

family is likely to have had considerable support there.^{15a} They also owned a house in Mecca.¹⁶ Should we assume that the unusual Maghrebin form of the name, which appears to have been a hypocoristic, could be explained with ‘Abd al-Rahmân’s fleeing to Spain from the Abbasids because of his close ties to the Umayyads?

The *rijâl* texts show his position as an intermediary: he was important for Medinan hadith,¹⁷ but had pupils in Basra as well.¹⁸ Ibn Abî Hâtim notes that he was close to Ibn Ishâq;¹⁹ the latter, too, had been a Qadarite in his youth and consequently not liked by the authorities.²⁰ – A connection with Basra is also clearly visible in the case of

Abû Naşr²¹ Yahyâ b. Abî Kathîr Yasâr²² al-Ṭā’î al-Yamâmî,

a *mawlâ* of the Ṭayyî’,²³ who had also moved between cities, but in the opposite direction. He came from Basra and allegedly left the city because he could not get along with Qatâda,²⁴ sometime before 117/735; from then onwards he lived in the Yamâma.²⁵ Walîd II’s lifestyle was not to his liking; he transmitted that in 125/743 the world had lost its jewel.²⁶ Maybe he refused to pay homage to him or his sons; he was said to have been interrogated because of this crime, and then beaten and his head shaved.²⁷ He died towards the end of the Umayyad era, in 129/747 or 132/750.²⁸

15a See also p. 182 above.

16 Madelung, loc. cit. 298.

17 Ibn al-Madîni, *Tlal* 81, 1; 87, 7; 88, 1; also 84, 5.

18 Ibn Hanbal, *Tlal* 372 no. 2467; also Wakîf, *Akhbâr* I 46, apu. f.

19 IAH II₂ 213, 1f.

20 See p. 756f. below.

21 Or *Abû Ayyûb* (IS V 404, 9). He had several sons besides Naşr: Kathîr (IS V 404, 7), ‘Abdallâh (AZ 448, apu., and Ibn Qutayba, *Ma‘ârif* 218, 7), and ‘Âmir (Jâhîz, *Bayân* III 212, 7).

22 Cf. Khalîfa, *Ṭab.* 514 no. 1780; IS V 404, 3f.; IS V 404, 15, has *Dînâr* instead.

23 IS V 404, 6. in Ibn Qutayba, *Ma‘ârif* 218, 3f., *Ṭayyî’* is corrupted to read *‘Alî*.

24 See p. 158 above.

25 Fasawî I 621, 11f.

26 Suyûtî, *La‘âlî* II 390, 13ff.; also vol. I 96f.

27 Thus Abû l-‘Arab, *Miḥan* 316, 7ff.; in general Dhahabî, TH 128, 15f., and *Ta’rîkh* V 180, pu. f.: because of criticising the Umayyads.

28 The date of 129 is more frequent; 132 is an inference from the report that he survived Ayyûb al-Sakhtiyânî (see p. 391 above) by a year (Bukhârî IV₂ 301, 6f.).