that of 'appointed' or 'specific', rather than 'few'. Given the context, to translate by 'few' verges on the absurd and even the impious. The closest synonym in Arabic in this instance and in Q2/184 appears to be muqaddarāt, and this is explicitly mentioned by Rāzī (p.172).

1 Fem. sing. ending. At Q3/24, an otherwise identical phrase has maʿdūdatin. This in itself is a clear demonstration of the flexibility of the 'rules' of agreement in Quranic Arabic. Commentators often interchange one form for the other: e.g. Rāzī, p.172, Zam., p.255.

2 Although the usage of a.m. here closely parallels that of Q2/184, the possibility of any connection between the three days of tashriq and the alleged pre-Ramadān fast would be hard to substantiate.
Similarly Q11/3 and 11/104 scarcely support the meaning 'few', and are in fact not quoted in the Muslim argument. This further illustrates the weakness and selectivity of the claim. Not only is the argument not applied consistently to the maḍāḍū form, it is not applied at all to other forms of the root c-d-d: as a convenient example, we may note that ʾidda in Q2/185 can clearly refer to any number up to thirty, the length of Ramadān. The general supplementary assertion¹, that c-d-d is used for small numbers, since a-h-b, h-th-y, and h-y-l, other roots with the idea of numbering, are used for large ones, has little weight. It may be conjectured that the idea of paucity was originally based on the use of the sound plural.

The final Qur'anic instance, and perhaps the most conducive to the 'few' interpretation, is Q12/20, where Joseph is sold by his brothers for ʾarāḥin maḍāḍū. In the context, 'few' would not be an unreasonable translation, but it is certainly not the only one possible². Again, 'numerically few' is not implicit, while 'relatively few' is more probable. Moreover, Boeckton³ has made out a good case for maḍāḍū being here a technical term, a mercantile cliche which by the time of the Quran had lost any real meaning.

As a final rejoinder to this claim concerning maḍūdāt, we may observe that there is no mention of any notion of size being attached to the root c-d-d or its derivatives in the Kitāb al-ʿAin of Khalīl b. Ahmad, our earliest Arabic lexical work, which of course considerably pre-dates Ṣamakhshārī.

It was suggested above that muqaddarāt offers the closest synonym for maḍūdāt in Q2/184. Accordingly, 'specified' or

---

¹ See e.g. Ṣamakhshārī, pp.254-5.
² The O.T. has here '20 pieces of silver'. This is neither few nor many, but is anyway greater than three, the number with which it is hoped to identify the maḍūdāt of Q2/184.
'appointed' days seems to be a reasonably close translation. This is agreeable with the fact of Ramadān being a specific and well-defined period. There is also a case for extending this meaning to include the more technical sense of 'divinely decreed'. Bearing in mind the wider context of the verses, and the spirit of takhfif which Muhammad is propagating in this section of the Quran, it is perhaps possible to admit the alternative translation 'relatively few' or 'only a few' days, without specific numerical implications. However, the lack of background information on the fact of Arabian Jews before Muhammad's edicts hinders any substantiation of this proposition: is Ramadān, as a single set period of fasting, a specific number of days, relatively less of a burden than numerous other fasts, or is Ramadān, although long, but a few days in comparison with the reward it brings? In the long term, the idea that maṣdūdāt indicated that other than Ramadān was referred to by the phrase a.m. failed to gain acceptance. However, as is generally the case with the Muslim sciences, an argument, once properly formulated and substantiated, never disappears even if it does fail, and the notion that maṣdūdāt implies fewness became firmly entrenched. Nevertheless, it presented little difficulty to those such as Rāzī who preferred to interpret a.m. as indicating Ramadān: he simply claims that compared with fasting the whole year (a concept familiar from the hadīth literature), even 30 days is a small number. Rāzī also disposes of a number of other arguments in favour of a fast prior to Ramadān, such as the post-classical hadīth

1 Qur'anic parallels include Q15/60,56/60,87/3.
2 See the reference from Rāzī in the next paragraph.
3 p.172.
4 pp.170-1.
5 Not in Jenniack's Concordance, nor encountered elsewhere.
in which the Prophet says that Ramadān abrogates all previous fasts, from which the automatic deduction is that some considered that there were previous fasts (though it is not actually stated that these were Muslim fasts). Others suggest that the verbal repetition of the marīd/safar clause (vv. 134-5) indicates that something other than Ramadān is meant the first time it occurs, for otherwise the repetition would be stylistically unacceptable. Yet others claim that a.m. cannot be equivalent to Ramadān, since the option of paying the fidya obtained during those days, while this is not now the case with Ramadān. One may attribute the tenacity of those who favoured the existence of a previous fast to its convenience as a suitable limbo to which might be consigned all the unwanted 'pre-abrogation' features of the fast as set out in the Quran, which by no means matched the fast as it was developed by classical Islam. There is no other reason why an interpretation other than the simplest (and the correct one) should have held on so long. As it happened, with the passing of time, the need to justify the three-day fast/al-saum al-awwal, by claiming that it was referred to in the Quran, disappeared, because both it and the accompanying claim of abrogation had come to be accepted as fact. The clear implication of the text could now be admitted without prejudice to the strength of the prevailing theory.

*fūmān kāna min kum marīdan aw ʿalā nafarīn*

Together with its sequel, this phrase forms one of the general conditions of prescribed fasting which Muhammad lays down in this verse.

In view of the several classes of people whom, reasonably enough, the compilers of the hadīth literature found it necessary to exempt from the rigours of fasting, it seems odd at first sight that the Quran's exemption should be so limited. However, it becomes apparent
from a study of the Quran that the sick and the traveller are so often mentioned, frequently together, as being exempt, or subject to special regulation, that as classes they seem almost stereotyped. Certainly, sickness and being absent would be the two commonest departures from normality, two states rendering difficult or impossible the proper performance of most religious rituals, which under Semitic systems tend to be activities requiring communal and physical participation. The clearest examples of this are congregational prayer, and the pilgrimage. Bearing this physical aspect in mind, it may be that here 'sick' is to interpreted as meaning 'incapacitated by sickness', and it may thus indeed include the old,

1 On the precise meaning of ṣaḥāfā ṣafarīn, see below, p. 46.

2 Macquoid's assertion, p. 53, that there are no parallels to this clause in the Quran is simply not true: the two classes are the subject of special regulation at Q4/42, concerning prayer, as also 25/6; at Q73/20 (cf. also a hadīth in b. Sa'd, 6,131, obviously influenced by the Quran: N says, 'Since Husain was killed, I have not ceased reciting the Quran except when sick or travelling') they are mentioned in connection with the recitation of the Quran. Not always the same phrase or order is used. At other times, they are treated singly: illness at Q2/196, 9/92, (224/61, 48/17); travel at Q2/283, 5/106. That to place the traveller, if not the sick, in a special category was a general Semitic custom may be indicated by numbers 9/111: one unclean or travelling, and thereby missing the Passover, is to celebrate it at a later date. Also mentioned in the Quran are the mishīn and ibn al-sabīl, and possibly also comparable is al-muqātil fi sabīl allāh.
infirm or pregnant, etc., as some fiqahā' suggest. Waqtendouk's suggestion (p. 58), that mention of the old is omitted from this verse in order to keep it short seems somewhat poorly founded. The old are very rarely mentioned in the Qurān: there is one verse dealing with old women's dress. It seems likely that the problems of the old would be settled by custom and common-sense, if they are not covered by the various provisions concerning the 'sick'. There is a possibility that in Muhammad's community there were very few old persons anyway. The incapacitation referred to above would be that degree of sickness which prevented physical participation in e.g. prayer (or going to a place of prayer). It seems unlikely that sickness debars one from fasting on grounds of ritual impurity; an important part of Muhammad's takhīf of Jewish prescriptions was a diminished concern with considerations of purity and impurity.

As for the meaning of 'ṣalā safarīn', there is a case for making this refer not simply to those 'on a journey', but more specifically to those on raids or other military expeditions. Occasionally an expression which does not explicitly mention war or fighting, such as 'darba fī-l-ārd' is used by the Qurān apparently to designate some kind of expedition, and the warrior is more than once the subject of special provision or mention, indicative

1 Although the nursing and pregant mother, a well known couple in the hadith, are mentioned separately in the Qurān (22/2'), this is an isolated occasion, and does not exclude their being covered by the term 'sick' elsewhere in the Qurān.
2 Q4/60 3 Cf. Numbers 9/11.
4 The ambivalence of the expression was noted by Jacob, p. 2: das Wort 'safar' kann nützlich Reise und Feldzug bedeuten.
5 Q4/101. Possibly it refers to trading.
6 Q4/101, concerning prayer.
of his constituting a well-known special case. Admittedly no firm grounds can be made out for considering this phrase to refer exclusively to the warrior, but if one takes it as representing in some way a takhfīf of previous practice, it might tie in with the bedouin practice of partial abstinence before going on a raid, and would make some sense of otherwise puzzling hadīths in which persons are depicted as fasting on 'journeys' which take place outside Rajnadān, when there is no other apparent reason for fasting: these people would be continuing a pre-Quranic practice, either in ignorance of the Qur'an, or in harmony with a broadened interpretation of the Quranic ordinance as being optional.

To anticipate slightly the discussion of the following phrase, fa'iddatun min ayyāmin ukhara; the use of the fa suggests that the regulation affecting the sick and the traveller may be absolute rather than optional. This can be seen either as an instance of takhfīf, with humanitarian as well as polemical elements, or alternatively a case may be made out for considering the ban absolute on the grounds that a fast performed while sick or away is technically or ritually incomplete and therefore invalid. However, too little is known or knowable of this aspect of the Semitic fast, and such a suggestion remains uncertain. The yusr-ūsr clause of 02/185, ahead, can be taken as supporting the takhfīf explanation.

Considerations of this nature do not arise in the fatsīrs. With the sole exception of Tūsī (perhaps also Rāzī), they consider the question of the absoluteness or otherwise of the regulation to be left open by the Qurān. It is left to the fuqahā' and the hadīth to settle both this and the parallel questions of what constitutes

1 BI, art. 'Nadhr'.
2 See the hadīth discussions of this, below, p.240.
3 p.175.
illness or a journey. Basically the Quranic provision is seen as a rukhsa, a divine relaxation of the otherwise inescapable obligation to fast the 30 days of Ramadan whatever one's condition, and the discussion centres round whether or not a rukhsa should be accepted; a strong hint of reluctance is evident in certain hadiths. Tusi (p.117) employs the argument that because the qada' (viz. 'idda min ayyamin ukhara) is obligatory, there is no option but to break the fast while sick or travelling. This appears to be not so much a case of arguing from first principles (the Quran), but rather a justification of an already assumed position, and as such it differs little from the rest of the reports.

fa'iddatun min ayyamin ukhara

Taken in conjunction with the preceding phrase, these words present no problems of comprehension. However, this is not to say that they do not provoke comment. In the tafsirs this is of two kinds, grammatical and speculative, the latter manifesting itself in variant readings of the Quranic text.

On the grammatical side, the case of fa'iddatun is examined and found to be in conformity with Arabic grammar, a parallel to fa-ittiba'un bi-l-ma'ruf, Q2/178. Noteworthy is the form of ukhara. This word, the plural of the feminine ukhra, can only refer to the one other plural in the vicinity, namely ayyam, plural of the masculine noun yaum, and of course according to Arabic grammar, feminine. Ukhara (like ma'dudat, earlier in the verse) must simply be accepted as one of the several instances of Quranic style which do not fit comfortably into the schemes of the later Muslim grammarians. Elsewhere in the Quran, it is applied more 'normally' to regular sound feminine plurals. It is evident from this and the case of ma'dudat

1 Tabari, p.152. 2 Q3/7,12/43,12/46.
that the theory of gender and adjectival agreement is by no means as settled as the strictly logical mind might desire.

Tüski, pp.116-7, Abū Hayyān, p.32, and Tabari, p.132, the only commentators to concern themselves greatly with this point, are naturally unable to accept it simply as Quranic idiom, and are hard-pressed to find a logical justification for it. Perhaps the best argument they offer is that ukhrā (which one would otherwise expect here) might lead to confusion as to whether it referred to ḥidda or ayyān. This would be unlikely in grounds of position, but as there is a recorded variant reading of ukhrā, it is clear that some-one had strong motives in suggesting it.

The sick and the traveller, then, are allowed (or directed) to perform their fast at a later date, when they return to a state of normality; they are not excused the duty. It was suggested above that humanitarian considerations lay behind the regulation. However, there is the possibility that polemics enter into it also, depending on whether or not Muhammad is seen as the originator of this rukhā. The possibility that this is an instance of takhfīf has been mentioned, but there is none of the explicitness of Q2/187, a much more definite example, and we have no knowledge of Arabian Jewish practice by which to judge any change. In view of the special concern for the sick and the traveller frequently expressed in the Quran, occurring usually in the form of asides, rather than as major announcements, it would seem that Muhammad was perpetuating attitudes (and perhaps making them obligatory for the first time) rather than innovating. If this is the case, then the humanitarian aspect would

1 Possibly the underlying principle here is that if a plural is collective, it is fem. sing., but if it has more an enumerative significance, it may also be fem. plural.

2 See below, p.129. 3 Cf. Q4/103 on salāt.
appear to be the dominant.

wa cālā alladhīna yūṭiqūnahu fidyātun

This phrase is perhaps the most controversial in the verses dealing with fasting: it stirs Tabari to even greater prolixity than usual. This is without doubt because according to the general interpretation, it apparently allows certain people to get out of the fast which has just been so solemnly imposed. Accordingly, the prevailing tendency of the mufassirūn is effectively to dispose of the phrase by one means or another: abrogation, variant readings, restrictive interpolation.

However, taking the view that abrogation is a later fiction designed to harmonise fiqh, hadīth, and Quran, that variants are similarly not contemporary with the Quran¹, and that the proposed qualifications of the phrase are artificial and neither disinterested nor supported by the text, one is forced to consider this phrase as part of a coherent unitary regulation concerning fasting.

Before proceeding to an examination of what the tafsīrs have to say, the possible meanings of this admittedly potentially ambiguous phrase will be analysed, and their relative likelihood of representing the true state of affairs assessed.

The Arabic itself is clear enough except for one thing, the referent of 'hu' in 'cālā alladhīna yūṭiqūnahu': it could refer to ṣiyām, some way away in the previous verse, or to the following clause². There can be little doubt that on grounds of position alone, it is much more likely that the fidya clause, or, more strictly, 'taหลวง', is what is referred to here. With this interpretation, the

¹ See below, p. 120.

² Either as a whole, in which case the hu is a damīr al-sha'ān, or more particularly to taหลวง; there is no practical difference in meaning.
applicability of the fidya clause is limited to those who through illness or absence have missed fasting at the proper time, while if hu is taken to refer to al-siyām, then virtually anyone can avail himself of the fidya in order to avoid fasting. The muḥafāṣirs are unanimous in their support for this latter view, but this is because as a whole they consider the option of making the fidya to be no longer open. By claiming that the fidya was once open to all, they make it appear the more unacceptable and incongruous in comparison with the fast as actually practised, and thus make their claim that the clause is now abrogated appear the more reasonable.

To take the question of the applicability of the fidya a step further: either it refers to the Muhammadan community in general, or to those sick and travelling. Conclusive evidence for the correctness of either suggestion is lacking.

The second one is preferable, however, as it is simpler: it can be considered as following on without interruption from the previous clause concerning the sick and the traveller, the waw acting as an ordinary conjunction between the ġidda and the fidya. If this is the case, it can be argued that the reason for the fidya now becomes apparent: it serves as an additional obligation of reparation (note the force of ġalā) for not having performed the fast at the right time. The missed days of fasting have been made up during the 'ayyām ukhara', but there is still a deficiency: the point of a prescribed fast is that it takes place at a set time, in this instance Ramadān, and so to do it out of time is in some respects to

1 But there is a self-contradiction which further gives the lie to the hu=siyām idea, according to which all are given the opportunity of breaking the fast, providing they pay fidya to the poor: this presupposes destitute poor, who are by their very condition unable to take advantage of the option; thus, all are not given the opportunity to break their fast.
make a deficient fast. The fidya, for those who can afford it, makes compensation for this aspect of the deficiency. This takes due account of the basic notion of redressing a balance which is contained in the root f-d-y, which is not, as Vagtendonk claims, p.59, neutral in meaning.

A refinement of the referring of the fidya to the sick and the traveller is possible if one now admits that the hu could refer to al-siyām (although as mentioned above, this seems unlikely); the implication of this would be that there are two types of breach of the fast; if one was sick or travelling, and incapable of further fasting, one was to break the fast and make it up later; those who could not have fasted while sick or travelling incur no penalty. However, if one could have carried on fasting, but did not actually do so, then additionally a fidya becomes payable as compensation for not doing what one could have done. Such an explanation has the slight advantage that once the individual has decided whether or not he can continue fasting, his subsequent actions are all laid down and unequivocally stated. However, as already observed, it depends initially on the somewhat dubious assumption that the hu refers to the rather distant siyām.

The wider interpretation of the fidya clause, namely to the Muhammadan community in general, requires an even greater degree of speculation. It also requires the supplying of at least one, if not several, words which are not implicit in the text, such as '(yuṭīqūnahu) min man shahida min kun al-ayyām', in order to make it clear that the waw does not imply a continuation of the idda clause. As pointed out above (p.38), the supplying of extra words, especially when the text has an intelligible meaning as it stands, is a procedure that must be employed with caution, but if one accepts the wider interpretation, then, to use Guillaume's words, 'One can hardly escape the conclusion that the verse allows a rich man to
buy himself out of the fast. Such a situation is not attested to historically, and is also undoubtedly completely at variance with the usual view of the Muslim fast as a communal activity, a period of great religious solidarity, which in more pious times it certainly was; it was repugnance at the idea of such a loophole that led the Muslims to circumvent it with such determination. One is therefore driven to seek some kind of justification for what the Quran appears to say. One must concede with the Muslims that the notion of a wholesale opting out of the fast is unacceptable, as making a nonsense of the whole idea of a divine prescription; this leads to the conclusion that in fact this clause originally applied to only a limited number of persons. One may then surmise that this was a special measure perhaps intended to benefit the rest of the community by imposing a kind of wealth tax on the rich. However, this involves a degree of speculation without strong support in the text, and on the whole, the wider interpretation of the fiyya clause seems an unlikely one.

To sum up briefly, a disinterested appraisal of the Quranic text suggests that the fiyya applies to the sick and the traveller, and not to the community at large.

The mufassirūn, approaching this phrase with certain preconceived notions, and influenced by what appears to have been the early abandonment of the fidya, at least in the form here laid down in the Quran, tend to draw rather different conclusions. One of the most prevalent, and indeed the only one mentioned by Muqāṭīl2 and Farrā',3, is that this clause (if not the whole verse) is abrogated

1 Islam, Harmondsworth, 1954, p. 184. It may be noted however that this fails to take fully into account the force of ʿalā.
2 ff. 22-3. 3 Ḥaṭānī, ad Q2/184.
by the following verse, or more specifically by the words 'faman shahida minkum al-shahra falsaygumhu'. This assumes 1) that the phrase 'alān alladhina yutīqūnahu is a general edict, not limited to the sick and the traveller, and 2), connected with this, that hu refers to āyām. Farra' does record the possibility of its referring to the word fidya'; this probably stems from his predominant interest in the grammatical rather than the practical aspects of tafsīr, as he makes no further comment on it. If abrogation is assumed, this alternative does not alter the meaning much, though it does avoid the rather incongruous introduction of an alleged option by 'wa alān', which, as already explained, is rather the hallmark of an obligation.

Tabarî, our next source, has practically all the classical arguments. After an initial sally against variants (on this, see below), he recounts almost a score of hadīths in support of the alleged abrogation of this verse. This device, as indicated above, permits the acceptance of the wide-spread conviction that the verse allows virtually any-one to get out of fasting; this, being a distasteful conception, immediately provokes the counter-assertion that the 'option' was temporary and no longer valid, being superseded by the subsequent revelation of v. 185. The abandoned fidya is then claimed to have formed part of the saum al-awwal.

The abrogation of the fidya being thus more or less firmly established, the question of why this change in revelation should have occurred has now to be settled. The various answers proposed

1 Ma'ānī, ad Q2/184.
2 On the force of alān, see remarks on kutiba, above.
3 pp.132ff.
4 One report in Tabarî (p.135, from Dahhāk) specifically lists the components of this fast.
naturally appear in hadīth form. Some say that the first fast was too difficult, because it lasted from Catama to Catama, with only one meal per day, which coincides with the taxing conditions posited by the tafsīrs as having prevailed before the revelation of v.187, q.v. Perhaps parallel to this is the assertion that originally the Muslims were unaccustomed to fasting, and needed to be broken in gently, i.e. with the option of getting out of it if it proved too difficult. As they became inured to the fast and its rigours, the option could be dispensed with. This assumes, as indeed most of the reports do, that Muhammad's followers were not previously well-acquainted with the standard religious activities. It may be noted that were this hadīth at all authentic, it would be far more likely to refer to Ramadan than a relatively easy three-day fast. It is this sort of discrepancy which gives the lie to the whole sawm al-awwal edifice, and thence to the claim of abrogation itself.

The second group of opinions mentioned by Tabari also accepts that the fidya clause is partly abrogated, but restricts its application to the old (sometimes also the pregnant and nursing mother), whose position as regards the fast occasions much discussion in fiqh and hadīth. It is argued that the original revelation (i.e. the fidya) applied to all old persons, whether they could actually fast or not, and that after the change in dispensation, it applied only to those who could not manage the fast. (This does have the merit of recognising the non-optional nature of the fidya clause.) To justify this, it is alleged that yuṭīq means 'to be able (to do a thing) only with difficulty', and hence by extension 'not to be able (to do a thing)'. This assertion is so extreme that one is led

---

1 p.135.

2 Probably the intention of the hadīth's authors. An example of an independent line of thought bent to fit the now standard sawm al-awwal theory.
straightaway to examine the motives of its proposers: it becomes clear that it is based on a desire to see accommodated in the Quran those groups of persons who are discussed in the fiqh, and in this case to back up a particular doctrine, rather than to bring from altruistic motives other invalid groups into line with the sick and the traveller. That this is the real situation is supported by the fact that it is to Ṣabbās that this doctrine concerning the old is generally attributed, and it is this same name that serves as a figurehead for the comparable doctrine regarding the old in the hadīth. The pre-abrogation attitude posited here is merely a reverse construction from the alleged second situation: there is no historical basis for it, just as there is nothing in the Quran which would support the limitation of the clause to the old, nor even include them.

The third opinion based on the standard text does not make use of abrogation. This is not, it should be added, from a dislike of it on principle. The phrase, it is said, refers to all persons, but after yuṭīqūnahu we are to understand the additional clause 'when they become old and unable through their old age to fast'. This arrives at substantially the same position as the second opinion above. Again, there is no indication in the text that such an interpolation is warranted, and its very awkwardness, coupled with the fact that it is attributed to Suddī (d.138) may be an indication that it is a relic from a time when abrogation was not an established principle, and when accordingly the harmony of fiqh and Quran had to be demonstrated in a more roundabout way. Though roundabout, the assertion remains alarming in its implications, for it shows that the tafsīrs have no compunction in reversing completely both the apparent, and, one would say, the intended meaning of the Quran, namely that the fidya is an established fact, and furthermore of an obligatory nature. Some attempt at rationalisation is made by
climbing that yutiqunahu refers to the period when these old persons were yet in good health. Included here are the hubla and murdi\(^c\). This hadith too is from b. 6abbas.

The extensive pattern of alleged variants constructed round this clause is discussed in another chapter. A brief mention will be made here of the most widely attested example of these, viz. yutawwaqunahu (pro yutiqunahu). This purports to bring the meaning of the verb round to the position required by the second group of opinions above, that is to say, 'find it difficult', 'cannot do it'. Clearly the assertion that such a meaning could be extracted from the form yutiqunahu itself was as unacceptable to some then as it is to reasonable opinion now, and consequently a firmer basis for it had to be sought. It comes as no surprise to learn that this reading is said to apply to the old, the pregnant, and the nursing mother, and is attributed to b. 6abbas.

Later tafsirs do not, on the whole, deviate from the first line of thinking mentioned above, that before abrogation, the fidya clause was of universal application, though most also discuss the variant yutawwaqunahu. However, in Tusi\(^1\), we find the proposal that the fidya used to refer to the old, the hubla and the murdi\(^c\), but was then partially abrogated, and subsequently referred only to the old. Whether or not this tafsir paralleled a severe opinion in the fiqh, according to which some considered the hubla and murdi\(^c\) should fast at all times, is not clear. As the fiqh developed, pregnant and nursing women came to be regarded as dealt with by the marid clause earlier in this verse, and it may be that as this came about, some attempted to confirm this thinking by removing mention of them in the fidya discussion. A third possibility is that supporters of the reference of the fidya to the old, aware that many regarded

\(^1\) pp.118-9.
this clause as the subject of abrogation, accordingly inserted into the hypothetical 'pre-abrogation' situation something inconsequential, the reference to the hubla and murdi, which could then be 'abrogated' without detriment to the position of the old.

Although Tabari does not mention it, it seems probable that in his time there was an opinion that the fidya clause in fact referred to the sick and the traveller (as suggested above, p.53). This view is attributed to al-Aqamm (d.346), and is mentioned by Razi and Abu Hayyan. He is taken to refer to siyam. This results in a two-fold provision: if the sick or the traveller cannot fast, they are to do so in 'aayam ukhar'. If they can fast, they have the option of doing so or breaking and paying over the fidya. In contrast to the similar interpretation advanced earlier, in which the marjd/safar provision was presented as being non-optional, this one introduces an element of choice, which does not appear to be completely justified, omitting as it does to take into consideration the obligatory and apparently unconditional nature of 'alaa. Apart from this, al-Aqamm's position seems a fairly reasonable one, and may represent a compromise between a literal interpretation of the Quran and the prevailing traditional exegesis. Its approach to literalness may however have been accidental, as it appears to have been motivated by a dislike of the b. 'Abbas 'old' interpretation, possibly because this was not sufficiently grounded in the text. Al-Aqamm's interpretation provoked several objections, for the continuing possibility of a fidya was still anathema to the majority.

Connected with the variants is the alleged elision of a 'laa' before yutiqunahu. This obviously supports the b. 'Abbas's claims, and is apparently first mentioned in tafsir by Abu Hayyan, though it is probably much older than this, being hinted at in many of

1 p.177. 2 p.36. 3 See variants chapter on this, below, p.141.
Tabari's reports. No doubt it was not popular since it set a dangerous precedent.

Generally speaking, the tafsīrs prefer straightforward abrogation, and it must be admitted that, given the convictions embodied in the fiqh that had to be shown to be in accordance with the Quran, this is perhaps the most satisfactory solution. Thus the assertion that abrogation had taken place here should not be seen as a deliberate plot by later commentators to mask the original meaning of the Quran. There are no grounds for doubting that they acted in perfect good faith, but once the general principle of abrogation had been formulated, it was fatally easy to see it as the solution of any problem caused by an apparent discrepancy between what the Quran said, and the current conception of what practice ought to be. In the present case, it seems more than likely that, faced with two broadly similar phrases, the marād/safar clauses of vv.184-5, it would have been a simple matter for a mufassir not familiar with the true historical context of the Quran to assume that one of them must be redundant. This seeming redundancy became 'confirmed' by a failure to realise the original nature and purpose of the fidya clause, leading to an exaggeration of the applicability of the latter which could only be countered satisfactorily by considering it no longer valid, so widely did the situation envisaged by this exaggerated application differ from that obtaining in reality. The situation thus became rationalised as an instance of abrogation in the technical sense. It is unfortunately true that all Western scholars hitherto have also accepted the occurrence of abrogation as a fact.

As pointed out above, it is difficult to assess what element of novelty or tahlīf there is, if any, in the marād/safar regulation as a whole.

1 Though in fact there are other instances; see e.g. Tab. on Q2/158.
In the Quran, food or the feeding of others, as distinct from the simple eating and drinking of Q2/137, is often mentioned in close connection with fasting, as something which can take its place. This is either to help make up for the incomplete fulfillment of the fasting prescription, as here, or as one of several alternatives to fasting when this is itself an atonement device.

It is not clear why feeding should here be the only way of implementing the fidya regulation. It may simply stem from a certain appositeness, in that the fidya here is part of the apparatus for making up a deficiency in the fast. Relief in kind seems to have been a common element in an apparently fairly standardized set of atonement devices occurring in the Quran. They reveal a certain deliberate interrelation: in Q58/4 we have two months' fast or 60 feedings, the same ratio as in the present verse (if one is justified in understanding 'per diem' in Q2/184), while in Q5/95, we have feeding or 'its equivalent' in fasting, which would imply a known rate of conversion. This last fact, and the probability that a fast of two consecutive months (Q58/4) could not have been imposed with any expectation of its being submitted to unless there were some precedent for it, tends to suggest that the details of the system

---

1 These alternatives are not usually of equal value. See below, p. 218-9
2 E.g. Q2/196, 58/4. The atonement aspects which later became associated with Ramadan do not appear to be at all dominant in the Quran.
3 We may note that 'it seems to have been the custom to give the poor the food which would otherwise have been eaten, or its equivalent'. (Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, art. 'Fasting'.)
4 Of course, it is possible that its precedent is Ramadan. Conclusive dating of the two verses would however be very difficult, if not impossible, to establish.
were customary and not of Muhammad's invention. The idea of kaffāra, of which the fidya is taken to be one method when used as in the present instance, is taken for granted in the Quran, and it must be presumed that the reason why we are so infrequently given details of it is that it is, or was, common knowledge. The instances where we are given information (Q5/89, 5/95, 4/92, besides those already mentioned) are not confined to any discernible group of activities. For example, some deal with shortcomings in ritual, while others deal principally with interpersonal relations. It may be that where Muhammad offers details, he is trying to change the prevailing custom, but there are no contextual indications that this is so.

The fact remains that in the great majority of instances where Muhammad legislates, he leaves the treatment of any infringement unmentioned.

That the food should be given to the poor is not surprising, for they are constantly held up in the Quran as the deserving objects of charity. The kaffāras of Q5/89, 5/95 and 58/4 single out the poor for special favour, but they also appear regularly in lists of persons to be given special consideration. The uniformity of these lists suggests a parallel with the stereotyped pair of the sick and the traveller, mentioned earlier in this verse. The common companions of the poor in these lists are parents, relatives, orphans, 'ibn al-sabil', while less frequently are added the neighbour (al-jār), the prisoner, beggars, and muhājirūn fi sabīl allāh.

As was the case with the traveller, a parallel may be found for many of these persons in the Old Testament, for example in the Ten Commandments.

1 Possibly favouring the wider interpretation of the fidya clause.
2 Q2/83, 177, 215, 4/7, 3, 36, 8/41, 9/60, 17/26, 24/22, 30/38, 59/7, 76/3, 90/14, 15.
In 96/34, 75/44, 39/13, 107/3, we find the feeding of the poor, sometimes combined with the care of orphans, mentioned as an implied charitable act.

If we may judge from a comparison of 95/89 and 5/95, there is no practical difference between ṭaḥām as used in the present verse, and ṭaḥām, which one might have expected here, and which is the commoner usage elsewhere in the Quran. While ṭaḥām can be an infinitive noun, which is quite acceptable here, it may be that, considered in its more concrete sense of 'food', it is more satisfactory as the badil of fidya, which is also a concrete term, i.e. something paid over, rather than a masdar.

famaat tənawuca khairan fahwa khairun lahu

This phrase, referring principally to those concerned with the fidya, but also capable of wider application, can have several interpretations, none of which differs greatly from the others. They rest on the translation adopted for the word khair. This point is however subsidiary to the main concern of the phrase, which is to make a contrast between the obligatory doing of good, and volunteering the same: the Quran implies that although some persons are feeding the destitute in expiation of a short-coming, this should not prevent others (or indeed the same persons) from doing the same but out of charity, and voluntarily.

To return to the question of the meaning of khair: at the first occurrence, it may be translated either by 'more/better', or 'goods' (rather than food), or 'a good deed'. The second alternative is perhaps the weakest, as we nowhere else find the giving of goods so specifically mentioned as a kaffāra in the Quran. If 'more/
better' is understood, the phrase can be seen as applying to those who are paying the fidya, suggesting that they do more than the minimum laid down, and heightening the impression that by not having fasted at the proper time, their fast is gravely defective, and needs as much reparation as possible. If simply 'a good deed' is understood, then the phrase is of a more general nature.

At the second occurrence, khair can mean 'better' or 'a good deed', something to be marked in one's favour (lahu) in the heavenly register. We thus have two likely translations for the complete phrase: 'he who volunteers extra, then that is better for him', applying to the fidya-payers; and 'he who volunteers a good deed (in this world), then it will be reckoned a good deed for his account (on the Day of Judgement)'. Precise assessment of the second half of this phrase is difficult, as it is something of a Quranic cliché.

For the Muslims, it is not a matter for controversy: the act in question is voluntary, if not abrogated anyway. The various suggestions, which as might be expected are concretisations of the 'more/better' interpretation, all have equal weight in the eyes of the mufassirūn. They say it either means feed more poor, or fast as well as pay the fidya. This last proposal disregards entirely the concept underlying the fidya: it is difficult to make compensation if there has been no prior short-coming. As for the first two suggestions, there is no reason why the Quranic words should be so narrowly defined— all that is intended is an increase in whatever way convenient of the ta'ām miskīn, without strict delimitation.

1 Q2/280, 4/25, 11/86, 16/95, 29/16.
2 Ş. c. Tabarî, p.142, Rāzî, p.179.
3 Unless it originally served as a reminder to payers of the fidya not to consider this as exempting them from performing 'ayyām 'ukhar'.
Placing this phrase, and indeed the whole of the latter part of this verse, in a wider context, it is possible to view it as not much more than an exhortatory refrain referring back to the imposition of the fast in v.183.

wa an taṣūmū khairun lakum in kuntum ta'zlanūna

Again, there are two possibilities for the translation of khair. One may interpret it as 'a good thing', as above, but to do so leaves the phrase without any real link with what has gone before. This is remedied by the alternative interpretation 'better', which prompts the question, 'than what?'. The answer to this can scarcely be other than the fidya, as indeed most of the tafsîrs claim\(^1\). The phrase is thus addressed to those who have made over the fidya, reminding them that though they have acted charitably (by obligation or otherwise), and in the interests of the community, to have fasted would nevertheless have been better. Thus they do not get lightly out of their original duty to fast, for their action brings the smaller reward. One point against this interpretation is the change of person, from the third in the fidya clause, to the second here. This may however not be critical\(^2\), and in any case one can link this phrase and the foregoing by considering it as reassuring those who fast Ramadān that their effort will bring reward just as the more tangible donations of the fidya-payers will bring reward.

Some of the tafsîrs are loath to cast out this last phrase with the rest of the verse when abrogation occurs, as it represents a valuable pious sentiment. They are thus unable to say 'than the fidya', and tend towards the 'good thing' interpretation\(^3\).

\(^1\) E.g. Tab.,p.143; Zam.,p.255. \(^2\) Possibly influenced by standing next to the semi-cliché 'in kuntum ta'zlanūna', also in the second person. See what follows. \(^3\) Ḥāzî, p.179.
The verse ending, like that of v.183, is a common one, and special relevance here need not be sought. However, it may be noted that khairun lakum is followed by 'in kuntum ta'lamūna' at Q2/280 and 29/16, and by 'in kuntum mu'minīna' at Q11/86 and 16/95. It therefore appears to be something of a set phrase, and may indicate that interpretations such as those advanced above run the risk of reading too much into the text.

To sum up briefly: this verse sets out some of the conditions applying to prescribed fasting in general, namely that it takes place on certain specified days, and that the sick and the traveller are the subject of special provisions.

Q2/185

shahru ramadāna alladhi unzila fīhi al-qur'ānu hudan li-1-nāsi wa bayyinātin min al-hudā wa al-furqāni fīman shahida minkum al-shahra falyaṣumhu wa man kāna minkum marīdan aw ʿalā ʿafāraq faʿaṣaddatun min ayyāmin ukāra yurūdu allāhu bikum al-yusra wa lā yurūdu bikum al-yusra wa litukmilū al-ʿiddata wa litukabbirū allāha ʿalā nā hadākum laʿallakum tashkurūna.

The month of Ramadān is that in which the Qurān was sent down as a guidance to men and as clear signs of guidance and of the Furqān. So he who witnesses the month at home, let him fast it, and he who is sick or on a journey shall fast a number of other days. God wishes the easy for you (He does not wish the difficult for you), and that you should do the number in full, and praise God for His guiding you. Perhaps you will be thankful.

The general message of this verse is quite simple: Ramadān is claimed to be a special month, and as a mark of its being special, a fast is instituted for its duration. Ramadān is thus the specification.
of the ayyān mc'dūdāt of v.183. The general provision concerning
the sick and the traveller is confirmed as applying to the just
specified fast, and the verse ends on an exhortatory note.

shahru ramadānā ... furqānī

Although previous translators of this phrase into European
languages have shown a marked reluctance⁠¹ to translate the Arabic
as it stands, and instead either give their translations sense by
supplying words (as indeed do most of the mufassirs) or deprive
them of grammatical sense by leaving out those 'implied' words, there
is no good reason why it should not be translated as an ordinary
nominal sentence, with shahru ramadānā its mubtada', and the follow-
ing words its khabar. Such a translation would be preferable on
grounds of simplicity and economy alone, but it is additionally
supported by two other factors: firstly, the force of the following
fa, which makes it clear that what it introduces is the logically
connected sequel to what precedes it; this gives the whole verse
coherence and meaning. Secondly, although there is no grammatical
link with ayyān mc'dūdāt, the desired virtual equation between these
days and Ramadān is in no way forced. The strict formal equation,
by which the mufassirs and others² understand 'kutiba callee al-
ziyān' in front of Ramadān³ in the same way as it appears before
ayyān mc'dūdāt, becomes unnecessary, and the more pleasing logical/
rhetorical chain, culminating in faman shahida minkum al-shahra, is
set up. It seems as thought the commentators were driven to supply
words in this way because it was felt that the Quran did not say

¹ E.g. Goitein, Elachère. ² E.g. Zam., p.256, Abu Hayyān, p.38.
³ The case of shahru is to some awkward in consequence, and is al-
ttered in a variant (below, p.147). Farrā' avoids this, saying 'ay wa
lakum shahru ramadānā'. Muqātil has no comment at all.
sufficiently directly and specifically 'Fast Ramadān!' (see what follows).

Taken in the above way, this sentence, giving as it does the reason for the institution of the Ramadān fast (although this reason may not be entirely clear), forms the logical introduction to the re-iterated and now specified command to fast.

The muḥtada'-khabar interpretation is present as a minority view in several of the tafsīrs. Only Tūsī makes it his first choice, while Zamakhsharī and Baidawi give it no preference. No-one disputes its grammatical validity, but Rāzī specifically says (p. 181) that it does not make clear enough the order to fast Ramadān. There is also the possibility that the nufassir used to supplying words to be understood would find this easier on the ear than the admittedly infrequent nominal sentence without inna.

The words 'alladhi unzila fīhi al-qur'ān' can be interpreted in several ways, all of which are broadly similar. There are two possible meanings for al-qur'ān, and two for fīhi.

Fīhi should be taken quite literally as 'in which', rather than 'concerning which'. This latter rendering requires qur'ān to be understood (quite legitimately) as 'provision', 'specific regulation', but to read it this way here removes the reason for the selection of Ramadān in preference to other months, which is the evident purpose of this clause: 'Ramadān is the month concerning which the command to fast came down, so fast it' is almost a nonsense, and that any-one should propose such an interpretation suggests that it was only from an aversion to the prevailing one, and not because of any inherent superiority. To translate 'in which' with this meaning of qur'ān is similarly unsatisfactory. Additionally,

1 Though cf. the opening of Sura 9: 25 barā'atun min allāhī.
2 See an isolated opinion in Zamakhsharī.
this meaning of Qur'an is scarcely compatible with the following
words which describe it. The remaining alternative is thus the stan-
dard interpretation. An aversion to the standard rendering is how-
ever understandable, for the structure built around this verse in
the tafsîrs is complex: its component assertions can only be ac-
cepted entirely, as a matter of faith, or viewed with great scepticism,
so neatly do they 'explain' various facts and tie in numerous loose
ends.

It should be noted that this verse is of considerable interest
to Muslims and non-Muslims alike, because it apparently offers one
of the Qur'an's rare clues as to the precise date of revelation. Un-
fortunately, it is not clear what has been thus dated. Orthodox
Muslim opinion, aware that Muhammad could scarcely have received
the whole Qur'an in one month, rationalises by saying either that
this verse refers to the beginning of Muhammad's revelation as a whole
(this is 'backed up' by Sîra material), or that the Qur'an came down
en bloc during Ramadân to the lowest of the seven heavens, thence
to be dispensed as and when required. If the speculation went only
this far, one could without difficulty accept the first of these
two suggestions as quite reasonable, but the tafsîrs then indulge

1 Although the year is not mentioned, this is 'calculable' by
other means.

2 It is open to the objection that the following words suggest a
complete work, not merely the first parts. However, this disregards
the force of the 'uwin'; also, the work could hardly have been quite
complete when this verse was revealed. It is quite conceivable
that having had his first 'revelations', Muhammad could then have
foreseen their/his future purpose, and/or that when this verse came
down, he could have projected the later characteristics of the
Qur'an back to its early stages.
in the vain attempt to pinpoint precisely the date of the revelation. It happens that other 'dating' verses in the Quran, similarly vague, both give and are given meaning when placed against this verse; those who juxtapose them never feel the need to justify their action in removing quite disparate verses from their contexts and then constructing from them a new and entirely artificial thesis. The verses in question are those mentioning Lailat al-Qadr, Q97/1, and al-Laila al-Mubarakā, Q44/2. We have no information about these occasions that is contemporary with the period of Muhammad other than that in the Quran, and consequently it is far from certain that L.Q. and L.M. are identical, or that L.Q. is a recurring event, still less that it comes at any time in Ramadān. Despite the extensive literature on the subject of L.Q., especially in the hadith, the assertion that the three verses are in any way connected remains no more than assertion, and any attempt to reconstruct a precise calendar of events from them remains unjustified.

The first suggestion above, that the phrase indicates that Ramadān saw the beginning of revelation, involves the least speculation: in the absence of facts, there cannot be enough caution, for it is apparent that almost all earlier scholars have fallen into the enticing trap, but trap nevertheless, of trying to assign precise dates and see connections where there is not enough material to build from. Having said that a Ramadān appears to have been the month in which Muhammad's revelation occurred, it must be remembered that we have only Muhammad's word for this. Whatever he meant precisely by this phrase is of less importance than the fact that he wished to provide an imposing-sounding reason for instituting a Muhammadan fast in Ramadān; in the absence of other information, Ramadān must be judged to have been selected as the fasting month

1 Jagtendouk, ch.5, on L.Q. etc., affords us a good example of this.
simply because it happened to be an imminent month when Muhammad found it politically necessary or convenient to introduce his polemically-adapted fast. The rationale for its selection is of secondary importance, as is the question of the truth of the rationale.

The remaining words of the phrase expand on the role of the Qur'an. It might seem tempting to equate hudān with fasting, and bayyināt with the various details of the fact here enumerated, but this does not agree well with the case of surqān, and tends to equate 'qur'ān' with 'specific regulation', which, it has been argued, is here unjustified. Besides this, such an interpretation detracts from the fact that Muhammad is here claiming the comprehensiveness of the Qur'an, and not just that it deals with fasting, which is self-evident anyway. It is because of the great status of the Qur'an for Muhammad, as a tangible book of scripture, a convincing sign of prophethood, as he believed specially vouchsafed to him, that Ramādān, in which the Qur'an allegedly came down, takes on a special nature which has to be marked in some way. As suggested above, this at least is the way Muhammad intended the situation to appear, and the real sequence of events may well have been the reverse of this, namely that Muhammad decided on Ramādān as the fast-period of his community, and then had to rationalise this decision. This he did by claiming it to have coincided with a significant point in his career, whereas it is more likely that (as with the introduction of the basis of the tahfīf principle in Q2/106) the deciding on Ramādān coincided with a significant point in his career as a politician.

As for the word surqān, it is not here a matter of critical importance which meaning is assigned to it, since there is no indication that it is specifically connected either with Ramādān or fasting. It appears that it is mentioned here simply as something

---

1 It is noteworthy that here a convenient 'variant' exists.
whose bayynat occur in the Quran. It is quite probable, however, that furqān here\(^1\) refers to the decisive battle of Badr, which for Muhammad was the equivalent of Moses' furqān, the dividing (f-r-q) of the Red Sea\(^2\). Just as this miracle was in Muhammad's eyes God's greatest sign wrought through Moses, so Badr was the greatest physical event in Muhammad's career, and therefore worthy of being mentioned alongside his sign par excellence, the Quran itself.

The Sira's claims\(^3\) that Badr took place in Ramadān may be derived from a loose interpretation of this verse; they may conceivably record fact, in which case Badr would be the significant political juncture mentioned above. As Wagtendonk suggests (p. 67), the equation of furqān with Badr would be rendered more definite by reading it in the nominative instead of the genitive, but it is not acceptable to propose variations of the text in this way. In all events, the connection between Badr and fasting remains coincidental.

Taking the whole phrase as it stands, all we can deduce for certain is that Muhammad wished it to appear that he had good reason to institute a fast in Ramadān. The probability is that it was chance that determined the selection of Ramadān in preference to other months, for Muhammad's prime desire was to institute a polemically altered fast, rather than simply to institute a (specific) fast. As has been suggested, the reasons he offers for the choice of Ramadān are secondary; the precise political impulse, if any, can scarcely be glimpsed at this distance in time.

Despite the stories such as those of Muhammad's tahannuth, etc., in Ramadān during his early days as a religious man in Mecca\(^4\), there

---

\(^1\) As it certainly does elsewhere in the Quran. \(^2\) Q2/50.

\(^3\) Sira, trans. Guillaume, p. 111; Wāqidī, II, pp. 801-2. Neither of these works is particularly early, and thus cannot be taken as historically dependable sources. \(^4\) Sira, trans. Guillaume, p. 105.
is nothing to indicate that Ramadan was in any way a special month before the Muhammadan fast was associated with it. The question to be asked is then not 'why Ramadan?', but rather, 'why a month?'.

Speculation over the solution to this problem has led many to lose a sense of proportion. Those who saw Manichaeans or Harranian influence in this have by now rightly been discredited, but many are still convinced of Christian or mainstream Jewish influence. The scanty evidence we have can form the basis only for probabilities, and not convictions.

Those who posit Christian origins for Ramadan hold up as the model the Lenten fast, but tend to gloss over the fact that Lent and Ramadan while both long are not of equal length, and fail to account satisfactorily for there being nowhere else in the Quran any sign of Muhammad's having adopted a Christian practice, or even of having been acquainted with any of the details of Christian worship.

Having regard to Muhammad's career, Jewish influence in the matter of the fast is inherently much more likely, but we have no evidence of any one-month fast among the Jews at the time of Muhammad. The one-month fast that we know of, in preparation for the Day of Atonement, is of a motive completely different to that of Ramadan, and appears to have originated in Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages.

However, there can be no doubt that fasts of a number of days were known in the Hijaz: Muhammad could not have imposed a month's fast with any hope of its general acceptance were it entirely novel. Q58/3-4, in which two months' consecutive fast is prescribed as

1 Gerlitz tried to prove that they were identical. 2 Zimmels, p. 605.
3 The best example of several Quranic kaffarās involving fasting, which, as noted above, suggest a well-known system and equally that fasting was a familiar activity.
one of the kaffâras for lightly using the zihâr formula, poses some
problems here: if it antedated Ramadân, then a one-month fast is
obviously not a complete novelty, but on the other hand, there is
no necessity to look outside Arabia or even Medina or Mecca for a
model - the custom may have been entirely local. Whether the idea
of fasting in months as a kaffâra was (non-orthodox) Jewish or
Arabian in origin cannot at present be determined. The notion of
kaffâra was certainly known to both groups. Even if Q58/3-4 post-
dates 2/185, the extreme length of the fast would still suggest
that the idea of fasting in months was well-entrenched. It has al-
ready been put forward that in mentioning this and other kaffâras
in the Quran, Muhammad was dealing with a well-established system,
and (as far as may be ascertained) not innovating to any great ex-
tent. The indications are then that in instituting the month-fast
of Ramadân, Muhammad was not acting without precedent, and that
such a precedent was probably confined to a small area.

fanâni shahida minkum al-shahra fâlyasunnu

Although this phrase might be considered the kernel of the
whole fasting section, specifically prescribing the Muhammadan fast,
the Muslims are by no means at one in their interpretation of it.
most of the confusion originates from the ambiguous nature of the
words shihida and shahr. It is not difficult to arrive at a reason-
able interpretation of them, but the nufassirs generally are led
astray by having to reconcile with the Quran certain non-Quranic
considerations.

1 See Ryckmans, and art. 'Expiation & Atonement' in Hastings' Enc.
2 Though conceivably the intention of the verse is that the two
parties should each fast one month. Against this is the force of
mutatâbi'ain.
To take the second word first: shahr here can only mean shahr Ramadān; it is only reasonable to expect the word to have the same meaning when it occurs for the second time in the same sentence, especially when the first part gives the reason for the order in the second part. By this is excluded the equation of al-shahr with al-hilāl. This belief stems from the mistaken assumption that shahida means virtually the same as ra'ā, which term is employed in the hadīth discussion of when Ramadān may be judged to have commenced, a discussion which the Quran makes no attempt to settle.

Such an interpretation creates the awkward necessity of referring the hu of fālyāqūmhu not to its nearest noun, but to one considerably removed (as happened with the hu of yūṭīqūnahu in the previous verse), i.e. the first word in the verse. It is not clear whether or not there were any firm grounds for the assertion that shahr could mean hilāl: the dictionaries certainly supply 'examples' which appear to support this, but their authenticity is suspect. Elsewhere in the Quran, the meaning of shahr is always confined to that of 'month', and that of hilāl to 'new moon'.

The other ambiguous word, shahida, does however definitely contain two distinct though cognate ideas, those of witnessing and being present. Of these two, the idea of witnessing is the more developed, and is thus probably the secondary notion. In the

---

1 I.e. the month of Ramadān, rather than one of the other meanings attributed to it, such as 'new moon': see Lane, sūr shahr, and what follows here.
2 The question is usually known as that of 'ru'yat al-hilāl'. See on this below, p. 229
3 But which the fuqahā' were nevertheless desirous of relating to the Quran.
4 Attested to in such forms as mashhād, mushhīd, and mashhūd.
preceding paragraph it was shown that shahida can hardly here signify 'witness': taking shahr to mean 'month', we would be led to the absurdity that only when Ramadan is over can one know that one has witnessed it and begin fasting it, and so it is clear that the alternative meaning of shahida is here to be preferred. However, in this instance, 'being present' is scarcely an adequate rendering of this other meaning, since in a sense all persons are present somewhere all the time. We must add 'in a particular place', or, since we are dealing with a period of a month, 'in the same place'. For practical purposes, then, this phrase treats of the opposite number of the traveller, one who stays put. The Muslim term for such a person is al-muqām al-sāḥīh, obviously derived by contrast from al-muṣāfir and al-mārīd. The idiomatic translation for shahida is thus 'to be settled, at home', but it should be noted that this fails to convey quite the flavour of the Arabic, which is apparently a technical term, comparable to the stereotyped couple of the sick and the traveller.

As for the commentators, the earliest, Muqātil and Farrā', both have the commonsense interpretation of the verse, and it is the only one they offer. They note that this is the phrase which abrogates the fidya clause, something which Tabārī omits to mention here, being much more concerned with the various aqwa'il on shahida.

---

1 This is noted in some tafsīrs: e.g. Rāzī, p. 185. 2 E.g. Rāzī, p. 185. 3 fol. 23r and sub Q2/185 respectively. 4 Though the hadīth generally uses the virtually synonymous term hadār (noun), which forms an assonant pair with its opposite, safar. In common usage, 'fi-l-hadār wa-l-safar' comes to mean 'at all times'. See e.g. b. Sa'ōd, 6, 248: kāna yakhtum al-qur'ān fi-l-hadār wa-l-safar. 5 pp. 146ff.
The first opinion that Tabari quotes is that attributed to, among others, b. Abbās: that, having been at home at the beginning of the month, one is obliged to fast the rest of it whether one subsequently travels in it or not. Although defensible, such an interpretation twists the literal meaning of the text somewhat. It therefore seems that it is not disinterested, and should be taken as an expression of the view that people who travelled in Ramadan and broke their fast were getting off lightly from their grave religious duty. It is clear that many were reluctant to accept what was regarded as a rukhsa, and this attitude has lasted until modern times. Going further along similar lines were those whom Tabari quotes as regarding unfavourably any travel whatsoever in Ramadan, whether accompanied by fasting or not.

Tabari's second main opinion is the usual view, that this phrase applies to al-muqīm al-sahīḥ (without regard to their condition at the beginning of the month), and this is Tabari's own preference. Supporting it are a number of hadiths which for him render the first opinion untenable.

The third, Hanafi, view, falls into disfavour with him because of its extreme application of qiyyaṣ. Abū Hanīfa's understandable but

---

1 'the beginning of the month': it seems that the shahr-hilal notion necessary for the shahida-ra'a theory has to some degree influenced the other interpretation; probably not vice versa.

2 It is strictly logical, but overlooks the fact that the syntax of such a sentence requires it to be taken as a whole, and not section by section.

3 Also indicated by the non-mention of al-marid. See what follows.

4 and that accordingly the applicability of the safar clause should be interpreted as restrictively as possible.

5 Westermarck, Morocco, p. 92.
hardly philologically justifiable contention is that shahida not
only means 'to be muqīm-saḥīḥ', but also by extension includes being
compos mentis, bāliğh, etc. The result of this is that one who is
delirious or in a faint or coma (not considered to be illnesses)
for the duration of Ramadan escapes both the obligation to fast and
the qada'; humanitarian, this rather undermines the orthodox concept
of a fard.

Tūsī\footnote{p.123} also favours the muqīm-saḥīḥ view, although mentioning
the opinion that travelling without good reason before the 23rd. of
Ramadan is not approved. This is evidently similar to the view men-
tioned above under Tabari's first opinion, but the precise signific-
ance of the date is elusive. There may be a connection with Lailat
al-Qadr (alleged to fall on an odd day in the last decade of Ramadan),
the special devotions of which would not be feasible while travelling.

Only Ṭārīkh\footnote{p.185}, who analyses the phrase strictly literally, comes
down in favour of the b. ĀAbbās opinion (though it is attributed by
him to Ālī).

\[wa\ man kāna minkum marīdan aw-Cala safārin fa`iddatun min ayyāmin ukhara\]

The meaning of this phrase has already been discussed at its
first occurrence. However, something more needs to be said concern-
ing its standing. The words are not a mere repetition, nor are they
to be justified by the assuming of the abrogation of the parallel
phrase in v.184, or indeed the whole of that verse. In the previous
instance, they form part of the general ordinances connected with
prescribed fasting, which was said to take place on certain specif-
ied days; here the regulation concerning the sick and the traveller
is re-affirmed, making it definite that the just-instituted Ramadan
is to be considered as a proper prescribed fast. Once the link has
been established, and Ramadan positively identified as the Muhammad-
an specification of ayyām ma`dūdāt, there is no need to repeat the
rest of the preceding verse, and equally there is no reason to con-
sider that the fidya provision is in any way put aside.

In support of this, it may be noted that the phrase is not in
fact repeated literally: the second time it occurs, it is introduced
by a wa rather than a fa, and this in itself implies a different re-
lation. Muhammad is simply confirming the continuing validity of the
marād-musāfīr regulation, etc., and its applicability to Ramadān,
and is not having to introduce it as a fresh subject as in Q2/184.

There seems little doubt that this phrase is not to be taken
as offering an option. The Muslim commentators, however, approaching
this verse with a knowledge of the figh discussions on fasting for
the traveller, on which many widely differing views are held, are
unable to assess the verse neutrally, and so fail to reach agreement.

Tabarī is the only mufassir to give us detailed comment at this
point. The others dealt with this phrase at its first occurrence,
which is hardly consistent with their general belief in its abrog-
ation. Tabarī outlines three standard views, bringing ḥadīths to
support each of them.

Some say that it is obligatory that one travelling should break
his fast, and indeed that any fasting the traveller may perform on
his journey is unvalid, and must be made up for later by another
fast. This is a strictly literal interpretation, but taken this far
it makes a nonsense of the humanitarian considerations which probably
lie partly at the root of the special provision for the sick and
the traveller. The imminent yusr-ṣur clause is said to support
this interpretation, and this can hardly be denied, at least in res-
pect of its first part.

Others also use the yusr-ṣur clause to support their opinion,

1 See above on this. 2 pp. 149ff.
3 With the exception of Baghwānī, p. 71.
saying that it means one should take the easiest course: these are
the people who consider that it is easier for some to fast than to
break, and indeed view the present provision as being entirely opt-
nional. This view is reflected in the 'in shi'ta fa-ṣum wa in shi'ta
fa-air' hadiths.¹

The third group, of a more ascetic tendency, claim that this
clause is but a rukha, to be taken advantage of only in case of
need, and that in fact fasting is preferable; this is certainly not
implicit in the Quranic text².

Only the first of those opinions can be said to agree more or
less with what the Quran actually says, but the fact that, along
with the other two opinions, this view is well-founded in standard
hadith suggests that its origin was in the schools, and that its
ostensible agreement with the Quran was to a certain extent fortu-
itous. That none of these views was derived from any primitive
Quran-based narrative tafsīr is demonstrated by the virtually com-
plete absence of any discussion of the sick³. This may be partly
due to an implied assumption that what applies to the traveller
applies equally to the sick, but the two cases are not entirely com-
parable, and the fact remains that in the Quran, it is the sick per-
son who is mentioned first.

¹ See below, p. 238.

² As has been argued above, fasting cannot be preferable in this
instance because no choice is offered. This is distinct from the
apparent message of Q2/184, an tasūmū khairun lakum, on which also
see below.

³ In Tabari's discussion, pp.149ff., the position of the sick is
an entirely subsidiary matter.
All the tafsīrs say that this phrase refers in the first instance to the preceding clause concerning the sick and the traveller, on the grounds that the latter is a rukhsha, and in agreement with the yusr-ṣur sentiment. This broad fact can scarcely be gainsaid. The one question that arises is that of why this phrase appears here and not in v.184. The answer to this is apparently that Ramadān is longer than the prescribed fasts that Muhammad’s followers were used to, and the bonus of the sick/traveller clause is rementioned partly to facilitate the acceptance of the burden of Ramadān. This seems to be borne out by the following words ‘lit-ṣubnē al-ciddata’, which see.

It has already been suggested that Muhammad was not innovating when he introduced the sick/traveller regulation, and for this reason, the yusr-ṣur clause is not to be taken as evidence of specific takhlīf. The novelty is in the applying of the sick/traveller provision to Ramadān. The idea of takhlīf might find support in the supposition that the ṣur referred to some previous, more rigorous, state of affairs; however, an examination of other Quranic instances of this two-part expression suggests that the ṣur part of the clause is simply an idiomatic complement to the yusr part, and that it does not refer to anything concrete.

As already indicated, the tafsīrs experience little difficulty with these words. Besides the predictable specific equations (yusr=fitr fi-l-safar, ṣur=gawm), some commentaries also take it as a

---

1 E.g. Tab.p.156, Zam.p.256. 2 This is not contradictory to what was said earlier about a month’s fast not necessarily being novel. 3 See e.g. Suras 92,94. 4 It should perhaps be seen in the wider contexts of the other takhlīfs proposed in Sura 2. 5 E.g. Tab.p.156.
dictum applicable to religion in general. The later works in addition to this involve themselves in the theological implications, such as the meaning here of irāda. Farrā' and Tabarī do not give equal emphasis to the sick and the traveller in their discussions of this phrase, a tendency that was remarked on above.

wa litukmilū al-ciddatā

Broadly speaking, the meaning of this phrase is clear - 'complete the number (of days to be fasted)' - but its relation to the preceding or subsequent words is capable of several interpretations; it is evident from the extensive comments of the Muslims that they too were exercised by it.

Farrā' of Kūfa regards the lām as a lām kay, governed by a subsequent suppressed verb, which he supports by not very convincing 'parallels' from the Quran, the meaning being expressed in full by a form of words on the lines of 'wa.litukmilū al-ciddatā allatī amartukum bihā'. He is forced to this interpretation, which is possible only if one accepts the likelihood of a suppressed verb, by the consideration that the presence of the waw blocks the possibility of the lām kay's being governed by a preceding clause (viz. fa'iddatun min ayyāmin ukhara, rather than yurīdullāhu bikum). This last is reasonable in itself, but the whole rests on the questionable assumption that the lām is a lām kay.

Tabarī too records the Kūfan view, and favours it because there is no lām comparable to that of litukmilū preceding the ātāf. He also noted the other view, that of the Da'rans, who consider the lām to be a lām an, i.e. that the li is governed by yurīd. The

1 Rāzī, p.187, Abū Hayyān, p.42. 2 Rāzī, p.187

3 It has been shown above that other 'instances' of words requiring to be understood are not in fact convincing.
construction has several Quranic parallels, which in this case appear quite genuine. The one verb governing the two constructions is somewhat awkward, especially in view of the intervening clause. However, this last, as has been suggested above, may not be of much concrete meaning anyway, and therefore likely to be passed over. The advantage of the Basran view is that the passage in question gains in meaning, since it now follows on the sentiment of the previous clause. Muhammad thus appears to be emphasizing here that the fast is relatively easy - all that is required is that the full number of days be fasted, whereupon the hardship is finished, even if, as in the case of the sick and the traveller, some of the days have to be done after Ramadān. That the phrase is thus addressed to the community at large is perhaps corroborated by the person of the verb. This in turn would suggest that the yusr-ṣusr clause is also generally addressed, and serves as an introduction to litukmilū rather than as a support for the marīd-safar clause.

As an alternative to relating the phrase to its surroundings grammatically, it is possible to make it stand by itself, by taking the wa as other than an ʿatf, i.e. that wa litukmilū is an imperative. However, the retention of the vowel of the li, while admissible, is not common, and is in contrast to the imperatives of the next verse. Blachère has been the only translator to adopt this rendering, which, it should additionally be noted, sever any close connection with what precedes the phrase.

wa litukabbirū allāha ṣalā ḍalā ḍa hadākum wa la lālakum tashkurūnā

This phrase presents few difficulties, standing in the same relation to yurīḍ as the previous one. There seems no doubt that

1 Though conceivably it serves both these purposes.

2 Wright I, para. 366, ren.: 'the kecr is usually dropped'.
kabbara is a technical term. However, the usual Muslim inference, that the present use refers particularly to the takbīrīs of the fitr or ihlāl of Shāwāl is not well-grounded. Zamakhsharī and Abū ʿIayyān use 'qīl' of this suggestion, which may indicate that they too did not find it convincing. If there is any connection between this practice and the Quran, the probability is that the custom is derived from the verse, rather than vice versa. The unlikelihood of Muḥammad bothering to mention such a small part of the ritual is strengthened by the fact that the phrase 'litukabbirū...hadākum' also occurs at Q22/27, where no reference to the fast is possible. In view of the cliche-like nature of the phrase, it is scarcely worth-while suggesting a particular reference for mā hadākum, though the echoing of hudan and al-hudā is no doubt not entirely coincidental.

Since kabbara is used technically elsewhere, there is little justification for Vagendonk's claim that here it means simply 'magnify', and thus constitutes a reason for fasting.

As for the final words, it seems clear that the Ramadān fast as instituted by Muḥammad (or at least Muḥammad's rationale for it) contains an element of thanks-giving, for his having been granted the Quran and (? )victory. Although the words are obviously little more than a rhyme, their aptness is probably intentional. Their occurrence at the end of another verse mentioning fasting, Q5/89, may be no more than coincidental, as there the immediately preceding words are not related to fasting. The wa may to some extent parallel those preceding litukmilū and litukabbirū.

---

1 Cf. the other Quranic usages: 17/11, 22/37, 74/3.
2 p.256, p.45 respectively.
3 Probably in effect 'Īslām' is indicated here.
4 p.60.
And when my creatures ask concerning me then I am near, I answer
the call of the caller when he calls me, so let them respond to me
and believe in me. Perhaps they will be guided.

This verse will be discussed as a complete unit, since its
interest as regards fasting lies not so much in the meaning of its
parts as in the role of the verse as a whole. There will therefore
be no detailed examination of the vocabulary and sentiments of the
verse.

At first sight, the verse appears to have little to do with
fasting; thus Bell was able to dismiss it as 'unconnected', a
chance interpolation resulting from primitive methods of editing.
However, it has been held that the Quran is on the whole a coherent
document, and it may further be shown that the section on fasting
is no exception to this.

There is clearly not a great deal in common between this verse
and the preceding, beyond a certain similarity in the general tone
of exhortation of the present verse, and the closing words of v.185.
A link has therefore to be sought with the following verse.

It is evident from an examination of v.187 that Muhammad is
dealing with potentially controversial regulations, which have the
intention of altering the prevailing state of affairs: principally
the verse is concerned with a takhřīf (cf. the year of v.135) of
the current customs surrounding the muftirāt. V.186 can thus be seen
as an advance defensive introduction to the novel elements, although
in fact what is being defended is Muhammad's authority to make the change, and his action in doing so. As is usual, Muhammad's self-defence takes the form of refuge behind God, the inspirer of all his revelation, as he would have it appear. In the final phrase of the present verse comes the injunction to believe and be guided, the order to accept the regulations following. However, this order is reinforced by making it into a sort of bargain - God is always at hand to answer the needs of His creatures; in return, God expects His creatures to respond to Him. This accounts for the otherwise apparently indirect form of the first half of the verse. The words 'sa'alaka canni' are not to be taken as referring to anything definite, such as for example any of the regulations in the following verse: canni can refer only to God, and not to His hukm, or any other object, such as al-sawm.

This is the only way the verse can be shown to relate acceptably to its surroundings: by 'acceptably' is meant taking into account the circumstances of Muhammad's position as we may derive them from the Quran¹. As the purpose of the verse is merely to re-affirm the divine authority behind the Quran's regulations, and that consequently they are to be obeyed without cavilling, the notion of a bargain, suggested above, should not be seen as the primary feature of this verse: it is merely the form which the necessary (for Muhammad) assertion of his divine backing assumes².

¹ See introduction to this chapter. ² If as seems possible (see below) the whole verse is a more or less faithful quotation from a Jewish source, this would account for the awkwardness of some of its parts: this awkwardness would for Muhammad be outweighed by the relevance of the other parts, not to mention the additional effects of divine sanction provided by a phrase recognisably from the previous book, and therefore confirming the content of Muhammad's book.
Thus it is clear that the verse refers to nothing concrete; even in context, it is little more than a pious generality, of which the purpose here is to draw attention to the divine presence behind the following proclamations. It is therefore unjustified to read much into it, and this is where other explanations have gone too far.

Wagtendonk¹, seeing in tīkāf a primitive pre-Islamic practice, of which in his view duʿāʾ must have been a part, would make an indirect link between the daʿwa of this verse and the ĥukūf of the next. This he ties in with the alleged partially pagan fast of 'ay-yām maʿdūdāt', and suggests that v. 186 originally came after the words a.m. in v.184. This is justified by positing a subsequent editing after the manner suggested by Bell. Besides this major assumption, he also assumes the operation of abrogation, and the considerable influence on the Islamic fast of a rather vaguely defined 'pagan' fast. None of these assumptions, it is maintained, is upheld by a careful and disinterested appraisal of the Quran. The connection between the general mention of prayer (if that is what daʿwa means here) and the presumably somewhat different duʿāʾ of the ĥukūf, is tenuous, and would hardly account for the inclusion of a whole verse not even close to the words it is allegedly associated with.

Goitcin, observing a parallel usage of the images of calling and nearness in Judaism, then proceeded to make ill-founded claims concerning the motivation of the fast of Ramadān². His parallel, Isaiah 58/6 - 'Inquire of the Lord while He is present, call upon Him when He is close at hand' - opens, so he claims, a section on fasting; in fact, the nearest reference to fasting is at 58/3, where the frame of mind befitting a faster is discussed, and so the pre-

¹ pp.69ff.
² Studies, p.99.
This parallel is hardly valid. In any case, this is a general passage not concerned with the motives of any particular fast. None of the other instances of the use of similar words noted by others have any link with fasting. This is not to deny that prayer and fasting are ever linked: as paired religious activities, they are often in hadith the hallmark of the pious. However, in revelation, and specifically in the Quran, they have different origins and motives. In the Quran, we are not dealing with habitual fasting as a religious exercise, but with a single fast instituted for a special purpose.

Having made his 'parallel', Goitein then makes the considerable jump from qarib/dawata/ujib to the Jewish Shema'nu prayer, used, among other things, in the litanies of the Day of Atonement and other fasts. He seems to ignore the fact that the one is the pronouncement of a (here) fairly beneficent God, while the other is the beseeching of a repentant community. Having made this connection, he apparently intends to show that the idea of self-castigation (innah nefesh) is behind the Muhammadan fast as it is behind the Day of Atonement.

Even given that Goitein considers the Day of Atonement to have been Muhammad's first model in instituting a Muslim fast, this reasoning is just not acceptable. It is true that self-abasement is probably an original motive of fasting in all communities, but Muhammad's motive in instituting Ramadan was somewhat removed from this primitive stage; as pointed out earlier, his fast was intended largely

---

1 But if we do not attempt to link the Biblical verse and v.186 via fasting, we are nevertheless left with a remarkable parallel in sentiment, and as argued above, it is the sentiment of this verse, the confirmation of divine support and the need for obedience, which is its major element. There is no particular reference to fasting, and it is entirely conceivable that in v.186 Muhammad is quoting, though not necessarily from a written text.
to conform with the fast of 'previous people', and not developed instantaneously. Furthermore, the immediate motive for its being set up when it was, was because (Muhammad claims) he wished to commemorate events attached to Ramadān, events that have no hint of self-abasement about them.

Neither Wagtendonk nor Goitein make any positive attempt to relate the verse to its context: the former sidestepped the issue by adopting Bell's method, while the latter progressed from one loosely connected point to another, leaving the text far behind his theories.

The Muslim tafsīrs offer little assistance to an understanding of the verse, as they almost all consider it in isolation, either relating in 'explanation' of it various hadīths which are patently derived from the text itself, or enlarging on the theological implications of this verse in the matter of prayer.

Naidūrī is apparently the first to propose a connection with the other verse, seeing it as an encouragement and confirmation of the previous words on takbīr and shukr. Beyond the partial similarity of tone in the two passages (see above), it is hard to see any definite grounds for such a view, unless takbīr is taken to be echoed in daʿwāt al-daʿāʾi.

Abū Ḥayyān mentions various times considered propitious for prayer, some of which are connected with the fast - the fitr and suhūr prayers. Muhammad ʿAlī makes an abstract connection, certainly not implicit in the text, namely that prayer and fasting are commonly linked (in other religions, hadīth), which while true is not sufficient to explain this verse in its context.

1 p.39  2 pp.45ff.  3 See below, p.253.  4 cf. his pp.77-8
Q2/187

When you fast, keep your deeds secret and not for show; so that God may have mercy on you. Fast from the dawn till the white thread of the dawn becomes distinct from the black. Have no contact with them while you are at your devotions in the mosques. Those are God's bounds. So do not come near them. Thus God explains His signs to the people, so that they may keep on the right side.

Intercourse with your wives is permitted you in the night of the fast. They are as a garment for you, and you for them. God knows you have been deceiving yourselves, so He has had mercy on you and relieved you, so now cleave to them, and follow God's command. Eat and drink until the white thread of the dawn becomes distinct from the black. Have no contact with them while you are at your devotions in the mosques. Those are God's bounds, so do not come near them. Thus God explains His signs to the people, so that they may keep on the right side.

This verse deals with some of the practical details of the fast. These differ from the regulations concerning the sick and the traveller in that Muhammad is here plainly dealing with pronouncements that diverge considerably from what many have hitherto accepted to be the norm. Such innovations require careful and precise enunciation because they concern matters close to the heart of the average believer, namely the mode of the fast. It is a commonplace that in a way the mode of observance of a religious duty, in this case the fast, is more important in the mind of the lay performer than the duty itself. Thus precise details become necessary here, whereas none have been mentioned hitherto.
Given that rafath is indeed a kunya of jimā<sup>c</sup>, as the commentators have it, there is little difficulty in determining the meaning of this phrase. Lailat al-ṣiyām is almost without doubt generic; one can only guess at the origin of the hadīth (fullest version in Tūsī<sup>2</sup>) that suggests that this only refers to the first night of Ramadān, with the additional information that jimā<sup>c</sup> was (ḥad been) mākruh on the first night of all other months. Unless it can be shown that there was indeed such an interdiction<sup>3</sup>, it would seem more likely that this latter part of the hadīth was but a rationalisation of the first part, which possibly owed its real origin to a reluctance (as noted in the case of the sick/traveller 'rūkhsa') to accept the easier conditions laid down in the Quran. It may indeed represent a continuation of the difference of opinion to be discussed later under 'takhtānūna ansūsā'um'.

