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FOREWORD

THE interrelationship and interaction of human cultures and civilizations has made the contributions of each the common heritage of men in all ages and all places. Early Muslim scholars were able to communicate with their Western counterparts through contacts made during the Crusades; at Muslim universities and centres of learning in Muslim Spain (al-Andalus, or Andalusia) and Sicily to which many European students went for education; and at the universities and centres of learning in Europe itself (such as Salerno, Padua, Montpellier, Paris, and Oxford), where Islamic works were taught in Latin translations. Among the Muslim scholars well-known in the centres of learning throughout the world were al-Rāzī (Rhazes), Ibn Sīnā (Avicenna), Ibn Rushd (Averroes), al-Khwārizmī and Ibn Khaldūn. Muslim scholars such as these and others produced original works in many fields. Many of them possessed encyclopaedic knowledge and distinguished themselves in many disparate fields of knowledge.

In view of this, the Center for Muslim Contribution to Civilization was established in order to acquaint non-Muslims with the contributions Islam has given to human civilisation as a whole. The Great Books of Islamic Civilization Project attempts to cover the first 800 years of Islam, or what may be called Islam’s Classical Period. This project aims at making available in English and other European languages a wide selection of works representative of Islamic civilisation in all its diversity. It is made up of translations of original Arabic works that were produced in the formative centuries of Islam, and is meant to serve the needs of a potentially large readership. Not only the specialist and scholar, but the non-specialist with an interest in Islam and its cultural heritage will be able to benefit from the series. Together, the works should serve as a rich source for the study of the early periods of Islamic thought.

In selecting the books for the series, the Center took into account all major areas of Islamic intellectual pursuit that could be represented. Thus the series includes works not only on better-known subjects such as law, theology, jurisprudence, history and politics, but also on subjects such as literature, medicine, astronomy, optics and geography. The specific criteria used to select individual books were these: that a book should give a faithful and comprehensive account of its field; and that it should be an authoritative source. The reader thus has at his disposal virtually a whole library of informative and enlightening works.

Each book in the series has been translated by a qualified scholar and reviewed by another expert. While the style of one translation will naturally differ from another as do the styles of the authors, the translators have endeavoured, to
the extent it was possible, to make the works accessible to the common reader. As a rule, the use of footnotes has been kept to a minimum, though a more extensive use of them was necessitated in some cases.

This series is presented in the hope that it will contribute to a greater understanding in the West of the cultural and intellectual heritage of Islam and will therefore provide an important means towards greater understanding of today’s world.

May God Help Us!

Muhammad bin Hamad Al-Thani
Chairman of the Board of Trustees
ABOUT THIS SERIES

This series of Arabic works, made available in English translation, represents an outstanding selection of important Islamic studies in a variety of fields of knowledge. The works selected for inclusion in this series meet specific criteria. They are recognized by Muslim scholars as being early and important in their fields, as works whose importance is broadly recognized by international scholars, and as having had a genuinely significant impact on the development of human culture.

Readers will therefore see that this series includes a variety of works in the purely Islamic sciences, such as Qur’an, hadith, theology, prophetic traditions (sunna), and jurisprudence (fiqh). Also represented will be books by Muslim scientists on medicine, astronomy, geography, physics, chemistry, horticulture, and other fields.

The work of translating these texts has been entrusted to a group of professors in the Islamic and Western worlds who are recognized authorities in their fields. It has been deemed appropriate, in order to ensure accuracy and fluency, that two persons, one with Arabic as his mother tongue and another with English as his mother tongue, should participate together in the translation and revision of each text.

This series is distinguished from other similar intercultural projects by its distinctive objectives and methodology. These works will fill a genuine gap in the library of human thought. They will prove extremely useful to all those with an interest in Islamic culture, its interaction with Western thought, and its impact on culture throughout the world. They will, it is hoped, fulfil an important role in enhancing world understanding at a time when there is such evident and urgent need for the development of peaceful coexistence.

This series is published by the Center for Muslim Contribution to Civilization, which serves as a research centre under the patronage of H.H. Sheikh Muhammad bin Hamad al-Thani, the former Minister of Education of Qatar who also chairs the Board of Trustees. The Board is comprised of a group of prominent scholars. These include His Eminence Sheikh Al-Azhar, Arab Republic of Egypt, and Dr Yousef al-Qaradawi, Director of the Sira and Sunna Research Center. At its inception the Center was directed by the late Dr Muhammad Ibrahim Kazim, former Rector of Qatar University, who established its initial objectives.

The Center was until recently directed by Dr Kamal Naji, the Foreign Cultural Relations Advisor of the Ministry of Education of Qatar. He was assisted by a Board comprising a number of academicians of Qatar University, in addition to a consultative committee chaired by Dr Ezzeddin Ibrahim, former Rector of the University of the United Arab Emirates. A further committee
acting on behalf of the Center has been the prominent university professors who act under the chairmanship of Dr. Raji Rammuny, Professor of Arabic at the University of Michigan. This committee is charged with making known, in Europe and in America, the books selected for translation, and in selecting and enlisting properly qualified university professors, orientalists and students of Islamic studies to undertake the work of translation and revision, as well as overseeing the publication process.
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TRANSLATOR’S INTRODUCTION

ʿUlūm al-ḥadīth (or ʿilm al-ḥadīth, usūl al-ḥadīth, etc.) is the broad designation which includes all of the various disciplines making up the study of ḥadīth. Among the works in this field are certain guidebooks which attempt to summarize the entire range of this material to allow students to understand the terminology of the collectors of ḥadīth and to validate the methods of these collectors. Ibn ʿHajār al-ʿAsqalanī (773/1372–852/1449) presents a brief survey of the history of this sub-genre in the introduction to his Nuzhat al-naẓar, his commentary on his own Nukhbat al-fikar.

The ancient and modern experts had many works about the terminology of the ḥadīth scholars. Among the first to compose a work on this subject was the judge Abū ʿAbdAllāh al-Ḥākim al-Nisābūrī [was another one of the first] but he did not revise and properly arrange [the material]. Abū Nuʿaym al-Iṣbahānī followed him. He did make a supplement (mustakhraj) to the book of al-Ḥākim al-Nisābūrī, but he left some things for his successors. Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī came after them. He composed a book he called al-Kifāya on the rules of transmission and another on the guidelines [of transmission] which he called al-Jāmiʿ li-ʿadāb al-shaykh wa-ʿl-sāmiʿ. Few were aspects of ḥadīth on which he did not compose a monograph. As Abū Bakr b. Nuṭaṅa put it, “Everyone who is fair knows that the scholars of ḥadīth after al-Khaṭīb are dependant on his books.” Some

1 For a brief discussion of this genre, see the article “Uṣūl al-ḥadīth” in The Encyclopedia of Islam (2nd edn., Leiden, 1953 ff.). The most thorough treatment of the development of this literary genre remains William Marçais’ introduction to his translation of Nawawi’s al-Ṭuqūb wa-ʿl-tayyir is-maʿrifat sawman al-Baṣhir al-Nādhīr, which originally appeared in installments in Journal Asiatique and was later issued as a separate volume under the title Le Tawqib de en-Nawawi (Paris, 1902).


4 Kitāb Maʿrifat ʿulūm al-ḥadīth, ed. al-Sayyid Muṣāqam Ḥusayn (Cairo, 1937).

5 Kitāb al-Kifāya fi ʿilm al-risāla (Hyderabad, 1357).

6 (Beirut, 1417/1996).

came after al-Khaṭṭāb and took a share of this knowledge. Al-Qaḍī ʿYāqūt composed a short book which he called al-ʿIlmūnūr and Abū Ḥaṣīb al-Mayyānī [that is al-Mayyānī] wrote a pamphlet which he entitled Mā lā yasaʿū al-muḥaddith jahlūhū.\(^8\)

With the perspective given to him by the two centuries, Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī regards Kitāb Maʿrifat annārīn al-adhāthī, more popularly known as the Muqaddima, of Ibn al-Ṣalīḥ al-Shahrazūrī as the most influential work on the study of hadīth: “The people took it up and followed its method. The versifiers, epitomizers, supplementers, abridgers, critics and proponents of it are innumerable.” Library catalogs bear witness that for the next few centuries the belief prevailed that the market could always render another synopsis, in either verse or prose, of the contents of Ibn-al-Ṣalīḥ’s work. Indeed, it would be no exaggeration to say that to this day most traditional hadīth scholarship is directly or indirectly based on this one work.

**Ibn al-Ṣalīḥ al-Shahrazūrī**

The career of Taqī al-Dīn Abū ʿAmr ʿUthmān b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Shahrazūrī\(^9\) was shaped to a remarkable degree by the political currents of his age. He was

---
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born in the village of Sharakhân located in the region known as Shahrazūr in Kurdish northern Iraq. Although Islamicists and Arabists are not accustomed to directing their attention to this part of the world, at the time of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's birth it was enjoying a period of great cultural efflorescence. Speaking specifically about the area of Shahrazūr, the contemporary historian Yaqtī (d. 626/1229) noted the rapaciousness of the Kurds inhabiting the surrounding mountains and the town's exceptional fertility in talented scholars. He makes particular reference to two famous Shāfi'īite families with roots there, the Banū 'l-Shahrazūrī and the Banū ʿAṣrūn, both of which supplied judges to the Zangids, Ayyūbids and others. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ does not seem to have been able to lay claim to any blood connection to either of the prominent Shāfi'īite families of al-Jazīra, although his father had studied under Sharaf al-Dīn b. Abī ʿAṣrūn (493/1100–585/1189), who later went on to become a very prominent figure in Zangid Syria.

Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ began his training in law under his father in Irbil, the capital of one of the minor principalities which lay between the Khwārazmians in the East and Ayyūbids in the West. The sources do not tell us when he arrived there or how long he stayed. However, one cannot help but feel that some elements of his basic religious outlook were forged in this period. As was the case with Shahrazūr, Irbil as portrayed in Tārīkh Irbil of Ibn al-Mustawfī (564/1169–637/1239) enjoyed a much more vigorous intellectual life than one would expect to find. The ruler of Irbil after 586/1190 was a former lieutenant and brother-in-law of Saladin, Muẓaffar al-Dīn Gökboiri. As was the case with so many rulers in this period, he took an active interest in religious matters. To judge on the basis of where he spent his money, Gökboiri's outlook appears to have been a form of conservative Sunnism which supported traditional manifestations of piety even when they lacked scriptural authority. The scale of his celebrations of the birth of the Prophet finds few parallels in Islamic history.

11 A number of the sources claim that Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ was born in the town of Shahrazūr itself.
He established a number of charitable foundations in Irbil, including a school of hadith named the Muṣaffariya. He also financed good works in Mecca and Medina and contributed to the construction of the main mosque of the Ḥanbalites in the Damascene suburb of al-Ṣāliḥiya.

Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ continued his education in Mosul, which by this time was one of the last outposts of the Zangids, a dynasty which originated in northern Iraq and had controlled Syria and Egypt until the advent of the Ayyūbids. There, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, before “his mustache sprouted,” tackled the popular manual of ʿIrāqi Shāfiʿism, Abū ʿIšāq al-Shirāzī’s al-Muḥadhdhab fi l-furūʿ, under the tuition of Ibn Samin (523/1129–588/1192). The pinnacle of his early academic career was reached when he became a teaching assistant of Ḥimād al-Dīn b. Yūnus (535/1140–608/1211), the leading Shāfiʿite scholar of the city.

There was great interest in hadith in northern Iraq at this time. The most famous member of the Zangid dynasty, Nūr al-Dīn, founded the world’s first school of hadith in Damascus, the Dār al-ḥadith al-Nūriyya, in 566/1170. Schools of hadith had also recently been founded in Irbil and Mosul. Therefore, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ’s interest in the subject of hadith was probably awakened at an early age. It should be noted that even in this era the study of hadith was not a normal element of the curriculum of the typicval student of law. Commentators had occasion to deplore the ignorance of hadith of legal scholars. We are told that in general the only hadith the jurists knew were the ones cited in their legal manuals and these were often viewed as unauthentic by the specialists.18

After his time in Mosul, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ made a lengthy journey to the major scholarly centers of the East, including Baghdad, Nishapur, Marv, Qazwin and Hamdan. Despite its crucial importance, this period of his life is particularly obscure and we know little more than the names of the teachers he met. Individuals like Ibn al-Samāʿī (537/1143–618/1221), Furāwī (ca. 522/1128–608/1212) and al-Muʿayyad (or perhaps al-Muʿayyid) al-Ṭūsī (524/1130–617/1220) are now nothing but placeholders in obscure isnāds, but in their day they enjoyed international prestige because they had comparatively short isnāds. Their prominence is reflected in the fact that their reports are the only ones for which Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ quotes the isnād in extenso in the Muqaddima.

The first time we hear of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ in the Ayyūbīd lands, where he would spend the rest of his life, is when he was appointed to the professorship of the Asādiyya law school19 in Aleppo. Presumably he took the reins of this Shāfiʿite law school shortly after the death of his predecessor in 608/1211. It appears that he did not occupy the position very long and he may have left as early as

17 For this individual and his family, see Halm, Ausbreitung, 188–9.
18 For example, Abu Shāma, Muʿammāl, 3:28–9; Lākawī, Al-Amma al-ṣaḥīla li-ʾiʿātila al-ṣaḥara al-kamīla, ed. ʿAbd al-Fattah Abu Ghudda (Aleppo, 1384/1964), 29–33.
610/1213. The reason for this is nowhere specified, although we may assume that his departure was amicable since the post remained in the hands of his family.

What Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ did next is unclear. Dhahabi asserts that he studied in Damascus around 613/1216, a terminus post quem apparently established by the death of the judge Ibn al-Ḥarastānī (520/1126–614/1217), who is said to have been one of his teachers. We next find Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ taking up the professorship of the Ṣalahiyah law school in Jerusalem in 615/1218, in the wake of his predecessor who had been ousted by the Ayyūbid prince al-Muʿazzam ʿĪsā in Damascus for protesting his decision to legalize the sale of wine. The Ṣalahiyah had been established by Salahidin in 588/1192 in the Church of St Anne and it was the first Ayyūbid foundation after they captured the city from the Crusaders. It is described as one of “the exalted positions in the kingdom of Islam," and Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ seems to have been successful in his tenure there and may have comfortably continued there indefinitely. As it turned out, he taught there scarcely a year before the Crusades intervened. Al-Muʿazzam found himself incapable of protecting the city, so to decrease its military value he ordered the dismantling of its walls. Despite many protests, the demolition began on 1 Muḥarram 616/19 March 1219 and this led to a mass exodus from the city. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ joined the “great mob” who “abandoned their possessions and belongings and dispersed in every direction throughout the area.” Unexpectedly, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ found himself out of work and on his way to Damascus.

