



Universidad Nacional de Catamarca - Facultad de Humanidades
Instituto de Investigación en Teorías del Arte y Estética
Revista Rigel – ISSN 2525-1945.

THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN IMAM MĀLIK AND 'ABD ALLĀH IBN 'UMAR IN AL-MUWAṬṬA' AND THEIR IMPACT ON THE PRACTICE OF THE PEOPLE OF MEDINA: EXAMPLES FROM THE CHAPTERS ON ACTS OF WORSHIP

Djalal Ailane

Faculty of Islamic Sciences, Batna 1 University, Algeria

Email: djalal.ailane@univ-batna.dz

<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-0379-2821>

Youcef Asselmi

Faculty of Islamic Sciences, University of Oran1, Algeria

Email: youcef463@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0009-0003-7031-6844>

Received : 05/02/2026 accepted: 09/03/2026 Publisher: 05/08/2026

Abstract

'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar is considered one of the primary Companions upon whose opinions and narrations Imam Mālik relied in developing his jurisprudence and compiling his Al-Muwaṭṭa'. He was among the leading authorities of Medina whose knowledge was directly linked to the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him). Despite this, Imam Mālik did not always adopt certain opinions reported from Ibn 'Umar, even though he explicitly cited them in Al-Muwaṭṭa'. This research examines a selection of these jurisprudential divergences, presenting the interpretations and justifications provided by scholars of the Mālikī school. The purpose is to clarify Imam Mālik's concept of 'the practice of the people of Medina' ('Amal Ahl al-Madīnah), upon which his school of thought is constructed. Since Ibn 'Umar was among the most prominent scholars of Medina, it raises the central question: How could Imam Mālik differ from him? The study concludes that instances where Imam Mālik differed from 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar fall into two categories: those open to reinterpretation (which do not represent true disagreement) and those reflecting isolated personal opinions of Ibn 'Umar. Furthermore, it demonstrates that Imam

Mālik's concept of 'the practice of the people of Medina' refers to the transmitted consensus of the majority of Medinan scholars, rather than the isolated view of every individual among them.

Keywords: Ibn 'Umar; Imam Mālik; Al-Muwatta'; Jurisprudential Differences; Practice of the People of Medina ('Amal Ahl al-Madīnah).

1. INTRODUCTION

Praise be to Allah, and peace and blessings be upon the Messenger of Allah, his family, his Companions, and those who follow him. The practice of the people of Medina ('Amal Ahl al-Madīnah) constitutes one of the foundational legal principles (Uṣūl) upon which Imam Mālik constructed his school of jurisprudence and derived subsidiary rulings. It is considered one of the primary sources of knowledge relied upon by Mālikī scholars in legal reasoning (Ijtihād) and legal deduction. The continuous practice transmitted and witnessed by the vast population of Medina carries greater normative weight than a solitary report (Khabar al-Wāḥid). Consequently, it serves to interpret texts, supersede general analogies and isolated personal opinions, indicate abrogation (Naskh), specify general texts (Takhṣīṣ al-ʿĀmm), and give preponderance to conflicting narrations.

Among the most noble and eminent scholars of Medina was the Companion 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb (may Allah be pleased with both of them). Imam Mālik drew extensively from his narrations and legal rulings in Al-Muwatta', basing the majority of his school upon them. Nevertheless, Imam Mālik departed from 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar's position across a number of specific issues. Imam Ibn al-ʿArabī highlighted several of these instances, stating:

"Among the reports Mālik included in his book that were narrated from Ibn 'Umar yet he did not adopt in practice are: his view that there is no harm in using leftover water from a woman unless she is menstruating; omitting recitation behind the Imam; reciting two or more surahs in a single rak'ah; delaying wiping over leather socks; making Witr two rak'ahs followed by one; his narration regarding the fear prayer; raising hands at ruku'; performing ablution for epistaxis; repeating prayer after touching the penis if within the time; and his view that prayers repeated with an Imam exclude Fajr and Maghrib (where Mālik differed with him on Fajr); and sprinkling water into his eyes. All of these Mālik included from Ibn 'Umar, yet he neither adopted nor acted upon them" (Ibn al-ʿArabī, 2007, Vol. 1, p. 112).