As for the implications of the verse, it is clear that by its having to be mentioned and argued in this way, the question of sexual relations during the fast was not settled. The usual inference of the commentaries, that because it is here declared halāl, then

<sup>1</sup> In this context it can mean little else: Tabarī lists along with jimā<sup>c</sup> the alternative interpretations nikāh and ghichyān al-nisā'. See ahead for a qualification of the jimā<sup>c</sup> definition.

<sup>2</sup> p. 132. Linguistically, lailat could well indicate the eve of the month of Ramadān, but the implication, that Muḥammad is permitting intercourse at that time alone, is hardly acceptable either with his well-known practicality or with Muslim practice.

<sup>3</sup> Which might be bound up with some form of reverence for the new moon; cf. the Jewish Kiddush ha-Nōdesh ceremonies, and some sabbath-like observation of the day of the new moon, not to mention the more irregular welcoming of the new moon by some bedu: cf. Jastrow, p. 214.
formerly it must have been harām (when it formed part of the abrog-
ated sawm al-awwal), simplifies the issue too much.

Muhammad was operating in a world of Jewish precedents: there
would therefore have been, from an orthodox point of view at least,
two modes of fasting, one more severe than the other. The severe
24-hour total abstinence was generally reserved for the solemn Day
of Atonement, and sometimes also the 9th Ab¹, while in other Talm-
udically regulated fasts, abstinence was limited to the day-time.

Normally then according to the official line, there would be no
doubt about sexual relations: they would be forbidden when the other
muftirāt were forbidden. However, the Talmud is no exception to other
codes of law, in that it does not to any great extent record uni-
versal practice, but rather the ideal. It is therefore probable that
in Muhammad’s Medina there existed more than two clearcut modes of
fasting, and that some unofficial practice would tend towards the
ascetic, i.e. an extension of that period of a fast-day actually
spent in abstention, or the continued abstention from one or other
of the muftirāt beyond the minimum period. Such a state of affairs
would constitute a fore-runner to the evidence of the hadīth, which
deals with fasting at much greater length than does the Talmud, and
in which we encounter many instances of the advocacy of protracted
fasting, and, sometimes combined with this, sexual abstinence².

Though admittedly scarcely more than surmise, it might also be sug-
gested that Muhammad’s followers, in their casting off of the author-
ity of the orthodox leaders, could be seen as anti-establishment
in outlook, and more likely on that account to include some persons
of an ascetic turn of mind. Confronted with the novelty of a one-
month prescribed fast, the early Muslims would thus have experienced
some confusion had not Muhammad settled the modality of Ramādān.

¹ See Katsh, p.132. ² See below, and Goldziher, Ascetisme.
If one accepts that the confusion was the result of existing diversity of practice, in all likelihood Jewish, then there is no need to posit a gap in revelation, something which the orthodox commentaries are forced to do, as a result of their conviction that the change in revelation detailed by this verse must be viewed as an internal Islamic affair, i.e. that there had been previously in Islam a fast where the provisions outlined in v.187 did not operate. That this action of theirs shows either God or Muhammad to have been rather lacking in foresight is not considered. The 'Jewish' explanation makes for a simpler and more cohesive interpretation of the text, and would be preferable on those grounds alone.

It is notable that in settling the question of sexual relations during Ramadān, Muhammad took the lenient view. Since Ramadān is a fast of a type not dealt with in the Talmud, we cannot say that this represents a deliberate Khilāf of Jewish practice, such as may be seen elsewhere in the Quran, but there is certainly no objection to considering Muhammad's choice here as part of his policy of takhfīf which is several times in evidence in this sura, being initially adumbrated in §2/106. It appears however that this instance of takhfīf is slightly different from the rest, for instead of directly altering the ordinance obtaining hitherto, Muhammad here achieves his aim by settling a pre-existing dispute in a manner favourable to his general plan.

As already mentioned, the Muslims observe the implications of this verse, but view it entirely within the Islamic framework. The presumed interdiction of sexual relations is thus incorporated into the hypothesis-cum-'fact' of the sawm al-awwal. During this first fast, it is said, one could not eat or have sexual relations during...

1 And probably of some long standing - cf. the discussion of takhtišūna, below. 2 E.g. Tabari, p.164-5
the hours of fitr if one had during that period either slept, or prayed the 'ishā' / 'atāma prayer. This regime is said to be also that of the Christians. Various people found themselves unable to hold out against temptation for such a period, and made appeal to the Prophet. Following this come the words which are the hallmark of the asbāb al-nuzūl hadith: 'fa nazalat tilka al-āya', and, with the utterance of v. 187, the situation becomes resolved, at least in the traditional accounts. The man who ate after having slept was Sirma b. Anas, and the man who could not refrain from his wife after the 'ishā' prayer was ʿUmar b. al-Khattāb. The two cases tend to become conflated in the later tafsīrs.

The only recorded exception to this interpretation is that of Abū Muslim, who refused to accept abrogation in this instance (and in the Quran in general). He held that this dispensation indicates not that the Muslims ever had another obligatory system besides their present one, but that this, the Muslim fast, abrogates that of the Christians. This is not to say that the Muslims or Muhammad ever copied this alleged Christian pattern even inadvertently: Abū Muslim is simply arguing his anti-nasikh case using the materials to hand, which are those of the orthodox Muslims. The assertion of

1. This appears to have been a somewhat careless attempt to provide a rationale for the regime of the sawm al-awwal, indicating further that this latter had no basis in fact: no mention of such a practice amongst the Christians has been found outside the Quran sources. It may be in some way connected with the earlier Christian Ramadān idea.

2. Thus in Muqātil. Later versions have several variations on this. Perhaps noteworthy is that the central figure in a number of hadiths concerning the fasting of the old is Anas (b. Mālik).

3. Rāṣī, p. 197.
Christian origins for the fast, or parts of it, is just one of these.

**hunna libasun lakum wa antua libasun lahunna**

This metaphor is not easily rendered in English. The tafsīrs generally accept that it is not literal, but explain it rather heavy-handedly. In the Quran, libās is used metaphorically as often as literally. In 27/26 it is applied to piety, in 16/12 to hunger, and in 25/47 and 78/10 to the night.

The usual explanations given are that this refers to mutual intimacy being similar to that of the clothes and the body, or, rather unlikely, that the two persons involved in intimacy sleep in one garment. Apparently an older explanation, however, and in turn not literal, is that the two partners find rest or comfort (sakan) in each other. One can see that this would not satisfy the more precise minds of later scholars, but it seems that the suggestion 'sakan' was made by one familiar with e.g. Q10/66, 'ja'ala lakum al-lail litaskūnū fīhi' (cf. also Q28/73, 50/61), and is thus an equally justifiable interpretation, within the terms of tafsīr.

Zamakhsharī asserts that this phrase constitutes the reason for the tahlīl of sexual relations, i.e. that man is incorrigibly weak-willed. There is no real syntactical justification for this, and moreover it raises the theological problem of God's having made a law which He knew could not be kept, and then repealing it.

The phrase should not be taken in isolation; it represents an encouragement to the acceptance of the previous words, and/or possibly an introduction to the following.

---

1 Quoted by Tabarī from Suddī and others, p. 163.

2 p. 297.
The intention of the first part of this phrase is clear enough, but the precise meaning is elusive. The reference can only be, in view of the context, to the doubt (or possibly error) prevailing concerning the mode of the fast, as mentioned earlier. It seems here that excessive caution or zeal is here the subject of a mild reproof.

Although the words ṭaba and cafā ancockum might appear to presuppose some kind of transgression, it is more likely that their sense here is rather that of alleviation. This would thus form an explicit confirmation of Muhammad's imposing the easier regime on his own community, an instance of takhīf comparable to that in the verse on qīṭāl, Q2/173.

As for the translation of takhtānūna anfusakum, that of 'uhamad Ali, 'you acted unjustly to yourselves', or the more general 'betrayed yourselves', is not very satisfactory, since there is little indication of what this refers to. It is possible to see this ikhtiyāna as not an individual activity but mutual: if some form of mutual attack or recrimination is posited, this might fit in with the unsureness concerning the varying modes of fasting. Certainly if some considered that only a fast of extreme length or conditions was valid, and others were content merely to abstain during the day, then acrimonious differences might well be expected. An answer to the question of how long these differences had been going on might be supplied by the tense of takhtānūna, which could suggest that the dispute was of fairly long standing, pre-dating the fast of Ramadān. It is conceivable that there was a gap between the prescription of Ramadān and the revelation of this verse: however, it is unlikely, as Muhammad would surely have realised that there would be difficulties or uncertainties in applying the customs associated with
previous fasts to this new Ramadān fast.

An alternative, more specific translation of the words, namely 'cheated yourselves of a right', is perhaps more in tune with Muhammad's general message in this section. This maintains the idea of an element of confusion concerning the question of sexual relations, but implies that the conviction that rafath was not permitted during the night hours of the fast was general, and further was ill-founded.

Muhammad, possibly aware that the taboo was traditional rather than prescribed, is thus able to appear as the enlightener, removing the self-imposed shackles typical of the old way of life, when he introduces this announcement. Although he is making life easier for his followers, technically this is no takhfīf, for he is simply making clear a rule that most had been unaware of.

The confusion or self-deception may thus be considered to be inherited from the Jews, or to be virtually Jewish, inasmuch as Muhammad's followers where they had no ruling from him would probably follow precedent. Muhammad's point here is that this precedent had no authoritative foundation, and could therefore usefully be abandoned. While not breaking any precepts, for practical purposes he certainly seems to have been innovating.

It is unreasonable to relate this phrase to abstinence during other than a fast period, namely a kind of iḥrām, as Vagendonk does (pp. 78ff.). Firstly one should have sound justifications before seeing exotic references in a set of verses that has up to now been dealing exclusively with fasting; secondly, alleged ancient Arabian practice cannot be adduced as a precedent unless there is reliable independent information concerning it: poetry and historiography produced by the Muslims cannot be considered to be suitable sources for this.

The Muslim tafsīrs are not very helpful on this phrase. They generally relate it to the previously mentioned stories of ʿUmar
and Sirma. One explanation, perhaps designed to lessen this blot on
the record of 'Umar's self-control, should be noted. Although no
doubt the figure of 'Umar was originally employed in order to indi-
cate that even the future caliph could not stand the strain, so
great was it. According to the new explanation, the kuntum clause
is conditional, i.e. you would have done yourselves an injustice
had the previous tahrim continued. It may be observed that Muham-
mad's settling this question on the easier side is in line with
his generally less restrictive attitude to sexual activity. Polit-
ically his virtual takhfif represented the best choice too, since
by making things no more difficult than necessary (cf. the yusr-
'usur clause) he could better ensure solidarity in the period of
united religious demonstration which he saw as part of the purpose
of Ramadān.

fal'ān bāshirūhunna wa-btaghū nā kataba allāhu lakum

The muḥاشīrs are almost unanimous in equating nūbāshara with
jimā. However, as pointed out elsewhere, in fiqh and hadīth nūb-
āshara refers to bodily contact with no automatic implication of
intercourse. Some tabāris seem to hint at this when they say that
nūbāshara equals jimā in the Quran, as if implying that the
equation was not otherwise quite normal. Al-Asāmī, the sole exception
to the general opinion, says it means jimā and what is less than
jimā, which is perhaps as accurate as we may get; Muhammad could
scarcely have encouraged sub-coital relations, to the exclusion of
coitus itself, during the night hours of the fast. Such a situation

1 See below, p. 268.
2 Tabari, p. 169. See also Tabari, p. 180, top.
3 Which is as good as saying 'in the present verse': there are no
other instances of b-sh-r form III in the Quran. 4 Ṣāliḥ, p. 201.
would have been patently impractical; although mubāshara does not apparently in itself designate intercourse, we may safely assume that Muhammad intended by this pronouncement to sanction the whole range of sexual relations. The night thus forms a complete contract with the day, when the actual fact takes place. At this time, intercourse is definitely prohibited, and other sexual occurrences also endanger the fact to a greater or lesser degree. This at least is Muhammad's view as expressed in the Quran here. The Quran says that contact between persons of different sex is, contrary to popular conviction, permitted during the night of the fact. It is on this point that Muhammad differs from a section of current opinion. There can be little doubt, however, that even for Muhammad the day-time ban remains absolute.

We must therefore suppose that the confusion previously alluded to, which gave rise to the takhtānūna phrase and indeed the beginning of the verse as well, must have concerned sexual relations in the broadest sense. This indicates that the equation of rafath with jinā, accepted for the time being above, is, as in the case of mubāshara, not entirely accurate; lesser activities must be included too. This is in fact more in line with the general extra-Quranic usage of the word rafath, which is held by the dictionaries at least to have a broader meaning not specifically connected with coitus.

As for the form of fā'īn bāshirūhunna, it is generally and reasonably held that this imperative is not an absolute command. It is more than likely that those who claim the opposite are those who make of this phrase a prohibition of āzāl, coitus interruptus.

The second half of this phrase can be seen as an indication:

1 See the hadīth discussions on qubla, jināba.
2 Š.Š. Ṣādī, p.201.
3 E.Š. Zamakhsharī, p.257.
of the strength of the opinion that sexual relations were at no
time compatible with a fast extending over a number of days, since
it is a virtual repetition of the message of the uhilla clause, this
time confirming that the dispensation is of divine origin - Muhammad
has to make clear that it is not he who is tampering with these
traditional attitudes, but rather that it is God who is having mercy
on His mistaken subjects, benignly removing their misconceptions.
The favourable nature of the utterance is indicated by the li of
kataba li. This forms a distinct contrast with the impositional
flavour of kataba _calū_, in e.g. Q2/183, and emphasises the idea of
takhfīf behind this regulation. Some Muslim commentators too consider
the object of the katb to be this rukhsa, which of course for them
is an alleviation of a previous Muhammadan regime, rather than of
a Jewish one.

The tafsīrs give a number of other explanations, all illustrative
of their familiar tendency to give concrete form wherever possible.
The most frequent definitions are: children; normal sexual relations;
Lailat al-Qadr⁴. Tabari² favours the first, since the begetting of
sons is more worthy than the mere quenching of desire. Zamakhsharī
thinks that the Lailat al-Qadr suggestion verges on bid'a³: Others⁴
deduce from the k-t-b of kataba that only intercourse with one's
wife or mamlūka is meant. While the first suggestion, children, is
quite straightforward, both it and the second proposal support the
anti-ṣazl body, or are susceptible of other interested interpret-
ations, and are suspect on that account.

¹ This has to be 'sought' since its precise date was never agreed
upon.
² p.169.
³ p.257. Possibly because he thinks it is too far-fetched.
⁴ See e.g. Rāzī p.202.
wa kūlū wa-shrābī hattā yatabayyana lakun al-khaitū al-‘abyādū min al-khaitū al-‘awādī min al-fājīr

It is not clear whether or not this phrase is to be taken in close conjunction with the previous ones concerning sexual relations. If it is, there must be posited a parallel difference of opinions (which in the tafsīrs give rise to the Sīrma hadīth, based on an alleged previous state of Islamic revelation); if it is not, then one can simply take it that having dealt with one of the principal muftirūt, Muhammad goes on to affirm his position regarding the other two, with no change implied. The lack of background information on this aspect of the fast renders this question incapable of conclusive settlement.

As for the meaning of the latter half of the phrase, it may either be taken as literal, in which case it is easily translated, or as metaphorical, when we are probably, though not definitely, supposed to consider the first appearance of light after the night as a line or thread of white, which, in its appearing, creates the effect of a contrasting line of black along the horizon.

The great difficulty with the literal interpretation is its manifest impracticality, for the discerning eye can distinguish between a black and a white thread throughout most nights (assuming they are cloudless), and not solely at the coming of the dawn. Another difficulty is that were this the correct interpretation, one might have expected khaftun ‘abyadū, etc., instead of the generic.

The second suggestion is scarcely more satisfactory, since it is susceptible of a variety of interpretations. However, it may safely be assumed that the first part of the dawn is meant, i.e. 'first light', rather than the so-called false dawn, which is not a universal or a constant phenomenon.

---

1 Cf. the English expression, 'the streak of dawn'.
The Muslim tafsīrs offer a variety of definitions, ranging in time from the false dawn to the sunrise. The shorter periods may be attributed to literalist interpretation, or pious caution, while in the longer ones may be detected not laxness but the desire to delay the eating of the suhūr, a later practice of polemical origin. Whether all or any of the suggested definitions ever represented widespread practice is debateable: modern custom seems to frown on the taking of food or drink for some time before dawn.

One early opinion, that of Suddī, simply paraphrases by 'hāṭṭā yatabayyana lakum al-nahār min al-lail'. The proposal is reasonable in itself, but the use of khāt to equal day or night seems to stretch the metaphor somewhat. However, it may be a genuine usage. If so, the problem of precise definition still remains. This is left to the lawyers, and probably remains in their hands: as already mentioned, the pious tend to have stopped eating long before any doubt begins to arise.

The tafsīrs mention the literal interpretation only to ridicule it in hadīths. These centre round a beduin who is said to have tied a black and a white qālā to his ankles, in order to be able to judge thereby the advent of day. The Prophet got to hear of this, and there then came down the words 'min al-fajr', previously absent, to show that it was not meant to be taken literally. The frequency with which these hadīths occur might indicate that some party was in fact advocating the literal interpretation, but it is more likely that the reason for its popularity lies in its anecdotal qualities.

As for the parallel between this verse and the Talmudic provision, first noted in modern times by Geiger and regarded as an

---

1 See below, p. 253. 2 See below, p. 257. 3 Tabari, p. 171
4 In Was hat Mohammed aus den Judentum aufgenommen?
undoubted specimen of Jewish influence ever since, some remarks should be made.

While it must be admitted that in the preceding pages the Jewish model has been held up as the greatest single influence in the faith instituted by Muhammad, it is only fair to point out here that the matter of the threads cannot be safely regarded as more than a parallel, and is not at all definitely a borrowing from the Talmud or related literature. This is because there are almost as many differences between the two cases as there are likenesses.

In the Mishna\(^1\) we have: 'From what time may one recite the Shema\(^2\) in the morning? From the time that one can distinguish between blue and white. R. Eleazar says: between blue and green (here the Jerusalem version adds: 'which is more difficult'). And he has time to finish until sunrise'.

Gemara of Babylonian Talmud: 'What is the meaning of "between blue and white"? This also one may distinguish in the night! It means rather, between the blue and the white in it. Others say, between a wolf and a dog, an ass and a wild ass, a friend at four cubits'. (These suggest the Mishnah ordinance was generally considered impractical if taken literally).

Gemara of Jerusalem Talmud: '....between blue and white threads of fringes' (referred to in Numbers 15:39\(^3\): no doubt not the original intention of the Mishnaic words). It carries on to list other distinguishing devices as in the Babylonian version.

The following differences between the Quran and the Mishna are revealed:

Blue for black (and in one version also green for white).
Order reversed in the Quran (more suited to parallel of day following night?).

Mishna concerns prayer, not fast.

---

1 Tractate Berakoth. 2 Jewish Enc. has 'purple and white'. 3 Where the New English O.T. has 'violet' for R.V. 'blue'.

Mishna concerns a terminus a quo, not a terminus ad quem. Quran apparently metaphorical (min al-fajr), Mishna generally taken literally in first instance. Threads mentioned in only one version of the explanation, and this apparently from a desire to refer it to a Biblical text.

While it may be that the Mishnaic words are a metaphor, it is striking that none of the commentators take it this way (possibly because the word translated by 'blue' in fact refers to a colour not associable with the night), preferring, it seems, tacitly to abandon the text in favour of more practical devices (and this two or three centuries before Muhammad). It may be noted that the Muslims would be less able to act in this way, since the text they are dealing with is scripture.

Because of the discrepancies, the parallel seems on balance to be a chance one, although it is realized that Muhammad's information on both Judaism and Christianity was not always of a canonical form; this could conceivably account for the deviations. The probability of anti-Jewish khilāf here seems slight, though it is possible that Muhammad, familiar with the device of the opposed colours used perhaps in a prayer ritual, chose to adopt it and deliberately change its meaning and application.

One other parallel worthy of note is the regulation concerning the evening shema, which is technically performable until the coming up of dawn, as is also the eating of offerings.

---

1 It is not known which if either version of the Talmud circulated most widely in the Hijāz.
2 Tractate Berakoth.
thumma atimmū al-qiyāna ilā al-lailī

The meaning of this phrase is clear enough, but, as the number of hadiths concerning it indicates, it is not very precise.

The question of when night falls is variously defined in the commentaries, but it must remain ultimately a matter of opinion, for the Quran gives no clear hint. It may be observed that ilā is used here rather than the hattā of the previous phrase, because although a particular point in time is meant here, lail is a period rather than a point.

The exact meaning of atimmū requires some attention. The assertion of ‘Abū Ḥayyān, that it implies a previous fast (on that day) is doubtful, and moreover suspect since it is used to back the questionable claim that the niya for the fast, and the post-jināba ghuls, may be performed in day-time. The usual translation, 'complete the fast', is inadequate, since the same implication arises, unless one considers the real meaning of the phrase to be 'complete the fasting day, which began the previous day at fiṭr-time, by now doing the actual fast'. A less cumbersome, and preferable, translation would be 'spend the entire rest of the day (24 hours) in fasting': this is influenced by the occurrence in the hadith, which may or may not echo the Quranic meaning, of such phrases as 'amarahu an yutimm yamāhū, an yutimm baqiyat yawmihi'.

The other Quranic usages do not give a firm guide; it does however seem that sometimes the sense of 'completion' is secondary, and that the word means little more than 'do', 'bring about', 'perform'. This last suggestion is apt for Q2/196 at least, which is the closest parallel to the fasting verse, and so it may be that 'atimmū

---

1 See e.g. Tābarī, p.177, Tūsī, p.135. 2 p.52.
3 Although this is the general meaning of atimmū, and its literal one too. 4 E.g. hadiths on ʿAshūrā, see below, p.180f.
al-siyām' is in fact no stronger than mere 'ṣūmū'. In this respect it is interesting to note that there is attributed to b. Hašūd 1 a variant 'aqīnū' for atimmū at Q2/196, which in the standard text reads 'wa atimmū al-hajj wa-l-cumra lillāhi'. It is possible that the completion aspect of atamma is to be stressed in another way, namely that we are to understand here something on the lines of 'make the fast total'; this however involves the implication either that the night period contains some element of fasting, or that there is novelty in the idea of total abstention during the day, and there is little in the Quranic text to give firm support for such contentions.

Apart from the ambiguity of lail, mentioned above, this phrase interests the commentators in that it can be made to justify several points disputed in the hadith. By considering the order to fast during the day as implying a complementary prohibition (nahy tahrīm rather than nahy tanzīh) on fasting at night, wisāl 2 is proved anti-Quranic and therefore reproachable. It need hardly be said that the inference of such a prohibition is not justified by the text, as neither is the assertion that wisāl īlā permitted because īlā implies up to and including the night 3. Others take siyām here to be general, and not restricted to Ramadān or even Quranic fasts as a whole, and thus hope to gain grounds for their claim that no voluntary fast should be abandoned before completion 4. These are all good examples of the way in which the Quran is called upon to support views on subjects properly (and originally) belonging to the realm of the hadith. Also interesting is the fact that the Quran does not constitute the last word: in the question of wisāl, both sides having made appeal to the Quran, Tabari finally decides against the practice on the grounds of the 'proofs' furnished by the hadith 5. The

---

1 Jeffery, Materials, p. 29. 2 E. G. Abū Hayyān, p. 52. 3 Rāzī, p. 205
4 Rāzī, p. 206 5 p. 179
fuqahā' are hard put to extract from the one useful verse enough
fiqh to cope with the whole subject of fasting.

Abū Hayyān (p.52) mentions the curious claim, attributed to
b. Abbās, that in instituting a day-time fast, God intended the
Khilāf of Ahl al-Kitāb.

It need hardly be added that, having dealt with the muftirāt
and the night in his own way, Muhammad does not deviate at all from
previous practice in his injunction to spend the day-light hours in
fasting, and he feels no need to justify this phrase.

wa lā tubāshiruhunna wa antum ḍākirūna fi-l-masājidī

While Wagentendorff's claim that the second half of this phrase
is the 'crux of the verse' (p.72) is somewhat extreme, it must be
admitted that it is indeed interesting. Here we have the only re-
ference in the Quran to the activity of ḍītikāf as forming part of
Muhammad's religion, and yet in classical Islām, it is a whole
institution. It has been maintained that hadīth and tafsīr are not
reliable direct sources of facts concerning the time of the Quran;
we are therefore entirely dependent for any reconstruction work on
the nature of ḍītikāf upon the Quran itself. All that can be said
with certainty from an examination of this phrase is that mubashara
is forbidden to those practising this form of devotion in the mos-
qu. We learn nothing of the time, nature or duration of
this rite, or whether it is necessarily connected with fasting or

1 If indeed this is what the practice was called in Muhammad's time:
the VIIIth form does not occur in the Quran.

2 As previously noted, a word of flexible meaning: probably here
signifying something at the lesser end of the scale, such as simply
'contact with women'.
with mosques. Naturally these are all questions discussed in the hadith; the tafsirs include some of these, and predictably offer the sabab al-nuzul, that before this verse was revealed, people used to practice mubahahara while in i'tikaf. The root c-k-f occurs several times in the Quran, where it appears to represent an established and still-flourishing rite that has long formed part of organised religion, by no means necessarily pagan. The fact that fasting is nowhere else connected with it suggests that the two activities are not inseparable. It is quite possible that this regulation, coming as it does right at the end of the fasting section, may be included here simply because mubahahara is of common concern to both activities.

This is not to deny that fasting and i'tikaf ever occur as joint religious activities in later Islam, though it may be noted that when linked they constitute the mark of the pious, the one guided by the Quran as traditionally interpreted, rather than forming part of prescribed religion as practised by the observant layman.

The pagan flavour of i'tikaf, which some have deduced from the Quran, is not entirely justifiable: until archaeological evidence to the contrary arrives, organised religion (and note that 'masajid' in the plural indicates a flourishing religion) in Medina and even Mecca must be considered to have been almost certainly the sole province of the Jews. While judgement may be reserved about the hajj,

1 All the other occurrences of the root c-k-f in the Quran are even vaguer: Q7/138, 21/52, 26/71, and possibly 2/125; suggest nothing much more definite than bowing down to worship.

2 Excluding of course the final phrase which is not in itself fasting-oriented.

3 As mentioned above, there is no other instance of mubahahara in the Quran besides this verse.
the rest of Muhammad's system is quite compatible with the Jewish
tradition, and there seems no good reason to except i'tikāf.

The theories of Wagendonk concerning du'a' and i'tikāf, and
his connecting them with a pro-Ramadan fast, have been noted above.
His mistaken reliance on Muslim tradition as sound argument is
responsible for many of his conclusions, which will not be discussed
further here.

tilka hudūdu allāhi fa la ṭaqrabūhā kadhālika yubayyinu allāhu āyātihi
li-l-nāsi la'callahum yattaqūna.

The contents of this last phrase are unremarkable, apart from
some echoes raised by the vocabulary. These are probably not entirely
fortuitous. We may note yubayyinu, cf. v. 135, and la'callahum yatta-
qaūna, cf. v. 133. The common (e.g. Q2/229, 230; 65/1) metaphor of the
'limits' confirms the divine origin of the foregoing prescriptions,
and by alluding to the prescribing that takes place in the first
verse, the end of the section acts as a balance to the beginning.
It also serves as a reminder that the sura as a whole is one greatly
concerned with prescription.

Thus Muhammad closes the section which was to be the basis of
one of the five shara'i of orthodox Islam. While keeping within
the broad framework of the Jewish tradition, he incorporated into
his version of the prescribed fast several features that deliberately
differed from the precedent. In doing so, Muhammad helped to build
up his own position of authority, and to weaken the hold of those
from whom he was breaking away. Although in perspective the Jewish
and Muslim fasts are basically the same, from Muhammad's viewpoint,
the differences, for which he claimed divine sanction, were far more
important than the similarities.

1 Rāzi notes that i'tikāf is the seventh hukm of the sura.
2 And the fact that he could bring them about and be followed.
Chapter Two

Other references to fasting in the Quran

These will not be discussed in as great detail as were Q2/183-7. Generally speaking, they are no more than incidental mentions of fasting, and consequently shed no great light on the practice in Muhammad's time, beyond indicating the broad fact that it was well-established. They have no great relevance to the 'Islamic fast', which is primarily Ramadān. We learn nothing of the style of the fasts involved. As for their motivation, and the 'phenomenological conclusions' to be drawn from them, these will not be discussed in this work: suffice it to mention the relevant sections of Wagtendonk, and the parallels in other religions noted by him and others. The attempt to establish the 'meaning' of these lesser Quranic fasts, when based as here on materials both scanty and ill-suited to such a purpose, seems foredoomed to failure.

The verses in question may be conveniently grouped into three divisions: i. Q2/196, 4/92, 5/89, 5/95, 58/3-4.

ii. Q33/35.

iii. Q19/26

i.

Q2/196 (Compensation for illness preventing pilgrimage): - fasting or alms or an offering.

(Compensation for tamattu): - an offering or a fast of three plus seven days.

Q4/92 (Compensation for killing an ally): - blood-money plus manumission. But if nothing to manumit, two consecutive months' fast.

1 Ch.6, also 7 to a certain extent. 2 See esp. his pp.123-132.
Q5/89 (Compensation for oath-breaking): the feeding of 10 poor, or clothing them, or manumission. Failing that, three days' fast.

Q5/95 (Compensation for hunting in ihram): the feeding of poor, or its equivalent in fasting.

Q58/4 (Compensation for misuse of zihār): manumission; failing that, two consecutive months' fast; failing that, the feeding of 60 poor.

This first group, containing references to fasting as a compensation or penance, have already been partially dealt with. It has been suggested that they form part of a well-regulated customary system that only occasionally gains mention in the Quran. It may be observed that fasting in Q2/196 (second instance), 4/92 and 5/89 appears as the last option, sometimes only applicable if the others cannot be managed. Fasting is itself not exactly an easy way out, and its presence here as a last resort seems to indicate that the primary intention is to make transgressors suffer materially, through payments in cash or kind. Where this is not possible, by reason of poverty, physical hardship is imposed. It is notable that of the common religious practices - prayer, pilgrimage, etc. - fasting is the aptest as a counterpart of material offering.

The kaffāra customs that Muhammad knew seem to have been of a primarily Arabian origin. This, however, is not to deny that, with the passing of time, they could have been drawn into the Jewish system as it evolved in Muhammad's area.

1 Above, p. 61.

2 Apparently of some long standing: see Ryckmans, p. 38.

3 Also Q5/95, 58/4, to a certain extent.

4 Cf. the hadith 'al-'sawm zakāt al-jasad'.
ii. Q33/35.

\[\text{inna al-mudimina wa-l-muslimat wa-l-mu'minina wa-l-mu'minat}\]
\[\text{wa-l-quninitina wa-l-qanitat wa-l-sadiqina wa-l-sadiqat wa-l-}\]
\[\text{sabirina wa-l-sabirat wa-l-khassina wa-l-khasiat wa-l-}\]
\[\text{mutasaddiqina wa-l-mutasaddiqat wa-l-samimina wa-l-samiat}\]
\[\text{wa-l-hafizina furujahum wa-l-hafizat wa-l-dhakirina allaha}\]
\[\text{kathiran wa-l-dhakirat adhad allahu lahum maghfiratan wa}\]
\[\text{ajran aziman.}\]

It is dangerous to build too much\(^1\) on a reference such as this. All that may safely be said is that fasting is here considered to be one of the marks of the true believers, male and female. There is no reason why this should not refer to the prescribed fast of Ramadân (the Muslims calculate Q33/35 to be Medinese), but it may equally refer to voluntary activity.

As for the claim, originally in the tafsîrs, but adopted by Wagendonk\(^2\), that säha (Q9/112, 66/5) is equal to sâma, it is without good grounds. The similarity of the context, it is suggested, is the origin of the equation, the more concrete notion of fasting appearing preferable in the tafsîrist's mind to that of wandering about, which seems to be the basic idea of the root, although generally it is employed with religious overtones\(^3\).

The verse 33/35 is of little use in an enquiry into fasting; although listing various religious activities, its purpose is far from being the exposition of the modality or motive of any of them.

\(^1\) Wagendonk pp. 128ff.
\(^2\) p. 128
\(^3\) Perhaps there should be mentioned with säha another root occasionally reckoned to mean fasting, in the Quran, namely s-b-r, at e.g. Q2/45 and 153. Again, this is simply a concretisation, without significance to the issue of the Quranic fast.
iii. Q19/26.

fa-kuli wa-shrabī wa qarri ā'īnān fa-imāmin tarayinna min al-bashari aḥadān, fa-qūlī ānnī nādhatu lī-l-rahmānī qawāmīn fa-lān ukkālim al-yawma insiyyān.

The reference to fasting here is puzzling, not least because the whole section in which the verse lies is somewhat garbled. This is interesting in that it serves as an indication that Muhammad's information concerning Christianity was not first-hand, but is unfortunately no help in unravelling the meaning of the verse in question.

Although we are dealing with the same root, s-(w)-m, as in the other Quranic instances of fasting, it is evident that here the meaning is different, and possibly much more primitive, along the lines of simply 'ceasing or refraining from doing a thing'. The Muslim philologers are in fact able to produce examples supporting this, but, as always in such cases, the chicken/egg problem arises. The preceding phrase, practically equivalent to 'eat, drink, and be merry', is almost completely incompatible with what follows, and can only be explained by positing defective transmission of the story before it reached Muhammad. The conclusion that the commentators draw, working backwards from the last phrase (itself oddly parallel to Joseph's earlier state, v. 10 of the same sura), that sawm virtually equals silence (ṣamt) is perhaps too restrictive. The last phrase is a bayān of the preceding one, and not a rigid definition.

The verse contains the only Quranic use of the form sawm as

1 There are no references to fasting or a vow of silence in any Christian version of the story.
2 Some persons even proposed to read ʿamt here (see e.g. Jeffery, Materials, p.53): they were no doubt aided in this by the similarity of the two words.
opposed to ṣiyām, and this may tend to confirm that they have slightlly different meanings. However, such differentiation is entirely disregarded in all later works, the two forms being used indiscriminately. There is not even any apparent attempt to give ṣawm the meaning 'a fast', and ṣiyām that of 'fasting', as one might perhaps have expected.

That ṣawm should in the Quran apparently preserve the less technical meaning is in contrast to the widely accepted notion that the expression for fasting as a religious activity was imported into the Arabic language in the form ṣawm.  

Without further contemporary evidence, the reference in this verse must remain obscure. This is however not of consequence to the present study, as the verse, whatever it means, has no bearing on the Muhammadan fast.

---

1 See on this e.g. Jeffery, Foreign Vocabulary, pp.201-2.
Chapter Three

Variant Readings of Q2/183-7

This chapter deals with those alleged variant readings of the Quran (qirā'āt) which occur in connection with the verses on fasting. Some of these variants have been briefly mentioned already.¹

The problem of accommodating various differing fiqh opinions in the same text, a need arising from newly-dominant theoretical considerations, naturally led the mufassirūn to interpret the Quran in different ways; that generally speaking this was the situation, rather than that the 'ambiguity' of the Quran led to differing interpretations, has, it is to be hoped, been sufficiently demonstrated². The present intention is to show that the variant readings are but an extension of this process of accommodation. Accommodation is almost too mild a word, for in several cases, the uncompromising desire to see a doctrine represented in the Quran led not to the adaptation of the doctrine, but to the adaptation of the Quran. It is clearer than ever from this kind of evidence that in many ways the Quran was not the pre-eminent factor in deciding the lines of development of the institution of fasting as it evolved in classical Islam, and was far from holding in practice the primary position assigned to it by Shāfi'ī's quadripartite theory of usūl al-fiqh.

It will be remembered that the Quranic verses on fasting fall into three main groups: the principal prescriptive block, those which may conveniently be called 'kaffāra' verses, and the two incidental instances of fasting, Q19/26 and 33/35.

As appeared from chapter one, the first section offers the greatest scope for discussion, and it is therefore not surprising

---

¹ P. 57. ² See above, p. 3. This of course is particularly the case in verses of legal or religious moment.
to find that by far the greatest number of variants connected with fasting are attached to this block.

In the same way as hadiths are furnished with isnads to 'guarantee' their authenticity, so do variant readings appear with their chains of authority, sometimes just as long and complete as those of the best hadiths, with the proviso that only a few are attributed to the Prophet himself: the claiming of prophetic authority would tend to make a nonsense of the classical Muslim datum that the Quran was uncollected and unwritten at the time of the Prophet's death. Schacht, building on Goldziher, has shown that every hadith of legal weight can be viewed as the embodiment of an opinion of one or other of the fuqahā' or ulama of the period considerably after Muhammad's death. Since hadiths proper and the qirā'āt have the same form, it may be inferred that both these types of information concerning the opinions, successful and otherwise, of the developing period of Islam, were the results of the same influences, and subject to the same tendencies. Two examples: just as in the hadith literature differing opinions are attributed to one and the same early authority, such as Abū Huraira or ʿAisha, so b. Abū Aswā or Ubai is made to uphold conflicting readings; just as in the hadith an opinion may be framed in such a way as to counter definitively another hadith (an instance of the process of abrogation), so, it will be shown, one reading may be formulated deliberately to counter the opinion supported by another reading. These considerations alone make a nonsense of any attempt to reconstitute the alleged primitive and differing codices of the Quran, long posited but never

1 Good examples of the isnads of variants appear in Abū ʿUbaid's Fadā'il al-qur'ān, the earliest work to record qirā'āt systematically.
2 See his Origine, esp. part II. 3 An inspection of the list of alleged owners of 'codices' in Jeffery, Materials, will reveal the presence of many names familiar from the hadith.
brought to light. In the absence of any concrete contemporary literary evidence of such codices (and there is none) they must be assumed to be as much part of the Muslim mythology as the content of the Sira, which is transparently not a biography in the accepted sense of the word, but largely a work on asbāb al-nuzūl.

It is worth examining the traditional accounts of the early history of the Quran in a little detail, if we are to gain a better appreciation of the function of the variants as a whole. It is claimed that variants arose because of memory lapses and the ambiguity of the Arabic script, compounded by the geographical scattering of the Muslim communities. These two principal assertions rest on two highly questionable assumptions, 1) that the Quran was initially transmitted verbally, and 2) that even when it was written down, there was no canon. The hypothesis of the Prophet's illiteracy, with which the oral transmission idea is linked, is one of the manifest

---

1 See particularly the works of Jeffery in this field, notably the introductions to the individual 'codices' in his Materials, and the summary notes to his two articles on the readings of Zaid b. 'Ali: having started from the wrong premisses, he just missed seeing the reason for the mass of inconsistencies which these premisses produced, although candidly pointing out their existence. He was also aware of the dubious authenticity of many readings (Materials, p.5).

2 It may be noted that the true nature of these latter devices, justifications of doctrines rather than explanations of their origins, was recognised and openly admitted (somewhat belatedly) by the 8th-century Shafi'i scholar Zarkashi (al-Burhān fi āulum al-qur'ān, Cairo, 1957-8, I, p.23); as for the readings, Qurṭubī wittingly or unwittingly outlines the process behind their formation, in a discussion of Q2/184, specifically the word yuṭiq-unahu, which has a widely-transmitted variant yutarqunahu (see below).
aburdities of the body of the Quran text theories. It is inconceivable that such a man, a merchant, arbiter and politician, should be ignorant of reading and writing; he was intimately familiar with a religion based on books, and refers often to reading and writing in his own book. Muhammad's work is a largely coherent volume, and there is no internal indication of its having been written down other than either by Muhammad himself, or under his close direction. As for the suggestion that in the period after Muhammad's death the Arabic script was incapable of differentiating between various sounds and conveying unambiguously when necessary a desired sense, there is now clear archaeological and numismatic evidence to disprove this. Other things being equal, there is then no reasonable basis for assuming other than that Muhammad wrote the book known as the Quran, and wrote it unambiguously.

Unlikely as the claims for Muhammad's illiteracy and the deficiency of the Arabic script are, they were nevertheless made, and it becomes of moment to enquire who might benefit from the positing of such a situation where the Quran text was not settled. The answer is clearly that such a state of affairs would favour those who asserted that there existed variations from the standard text. Lest it should appear that the traditional accounts of the history of the text of the Quran were coldly fabricated with a view to covering up or accounting for the machinations of a later generation of scholars, it will be as well to try to reconstruct the circumstances probably accompanying the appearance of the earliest variants: it seems highly likely that the first ones stemmed simply from suggested alternatives to the standard text, suggestions that were nothing more than scholarly observations. For example, Farrā', talking of a word

---

1 See the work of Grohmann and Nabia Abbott in this field: Grohmann: Der Islam, 33, 1953, p. 221; Textes Epigraphiques, Louvain, 1962, pp. 57-8, which refers to a diacritically pointed MS. of 22 A.H. This is also mentioned by Nabia Abbott in Rise of the N. Arabic Script and its Quranic Development, Publications of the Chicago Oriental Institute, vol. 1, Chicago 1939.
in the accusative in the original text, says 'If it were in the nominative, it would be all right'\(^1\). In transmission, such a suggestion acquires the trappings of 'authority', and the nucleus of ra'y, innocently uttered, becomes transformed into a locally preferred alternative to the standard text. With the gradual proliferation of these variations, a tendency develops, that of gathering under the name of some eponymous figure the textual variations of a particular centre of learning. This figure becomes depicted in the classical theory as a local 'reader'\(^2\). By a backward projection, the alternative readings now associated with his name become concretised as constituting his version of the text of the Qur'an, his 'codex'. Repeat this process with all the main centres of intellectual life in Islam, and there forms exactly that picture of a number of differing codices which the classical theory portrays. But the existence of these codices, it is submitted, is an illusion: they represent the rationalisation of the fruits of originally innocent\(^3\)

\(^1\) Na\textsuperscript{c}\text{"an\textsuperscript{i} al-qur\textsuperscript{\text{"an}, sub 2/184

\(^2\) Thus in later writings, the Farr\text{\text{"a}' observation takes on the form of a definite 'variant', with supporting names - see below. Goldziher, Richtungen, p. 6, offers concerning variants the theory of glosses which for justification were given the name of a companion; these develop into 'readings'. It is maintained in the present study that this tendency is by no means limited to the interpretative type of variant.\(^3\) That is to say, innocent in the sense that generally no hope was entertained of any suggestion eventually supplanting the standard text, even though the suggestion may have had some polemical charge. It is interesting to note that 'modern Muslim savants almost invariable set aside the variants recorded from the old Codices on the ground that they are Tafs\textsuperscript{\text{"ir (Jeff.\text{Hut.}, p. 10). Jeff. suggests that this discarding stems to a certain degree from the embarrassment that the existence of the variants occasions.\(}
speculation on one unchanging text, and one alone. However, once the theory of a number of differing codices had grown up, and the idea of variant readings, as opposed to suggested alternatives, had become established, the way was open for the promulgation of alternatives-cum-variants with definite polemical overtones, as an additional means, besides the hadith literature proper, of advancing particular opinions. By this stage, the process had become self-sustaining: the rationalisation offered by the theories provided ground for the proliferation of qirā'āt, while the increasing numbers of the latter provided 'evidence' for the rationalisation.

The qirā'āt literature is thus capable of explanation in such a way that a) it is shown to be of comparable motive, and in large measure origins also, to the hadith and tafsīr, and b) it restores part of the early history of the Islamic sciences to a more rational and acceptable level; by removing the fabulous elements, the underlying motives and processes appear as entirely understandable and in no way sinister.

Given this somewhat hapahzard pattern of evolution, it is not surprising that the details of the Muslim theories of the history of the qur'ān-text vary considerably, and there is some confusion as to the relation of the texts of the seven (or ten, or fourteen) local Readers to that for which ʿUthmān was allegedly responsible. This inconsistency, in conjunction with the other weaknesses of the traditional account - Muhammad's supposed illiteracy, the alleged inability of a trading city to furnish better writing materials than flat stones and camels' shoulder-blades, the non-survival of any non-standard codex, the lack of any precise details of the early codices beyond vague information about the number of suras, order of verses, etc. - tends to suggest that the qirā'āt phenomenon did not last long enough to become conclusively elaborated, or to gain widespread acceptance among all ranks of scholarly opinion.
It appears that a very few readings were known in the latter half of the second century\(^1\); the greater number seem to have been elaborated shortly after this. However, Tabari, who was familiar with quite a few of the fasting variants, never accepts any of them, and his remark on the variant 'mutatābi\(^{cāt}'\(^2\), an addition to the standard text proposed in the name of Ubai, which would support Tabari's own conviction in the matter in question, is revealing: 'dhalika khilaf mā fī maṣāḥifina, fa-ghairu jā'iz\(^3\). On the word yuṭīqūnahu (Q2/184) for which there are numerous variants, he says: 'yuṭīqūnahu' is the reading of all Muslims, and thus it is written in our copies of the Quran. It is a reading that having been transmitted down the centuries should not be differed from by any of Ahl al-Islām\(^4\). The traditional form of the variant literature, providing 'guarantees' of authenticity hardly different from those of hadiths, failed in the long run to convince people that there was any real justification for taking into critical consideration any Quran-text other than that single one in universal use\(^5\). The attitude of Tabari is reflected in other works, which refer to even the most famous variants as 'shādhdh'\(^6\). This scepticism seems not to be based on any formal renunciation of the theory of variants, by a process of ījmā'\(^6\) or the like, but simply on the fact that no-one had ever seen a Quran that contained any of the variants, however well they might otherwise

\(^1\) In Ḥālik, Shāfi'ī, Ḥuqāṭīl, Farrā' (see below). However, variants of Q2/133-7 noted in these early sources account for much less than 10% of the total number of different variants. 

\(^2\) Q5/89.

\(^3\) See also the considerably earlier Abu ʿUbaid, Māh, fol. 27, who is disinclined to accept even the most famous fasting variant, observing that it is not in the Maṣāḥif of the Hijāz, ʿIrāq, Shām or elsewhere.

\(^4\) P., 52. 

\(^5\) The origin of which in turn had now to be accounted for: see Tab., I, pp. 20-60.

\(^6\) E.g. Lisān al-ʿarab, s.v. ṭ-u-q.
be documented, and it remains the case today that there is only one Qur'an throughout the Muslim world; what variations there are, are connected with the actual pronunciation, rather than any deeper matters. This fact alone would be enough to raise doubts about the existence of any early variant codices. That the variants did not die out, after they had ultimately failed to become deemed worthy of serious consideration in the religio-legal arguments that many of them had been designed to support, is due to the never-failing tendency of the Islamic sciences as a whole. Obsolete opinions disappear only very slowly, if ever. All the evidence points to the fact that the Qur'an as Muhammad's own work has not changed significantly since it left his hands; although for long after his death it was not the subject of recorded scholarly study and application, it must have been continuously in the minds and eyes of thousands of Muslims as a liturgical document; where then was the opportunity for major deviations to creep in?

An analysis of the alleged variant readings connected with any particular group of verses will reveal that they may be divided in two ways, according to type and according to purpose.

The types of variants are three: those that retain the skeleton of the original word, but vary as to dotting and vocalisation, etc.; those where the skeleton of the word is altered, occasionally in such an extreme manner that a more correct term would be substitution; and those where extra words or phrases are imported into the original text. Broadly speaking, the first type is the most frequent, the third the least so. An authority of the eminence of Shafi'i, who was not very convinced by variants, refused to admit any of the two latter classes, interfering as they do with the written text as it often appears, unvocalised. It is among variants of the first type that one might start looking for such genuine variations from Muhammad's text as there may be: a convenient example would be the
malik/mālik of sura 1°. However, the majority of even the vocalic or diacritical variants, the least complicated type, can be shown to have polemic weight, and thus cannot be considered innocent or genuine variations from the original text.

This leads to the discussion of the purposes that variants serve, and these can similarly be divided into three groups.

Firstly, readings of direct polemical significance, supporting a doctrine or doctrines at variance with that of the standard reading, and which came into being initially from a desire to see an opinion represented in the Quran. Again, as pointed out above, there is every likelihood that, before the idea of variants became established, the authors of the suggestions they embody probably held no conscious wish to impose directly their own opinions on the Quran, and to supplant all other interpretations; according to their way of thinking, what the Quran said was not yet a necessary or decisive argument.

Secondly, there are readings not of weight in religious or legal debate, but contributing in some measure to other spheres of Islamic science where there was argument which could usefully be strengthened by appealing to Quranic precedent. The most obvious case in point is philology, especially the field of morphology°. Such readings may often also belong to group three below.

Thirdly, readings of an apparently subsidiary nature, yet in fact helping to play a fundamental role. These would include the genuine, innocent, variants, but also number Quranic 'parallels' to other, more significant, variants, introduced simply in order to reinforce the notion of the existence of variants, and to aid in the establishing of them as a phenomenon of apparent antiquity.

---

1 See e.g. Jeff., Kat..p.25. 2 Cf. the quotation in Goldz.,Richtungen,p.50: al-carabiyya tusahhah bi-l-qirā'a,lā al-qirā'a bi-lzarabiya.
The fact that all variants can be thus classified is in itself an indication that they do indeed derive from a single well-known text; they show nothing of the types of inconsistency which might be seen if they were associated with an imperfect amalgam of genuinely differing recensions, as the Muslim theory demands, and the pattern of their first appearance in written works, as opposed to their claimed dates of origin, further reinforces the conviction that they are in practically every case in no way genuine or early.

In the light of the above, it is clear that there is no sure way of identifying conclusively the very small proportion of genuine variations from the text of the Quran. However, it is equally clear that for the purposes of understanding and translating the Quran, there is no need to look further than the copy which we have in front of us, for to all intents and purposes, we have the original. The bulk of the variant readings can without qualms be left aside as later inventions, leaving only a small number of variations affecting only the pronunciation or the spelling of the passages in which they occur. This is not to deny that the majority of variants have any use, but it is not the Quran that an analysis of them illuminates; rather, it is the arguments which at a later date were built around the Quran, as that document came to be held to be one of the theoretical cornerstones of legal and religious procedure, indispensable and not to be ignored.

There now follows a list of the recorded variants of Q2/183-7, together with the arguments each one is capable of supporting. The widely printed Egyptian text of the Quran, supposedly identified

\[1\] See below, p. 125. \[2\] Pace Jeff., p. 14! "it is of course obvious that all the information we can gather regarding the text of these early codices is of the utmost importance for the text criticism of the Q."
with the recension of Hafṣ, but in fact simply the original text, is taken as the standard, for purposes of comparison.

In the matter of sources, as many original works as were readily available were consulted, principally based on the list offered by Jeffery. A very small number of the variants he quotes in the body of his book have not been found in original texts, and as he does not give references, these must be assumed to be in the works he quotes which it was not possible to consult. All variants are noted, not merely those attributed to Companions: this has resulted in a considerable increase on Jeffery's total. An exception has been made of a few variants dealing with minor orthographic points, which have been omitted. The classification of variants according to their ancient 'authorities' has not been attempted, for reasons made clear above. Because of their limited interest, the variants connected with the other verses mentioning fasting will not be discussed in this chapter.

The distribution diagram which follows is of course not too conclusive; not all writers will have troubled to record all variants known to them, and not all writers have been available for consultation. However, it does tend to show that extremely few of the variants are early - more than half of the total number recorded only by writers who died after the fourth century of Islam. By the time of Bukhārī, only a tenth of the final number had been noted down. Such a situation is in no way compatible with the fixed pattern of early codices alleged in the theories advanced by the Muslims to account for the phenomenon of the qiraʿāt.

1 Materials, p. 17.

2 For the results of such an exercise, see the body of 'Materials'.


Distribution diagram of variants of Q2/183-7.

A cross denotes the first record of a particular variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muqūtil b. Sulaimān.</td>
<td>d.150</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tībawāîh</td>
<td>d.176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālik</td>
<td>d.179</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fārābī</td>
<td>d.203</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shāfi‘ī</td>
<td>d.204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Ubaid.</td>
<td>d.223</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bukhārī</td>
<td>d.256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tābarī</td>
<td>d.310</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Abī Dā‘ūd.</td>
<td>d.316</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Muslim</td>
<td>d.322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Khālawaih</td>
<td>d.370</td>
<td>xxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaṣṣāṣ.</td>
<td>d.370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Jinnī.</td>
<td>d.392</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM Or 4257.</td>
<td>ca.400</td>
<td>xxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dūnī.</td>
<td>d.444</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baihaqī.</td>
<td>d.458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭāheī.</td>
<td>d.460</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamakhsharī</td>
<td>d.467</td>
<td>xxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarakhsī</td>
<td>d.483</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baghawī</td>
<td>d.516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wāsiṭī.</td>
<td>d.521</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn al-Jawzī.</td>
<td>d.596</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāzī.</td>
<td>d.606</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ūkbārī.</td>
<td>d.616</td>
<td>xxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qurṭubī.</td>
<td>d.656</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baidāwī.</td>
<td>d.685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Ḥayyān.</td>
<td>d.754</td>
<td>xxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazarī.</td>
<td>d.833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Ḥajar.</td>
<td>d.852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawkānī.</td>
<td>d.1250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jeffery. xxxxx
No variants of this verse have been recorded. From this it may be deduced that no-one in the period when variants were being promulgated denied that fasting was a prescribed part of the faith. Cf. the taṣāfira of Ḥadīth on this verse: 'Innahu kataba ʿalāniḥi ʿalā siyāha wa alṣamāhù iyyāhū wa awjābahu ʿalāniḥi, la khilāf fīhi'\(^1\). Shāfiʿī mentions that the knowledge that the month (to be fasted) was Ramadān, and that its fast was a fard, is so widespread, and always has been, that it has never been necessary to relate from the Prophet a hadith specifically to this effect\(^2\).

Q2/184

Official Egyptian version ("E"): ayyānun macăḍūdūn

The position of this phrase, at the beginning of the verse, together with the following 'fa'-clause, shows that it can only be read as a direct continuation of 2/183, defining the period for which fasting is prescribed.

Variant ("Vt"): ayyāmūn maḍūdūn

Read by\(^3\): b. Ḥaṣcūd (Kh. p.11); b. Ḥaṣcūd, Ābū Dharr, Ābū Ḥusain (cūk. 123, p.58.); b. Ḥaṣcūd (Abū Ḥayyān, p.39); b. Ḥaṣcūd and b. (sic) Dharr (Jeff., p.29).

The immediate result of the change to the nominative is to weaken the tie between this verse and the preceding, which raises the suspicion that to consider the passage as two quite separate

\(^1\) p.280.  
\(^2\) Risāla, paraa. 436,438.  
\(^3\) Sc. throughout this chapter 'alleged to have been' read by. As pointed out in the introduction to this section, these allegations will often have been preceded by 'suggested readings'.
verses was a deliberate tactic. There are two possible motives for this: at the simplest level, it may have stemmed from a conviction that a sentence starting thus with an accusative was inelegant or incomplete; the practical meaning of the verse is unchanged, a.m. now being in apposition to al-siyām (Q2/133), whereas formerly it was a ṣarf. ʿUkbārī takes the apposition a stage further by suggesting that a.m. stands for ʿammu ayyāmin (maʿdūdatin). This is typical of the tafsīrist's desire for absolute explicitness, and is comparable to the more orthodox explanations of ayyānam maʿdūdatin as meaning '(fa-nūnū ayyāmin) a.m.'. Alternatively, a.m. in the nominative can now be considered as a kind of heading for the whole verse, echoed in form and in root by the ensuing fa-ʾiddatun. It is to be noted that the equation of a.m. and fa-ʾiddatun precludes the equation of a.m. and Rāmadān, which some muḥāfīzir, considering a.m. to refer to a quite different, three-day, fast, found awkward. This reading then may conceivably be intended to support the abrogation of v.134, by minimizing any complications arising from the run-over of meaning from v.133 to v.134.

E: fa-ʾiddatun

An alternative to al-siyām, v.133, and therefore 'kutiba ḍalai-kum' is to be understood here: cf. Rāzī, ad loc.; 'ay fa-ḍalaihi ʿamnu ʾidda...'.

Vt: fa-ʾiddatun

Recorded by Zam. (p.255), Rāzī (pp174-5), ʿUk. NS (p.56, margin), Qurt. (p.281), Baid. (p.38), ṢA (p.32); attributed to b. Nīqṣam (Jeff., b. N.).

Qurtūbī (p.281) says of fa-ʾiddatun: wa al-ʾidda fiʿla min al-ʾadd, wa hiya bī-maʿnā al-maʿdūd. 2 See above, p.38.
The lack in most of these references of even the shortest isnaḍ is in itself an indication that this variant lacks great polemic weight. Either it is intended as an adverbial accusative, parallel to a.m.\(^1\), or there is to be understood an expanded phrase such as 'fal-yaṣṣūm ǧiddatan'\(^2\), again an addition which makes precisely clear what is intended by the verse. This desire for precision perhaps arose from the fact that here it is a matter of one of the five pillars of the faith, where the underlying Quranic injunction must be made quite clear.

Farrā' observes concerning this verse 'wa law kānat nāṣaban, kānā gāvāban'\(^3\), and ʿUkbārī\(^4\) has 'wa law qurī'ā...'. As indicated above, this hypothetical observation is illustrative of the probable mode of formation of many variants - an innocent grammatical alternative proposition acquiring with the passage of time an existence of its own and eventually an authority.

A comparable variant occurs at Q2/196, where b. Miqṣam proposes 'fa-fidyatan' for 'fa-fidyatun' (Jeff., b.M.).

E: ayyāmin ukhara

Ukhara, being plural, can only agree with ayyāmin. The use of the plural form of the adjective, rather than the feminine singular, is possibly comparable to the preceding (ayyāmin) maḍūdātin. Although less common than the fem. sing. form, a plural adjective is of course quite permissible in Classical Arabic.

---

1 Perhaps the more probable origin, in view of the comments of the grammarian Farrā' (see what follows).

2 Cf. qurt., Rāzī, Mān., Baid., ad loc.

3 aḏānī, ad Q2/124.  

4 Imlā', p.80.
Suggested, without specific attribution, by Tūsī (p.116), Rāzī (p.176), ʿAll (p.33); read by b. Ḥasādū (ʿUk. l.S., p.57; Jeff., p.29).

While the adjective is now in a more regular form, the fem. sing., and perhaps preferred by some on that account alone, or suggested in order to show that ukhara was in fact identical with ukhrah meaning, there is now the possibility of applying ukhrah to (fa-)iddatun. This is significant only insofar as it is then impossible, if the adjective applies to the singular ʿiddatun, to understand after it ʿmutatabiʿat, a step taken by those holding the doctrine that the qadaʿ of Ṣamādān must be performed on consecutive days. This belief can be supported by another route, if it be granted that the plural ukhara is more reminiscent of the mutatabiʿat than the singular ukhrah. While this has no official sanction from the grammarians, it seems quite possible that the plural could be seen to refer to a sequence of individual days, while the singular would apply to days in general.

In support of this may be mentioned Qurṭubī's comment at this point: 'wa hiya (sc. ukhara) ʿiftatun li-ayyāmin, wa lam tajiʿ ukhrah li-ʿallā yashkul bi-annāḥa ʿiftatun li-l-ʿidda'. Unfortunately Qurṭubī does not outline the consequences of this ambiguity, but the mutatabiʿat question is the only matter which presents itself as turning in any way on the vocalisation of ukh-r-.

Read by Ubai (Ḥālik 49, Shāf. Umm 2/103, Zam. p.255, Rāzī, p.176, ʿAll, p.35, Jeff. p.120, Nöldeke, p.83.).

1 This doctrine is attributed to b. Ḥasādū; his naming here as the 'reader' of this variant may thus be a deliberate move of attack by his opponents in this matter.

2 Possibly a later interpolation in Mālik's text. Similarly, the reference in Shafiʿī is of doubtful authenticity.
This self-explanatory addition is intended to settle the long-standing argument, mentioned above, as to whether fasts other than Ramadan, usually specifically the qadā' of Ramadan, should be performed consecutively or not. The allegation of this variant gains some support from the fact that sometimes in dealing with fasts the Quran does mention consecutiveness, using this word1. 'A'isha, quoted by Qurṭubi, in turn quoting the Sunan of Dāraqutnī, on this verse, is alleged to have said 'nazalat "fa-‘iddatun min ayyāmin ukhara mutātābi‘atīn", fa-saqātāt "mutātābi‘atīn"' 2. This hadīth may be a rationalization of the existence of the variant, or an attempt to abrogate it; the latter is perhaps more probable, since the ‘A'isha report is late. Additionally it may be noted that saqāta is one of the technical roots equated with naskh. There is apparently no other opinion from ‘A'isha along these lines.

VT: ayyāmin ukhara mutātābi‘atīn

Read by Ubai (Sarakhsi, p. 75).

This reading, which Sarakhsi calls shādhdh, is probably identical with the above. Mutātābi‘a is often used in the tafsirs interchangeably with the plural form, even when discussing the same verse3.

E: yutqānahu

Read in this way, there can be little doubt4 that the 'hu' refers effectively to 'fidya'; in contrast, the orthodox interpretation refers it with rather less probability to 'ṣiyām'. Both these views result in the creation of an alternative to fasting. The various methods resorted to by the classical Muslim scholars to amend

---

1 Q4/92,58/4.
2 p.231. Daihaqī, p.253 has virtually the same hadith from ‘A'isha.
3 e.g. Rāzī.
4 See above, p. 50.
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this situation, which was to them undesirable and indeed unaccept-
able as a contemporary fact, have been dealt with elsewhere. It may
be recalled that the principal device was that of abrogation, by
v. 185, but as will become apparent from what follows, much effort
was also put into the production of variants designed to cope with
the difficulty; their complexity was one of the factors which led
b. al-‘Arabī to describe this verse as a 'baidat al-‘uqr'".

Aḥkām, I, p. 79.

1 The text of N&M omits the 'n' of yut. in one version. Probably
   a scribal error.
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'manage with difficulty', 'be unable to'. This is arrived at by taking yuṭawwaq as a denominal form from ṭawq, yoke or burden. Hu is again taken to refer to al-siyūm, and the altered meaning suits those of the opinion that various classes of people, such as the elderly and infirm, should be exempted from the rigours of fasting. This doctrine is attributed to b. 'Abbās, who, as will have been noted, is the most frequently quoted authority for this reading. Abrogation becomes unnecessary now, for the fidya clause is thus removed from general applicability. It is not apparent that this dispensing with naskh was deliberately designed to that end.

The word yuṭawwaqūnahu itself appears to be something of a neologism¹; the mufassirūn almost invariably feel obliged to follow it with an explanatory 'ay yukallafūnahu², while yuṭiqūnahu is usually considered sufficiently clear to stand without further definition. It is perhaps possible that this definition by means of the root k-l-f is influenced by the appearance in Q2/286 of both this root and ṭ-w-q. The scepticism of some over this most famous of the variants connected with fasting has been noted already³, and we may also note the comment of b. Hajar, who says that some claim this is a tafsīr and not a reading⁴.

¹ With this precise meaning at any rate. It occurs at Q3/179, sayuṭawwaqūna. The existence of the word elsewhere in the Quran may, as in the case of mutaḥa'īn above, at the earliest period have given the impetus for suggesting that it might be preferable to read it at Q2/184 also. Cf. introductory remarks on the origin of variants.
² Tāb.p.138, for example. ³ Above,p.120.
⁴ According to Ṭūsī,p.119, some avoided the implications of the yuṭawwaqūnahu variant by interpreting it as yulzamūnahu, i.e. with a meaning identical to yuṭiqūnahu.
Vt: yutayyiqūnahu

Read by b. 'Abbas, Mujahid (Khāl., pp. 11-2); b. 'Abbas, 'Ikrima, Mujahid (Jeff., pp. 195, 269, 277, respectively.).

A variation in form only on the original, yuṭīqūnahu, without appreciable change in meaning. As shown below, the similarity of the main authorities to those of the preceding variant supports this. It is perhaps comparable to other cases of a change in form, but there may also be detected a possible origin in oral debate. It may be conjectured that the proponents of the variant yuṭawwaqūnahu announced that all scholars were agreed that the correct reading, as received from the best authorities, was the second rather than the fourth form. Their opponents would have made a show of agreeing with this, and would then have pointed out that of course the middle radical was a ya, and not a wāw. Such a suggestion could hardly have been more than a debating device, as it must have been common knowledge that in all other forms of the root, the middle radical, when strong, is waw. The ya can only have come from the imperfect of the fourth form, yuṭiq. Whether the ya suggestion did indeed have a fortuitous origin as outlined above or not, it was certainly taken seriously by later scholars, and considerably developed, while retaining its basic identity of meaning with the original yuṭīqūnahu. This development was no doubt helped by its supposed derivation from the strong root tawq via the form tafaiʿala, giving in this case (ta)ṭayyaqa, as tadayyara from dawr (Abū Hayyān, p. 35). This derivation need hardly be taken seriously: it is not evident that the form tafaiʿala is much more than a nonce-form, developed if not originated by the grammarians for their own convenience.

1 Cf. discussion on 'litukmilū', below, p. 152.
Vt: yutwiqūnahu

Read by Humaid (Qurt., p. 286, Ah', p. 35, Shawkānī, p. 158.)

Although this deliberate archaism might seem to be nothing more than an attempt to back up the grammatical opinion that all hollow verbs may follow either the strong or the weak inflection, in this case in the fourth form (cf. Wright I, para. 61), there is a further point at stake, connected with the arguments mentioned under the preceding variant. If, as this variant sets out to do, it can be established that the 'ain of täga is more properly waw, rather than ya, then the case of those who would support the variants and indeed the original reading with the middle radical ya is weakened. In effect of course the present variant is indistinguishable from the standard reading. This gives some indication of the speciousness of the variant literature, especially in its more elaborate forms: in attempting to support the waw form, the readers of yutawwaqūnahu have recourse in their search for proof to an adaptation of yutiqūnahu, which according to their system is an unacceptable reading.

Qurtubī and Abū Hayyān, treating it at the grammatical level, do not think much of it. Qurtubī says that the weak inflection, yutīq, is the regular one ('wa al-qiyās al-ītīlāl'), and the other adds that it is shādhdh.

Vt: yatastawwaqūnahu

Read by 'Ātā' from b. 'Abbās (Khal., pp. 11-2); b. 'Abbās (Zam., p. 255), Jeff., p. 195); noted by 'Ukbārī (MS, p. 57), Baidāwī, p. 38.

This is an alternative to yutawwaqūnahu, supporting the same argument by a different route, i.e. with the meaning '(those who) impose it upon themselves as a burden', rather than '(those who)
have it imposed upon them as a burden'. While there is little to choose between the two, it may be that the proponents of yatatawaqünahu favoured the more voluntary, self-affecting nature of the act described by the fifth form. It is quite possible, however, that the fifth form was preferred for reasons of euphony with the following taṭawa‘a. Such euphony would enhance the case of those claiming waw as the middle radical.

Vt: yattawwaqünahu


Parallel to the preceding variant. The contraction and assimilation are more ‘Quranic’, which may account for its being more widely recorded. This more polished form would probably be the later of the two; indeed it is first noted by b. Jinnī, who died after b. Khālawaih, the first recorder of the fuller version, although admittedly only a few years separated their deaths.

Vt: yattayyaqünahu

Read by b. ‘Abbās, Mujāhid, ‘Ikrima (b. Jinnī, sub Q2/184); Ibn al-Anbārī from b. ‘Abbās (Qurt., p. 287); ‘Ikrima and ‘firqa’, Mujāhid, b. ‘Abbās (AH, p. 35); b. ‘Abbās (Shawkānī, p. 158); ‘Ikrima and Mujāhid (Jeff., pp. 264 and 267).

1 See Wright I, para. 111. Comparable perhaps is the vt. yataṣa‘adu for yassa‘adu (Q6/125), and yatāṭahharū for yatataḥharū (Q9/108), Jeff., p. 256.
This reading, with second radical ya, can be seen as a counter to the preceding two readings; its development is doubtless parallel to that of yuṭayyiqūnahu, with a fifth form instead of a second. The ya is a reliable indication of a reading designed to support the arguments of those who approved of the original yuṭīqūnahu, that is to say it is a reading not opposed to the standard, but to those who oppose it. Again, some sought to give grammatical justification for the derivation of this form from the root t-w-q.

Although admitting that this reading is 'good Arabic', Qurṭūbī is careful to point out that this was not 'min al-qur'ān', and that 'innamā hiya qirā'a 'alā al-tafsīr'. As already pointed out, many variants probably owe their origin to a transformation of opinion into qirā'a, and it is likely that caveats such as Qurṭūbī's could be made concerning a great deal of them.

Vt: yatīqūnahu

Read by Nujāhid (Qurt., p.286, Jeff., p.277).

This is clearly an open attempt to provide a firm foundation for derived forms with second radical ya. It sidesteps the complicated grammatical devices, already alluded to, which are used to explain how yatīyayyaq may be derived from t-w-q, by asserting that there exists in conjunction with the root t-w-q another root, t-y-q; yatīq could only come from such a root. However, it is nowhere attested to in the lexica; Qurṭūbī states bluntly that the word is wrong, and should have waw and not ya.

Vt: yutayyaqūnahu

Read by b. 'Abbās (b. Jinnī, sub Q2/184); b. 'Abbās, 'Ikrima, Nujāhid (Jeff., pp.195,269,277 respectively); recorded by Zam., p.255,

1 See Abū Hayyān.
This reading is a refinement of yuṭayyiqūnahu, reflecting the attacked yuṭawwaqūnahu in the use of not only the second form, but also the passive voice. The difference in meaning between 'are able' and 'are enabled' is here overlooked entirely, for the purposes of debate. Lane, apparently quoting Tāj al-‘arūs
, equates this reading, wrongly, with yuṭawwaqūnahu. It is a further example of the efforts made to show that the ya verb was just as capable of full inflection as the waw verb.

Vt: yuttayyaqūnahu

Mentioned by Abū Ḥayyān, p. 35. In its use of the passive, this reading is clearly linked with the preceding one. They may simply have been employed to support the contention that the passive of this notional verb was a) possible, and b) bore the same meaning, for practical purposes, as the active. The relative rarity of this reading, compared with its companion, confirms the suspicion that the second, rather than the fifth, is the primary one.

Vt: yuttayyiqūnahu

Read by Mujāhid from b. Abbās (Khāl., pp. 11-2). This would appear to be the result of a copyist's error; it does not conform with any known verb paradigm. Possibly it is intended as a dialect form (see what follows), but as yuṭayyaqūnahu is separately noted from Mujāhid (Khāl., above, p. 136), it should probably be read yuṭayyaqūnahu, or, as the latter reading is otherwise anonymous, yaṭayyaqūnahu.

---

1 Though the source of his quotation is not clear.
2 Cf. also Zam., p. 255.
Vt: yittayyaqūnahu

Read by b. `Abbās (Jeff., p. 195). This reading can be seen as reinforcing the fifth form group of ya readings by deliberately employing a pseudo-archaic or dialectal form. By giving the ya form a respectable pedigree, its proponents may have hoped to disguise its newness. Alternatively, this variant could be considered as a spurious 'shāhīda', invented in order to be cited by those who claimed the prefix of the imperfect was capable of taking kisr. This explanation seems however to be less likely in this context, on account of the initially infirm position of the ya readings.

Vt: yutawwiqūnahu

Mentioned in commentary on Riyāḍ edition of Abū Ḥayyān, p. 35. To give this reading the idea of 'imposing' in any active sense, as its form demands, makes a nonsense in this context. In explanation of it, one can make out a case for its being the extreme point reached by the arguments of those who read ya in opposition to waw. The existence of the ya form having been demonstrated to their satisfaction, the obvious next step was to impose the meaning of the secondary group upon the original. This variant can thus be understood as being exactly parallel in both form and meaning, to the second form of the ya verb, in turn based on yutūqūnahu.

In the hadith, the form tūwwiqā is used in the sense 'to be

---

1 Cf. Wright I, para. 90, Remarks on the Imperfect.
2 Possibly a comparable example is the variant ni`bud for na`bud (Q1/5), alleged to have been read by Zaid b. 'Alī. (Jeff., ZbA).
3 Apparently also elsewhere: Lane mentions, concerning yutawwaqūnahu, that it appears 'erroneously' in the Calcutta ed. of the Qāmūs as yutawwiqūnahu. 4 See Wensinck’s Concordance, s.v.
enabled to'. Whether this seen as a denominal form from ṭaqatun, or the passive of the verb of yuṭawwiqūnahu, is not important: the point is that ṭawwaqa now incorporates in one form both of the ideas associated with the basic root, those of capability and burdening, which though related, were originally distinct.

VRT: yuṭaigntyūnahu

Recorded by Zamakhšarī, p. 255, and Bāḏawī, p. 38. Lane mentions the Calcutta edition of the Qāmūs as having this erroneously for yuṭaiwaqūnahu¹.