The Ayyūbid prince al-Muʿazzam was given control of Damascus in 594/1198. He first ruled in the name of Salahidin’s son al-Ṣā‘īd and then in the name of his own father, the brother of Salahidin, al-Ṣā‘īd. Al-Muʿazzam took over in his own name upon his father’s death in 615/1218. He stands as one of the more spectacular figures of Islamic history. A scholar of certain attainments, he was determined to place his personal mark on the intellectual life around him. His most enduring legacy may be the book ascribed to him, The Missile Hitting its Mark in al-Khaṭḥīb’s Liver (al-Sāḥn al-muṣṭh fi kābūd al-Khaṭḥīb), a polemical tract refuting the attacks against Abū Ḥanīfah (d. ca. 150/767) made by the Shāfī‘īs.
al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (392/1002–463/1071). The book is interesting for a number of reasons, not least for what it reveals about its putative author’s preoccupations. The charge to which it responds first and at greatest length is that the imām of the Ḥanafīs had a deficient knowledge of the Arabic language. (Of the eponyms of the four main schools of Sunnite law, ʿAbū Ḥanīfah was the only one who was – like al-Muʿāẓẓam – not an ethnic Arab.) Ḥanafism and the Arabic language were the twin passions of al-Muʿāẓẓam’s life.

Al-Muʿāẓẓam’s Ḥanafism is a mystery both in its origin and its form. He, and his son following in his footsteps, were the only Ḥanafīs in a dynasty that was otherwise Ṣafīfite. When asked how he alone in his family happened to be a Ḥanafite, he flipantly replied, “Do you not wish that there be a single Muslim among you?”28 He studied Ḥanafite law under Jamāl al-Dīn al-Ḥaṣrī (546/1151–636/1238), the most prominent Ḥanafī of his time in Damascus, and composed, with the help of a ghostwriter, a commentary on Shaybānī’s al-Jāmi’ al-kabīr, a standard work on Ḥanafite law.29 However, in the increasingly conservative spirit of his age, al-Muʿāẓẓam seems to have later moved toward a purer Ḥanafism centering on the school’s eponym; one is tempted to say, a fundamentalist Ḥanafism. He commissioned a work called al-Tadhkira, a ten-volume digest of the doctrines of ʿAbū Ḥanīfah stripped of the accretions of his students and later followers. Sībī ṣ al-Jawzī (581/1185 or 582–654/1256) tells us that “he was never separated from [this book], whether on a journey or at home. He read it continuously and wrote on the back of each volume, ‘ṣāīb ‘Abū Bakr b. Ayyūb [al-Muʿāẓẓam] has completed learning [this volume].’”30 His missionary zeal led him to found a Ḥanafite law school, the Muʿāẓẓamīyya, in the Ḥanbalī enclave of al-Ṣāliḥiya in 621/1224. His activities in the realm of the Arabic language were less provocative. He sponsored a great lexicographical compilation based on a number of earlier works.31 Not content to savor his pleasures in private, he paid cash prizes to students who had mastered certain grammatical and lexicographical texts, which did temporally stir up some interest in these books.32

Al-Muʿāẓẓam’s reign was an age of relative liberalism. Jews and Christians were allowed to hold public office and build additions on their houses of worship. Wine was legalized so that it could be taxed. The so-called “sciences of the Ancients” (for example, philosophy and Logic) were cultivated and al-Muʿāẓẓam

30 Miṣrāt al-zamān, 8(2):645.
32 Nuṣaymī, Dāris, 2:580.
33 Sībī ṣ al-Jawzī, Miṣrāt al-zamān, 8(2):647. Ḥājī Khalīfā says that the prince used to give money to students who mastered Shaybānī’s al-Jāmi’ al-kabīr and his al-Jāmi’ al-jaghīr, two works of Ḥanafite law; Kashf al-zunūn, 1:col. 568.
himself was a friend of the speculative theologian ʿAmidī (551/1156–631/1234). What al-Muʿāẓẓam could not bring himself to tolerate was the strict literalism advocated by some of the local Ḥanbalites and their restive followers. The profile of the Ḥanbalites in Damascus had been considerably heightened in 551/1156 by arrival of Ḥanbalite refugees fleeing the Crusaders from the area around the Palestinian village of Ḧammāt. Their common origin as well as their close family ties gave the immigrant Ḥanbalites a cohesiveness which allowed them to exert far greater influence than their numbers warranted. Their migration to the Damascene suburb of al-Ṣāliḥiya, which began in 553/1158, only served to prolong and strengthen their unity, which, one imagines, would have rapidly broken down if they had continued to live in the midst of the greater Damascene society. In al-Ṣāliḥiya they created a vigorous Ḥanbalite intellectual life which would hardly have been augured by the group’s rural origin. Two of the greatest names in Ḥanbalism emerged from this milieu, Ibn Qudāma (541/1147–620/1223) and ʿAbd al-Ghani b. ʿAbd al-Wāḥid (541/1146–600/1203). Despite their suburban exile, the Ḥanbalite refugees continued to play a role within the city walls. Al-Muʿāẓẓam was eventually obliged to grant the Ḥanbalites a miḥrāb of their own in the Umayyad Mosque, the religious center of the city. This became their base for menacing the local Ashʿarites. Fakhr al-Dīn b. ʿAsākir (550/1155–620/1223), Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ’s unhappy predecessor at the Ṣāliḥiya in Jerusalem, had retired to Umayyad Mosque. As an Ashʿarite, he was obliged to make circuitous detours to avoid walking near the Ḥanbalites for fear that they would commit an outrage on his person.

Al-Muʿāẓẓam’s special antipathy for the Ḥanbalites is illuminated by his famous showdown with the aforementioned ʿAbd al-Ghani in 595/1199. ʿAbd al-Ghani had traveled very extensively and it seems that no one with a religious text to transmit escaped his attention. A pathological troublemaker and career martyr, throughout his life we detect an eagerness to undergo a miḥna, or trial, like the one the imām Ahmad b. Ḥanbal suffered at the hands of the ʿAbbasīd caliph al-Maʾmūn and his successors, a subject he treated in a monograph. He chose Isfahan, the hometown of the Ashʿarite Abū Nuʿaym al-Iṣbahānī

37 Kitāb Miḥna al-imām Abū Ḥanīfah (Cairo, 1991).
(336/948–430/1038), as the place to point out the one hundred and ninety mistakes the latter committed in his Kitāb Maʿrisat al-Ṣahāba. For this service, the local Ashʿarites almost killed him and he fled the city wearing only a loincloth. In Mosul he taught ‘Uqaylī’s Kitāb al-Da’afī’ al-kabīr, which contains an uncomplimentary account of Abī Ḥanīfa. In response, the local Ḥanafites rose up and had him put in prison. He would have been put to death had a quick-thinking friend not removed the objectionable pages from the book before his enemies could get their hands on it.

In al-Muʿāzẓam’s Damascus, ʿAbd al-Ghani chose the venue of the Umayyad Mosque to announce his anthropomorphic doctrines based on a literal reading of the Qurʾān. Inevitably, this incited the non-Ḥanbalites and they carried their protest to al-Muʿāzẓam and his Commander of the Citadel. A legal opinion was issued declaring ʿAbd al-Ghani to be an unbeliever and innovator who was not to be left at large among the Muslims. When personally examined, ʿAbd al-Ghani refused to back down. It was ordered that his minbar be smashed and the Ḥanbalites were evicted from the Umayyad Mosque. ʿAbd al-Ghani must have thought that he had finally found his al-Maʿmūn in al-Muʿāzẓam. Alas, the prominent establishment Ḥanbalite al-Nāṣih b. al-Ḥanbali (554/1159–634/1236) inopportune spoilt the tableau by raising a mob and threatening mayhem. At this point the army was called out to protect the Ḥanafite prayer area. Within hours the Ḥanbalites were allowed to resume their position in the Umayyad Mosque. ʿAbd al-Ghani was obliged to seek martyrdom in Egypt, where he died in 600/1203 on the eve of another banishment.

This would not be a welcoming environment for Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ. Although his views were by no means as extreme as those of ʿAbd al-Ghani – an innate conservatism kept him from indulging in the provocative positions of the most radical Ḥanbalites – they were markedly different from those of al-Muʿāzẓam.

[Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ] was a traditionalist following a good doctrine. He abstained from the tendentious interpretation of the theologians. He believed in what was established by the texts. He did not go beyond the texts and he accepted their literal meaning.

According to a titbit of gossip picked up in Mosul by Ibn Khalīkān (608/1211–681/1282), who was himself a native of Irbil, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ missed his

39 I have been unable to locate a copy of A.A. Badawi’s Maʿmūn Bani Ayyūb: al-Muʿāzẓam ʿIsā (Cairo, 1953).
40 Dhahabi, Taḏkira, 4:1431.
chance early in life to fit into al-Mu‘azzam’s personal circle. As a youth he secretly studied Logic under the brother of one of his first teachers, Kamāl al-Dīn b. Yūnus (551/1156–639/1242), a Shāfi‘ī prodigy of learning who taught Shayhānī to Ḥanafites, the Gospel to Christians and the Torah to Jews. He made no progress and when Kamāl al-Dīn advised him, “People think well of you and they ascribe irreligion to everyone who studies this subject. You will spoil their opinion of you and not get anything out of this subject,” he was willing to drop it. 41 Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ would later sourly dismiss Logic as “pompous words which God has made superfluous for all sane people.” 42

Despite his ideological handicap, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ did what he could to catch the princely eye in Damascus. In 620/1223 we find him among the scholars attending a lesson held to commemorate the internment of al-Mu‘azzam’s father in the Greater Ḥādiyya. He could not yet occupy one of the places of honor on either side of al-Mu‘azzam, but he did manage to maneuver himself into a prime position in the second rank, directly in front of him. 43 Sībṭ b. al-Jawzi refers to Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ’s predicament in his self-serving obituary of him. 44 Sībṭ, the grandson of one of history’s greatest Hanbalites, Abu ‘l-Faraj b. al-Jawzi, had seen which way the wind was blowing and converted to Ḥanafism. He then succeeded extraordinarily in insinuating himself into the good graces of al-Mu‘azzam. He writes that Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ buttonholed him at a shrine in a suburban park and asked him to intercede on his behalf with the prince: “Ask him to give me a school!” Sībṭ says that at the time al-Mu‘azzam specifically disliked Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, but does not make clear whether this was because of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ’s generally conservative outlook or due to some particular offense on his part. Sībṭ claims that he kept after the prince and eventually reconciled him to Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ.

Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ’s networking finally paid off when he assumed the professorship of the Raḥwīya in 622/1225. Nevertheless, a rather obscure incident reveals that even now his position remained vulnerable. The school’s founder was a wealthy merchant known as Ibn Rawāḥa, who lived in the school. After his death in 623/1226 (or 622), the famous Sufi Ibn ‘Arabī (560/1165–638/1240) and Abu ‘l-Ḥasan Khazā‘l (ca. 547/1152–623/1226), the head of the shrine of ‘Ali b. al-Ḥusayn, Zayn al-Ṣābitin, in Damascus, came forward and claimed that Ibn Rawāḥa enjoined them “at night” — in the form of an apparition? — to bear witness on his behalf for the removal of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ. This led to a complex series of events, which none of the sources cares to unravel. Involved seem to have been Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ’s refusal to allow the burial of the founder within the precincts of the school and some extremely restrictive stipulations placed on the running of the institution, which apparently could not be enforced. A provision forbidding Jews,

41 Ibn Khallikān, Wafayāt, 5:314; Subki, Ṭabqāt, 8:382.
42 Dhabah, Sīyar, 23:143.
43 Abū Shāma, Dhayl, 132–3.
44 Miḥāʾ al-ṣamān, 8(2):758, reading madrasatan instead of madrasatahā.
Christians and extremist Ḥanbalites from setting foot in it is cited: Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ weathered the storm and seems to have held the position until his death.⁴⁵

Al-Muʿāẓẓam died in 624/1227 at the age of forty-seven and was succeeded by his son Dāwūd, who continued his policies. Two years later Dāwūd was pushed out by his uncle al-Ashraf. Although al-Muʿāẓẓam and al-Ashraf were born only a day apart, rarely have brothers shown more marked contrasts. While the high-flying al-Muʿāẓẓam was conversing with philosophers and philologists in the sunny gardens of Damascus, al-Ashraf was campaigning ceaselessly in the icy north, extending and defending the Ayyūbīd domains. The acquisition of the sandal of the Prophet was his major cultural achievement. While visiting his nephew in the summer of 625/1228, it dawned on al-Ashraf that there was more to life than freezing and fighting and he resolved to take Damascus.⁴⁶

When he finally did, he immediately put his own stamp on the city. If al-Muʿāẓẓam was al-Maʿāmūn, al-Ashraf was al-Mutawakkil. Public morality was restored, non-Muslims were put in their place and the rational sciences were forbidden. Al-Ashraf renounced the sin taxes (if not the sins): wine was formally forbidden. The additions to the church of Maryam were torn down and the Christian superintendent of the treasury was humbled. As for the unholy pursuit of philosophy and science, Abū Shāma writes,

Study of the sciences of the Ancients had become widespread during the last years of the reign of al-Muʿāẓẓam b. Abī Bakr and in the reign of his son Dāwūd and that became more common until God extinguished it in the reign of al-Ashraf.⁴⁷

The great Almīdī was put under house arrest, perhaps on the basis of a famous legal opinion given by Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ himself.⁴⁸

In this more congenial climate, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ’s career took off. The year 628/1231 was particularly notable. This was when he made the pilgrimage to Mecca⁴⁹ and became the first professor of the Inner (or Smaller) Shāmīya.⁵⁰

---


⁴⁷ Abū Shāma, Dhayl, 156.


⁴⁹ Abū Shāma, Dhayl, 160; Ibn Kathīr, Bidāya, 129.

⁵⁰ Ibn Shaddād, al-ʿĀlāq al-khaṭṭāra: Dimashq, 232; Nuʿaymi, Dāris, 1:301–13; ‘Almīwī, Mukhtaṣar, 48–9; ‘Ulabī, Khīṭāt, 126–7. There seems to have been some confusion (see Ibn Shaddād, al-ʿĀlāq al-khaṭṭāra: Dimashq, 241; Nuʿaymi, Dāris, 1:277; ‘Almīwī, Mukhtaṣar, 47) as to whether it was the Inner or Outer Shāmīya where Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ taught, Ibn Khallikān (Wafayāt, 3:244) explicitly says that it was the Inner.
founder of the school, Sitt al-Shām Zumurrud Khāṭūn, was one of the grand ladies of the Ayyūbid family. A sister of Saladin and al-Ṣādiq, she had blood ties to over thirty Ayyūbid princes. She devoted her life to good works and every year spent large sums of gold on potions and medicines which were produced in her house in the city and distributed to the populace. She had earlier founded a large school of Shāfiʼī law outside of the city walls and before her death in 616/1220 she arranged to have her house, located near the Bimaristan al-Nūrī, converted into the school of Shāfiʼī law where Ibn al-Ṣāliḥ taught.