Ibn al-ʿArabī enumerated eleven specific issues, while others exist in the chapters on worship that he did not mention—such as pronouncing the Tasmiyah in Tashahhud, Tahṣīb during the Friday sermon, voluntary prayers during daytime travel, omitting Qunūt in Fajr, the second prostration in Surah al-Ḥajj, fasting while traveling, Fidya for pregnant women, entering Ihṛām prior to the Mīqāt, and preferring Tamattu' in Hajj. Together, these constitute twenty distinct issues in the domain of ritual worship ('Ibādāt).

This study examines ten selected issues among these legal divergences, presenting the interpretations and analytical explanations formulated by Mālikī scholars to address the core research problem.

Research Problem

The central problem of this research consists of clarifying the impact of ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar's divergent opinions on defining the concept of 'the practice of the people of Medina' (‘Amal Ahl al-Madīnah) and establishing an accurate understanding of this legal principle. This gives rise to the following sub-questions:

1. What is the status of the Companion ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar within the framework of ‘Amal Ahl al-Madīnah?
2. Did Ibn ‘Umar truly contradict the practice of the people of Medina, or can his opinions be reinterpreted to resolve the apparent conflict?
3. Does relying on ‘Amal Ahl al-Madīnah require unanimous agreement among all Medinan scholars, or is majority consensus sufficient?
4. Does ‘Amal Ahl al-Madīnah constitute an absolute consensus equivalent to the Ijām‘ of the Ummah that cannot be opposed?
5. Does this practice encompass personal scholarly reasoning (Ijtihād) or is it restricted to transmitted practices (Manqūlāt)?

Methodology

To address these research questions, the study employs an inductive approach (Al-Manhaj al-Istiqrā’ī) to trace the opinions of ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar where Imam Mālik explicitly differed in Al-Muwatta’, followed by an analytical approach (Al-Manhaj al-Taḥlīlī) to examine these opinions, their scholarly justifications, and their implications for ‘Amal Ahl al-Madīnah.

Structure of the Paper

The paper is structured into three main sections:

- Section 1: Biography of the Companion ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar and His Status in Al-Muwatta’.
- Section 2: Discussion of Selected Legal Opinions of ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar Differed Upon by Imam Mālik.
- Section 3: The Concept of ‘Amal Ahl al-Madīnah and the Impact of Ibn ‘Umar's Divergences in Defining It.

2. BIOGRAPHY OF ‘ABD ALLĀH IBN ‘UMAR AND HIS STATUS IN AL-MUWAṬṬĀ’

2.1. Biography of ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar

Name, Lineage, and Mother: He is ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb ibn Nufayl al-Qurashī al-‘Adawī, Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān. His mother was Zaynab bint Maz‘ūn ibn Ḥabīb al-Jumaḥī, sister of the noble Companion ‘Uthmān ibn Maz‘ūn (Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, 1992, Vol. 3, p. 950; Ibn Ḥajar, 1994, Vol. 4, p. 128).

Birth: He was born in the third year following the commencement of the Prophetic mission, as stated definitively by Al-Zubayr ibn Bakkār (Ibn Ḥajar, 1994, Vol. 4, p. 128).

Conversion and Migration: He embraced Islam alongside his father at the age of ten and migrated to Medina prior to his father's migration (Ibn al-Athīr, 1994, Vol. 3, p. 338).

Military Participation: During the Battle of Badr, he had not yet reached puberty, so the Prophet (peace be upon him) deemed him too young to participate. Similarly, during the Battle of Uḥud, at fourteen years old, he was turned back, but he was permitted to fight in the Battle of the Trench (Al-Khandaq) at age fifteen. He witnessed the Treaty of Ḥudaybiyah and the Conquest of Mecca at age twenty, participating actively in subsequent expeditions throughout the Prophet's lifetime (Al-Bukhārī, 2001, Vol. 5, p. 122; Ibn Sa‘d, 1990, Vol. 4, p. 105).