It is reasonable to assume that Zamakhšarī, and in turn Bāḏawī, was not perpetuating an error when they recorded this form, and that it is in fact Lane who is mistaken. If it is not connected, via yuṭaiwaqūnahu, with the derivation of ya forms from ṭawq, then it can only be satisfactorily classified as a diminutive verb, meaning '(those who) can manage only a little fasting'. This then would represent an attempt by those who favoured the waw readings to invest the now firmly established ya group of readings² with a meaning more acceptable to themselves. The oddity of the form suggests that it is scarcely more than a nonce-word, as indeed others of these variants seem to be, coined for the sake of argument and debate.

¹ Yuṭaiwaqūnahu has not been recorded as a vt; it seems to represent a stage in the grammarians' argument for deriving ya forms from ṭ-w-q. The basic form is said to be fai‘ala (see above). The ya having sukūn, badl occurs between it and the waw; the latter is assimilated, to produce double ya. In the case of yataṭaiwaqūnahu, whence yataṭayyaqūnahu, where the pattern is tafai‘ala, the grammarians are able, as noted already, to advance an 'example', tadayyara, from d-w-r. Abū Ḩayyān explains this process, originally in Sībawīh.

² And indeed the original yuṭṬa, with which it is skeletally identical.
The diminutive verb does in fact have a respectable pedigree: though limited by the classical scholars to certain verbs of wonder, it also occurs in dialect, and it seems likely that this example would be readily intelligible to the scholarly mind.

**Vt: yatātniqūnahu**

Recorded by Zam., p. 255, and Bair., p. 38.

This reading counters yaṭṭayyaqūnahu in the same way as the preceding one does yutāyyiq/yuṭqūnahu.

The proliferation of variants around the one word yutiqunahu, which can be reduced to just two basic points of view, is unusually great. It is facilitated by the nature of the original: a verb, hollow, and containing in its root two opposable ideas, which makes for much potential flexibility. It is hard to say why this potential became realised, for many of the forms produced are outlandish, if not unnatural. To recapitulate briefly on what was said earlier concerning the origin of variants in general, it seems that to make sense of the situation, a good many of this particular group of variants must be considered to be merely suggestions, possibilities, which were never intended to be taken as definite precedents or examples of genuine usage, but which through being recorded in writing, and quoted, acquired an air of authority, and came in the end to be called 'readings', and to have, in most cases, some specific attribution. This would appear to be a reasonable explanation of how the first polemical variants of all came into existence; whether it is the process underlying every one of them is uncertain. It is perhaps possible to separate from the variants proper a number of

1 Wright I, para. 184, rem. f.; Sībawih II pp. 4, 135; b. al-Anbārī, Gram. Streitfragen, Qn. 15, p. 57. 2 Cohen, pp. 141-2.
'readings' that in fact never became more than suggestions - these would be those such as the last two mentioned above, which are only recorded very late, and without 'authority'.

Vt: lā·yutīqūnahu

Read by Ḥafṣa (Jeff., p. 214); recorded by Jalālain, Abū Ḥayyān, p. 36.

This has the same effect as the yuṭawwaqūnahu variant. However, it seems that the suggestion that a 'lā' was to be inserted set too dangerous a precedent, and it was not widely accepted. This is parallel to a general tendency, among the most orthodox at least, to frown upon variants that were not formally close to the original, but involved additions. This insertion of a 'lā' is not however unique: according to Farrā', on Q2/158, some read 'an lā·yaṭṭawwafa'. The similarity of the roots involved is perhaps not without significance.

E: fidyatun taʿāmu miskīnīn

With this vocalisation, the fidya, if and when it is applicable, is specified straightforwardly as the food (or feeding) of a poor man.

Vt: fidyatun taʿāmu macākena

Read by b. ʿUmar (Bukh., K. Tafsir, Ṭab., p. 141); b. Hishām (Dānī, Taysīr, p. 79, Muqni', pp. 11, 89); b. ʿĀmir and Nāfī' (Bahāqī, p. 200); b. ʿĀmir from b. Hishām (Baid., p. 38); Hishām (Abū Ḥayyān, p. 37); b. ʿĀmir and the Medinese (B. al-Jazarī, Tafsīr, p. 226); Abū Ubaid, N&H, apparently has this as his textus receptus.

1 Other refs. in Jeff., Mat., e.g. p. 185 ('Allī). 2 fol. 24. Yet see fol. 26, where a ṭafsīr of ṭaṭawwara khairan is 'ay miskīnīn'.
This reading represents a direct difference of opinion concerning the amount of food to be paid over in the fidya. Some claimed that a number of poor were to be fed daily by one breaking Ramadzan, and presumably read the plural. Tabari, on the other side, claimed that if the plural were read, it referred not to the feeding of numbers of poor, but to feeding a single poor person for the number of days that had been broken. It is interesting to note that the ahl al-amsær, according to Dānī, are agreed that masākīna does not have an alif in writing. Thus the upholders of the variant take shelter behind an abbreviated form of orthography.

Vt: fidyatu taʻāmi miskīn/masākīna

Read by al-Hasan, most Medinese (Tab., p. 141); Nāfi and b. ʻĀmir (BM Or 4257, fol. 99); Nāfi and b. ʻĀmir from b. Dhakwān (Baihaqī, p. 200, Dānī, Tayzīr, p. 79, Baid., p. 38, Rāzi, p. 179); Nāfi and b. ʻĀmir (Tūsī, p. 116, b. al-Jawzī, p. 186); Nāfi and b. Dhakwān (Abū Ḥayyān, p. 37, BM Or 5609, fol. 66); Medina and Shām (Bagh., p. 70, Qurṭ., p. 287, Shawkānī, p. 158); Medinese and b. Dhakwān (b. al-Jazarī, II, p. 226).

There appears to be no practical difference between this reading and the preceding two. The only effect of the use of Ḳāf between fidya and taʻām is to define fidya. This variant thus seems to belong to the third class, i.e. it is a genuine variant probably owing its origin to similarity of pronunciation. That it is, or was at one time, a live issue, may be inferred from Tabari's discussion, where he talks of the practice of the qurrā', using the word in its commoner sense, that of reciters, rather than authorities for variants. The difference between fidya and fidyatun appears therefore not to be polemically based; its difference from the majority of variants is exemplified in the mention of schools.

1 See further on this the ṭafsīra, ad loc.
(Medina, Shām) in its favour, something which suggests that it formed a genuine point of disagreement\(^1\). What seems to be a comparable case occurs at Q4/92\(^2\), where the E 'fa-taḥrīru raqabatin muʿminatin' becomes in a variant attributed to Zaid b. 'Alī (Jeff., ZbA, 257), 'fa-taḥrīrun raqabatan muʿminatan'. This question of the use of idāfa is also the subject of variants at Q5/95 (Dānī, p. 100), and the two cases are linked by Baghawī, p. 70.

E: fa-man tatawawā' a khairan

As was noted in the previous chapter, khair is capable of being interpreted in various ways, none of which is definitely more suitable than another: it can be the adjective of a suppressed noun, a comparative, or a substantive in its own right. The comparative was clearly thought by some to be the intended sense, for it appears that the following variant counters that meaning.

Vt: fa-man tatawawa' a bi-khairin

Read by b. Masʿūd (b. Abī Dā'ūd, p. 57, Jeff., p. 29).

As just suggested, the use of bi gives khair a more concrete nature. Baidāwī, commenting on the standard version, decides that khairan stands for bi-khairin\(^3\), or that it has a suppressed noun, or that the verb here has a transitive force; these three alternatives reveal a common tendency to consider khair a substantive, and to read bi-khairin would confirm this and eliminate ambiguity. It

---

\(^1\) Perhaps also indicative of this is the fact that b. al-Jawzī (p. 186) also gives authorities for the E version. This is unusual, and appears to be a characteristic of b. al-Jawzī; he does the same for litukmilū (see below, p. 152).  

\(^2\) Which verse also contains a mention of fasting.  

\(^3\) Again illustrative of the mode of formation of variants: 'it could be' becomes 'according to N, it was'.

is of course possible that Baidawi's remark about the transitiveness of the verb reveals a point that was under discussion: in this case the variant would be the product of grammatical rather than legal or religious considerations. Bi-khairin is also read by b. Mas'ûd in a variant of Q2/158 (Jeff., p. 28).

Vt: fa-man tatawwa'a khairan fa-huwa sharrun, wa al-siyâm mu khairun

Read by Ubai (Jeff., p. 120).

Leaving aside for the moment the substitution of al-siyâm for an taṣūmū, it is evident that there was no doubt in the mind of the author of this variant that khairan refers to the fidya, and that the fidya is a bad thing, in no way an acceptable substitute for the fast. Although at first sight the antithesis of khair and sharr seems neat, in this context they are not quite opposites, even if one translates by 'better - worse'. It almost appears that tatawwa'a here has the sense of 'consider', 'reckon'. The length of this variant is remarkable.

Vt: fa-man yattawwa'a khairan

Read by Ḥamza and Kisā'ī (BM Or 4257 fol. 97); Ḥsā b. 'Amr and Yahyā b. Waththāb, Ḥamza, Kisā'ī (Qurt., p. 290, Shawkānī, p. 158); Ḥamza Kisā'ī and Khalaf (b. al-Jazarī, II, p. 223); Ḥamza and Kisā'ī (BM Or 5609, fol. 62); the Kūfans except ʿĀşim (Lane); b. Mas'ûd (Nöldeke, GdQIII, p. 61); noted by Zam., p. 255, and Ah., p. 38.

This reading is not noticeably different in meaning from the standard version. There may be a grammatical point at stake here, for which this variant is intended as a shāhīda, or conceivably it is desired to provide a parallel for one of the yutiqūnahu, such as yattayyaqūnahu. A further possibility along these lines is indicated by b. al-Jazarī, who notes that the same variant is said to appear
at the other occurrence of this phrase, at Q2/158. Here the variant is clearly influenced by the closely preceding yattawwafa.

E: wa an taṣūmū khairun lakum

Straightforward, with the exception of the possible ambiguity of khair once more, which does not in fact become an issue here.

Vt: wa al-siyāmu khairun lakum

Read by Ubai (Zam., p.255, Qurṭ., p.290, Nöldeke, GdQIII p.83, Jeff., p.120).

There is little to choose in practical terms between the an maṣdariyya construction and the maṣdar itself. Indeed, the point of this variant may be to demonstrate that fact. Sībawaih I, p.475: 'wa an taṣūmū... ya'ni al-ṣawm khairun lakum: al-ff'il bi-manzilat maṣdar'. It may however be designed to show that the regular maṣdar of the verb ṣāma is siyām rather than ṣawm. While it is tempting to see siyām exclusively as the maṣdar, and ṣawm as the noun (comparably with English 'fasting' and 'fast' respectively), no such consistency is displayed in Arabic, even in the Qurān itself, where siyām is made to carry both meanings. The one instance of ṣawm (Q19/26) seems to suggest a noun. Alternatively, the maṣdar may here be used simply to parallel in form the word fidya, and to make more explicit and striking the contrast between fidya and fast, and to enhance the preferability of the latter.

In Nöldeke is the observation that this reading eliminates the possibility of reading 'wa in taṣūmū' (see below). This suggestion seems somewhat out of place here, since although such a vocalisation could reinforce the optional nature of the alternatives of fast and fidya, this possibility is not entirely absent from the standard

\[1\] See also Jeff., p.28.
version. Further, to read 'in' here makes the rest of the phrase somewhat awkward, as it does not constitute a properly formulated jawāb to the condition.

Vt: wa in tasūmū

Read by Zaid b. 'Ali and Abū 'Imrān (Jeff., ZbA, p. 254); Zaid b. 'Ali, Abū 'Imrān, b. Qais al-Juba'ī (Uk. MS. p. 57, margin).

The use of 'in' for 'an' reinforces the sense of option in the phrase, but as just intimated, this does not result in any practical difference in meaning. Yet the change to what must be admitted is the less likely vocalisation can hardly be seen as other than deliberate. Possibly it represents a shāhida in a grammatical argument.

Vt: wa al-sawmu khairun lakum

Read by 'Atiyya from Ubai (Ah, p. 38); Ubai (Jeff., p. 120).

This reading is identical in meaning with that mentioned above using siyām, and seems to be intended to show either that sawm and siyām are interchangeable, and equally acceptable, which would tend to support the 'philological' explanation advanced for that variant, or alternatively that sawm does in fact mean 'fast', in the Quranic context: at Q19/26, there is some dispute among the commentators as to whether sawm means fast or some other thing. If this is the case, the 'siyām' variant could be seen as a deliberate counter to this, made by those who claimed that sawm in the Quran was equal to qam.

Q2/185

E: shahru ramadāna

The reading of shahru in the nominative admits of two interpretations: either it is in apposition to al-siyāmu, or (preferably) it is the mubtada', with ramadāna, of a nominal sentence, unconn-
ected grammatically with v.183. The 'i.e. wa lakum shahr ramaḍān' suggestion of Farrā' is not acceptable as a third alternative, as it is not really an analytical explanation.

Vt: shahr ramadāna

Read by al-Hasan (Farrā', sub Q2/185, Bergsträsser, p.24); 'Āsim and Mujāhid (Khāl., pp.11-2); Mujāhid, Muʿāwiya, al-Hasan, Zaid b. 'Alī, 'Ikrima, Yaḥyā b. Yaʿmur (b. al-Jawzī, p.187); Zaid b. 'Alī, 'Ikrima, Majūhid (Tuk. MS, p.57); Mujāhid, Shihr b. Ḥawshab, Hārūn b. Aʿwar from Abū 'Amr (Qurt., p.291); idem, plus Ḥaša from 'Āsim (Abū Ḥayyān, p.38); Mujāhid, Shihr b. Ḥawshab, Hārūn b. Aʿwar, Abū 'Amr, Kiszāʾī, Farrā' (Shawkānī, p.159); 'some readers' (Ṭab., p.144); also from Tūsī, p.121, Zam., p.256, Rāzī, p.181, Baidāwī, p.38.

Read in the accusative, shahr Ramaḍān can be seen as a direct badl of ayyāmin maʿdūdātīn. This is in direct contradiction to a number of muṭḥassirūn who considered a.m. to be not Ramaḍān at all, but some other number of days, part of the sawm al-awwal, which was in turn part of the naskh claims surrounding v.184. However, the connection with a.m. may still be minimised by considering the accusative of shahr to be the result of a suppressed verb, such as 'ṣūmū' (Baidāwī, 'Ukhrī). As explained above, it is very rarely that such extra words are the most natural way of bringing meaning to a Qurānic passage. In this case, a desire to see here an explicit command to fast Ramaḍān is probably the underlying motive.

Jazari, II, p.236, mentions that some run the two words together; this is most probably simply matter of tajwīd, and not stemming from any wish to obscure the vowel deliberately.

Ibn al-Jawzī (p.187) gives Qurānic parallels for this accusative which indeed could have offered the stimulus for the suggestion of

1 See above, p.35. 2 Cf. Bersträsser, p.24.
this variant\textsuperscript{1}. 

\textbf{Vt: shahara ramadāna}

Read by Mujāhid, Ḥumaid b. Qais, b. Muḥaṣṣin, b. Shihāb\textsuperscript{2}(Uk. MS, p.57).

This ingenious apparent transformation of noun into verb can, according to Ḫubārī, be explained in two ways: either shahara is nothing more than a dialect form of shahra (he cites as parallel nahr and nahar\textsuperscript{3}), or it is indeed a verb, with God as the unnamed subject. The meaning is thus 'God has made clear Ramadān, etc.' As far as may be judged, there is no polemical weight behind this altered introduction to the verse; it perhaps runs more smoothly as a sentence than the admittedly uncommon mubtada' without inna presented by the standard reading.

\textbf{Vt: shahri ramadānu}

Recorded by Ḫubārī, Imlā', p.82.

It is to be presumed that the possessive refers to God, and that as with the preceding variant, the intention is to produce a more smoothly flowing start to the verse, although it is perhaps intended to counter one or other of the other readings, by altering the skeletal outline of the word. The proposer of this variant was no doubt aware of the special position among months claimed for Ramadān by several hadiths\textsuperscript{4}, and also of the conviction held by some that Ramadān was in fact a name of God. It seems unlikely that this

\textsuperscript{1} Q22/77 millata abīkum, 2/138 sibghata allāhi.

\textsuperscript{2} These authorities possibly belong to Ḫubārī's next vt., al-qur'ānu.

\textsuperscript{3} The present vt. would thus be a shahīda for this phenomenon. Q2/249 has the vt. nahr for nahar (Jeff., Zba, p.255), and Q54/49 has the vt. qadar for qadr (Jeff., FZbA, p.232).

\textsuperscript{4} See below, p.395.
reading was intended to settle the related argument over whether one should properly say 'the month of Ramadan' or simply 'Ramadan'. The first person employed by this variant does not agree well with the passive verb which follows.

**E: alladhī unzila fīhi al-qur'ānu**

A straightforward statement; the passive verb is in harmony with the preceding 'kutiba' of v.183.

**Vt: alladhī anzala fīhi al-qur'āna**

Read by Zaid b. 'Ali, b. al-Samaifa' (Jeff., FZbA, p.220).

It is difficult to see any real change in meaning effected by the change to the active; the suspicion is that this is intended to act as a shahīda for another, parallel, variant elsewhere in the Quran, where the change is of some moment. It may be noted that this variant would support the claim that Ramadān is a name of God.

**Vt: qur'ānan**

Read by b. Kathīr (Dāñī, Taysīr, p.79).

This reading may presuppose some variant such as the preceding one, but it seems more likely that it is intended, by making it indefinite, to alter the meaning of the word qur'ān. The sense of the verse would then be 'The month of Ramadān is that in (or concerning) which it (i.e. fasting) was sent down as a prescription'. This reinforces the injunction to fast Ramadān which follows; such a reinforcement might stem from the widely attested desire for absolute explicitness about the command to fast, or in order to support a con-

---

1 See below, p.395. 2 Comparable are the FZbA vts., at Q13/36 (p.225) and Q29/46 (p.228), which have anzala pro unzila. Also in Jeff.p.164 we have anzala for nuzzila. But no advantage is apparent here either.
viction that Ramadan is to be fasted because it was in Ramadan that
the order to fast came down. This counters the standard Muslim inter-
pretation, distasteful to some serious commentators, that Ramadan
is to be fasted because the entire Quran came down en bloc in Ramadan
to the lowest heaven, thence to dispensed as and when required.

Vt: qurānuhu

Read by b. Kathīr (Dāni, Taysīr, p.79).

Disregarding the absence of hamza (on this, see next variant),
this reading can be seen as parallel to the preceding one, in that
it supports the same, more restricted, meaning of qur'ān. This mean-
ing, it should be noted, is by no means excluded by the standard
reading, though in that case the logic of the sentence becomes rather
involved.

Vt: al-qurānu

MS, p.57 (anonymously), Jazari II, p.226). Also attr. by Bagh. to Shāfi’ī.

This reading supports that group which would derive the word
quran from the root q-r-n, rather than from root q-r-‘1. This phil-
ological consideration reveals that from the tafsīr point of view,
this variant is no different from the standard version.

E: falyasumhu

An ordinary lam al-amr.

Vt: faliyasumhu

Read by 'Alī and 'Īsā (Khāl., pp.11-2); 'Ikrima, Sulaimān Taimī
and ?Ubaid b. Ḥuṣān (‘Uk. MS, p.57); al-Ḥasan and al-A‘raj (Qurt.,

1 See e.g. Rāzī, pp.182-3.
This variant can either be taken as genuine, simply a matter of differing pronunciation, or concerned to illustrate the grammatical contention that a lām al-amr does not necessarily take sukuń when preceded by a particle such as fa. Bergsträsser, p.27, gives other comparable instances of -li- for -l-.

Vt: falayagumhu

Read by al-Farrāʾ (Abū Ḥayyān, p.41).

Again, non-religious considerations lie behind this variant; it is read by those who claim that the vowel of the lām al-amr can vary to agree with the following vowel.

E: al-yusra.....al-ʿusra

The usual vocalisation, with sukuń of the sīn in both cases.

Vt: al-yusura.....al-ʿusura

Read by Abū Jaʿfar Madanī (Khāl., pp.11-2, Bagh., p.72, Wāsiṭī, fol.121, Nöldeke, GdQ III, p.139); ʿjamāʿaʾ (Qurt., p.301); Abū Jaʿfar, Yahyā b. Waththāb, Ibn Hurmudh, ʿĪsā b. ʿUmar (Abū Ḥayyān, p.42); Abū Jaʿfar, Abū ʿAmr (Jazarī II, p.226, 216); noted by Zam., p.256; Naṣr b. Shaibān, Abū Shaikh (ʿUk., p.57); Abū Jaʿfar, al-Ḥasan, b. Miqsam (Jeff., bM.).

Although possibly an innocent variant, a matter of pronunciation, this reading is certainly capable of 'substantiating' the claim that a noun of the measure fuʿal may equally be read fuʿal1.

1 Bergsträsser, p.20, gives numbers of variants of both fuʿal pro fuʿul and v.v. Cf. also Q103/2, khusur pro khusr (Jeff., FZbA, p.286); fuluk pro fulk (Q2/164) (Jeff., FZbA); muluk pro mulk (67/1, Jeff., FZbA).
It should perhaps be noted that this type of variant, in contrast to the more heavily charged type, e.g. yuṭawwaqūnahu, was not intended to supplant the original altogether, since it is the object of its supporters to point out that two forms of a word can exist side by side: their interests were served if, while accepting that the standard text read yusr, they could at the same time point to such and such a companion who read yusur.

Vt: al-yusrā

Read by Ubai (Jeff., p. 120).

If yusrā is taken as a superlative, this reading can be seen as upholding the claim of e.g. those who say that fasting while travelling is not necessarily banned by the Quran. The standard version of this phrase is usually taken as favouring the acceptance of the rukhā, and according to some, it obliged those travelling to take the easy path, i.e. to break. But by reading yusrā, the option is in some measure restored: one is to take that course which is easier, which, it is implied, will not necessarily in the case of everyone be that of breaking. Yusrā can also be taken as a noun, of substantially the same meaning as yusr, and in this case may be connected with the argument surrounding other words which can have a terminal ya added. Thus Ubai (Jeff., p. 149) is said to have read at Q23/71 bi-dhikrahum for bi-dhikrihim, and at Q20/14 li-dhikra for li-dhikri (p. 146). Bergsträsser, p. 22, also Jeff., p. 86, has a variant ḥusnā for ḥusnān (Q42/23).

E: li-tukmilu al-‘iddata

The fourth form verb, said by BM Or 4257 fol. 99 to be the

---

1 This somewhat strained interpretation is in fact applied by some even to the standard text: see e.g. Rāzī, ad loc.
commoner usage (i.e. than the second form).

**Vt: li-tukammitū al-'iddata**

Read by Abū Bakr and Ya‘qūb (BM Or 4257, fol. 99); b. Kathīr and Abū Bakr (Dānānī, Taysīr, p. 79); 'Aṣīm from Abū Bakr (Ṭūsī, p. 120); Abū Bakr (Bāgh., p. 72); Ya‘qūb and Abū Bakr (Wāṣitī, fol. 12); Abū Bakr from 'Aṣīm (b. al-Jawzī, p. 188, Rāzī, p. 188); Abū Bakr from 'Aṣīm, Abū 'Amr, al-Ḥasan, Qatūda, A‘raj (Qurt., p. 305); 'Aṣīm from Abū Bakr (Baid., p. 39); Abū Bakr and Abū 'Amr (Abū Ḥayyān, p. 42); Ya‘qūb and Abū Bakr (Jazārī, II, 226); also Zam., p. 256; b. Miqṣam, Abū Bakr, Ya‘qūb, al-Ḥasan (Jeff., bM.).

This reading and the standard version are so close in meaning as to make it likely that they are in fact genuine variants. However, there may be a link with the dispute over what ‘idda refers to. If one reading could be made to bear the meaning 'perform in full', and the other 'make up the number', then the first would support those who argue that ‘idda refers to the whole month, and the second those who favour the 'other days' prescribed for those sick or travelling. But the dictionaries offer no evidence of such a differentiation in meaning, and neither do the commentators hint at it: Qurṭubī states briefly that they are 'lughatān' - two equally acceptable forms of the same word. Other possible influences behind this variant include a desire for formal similarity between this verb and the following 'li-tukabbirī', and some connection with other Quranic occurrences of the same root: in BM Or 4257, we are additionally told that Abū ‘Amr used to read the second form, but

---

1 Bergsträsser has numerous examples of forms I and II being inter-changed 'ohne wesentlich Bedeutungsunterschied', and also some of II and IV, as here. Cf. also a‘lamtana for ‘allamtana, Q2/32, (Jeff., ZbA, p. 253), and anzala for nazzalna, Q50/9, (Jeff., FZbA, p. 232).
then changed to agree with 'al-yawma akwaltu lakum dīnakum' (Q5/3).
This last could however be seen as a counter to the variant made by
supporters of the standard text.

Q2/186
E: ُcibādī

The possessive ya is written in full.

Vt: ُcibādī

Read by Nuʿaim b. Maisara (Khāl., pp. 11-2).

This variant may just be a question of differing orthography,
or intended to demonstrate as a principle that in all case the first
person possessive suffix may be shortened. Such a claim would be
useful in e.g. the dhikr-dhikrī dispute, mentioned briefly above.
It is possibly intended to harmonise with the following dācı.

Vt: ُcibādīya

Mentioned by ʿUkbārī, MS, p. 57, possibly attributed to b. al-
Samaifaʿ and Abū Mutawakkil.

As ʿUkbārī says, this form represents the asl, an archaic form
of ʿibādī (cf. Wright I, para. 185, rem. d.). It is probably suggested
here simply as a grammarian's shāhīda 1.

E: al-dācı

The shortened form, though this time a present participle.

Vt: al-dācı

Mentioned by Baghawī, p. 73, BM Or 4257 fol. 99, Rāzī, p. 192.

1 Cf. perhaps the vt. baʿdiya for baʿdī (Q61/6), recorded by Jeff.,

The lack of supporting authorities clearly suggests that this is a simple orthographic variant, of no weight in argument, although there is the possibility that it is influenced by the standard, full, version of 'ibādī, above.

E: falyastajībū

A straightforward lām al-amr.

Vt: faliyastajibu

Mentioned by 'Ukbārī, HS, p. 57.

Again the addition of the kisra has no effect on the meaning, and this must be considered parallel in intention to faliyasumhu, above.

E: yarshudūna

The normal vocalisation of the imperfect of rashada.

Vt: yarshidūna


This vowelling is unusual. Lane does not record it. It may represent an attempt by a grammarian to establish a precedent for such a form. 'Ukbārī says it comes, like the preceding, from rashada.

Vt: yarshadūna

Read by Abū Simāl, b. Qais al-Juba'i ('Uk, MS., p. 58); noted by Zam., p. 256, Baid., p. 39, Alī, p. 47.

The vowelling of this variant is accepted as a 'lugha' of the standard version (Qurtubī, p. 313), and it may therefore be regarded...
as a genuine variant. The original verb in this case is rashida.

Vt: yurshadūna
Read by Abū Simāl (Khāl., pp. 11-27); noted by Abū Ḥayyān, p. 47.
Again, no difference in meaning can be detected, unless the use of the passive can be considered to suggest more closely the divine agency behind the verb; right-guidance thus becomes a reward for belief.

Vt: yurshidūna
Read by Ḥuḍādh, Abū ʿImrān, b. Abī ʿAbla (ʿUk. MS, p. 58).
A change in meaning, brought about by the use of the fourth form, is evident here, but the purpose of the variant is unclear. The basic message of the phrase, i.e. that from belief stems right-guidance, is not affected by whether it is the believers who receive the rushd, or others who receive it from the believers.

Q2/187
E: al-rafathu
The singular.

Vt: al-rufūthu
Read by b. Nasʿūd (Abū Ḥayyān, p. 48, Jeff., p. 29; Nöldeke, GdQ, III, p. 62); Zaid b. ʿAlī and b. Nasʿūd (ʿUk. MS, p. 58, margin); Zaid b. ʿAlī (Jeff., ZbA, p. 254); noted by Ṭab., p. 161, Zam., p. 257, Baid., p. 39, Rāżī, p. 199.
Although allowed by the dictionaries to be a masdar of the

1 According to Bergsträsser's text, this should possibly be read yurashshadūna. However, a footnote admits the first form, which, as Abū Ḥayyān shows, is attested to elsewhere.
verb rafatha (as indeed is al-rafath), al-rufūth is reckoned by 'Ukbārī and Jeff., ZbA, to be a plural. Whatever it is grammatically, there appears to be little change in meaning, unless it be that by considering it plural, rufūth can be taken to refer to the number of various activities whose licitness is confirmed by this phrase, in contrast to the more abstract sense of rafath. This seems unlikely however, as also does the possibility that the plural is a sign of the plurality of the nights in which rafath is allowed. There does not appear to be any definite connection between this occurrence of the root rafath and its later appearance at Q2/197, which also attracts a variant, namely al-rufūth. It is possible, though, that as Beck\(^1\) suggests, rufūth is influenced by the fusūq of Q2/197\(^2\).

\[E\text{: uhilla al-rafathu}\]

The passive verb parallels kutiba, v.183, and possibly also unzila, v.185. The unmentioned agent is of course God.

\[Vt\text{: ahalla al-rafatha}\]

Read by b. Maisara (Khāl.,pp.11-2); noted by ÅH,p.148, Zam., p.257, Nasim,p.199.

The general sense remains unchanged; this reading possibly serves as a parallel to a similar variant elsewhere in the Quran\(^3\).

---


\(^2\) Cf. also al-Farrā', ad Q2/187. He appears to suggest a b. Nas'ūd vt., la rufūth wa la fusūq, but this does not fit the context of Q2/187, and must be taken as referring to Q2/197.

\(^3\) At Q5/96, uhilla (ZbA,p.258) and ḥurrima (FZbA,p.223) both have vts. in the active. Here there seems to be a gain in harmony with preceding and following verbs. At Q5/1, uhillat becomes in a vt. ahlaltu (Jeff.,p.38, b. Nas'ūd. Also attrib. to Ubai and Zaid b. 'Ali).
It does not seem genuine, for the loss of harmony with the preceding verbs is very noticeable, and to abandon it can hardly be other than deliberate. It is possibly intended to parallel the unsila/anzala variant above, but the authorities are not the same. The difference in voice gives rise to a potential ambiguity in the subject: is it God or Muhammad that is stated here to have brought the change in dispensation? It is however unlikely that a Muslim would consciously introduce such an element of doubt.

E: wa-btaghū

The object of the 'seeking' here enjoined is not clear to the Muslim commentators. They suggest, for instance, wives, children, Lailat al-Qadr, and divine prescriptions. However, it is reasonably certain that the initial meaning of this passage is 'seek what God has written for you' (as opposed to 'imposed upon you'), referring to the just-mentioned rukhsa concerning nocturnal indulgence.

Vt: wa-btīghū

Read by b. `Abbās (Khāl.,pp.11-2).

This reading is apparently intended to establish a feature of dialect; it cannot be derived from any other verb or form than that of the standard version.

Vt: wa-ttabi`ū

Read by b. `Abbās (Farrā', ad.Q2/187; Zam.,p.257); b. `Abbās among others (Tab.,p.170); al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, al-Ḥasan b. Qurra (Qurt.,p.138); b. `Abbās, al-Ḥasan, Mu`tawiya b. Qurra (AH,p.50); b. Mīqasam, b. `Abbās, al-Ḥasan (Jeff.,bM.); noted by Rāzī,p.203.

1 See above,p.99. 2 Note that when asked whether this reading or the standard was preferable, b. `Abbās replies (in Farrā') that they are equal, but in Ṭabarī adds that (nevertheless) the latter is better.
The variant appears to be designed to function as evidence to uphold the claims of those who said that the early Arabic script was defective, thus helping to justify the existence of variants as a phenomenon: the skeletal outlines of this variant and the standard version are identical, and the meaning is virtually unaltered, and it would thus constitute a good 'example'. Alternatively, it can 'be seen to favour the opinions of those who claimed that what should be 'followed' is the divine prescriptions, rather than the other suggestions mentioned above. The variant is possibly influenced by close parallels elsewhere in the Quran, such as Q2/170: ittabi'ū mà anzala allâhū; Q7/3: ittabi'ū mà unzila ilaikum.

Vt: wa-bghū

Read by Aʿmash (Râzî, p.203, Jeff., p.316).

This variant, using the first form of the verb, practically synonymous with the eighth, eliminates the 't' infix of the latter form. This could conceivably be intended to prevent the reading of e.g. wa-ʾttabi'ū from the word skeleton, but the motive behind such a move remains obscure.

Vt: wa-ʾtū

Read by Aʿmash (Zam., p.257, AḤ, p.50, Jeff., p.316.).

This reading supports the acceptance of the Quran's rukhsa in the most direct way, atā here being understood in the sense atā imraʾatahu.

E: ʾākifūna

The present participle, in its usual form.

Vt: ʾakifūna

Read by Abū Simāl (Khāl., pp.11-2); Abū Simāk, Abū Nahīk (ʾUk. MS, p.58); Qatāda (AḤ, p.53).
According to the lexica, 'akif has no participial force, and no meaning relevant to the present context. It appears then that the omission of the alif is merely a feature of the script, rather than a matter of pronunciation. It is possible that it is intended to parallel the alleged omission of alif in the writing of the next variant.

E: al-masājadī

This clearly implies that there was at the time of utterance of this verse a plurality of places of worship which the followers of Muhammad might frequent.

Vt: al-masjidi

Read by Abu 'Amr (Khal., pp. 11-2); 'Āmir al-Sha‘bī, A‘mash ('Uk. MSS, p. 58); Mujāhid and A‘mash (All., p. 54, Jeff., pp. 277, 316).

The singular supports those who claimed that there was 'no i'tikāf except in the masjid al-ḥaram'. Later writers, such as Abū Ḥayyān, circumvent this by saying that here the singular is li-l-jins, generic. This variant is also proposed at Q9/17 (from Mujāhid, 'Atā'; Jeff., pp. 278, 286). In this case, the concern seems to be to establish that at the time of revelation there was only one place of worship for the Muslims.

It may be seen from the above that the question of fasting as it is treated in these few verses of the Quran contains a number of instances where differences of opinion became crystallised in variant readings. All the variants recorded can be accommodated within the scheme outlined in the introduction to this chapter.

1 See on this e.g. Rāzi, pp. 206-7.
Because these verses deal specifically with fasting, all the variants have been listed and commented upon. Those in the remaining verses mentioning fasting are of less interest, however, and will be omitted here.
Chapter Four

Fasting in the early hadīth

Introduction.

This chapter deals with the development of the theory on fasting, as a Muslim institution, in the period up to and including the life-time of Shāfi‘ī, who died in 204 A.H.; the materials used will be confined largely to those of authors who died before this date. This limit is chosen because of Shāfi‘ī’s great reforming and organising influence. After he elaborated his theories of usūl al-fīqh, bringing order and a comprehensive system where none had been before, the less disciplined approach to legal argument previously current suffered a rapid eclipse. Practically all those who post-date him are influenced by his thinking; the former individuality is much less in evidence. But before his time, it is possible to reconstruct from the works of the second century of Islam the outline and sometimes also the detail of the interests and practices of regions and individuals at a time when the fiqh was still developing, and when dogmatic considerations did not weigh so heavily in the expression and documentation of decisions. We may also discern the probable origins of many features of the Islamic fast which were later obscured, consciously or otherwise, by the homogenising tendencies of the hadīth process as later elaborated.

Briefly, before Shāfi‘ī’s reforms, lawyers derived their fiqh from a number of sources – custom, idealized custom, ra‘y, and the Quran. After Shāfi‘ī, there was a rapid adoption of a systematic approach: Quran, then the sunna of the Prophet, then qiyyās, and, later, ijmā‘. The content of the raw material of the

1 On the nature and impact of Shāfi‘ī’s works, see Schacht, Origins.
law naturally did not change overnight when Shāfiʻī's influence became felt: the bulk of it remained unaltered in substance, but with the new demands becoming felt, it had to be differently presented and documented. In the new, more stringent, atmosphere, references had to be given for any argument proffered before others would accept it. No longer could an argument stand by itself. A need for precise documentation had arisen, together with a demand that the origin of any particular doctrine be clearly traceable to one of the 'new' founts of law.

Accordingly, there came about the development and extension backwards of isāma, resulting from the heightened competition to supply more convincing and ancient authority for one's arguments, and the mutation of opinions into documented ḥadīths, appealing to Muhammad as the law-maker (or more accurately, law-ratifier), and the more consistent reference to the Quran. With the ḥadīth form now firmly established, internal documentation techniques flourish: the principle of abrogation becomes an important tool, and dating devices become commonplace. It must be stressed that with the exception of the ideal approach of Shāfiʻī himself, generally the principles he advanced tended to change only the form of legal material, and not the content.

As Schacht noted in his EI article on second-century literature, from the point of view of producing books, the lawyers were by far the most prolific group in this period of Islam. It is accordingly not surprising that with the sole exception of some occasional references in poetry, all our information on fasting in

---

1 Not necessarily the same, it may be noted, as following what the Quran said. 2 Internal in the sense that they affect principally the matn of the ḥadīth. 3 In the main article 'Arabiyya; 2nd. ed., p.588, col.2.
the first two centuries of the Hijra derives from legal works, in which category for practical purposes may be included parts of the Sira, and such of the tafsīr literature as is relevant. This is unfortunate in one respect, since there is no way of telling how much this information coincides with the actual practice of the time and place from which it originates. It becomes clear from a study of sections of the admittedly somewhat late Mudawwana, for example, that the fine detail of the discussion is almost entirely theoretical, and quite incapable of relating to normal practical life. This fact raises doubts concerning the true nature of the apparently less theoretical material: when Ḥālik says: 'al-‘amal 'indanā', the first inclination is to translate this as 'what we do', rather than 'our opinion'. But what of 'al-‘amal 'indī'? There is little hope of always drawing a firm line between the practice and the theory in this period; however, sometimes the matter is clear enough, and in later times non-legal writings can occasionally give useful information in this respect.

The treatment of the material here employed is a straightforward broadly chronological analysis of each topic. Although in no way novel as an approach, it is believed that this is the first time it has been applied to the type of material in hand. Included also are comments on the origins of the problem, where appropriate, and observations on the handling of their material by the source authors.

It has been found convenient to follow the Muslims' division of the discussion on fasting into various topics. These may be roughly divided under a number of group headings: days and other periods of fasting; practices relating to the fast which have Qur'anic connections; other practices; things which break the fast.

1 See e.g. Mudawwana pp.198,212,214,222.
Notes on the sources used in this chapter

These are principally collections of ḥadīths, drawn from two main areas. From the Hijāz, we have the Medinese Muwatta' of Mālik, d.179, a compendious work of ḥadīths and opinions; from the `Irāq, the Kitāb al-Āthār of Abū Yūsuf, d.182, generally opinions with short 'genuine' isnāds, and the works of Shaibānī, d.189: a version of the Muwatta'\(^1\), his Āthār and his Jāmi° Saghir. These last two works are broadly similar to that of Abū Yūsuf. Also `Irāqī, but somewhat later, is Ṭayālisī, d.204, the author of the first recorded musnad, containing almost fully developed ḥadīths of the classical type: alleged incidents of a period long past, recalled by a more or less extensive chain of 'authorities'.

The other main works also contain ḥadīths, but are more discursive and include more argument. These are the Mudawwana, a handbook of the early Mālikīs, and the writings of Shāfi`ī, who was originally Medinese in outlook but who subsequently developed a broader viewpoint of his own. His works are varied but in general orderly, and besides giving expositions of his personal opinion, he also left treatises dealing with those of others. Although frequently couched in polemical style, these latter works afford valuable material for the comparative study of the questions involved\(^2\).

Occasionally useful have been the tafsīrs of Muqātil b. Suhaimi,
d. 150, and Farrā', d. 2041, who were both 'Irāqīs.

The limitations of the present study have meant that, with the exception of the taṣṣīr of Muqātil, only printed works could be used for the chapters dealing with the ḥadīth. This has had the result that broadly speaking, the subject of fasting has been seen only through the medium of more or less canonical or proto-canonical materials. It remains to be discovered how much the conclusions reached would be modified by a knowledge of the arguments of those who did not follow the principles which became crystallised by Shāfi'ī.

Even when we are dealing with the writings of mainstream thinkers, there is no knowing how complete a picture is given by such material as is readily available: in the works of Shāfi'ī, there are clearly some lacunae, for example in the Kitāb al-Ṣawm al-Kabīr. The further qualification has to be made that even when ḥadīths do survive, they are often merely the bare bones of arguments. Much of what follows, then, has to be tentative and the result of informed surmise, though with some knowledge of how the minds of the early lawyers worked, it is hoped that the analyses advanced here coincide tolerably well with what actually happened.

---

1 Besides the 'Irāqīs and the Medinees, there also existed a Syrian school, but it receives scant attention in the surviving works. For an assessment of such Syrian material, see Schacht, p. 288.
Non-Quranic days and periods of fasting

It is evident from what follows that in the period which ended with the death of Shāfi‘ī regular fasting in addition to that prescribed by the Quran was widely considered to be a commendable and worthwhile practice. There were indeed some who disagreed with this, but they seem to have been a small minority.

This generally favourable attitude among the Muslims to fasting at certain times is but one aspect of the long Semitic tradition of viewing certain days as especially honoured. These days are almost always linked to the calendar: in one of the rare cases where this is not initially so, namely when the Prophet is credited with a recommendation to fast three days per month, the first reaction of the Muslims is to attempt to define precisely which days of the month are meant.

The following section is devoted to an examination of these various days and periods.

Friday

As Goldziher noted, Mālik 60 expresses strong opinions on the fasting of Friday: 'I have heard of no traditionist, faqīh, or other responsible person forbidding the fasting of Friday: to fast it is meritorious. I have seen a learned man fasting it, even choosing to do so out of preference (to other days)'. Mālik quotes no hadīths on the subject, and it is evident that only recently has he heard the suggestion that it might be wrong to fast on a Friday,

---

1 See section on Basic Fast, below, p. 211.
2 On this in Islām, cf. Goldziher, Tagewählerei.
3 See section on Three Days, below, p. 200.
4 REJ, vol.28, pp.83-4
which by implication is what at least some people were wont to do

Mālik’s favourable attitude to the practice is echoed in Shāfi‘ī’s Kitāb Ikhtilāf ʿAlī wa ʿAbdullāh (b. Masʿūd)\(^2\), where the latter, the eponymous founding figure of Kūfān legal thinking, is shown as opposing ʿAlī’s professed dislike of Friday fasting. ʿAlī represents a later stage of Kūfān doctrine\(^3\), and this fact may here be indicated by his doctrine being expressed in regular ḥadīth form, and the opposed view being simply a statement—a more primitive method of presenting an item in legal argument. By the time of Ṭayṣārī, however, b. Masʿūd’s doctrine too is expressed in ḥadīth form:

\[\text{Tayy.359:—Abū Dā‘ūd—Shaibān—ʿAṣim—Zīr b. Ḫubaish—ʿAbdullāh:}\]

\[‘ ma ra‘aytu rasūl allāh mufṭiran yawm al-juml’a’.\]

The wording of this ḥadīth may indicate that, under the influence of opposition, the original merely preference for Friday had hardened into something approaching an injunction.

Since in this early period the custom appears to have been widespread in area, it does not seem necessary to seek its origin in any specific outside influence\(^4\). Although it is dangerous to equate too closely the Muslim Friday with the Jewish Sabbath or Christian Sunday, it is reasonable to suppose that the pious mind will always try to honour the special day of the week, in the absence of any

\[\text{1 The Mudawwana is silent on Friday fasting. This probably indicates that among the Mālikīs there was still no difference of opinion on the matter, though as Friday is a voluntary fast, it may be that it was not thought worthy of discussion, along with other voluntary fasts which are well attested to outside the Mudawwana.}\]

\[\text{2 Umm 7/189.}\]

\[\text{3 See Schacht, Origins, pp. 240–1.}\]

\[\text{4 Possibly fasting was seen by some as an ancillary to the special Friday prayers. On the pairing of fasting and prayer in general, see p. 210}\]
prohibition or other discouragement. This would account for the state of affairs in the Muslim world until certain legal theorists who wished to sever all apparent dependence on Judaism, and indeed to contradict it positively, saw in the Friday fast a reflection of the Jewish and Christian tendency to magnify their respective sabbaths, and determined to suppress it. This notion becomes explicit in later hadiths. The fact that only in exceptional circumstances do the Jews actually fast on the Sabbath is here immaterial: although the Muslims in this respect were echoing the Jewish practice in their deprecation of Friday fasting, they were achieving their wider aim of the khilaf of the general taʿzīm of the special day.

1 Though in the Christian world at least, honouring it with a fast was not always acceptable: St. John Damascene, col. 71: Quicunque Dominicam aut Sabbatum jejunaverit, uno Sabbato excepto, hic Christi interfector est. 2 A tendency conveniently expressed by the one word 'khālifāhum'. See Vajda, A 1937, p. 63, Gaddižer, REJ 28, p. 77. Though possibly partly derived from an inherited dislike of the Jews, it is more likely to have stemmed from the new theoretical demand that Muslim practice be seen to have an exclusively Muslim pedigree. This demand manifested itself in polemical activity when, as here, the Muslim practice seemed to be based on non-Muslim precedent. This attitude was in contrast to the practice of some earlier lawyers who had been content to act on a more widely based system of precedent. Cf. b. Saʿd, 134: kāna rasūl allāh yuḥibb muwāfaqat ahl al-kitāb fīmā lam yu'mar fīthī. 3 See below, p. 286.

4 In the Talmud, Minor Tractates, p. 295, we find that a certain group of men generally given to fasting would not fast Friday out of respect for Saturday, presumably a reinforcement of the Saturday prohibition. There is no apparent link between this Friday ban and the Muslim one.
Goldziher also notes the parallel tendency embodied in the post-Shafi'î hadith 'lā taj'alū yawm 'Idikum yawm qawmikum'. His apparent implication here, that the Muslims generally regarded Friday as an 'Id, comparable to the major festivals, is open to doubt, for this hadith is more usually quoted in connection with the question of fasting on yawm al-fitr and yawm al-na'hr, q.v., p. 196.

The situation in Medina, however, remained stable as far as can be judged from the works of Shafi'î: he nowhere discusses the fasting of Friday in detail, but the passing mention (Umm 2/104) shows that the choice of Friday as a voluntary fast-day was known and tacitly approved.

As was noted above, it was not until after Shafi'î's time that specific reasons were advanced for not fasting Friday. Besides the b. Mas'ūd hadith (359), Tayalisi has four other hadiths, none fav-

1 Possibly not polemic, but anti-ascetic, since it is itself paralleled in Jewish lore (admittedly post-Muhammadan): Maimonides' Code, p. 274: 'No fasting on a festival, or even on its second day'. Cf. also Talmud, Mo'ed Katan, p. 46: 'No joyous celebration without food and drink'. This in turn recalls the Tashriq hadith (below, p. 200) to the effect that 'hādhihi ayyām aklin wa sharbin'.

2 This is not to deny that there are many hadiths in ta'zīm of Friday, some of which claim it is an 'Id, e.g. Mālik Tahāra, 113. See also Ḥilyat al-Awliyā', III, p. 266. 3 Although Tayalisi died in the same year as Shafi'î (204), his material is consistent in betraying signs of being considerably influenced by the ideas advanced by Shafi'î concerning the status and role of the sunna. His collection, in the form we have it, is probably the compilation of his pupils, and will not therefore be taken as conclusive evidence in pre-204 matters.
ourable to the practice, and all going back to the Prophet, in itself an indication of their relative lateness.

It is interesting that in three of them no direct attempt is made to dislodge the custom, which suggests that it was firmly established. The Prophet is made in 1623 and 2595 to prohibit the deliberate fasting of Friday by itself. It becomes allowable only if accompanied by a preceding or following day. This device avoids the absurdity of an outright prohibition of Friday fasts, when inevitably there will be at least four in every Ramadan. Tay. 1114, to judge by its isnad, which ends in a minor companion, Abü Aws, rather than the Abü Huraira of 2595 or the wife of the Prophet in 1623, is earlier than these two, and is predictably less severe but still negative in tone; the Prophet asserts that the ordinary devotions of a Friday properly fulfilled will count for far more than any amount of fasting, without any explicit command or prohibition.

Tay. 1922 assumes that Friday should not be fasted, for it shows b. 'Umar confronted with the dilemma of a man who has vowed to fast Friday. His reply shows that according to the proponent of the hadith the prohibition on fasting this day overrides the Quranic command to fulfill vows, an illustration of the principle that 'al-sunna takhuzz al-qurān.'

The prohibition also occurs in Tay. 2105, which lists various unfastable days. The last of these is 'yawm al-jum'a mukhtāṣa min al-aṭayām'.

It may be noted that the 'All hadith recorded by Shāfi‘ī does not appear to have survived elsewhere. However, Shu‘ba, who figured in the isnad of that report, also recurs in the first three of the above hadiths from Tayālisi.

---

1 Cf. Talmud, Erubim, pp. 28ff.: some say that no fast is proclaimable on X, Y, or Z, though acceptable if already commenced.
2 Q16/91. 3 See Shāfi‘ī, Risāla. 4 See above, p. 168.
From the absence of any pro-Friday-fast ḥadīths, it may be assumed not that there never were any, but that they were eclipsed by the prohibition hadiths that are preserved in Ṣayāliṣ; these last would not have developed their isnāds as they did without the stimulus of opposition. The prohibition seems to have been confined in this period to one area, ‘Irāq, which was why the almost complete unanimity of Ṣayāliṣ's hadiths was possible. The one exception, Ṭay. 359, does not reappear, and may be considered obsolete.

Apparently equally unanimous, but of the other opinion, was the feeling of the colleagues of Mālik and Shāfī'ī.

**Six days of Shawwāl**

In the tafsīr of the Bāṣran Muqātil b. Sulaimān, d. 150, is an intriguing ḥadīth: Saʿīd b. Abī Saʿīd - Barā' b. Ṭāzib: the Prophet said: 'he who fasts the month of Ramadān and six days of the month of Shawwāl, then that is as if he had fasted eternally (fahuwa ṣawm al-dahr)'. The intended inference from this is that these extra days of fast are a praiseworthy act. The ḥadīth is clearly virtually identical with Ṭay. 594: Abū Dā'ūd - Warqā' - Saʿd b. Saʿīd - 'Amr b. Thābit - Abū Ayyūb: the Prophet said: 'He who fasts Ramadān and follows it with six (days) of Shawwāl has as good as fasted the whole year'.

1 Fol.24 2 Note the extended and developed isnad. Muqātil is generally held (see Brockelmann, Sezgin) to be an unreliable authority because of his apparently casual treatment of isnāds; however, it is equally possible to advance his lack of concern for isnāds as proof of his genuine earliness, and the authority of his reported statements. His material does not appear to be anachronistic, and there seems no good reason to doubt that what is attributed to him is indeed his.
The only lengthy discussion of this subject in this period comes in Mālik 60, where we find a long rebuttal of such a proposition, in tones comparable in their vehemence to those of his defence of Friday fasting. Mālik says that he knows no-one of the ahl al-‘ilm or fuqahā who fast these days. He has heard nothing on it from any of the salaf (i.e. no ḥadīth-type information); it is frowned upon by ahl al-‘ilm; they fear it as a bidʿa, and that ignorant folk should join to Ramadān what does not belong to it, even if they did consider that ahl al-‘ilm did give them licence in this matter.

Although writing much later than the period in question, Abū Bakr Ṭūṭūshī, d. ca. 520, records some early opinions on the six days of Shawwāl, which since they are not cast in ḥadīth form, may perhaps be authentic. He notes that Mālik disliked (kariḥa) such a fast (as above), and that similarly Abū Ḥanīfa ḥā istaḥabba ṣiyāmaha. Shāfīʿ, however, yastahibbu ṣiyāmaha. Ṭūṭūshī concludes, almost certainly correctly, that Shāfīʿ bases himself on a version of the Prophetic ḥadīth already mentioned; this being, as far as we can tell, the only ḥadīth in this period, Shāfīʿ would have had no option, according to his own system, but to accept it. In Ṭūṭūshī’s view, Mālik and Abū Ḥanīfa have no argument to fall back on, unless it be that they fear that enforcing this fast could lead to people thinking that it was an extension of the far-īda, the prescribed month of Ramadān. As we have seen, Mālik does indeed dislike the idea of joining the extra days on to Ramadān; however, his position is far from being a reluctance to enforce the fast, as Ṭūṭūshī imagines, but rather that of unqualified disapp--

1 pp.60-1. 2 Cf. the partisans of b. Masʿūd in Shāfīʿ’s K. Ikht. ʿAllā wa ʿAbdullāh, referred to above: ‘hum yastahibbuna ʿawm yawm al-jumʿa’. 3 Though none such is contained in any of the extant works of Shāf.
Hālik understands the six days to come after the 'Īd al-ifiant, but this may be because for him Rāmāḍān without the usual iftār celebrations is unthinkable; certainly it is possible that this ḥadīth proposes a fast of 36 days, and equally certainly, the fate of the iftār ceremonies would be one of the first questions to come to the mind of the average Muslim on hearing a suggestion such as that contained in the two above ḥadīths. Leaving this aside, for it is never apparently discussed, the only reasonably definite observation to be made is that, as with the prohibition of the Friday fast, 'Irāq is the source of the bidā'-a, although, as noted above, there were some, such as Abū Ḥanīfa, who were not keen on the practice.

The underlying motive remains obscure; nevertheless, several possibilities suggest themselves. This fast can be seen as in some way counter to the widespread (in ḥadīth at least—see below) notion of the desirability of a fast of three days per month, both 30+6 and 12×3 having the same total of 36\(^1\). The 36 days thus fasted would then be free of any of the associations undoubtedly present in some formulations of the three days' fast\(^2\).

---

\(^1\) See ahead, p. 201, where three days' fast per month is likened, as in the Muqātil ḥadīth above, to al-dahr. The three days' fast is sometimes rationalised by reference to the Quranic 'al-ḥasana bi-ashri anthālihā' (6/161), which may of course also lie behind the 6 of Shawwāl suggestion. This has an interesting parallel in St. John Damascene, col. 67, where it is explained how seven times five days fast in Pentecost, plus one, plus one half-day, equals a total of 36\(\frac{1}{2}\) days, in turn equivalent to one-tenth of a year.

\(^2\) E.g. Thursday-Monday-Thursday, p. 203; the 13th, 14th, and 15th of the month, p. 202, both having Jewish connections.
It is suggested that these days are intended to be used by women to make up those days of Ramadān rendered unfastable through menstruation. This appears to be an attempt to minimize the importance of the Shawwāl fast, for there is nothing in the ḥadīths to justify their exclusive reference to women, nor is menstruation commonly held by Islamic law to last six days. Certain modern sources do however reveal a connection between women and this particular fast. Antoun, dealing with sundry fasting favoured by women, mentions among others the fast of six days of Shawwāl, after the fiṭr, which is in turn followed by what is called ‘Ṭd al-‘ajā’iz’. A. Jaussen mentions a Fête de la Dame (‘Ṭd al-sitt) in Shawwāl, and he says there exists some confusion between this and the ‘Ṭd al-sitta (of Shawwāl). The only widespread example in Islamic literature of anything taking six days is that of the Creation.

The idea of six days of fasting is also present outside Islam. According to the Universal Jewish Encyclopaedia, some would fast six days after the New Year. Moses is credited with having waited

---

1 See e.g. on this Th. W. Juynboll, Handbuch des Islamischen Gesetzes, (Leiden/Leipzig) 1910, p.132.
2 Although not mentioned in the Qur'an as one of the muftirat, nevertheless menstruation is unanimously held to be such, at least by the fuqaha'. See b. al-Ḥājj II, 64, for an account of a common practice in defiance of the fuqahā'. 3 p.100.
4 It is a curious fact that voluntary fasts are often in Islam particularly associated with women. This is borne out several times in the ḥadīth: see what follows.
5 p.341. Conceivably the 'sitt' is not the honorific at all, but stands for sitt layālī.
6 E.g. Q25/59,32/4,50/38,57/4. Adam and Eve stayed in Paradise for six days. (b. Qutaiba, Ma‘ārif, Cairo 1960, p.15).
six days on the mountain before receiving the Ten Commandments, in order to be purged of all the food and drink in his bowels. St. John Damascene, col. 74, mentions a six-day fast 'propter Judaeorum iniquitatem'. It remains to be seen whether or not these instances have any bearing on the Muslim practice.

'ʔAshūrā'

That 'ʔAshūrā', a fast day celebrated on the tenth of Muḥarram, is closely related to the Jewish Yom Kippur has long been established. Its name and time of celebration leave no doubt about this. However, the assertion that 'ʔAshūrā' has formed part of Islam everywhere since Muhammad's lifetime, an assertion based on 'unanimous reliable tradition', must be questioned. In the first place, there

1 Talmud, Minor Tractates, p. 1.
2 See Lev. 23/27. Y. K. is supposed to have been instituted so that the Children of Israel might atone for the sin of the Golden Calf; fasting is but one element of the atonement rites of this day.
3 Goldziher REJ 25, p. 75; Vajda JA 229, p. 122; HUCA 1938, p. 373ff.; EI article "ʔAshūrā" (Wensinck). Vajda's treatment of the subject is perhaps the fullest hitherto, at least in its reference to the ḥadīth material involved. However, while correctly apprehending the motive of parts of this material, he was prevented from seeing the pattern of the whole by his approach, which lacked any examination of chronological development, and by his eclectic attitude to the ḥadīths.
4 Wensinck, EI 1&2; accepted by most European scholars, including the most recent: Vajda (see n. 3), Goitein, Wagendonk. As Schacht, Origins, p. 4, points out, the general recognition of Goldzi's findings on the ḥadīth, and their implications, has not always been accompanied by their being implemented other than haphazardly, with frequently unfortunate results.
is no justification for considering the text of any ḥadīth to be a record of historical fact; claims of reliability and unanimity can have little value when it may be shown that both qualities have been artificially engineered. In the second place, careful analysis of the earliest authentic discussions reveals a picture that simply does not tally with the orthodox Muslim view, which is largely that of the West also.

Certainly, there is a large number of ḥadīths on the subject of 'Ashūrā', and not one attempts to deny that the Prophet ever fasted it. But Mālik, who has three of the more widely circulated ones significantly makes no comment on them or their differences (one enjoins the fast of 'Ashūrā', two forbid it), even though they contain the germ of an argument which Shāfi‘ī felt obliged to deal with at length in Kitāb Ikhtilāf al-Ḥadīth. This indifference is reflected in the authoritative handbook of the early Mālikīs, the Mudawwana, which contains only one passing reference to 'Ashūrā': 'Qadā' of Ramaḍān may be performed in the first ten days of Dhūl-Ḥijja and also on the day of 'Ashūrā'. The implication here, by analogy with the case of the ten days of Dhūl-Ḥijja, is that while 'Ashūrā' might be fasted for itself, it is not so special that another type of fast may not be performed on the same day. It appears from the preceding items of information taken as a whole that while known as a day connected with fasting, 'Ashūrā' was not of extraordinary significance, and certainly not comparable to any fast prescribed by the Quran. The latter, it need hardly be said, makes no mention, direct or otherwise, of 'Ashūrā'. This must be taken to

1 Cf. Goldz., Muh. Stud. II, on tadlīs, etc. 2 Malik 33, 34, 35.
3 p. 211. On p. 215 is a discussion on the (voluntary) fasting of Muharram; though the case is probably entirely hypothetical, it is yet noteworthy that there is no mention of 'Ashūrā', even implicitly.
represent the general early Medinese attitude, and possibly that of the Hijaz as a whole.

Knowledge of 'Ashūrā' among the Muslims would stem either from the Jews, for whom it was one of the most important festivals, or from popular memory. There is also the likelihood that not a few Muslims fasted 'Ashūrā', since Jews had formed a considerable part of Muhammad's earliest followers, and, in some areas at least, were among the number of the converted, and in the absence of a Quranic prohibition, they would be unlikely to wish to forego the spiritual benefit to be derived from the observance of this great day. Bear- ing in mind that the essential motive behind the Jewish 'Ashūrā' was the forgiveness of sins, which is not an exclusively Jewish concept, there is no reason why the descendants of these converts should not have perpetuated the custom. For the Medinese, therefore, 'Ashūrā' was an accepted and non-controversial fact. We must look elsewhere for the origin of the differences of opinion.

It is significant that the earliest opinions concerning 'Ashūrā' come from the Iraq. In the Iraq there were not only the flourishing Muslim centres of learning and population, but also the academies and settlements of the Jews. The situation was therefore conducive to that spirit of polemic which pervades so much of the Classical Muslim writings, perhaps the best example being the tafsir of Tabari. The Muslims found themselves obliged to establish their separate identity, and when a Muslim practice seemed to owe too much

1 Various hadiths explicitly acknowledge this aspect of 'Ashūrā' as a Muslim occasion: see the 'Arafa comparative hadiths, below, p.189. Vajda, NUCA, p.373, n.9, notes that Zurqānī has a hadith in which the Quraish are said to have adopted/instituted 'Ashūrā' in expiation of a great sin they had committed - an obvious calque of the traditional Jewish explanation. See further on this, ch.5.
too overtly to outside influence (it will emerge from this chapter that this was usually Jewish influence) the apologists had either to suppress it or disguise it. It is perhaps indicative of the strength of 'Ashūrā' as an 'Islamic' rite that in general the latter course, that of disguise, was adopted for it.

Our earliest record of 'Ashūrā' comes from the tafsīr of Muqātil (fol. 22), who makes the brief observation that 'Ashūrā' was practised before the imposition of Ramaḍān. This refers to the notion that the fast of 'Ashūrā' was abrogated by the subsequent prescription of Ramaḍān. Next in the 'Iraq, Shāfi‘ī has preserved for us a difference of opinion between b. Mas‘ūd and 'Alī, who stand respectively for the earlier and later Kūfan schools. 'Alī appears in a ḥadīth that is later attributed to the Prophet, in which he goes

1 Their objection was not usually to the content of a practice, nor to its 'foreign' nature. Their concern was the theoretical one of showing that a practice had a proper and specifically Muslim pedigree, and was not adopted on the basis of a loose general custom. As is the case with much of the ḥadīth, the problem for the Muslims is one of documentation rather than content.

2 With the accompanying implication that 'Ashūrā' had been an obligatory fast in Islām. See further on this below, and ch. 1. This ḥadīth is itself an indication that 'Ashūrā' was already the subject of debate and difference. 3 K. Ikht. 'Alī & b. Mas‘ūd. 4 See above, p. 177.

5 This reference to 'Alī is possibly preserved in Tay. 1212: 'mā ra‘ayt aḥadān a‘mara bi-ṣawm 'Ashūrā’ min 'alī b. abī ʿālib wa abī mūsā’.

6 Arabic: kharaja yastasqī. This reference to istisqā‘, rainmaking, is mystifying. It occurs in no other version of the ḥadīth; as far as may be ascertained, 'Ashūrā' is never connected with rainmaking either in Judaism of Islām. On istisqā‘, see below, p. 205.
out on the day of 'Āshūrā', telling such persons as started the day fasting to carry on doing so, and such as did not, to refrain thenceforth from eating. As it stands, this ḥadīth can hardly be seen as other than a straightforward commendatory ḥadīth, favourable to 'Āshūrā'; subsequent versions¹ are somewhat modified. The supporters of b. Nas'ūd, however, reckon that he who did not start the day fasting should not fast (sc. the rest of the day). While it is possible to see this as less favourable to 'Āshūrā', it is more than likely that the point at stake is not 'Āshūrā' at all, but whether once having started a day in a particular condition (i.e. either fasting or muftir), one may afterwards change it². As such, this represents simply a divergence between two groups of scholars, and has no obvious polemical overtones. It is difficult to decide whether the original role of the 'Ali ḥadīth was to settle this question of the change of state, or whether it is here being quoted by the b. Nas'ūd party out of context. Certainly in later discussions, it always appears solely in the sections connected with the fasting of 'Āshūrā'.

Abū Yūsuf (801) records a polemical assertion, attributed to b. 'Abbās, that 'Āshūrā' is on the ninth (of Muḥarram). This is clearly in opposition to 802, from Ibrāhīm, that it is on the tenth. Ibn 'Abbās's suggestion is designed to camouflage the true origins of 'Āshūrā'³, which reveals by its very name its essential connection with the tenth day. 802 may be considered subsequent to 801 in time, for otherwise it would have been an entirely unnecessary observation. The claim that 'Āshūrā' is on the ninth accepts that it is a well-established custom among the Muslims, but attempts to

¹ See ch. 5. ² This is connected with the question of the nīya, or 'intention', the relevance of which to the fast is discussed at length in the Mudawwana, and elsewhere. ³ In line with the 'khālifūhum' precept, on which see p. 169.
deny its origin from, and connection with, the Jewish festival of the same name and time of celebration.

As has already been said, concern over 'Ashūrā' seems at this period, i.e. before Shāfi'ī's systematic discussions, to be limited to the scholars of the East. The contents of Mālik's hadīths, while bearing evidence of controversy, seem to reflect mostly 'Irāqī 'concern rather than that of the Hijāz. Mālik 34 runs: Ibn Shihāb - Humaid b. 'Abdulrahmān b. Awf heard Mu'āwiya b. Abī Sufyān say on the day of 'Ashūrā', from the pulpit, 'People of Medina, where are your ulema? I heard the Prophet say of this day, "It is the day of 'Ashūrā'. Its fasting was not prescribed for you. I am fasting it. He who wishes to, let him fast it, and he who wishes to, let him break on it." Here the question is not one of origins, but of status. The plain message of the hadīth is that 'Ashūrā' is for the Muslims not more than a sunna, an optional matter entirely. This stands in contrast to the claim that 'Ashūrā' was at one time or another a fard fast prescribed for the Muslims, a claim made by some Muslim theorists who hoped to deprive 'Ashūrā' of any current standing within Islām by considering it abrogated by Ramaḍān. In order to further this claim, it was initially necessary to posit that it had once been obligatory, for if Ramaḍān was technically to supersede another fast, then this other fast had to be comparable to Ramaḍān, namely wājib. This argument is largely an internal Muslim affair in its details, but it is of course not accidental that the alleged position of 'Ashūrā' as a Muslim fast, that of being optional, is in sharp contrast to its strictly obligatory nature in Judaism. Although the isnād of this hadīth is 'Medinese', this is no guarantee that the hadith is itself Medinese.

It seems that some were not prepared to accept that 'Ashūrā'

1 Cf. Schacht, Origins, p.32.
was only optional; such persons would have in the earliest period been concerned to uphold the practice of fasting on that day as a religious observance, rather than make any claims about its origin or status within Islam. Thus Malik (35) says that he has heard that ‘Umar b. al-Khattab (one of the most renowned Medinese authorities) sent word to ‘Harith b. Hisham that the following day was ‘Ashura’, and that he should fast and order his people to fast too. In Yus. 803, the same hadith appears, now with the Prophet instead of ‘Umar, and ‘Harith replaced by an anonymous companion. The hadith is reinforced with an additional phrase which says they are to fast even if they have already eaten (on that day). Although the common subject matter is bound to be responsible for a certain similarity in the hadiths, it seems that these last two, and the Ali hadith above¹, and the latter part of the Mu‘awiya pulpit hadith, can all be traced to a common original sentiment in which one person urges a group of others to observe the fast, with subsequent polemical variations. This original was basically concerned with the straightforward promotion of ‘Ashura’ as a sunna; since these versions contain no dating devices, there is no justification for the claim² that the Prophet’s advocation of ‘Ashura’ here predates the new order of things brought about by the imposition of Ramadan: there is also no indication that these hadiths are concerned to promote ‘Ashura’ as a sunna in technical contrast to a prescriptive fast. They would thus seem to represent an early stage of the argument.

Malik’s third hadith is from ‘A’isha: ‘Ashura’ was a day that the Quraish used to fast in the Jahiliyya, and the Prophet (too)

¹ p.179.
² Made in most tafsirs, and subsequently forming the foundation of most Western theories on the chronology of fasting in early Islam.
used to fast it in the Jāhiliyya. When he came to Medina, he fasted it and ordered its fasting. When Ramadān was prescribed, then that was the farīda. And the day of 'Ashūrā' was left. And he who wanted to, fasted it, and he who wanted to, left it. The report reveals two other steps in the disguising and downgrading of 'Ashūrā'. Firstly, 'A'isha is made to assert that it was a day fasted by the Quraish, of whose number Muhammad was naturally one, in the time of the Jāhiliyya. Although appeal to the 'amr of the Jāhiliyya is not usually welcomed in the hadith literature, the object here is clearly to provide an Arabian, i.e. non-Jewish origin for the fast of 'Ashūrā'. The appeal to the Jāhiliyya is however only temporary, for, it having been established that the Prophet too used to fast it and indeed made it obligatory after his arrival in Medina, the second attack is made, along the lines already indicated above: the concession to 'Ashūrā' being granted, it is now countered by the assertion that after Ramadān came down, the former fast was then left (taraka/turika), and became optional. Closely parallel to the Malik 33 hadith are Tay. 784 and 1211. The prime concerns of this hadith, then, are to supply 'Ashūrā' with a non-foreign pedigree, and to settle its theoretical status within Islam in such a way as to accord with what must be presumed to be its contemporary position, that is to say, a fast not comparable to Ramadān but nevertheless widely recommended. The relationship between 'Ashūrā' and Ramadān is also discussed in tafsīr, but the bulk of this material postdates the hadith arguments, and there is little doubt that this is an instance of the tafsīrs' being in debt to the hadīth, rather than

---

1 In accordance with the new demands in the matter of documentation. See above, p. 169.
vice-versa.  

The Muw. Shaib. does not have a ḥadīth equivalent to Mālik 33, the ‘A‘īsha/Jāhilīyya report, but under his version of Mālik 34, the Mu‘āwiya ḥadīth, Shaibānī adds a note which amounts to a paraphrase of it. He concludes with the observation that ‘Āshūra‘ is (now) optional, and this is said to be the attitude of Abū Ḥanīfa ‘wa-l-‘āmma qablanā’. From this it appears, as suggested above, that the last phrase, an expression of the actual state of affairs,  

1 As explained, the sequence of events carefully outlined in this ḥadīth is typical of a 'dating' ḥadīth, habitually employed in questions of abrogation, such as the tafsīrs of Q2/183-7 deem unavoidable. An abrogatum is necessary for the theory built round these verses to work, and the ‘Āshūra‘ abrogation claim, familiar from ḥadīths such as the present one, was chosen by some (not all - an indication that the ‘Āshūra‘ claim was not universally accepted, and was certainly not regarded unanimously as historical fact) to fill this role. Naturally, an element of religious polemic is not absent here. The claim that ‘Āshūra‘ was ever obligatory in Islam represents nothing more than a stage in a technical argument, primarily of those concerned with usūl al-fiqh, but latterly adopted by the tafaqrists also. See also ch.1 on this.

2 Until more is known of the relation of the two Muwattā’s it is difficult to assess the relative significance of their contents. There are indications that possibly Mālik’s Muwattā' as we have it is rather later than Shaibānī’s, and, were this so, it could be that Mālik 33 is in fact the realization in hadith form of a commonly-held theory such as is expressed in Shaibānī’s note ad his version of Mālik 34. It is unlikely that Shaibānī is rendering a hadith in his own words.

3 'He who wishes to, let him fast it, and he who wishes to, let him break on it'.
is the only part of the hadīth of even remote legal applicability, and that therefore as a whole it reflects other considerations, namely the establishment of the technical theoretical basis of ‘Ashūrā’ within Islam.

Shāfi‘ī is the only source to give any lengthy exposition of the subject in this period; he has some new hadiths in his late work, Kitāb Ikhtilāf al-ḥadīthī, and his main concern is this theoretical one of settling the question of whether ‘Ashūrā’ was ever obligatory or not. The original simple question of advocating ‘Ashūrā’ as a good practice is now quite obscured.

Of the six ḥadīths that Shāfi‘ī quotes here, the second is the same as Mālik 33, the ‘A‘isha/Jāḥiliyya report, and is indeed related from Mālik, as in the fourth, equivalent to Mālik 34, the Mu‘āwiya ḥadīth. The third is an expanded version of the latter, but the additional material has no apparent relevance to ‘Ashūrā’. The fifth is clearly related to Mālik 33: thiqa – Yaḥyā b. Ṭāsān – Laith b. Sa‘d – Nāfi’ b. ‘Umar: the day of ‘Ashūrā’ was mentioned in the Prophet’s presence, and he said, ‘It was a day that Ahl al-Jāḥiliyya used to fast; he of you who wishes to fast it, let him do so; he who dislikes it, let him leave it’. This hadīth does not appear in later collections, and may well have been superseded by the more complicated Mālik 33, which introduces the question of Ramaḍān. Although Mālik 33 is the first of the two to be recorded, it seems probable that the b. ‘Umar version was the original. These four hadiths of Shāfi‘ī’s consider ‘Ashūrā’ to be now optional.