Ibn al-Ṣāliḥ reached the peak of his career when al-Ashraf made him the first professor of the Dīr al-ḥadīth al-Ashrafīya, one of the two schools of ḥadīth founded by al-Ashraf. One of these, the Ashrafīya al-Barrānīya, was located in the suburb of al-Ṣāliḥiya and put under the control of the local Hanbalites. The inner Ashrafīya, where Ibn al-Ṣāliḥ taught, was located within the walls of the city of Damascus, near the main gate of the Citadel and was given to the Shāfiʼites. It was constructed on the site of the former home of the prominent general Šārīm al-Dīn Qāyûm al-Najmī (d. 596/1200), which al-Ashraf purchased in 628/1231 and renovated over the course of two years. The opening of the school in 630/1233 coincided with the arrival of the elevated hadīth transmitter Ibn al-Zubīdī (d. 631/1234) from Baghdad, who was feted by al-Ashraf during the month of Ramadan and presided over the recitation of Bukhārī’s Saḥīḥ in the newly opened hadīth school.

Ibn al-Ṣāliḥ died in his chambers at the Ashrafīya on 25 Rabi' II 643/19 September 1245, during the Khwarazmian and Egyptian siege of Damascus. The blockade caused a severe famine within the city and a number of prominent scholars were carried off. Nevertheless his funeral was very well attended. Ceremonies were performed in the Umayyad Mosque and the crowd followed the funeral procession to the city gate known as Bāb al-Faraj. Inside of the gate, the ceremonies were re-enacted. Then a brave group of men hitched up their gowns and hastily delivered his remains to its burial site at the edge of the cemetery known as Maqābir al-Ṣūfiya. In later years, his tomb was visited as a site of blessing and it was said that a prayer made there would be fulfilled.

The Muqaddima

Ibn al-Ṣāliḥ intended the Muqaddima to be a basic introduction to the study of hadīth.

This book is an entryway into the study of ḥadīth, an attempt to make clear its main and secondary issues and to explain the terminology, aims

52 Nuṣaymi, Dāris, 1:19–47; ‘Almaawi, Tanbih, 10–12; Badrān, Munaddamat al-aṭlāl, 24–32; ‘Ulabī, Khiṣāt, 75–7.
and concerns of its practitioners. Ignorance of these matters greatly
imparts a transmitter. This book is — God willing — worthy of receiving
attention before any other.\textsuperscript{53}

The \textit{Muqaddima} began as a series of individual lectures which were only later
placed in the present arrangement.\textsuperscript{54} In composing the \textit{Muqaddima}, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ
drew heavily on the works of most of his predecessors in the field and the final
product bears an especially strong resemblance to al-Ḥākim al-Nisābūrī’s \textit{Kitāb Ma’rifat ʿulūm al-hadīth}. Considering this, it should not surprise us to read
that at one point in his life Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ undertook to write a commentary on
al-Ḥākim’s book.\textsuperscript{55} We may safely surmise that the commentary, which he never
completed, grew into the \textit{Muqaddima}. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ made no attempt to conceal
his debt to al-Ḥākim. He gave his work, popularly known as the \textit{Muqaddima}, an
almost identical title, \textit{Kitāb Ma’rifat anwāt ʿilm al-hadīth},\textsuperscript{56} and adopted
al-Ḥākim’s concept of dividing the study of hadith into a number of individual
categories (sing. \textit{nawāt}), although he thoroughly reorders them and adds thirteen
new ones, bringing the total to sixty-five.

How can we explain the astonishing success of this work, since it clearly broke
little new ground in terms of its basic format? Where the \textit{Muqaddima} did represent
more of a departure from its predecessors was in its style. Abū Bakk r. Musaddī
(ca. 593/1196–663/1264) described how it appeared to contemporary eyes:

\begin{quote}
[Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ] composed a \textit{fiqhi} book on the sciences [of hadith] and
followed a theoretical course in its laws. He used to favor reason over
reports (\textit{athar}) and analogy over anecdotes (\textit{khabar}). In [this work] he
prepared principles of which no clear representation had [hitherto] been
made.\textsuperscript{57}
\end{quote}

Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ wrote the \textit{Muqaddima} like a law book rather than a hadith book.
Most notably he eschewed the ponderous habit of most of the writers on hadith
of quoting earlier authorities at length. Writers on hadith had hitherto been
averse to speaking in their own voice, adding only a sentence or two of their own
composition here and there to highlight the significance of the quoted material.
In addition to making their books long-winded and cumbersome, this taxed the
reader’s patience and attentiveness. Although the \textit{Muqaddima} still includes a good
deal of quoted material, it does so much less than its predecessors. The easier
style probably contributed greatly to the popularity of the work.

\textsuperscript{53} \textit{Muqaddima}, 436.
\textsuperscript{54} Ibn Hajar ascribes the deficiency he perceives in the arrangement of the book to this procedure;
\textit{Nuzhat al-nazar}, 5.
\textsuperscript{55} Ibn Rushayd, \textit{Miṣṣ al-ṣuyūṭ}, 3:218.
\textsuperscript{56} Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ knew the title of al-Ḥākim’s work to be \textit{Kitāb Ma’rifat anwāt ʿulūm al-hadīth}, see
\textit{Muqaddima}, 213.
\textsuperscript{57} Ibn Raftī, \textit{Tārīkh}, 132.
This Translation

I have relied largely on two modern editions of Ibn al-Šalāḥ’s text, Nūr al-Dīn ʾItr’s Ulūm al-ḥadīth li-Ibn al-Šalāḥ (Damascus, 1387/1966) and the late Ṭāhira ʿAbd al-Rahmān’s Muqaddimāt Ibn al-Šalāḥ (2nd edn, Cairo, 1989). In the instances where I was able to consult the relevant manuscripts, it appears that in most cases the readings that Professor ʾItr gives are to be favored where they disagree. Nevertheless, the copious supplementary material Professor ʿAbd al-Rahmān provided makes her edition indispensable to the serious student.

Two procedures I have adopted may require some explanation. I have been sparing in the use of brackets to indicate material not present in the original text, especially when it is merely a question of meeting the demands of English usage. I have used brackets when supplying additional elements to names mentioned in the text in the hope of rendering them more easily identifiable to the reader, when providing short explanatory notes, when the material supplied is more extensive and when it seemed to me to be more open to dispute. I should also draw attention to a practice I have adopted in an effort to render the text clearer to the average reader. Ibn al-Šalāḥ did not have at his disposal that great scholarly convenience, the footnote. He therefore had to incorporate his digressions in the body of the text. In the instances where these are relatively lengthy or interrupt the flow of the argument, I have distinguished them by presenting them as an indented text block.

Despite all appearances to the contrary, I have attempted to keep the footnotes to a minimum. The Muqaddima amply exemplifies what Professor Franz Rosenthal has called the philnomymous character of Islamic scholarship. I have tried to identify all of the individuals mentioned in the text at the first appearance of their name. Ibn al-Šalāḥ cites a number of extremely obscure, usually very early, figures as illustrations of particular phenomena. In the cases where little seems to have been known about the person, apart from the characteristic which prompted Ibn al-Šalāḥ to mention him, I have merely provided a reference to the entry on him in one or two of the standard biographical dictionaries. Ibn al-Šalāḥ quotes extensively from his predecessors. Where he provides a clue about the specific written source from which he drew the quotation, I have attempted to provide adequate bibliographical information. It should be noted that in almost every instance there is some variation, usually minor, between Ibn al-Šalāḥ’s rendering of the quoted passage and the way it appears in the modern printed edition of the same text.

In conclusion, I would like to acknowledge the help I received from others. A generous grant I received from the American Philosophical Society allowed me to travel to Syria and Egypt in the summer of 1996. Professor Raji Rammuny, the coordinator of the series in which this volume appears, has shown great patience and helped me overcome a number of obstacles. Professor ʿAbd al-Rahmān (perhaps better known under her nom de plume “Bint al-Shāṭi”) freely provided valuable assistance and advice. I would especially like to express
my gratitude to Professor Rosenthal. He has on occasions too numerous to mention allowed me to benefit from his vast expertise on questions both general and specific. To him I dedicate this translation.
"Our Lord, give us mercy from You and grant us guidance in our affair."

Praise – the most complete and highest praise – be to God, the Guide for those who seek His guidance, the Guardian of those who fear Him and the One who suffices for those who seek His approval. The most perfect prayers and blessings on our Prophet, the other prophets and the family of each so long as someone asks for His forgiveness and invokes His mercy. Amen! Amen!

The science of hadith is one of the best of the excellent sciences and one of the most beneficial of the useful disciplines. Manly and virile men – that is, thorough and complete scholars – love it and the only people who dislike it are contemptible and base. It is one of the sciences with the greatest relevance to the various other sciences, especially applied law (fiqh), which is the central science. For that reason, the errors of those writers on applied law who are unfamiliar with the science of hadith are numerous and the imperfections in the remarks of those scholars who forsake it are plain.

Formerly the stature of hadith was exalted. The throngs of hadith students were massive and the capabilities of the experts in the discipline and the transmitters of hadith were high. Through their living the different sciences of hadith were made vital, through their continued existence the branches of the various sub-disciplines of hadith were kept fresh and the abodes of hadith were occupied by its students. These students and experts have now died off and the sciences of hadith have been obliterated to such an extent that the practitioners in hadith are only a tiny band, few and weak in number. For the most part, in taking up hadith they are concerned with nothing more than hearing them heedlessly, and in recording hadith they do not expend more effort than to write them down defectively. They toss aside the various sciences of hadith through which the stature of hadith became exalted and they have made themselves remote from the bodies of knowledge which made it magnificent. Just when someone examining a difficulty in the science of hadith could hardly find anyone capable of explaining

1 Qura'n 18:10.
it and someone who wanted to pursue the science of ḥadīth could hardly come across anyone knowledgeable in it, generous God (He is blessed and exalted and He deserves all praise) bestowed a blessing in the form of the book *Kitāb Maʿrifat awrāq ilm al-ḥadīth* (Knowledge of the Categories of the Science of Hadīth). This book divulged the hidden secrets of the science of ḥadīth, explained its stubborn difficulties, made firm its joints, set down its rules, illuminated its lineaments, clarified its rulings, detailed its subcategories and shed light on its principles, elucidated its branches and subsections, brought together its various sciences and benefits and tracked down its stray and valuable points. I beseech, entreat and humbly pray to God, the Great — in whose hand lie harm and benefit and granting and forbidding —, seeking His favor by every means and requesting His intercession in every way, that He make this book replete in that regard — and more replete — and that He make it ample for all of that — and more ample — and that He make the reward for it and the benefit of it great in this world and the next. God is near and He answers our prayers. I will have no success without God. Upon Him I rely and to Him I turn repentantly.

This is a list of the Categories of hadīth:

1. Sound ḥadīth (*maʿrifat al-ṣāḥiḥ min al-ḥadīth*)
2. Fair ḥadīth (*maʿrifat al-ḥasan minhu*)
3. Weak ḥadīth (*maʿrifat al-qaṣīf minhu*)
4. Supported ḥadīth (*maʿrifat al-munad*)
5. Uninterrupted ḥadīth (*maʿrifat al-muttaṣil*)
6. Raised ḥadīth (*maʿrifat al-mawṣūf*)
7. Halted ḥadīth (*maʿrifat al-mawṣūf*)
8. Cut-off ḥadīth, and they are different from interrupted ḥadīth (*maʿrifat al-maqtūʿ wa-huwa ghayr al-munqatī*’)
9. Loose ḥadīth (*maʿrifat al-mursal*)
10. Interrupted ḥadīth (*maʿrifat al-munqatī*’)
11. Problematic ḥadīth, and this is followed by the discussion of some subsidiary issues, including the isnad containing the word “‘an” (from) and the suspension of ḥadīth (*maʿrifat al-muḍāl wa-yalihi taṣfīḥt minhā fi ‘l-ṣīnād al-mu‘ān mina wa-minhā fi ‘l-taṣīʿa)
12. Misrepresentation and the treatment of misrepresented ḥadīth (*maʿrifat al-tadlis wa-ḥukm al-mudallas*)
13. Anomalous ḥadīth (*maʿrifat al-shādhdh*)
14. Unfamiliar ḥadīth (*maʿrifat al-munkar*)
15. Analysis, parallelisms and attestations (*maʿrifat al-ṣibār wa-ʿl-mutābaqāt wa-ʿl-shawāhid*)
16. Additions of reliable transmitters and the treatment of them (*maʿrifat ziyyādāt al-thiqāt wa-ḥukmihā*)
17. Isolated ḥadīth (*maʿrifat al-afrād*)
18. Defective ḥadīth (*maʿrifat al-ḥadīth al-muṣallal*)
19. Disrupted ḥadīth (*maʿrifat al-nuḍṣarīb min al-ḥadīth*)
20. Material interpolated into ḥadith (maʿrifat al-mudraj fi 'l-ḥadith)
21. Forged hadith (maʿrifat al-mawdūʿ)
22. Mixed-up hadith (maʿrifat al-maqlūb)
23. The characteristic of those whose transmission is accepted and those whose transmission is rejected (maʿrifat šīfah man tuğbaltu riwaṭyatuḥū wa-man turaddu riwaṭyatuḥū)
24. The methods of hearing and receiving ḥadith, and this chapter includes an exposition on the forms of licensing and their treatment as well as the rest of the ways of taking up and receiving hadith – it contains much information (maʿrifat kaysiyat samāʿ al-ḥadith wa-taḥammulīt wa-fihi bayān anwār al-iṣāra wa-ḥikīmatīn wa-sīr waṣīr al-akhīdha wa-l-taḥammul wa-fihi 'ilm jann)
25. The writing of hadith and the means of fixing and recording texts, and this chapter contains excellent and important information (maʿrifat kitābat al-ḥadith wa-kayfiyat al-ḥaddīh wa-taqyīdīh wa-fihi maʿārif mahīma rūqa)
26. The manner of relating hadith, the stipulation regarding the conveyance of them and related matters, and this chapter contains many of the valuable points of this science (maʿrifat kayfiyat riwaṭyat al-ḥadith wa-sharj aḏārīth wa-mā yatāʾillum bi-dhālika wa-fihi kathir min nafaṣīs ḥādha 'l-ṣilm)
27. Guidelines for the transmitter of ḥadith (maʿrifat ʿādāb al-maḥaddith)
28. Guidelines for the student of ḥadith (maʿrifat ʿādāb ūlī al-ḥadith)
29. Elevated and low isnāds (maʿrifat al-ismāʾi wa-l-nāzīl)
30. Famous hadith (maʿrifat al-maṣāḥib min al-ḥadith)
31. Rare and scarce hadith (maʿrifat al-gharib wa-l-sazīz min al-ḥadith)
32. Rare words in the ḥadith (maʿrifat gharīb al-ḥadith)
33. Enchained hadith (maʿrifat al-muṣaṣṣal min al-ḥadith)
34. Abrogating and abrogated hadith (maʿrifat nasīkh al-ḥadith wa-manṣūkhīn)
35. Misreadings in the isnāds and texts of hadith (maʿrifat al-muṣāḥḥat min asānīd al-ḥadith wa-muṭāniḥā)
36. Contradictory hadith (maʿrifat muḥkataf al-ḥadith)
37. Additions to cohesive isnāds (maʿrifat al-mazād fi muṭtaqī al-asānīd)
38. Hadith with hidden looseness (maʿrifat al-muḥāṣṣil al-khafs irsāluḥū)
39. The Companions (God be pleased with all of them) (maʿrifat al-Ṣaḥāba)
40. The Followers (God be pleased with all of them) (maʿrifat al-Tābiʿīn)
41. Older people transmitting from younger ones (maʿrifat al-aḏābir al-ruwāt ʿan al-aṣāḥīḥ)
42. Symmetrical transmissions, and other instances of peers transmitting from one another (maʿrifat al-mudāḥaj wa-mā swāḥlu min riwaṭyat al-aqrān baḥṣihim ʿan baʿṣ)
43. Brothers and sisters among scholars and transmitters (maʿrifat al-ikhwā wa-l-aḥkāwāt min al-ʿulāmāʾ wa-l-ruwāt)
44. The transmission by fathers from their sons (maʿrifat riwaṭyat al-ḥād ʿan al-ʿabnū)
45. The opposite of that; that is, the transmission by sons from their fathers (ʿaks dhālika maʿrifat riwaṭyat al-ʿabnū ʿan al-ḥād)
46. Those from whom two transmitters related, one early and one late, with a great difference between their date of death (ma'rifat man ishtaraka fi 'l-riwāya 'anhu rāwiyān mutaqaddim wa-muta'akkhir tabā'ada mā bayna wa'fātayhim)