Virtues and Scholarly Standing: Ibn ‘Umar was renowned for piety, scrupulous adherence to the Prophetic Sunnah, and extreme caution in issuing legal rulings (Fatāwā). Scholars noted that he was among the most knowledgeable Companions regarding the rites of Pilgrimage (Hajj). Al-Zubayr ibn Bakkār recorded that Ibn ‘Umar meticulously memorized every statement of the Prophet, inquired about what transpired during his absence, retraced the Prophet's steps at every place of prayer, and stood at the exact location where the Prophet stood on Arafat (Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, 1992, Vol. 3, p. 952). Imam Mālik noted that Ibn ‘Umar lived to eighty-six years and issued legal rulings in Islam for sixty years (Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, 1992, Vol. 3, p. 953). Abū Salamah ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān remarked: "‘Umar lived in a time when he had peers, whereas Ibn ‘Umar lived in a time when he had no equal" (Al-Dhahabī, 1985, Vol. 3, p. 215).

Narrations: He was among the most prolific narrators of Hadith (Al-Mukthirūn), transmitting 2,630 traditions from the Prophet (peace be upon him) (Al-Dhahabī, 1985, Vol. 3, p. 238). He also narrated from Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, ‘Uthmān, Abū Dharr, Mu‘ādh, and ‘Ā’ishah. Leading Successors (Tābi‘ūn) narrated from him, including Sa‘īd ibn al-Musayyib, Nāfi‘, Sālim, ‘Abd Allāh ibn Dīnār, and Al-Zuhrī.

Death: He passed away in Mecca in 73 AH (or 74 AH) at the age of eighty-four and was buried in Dhū Ṭuwā in the cemetery of the Muhājirūn (Ibn Ḥajar, 1994, Vol. 4, p. 130).

2.2. Status of ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar in Al-Muwaṭṭā’

‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar occupies a central position in Al-Muwaṭṭā’, serving as one of its foundational pillars. His narrations form part of the 'Golden Chain' (Silsilat al-Dhahab), regarded

by Imam al-Bukhārī as the most authentic transmission chain in existence: Mālik from Nāfi' from Ibn 'Umar (Al-Bukhārī, 2001, Vol. 1, p. 8).

A thorough examination of Al-Muwatta' reveals the following statistics regarding Ibn 'Umar's narrations:

- Imam Mālik recorded 467 reports from Ibn 'Umar, including Marfū' (Prophetic), Mawqūf (Companion), and legal opinions.
- 100 of these reports are directly attributed to the Prophet (Marfū').
- The majority are narrated through his freed slave Nāfi' (approximately 239 reports).
- 38 reports are narrated via 'Abd Allāh ibn Dīnār.
- 20 reports are narrated via Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī.

3. LEGAL DIVERGENCES OF IBN 'UMAR DIFFERED UPON BY IMAM MĀLIK

3.1. Omitting Continuity (Muwalāt) in Wiping Over Leather Socks (Khuffayn)

Issue Formulation: Continuity (Muwalāt/Fawr) in ablution requires performing purification acts sequentially without significant time gaps. In wiping over leather socks, if a person washes his face and hands and wipes his head, but delays wiping his leather socks until a time gap occurs, is his ablution valid?

Ibn 'Umar's Opinion: Al-Muwatta' records that Ibn 'Umar did not consider continuity mandatory. Nāfi' narrated that Ibn 'Umar urinated in the market, performed ablution by washing his face, hands, and wiping his head, and then was called to a funeral prayer in the mosque, where he wiped over his leather socks and prayed (Mālik, 2004, Vol. 1, p. 55).

Mālik's Position: The dominant view in the Mālikī school is that continuity is obligatory when remembered and capable (Wājibah ma'a al-dhikr wa-al-qudrah) (Al-Dardīr, n.d., Vol. 1, p. 112).

Mālikī Reconciliations: Mālikī scholars interpreted Ibn 'Umar's action in four ways:

1. It represents his personal opinion that continuity is Sunnah (the view of Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam), which Mālik did not adopt (Al-Bājī, 1332 AH, Vol. 1, p. 82).
2. The time gap between the market and mosque was minor and thus forgiven (Ibn al-'Arabī, 2007, Vol. 1, p. 115).
3. Ibn 'Umar suffered from an ailment in his feet that prevented him from sitting in the market, delaying wiping until he reached the mosque (Al-Lakhmī, 2011, Vol. 1, p. 140).
4. He delayed due to forgetfulness or lack of water, both of which excuse non-continuity (Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, 2000, Vol. 2, p. 95).

3.2. Nullification of Ablution from Epistaxis (Nosebleed)

Issue Formulation: Does blood flowing from the nose (epistaxis) invalidate ablution?