The remaining two differ: the sixth is from Sufyān – ‘Ubaidallāh b. Abī Yazīd – b. ‘Abbās: I never knew the Prophet to fast a day

1 Umm 8/498. 2 Gaudefroy-Demombynes, Mahomet, Paris 1957, p.563: ‘Abdullāh b. ‘Umar refused to fast ‘Ashūrā’ in order not to follow a pre-Islamic custom. (No source given).
preferring its faql over other days except this day, i.e. the day of ‘Ashūrā’. This hadīth is plainly favourable, and also uncomplicated. It is quite unconnected with the disguising 'ninth Muḥarram' hadīth mentioned above by Abū Yūsuf as being related in the name of b. ‘Abbās.

The remaining hadīth of Shāfi‘ī, the first one he quotes in Kītāb Ikhtilāf al-Ḥadīth, is from b. Abī Fudaik – b. Abī Dhi‘b – Zutri – c. ‘Urwa – c. ‘Ā’isha: the Prophet used to fast the day of ‘Ashūrā’, and ordered (amara) its fasting. The implication of this hadīth is obvious – ‘Ashūrā’ is to be regarded as an obligatory fast. However, it is noteworthy that the Mālik 33 hadīth, the ‘Ā’isha/Jāhiliyya report, which appears to incorporate this hadīth, is also related from ‘Urwa – ‘Ā’isha. Again there is the problem of what would appear to be the secondary, more developed, hadīth being recorded before the simpler one. Nevertheless, it seems reasonable to suggest that Shāfi‘ī’s first hadīth represents a fairly primitive and ‘innocent’ pro- ‘Ashūrā’ attitude which was successfully countered at a later stage, when polemical considerations had become more dominant, by amalgamating it with a ‘Jāhiliyya’ hadīth2, and thus producing a hadīth3 which (a) put ‘Ashūrā’ on a more acceptable level (i.e. made it 'optional' probably reflecting current practice or at least pious opinion) and (b) solved the problem of its non-Muhammadan origins, which had caused trouble both on the level of inter-religious polemic and in the field of internal usūl al-fiqh theory.

It is in fact the Zuhri – ‘Urwa – ‘Ā’isha report which prin-

---

1 In the ḥadīth, Amara does not invariably convey a sense of obligation, in the technical sense however, and it is possible that here only recommendation is implied.

2 E.g. Shāfi‘ī’s fifth, from Māfir – b. ‘Umar.

3 Mālik 33, = Shāfi‘ī’s second.
cipally engaged the attention of Shāfi‘ī in his discussion of these six ḥadīths: 'There is no difference between these ḥadīths in our opinion, wallāhu ʿalām, except something in ʿAʾishaʾs ḥadīth, which is an example of these ḥadīths which I have described that are related by one muḥaddith and not by another'. Shāfi‘ī admits that were it the only ḥadīth on the subject, one could not escape the conclusion that 'Ashūrā' had been a fard. However, it is clear to him that it is to be interpreted in the light of the other ḥadīths, specifically that in which Ramadān is shown to be the fard at present in force, and where 'Ashūrā' is 'turīka', that is 'turīka ṭiḥābuḥu - it ceased to be an obligatory Islamic fast. Shāfi‘ī further judges it unlikely that 'Ashūrā' was ever a fard, but at most wājib. Whether he is justified in reading the technical expression 'Ṭiḥāb' into this is debateable, and of course his whole approach to the material in hand is conditioned by a need to harmonize wherever possible, but this explanation does maintain for Shāfi‘ī the historical and theoretical superiority of Ramadān, the Quranically prescribed fast, while acknowledging 'Ashūrā' as a contemporary fact. It is not 'Ashūrā' itself which is at stake, but the secondary point of its status within Islam and its relation to Ramadān.

That the Jāhilīyya 'Ashūrā' and subsequent 'abrogation' by Ramadān ḥadīth was no more than a hypothetical assertion may be seen from Tay. 2625, where we have a quite different version of the events leading to Muhammad's alleged adoption of 'Ashūrā': Abū Dāʾūd - Shuʿba - Abū Bishr - Saʿīd b. Jubair - b. ʿAbbās 1: when the Prophet arrived on Medina, he found the Jews fasting 'Ashūrā', and asked them about it. They said it was the day on which God drowned Pharaoh (sc. drowned his forces in the Red Sea) and saved

1 Cf. his use in Yūs. 801 above p.180.
2 Possibly vocalised 'taraka', implying that Muhammad never actually made of Ashura a fard.
Moses. The Prophet then said, 'We are more closely related (nahnu awlā) to Moses than you', and ordered its fasting. The assertion that the Jews have less claim to Moses than the Muhammadans is of course directly in line with Quranic polemic, and the hadīth is more honest than the 'Ā'isha/Jāhiliyya one, insofar as it at least admits the true origins of the 'Ashūrā' fast. Historically it is valueless, and in no way suitable as a starting point for the construction of a chronology of the Islamic fast, as some have believed.

The dating element in the hadīth is simply a relative device: 'when he arrived in Medina' means nothing more than 'before Ramadān came along and displaced 'Ashūrā'. This being the case, it is to be suspected that the dating phrase was not originally in the hadīth, whose first intention seems to have been to promote 'Ashūrā' as a Muhammadan and not a foreign-based sunna, rather than to settle the question of its 'Ījāb and consequently its relation to Ramadān.

The alleged reason for the celebration of 'Ashūrā' in this hadīth does not tally with the traditional Jewish explanation, and may simply represent a piece of fanciful ta'wil on the part of a Muslim polemicist, an item of unfounded assertion similar to the suggestion that the Christian Lent was the model for the Islamic fast, though in this case the assertion is draped round a standard jibe that the Jews continually showed themselves incapable of appreciating prophets and the other benefits that God granted them.

It is perhaps conceivable that the idea of Furgān provides a common

---

1 Cf. the Quranic claims about the Arabs' descent through Ismā'īl.
2 Wagtendonk, ch.5, Sprenger, p.53ff.
3 Although the mention of Moses in connection with Yōm Kippūr has some traditional justification.
4 Combined with anti-Jewish, pro-Muhammadan propaganda.
5 See above, ch.1.
6 Q2/16,27 etc.
link here: Moses' Qur'an was dividing of the Red Sea, and, according to this hadith, it is commemorated by a fast; Muhammad's Qur'an, mentioned in Q2/185, also appears to be connected with a fast, this time the Muhammadan one of Ramadan.

Although there are only a few instances in the early hadith of voices being raised strongly in favour of 'Ashurā', it is clear that (presumably at a popular level) the practice of fasting was well established. Besides the efforts to make its origin less apparent, there was also an attempt to downgrade it by claiming that the fasting of the day of 'Arafat was much more meritorious. Thus Yus. 804 and Shaibani I, Bab faqil al-sawm, both from Sa'id b. Jubair state: Fasting the day of 'Ashurā' is equivalent (in worth) to fasting the whole year, whereas fasting the day of 'Arafat is equivalent to fasting two years. Although these equivalents are in fasting and not in redemption of sins, in later versions this is not the case, and it is therefore probable that there were some Muslim apologists who were better acquainted with the ideas attached to the Jewish 'Ashurā' than the authors of the Pharaoh/Moses hadith above. In any case, the equivalents are reckoned in years, which is agreeable with the notion that Yom Kippur atones for the whole year. The Mukhtasar of Muzani also has this hadith,

1 Q2/50. 2 Despite the fact that the fast of 'Arafat was itself a disputed matter: see below, p. 194.

3 The choice of 'Arafat was obviously conditioned by there being few if any other regular one-day fasts in Islam. The partial alliteration of 'Ashurā' and 'Arafat is perhaps a contributory factor. 'Arafat is on the 9th. Dhul-Hijja, which raises the question of a possible connection with the suggestion that 'Ashurā' is to be fasted on the ninth of the month of Muharram.

3 See below, p. 194.
but Shāfī'ī makes no relevant comment on it. Obviously related is Ṭay. 602, where the Prophet says, 'I consider the fasting of the day of 'Arafat atones for the year before it and the year after it'.

In conclusion it seems safe to say that as a practice 'Aṣḥūra' was little affected by the discussions concerning it. These appear to have originated in the 'Irāq, where there would have been the greatest sensitivity among Muslim scholars on this type of subject, in which could be seen a practice owing its origin to a group outside Islām, and which therefore had to be naturalized and given a definite position within Islām, as there appeared to be little hope of expunging it entirely. As has been elaborated above, an uncomplicated tendency to promote 'Aṣḥūra' as a desirable fast was overshadowed by these subsequent needs to accommodate it in a more formal manner. The pre-occupation with the question of the relation of 'Aṣḥūra' and Ramadan, which is evident in Shāfī'ī, has exercised writers on the subject to the present day, largely, it appears, from the mistaken assumption that the two had always been intimately connected, instead of being first linked by a second-century theory.

Dhū-l-Hijja

The question of fasting in the pilgrimage month is somewhat confused, not least because the month can be broken up in various ways into a number of sections, some overlapping, and concerning each of which there is some difference of opinion. Interest is mainly confined to the period of the pilgrimage itself. The only definite information on the subject is contained in the Quran, 2/196, which states among other things that he who temporarily drops his ihram, between the 'umra and the ḥajj proper, should make whatever offering he can manage, or, failing that, should fast three days during the pilgrimage and seven later.
An outline of the timetable of the hajj will be useful:

1st-10th Dhū-l-Hijja - collectively known as al-‘ashr.
7th Dhū-l-Hijja - khutba in Mecca
8th " " - tarwiyya; ḥiṭam reassumed by the mutamatti
9th " " - wuqūf at ‘Arafat
9th (eve.) - departure from ‘Arafat
10th " "
11th " " - ayyūm al-naḥr, al-ahdā
12th " " - ayyūm al-tashrīq, Minā
13th " "

It is not clear whether certain days were unfastable before the Quranic tamattu ordinance, or whether it became necessary to consider them so because too many were by their fasting detracting from the general post-ḥajj celebrations, almost invariably involving the slaughter of numbers of animals. The Quranic prescription may of course merely have sanctioned existing practice. It is perhaps noteworthy that the hadiths and discussions very rarely explicitly relate the question of fasting to its fittingness for a pilgrim. The general dislike of fasting feastdays has been mentioned above (p.170), as has the possibility that it is a deliberate contradiction of alleged Jewish practice. Whether this allegation is true or not, the desire to curb untimely zeal for fasting is understandable.

As for the muta fast, we find in the Muwatta that Mālik claims the days of ahdā and Minā are unfastable, which last agrees with Mālik 36, from Abū Nuraira: the Prophet forbade the fasting of two days, the day of fīṭr and the day of nahr. Elsewhere, in the Mudawwana (p.211), Mālik is prepared to admit certain fasting on the last day of Minā, but is adamant that the three days of nahr are inviolable. However, the less rigorous attitude towards the last day of Minā is in Muw. Shaib. 25 extended back to the first two days as well: according to Shaibānī, Mālik here says that the muta-
mattī who cannot find the prescribed hady, or who missed doing his three days' fast before the day of naḥr, may fast during the days of tashrīq. Similar are the ḥadīths to this effect from ʿAʿisha and b. ʿUmar (Mālik Ḥaḍīj 255); this suggests that the regular practice of the mutamattī was to fast as soon as possible.

Shāfīʿī, according to the mukḥtaṣar of Ḥuznā (Umm 8/59), was also once of this opinion, but subsequently disallowed it. The wording implies that his is not the general opinion. His objection to even a mutamattī fasting these days (the days of adḥā and tashrīq) is based on the 'nahy al-nabl'. There is little doubt that this refers to e.g. Mālik Ḥaḍīj 134; the Prophet forbade the fasting of the days of Ḥaḍīj. It is clear then that Mālik's opinion (as opposed to his ḥadīths) and the former thinking of Shāfīʿī both date from a period before the prohibiting hadith came into circulation, or at least before it gained cogency. Possibly Mālik distinguished between the mutamattī and others, for in referring to this ḥadīth elsewhere, he seems to accept that the prohibition of the Prophet has some validity: discussing perpetual fasting, he approves of a report that this practice is acceptable if the prophetically prohibited days are omitted.

The probability that the mutamattī was to fast his initial three days as soon as possible, mentioned above at Muw. Shaib. 25, is reinforced by the observation of al-Farrāʾ on Q2/196: 'the last day is 'Arafat, and the other two are to be done during the 'ashr'.

1 Also thus in Muw. 1/389.
2 It appears from Muw. 1/389 that according to Mālik only persons performing certain τουρικ kaβfara fasts, such as the mutamattī, were allowed to fast during this period.
3 Mālik 37 4 See below, p. 207. 5 These are listed as Ḥaḍīj, adḥā, and fiṭr.
Mālik too allows these days to be performed non-consecutively. It is evident that the prohibition, which in all forms is prophetic, is later than the permitting hadiths, such as Mālik Ḥajj 255, which come from Companions. What is not clear is when the mutamattī is supposed to make his Quranically prescribed three days' fast during the Ḥajj, if the prohibition is regarded as valid: the Quran appears to imply that the fast comes after the completion of the 'umra, but it seems from al-Farrā's statement that in practice this is not necessarily so. He may of course himself be influenced by the prophetic prohibition. It is not impossible that the difference in practice reflected by the Mālikī material and the prophetic prohibition has its explanation in regional variations.

It is to be noted that the Mudawwana discussions of fasting in this general period mostly concern the qaḍā of Ramadān. This could indicate that this time was specially chosen for such fasting, or might simply be an acknowledgement of the fact that this period contains a concentration of debateable days, and that for the Mālikīs of the Mudawwana, for whom voluntary fasts are not of great importance, the qaḍā of Ramadān is the most important fast after Ramadān itself.

Besides the Quranically based fasts connected with this part of Dhū-l-Hijja, which is sometimes termed the 'ashr, i.e. the first ten days of the month, there is also an isolated reference to a voluntary fast that in later times is the subject of several hadīths. The report occurs in the Kitāb of Sībawīh, and in it the Prophet is made to state: 'There are no days fasting in which is dearer to...
God than the ‘asr of Dhū-l-Ḥijja’. It seems that here fasting is being recommended as a way of profiting additionally from the baraka of this period. It is conceivable that the ḥadīth is directed toward those not actually participating in the pilgrimage, and that there is little connection with the total of ten days mentioned in the ‘mūta’ provision. That fact that the ḥadīth is first recorded by an Eastern scholar may tend to support the suggestion that it was directed toward those distant from the Ḥijāz.

The question of fasting on the day of ‘Arafat has already been mentioned in connection with ‘Aṣhūrā’. Although the suspicion arises that the ‘Arafat fast was instituted from polemical reasons of this nature, there also exists a quite separate discussion of ‘Arafat, with no mention in it of the Jewish fast, implying that there was indeed a custom of marking this day with a fast. It is not possible to establish conclusively which of these two questions associated with ‘Arafat arose the first.

At this period, there are only two ḥadīths in favour of the ‘Arafat fast, besides the ‘Aṣhūrā’ comparative ones. Mālik Ḥajj 133: Yahyā b. Sa‘īd - Qāsim b. Mūḥammad: ‘A‘īsha used to fast the day of ‘Arafat—a simple assertion. Yūs. 818 conveys the same inform-

---

1 Sībawayh died at almost the same time as Mālik; this may thus be another instance of a voluntary practice probably known to Mālik but on which he makes no recorded comment. The reference is taken from Mālik’s text of the Kitāb. 2 Farrā’s mention of ‘Arafat fasting (above) does not necessarily imply its being singled out for special celebration in this way. 3 On a different question, but perhaps comparable in its use of ‘A‘īsha, is Mālik Ḥajj 255, above.
ation by a different iṣnād in a hadīth apparently chiefly concerned with the day of nahr: 'Ā'ishah is shown as fasting 'Arafat, and Mas-rūq, it is said, would have done so too had he not thought that the day in question was not 'Arafat but yawm al-nahr. By implication, 'Ā'ishah fasts 'Arafat voluntarily'.

These hadīths are countered by Muw. Shaib. 232 and the practically identical Tay. 1649. These admit the true situation, but project it back in to 'history': they state that there was some dispute over whether or not the Prophet fasted on the day of 'Arafat, and then 'settle' the matter by having Umm Faḍl go and send the Prophet a bowlful of milk, which he then drinks. The prophetic action is probably designed to supersede that of his wife 'Ā'ishah, and can be seen as bolstered by the choice of Umm Faḍl: although the latter was not a wife of the Prophet, she is supposed to have been the first woman to accept Islām after Khadija3, and was therefore senior by a great deal to 'Ā'ishah. This principle of gauging a person's trustworthiness as a hadīth authority by the length of their Islām was a relatively early development, and in some respects short-lived: its method of approach is directly opposite to that of abrogation, according to which the latter action is the model.

Both the hadīths locate this occurrence at 'Arafat itself. Whether this is meant as a ta'kīd of the implied disapproval of fasting, or indicates that the problem is confined to 'Arafat anyway, is not certain4. Probably it is the latter, for Shaibānī in

---

1 I.e., not on account of the mut'a provision. 2 = Mālik Ḥajj 132. 3 Ibn Sa'd 8, p. 204. 4 There is nothing in the sources to support the otherwise reasonable theory that fasting on 'Arafat day was considered a way for non-pilgrims to participate by proxy in the pilgrimage activities (cf. the adhā sacrifices which are made throughout the Islamic world, and not just at Mecca).
discussing this hadîth says that fasting 'Arafat is entirely a voluntary matter, though if the fasting renders one too weak to make the ritual du‘â’ (in the pilgrimage ceremony), then it is preferable to break¹. It seems therefore that there was no strong tradition of fasting on 'Arafat day. The 'A'isha hadîths of course show that some favoured it, but this party does not seem to have been able to reply to the Umm Fa‘îl hadîth. In the light of this, the promotion of 'Arafat as a counter to 'Ashûrâ' seems to be an almost entirely artificial affair. It may be surmised that the motive of those who did not favour the fasting of 'Arafat was the desire to keep the culminating day of the pilgrimage a time of celebration rather than one of self-castigation. This view is supported by an apparently authentic report from Sa‘înūn², who relates that Ibn Wahb vowed never to fast the day of 'Arafat again. This was because he fasted it once and he became much oppressed by the heat and thirst while at the mawâqif. He said, 'The rest of the people were awaiting the rahma, while I was waiting only for the time of iftâr'.

It seems that the fasting of 'Arafat never became widespread: some Mandaean make a deliberate point of fasting it to counter the Muslims' reverence for it³.

There is rather more unanimity concerning yawm al-nahr, the 10th of Dhu‘l-‘Hijja. Mâlik 36⁴ is a hadîth from Abû Huraira, to the effect that the Prophet forbade the fasting of two days, those

³ Cf. Drower, p.92.
⁴ = Mâlik Hajj 136; cf. also Mâlik 'Idain 5.
of fitr and adhūn (= nahr). Similar is Ṭay. 2238, from Abū Saʿīd.

As noted above, Malik'37 mentions, without specific attribution, the prophetic prohibition of fasting Minā, fitr and adhūn. This three-fold prohibition seems to be somewhat different from the Abū Huraira ḥadīth, and may be linked with Ṭay. 2105, from Anas, in which the Prophet forbids fasting on six days of the year: taḥrīq, fitr, adhūn, and Friday by itself. Although Malik appears here to adopt the ruling in a fairly detached manner1, he is elsewhere more definite: cf. Mud. 205, where one proposing a fast on (fitr and) adhūn is told, 'ḥūdha al-yawm la yaṣluḥ fihi al-ṣawm, fa'af'tir'. Although there is no specific reference to any prohibition from the Prophet, this does not mean Malik ignores it - cf. Shaib. II, Bāb man yūjib al-ṣiyaṃ 'alā nafsīhi, where again the ḥadīth is not mentioned, while in another place2 Shaibānī makes it clear that the Prophet's nahy is quite binding. Shāfiʿī, as might be expected, does not allow fasting on the day of nahr, 'ali nahy al-nabi'3.

There is no hint of the original motive behind the disapproval. Again, it would be reasonable to expect a desire for solidarity on this day of sacrifice and the accompanying consumption, when one fasting would be somewhat conspicuous and inviting censure or opprobrium.

There is one ḥadīth, first recorded by Abū Yūsuf (818) which could be construed as permitting fasting on the day of nahr. It shows Ḥaṣrūq being deterred from fasting by the conviction that the day in question was the day of nahr. Ā'isha rebukes him, saying the day if nahr is only the day on which people make their sacrifice, while the day of fitr is only the day on which people

1 He is dealing with another subject at the time.
3 Mukht. Muzani, Umm 8/59, cf. also Umm 2/104.
break their fast. However it is clear from the contexts in which this ḥadīth appears elsewhere\(^1\) that it is intended to justify the principle that regardless of the actual state of the calendar, the day on which most people celebrate a festival is to be taken as the proper day for its celebration by all, i.e. general practice overrules a theoretical calculation of the date of a festival.

A subsidiary question whose relation to the above-mentioned ban on nahr fasting is difficult to determine is raised by Tay. 811: Abū Dā'ūd - Thawāb ibn 'Utba al-Mahrī - 'Abdullāh ibn Buraida al-Aslāmī - Abīhī; the Prophet would not go out on the day of fiṭr until he had eaten, nor go out on the day of nahr until he had sacrificed. This is possibly evidence of a compromise - fasting has prophetic sanction for part of the former day at least. However, Mālik (ʻĪdān 7) does not consider people obliged to eat before going forth on the day of adhā, as some claim is the practice for the day of fiṭr. Whether here Mālik is echoing local custom, or the point of view expressed in Tay. 811, is not clear.

Shāfī'ī makes brief mention of this point in discussing the fiṭr side of the question\(^2\), and oddly makes no reference here to the prohibiting ḥadīth from the Prophet. This is perhaps because he does not regard abstaining from food for such a short time as proper fasting\(^3\). Shāfī'ī - Sa'd - Zuhrī - b. Musayyib: the Muslims used\(^4\) to eat on the day of fiṭr before the ṣalāt, and they do not do this on the day of nahr. Discussing this and other fiṭr ḥadīths, Shāfī'ī concludes that it is best if one eats before prayer on the

---

\(^1\) E.g. Umm 1/230; Muqātil fol. 24R. \(^2\) Umm 1/232-3.

\(^3\) This is generally the case in Islām, in contrast with Christianity and Judaism, where fasts of only a few hours are permitted.

\(^4\) It is not clear whether the tense indicates that this was not always the case.
day of fitr, but the reverse is the case on the day of adha. There is no penalty, however, if this is not done.

It would be tempting to consider these last opinions as the target of the prohibition attributed to the Prophet. However, it is difficult, though not impossible, to make out a case for this chronologically—unless there is definite proof to the contrary, we must take material attributed to the companions to be earlier than that which is related in the name of the Prophet. There is also the fact that the prohibition gives no indication of particularly attacking a fast in the early part of the day.

The equivocal position of Malik concerning the days of Minah/tashriq has been noted above. However, it is clear that Shaibani's thinking, and latterly that of Shafi'i, represented the majority view of their period, namely that these days were in general not to be fasted. The Prophetic prohibition on the fasting of these days was known in all areas. In certain forms it seems to be an extension of e.g. Malik 36, which was confined to fitr and adha. This grouping of similar edicts for mutual strengthening is a common device of the hadith.

The hadith under Naw. Shaib. 25 does not appear in the Mawrid of Malik: 'Abdullah b. 'Amr b. 'As went into his father's house during the days of tashriq, and he offered him some food, saying, 'Eat'. 'Abdullah said to his father, 'I am fasting'. He replied, 'Do you not know that the Prophet used to order us to

---

1 Naw. Shaib. 25. This does however only deal with the Mut'a fast. 2 Umm 2/104; Muz., Umm 8/59. With this, the same reservation applies as in n.1. 3 Malik 37, Shafi'i, Muz., Umm 8/59; Malik Hajj 137, cf. Naw. Shaib. 24; Tay. 2105. Implied prohibition also in Shaibani II, Zab. man yujib al-siyam 'ala nafsihi. 4 E.g. p.201.
break during these days?'. This may refer to the more widespread hadīth, but it is more likely that it is of independent growth, although parallel in intention.

Another hadīth rationalises the hitherto bald prohibition, and may on that account be considered later. Mālik Ḥajj 135: the Prophet sent 'Abdullāh b. Ḥudhāfa to go the rounds on the days of Ḥinā', to say that these were the days of eating and drinking and being mindful of God (hiya ayyām aklin wa sharbin wa dhikri allāh).\(^1\) Similar is Ṭay. 1299, with quite different personae, and without the final phrase. Fasting is forbidden by implication. Another version, employing this time 'Alī, is used by Shāfi'ī in the Risāla to prove a point in an unconnected matter, and in this case, a specific injunction not to fast is added. Although the Quran is never mentioned in these discussions, which is in itself significant, it is instructive to note Q22/28, where, concerning the sacrificed animals of the ḥajj, the Quran says, 'Eat of them, and feed the poor unfortunate'.

Three days' fast

The custom of fasting three days, at variously defined times, is not discussed by Mālik and Shāfi'ī. In view of the latterly widespread documentation of the practice, there can be little doubt that these two were in fact aware of it, and it must be supposed that their reason for not mentioning it is comparable in this case to the attitude of the Mudawwana and Abū Yūsuf, who being as a rule little concerned with specific non-Quranic voluntary fasts, also ignore it. However, Muqātil b. Sulaimān, discussing

\(^1\) In Jeffory, *Materials*, p.336, 'ayyām aklin wa sharbin' is proposed (not particularly aptly?) as a variant for 'shurb', Q56/55.
Q33/35, says: 'He who fasts Ramadān and three days of each month belongs to the people mentioned in this verse; when he fasts the ayyām al-bi‘ād, when it is the 13th., 14th., and 15th. of the month. And the Prophet said, "He who fasts them, then he has fasted for eternity (faqad gāma al-dahr)".

Tāyāliṣī has no fewer then fifteen ḥadīths on the subject. Abū Hurairā, with five different isnāds, says, 'The Prophet (‘Khalīlī’) counselled me to do three things – to fast three days per month, to pray the witr, and (in most versions) to pray the qūhā'. As noted under tashriq above, frequently a number of assertions are grouped together for strength, especially when, as here, all are disputed in some degree.

Other general exhortations come from Tay. 482, 1074, 1313, and 2393. All these except 1313, represent Ramadān (in 482 and 2393 called 'shahr al-ṣabr') and three days per month as equal to eternal fasting, as was the case in the Muqṭil report. This equation is more properly part of the discussion of  qaum al-dahr, although possibly it is also linked with the idea of 'al-ḥasanah bi-‘ashri amthālihā; thus three days fast serves the needs of one month. This no doubt is a subsequent rationalization of this fast, rather than the real

1 See below, p. 202. 2 See below, sub Dahr, and cf. Six Shawwāl, above. Several ḥadīths have a polemical injunction to fast three days per month, which is designed to serve as a substitute for  qaum al-dahr. They obviously borrow the three days motif from ḥadīths such as are described below, and do not represent original information.

Examples: Tay. 33, 2255, 2280, 2288. 3 Tay. 2392, 2396, 2447, 2471, 2593.

4 Where it is claimed that such a fast 'yudhib maghlat al-ṣadr'.

5 Again from Abū Hurairā.

6 See below, p. 207.

7 Cf. Q6/161.

8 Cf. Tay. 2280.
The three days are variously defined: Tay. 360, from b. Mas'ūd:

The Prophet used to fast three days of the ‘idda of each month. (This has no immediately apparent meaning, and should perhaps read ‘ghurra’ rather than ‘idda’.)

Tay. 45: The Prophet said: ‘Fast the white nights (al-layālī al-bīd), the 13th, 14th, 15th.’ In Tay. 1225, the bīd-fast is equated (in worth) with qiyām al-dahr.

Tay. 475: The Prophet said: ‘O Abū Dharr, when you fast three days of the month, then fast the 13th, 14th, 15th.’

Tay. 1556: ‘Ā'ishah was asked if the Prophet fasted the well-known/distinctive/customary days of the month (al-ayyām al-madlūma). She replied that he did. Respecting this last ḥadīth, it seems unlikely that there is any connection with the ayyām maʿlūmāt of Q22/28, as it appears to refer to days that recur every month, and it is thus reasonable to assume that it refers in fact to the bīd, those nights especially remarkable for their moon.

It is likely then that apart from the general ḥadīths that leave the days unspecified, there are at this period only two main definitions, namely the first three days of the month, and the middle three. Possibly, since it has ‘Abdullāh b. Mas'ūd as guarantor, while the other ḥadīths have lesser figures, Tay. 360, which advocates the ghurra, is intended to counter the general opinion.

Tay. 1572 shows Ā'ishah claiming that the Prophet used not to care which part of the month he made his three days fast in. This

---

1 Cf. Wright, II, para. 111, and below. 2 Cf. Ibn al-Athīr, Nihāya, s.v. b-y-d: ‘It is short for ayyām al-layālī al-bīd, so called because in them the moon is risen from beginning to end. The general reading al-ayyām al-bīd is erroneous’. 3 On this word, cf. Birūnī, e.g. p. 234: The Sogdians have among their months many festivals and ‘ayyām maʿlūma muʿaṣṣama’.
is designed to counter all the definitions, and need not be seen as merely a rationalizing of the differences.

Besides this three-day fast and its manifest variations, there exist other three-day fasts. First of these is the practice of fasting the series Thursday-Monday-Thursday, borrowed from the Jews, and to be mentioned at greater length later. The Abu Huraira hadiths above may well refer to this as well as or instead of the bid fast. However, it is definitely a separate phenomenon, not least because the days are fasted in a series and not consecutively. The second is the Istisqā' or rain-making fast.

The notion of doing things for three days is common enough—witness the tashrīq ceremonies, and the initial three-day fast of the mutammatti'a, as well as, for example, the traditional three days of ḍiyāfa. It is therefore not surprising to learn that there are Jewish instances of a three-day fast, besides that just mentioned, which is not of consecutive days. They include the fast of Moses on the mountain before receiving the tablets; the Karaites fast of three days before the Passover; the fast of Esther through Passover, said by some to have been on the 13th-15th of Adar; II

1 Because of undesirable associations attached to the defined fasts—possibly traces of moon-worship in the bid fast. On other anti-definition hadiths, see below, p. 211.
2 See below, p. 320.
3 p. 205.
4 Above, p. 176. This passage is quoted in the Sira (trans. Guillaume, p. 251).
5 Qirqisnī 4,924. Ginzberg, IV, p. 123.
6 Others, say the 14th-16th. It is interesting that this fast is 'historically unverifiable' (Rabinovitz pp. 32-4) and that the first definite mention of it comes in 760 A.D. (= 142 A.H.). The fact that there are other explanations of this fast (Vajda, MUCa, 384, Talmud. Minor Tractates, p. 294), and/
Macc. 13/12\(^1\); the three-day fast for all practised by some Karaites after the specially fasted 70-day period\(^2\). These fasts, where regular, are annual rather than monthly, which perhaps tends to confirm that in the case of the Muslim three-day fast, a lunar connection is to be sought.

Since all our references to a three-day fast in this period come from the Cîrăq, it seems likely that Jewish influence is at work, although instances of things being done in threes are so widespread that the custom might also be spontaneous. It is perhaps relevant to note that Mālik, in dealing with the Quranic kafrāra fasts, says that where the length of these is not specified, they are to be of three days\(^3\); this may however be simply by analogy with the kafrāra of Q5/89.

Little idea can be drawn from the hadīth as to the motive behind the three-day fast in Islam. Reverence for the moon, it has been suggested, might play some part, especially in the case of the bīd fast: the moon has always been a body of great moment in the Semitic mind\(^4\).

\(1\) Other refs. in Vigouroux, Dictionnaire de la Bible.
\(2\) Qīrqīsānī, 4,919.  
\(3\) Mālik Ḥajj 160. Referring to Q2/196 and possibly Q5/95.
\(4\) Perhaps relevant here is Talmud, Minor Tractates, pp.406,426: If one eats fat beef or vegetables on the night of 14th. or 15th. of the month, his blood is on his head (i.e. he courts danger). Westermarck, Principles, pp.396,411, gives several examples including Jewish ones, of fasting at the new and full moon 'presumably for fear of eating food which is supposed to have been polluted by the moon'.
In the tafsirs, some mention is made of a fast of three days in connection with the ayyām ma’dūdīt of Q2/184. This however is a later development, and seems to be borrowed from hadīths such as have just been discussed, rather than to represent a separate manifestation of the phenomenon.

Referring back briefly to the bid, it is to be remarked that according to Burnaby, the Jewish 'Ashūrā' is sometimes called the White Fast (no references given).

Note in conclusion that there is at this period no specific attack on the custom of fasting three days per month, but merely some disagreement as to its definition. It is apparent that the custom was widespread, in the East at least, and was not considered objectionable. As far as we can tell, it stemmed from popular practice, and did not immediately begin to attract formal Islamic documentation.

Istisqā' fasting

It is convenient to insert here some mention of this fast, since it has a connection with the preceding, and is otherwise virtually unclassifiable. It is mentioned by Shāfi‘ī in his Kitāb al-Istisqā', in a passage which is in many ways unparallelled in Islamic literature. It is recorded that a certain imām had a practice of ordering his people to fast three days before commencing their istisqā' prayers. Shāfi‘ī approves of this custom, and further that a (voluntary) fourth day should be observed. Although the idea of fasting for rain is by no means novel, it is singular that this is the only mention encountered of its forming part of

---

1 See Quran ch. on this, p.38.
2 Jewish and Muhammadan Calendars, p.186.
3 Umm 1/248.
an Islamic ritual\(^1\). As noted under 'Ashūrā', there is an enigmatic reference to 'Ali's going out on the day of 'Ashūrā' to 'yastasqī', but it seems likely that this day can have been a regular day for rain-making, if only because of the gradual rotation of the Muslim calendar. It is also the only Islamic instance of a fast with a definite purpose, other than the Quranic kaffara fasts, which last can be considered retroactive\(^2\). In addition, the concept of an imām, however this word is to be interpreted, ordering a fast is unknown in the canonical Islamic literature.

Referring to Shāfi'ī's discussion of the matter, it is interesting that no mention is made of any formal authority to back up this practice, which may indicate that this is one of Shāfi'ī's earlier statements.

The fact that three days are recommended immediately recalls the Jewish three-day rain fasts, which form much of the matter for debate in Talmud Ta'anith. These are ordered by the priests or elders, but are not of consecutive days.

Gaufroy-Demombynes, p. 566, notes that the pre-Islamic Arabs seem to have fasted three days before the rain prayer, and that custom has preserved this abstinence. It has unfortunately not been possible to trace the source of this statement.

\(^1\) In the preparation of this study, nothing on this subject has been noticed in any of the kutub al-ṣiyām in hadith or elsewhere, and nothing is revealed by Wensinck's Concordance.

\(^2\) One can also discount here such oddities as the Moroccan practice of fasting three to seven days in order to become a juggler. (Westermarck, Morocco, p. 362).
Sawm al-dahr

Perpetual fasting (in the daytime⁴), known in the ḥadīths as sawm al-dahr or sawm al-abad, is to be distinguished from wiqāl, which tends to refer more to prolonged complete abstinence.

Our earliest references come from Muqātil (fol. 24r), in the already mentioned ḥadīths, which liken Ramadan plus six days of Shawwāl, and three days per month respectively, to sawm al-dahr. Although there is no reason to suspect these ḥadīths of being in the first instance polemically opposed to sawm al-dahr, the possibility is there, for there is definitely in later ḥadīths a considerable body of feeling against what must have been reckoned by some to have been an unnecessarily ascetic practice.

For Hālik it is a question of little moment: he has heard (37) the ahl al-ʿilm say that there is no harm in it, providing certain days (Mīnā, ʿaḍhā, fitr) are broken. Shāfiʿī is silent, and the Mudawwana does not discuss the matter as such, although on p.192 is mentioned the hypothetical case of one vowing to fast a month or a year². There is also (p.127) the case of one vowing to perform in perpetuity another kind of fast. Other indirect references also tend to support the existence of the practice: Shaʿbī on Q2/183, in Farrā': law ʿum al-sana kullaha, laʾaffart yawm al-shakk³.

In contrast with these rather meagre materials, Tayālisī has a number of different opinions, all of which are related from the Prophet. Since none actually forbids the practice, it may be

---

⁴ This at least. There is no firm evidence of this from contemporary ḥadīths, but it may be inferred from the Āmir b. ʿAṣ ḥadīths; see below, p.209.

² Cf. Chaib. II, Bāb man yūjib al-ṣiyām ʿalā nafsihi; Shāfiʿī Umm 2/104.

³ On yawm al-shakk, the doubtful day at the end of Shaʿbān, see below, p.234.
assumed that it was widespread. A specific origin need not be sought for this common ascetic practice.

Ṭayālīnī's ḥadīths are of varying opinions: 513, 514 are favourable: the Prophet said, 'He who fasts perpetually will find hell has become narrow for him (i.e. he is safe from hell)'. 1147 places him in a sort of limbo, where his action has no merit: concerning perpetual fasting, the Prophet said, 'He who fasts perpetually does not fast' (the idea being that a hardship regularly undertaken becomes no hardship).

There are two anecdotal ḥadīths commonly associated with this question.

The first, disapproving of the custom, concerns a man who is absent from the Prophet for a year, and who on returning is not recognised by the Prophet, so altered is his appearance through perpetual fasting. The Prophet asks him who ordered him thus to torment his soul, and orders him to fast (instead) one day per month. The man replies, 'Give me more'. The Prophet says, 'Fast two days.....' etc., until he says, 'Fast three days of each month'. There seems no reason to think that such a ḥadīth represents the origin of the three-day fast, but rather that the three-day fast is the 'natural' substitute for a prolonged fast, and especially

1 'Nan ṣāma al-dahr ḍīqat 'alaihi jannaham hākadha wa 'aqada tis'īn'. Goldziher, (Über Zahlenfiguren, ZDMG, LXI, 1907, 756-7) explains how the 'aqd symbol for 90 stands for something narrow and difficult of entry.

2 It is not clear whether Sa'adiah Ga'on's judgement (Yale Judaica Series, I, p. 161.), that it is impossible for one to fast every day, refers to the same attitude.

3 E.g. Tay. 33.

4 Tu'adhādhīb nafsak - curiously parallel to the standard Hebrew expression for fasting, Ta'anith nefesh.
suited to the haggling device of the story.

The second type of the anecdotal ḥadīth is initially of the same tendency, and concerns 'Abdullāh b. 'Amr b. 'Āq, said to be a keen faster. In later years, this hadīth has almost innumerable varying recensions. Ṭay. 2255 contains several of the usual features: Abū Dā'ūd - Shu'ba - Ḥābīb b. Abī Thābit - Abū 'Abbās - 'Abdullāh b. 'Amr: the Prophet said to me, 'Am I not informed that you spend the night in vigil and the day in fasting? Do that, and your eye will become sunken, and your soul faint. He whofasts perpetually does not fast: (proper) fasting is three days of each month, (that is as good as) perpetual fasting'. Up to here the hadīth is comparable with the preceding one, but now it counters the three-day fast, and ends up with a compromise version of perpetual fasting: I said, 'O Prophet of God, I can manage (more than that)'. He said, 'Then fast the fast of David, peace be upon him; he used to fast a day, and then break a day, and used not to flee when he confronted (the enemy)'.

The interesting motif of the fast of David has, according to Jacober, no parallel in Jewish literature, although David is

---

1 E.g. Ṭay. 2255,2280.  2 Evidently a real danger: it is reported of Ahmad b. Zaid al-Makha'ī that he lost the sight of one eye through great fasting. (Ḥiyya, II, 104).

3 Cf. Saadia Gaon, p.367: fasting for a day impairs hearing, sight and intellect.

4 On this phrase (wa lā yafirr idhā lāqā), cf. b. Sa'ād 1,9: ummati la yafirr. David's steadfastness is perhaps connected with the Quranic image (21/80) of him as the inventor of armour.

5 P.63. The vigil of David hadīth is also mentioned by W.R.Taylor, al-Bukhārī and the Aggada, MW 33, 1943.

6 But cf. II Sam. 12/21-3.
credited with being devoted to night vigils. It seems that the choice of David is not a chance one for he is not otherwise a particularly frequent figure in Muslim lore, and in versions of this ḥadīth, his name remains constant. It may be that the zeal for night prayer (cf. Q73/20), in Arabic 'qiyyām al-lail', automatically evoked in the Muslim mind the parallel and partially assonant phrase, qiyyām al-nahār. The two activities are often linked in the biographical literature: alus was qa'wām, qa'wām: qa'ūm, qa'ūm¹.

To return to the intent of the ḥadīth: it is clear that this is to reinstate, at least partially, the idea of qa'wām al-dāhr. That this ḥadīth is the secondary one is evident not only from the developed form of its argument, but it is also indicated by the existence of short forms² of the ʿAbdullāh b. Ṭāf ḥadīths that lack the David motif, and the fact that the earlier ḥadīth barely survives this period. The change from 'a man' in the first ḥadīth to a well-known companion in the second is also indicative of their relative position in time and the argument.

The dāhr/three-day comparison also exists outside these longer hadiths, for example in Tay. 482,1074,1225,2393. Tay. 2288 should perhaps be included here: it invokes the law of diminishing returns, suggesting that to fast one day per month brings the reward of the remaining days; to fast two days brings the reward of the remaining days. The ḥadīth ends by recommending a fast of three days per month, thus striking a balance between zeal for fasting and its decreasing worth.

¹ E.g. Sa'd 8,58 and passim in Ḫīlyat al-Awliyā'. Just one example from outside Islam: Saadia Gaon, p.395: some say the highest endeavour is to fast by day and arise by night. For the antithesis of this, cf. Ḫīlyat al-Awliyā', IV,59: al-shaiṭān al-akūl al-na'ūm.

² E.g. Tay. 2280.
The picture presented by the hadiths as a whole is thus not one of regional or even internal polemical differences (though in fact the question of sawm al-dahr seems to be confined in this period to 'Iraq), but merely of various attempts to regulate zeal, with one notable counter-blow in the form of David's fast, effectively half of al-dahr, which nevertheless still acknowledges the dislike of perpetual fasting. This motive has parallels in the Jewish literature: He who augments, diminishes; he who fasts in chastisement of self will be designated sinner; each man will be called to account for everything which his eye perceived but which he did not eat.

Basic fast

There are grouped here a number of hadiths that although not necessarily of the same origin in either time or place nevertheless express a common tendency. This, put simply, is a desire to get away from the ever-increasing range of alleged sunna fasts, and back to the one divinely prescribed regular fast, Ramadân. How much this was attributable to a dislike of asceticism, or to positive fundamentalism, or a distrust of some or even all of the material that was appearing under the name of the Prophet, cannot now be determined.

Already noted is the idea that an increase of fasting does not bring an increase of reward. Another good example, not confined to fasting, is the hadith of varying recension in which a beduin comes to the Prophet, enquires about Islam, is told of the five sharī'ī, and that nothing more than this is required, unless he wishes to do so voluntarily. The beduin says that by God he will

1 Talmud, Sanhedrin and Ta'anith. 2 Tay. 22, 2329, Shāf. Ris. 344; Malik Safar 94.
not exceed the minimum, and the Prophet replies approvingly, 'aflaha in ṣadaqa'. Tay. 2329's version says, concerning the fast, 'and to fast of the twelve months one month', with a clear hint of 'only' about it.

Several ḥadīths are at pains to refute the suggestion that the Prophet ever fasted any complete month other than Ramadān, e.g. Tay. 1497: 'A'isha: 'The Prophet never used to fast a complete month except Ramadān, nor spend a night in vigil, nor recite the Quran at night.'2 The first part of this message is also contained in Tay. 2626, Mālik 56. This last reveals the probable object of attack of all these hadiths, by further stating that the Prophet was most given to fasting in Shaʿbān.3 In later times, the alleged fasting by the Prophet of Muḥarram and Rajab is also attested to, and these may well have been included in the attack. The motive is clearly the fear of setting up a fast of a month's length which could seem to rival Ramadān in some way.

More general in application is the claim that the Prophet observed no set habits in his fasting. Mālik 56: the Prophet used to fast until we said, 'He never breaks', and used to break until we said, 'He never fasts'.

There remain to be discussed in this first section two aspects of fasting which at this stage are little more than hinted at, but which emerge as more important later.

1 There is the possibility that part of this ḥadīth's purpose is to establish that the sharā'i' are in fact five in number.

2 A further example of the three-fold ḥadīth; see above, Three-Days. The latter part of the present ḥadīth relates to arguments arising from Q73/20.

3 See also Tay. 1475, 1603; Muw. Shaib. 27.

4 Similar is Tay. 2037, and first half of Tay. 2626.
Firstly, the fasting of Monday and Thursday, certainly a Jewish borrowing. Ibn al-Qāsim, Mudawwana p. 217, says that Mālik was more than once asked for his opinion on a particular point of the fast of the woman who has taken it upon herself to fast Mondays and Thursdays for eternity, and the inference is that this was not an exceptional undertaking.

Ṭay. 632, the only hadith in this period, already goes back to the Prophet: Usāma b. Zaid was travelling to some property of his in Wādi al-Qura, and he was fasting Mondays and Thursdays. I (his mawla) said to him, 'Are you fasting even though you have grown old and weak?' He said, 'I saw the Prophet fast Mondays and Thursdays, and he said, "One's deeds are raised up (for heavenly account) on Mondays and Thursdays"'.

Secondly Shabān, already touched on above. The assertion that the Prophet did not fast all of Shabān is obviously a counter to the opinion that he did not do so, an opinion upheld by Ṭay. 1475: the Prophet used not to fast any month of the year except Shabān, which he used to fast in its entirety. This last phrase may be quite innocent, but may also be interpreted as referring to the yawn al-shakk, the day concerning which there is doubt as to whether it belongs to Shabān or Ramadan, and therefore whether it should be fasted or not. We see from Mālik 56 (above) that Shabān was still favoured as a month for fasting in, and in fact no hadith

1 Cf. Vajda, NUCA p.380ff. 2 Cf. Talmud Ta'anith 52, a vow to fast Mondays and Thursdays for ever. Also discussion of yawn al-ithnain in Shafi'i, Umm. 2,158, Sawm al-Nadhr. In Mud. 216, a man vows to fast Thursdays in perpetuity.

3 Presumably Ramadan is automatically understood here, being obligatory rather than voluntary.

4 See below, p.234.
offers a reasoned objection to such a fast. Tay. 1603 claims that the Prophet never used to fast two months conjointly except Sha'bān and Ramaḍān. The two consecutive months thus formed recall the Quranic kaffāra for ẓihār (Q58/3-4): although later writers do in fact connect the fast of Sha'bān and Ramaḍān with this verse, it seems unlikely that this represents the original motive for such a fast. Firstly, the need for a ẓihār kaffāra must have been an extremely infrequent occurrence in the classical times, and the call for a fasting kaffāra even more uncommon. Secondly, the problem of niyya immediately presents itself: how can Ramaḍān, a fast performed because it is prescribed by the Quran, be allowed to form part of a fast which is intended to fulfil an entirely different purpose, namely that of kaffāra? The short answer is that according to the ancient schools, it may not.

The true reason for the fasting of Sha'bān seems more likely to be found in a consideration of the reverence accorded to the night of niṣf Sha'bān, a time of great baraka. The basis for the objection to Sha'bān seems easier to pin down: it is the fear that such a fast should become considered as parallel to or even rivalling the fast of Ramaḍān. It is possible that some fasted Sha'bān in ta'zīm of Ramaḍān: this would be comparable with the late Jewish practice of fasting the month of Adar in preparation for and in honour of the Day of Atonement on the tenth of the following month.

Although mentioned in a number of ḥadīths as being of the number of the prohibited days, the fasting of the day of fiṭr is

---

1 In printed text read 'shahrain' pro 'yawmain'.
2 E.g. Ṭūsī, Istibṣār.
3 Thus e.g. Shāfiʿi, Umm 5/279.
never treated as a separate subject in the hadîth collections. There is no evidence that anyone ever made a special point of fasting this day in isolation, and its inclusion in the hadîths must simply be for the sake of completeness, an acceptance of general practice - the so-called 'Îd šagîr, universally observed, which often eclipses the 'Îd kabîr.

The following section deals with problems related in varying degree to the Quranic provisions on fasting, as they appear in the hadîth literature of the period under discussion; the Quranic context of these issues is treated at greater length in another chapter.

Fidya

Quran 2/184 reads, in part, 'faman kâna minkum marîdan aw 'alâ safarin fa'tiddatun min ayyâmîn ukhara wa 'alâ alladhin yuṭiqûnahu fidyatun ta'âmu miskînîn'. The evident meaning of the latter half as it stands is that those who can afford it are to make recompense (for not fasting) by feeding a poor man. For reasons which are explained elsewhere, this was seen by the majority of the exegetes of the Quran as constituting a dispensation of a general and optional nature, and in their view such a state of affairs, where the solemn obligation to fast could apparently be cast aside by those with sufficient funds, was unacceptable.

The loophole was blocked either by considering the fidya-clause abrogated, by Q2/185, or subjecting it to forced interpretation, which included the suggestion of variant readings that

---

1 See above, ch. 1.
2 See below, pp. 50ff.
completely altered the sense of the passage.

Before the time of Shāfi`i, when for the lawyers, the Quran did not yet occupy the theoretical position to be assigned to it by the usūlīs, the fidya outlined in Q2/184 was for practical purposes ignored. Thus Malik 51, commenting on a report that Anas b. Malik used to make fidya after he grew too old to fast, says he does not consider such action necessary, although it is commendable. Malik clearly thinks that the old and infirm may without penalty give up the fast. This humane attitude, while possibly an instance of ra'y, may be based on the conviction that yuṭiqunahu means 'can manage (fasting) only with difficulty'. Malik's unconcerned approach to the above hadith is not surprising, for although he takes it as such, the Anas report does not represent a legal opinion proper, but rather one of the tafsīr devices adopted to associate the application of the fidya with the old and by extension to deny it to other groups. The tafsīr may however owe something to what is apparently a genuinely legal hadīth, an example of which is in Nuqūtil: Anas b. Malik broke from old age in the year in which he died, and made no qaḍā'. There does not seem here to be any question

---

1 There is the possibility that perhaps in the city of the Prophet the fidya clause was observed in what is argued (see ch. 1) to be its correct manner, i.e. applying not generally but particularly to those affected by the mārid/safar regulation, as a recompense for incomplete fulfilment of the command to fast at a specified time. But no positive evidence for such a continuation of the original ruling is detectable in the ḥadīth or elsewhere.

2 This last phrase (Arabic 'ala mashaqa') is understood by those who view the fidya as not abrogated, and still applicable to a section of the community. It is paralleled by the variant yuṭaw-waqunahu.

3 Fol. 24.
of, or reference to, the fidya. Again, the second hadith reflects a commonsense attitude, in some ways paralleling the above judgement of Malik. The arguments of both the Anas hadiths are confirmed by Qasim and Salim, two of Malik's followers, in Mud. 211: 'la ṣiyām alaihi (sc. the old man) wa la fidya'.

In Kūfa however, the case of the old man is considered to be definitely regulated by the Quran, although, as suggested above, this is not implicit in the text. Accordingly, Yus. 810 imposes itṭām ( = fidya) on the old man who is unable to fast. The fact that this hadith is from Mujāhid, a notable tafsīr authority, and is in the form of a sābab al-nuzūl, indicates that we are dealing with what is primarily tafsīr material. That it supports the Kūfan legal attitude is confirmed by Yūs. 814, which is obviously related. This latter hadith is from Ibrāhīm; it repeats the itṭām injunction, and specifies the amount of food necessary. Although it is hard to separate with precision tafsīr hadiths from legal hadiths, it does seem in this case that a general concern for the position of the old was deliberately taken up and particularized by some who sought to restrict, for tafsīr motives, the fidya passage in the Quran.

After the earliest period, the case of the aged is usually treated in conjunction with that of the pregnant or nursing mother. In Mud. 210 we can observe the transition from treating the latter two on their merits, by raʿy, to the analogical process of treating

1 Note the apparent interchangeability of this form and the Quranic taʿām.

2 A half-ṣā of wheat per diem. It is interesting to note that Malik 51 says that if an old man should wish to make fidya, then the amount necessary is only one mudd (a quarter-ṣā). There has obviously been some disagreement.

3 Connected with the elaboration of the ṣawm al-awwal hypothesis.
them as 'sick' and therefore governed by Q2/184. This change of approach may perhaps be related to a decline in the popularity of the selective 'old' interpretation of the fidya clause of the Quran, in favour of the theoretically more soundly-based device of abrogation, which was the choice of most of the later mufassirün, including Ṭabarī.

Similar to the Mudawwana passage is Mālik 52, where Mālik gives his opinion that the pregnant woman who fears that fasting will affect her child, should break and make fidya, and then mentions that the ahl al-ʿilm think that she should make qaḍā, as she is to be considered 'sick'. The pregnant woman who has no such fears is to fast normally.

In some cases, Mālik also considers qaḍā to be necessary, but for different reasons.

It seems that here Mālik suggests the fidya purely from raʾy: the idea that the fidya applies to the sick (and the traveller) is never found in the tafsīrs.

---

1 Noted by Schacht, Origins, p.113. The possibility is discussed elsewhere (pp.44f.) that 'sick' here and elsewhere in the Quran can be taken as a technical term and means 'incapacitated by sickness'. It would thus probably include such cases as Mālik mentions here.
2 Comparable is Yūs. 815: fitrānd qaḍā (no fidya).
3 Cf. Maimonides, Code, p.450: Pregnant and nursing mothers fast all day on the 9th. Ab, as also on the Day of Atonement. For a different opinion, see Talmud Pesahim 268-9. For a modern Islamic instance of a refusal to exempt nursing mothers from the fast, see Dickson, p.579.
4 As suggested above, it is possible that there is some influence from the interpretation 'yuṭ Ḱiqūnahu ʿala mashaqa'.
5 As an acceptable doctrine. It is mentioned, only to be rejected, in Rāzī, pp.173-4.
Hugatil (fol. 24), probably reflecting the 'Irāqī position, says that women who fear for their unborn children should break their fast and feed the poor (half-qā'^), without qadā'. Yus. 815, which imposes fitr and qadā' (and not fidya) in such a case, perhaps indicates that the position outlined in the Hugatil hadith was superseded in the same way as Mālik's early doctrine was abandoned, though of course both doctrines may have existed simultaneously for a while.

Shafī'ī also shows evidence of a developing opinion. In Umm 2/103 he retains the fidya for pregnant and nursing mothers, if they feel they are unable to fast. If they find it positively harmful, then they are considered 'sick'. The old man who is incapable of fasting pays qadaqa, by analogy with the alternatives prescribed for one who cannot make the pilgrimage (Q2/196). It seems he has heard of a suggestion such as was contained in Yus. 810, that Q2/184 refers to the old, and is inclined to accept it, but he is unsure of it - 'wallāhu a'lam'. It is perhaps rather less arbitrary than his Quranic analogy.

His views became more settled later. In Mukht. Muz 3, we see that Shafī'ī has now heard of the b. 'Abbās variant reading yutawwaqūnahu (for yuṭīqūnahu), designed to support the Yus. 810 contention that Q2/184 refers to the old. Shafī'ī prefers the standard reading, which he then disposes of by abrogation, and this inclines

---

1 Cf. Umm 7/251. 2 In Tay. 1062, 1065, we find two similar hadiths giving the sabab al-nuzūl of this verse. It tells us nothing that cannot be deduced from the Quranic text.

3 Umm 8/59. 4 See above, p. 131.

5 It is perhaps not coincidental that b. 'Abbās is one of the authorities for the similar doctrine advanced in Hugatil fol. 24 on behalf of the pregnant and nursing mother.
him reject the Yus. 810 claim. He now relies firmly on his previous analogical Quran interpretation as the mainstay of his conviction.

In conformity with this dismissal of the fidya clause, Mukht. Nuz. (Umm 8/57) abandons the fidya prescribed for the pregnant and nursing mother in Umm 2/103, and substitutes qadaqa - evidently a further qiyas on Q2/196, and a parallel to the case of the old man.

From elsewhere in the Umm, it is clear that Shafii was aware that some preferred qadā' for the pregnant and nursing mothers, but he seems to make no comment on this, choosing instead to advocate qadaqa.

The decline of the fidya as a solution to the problem of the old man, etc., apparently common to all areas, may possibly be due to its weak basis in the Quran, and might represent a tacit admission that the reference to the old was in the first instance a tafsir device. Both the qadā' solution, and to a lesser extent, Shafi'i's qadaqa solution, are more in line with the Quranic prescriptions, clear evidence of the growing importance of the Quran as a theoretical source of law.

Consecutiveness

The question of whether a fast of a number of days (excluding Ramadān) should be performed consecutively or not provoked many differences of opinion in the period before Shafi'i's death. This was partly because the Quran does not consistently settle the matter. In Q4/92 and 58/4, we find prescribed 'two consecutive months', but in Q2/196 and 5/89 simply 'three days' and in 2/184 'other days'.

Generally discussion centres on the only fast of any length

1 7/251. 2 Though not total: Antoun (pp. 41, 103) records contemporary instances of old men (and menstruants) paying the fidya.
likely to occur under normal circumstances, namely the qaḍā' of
days missed in Ramadān. This is also the only obligatory fast
imposed by the Quran, outside Ramadān, and has no alternatives ¹.

In Malik 45, for example, Ibn ʿUmar says that he who breaks
Ramadān through illness or during travel should make qaḍā' consecut-
ively. The Muw. Shaib. version of this omits the qualificatory ill-
ness and travel clause, but has a comparable opinion from b. ʿUmar:
la yufarraq qaḍā' Ramadān. These opinions already betray the exist-
ence of a debate. Although not explicit, it may be assumed that
the 'b. ʿUmar' point of view is based on an analogy between the
indivisible original, Ramadān, and its substitute ².

Mālik 46, through Zuhrī, shows b. ʿAbbās and Abū Huraira taking
opposite views on this subject, though it is not said who favoured
what. This is somewhat inconclusive, especially as the two are else-
where ³ represented as being of the same opinion. Mālik 48 tells us
that Saʿīd b. Musayyib favoured consecutiveness, and while Mālik
himself was of the same opinion, he also considered that non-cons-
ectiveness (tafriq) was admissible.

Mālik's position is further elaborated in Mūd. 212-3, where he
notes that in the Quran the month fasts are explicitly consecutive,
while this is not the case with the day fasts. He states his clear
preference for consecutiveness on all occasions ⁴, but does not deny
the validity of tafriq where there is an option. The Mūdawwana has
a considerable list of those seeing no harm in tafriq: b. ʿAbbās;
Abū Huraira, ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀq, ʿUrwa b. Zubair, ʿAtā' b. Abī Rabāḥ,
Jubair.

¹ Contrast the first four Quranic refs. above. ² Though Mālik's
position, as is shown below, is arrived at along slightly different
lines. ³ See what follows. ⁴ Cf. his comments ad 48,49.
Against them are set b. Īsam (cf. Malik 45), 'Alī, and Saʿīd b. Musayyib (cf. Malik 48), and from Yūs. 812, Ibrāhīm and ʿĀmir. The only reasonably definite inference to be drawn from those lists is that the differences that the matter provoked were numerous. Those differences, it is felt, were largely on a theoretical plane.

Malik 49 reveals the next stop in this hitherto inconclusive confrontation of opinions. In a ḥadīth, Humaid refers to an enquirer that tafrīq is permissible in a kaffāra fast (Q2/196,5/89; it is here assumed that those kaffāras whose consecutiveness is Quranically specified are here excluded). Mujāhid then contradicts him, on the basis that according to 'the reading of Ubai b. Ka'b! the Quranic text was 'three consecutive days'! The circumstances preceding this assertion must be typical of the origins of many of the alleged variant readings of the Quran. This particular variant has immediate polemical relevance, and shows how thinking conditioned by technical considerations of usūl al-fiqh, principally qiyyās, coupled with the realisation that a 'Quranic' argument was now coming to be regarded as of great weight, led to an allegation, which according to custom was expressed in ḥadīth form, and which in time became treated as fact. It is indicative of the artificiality of this reading that Ubai is not mentioned in the just-quoted lists of parties for and against consecutiveness.

Malik does not himself act on Ubai's allegation, though he does not criticise it, presumably because it favours his own opinions. Maw. Shaib. does not have the Ubai reading ḥadīth2, but Shaibīnī follows Malik in preferring consecutiveness while not

1 See above, p.129. His reading was not confined to this instance of the kaffāra fast, but was by some at least alleged to exist in all cases where the Quran left the matter unsettled. 2 The precise implications of this non-inclusion are difficult to determine.
disallowing tafsir. This, he claims, was Abu Hanifa's doctrine, and that of the 'Amma. However, there are the differing opinions, noted above, from Yus. 811-2.

This being the case, it is not evident that either point of view in this matter is exclusively confined to any particular place. As the question is peculiarly Islamic in nature, and not of great practical or spiritual consequence, it is safe to say that in this early period, it is not much more than a matter of private opinion. A consistent analogical approach to the only incontrovertible information, that contained in the Quran, is generally preferred, though not universally insisted upon.

As might be expected, Shafi' has a more clear-cut approach to the problem: 'Every fast not specified in the Quran as consecutive may be fasted separately, on the analogy of fadidda min ayyamin ukhara (Q2/184-5) where idda means simply a number, without any mention of mutatabi'at'. Similar is Umm 2/103: 'idda min ayyamin ukhara,' without any mention of mutatabi'at, referring no doubt to the Ubai reading or the assertion which preceded it. However, he preferred consecutiveness where the matter is optional. Shafi'is apparent rejection of the variant is interesting, since it seems to show that for him a qir'a did not have the strength of the Quranic text as generally received, an important pointer to the basically anachronistic nature of the alleged variants as a whole.

Shafi' also quotes the earliest hadith from the Prophet on the subject, through an unnamed companion, to the effect that once the number of days to be fasted has been ascertained, they may be fasted in any manner, i.e. consecutively or otherwise. One gathers that...

1 Umm 8/293. Cf. also 7/66. 2 Umm 8/58. 3 In this place, at least.
the ḥadīth is still fairly primitive, as it appears nowhere else as an argument, and seems not to take any account of the Quran.

In Umm 2/103, we find that fasting in kaffāra of an oath, left unqualified by the Quran, is to be consecutive, though apparently Shāfi‘ī was doubtful on this. Muzanī noted this instance of inconsistency with his other qawl, and it seems that this is a remnant of a previous reasoning by qiyāṣ that fasting in kaffāra al-ẓihr is consecutive, and that this, being also a kaffāra, should serve as a model for fasting in expiation of an oath.

Shāfi‘ī also makes it quite clear that if a fast is consecutive, then any break, whether normally excusable or not, renders the faster liable to start again from scratch, with the sole exception of the menstruating woman. This attitude is severer than that of Mālik, for whom menstruation is joined to illness as legitimate reason for breaking.

In K. Ikht. Abī Ḥanīfa and b. Abī Lailā, Shāfi‘ī represents these two as differing on the two months' fast penance for breaking Ramaḍān without due excuse. This penance is based on latterly widespread ḥadīth, which in turn is based on Q58/3-4 or Q4/92. Abū Ḥanīfa maintained that it could only be consecutive, while b. Abī Lailā considered that it need not be so. Schacht deduced from this that the hadith originated between the two Kūfīan figures; but this is not necessarily so. The only definite conclusion is that b. Abī Lailā did not accept the opinion which came to be expressed in the ḥadīth.

As the above shows, there was also some discussion of the consecutiveness or otherwise of non-Quranic fasts. Mālik (Mud.

---

1 Q5/89. 2 Umm 8/293. 3 I.e. through sickness or travel. 4 Umm 7/66, 8/293. 5 Cf. Mālik 40. 6 See below, p. 226. 7 P. 142.
213-8) considered that if one vows to fast a month, or a number of
days, they need not be consecutive unless initially specified as
such.

Although, as has been seen, there was some diversity in the
approaches adopted towards the question of consecutiveness, little
acerbity is evident, and few hadīths were generated. This would
help to explain the non-appearance of the subject in the various
kutub al-ṣiyām of later authors.

It may be noted in passing that in discussing fasting as a
method of rain-making, Shāfiʿī mentions a fast of 'ṭalātthat ayyām
mutatābiʿāt', again evidence that the consecutiveness of non-Quranic
fasts was also considered material, and incidentally curiously par-
allel to the Ubai reading. It need hardly be said that a consecutive
fast would almost invariably be thought by one performing it to
be more efficacious than a separated fast, even though the latter
might in some cases have the sanction of the fuqahā'.

Fitr Ramadān

The question of the penalty, if any, for breaking Ramadan
without excuse\(^1\) (generally by sexual intercourse, though occasio-
nally eating and drinking are added by analogy), which was briefly
mentioned above, is an interesting one from the point of view of
the hadith material involved. In this early period, there is
basically only one hadith, which appears suddenly\(^2\) and almost
immediately achieves widespread circulation and recognition, being
accepted in part or in whole by all major parties, and provoking

---

\(^1\) In contrast to breaking it 'nāṣiyān'. The deliberateness of the
act is generally assumed, and not always explicit in these discussions.

\(^2\) I.e. in its first recorded form it is practically as fully dev-
loped as in its later manifestations.
no noticeable opposition.

Some idea of the state of affairs obtaining before the hadith principle became very developed may be had from Yūs. 822; Ibrūḥīm, reported through Ḥammād - Abū Ḥanīfa, says of one breaking Ramadān deliberately that he should seek pardon from God, and fast another day in its place. In Ḍhrār Shaib. 9, this is elaborated slightly, though keeping the same isnād, to specify sexual intercourse; the atonement is now qāḍā', plus as much free-will offering as can be afforded, and the taʿzīr penalty if the imām finds out. Following Schacht, we may place this opinion as belonging to the time of Ḥammād, d. 120.

Of approximately the same period, perhaps slightly later, is Muqātil fol. 24, the earliest instance of the hadīth that dominates all later argument: Muqātil - Īmar b. Shuʻaib - Abī Thī - Jaddīhī: the Prophet said, concerning the man who has sexual relations with his wife in Ramadān deliberately, he should free a slave, or failing that, sacrifice an animal, (or failing that) let him feed 60 poor and make up the day missed. These alternatives are evidently

---

1 Opinions of Ibrūḥīm Nakḥa and Saʿīd b. Jubair in Baihaqī 228: mā nadrī mā kaffāratuhu yaqūm yawmān makānuhu wa yastaghfir allāh, i.e. la kaffāra ʿalāihi. 2 This is incidentally the only mention of the taʿzīr in connection with the fast in any of the canonical and related smaller works that has been encountered in the preparation of the present study. 3 Bq. 234-6. 4 This should perhaps read ʿAmr and not ʿUmar. 5 The format suggests that this is the title of a well-known legal question. 6 Although possibly this represents the original version, there is a suspicion that the text is incomplete. A familiarity with the Quran invites the inference that the feeding of the 60 poor is the alternative to 60 days fast.
borrowed from the Quranic kaffāras; this becomes quite clear in the version in Kitāb Ikhtilāf 'Ali wa Abī Ḫanīfa, which is perhaps a development from the Muqātil stage in that the 'man' now becomes 'a beduin' who comes to the Prophet seeking advice. The Prophet offers him in turn the three alternatives of the Quranic kaffāra (Q58/3-4)¹: freeing a slave, two months' consecutive fast, the feeding of sixty poor, plus the option of offering qadaqa (perhaps borrowed from Q2/196, or Ṭthār Shaib. 9) before being forced by reason of the offender's extreme poverty to let him off. This last phrase can be seen either as an intended demonstration of the Prophet's magnanimity, or as foreclosing the possibility of a fourth option or additional command, namely the fasting of a day in place of the one broken. Thus also run Muw. Shaib. 3, Yūs. 795, Mālik 28.

Other versions appear to borrow from other Quranic prescriptions, for example, the offering of an animal (cf. Q5/95) proposed in the Muqātil version and Mālik 29². It is apparent that all versions are the fruit of ra'y, but equally clearly, there is a tendency for the analogies to be constructed with the material of the Qurān in mind.

One may easily imagine that the original proposer of the hadoth felt that only a Quranic punishment was fitting for a breach of the Qurān's major fast, something which was undoubtedly regarded by many as a grave lapse in a period of communal religious activity³. Compare Ţay. 2540 from Abū Huraira: the Prophet said, 'Eternal

¹ That this was the origin was recognised by the Muslims, e.g. Sarakhsi, 56. The reference to Q58/3-4 is not as arbitrary as might at first appear: the verse deals with sexual relations, and is thus suitable for qiyās. ² Cf. Shāfiʿī's Umm 2/98, also 8/373.

³ Even today, the observance of Ramaḍān is generally the most seriously undertaken of all the traditional duties incumbent on the Muslim.
Fasting could never atone for breaking a day of Ramadān without excuse.¹

Mālik 29 reaffirms this special position of Ramadān in another way for he is unwilling to apply the rigorous kaffāra outlined in the principal ḥadīth for any fast but Ramadān itself, i.e. not for qaḍā' Ramadān. The ḥadīth in Mālik 29 also adds that the beduin was finally required to qaḍā' a day in place of the day broken. This remedies the earlier situation where in the last resort the offender escaped without any penalty, and is probably a stage later than Āthār Shaib. 9, where Shaibānī seems to take the qaḍā' element of the earlier Ibrāhīm judgement (Yūs. 822) and add it to the qihār kaffāra, to arrive at his own and Abū Ḥanīfa's doctrine. In Muw. Shaib. 3, he extends the penance to include those who eat or drink by day in Ramadān without excuse.

Although Mālik quotes the ḥadīth, it is clear from Mud. 218 that he does not feel bound to accept it entirely. He asserts that only the feeding of the poor will atone for the breach; which view is possibly based on a desire to imitate the terms of the Q2/184 fidya. He further claims that manumission and fasting, the other main alternatives, are unacceptable. Certainly fasting as a punishment for breaking a fast is somewhat incongruous. It is to be noted that in his discussion of the ḥadīth Mālik 29, he limits himself to the defining of the amount of food, which suggests that for him the rest of the ḥadīth was of little or no importance. It is likely that the ḥadīth did not represent Medinese opinion.

Shafiʿī is not surprisingly driven to scorn, and professed amazement that the Mālikīs should have adopted such an arbitrary

¹ This hard line from Abū Huraira perhaps be compared with his alleged but so far unsubstantiated severe judgement in the case of junub. However his name is also attached to a version of the principal ḥadīth outlined above.
approach to a hadith from the Prophet. He naturally accepts it, and settles various details, establishing the exclusive nature of the alternatives, namely that there is to be no feeding of poor people if one can fast two consecutive months, and no fasting if one can find a slave to free.

Shafi'i thinks little of a saying attributed to Rabia, that a day broken in Ramadhan should be made up for by twelve other days, on the principle that the one month of Ramadhan satisfies the fasting requirements of the whole year. One suspects that this is spurious information, in line with Rabia's reputation of being an extreme user of ra'y.

The slight differences between the various versions, principally the addition or omission of clauses concerning sadaqa, or the replacement of the missed day, do not occasion any discussion in this period.

Ru'ya

Since the Quran prescribes fasting for all Muslims for a specified period, namely Ramadhan, it is naturally a matter of some moment to determine exactly when this month begins and ends. The hadiths on this subject are many and varied, and have proved to be among the most difficult to correlate.

This is not a little due to our ignorance of how the Islamic calendar worked. Certainly popular practice seems always to have considered the sighting of the new moon as the beginning of the month.

---

1 Umm 3/56, cf. also 2/98. 2 Cf. Schacht, p. 247. But in Hilayat, IX, 110, this report has a tolerably 'authentic' form.
3 See e.g. Lane, Manners, p. 478, and Jastrow, p. 213. 4 This is allegedly derived from, but probably merely sanctioned by, Q10/5.
but for official purposes there was 'from an early period' a regulated calendar. This was based on a unit of 59 days, the approximate length of two lunar cycles. Coupled with the intercalation of eleven days over each successive period of 30 years, this system is of 'a considerable accuracy'. For convenience, the standard year is of six two-month cycles, each of 30 plus 29 days. Ramadān, the ninth month, is thus of 30 days.

The Jews had also been faced with the problem of a calendar. Although a computed calendar, based on the true new moon (i.e. the astronomical conjunction, rather than the first appearance to earth-bound observers) had existed since before the Dispersion, and had allegedly been revised by Hillel II (d. 358 A.D.), Palestine and Babylon had retained the direct observation method until at least the middle of the fourth century A.D. The question of the calendar was one of the big areas of difference between the Rabbanites and the Karaites, the latter preferring the primitive method, in accordance with their fundamentalist scripture-based precepts.