47. Those from whom only a single transmitter related hadith (ma'rifat man lam yarwi 'anhu illā rāwīn wāhid)

48. Those who are referred to by different names or varying epithets (ma'rifat man dhukira bi-asma' mukhtalifa aw nu'att mata'addida)

49. Unique names of the Companions, transmitters of hadith and other scholars (ma'rifat al-mu'tadāt min asma' al-Šāhāba wa-ruwāt wa-'l-ulamā')

50. Names and paydonymics (ma'rifat al-asmā' wa-'l-kunā)

51. The paydonymics of those better known under their name, rather than their paydonymic (ma'rifat kuna 'l-ma'rafin bi-'l-asma' dāna 'l-kunā)

52. Nicknames of transmitters of hadith (ma'rifat alaqāb al-mu'addithin)

53. Homographic [names and gentilics] (ma'rifat al-mu'talif wa-'l-mukhtalif)

54. Homonymic [names and gentilics] (ma'rifat al-muttaqiq wa-'l-mu'tariq)

55. A category composed of the two previous categories (nawf yatarakkabu min hādhayin 'l-nameyn)

56. Transmitters resembling one another in name and lineage who are distinguished by the relative position of the names of the son and father (ma'rifat al-ruwāt al-mutashābihin fi 'l-ism wa-'l-nasab al-mutamāyizin bi-'l-ta'qdim wa-'l-ta'khir fi 'l-ibn wa-'l-ab)

57. Those whose lineage refers to someone other than their father (ma'rifat al-mansūbin ila ghayr ābahim)

58. Gentilics the actual significance of which differs from the apparent one (ma'rifat al-ansāb allattu āhināhā 'alā khilāf zāhirihā)

59. Obscure references (ma'rifat al-mubhamāt)

60. The dates of transmitters, including their death and other relevant dates (ma'rifat tawārikh al-ruwāt fi 'l-waṣfiyyāt wa-ghayrihā)

61. Reliable and weak transmitters of hadith (ma'rifat al-thiqāt wa-'l-ju'dūfi min al-ruwāt)

62. Reliable transmitters who confused their hadith at the end of their life (ma'rifat man khallata fi 'akhir 'unjrih min al-thiqāt)

63. The generations of transmitters and scholars (ma'rifat taḥaqāt al-ruwāt wa-'l-ulamā')

64. Transmitters of hadith and other scholars who were clients (ma'rifat al-mawālt min al-ruwāt wa-'l-ulamā')

65. The residences and lands of transmitters (ma'rifat awji 'an al-ruwāt wa-ḥalānāhim)

That is the last of the Categories but it is not the last of what is possible in that regard. The science of hadith can be divided into countless categories, since the states and characteristics of hadith transmitters and the states and characteristics of hadith texts are endless. Every one of these states and characteristics deserves to be mentioned separately and requires its own specialists — for each is a Category in its own right — but that would be an endless task. God is enough for us and an excellent protector.
Category 1

SOUND ḤADĪTH

(Ma‘rifat al-sāḥīth min al-ḥadīth)

Know – may God enlighten you and me – that hadith, in the view of the scholars of this discipline, fall into the divisions of “sound” (ṣāḥīh), “fair” (ḥasan) and “weak” (daʿīf). The sound hadith is a “supported” hadith (al-ḥadith al-musnad), the isnād of which coheres continuously through the transmission of one upright and accurate person from another up to its point of termination. The sound ḥadīth can be neither “anomalous” (shāhadh) nor “defective” (muṣallal). These descriptions exclude the “loose” (mursal), “interrupted” (munaqṣat), “problematic” (muṣ‘al) and anomalous hadith; the ḥadīth containing an impairing defect (ṣilā); and the ḥadīth the transmitter of which suffers from any variety of discretion (jarb) – these are Categories which will be discussed below, God (He is blessed and exalted) willing. This is the hadith which is indisputably judged to be sound among the scholars of hadith.

Sometimes the scholars of ḥadīth differ over the soundness of certain hadith, either because of their disagreement over whether these characteristics are found in them or because of their disagreement in stipulating the necessity of some of these characteristics, as in the case of the loose ḥadīth. When they say, “This is a sound ḥadīth,” what is meant is that its support (ṣanad) is cohesive and it possesses the rest of the aforementioned characteristics. The standard of the sound ḥadīth does not require that it be definite that the ḥadīth is sound in reality, since this standard admits the hadith that a single upright transmitter is alone in relating and this type of hadith is not one of the reports (akhkār) which the Community unanimously agreed to receive with acceptance. In the same way, when they say regarding a ḥadīth that it is “unsound,” this is not a definite statement that it is actually a falsehood, since it may in reality be a truth. All that is meant is that its isnād is not sound according to the aforementioned standard. God knows best.

Some Important Notes

1. Sound ḥadīth fall into the categories of “agreed upon” (muttafaq ‘alayhi) and “disputed” (mukhtāraf fihī), as was noted above, and they also fall into the categories of “well known” (mashhūr) and “rare” (gharib), and categories in between. The grades of sound hadith vary in potency according to the degree that the ḥadīth possesses the aforementioned characteristics upon which soundness is based. In view of this, sound ḥadīth can be divided into innumerable subcategories. For this reason, we think it is better to refrain from judging any isnād or ḥadīth to be the absolutely most sound, although a number of the authorities in ḥadīth have ventured into that morass and their opinions were therefore contradictory.
We heard¹ that Isḥāq b. Rāhawayh² said, “The soundest of all isnāds is Zuhri’ from Sālim” from his father.”³ We also heard something similar from ʿAbd b. Ḥanbal.⁴ We heard that ʿAmr b. ʿAbd al-ʿAllās⁵ said, “The soundest isnād is Muḥammad b. Ṣhrin” from ʿAbīdah⁶ from ʿAlī.”⁷ We heard something similar from ʿAbī Ṣalāḥ al-Madīnī⁸ and this view was related from others as well. There are some who specify the transmitter from Muḥammad [b. Ṣhrin], some making him Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī⁹ and others Ibn ʿAwn.¹⁰ One of the things we hear from Yaḥyā b. Māṭīn¹¹ is that he

¹ Ruwaḥa: In his Ṣabaqat al-fiqha al-Shafiʿīya (ed. Muḥyt al-Dīn ʿAlī Najib, 2 vols, Beirut, 1413/1992, 1:77), Ibn al-Ṣāḥib explained that he used this term in the instances where he had an isnād which for the sake of brevity he did not reproduce. For the vocalization of “ruwaḥa,” see ʿAbd al-Ghant al-Nabulusi, Idāh ma lada yna fi qawl al-muhaddithīn “ruwaḥa,” Maktabat al-Asad (Damascus), no. 14123 ff, 29a–31b.
² Abū Yaḥyā Ḣabīb b. Rāhawayh (or Rāhwayh, 161/778–238/853) was one of the most important of the adherents of ḥadith of his era; EE, 3:902, Fuat Sezgin, Geschichte der arabischen Schrifttum, 10 vols. (Leiden, 1967–95), 1:109–10.
³ Abī Bakr Muḥammad b. Muslim b. Shihāb al-Zuhri (ca. 50/670–124/742) was an important figure in the history of ḥadith; Encyclopaedia of Islam, 1st edn, 4 vols (Leiden, 1908–36), 4:1239–41; Sezgin, G.A.S, 1:280–83.
⁴ Abū ʿUmar (or Abū ʿAbd Allāh) Sālim (d. 106/724), the son of Abū Ṣalāḥ b. ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, was famed for his pietry; Dhaḥabi, Siyar, 4:457–67.
⁵ Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ʿAbd Allāh was the son of the second Caliph ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb (r. 13/634–23/644). He died in 73/692 at over eighty years of age; EE, 1:53–4.
⁶ The doctrines of Abū ʿAbd Allāh Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. Ḥanbal (164/780–241/855) would eventually form the basis of the Ḥanbalite law school. His ḥadith criticism and legal opinions have been collected in a number of works and a very large collection of ḥadith, called “mustad,” is ascribed to him; EE, 1:272–7; Sezgin, G.A.S, 1:502–9.
⁷ Abū Ḥaḍrām ʿAbd b. ʿAlī al-Faṣṣās was born around 160/776 and died in 249/863; Dhaḥabi, Siyar, 11:470–72.
⁸ Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Ṣhrin (ca. 33/653–110/729) was a Baṣrī authority in ḥadith whose later generations regarded as an expert in dream interpretation as well; EE, 3:947–8; Sezgin, G.A.S, 1:833–4.
⁹ Abū Muslim ʿAbdād b. ʿAmr al-Salmānī (d. 72/691) was a well-respected Kāfir scholar. There is a good deal of confusion concerning the various elements of his name; Dhaḥabi, Siyar, 4:40–4.
¹⁰ ʿAlī b. Abī Tālib was one of the first men to convert to Islam and the son-in-law of the Prophet Ṣaḥḥām. He served as the fourth caliph from 35/656 until his assassination in 40/661; EE, 1:381–6; EE, 1:838–48.
¹¹ Abū ʿAlī-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. al-Madīnī (161/777–234/849) was one of the greatest ḥadith critics of his generation. His judgements are preserved in his al-Ḥal (ed. Muhammad Muṣṭafā al-ʿArṣamī, 2nd edn, Beirut, 1980) and in many later sources; Sezgin, G.A.S, 1:108.
¹² Abū Bakr Ayyūb b. Abī Ṣamʿah Kaysān al-Sakhtiyānī (68/688–131/748) was a famed Baṣrī transmitter of ḥadith; Sezgin, G.A.S, 1:87–8.
¹³ Abū ʿAwn ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAwān al-Muṣţari (66/686–151/768), like Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī, was a Baṣrī scholar of ḥadith renowned for his pietry; Dhaḥabi, Siyar, 6:364–75.
¹⁴ The ḥadith criticism of Yaḥyā b. Māṭīn (158/775–233/847) is preserved in his Taʾrǐkh (ed. Ahmad Muḥammad Nār Sāfī, 4 vols, Mecca, 1979), composed by his student ʿAbdās al-Dūrī (d. 271/884), and in a number of other works. Later authorities frequently cited his opinions; Sezgin, G.A.S, 1:106–7.
said, "The finest isnād is al-A‘mashā" from Ibrāhima from ‘Alqama from ‘Abd Allāh." We heard that Abū Bakr b. Abi Shayba" said, "The soundest of all isnāds is Zuhri from ‘Ali b. al-Ḥusayn" from his father" from ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib." We heard that Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Bukhārī" – the author of the Saḥīḥ (Collection of Sound Hadith) – said, "The soundest of all isnāds is Mālik from Nāfi" from [Abū ‘Abd Allāh] b. Umar." The authority Abū Maṇṣūr Abū al-Qāhir b. Ṭāhir al-Tamimi extrapolated from this that the most exalted isnād must be Shafi‘i from Mālik from Nāfi from Ibn ‘Umar, and he cited as proof the consensus of the scholars of ḥadith that there was no transmitter from Mālik more exalted than Shafi‘i (God be pleased with all of them). God knows best.