Ibn 'Umar's Opinion: Al-Muwatta' records via Nāfi' that when Ibn 'Umar experienced a nosebleed during prayer, he would leave, perform ablution, return, and complete his prayer without speaking (Mālik, 2004, Vol. 1, p. 62).

Mālik's Position: Imam Mālik held that ablution is nullified only by substances exiting the two natural passages under normal conditions. Epistaxis does not invalidate ablution. Mālik stated in Al-Muwatta': "The established practice among us is that ablution is not required for a nosebleed, blood, or pus flowing from the body" (Mālik, 2004, Vol. 1, p. 63).

Mālikī Reconciliations:

1. 'Ablution' (Wuḍū') in Ibn 'Umar's report refers to its linguistic meaning—washing the blood off the body for cleanliness—rather than legal ritual ablution (Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, 1387 AH, Vol. 3, p. 280).
2. Ibn 'Umar held a personal opinion that severe epistaxis invalidates ritual purity, as supported by reports in Al-Muṣannaf of Ibn Abī Shaybah and 'Abd al-Razzāq (Ibn Abī Shaybah, 1409 AH, Vol. 1, p. 110; 'Abd al-Razzāq, 1403 AH, Vol. 1, p. 145).
3. Ibn 'Umar performed full ablution out of recommended precaution (Tawaffī/Iḥtiyāt) rather than obligation (Ibn al-'Arabī, 2007, Vol. 1, p. 118).

3.3. Sprinkling Water into the Eyes During Ghusl

Issue Formulation: Is it prescribed to sprinkle or wash the interior of the eyes during major ritual bathing (Ghusl)?

Ibn 'Umar's Opinion: Nāfi' reported that when Ibn 'Umar performed Ghusl from Janābah, he would sprinkle water into his eyes (Mālik, 2004, Vol. 1, p. 78).

Mālik's Position: Imam Mālik rejected this practice, stating: "The established practice among us is not based on Ibn 'Umar's tradition regarding sprinkling water into the eyes" (Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, 2000, Vol. 2, p. 140; Al-Bājī, 1332 AH, Vol. 1, p. 102).

Mālikī Reconciliations:

1. Ghusl requires washing the external body, not internal organs. Ibn 'Umar's action was an isolated personal extreme precaution (Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, 2000, Vol. 2, p. 142).
2. Washing the interior of the eyes causes medical harm. Historical sources note that Ibn 'Umar eventually lost his sight due to this practice (Al-Jazūlī, n.d., Vol. 1, p. 115; Al-Ḥaṭṭāb, 1992, Vol. 1, p. 305).

3.4. Bathing with Leftover Water of a Menstruating or Janābah Woman

Issue Formulation: Is it permissible for a man to perform purification using water left over in a vessel used by a woman who is menstruating or in a state of Janābah?

Ibn 'Umar's Opinion: Ibn 'Umar stated in *Al-Muwatta'*: "There is no harm in bathing with the leftover water of a woman, as long as she is not menstruating or in a state of *Janābah*" (Mālik, 2004, Vol. 1, p. 82).

Mālik's Position: Imam Mālik and the majority of scholars permitted using leftover water unconditionally, stating: "There is no harm in the leftover water of a woman even if she is menstruating or in *Janābah*" (Ibn al-'Arabī, 2007, Vol. 1, p. 122; *Al-Bājī*, 1332 AH, Vol. 1, p. 108).

Mālikī Reconciliations:

1. Ibn 'Umar's restriction contradicts explicit authentic Hadiths, such as the report of Maymūnah where the Prophet (peace be upon him) bathed from leftover water, stating: "Water does not become impure through *Janābah*" (Muslim, n.d., Vol. 1, p. 256).

2. Ibn 'Umar's own alternative narrations show his servant women handling his water vessels while menstruating, indicating that his statement reflected personal precaution rather than prohibition (Mālik, 2004, Vol. 1, p. 83; Ibn al-'Arabī, 2007, Vol. 1, p. 124).

3.5. Reciting Behind the Imam in Silent Prayers

Issue Formulation: Is a congregational follower (*Ma'mūm*) required or recommended to recite *Surah al-Fātiḥah* behind the Imam during silent prayers (*Sirriyyah*)?

Ibn 'Umar's Opinion: Ibn 'Umar held that a follower never recites behind an Imam under any circumstance: "Whoever prays behind an Imam, the recitation of the Imam suffices him" (Mālik, 2004, Vol. 1, p. 105).