According to Baron, the Isawites and the Yudghanites, groups allied to the Karaites, were accused by Saadia Gaon of imitating the Muslims in their rejection of the computed calendar. At this later stage, it may be true that the influence was running this way, but at an earlier period there seems little doubt that there was a common concern among both Muslims and Jews on this question. The contemporary documentation of the disputes on the Jewish side is

---

1 I.e. not religious. 2 EI, art. 'Zamān'. 3 Burnaby, p. 380. 4 In theory at least: Baron V 191-2 shows that some Karaites in practice conformed with the Rabbanites. 5 V, 94. 6 It should be noted however that by Saadia's time, the Isawites and Yudghanites were numerically very small (cf. Baron V 193.). 7 Cf. Q2/189, yas'alūnaka 'an al-ahilla, etc., and what follows here.
however extremely sparse. That Muhammad was aware of the disputes may be inferred from his professed dislike of interfering with the 'natural' calendar, and his rejection of the intercalary month\(^1\), which may be seen as part of his latter policy of deliberately countering various of the orthodox Jewish practices. His success was only partial, for, as noted above, official practice still countenanced intercalation, albeit of days rather than months, as in the Jewish system.

Although a rejection of computation may be polemically advantageous, it introduces the great practical difficulty of determining the arrival of the new month when the sky is obscured or overcast. Some policy becomes necessary to ensure that in the case of Ramadan the month is fully and uniformly fasted. Either one starts fasting from the earliest point in time at which the new moon might conceivably be expected, or some standard calculation or rule of thumb (distinct from computation) must be developed and adopted.

In the light of the foregoing observations, an assessment of the hadith material involved will now be attempted. In Hālik \(^2\), the Prophet says of Ramadan, 'Do not fast (it) until you see the new moon, and do not break until you see the new moon (sc. of Shawwāl). If it is overcast, "fa-aqdirū lahu" \(^4\). There are here two sets of possibilities: 1) the first part of the hadith is a counter to any method other than direct observation\(^3\), or it means 'Do not fast before seeing the new moon', or it is simply an introductory phrase for the second part; 'aqdirū lahu' either means 'Use the

\(^1\) \(29/36-7, 10/5\). \(^2\) = Huw. Shaib. 1. \(^3\) This is suggested by the negative command. Against this is that it never occurs without the second part. Also, Ṭay. 1810 (cf. Muqātil, fol.24) has the phrase in positive form. \(^4\) Parallel to other hadiths against fasting the 'doubtful day': see below, p.234.
date arrived at by computation', or 'Reckon a certain number of days from the previous new moon'.

All the fuller version of this ḥadīth assume this last to be meant, for they variously define the length of the month in days. Mālik 2, from 'Abdullāh b. Dīnār - b. ʿUmar, obviously closely connected with Mālik 1, inserts at the beginning, 'The month is 29'. By 'the month' is presumably meant Ramadān, though in favour of the interpretation Shaʿbān is that it is more important not to miss a day at the beginning of the month than not to run over at the other end. Also, to refer 29 to Shaʿbān agrees with the official calendar. Mālik 3, through b. ʿAbbās, ends: 'complete the number 30'. Here there seems less doubt that Ramadān is meant, though there is a possibility that this ḥadīth and the previous one are intended to be contradictory.

Yūs. 820 relates from Zuhrī a well-known ḥadīth concerning the Prophet, who, it is said, once had occasion to swear off his wives for a month. ʿAʾisha is represented as being surprised to see him back on the 29th, and is told by the Prophet that the month can be of 29 days, and it can be of 30. If taken as referring to months in general, the ḥadīth does little more than state the obvious, and it seems more profitable to see it as referring to a single month, specifically Ramadān, and either acting as a compromise between two opposed parties, respectively claiming that Ramadān never

---

1 Though Zurqānī II 154 records an 'astronomical' interpretation of this, which has an air of credibility. 2 Cf. Q2/185, shahru Ramadān, etc. 3 Cf. Q2/185, li-tukmilu al-ʿidda. 4 Cf. Muqātil, fol. 24, which has slightly different wording; Tay. 873, 2481, 2671, 2306. 5 Cf. perhaps Tay. 1550, where in a different hadith ʿAʾisha promotes the '29 as much as 30' view. See also Muqātil, fol. 24. 6 Shāf., Ris. p. 81, not talking about this problem in particular, says of Ramadān 'wa qad yakūn 30 wa 29'.
is less than 30 days, or justifying the vagaries of direct observation. There is no mention of Ramaḍān or fasting in this ḥadīth, but it is nevertheless always included in the chapters on fasting. The same ḥadīth occurs in varying forms at Tay.24,2744, both through b. ʿAbbās, promoting this time 29 alone.

It is at least clear that some thought Ramaḍān could be of variable length, for in Tay.863 we have an opposing ḥadīth which claims the Prophet said ‘Shahrū ʾIdin lā yanquqāna‘, referring to Ramaḍān and Dhū-l-Ḥijja, both officially 30-day months. The opinion behind this ḥadīth probably stemmed from a pious desire to fast Ramaḍān ‘properly’, i.e. as much as possible, and this motive, as much as any desire for following a strict method of computation in the calendar, probably accounts for many of the '30' ḥadīths.

In his general discussion of the ruʿya3, as this question is usually known in the legal works, Shāfiʿī makes no mention of these particular differences. This possibly indicates that the matter was of no great interest to him, or that it was not primarily a Ḥijāzi concern. Elsewhere he quotes Mālik 3, but with the addition of the ending of Mālik 3, 'fa-akmilū al-ʿidda', and Mālik 3 itself.5 His statement in K. Ikhtilāf al-Ḥadīth that if it is overcast, one should count 30 of Shābān and do likewise with Ramaḍān, seems to be based rather on another ḥadīth, from Abū Huraira, also known in the Mudawwana (204), dealing with yawn al-shakk, on which see below.

If it may be assumed that the 'aqdirū phrase always formed part of the type of ḥadīth mentioned initially above, then it seems that for the purposes of fasting at least, there was no noticeable departure from a general opinion that the visual method was to be

---

1 Mālik 3, above, from b. ʿAbbās, said 30. In Tay.2721, a separate ḥadīth, he says simply 'akmilū al-ʿidda'. 2 Again, cf. Q2/185, fa-akmilū al-ʿidda. 3 Umm 2/94. 4 Umm 8/372. 5 Umm 8/56.
employed for ascertaining the limits of Ramadān under conditions of
fine weather. The dispute appears to be over the length of the month
to be assumed if it is overcast; however, it is entirely possible
that the 29/30 discussion is but an aspect of the related problem
of yawm al-shakk, the day which comes at the end of Sha‘bān, conce-
erning which there is doubt as to which month it properly belongs to,
and therefore whether it should be fasted or not.

Shāfi‘i devotes rather more space to the discussion of this
question, and concludes that generally the practice of fasting yawm
al-shakk is wrong. This may be why he favours treating Sha‘bān as
of 30 days if the disputed day is overcast, and such an attitude
would no doubt stem from a fear of treating as Ramadān what does
not belong to it.

However, Mālik treats this question as quite separate from the
preceding one: he has no ḥadīth, but says (55) that the ahl al-‘ilm
forbid it, if the doubtful day is ‘intended’ (manwāh) as part of Ram-
dağān. As a voluntary fast, not connected with Ramadān, then there
is no harm in it. Mālik observes that this is the practice of Medina.
In Mud. 204 there is a hadīth that exactly matches this point of
view from Darāwardī, a contemporary of Mālik, also Medinese: Abū
Hurairā: ‘Do not precede the month (Ramadān) with either one or two
days fast, unless this coincides with a fast that you are already
engaged in’. Rabi‘a, another Medinese, expresses the same idea in
a different way (Mud. 204). The principle behind all this is the
typical early Mālikī consideration of the niya, specifically here
the reprehensible ‘niya Ramadān ala shakk’. It seems to be primar-
ily a Medinese concern, although it is true that Abū Yūsuf of Kūfa

1 Cf. a later ḥadīth to this effect (p. 349), and comparable objec-
tions to the fasting of 6 of Shawwāl, and of Sha‘bān as a whole.
2 Probably also a factor in Shāfi‘i’s judgement; cf. Umm 7/96.
3 Cf. Mud. 204. 4 Similar is Ḥay. 2361.
Says (800) that lbrrhIm disliked the practice. Shafi‘I reveals that this apparent early unanimity was not long-lived. In Kitab al-Sawm al-QughrI, is a hadith from `Ali via Darawardi to the effect that to fast a day of Shabban is preferable to breaking a day of Ramadan. This is an expression of straightforward pious circumspection, ijtihadi, the matter of the niya being disregarded. Shafi‘I ignores this (for him awkward) reference to yawm al-shakk, to concentrate on another aspect of the hadith. More straightforward is Ikhtilaf, where we find that b. `Umar used to fast a day before the new moon. Both these favourable hadiths are from companions; all except one of the opposition hadiths are from the Prophet.

As Bilal is adamant that Medina dislikes the practice of fasting yawm al-shakk, it is reasonable to assume that he has heard the opposite suggestion. The b. `Umar hadith may have been designed by others to undermine the Medinensese attitude, and the `AlI hadith is almost certainly `Iraqi. However, Tayalisi’s hadiths on yawm al-shakk are unfavourable to the practice, as also are both of Abu Yusuf’s. As far as one can tell, Shaitani was of the same opinion.

There remain several small points connected with the ru’ya which will not be discussed in detail here, such as: whether one or two witnesses are required for the sighting of the moon; the niya; when

1 Also in Kitab al-Sawm al-KabIr. 2 Comparable in a way is the report of Dickson, p. 219: Shi‘Is on principle and to show their greater zeal, nearly always start to fast (Ramadan) a day earlier than the Sunnis, and continue for a day longer. 3 Though possibly this writing is of an early date, before he had formulated his later theories on the subject. In support of this is the presence of Darawardi, whom Shafi‘I did not readily accept as an authority in later years. 4 Umm 8/546, cf. 8/56. 5 From b. `Abbas, Umm 8/546; see also the Farrah Sha‘bi hadith, above, p. 24. 6 Cf. Schacht, p. 32. 7 2361, 2721. 8 819, 300. 9 See Huw. Shaib. 1.
fitr should be made on the last day of Ramadān if the new moon becomes visible while it is yet day.

Although most of the Ru'ya discussions revolve around technicalities that are entirely internal Islamic matters, there is a suspicion that some of the concern about yawm al-shakk in particular stems from broader Semitic tendencies, related to the honouring of the new moon. It is a fact that the beduin at least until recently welcomed the new moon, especially that of Ramadān, with gunfire and shouting, and this is but one aspect of a widely-documented reverence for that heavenly body. Within Islam, mention may be made of the bīq-fast, and certain interesting features are to be found in Judaism too: the Code of Maimonides states that there is to be no fasting on New Moons. In contrast, there was a mediaeval custom of fasting certain months to take the place of an expiatory new moon sacrifice. Among the Falashas, there takes place on the 29th of the eighth month a fast of supplication.

With the possible exception of the two companion hadiths mentioned above, there is little evidence of any of the non-technical aspects of this problem being recorded in the surviving hadīth literature, and certainly little definite indication of what original motives lay behind the fasting of yawm al-shakk.

Safar

The Quran clearly encourages the traveller to break his fast in Ramadān, and indeed may even be considered to enjoin this positively. However, certain people were reluctant to accept this dispensation; whether this was from reluctance to abandon a previous

usage, or simply from a desire for the additional heavenly reward of fasting when this was not obligatory or of not interrupting Ramadān, may not now be determined. Certainly, there are reported a number of actual instances of a reluctance to stop fasting during travel¹, as well as the many allegations to that effect in the hadith literature. The differences of opinion on this matter gave rise to a great number of ḥadīths².

Perhaps the earliest are those in Ḥuqāṭīl (fol. 24): one is plainly in favour of fasting: Abū Dardā' said, 'In qunata fa-ма'jūr, wa in aftārta, fa-ма'dhūr'.³ The other represents a compromise, and indicates that two opposed parties were already well established: ʻUmar b. Shu’aib - Abī Thi - Jaddihi: We saw the Prophet during travel (both) fasting and breaking.

We next have several companion ḥadīths which are soon superseded: the Ḥuqāṭīl hadith had already made appeal to the Prophet. Mālik 25⁴ is a bald assertion from b. ʻUmar, through Ḥāfiẓ, that he did not fast while travelling. Mālik 26, Hishām - ʻUrwa, says that while ʻUrwa did do so in Ramadān⁵, his companions did not. This is presumably intended to present the matter as optional⁶. Similar in form is Shaibānī, Ḥādhār, 1, where it is claimed that Ḥudhaifa, a Medinese in Kūfa, fasted during travel, while Abū Mūsā, a Baṣran, broke⁷. These figures are no doubt intended to represent their respective local schools of fiqh.

In Mālik 24, we again find the Mālik - Hishām - ʻUrwa isnād

---

¹ E.g. Dickson, p. 580, Burckhardt I, 99, Thomas, p. 244.
² This would be added to by the presence of a tafsir problem.
³ This ḥadīth appears nowhere else. ⁴ = Muw. Shaib. 13.
⁵ This qualification is perhaps implicit in the preceding ḥadīth.
⁶ Cf. Ḥuqāṭīl fol. 24, above.
⁷ In the printed text, supply 'aftāra' between 'wa' and 'Abū Mūsā'.
supporting the optional claim (cf. Malik 26), though the matn is changed: Ḫamza b. ʿAmr al-ʿAslami, said to be a keen faster, asks the Prophet whether he should fast while travelling. The Prophet leaves the choice entirely to him, with no preference expressed: in shiʿita fa-ṣum, wa in shiʿita fa-ṣāfīr. Similar is Malik 23, where we are told that on a journey with the Prophet, those fasting did not upbraid those breaking, nor vice versa. The Mudawwana, 203, has an ʿAslami Ḥadīth with a different, non-ʿfamily' isnād, and is therefore possibly earlier: it supports the acceptance of God's rukhsa.

Yūs. 792 presents a different theme: the Prophet sets out on a journey in Ramaḍān, and when the (fasting) persons complain of distress on the way, he breaks until he reaches Mecca. Similar is Yūs. 793, in which the place of fitr is specified as Qudaid. Although a fairly natural development, given the topic in hand, the motif of the Medina-Mecca journey may be borrowed from Shaib. 1, in which a member of the Banū Suʿūla says 'kharajt ilā Mecca', introducing the Ḥudhaifa-Abū Mussa Ḥadīth above. As it stands, the present Ḥadīth is capable of several interpretations: either it claims that fasting on a journey is optional, or that it should only be done if it causes no hardship, or, most likely, it suggests that a traveller may break his fast only if going further than the distance between Mecca and Qudaid. To this extent, then, the purpose of the Ḥadīth is nothing more than to establish for legal purposes the meaning of 'safar' in terms of distance. No place was mentioned by name in

1 Also in Shāf., Umm 2/102. 2 Cf. Umm 2/102. 3 Cf. Schacht on this, p. 170. 4 Possibly influenced by Q2/185, yurīd allāh bikūm al-yusr, etc. 5 A precisely similar phenomenon is to be observed in the question of qaṣr al-ṣalāt fi-l-safar. Restricting the comparison to this period, the problem as dealt with by Malik appears to be rather simpler than that of fasting while travelling. The majority of /
the Yūs. 792 hadīth, and it seems highly probable that the mention of Qudaid in the second hadīth represents a deliberate attempt to change the purpose of the hadīth while borrowing a well-known pattern.

Mālik 21 resumes this theme: the Prophet sets off for Mecca in the year of victory (Ramaḍān 8 A.H.) and fasts until he reaches Kadhād1, a place seven-tenths of the way between Mecca and Medina2, where he breaks. His companions break too, for they continually act upon the most recent order of the Prophet: kānū ya‘khudhūna bil-aḥdath fāl-aḥdath min amri rasūlillāh. This phrase, coupled with the explicit dating, leaves no doubt that this hadīth is designed to abrogate what has gone before. Again, the precise target of the hadīth is not quite clear. Kadhād may be intended to represent the minimum distance to be travelled before fasting may be abandoned, or the hadīth may more simply be seen as absolutely disapproving fasting while travelling. It appears to be more developed than Mālik 22, which has a less complete isnād. In it we find the Prophet in the year of victory ordering ḥit while on a journey, on account of the nearness of the enemy, although he himself continues to

/Mālik’s hadīths are concerned to settle this point of what legally constitutes a journey, and there is no discussion of optionality etc., and less concern with dating the various items in the argument. As for the common theme of the Mecca journey (cf. Mālik Qaṣr al-Ṣalāt 15), it does not seem possible to establish which if either discussion employed it first. Only infrequently are the two questions treated jointly, e.g. the rather late Ḥilyat al-Awliyā‘, VII, 318: khair ummatī alladhīna ... ʿādārā sāfarū qasārū wa aṣṭarū.

1 Sic. Usually vocalised Kudaid; perhaps intentionally differentiated here from the otherwise assonant Qudaid.
2 This information from the note ad Mālik 22.
fast; some try to emulate him, and to quench their zeal, he publicly
drinks some water at Kadiā'1.

Similarly devised, though of opposite intent, for in it the
Prophet recommends fasting for the traveller, is the hadīth from
Anas b. Malik2 which is dated to the time of the battle of Hunain,
generally reckoned to have taken place a month or two after Ramaḍān
8 A.H.3, and thus deemed to abrogate the Kadiā hadīth. The Hunain
hadīth does not re-appear elsewhere at this period, although Tay-
2157 does add Hunain to a version of Malik 23 (see below). A puzz-
ling aspect of the Anas hadīth is the reason why the Prophet's
companions on this raid4 should have been fasting at all, if it was
not Ramaḍān.

It is plain that Malik's hadīths (21 and 22, above) can be
seen as showing that it is not done to fast while travelling. However,
Yus. 792 and 793, although potentially of the same tendency, may
rather be intended to show that it is permissible to change from
fasting to breaking in the course of one day5. This is a matter

---

1 The mention of the enemy recalls the hadīth discussions of salah
al-khawf, but no precise links are apparent. 2 Nudawwana 203.
3 Cf. b. Sa'd II108. 4 The fact that these hadīths are often
dated to raids may be because these constituted the most firmly
established 'journeys' in the career of the Prophet. However, this
phenomenon, and other factors (see Quran chapter), give rise to the
suspicion that for some of the Muslims, and possibly in the Quran
as well, safar does in fact mean raid. The fact that even today,
some beduin practice a degree of abstinence before setting off to
fight, might give some clue as to why they were fasting outside
Ramaḍān. 5 Cf. a version of the Kadiā hadīth explicitly to this
effect in Umm 2,101. Shīfi`ī is not convinced of its authenticity.
This question of change of state is also present in the qasr al-salāt
discussions.
connected with the broader problem of the niya, which occupies the lawyers of the Mudawwana at some length (201-3) but which will not be examined in detail here. There are thus several inter-related issues in the fasting while travelling hadiths, and it is not now always easy to distinguish which point - niya, minimum journey, or simple preferability of fasting or breaking - is the main subject of any one hadith.

It emerges that Malik, together with the majority (of the Medinese), prefers fasting for such as are able, although he is bound to admit (Malik 41) that the Quran allows the traveller to break, in spite of his being generally more capable of fasting than a sick person. Agreeably with this fairly strict approach, he considers that a kaffāra, as well as the Quranic qādī, is necessary if one breaks on a journey without reasonable excuse after having been fasting. Part of the punishment here will be for breaking the niya.

In general, the early Malikī position is basically in line with the Quran, though there is a distinct reluctance to accept the rukhsa to the full, almost as if 'ala safarin' was only to be considered a reasonable excuse for breaking when it became equal to 'marīq'. The hadiths from Aslamī and 'Ā'ishah (Mād. 203), which regard the matter as quite optional, are supplied, as is often in the Mudawwana, simply out of academic interest, and not as proofs or arguments for the Malikī point of view. The less severe view which promoted these latter hadiths therefore probably stemmed from outside the Hijāz.

In contrast with the Malikīs' approach, although the question is originally Quran-based, is not greatly influenced by what the Quran says, being founded on independent principles such as that of

1 This reasoning is no doubt behind the conviction that only a traveller going more than a certain distance may break.
the niya and the preferability of remaining in one state throughout the day, Shafi'i has the Quran constantly in mind. Nevertheless, it is Shafi'i, and not the Quran, that slices through the conflicting hadiths to produce a tolerably consistent doctrine. He has a variety of hadiths, only about half of which are traceable to Malik. The newer ones tend towards the view that fasting while travelling is reprehensible.

One develops the story of the Medina-Mecca journey (cf. Malik 22), although the place of fitr is now Kurā al-Ghamīm. When the Prophet hears of the persistence of some in fasting, he exclaims, 'ulā'ika al-ugāt', which in Quranic terms is quite true. In another, the Prophet utters over the body of one who has fainted, 'laisa min al-birr an taqūm fi-l-safar'. One version of this adds that this was on the Tābūk raid, which took place in 9 A.H. This probably indicates that the Ḥunain hadiths, (or perhaps all the opposition hadiths) were thought worthy of being countered; the hadith may also be designed to avoid any Nāliki interpretations of the 'year of victory' hadiths.

Shafi'i, Umm 2/102, feels forced to accept that the Quran forbids travelling while fasting, but this for him is not an absolute tahrim, because of the Malik 23,24 hadith which claims that the matter is optional. To the objection, presumably of those whom Shafi'i mentions as considering the tahrim absolute, he answers that the Prophet forbade fasting at that time only because the enemy was near. This raises the suspicion that the phrase 'ittaqū 'aduwwakum', which does not appear in most recensions, is an insertion designed to counter this very objection, or one similar,

---

1 On this phrase, cf. Q 2/177.

2 See above on the apparent identification of safar with raid.

Tābūk also features in a hadith on qaṣr al-ṣalāt.
which had no doubt been raised well before Shāfi‘ī’s mention of it.

Bearing in mind the foregoing, Shāfi‘ī, like Malik, states his preference for fasting if one can manage it, and calmly asserts that the ‘laisa min al-birr’ hadith may be taken as not contradictory to the Aslamī (optional) hadith, but as explaining it (Umm 2/102); that is to say, if you fear that fasting will be too much for your body, then you may choose not to do it.

Shāfi‘ī’s discussion of al-siyām fi-l-safar in Kitāb Ikhtilāf al-Ḥadīth is later than the above:\textsuperscript{1} the awkward interpretation of the Quran is replaced by one more in line with the conclusion reached in the Umm, and the Quranic implications (as Shāfi‘ī sees them) are expanded along the lines of the ḥadīths, so that those he quotes become almost superfluous. Only the laisa al-birr/Aslamī contradiction is left to be dealt with.

Shāfi‘ī cannot avoid the evident Quranic rukhṣa, but chooses in effect to ignore the consequent yusr-‘usr clause. His final words on the subject are: ‘Acceptance of a dispensation is not obligatory, and disregarding it not a sin’. Wherever there is no extreme of hardship, then, he prefers fasting for the traveller, continuing Malik’s line of thinking, and, to his own satisfaction at least, nullifying the opposition.

Thus both Malik and Shāfi‘ī are disinclined to accept the Quranic rukhṣa, in spite of various ḥadīths opposing this view which appear to have come into circulation after the time of Malik. In this respect it is interesting to note that of Tayālisī’s eight ḥadīths, which contain the motifs lacking in Malik but known to Shāfi‘ī,\textsuperscript{2} two are positively against fasting during a journey, four

\textsuperscript{1} Darāwardī is replaced in Isnāds by someone more trustworthy in Shāfi‘ī’s eyes. An example here is Ikht. (Umm 8/492).

\textsuperscript{2} Kurā al-Ghātha and ‘ulā‘ika al-‘asāt’ in Tay. 1667, laisa min al-birr in 1243.
are quite optional\(^1\), and two are of the Medina-Mecca journey type, and, being without great detail, may be counted as optional too\(^2\). The consensus of these is therefore more favourable than not to the breaking of the fast during travel. How much these discussions belong to the realm of tafsir is difficult to determine; it will be noted that there is in them little mention of the more definitely legal question of what constitutes the minimum journey.

Comparable to the impression given by the Tayalisî hadîths is Shaibânî's comment on Huw. Shaib. 14\(^3\), where he claims that the general opinion (of Küfa), and that of Abu Hanîfa, favours the optional view, though he does not use the Quran as an argument. Even Shaibânî, however, says fasting is 'afdal' for him who can manage it.

Although the 'Irâqî doctrine appears more lenient\(^4\) than the Nijâzi, it does not seem justified to confine either point of view in this matter to one area or the other. It is notable that although Shâfi'i would have us believe that he is guided by the Quran, he perpetuates the strict Mâlikî outlook which counters the Quranic message, while Shaibânî who does not mention the Quran lies closer in fact to its prescription.

---

1 Two from b.'Abbâs (1492,2677); cf. Mud. 203.

2 Though cf. the other interpretations above. Tay.'s remaining hadîths: 1175,2157,2701,2644. 3 = Mâlik 21.

4 Cf. Shaibânî's comment on Shaib. 1.
Some fasting customs not connected with specific days or periods, and not dependent upon any Quranic ruling, will now be dealt with.

Wiṣāl

Wiṣāl is the practice of fasting for a prolonged period without the nocturnal respite, in the first instance for two days and the intervening night. When wiṣāl refers to considerably longer periods, total abstinence gives way to the eating and drinking of a minimal amount only, generally once a day, at sunset (or saḥr; see below). At this point, there is similarity, if not identity, with sawm al-dahr. The practice clearly derives from ascetic motives.

For Mālik the question is a simple one: he gives two ḥadīths of similar substance, in which the Prophet prohibits the practice, but exempts himself, claiming to be supernaturally nourished. Thus Mālik 39: Abū al-Zinād - Aḥrāj - Abū Huraira: the Prophet said, 'Beware of wiṣāl!' They said, 'But you practise it, 0 Messenger of God.' He replied, 'I am not like you, I am fed and watered by my Lord.' It is generally assumed by the Muslims that although nourished, the Prophet was in fact practising wiṣāl: whether this is exactly what the ḥadīth says is debateable.

1 Thus Muw. Shaib. Bab al-wiṣāl fī-l-ṣiyām, Tay. 1125. 2 See above, p.207. 3 Mālik 38,39. Cf. the two ḥadīths of Muw. Shaib. Bab al-wiṣāl fī-l-ṣiyām. 4 Sc. at night? The last phrase of this hadīth is practically identical with Q26/79: (rabb al-ʿālamīn) yuṭʿimūnī wa yasqīnī. Note also Ḥilyat al-Awliyā', X, 51: Do not force food and drink on your sick; their Lord feeds and waters them.

5 It could be intended to show that the Prophet only appeared to be practising wiṣāl (cf. Rāzī, p.205), but there does not seem to be any point to this. In later versions of the ḥadīth, it becomes definite that the Prophet was in fact observing the practice.
For the lawyers of the Mudawwana, the matter does not merit discussion, and forī Śafīʿī, who naturally selects the Mālik-Nāfiʿ b. ʿUmar ḥadīth as being the sounder of the two, there are no difficulties: God is simply making a distinction between the Prophet and lesser people, in that he has divine licence to do some things that remain forbidden to others.

However, the true situation is not quite as simple as this, for the ḥadīth gives us a clear picture of two previous stages in the argument, namely a Prophetic prohibition, and another prophetic tradition sanctioning the practice. The purpose of the present ḥadīth is to remove the strength of the sanctioning tradition by restricting its application to the Prophet himself. The ḥadīth's intention is therefore not primarily to magnify the figure of the Prophet, but rather to score a point in a matter of debate.

The khaṣāʾīs ḥadīths, of which this is a specimen, are not connected with for example those parts of the Sira which seek to furnish Muhammad as the Prophet of Islam with a partly superhuman nature, comparable with that of the leaders of earlier and rival religions.

Ṭayūlīzī has four ḥadīths on ḥiṣāl, all of which mention the Prophet's prohibition, though only one, 1579, in words reminiscent of Mālik's hadiths. Ṭay. 1764, from Jābir b. ʿAbdullāh, says simply that the Prophet forbade ḥiṣāl in fasting. It is possibly the prototype of the first statement in the Malik 38/39 ḥadīth, although the short sentence, lā ḥiṣāl fi-l-ṣawm, recalls similar concise maxims.

---

2 Cf. Q 5/67, waḥāhu yaʿṣimuka min al-ʿnās. On the other hand, Q18/110, innāma anā basharun nithlukum.  
3 Mukht. Muz., Umm 8/59.  
4 1125,1579,1764,2173.  
5 For examples, see Schacht, Origins, Index of legal problems.
which may indicate that the ḥadīth, appearing only in the rather late Tayālisī, was indeed a 'legal' maxim that only latterly became attributed to the Prophet, as an additional weapon in the argument.

Ṭay. 1125 relates the story of one Laila, wife of Bashir b. al-Khaḍāqiyya, who says, 'I wanted to fast two days in ṭıṣāl', and mentioned this to Bashir. He said the Prophet forbade this practice, and said the Jews do it, so fast, but break when the night comes. This rationalisation by reference to the Jews is unusual, and in contrast to the more common 'khalifūhum' type of ḥadīth, where divergence from the Jewish practice is the original motive for the alleged Muslim sunna.

This assertion concerning the Jews seems at first to be doubtful; Vajda¹ thinks that the practice is originally Christian, and says that this has often been shown, but unfortunately gives no references. (It is however clear that asceticism was a marked feature of the early church, though of course such an attitude was not exclusively confined to the Christians). Even assuming that Vajda's assertion represents the true picture, there remains the possibility that the Christians were influenced by the Jews. In fact the notion of prolonged fasting is well attested to in both the O.T. and the Apocrypha², and in view of the fact that there is virtually no other evidence of Christian influence on Islamic practice, on balance the suggestion seems ill-founded here also.

While it is dangerous to argue directly from Apocryphal times to the 7th. or 8th. centuries of the Christian era, the possibility of a continuum is nevertheless established, and it seems reasonable that the words put into the mouth of the Prophet in Tay. 1764 should

---

¹ HUCA 385.

² Esther 4/15, Tobit 3/10 (3 days); I Sam. 31/13, I Chron. 10/12, II Esdras 5/12,6/31 (longer periods). See also-Enc. Jud. vol.6, col.943.
have the same ultimate basis in fact as in the cases of Abūrū and Ta‘īf, for example. Again, 'Irāq seems to be the place where the practice becomes part of Islām: the 'Irāqīs have the larger number of ḥadīths, and are responsible for virtually all the known discussion of the subject in this period. Shaibūnī quotes Mālik 38/39, and adds, 'We uphold this. 'Iṣāl is makrūh. . . . and this is the view of Abū Ḥanīfa and the majority. The predominant ḥadīths thus reflect the main 'Irāqī point of view, and may therefore be judged to have originated among the eastern scholars.

It was suggested above that behind the Mālik 38/39 hadīth lay an original pro-'Iṣāl ḥadīth or opinion. Shaib. Athār. 10 and Yūs. 794, both from Abū Ḥanīfa from Ḥāl b. Aqmar may represent this. Alike both in general form and in much of the detail, they assert that the Prophet (Yūs. adds 'in Ramadān') took great pains to consume no more and no less than a drink of milk (Yūs.: 'at saḥr'), having spent the day fasting and the night in vigil. It seems that ḍa‘m al-dahr is not here referred to. Since only the Prophet is specifically mentioned as acting in this manner, this hadīth would tie in conveniently with 'the people's ' assertion in the Malik 33/39 counter-hadīths.

Although the anti-'Iṣāl hadīths far outnumber those favourable to the practice, it seems that it showed little sign of succumbing to the adverse propaganda. Completely: Ṭay. 2173 has Abū Sa‘īd al-

---

1 See below, p. 176, and above, p. 250.

2 Shāfi‘ī in his comment mentioned above seems to be adopting a purely servile attitude to the hadīth - it is not apparent that for him it endorses any previously known doctrine.

3 A variant text omits these last three words.
Khudrī remarking that his sister persists in *wişâl* in spite of both the Prophet's prohibition and his own. Abū Sa'îd's sister Furai'a bint Mâlik b. Sinân enjoys a certain fame in hadîths connected with another legal question, but it is not apparent that these throw any light on the present case. The figure of Abū Sa'îd's sister may stand for women in general, perhaps paralleling Lailâ in Tây. Above, but any precise connection between women and *wişâl* remains elusive. Although the matter has not been systematically investigated, in dealing with the fasting hadîths as a whole, the impression has been gained that women feature in them more frequently than in hadîths on other subjects. It may tentatively be suggested that this is an acknowledgement by the composers of the hadîths of a greater liking for voluntary fasting among women; this phenomenon is substantiated by occasional factual reports.

There remain a few minor points connected with the discussion of *wişâl*. It may be noted that Shâfi'î's version of Mâlik 38 has '*(innâ lastu)* mithlakum' for ka-hai'atam. There seems no practical difference, but the latter version does recall (and controvert) the Qur'anic 'innenâ anân basharon mithlakum'.

Taking *wişâl* by its less rigorous definition, the eating of one meal per day, a parallel arises with the Jewish method of performing long fasts. Compare also the situation which Q2/187 is reforming. It is therefore conceivable that besides the anti-ascetic element, which seems to have motivated the earliest hadîths, part

---


3 Used in an identical way, Mâlik Ḥajj 83. 4 Q18/110. This phrase, without the final word, appears in numerous hadîths (see Wensinck) and occurs in the *Kuważţa* (Aqâdiya 1).

5 Some at least seem to have been performed thus: cf. Enc. Jud. 'Fasting'
of the reason for the dislike of wişål was its closeness to regular Jewish practice. However, the definition of wişål is somewhat flexible, and it is not definite that all the Muslim lawyers would have called such fasting by the name of wişål.

An instance of an alternative name for wişål apparently occurs in Ḥuw. Shaib. 27, where the 'ḥatta' ḥadīth¹, the purpose of which is to counter non-prescribed fasting customs in general, is used to the opposite effect. Its clause 'kāna rasūl allāh yaqūm ḥatta naqūl lā yuṣīf' is taken in isolation to justify a bāb-heading 'al-mud- ʿawama 'alā al-ṣiyām'.

Taʿjīl al-fitr

Taʿjīl al-fitr (or al-iftār), the deliberate bringing forward in time of the meal that marks the end of the fasting day, originated, as Vajda and earlier Goldziher noted², in the desire to establish a contrast between Islam and Judaism. This desire is expressed in the one word 'khāliifūhum'³. Given this inter-religious polemical origin, it is not surprising to find repeated the pattern of the ʿAshūrā discussions: the practice is ignored by the Mudawwana, while Mālik who has three ḥadīths on taʿjīl⁴, has no comment to make. The earliest recorded mention of the subject comes from the tafsīr of Muqāṭil b. Sulaimān: Muqāṭil - 'Aṭā'. - Umm Dardā' - Abū Dardā': 'Three things are the mark of prophethood: taʿjīl al-fitr...'

Altogether there are ḥadīths of four different motifs on this subject by the time of Shāfiʿī, although the latter only mentions those of Mālik, and apparently does not know Ṣay. 600 from the

¹ See Basic Fast, p.211. ² Vajda, HUCA, 370. Goldziher, Mohamm edanische Polemik. ³ See Friday, above, p.167. ⁴ Two are virtually identical and favour taʿjīl. The other does not.
Prophet, which supports his own opinion. However, even from these few materials can be reconstructed evidence of a lively and developing debate.

Shafi'i's writings on the subject are fairly late, and he does not devote much space to its discussion. He simply takes together Malik's prophetic hadith, 'lä yazāl al-nās bi-khair mà ajzalū al-fitr' (this is not in itself incompatible with his dictum that eating must stop until the sun sets) and the 'Umar and 'Uthman hadith, Malik - Zuhri - Humaid b. 'Abd al-Rahmān: 'Umar and 'Uthman used to pray the maghrib prayer after making sure that the black night had come before they would break their fast. Then they would break after the prayer, and this in Ramadān. This of course is opposed to the former hadiths of Malik. Shafi'i realises this, but nullifies the intention of the companion hadith by claiming that fasting after nightfall is a technical impossibility, and that the two were in fact breaking without having consumed anything. Shafi'i supposes that 'Umar and 'Uthman were seeking the faḍl of abstaining from food longer than necessary, and that they were (mistakenly) thinking that the matter was open (wāsi'). It is interesting that Shaibani, commenting on this hadith and obviously less bound by the Prophet's words than Shafi'i, also considers the matter 'wasi', seeing no ba's in breaking either after or before the prayer.

It appears that Malik was revised in Shafi'i's lifetime to

1 Malik 6 & 7, = Muw. Shaib. 18. 2 This phrase is not uncommon: parallels in b. Sa'd 1216, 22130. 3 Umm 2/96. 4 He quotes here Q2/187, 'thumma atimmū al-siyām ilā al-lail'. 5 Similar is Muw. Shaib. 9. 6 Probably two to provide the two shahids. 7 Muw. Shaib. 19. 8 It may of course be that 'Before or after?' is the question the hadith is designed to answer: this does not stop it forming material for the present debate also.
exclude any possible objections from parties who favoured the delaying of the fiṭr meal, for although in the Kitāb al-ṣawm al-Kabīr the ḥadīth is as in Mālik, in the Umm (1/97), it has the addition 'wa lam yu’akhkhirūhu'.

In view of the anti-Jewish motive for the practice of taʿjīl al-iftār, it is natural to look to the Īrūq for its origin, and it is noteworthy that in addition to the Muqṭīl hadīth above, Tayḥlisī, another Başran, has two of the three pro-taʿjīl hadīths of the period.

One of them, 1512, appears regularly in later collections, probably because of its anecdotal style. Put briefly, two companions ask 'A'isha whether it is better to hasten iḥṭār and delay suḥūr, or delay iftār and hasten suḥūr. 'A'isha replies that the former is better, being the practice of the Prophet. This pairing of the two complementary activities also occurs in the Muqṭīl hadīth, and in Shaib. 1, where the hadīth is in a rather different form, and only at the companion level. Again, the former choice is the accepted doctrine, according to Shaibānī. Comparable is his comment ad Muw. Shaib. 18.

Ṭayḥlisī's other favourable hadīth, 600, is a polemical adaptation of, and counter to, Mālik 8. 'Umar and 'Uthmān are replaced at their prayers by the now more authoritative figure of the Prophet, who says that the breaking of the faster lies in preceding the rising of the stars, i.e. not so late as 'black night' of the earlier hadīth. The last phrase of the report, 'mubādarat ẓulū al-ḥujjām', recalls the Jewish injunction to assess the arrival of night by the sighting of a certain number of stars, although for the purposes

---

1 See below, p. 253. 2 Though if taken in conjunction with Muw. Shaib. 19, it is clearly not actually binding. 3 See Vigouroux, art. 'JeSnc', col. 1532.
of the Muslim fast, nightfall is traditionally always reckoned in terms of dark and light, rather than by the visibility of the stars.

An examination of the two textually identical hadiths of Malik (6 & 7) reveals that while one is from the early traditionist Sa'id b. Musayyib, the other has the earlier Sahl b. Sa'd al-Sa'di, and this is the hadith that Shafi'i uses.

There can be little doubt that the motive behind the ta'jil hadiths is entirely polemical. Because the first hadiths were placed under the authority of the Prophet, Shafi'i adopted them and consolidated their lead over the then less developed opposition hadiths. In this way, the virtue of prolonging the fast, which one might have otherwise expected to have become more prominently advocated, is eclipsed by the desire to counter the practice of the Jews.

Suhūr

The word sahūr, coming from a root which contains among other notions that of 'dawn', signifies the meal eaten at the end of the night before recommencing the fast. Suhūr is the act of eating the same.

As was seen above, some hadiths treated suhūr and iftār jointly, as complementary activities at opposite ends of the day. However, Malik, in his section on ta'jil al-iftār, has no mention of suhūr, and it is plain from Mud. 191 that the early Malikis were

---

1 Nuqattil, fol. 24, Tay. 1515, Shaibani p. 48. 2 But Mud. Shaib., būb matā yuḥram al-ta'am 'alā al-ğā'im, has a hadith featuring Bilal which appears later in Tayālisī. This hadith does in fact occur in Kalik, but in his R. al-Ṣalāt (14&15), and it is the one known to Shafi'i (see what follows). No specific mention of suhūr is made in it, and possibly it was not designed as a suhūr hadith, but the fact/
not concerned with the meal as such, but, as is often the case, the
determining of what kaffāra or qaḍā' is necessary, in this instance
for one eating after dawn. We find that Mālik has recently had cause
to consider the so-called false dawn, and by analogy with the
afterglow which sometimes follows the sunset, he takes it to be part
of the night, for the purposes of the faster.

It is evident that the possibility that it could be viewed
otherwise has either occurred to him or been mentioned to him¹, but
as far as we can tell, not as a definite opinion or ḥadīth. Shāfi‘ī's
attitude, as expressed in Umm 2/96, is that eating is permissible
until the manifestation of the latter dawn - the one which spreads
on the horizon (muṣṭariḍan ʿi-l-ufūq). This is the same phrase as
Mālik (Muḍ. 191) uses; see further on this note 1 below. This judg-
ment is based on the alleged practice of the Prophet, but there is
no surviving ḥadīth which clearly fits this assertion, unless it is
Ṭay. 151² that is referred to. The same prophetic precedent is per-
haps referred to in Nukht. Muẓ.³, where it is stated that Shāfi‘ī
preferred ta‘ṣīl al-fitr and ta‘khīr al-suḥūr on the basis of the
Prophet's action.

In Kūṭṭāb Ikhtilāf ʿAlī wa b. Mas‘ūd, the Prophet is not men-
tioned. Shāfi‘ī simply says that suḥūr is before sunrise (ṭulūʿ al-fajr)⁴

¹ Not necessarily in connection
with suḥūr. Another question related to this time of day is that of
when the suḥōr/fajr prayer may be performed. In e.g. Umm 1/73-4, it
is decided that it may be started only when the second dawn has ar-
ried (wa idḥā būna al-fajr al-akhir muṣṭariḍan ḥallat ẓalāt al-ṣubḥ).
² See Taʿjīl, above, p. 252. ³ Umm 8/57. ⁴ Cf. Talmud Babli,
Pesahim: In a public fast, one may eat until the ascending of dawn.
and that neither the Hijazi ulama nor the party of 'Abdullāh b. Nasrūd (the early Kūfans) agree with the ʿAlī ḥadīth that the Prophet prayed the ʿubūḍ prayer and then said, 'This is when the white thread becomes distinct from the black', i.e. advocating taʾkhir.

This introduction of the Quran is evidently a later step. It is clear from this brief discussion that taʾkhir al-suḥūr did not mean for Shāfiʿī such a lengthy delay, that is, until after the ʿubūḍ prayer, though of course the ḥadīth he knew may have had intentions similar to those of the ʿAlī ḥadīth.

The subject did not apparently occasion much debate in the Hijāz.

There is to be found elsewhere in Shāfiʿī another ḥadīth which by others was applied to the question of taʾkhir. Shāfiʿī's non-use of it may indicate that in his eyes it dealt with another, albeit related, subject, that of the timing of the adhān. However, both his versions of the ḥadīth make specific reference to eating and drinking, and it is difficult to see that it was designed to deal with anything other than a fasting problem.

It concerns the two muezzins of the Prophet, Bilāl and b. Umm Naktûm. Sufyān b. `Uyaina - Zuhrī - Sālim b. ʿAbdullāh b. ʿUmar - Abīthi: the Prophet said: 'Bilāl makes his adhān while it is (yet) night, so eat and drink until you hear the adhān of b. Umm Naktûm'. The other ḥadīth runs: Mālik - Zuhrī - Sālim b. ʿAbdullāh: the Prophet said, 'Bilāl makes his adhān while it is (yet) night, so eat and drink until b. Umm Naktûm calls. And b. Umm Naktûm was blind,

1 Referring to Q2/187. Cf. the later ḥadīths on this. 2 Umm 1/83: būb waqt al-adhān li-l-ṣubh. 3 Cf. Mālik, K. Nidā' 15. Like Shāfiʿī, Mālik seems unconcerned by the fasting implications of the ḥadīth. 4 Arabic 'inna Bilāl yuʿadhāhin bi-lail', which is conveniently alliterative.
and used not to call until some-one said to him "asbahta, asbahta".

These hadîths can be said to be in favour of ta'khîr, but little more can be stated with certainty. The extent of the delay advocated is not clear. Tay.1661 parallels these hadîths, and it appears from others of Tayâlisî's reports with the same theme that it is by no means the original version. In Tay.897, the Prophet says that the adhân of Bilâl should not be cause for those eating sahûr to leave off doing so, and neither should 'this whiteness' - the false dawn. Tay.350, rationalising, adds that Bilâl's adhân is only to recall those who have spent the night in prayer, and to wake the sleeper. Tay.1661 can be seen as amending this rather unsatisfactory state of affairs, where the Prophet is in effect saying 'Ignore the adhân', by introducing b. Umm Maktûm, as in the Shâfi'î hadîths. We learn further that those present used to restrain b. Umm Maktûm until they had quite finished their sahûr. Nevertheless, there was only a short time between the two adhâns. This last has the flavour of a pious amendment. Later versions quantify the interval.

As was hinted above, it is difficult to decide which question the original hadîths were aimed at settling. In particular it is not clear whether the idea of two differently timed adhâns represents a genuine practice, or a rationalistaion of a difference of opinion, over adhân times, or is simply a fiction stemming from the ta'khîr hadîths.

Despite these problems of precise interpretation, the general tendency of the hadîths on ta'khîr al-suhûr is clear enough - a delaying of the last meal of the night as long as possible. It seems not entirely fortuitous that this question should have become linked with that of tatjîl al-if'târ, which had polemical origins¹. Later

¹ One is probably modelled on the other, but it is hard to say which came first.
hadiths\(^1\) certainly make the sahūr the object of a deliberate contradiction of Jewish practice, but this is over the actual eating of the meal, rather than the time of its consumption.

Tay\(^2\) 2006 is interesting in this context. In it, the Prophet says, 'Eat the sahūr, for it is a baraka'. The need for such exhortation might indicate that there was a practice among some of not eating in the latter part of the night. The hadīth might equally be construed as an anti-ascetic measure, perhaps against some form of wīğāl, or as anti-Jewish\(^2\).

From accounts of fasting in Ramaḍān in recent centuries\(^3\), it appears that the sahūr is generally taken well before the night ends, and this consideration suggests that the discussion over its precise timing may well have been largely theoretical.

al-Sawm ʕan al-Mayyīt.

It is a general principle in Islām that religious obligations cannot be performed on behalf of others. However, this conviction was not always universally held\(^4\). Yus. 796, from Ibrāhīm, and Mālik 43, from b. 'Umar, both state that no-one may fast or pray on behalf of another, it apparently being presumed that the other party is dead. From such statements, it may be inferred that the opposite had been suggested. These two instances are opinions rather than hadiths. The opposite point of view is upheld by Tay 2630, from b. 'Abbās, where the Prophet orders a woman to fast for her sister who

---

\(^1\) See below, p.373.  
\(^2\) Cf. later hadiths, and Goldziher, Mohammedische Polemik.  
\(^3\) E.g. Lane, p.484, Antoun, p.102, Dickson, p.579, Bliss, p.213.  
\(^4\) In the pre-Islamic period, expiations could be shared (Ryckmans, p.33). See also Shafi'i, K. Ikht. al-Hadīth, būb al-rajal yamūt wa lam yaḥujj aw kāna ʕalaihi nadhr. Also Umm 2/115, ḥajj 'an mayyīt.
died on a journey before being able to perform a previously vowed fast.

The matter occasions no direct discussion in this period. Malik debates the related topic of whether or not the qadā' of outstanding fasts, by feeding poor people, may be a charge upon the estate of the deceased. He decides that it is, if the dying man specifically makes a bequest for that purpose within the permitted third of the total estate, but that if he does not so stipulate, then the matter is optional. Thus the unfulfilled duties of the deceased, as opposed to the qadā' or kaffāra therefor, never become incumbent upon others. This is agreeable with Malik. Similarly Shāfi‘ (Umm 2/103) says that if one becomes sick (in Ramaḍān), and does not recover, there is no qadā' necessary, but if one recovers before subsequently dying, and does not take the opportunity to work off the outstanding days, this shortcoming should be paid off (out of the estate) at the standard rate of one mudd per miskīn per day. Although this is more rigorous than Malik's view, it is still only the kaffāra, and not the deed itself, which is considered outstanding.

Fasting in commemoration of the dead, as opposed to fasting on their behalf, has no place in Islam as classically formulated. Possibly the Shi‘i ‘Ashūrā' ceremonies can be partly seen as an example of such a practice, but this cannot be stated with certainty, as the festival contains so many different strands. Westermarck gives a Moroccan instance of fasting after a death; this primitive activity gains no mention in the classical works.

1 Though Zurqānī, II, 183, says Shāfi‘ and others 'yastahibb li-wārithihī an yasūm 'anhu'. 2 In contrast with, for example, the Jewish practice. 3 Principles, p. 399.
Certain of the muftirāt, that is those events or practices which break the fast, will now be discussed. Some of these questions, such as the inhaling of dust, or swallowing rain-drops, are too trivial for detailed examination, especially as they show no signs of having provoked serious difference of opinion, and certainly no argument that found expression in the form of hadīth. Accordingly, only the major muftirāt will be dealt with here.

Hijāma

For Mālik, the question of hijāma (cupping or phlebotomy)¹ is relatively clearcut. He has three hadīths on the subject: 31, going back to b. ʿUmar, is a simple assertion that the latter and Saʿd b. Abī Waqqās cupped while fasting; 30² also goes back to b. ʿUmar, with a slightly improved isnād (Nāfiʿ³ instead of Zuhrī) and designed to counter 31 by adding that in later life b. ʿUmar gave up the practice. A further remark, apparently by Mālik himself⁴, makes it clear that it is quite acceptable to cup after the iftar, in a period of several days fasting. 32, from ʿUrwa, seems concerned not so much with whether or not one may cup while fasting (though an additional clause does favour this), but rather with the question of whether once having cupped, one should carry on fasting. ʿUrwa considered that one could do so.

Mālik ignores the subsidiary point raised by 32, and expresses his view, recounted three times in a somewhat rambling judgement, that unless undue weakness is to be feared as a result of cupping,

¹ Unless the contrary is stated, this is taken to mean 'while actually fasting'. ² Similar are Shāfiʿī, Umm 8/372 (Kitāb al-Ṣawm al-Kabīr), and Maww. Shaib.⁹. ³ On whom cf. Schacht, e.g. p.248. ⁴ But cf. Maww. Shaib.⁹.
there is nothing against one so doing, nor is any qaṣā' necessary, even in Ramadan. The Mudawwana has two ḥadīths from the Prophet, one saying that cupping is one of three things that do not cause the faster to break, and the other, through b. 'Abbas, that the Prophet used to cup while fasting.

Abū Yūsuf in Kūfa knows of three ḥadīths: his 807 parallels Mālik 31, though the two worthies are now Sa'd b. Mālik and Zaid b. Thābit. This recurrence of a pair of figures seems not fortuitous, and may perhaps be intended to represent the two parties to the cupping operation, the patient and the surgeon. Although the discussion revolves for the most part around the patient, the operator is also mentioned sometimes (see below), especially if it is a question of censure. It is conceivable that this is in some way connected with the dislike of carrying on a trade in the day-time in Ramadan.

Yūs. 809 is slightly later: we learn that Umm Salama, a wife of the Prophet (and therefore a more authoritative companion) cupped while fasting. This ḥadīth has not apparently survived elsewhere. It was doubtless superseded by Yūs. 808, similar to the b. 'Abbās ḥadīth of the Mudawwana, but adding that the Prophet was not only fasting but in ḥiḥrūm also. This is a subtle device for dating a ḥadīth to the end of the Prophet's life, and thereby abrogating his

---

1 On this matter of undue weakness, it may be noted that although cupping would imply an illness needing cure, such illness, which in the case of Ramadan at least would be governed by the marāḍ/safar clause of q2/184-5, is never mentioned in the relevant ḥadīths.
2 Cf. Hud.198, where read 'fa-salima' for 'muslim'. 3 The additional information, that they practised ḍazl, seems here subsidiary.
4 It may be less specific than this: the pairing could simply reflect the common conviction that two are better than one, which in Islam has legal strength, in the matter of witnesses.
former actions: the only pilgrimage the Prophet made as leader of the Muslims was the so-called Ḥajjat al-Wadā', in the year 91.

The existence of these improvements reveals that there was the stimulus of opposition. Although claims that the Prophet did not cup while fasting are as yet unrecorded, except in the rather later Ṭayāliṣī, and once in Shāfi‘ī, they were evidently fairly widespread at an earlier date.

Shāfi‘ī in the Kitāb al-Ṣawm al-Kabīr mentions only Ḥālik 30, that b. ʿUmar cupped while fasting. This may be because the K.S.K. has not survived in its entirety. In the Kitāb al-Ṣawm al-Saghīr, however, the same ḥadīth appears, and also Ḥālik 32, although the first part, which, as suggested above, deals with a different problem, is omitted2. Shāfi‘ī says that each point of view has many followers, and although he knows two ḥadīths from the Prophet, one that he cupped while fasting (probably the b. ʿAbbās ḥadīth), and the other that he said 'afṭara al-ḥūjim wa-l-mahjūm', neither for him is reliable. If either were, he claims, he would uphold it. Faced with this dilemma, he prefers not to cup, 'li-l-tawaggi', though following the judgement of Ḥālik, he says that if one should cup, then it does not break the fast.

By the time Shāfi‘ī wrote the K. Ikhtilāf al-Ḥadīth, the position had changed. He now has the 'afṭara' ḥadīth in substantially the same dress as Ṭay.1118, though with altered isnād and with substantial padding: ʿAbdulwahhab b. ʿAbdulmajīd - Khālid b. Ḥadhīḥa’ -

1 Similar to Yūs.808 is Ṭay.2698. This and Ṭay.2700 have an improved isnād through Mīqāsam which appears in most subsequent versions of this ḥadīth, e.g. Shaf.-K.Ikht.Ḥadīth, also foot Umm 2/108-9. The fact that the Prophet did cup while on pilgrimage is 'established' in numerous ḥadīths, e.g. Umm 7/212.

2 Supply 'illā' in the printed text.
Abū Qilāba - Abū al-Ashʿath Ṣanʿānī - Shaddād b. Aws: I was with the Prophet at the time of the conquest (of Mecca), and he saw a man being cupped on the 18th. of Ramaḍān¹, and he said, while holding my hand, 'affara al-ḥājim wa al-mahjūm'. This counters the former companion, now prophetic, ḥadīth from b. ʿAbbās, which for Shāfiʿī now has the fairly strong isnād Sufyān - Yazīd b. Abī Ziyād - Miqsam - b. ʿAbbās. Confronted with two ḥadīths of apparently equal weight (though Shāfiʿī still says 'if both are sound', as if there is yet some doubt²) he resorts to naskh, along the lines indicated.

It is possible that the reference to the conquest of Mecca³, another obvious dating device, was inserted by the upholders of the b. ʿAbbās ḥadīth to strengthen their case, since as far as we may tell, the Miqsam ḥadīth is younger than the b. ʿAbbās one, and there would have been no point in the proponents of the Miqsam report thus dating their material. Shāfiʿī thus ends up agreeing with the majority view, certainly that of Ṣāliḥ, Abū Yūsuf, Shaibānī⁴ and Abū ʿUṣayf, namely that cupping does not break the fast.

Shāfiʿī also offers in support of his conclusion the independent principle that nothing coming out of the body breaks the fast.

---
¹ No special significance should be attached to this date; it is probably merely circumstantial detail designed to give 'authenticity'.
² Indeed Nuzanī, who died 264, was still not convinced by the ḥājim and mahjūm ḥadīth, and is able to explain it away without much trouble (Abī ʿAmr wa Nāḥy, p. 160). Part of the doubt may have concerned the exact reason why the ḥājim broke, for nothing enters or leaves his body: Zurqānī II, 176, indicates that some resolved this by considering his fiṭr virtual rather than actual - the ajr of his fast is lost, though physically his fast is still sound.
³ I.e.: before the ḥujjat al-wadāf.
⁴ Ṣāliḥ, Abū Yūsuf, Shaibānī, second and third ḥadīths.
As far as may be ascertained, this is nowhere attributed to any early authority, and certainly not to the Prophet. It appears at this stage to be simply an anonymous legal principle, or possibly an instance of the use of ra'y on the part of Shafi'i. In later times, it is attributed to b. `Abbás and others.

It may be that in the attempt to establish this principle lies the reason for the unexpectedly large number of hadiths that this practice provoked. If it could be shown that immediate physical relief from the rigours of fasting, rather than the prospect of curing some unrelated ailment, was the motive behind those who cupped while fasting, then this last problem might be solved. There is also the possibility that cupping attracted so much attention because it is concerned with blood, a substance closely connected with matters of ritual purity, and one's ability to participate in an observance such as the fast.

It may be noted in conclusion that two unfavourable opinions concerning cupping occur in the Talmud; if a man fasts after letting blood, his blood is upon his head (i.e. he courts danger); intercourse after cupping brings a deformed or diseased child, if no food is taken after the cupping. Behind both these beliefs lies the 'commonsense' view that cupping brings about a dangerous weakness.

---

1 See e.g. Zurqam, II, 176.

2 In this connection, there is a noticeable parallel with the case of menstruation, which also breaks the fast. Occasionally, hijāma is mentioned as fit to be discouraged at other times also: Westermarck, Pagan Survivals, p. 133: bloodletting is not to take place on a Friday (apparently from a hadith).

3 Minor Tractates, pp. 406, 564.
The legal position of one starting the fasting day in a state of ritual pollution occasioned by seminal discharge (known as jināba, adj. junub) and not having washed before dawn is a question that provoked heated debate at an early period. It appears in a fairly developed form in Mālik, and Schacht uses it as an example of 'the conflict of doctrines in the growth of traditions'¹. All Mālik's hadiths go back to the Prophet by way of his wives², which is not surprising in view of the intimate nature of the subject³.

Mālik 12, from ‘A‘ishah and Umm Salama, is the simplest example, yet its assertion, that the Prophet's jināba was the result of intercourse and not of a nocturnal emission, already indicates an attempt to counter a previous objection to the original contention that the Prophet would fast after commencing the day in a state of jināba.

Mālik 10 is virtually identical, but makes an additional proviso, 'in Ramadān', a further strengthening of the pro-jināba case. Ṭay. 1502, 1503 are similar to Mālik 12, emphasising that the Prophet would arise (aqṣaḥa⁴) junub, then wash⁵ (iqḥatasal) and go off to prayer as on a normal day. This mention of prayer may be a device to affirm the validity of the fast after jināba by pointing to the Prophet's normal action, even though he had been junub, in this other devotional activity.

The next stage, represented by Mālik 9⁶, is designed to show that this practice was not the exclusive personal prerogative of the Prophet⁷, obviously countering another objection: a man comes

¹ pp.152-3. ² Generally ‘A‘ishah and Umm Salama. ³ On this, see Shāf. in K. I'tibār, p.137. ⁴ Necessarily after dawn? ⁵ This described in a manner similar to that of Yūs. 824, below. ⁶ = Muw. Shaib. 4, Shāf., Umm 8/372. ⁷ Cf. the case of wiṣāl. On personal privileges of the Prophet, see Schacht, p.46.
to the Prophet, asking what he should do, as he has arisen junub, but wishes to fast. The Prophet replies that he is in the same condition, and merely proposes to perform the ghusl and commence his fast. The man objects, saying, 'O Prophet, you are not like us, for God has forgiven you all your sins.' The Prophet becomes angry at this, with the clear implication that in this kind of matter at least, he is no different from all other men.

Mālik 11 uses the same isnad as 12, and in a rambling anecdotal hadīth, 'A'isha confirms her statement of Mālik 10 & 12, to the discomfiture of Abū Huraira, who has been reported as supporting the opposite doctrine, namely 'man aṣbaḥa junuban afṭara', a phrase which has the characteristic ring of a legal maxim. Abū Huraira is made to admit that he has no sound authority for his statement - 'innamā ankhbaranī mukhbir'. Essentially similar is Yūs. 824, whose different isnad goes back only to Ibrāhīm of Kūfa (d. 95), and which is therefore probably an earlier version.

It is quite possible that the somewhat disreputable figure of Abū Huraira was deliberately chosen to represent and discredit the view that jināba without washing before dawn breaks the fast, especially as at this period his alleged opinion survives nowhere outside this hadīth. Ṭay. 1606, in which Abū Sa'id comments on a simple favourable hadīth, saying that Abū Huraira was alone in his opinion,

1 As Zurqānī, II, 159 observes, 'i'taqada al-rajul anna dhālika min khaṣā'īṣīhi li'anna allāh yuḥillu li-rasūlihi mā shā'a'.
2 = Mush. Shaib. 5. 3 On Muslim doubts about Abū Huraira, see G. H. A. Juynboll. 4 If the A. H. doctrine was ever seriously held (on which see below), it is possible that his name is used for abrogation purposes: A. H. is generally held to have become a Muslim only two or three years before the death of the Prophet.
need not be taken as anything more than a reference to a hadīth such as Yūs. 824 or Mālik 11.

Mālik’s own opinion was quite in line with his hadīths. He saw no harm in the practice, even if it was deliberate (Mud. 206). Ibn Wahhāb knows another favourable ‘A‘īsha hadīth (Mud. 207), parallel to Mālik 11&12, more graphic in detail, and with a different, shorter isnād: because of this, and its explicitness, it may perhaps be considered an early version.

Apart from these instances, the practice does not occasion any debate in the Mudawwana. This, and the fact that Yūs. 824 goes back only to Ibrāhīm, points to the Irāq and more specifically Kūfah as the probable origin of the difference of opinion. In addition, we have the rhetorical exclamation of b. Hasān b. Majātūd (Yūs. 825), ‘What connection is there between fasting and jīnāba?’ (expecting the answer ‘none’), reported from Ibrāhīm. Tay. 1502, a favourable hadīth, has Sha‘bī, another Kūfan, in its isnād. However, he is almost as fictional a character1 as Sa‘īd b. Musayyib of Medina, who appears in Tay. 1606. The number of different isnāds suggests that the names of ‘A‘īsha and Umm Salama were used early on, without specific isnāds, and that these then grew fairly haphazardly.

It is interesting that Shāfi‘ī, who initially quotes formally only Mālik 92, notes that there are other recensions, and that the opinion expressed in it coincides with the local doctrine and indeed that of most areas. Though latterly of course Shāfi‘ī’s acceptance of the doctrine is based on the alleged action of the Prophet3, it seems here as though he allows local practice to confirm his own thinking. In spite of the fact that the favourable view in the matter of jīnāba is that of the majority, Shāfi‘ī does take the trouble to rebut the counter doctrine. From his words, it is hard

1 See Schacht on this, p.230. 2 Umm 4/97,8/372. 3 Nukht. Muz., Umm 8/56.
to judge whether this for Shāfi‘ī is hypothetical or not. In the later K. Iḥtibār of Hamadhānī appear two scholars, Hasan of Basra and Awhāfī, who are said to have held this opinion, but these assertions are qualified and uncertain.

Shāfi‘ī’s rebuttal uses an argument that parallels b. Mas‘ūd’s rhetorical comment in Yūs. 825. The argument in itself is sound enough, but it misrepresents the opposition’s case, and does not answer it, for it fails to deal with the fact that it ultimately remains purely a matter of opinion whether or not jināba breaks the fast. Pursuing his arguments, Shāfi‘ī, in a sarcastic reference to the alleged opinion of Abū Huraira, purports to show that such a suggestion is devoid of meaning as it stands, and that the meaning which is accordingly to be supplied is in fact that of the prevailing doctrine.

Shaibānī’s comments follow a different line, which Shāfi‘ī would surely have adopted had he been aware of it when writing the above, so awkward is his defence of his own stand. Shaibānī accepts the Qīsha hadiths, and shows their meaning to be in evident harmony with the prescription of the Quran, 2/187, īḥilla lakum lailata al-qiyāmi al-rafathu ila nisā‘ikum. Laila is taken to mean necessarily the entire night; hence if one is allowed jimā‘ until dawn, how can the following ghusl fail to be after dawn? This introduction of the Quran as a proof is undoubtedly secondary, for the almost unanimously held opinion that jināba does not break the fast, is ultimately grounded in common sense, and not in need of such elaborate justification.

It is again evident that the dispute was Ṣuṣāqī in origin: by

1 Maw. Shaib. 5. 2 Cf. perhaps a ḥadīth from b. ʿUmar (Azmi, p. 127): a wa in al-muʿadhdhin adhdhana bi-i-ḥalat wa ana baina rajlai irraʿati, la-aqṭasaltu thumma atmamu ʿawmī.
the time Shāfi‘ī wrote his Kitāb al-Ḥadīth, the argument outlined by Shaibānī had reached the Mālikī areas, and Shāfi‘ī adopts it wholesale\(^1\), and naturally without acknowledgement. His previous grounds for objection to the Abū Huraira story are now however based on the relative authority of the reports; the words of the two wives of the Prophet far outweigh a report from a companion from an anonymous person. This also shows how Shāfi‘ī’s thinking had developed. He is also able to employ further sophisticated arguments, mostly analogies.

The suspicion arises that the attitude typified in the Abū Huraira assertion was never widely held anywhere, and was something of a red herring, stemming perhaps from an over-systematic application of the laws of ritual purity\(^2\) at some stage in the development of the legal sciences. The proposition (there seems too little evidence to call it an opinion of the usual type) was quickly and generally rebutted, but because it was cast in hadīth form, and an anecdotal hadīth at that, it was virtually assured of immortality.

**Qubla**

In Q2/137 we find that during the night of Ramaḍān the faster may indulge in what is termed ‘rafath’ and ‘mubāshara’. Both these terms are said in the tafsīrs to be kunyas of ḫimā‘, rafath meaning originally to speak directly of that which should only be alluded to, and mubāshara carrying the idea of mutual contact of skins or bodies. Leaving aside rafath, as it is not mentioned in the legal works, an examination of the usage of mubāshara in Mud. 195-9 reveals that for the Mālikīs, and presumably (see below) their contemporaries in other regions, the Quranic metaphorical extension of meaning to include sexual intercourse is entirely ignored; mub-

\(^1\) Umm 3/528. \(^2\) This naturally leads one to look towards the Jews; cf. posited ‘Irāqī origins above.
Ashara is apparently synonymous with mulāmāsa, and means simply bodily contact, without any inherent sexual connotations. Evidently in the Quran it can refer to something stronger than this, but the mufassirs' equation, rafath = mubāshara = jimū is apparently mere assertion, stemming from ignorance of the situation that the Quranic ordinance was reforming, and perhaps also a desire for tidiness.

The Quran does not explicitly forbid mubāshara during the day. This fact, coupled with the potential ambiguity of the word, raises the question of whether or not bodily contact between the sexes is permissible during the day. In the ḥadīth, the question generally becomes specified as that of 'al-qubla li-l-qā'im'. That it was considered to be of some importance may be seen from the fact that Mālik, who in his Kitāb al-ṣiyām has 60 sections, generally of one ḥadīth each, has on this subject eight ḥadīths. These he places into two categories, according to whether they take the severe or the lenient view (tashdīd or rukhṣa).

1 Cf. a ḥadīth from al-Ḥasan, Sarakhsī, p. 59, where mubāshara is qualified by the adjective fāhisha; it is obviously basically a fairly neutral word. Qurqūnī, II, 165, says: 'yubāshir... ay talmas bashratuhu bashrat al-mar'a, wa nahw dhūlika, lā jimū'. See on this, above, p. 156 et seq. The context however makes it almost certain that such a prohibition is to be understood.

2 Though mubāshara is fairly frequently mentioned too. Where both are mentioned in the same place, it has not been observed that individuals hold opinions which differentiate between the two.
Mālik 17 represents one of the earliest recorded opinions, and reveals the existence already of a legal problem with two distinct parties: Abū Hurairā and Sa`d b. Abī Waqqāṣ used to take the lenient view (kānā yurūkhisānī fī-l-qubla 1-l-ṣā'īm). Shaib. 3 and 6 are primitive ḥadīths, with the isnād Abū Ḥanīfa - Ḥammād - Ibrāhīm, saying respectively that the Prophet used while fasting to kiss, and to indulge in mubāshara.

For the other side we have Mālik 201 and 18b. In the former, b. `Umar forbids both qubla and mubāshara for the faster, while in the latter, `Urwa does not consider that al-qubla can be conducive to good (lā taddū ilā khair).

Also at the companion level, we find b. `Abbās (Mālik 19) permitting qubla for the older man, and disliking it for the young2. The obvious motive behind this hadith is mentioned specifically in a ḥadīth from the Prophet (Mud. 196) which ends with a phrase reminiscent of Mālik 18a3 - al-shaikh amlak bi-nafsihi. Compare here also Shaibānī's comment on Shaib. 64 (above): 'We see no harm in (mubāshara) so long as he does not fear himself inclining to other than mubāshara'. Concerning the Mud. 196 ḥadīth, the assertion at this point in the Ṣudawwana that b. `Abbās had the same doctrine as the Prophet is clearly an inversion of the true state of affairs, as regards the chronological development of the ḥadīths.

Mālik 15 is pro-qubla, and seems to be deliberately and polemically modelled on Mālik 20, the `Umar prohibitory ḥadīth: it says

---

1 Cf. Azmi 3; Mālik 20 = Muw. Shaib. 8, which in the Lucknow edition has the gloss 'li`anna man ḥāma ḥawla al-ḥimā yūshik an yaqū fi-thi' - another ḥadīth. 2 Baihaqī 232 has a ḥadīth (also from a companion) where b. `Umar is criticised by an old man for forbidding qubla. b. `Umar replies: 'amma ant, faqabbil, fa laisa ʿinda istik khair'. 3 See below, p. 271. 4 As on Muw. Shaib. 7.
that 'Umar's wife kissed 'Umar's head while fasting, and that he did not forbid her. 'Umar's former words are thus superseded by what is more convincing in hadith terms, namely his action. This is the first hadith to make appeal to a woman in illustration of its point, and the genre quickly reaches its logical culmination in 'A'isha, who, being by all accounts the favourite wife of the Prophet, was presumably best aware of his personal mores. Thus Mālik 14: Hishām - 'Urwa: 'A'isha said, 'The Prophet used to kiss one of his wives while fasting'. Then she laughed. The clear implication is that she was the one thus favoured.

'A'isha also appears in Mālik 16, urging the fasting 'A'isha bint Ṭalḥa to welcome her returning husband with kissing and carressing (mulā'aba), reassuring her that this is quite alright. No specific appeal is made to the Prophet here, and the hadith may therefore be earlier than the preceding one.

The opponents of the qubla then take up the figure of 'A'isha in Mālik 18a. She admits that the Prophet used while fasting to kiss her, but then asks, 'Which of you had as much self-control as he?', meaning that he was always able to curb any desire to go further, and that this was an example of his superiority to other men - one of his so-called khas'īṣ. It may be noted that this appeal to the special position of the Prophet has already been made more than once in the field of fasting.

This hadith is in its turn answered by the lengthy and explicit Mālik 13, using Umm Salama, perhaps the most frequently quoted wife.

1 And being his youngest wife, she is advantageous from a naskh point of view. 2 Like 'Umar, now taken up by the opposing side - contrast with Mālik 18b. 3 = Huw. Shaib. 7. 4 'ayyukum amlak li-nafsihi. Cf. above, p.270. 5 See above, on Wiqāl, Jināba. 6 = Huw. Shaib. 6.
of the Prophet after 'A'isha. The hadīth makes it clear that kissing while fasting was not a personal prerogative of the Prophet. An objector says, 'We are not like the Prophet of God, for God permits his Prophet what he wishes.' The Prophet becomes angry at this suggestion, and intimates that his superiority over other men lies in greater piety rather than in being the subject of special divine dispensations.

In some ways, 'A'isha seems to have been a 'natural' choice as the protagonist in the hadīths of both sides and all regions, for the isnād culminating in her vary widely. Yus. 805 contains a simple statement, parallel to that of Mālik 14, but possibly slightly earlier, since it makes no mention of the object of the Prophet's attention, while Yus. 806 has a kunya for yuqabbil, 'yuṣīb min wajhihā', which suggests a later refinement. This might derive from a desire to make 'A'isha avoid rafath, strictu sensu, in her speech; in the same way, certain persons were troubled at her saying 'irb (see below).

Although Mālik does not discuss the hadīths in the Nuwaṭṭa', his opinions on this question are recorded in the Hudawwana, 195-7. He dislikes kissing for the faster ('lā uḥibb': in another response, he considers the qubla makrūh), and, it seems, any other contact with women (wa lā an yubāshir). Ibn. ʿAbbās is also said to have forbidden mubāshara, and the same is related of b. ʿUmar, Zuhri, and ʿAtī b. Abī Rabīḥ. Others make the distinction, which is perhaps implicit in the judgements of former lawyers, that only mubāshara which is done deliberately for the pleasure thereof is blameworthy. The point at which kissing or contact becomes reprehensible

---

1 Cf. Yus. 805 (= Shaib. 4, similar to Shaib. 3) and Yus. 806 (= Shaib. 5).
2 Cf. Tay. 1391: mā kāna yamtanī ḫu min wajhihā.
3 Cf. Mālik 20.
is variously defined, in terms of physical reactions, in detail, while the discussion remains academic, detached, and, one must surmise, largely hypothetical.