16 Abū ‘Imrān Ibrāhima b. Yazīd al-Nakha‘ī (ca. 50/670–ca. 96/715) was one of the most prominent of the early jurists of al-Kūfa; EF, 9:921–2; Szecin, GAS, 1:403–4.
17 Abū Shībāl ‘Alqama b. Qays al-Nakha‘ī al-Kūfī (d. ca. 62/682) was a prominent Kūfī legal scholar; Dahahab, Siyār, 4:53–61.
18 Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Raḥmān Abīl Allāh b. Mas‘ūd al-Hudayhī was an energetic teacher of the badth of the Prophet who died in Medina in 32/653; Dahahab, Siyār, 1:461–500.
20 ‘Ali b. al-Ḥusayn b. Abī Ṭālib (ca. 38/659–94/712), known as Ŷayn al-Ābidīn, was the fourth imām of the Twelver Shiites; EF, 1:849–50.
21 Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥusayn was one of the beloved grandsons of the Prophet. His father was the Prophet’s confidant and son-in-law Abī Allī and his mother was Fāṭima. He died in the Battle of Karbala in 61/680; EF, 3:607–15.
22 Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl al-Bukhārī (194/810–256/870) was the author of the most famous hadith collection, popularly known as Saḥīḥ al-Bukhārī (published a number of times), and a number of other important works of hadith scholarship; EF, 1:1296–7; Szecin, GAS, 1:115–34.
23 Abū ‘Abd Allāh Mālik b. Anas al-Aṣbāḥi (93/712–179/795) was the greatest scholar in the city of Medina during his lifetime and the eponym of the Mālikite law school. His views are preserved in his al-Muwaṭṭa’, which has reached us in a number of recensions; EF, 6:262–5; Szecin, GAS, 1:457–64.
24 Abū ‘Abd Allāh Nāfi’ (d. ca. 117/735), the client of Abū Allāh Abī ‘Umar, was a prolific transmitter of hadith; EF, 7:876–7.
26 Muḥammad b. Idrīs al-Shafī‘i (150/767–204/820) was the eponym of the Shafi‘ite law school and an influential figure in the development of Islamic legal thought; EF, 9:181–5; Szecin, GAS, 1:484–90.
2. When, in the personal ḥadith collections and other books which are in circulation, we encounter a ḥadith sound in regard to its isnād, but we do not find it included in either of the two Ṣaḥīḥs or designated as sound in any of the other well-known and authoritative compositions (muṣannafāt) of the leaders in ḥadith; we do not presume to judge it conclusively as sound. These days it is no longer feasible for someone to apprehend sound ḥadith on his own by merely examining isnāds. This is because in every isnād of that kind of ḥadith you find among its transmitters someone who merely relied upon what was in his book in its transmission and lacked the level of retention, accuracy and exactitude stipulated for sound ḥadith. So, for the recognition of sound and fair ḥadith, the matter reverts to relying on what the authorities in ḥadith designated as such in their well-known and authoritative compositions, which have been rendered safe from alteration and corruption by the circumstance that they are widely known. The continuance of the chain of the isnād – by which this Community (may God augment its glory) has been distinguished – has become the principal reason for the circulation of isnāds apart from [those in the authoritative collections]. Amen!

3. Bukhārī – that is, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Iṣmāʿīl al-Bukhārī al-Juʿfī, a client of the Juʿfīte tribe – was the first to compose a collection containing only sound hadith. Abū ʿUṣayn Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Dārāmī al-Qushayrī – a member of the tribe of Qushayr – followed him. Although Muḥammad took hadith from Bukhārī and studied under him, he did share most of his teachers. The books of Bukhārī and Muḥammad are the soundest books after the august book of God [that is, the Qurʾān]. The statement we repeatedly heard from Shāfiʿī (God be pleased with him) – and others related it with different wording – : “I do not know of a more correct book of religious knowledge in the world than the book of Mālik [that is, al-Muwatta’]” was made by him before the books of Bukhārī and Muḥammad came into existence. The book of Bukhārī is the sounder of the two in regard to being a collection of sound hadith and also the more useful. There is nothing wrong with the statement we heard from the expert Abū ʿAli al-Ḥāfīz

---

27 ʿAjāʾīb al-ḥadīth: Taḥānawi defines ʿajāʾīb (pl. ʿajāʾib) as “a book collecting the hadith of a single individual,” Kashf ʿishāb al-funūn, 2 vols ([Istanbul], 1317), I:206. Students frequently gathered the hadith of a particular transmitter in this form to bring to his class for audition and occasionally these works found their way into general circulation. Some of the most renowned ʿajāʾīb are listed in Ḥājī Khālid, Kashf, I:chaps 583–90 and Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Kāṭīb, al-Risāla al-mustajrafa bi-bayān mashhūr khutub al-sunnah al-mukharrrafa, 3rd edn (Damascus, 1383/1963), 86–94.

28 In addition to his Ṣaḥīḥ (published several times), Muḥammad (d. 261/875) composed a number of important works on the study of hadith, several of which will be mentioned in the course of the present translation; EI, 7:691–2; Sezgin, G4S, 1:136–43.

29 From the fact that Muḥammad studied under Bukhārī, the scholars of hadith would as a matter of course have inferred that Muḥammad belonged to the generation after that of Bukhārī, rather than the same one, as was actually the case.
al-Nisabûrî**, (the teacher of the expert Abû 'Abd Allâh al-‘Hakîm)**: "There is no book on earth sounder than the book of Muslim b. al-‘Hajjâj," and there is nothing wrong with the doctrine of the North African scholars who prefer the book of Muslim to that of Bukhârî; if what is meant is that the book of Muslim is superior since no unsound hadîth are mixed into it. After the introductory chapter of Muslim's book, only sound hadîth are enumerated in it and they are not coupled with hadîth like those occurring in the chapter headings of Bukhârî's book for which he did not provide isnâds meeting the standard stipulated for sound hadîth. It does not necessarily follow from this that the book of Muslim is superior to the book of Bukhârî in what pertains to the essence of a book of sound hadîth. If what is meant by these views is that the book of Muslim is sounder as a book of sound hadîth, it redounds against whoever says it. God knows best.

4. Bukhârî and Muslim did not include all of the sound hadîth in their Šâhidhs and they did not take it upon themselves to do that. In fact, we often heard that Bukhârî said, "I put into Kûtâb al-Jâmî' (Comprehensive Collection; that is, his Šâhidh) only what was established as sound and I left out some sound hadîth for fear of proximity." We heard that Muslim said, "I did not place here" -- that is, in his book, the Šâhidh -- "all of the hadîth I consider to be sound. I put here only those hadîth they accepted unanimously." He meant -- and God knows best -- that he only put in his book the hadîth which in his opinion met the standards of the hadîth unanimously regarded as sound, even if in the opinion of certain people some of these hadîth do not appear to meet these standards.

The expert Abû 'Abd Allâh b. al-Akhram** said, "Few are the well-established hadîth that escape Bukhârî and Muslim," -- that is, in their books. One should say that they are not few. Al-Mustadrak 'ala l-Šâhidhâyn** (The Supplement to the Two Šâhidhs) of Abû 'Abd Allâh al-‘Hakîm is a large book which includes a good deal of what escaped their notice. Even if an

---
30 Abû 'Alt al-Husayn b. 'Alt al-Nisabûrî (277/899–349/960) was one of the great hadîth scholars of his age and is best known, as this passage indicates, for being the mentor of al-‘Hakîm al-Nisabûrî; Dhaahab, Siyâr, 16:51–9.
31 Abû 'Abd Allâh Muhammad b. 'Abd Allâh (321/933–405/1014), also known as al-Nisabûrî, was one of the most prolific authors on the subject of hadîth during the fourth/tenth century. Two manuals of hadîth from his pen have survived. The larger, Kûtâb Mu'ârifat ‘ulam al-hadîth, Ibn al-‘Salâh used as a model for the Mapadâmâ. His shorter manual, al-Madîkhal ilâ mu'ârifat al-Ikîl, has been edited and translated by James Rhoson (London, 1953); EJ, 3:82; Sezgin, GAS, 1:221–2; EIr, 1:250–51.
33 The sources ascribe a number of works with interesting titles to Abû 'Abd Allâh Muhammadd b. Ya‘qûb b. Yûsuf al-Shaybânî al-Nisabûrî (250/864–344/955). Regrettably, none of them seems to have survived; Dhaahab, Siyâr, 15:466–9.
34 4 vols (Hyderabad, 1334–42).
argument may be made against Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥakīm regarding some of his hadith, many of his sound hadith remain untainted. Indeed, Bukhārī said, “I have one hundred thousand sound hadith and two hundred thousand unsound.” The total in his book Sahih is 7,275 hadith, including some repeated hadith. It has been said that with the omission of the duplicates the total is four thousand. In their35 opinion, however, this figure may include the accounts (aitār) of the Companions and Followers,36 and often a single hadith related with two isnāds is counted as two hadith.

The augmentation of the sound hadith beyond the contents of the two books: those who seek this should obtain their additions from the hadith clearly designated as sound in one of the famous, authoritative compositions of the leaders in hadith – like Abū Dawūd al-Sūlāyānī,37 Abū ʿĪsā al-Tirmidhī,38 Abū ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Nasāʾī,39 Abū Bakr b. Khuzayma,40 Abū ʿl-Ḥasan al-Dārāqūṭī41 and others. For this, it is not enough that the hadith merely be found in the books of Abū Dawūd, Tirmidhī, Nasāʾī and the rest of those who brought together sound and other hadith in their works. In contrast, the mere presence of a hadith in the books of those of them who stipulate that the hadith they collect be sound – like the book of Ibn Khuzayma – does suffice. We regard in the same fashion the material found in the books providing versions of the hadith in the book of Bukhārī and the book of Muslim (God be pleased with them) with variant isnāds42 – like the

35 The antecedent of this pronoun appears to be those who provided the figure of four thousand.
36 In the broadest sense, the Companions (Ṣaḥāba) were the early Muslims who had contact with the Prophet, although the exact form of contact required was disputed. The Followers (Tābiʿūn) were the students of the Companions; see EI, 8:827–9 and 10:28–30. These two groups are discussed in depth below, in Categories 39 and 40.
37 Abū Dawūd Sulāyānī b. al-Ashārī al-Sūlāyānī (202/817–275/899) was the compiler of the famous Kitāb al-Sunna (published several times); EI, 1:114; Sezgin, GAS, 1:149–52.
38 The hadith collection of Abū ʿĪsā Muhammad b. ʿĪsā b. Sawra al-Tirmidhī (210/825–279/992) is commonly called al-Jāmiʿ al-sahih, although Ibn al-Salāḥ would prefer simply al-Jāmiʿ. It is available in a number of editions; EI, 4:796–7; Sezgin, GAS, 1:154–9.
39 Abū ʿAbd al-Rahmān Aḥmad b. Shuʿayb al-Nasāʾī (215/830–303/915) was born in Nasā in Khurāsān and traveled extensively, collecting and teaching hadith, before settling in Egypt. His famous hadith collection is now known as Kitāb al-Sunna (published several times); EI, 7:969–70; Sezgin, GAS, 1:167–9.
41 Abū ʿl-Ḥasan Ḥāfīz b. Umar al-Dārāqūṭī (306/919–385/995) composed a hadith collection named Kitāb al-Sunna (4 vols, Cairo, 1386/1966) and a number of other works concerning the study of hadith; EI, 2:136; Sezgin, GAS, 1:206–9.
42 Al-khuṭṭab al-mukhtarraṣṣa (ʿala kitāb al-Bukhārī wa-kitāb Muslim) Sahlahu defined “istiḥkrāj” – the form of the word later scholars preferred to takhrīj – as follows: “An expert takes, for instance, the Sahih of Bukhārī and he presents the hadith from it one by one with his own isnāds, without stipulating for himself that the transmitters be reliable;” Fath al-Maghīth, 1:39.
books of Abū ʿAwāna al-Isfarāyīnī, Abū Bakr al-Ismāʿīlī, Abū Bakr al-Barqūnī, and other works— which completes the abridged hadith and provides commentary on many of the hadith of the two Ṣaḥīḥs. A considerable amount of this kind of material is found in al-Jamʿ bayn al-Ṣaḥīḥayn (The Union of the Two Ṣaḥīḥs) of Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥumaydī.

The expert Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥakim occupied himself with augmenting the number of sound ḥadīth beyond the contents of the two Ṣaḥīḥs. He collected [the fruit of his research] in a book he called al-Mustadrak in which he placed the ḥadīth not found in either of the two Ṣaḥīḥs which he regarded as meeting the standard of the two teachers [that is, Bukhārī and Muslim]—that is, they had included material from the transmitters of the hadith in their book— or as meeting the standard of Bukhārī alone or that of Muslim alone. In addition, al-Ḥakim included the ḥadīth that his own efforts led him to regard as sound, even if they did not meet the standard of either Bukhārī or Muslim. He is liberal in interpreting the standard of the sound ḥadīth and free in applying it. It is best that we take a moderate position regarding him. We say: A ḥadīth he reckons to be sound, if we do not find it regarded as sound by any other authority, is, even if it is not sound, a fair ḥadīth to be cited as a proof and acted upon, unless a defect positively determining its weakness appears in it. In this respect, the Ṣaḥīḥ of Abū Ḥātim M. Ḥibbān al-Bustī (God bless all of them) is similar to it. God knows best.

5. The books providing versions of the ḥadīth in the book of Bukhārī or the book of Muslim (God be pleased with them) with variant isnāds: the authors of these books did not take it upon themselves to match Bukhārī and Muslim in regard to the exact wording of the ḥadīth without addition or omission. This is

---

44 The book of Abū Bakr Ahmad b. Ibrahim al-Ismāʿīlī (277/890–371/981), al-Mustakhrraj `ala ʿl-Ṣaḥīḥ, was based on Bukhārī’s work; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:602.
45 Abū Bakr Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Barqūnī (336/948–425/1034) was a teacher of al-Khaṭṭāb al-Baghdādī; Efr., 1:821. The title of the work referred to here seems to have been al-famʿ bayn al-Ṣaḥīḥayn; see Ḥāfiz Khalīfa, Kashīf, 1:col. 599.
because in pursuit of elevation of isnād they related these hadith from sources other than Bukhārī or Muslim and thus some variation in wording occurs in them. This is also the case with the hadith authors included in their own independent compositions—like al-Sunan al-kabir (Great Book of Sunnas) of Bayhaqi, Sharḥ al-Sunna (Explanation of the Sunna) of Abū Muhammad al-Baghawi, and others—for which they say, “Bukhārī” or “Muslim” “included it.” Nothing more may be inferred from that other than that Bukhārī or Muslim included the archetypal aṣl of that hadith, it being probable that there is a difference in wording between the two versions. There may also be some variation in the meaning and I have in fact found some hadith in which there is a degree of variation in regard to the sense. When that is the case, you may not transmit a hadith from these books, saying, “It occurs in this form in the book of Bukhārī” or “the book of Muslim” unless you compare its wording [with the version given by either Bukhārī or Muslim to verify this] or the author who provides the version with the alternate isnād has said, “Bukhārī included it with this wording.”

These works differ from the abridgements of the two Sahīhs. The authors transmit in their abridgements the wording of the two Sahīhs, or that of one of them. However, one of these works, Humaydī al-Andalusi’s al-Jami’ bayn al-Saḥīḥayn, does include additional supplementary material for some of the hadith, as we mentioned above. Occasionally a person who does not know better transmits something he finds in this book as if it were from one or both of the Sahīhs, and he falls into error because it is one of these additions not present in either of the two Sahīhs.