Mālik's Position: Imam Mālik held that it is *Sunnah* for the follower to recite silently behind the Imam during silent prayers (*Dhuhr* and *'Aṣr*), stating in *Al-Muwatta'*: "The established practice among us is that a person recites behind the Imam in prayers where the Imam does not recite aloud" (Mālik, 2004, Vol. 1, p. 106).

Mālikī Reconciliations:

1. Ibn 'Umar's absolute statement referred specifically to audible prayers (*Jahriyyah*), expressed in general terms (*Al-Bājī*, 1332 AH, Vol. 1, p. 135).

2. Alternatively, it represents his personal opinion, whereas Mālik prioritized the transmitted practice of leading *Medinan Successors* like 'Urwah ibn al-Zubayr and *Al-Qāsim ibn Muḥammad* (Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, 2000, Vol. 3, p. 45).

3.6. Mentioning the Tasmiyah (Basmalah) in Tashahhud

Issue Formulation: Is it prescribed to pronounce '*Bismillāh*' before reciting the *Tashahhud* in prayer?

Ibn 'Umar's Opinion: *Al-Muwatta'* records that Ibn 'Umar began his *Tashahhud* with: "*Bismillāh, al-Taḥiyyātu lillāh...*" (Mālik, 2004, Vol. 1, p. 112).

Mālik's Position: Imam Mālik adopted the Tashahhud taught publicly by ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb from the Minbar, which omitted the Basmalah. Mālik stated in *Al-Mudawwanah*: "I do not recognize 'Bismillāh al-Raḥmān al-Raḥīm' in Tashahhud; one begins directly with *Al-Taḥiyyātu lillāh*" (*Al-Qayrawānī*, 1994, Vol. 1, p. 120).

Mālikī Reconciliations: Mālikī scholars noted that reports adding Basmalah to Tashahhud were evaluated as weak by major Hadith critics (including *Al-Bukhārī*, *Al-Tirmidhī*, and *Al-Nasā’ī*). Furthermore, Ibn Mas‘ūd and Ibn ‘Abbās explicitly reprimanded individuals who added Basmalah to Tashahhud (*Al-Māzarī*, 2008, Vol. 1, p. 210; *Al-Zurqānī*, 2003, Vol. 1, p. 280).

3.7. Undoing/Breaking the Witr Prayer (Naqḍ al-Witr)

Issue Formulation: If a person prays Witr early at night and later decides to perform voluntary night prayers (*Tahajjud*), should he pray one single rak‘ah to 'undo' his previous Witr before praying in pairs?

Ibn ‘Umar's Opinion: Nāfi‘ reported that when Ibn ‘Umar feared Fajr while in Mecca, he prayed a single rak‘ah of Witr. When the clouds cleared and night remained, he added one rak‘ah to make it even (*Shaf‘*), prayed voluntary pairs, and then repeated Witr at the end (*Mālik*, 2004, Vol. 1, p. 142).

Mālik's Position: Imam Mālik and the majority prohibited 'undoing' Witr. A person who prays Witr should perform voluntary night prayers in pairs without repeating Witr, citing the Hadith: "There are no two Witr in one night" (*Ibn Rushd*, 1988a, Vol. 1, p. 180; *Al-Bājī*, 1332 AH, Vol. 1, p. 165).

Mālikī Reconciliations:

1. Ibn ‘Umar had not yet pronounced the final Salām after his initial single rak‘ah when he realized time remained, so he joined a second rak‘ah seamlessly (*Al-Bājī*, 1332 AH, Vol. 1, p. 166).
2. Alternatively, 'Naqḍ al-Witr' was an isolated personal *Ijtihād* of Ibn ‘Umar that was rejected by major Companions like ‘Ā’ishah and ‘Umar ibn Yāsir (*Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr*, 2000, Vol. 3, p. 110).

3.8. Fidya (Expiation) on Pregnant Women

Issue Formulation: If a pregnant woman breaks her Ramadan fast out of fear for her unborn child, is she required to pay Fidya (feeding a poor person) in addition to making up the missed day (*Qaḍā’*)?

Ibn ‘Umar's Opinion: Ibn ‘Umar ruled in *Al-Muwatta’*: "She breaks her fast and feeds one poor person a Mud of wheat for every day" (*Mālik*, 2004, Vol. 1, p. 302).