Mālik is altogether severe in these matters: he considers that anything from an erection upwards incurs at least qaḍā. He relates with evident approval a story of pious men of days now past who forbore to enter their homes by day when fasting for fear of anything untoward. Shāfiʿī is less stringent.

Mālik, then, follows a strict line, based, as far as may be judged, on pure raʿy. How much this influenced, or was influenced by, contemporary practice, cannot now be determined. As was hinted at above, if the attitudes on this matter evident in the Quran still prevailed in Medina in the second century of Islam, this would help to account for Mālik's opinions.

In contrast with Mālik's attitude, Shaibānī and Abū Ḥanīfa (Shaib. 5) are uncomplicated in outlook: they see no harm in the matter, providing the man remains in control of himself.

Shāfiʿī came to be of an inclination similar to that of Mālik: if one is aroused by a kiss, he should refrain (Umm 8/57). He is unable to say that it actually breaks the fast, although Rābi' reports another saying of Shāfiʿī's, that it does break. This is apparently related to a hadīth from the Prophet, which is the same as Mālik 18a, with the exception that the phrase 'āyyukum amlak li-nafsihi' now runs 'āyyukum amlak li-irbihi'. Later muḥaddiths are at pains to explain this grossness in the mouth of 'Aisha by

1 On al-naẓara bi-l-shahwa, cf. Talmud Minor Tractates: to look at a woman is tantamount to having her.
3 Shaib. 5: 'an ghair dhālika, ay illā al-nizāl'; Muw. Shaib. 6: 'an al-jimā`: ritual pollution, as much as contradiction of the Quran, is probably the factor in considering this limit.
claiming that 'irb means ḥajja rather 'aduwa, or revocalizing it to 'arab. Ṭayy. 1399, accepting the original wording, makes the best of it by making one of the figures who ask 'A'isha on this subject hesistate and say, 'mā kuntu li-arfath 'inda umm al-mu'minīn'. It was probably a Mālikī who made the substitution, which narrows the meaning of the ḥadīth in a manner consistent with the attitudes of the Nudawwana.

Shāfi'ī's reluctance to depart from the Mālikī line is well illustrated by his saying, 'We allow this (the qubla) because of what the Prophet did (cf. Mālik 14) and the relaxation made by b. 'Abbās and others', namely that qubla is all right for the old, etc.\(^1\), and, as might be expected, he quotes the disapproving Mālik 18a and 18b. Mentioning the b. 'Abbās judgement, he says there is no ikhtilāf on this, but it is reasonable to interpret this as applying only to the Mālikī areas. Shāfi'ī in the Risāla quotes also Mālik 13, a pro-qubla ḥadīth, but this is used for another purpose. At times he seems to be somewhat arbitrary in the materials he chooses to take note of.

Shāfi'ī had not always been of this general persuasion. In his Kitāb Ikhtilāf 'Ali and b. Mas'ūd, we find that the early Kūfans consider the qubla makrūh, while the later Kūfans disagree: theirs is the attitude reflected in Yūs. 805, 806 and Shaibānī. Shāfi'ī's comment on this is that we (the Ḥijāzis) have it from the Prophet that he kissed while fasting, and from more than one companion, so we say 'la ba's'. Shāfi'ī may well have been forced to adopt this position because Mālik's unfavourable ḥadīths do not, with the single exception of 18a, which is isnādless, go back to the Prophet,\(^1\)

\(^1\) Cf. Nudawwana. Nuzānī has 'b. 'Umar and b. 'Abbās'. It may be noted here that Muhammad, being of a fairly advanced age when he was married to 'A'isha, is conveniently covered by the b. 'Abbās tahlkṣīq.
and therefore would not for Shāfi‘ī constitute binding arguments. This
state of affairs would naturally have been remedied by the later
Ḥālikīs.

Ṭayālīsī has a number of ḥadīths on this subject: Ṭay. 1399
has been dealt with above; the remainder¹ are simple assertions,
all but one² from Ḍhī'isha, that the Prophet used to kiss while
fasting. The nature of Ṭayālīsī’s ḥadīths as a whole tends to sup-
port the conviction that in general the Ḥudālsīs were more lenient
in this matter. It is not clear whether the change recorded in K.
Ikhtilāf Ḥālī and b. Makīūd represented a general shift of opinion,
or rather merely a change of emphasis.

It is unlikely that we are meant to take seriously the alleged
saying of Rabī‘a that the faster who kisses his wife should go into
i’tikāf for three days³.

Siwāk

Besides the major muftirāt⁴, or at least those which provoke a
good deal of discussion, which have been dealt with above, there re-
main a number which being of no great importance generally failed to
generate ḥadīths, and were dealt with by the lawyers with ra’y and
qiyyūs, more or less systematically applied, and to a greater or lesser
degree of detail. Such are the questions of vomiting, sneezing, using
enemas, rinsing the mouth, swallowing things other than food or
drink, eating or drinking involuntarily or forgetfully, wounds to the
stomach, etc.

¹ Ṭay. 1391,1476,1522,1523,1534,1578,1586. ² 1586, from Ḥafṣa.
³ Shaf. Umm 7/244. Cf. Schacht on Ḥaft ‘at al-ra’y’. In this inst-
ance cf. perhaps Q2/187, ‘la tubāshirūhunna wa antum ṭākifūn’.
⁴ Amongst these should perhaps be included menstruation: though not
mentioned in the Quran in connection with fasting, there is a univ-
ersal conviction that it breaks the fast; it therefore does not pose
much of a problem.
One of the more interesting examples should suffice, that of siwak, the use of the tooth-stick.

Mālik has no hadiths on the subject, but is at pains to establish that for ahl al-‘ilm, siwāk is neither forbidden nor makrūh at any time of the day whatever.

This is an indication that an objection has been raised to its use at a certain time of day. From later debate we may safely infer that this was the latter half, when the breath of the faster begins to grow somewhat stale. This is exemplified by Shāfi‘ī, who sees here an application of the latterly widespread ḥadīth to the effect that the remains of food in the mouth of the faster are, to God, sweeter than musk. Mālik also knows this, but does not relate it to this problem, probably not seeing the ḥadīth as legally applicable at all. For Shāfi‘ī, then, the use of the siwāk in the afternoon is reprehensible.

Mālik ignores this consideration, and we may accept Mad. 201 as a reasonable explanation of this: Mālik is more concerned with whether or not the stick, or using it, is a possible form of nourishment. Accordingly, he dislikes using a green stick, though oddly enough a dry one wetted is permitted. Neither Shāfi‘ī nor Shabbān nor Ibrāhīm (Yaṣ. 813) is worried about this.

It appears that this generally moderate attitude did not prevail amongst all parties, for it was found necessary to create Tay. 1144, an assertion that the Prophet used to use the siwāk times without number whilst fasting. This is paralleled, with the same isnād, in Mad. 201.

---

1 Cf. Shaib II, 3. 2 58; cf. also Tay. 2413.

Ethical hadiths

Not surprisingly, the legal works which constitute virtually the sole source of our information on fasting in this period, and which as has been seen may often be suspected of giving us details of opinions rather than of practices, contain little material that is not susceptible of direct legal application. However, there are to be found a few injunctions that are guided by moral rather than legal considerations. These came originally no doubt from diverse sources, although they may conceivably have already been gathered together in works similar to the (later) Jāmi‘ of Ibn Wahb, which contains a considerable proportion of non-legal ḥadīths.

A typical example is Shāfī‘ī, Umm 8/58: Fast decorously, and do not use unseemly language. If a faster is abused, he should (merely) reply, ‘anā ṣa‘īm’, on account of the Prophetic ḥadīth to that effect¹.

There is also a number of ḥadīths which attempt in one way or another to assess the spiritual value of fasting. At this period, the main source for this kind of ḥadīth is Ṭayālīsi, although Mālik also has three², all through Abū Huraira, a convenient vehicle for pious material of no legal weight. These ḥadīths by their nature are not likely to show evidence of serious differences of opinion, and none are to be noticed.

Several of the themes which occur repeatedly in later collections are already present: Ramadān sees the opening of the gates of Paradise, the shutting of those of Hell, and the chaining up of the satans³. Fasting is a jannah, a protection⁴. The remains of food

in the faster's mouth (khulūf fam al-ṣā'īm) are to God sweeter than musk (which, as another ḥadīth points out, is in turn atyab al-ṭīb, the most fragrant of perfumes). In Tayālisī 2436, this sentence appears at the end of a longer ḥadīth, and the implication here is apparently that the faster should not use perfume. It is doubtful whether this is always the object of this ḥadīth. On these 'khulūf', compare perhaps Talmud Haṣagah: His teeth were black by reason of his fasts.

Another ḥadīth claims that every good deed is rewarded ten-to seven hundred-fold, excepting fasting, the reward of which is in the hands of God. This seems to indicate that fasting is the only genuinely selfless activity. One day's fast in the way of God is said to ward off hell for seventy autums. Compare here the case of the Rabbi who fasted 'um vom Feuer des Hölles nicht versehrten zu werden'. As for the mention of 'fi sabil Allah' in this hadīth, there may be here a connection with the abstinence said to be observed by the Arabs before battle. Compare also the reports of fasting on raids mentioned under 'Safar' above; while not historically true, these reports may derive from a model based in real life. According to Tay. 2584, the faster's prayers are answered — probably related to Q2/186.

Several ḥadīths stress the importance of the purity of the inner

---

1 In contrast to the sensation experienced by mortals: cf. Francis Gano Benedict, A Study of Prolonged Fasting, 1915, Washington D.C. p.64: On the 3rd day, the odor of the breath was offensive, becoming fetid... (but becoming less so by the 31st day). See also Zurqānī II, 198. 2 Ibn Sa'd I 2 l 13. 3 Mālik 50, Tay. 2584 (cf. Azmi 3) The precise meaning of the last phrase of this is not clear: a number of theories are enumerated by Zurqānī II 200. 4 Tay. 2186. On reckoning in autums, cf. b. Sa'd I 1 l 10, '40 kharīf'an'. 5 Enc. Judaica, from B. Mez. 85a. 6 See ch.1 on possibility of Quranic 'safar' equalling 'raid'.

motives of the faster, as opposed to his outward physical abstention: he who fasts in faith and mindful of the heavenly rewards (imān wa ihtisāban) will be forgiven all his sins. It is possible to see here a general counter to the debatable claims surrounding the relative powers of forgiveness attributable to the 'Ashūrā' and 'Arafat fasts, and comparable in motive to the 'Basic Fast' hadith discussed earlier.

Tay. 74; 2131, however, suggest that no physical act of piety can approach in worth a love of God. Returning to the motives of the faster, Tay. 1120 says that he who fasts unwillingly is like a mushrik. Tay. 2107 asks rhetorically, 'How can one fast who continues to eat the flesh of other people?' (i.e. indulge in backbiting). This is comparable to the injunctions to avoid evil speech (above), and in the Ginza Rba of the Mandaean, we find: 'Fasting is not a physical affair, but consists of restraining one's mouth from lies, one's mind from evil thoughts, etc.' Continuing the idea of kaffāra is Tay. 408, where it is claimed that fasting, sadaqa, al-amr bi-l-ma'ruf and al-nahy an al-munkar all atone for the fitna that lies in wife and property.

Various minor sunnas are propounded: the best thing to break one's fast with is dates, and failing that, water, for water is 'tahūr'. This is possibly directed against over-indulgence during the nights of Ramadan. The guest should not fast (when others present are not doing so). He who continues to fast while others eat in his company will have the angels praying over him. The young man

---

1 See also Ghazālī on this. 2 This apparently non-Islamic concept is fairly well attested to in the ḥadīth: see Wensinck, Concordance. 3 Cf. Q49/12. 4 Pp. 18, 23ff. 5 Tay. 1261. 6 Tay. 2203. 7 Tay. 1666. This does not necessarily contradict the preceding ḥadīth.
who cannot afford to set up home and marry is advised to fast, for fasting is tantamount to wija'1 - a sort of temporary castration. Compare here the story of Joseph's fasting as a prophylactic against the allurements of Potiphar's wife2, and contrast the barren Rachel's desire for fertility, realised after twelve days' fast3.

In connection with the gates of Paradise, mentioned above, there is an interesting hadith in Malik4 which says that for the practicants of each religious observance, there is an appropriate gate, named after the activity5, except for the fasters, whose lot it is to pass through the only specially-named gate, that of al-Rayyān. This name, presumably derived in some way from the notion of moisture or quenching (root r-y-y), does not appear, as far as may be discovered, in any place independent of this hadith, and its origins are therefore hard to trace. The idea of gates in Paradise is of course familiar in Jewish literature, and the name Rayyān may perhaps stem from such a source.

Besides the main topics which engage the Muslim writers on fasting, there are naturally a number of minor problems which because of their purely technical nature or non-controversial nature are outside the scope of this study. They include discussions of minor muṣṭirāt6, voluntary fasting, forgetful or mistaken breaking of the fast, the minor Qur'anic fasts, and when the qaḍā' of Ramaḍān may be performed. Generally the materials are scanty, and show little evidence of great debate.

---

1 Tay. 272.  
3 Ginzberg, I, 415.  
4 Jihād 49.  
5 E.G. Bab al-Ṣalāt.  
6 On these, see Siwāk, above.
One rather larger topic which has been excluded from this study is that of I'tikāf, to which may perhaps be joined Lailat al-Qadr. Although traditionally associated with Ramadān, these two subjects do not in fact have much to do with fasting; as is pointed out elsewhere¹, even the link with Ramadān is somewhat tenuous, and they will accordingly be ignored.

¹ See under Q2/187, p. 156.
Chapter Five

Fasting in the post-Shāficī ḥadīth

Note on the sources

The bulk of the references in this chapter come from the six canonical works, with the addition of the Musnad of Ibn Ḫanbal. The collections of Dūrīmī and the somewhat later Naisabūrī and Baihaqī have also been useful. Not strictly a work of ḥadīth, but containing much valuable material, are the Ṭabaqāt of Ibn Sa'd; minor sources have included the Ṭabaqāt of Khalīfa b. Khayyāt and the work of fiqh attributed to Zaid b. Ḥaffect. The Kanz al-ʿUmmāl has been found to contain many ḥadīths not otherwise available in printed form, and the ḥadīths of Taisī have also been consulted. Other lesser works are indicated as they appear.

Because of the great number of ḥadīths in this period, their generally technically well-developed form, and consequent relative anonymity as regards party and place of origin, chronological and regional comparisons have not been possible in this chapter, beyond the occasional indication of a ḥadīth first recorded in, say, Baihaqī, as 'late'. Attention has been directed almost exclusively at the content of the ḥadīths, rather than their isnāds, with the intention of continuing the analysis of their argument commenced in the previous chapter.

To stem the proliferation of references, the major post-canonical collections are not quoted except when they introduce novel material, and many duplicate references have been omitted in the case of the Musnad of b. Ḫanbal.
Friday

A growing tendency to disapprove of the fasting of Friday was noted in the previous chapter (pp.167ff.). As far as may be judged, it had been a fairly widespread custom, hitherto regarded as unobjectionable in most parts. Post-Shafi'i hadiths are almost unanimous in their support of the unfavourable attitude. A few hadiths (basically identical) forbid the practice outright. This must refer to the custom of regularly fasting Fridays, rather than constituting an absolute ban on all Fridays: as was mentioned before, the most obvious flaw in such a ban would be the case of Ramadān. The hadith is strongly asseverative. Most versions come from Muhammad b. 'Abbād b. Ja'far, and others from Abū Huraira. Mus.146 is typical: Muḥd. b. 'Abbād: I asked Jābir b. 'Abdullāh while he was performing the ʿawāf (round the Kaʿba), 'Did the Prophet forbid the fasting of Friday?'. He said, 'Yes, by the Lord of this house'. The form of the careful question and answer, posed in a very holy spot, is clearly designed to reinforce the point of the hadith. In other versions, Abū Huraira denies, 'wa rabb hādha al-bait', that it was he who forbade the fasting of Friday, but rather it was the Prophet: this is accompanied by a similar claim concerning Abū Huraira's notorious doctrine on jināba. It therefore seems that this hadith represents a strengthening of the case of those who hold the A.H. view on jināba, since in the case of Friday, a parallel claim is better documented. With the validity of the A.H. doctrine on Friday thus 'established', the A.H. claim on jināba, which is otherwise weak, gains a measure of 'authenticity'. If this accurately represents the background of the hadith in question, then it may be concluded that it was never

1 Maj.1724, Mus.146, Bukh., bāb qawm yawm al-jum'a, Dār.1735, Ḥan.7382, 2/286, 3/296, 312, Tir.742a. 2 According to b. Sa'd 5/350, he was 'qalīl al-ḥadīth': none are quoted. 3 Above, p.265.
intended to count as an argument in the discussions concerning Friday. The 'bait' motif in the A.H. versions is probably borrowed from the widely received b. "Abūd ḥadīth.

The paradoxical nature of the Muhammad b. "Abūd ḥadīths is recognised by Bukh., bāb ṣāwam yawm al-jum’a, which adds the explanatory clause 'i.e. that it should be fasted in isolation', which brings the ḥadīth into conformity with the import of practically all the other unfavourable reports. Bukhārī's tarjama reinforces this view, using words which apparently never occur in ḥadīth form: 'man aṣbaḥa ṣā‘īsan yawm al-jum’a fa‘alaihi an yuṣīr'.

There are several versions of this basic message. Tir.742a has the common one from Abū Huraira, which Tirmidhī claims is generally adopted by the jurists: the Prophet said, 'None of you should fast Friday unless you also fast before or after it'. Mus.148 adds: 'and no qiyyām on the night of Friday' - cf. the Abū Dardā' hadīth below. Although the Abū Huraira report is so widespread, there must have been some defect in it to necessitate the floating of the b. "Abūd hadīth, whose first recorded appearance is after that of the A.H. one. Similar to the A.H. hadīth is Ḥan.2615, from b. "Abūs: 'lā taṣūmū yawm al-jum’a waḍḥahu'. Slightly more elaborate are Sa’d 4/61, Ḥan.6/444, in which the Prophet rebukes Abū Dardā' for specially spending (ikhtaṣṣa) the night of Friday in vigil, and the day in fasting (the familiar qiyyām/qiyyām pairing); also Ḥan.5/224-5, in which Bashīr b. al-Khaṣṣā‘iya is told by the Prophet not to carry

1 There are nevertheless other ḥadīths from A.H. on this subject (see below), which seem detached from any considerations affecting the jiynāba issue. These no doubt helped to form a basis for the jiynāba-polemical ones. 2 Cf. also Ḥan.2/365. 3 Cf. earlier Tay.1623, 2595. 4 Bukh., bāb ṣawm yawm al-jum’a, AD, bāb al-nahy an yakhuṣṣ yawm al-jum’a bi-ṣawm, Mus.147-8, MAJ.1723, Ḥan.2/407.
out his proposal to fast Friday by itself\(^1\) and to refrain from speech on that day - this latter practice is not unknown in the ḥadīth\(^2\).

Of comparable content is a ḥadīth\(^3\) from Juwairiya bint al-Ḥārith whom the Prophet is said to have married in Shābān 5 A.H. Its content does not appear to contrast with that of the previous 'lā takhūṣūs' ḥadīths\(^4\), and may perhaps be intended to demonstrate that the ḥadīth applies equally to women. Compare on this Sa`d 72194, where Junāda Azdī, in a report in which the Prophet at the Friday prayers publicly takes a drink to show he is not fasting, says, 'I came to the Prophet fasting on a Friday in a group, of which some were women.'

Tirmidhī mentions that he has heard along these lines from 'Alī (cf. Shāfī’ī’s K. Ikhtilāf ‘Alī wa b. Masʿūd), Anas, and ʿAbdullāh b. ʿAmr\(^5\).

The other motifs in the anti-Friday ḥadīths are not new: in Sa`d 5/375, Ḥan.4/8, Tir. Jum`a 4, fasting is not actually forbidden, but reckoned inferior to the other observances of the day (cf. Tay. 1114, earlier). This ḥadīth seems to have been polemically adapted to counter the Friday fast, for other versions (e.g. Sa`d 4287) omit any mention of the fast.

Ḥan.2/303\(^6\) is apparently a conversion of a standard A.H.

---

\(^1\) In the KU2318 version of this: 'lā taṣūm yawm al-jum`a illā fi ayyām huwa aḥaduhā wa immā fi shahr huwa aḥaduhā'. \(^2\) Cf. Goldziher, Ascétisme, where the character is Anas b. Mālik. \(^3\) Ḥan.6771, 6/430, 6/324, Sa`d 8/85, Bukh., bāb ḡawm yawm al-jum`a, Naisab.436. \(^4\) It is possibly more personalised and anecdotal in form. \(^5\) Cf. Ḥan.6771. But see Tir.742, b. ʾUmar. \(^6\) Cf. b. ʾHajār on Bukh., bāb ḡawm yawm al-jum`a, also Naisab 437.
hadîth: it inserts at the beginning, 'Friday is an ‘Id, so do not make your ‘Id day a fast day'. This latter phrase exists separately, and the suspicion arises that the assertion that Friday can be considered an ‘Id is questionable, to say the least. However, this does represent the only attempt in hadîth form to rationalize the prohibition on Friday. "Abî Bâsir is interesting here, for it twists this thinking slightly: ‘lā tašûnū yawm al-jum‘a fatattakhidhûhu ‘Idan'; this has the scarcely orthodox assumption that fasting is the prerequisite or characteristic of an ‘Id.

For further information we may turn to b. 'Abbâs, ad Bukh., bâb šawm yawm al-jum‘a; besides the assertion that Friday should not be fasted because it is an ‘Id, he suggests that one should not fast ‘lä fallâ ya‘d‘af ‘an al-‘ibâda', or because of fear of going to excess in honouring it, as the Jews became obsessed with Saturday, or because of fear lest it become considered obligatory, or that it be made obligatory (here khilāf of the Christians is said to be the motive). The polemical element, discussed in the previous chapter, is evident in these 'reasons'.

Another support of a negative kind for the anti-Friday fast sentiment is contained in Tir. 746, where it is claimed that the Prophet would fast the Saturday, Sunday and Monday of one week, and the Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday of the next.

The evidence of the hadîth clearly suggests that although, as Tir. 742 remarks, some of the ahl al-‘ilm favoured Friday fasting, this point of view failed to gain much post-Shâfi‘î support. The Tay. 359 hadîth, 'ma ra‘ayt rasûl allâh muftîran yawm al-jum‘a', is still known, but shows no sign of having developed. One new pro-

1 See also Ḥilyat, 3/266: the Prophet said, 'God made Saturday an ‘Id for them, and chose Friday for us, and made it an ‘Id for us'.
2 Maj. 1725, Tir. 742, Bai. 294, Ḥan. 3860.
Friday ḥadīth is KU2558: 'man ẓāma yawm al-jum'a kataba allāhu lahu 'ashrata ayyām'. Another ḥadīth promises a rather greater reward: Ka'b al-Aḥbār said, 'David used to fast one day and break the next, and when his fast happened to fall on a Friday, he would increase his ṣadaqa offering and say 'Its fast is like the fast of 50,000 years, like the length of the Day of Judgement. It is the same with other deeds; their reward is multiplied in it (Friday)'. These ḥadīths by themselves would scarcely have given rise to the great number of anti-Friday fast reports, and since we have virtually only one side of the argument, it seems that the other side, the pro-Friday section, must have been the relatively inarticulate popular practice, something which, for polemical reasons, few of the later fuqahā' chose to defend. The apparent innocence of Mālik's position has been lost. Nevertheless, in spite of the dearth of specifically pro-Friday fast ḥadīths in this period, there is evidence of the taʿżīm of Friday in other ways: Ḥan. 3/340: yawm al-jum'a sayyid al-ayyām wa aʿzamuhā 'inda allāh min yawm al-fiṭr wa yawm al-āḏhā; Sa'd 5/367: Do not mount (to travel) on a Friday, or on the ʿIdāin.

There are one or two ḥadīths which favour a Friday fast apparently in conjunction with other days (not always consecutively). Thus Ḥan. 6/289, which is a version of the Three Days ḥadīth, specified here as Monday, Friday and Thursday (sic). This appears to be a concoction of the Monday and Thursday recommendation with the Friday either thrown in to make up the three, or in order to

\[1 = Zurrānī 2/203. \ 2 Ṣiyāt al-Awliyā', 5/382. It is doubtful whether the reporting of this particular ḥadīth by Ka'b al-Aḥbār is indicative of a Jewish origin. \ 3 Cf. Sa'd 1/8. \ 4 Said here to be Adam's birthday. \ 5 Compare the dislike expressed by some of travel in Ramāḍān. \ 6 p.321. \ 7 pp.213,324.\]
promote it by association with the more established fast. Baihaqi promises forgiveness of sins to whomever fasts Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, another formulation of the three days; cf. Ḥan. 3/416: Ramadān, Shawwāl and Wednesday, Thursday and Friday ensure entrance to Paradise. Another version says the Prophet actually ordered such a fast; b. Ḥabbās favoured it. Also relevant here is KU2623: he who fasts three days of a 'shahr ḥarām', Thursday, Friday and Saturday, then God will write up to his account two years of worship. Finally, Baihaqi has what seems to be a version of the 'qillamā' ḥadīth from b. Ḥāsa'ūd: the observation that the Prophet was rarely seen muftir on a Friday is reinforced by the further remark 'and seldom did the fast of Friday escape him'. These ḥadīths are almost without exception either late or non-mainstream. There seems little doubt that despite an undercurrent of feeling favourably disposed to the Friday fast, scholarly opinion tended towards the opposite viewpoint. Their caution was probably principally due to a fear of excessive ta'zīm of the day by the populace, backed up by an awareness of the polemical necessity of appearing to differ from the Jews and Christians.

Shawwāl

The post-Shāfi'ī period sees a great proliferation in the number of ḥadīths concerned with fasting in Shawwāl. The commonest theme is that of Ramadān plus six days of Shawwāl being comparable to fasting in eternity. A slightly different version, in which

1 No doubt this 'favouring' represents the origin of the prophetic ḥadīth. 2 See p.168. Other versions of this occur at Ḥan.3860,Nas., bāb ḍawm al-nabi. 3 AD,bāb fī ḍawm shawwāl,Tīr.759,Māj.1716,Nus.204, Ḥan.5/417,Dār.1761. According to the Nīzān, the common link in the/
ğiyyām al-dahr is replaced by giyyām al-sana (cf. the earlier Tay. 594),
is represented by Ḥan. 3/3081. This may be intended as a deliberate
expunging of the dahr motif, confirming the report's open implicat-
ion that it is an anti-dahr ḥadīth (of which there are several other
types), or more simply an introduction of the motif of expressing
the value of a fast in yearly terms2. See also what follows: to read
'sana' facilitates the rationalisation of the six-day fast.

There now seems little doubt that the six days are intended to
come after the fitr of Ramaḍān. Although only four ḥadīths specif-
cally say 'baʿd al-fitr', there is no indication that the other
versions imply no break is to be made. Three of these, Maj. 1715, Ḥan.
5280 and KU2957, together with Dār. 1762, versions of the 'year' type,
are the only ones4 to attempt to provide a reason for the six-day
fast. As hinted at in the previous chapter, a fairly satisfactory
solution can be arrived at by arithmetical means: taking the text
'al-ḥasana bi-ʿashri amthālihā', Ramaḍān is seen to account for ten
months, while the six days of Shawwāl account for the remaining two
months (= approximately 60 days). It is doubtful whether this is
the true reason, for the precise motive for the selection of Shawwāl
rather than another month remains unexplained, unless it is that it
happens to be the month immediately following upon Ramaḍān.

As suggested previously, the 36 days of Ramaḍān and Shawwāl can
equally be seen as a reformulation of the three days per month notion:
this explanation is advanced by b. Mārik ad Tir. 759, who incidentally

/īsnāds of all these, Sahl b. Saʿīd, was thought weak by Nasaʾī
(and b. Ḥanbal), which would explain the former's non-inclusion of
this ḥadīth, and perhaps also that of Bukhārī. 1 Also Ḥan. 3/324,
3/344. Different īsnād also, although the Tay. version had Sahl.
2 Cf. the 'Arafat/ʿAshūrā' ḥadīths. 3 Maj. 1715, Ḥan. 5/280, KU2957
(similar- are 2598, 9) and KU2605. 4 KU2604 may be included here.
also considers that the six days may legitimately be fasted non-consecutively. Again, no reason for such a reformulation is given.

Possibly because it could be interpreted or defended as but an alternative expression of other more generally accepted fasts, the hadith met with little recorded opposition. However, ad Tir. 759 we do have an opinion of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, who is stated to have said on hearing this hadith, 'By God, God is perfectly satisfied with the fasting of this month (sc. Ramaḍān) for the whole year!' Tirmidhī says he has heard on this subject from Abū Ḥuraira also, but the hadith does not appear to be extant. According to Ṭurṭūshī, 60-1, many thought that fasting in Shawwāl was obligatory, and this he takes to be the reason behind the reported dislike of it among some fuqahā'. It is not clear whether this was in fact always the case.

Ṭūsī, Istibṣar 2/132, basing himself on two opinions from companions, is lukewarm on the subject of fasting those days following the fitr - Shawwāl is not explicitly mentioned. From Zuhrī we learn that the fasting of the six days after the fitr is quite optional, and from Ḥuṣaini that one should not fast after Ramaḍān voluntarily until three days have elapsed; the three days probably represent the usual extent of the fitr celebrations. Ṭūsī deduces from these hadiths that these days after the fitr have more faḍl than other days, and that fasting in them is quite optional. It seems that he selects these reports to reinforce an opinion already held, for no mention is made of the favourable hadiths from the Prophet.

The six days of Shawwāl hadiths were not the only manifestation of the special regard in which that month was held. In an explicitly

1 'Huwa mithl ʿiyām thalāthata ayyāmin min kulli shahrin'. This is strictly speaking not quite accurate, as Ramadan plus 11×3 does not equal Ramaḍān plus six. 2 Cf. here also Ṭūsī 203. 3 Possibly this is so because he is not a Sunnī.
anti-dahr ḥadīth1, the Prophet suggests that equivalent in worth to ǧiyām al-dahr is the fast of Ramaḍān 'wa alladhi yalīhi', plus every Wednesday and Thursday. Similar is Ḥan.4/78, which names Shawwāl, and Ḥan.3/416, which adds Friday to Wednesday and Thursday. Arithmetic is apparently of no avail here2. The fasting of Shawwāl may be comparable to that of Shaʿbūn, where the proximity to Ramaḍān is definitely significant3. Other indications of the special position of Shawwāl include the report in Mālik4 that the Prophet made up any iʿtikāf that he had missed in Ramaḍān with ten days of Shawwāl, and the allegation that this month was one of the asḥur al-ḥurūm. The EI mentions that some considered Shawwāl lucky for marriages5, others the opposite. Māj.1744 also reveals a connection between Shawwāl and the asḥur al-ḥurūm: Usāma b. Zaid is said to have made a habit of fasting these months, until the Prophet ordered him to fast Shawwāl instead, which he then did until his death. Apparently connected with this hadith is the succinct 'ṣum Shawwālān' (KU2600 - from Usāma).

Possibly related to, or countering, the six days of Shawwāl reports, are other ḥadīthṣ proposing a fast for three days after Ramaḍān: this period would appear to coincide with the actual length of the fiṭr festivities6. Conceivably here the motive is to avoid

---

1 AD, bāb fi ǧum Shawwāl. Same as Tir.748, KU2601; all from Muslim Qurashi. 2 Unless Ramaḍān plus Shawwāl plus every Wednesday, Thursday and Friday is seen as approximately equal to half of al-dahr; cf. the fast of David, mentioned under Dahr, above, p.207. 3 See p.333. 4 Bāb qaḍāʿ al-ʿitikāf. 5 Cf. Baladhurī, Ansāb al-Aṣhrāf, Cairo 1959, pt.1, p.410: ʿAʾisha said, 'The Prophet contracted marriage with me in Shawwāl, and made me his bride in Shawwāl'. 6 Türk 203, cf. also Istibṣār 132.
undoing the good achieved in fasting Ramadān by giving oneself over to the customary extravagances of the festival.

According to Birūnī, p. 333, on the 4th. Shawwāl falls the yawn al-Muhāhala, which some recommend should be fasted. On this, see below, p. 315.

'Āshūrā'

It was observed in the preceding chapter how the Jewish fast of Yom Kippur had become firmly seated in Islām as the fast of 'Āshūrā', and how various methods were adopted to try to disguise its origins. These efforts continued after the time of Shīfi, as also did the controversy over the historical and present status of 'Āshūrā' within Islām: the various contentions, that it was enjoined, preferred, optional or abandoned, each have ḥadīths to support them. Very little in the way of fact can be drawn from the mass of ḥadīths surrounding the problem, but it seems incontrovertible that the fasting of 'Āshūrā' was an ineradicable part of popular Islamic practice in at least the central regions of Islām. Most of the ḥadīths in this period have either appeared previously, or can be directly traced to earlier reports, but a few new themes occur also.

In the discussion of the origins of 'Āshūrā', the claim that it stems from a Jāhili practice (cf. Ḥālik 35), and is therefore not Jewish, finds much support. The commonest version claims that 'Āshūrā' was ordered by the Prophet, but that after the imposition of Ramadān, it became optional entirely. Others are similar, but lack the mention of its being previously ordered. This might indic-

ate that the 'order' was inserted either to make 'Ashūrā' as an imposed fast strictly comparable with Ramāḍān, and therefore capable of being abrogated by the latter, or to make the whole ḥadīth counter a separate claim that 'Ashūrā' was (still) an ordered fast. Some versions have an addition clearly intended as unfavourable to 'Ashūrā': b. ʿUmar (the last link in the isnād) never used to fast it unless it coincided with some other fast he happened to be engaged in - compare the Friday ʿlā takhuṣṣ ḥadīths. Only a very few versions attempt to give a reason for the Jāhilīs' fast. It is said to be 'yawn min ayyām allah'. The Prophet offers this information after the imposition of Ramadān, and the addition is clearly designed to maintain 'Ashūrā' in a favoured, if now optional, position. Ibn Ḥajar (on Bukh., bāb ʿiyām yawn 'Ashūrā') notes a more detailed explanation, that some say Quraish committed a great sin in the past, and instituted the 'Ashūrā' fast to atone for it - a barely concealed calque of the traditional Jewish explanation of the origin of Yōm Kippūr. Note also a claim occurring at the ʿHan. 6/244 version of the ḥadīth, that 'Ashūrā' was a day on which the Ka'ba was veiled. This is the only 'concrete' link with the Jāhilīyya, but given the polemical charge of the ḥadīth, it cannot be taken to represent any historical fact. Seemingly anti-'Ashūrā' is a version of the Jāhilīyya report in which the fasters are not described very flatteringly: Ḥilyat al-Awliyā', 9/41: kānat al-wāḥash tasūm yawn 'Ashūrā'. Also resenting the connection with 'pagan' times is the assertion of b. Duraid, that 'Ashūrā' is an Islamic name, unknown in the Jāhilīyya.

1 Dār. 1419, Abū ʿUbayd, fol. 45, Mus. 119, Saʿd 4, 16, Ḥan. 44/83, Bukh., bāb wujūb ʿawm ramaḍān. 2 Mus. 117, Ḥan. 5203, AD, bāb fi ʿawm yawn 'Ashūrā'. 3 Cf. b. Ḥajar on Bukh., bāb ʿiyām yawn 'Ashūrā'. 4 Zūrqūnī, 2, 117.
A quite separate ḥadīth is b. Sa'īd 1,17 (cf. also Ḥan.2/359), which claims that Noah and his company embarked on the 10th, Rajab, and disembarked on 'yawm ʿAshūrā' min muḥarram, and that it is for this reason that those who fast ʿAshūrā' do so. This may be an attempt to give ʿAshūrā' a pre-Jewish origin, or may simply be a borrowing from Jewish folklore, an instance of the familiar tendency to associate numbers of 'historical' events with important dates in the calendar. A fuller version of the Noah ḥadīth in KHI (2642, from Abū Shaikh) exemplifies this further: Noah descended from the ship onto Mt. Jūdī on ʿAshūrā' day. Noah fasted and ordered those with him to fast, in thanks to God. On ʿAshūrā' day God forgave Adam and also the people of the city of Jonah, and on it he split the sea for the Israelectes. On it were born Abraham and Jesus.

Another ḥadīth concerning the origins of ʿAshūrā' is that in which the Prophet is shown as arriving in Medina to find the Jews fasting it (known also to Mālik). On enquiry, he finds that the fast commemorates the victory of Moses over Pharaoh; he then pre-empts the Jews' right to celebrate the day, by saying (in most versions) 'nahnu aḥaqq bi-mūsā minkum', and ordering its fast. Some recensions have 'awlä' instead of 'aḥaqq', which suggests more clearly that Muhammad and his followers have kept more closely in line with Moses' precepts than have the Jews, who, as the Quran frequently testifies, often opposed the will of divinely sent messengers. As previously indicated, this ḥadīth simultaneously recog-

---

1 This odd turn of phrase is not paralleled elsewhere. 2 Cf. Muhammad's references to the pure time of Abraham. 3 Cf. the long list of events associated with ʿAshūrā' by Bīrūnī, p.329. 4 On Adam in connection with the fast, see also p.318. 5 In fact the (Qur'anic) 'awlä' variety is recorded first. Perhaps not too much significance should be attached to the difference. 6 See Sura 2, passim.
nises and attempts to quash the Jewish nature of the day. Thus the generally received Sa‘Id b. Jubair version. The fact that it orders the fast of ‘Ashūrā’ is interesting, but does not unduly worry the muḥaddithūn, who have no difficulty in regarding it as abrogated, either as in the Jahiliyya type of ḥadīth, above, or by the sequence of events outlined in the ‘Ā‘isha ḥadīth, below. Thus b. Ḥajar sees it as belonging not to the body of currently valid material, but to the time when ‘wajaba ‘alaihi (sc. Muhammad) muwāfaqat ahl al-kitāb’.

One must assume that Ḥan.3/340, from Jābir, which says ‘The Prophet ordered us on ‘Ashūrā’ day to fast, and said “It is a day that the Jews used to fast”’, is an apocopated version of this; the apparent suggestion that something should be done because the Jews do (or did) it is really not acceptable under any circumstances in orthodox Islam. It would seem that this attempt to promote ‘Ashūrā’ as a sunna is either fairly old, or came from an area or group where the general doctrine that reference should not be made to other religions for authority had no strong hold.

The acceptance of ‘Ashūrā’ in the ‘aḥaqq’ hadiths is not countered, but is subtly changed in another version, where the Islamic practice is rationalised in such a way as to make it appear a deliberate contradiction of Jewish practice (the ‘khālifūhum’ notion). Thus Bukhārī: the Jews used to reckon ‘Ashūrā’ an ‘Īd (and therefore, according to majority Islamic thinking, not fastable), so, Muhammad says ‘Fast it’. This of course ignores the fact that although Yōm

---

1 Ḥan.127-8,AD 123, Bukh., bāb šiyām yawm ‘Ashūrā’, Hāj.1734, Ḥan.2644, 2832; cf. also Ḥan.2/359,3164, Dār.1766. 2 ad Bukhārī, bāb šiyām yawm ‘Āshūrā’. 3 Though the isnād is different. 4 Unless one takes refuge in the manner of b. Ḥajar. But this is not apparently implicit here. 5 Bāb šiyām yawm ‘Āshūrā’. Cf. also Ḥan.4/409, and Ḥus.129,130.
KippUr is a major occasion in the Jewish calendar; it is nevertheless a fast. The 'fact' of Muhammad's arriving in Medina to find the Jews engaged in 'Ashûrâ' has provoked the expenditure of much effort in attempts to show that Muḥarram and Tishrî did indeed coincide in that particular year of the Hijra, or conversely, accepting and building up from this datum a complex chronology of fasting in the early years of the Hijra. However, this ḥadîth is like all others in that the information it contains is by itself no guide to historical fact; in this case, it is simply part of the presentation of a polemical case, and any attempts to prove it correct or extrapolate from it can only be vain: the Muslim calendar did not exist at this date as a separate system, and no disinterested student has shown that the months of Muḥarram and Tishrî did coincide at this time. Even Birûnî, who was quite willing to accept the Jewish origin of 'Ashûrâ', would not accept this precise calendrical parallel, for want of proof.

AD, bāb ma ruwiya anna 'Ashûrâ' al-yawm al-tâsîf, (also Mus. 133) admits the Prophet's having ordered the fast of 'Ashûrâ', but is apparently concerned to clear the Prophet of any charge of continuing a Jewish practice. The Prophet is told that 'Ashûrâ' is a day venerated by the Jews and Christians, and his reply is to say that next year, it is to be fasted, on the ninth (or the eleventh: Bâhiq 287). However, by the time the year had elapsed, the Prophet was no longer alive. The report is clearly comparable in many ways with the earlier 'ninth' ḥadîths, but does not enjoy a wide circulation in this extended form. This is no doubt partly because it is so clearly at variance with the Jewish (and Qurashi) origin ḥadîths, which place the adoption of 'Ashûrâ' at the beginning of Muhammad's

1 p. 329. 2 The latter are simply included for good measure; no need to search for a historical Christian 'Ashûrâ'.
period in Medina, if not earlier. The ḥadīth is somewhat inconclu-
sive in one respect, for although the last ascertained act of the
Prophet was to fast the tenth, his last order was to fast the ninth.
This dilemma may however be a secondary point, for the ḥadīth can
also be taken as an intended proof that ʿAshūrāʾ was never abrogated.
If this were the real purpose of the report, it would help to explain
its infrequent appearance in this form, as the continuing force of
the order to fast ʿAshūrāʾ was not a widely held doctrine among the
aṣḥāb al-ḥadīth.

That this version of the ḥadīth was designed to settle an
argument about abrogation rather than the ostensible problem of the
date of celebration of ʿAshūrāʾ may be indicated by the existence
of other, simpler, ḥadīths¹ in which the Prophet says, 'If I live to
see another year, I shall fast (ʿAshūrāʾ) on the ninth'; this report
is more clearly in favour of the change to the ninth, and the
'khālifūhum' motive is explicitly mentioned in Ṣan. 2154 (see below).

Another type² is apparently secondary, for it involves a con-
scious and deliberate defence of the 'ninth' view, as compared with
the earlier mere recommendations. Ibn ʿAbbās³ is approached in the
Masjid al-Ḥarām (in a holy spot, and therefore guaranteeing his
veracity) and asked about ʿAshūrāʾ. He explains that it is to be
celebrated on the ninth day from the beginning of Muḥarram; his
questioner asks further whether Muhammad fasted thus, and b. ʿAbbās
says that he did. The alleged prohetic precedent had obviously been
called into question.

¹ Maj. 1736, Ṣan. 2106, 3213, 1971, Mus. 134.
² AD, būb mā ruwiya anna ʿashūrāʾ al-yawm al-tāsiʾ, Mus. 132, Ṣan. 1540,
2135, 2214, 3212, 3393, Tir. 754.
³ Also the companion in the previous ḥadīth. He was also the figure
in the early ḥadīth on this subject from Abū Yūsuf, 801.
There are two other isolated hadiths on this topic, still from b. `Abbás. Ṣanʿ 2154 says: the Prophet said, 'Fast ʿAshūrā'; be different from the Jews in it, fast before it a day, or after it a day'. The presumed implication is that either the ninth or the eleventh is to be fasted, rather than the tenth plus another day, although the latter interpretation is supported by Tirmidhi's addition (755):

b. `Abbūs said, 'Fast the ninth and the tenth, and be different from the Jews' ¹.

It may be that the 'ninth' suggestion was never taken seriously, for there is only one ḥadīth that specifically rebuts it (perhaps the mass of other ʿAshūrā' reports are seen as sufficient support of the orthodox definition of its date, together with the innate linguistic connection of ʿAshurā' with the tenth), namely Tir.755:

b. °Abbās (I) says the Prophet ordered the fast of ʿAshurā', the tenth day ². However, some parties went so far as to rename the shifted ʿAshurā' by the analogical name Tāsū'ā' ³, and there are indications in Tūsī (203) that its fasting was an actual practice ⁴. Some tried to minimise the 'ninth' suggestion: see Taḥwīl,337.

The Jāhilī origin ḥadīth, it was noted above, terminates with the Prophet leaving the post-Ramadān ʿAshūrā' as an entirely optional matter. Virtually the same ḥadīth, without the Jāhilī phrase at the beginning, is Mus.115 (cf. also Bukh., bāb ʿiyām yawm ʿAshūrā', Bukh., Taf. Q2/183). These are also from Urwa ʿNīshā, and it is reasonable to assume that the ḥadīth represents the model for the 'Jāhilī' ḥadīth.

---

¹ Cf. on this b. Ḥajar on Bukh., bāb ʿiyām yawm ʿAshūrā', and Tūsī 203. ² Cf. earlier Yūs. 802. For Muslim 'explanations' of the name, see b. Ḥajar on Bukh., bāb ʿiyām yawm ʿAshūrā'. ³ Mus. 125, Abū ʿUbaid fol. 46, Ṣanʿ 5/96. Cf. also note ad Tir. 752. ⁴ Though as the fast on this day is said to be in commemoration of Ḥusain's confinement in Kerbelā', it is possible that the fast preceded the name Tāsū'ā'.
Comparable in content and purpose is a report from Jābir b. Samura, in which the Prophet orders the fast of Āshūrā', and vigorously encourages its observance (yāḥuththunā wa yataḥhaḏnā āl-aihi). After Ramaḏān was imposed, he ceased this, but on the other hand he did not forbid the fasting of the day¹. Somewhat shorter, and with a different isnād, is Bukh.,bāb šiyām yawm āshūrā': the Prophet said, 'If one wishes, one may fast the day of Āshūrā'.

Slightly more positive is another ḥadīth, generally through Qāsim b. Mukhaimira², where the question of Āshūrā' is treated jointly with the similarly disputed one of zakāt al-fiṭr. After the appropriate nāsikh verse came down, the Muslims were neither enjoined to observe it, nor were they prohibited from doing so, but nevertheless, they observed it. In some ways comparable here is the Muṭāwiya pulpit ḥadīth³, although this also serves as an argument in the related topic of documenting the basis of Āshūrā' within Islam.

Such arguments from the realm of usūl al-fiqh lie behind many of the ḥadīths concerning Āshūrā', as was pointed out in the previous chapter, and naturally the theories that provoked the creation of such ḥadīths were still current in the period of the later collections. However, most of the moves in the argument appear to have been made by the time of the death of Shāfiʿī, and although the material of the arguments survives in ḥadīth form, the general impression gathered from the mass of post-Shāfiʿī reports is that the

¹ For refs., see n3, p.298. On Tāsūʿā', we may note that Jaussen,p. 373, mentions that among unlucky days there figure the 'tāsūʿ', or days with a nine in their date. ² Nas. Zakāt 35,Ḥan. 616,Abū ʿUbaid, fol.46. ³ See above,p.181. Ḥan. 4/95,96,97,Nus. 126,Nas. 80,Bukh.,bāb šiyām yawm āshūrā'.
theoretical position of 'Ashūrā' was no longer such an important issue. Many of the ḥadīths appear to be of a simpler type, dealing with 'Ashūrā' as an accepted Muslim sunna fast.

Examples of this tendency are those ḥadīths which unequivocally enjoin the fasting of 'Ashūrā'. These cause no problems to the theorists, who regard them as to be seen in the light of those other hadiths which state the same and then go on to introduce the abrogating Ramaḍān, reducing 'Ashūrā' to optional status or less. However, since they are in fact not so developed, it seems reasonable to assume that their original purpose was to advance the position of 'Ashūrā' as a current Muslim fast. There are not many of these ḥadīths, and we may safely assume that a number of them suffered conversion through addition as just outlined.

One such 'simple' ḥadīth is Ḥan.4/6, in which ʻAbdullāh b. Zubair says from the pulpit, 'Today is ʻAshūrā', so fast it; the Prophet ordered its fasting'. Another is Ḥan.1069, in which it is claimed that the Prophet fasted 'Ashūrā' and ordered its fasting. Ḥan.4/415 is set in the mosque of Kūfa, where Abū Mūsā ʻAshūrā has a message similar to the foregoing. The mention of Abū Mūsā recalls the ḥadīths in Shāfi'i's K. Ikhtilāf ʻAlī wa b. Masʻūd, as also do several ḥadīths in Kanz al-ʻUmmāl: 2977,2995: ʻAlī and Abū Mūsā were the most given of the companions to the ordering of 'Ashūrā'. In KU2993, it is said that ʻA'isha was told that 'Alī ordered the fast of 'Ashūrā', to which she replied, 'He is the most knowledgeable

---

1 Not previously recorded in their present form, though naturally their tendency is paralleled by some of the early, non-technical, 'sunna' type ḥadīths. 2 Cf. the Mu'āwiya hadith. The pulpit motif is lacking in the Ḥan.4/5 version of this. 3 Alā q Dār.1767, Māj.1733, both Urwa – ʻA'isha. More brief is KU2988 from ʻA'isha: the Prophet used to order the fast of 'Ashūrā'. 4 See above, p.179.
about the sunna of those who remain (alive)'. In KU2992, it is said that the Prophet and Abū Bakr and Ĉumar all ordered the fast of ĈAshūrā'. The appeal made by these hadīths to companions suggests that perhaps they are considerably older than their first recorded appearance would suggest.¹

A more widespread hadīth advocating ĈAshūrā', but which takes a form less susceptible of abrogation by alteration than those previously mentioned², is that in which the Prophet orders a man of Aslam to tell his people that it is ĈAshūrā', and that it is to be fasted even if they have already eaten that day³.

This hadīth is carried further in Mus.136, 7; Bukh. bāb șawm al-șibywān, (cf. also Tir.752): Rubayyi' bint Muțawwidh adds, '....and after that we used to fast it, and make our children fast it, and make a plaything of wool to distract them if they cried for food'. The hadīth is clearly designed to reinforce the ĈAshūrā' fast, rather than promote the fasting of children, which in classical Islām at least is not favoured before maturity⁴, even though they may be keen to do it⁵. However, as if often the case, practice seems to have differed from legal theory; at Sa'd 6/78, a drunkard is upbr-aided for his condition with the words, 'wailak wa șibywānunā șiyām'.

¹ All these KU hadīths are said to come from Ibn Jarīr (Ṭabarī).
² Possibly accounting for its more frequent occurrence.
³ It is possible that this hadīth is related to the question of niya, specifically the point of whether having started the day in one state, i.e. not fasting, it is technically possible then to commence a fast. See on this the versions of this hadīth at Bukh., bāb idhā nawā bi-l-nahār șawman, and Nasa'ī 72-3.
⁴ Cf. b. Ḩajar, ad Bukh., bāb șawm al-șibywān.
⁵ For an example of this, see Joumier and Corbon, pp.3-4.
Compare the severity of the Jewish 'Ashūrā', where according to some, children also have to fast.

A quite different type of hadith advocating 'Ashūrā' is that found in KU2617, where the Prophet says, 'Fast 'Ashūrā', (it is) a day that the prophets used to fast, so fast it'. Similar is KU2618 (= 2636): 'Ašūrā' is the Id of a prophet who was before you (qablikum: cf. Q2/183), so fast it'. Whether or not these hadīths are connected with the polemical 'Moses' hadīths above is hard to determine. They may well represent a less complicated appeal to the past, comparable with the claims concerning Noah, above.

Other favourable hadīths remove the question of 'Ašūrā' from any pseudo-historical framework (perhaps deliberately, since this was so disputed) and simply recommend it as a straightforward sunna, e.g. Ḥan.6/288: the Prophet used to fast the ninth of Dhū'l-Hijja, the day of 'Ašūrā', and three days of each month, the first Monday and two Thursdays. Note that here no comparison is made between 'Ašūrā' and 'Arafat (ninth Dhū'l-Hijja). The question of 'Ašūrā' s being ordered or not is ignored, which is also the case in another hadīth, from b. 'Abbās: I never saw the Prophet deliberately prefer the benefit of fasting one day over others except this day, and this

1 Apparently of a different intention to such hadīths is b. Sa'd 8/227, where it is said of Ruzaina that she related hadīths on 'Ašūrā'. b. Ḥajar's Tabaqāt reveals the following attributed to her: (the Prophet ordered 'Ašūrā'): he would call his children and those of Fāṭima who were yet nursing, and spit in their mouths, and say to their mothers, 'Don't suckle them today'.

2 Cf. also the similar Ḥan.6/287, also Ḥan.6/423,5/271, Nas.80.

3 Bukh.109,Hus.131,Ḥan.3475,2856,1938,Nas.80,Tir.752,KU2057,2976, 2986.
month (i.e. Ramāḍān). It is interesting to note that none of Nasā'ī's types of ḥadīth is mutually contradictory, and all favour 'Ashūrā'. This may conceivably reflect Nasā'ī's own bias, but equally it may indicate that for practical purposes the arguments over 'Ashūrā' were over (Nasā'ī is the latest of the canonical six), with the result that the ḥadīths with polemical overtones, omitted by Nasā'ī, were, as suggested above, merely the records of earlier controversies rather than weapons in current use, and further that there was general agreement that the fast of 'Ashūrā' was a good thing, at the mustahabb level. Tir.753 seems to confirm this: 'The practice is according to 'A'isha's hadith - the Jāhiliyya one, which terminates by saying one is free to fast 'Ashūrā' if one wants.

Also on the favourable side may be mentioned three ḥadīths in KU2641: He who fasts yawn al-zīna, that is, yawn 'Ashūrā', will thereby make up for any fast he has missed in that year. 2644: He who can look after himself (wasi'ā ala nafsihi) and his family (ahl) on the day of 'Ashūrā', then God will look after him for the rest of the year. 2976: 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb said, 'On the Day of Judgement, God will ask you only about the fast of Ramāḍān and of yawn al-zīna, ya'ni yawn 'Ashūrā'.

Even before the time of Nasā'ī, there are not many ḥadīths which positively disapprove of the fasting of 'Ashūrā' as a current practice. The unfavourable comparison with Arafat continues as before, in various recensions. Some have only the 'Ashūrā' part

---

1 This last phrase not present in the Shafi'i K. Ikhtilāf version of this ḥadīth, and its purpose might well be to rebut the assertion that 'Ashūrā' is abrogated by Ramāḍān. 2 Cf. Hamadhāni, Ichibār, 133: 'Ajama' ahl al-'ilm 'ala anna sawm 'Ashūrā' mandūb ilaihi'. 3 The origin of this term is obscure. 4 The idea of 'Ashūrā' as the kaffāra for the whole year has already been noted. 5 See ch.4.
(cf. the 'zina' hadīths above), and are possibly the original type, since they parallel the orthodox Jewish views on this day as atoning for the whole year, but equally some versions have only the 'Arafat part.

More definitely opposed is the hadīth in which Aschath b. Qais comes upon 'Abdullāh b. Mas'ūd eating on the day of 'Ashūrā'. The former is invited to join, but replies, 'I am fasting', to which 'Abdullāh says, 'We used to fast it but then it was dropped'. Most versions also mention the imposition of Ramādan as the reason for the abandonment. Although obviously related to the 'historical' hadīths discussed earlier, the style of the hadīth appears to indicate that it is intended to express a current antipathy to 'Ashūrā', rather than to settle its historical and theoretical position.

The canonical collections of hadīth in dealing with 'Ashūrā' do not reveal all the facets of the subject, complex as their treatment of it is. Being Sunni to a man, they ignore the greatly different emphasis that 'Ashūrā' carries in the Shi'a world. The EI gives a convenient résumé of the rites associated with the 10th. Muharram in this respect, and it might seem that these are quite separate from the 'Ashūrā' of Jewish origin so far discussed. However, it appears from a study of the Shi'a traditions that the two aspects are not entirely disparate. Because the basic assumption is that for the Shi'a the day of 'Ashūrā' is a day of mourning for the murder of al-Ḥusain, the views of Shi'a scholars have been ignored in discussions of this fast in Sunni Islām. This stand is only justifiable in dealing with the popular 'Ashūrā': the Shi'a traditions reveal that for the Shi'a scholars the matter was not quite so simple. Thus

/Sa'd 7236, Mus. 196-7.

we find that the observation by fasting of ʿAshūrāʾ as a day of mourning for al-Ḥusayn in general reprehended. Excessive emotion is frowned on, but on the other hand, so is the fasting of ʿAshūrāʾ in the hope of benefiting from its faḍl, in the mistaken following of the belief if 'our opponents': these are probably the Jews, just as the Jews were the object of khilāf in some of the more explicit Sunni traditions.

The ShiʿʿI traditions as a whole appear to reveal an internal division of opinion, rather than a polemical difference between ʿAlids and Sunnis. It is fairly well-known that to a large extent, and with the exception of the isnāds, ShiʿʿI hadīths are similar if not identical to those in the Sunni collections. It is consequently not surprising to find in Tusi (Istibšār) that the first ḥadīth is a polemical anti-Jewish one, familiar from the Sunni works, proposing the ninth instead of the tenth of Muharram. Others are quoted which are broadly favourable to the fasting of ʿAshūrāʾ, and comparable with Sunni traditions, for instance that which claims that ʿAshūrāʾ brings the kaffāra of the whole year. However, the tone of other hadīths, particularly those of Tusi's Sunan, is somewhat different. In one, ʿAshūrāʾ is condemned (for no specific reason), and another repeats the 'abrogated by Ramadān' story, and further claims that to fast anything 'matrūk', as ʿAshūrāʾ is, is a bidʿa. ʿAshūrāʾ is not to be fasted anywhere: it is a day concerning which no 'kitāb' came down, nor sunna, except the sunna of 'al-zuyyād bi-

1 An exception to this is ʿAmili, a twelver, for whom 'ṣawm yawm ʿAshūrāʾ huznan' is one of the mustaḥabb fasts (fol. 18).

2 Though possibly the Sunnis are meant. This would perhaps acknowledge the general practice of fasting ʿAshūrāʾ. Tusi, Istibšār, p. 136. 4 This is also in ʿAmili, fol. 18. 5 In general, the ḥadīths here are not Sunni calques.
qatīl al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī. It is a day of 'taḥmūm' for Muslims, therefore they should not fast it, and he who does fast it will be rewarded with hellfire. Clearly, excessive zeal on the part of some led to the composition of ḥadīths against such observance of the day, which were based on the arguments of the Sunnī reports. Tūsī recognizes the difference between the two types of ḥadīth, those favourable and those strongly against, and rationalizes their differences along the lines outlined above, connected with the death of Ḥusayn. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, it seems safe to assume that the celebration of 'Ashūrā' on the same day as the anniversary of the death of al-Ḥusayn is largely a matter of coincidence: it may be surmised that the latter event became attached by attraction to the existing festival, which already had penitential overtones, although it is of course possible that the murder did indeed fall on the 10th. Muḥarram.

Dhū-1-Ḥijja

One aspect of the religious practices connected with Dhū-1-Ḥijja, that was recorded in only one instance before the death of Shāfiʿī, is much more in evidence after that time. This is the general veneration of the first ten days of the month, known as ayyām al-ʿashr. Tir. 757 (Baihaqī 284)¹ represents the Prophet as claiming that good works performed in these days outweigh even jihād in terms of heavenly reward: the Prophet himself spent the days in charitable acts and spiritual exercise. Dār. 1781 adds that Sahād b. Jubair, who appears in the isnād of all versions, gave himself over to extreme 'juhd' in these days. This information may indicate that the prophetic ḥadīth was predated by a companion version in the name of Sahād. Although neither the Prophet nor Sahād is specific-

¹ Similar are AD 117, Dār. 1780, Māj. 1727.
-ally credited with having fasted this period, it may safely be as-
sumed that this is at least part of the intention of the ḥadīth, since
the muḥaddithūn are united in placing this ḥadīth in their respective
abwāb al-ẓawā'. There are also other ḥadīths which are more explicit
- see what follows.

The variations⁴ on the above ḥadīth display the concretising
arithmetical tendency already noted in, for example, the 'six days
of Shawwāl' ḥadīths. They mention the fast by name, and claim that
to fast these ten days is equivalent to fasting the whole year,
while the qiyyām of each of the ten nights is equivalent to the qiyyām
of Lailat al-Qadr. KU2651 is even more generous, promising a year's
fast for each of nine of the days, plus two years for the day of
ʿArafat. Nasaʾī 95 has several ḥadīths claiming that the Prophet
would fast nine or ten days of Dhū-l-Ḥijja, among other fasts².

Opposed to these ḥadīths is one through Ibrāhīm - Aswad -
ʿĀ'isha, who says that she never once saw the Prophet fasting the
ʿashr³. This is obviously a counter-ḥadīth in design, and is verb-
ally reminiscent of the ʿĀ'isha report claiming that the Prophet
never fasted a complete month⁴. It does however seem to be quite old,
since Tir. 756 also records the ḥadīth with a less developed isnād,
terminating in Ibrāhīm himself, with slightly different wording:
the Prophet was never seen fasting in the ʿashr.

The motive behind fasting and otherwise marking the ʿashr is
probably not very complex, being simply an expression of the regard
felt for Dhū-l-Ḥijja as the pilgrimage month, possibly experienced
more by those who were unable to make the pilgrimage in person. It
could thus form a kind of unofficial kaffāra for missing the ḥajj.

¹ Tir. 758, Māj. 1728.   ² Cf. here Han. 6/287.   ³ Māj. 1729, Tir. 756,
AD, bāb fi ḥaṭ fiṭr al-ʿashr, Mus. Ḥāfīz, 9, 10, Han. 6/42.
⁴ See above, p. 212.
It is unlikely that these ten days have anything to do with the three plus seven days of the *tamattu* ordinance (Q2/196); the timing prescribed by the Quran is not compatible with a fast of the first ten days of the month, though according to some, the *cashr* was indeed the period preferred for the *mutca* fast. This opinion may be attested to in Bukhārī, bāb ʿiyām ayyūn al-tashrīq: the *mutca* fast is (performable) up to the day of ʿArafat. For a more regular interpretation, see Nas. Manāsik al-Ḥajj 50, which gives the Quranic ruling almost verbatim.

Post-classical ḥadīths reveal a tendency (perhaps implicit earlier) to raise the question of whether or not qaḍā' of Ramadān may be performed during *cashr*, and seem to imply that this period is more favourable than others for such fasting; compare KU2120: Ramadān is the 'sayyid' of months, and Dhū-l-Ḥijja is the greatest of them in respect of ḥurma.

In connection with the *cashr*, some mention should be made of Nas.80: the Prophet used to fast, ʿAshūrā, and nine of Dhū-l-Ḥijja (tiscan min Dhī-l-Ḥijja). Whether this means in fact nine days, or just the ninth (ʿArafat) is unclear; certainly all other versions of the ḥadīth just have tisc a Dhī-l-Ḥijja, which would perhaps be most readily understood as the ninth. More clear-cut is al-ʿĀmilī, who recommends as a mustaḥabb fast 'awwal Dhī-l-Ḥijja ilā tāsiʿihi. Without this last information, one would have been tempted to suggest that the nine days in question were the 1st-8th, plus the 10th, with the omission of ʿArafat, whose fast is often vetoed. ʿĀmilī also

---

1 E.g. Farrā', ad Q2/196. 2 Though this could quite well refer to the initial three days, rather than the full ten. Tir.773 appears to suggest it is normal for the mutamattic to do his fasting in the ashr. 3 Istibṣār 119,KU2697-9,Baihaqī 285. Unfavourable to this is KU2798. 4 Cf. also Nas.95. 5 Fol. 18.
relates that fasting the nine is equivalent to fasting in perpetuity.

With the possible exception of the 9(th) Dhū-l-Hijja reports, the cashr hadiths make no reference to the fasting of Ārafat. This may be because they are intended to apply to those not at Ārafat, and not on the pilgrimage, and for whom Ārafat is fastable, according to many. Aside from this, the question of fasting Ārafat shows some development in the post-Shafīī hadith literature: it is mostly an increase of opinions supporting the unfavourable view. The opposite view was never well represented in hadith, though it existence is perhaps implicitly demonstrated by the widespread hadith in which Umm Faḍl offers the Prophet a drink on the day of Ārafat, and he accepts. This report is in some versions altered to feature instead of Umm Faḍl her sister Haimūna, the last wife of the Prophet. This alteration may represent an abrogating refinement that resulted from the stimulus of opposition.

Of a parallel tendency are several hadiths from b. Umar, in which he says he never fasted the day of Ārafat, and neither did the Prophet or the first caliphs, though the matter remains optional (this is specified as being during the ḥajj). In Saʿd 7/90, b. Umar is shown as forbidding its fast.

Abū Huraira is also used to attack the fasting of Ārafat, this time specifically in Ārafat. Thus Ḥan.2/304, where he repeats a prohibition of the Prophet.

It certainly appears that, although not always explicit, a distinction is drawn between the fasting of Ārafat in Ārafat and outside it. Thus no hadith specifically favours Ārafat fasting in Ārafat.

---

1 Bukh. bāb ṣawm yawm Ārafat, Mus.110-1, Saʿd 8/204, Tir.750, Ḥan. 6/339. 2 Thus Tir.751,750, Dār.1772. Ḥan.5948 omits mention of the ḥajj. 3 Cf. Saʿd 1/17: b. Umar used not to fast Ārafat day.

4 Also Māj.1732, Naisab.434, AD, fī ṣawm yawm Ārafat bi-Ārafat.
Arafat, while none forbids it outright outside Arafat. An exception to this general rule is to be noted in Tusı: Do not fast Ḥashūrā or Arafat in Mecca or Medina or anywhere else.

One other hadīth, supporting the majority view, appears to borrow from a motif more commonly associated with the question of ayyām al-tashrīq: the Prophet says, 'The day of Arafat and the days of tashrīq are our Islamic 'Īd, and they are days of eating and drinking'. This is as close as the hadīth literature comes to rationalising the Arafat prohibition. Another borrowing hadīth comes in Tusi: the Prophet never fasted Arafat after Ramadān came down. This is clearly closely linked in form to the Ḥashūrā hadīths.

In contrast with these hadīths, there are still several which are broadly favourable to Arafat fasting. Already noted is the theme of the comparison between Arafat and Ḥashūrā, where the former is deemed to be twice as effective as the latter, lasting two years instead of one. Not all versions appear to be complete: Tir.749 and KU2651 do not mention Ḥashūrā, though the fact that Arafat is still alleged to atone for two years implicitly invites a comparison with something else that is less efficacious. The possible logical oddity of the comparative hadīth - if Arafat atones for two years, then strictly speaking it would be unnecessary to fast it every year - seems to confirm the suspicion that the hadīth was devised primarily as a weapon against Ḥashūrā, although the atonement aspects of Arafat may have been genuine, even if the atonement was not originally associated with fasting.

1 But Istibqār 133-4 is quite moderate in this matter. 2 P.203. 3 Dar.1771, Naṣ.434, Tir.773, AD, āyām ayyām al-tashrīq. 4 203. Also Istibqār 133. 5 E.g. Ḥan.5/295. 6 See ch.4. 7 Cf. Tusı 181.
In Istibqar 133, we find that 'Arafat is equal to (but) one year. Whether this represents a deliberate khilaf of the regular hadith is hard to say (see also what follows).

The other early hadith, concerning 'A'isha's fast during 'Arafat, also survives, but only in Jan.6/1281. It has apparently been robbed of some of its force by the addition of the rationale that it atones for the preceding year. This restriction to one year alone may possibly represent a primitive attempt to usurp, rather than outdo, the position of 'Ashûrâ'. It is surprising that it is not more widely received; this provokes the suspicion that it advocated, or was seen to advocate, the fasting of 'Arafat in 'Arafat.

More novel is the composite hadith in which the 9th Dhû-l-Hijja, rather than 'Arafat by name, appears as a day to be fasted as a sunna. This is possibly linked with Tûsî 203: in it a man replies when asked about 'Arafat, 'I fast it; it is a day of du'a' and mas'ala. This appears to reflect an unknown outside consideration.

One last report, not exactly a hadith, which may be quoted in favour of the 'Arafat fast, is to be found in Hilyat al-Awliyâ'(4/281): it runs '... and wake up your servants so that they may take their sahûr in preparation for the fast of the day of 'Arafat'.

Although any unjustifiable harmonisation of hadiths is to be guarded against, it does seem that opinion is settled that in 'Arafat itself fasting is not permissible, but that it is acceptable elsewhere.

---

1 Cf. possibly also AD98, Tir.773. 2 Cf. the rather ambiguous opinion of Tir.750. 3 E.g. Han.6/423,5/271,6/288, Nas.80, Baihaqi 285.
4 The same phrase occurs in a similar hadith at Istibqar 133.
5 Though possibly it simply refers to the regular 'Arafat ceremonies. On du'a' and mas'ala in connection with the fast, cf. Q2/186.
As was the case before Shafi'i's death, the majority opinion, as expressed in the hadiths, is to disapprove of the fasting of yawm al-na'hr/al-adhā.

A common report to this effect is that through Abū 'Ubayd mawla 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Awf, that one or more of the first caliphs, usually Ĉūmar, reported that the Prophet forbade the fast of adhā and fiṭr.

Several of these mention the early argument of Ă'isha, that fiṭr is the day you break, and na'hr the day you slaughter. The prophetic prohibition is also related from Abū Huraira, in a straightforward manner, and from Abū Sa'Id al-Khudrī. Mus. 143 and Tir. 802 have the same prohibition from Ă'isha.

Various other hadiths repeat earlier themes: the Prophet used not to go out on the morning of yawm al-na'hr without having eaten; the question of one who vows to fast yawm al-na'hr, answered by b. Ĉūmar (Mus. 142, Ḥan. 6235, 5245, 4449, Bukh., bāb sawm yawm al-na'hr).

Perhaps an earlier hadith, since it is still at the 'successor' level, is Sac'd 5/134, where Hishām b. Ĉurwa makes a point of breaking fiṭr and na'hr. Another companion hadith, implicitly advocating eating, is Kh. p. 114. Also at the companion level is Sac'd 6/114-5.

Only one hadith attempts to rationalise the na'hr prohibition, and this is not specifically against fasting; it is along predictable lines: Sac'd 5/393: it is a day of sacrifice and celebration.

---

1 Ḥan. 435, 225, 227, 224, 163, 382, Ḥej. 1722, Tir. 771, Mus. 138, Bukh., bāb sawm yaws al-fiṭr, AD, bāb sawm al-‘Īdāin. 2 On yawm al-fiṭr, see ch. 4, p. 190 et seq. 3 See above, p. 197. 4 Ḥan. 2/511, Mus. 139, Bukh., bāb sawm yaws al-na'hr. 5 Bukh., bāb sawm yaws al-na'hr, sawm yaws al-fiṭr, Dār. 1760, Ḥej. 1721, Tir. 772, Mus. 140, 141, AD, bāb sawm al-‘Īdāin. 6 Ḥan. 3/7, 3/39, 3/66, 3/85. 7 Ḥan. 5/353, 2868, Ḥej. 1756, 1754.
As for the question of fasting during the days of Minā/tashrīq, there is a little fresh argument recorded in the Ḥadīth. Previous themes are repeated in numerous slightly differing versions. Thus the Ālī Ḥadīth, which is the most widespread. In Ḥan992 and Saʿd 2/134, there is no mention of the Prophet as author of the statement, which may reveal an earlier level of the Ḥadīth, although in the Saʿd report, it should be observed that Ālī is said to be mounted on the Prophet’s mule. The same Ḥadīth comes also from other companions: Mus.145, Ḥan.3/460 have Kaʾb b. Malik and Aws b. Ḥadhān (the two representing the legal shāhidān?); Budail b. Warqāʾ appears in Saʿd 2/134,2/31, Kh. p.108; ʿAbdullāh b. Ḥudhāfa in Ḥan.3/451, Ḥan.5/224, Saʿd 2/134 (also on the Prophet’s mount); Bishr b. Sūhāim in Dār. 1773, Ḥāj. 1720, Ḥan. 4/335, which has an extra clause stating that ‘lā yadkhul al-janna illā muʾmin’. Ḥan.708, Saʿd 2/134 (bis) add ‘wa dhikr lillāh’ to the akl and sharh.

The simple prohibition, with the same rationalisation as in the Ālī Ḥadīth, is generally from Abū Huraira. Occasionally, 'ayyām aklin' becomes 'ayyām ʿuṭūmin', and in one version (KU2829) 'biṭāl' is added to the list. The Ḥadīth also comes from Yūnus b. Saddād (Ḥan. 4/77) and Ṣuḥbaisha al-Hudhali (Mus.144). In Dār. 1773, Dār. 773, from Ṣuqba b. ʿĀmir, ayyām al-tashrīq are combined with Ārafat, under the title ‘Tūnā ahl al-islām’, as unfastable days.

It is possible that this Ḥadīth, considered generally, is less advanced than the Ālī Ḥadīth, for the latter localised the action, suggesting that perhaps the same considerations are involved here as was the case with Ārafat, namely that those who are present at the pilgrimage celebrations are subject to a different regulation.