Two benefits are derived from the aforementioned versions with variant isnāds of the hadith in the two books [that is, the Sahīhs of Bukhārī and Muslim]. The first is elevation of isnād. The second is the augmentation of the extent of the sound hadith by their additional words and their supplements to some of the hadith. The soundness of these additions is established by these variant versions, because these versions come with isnāds established in one or both of the Sahīhs and emanate from that well-established source. God knows best.

48 “Uṣūl al-ismā: The fewer intermediaries mentioned in an isnād, the more “elevated” it was considered; see below, Category 29.
49 Abū Bakr Ahmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Bayhaqi (384/994–458/1066) was an important Shafiʿite who wrote a number of works on hadith, including his al-Sunan al-kabir (published as Kitāb al-Sunan al-kubra), 10 vols., Hyderabad, 1344–55; Brockelmann, GAL, 1:446–7, Suppl., 1:618–19; EF, 1:1130.
50 Abū Muhammad al-Ḥusayn b. Maṣʿūd b. Muhammad al-Baghawi (433/1042–516/1122) was a pious scholar who worked hard to popularize the study of hadith. Sharḥ al-Sunna (ed. Shu‘ayb al-Arnaʿū and Muhammad Zuhayr al-Shāwṭis, 16 vols., Damascus, 1390/1971 ff.) is one of his most famous works; Brockelmann, GAL, 1:447–9, Suppl., 1:620–22; EF, 1:893.
51 Bukhārī asserts that the sukkārīj was obliged to select the versions of the hadith with isnāds which were identical to the original ones for as many links as possible, unless there was a compelling reason not to do so; Fath al-Mukhtār, 1:39. It has been asserted (pace Ibn al-Salāb)
6. The hadith that Bukhārī and Muslim (God bless them) provide with an uninterrupted isnād in their books: these beyond a doubt represent the material they judged as sound. There is doubt about some of the “suspended” hadith (muṣallaq); that is, the hadith with an isnād from the beginning of which one transmitter or more is omitted. The majority of these are in the book of Bukhārī; there are very few in the book of Muslim. We should say: These and similar hadith which contain an expression decisively and conclusively indicating their ascription to the person from whom they are “suspended” — for example, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said (qāla) such and such,” “Ibn ʿAbbās said such and such,” “Mujāhid said such and such,” “Affān said such and such,” “Qānābī said such and such,” “Abū Hurayra related (rawā) such and such,” and similar expressions — are judged to be established as actually coming from that person. On the basis of all these expressions, it is determined that the person to whom Bukhārī ascribed the hadith spoke and related [the text that follows]. Bukhārī would not have deemed it permissible to state this [that is, to use these unequivocal expressions] without qualification unless it was established in his view that the hadith came from the person to whom it is ascribed. If the transmitter from whom the hadith is suspended is not a Companion, the judgement regarding the soundness of the hadith depends on the cohesiveness of the isnād between that person and the Companion.

The phrases containing no decisive and conclusive indication in their wording — for instance, “Such and such was related from (raviya ‘an) the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him),” “Such and such was related from X,” “On this topic we find such and such from (‘an) the Prophet (Peace be upon him),” and similar expressions: none of them contains any decisive indication establishing it as coming from the person to whom Bukhārī ascribed it, because expressions like these are also used with weak hadith. However, Bukhārī’s inclusion of this kind of hadith among the sound hadith provides an indication of the soundness of its archetype which one can be comfortable with and rely upon. (God knows best.) Indeed, few of Bukhārī’s suspended hadith fail to attain the standard of the sound hadith and in his book these are found in certain places in the headings

that the soundness of the isnāds of the alternate versions was confirmed only insofar as they were identical to those in the two Ṣaḥīḥs; W. Marçais, Taqāṣī, 9, n. 3.
52 Abu ʿAbbās ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbbās (d. ca. 68/687) was a Companion of the Prophet who was especially expert in the interpretation of the Qurʾān; EF, 1:40–41; Sezgin, GAS, 1:25–8.
53 Abu ʿl-Ḥaḍrā Masūḥīd b. Jahr al-Makkī (ca. 21/642–ca. 104/722) was best known as an expert in the Qurʾān; EF, 7293; Sezgin, GAS, 1:29.
54 Abū Ṭūḥānān Affān b. Muslim al-Saṣfārī (ca. 134/751–220/835) was born in al-Baṣra and taught hadith in Baghdad; Sezgin, GAS, 1:102.
55 Abū ʿAbd al-Rahmān ʿAbd Allāh b. Maslama al-Qānābī (ca. 130/748–221/836) was a long-time student of Mālik; Dhababī, Siyar, 10:257–64.
56 The Companion Abū Hurayra al-Dawṣī (d. ca. 59/679) was a major transmitter from the Prophet. There is considerable controversy surrounding the other elements of his name; EF, 1:129.
of the chapters, not in the substance of the book and its prime subject matter as indicated by the title he gave it, *al-Jāmi‘ al-musnad al-ṣaḥīh al-mukhtasar min umūr Rasūl Allāh wa-sunanīha wa-a'yānīha* (*The Comprehensive Collection of Supported Sound Hadith Summarized from the Actions, Practices and Battles of the Messenger of God*).

The applicability of Bukhārī’s statement, “I put into *Kitāb al-Jāmi‘* only what was established as sound,” goes back to the distinction which we explained. The same is true of the applicability of the statement of the expert Abū Naṣr al-Wā’ilī al-Sijzi, “Scholars, the jurists and others, unanimously agree that if a man had sworn to divorce his wife if not all of the ḥadith related from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) in the book of Bukhārī were established as being authentically from him and said by him, there would no doubt about it: the man did not break his oath and the wife remains as before in his snare.” This is also true of the statement of Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Humaydi in his book *al-Jāmi‘ bayn al-Ṣaḥḥayn*, “These two [that is, Bukhārī and Muslim] are the only old authorities (God be pleased with all of them) we found who clearly expressed soundness to us in all of what they brought together.” All of that refers to the substance and the prime subject of the book and the texts in the chapters, rather than the chapter headings and the like, because in some of these chapter headings there is material that is absolutely not sound. An example of this is Bukhārī’s chapter on the ḥadith concerning the thigh where he relates from Ibn ʿAbbās, Jarhad, and Muhammad b. Jahsh from the Prophet, “The thigh is one of the privy parts.” Another example is his remark in the first of the chapters concerning the major ablution, “Bahz b. Ḥakīm” said from his father from his grandfather from the Prophet, “God most deserves that one have shame before Him,” and this definitely fails to meet Bukhārī’s standard. For that reason, Humaydi did not include it in his *al-Jāmi‘ bayn al-Ṣaḥḥayn*. So note that, for it is significant yet not readily apparent. God knows best.

57 The most important work of the anti-Ashrāfite polemicist Abū Naṣr ʿUbayd Allāh b. Saʿd b. Hitm al-Wā’ilī al-Sijzi was *al-ʾIhāna al-ḥabūrā*, in which he argued that the Qurʾān is uncreated. He died in 444/1052 in Mecca; Dīhāb, *Sirāj*, 17:654–7.


7. Since the question of the recognition of sound hadith ultimately reverts to the material the authorities included in their compositions which are responsible for declaring them to be sound, as mentioned above, the need to direct our attention to the subcategories of sound hadith is, as a consequence, urgent.

a. The sound hadith included by both Bukhārī and Muslim.
b. The sound hadith included only by Bukhārī, that is, as opposed to Muslim.
c. The sound hadith included only by Muslim, that is, as opposed to Bukhārī.
d. The sound hadith which meet the standard of both of them, but which were not included by them.
e. The sound hadith which meet the standard of Bukhārī, but which were not included by him.
f. The sound hadith which meet the standard of Muslim, but which were not included by him.
g. The hadith regarded as sound by others, but which do not meet the standard of either Bukhārī or Muslim.

These are the main subcategories. The highest is the first, and it is one which the scholars of hadith often call "agreed upon to be sound" (ṣaḥīḥ muṭtafaq ṣālīḥī). When they apply that term without qualification, they mean by it the agreement of Bukhārī and Muslim on it, and not the agreement of the Muslim Community. However, the agreement of the Muslim Community on it necessarily follows from the agreement of Bukhārī and Muslim and is concurrent with it, because of the agreement of the Muslim Community to receive with acceptance whatever Bukhārī and Muslim agreed upon. The soundness of this entire subcategory is definitely settled. Theoretical and certain knowledge occurs through it, contrary to the doctrine of those who deny this, arguing that their agreement does not in principle produce more than the presumption (ṣaʾānū) [that the hadith is sound]. They claim that the Muslim Community received these hadith with acceptance only because it is obliged to act on presumption, although presumption sometimes errs. Formerly, I had inclined toward this view and regarded it highly. Then it became clear to me that the doctrine we had chosen in the first place is the correct one, because the presumption of someone who is protected (maṣūm) from error is never wrong and the Muslim Community, when united by consensus (fiṣīḥā), is protected from error. For this reason, consensus based on someone's personal endeavor (ijtihād) is a decisive proof, and

63. Al-qīm al-yaqīn al-naẓārī. In discussing this passage, Ibn Ḥajar noted that al-qīm al-naẓārī differs from al-qīm al-darrī in that the former admits doubt while the latter does not. He equated yaqīn with qāfī and interpreted it to mean that Ibn al-Ṣalāh was asserting that these hadith possess an absolute level of soundness which renders comparisons between them impossible, a view which Ibn Ḥajar did not personally endorse; Nukhbat, 1:379.
64. The reason for the shift from the first person singular to the first person plural is not clear.
most of the cases of the consensus of scholars are of that kind. This is a precious and useful point.

One of the ramifications of this is the doctrine that the hadith which either Bukhārī or Muslim is alone in including come under the heading of what is decisively regarded as sound because of the Muslim Community’s reception of each of their books with acceptance in the fashion detailed by us in the preceding paragraph. This applies to all but a few insignificant items which some of the critics among the experts of hadith—like Dāraqūṭni65 and others—have discussed. These are known to the scholars in this field. God knows best.

8. When it becomes clear, from what we said above, that the way to identify sound and fair hadith is now confined to the consultation of the two Sahīhs and other authoritative books, [it will be seen that] the course open to the student who wants to act on these hadith or cite them as a proof—if he is one of those permitted to act on hadith and cite them as proofs to a partisan—is to consult a copy of the text (ṣīḥ) which he personally or some other reliable person has collated against numerous sound copies transmitted through several different channels. So through the collation, in conjunction with the ubiquity of these books and the improbability that they were intentionally changed or corrupted, he obtains confidence in the soundness of what those texts agree upon. God knows best what is correct.

---

65 This is a reference to Dāraqūṭni’s Kitāb al-Tabābū (published with al-Izāmāt, Medina, 1397/1978).
Category 2
FAIR ḤADRĪTH
(Maʿrifat al-hasan min al-ḥadīth)

After relating that ḥadīth, according to the scholars of this discipline, fall into the three divisions we mentioned above, we heard that Abū Sulaymān al-Khaṭṭābī (God bless him) said, “‘Fair’ is the ḥadīth, the source of which is known and the transmitters of which are famous. Most ḥadīth fall into this category and it is the category which most scholars accept and the generality of jurists employ.” We heard that what Abū ʿIsā al-Tirmidhī (God be pleased with him) meant by “fair” is “that no one in the isnād of the ḥadīth is accused of falsehood, that it is not an anomalous ḥadīth (ḥadīth shādīdh) and that something similar to it is related from more than one line of transmission.” One of the more recent experts’ said, “‘Fair’ is the ḥadīth in which there is a slight but tolerable weakness. It is suitable for use.” All of this is ambiguous and inadequate. Nothing in the definitions of Tirmidhī and Khaṭṭābī distinguishes the fair ḥadīth from the sound. I have examined and researched the question of the fair ḥadīth at length, collecting the scattered remarks of the experts and taking note of the instances of their usage of this term. It became abundantly clear that there are two subcategories of fair ḥadīth.

1 Although the works of Abū Sulaymān Hamd b. Muhammad al-Khaṭṭābī (296/908–386/996) were extremely influential, his life is poorly documented. He was the first to write commentaries on the major ḥadīth collections. His Muṣūlim al-Sunān (ed. Muhammad Ṭāhlīb al-Ṭabbākh, 4 vols, Aleppo, 1351/1932–1352/1934) deals with the Sunān of Abū Dawūd al-Sijistānī while Aḥām al-sunān (ed. Yūsuf al-Kattānī, 2 vols, Rabat, n.d.) treats Bukhārī’s Sahīḥ; EF, 4:1131–2; Seegmün, C.AS, 1:210–11.
2 The word “mukk라f” is not a technical term in the study of ḥadīth and on its own yielded very little meaning to later commentators. They tended to interpret the phrase “the source of which is known” as a reference to the necessity of cohesion in the isnād of the fair ḥadīth, seemingly because that would otherwise be missing from Khaṭṭābī’s definition; e.g., Sakhāwī, Fath al-Mughthī, 1:62–3; Zayn al-Dīn al-ʿIrāqī, al-Tajīrī wa-l-tīlāh, ed. Ṭāl al-Rahmān Muhammad ʿUthmān (Cairo, 1389/1969), 44; Zakariyyāʾ al-Anṣārī, Fath al-Bāṣal ʿAṣīr al-ṣifrat al-ʿIrāqī (bound with ʿIrāqī, al-Tahqīr wa-l-tajīrī, ed. Muhammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-ʿIrāqī al-Ḥusaynī, 3 vols (Beirut, n.d.), 1:84.
5 Band al-musawākkhāḥān: although the division between the mutaqaddimān and the musawākkhāhan, “the ancients and the moderns,” would seem by its nature to be relative and approximate, it is perhaps instructive to note that Dhahabi (d. 748/1347) made the year 390/912 the dividing line; Mizān al-Fīlīdāl fi-naqd al-rijāl, ed. Ṭālī Muhammad al-Ḥajjāwī, 4 vols (Cairo, 1382/1963), 1:4; id., al-Muḥtari fi-l-ṣeʿla, ed. Nūr al-Dīn al-Itrīr, 2 vols (Aleppo, 1391/1971), 1:4; Ibn Ḥajr, Liṣān al-mizān, 6 vols (Hyderabad, 1329–31), 1:8–9, 5:396.
1. The ḥadith the isnād of which includes an outwardly acceptable individual whose suitability has not been confirmed: yet, this individual is not careless, prone to mistakes in what he transmits nor accused of falsehood in ḥadith; that is, he manifests neither the practice of deliberately lying in ḥadith nor any other reason for vitiating his integrity. In addition, it has become known that a text like that of the ḥadith or one similar to it has been transmitted through one or more different lines of transmission. In this way, the ḥadith is reinforced by the parallelism of someone else being in conformity with its transmitter with something like it or by another attestation to it; that is, the appearance of another ḥadith with a similar text. This way the possibility that it is anomalous or unfamiliar (munkar) is excluded. The remarks of Tirmidhī concern this subcategory of fair ḥadith.