Mālik's Position: Imam Mālik ruled that a pregnant woman is categorized like a sick person—she is required only to make up the missed days (*Qaḍā’*) without paying Fidya. Mālik stated: "The scholars hold that she owes *Qaḍā’*, as Allah says: 'A number of other days' [2:184]; they view her

condition as an illness fearing for her child" (Mālik, 2004, Vol. 1, p. 303). (Note: Mālik required Fidyā for nursing mothers due to alternative arrangements, but excluded pregnant women).

Mālikī Reconciliations:

1. Ibn 'Umar's recommendation of feeding was interpreted as recommended (Nadb) rather than mandatory (Al-Bājī, 1332 AH, Vol. 2, p. 140).
2. Alternatively, it reflects a secondary narration in the school (matching Ibn 'Abbās) that was set aside in favor of analogy with the sick (Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, 2000, Vol. 4, p. 85).

3.9. Entering Iḥrām Before the Mīqāt

Issue Formulation: Is it permissible or recommended to enter Iḥrām for Hajj or 'Umrah prior to reaching the designated geographical boundaries (Mawāqīt)?

Ibn 'Umar's Opinion: Al-Muwatta' records that Ibn 'Umar entered Iḥrām from Al-Fur' (before Dhū al-Ḥulayfah) and from Jerusalem (Ilya) (Mālik, 2004, Vol. 1, p. 330).

Mālik's Position: Imam Mālik disliked entering Iḥrām before the designated Mīqāt, aligning with 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb and 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān, who reprimanded Companions for initiating Iḥrām early (Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, 2000, Vol. 4, p. 210).

Mālikī Reconciliations:

1. Ibn 'Umar's journey to Al-Fur' was for personal business, and he initiated Iḥrām when deciding to begin pilgrimage, rather than intentionally bypassing the Mīqāt (Al-Bājī, 1332 AH, Vol. 2, p. 205).
2. Transmitted Sunnah takes precedence over a Companion's personal action (Al-Bājī, 1332 AH, Vol. 2, p. 206).

3.10. Preference of Tamattu' in Hajj

Issue Formulation: Which mode of Hajj is superior—Ifrād (Hajj alone), Qirān (combining Hajj and 'Umrah), or Tamattu' (performing 'Umrah during Hajj months then exiting Iḥrām before Hajj)?

Ibn 'Umar's Opinion: Al-Muwatta' records that Ibn 'Umar preferred Tamattu': "By Allah, performing 'Umrah before Hajj and offering a sacrifice is more beloved to me than performing 'Umrah after Hajj in Dhu al-Hijjah" (Mālik, 2004, Vol. 1, p. 340).

Mālik's Position: Imam Mālik held that Ifrād is superior to Tamattu' and Qirān, stating in Al-Mawwāziyyah: "Ifrād from the Mīqāt is more beloved to me" (Ibn Rushd, 1988a, Vol. 2, p. 95).

Mālikī Reconciliations: Ibn 'Umar's preference for Tamattu' was intended to emphasize its permissibility in response to earlier restrictions imposed by 'Umar and 'Uthmān, rather than asserting its absolute superiority over Ifrād (Al-Bājī, 1332 AH, Vol. 2, p. 220).

4. CONCEPT OF ‘AMAL AHL AL-MADĪNAH AND THE IMPACT OF IBN ‘UMAR'S DIVERGENCES

4.1. Concept of ‘Amal Ahl al-Madīnah

The practice of the people of Medina (‘Amal Ahl al-Madīnah) is among the most celebrated legal principles of the Mālikī school. Scholars historically differed in defining its precise scope and authority:

1. Definitions of Authority:

- Absolute Consensus: Claims that Medinan practice represents the exclusive consensus of the entire Ummah (rejected by mainstream scholars).
- Preference in Transmission: Using Medinan practice to give weight to one transmitted Hadith over another.
- Non-Binding Preference: Considering Medinan practice superior while permitting disagreement.

2. Scope of Practitioners:

- Restricted to the Seven Jurists of Medina (Al-Fuqahā’ al-Sab‘ah).
- Restricted to the Companions residing in Medina.
- Encompassing the Companions and Successors (Tābi‘ūn).
- Encompassing the scholars of the first three virtuous generations (Preferred View) (Al-Qarāfī, 1994, Vol. 1, p. 45; Nūr Sayf, n.d., p. 88).