1 Ṣay.1299: 'these are days of eating and drinking'. 2 Ḥan.221, 567,708,824. 3 Thus Ḥan.3/494, featuring Bilāl. 4 Ḥan.2/387,5/75, 7134, Ḥāj. 1719. 5 Explained as ‘wiqā al-nisāʾ’. 
from that applying to those not in Mecca, and who are participating by proxy. However, the precise import of a hadith such as Sa'd 5/101, Sa'd b. Musayyib used to fast perpetually, but yet break on tashriq in Medina, is elusive.

Another fairly common hadith is that involving 'Abdullāh b. 'Amr b. 'Aq, noted under the discussion of Dahr as a keen faster, who refuses to stop fasting on the days of Minā until assured that it is a prophetic prohibition which forbids this. As there is no separate hadith recording 'Abdullāh's practice without any subsequent modification, the hadith need not be taken as indicating any real difference of opinion: like the Sa'id b. Musayyib hadith, the more extreme the case, the more impressive, as an argument, is the eventual conversion. A slightly different version shows 'Abdullāh in repentant old age, wishing he had accepted the prophetic precedent—compare the dahr/three days hadiths where a similar device is used.

The only glimpse of any real opposition to this unfavourable view occurs in Bukhārī, who has in the tarjama of bāb šiyyām ayyām al-tashriq a hadith claiming that 'A'isha used to fast the days of Minā and that so did Hishām. This is perhaps comparable to the stubbornness attributed to 'A'isha in the pre-Shāfi'ī period over the matter of Arafat. Bukhārī however chooses not to take it at its face value, but interprets it in the light of another hadith from b. 'Umar and 'A'isha, where the days of Minā are permitted to be fasted but only as part of the mut'a fast. The same information is confirmed by other hadiths in the same bāb (cf. also KU2834). Ibn Ḥajar is not totally convinced by Bukhārī's reasoning on this point.

So far the fasts mentioned in connection with Dhū-l-Ḥijja have largely followed on previous tendencies noted in the preceding chap-

1. On this point cf. Istibghär p.132. 2 Ḥan.4/197, DER.1774, AD, bāb ša'm ayyām al-tashriq, Sa'd 4.10. 3 Sa'ed 4.10. 4 Cf. pre-Shāfi'ī debate.
ter. However, in certain of the Shi'i works, a number of other fasts, principally of a commemorative nature, it appears, are recommended. Thus the 1st. of Dhū-l-Ḥijja is said to be Abraham's birthday, and its fast is said to equal that of 60 months. The 18th. is reckoned to be the day of naṣab of the Prophet\(^1\), and we are told that prophets used to fast this day\(^2\). Again, it is said to equal 60 months' fast. According to ʿĀmilī, another Shi'i, the 24th. is to be fasted, as it is yawn al-mubāhala\(^3\). Whether these days are exclusively Shi'i fasts is not clear. Interesting also is ʿAbū ʿAṣīr\(1\) p. 337: the Prophet used to fast half of Dhū-l-Ḥijja, ʿAshūrā', and three days.

It may be convenient to include here the 15th. Dhū-l-Qa'da, which ʿUsī recommends as a fast-day, for on it was founded the Ka'ba. The reward of this day is also 60 months.\(^4\)

In conclusion it may be noted that there may be a further connection between fasting and the pilgrimage in those ḥadīths which claim that an āmara in Ramaḍān is as good as a ḥajj.\(^5\)

Three Days

The practice of fasting three days per month, covering as it does a number of different formulations, becomes more widespread and complicated in the ḥadīth of the post-Shafi'i period.

The simple 'awṣānī khalītī bi-thalāth' report of Abū Huraira\(^6\)

---

1 Sc. when he first received the Message? 2 Ṭūsī 203, 4. Compare an ʿAshūrā' ḥadīth in similar terms. 3 Cf. Q3/61, where this root occurs. For a different dating of this, and a note on the associations of the day, see Bīrūnī, p. 333. 4 ʿĀmilī also mentions this figure; it is apparently a common Shi'i device. 5 E.g. Sa'd 8/314. 6 See above, Three Days, p. 200.
is the commonest\(^1\). It is now related in some cases from Abū Dharr too\(^2\). Two of these versions incorporate the 'al-ḥasana bi-‘ashri anṭāliḥā’ rationale\(^3\). Abū Dardā\(^4\) serves as the figurehead in other versions. Whether the use of these two companions reflects some dissatisfaction with the Abū Huraira version is unclear. Comparable in format to these ḥadīths is Ḥan.6/287, where ʿAʾisha lists various practices, this time four in number, which the Prophet never omitted to observe. One of these is the fasting of three days per month. Slightly adapting the ten-fold reward notion is KU2586, where we learn that the three-day fast will atone for ten evil deeds, and will purify in the same manner as water.

There are other straightforward recommendations of the three-day fast which are not concerned to specify the days in question: Ṣaʿd 1/230: Three days' fast is a great spiritual cleanser (yudhhib kathīr min waḥr al-ṣadr)\(^6\). Ḥan.2/263: Shahr al-ṣabr plus three days per month is equivalent to perpetual fasting.

There are also other ḥadīths introducing this equation with ṣawm al-dahr: Ḥan.4/197: the Prophet said, 'Three days fast equals ṣawm al-dahr wa ifṭārahū'\(^8\). Still at the companion stage, and not

\(^1\) Ṣaʿd 7/115, Ḥan.7138, 7180, 7452, 7527, 7503, 2/265, 2/271, 2/277, Ṣaʿd 90, 93, Bukh., bāb ẓiyām al-bīḍ, Tir.760, 762, Dār.1752-3, Mus. Musāfirīn 85, AD, K. Ṣalāt 331. \(^2\) Ḥan.5/173. \(^3\) Ḥan.5/173. \(^4\) Ḥan.5/173. \(^5\) Ḥan.5/173. \(^6\) Ḥan.4/197. \(^7\) Ḥan.4/197. \(^8\) Ḥan.4/197. Also Zaid, bāb ẓawm al-tatāwūs, Ḥan.5/154, 5/363, Ṣaʿd 94; some add Ramaḍān ('shahr al-ṣabr').
elsewhere attested to, is the comparable Sa’d 7/65, where the (*per-
petual*) faster is persuaded by °Umar to accept the more moderate
three days' fast. In Nas.94, °Umar's son relates a simple ḥadīth,
that the Prophet used to fast three days per month. These would seem
to contrast with the information given at Sa’d 4/116, where b. °Umar
is shown as having broken after three days of apparently continuous
fasting; the 'continuous' element is certainly not implicit in the
great majority of the three-day fast ḥadīths. The Sa’d report is
matched in some ways by Ku2560: he who fasts three days of each ḥarām
month, joining them together (yuwaλı bainahunna), God will forgive
all his past sins.

A number of ḥadīths come from Abū Nawfal b. Abī °Aqrāb. One2
claims that the last amr of the Prophet was 'fast three days per
month'; the form would suggest an attempt at abrogation3, and the
other reports in Abū Nawfal's name suggest how this is to be inter-
preted. These reports depict him in bargaining (istizāda) with the
Prophet over the matter of fasting. Although Abū Nawfal is keen, the
Prophet will not allow him to fast more than three days per month —
this thus constitutes the last order of the Prophet. The process of
bargaining is familiar from the b. °Amr b. °As ḥadīths4, and as
these latter ḥadīths eventually allow the greater fast of David,
it becomes highly probable that the Abū Nawfal versions5 represent
an adaptation and rejection of ḥadīths which permit such an exten-
sive fast.

Various reports6 mention figures going without food for

1 This addition not noted elsewhere. 2 Sa’d 7/7. 3 Quite sep-
parate from the tafsīr discussion of the three days alleged to have
been fasted in the earliest period of Islam. 4 See discussion of
Dahr, above, p.207. 5 Ḥan.4/347,5/67,Nas.96; cf. also Sa’d 7/31.
6 E.g. Sa’d 12114.
varying periods. Even when this period is of three days, it seems likely that such information is not connected with fasting, but is rather intended to illustrate the straitened circumstances these persons had fallen into.

Of the different specifications of the three days, the bid remains the most popular. An example of this is in Bukhārī, where, above an Abū Huraira hadith of the type just mentioned, appears the tarjama 'ṣiyām al-bid 13, 14 & 15'. Outside Bukhārī, the principal hadīth is related through Anas b. Șīrīn, in varying recensions: the Prophet ordered the fasting of the bid, the 13th., 14th., and 15th., they are qiyyām al-dahr/ qiyyām al-shahr. Similar hadīths come from Abū Dharāna and Abū Dharr.

Dār.1754 apparently borrows from one of the 'simple' hadīths previously quoted: 'bid equals qiyyām al-dahr wa iftārāhu'.

Most positive is Nas.77, from b. Șabbās: the Prophet used never to break the bid, either in ḥaḍar or saḥar.

Besides these hadīths which set out to recommend the bid in one way or another, there are others which are at least partly concerned to settle the origin and definition of the fast. Some of these are merely fabulous, such as KU2579, where it is claimed that after Adam's fall, he became blackened; at God's behest, he fasted the 13th., 14th., and 15th., and by the end of that period he had regained his pure whiteness - hence ayyām al-bid. Others attempt to claim that the 'ghurr' and the bid are identical, and that both refer to the

---
1 AD, būb fī șawm thalāthat ayyām, Nas.97, Ḫan.5/27-8, Saʿād 7,129, Ṣāj. 1707, Tir.761. 2 Ḫan.5/150; Ḫan.5/152,5/177, Tir.761, Nas.76; cf also Ḫan.210. 3 An apparently slightly different version of this is quoted by Gaudefroy-Demombynes, Mahomet, p.566. 4 Ḫan.5/130, Nas. 10,96-7. 5 See p.202, and below.
13th., 14th., and 15th. This claim is suspect on linguistic grounds alone¹, and is probably an attempt at harmonisation on the part of the supporters of the bid fast, who appear to have been a majority. This difference of opinion, which is here ill-concealed, together with the variant definition of the bid by some as the 12th., 13th., and 14th.², would account for the explicit and almost constant definition of the bid (as the 13th.-15th.) in even the non-polemical hadiths on this subject.

The defining of the three days as the ghurra, known from Tayyälist, and understood to fall at the beginning of the lunar month, is also quite well represented, in a hadith from Musä b. Talha - Abü Huraira. The Prophet asks a beduin why he is not eating, and receives the reply that he is fasting three days per month. The Prophet suggests that this being so, he should select the ghurr for this purpose³. An Abü Huraira hadith from Ḥan. (2/353) says simply 'ṣum awwal al-shahr'. Less anecdotal in form than the first hadith is one from 'Abdulläh b. Naṣūd in which the Prophet is represented as fasting the three days of the ghurra of each month⁴. In support of the first three days is Ḥilyat al-Awliyä 1/382, where Abü

---

¹ These hadiths use the term 'ghurr'; the hadiths mentioning it without referring it to the bid usually say 'ghurra'. Normal usage seems always to refer to the beginning of the month; see e.g. Ibn Ḥayyän al-Qurṭubä, al-Muqtabäis, Beirut 1965, p.229: 'wa fī yawm al-ithnain, ghurrat shawwal, alladhī huwa yawm 'Īd al-fitr...'.

² Though frequently referred to (b. Ḥajar, Tir., Abü Hayyän), this definition gained little foothold in the hadith. It may be surmised that both definitions refer in fact to the same days, and that the confusion arises from differing opinions as to which is the first day of the month. ³ Nas.107,96, Ḥan.2/336,2/384. ⁴ Ḥan.3860, AD, būb fi ǧawm thalāthat ayyām,Tir.742,Nas.79.
Huraira points out that having fasted them, his ajr for the month is assured, should anything happen subsequently (that might prevent him fasting).

Promoting other definitions, we still have the earlier 'surar' hadith, but this appears to have been reduced to two days. Also surviving is the hadith recommending the fast of 'al-ayyām al-ma'ālima.

A'isha still appears in the hadiths claiming that the Prophet was not concerned to observe any set pattern of days in his fasting.

It is not apparent that there has been any great development of these minority definitions, at least as they are recorded in the hadith. Certainly the straightforward bid definition is by far the most popular.

All the above definitions concerned blocks of days. In the post-Shafi'i period there arise a number of other recommendations dealing with sequences of days.

The fasting of Monday and Thursday of each week was noted in the previous chapter; without doubt it stemmed from Jewish practice. A similar origin must be pointed for the post-Shafi'i formulation of the three days per month outlined in e.g. AD, bāb fi sawm thalāthat ayyām: the Prophet used to fast three days of the month; the Monday and Thursday of one week (the first week of the month), and the Monday of the following week. Occasionally the sequence is said to be Thursday-Monday-Thursday (Nas.95).

Another type of hadith has a list of some of the Prophet's fasts: 9th. Dhū-l-Ḥijja, 'Ashūrā', and three days of each month, defined as Monday and two Thursdays. It will be noted that the sequence has several varying definitions.

1 Han.4/432 et al. 2 Han.6/175. 3 Han.6/146, AD, bāb fi sawm thalāthat ayyām, Mus.194, Tir.763, Rāj.1709. 4 Comparable are Han.6/287, 5643, Nas.79,95. 5 Han.6/288, 5/271, 6/423, AD.
It is true that generally speaking, in Talmudic Judaism the Monday-Thursday-Monday sequence is confined to rainmaking fasts, but there is also some mention of it in e.g. Mishnah Megillah, concerning the fast of Esther\(^1\). In noting this Vajda could not find evidence of a three-day fast among the Jews in classical Muslim times, but this is not conclusive, for our knowledge of Jewish life and theory of that time is very scanty. It is not evident that within Islam this fast serves any purpose as specific as that of inducing rain.

The confusion of definition, remarked on above, may possibly derive from a conflation of the tacitly acknowledged Jewish fast of Monday and Thursday with the more 'Islamic' notion of Muhammad's alleged three-day fast, in order to disguise the Jewish origin of the former. The ḥadīth never offers a rationalisation of the Monday-Thursday-Monday fast, in contrast with the case of the Monday and Thursday practice.

There remain other less widely attested versions of the three days per month fast: Ḥan.6/289, from Umm Salama: the Prophet used to order me to fast three days per month, Monday, Friday and Thursday. No indication is given of which weeks the days are to be fasted in. The ḥadīth probably represents a combination of interests, either promoting the disputed Friday by placing it alongside the well-established Monday and Thursday, inside the framework of the equally soundly based (in ḥadīth at least) three days per month, or else it counters some other formulation of the three days.

Ḥan.3/416 says that he who fasts Ramaḍān and Shawwāl, plus Wednesday, Thursday and Friday,\(^2\) will enter Paradise. Here it would

---

\(^1\) This is probably not a historical fast, but rather an attempt by later Jews to provide justification for their own practice.

\(^2\) Wednesday, Thursday and Friday are recommended by themselves/
appear that the first two days are seen as in some way preparatory for the special day of the week, Friday\(^1\). Possibly in deference to the widespread opinion that Friday is not to be fasted, there exist other versions of this hadith\(^2\) in which only Wednesday and Thursday are recommended. This hadith should perhaps not be included here, as the three days in question seem to be a weekly rather than a monthly fast. More compatible with other three-day fast hadiths in this respect is Tir.746: the Prophet used to fast the period Saturday to Monday of one month, and Tuesday to Thursday of the next. Here is tacit support for the anti-Friday party. If this is taken as primarily a three-day fast per month hadith, it is clear that such a formulation is free of all possible charges of outside influence.

It is fairly well known that the Christian fast of Wednesday and Friday is a polemical alteration of the Jewish Monday and Thursday practice\(^3\). Something similar to this appears to occur in the case of the Monday-Thursday-Monday three-day fast hadiths, for example in Tusi 187-8\(^4\), where we learn that the Prophet would fast the first Thursday of the month, the Wednesday of the middle decade, and the last Thursday of the month\(^5\). The polemic element may however not be.

\(^1\) See e.g. New Catholic Enc., vol.5, p.850. \(^2\) Han.4/78, AD, bāb ᵰ sawm shawwāl. \(^3\) Cf. on this Istibṣār 136. \(^4\) Conceivably they are joined to Friday in order that the latter may be fasted without transgressing the 'nahy an yakhuṣṣ yawm al-jum'a bi-ṣawm', noted earlier.

\(^5\) A hadith of somewhat similar content is mentioned soon after this, and deserves being recorded as an example of the device of abrogation being rather over-employed: when the Prophet first got his message, it is said, he did not fast regular periods. Then he left that, and fasted alter-
strong here, as these days are termed 'ḥādhihi al-ayyūm al-makhūfa', suggesting that for some reason they are regarded as ominous. Other hadiths in Ṭūṣṭ (189) confirm this, for Wednesday at least, which is said to be the day on which fire (=hell?) was created, and against which fasting is a protection. It is additionally claimed that Wednesday is the day which God habitually selected in the past for the punishment of various peoples. Thursday, when it is mentioned in detail, is said to be a day on which good deeds are taken up for account, an explanation already noted. Although Ṭūṣṭ is a Shīʿī, references to this Thursday-Wednesday-Thursday fast are not confined to Shīʿī works, and the explanation offered does not appear to be exclusively Shīʿī in tone. The precise origins, however, remain obscure.

In some ways comparable to the above fast are some b. ʿAmr b. ʿAs hadiths (e.g. Ḥan.6775), which have 'one day in ten' as their form of the three-day fast, which last is an element of that ḥadīth. This definition, though reasonable enough, is not otherwise attested to in strictly canonical works. It is however known to Tirmīḏī, who is quoted by b. ʿAJar at Bukhārī, bāb qawm al-bīd, and who lists the various forms taken by the three days. Besides those dealt with above, he mentions the 1st., 20th., and 30th, the first of each decade, and the last three days of the month. The first two suggestions are probably literalist interpretations of the prophetic recommend-
ation, with a deliberately neutral flavour, while the last one is the logical next step from the better documented alternatives, the first three and the middle three days of the month. Whether these suggestions were ever contained in ḥadīth form is uncertain; they may well have been no more than scholarly conjectures.

The ḥadīth literature also contains references to the Quranic three day fasts, or gives alleged instances of them: Ḥan.4/145, for example, where a foolish vow is compensated for by a three-day fast. In Ḥan.4/244 a pilgrim shaves his head and fasts for three days. There appears to be no connection between these Quranic fasts and the various formulations examined above.

Monday and Thursday

The fasting of Monday and Thursday, that is to say each week, rather than in a sequence of three days per month, was briefly observed in the period before Shāfi‘i’s death. Latterly, it is widespread in ḥadīth. No report specifically disapproves of the custom.

There are a number of favourable companion ḥadīths; these may be taken as the fore-runners of the later material, since they only occur in b. Sa‘d, whose work is early and not formally as rigid as that of the more strictly classical authors. It is clear that the observance of Monday and Thursday was widely held to be a pious

1 Though Ghazālī, p. 237, mentions one interpretation of ḍ-dahr as three days each at the beginning, middle and end of the month. Westermarck, Morocco, p. 89, has an instance of the one day in ten fast, and it may also be noted that in the Soviet Union, social pressures have forced the Muslim leadership to recommend a three-day fast, of the 1st, 15th, and 29th or 30th days, in place of Ram-adān. (Bennigson, 178). 2 Cf. also AD, Aimān 209, Dar. Nudhūr 2339.
practice. Thus b. ʿAbbās: my mother died while fasting Mondays and Thursdays (Ṣaʿd. 8/203). ʿAbdullāh b. Masʿūd used to fast Mondays and Thursdays (3/109). ʿUmar b. ʿAbdulʿazzīz used to do this also (5/245).

Simple ḥadīths of this type which have been transferred to the Prophet are Ṣaʿd 12/105, 5/206; Najs. 79. In a ḥadīth from Ṭāʾīṣa (3), the Prophet is stated to have actually preferred the fasting of these two days.

The Abū Huraira hadith, which Ṭāyālisi reported, is also common. This gives the Prophet's reason for fasting Monday and Thursday: 'al-ʿamāl ṭuʿraḍ' on those days (5). Monday is also seen to be of significance in other ḥadīths (cf. Vajda 380 et seq.), but it is not clear how much these represent a rationalisation of the Monday and Thursday fast. Certainly some Muslims saw these other events mentioned in connection with Monday as relevant to the fast: Najs. 198: the Prophet was questioned about the Monday fast, and said, 'On it was I born, and on it I received revelation'. Comparable is Ḥan. 5/297: Monday and Thursday were the days of my birth and death. KU2959 adds that the Prophet died on a Monday. KU2960, restricting itself to Monday, mentions the Prophet's birth, revelation, hijra and death as having

---

1 Umm Faḍl. She appears in certain other ḥadīths relating to fasting, but is not apparently recorded elsewhere in connection with the present subject. 2 Contrast 3/109: ma raʾayt faqīhan qaṭalla ʿawman min ʿabdillāh b. masʿūd. 3 Ṣāi. 1739, Ṭir. 745, Ḥan. 6/60, Najs. 39, 79. 4 yataḥarrā. The same phrasing is used in certain ḥadīths concerning ʿAshūrā'. 5 Ṣāi. 1740, Dār. 1758, Ṭir. 747, Najs. 77-8, Ḥan. 2/329, Weill. 43. 6 The versions tend to omit Thursday from the discussion (e.g. Najs. 197, and some of AD, bāb fi ʿīyām al-dahr taṭawwuṭan). 7 Both ḥadīths from Abu Qatāda. Cf. Ṭir. 745, Najs. 197.
occurred on that day, and as reasons for its observation as a fast day. There are numerous references to these and other events having taken place on a Monday which make no mention of any fast on that day.

A simple expression of preference for the Monday and Thursday fast is incorporated in a version of the b. āmīr b. ṣāḥīḥīth².

Mentioned earlier under 'Three days' was Ḥan.6/289, where Friday is added to Monday and Thursday. Monday occasionally appears as the object of a vow to fast, e.g. in Bukhārī, bāb ʿawm yāwma al-nahr; this is clearly similar to earlier instances of the same thing in the Mudawwana, etc.³

Some light may be shed on the origin of the Thursday fast, which generally receives less attention than that of Monday, by the information that in some parts of the Arab world, Thursday, the fifth day, is regarded as lucky, and shares with five (fingers) an efficacy against the evil eye.⁴

At no time does any explicit polemic element appear in the ḥadīths concerning Monday and Thursday, nor any recognition of the foreign origin of their fasting, unless the association of the days with events in Muhammad's life is taken as designed in part to disguise. The 'aʿmāl tuʿraḍ' notion is probably borrowed, but as it is not exclusively Jewish in tone, it would be unobjectionable and unnoticed.

Other days

A certain number of ḥadīths advocate the fasting of Wednesday and Thursday. Whether this is done deliberately, to avoid Monday,

---

or is in ta'zīm of Friday, is not ascertainable. Ḥan. 3/416 does in fact add Friday to these two. These ḥadīths are all substantially the same, and also advocate Shawwāl. In Ḥan. 6235 is discussed the question of one vowing to fast Wednesday or Thursday.

As is the case with Monday and Thursday, the fasting of Wednesday and Thursday is never explicitly disapproved. For the possible motive behind the fasting of Wednesday, see above, pp. 322-3.

Tir. 746 advocates the fasting of all the days of the week except Friday, in alternate groups of three days. Monday, Wednesday and Thursday have been discussed above, and Saturday and Sunday receive further mention below, but, so far as may be discovered, Tuesday is never apparently referred to elsewhere. It appears that by itself it is not a day of especial significance, and is here simply one of a block of three days.

The fasting of Saturday is not a subject that occupied the Shaikhain. However, b. Ḥanbal and the four lesser fiqhā all mention it, unfavourably. The treatment bears some similarity to that of Friday fasting - thus Dārimī's bāb-heading (100): al-nahy an yakhūṣ al-sābt b-ẓawm. The ḥadīth comes via ʿAbdullāh b. Busr, and usually also his sister ʿammā: the Prophet said, 'Do not fast Saturday except insofar as it forms part of imposed fasts. Even if you have only a twig or a piece of bark, chew on it (and thus break). This prohibition is rather stronger than the anti-Friday hadiths ever became. The ʿillā fıma ufturida ʿalaikum' clause has the flavour of

1 Thus Tir. 748, Ḥan. 4/78, AD 11.  2 See further on this under Three Days.  3 Though Goldziher, Tagewhlderei, says Tuesday is a 'day of blood', and possibly ominous on that account. He suspects Jewish influence in this.  4 Kh. p. 337 has ʿamma instead of ukht.  5 Ḥan. 6/369, 4/189, Māj. 1/26, Dār. 1756, Tir. 744, Kh. p. 337, KU2814.
a legalistic amendment.

Less severe, but of the same intent, is Ḥan.6/368, where the Prophet tells a woman fasting Saturday that in terms of heavenly ajr, her action is neither beneficial nor detrimental. The figure of Ṣammā' bint Busr reappears in a version of this ḥadīth that is also by implication unfavourable: KU2322,2537: Eat, for fasting Saturday is neither for you nor against you.

There can be little doubt that the fasting of Saturday came to be questioned because of a sensitivity among the Muslims over the Jewish Sabbath, which they felt it their duty to ignore or detract from at all costs. It is not now clear whether the first ḥadīth mentioned above is simply an academic reaction to Saturday, or counter to a genuine practice. However, it certainly seems to be extreme sensitivity that would forbid the fasting of Saturday outright; although on the face of it, it might be construed as a taʾzīm of Saturday (=Sabbath), it ignores the fact that, in orthodox terms at least, Saturday is for the Jews not fastable, except when it coincides with Yom Kippur. It would thus appear that the promulgators of this ḥadīth were only superficially aware of the Jewish manner of observing the day. That the Jewish Sabbath is at the bottom of the matter is revealed definitely by Tir.744 (Bai.302): kirāhiyyat an yakhuṣṣ al-rajul yawm al-sabt bi-ṣiyām li'anna al-yahūd tu'azzim yawm al-sabt.

It seems that certain Muslims, possibly better informed, also

1 Despite the Jewish Saturday fast prohibition, the Christians pointed out that Elijah and Daniel had fasted on that day (Baron,5/124). Baron also points out that Saturday is unlucky because of 'ancient folkloristic connections with Saturn' (5/91). It is perhaps conceivable that such a superstition could, at some remove, have influenced the Muslim view of this day.
found this hadith somewhat illogical, for in several places its is-
nūdī is attacked. Thus Abū bāb al-nabay an yakhūq yawm al-sabt bi-qaww: 
Zuhrī said when (this) prohibition was mentioned to him, 'It is a 
Ḥimṣī ḥadīth'. Awzārī, the lawyer of Syria, is made to back up this 
implied criticism: 'I tried to suppress this ḥadīth until I found 
that it had (despite this) become widespread'. Malik also is said 
to have disliked it.

Dhahabī (Miṣzān) relates that Abūdullāh b. Būsir is generally 
considered weak and untrustworthy. His ḥadīths reveal him to be a 
Ṣāliḥī or an ʿAbbāṣī, it is said. Whether these charges of non-orth-
odoxy are true or not, it is plain that they are intended to reflect 
on the material transmitted in his name. What is not made clear, 
however, is whether it is the argument or the intent of the ḥadīth 
that is not favoured.

From the rather confusing ḥadīth material, there is no firm 
evidence to suggest that there was any practice of fasting Saturday. 
However, in Tāj al-ʿArūs, sw. s-b-t, there is the curious information 
that Thaʿlab related from b. al-ʿArabī: do not be a sabatī, i.e. one 
who fasts Saturday by itself. The date of origin of this word sabatī 
(which does not have this meaning in b. al-ʿAthīr, Lubāb, 1/527) is 
uncertain.

In spite of the inconclusive nature of the above material, 
other ḥadīths, not obviously related, are to be found, which suggest 
with perhaps a greater degree of likelihood that there was indeed 
a custom of fasting Saturday. A motive is explicitly provided by

1 Cf. also Naisab. 1436, Bai. 302. 2 The significance of this is un-
certain; possibly it is intended to indicate that the report is mere-
ly local, and thus not trustworthy. 3 Elsewhere he is said to be a 
Qadarī. 4 Contrast here Sāmarrāʾī, p. 19: Sabatī is a name for one 
born on a Saturday.
\(\text{Han. 6/324}^1\): the Prophet used to fast Saturday and Sunday more than other days, saying that they are the 'Id of the mushriks\(^2\), and that he likes to differ (ukhälif) from them. This idea of khilāf is a much more common expression of the Muslim polemical spirit than is the absolute avoidance of Saturday advised in the other hadīths, and it is for this reason that the two hadīths seem almost entirely unconnected. Leaving aside the fact that one is in favour of fasting Saturday while the other is against, there is the fact that one deals with Saturday and Sunday jointly, while the other is solely concerned with Saturday\(^3\).

Sunday fasting, which receives the same treatment as that of Saturday in the above hadīth, is otherwise unnoted as a separate phenomenon in this generation of the hadīth literature. The reason behind its fast is apparently entirely polemic, and it may be doubted whether there was ever any widespread practice behind the proposition, as it is quite likely that the Christian 'Id was simply added to the Jewish one for the sake of completeness.

**Various Months**

Besides the above mentioned novel fasts of certain days of the week, there appears in post-Shāfi‘ī times a number of recommendations to fast certain months of the year. One of them, it is true, is not entirely without precedent. This is the fast of the month of Sha‘bān, which was already recommended in one or two early hadīths, but which in the latter period undergoes great proliferation. The motives

---

1 Cf. Baihaqī, 303. 2 Presumably the Jews and Christians combined. 3 Saturday is defended in Ṭahāwī 389.
behind the fast, which earlier could only be tentatively deduced, are now confirmed explicitly.

The most widely received hadîths are those from Ă'isha, perhaps the type which Tay. 1475 was intended to counter. The simplest is exemplified in Han. 6/84: the Prophet was not more given to fasting in any month than he was in Sha'ban; he used to fast it all. This last phrase already betrays some development in the argument. Hadîths not recorded until somewhat later reveal a similar regard for Sha'ban: Tusi 188: the Prophet used to say, 'Sha'ban shahr i'. This is expanded in KU2071: the month of Ramadân is the month of God, and the month of Sha'ban is my month. Sha'ban is the purifier (muṭahhir), Ramadân the atoner (mukaffir).

The above hadîth from b. Hanbal shows that there appears to have been some difference of opinion as to whether or not the Prophet fasted all of Sha'ban: this may have been derived from qualms connected with the 'yawm al-shakîk at the end of Sha'ban, or from a desire to conform with the 'mâ ṣama shahran kâmilan illâ Ramadân' hadîths, which had been in existence in the period before Shâfi'i's death. Thus some hadîths have, instead of 'all' (of Sha'ban), 'most' or 'the greater part' ('ammatuhu, illâ qalîlan). This is clearly at variance with the original message of the b. Hanbal hadîth. In

1 See under Basic Fast, above, p. 211. 2 Cf. Nas. 37, Naisab. 434, Han. 6/188, Nas. 78(5), Nas. 39 (adds Monday and Thursday), Mus. 177.
3 Perhaps connected with the variant 'shahr Ramadân'. 4 Cf. possibly Ḥilyat al-Awliyyâ': Abû Huraira: let us go into mosques in Ramadân, 'linuṭahhir ṣawmanā'. 5 On this, cf. AD, bāb fīman yasil Sha'ban bi-Ramadân, a yawm al-shakk hadîth with a Sha'ban heading.
6 The contradiction is recognised by commentators, some of whom attempt to justify it with the claim that 'all' in Arabic can mean 'most'. (Tir. 737, Nas. 78).
contrast with those amending additions, there are some which confirm the original intent - kāna yaṣiluhu¹ (sc. Shābān) bi-Ramādān.

Practically all these variations can be found attached to the 'haddith, which as was explained earlier, was designed to support the claim that the Prophet observed no fixed habits in his fast. Such additions of course rob the latter hadith of its intended meaning².

A number of hadiths comparable to the Ḥanbal hadith come from Abū Salama and Umm Salama. In some cases this seems to be simply because it is of a different motif, but at other times it appears the contradictions in the ʿAḥīsah hadiths, outlined above, were felt by some to be unacceptable. In this latter group can be placed Māj. 1748, Ḥan.6/311,6/294, Nas.36.

The motive of the hadiths in the former category is possibly a rationalisation of the Shābān fast³. Thus Nas.35: Umm Salama said, 'I never saw the Prophet fast two consecutive months⁴ other than Shābān and Ramādān, which he used to join (yaṣil)⁵. However, it is to be doubted that this is in any way a genuine explanation for the fasting of Shābān: most jurists would not countenance Ramādān

¹ Cf. wīgāl (Nas.77(6),Māj.1649,AD 110,Nas.78(2)). Some bāb headings e.g. Dār.1746,Tir.736,Māj.1648, call this wīgāl, but this is doubtful. The intention of this addition is more probably to indicate simply that the Prophet left no gap between Shābān and Ramādān; but see ahead also. ² Nas.37,36(3),77(7),Ḥan.6/107,6/39b,6/143,Māj. 1710,Bukh., ṣawm Shābān,Nus.176,AD, bāb kaif kāna yaṣūm al-nabi, Nus.175,Tir.736. ³ As suggested in the previous chapter. ⁴ Cf. Q58/3-4. ⁵ Three hadiths to the effect that whenever the Prophet fasted two consecutive months, it was always Shābān and Ramādān, occur at Baihaqī 210.
being fasted as part of a kaffara (it must be 'intended' as an obligatory fast). As pointed out elsewhere, there is a suspicion that in practice these consecutive months were rarely fasted, and this would further diminish the need for a special hadith to define them. It is quite conceivable that in spite of the clear Quranic reference, the kaffara fast is not the target of this hadith, but rather it is aimed at the question of yawn al-shakk.

So far the various hadiths mentioning Shaeban appear to do so only incidentally, as a lever in other arguments. These references may indicate tacitly that the fasting of Shaeban was indeed a widespread and well-known phenomenon.

Several of the remaining hadiths give other reasons for the marking of Shaeban with a fast. Thus Tiro Zakat Bab 28: the Prophet was asked which fast was most preferable after Rajab, and he said, 'Shaeban li-tawaf Ramadhan'. This suggestion, involving as it does the rather primitive notion of honouring a month, does not appear contrived, and probably genuinely reflects one of the main impulses behind the Shaeban fast.

The explanation offered by Nas.78, however, seems to lack this disingenuousness: Usama b. Zaid: I said to the Prophet, 'I notice you fast Shaeban much more than other months'. The Prophet replied, 'It is a month that is neglected between Rajab and Ramadhan, and it is a month in which one's deeds are raised up to the Lord; I prefer that my deeds be raised up while I am fasting'. The same was said

---

1 None of the other kaffara fasts in the Quran have such hadiths attached to them. 2 Cf. here Baihaqi 410. Bai.200: Break between Shaeban and Ramadhan. 3 Also Bai.305, KU2535. Cf. the suggestion to this effect in the previous chapter. 4 Cf. the hadith 'al-ghay'ibim tujab da'watuhu'.
of Monday and Thursday, and in fact Nas.78 has the same isnād added to a Monday/Thursday ḥadīth of comparable style. The two fasts are treated jointly in a ḥadīth from Usāma at Ḥan.5/201.

Apart from originally non-specific ḥadīths against the fasting of particular whole months, mentioned above, there exist other ḥadīths which disapprove of the fasting of Shācbān for a definite reason. This disapproval is necessary, it is alleged, because some extremists go so far as to claim that the fasting of Shācbān is wājib, and, like Ramadān, days omitted must be made up for. One ḥadīth mentioned by Tūsī is at great pains to demonstrate that the Prophet’s fasting of Shācbān was as a sunna, and not as a fard. The extremists who go so far in taḍzīm of Shācbān are nowhere referred to as other than ‘qawm’, and there is no clue as to their identity.

Another, perhaps separate, consideration in the fasting of Shācbān is the position of Lailat al-Nisf, which as e.g. Tir.739 points out, is a night when God caused Revelation to descend to the lowest heaven, and when there is an abundance of forgiveness. Its mention in fasting ḥadīths appears to be to a certain extent coincidental. Thus a number of ḥadīths from Abū Huraira select Lailat al-Nisf as a conveniently situated and well-known date from which to promote the idea of ‘lā taqaddamū ramadān bi ṣiyām’2, either against the fasting of yawm al-shakk, or the magnification of Ramadān by previous fasting. The ḥadīths are quite straightforward: idhā kān al-nisf min shācbān, fa-amsikū can al-sawm ḥattā yakūn Ramadān. Tirmidhī’s observations at 738 make it clear that the reason for imṣāk was a dislike of the taḍzīm of Ramadān, and that it had no inherent connection with the 15th of Shācbān: qīla innamā al-

---

1 Tūsī, Istibṣār 138, Sunan 188. 2 This ḥadīth also in the name of Abū Huraira – see Tir.738. 3 Ḥan.2/442, Māj.1651, AD 23, Dār. 1747-8, Tir.738.
This last consideration is quite absent from other reports which openly favour the fast of Lailat al-Nisf, such as Zurqanî, 2/196, from Abû Ya'qûb: 'On it) God decides which souls are to die in that year; so I prefer that my fate should be decided while I am fasting'. There is also a ḥadith from 'Alî, claiming that the Prophet said a vigil should be kept on this night, and its day should be fasted. The Abû Ya'qûb report may probably be taken as indeed representing the motive of most fasters of this day.

The ḥadiths advocating imsâk, above, constitute one of the few explicit attacks on the fasting of Shâbâbân as a month, though it may be noted that the 'mâ ǧâma shahrân kūmilan qaṭṭ' ḥadith probably had Shâbâbân as its primary target; the fasting of Shâbâbân is the most widely promoted of month fasts in the ḥadith (besides Ramaḍân, of course). In addition, Shâbâbân is the first such fast referred to, and the counter ḥadith is also early.

Rajab, one of the Ashhur al-Iṣurūm, enjoyed a certain eminence among the months of the year — in it, according to tradition, occurred the Mi'raj, the Prophet's qumra, and his mabâth. An instance of its general veneration comes in Ḥilyat al-Awliyâ', 6, 269: the Prophet said, when the month of Rajab commenced, 'O God, bless us in Rajab and Shâbâbân, and bring us to Ramaḍân'. This last report may indeed hint at the fasting which some saw fit to advocate in this month. The earliest mention of the practice is in b. Ḥanbal, who has a disapproving ḥadith, as in fact are nearly all subsequent reports.

Han. 181: Asmâ' enquires of b. ʿUmar his opinion on three matters, one of which is the fasting of the whole of Rajab. Ibn ʿUmar implic-
-itly condemns it by likening it to ṣawm al-ābud. The inclusion of the word 'kullahu' indicates that again, as with Shabān, it is the fear of another month rivalling Ramaḍān that lies behind the disapproval. There is apparently no condemnation of the fasting of part or parts of Rajab.

An indirect censuring of the practice also occurs in Ḥan.2046¹, where Saʿīd b. Juhayr, when questioned on this subject, relates the Prophetic 'ḥattā' ḥadīth². The introduction of the Prophet is completed in Ṣādi.1743, where from b. ʿAbbās we learn that 'al-nabī nāḥā ḍan ḡiyām rajab³, tout court.

There are no pro-Rajab ḥadīths in the canonical collections. It seems reasonable to suppose, therefore, that to some extent at least we are dealing with a genuine popular practice, whose upholders were generally speaking not concerned to defend themselves in the ḥadīth. KU does however contain some examples of favourable reports, taking the well-known form of promises of great rewards to those observing the practice. KU2646 runs: 'There is in Paradise a river called Rajab; it is whiter than milk, and sweeter than honey. He who fasts a day of Rajab will be given to drink of this river by God'. Somewhat similar is 2967 (also 2968): In Paradise there is a palace reserved for the fasters of Rajab.

2647: Fasting the first day of Rajab is atonement for three years; the second, two years; the third, one year, and thereafter each day is worth a month.

2648: The fast of the first day of Rajab is equivalent to one year's fasting. He who fasts seven days, seven gates of hell will become locked against him. He who fasts ten days, will be told by

---

¹ = 3011, Ḥus.179. ² See Ḥālik 56, under Basic Fast, p.212.
³ = KU2310, from b. ʿAbbās. ⁴ Also in Ṭūrṭūshī, p.125.
a heavenly voice to ask, and it will be given him.

2987: 'Urwa asked b. Ĕmar whether the Prophet used to fast in Rajab. He replied, 'Yes, and he used also to esteem it highly (yusharrifu')

Taking these ḥadīths as a whole, it appears that there is no definite motive behind the fast of Rajab, other than the conviction that it is generally beneficial - an extension perhaps of the special reverence accorded to it as one of the ashhur al-ḥurum.

The suspicion that Rajab fasting originates at a popular level gains weight from the long argument of Turṭūshī against what he calls the Rajabiyyūn: his work (K. al-Ḥawādith wa-l-Bidā' ¹) is much concerned to stamp out what he sees as popular abuses in religious matters: his tenet is that while a practice may be widespread, this is no guarantee of its admissibility².

His position is that while Rajab is quite permissible as a voluntary fast performed by an intelligent believer, there is the danger that ill-informed people will take this action as justifying the treating of Rajab as a sunna, or even a farḍ like Ramadān³. He has a number of ḥadīths disapproving of the practice⁴, of which a considerable proportion are from companions - this perhaps to indicate that the practice was post-Prophetic and therefore of unsound basis? An example in the one from the Caliph Ĕmar⁵, who used to beat the hands of the people in Rajab until they put their hands into some food. He said, 'Rajab is nothing more than a month that the Jāhiliyya

¹ Pp. 127-30. This reference from Goitein. Turṭūshī died in the sixth century. ² 'Shuyūhiyyat al-fīl lā tadall ēla jāwāzīhi'.
³ He also has a b. Ėbbās ḥadīth specifically to this effect.
⁴ Besides those mentioned above. ⁵ Also in KU2966. Contrast KU 2987, above.
used to venerate, and which was left (turika) when Islam came.' Abû Bakr scolded his family for making Rajab like Ramadân. Ibn 'Abbás recommended that Rajab be considered an 'Īd, so that to break it would be to observe it.

It may perhaps be doubted whether the arguments advanced by Turtūshī had any appreciable effect on the popular practice.

In the explanation offered for the Shābān fast, it was noted that the Prophet claimed Shābān was a month neglected between Rajab and Ramadân. Whether this implies that Rajab was to be favoured with a fast, is not clear. If so, the popular basis would appear to be common to both fasts, and these ḥadīths could be considered to advocate indirectly the Rajab fast.

In conclusion, mention may be made here of a specific fast in Rajab. This is that of the 27th, the Ḥabîth of the Prophet. This is treated of in Tūsî and Amîlî, both Shi'î writers. The fast is said to be the equivalent of that of 60 months.

Another month often accorded special consideration is al-Muḥarram, and not surprisingly, certain ḥadīths recommend that it should be fasted. It was apparently looked upon with greater official favour than the fasting of Rajab, for the ḥadīths that survive all approve of it.

The most widely received is that through Abû Huraira: the Prophet said, 'The best fast after Ramadân is Muḥarram' (Dâr. 1765). Most versions in fact say 'shahrullâh Muḥarram', a Quranic quotation

1 Cf. the ḥadîth about 'Aṣhūrā', above, p. 183. Turt. mentions that one meaning of the verb rajaba is 'to venerate'. 2 Nas. 78, Ḥan. 5/291. 3 203-4. 4 Fol. 18. 5 Afdâl - used also in a Shābān ḥadîth. 6 AD, bāb fi ṣawm al-muḥarram, Mus. 202, 203, Tir. 740, Nas. 101.
which indicates the regard in which the month was held. In others,
the phrase is elaborated to 'shahrullāh alladhī tad'ūnahu al-Muḥā-
ram'.

The other ḥadīth is from ʿAlī. In it a man comes to the Prophet
and asks him what fast he would order him to do after Ramadān, (cf.
the previous afdāl baṣda Ramadān). The Prophet recommends al-Muḥ-
arram, for it is the month of God, and in it is a day on which God
forgave a people, and on which He (will) forgive others. This latter
part of the ḥadīth can only refer to ʿAshūrā', and is the only oc-
casion in the ḥadīth literature where there is any hint given of the
true nature of the day. It is of course quite possible that this ref-
erence to the ʿAshūrā is an addition to the original ḥadīth, for
there is no justification for considering the shahrullāh observation
in the first ḥadīth above to refer particularly to ʿAshūrā' or any
other single day of the month. It may be noted that this is the only
observed reference to ʿAlī in connection with ʿAshūrā' since the
early 'yastaṣqī' ḥadīth.

An isolated ḥadīth, KU2622, claims that he who fasts one day of
Muḥarram will receive thirty ḥasanāt.

Although the Jews extended the influence of 10 Tishrī back
through to the month of Adar, there is no indication that in Islām
veneration for ʿAshūrā' was behind the advocation of the fast of the
month of al-Muḥarram. It is conceivable that here not the originally
Jewish ʿAshūrā' is referred to, but rather the Shīʿī one, which would
provide a more plausible reason for a fast in lamentation of one
month. Whatever the reason behind the mention of ʿAshūrā', it seems

---

1 Māj.1742,Dār.1764,Ja.2/303. 2 Ḥan.1334,Tīr.741,Dār.1763,Ja.1321.
3 Besides the ʿAshūrā'/ʿArafat comparisons. 4 Above, p.179.
5 Possibly influenced by the 30 days of the month. 6 This would
perhaps also account for the presence of ʿAlī. Tīr.'s isnad has 3ʿAlīs.
fairly clear that this is only one of two separate strands involved in the Muharram fast, the other being the more general reverence alluded to in the expression 'shahrallāh'.

Besides the specific fasting of Rajab and al-Muharram, the so-called Ashhur al-ḥurum are also the subject of a general recommendation as periods in which fasting is good. This injunction occurs at the end of a version of the beduin 'dahr' ḥadīth in which the Prophet recommends the persistent beduin to fast first one, then two, then three days, and finally adds 'sum min al-ḥurum' (AD būb fī qawm ashhurst al-ḥurum, Sa'ed 7,58) 'famin al-ḥurum' (Han.5/28d) 'sum al-ḥurum' (Maj.1741). It seems that the last phrase is to be interpreted in the light of the first two, i.e. that 'of', rather than 'all', is meant.

Ghazālī, Iḥyā', p.237, has a ḥadīth not recorded elsewhere which is somewhat reminiscent of the Muharram 'thirty ḥasanāt' ḥadīth above: the Prophet said, 'The fast of one day of a shahr ḥarām is better than thirty days of another month, and the fast of a day of Ramadān is in turn thirty times greater than this'. Ghazālī also has a ḥadīth which claims that the fast of Thursday, Friday and Saturday in a shahr ḥarām is worth the worship of 900 years for each day.

In another ḥadīth, a companion is told to give up fasting Ashhur al-ḥurum and instead fast Shawwāl, so it is possible that though there is little material surviving, there was in fact some difference of opinion on this matter.

Leaving aside this last point, it may be observed that the general tendency to honour months with a fast is but another reflection of the continuing influence of the lunar cycles on the Semitic

---

1 See above, p.208.
mind. Ramāḍān may provide the immediate model in some cases, but there is evidence elsewhere in the Qur'an that for other fasts too, the month was not by any means a novel unit.

Remarkable in that it constitutes the only noted instance of a long fast not tied down to a specific period, and advocated as a practice, rather than claimed to be an historical event, is KU2549: he who fasts forty days (qabāḥan), in which he seeks only the face of God, will be given by God everything he asks for. There seems no reason to see here any connection with the forty days of fasting culminating in Ḍāshūrā' of some medieval Jews (Adar and ten of Tishri).

**Basic Fast**

In the matter of what has been termed the 'basic fast', there are several new ḥadīths of broadly similar purpose, besides the well-represented 'ḥattā' ḥadīth. It has already been noted that the intention of this ḥadīth - to suggest that the Prophet observed no fixed habits in his fasting - was adapted by some, in order to refute the upholders of the Sha'bān and Rajab fasts. The Nas.79 version, which adds at the beginning, 'kāna rasūlullāh yasrūd al-ḍa'awn' appears to be attempting to harmonise the ḥadīth with the impression to be gained from the ḥadīth literature as a whole.

---

1 E.g. Q58/3-4.  
2 On this motif, cf. Rajab ḥadīth above.  
3 The Bible of course contains other references to 40 day fasts.  
5 In Tūsī, adapted to promote the 'Davidic' Fast (187).  
6 This word carries a basic meaning of persisting in something, but often particularly refers to fasting.
namely that the Prophet was known to have practised many and varied facts. However, Tir. 768 suggests that this mention of sard may be explained in another way. It has the bāb-heading al-Sard fi-l-ṣawm, and suggests that the inference to be made is that the first half of the ḥadīth (kāna rasūlullāh yasqām ḥatta naqul lā yustīr) supports prolonged fasting of this type. Needless to say, such an explanation entirely ignores the second part of the ḥadīth, and cannot be considered disinterested.

Other versions of the original ḥadīth extend its message to include qiya'am as well as siyām in the familiar parallel.1

More definite in intention is the hadīth exemplified by Han. 157: the Prophet never fasted a complete month except Ramaḍān since he came to Medina. This last phrase, lacking only in Han. 6/54, is clearly a dating device, and is sometimes improved on by ḥatta māt or a similar expression. Almost all other versions of this ḥadīth appear in conjunction with the ḥatta ḥadīth.

Han. 6/62 adapts the ḥatta motif slightly: Ṭa'īsha says, 'I never knew the Prophet to fast a month without breaking part of it, nor break a month without fasting part of it, until he died.'

It is also Ṭa'īsha who answers a query about the Prophet's fast in Bukh. 93: the Prophet never used to fast any particular days. His...

---

1 Bukh., bāb ma yudhkar min ẓawm al-nabī, Tir. 769, Han. 3/104.
2 Nearly always from Ṭa'īsha or b. ʿAbbās. Han. 2450, 1998, 2151, 2949, 2737, 6/227-8, Nas. 38, 77, Māj. 1711, Mus. 173, 4, 8, Tir. 768, Dar. 1750, Bukh., bāb ma yudhkar min ẓawm al-nabī. 3 Generally kāmilan or tāmman. Occasionally mutatābi'īn (Mus. 178, Māj. 1711, Han. 6/109); presumably these have the same intention, but are possibly against the w iqāl of Sha'bān with Ramaḍān. Nas. 38, Mus. 172, have 'shahrān ma'lūman'.
4 Cf. also Mus. 172-3.
Camal was continuous; which of you could manage what he could? This last part is probably not restricted to the field of fasting. On this general note, it may be observed that the five-sharī'ī fādîth, in which the Prophet outlines the minimum essential observances, is still well-known, though not always mentioned in the Kitāb al-sawm of the various authors.

Sa'ād 4,60 resumes a theme present in some of the b. Cāmr b. Cāq dahr fādîths: innā lif-ainik ḥaqqaqan, inna li'āhlik ḥaqqaqan; ṣum wa af'tir, ǧalli wa nam.

Similar is Mus. Nikāḥ 5, directed against al-camal fī-l-qirr. In it the Prophet counters asceticism by advocating moderation: 'uğallī wa anām, aşūm wa af'tir, atazawwaj, faman raghiba 'an sunnātī, falaisa minnī.'

In line with the minimum fast stipulated in the five-sharī'ī fādîths is Sa'ād 6/207: Abū Şādiq used never to volunteer even one day's fast in the year, nor do one extra rak'ā.

The basic motive behind all these fādîths is self-evident—a desire to keep sight of the essential religious duties, to reserve one's efforts of devotion for them, and to avoid the proliferations of the sunna fasts.

---
1 Cf. the phrase 'ayyukum amlak li'irbihi', (above p.273).
2 Nas. 1-5, Bukh., bāb wujūb ṣawm Ramadān, Mus. İmān 1-10, AD Sunna 522, Dār. 656.
3 E.g. Mus. 136. 4 Cf. Sa'ād 1, 90.
Fidya

The fidya clause in the Quran is generally considered in the post-Shafi'i period to have been abrogated; the hadiths in the collections not surprisingly reflect practically the same state of affairs as is portrayed in the tafsir discussions.

Numerically dominant is the hadith from Salama b. Akwa, not previously recorded, of which the message is: when this verse (Q2/184) first came down, those who wanted to, paid the fidya, until the following verse came down, which removed this option. Comparable is AD, bāb naskh qawlihi 'wa 'alā 'alladhīn', etc., from b. Abbās, and the hadith in the tarjama of Bukh., bāb 'wa 'alā alladhīn', etc., from b. Abī Lailā, which offers a rationalisation for the initial state of affairs: they found it hard to fast at first, so had to have the option of the fidya.

Also supporting the claim of abrogation is a hadith from b. āl Umār. This is attached to a claim that b. āl Umār 'read' part of the abrogated phrase in a variant form (yuṭawwaqūnahu). This paradoxical observation may be resolved either by considering that the second phrase is a polemical attack on the first, or that possibly b. āl Umār is supposed to consider the abrogation as not total, with the old, etc., still governed by the fidya provision. Neither of these answers seems very convincing. Ibn āl Umār's alleged reading of a variant in a phrase he considered abrogated anyway may simply represent an inept conflation of two separate items of information.

Besides abrogation, there exists another way of disposing of the awkward fidya clause, namely by restricting its meaning with a variant. This comes, as before, from b. Abbās, who refers the rukhṣa to the.

---

old and infirm. Bukh. Taf. Q2/185, on this point, says specifically that the verse 'laisat bi-mansūkha'. Ibn Ḥajar remarks that this is a minority claim. Comparable is Nas. 70, where yuṭiq is said to equal yukallaf. As pointed out already, the doctrine concerning the old is the reason for the variant, and not vice versa.

This special application of the fidya to the old is claimed in ḥadīths involving Anas b. Mālik, who in old age is said to have been unable to fast, and accordingly broke and paid over a fidya of food to the poor.

Some, however, who presumably accepted the standard abrogation claims, disallowed this privileged position for the old. Saʿd 7/89: to break Ramaḍān is a ṣadaqa from God to the sick and the traveller (alone). This is attributed to Anas b. Mālik, probably deliberately, and certain persons seem to have realised that this was not quite compatible with the Anas doctrine above, for some versions of the second ḥadīth make it clear that someone other than the most famous bearer of the name of Anas b. Mālik was meant.

These last ḥadīths also introduce the pregnant and nursing mother. Simple fiṭr and qaḍā by these parties was unacceptable to some, and b. ʿAbbās again appears, upholding itcām for them - the fidya clause is 'muthbata' for them also.

Some non-canonical ḥadīths reveal a more lenient attitude: Saʿd 7/156: the old man who cannot pray or fast cannot on the other hand do any evil (so let him alone). In Tūsī, several ḥadīths suggest

---

1. This is scarcely justifiable without an interpolation of some kind: possibly an original 'yuṭawwaq' has been edited into 'yuṭiq'.


3. Thus also Tir. 715, Māj. 1667, Nas. 69. 4. Cf. AD, bāb man qāla hiya muthbata, Tir. 715, Zaid, bāb man rakhkhaṣa fi ʿiftār shahr Ramaḍān, Bukh. Taf. Q2/184, Māj. 1668. 5. Istibṣār 104.
that the old should pay the fidya, but if they cannot afford it, then no matter. Others reckon that his sons or relatives should in this case fast for him, a somewhat unorthodox suggestion.

In comparison with the previous material, these last ḥadīths seem much more practical, and lead one to suspect that the others represent more the continuation of the theoretical debate concerning fidya which in this period is more fully treated in the tafsīrs than in the ḥadīth collections ¹.

Consecutiveness

The question of the consecutiveness or otherwise of fasts other than Ramadān is apparently entirely ignored in the post-Shāfi‘ī ḥadīth ². This may be due to the fact that it is dealt with in the tafsīrs. Its being concerned to a certain extent with variants may have contributed to the lack of development of ḥadīths of the usual kind in this subject: reports concerning variants rarely mention the Prophet, as a result of the theoretical considerations behind the whole science of qirā‘āt.

Fitr Ramadān

On the fate of one who breaks Ramadān without proper excuse, there seems to be little real development in the post-Shāfi‘ī period. This is possibly because the question of punishments, which is the essence of this problem, is not generally within the province of ḥadīth, but is dealt with by the taʿzīr system, for which there

¹ A sign of this is the dearth of material from b. Ḥanbal on this subject. ² A ḥadīth in Bai. 259 likens qadā' Ramadān to a debt: it may be paid off bit by bit. Otherwise there is nothing.
are few available records. This again reinforces the impression
that the muḥaddithūn are dealing in abstract discussions for much
of the time.

The severe Abū Hurairā ḥadīth, claiming that even eternal
fasting would never atone for a breach of Ramadān, survives unaltered.
in essentials. Most versions of the Abū Hurairā 'waqāt āḥlī'
ḥadīth, in which the Prophet proposes for the breach a series of
atonements parallel to those of the ḥāfīr regulation in the Quran,
are unremarkable. The fact that in some the amount of food in the
ṣadaqa suggested as a last resort is defined is not necessarily an
indication that the ḥadīth had any practical value, for it can be
seen as no more than a simple calculation based on the number of
poor persons to be fed, in accordance with well-known precedents.

The earlier Saʿīd b. Musayyib version of this, which adds 'wa
ṣum yawman ṭarānahu', no longer appears under this name, except in
one case, although the idea is preserved in a few other scattered
versions.

The earlier additional option of sacrificing a 'badana' is pre-
served at Ḥan.6945, while the 'wa-astaghfir allāh' motif reappears
in AD, bāb kaffāra man aṭā ahlu fī Ramadān.

Several ḥadīths, apparently similar to the Abū Hurairā version,
come through Ḥaỉsha. These all in fact miss out the ḥāfīr provision,
and pass directly to the ṣadaqa provision. This is interesting in

---

1 Cf. the AD bāb-heading, 'al-taghlīf fī man aṭṭara ʿamadān'.
2 Māj.1672, Dār.1722-1, Tir.723, Ḥan.2/386, AD, bāb al-taghlīf, Tarj. Bukh.,
bāb idhā jāmaʿa fī Ramadān. Zaid, bāb kaffārat man aṭṭara fī Ram-
adān mutāʾammīdan, has 'būshartu' for 'waqātī'. AD, Ḥan.6944, 2/281,
2/273, 7288, Bukh., Dār.1723-4, Zaid, Māj.1671, Nuṣ.81-4, Tir.724. 4 Māj.
1671, cf. Bukh., Tarjama of bāb idhā jāmaʿa fī Ramadān. 5 Ḥan.6945,
Saʿīd 2.102. 6 Also at KU2210 7 Cf. Istībār p.81.
that it reflects the position adopted by Mālik. It is of course possible that the ḍaḥīr provision ḥadīth did not originally terminate with the ḡadaqa option, and that this latter was appended by persons of a disposition similar to that of Mālik. The tone of these Ǧāʾishā ḥadīths is clearly not rigorous - they do not even add any order to make up the day broken, and in this respect they parallel the 'wa-astaghfir allāh' ḥadīths. This is a doctrine comparable to the eminently reasonable views generally held of one who eats or drinks forgetfully - he should simply carry on his fast, as his breach was accidental.

Tirmidhi 724 mentions that some, by qiyaṣ, place eating and drinking together with jimāʿ, as dealt with by the Abū Huraira hadīth.

As was mentioned above, the canonical ḥadīth material does not show much sign of active development. There are however some pieces of isolated information that are relevant to this subject. Representing an extreme view, we have KU221-2, which claim that one day of Ramaḍān broken without excuse can be made up for only by thirty other days of fasting. Ḥūsain is able to explain the difference between the three-fold kaffara of some hadīths and the simple qadā of others: if the breach was on something otherwise ḥarām, then the more complex penalty is due, but if on something otherwise ḥalāl, then the simple one. In a strange hadīth in b. Ḥanbal (4/37), there appears an incident in which a man has intercourse with his wife by day (in Ramaḍān); he asks his people what action he should take, but they refuse, it is said, to go en masse to the Prophet in case a Quran should come down to them on this subject. This is perhaps in-

1 Above, pp. 216-7. AD, bāb kaffāra man atā ahlahu fī Ramaḍān, Dār. 1725, Mus. 35-7, Bukh., bāb idhā jāmata fī Ramaḍān. The common word in these ḥadīths is 'muḥtaraq', used to describe the offender. 2 Though one may perhaps be understood. 3 Istibṣār p. 97.
tended to rationalise the apparent diversity of opinion in the hadith.

**Ru’ya.**

The involved question of al-ru’ya, the determination of the beginning and end of Ramaḍān, does not appear to have been further elaborated by the muḥaddithūn of the time after the death of Shafī’ī: practically all the ḥadīths, numerous as they are, derive from earlier models.

Such is the claim, made through b. ʿUmar, that the Prophet said that the month was 29 days. The implication here seems to be that the month may be of 29 days, rather than that it is invariably so, and occasionally an addition makes this specifically clear (Ḥān. 2335). In an unusual 'confirmation' of this claim, the Prophet says that Gabriel himself came and told him that the month was 29 days (Ḥān. 1885, Nas. 16).

Also familiar is the ḥadīth, generally from Abū Hurairā, to the effect that one should fast and break at the appropriate new moon, but if it is overcast, one should count 30. The b. ʿUmar version of this omits the 30, and suggests simply 'aqdirū.

The ḥadīth in which the Prophet makes use of hisāb al-ʿaqd, generally to promote the '29' claim, through b. ʿUmar again, is also

---

Intended to counter the possibility of Ramadān being less than 30 days is the 'shahrā 'Idin lā yanyuşāni' ḥadīth, another theme known since early times. Tūsī 184 expresses this in two different ways: 'Ramadān is 30, it is never shortened', and 'Sha'bān is never complete' i.e. never 30.

The ḥadīth in which the Prophet swears off his wives for a month, only to return after 29 days, is also still in evidence.

A new report which appears to convey an old point of view in a form much less ambiguous than is generally the case, is AD, bāb idhā ughmiya al-shahr: the Prophet used to pay special attention to the passing of the days of Sha'bān. He would then fast Ramadān until the new moon appeared, but if it was overcast, he would reckon 30 days (from the beginning of Sha'bān), and then fast. Apparently comparable to this, but with no figure specified, is KU2130: uḥṣū 'iddat Sha'bān li-Ramadān.

The isolated hadīths in support of the 29 definition do not appear to have any precedent: Sa'ed 6/163: We once fasted Ramadān as 28 days in the time of 'Alī, and he ordered us to make up a day. Ḥan.7417: the Prophet said, 'How much of the month (of Ramadān) has elapsed?' We said, '22 days have gone and eight remain'. He said, 'Rather, 22 days have gone and seven remain. Seek it (Lailat al-Qadr) tonight'. The introduction of the Lailat al-Qadr theme does not seem to bear on the proposed definition of the month as 29 days.

There is still a large number of hadīths treating the ru'ya question in terms of the suitability for fasting of 'yawn al-shakk'.

---

Thus the 'lā taqaddamū Ramadān bi-ṣawm yawm wa lā yawmain' ḥadīth.  

Interesting in that it appears to be the only new development on this front is a ḥadīth promoting the fasting of the surūr of Sha'būn. The surūr are defined in some versions as the last days of the month, and the motive would clearly be to fast these days out of ihtiyāt lest one should miss a day of Ramadān, or possibly to perform some kind of introductory fast. It is noteworthy that in other versions, presumably issuing from the 'lā taqaddamū' lobby, the surūr are alternatively defined as the first part or the middle of the month. In another new ḥadīth, Āmmār makes it clear, by inviting those present to partake of some roast sheep, that yawm al-shakk is not to be fasted. Those who demur are, he says, disobeying the Prophet. If these last ḥadīths can be taken as indicative of a general tendency, it would seem that in the post-Shāfi‘ī period, the ru'ya issue was coming to be settled by reports dealing with the more specific point of yawm al-shakk, rather than the more unwieldy matter of the calendar. The ḥadīth material on the latter subject may, as has been suggested already, have been too abstracted from actual practice, and may consequently have become disregarded by some. 

As before, a number of reports concern the technical questions of the witnessing of the ru'ya; how many witnesses are necessary, what happens when the ru'ya occurs at different times in different places; they will not be discussed further here, as neither will an

1 Cf. earlier, p. 234. Dār. 1696, Nas. 33-4, Māj. 1650, Tir. 684-5, Mus. 21, Sa'id 8/350, İjan. 7199, 2/281, 2/347, 4/314, AD, bāb fīman yāsīl Sha'būn bi-Ramadān, Bukh., bāb lā taqaddamū, etc. 2 Mus. 195, 199-201, Dār. 1749, AD, bāb fī-l-taqaddam, Bukh., bāb al-ṣawm fī ākhir al-shahr. 3 Cf. the Sha'būn li-ta'zīm Ramadān hadīths, p. 333, and also the Jewish introductory fast to Yōm Kippūr. 4 Tir. 686, Māj. 1645-7, Nas. 40-1, Dār. 1689-90 AD, bāb kirāhiyyat ʿawm yawm al-shakk. 5 Cf. above, p. 235.
apparently novel ḥadīth which suggests a formula of words for use on witnessing the new moon.

**Safar**

In the post-Shafi‘ī period, the question of fasting on a journey, already a complex issue, becomes the subject of well over a score of different types of ḥadīth. Most of these, however, can be traced to earlier themes.

If any generalisation can be made with safety, it is that according to the ḥadīth literature as a whole, the acceptance of the Quranic 'rukhṣa', as the Muslims see the phrase, is preferred. This is more or less the view that prevailed earlier in ḥadīth, but it was seen that those jurists whose personal opinions were recorded tended towards the view that fasting was preferable. The overall tendency of the later ḥadīth may perhaps reflect the increasing influence of the Quran1 in this matter.

A number of ḥadīths resolve the dilemma of whether or not to fast during travel by considering the matter to be entirely optional. Thus the popular Ḥamza al-Aslami ḥadīth, noted before2 The Nas.64 and Mus.107 versions of this are altered to favour slightly the breaking of the fast: while the choice is still open, accepting the rukhṣa is said to be ḥasan', while if one fasts, it is no more than 'lā junāh alaihi'. Another optional ḥadīth comes from b. Mas‘ūd3: the Prophet both fasted and broke during travel.

Also carried over from earlier times is the 'lam ya‘ib al-šā‘im ‘alā al-muḥṭir' ḥadīth, generally from Abu Sa‘īd al-Khudrī or

---

Anas', and continuing in the optional vein is an anonymous report in b. Sa'd's general account of the Fath expedition: the Prophet's munādī said, 'He who wishes to break, let him do so, and he who wishes to fast, let him do so'. The same suggestion comes from the Prophet himself, via b. ʿAbbās, in a ḥadīth familiar from e.g. Ṭayī. 2677. This is sometimes dated in ʿâm al-fāṭḥ and placed in ʿUsfān.

A rather grudging admission of the rukhṣa comes in KU2239: he who breaks (on a journey), then that is the rukhṣa; (but) he who fasts, then fasting is better (aṣfāl).

Going in the other direction are ḥadīths such as the previously noted 'laīsa al-birr an taqāmū fī-l-safar' ḥadīth, which is definitely pro-fiṭr. Some versions of this mention that the man whose plight caused the Prophet to make this utterance was exhausted by the effort of fasting while travelling. This would indicate that it is not an unconditional acceptance of the rukhṣa that is intended, but rather the message 'fast if you can manage it, but not otherwise'.

Jābir, occasionally the vehicle for the above ḥadīth, also appears in the 'ūlā'ika al-ṣugāt' reports, of comparable motive, though with their mention of Kurā al-Ghamīm, they introduce the question of the minimum journey on which breaking is permissible.

---

As was noted before, a number of other hadiths also mention place names, such as the 'ahdath ahdath' report sited in Kadid. Sa'd 2199 seems to preserve a slightly less polished, and therefore perhaps earlier, version of this: 'they used to consider that (breaking) was the last (stage) of the amr of the Prophet'. The hadith placed in Qudaid also survives, as does that mentioning Marr al-Zahrān. This type of hadith does not appear to be well represented in the Sahihain, and it may be that this method of establishing the minimum journey had fallen into disuse. It is not intended to go into the details of the minimum journey reports here.

The hadiths mentioning specific journeys, then, can generally be classed as pro-fiṭr, albeit sometimes incidentally.

The early information (Mālik 25) that b. 'Umar was not fond of fasting on a journey is still to be found, though with isnād unadvanced. Thus Sa'd 4109, which has an addition intended to show that nevertheless he did not approve of fasting. However, it is possible that this hadith did undergo a development: in Han. 5392, 5750, b. 'Umar relates from the Prophet hadiths which are favourable to 'his' point of view.

With reference to the reports of b. 'Umar, it is perhaps not coincidental that 'Umar himself is also said to be of this opinion. Thus Tir. 714: we went off on raids with the Prophet in Ramāfīn, the Fath and Badr expeditions, and broke our fast in them both. The mention of raids, rather than just travelling, will be noted here, but it may be doubted whether the heading of Tir. 714, al-rukhṣa li-l-muḥārib, is anything other than an extrapolation from the hadīth that

1 Cf. earlier p. 240. Han. 1892, Dār. 1715, Mus. 88, Sa'd 21100. 2 Han. 2185, 3176, 3209, 3279, Nas. 61, Sa'd 21100. 3 Han. 2884, 3460, 3/29, 2/336, Nas. 56. Other hadiths connected with this subject include: Han. 2563, Nas. 67, etc. 4 Also Han. 140, 2, Sa'd 2113. 5 Cf. p. 240 above.
it introduces; it is not apparent that in this period the distinction between raiding and travelling, and the possible original meaning of ḍālū safār, was still a live issue.1

More definitely in favour of fiṭr, instead of merely acknowledging the existence of the rukhṣa, are some new themes, for instance 'al-ṣū'īm fi-š-safar ka al-muṭṭir fi-š-haḍār'. This does not seem to have been very popular, for in spite of its 'epigrammatic form, it is not very widely encountered2. Ibn Māja's version has the note 'ḥādhā al-ḥadīth laṣa bi-shai'.

Another ḥadīth represents the Prophet once again on a journey. The muṭṭirs among his companions, it is said, were able to cope, but the fasters became weak, at which the Prophet said, 'The muṭṭirs are the ones who will get the reward today'3.

On another journey, those of the number who fast cause Dāḥiyya b. Khalīfa to say on his return, 'This is something I never expected to see, people avoiding the guidance of the Prophet and his companions'.4 Another report not directly involving the Prophet is that in which a passenger on a boat makes a point of deliberately eating immediately after setting sail, in order to emulate the sunna of the Prophet5.

Plainly Quran-based is a hadīth6 in which Anas is told by the Prophet of God's provisions concerning prayer and fasting during travel7. Also favourable to fiṭr, but with a qualification that is

---

1 But see Ijā'īyat al-Awliyā', 2/217: rakhkhṣa allāh laka fi-š-fiṭr wa-š-ṣāfār; a few other ḥadīths also mention the matter. See below.  
2 Māj. 1666, Nas. 60. 3 Mus. 100-1, Nas. 59. 4 Ḥan. 6/398, 6/7, AD bāb qadr maṣṭa rā yuoṭṭir fitr. 5 AD, bāb matā yuṭṭir al-muṣāfīr, Dār. 1720; cf. Tir. 799-800. 6 AD, bāb ikhtiyār al-fitr (similar are Nas. 57-8, Dār. 1719). 7 The fact that the topics are not combined more often indicates how low Quranic considerations rate in most of the ḥadīth discussions of this subject.
hard to assess, is the report in which, on a hot day, all broke on a journey with the exception of the Prophet and Ābdullāh b. Rawāḥa. There is nothing in the recorded biography of the latter⁴ that sheds any light on this; his inclusion apparently vitiates the otherwise obvious conclusion that the ḥadīth is intended to promote the cīma of the Prophet. There is a slight possibility that the phrase is an addition, somehow intended to demonstrate for abrogation purposes that the report is a late one, since Ābdullāh b. Rawāḥa was killed at Hu'ta, which is said to have taken place in Jumāda I, 8 A.H.². It may also be noted that he invited Abū Dardā', the last figure in the isnād of all versions⁵, into Islām⁴.

On the reluctance of the Prophet himself to break the fast, even though others were doing so, a parallel to the preceding ḥadīth can be found in Ḥan.3/46, where the Prophet is however eventually forced to break because of the obduracy of his emulators. He had originally claimed, 'I am not like you⁵, for I am riding, and (therefore) less exerted', but this did not stop those on foot from persisting in fasting.

It would appear that the Medina-Mecca journey theme was almost played out (or that the argument behind it was over), for there are no definitely new versions of it after Shāfi‘I's death, although certain ḥadīths do use the motif for a somewhat different purpose. This is that of showing that fiṭr is the best, and indeed the only, option, when one is close to the enemy. Thus from Abū Sa‘īd, in an

---

¹ See Sa‘d 21. ² Sa‘d 3 222. ³ Hus.103-9, AD bāb ikhtiyār al-ṣiyām, Māj.1663, Bukh.‘bāb’ (sic), Ḥan.5/194,6/444. ⁴ Sa‘d 7. ⁵ ‘innī lastu mithlukum'; this phrase also occurs in wīsāl ḥadīths. See above, p.245.
adaptation of the Kadīd story\(^1\). It seems that some were at pains to show that the order to break given by the Prophet in this ḥadīth was restricted to battle conditions only, for Abū Saʿīd is made to add that he fasted with the Prophet on a journey after this.