2. The ḥadith the transmitter of which is someone famous for veracity and honesty who, however, did not attain the grade of the transmitters of sound ḥadith, because he fell short of them in retention and exactitude: despite that, his state is superior to that of the transmitter whose ḥadith are counted as unfamiliar, if he is alone in transmitting them. For all of this, the ḥadith must [first] be considered to be secure from being defective (ma'alla), as well as secure from being anomalous or unfamiliar. The remarks of Khaṭṭābī concern the second subcategory of fair ḥadith.

What we have said brings together the scattered comments of those whose remarks on the fair ḥadith have come to our attention. It is as if Tirmidhī had mentioned one of the two categories of the fair ḥadith and Khaṭṭābī had mentioned the other, each of them limiting himself to what he regarded as problematic and passing over what he saw as unproblematic, or paying no attention to some aspects of it, overlooking them. (God knows best.) The preceding was an enumeration of the principal aspects of the fair ḥadith and we will now clarify the matter through a discussion of certain points worth noting and certain subsidiary issues.

1. The fair ḥadith falls short of the sound in that the standard of the sound requires that the integrity, accuracy and exactitude of all of the transmitters of the sound ḥadith be established, either by explicit transmission or by way of general acknowledgement, as we will explain, God (He is exalted) willing. That is not stipulated for the fair ḥadith. As stated above, the appearance of the ḥadith from several paths of transmission and the other conditions which were explained earlier do suffice in the case of the fair ḥadith.

---

7 Mattīr literally means “veiled” and may be translated as “respectable.” Ibn Hajar equated mastīr with majhūl al-ḥāl, Nukhbat al-naẓar, 87.
Whenever a Shāfiʿī jurist regards that with skepticism, we remind him of the provision of Shāfiʿī (God be pleased with him) concerning the loose ḥadīth (marāṣil) of the Followers: that he accepted a loose ḥadīth for which there was a similar supported version (musnad). Likewise, he accepted a loose ḥadīth if another loose ḥadīth transmitted by someone who had not studied with the teachers of the first Follower was in agreement with it. Shāfiʿī said this in some of his remarks where he speaks of several ways of determining the soundness of the source of a loose ḥadīth on the basis of its coming from another line of transmission. We also remind the skeptical Shāfiʿī that Abu ʿl-Muẓaffar al-Samʿānī and others related from one of the students of Shāfiʿī that the transmission of an outwardly acceptable transmitter is to be accepted, even if the testimony of an outwardly acceptable individual may not be accepted in court, and there is a cogent reason for that. So how [could a Shāfiʿī object], when for a ḥadīth to be considered fair we would not be satisfied – in accordance with the foregoing remarks – by its mere relation by an outwardly acceptable individual? God knows best.

2. Perhaps some clever investigator will say, "We find ḥadīth judged as weak, despite their having been related with many isnāds through numerous lines of transmission, like the ḥadīth, 'The ears are part of the head,' and similar ones. Why do you not include that ḥadīth and the others like it in the category of fair ḥadīth, because the various versions reinforce one another, in the fashion you previously described regarding fair ḥadīth?" The answer to this is that not every weakness in a ḥadīth is eliminated by the ḥadīth coming from several lines of transmission. Rather, the situation varies. One weakness which the passage of a ḥadīth through several lines of transmission eliminates is the weakness which arises from some deficiency in the retention of its transmitter, when he is otherwise veracious and pious. When we see that the ḥadīth he related also comes from another line of transmission, we realize that it is one of the ḥadīth that he had retained properly and his accuracy in it was not impaired. Likewise, when the weakness of the ḥadīth is on account of looseness (irsāl), it disappears because of something along these lines – as in the case of the loose ḥadīth which an expert authority transmits as loose – since it contains just a small weakness which disappears through its relation from another line of transmission. There are also types of weakness which are not eliminated by something similar to that, on account of the severity of the weakness and the failure of this "bone-setter" to reduce the fracture in it and mend it. An example of this is the weakness which arises from the transmitter being accused of falsehood or from the ḥadīth being anomalous. This is an outline, the particulars of which are acquired through practice and study. So be aware of that. It is one of the fine points. God knows best.

8 Abu ʿl-Muẓaffar Maṣṭar b. Muḥammad al-Samʿānī (426/1035–489/1096) was the grandfather of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's teacher Abū Saʿd al-Samʿānī; Brockelmann, GAL, 1:524, Suppl., 1:731.
3. If the transmitter of a hadith lags behind the grade of those who are retentive and exact – yet is widely known for veracity and respectability – and in addition to that his hadith was related through more than one line of transmission, the strength of the hadith is reinforced from both sides and that lifts his hadith from the grade of fair to the grade of sound.

An instance of this is the hadith of Muhammad b. Amr from Abu Salama from Abu Hurayra that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, “Were it not that I would be imposing a burden on my Community, I would have ordered them to clean their teeth with a tooth-stick before every prayer.” Muhammad b. Amr b. Aqama was renowned for veracity and piety, but he lacked exactitude. So some regarded him as weak on account of his poor retention while others deemed him reliable because of his veracity and augustness. Thus his hadith from this standpoint is only fair. When the circumstance that the hadith is related through other lines of transmission was combined with that, our fears about his poor retention vanished and that slight shortcoming was mended. So this isnad was established as sound and the hadith attained the level of the sound hadith. God knows best.

4. The book of Abu 'Isa al-Tirmidhi (God bless him) is a fundamental document for the recognition of fair hadith. He is the one who referred to this category of hadith by this name and he used the term often in his Jami'. The term “fair” is also scattered throughout the remarks of some of his teachers and the members of the generation of scholars before him, like Ahmad b. Hanbal, Bukhari and others.

The various copies of Tirmidhi's book differ in his designations, “This is a fair hadith,” or “This is a fair and sound hadith (hadith husan sahih),” and the like. So it is best that you correct your copy of it against a batch of other copies and rely on what they agree upon.

Daraqutni in his Sunan explicitly designates many of his hadith as fair and this designation also occurs often in the Sunan of Abu Dawud al-Sijistani (God bless him). We heard that he said, “I mentioned in my Sunan the sound hadith and those similar and close to them.” We also heard his remarks to the effect that he mentions for each topic the soundest hadith known to him. He said, “I have indicated those hadith in my book that contain a severe debility. The hadith I do not say anything about are good (sahi), and some are sounder than others.”

9 Abu 'l-Hasan Muhammad b. Amr b. Aqama al-Laythi (d. ca. 145/762) was best known as the principal transmitter from Abu Salama; Dhadhib, Syarif, 6:136-7.
10 Abu Salama 'Abd Allah (or 'Isa al-Ma'mun) b. Abu al-Rahman al-Qurashi (ca. 20/641-94/713) was a Medina expert in hadith and law; Dhadhib, Syarif, 4:287-92.
this basis, the ḥadith which we find mentioned in his book without any designation – if they are not in either of the two Sahih and no scholar who discriminates between the sound and the fair designates them as sound – we know to be fair in the opinion of Abū Dāwūd, although some of them may not be fair in the opinion of others and may not be included in the material which we have established the accuracy of calling “fair” in accordance with what has been said above. This is because – when the expert Abū ‘Abd Allāh b. Manda12 related that he heard Muhammad b. Sa‘d al-Bāwardi13 saying in Egypt, “It was Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Nasā’ī’s way to include the ḥadith of all of those transmitters who were not unanimously rejected,” – Ibn Manda himself added, “Abū Dāwūd al-Sijīstānī as well adopts the same course, including ḥadith having weak isnāds if he does not find anything else on the topic, because in his view they were stronger than the arbitrary opinions (ra‘ay) of men.” God knows best.

5. The author of the Maṣāḥīḥ (Lamps)14 (God bless him) came to divide his ḥadith into two categories, the sound and the fair. By “sound” he meant the ḥadith appearing in one or both of the Sahih and by “fair” the ḥadith Abū Dāwūd [al-Sijīstānī], Tirmidhī and their peers included in their compilations. This is a usage unrecognized by others. The scholars of ḥadith do not consider the fair ḥadith to consist of that, for these books [that is, those of Abū Dāwūd al-Sijīstānī, Tirmidhī, and so forth] contain fair and other ḥadith, as has been made clear. God knows best.


---

12 Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ishaq b. Manda (310/922-395/1005) was the author of several religious works; EF, 3, 386.
13 Some have identified this Muḥammad b. Sa‘d al-Bāwardi as the Abū Maṣūr al-Bāwardi who is mentioned as an author of a work on the Companions by Ibn Ḥajar, al-Iṣba fi tama‘īs al-Suhba, 4 vols (Cairo, 1328), 1:3 and Sakhwī, Plān, 161; see, for example, Katrān, Rūdā, 128.
14 Baghdādi was the author of the collection of ḥadith without isnāds entitled Maṣāḥīḥ al-zunna (ed. Isrā‘īl Muḥammad Ramadān, 2 vols, Beirut, n.d.). Despite Baghdādi’s unique views (presented in the very brief introduction to the work), Maṣāḥīḥ was very popular and spawned considerable activity among later scholars; see Ḥāji Khālitā, Kashf, 2:cols 1698–702.
15 Abū Dāwūd Sulaymān b. Dāwūd b. al-Ja‘far al-Ṭayālīstī (133/750–203/818 or 204) was a famous ḥadith scholar in al-‘Aṣr, EF, 4:708; Sāqīn, G.A.S, 1:97–8.
16 Abū Muḥammad ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Mūsā al-‘Abī (d. 213/829 or 214) is said to have been the first scholar in al-‘Aṣr to compose a musnad; Dhahabī, Siyār, 9:553–7.
17 The very large musnad ascribed to Ahmad b. Ḥanbal was published in six volumes (Cairo, 1311–13).
19 Abū Muḥammad Abī (or Abī al-Hamīd) b. Ḥumayd al-Kashāhī (or al-Kishāhī) was a prominent transmitter of ḥadith who died in 249/863. His Musnad has survived in the form
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Dārīmī,20 Abū Ya'āqūb al-Mawṣūlī,21 al-Ḥasan b. Sufyān,22 Abū Bakr al-Bazzār23 and similar works — do not reach the level of the Five Books — that is, the two Sahīḥs, the Sunan of Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī, the Sunan of Naṣārī, the Ḥākimī of Ṭirmidhī — and works similar to them in that the hadith appearing in them are suitable for citation as proofs in arguments and for being relied upon, unless they are designated otherwise. The custom of the compilers of the musnads was to include in the chapter (musnad) of each Companion all of his hadith they related, without restricting themselves to the hadith worthy of being cited as proofs. For this reason, the level of these musnads fell below the level of the Five Books, even if these musnads are highly esteemed on account of the augustness of their compilers. This is also true of the works arranged by subject based on these musnads. God knows best.

7. The statement of scholars, "This is a hadith sound from the standpoint of its isnād (ṣaḥīḥ al-isnād)" — or "fair from the standpoint of its isnād (ḥasan al-isnād)," — is less than their saying, "This is a sound hadith" — or "a fair hadith" — because sometimes it is said, "This is a hadith sound from the standpoint of its isnād," and the hadith is not actually sound on account of being anomalous or defective. However, when a reliable author says nothing more than that it is sound from the standpoint of its isnād and he does not go on to bring up a defect in it or impugn it, the presumption from this is that he judged it to be intrinsically sound (ṣaḥīḥ fi nafsīh) because the lack of a defect or reason for impugnment is what is initially presumed. God knows best.

8. The statement of Ṭirmidhī and others, "This is a fair and sound hadith" (ḥadith Ḥasan ṣaḥīḥ) is problematic because the fair hadith is inferior to the sound, as was explained above. The conjunction of these two states in a single hadith is the conjunction of the negation and assertion of this inferiority. The answer here is that the expression concerns the isnād. When a single hadith is

20 Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Dārīmī was born in 181/797 and died in 255/869. His Musnad — in which the hadith are arranged by subject — has been published as Sunan al-Dārīmī (ed. Muḥammad Ahmad Duhmān, 2 vols, Damascus, 1349); EJ, 2:159; Sezgin, GAS, 1:114–15.
21 Abū Ya'āqūb Ahmad b. ʿAlī b. al-Muḥannā al-Mawṣūlī (210/826–307/919) was esteemed because, among other things, he taught his Musnad (ed. Ḥusayn Safīdī, 14 vols, Damascus, 1404/1984–1410/1990) for the sake of God rather than for worldly gain as others did (e.g., al-Ḥasan b. Sufyān); Sezgin, GAS, 1:170–71.
22 Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥasan b. Sufyān al-Nasawī was born around 213/828 and died in 303/916; Sezgin, GAS, 1:169–70. Ḥajjī Khalīfa mentions his musnad in Kaif, 2: col. 1682
23 Abū Bakr Ahmad b. ʿAmr al-Bazzār died in 292/903. His musnad has been published as al-Bukhār al-zakhiḥāh (ed. Muḥammad al-Raḥmān Zayn Allāh, Medina, 1416/1996, only vol. 8 seen); Sezgin, GAS, 1:162.
related with two isnāds, one of them fair and the other sound, it may properly be called a “fair and sound ḥadīth;” that is, it is fair in relation to one isnād and sound in relation to the other. However, it is not unheard of for someone to use that expression, meaning “fair” in its everyday sense – that is, what the soul inclines toward and the heart does not reject [that is, in the sense of “beautiful”] – rather than the technical meaning with which we are concerned, so be aware of that. God knows best.