3. Categorization of Practice:

- Transmitted Practice (‘Amal Naqlī): Practices transmitted orally or behaviorally generation-to-generation (e.g., call to prayer, measures of Ṣā’ and Mudd). This category constitutes binding legal proof (Ḥujjah) by consensus of Mālikī scholars and Ibn Taymiyyah (Ibn Taymiyyah, n.d., p. 15; Al-Bājī, 1332 AH, Vol. 1, p. 15).
- Analytical Practice (‘Amal Ijtihādī): Practice derived through scholarly reasoning during the era of Companions and Successors. Mālikī scholars differed on whether this second category constitutes binding proof or merely a weighting factor (Tarjīh) (Al-Qāḍī ‘Iyād, 1403 AH, Vol. 1, p. 72).

4.2. Impact of Ibn ‘Umar's Divergences on Defining ‘Amal Ahl al-Madīnah

Analyzing the instances where Imam Mālik differed from ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar yields crucial methodological findings regarding ‘Amal Ahl al-Madīnah:

1. Individual Divergence Does Not Invalidate ‘Amal: ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar was among the paramount authorities of Medina. Yet, Imam Mālik departing from his individual view demonstrates that the opposition of an eminent Companion does not invalidate ‘Amal Ahl al-Madīnah. As Ibn al-‘Arabī noted, Mālik cited these narrations in Al-Muwatṭa’ to document the

transmission, while choosing the prevailing collective practice over the isolated Companion opinion (Ibn al-‘Arabī, 2007, Vol. 1, p. 112).

2. ‘Amal Represents Majority Transmitted Practice: ‘Amal Ahl al-Madīnah does not require unanimous agreement from every single scholar in Medina; rather, it reflects the practice transmitted by the vast majority (Al-Ghalabah).

3. ‘Amal is Not Absolute Total Consensus (Ijām‘ al-Ummah): Treating Medinan practice as identical to infallible Ummah consensus is a misconception. Al-Qāḍī ‘Iyāḍ refuted critics who claimed Mālik rejected all authentic Hadīths contradicting Medinan practice, explaining that Mālik prioritized continuous transmitted communal practice (‘Amal Naqlī) over single-narrator reports (Khabar al-Wāḥid) (Al-Qāḍī ‘Iyāḍ, 1403 AH, Vol. 1, p. 75).

4. Transmitted Practice Overrides Individual Reasoning: When an individual Companion's opinion (Ijtihād) conflicted with established transmitted practice (‘Amal Naqlī), Imam Mālik consistently prioritized the transmitted practice, setting aside the isolated Ijtihād (Al-Qāḍī ‘Iyāḍ, 1403 AH, Vol. 1, p. 78).

5. CONCLUSION AND FINDINGS

This study examines the jurisprudential divergences between Imam Mālik and ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar in Al-Muwatta‘, establishing the following key conclusions:

1. The noble Companion ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar stands as one of the primary pillars upon whose narrations and rulings Imam Mālik constructed his jurisprudence in Al-Muwatta‘.

2. In specific instances, Ibn ‘Umar held isolated personal opinions (Infirādāt) that Imam Mālik did not adopt, prioritizing the collective practice of Medina.

3. Apparent divergences between Mālik and Ibn ‘Umar fall into two categories: genuine legal differences based on conflicting proofs, and apparent differences that can be reconciled through linguistic or contextual interpretation.

4. Imam Mālik's concept of ‘Amal Ahl al-Madīnah does not demand unanimous agreement from every Medinan scholar, but rather relies upon the transmitted practice of the majority.

5. The authoritative ‘Amal Ahl al-Madīnah prioritized by Imam Mālik over single-narrator reports is transmitted behavioral practice (‘Amal Naqlī), rather than individual analytical reasoning (‘Amal Ijtihādī).

REFERENCES

- ‘Abd al-Razzāq, A. B. (1983). Al-Muṣannaf (H. R. Al-A‘ẓamī, Ed.; 2nd ed.). Al-Majlis al-‘Ilmī.
- Al-Bājī, A. W. (1332 AH). Al-Muntaqā sharḥ Muwaṭṭa‘ Imām Mālik (1st ed.). Maṭba‘at al-Sa‘ādah.
- Al-Bukhārī, M. I. (2001). Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī (M. Z. Al-Nāṣir, Ed.; 1st ed.). Dār Ṭawq al-Najāh.