Another new ḥadīth\(^2\) of similar purpose is the one related by Jābir, concerning a man who while on a raid persisted in fasting, to the detriment of his general condition (probably the reason behind the prohibition in all the ḥadīths mentioning raids\(^3\)); the Prophet admonishes him, and asks if being 'Ī sabīl allāh is not enough (in terms of the heavenly reward to be gained). Interesting in that it appears to preserve an indication of the motive behind the habit of fasting on a raid is Saʻd 6/110: al-Nuhājir desired on the day of the battle of Tustar to dedicate himself to God; he was fasting (he was subsequently ordered to break).

Something of an anomaly is Saʻd 21100, possibly a relic of an earlier debate, since it is both simpler in form than, and counter to the sentiment of, comparable ḥadīths: the Prophet conquered Mecca in ten (days) of Rāmādān, fasting, travelling and mujāhid.

Occasionally travel is introduced into other ḥadīths in order to reinforce a point, or to enhance a reputation for piety: Abū Ṭalḥa used never to break during travel or illness\(^4\); Usāma, even on a journey, would never abandon his practice of fasting Mondays and Thursdays\(^5\). This last is exceptional in that it mentions a fast other than Rāmādān in connection with travel.

---

\(^1\) Saʻd 21100, Ḥan.3/35,3/87, AD bāb al-șawm fī-l-safar, Mṣb.102.
\(^2\) Ḥan.3/327,3/329.  \(^3\) And possibly indeed the Quranic provision itself. See p.46.
\(^4\) Ḥan.3/104.
\(^5\) Saʻd 4150.
As pointed out in the beginning of this section, the question of fasting while travelling seems to have been reckoned in the majority view to be a matter of a rukhā which it is better to accept if one suffers hardship through fasting. Despite a fairly clear ruling in the Quran, this consensus is arrived at through personal opinion, and the ḥadīths do little more than reflect the various facets of the latter. There is no great polemic element in the discussion, and possibly for that reason the majority of the numerous ḥadīths are relatively flat statements.

**Sawm al-dahr**

The discussion of sawm al-dahr is dominated in the post-Shāfī‘ī period by the ʿAbdullāh b. ʿAmr b. Ṭāṣ ḥadīth, which, briefly, seeks to reduce any tendency to fast dahr as much as possible, but which generally is altered so that ultimately it supports 'half of dahr', that is to say the fasting of alternate days, the so-called 'sawm Dā'ūd'. It exists in scores of recensions, the varying details of which will largely be ignored here.

Several of the motifs of the b. Ṭāṣ hadīth exist separately from the main report, notably the mention of the fast of David. Whether these motifs were always independent or not cannot now be ascertained. This seems unlikely, when, as in the case of the David hadīth, b. Ṭāṣ appears in the isnād: e.g. Ḥan. 6491, where David's fast of alternate days is said to be 'ahabb al-ṣiyām ilā allāh'. Tir. 770 has a note, apparently intended to corroborate the hadīth (though why this should be necessary is not clear), that baḍ

1 Bukh., bāb ḥaqq al-jism fī-l-ṣawm, and following abwāb, Mus. 181-3, 186-8, 191-3, Ḥan. 6477 and 22 more, Nas. 86-90. 2 Also Ḥāj. 1712, Mus. 189-90, Dār. 1759, Ḥan. 6921, 6534, 6789 (afḍal al-ṣawm), AD, bāb fī ʿawm/
ahl al-cilm any that the best fast is to fast one day and break one day. Tir. also notes that it is said that such is the hardest fast (sc. permitted in Islam?), which statement might be taken as a genuine opinion\(^1\), or else as a polemical assertion designed to back up the Prophet's claim to this effect.

Still on the subject of the alternate days of fasting and breaking attributed to David, it is interesting to note that in b. Sa'd there occur three references to Companions (and later figures) fasting alternate days, without any specific mention of David\(^2\). This would appear to indicate that there was a genuine practice of this type\(^3\), though when and where the name of David became associated with it is unclear\(^4\).

Greatly elaborating the David hadith is KU3015: David fasted one day and broke one day; his son Solomon fasted three days each at the beginning, middle and end of the month; Jesus fasted al-dahr; Mary fasted two days and broke one; Muhammad fasted three days per month. Not surprisingly, the hadith is deemed da'if. KU2949 gives the only variation in definition of the fast of David: he used to fast one day, and break two days: one day liqāq ‘ihi\(^5\), one day /yawm wa fiṭr yawm, Tir.770,Nas.86,76; Ḥan.2878 comes from b. ʿAbbās.  

\(^1\) A case could easily be made out for continued stopping and starting being more difficult than perpetual fasting.

\(^2\) b. ʿAwn, 726,b. Sirīn, 7145,Nakha'i, 6,192. Cf. also Bukh., bāb ʿawm yawm wa ifṭār yawm, Bai.301.  

\(^3\) Although it is possibly credited to these figures post mortem in order to enhance their reputations.

\(^4\) In Ḥilyat al-Awliyā', the David report is transmitted by Ka'b a-ʿAbbār. This is the only even partial confirmation of what would seem most probable, a Jewish origin.  

\(^5\) Meaning uncertain; possibly it here signifies the official duties of a qāḍī.
linisā'īhi.

Of the major varieties of the b. ĈAmr b. ĈĀqṣ, perhaps two are worth noting briefly; those in which the law of diminishing returns is invoked, and those in which Ĉabdullāh regrets not having accepted the rukhnā of the Prophet. This version, unlike the preceding, was not recorded in the period before Shāfi'ī's death.

A less common version offers an interesting parallel to the 'ġawm = wijū' idea: Ǧan.6764 (also 6477) mentions in the introduction to the body of the hadith that b. ĈAmr b. ĈĀqṣ was so preoccupied with fasting and prayer that he neglected a new wife of his. Also notable is Mus.188, where b. ĈAmr is admonished by the Prophet as usual, but does not make any reply: we are probably to assume that this time he accepted the Prophet's advice immediately. It would be tempting to consider this as the original of all the other b. ĈAmr hadiths, but the likelihood is that it is rather a later shortening.

The other main pre-Shāfi'ī anti-dārāh hadith only exists in one version in this period (Ṣacīd 7,58). This may be an indication that the hadith was seen not so much as against dārāh, but in favour of the three days' fast.

Also recorded earlier was the hadith claiming 'lā qa'm man qa'm al-dār al-abad', which is now generally from b. ĈAmr b. ĈĀqṣ, and the comparable assertion that he 'lā qa'm wa lā aftara', which usually comes from Muṭarrif. One recension has the otherwise unrec-

1 P.209 (Mus.192, Ǧan.7098,6775,6951,6545).
2 Nas.88,Mus.193,Bukh., bāḥ ḥaqq al-jīm fī-l-ġawm, Ṣacīd 4,2-9-10, Ǧan.6832,6877,7023. 3 P.280. 4 Concerning the unrecognizable beduin (above, p.208).
5 Ǧan.6257,6866,6789,6988,Ḥāj.1705,Mus.197,Nas.85,Ǧan.6/455 (from Asmā'). 6 Ṣan.4/24-5,Nas.81-3,Ḥāj.1705,Mus.197,Nas.85,Tir.767, Dār.1751.
ordered fuller phrase 'lā yuftir nahār al-dahr' (Han.4/426).

More ominous is Han.4/414: the Prophet said that he who fasts dahr will be grasped by hell.

Already noted as borrowing from the dahr themes to promote other fasts are the Shawwāl hadīths. Whether these can be considered as positively anti-dahr is debatable. Perhaps more definite are those which make a polemical redefinition of dahr (as do some of the b. Āmīr b. Ṭāq hadīths): ǧawm shahr al-gabr plus three days equals al-dahr, for example (Han.2/263,5/295).

The great number of hadīths dealing with dahr suggest that it was in fact probably quite widely practised, and indeed there are numerous reports in works such as Ḥilyat al-Āwliyā' of individuals fasting long periods (see further on this below). Besides the major hadīths mentioned above, which universally disapprove of dahr, even if some are able immediately afterwards to admit the fast of David, there are one or two lesser known hadīths, in the same vein.

Thus Zaid, bāb al-wiṣāl fi-l-qiyyām wa ǧawm al-dahr: the Prophet forbade perpetual fasting. (It may be doubted that this is a genuine hadith, but rather a distillation of hadith material). Nas.85: the Prophet was told of a man fasting dahr. He said, 'I wish he were never fed for eternity, and (I wish it) even more in the case of those fasting two-thirds or half of dahr. Fast instead three days per month. That will banish spiritual heaviness'.

From b. ʿUmar: O Prophet, what of one who fasts two days and breaks one (two-thirds of dahr)? The Prophet replies, 'Can anyone do that?' What of one day's fast, and one day's break? 'That is David's fast'. What of one day's fast, and two day's break? 'I wish

1 Cf. Bai.300. 2 AD, bāb fī ǧawm Shawwāl, Ṣāḥ.1716,Tīr.759, ʿUmar.204,Ḥan.5/417,Ṭār.761. 3 Ṣāḥ.1713,Nas.85,Us.197,AD, bāb fī ǧawm al-dahr taḥawwūl, Us.196.
I could do that'. This ḥadīth is plainly anti-dahr, and also cool towards the fast of David.

It is interesting that several ḥadīths discuss the details of ẓawm al-dahr, despite its being universally condemned, in the ḥadīth at least. These have been partially mentioned earlier, and treat the question of whether or not dahr should include Adḥā, Fiṭr and Tashrīq. Some say that by breaking on these days, one escapes the kirāhiyya attaching to ẓawm al-dahr (Tir. 767, KU2837). Others will not accept this, and say that dahr means not breaking except on these five days. From b. ʿAmr b. ʿĀq (again!), we have the information that Noah used to fast dahr, except fiṭr and adḥā.

It was noted above that b. Saʿd recorded some who practised the fast of David: similarly, he has a number of brief notes, apparently biographical rather than ḥadīth-type in most cases, about various persons who fasted dahr: Ṭrāk b. Mālik (Medinese, 5/188); Saʿd b. Nusayyib (5/94, 98); ʿAbdullāh b. Buhaɪma (Meccan, 4/65); al-Aswād (Kūfan, 6/46-7); ʿA'isha (8/47). There is also one from b. Ḥanbal; Abū Ṭalḥa (3/104). As with the David-fasters, one cannot be sure how historically accurate such information is; no doubt much of it represents the notions of pious hagiographers, but nevertheless, the contrast between this kind of material, and the condemnation of the dahr fast in the ḥadīth, is very marked. Other reports in b. Saʿd mention individuals who have fasted great numbers of years; this kind of practice is obviously close to the dahr fast, even if technically it cannot be called such.

Sometimes in bāb-headings and discussions of long periods of fasting, and less frequently in ḥadīth itself, the expression sard/

---

1 Māj. 1714, KU2302. It may be remembered that Noah was also credited by one report with the founding of ʿAshūrā'. 2 E.g. Saʿd 6/235, 5/305. 3 Saʿd 6/47, 5/94, 5/134, Nas. 79 et al.
/yasrud\(^1\) al-ṣawm is used. It does not appear that there is any practical difference between dahr and sard, insofar as either of them is capable of accurate definition - it is evident that prolonged fasting may range from an extension of Ramaḍān as popularly practised, to permanent semi-starvation. Ṣawm al-dahr is also mentioned occasionally in a rhetorical fashion, as something extremely difficult\(^2\).

**Wisāl**

After Šaybān's death, the discussion of wisāl in fasting reveals a considerable variation in the definition of this practice. The varying degrees of severity provoke a number of different responses from the lawyers, though in general they tend to regard the practice with disfavour.

The discussions are dominated by the Prophetic ḥadīth\(^3\), in which the Prophet forbids wisāl to his followers, claiming meanwhile that in his own wisāl he receives divine sustenance\(^4\); several other themes exist by the side of this main ḥadīth. It is received from five companions, c‘A‘isha\(^5\), b. c‘Umar\(^6\), Anas\(^7\), Abū Huraira\(^8\), and

\(^1\) See below, p.341.  \(^2\) E.g. Tir.723, Māj.1672, Dār.1721-2, Ḥan.2/386, AD, bāb al-taghlīq fī man aftara Ramaḍān.  \(^3\) P.245.  
\(^4\) Tūsī 180 appears to borrow from this ḥadīth: God feeds and waters the faster in his sleep.  \(^5\) Mus.61, Bukh., bāb al-wisāl.  
\(^6\) Bukh., bāb al-wisāl, Ḥan.4721, 4752, 5197, 5795, 6125, 6299, 6413, Mus. 55-6, AD, bāb fi-l-wisāl. Cf. Tir.778.  \(^7\) Ḥan.3/170, 3/197-8, Tir. 778, Dār.1711, Bukh., bāb al-wisāl.  \(^8\) Ḥan.7326, 7431, 7539, 7228, Dār.1710. Other versions of this (e.g. Ḥan.7486, Mus.68) add 'fa‘ak-lifū min al-a‘māl mā lahum bihi ṭāqa'.
Abū Saʿīd1: their respective versions do not apparently differ greatly, although, as shown below, some have noteworthy additions.

Three2 of b. ʿUmar’s ḥadīths add 'in Ramaḍān', and this is clearly significant. While there are no grounds for disapproving of ṭiṣāl in general, a Muslim may reasonably argue that the Quran3 suggests that the night of Ramaḍān may not be fasted, and so a distinction is sometimes drawn between that month and the rest of the year. In support of this is the maxim 'lā ṣiyām fī-l-lail', now also recorded in ḥadīth form4. KU2311: God prescribed no fast in the night-time, and he who so fasts, disobeys, and has no reward.

Another Quranic consideration, that of 'yurīd allāh bikum al-yuṣṭ' (Q2/187), may be behind the addition of the phrase 'raḥmatan lakum' after the prohibition of ṭiṣāl5.

The ḥaṣṣā'īṣ ḥadīth is strengthened in some versions from Abū Huraira and Anas. The standard ḥadīth is retailed, with the addition that some of the people are said to have ignored the prohibition. The Prophet then determines to put them in their place, and enters upon ṭiṣāl with them. However, the month comes to an end6, and the Prophet then says that if the month had lasted longer, he would have outlasted them. This remark, the ḥadīth points out in conclusion, was of the nature of a reprimand - 'ka’l-munakkil bihim', or similar7.

---

1 Ḥan.3/30,3/57. 2 Ḥan.5795,4721,Mus.56. Cf. also Mus.60. 3 Q2/187. See above, p.105. 4 See Bukh., tarjama of bāb al-ṭiṣāl, and b. Ịjar on this. 5 E.g. at Mus.61. See also Bukh., bāb al-ṭiṣāl, ḥadīth from ʿAʾishah. 6 We must assume that Ramaḍān is meant, and it is specifically mentioned in Mus.60. 7 Abū Huraira: Ḥan.2/281,Dār.1713,Mus.57,Bukh., bāb al-tankīl. Anas: Bukh., bāb al-tankīl, tarjama, Mus.59-60. Ḥan.3/200 ends 'liyadāʾ al-mutakammiqūn taʾammuqahum'.
Compare here one of Bukhārī’s tarjamas, ‘al-tankīl li-ma‘n ‘akthara al-wiṣāl’, which seems to suggest that perhaps wiṣāl in moderation is acceptable. It is anyway more than the two days and one night of the earlier definition noted in Shaibānī, though this may well have been a minimum.

This dislike of wiṣāl is echoed in various simple ḥadīths which state briefly that the Prophet said there was no wiṣāl in fasting, or that he forbade it.

Perhaps because of the difference between Ramadān and other months, there is some variation of opinion about the status of wiṣāl among the orthodox, whose principal ḥadīth is the khaṣā‘iṣ one (thus Tir.778; 'It is generally, adopted'): they are uncertain whether to consider it forbidden or merely makrūh. Thus b. Ḫajar, on Bukh., būb al-wiṣāl: 'The schools are divided between taḥrīm and kirāhiyya'.

Tir.778's būb-heading is 'kirāhiyyat al-wiṣāl li-l-ṣā'im', while Dar.1710 is headed 'al-nahy 'an al-wiṣāl'. As pointed out earlier, a further division can be made between those who respectively consider the nahy as absolute, or desirable.

In the Lailā imrā'at Bāshīr Ḥadīth (Tay.1125), the Jews were held up as a people who practised wiṣāl, thus constituting an example not to be followed by the Muslims. Now however the Jews are replaced by the Christians, and the ḥadīth ends 'so follow God's command in the Quran'. The lack of consistency concerning the party not to be imitated suggests that this detail is but circumstantial padding, and that the report is merely another expression of the Quran-based (or Quran-rationalised) antipathy to wiṣāl.

The variation at the 'disapproved' end of the scale is quite

---

2 P.105.
3 Ḥan.5/225. Cf. also Tir.778, and b. Ḫajar ad Bukh., būb al-wiṣāl.
separate from the larger difference of opinion between the disapp-
rovers in general and those who were in favour of wisal. This diff-
ERENCE is recorded in the ḥadīths, but is ignored by the compilers.
The most widespread argument in favour of the practice is a perversion of the khaṣṣ'īs ḥadīth, which would indicate that the dispute over wisal, having had a long history in the ḥadīth, was still cap-
able of development. In the favourable reports, from Abū Sa'īd, there is inserted after the Prophet's nahy the phrase, 'If you wish to practise wisal, do so until the sahr'. This reveals that wisal is not always the complete abstinence suggested by the Shaibānī definition, which of course could not be maintained for very long. The ḥadīth represents a compromise, but presumably did not worry the orthodox unduly as it makes no specific mention of Ramaḍān. Ḥan.3/96 presents the same conclusion in a slightly different way: the Prophet forbade wisal, but his Companions did not cease doing it until he made a rukhṣa for them, al-saḥr ilā al-saḥr. Ḥan.1194, from 'Alī, a new figure in wisal ḥadīths, says that the Prophet used to practise wisal from saḥr to saḥr, something which none of the other reports ever claim. This ḥadīth does not seem to have been much noticed, for it is never specifically attacked, in spite of its content which is variance with the majority ḥadīths. These favourable opinions recorded in b. Ḥanbal are perhaps relatively early, for they contain

1 Under laboratory conditions, however, a fast of one month is quite feasible with a healthy individual, water being taken in limited quantities throughout this period (Benedict).

2 Bukh., bāb al-
wisāl ilā al-saḥr, Dār.1712, Ḥan.3/8,3/87, Ad, bāb toISOString-

3 There would naturally be little difficulty in 'harmonising' it with the khaṣṣ'īs ḥadīth, by claiming it represented the Prophet's unique action, rather than a sunna to be followed.
nothing to counter the 'lā ṣīyām fī-l-lail' idea which the orthodox upheld.

Also capable of being regarded as favourable are some ḥadīths from ʿAbdulrahmān b. Abī Lailā, although possibly they are intended to demonstrate that the Prophet intended a naḥy rather than a tahrīm: the Prophet only forbade wiṣāl (and ḥijāma) as a mercy to his companions, and he did not declare them ḥarām. Some of these ḥadīths are remarkable in that they use muwāṣala instead of wiṣāl, the only occurrence of this in ḥadīth.

On the favourable side may be mentioned finally a solitary companion ḥadīth, at Tir.778: ʿAbdullāh b. al-Zubair used to 'yuwaqil al-aṣyām wa lā yuṭfir' - apparently running several days together, rather than practising saḥr-wiṣāl.

The general impression gained from the above is that there was a considerable unwillingness to abandon wiṣāl (probably in both the severe and the saḥr form), even though the orthodox, who came to be guided by their interpretation of the Quran, disliked or prohibited the practice. While the Quran does not in so many words prohibit wiṣāl, it certainly appears that its intention is to counter it, at least in the saḥr form, and as such represents a reaction to the method currently in force in Muhammad's Medina. It is uncertain whether we may assume that those in favour of wiṣāl in Islam were influenced by a Jewish model; the one ḥadīth that mentions other religions is not very conclusive, and the nature of wiṣāl is such that as a practice it could have evolved as an ascetic activity independently of any outside influence.

---

Ta'jīl al-iftār

The first thing to be noted in the post-Shāfi‘ī discussion of ta'jīl al-iftār is the virtually complete disappearance of the opposition voice in ḥadīth form. The sole exception to this is Sa'd 5114, the Ĉūmar and Ĉūthmān ḥadīth (Māl.8), which is apparently just a relic, as it has made no advance in form or content since being impugned by Shāfi‘ī; it is still at the companion level. The contrasting proliferation of the favourable ḥadīths may however indicate that there was still some opposition, unless it can be shown that such proliferation is partly due to differences on a level of detail, for example, that of how much the iftār may be advanced.

At the openly polemical level, there survives yet the Sahl b. Sa'd 'lä yazāl al-nūs bi-khair mā cajjalū al-fiṭr' ḥadīth1, which is also recorded from Abū Hurairā2, with the explicit addition, 'the Jews delay it'. Of slightly stronger wording is AD būb mā yustaḥabb min ta'jīl al-fiṭr3: Lā yazāl al-dīn zāhiran mā cajjala al-nūs al-fiṭr li-anna al-yahūd wa-l-naṣārā yu'akhkhirūnahu. The introduction of the Christians is probably a purely adventitious addition, for the sake of completeness: there is no evidence of its being based on fact. KU2279 has the simple version of this ḥadīth, with the addition 'wa lam yu'akhkhirūhu ta'khīra ahl al-mashriq'. A series of ḥadīths in KU (2777-9), from Ĉūmar, not the Prophet, endorse this observation: the ahl al-ĈIrāq, who wait for the appearance of the stars before breaking their fast, are held up as a bad example. Even if we assume these 'people' to be Muslims, there can be little doubt that their alleged bad practice is the result of influence from the

---

1 Ĉf. earlier, p.251. Mus.48, Tir.699, Māj.1697, Dār.1706, Bukh., bāb ta'jīl al-iftār. 2 Cf. the a'jaluhum ḥadīths, below: Māj. 1698, cf. Tir.699, KU2257. 3 Also Ĉan.2/450.
Jews - the mention of the stars points to this. In the more regular hadīth is a sentiment which echoes this: ʿlā taẓāl ummatī al-aʿlā sunnatī mâ lam tantaẓir bifiṭrīhim al-nujūm.

Also recommending taẓāl in a general fashion is a new hadīth, also from Abū Huraira: God says, 'aḥabbu cībūḍ ilayya aʿjlaluhum fiṭrān'. Another hadīth of comparable intention is Saʿd 1:104: the Prophet says, 'It is the habit of us prophets to practise taẓāl al-iftār and taʾkhir al-suhūr (and other things)'. The mention of former prophets need not be taken as in any way factual - it is merely a strengthening device.

Another hadīth left over from pre-Shafiʿī times, and also showing signs of development, is the Abū Ḥāṭiyya and Masrūq hadīth, in which these two ask a wife of the Prophet about two persons who act in opposite ways on certain matters. The two activities are now however taẓāl al-iftār and taẓāl al-ṣalāt versus their taʾkhir, as opposed to the earlier taẓāl al-iftār and taʾkhir al-suhūr. The ṣalāt in question is almost certainly the one closest to iftar time, the maghrib, which is in fact mentioned in Mus.50. Similarly Ḥan.5/421: Pray the maghrib when fitr comes, and precede the rising of the stars. The introduction of prayer, a move which destroys the balance of the earlier taẓāl iftār - taʾkhīr suḥūr hadīth, is clearly designed to settle a question that for Shaibānī at least had been quite optional.

---

1 b. Ḥajar, on Bukh., bāb taẓāl al-iftār, cf. AD Ṣalāt 99, Nais.434.
2 Ḥan.7240,3/329, Tir.700-1. 3 There is no obvious reason for this being a 'qudsī' hadīth.
4 The Bai.238 version of this commences, 'We Prophets were ordered to speed the iftār.'
5 Cf. Ṭay.1512; Mus.49,50, AD, bāb mā yustahabb min taẓāl al-iftār, Tir.702, Ḥan.6/48. 6 Except in some versions: e.g. Nas.24.
It may therefore be the case that the question of the timing of this prayer became acute only after Shaibānī's time. As in Tayyilisī, the party in this ḥadīth who acted in line with the Prophetic precedent is claimed to be b. Masʿūd, which possibly indicates a Kūfan origin for the ḥadīth; Tir.702, Mus.49 and Nas.23c all name the other party as Abū Mūsā, of Kūfa and Baṣra.

So far little attempt has been made in the ḥadīths quoted to establish any precise time for the ifṭār. More definite are two other ḥadīths which attempt to delimit how far taʿjil should be taken. As indicated above, this is the only apparent area of conflict in this period.

In the first type, from ʿUmar, the Prophet says, 'When night approaches, and day retreats, and the sun sets, then the faster may break'. The time here intended for the ifṭār is of course governed by what is meant by 'sets' (ghābat/gharibat). Bukh., bāb matā yuḥi ili fiṭr al-ṣā'im, tarjama, offers some information that may be intended either to explain or correct this hadīth: Abū Saʿīd Khudrī used to break when the disc (qurs) of the sun disappeared (ghāb).

The ʿUmar ḥadīth also exists in a version that omits the sunset phrase, and may perhaps be the more original of the two.

The ḥadīth of the second type is somewhat longer, and incorporates elements of the preceding one. It is from ʿAbdullāh b. Abī Awfārī, and a typical version (Bukhārī, bāb matā, etc.) runs: We were with the Prophet on a journey (this is not apparently significant here): he was fasting. When the sun set, he called for some jadh to eat. They said, 'It is not yet evening' (bis). At the third request, the jadh was made 'for the Prophet, and he then said, 'When you see

1 Mus.51, Ḥan.231,358, Dār.1707, Tir.698, AD, bāb waqt fiṭr al-ṣā'im, Bukh., bāb matā yuḥi ili fiṭr al-ṣā'im. 2 Ḥan.192,383, AD, bāb waqt fiṭr al-ṣā'im. (tarj.), Tir.698.
the night approaching from here, then break. The message of the ḥadīth does not seem to be greatly different from the preceding one. Neither one affords much precision, but suggests that as soon as it begins to get dark in the East, one may break, however much light remains in the West. The mention of the night is probably conditioned by the Quranic 'thumma atimmū al-ṣiyām ilā al-lail'.

Tir.699 mentions that there are hadīths on this subject from b. ʿAbbās and Anas b. Mālik, but it seems that these are not extant.

Although not susceptible of conclusive proof or denial, there is a suspicion that just as the suḥūr of popular practice was and is taken much earlier than is suggested by the ḥadīth, so popular practice delayed ifṭār to a period when there was no doubt about the night's having arrived. The ḥadīths are thus not much more than polemic, and the materials of academic argument, rather than practical guides.

Suḥūr

The discussions of suḥūr are more extensive than those of ifṭār. This may be attributed to the fact that not only is a time being discussed, but here an institution as well.

Thus a number of ḥadīths have for their purpose the recommendation of suḥūr as a practice. The quantity of these recommendations leads to the suspicion that perhaps some persons were omitting the meal; such a habit could be identified with a kind of wiqlī, rather than a positive dislike of the suḥūr, for there are no anti-suḥūr.

1 Similar are Mus.52-4, Bukh., bāb taqīl al-ifṭār, AD, bāb waqt fiṭr al-ṣū'īm; cf. Tir.698, Ḥan.4/380, Bukh., bāb al-ṣawm fi l-safar wa l-ifṭār.
The best example is the Prophetic hadīth, known also before Shāfi’ī’s death: tasāḥharū, fa’īnna fī 1-sūḥūr baraka. 3

A similar hadīth is e.g. Nas.26: I heard the Prophet giving an invitation to sūḥūr in the month of Ramaḍān, saying, ‘Come to the blessed meal (al-ghadā’ al-mubūrak)’. 4 The fact that ghadā’ commonly refers to the midday meal rather than something earlier, as the root meaning would suggest, possibly gave rise to the explanation that the Prophet called the sūḥūr a ghadā’ because it replaces the midday meal omitted during a fast.

More insistent, perhaps significantly so, upon the eating of sūḥūr in the month of Ramaḍān is Nas.25: the Prophet when taking sūḥūr said, ‘It is a baraka 6 given to you by God, so do not omit it’. Other versions 7 add, ‘even if it be only a gulp of water; God and his angels pray over the mutasahāhirūn.’ Zaid, bāb al-sūḥūr wa faḍ- lihi, adds that the one who takes sūḥūr will be throughout the day ‘shāb‘ān nan rāyyānan’ from its baraka.

This insistence on even a token sūḥūr (cf. here Ḥan.3/379: ‘wa

---

1 The Bukh. tarjama which claims that the sūḥūr and its baraka is not wājib, since the Prophet practised wīṣāl and did not then mention sūḥūr, is surely hypothetical.
2 In Tay.2006 this ‘fī’ is omitted. This is possibly a printing error, as subsequently it is always present.
4 Cf. also Nas.27,Ḥan.4/126,AD, bāb man sammā al-sūḥūr ghadā’.
5 Similar is Ḥan.5/367.
6 Cf. KU2852: allāhumma būrik li- ummatī fī suḥūrihiḥ.
7 Ḥan.3/44,3/12; cf. also Zaid, bāb al-sūḥūr, etc., KU2354-6.
law bi-shay') probably indicates that here the realisation that the taking of the suhûr is a polemical act is to the fore. In this respect other ḥadîths¹ are more explicit: the Prophet said, 'The difference between our fast and that of Ahl al-Kitâb is the saḥr meal'. Similar is Dār. 1704², reinforcing the claim that even a morsel of food is sufficient. Zaid, bāb al-suḥûr, etc., has the Christians in place of the Jews, but why this alteration should have occurred is not clear. At KU2361, the message is expressed very concisely: tasāḥharû wa khâlifû ahl al-kitâb. Ibn Ḥajar, on Bukh., bāb ta'khîr al-suḥûr, mentions this idea of mukhālafat ahl al-kitâb, and also the fact that the suhûr strengthens the faster in mind and body; this practical side of the suhûr is probably so self-evident that it scarcely needs mentioning. Certainly only a few ḥadîths deal with it specifically. For example, Mâj. 1693: Make use of the food of the saḥûr against the fast of the day, and use the qailûla against the qiyām of the night. KU has several similar ḥadîths on this subject³, which mention in addition that a touch of perfume strengthens one for the fast.

In the same way as some ḥadîths recommend special faṭûrs, one or two mention preferable saḥûr foods: Nas. 29: tamr, sawīq⁴.

Most of the rest of the ḥadîths are concerned with ascertaining the time of the saḥûr.

Some merely recommend its ta'khîr, as in the case of those which treat the question jointly with that of the ifṭâr⁵.

The majority attempt to fix the time of the suhûr either by

¹ E.g. Tir. 708-9, KU2362. ² Also Ḥan. 4/197, Nas. 28, Hus. 46, AD, bāb tawkîd al-suḥûr. ³ 2357-9. ⁴ Cf. also Ḥan. 5/192, 3/197, AD, bāb man sammâ al-suḥûr ghadā'. ⁵ Mentioned above under ifṭâr, e.g. Nas. 24, Saʿod 1, 104.
describing the appearance of the sky at the appropriate point in
time, or determining its relation to the first prayer of the day.
The Bilal ḥadīth, noted earlier, generally combines both of these
devices. In it the believers are instructed to ignore the adhān of
Bilal and to wait for that of b. Umm Maktūm. This motif suffers an
inversion at Sa′d 4.154. This is probably merely chance. It is
scarcely the original, since earlier versions are shorter; the evi-
dent euphony of 'innamā yu'adhāhin Bilāl bi-lail' is lost. Simple
versions of the regular ḥadīth are numerous. In others, the Prophet
tells the people to ignore Bilal's adhān and also the false dawn
('ḥādha al-bayyā'). and to stop eating only when 'al-fajr al-mustāfīr'
appears. This is clearly an adaptation of the previous ḥadīth, for
the mention of Bilal is somewhat bereft of meaning unless followed
by an explanatory clause such as is supplied by the action of b. Umm
Maktūm. There is one ḥadīth which recognises this weakness; in it
Bilal is told that he is making the adhān at the false dawn, thus
giving good reason why he should not be followed. Similarly, Ḥan.
3/140 gives Bilal's 'defective vision' as reason why his adhān should
be ignored. Other ḥadīths show the people restraining b. Umm Maktūm
until after they had finished their meal, and then saying to him
'qad asbahta'. These are perhaps intended to show that b. Umm Maktūm
too was precipitate in his adhān, or represent a fairly extreme view,
that the adhān should only be made when the suhūr is finished, how-

1 Ḥan.6/433, Tūsī.190, Sa′d 4.152. 2 Possibly a pious emendation,
countering any implication that one of the Prophet's muezzins was
always wrong. 3 Ḥan.4551,5195,5285,5316,5424,5498,5852,6050, Mus.
36-7. 4 Cf. earlier material, p.254. Mus.41-4, Tir.706, Nas.32, Ḥan.
6 Cf. Tay.1661, KU2849. 7 Ḥan.6051,6/433, Sa′d 4.152, 8/265.
-over late that might be.

In hadiths such as AD, bāb fī waqt al-suḥūr\(^1\), there is a repetition of the earlier rationalisation of the difference between the two muezzins: Bilāl's adhān is merely to wake the sleeper, rather than to summon to prayer. These hadiths generally conclude with the Prophet making a gesture of the hands apparently again countering the false dawn, in favour of the more widely spreading later dawn. The same distinction between the dawns is also drawn in e.g. Tir. 705\(^2\), where the latter dawn is described as red. This hadith is apparently of an independent strain - it contains no mention of Bilāl, etc. AD observes that it comes from Ahl al-Yamāma, which perhaps accounts for this. Baihaqi 216\(^3\) distinguishes the two dawns in another way: one of them 'lla yuḥtīm al-ṭaḥām wa lā yuḥill al-salāt', while the other has the opposite effect. KU2840 is a rather curious hadith in which someone appears to be attempting to delay the dawn by wishful thinking: Abū Bakr used to say to Sālim b. Ṣubaid, 'Stand between me and the dawn until I have had my saḥūr'.

The harmonisation of the Bilāl/b. Umm Maktūm hadith\(^4\), a pious emendation claiming that in spite of their difference, there was but a short period separating the two adhāns, is still recorded\(^5\). The 'controversy'\(^6\) surrounding the two muezzins, which originally had quite clear motives\(^7\), seems to have been sidetracked by complications

\(^1\) Ịṣan.3654,3717,4147,Nas.32,ṣaḥ.1696,Hus.39-40, b. Ḥajar on Bukh., bāb qawl al-nabī lā yamnaṣṣānākum, etc. 
\(^2\) Also Ịṣan.4/23,AD, bāb fī waqt al-suḥūr. 
\(^3\) Also Nais.425. 
\(^4\) Tay.1661. 
\(^5\) Hus.38,Saʿd 8/265,Bukh., bāb qawl al-nabī lā yamnaṣṣānākum, etc. 
\(^6\) The non-historicity of the Bilāl issue is clearly indicated by its non-appearance in the relevant section in b. Saʿd. 
\(^7\) Cf. above, p.255.
and rationalisations which eventually concealed the purpose of the original Bilāl ḥadīth, which presumably had been to show that the saḥūr may be taken even after the adhān. For this reason, other ḥadīths developed, along fresh lines, for example, Bukh., bāb qadrīkum baina al-saḥūr, etc.: we had saḥūr with the Prophet, then got up to pray. The question is asked, 'How much time was there between the adhān and the suḥūr?', to which the reply is '50 Ḥāyāt'1. That these replace the Bilāl/b. Umm Ḥakīm ḥadīths is probable, since they have the same message, i.e. that the suḥūr may come after the adhān, but before the prayer. Similar in intent is Bukh., bāb ta'khīr al-suḥūr: Sahl b. Saʿīd says, 'I used to take saḥūr with my family, and my pace was such that I would arrive to perform my prostration along with the Prophet'. Ḥan.6/13 apparently shows the Prophet eating his saḥūr rather later, when he was actually in the mosque, but the intention may rather be to demonstrate that the eating of saḥūr in the mosque is permissible2, without specification of time.

A few new ḥadīths continue to make reference to the state of the sky in order to establish the time, and they convey virtually the same message as before: Māj.16953: I had saḥūr with the Prophet; it was day, except that the sun had not come up.

The picture that emerges from the foregoing ḥadīths is not clear as regards differences of opinion about the time of the suḥūr: taken as a whole, they reveal a general tendency to advocate the leaving of

---

1 Cf. also Nas.22-3,29,Dār.1702,Ḥan.3/170,3/197,5/185,5/195,Mus.47,
Māj.1694,Tir.703-4. Compare here Nas.21 from Ḥudhaifa, which suggests that it was but a 'ḥunāiha' between his suḥūr and the start of prayer.
2 Perhaps for those maintaining all-night vigils in the mosque.
3 Cf. also Nas.21,Ḥan.5/400.
the eating of the meal until fairly late. It seems that the polemical urge to flout the caution of, for example, the Jews, a clear parallel to the taqjil al-fitr, was behind this tendency, for a hadith such as AD, būb fī al-rajuš yasma' al-nidā', etc., which is not connected with suḥūr by name, gives the lie to much of what has gone before: 'If one hears the adhān while the cup is at one's lips, one may quench one's thirst before putting it down'. This implies a much greater regard for the adhān, and, it is suggested, matches the actual state of affairs more closely than the various proposals for disregarding the adhān outlined in the Bilāl hadiths. Besides this, there is the clear evidence of modern practice, that the suṣūr precedes by a considerable margin the time when any doubt may occur as to whether or not it is yet night. In this respect b. Ḫajar is interesting: One of the bad things of the present day is the additional adhān twenty minutes before dawn, for ihtiyāt. Also relevant is the comment of b. al-Ḥājj on 'tashīr': Some evil people take saḥūr in the middle of the night; it is intended as a strengthener against the day, therefore take it late.....It is anyway wrong to eat at this time of night, since vapours rise to the brain, and the resulting sleep prevents one from keeping the night vigil. He rejects the claim that an early suḥūr avoids the danger of eating after dawn: everyone, he says, lives near enough to a mosque to know the right time. He also denounces the practices used in certain countries to announce the approaching day.

---

1 See above, p.257.  2 On Bukh., būb taqjil al-ifṭār.
3 P.259 (vol.2).  4 Musical instruments, singing, etc. These detract from the ihtirām due to Ramāqān.
al-Sawm can al-mayyit

In the case of al-gawm can al-mayyit, it may be remembered that the earliest recorded opinions were disapproving. However, there was also a somewhat later hadīth, Ṭay.2630, which sets the pattern for much of the subsequent argument: A woman’s sister vows to fast a month, and then dies at sea. The Prophet tells the sister, "qūmī canhū". Mus.157-8, Tir. Zakāt 31 are similar; some recensions have 'two months' instead of one (but see what follows). The precise significance of the fast being a vow is not clear. It is notable that in every case the deceased as well as the relict is female. A parallel may perhaps be made here with the Mālik/Nud. question of a woman vowing to fast for eternity: possibly women were more in the habit of making vows in general.

The same opinion on sawm can al-mayyit is upheld by the concise AD 302 fīman māta wa alaihi siyām, from Qurwa-‘Alīsha: man māta wa alaihi siyām, qāma canhū waliyuhu. In his tarjama, Bukh. quotes a saying from al-‘Iṣāṣan that a month’s fast may be performed by 30 persons in one day. Apparently b. Wahb also knew this hadīth, but with a shorter isnād. Other works, such as the Istibṣur 108-110, uphold the 'wali' idea, but the principle is qualified by e.g. Ťūsī 196, where the wali only fasts if there is not enough money in the deceased's estates to provide sadaqa.

In another hadīth employing a woman, the mother of another woman, the Prophet is asked if qaḍā' may be made on behalf of the dead person. The Prophet draws a qiyyās with a debt, suggesting that

1 Ḥan.3137,1861. 2 Also Mus.153, Bukh., bāb man māta wa alaihi gawm, Ḥan.6/69. 3 But it does not appear to be in e.g. the Mudawwana. 4 Bukh., bāb man māta wa alaihi gawm. 5 In Bukh., bāb man māta wa alaihi gawm, Tir.716-7, the sister.
qaḍā' should be made, for 'dāin allāh (sc. the missed fast) aḥaqq an yuqqā'1.

The above ḥadīth would appear at first sight, in its use of the word qaḍā' to refer to qaḍā' Ramadān. However, referring back to the wālī ḥadīth, we find that according to AD bāb fīman māta wa ʿalaihi qiyaʾm this refers to a vow. The same opinion occurs later in AD, where b. ʿAbbās, who figures in some isnāds of the 'aḥaqq' and 'ṣūmī ʿanḥā' ḥadīths, says that the wālī fasts in the case of a vow, having previously stated that if the outstanding fast is overdue Ramadān, then ḳām and not fast is the wālī's duty. This is obviously intended to harmonise the preceding ḥadīths favourable to fasting with the ḳām ḥadīths, of which there are now only two2. Tir. 718 notes anonymously the earlier b. ʿUmar doctrine that no-one should fast on another's behalf, but this viewpoint is not otherwise now well represented. It is not clear that the distinction between a vowed fast and that of Ramadān was ever a valid one.

A somewhat later opinion, vigourously in favour of fasting on behalf of a dead person, comes from Ḥilyat al-Awliyā' 9/54.

It is difficult to account for the shift of opinion in this matter, towards an acceptance of fasting on behalf of persons deceased, unless it is simply a lawyer's extension by qiyaʾs of the debt principle to which no-one found a convincing reply, at least in ḥadīth.

On a less legalistic note, it may be observed that some felt not unnaturally that to die fasting was an esteemed way of leaving this world3. Ḥilya, 5/23: the Prophet said, 'He whose death coincides

---

2 Cf. earlier, p. 258. Māj. 1757, Tir. 718. 3 Though others differed on this point: see below, p. 396.
with the end of Ramadān will enter Paradise.'

Not related specifically to the dead, but of interest here, is the report in Ḥilya 1/269, which is apparently opposed to performing religious duties for others; it claims that the secret 'shirk' is to fast or pay ṣadaqa on another's behalf. (li-rajulin).

**Hijāma**

Although there is not much room for development or diversification of opinions on the question of cupping, there are one or two new features to be noted in the ḥadīth material.

The doubt, expressed by Shafiʿī with the words 'in thabata', as to the soundness of the ḥadīths, exists no longer, and meanwhile the companion ḥadīths have largely faded from the scene.

The principal favourable ḥadīth of former years is still strong. In its basic form, 'iḥṭajama al-nabī wa huwa qā'im', it is known to Bukhārī and others. More useful, from the abrogation point of view, is the version which adds 'wa huwa muḥrim'. Most explicit in the dating of this iḥṭijām is Tir.774, where the event is said to have taken place during the Ḥijjat al-Wadā, which, given the orthodox biography of the Prophet, the other ḥadīths must imply also.

Some ḥadīths add a phrase which seems to imply that the cupping took place on a journey, or in a particular place: Ḥan.1943, Tir.777 - between Mecca and Medina; Ḥan.2186 - in al-Qāḥa. The introduction of the question of travelling is clearly deliberate, but seems inappropriate to the matter of hijāma. It is therefore likely

1 There are occasionally exceptions to this: see Tir.774.

2 Again, an exception may be made: Bukh.46, tarj. 3 Bukh.47, Tir.774, 776, Ḥan.2536,2594,2716, AD al-rukhṣa fī al-qā'im yaḥtajim.

3 As before, p.260. AD al-rukhṣa, Ḥan.1849,2589,Saʿd 11144, Māj.1682, Tir.775.
that it arises not through any physical connection with the practice of cupping, but as a counter to those opposition hadiths which depict the Prophet on a journey, purely as an incidental detail. The theme of the journey appears also in Sahîd 227, an unrelated hadith which offers a commonsense reason for cupping: the Prophet used, if suffering at all, to cup. He once set out for Mecca, and when he assumed his ihâm, he felt unwell, so he cupped. All these hadiths, excluding the last one, come through b. 'Abbâs, and most have as their second guarantor Miqsam.

In a version reported in Sahîd 8/96, the Prophet marries as well as cups while in ihâm. It may therefore be the case that the hijâmah hadiths mentioning ihâm derive this theme from the reports claiming that he married at this time¹, a more important matter, and one perhaps more likely to be the model than the question of hijâmah.

Also favourable is AD 58, a new hadith, but which has a defective isnâd² and which only occurs once. It combines three issues in one hadith: the Prophet said, 'Neither he who vomits, nor he who ejaculates, nor he who cups, breaks his fast.'

Other hadiths allow the faster to cup, but only when he is not fasting, i.e. at night, or at least towards the end of the day. Thus Kh. p. 106: the Prophet cupped after the 'aqr while fasting. KU2736: the Prophet while fasting called for a cupper, and said, 'Wait until after the sun has set'. KU2731: Abû Müsâ cupped at night, not wishing to do so by day lest he disobey the Prophet's utterance 'aftâra al-hâjim wa-l-mahjûm'.

Other qualifications, perhaps implicit in some of the foregoing hadiths, include the Mâlik view, that hijâmah is lawful unless undue weakness (leading to iftâr) could result. This is now embodied in a

¹ See e.g. Sahîd 8/96-7. ² Rajul - rajul. ³ Cf. KU2214-5.
⁴ Cf. Tarj. Bukh. 46.
(non-prophetic) ḥadīth. The same notion is used to rationalise the opposition view: the Prophet cupped while in ḱḥrām, and fainted. For this reason he disapproved of ḥijāma for the faster.

Although the early companion ḥadīths are not now mentioned as proofs, various opinions are mentioned under Tir. 774, and in the tarjama of Bukh. 46. The latter has the ḥadīth according to which b. ʿUmar used to cup and then gave it up. The story now has the addition that afterwards he used to cup at night (see above). This, as other mentions of the night, would not appear to be intended to counter any suggestion that cupping at night was not permissible, but rather to reinforce the Prophetic prohibitions.

Also mentioned by Bukh. as favourable to the practice are Saʿid and Yazīd b. Arqam, and Umm Salama. Favourable without qualification is the companion ḥadīth from Umm Alqama: we used to cup in the presence of Ḥūṣain, and she did not forbid us.

Similar is Saʿid 1,21435, in which Abū Taiba passes Jābir with his cupping implements during the day in Ramaḍān. Jābir asks where he has been, and Abū Taiba replies that he has been at the Prophet's house, cupping him. According to b. Saʿid6, Abū Taiba enjoyed some considerable repute as a cupper of the Prophet. The mention of the daytime in this report stands in contrast to the Kh. 8 version, in which it is said that Abū Taiba cupped the Prophet 'baʿd al-ḍagr'.

The principal opposition ḥadīth, already mentioned above, 'aftara al-ḥājim wa-l-mahjūm, is fairly well represented7. However,
it may be noted that neither Muslim nor Bukhārī has it as a ḥadīth, though it is mentioned in the tarjama of Bukh. This may reflect the doubts that e.g. Shāfi‘ī had had about its soundness; the tarjama reiterates these with a ‘wallāhu a‘lam’¹. The absoluteness of the ḥadīth was no doubt felt by some to be awkward, hence its abrogation, though it is not without subsequent qualifications.

Illustrative of the severe attitude which promulgated this ḥadīth is KU2727, which proposes a kaffāra for breaking the fast by cupping.

There are several fuller versions of the ‘aftāra’ ḥadīth, e.g. Dār.1737: Shaddād b. Aws was walking with the Prophet on the 18th² of Ramāḍān, and the Prophet saw a man cupping: he said, ‘aftāra’, etc.³. There is no indication in the ḥadīth of the precise reason for his utterance; while possibly it is fear for the faster’s capacity to carry on fasting after cupping, there is also, though this is never explicitly mentioned anywhere in the ḥadīth literature, the possibility that behind the ‘aftāra’ observation is the conviction that ħijāma per se breaks the fast, involving as it does the letting of blood, a substance of great ritual significance.

The ḥadīth is slightly reminiscent of the laīṣa al-bīr al-qiyyām fī safar ħadīth, in which the Prophet passes by one exhausted by fasting during travel, and condemns the practice.

KU2718 supplies a clear counter to the aftāra ḥadīth: it claims that the Prophet only made this pronouncement because the ḥājīm and ¹ Muzanī, Amr wa Nahy, simply explains it away by suggesting that the two had eaten, or something else that would break their fast: he reaffirms the principle that nothing coming out of the body is muftir.
² The same date as in the Sā‘d Abū Taibā report above. ³ Also Ḫan.
maḥjūm were abusing (yağhtūbūn) a man in Ramaḍān.

There are also other unfavourable ḥadīths: Ūan.2228, mentioned above; Tir.774, which says that Ḥalīf, Saʿīd, ʿUsāma and ʿAlī ʿishā reported unfavourably on this subject, while ʿAbdulrahmān b. Mahdī reckoned that the muḥtajām should perform qaḍā' of the day broken. More moderate is the opinion of Dārimi (1738) who does not dislike ḥijāma positively, but who would exercise caution in the matter - 'attaqi al-ḥijāma fī-l-ṣawm'.

Cutwardly unfavourable, but seemingly really designed to undermine such a view, is Ūan.5/3632, where it is claimed that the Prophet only forbade (nahā) wūjūl and ḥijāma in the best interests of his companions, but did not prohibit (yuḥarrim) them outright. This would appear to justify ḥijāma, at least if no undue weakness is to be feared as a result.

Bukh.46 in his tarjama raises briefly the question of whether anything coming out of the body can break the fast. This aspect of the discussion never seems to have quite made the transition from legal principle to ḥadīth material: all we are told is that Abū Huraira claimed that things coming out did break the fast, but that his opinion is overruled by that of the majority.

This last assertion of Bukhārī's, to the effect that ḥijāma is admissible, certainly appears to reflect the general impression to be gained from the ḥadīth material, in spite of the existence of unfavourable ḥadīths, clearly regarded by some as of doubtful applicability.

1 Cf. the injunctions to the faster to avoid ill-speech.
2 Also Ūan.4/314, ʿAd bū al-rukhṣa fī al-ṣā'īm yaḥṭajim.
3 Cf. earlier, p.262,
Jināba

The position of one commencing the fasting day in the condition of Jināba seems to have changed little since the early period. A'isha and/or Umm Salama still promote the basic ḥadīth, that the Prophet used to start the day while junub, and would wash and fast as normal¹. There are various minor variations of no apparent significance. Abū Dāūd notes that a few ḥadīths add 'in Ramadān'. This is, it seems, a pertinent addition, for Māj.1703, a slightly longer version of the standard ḥadīth, has one of the guarantors specifically asking another whether it was in Ramadān. The answer given is that both in and out of Ramadān the matter is the same².

The opposing doctrine is as vaguely documented as before. It is still associated only with the name of Abū Huraira, and attracts various unfavourable remarks³. In all the fuller versions there is an obvious harmonisation, according to which Abū Huraira eventually recants⁴; al-Faḍl b. ʿAbbās (and not the Prophet) is said to have told him the ḥadīth. Bukh., bāb al-ṣā'im yuṣbih junub, offers the additional information that Hammām and b. ʿAbdullāh b. ʿUmar used also to relate this ḥadīth, from Abū Huraira. This second name may in fact be identical to the ʿAbdullāh b. ʿAmr of Māj.1702, where we have the asseverative ḥadīth in which Abū Huraira swears by the Kaʿba that Muḥammad, and not he, was the author of the ḥadīth⁵. This attribution to the Prophet is a new feature in an otherwise familiar

¹ Han.6/38, 6/102, 6/203, 6/245, 6/170, 6/289, 1804, Mus.76-8, 80, AD bāb fī man aṣbaḥa junub, Bukh. bāb al-ṣā'im yuṣbih junub, Tir.779, Dār. 1732, Māj.1704, Zaid.10. ² Cf. end Mus.75. ³ Bai.214; ʿqāla Allāh fī qīqāṣihī....', - Ictibār 135. ⁴ Mus.75, Han.6/99, 1826, 1804, Bukh. bāb al-ṣā'im yuṣbih junub. ⁵ Cf. also Han.7382, 2/286, Ictibār 135.
hadith, and on the face of it, would appear to strengthen Abū Hur-aira's case. However, nothing is made of it by b. Māja, and it seems that it never gained general acceptance; it certainly failed to provoke any reaction in the ḥadīth, and was possibly dismissed out of hand by the orthodox.

There also remains, but only in a few cases, the 'lasta mithlānā' hadīth, which was used to back up the favourable view. There is no material alteration, and this reinforces a general conviction that the subject was no longer a matter for live debate. This is not necessarily contradicted by material such as is in Istibār 85 which suggests that if the delaying of a state of jināba until dawn is deliberate, then it merits a considerable kaffāra, or qaḍā'. The question of deliberate intention in this matter does not apparently arise in any of the ḥadīths.

Qubla

The question of al-qubla li-l-ṣā'im similarly shows no evidence of great advance in argument, though there is considerable variation in the details of the principal hadīth from one or other of the Prophet's wives, to the effect that he used to kiss while fasting. There survives also the similar hadīth that the Prophet used to kiss one of his wives, at which the wife reporting this fact laughs. In some versions we learn also that the Prophet used to 'yamass lisanāhā'.

1 Cf. earlier, p. 265, Mus. 79, AD bāb fīman aqba'a junub, Ĥan. 6/67.
2 From Ĥā'isha: Ĥan. 6/130, 6/192, Mus. 69.72, Dār. 1730.
From Ĥafṣa: Ĥan. 6/268, Mus. 173, Māj. 1685.
From Umm Ḥabība (new): Ĥan. 6/325.
From Umm Salama: Bukh. 37, Ĥan. 6/317, Dār. Šalīt 1050.
3 Mus. 62, Buch. 36, Ĥan. 6/207. 4 AD bāb al-ṣā'im yabla' al-rtq, Ĥan. 6/123.
The earlier hadith which employed a kunya for 'kiss' is still in evidence. The 'yuqīb min al-ru'ūs' of this hadith may be parallel to e.g. Jan. 6/101 in which the Prophet, it is said, used to kiss (her) face as much as he wanted, until ifṭār time. This may be intended to limit the kissing to the face, and to discourage mubāshara.

The Tay. 1534 hadith, which made it specifically clear that Ramaḍān ("shahr al-ṣawm") was meant in the qubla reports, is also preserved.

Other favourable hadiths incorporate variations intended to clarify, qualify or reinforce. Thus Jan. 6/176, in which Ḥ'isha says, as the Prophet leans over to kiss her, 'I am fasting'. The Prophet replies that he is also. This reaffirms that in the matter of qubla, women are technically in the same position as men.

In Hus. 63 (Jan. 6/39), Ḥ'isha is asked whether the Prophet used to kiss her while fasting. She hesitates a while before replying that he did so. This is designed to show that her answer was considered, and therefore accurate.

More definite in its qualifying effect is the 'ayyukum amlak' hadith from Ḥ'isha. Apparently connected with this, in that it mentions the ṣigma of the Prophet, in order to deny the qubla to other people, is KU2788(49).

Apart from the basic hadith from a wife of the Prophet, there remain other motifs already familiar: that in which ʿUmar is reassured by the Prophet after he has inadvertently kissed his wife.

---

1 Ḥan. 2241, 3391. 2 Cf. also Ḥan. 6/263. 3 Hus. 70-1, Nāj. 1783, Tir. 727, AD bāb al-qubla li-1-ṣā'īm. 4 Cf. also Ḥan. 6/162, 6/320, AD bāb al-qubla li-1-ṣā'īm. 5 Cf. earlier, p. 270. Nāj. 1684, Hus. 64, 66. 6 Dār. 1731, AD bāb al-qubla li-1-ṣā'īm, Ḥan. 138, 372.
also the khaṣṣā'īṣ haddīth, now recorded only once\(^1\), with no apparent reason for its decline.

As before, the question of mubāshara is treated favourably in qubla-type haddīths\(^2\). Otherwise unrecorded is Sa'd 8/354, in which a companion's wife stays under a blanket with him during the day in Ramaḍān in order to keep warm - by this, mubāshara is implicitly approved. A modest qualification appears at Ḥan.6/59 where Ā'isha says that the Prophet used to practise mubāshara, but placed a cloth between their pudenda, presumably out of ihtiyāt. Comparable is KU 2194: Everything about a woman is permissible for a man during his fast, except what is between her legs\(^3\).

Thus the favourable haddīths: on the other side, there are the haddīths that make a distinction between the cases of the old man and the youth\(^4\) (possibly implicit in the 'amlak haddīths mentioned above), though in haddīth the question is not as widely discussed as in the fiqh works. Another instance of this decline is the virtual disappearance of the haddīth in which Urwa claims that kissing while fasting is not conducive to goods\(^5\).

However, ʿUmar, who figured in a favourable haddīth (see above)

---

\(^1\) Mus.74. Cf. earlier, p.271.  
\(^2\) Dār.775,6,Mus.67,Ḥan.3/426,6/40, Māj.1687,AD bāb al-qubla li-l-ṣā'īm,Mus.65,8,Tir.728-9,Ḥan.6/216, Bukh., bāb al-mubāshara li-l-ṣā'īm. Mubāshara does not receive much attention. It is probably treated by the fuqahā' as a qiyās of the qubla.  
\(^3\) Cf. b. Ḥajār ad Bukh., bāb al-mubāshara li-l-ṣā'īm.  
\(^5\) Dār.1739. No evidence of any attempt to attach it to the name of the Prophet.
is retained in a new report. According to this, 'Umar said, 'I saw the Prophet in a dream. He ignored me, saying that I had kissed while fasting'. He vowed thenceforth never to do such a thing.

Rather subtly against the qubla is a hadith in which Umm Salama observes that while the Prophet kissed 'A'isha (acknowledging the standard hadith), she herself received no such favour. The reason she offers for this is that the Prophet 'la yatamālak annā ḥubban', implying that it was not his usual practice to kiss while fasting. A comparable attempt at minimization is the b. Ḫajar (Bukh. bāb al-qubla li-l-ṣā'īm) claim that some say the Prophet only kissed 'A'isha because she was young.

Uncompromising is an apparently new hadith from Haimūna bint Sa'īd, the mawlat of the Prophet, in which he declares that he who kisses during the fast, breaks. The Ṣāj.1686 version of this says that both parties break (cf. al-ḥājim wa al-maḥjūm?). It is odd that this severe view, which, there seems no reason to doubt, was not uncommon, is not better represented in the hadith. Thus Tir.727 mentions there is ikhtilāf on this subject, but retails no opposition hadiths. Possibly those who held such views were of a class that did not generally avail itself of the hadith as an instrument of argument.

It is this sort of consideration, plus the general lack of progress, that gives rise to the impression that to a certain extent

---

1 Bai.232 (a slightly different version appears in Uilyat al-Awliyā' 1/45). The appearance of the Prophet in dreams is a not uncommon occurrence in the hadith literature, though the motive is not always an attempt at postmortem abrogation, as here. 2 Ṣan.6/317.

3 Contrast 'A'isha-type hadiths in Umm Salama's name mentioned above.

4 Ṣan.6/463, Sa'īd 8/223.
in some subjects, such as the matter of the qubla, the ḥadīth material available is now not even the basis of argument, let alone the mirror of argument; the details of these matters are settled elsewhere, probably almost entirely in the fiqh.

**Siwäk**

Although Tir. 725 notes that some dislike siwäk with a green stick for the faster, or that he should use a toothstick toward the end of the day, there are no ḥadīths as such in the classical collections. In Saʿd 12170 is a report in which Qatūda relates that the Prophet used to use a green (raṭb) stick. He is told that certain people dislike this practice, to which he replies angrily by repeating the Prophetic sunna. In Kanz al-ʿUmmāl are several ḥadīths' reflecting the opposed opinions on wet and dry sticks, and the beginning and end of the day. The earlier ḥadīth, that the Prophet used the siwäk times without number while fasting is the most common in the regular collections. Bukh. Tarj. 41 introduces sundry pieces introducing sundry pieces of information in favour of siwäk, but as he himself points out, they do not specifically refer to the faster. All the above ḥadīths and opinions concerning siwäk and the faster were recorded before, and do not appear to have undergone any significant development. The only new ḥadīth is Māj. 1677, where ʿA'isha, says that the Prophet said that siwäk was one of the best habits that the faster could adopt.

---

Didactic material

In the post-Shāfi'i period, the number of not specifically legally applicable ḥadīths undergoes a considerable expansion. Virtually all the previous themes, and many new ones, are represented. The increase is partly accounted for by the overall growth of the ḥadīth literature, but also by the change in its character: there is an evolution from the primarily legal tone of second-century material (such of it as survives, at least), to the attempt to cover comprehensively the whole life and attitudes of the Muslim, in this case the fasting Muslim, as well as his physical deeds. They commonly include this non-legal material in a 'bāb fī faqīl shahr Ramaḍān' or similar.

Previously recorded themes include: the gates of Paradise are open in Ramaḍān, etc. Several of the longer versions of this add that Ramaḍān is a 'shahr mubārak'. Fasting itself is said to be the gate of worship.

The heavenly gate of Rayyān is reserved for fasters. In Usīya, 6/31, Rayyān is called a nahr, rather than a gate, which is perhaps more consistent with the root meaning of the word. Besides al-Rayyān, Heaven also contains gardens for fasters, a special room for them.

---

1 Dār. 1776, 1782, Nas. 8, Tir. 682, 764, Nāj. 1638, 1641, Bukh., faqīl al-ṣawm.
2 ʿJan. 71, 78, 2/281, 2/385, Nas. 8, Dār. 1782, Nāj. 1642, Tir. 682, Mus. 1-2, Zaid, bāb faqīl al-ṣiyām, Bukh., bāb hal yuqūl Ramaḍān, etc.
3 KU1927. In Usīyat al-Awliyā', it is stated that this gate opens for fasters, while those of fujūr are closed. 4 ʿJan. 2/268, 5/333, 5/335, Mus. 166, Tir. 765, Nāj. 1640, Nas. 47-8, Bukh., bāb al-Rayyān li-ṣā'īmin. 5 Cf. perhaps the claim that Rajab is the name of a heavenly river, above, p. 336. 6 KU2652. 7 ʿJan. 5/343, Tir. Janna 3.
and a special table. Possibly related to the Rayyūn = nahr report is Ḫilya 6/238, where it is said of NN that a āḥād is reserved for him in Paradise.

Fasting is still said to be a protection, against fire, and against battle.

The report that 'the remains of food in the mouth of the faster are sweeter to God than musk' occurs in many versions. KU2030 notes that on the Day of Judgement, those who have fasted will be noted for their sweetness of breath. It appears that the comparison with musk is not restricted to fasting matters: see Saʿd 72144. Often connected with the 'khulūf' hadith is that which promises two joys to the faster, that of breaking, and that of meeting his Lord.

A day's fast in the way of God wards off hell for 70 autumns. Ḫan.6/444 increases the delay to 1000 years. The connection between jihād and fast is made also in a new ḥadīth, where we learn that one day's 'ribāt fi sabīl allāh' equals a month of fasting. Another

3 Possibly connected with the motive behind fasting during raids discussed under Safar. 4 Ḫan.4250,7174,7485,7194,2/266,3/5,3/40, 6/240,Nus.161,3-5,Nas.44-5,Ḥāj.1638,Dār.1777,Ẓaid, bāb faṣl al-ʿiyām, Tir.764,Bukh., bāb faṣl al-ṣāwm. 5 This occurs separately at Dār.1776,Tir.766,Ḥan.2/345. 6 Ḫan.3/59,3/83,3/45,3/26,Nas.50-1, Nus.167-8,Ḥāj.1717-8. The autumns theme also occurs at Weill,p.50, where he comments on it. On the unapproachable worth of ghazw, see Ḫan.3/439. 7 Cf. Q22/47. While according to Ḫilya,6/18, ordinary fasting averts al-nūr for only 100 years. 8 No obvious connection with Ramaqlān. Ḫan.5/440,Nus.Īmāra 163,Nas.106. Cf. Ḫilya 8/376; the Prophet said, 'The ghazī in the way of God is like a pillar, fasting and keeping vigil.'
hadith claims that the mujāhid is the equal of him who fasts and keeps vigil.

The faster's prayers are answered.

Purity of motives and habits in the faster are again enjoined: he should refrain from rafath and back-biting, he should fast in faith (imān)5. However, even fasting or other forms of worship cannot take replace a love of God. Many a faster derives only hunger from his fast7. Several new hadiths proceed along the same lines: the fast should be undertaken seeking the face of God8; it should also be of the eyes and ears, not just of the mouth9; it should be kept private10; there should be no boasting of a fast11.

In the field of minor sunnas, we find it proposed that the fitr should be on dates and/or water12, and a formula to be uttered at the iftar is also supplied: Allāhumma! For you have I fasted, and on your bounty have I broken. Perfume is said to be the ghadh of the faster, suggesting that it is seen as a harmless way of compen-

---


sating for the deprivations of the fast. 

Presumably dealing with the voluntary faster, we find it proposed that the guest should not fast. Some claim that he may if given permission (by the host) to do so, which raises a parallel with the case of the wife, who may not fast without the permission of her husband.

Conversely, if one continues to fast while guests eat, then the angels pray over one.

Fasting is still recommended for the bachelor.

If one gives a faster his fitr, then one receives a reward equivalent to that of his fasting. Generosity in general in Ramaḍān is recommended. For those lacking in wealth, prayer, alms and fasting will suffice in the matter of charity. Mājah claims that fasting is the zakāt paid by the body.

Urging moderation is a ḥadīth from b. ʿIbīn, in which the Prophet admonishes ʿUthmān b. ʿAzīz for praying all night and fasting all day. He reminds him that 'ruḥbāniyya' was not prescribed for Muslims. In a somewhat similar vein is the ḥadīth that claims the patient faster is no better than the thankful eater.

---


More positively in favour is e.g. Nas. 46, in which the Prophet urges an enquirer to take up fasting, for it has no equal. Another hadīth claims it constitutes the half of ḍabar. Fasting and prayer together make up ḥibād; fasting will intercede for the faster on the Day of Judgement.

While he who fasts in heat may get an extra ajr, those who fast in winter may enjoy this "cool bounty". When it is very cold, a faster may be excused performing the ghusl. Ābdūlrahmān b. Aswād used while fasting to place his feet in water (to cool himself). In Jān. 3/279, Abū Ṭalḥa is portrayed as eating the māṭr bārid (= snow?) while fasting; he claims it is a baraka. In another version of this, he further claims it is neither food nor drink; his action is alleged to have prophetic authority (Tahāwī, Mushkīl, p. 347).

A number of hadīths discuss the question of whether one should say 'Ramadān' or 'the month of Ramadān'. While this would appear to be an artificial problem, arising simply from the observation of the difference in usage, there is the additional matter of the associated claim that Ramadān is a name of God. Although it is generally acknowledged that it is not one of the 99 beautiful names, the commentators are obviously uneasy about rebutting it outright. It is not known where this assertion about Ramadān stems from.

---

1 Ḥāj. 1745, Ḥan. 4/260. 2 Sa’d 723. 3 Ḥan. 6626. 4 Tūsī 180. 5 Ḥan. 4/335, Tīr. 797. Cf. Ḥilya 9/20: al-shīhabī. 6 Sa’d 8/2076. 7 Sa’d 6/203. 8 Cf. here the case (Tūsī 202) of a man who vows to fast three days per month, and puts it off until winter comes. 9 Although it says shahr Ramadān in Q2/185, hadīths quoting the Prophet's words may be advanced for both sides. 10 Nas. 9, Bukh., bāb hal yuqāl Ramadān, etc., KU2128.
Ramaqān as the month of fast conveys some of its baraka, detailed in Ku2054 as being composed of firstly rahma, then maghfira, then deliverance from hellfire, to other activities as well; an 'umra performed in Ramaqān is said to be equal to a ḥajj; it is an appropriate time for qadaqa. Sa'ad 5/295 mentions a practice of perfuming the mosques in Ramaqān. Han.2/330 claims simply that there never came to the Muslims a better month than Ramaqān. Perhaps reminiscent of the hadīths comparing qāshūrā and Ārafat is Ku2027, cf. 2113, which claims that Ramaqān acts as a kaffāra for the forthcoming year. Also indicative of the efficacy of fasting is Ku1993(6), according to which the faster is performing a good deed even while asleep.

Besides the mention of the names of those who spent their entire lives in fasting, there are also other occurrences of persons being favourably described as habitual fasters or given to prayer (qā'im qā'im): 'Umar (Han.3/1186); 'Abdullāh b. Zubair (Mus. Faq. Sāh. 102 (229)); Abū Bakr (Mus. Zak. 87, Faq. Sāh 12); Hafṣa (Sa'ad 8/58); Khālid b. Ma'dān (Sa'ad 7,2162); 'Uthmān (Sa'ad 3,49). They were possibly aware of the hadīth that he who dies of fasting will get a great reward. In contrast to this we may note that he who becomes exhausted by fasting in Ramaqān and does not break, and then dies, will go to hell.

Besides individuals, some groups also are said to be great fasters; however their zeal avails them nought, for they are not rightly guided; such are the Khawārij and the Ḥarūriyya.

1 Cf. also Ku2111,2056. 2 Sa'ad 8,315,Kh.,p.69,p.336, Sa'ad 8,216. 3 Han.3291. Some hadīth collections have complete sections devoted to the qadaqūt of Ramadān and al-Fitr. 4 See above, p.362.

5 Ku2029. 6 Ku2340. 7 Han.3/52. 8 Han.3/33.
The zeal that verges on asceticism sometimes combined silence\(^1\) with fasting\(^2\). This is condemned in the ḥadīth\(^3\), with the exception of KU1988, where it is said that the silence of a faster is in fact praise (taṣbīh).

In addition to the heavenly object in fasting, two other ends may be noted in conclusion. Tūsī 180 notes that fasting is good against a calamity\(^4\), while KU1991 proclaims briefly 'ẓūmū tasīḥḥū'; the connection between fasting and health is not made elsewhere in the ḥadīth\(^5\).

\(^1\) Cf. Q19/26. \(^2\) Cf. Goldziher, Ascétisme.

\(^3\) AD Aīmūn 208, Ḥanīfī 4/168, 5/224-5, Tūsī 189.

\(^4\) Obvious Jewish parallels here.

\(^5\) Nor, apparently, in such Arabic medical works as have been readily available for examination.
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Encyclopaedia Judaica: Berlin, 1928-34.


Studies in Islamic History and Institutions, Leiden, 1966. (Ch. 4)
ZDMG, 32, p.372ff.

(Muhammadanische Studien) Muslim Studies, ed. S.M. Stern, 2 vols.,

De l'ascétisme aux premiers temps de l'Islam, RHR,38,1898,314-324.

Über Zahlenfiguren. ZDMG,61,1907,756-7.


al-Hamadhänī (Abū Bakr Muḥd. b. Ḥūṣayn): Kitāb al-İstibbār. Hydarabad,
1359/1940.


Ibn Abī Dūd: see Jeffery.


Ibn Ṭanbal: al-Musnad. Ordinary numbers refer to the uncompleted
collection of Muhammad Shākir, Cairo. Two-part numbers (e.g. 3/456)
refer to the volume and page of the 6 vol. Cairo 1313 edition.


Refs. are to vol 1.


Ibn Saʿd: Kitāb al-ṭabaqāt al-kabīr. ed. E Sachau et al. 8 vols.,
Leiden, 1904-17.


Ibn Ṣinnāt: see Bergsträsser.

Ibn Khālīfah: see Bersträsser.

Jacob, K.G.: Der Muslimische Fastenmonat Ramaḍān, in VI Jahresbe-
richt der Geographischen Gesellschaft, Qēifswald,1896,pp.1-33.


The Qurān readings of Zaid b. ʿAlī. RSO, 16, 1936, pp. 249-289.

Further Qurān readings of Zaid b. ʿAlī. RSO, 18, 1940, pp. 218-236.


The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qurān. Baroda, 1938.

John of Damascus: vol. 97 of Kigne's Patrologiae Cursus Completus.


Lane, Edward Wm.: Arabic-English Lexicon. 1863-93.


Lidzbarski, Mark: Ginza Rba. Göttingen, 1925.


Marraccio, Lodovico: Alcorani textus. 1698.


Nemoy, Leon: Early Karaite Code of Law. See Qirgisani.


Bûlâq, 1289/1872. Refs. are to vol. 2.


Shâfiʿî (Muḥd. b. Idrîs): al-Umm (& other tractates) 8 vols. Cairo, 196

Muwaṭṭa’ al-Shaibani. Lucknow, 1880.


Refs. are to vol. 1.


Ṭabarī: Jāmiʿ al-bayān fī tafsīr al-qur'ān. Refs. are to vol. 2.

Ṭahawi: Sharḥ maqāni al-āthār. Delhi, 1348/1929.

Mushkil al-āthār, Hyderabad, 1333/1915.


Ṣukbārī (Ṣabdullāh b. Ḫusain): Iqrāʾ al-qirāʾāt al-shāhāda.

MS Mingana Islamic Arabic 1649.


Vajda, Georges: Juifs et Musulmans selon le Ḥadīth. JA, 229, 1937.


Westermarck, Edward: The Principles of Fasting. Folklore, 18, 1907, pp. 391-422.

Ritual and Belief in Morocco. London, 1926.


Ref. are to vol. 1.


Ref. are to vol. 2.