- Al-Dardīr, A. (n.d.). Al-Sharḥ al-kabīr ma‘a ḥāshiyat al-Dasūqī. Dār al-Fikr.
- Al-Dhahabī, S. D. (1985). Siyar a‘lām al-nubalā’ (S. Al-Arna’ūt, Ed.; 3rd ed.). Mu‘assasat al-Risālah.
- Al-Ḥaṭṭāb, M. M. (1992). Mawāhib al-jalīl li-sharḥ Mukhtaṣar Khalīl (3rd ed.). Dār al-Fikr.
- Al-Jazūlī, ‘A. ‘I. (n.d.). Sharḥ Al-Risālah. Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah.
- Al-Lakhmī, A. M. (2011). Al-Tabṣirah (A. Al-Qāḍī, Ed.; 1st ed.). Ministry of Awqaf and Islamic Affairs.
- Al-Māzarī, M. ‘A. (2008). Sharḥ al-Talqīn (M. Al-Suleimānī, Ed.; 1st ed.). Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī.
- Al-Qāḍī ‘Iyād, ‘A. M. (1403 AH). Tartīb al-madārik wa-taqrīb al-masālik (M. Ibn Tāwīt, Ed.; 2nd ed.). Ministry of Awqaf and Islamic Affairs.
- Al-Qarāfī, S. D. (1994). Al-Dhakhīrah (M. Ḥajjī, Ed.; 1st ed.). Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī.
- Al-Qayrawānī, S. S. (1994). Al-Mudawwanah (1st ed.). Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah.
- Al-Zurqānī, M. ‘A. (2003). Sharḥ Muwaṭṭa’ al-Imām Mālik (T. A. Sa‘d, Ed.; 1st ed.). Maktabat al-Thaqāfah al-Dīniyyah.
- Ibn Abī Shaybah, A. B. (1988). Al-Kitāb al-muṣannaf fī al-aḥādīth wa-al-āthār (K. Y. Al-Ḥūt, Ed.; 1st ed.). Maktabat al-Rushd.
- Ibn al-‘Arabī, A. B. (2007). Al-Masālik fī sharḥ Muwaṭṭa’ Mālik (M. Al-Suleimānī, Ed.; 1st ed.). Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī.
- Ibn al-Athīr, ‘A. M. (1994). Usd al-ghābah fī ma‘rifat al-ṣaḥābah (1st ed.). Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah.
- Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Y. A. (1987). Al-Tamhīd li-mā fī al-Muwaṭṭa’ min al-ma‘ānī wa-al-asānīd (M. A. Al-‘Alawī, Ed.; 2nd ed.). Ministry of Awqaf and Islamic Affairs.
- Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Y. A. (1992). Al-Istī‘āb fī ma‘rifat al-aṣḥāb (A. M. Al-Bajāwī, Ed.; 1st ed.). Dār al-Jīl.
- Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Y. A. (2000). Al-Istidhkār (A. M. Qal‘ajī, Ed.; 1st ed.). Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah.
- Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, A. A. (1994). Al-Iṣābah fī tamyīz al-ṣaḥābah (A. M. Al-Bijāwī, Ed.; 1st ed.). Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah.
- Ibn Rushd al-Jadd, M. A. (1988a). Al-Bayān wa-al-taḥṣīl (M. Ḥajjī, Ed.; 2nd ed.). Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī.
- Ibn Sa‘d, M. K. (1990). Al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā (M. A. ‘Aṭā, Ed.; 1st ed.). Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah.
- Ibn Taymiyyah, A. A. (n.d.). Ṣiḥḥat uṣūl ahl al-Madīnah. Maṭba‘at al-Imām.
- Mālik ibn Anas, A. A. (2004). Al-Muwaṭṭa’ (B. A. Ma‘rūf, Ed.; 1st ed.). Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī.

Muslim, H. Q. (n.d.). Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim (M. F. ‘Abd al-Bāqī, Ed.). Dār Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī.

Nūr Sayf, A. M. (n.d.). ‘Amal ahl al-Madīnah bayna muṣṭalaḥāt Mālik wa-ārā’ al-uṣūliyyīn. Dār al-Buḥūth li-al-Dirāsāt al-Islāmiyyah.