9. There are some scholars of ḥadīth who do not recognize fair ḥadīth as a separate category, subsuming them in the types of sound ḥadīth, since they are included in the types of ḥadīth which may be adduced as proofs. The expert Abū ʿAbbās Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥakīm’s adherence to this doctrine is apparent from his remarks in his Taṣārufatu and he indicates it also by calling the book of Tirmidhi the al-jāmī al-saḥīh (The Comprehensive Collection of Sound Ḥadīth). The expert Abū Bakr al-Ḵaṭṭābī also applied the name of “Ṣaḥīḥ” without any qualification to Tirmidhi’s book and to the book of Nāṣr. The expert Abū Ṭāhir al-Silǎfī brought up the Five Books and said, “The scholars of the East and the West agree upon the soundness of them.” This is an instance of careless speech, for the authors of these books have clearly designated some of the ḥadīth they contain as being “weak” (daʿīf), “unfamiliar” and other similar terms descriptive of weak hadith. Abū Dāwūd [al-Sijistānī] in the passage we quoted above clearly indicated the division of the ḥadīth in his book into sound and other kinds of ḥadīth and Tirmidhi clearly distinguishes between the sound and the fair hadith in his book. If someone who does not deny that the fair hadith is inferior to the sound as described above calls a fair hadith “sound,” it is merely a case of a difference in expression rather than in sense. God knows best.

24 Abū Bakr Aḥmād b. Ṭāhī b. Thābit (392/1002–463/1071), popularly known as al-Khaṭṭāb al-Baghdādī, was one of the towering figures of traditional Islamic scholarship and his Taṣārīf Baghdād (14 vols, Cairo, 1349/1931) is the finest classical biographical dictionary. Several of his other important contributions to the study of hadith will be mentioned in the course of this present work; Brockelmann, GAI, 1:400-401, Suppl., 1:562-4; EF, 4:1111-12.

25 Abū Ṭāhir Aḥmād b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Silaʿfī was born around 472/1078 in Nishapur. After extensive travels, he settled in Alexandria in 511/1117, where he remained almost continuously until his death in 576/1180. During his lifetime he was the most important scholar of hadith in the Western Islamic world; Brockelmann, GAI, 1:450, Suppl., 1:624; EF, 9:607-9.
Category 3
Weak Ḥadīth
(Maʿrifat al-daʿīf min al-ḥadīth)

Every hadith in which the traits of the sound hadith and the fair hadith mentioned above do not come together is a “weak” hadith. Abū Ḥātim b. Ḥiibbān al-Bustā went overboard in creating subcategories of weak hadith, coming up with forty-nine. What I gave here is a general rule for all of that.

The procedure for someone who seeks to expound at length on this topic is to take a particular trait of the sound or the fair hadith and make the hadith that lack that trait a separate subcategory of weak hadith— if there is nothing mitigating the absence of the trait in the fashion established in the Category of the fair hadith. He then should make the hadith that lack that trait in addition to another particular trait a second subcategory. Then he should make the hadith that lack that trait in addition to two other particular traits a third subcategory. He should continue in this fashion until he covers all of the aforementioned traits. Then he should go back and pick anew a trait other than the one he initially picked and make the hadith that lack it alone a subcategory. Another subcategory is comprised of the hadith that lack the new trait and another trait—and let the latter trait be different from the one he began with because it was already used in the subdivisions based on the lack of that first trait—and so on to the last of the traits. The last and lowest subcategory is composed of the hadith that lack all of the traits. For the traits that have special stipulations (sharīʿah) do the same thing with their stipulations so that the subcategories are thereby further multiplied.

The subcategories of the weak hadith which have well-known special appellations are the “forged” (maqḍūʿ), the “mixed-up” (maqṣūḥ), the “anomalous” (shāḥīd), the “defective” (muṣʿallāt), the “disrupted” (muṭṭārīb), the “loose” (muṣūl), the “interrupted” (muḥqūqīf) and the “problematic” (muʾḍāl). The explanation of these will appear in later chapters, God (He is exalted) willing. It will be noted in the Categories we will be presenting that they are general Categories of the Sciences of Ḥadīth and not specifically Categories of the original system of classification,1 which we have now completed. We beseech God (He is blessed and exalted) to make all-encompassing the benefit of this book both in this world and in the hereafter. Amen!

---

1 That is, the division of hadith into sound, fair and weak; see Ibn Ḥajar, Nukat, 1:504.
The expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb (God bless him) stated that the scholars of ḥadīth hold the supported ḥadīth to be the one with an isnād which coheres from the person transmitting it up to its point of termination. Most often the term is applied to the hadīth which came from the Messenger of God (God be pleased with him), rather than the hadīth which originated with the Companions and others. The expert Abū ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-Barr stated that supported hadīth are exclusively those “raised” (raʾṣūf) to the Prophet (Peace be upon him). The isnād may be uninterrupted (muṭṭaqī) — like Malik from Nāfiʿ from Ibn ʿUmar from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) — or it may be interrupted (munqatī) — like Malik from Zuhri from Ibn ʿAbbās from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). The second hadīth is supported since its isnād goes to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) and it is interrupted because Zuhri did not hear hadīth from Ibn ʿAbbās (God be pleased with them). Abū ʿUmar related from several scholars the view that the term “supported” applies only to the hadīth with an uninterrupted isnād raised to the Prophet (Peace be upon him). The expert Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥakim (God bless him) stated that unambiguously and did not mention any other definition in his book. These are three differing interpretations. The first opinion is the most balanced and appropriate. God knows best.
Category 5  
UNINTERRUPTED ḤADĪTH  
(Ma‘rifat al-muttaṣil)

The uninterrupted ḥadīth is also called “connected” (mawṣūl). The term, when used without qualification, may be applied to both raised (marfū‘a) and halted ḥadīth (mawqūf). It is the ḥadīth with an isnād which is uninterrupted because each of its transmitters heard the ḥadīth from the person above him up to its point of termination. An example of a raised uninterrupted ḥadīth from the Muwatta’ is “Mālik from Ibn Shihāb [al-Zuhri] from Sālim b. ʿAbd Allāh from his father [that is, ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar] from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him).” An example of a halted uninterrupted ḥadīth is “Mālik from Nāfī‘ from Ibn ʿUmar from ʿUmar: ʿUmar said …” God knows best.

---

1 ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb was a close associate of the Prophet Muhammad and served as caliph from 13/634 until his assassination in 23/644; EF, 3:982–4.
Category 6
Raised Hadith
(Ma'rifat al-marfu')

The term "raised" applies exclusively to the hadith attributed to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) and it does not apply, when used without qualification, to anything else, just as the term "halted" (mawqaf) is applied to the Companions and others [and not to the hadith of the Prophet]. The raised hadith may be uninterrupted (muttaṣi'), interrupted (munqat'), loose (mursal) and the like. Some people regard the raised hadith and the supported (musnad) as being the same, arguing that both may be either interrupted or uninterrupted. Others maintain that they differ in that a raised hadith may be either interrupted or uninterrupted while the term "supported" applies only to the uninterrupted hadith attributed to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). The expert Abū Bakr b. Thābit [al-Khatīb al-Baghdādi] said, "The raised hadith is the one in which a Companion gives information about the words or deeds of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him)." He restricted the term to the transmission of the Companions and thus the loose hadith of the Followers (mursal al-Tabīn) from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) were excluded. The scholars of hadith who contrasted the raised hadith with the loose meant "uninterrupted" when they said "raised." God knows best.

1 Kifāya, 21.
Category 7
HALTED ḤADĪTH
(Maʾrifat al-mawqūf)

The halted ḥadīth is the one which is transmitted from the Companions (God be pleased with them) concerning their words, deeds and the like and which is stopped at them and is not carried past to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). If its isnād is cohesive to the Companion, it is called “connected halted” (al-mawqūf al-mawṣūl); and, if its isnād is not cohesive, it is called “unconnected halted” (al-mawqūf ghayr al-mawṣūl). This is similar to what is known to pertain to the hadith raised (marfūʿ) to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). (God knows best.) If the term “halted” is used without any qualification, it refers exclusively, as we mentioned above, to a hadith of a Companion. The term is sometimes used with qualification for transmitters who were not Companions. It is said, “X halted (waqafā) such-and-such hadith at ‘Atb” – or “Tawūs” or someone similar. In the terminology of the Khurāsānī jurists, we find that the halted hadith is identified with the term “account” (athār). One of them, Abu'l-Qāsim al-Fārābī, said in something of his we read, “The jurists say a ‘report’ (khabar) is what is related from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) and an ‘account’ is what is related from the Companions (God be pleased with them).”

1 Abu Muḥammad ‘Atb b. Abī al-Rahbāb Ashām (27/647–114/732) was the student of a large number of Companions; Sezgin, GAS, 1:31.
2 Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān Tāwūs b. Kaynūn (d. 106/724), like ‘Atb, was a prominent transmitter from the second generation of Muslims; Dhahabi, Siyār, 5:38–49.
Category 8
Cut-off Hadith
(Ma’rifat al-maqatil)

The cut-off hadith is not the same as the interrupted (munqatil) which, God (He is exalted) willing, will be discussed later. Maqati’ and maqatil are given as the plurals of maqatil. The cut-off hadith is a report concerning the words and deeds of the Followers, halted at them. The expert Abu Bakr al-Khaṭīb said about the cut-off hadith in his Jāmī’, “The Cut-off Hadith: the cut-off hadith are those halted at the Followers.” I have also found the cut-off hadith interpreted as interrupted – that is, unconnected (ghayr manjūl) – in the remarks of the imām Shafi’i, Abu l-Qāsim al-Ṭabarānī and others. God knows best.

Subsidiary Issues
1. The statement of a Companion, “We used to do such and such,” or “We used to say such and such,” falls into the category of halted hadith, if he does not ascribe it to the time of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). If he does ascribe it to the time of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), it belongs to the category of raised hadith (marjub), as the expert Abu ‘Abd Allah b. al-Bayyi’i [al-Ḥakim al-Ḥisabūl], other scholars of hadith and others have unequivocally stated. I read that Abu Bakr al-Barqānī asked the authority Abu Bakr al-Ismā’ili about that and he denied that it constitutes a raised hadith. The claim that it is raised deserves credit since the obvious implication of [the statement that they used to say or do something during the lifetime of the Prophet] is that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) took cognizance of [what his Companions were saying or doing] and tacitly assented to it, and his tacit assent is one of the forms of raised sunnas. The categories of raised sunnas include the words of the Prophet (Peace be upon him), his deeds, and his tacit assent and forbearance from rejecting [the statements and actions of his Companions] after becoming cognizant of them. Examples of this last kind of raised sunna are the statements of a Companion, “We did not use to think that there was anything wrong with such and such while the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) was among us,” “Such and such used to be said during the Prophet’s lifetime,” or, “They used to do such and such during the life of the

1 Jāmī’, 356.
2 Abu l-Qāsim Sulaymān b. Ajmad al-Ṭabarānī (260/873–360/971) was the author of a number of important works on hadith; Sezgin, G.A.S, 1:195–7.
3 ‘Ulam al-ḥadīth, 22.
4 A sunna is a practice endorsed by the precedent of an authoritative figure.
In regard to the report we heard from al-Mughira b. Shu'ba,3 “The Companions of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) used to tap on his door with their fingernails,” Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥakīm stated, “Those who are not versed in this craft mistakenly believe that this hadith is supported”—that is, raised—“on account of the mention of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) in it. It is not supported, but rather halted (marzqīf).”4 Al-Khaṭṭāb said something similar to this in his Jāmi5 as well. Rather, it is, as stated above, raised. It is more appropriate that it be termed “raised” since it is more probable that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) was cognizant of the act described, and al-Ḥakīm acknowledges that as constituting raised. We used to count this as one of the things we held against al-Ḥakīm. Then we interpreted it, giving him the benefit of the doubt, to mean that he meant that this hadith is not explicitly supported, but rather it is literally halted, just as the rest of [the examples discussed] earlier were literally halted. We made it raised only on the basis of its sense. God knows best.

2. The scholars of ḥadith view a Companion’s statement, “We were enjoined to do such and such,” or, “We were forbidden to do such and such,” as belonging to the category of the raised and the supported hadith. Indeed, this is the doctrine of most scholars. A certain group including Abū Bakr al-İsmāʿīlī disputed that. The first view is the correct one because such statements, when unqualified, by presumption go back to the one who possesses the right to enjoin and forbid and he is the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). The same is true of the statement of a Companion, “Such and such is a sunna.” The sounder opinion is that this statement is a raised supported hadith, because the presumption is that the Companion means by this expression only the sunna of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) and following him is what is required. This is also true of the statement of ʿAnas’ [God be pleased with him], “Bilāl was ordered to say the words of the call to prayer twice and the words of the iqāma once,” and other

5 The prominent Companion Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Mughira b. Shu'ba al-Thaqāfī served as the governor of al-Baṣra and al-Kūfah under the early caliphs and died of the plague in the year 50/667 at around the age of seventy; EF, 7:347.
6 Ulūm al-ḥadīth, 19.
7 Jami, 335.
8 Abū Ḥamza ʿAnas b. Malik al-Anṣārī was one of the last Companions of the Prophet to die and a prolific transmitter of hadith. He died in al-Baṣra around the year 93/712—the exact date is disputed—at over one hundred years of age; EF, 1:482.
9 The renowned Companion Bilāl b. Rabīḥ (d. ca. 20/641), who was also known by his mother’s name as Bilāl b. Hamīma, served as a muezzin during the lifetime of the Prophet; EF, 1:1215.
analogous statements. So there is no difference between Anas saying that in the
time of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) or after him (Peace be upon
him). God knows best.

3. The assertion that the commentary (tafsir) of a Companion constitutes a
supported hadith holds true only in the case of a Companion giving an inter-
pretation concerning the circumstance of the revelation of a verse of the Qur’an
and the like. For instance, the statement of Jabir9 (God be pleased with him),
“The Jews used to say that the child of someone who has vaginal intercourse
with his wife from the rear will be born squint-eyed. Then God (He is mighty
and majestic) revealed the Qur’anic verse [2:223], ‘Your women are a field for
you …’” The other interpretations of the Companions which do not contain the
ascription of anything to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) are counted
as halted hadith. God knows best.

4. The hadith in the isnads of which it is said at the mention of the Companion,
“He raises the hadith” (yafû’u), “He reaches with it” (yabilghu bihi), “He
advances it” (yamiin) or “As a transmission” (riwâyatun) are considered raised
hadith. An example of this is “Suﬁyân b. ‘Uyayna” from Abu “l-Zinzid” from
al-A‘raj10 from Abû Hurayra as a transmission, “[The Hour will not come until]
you fight a people with small eyes …,” and with the same isnad, “from Abû
Hurayra, he reaches with it, ‘The people are subordinates of the Quraysh …’”
All of these expressions and others like them allude to the Companion raising the
hadith to the level of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) and scholars
judge them to be plainly raised. When a transmitter says about a Follower, “He
raises the hadith,” or “He reaches with it,” that is also raised, but it is a loose
raised hadith (marfu’ mursal). God knows best.

---

10 The Companion Abû ‘Abd Allâh Jabir b. ‘Abd Allâh b. ‘Amr al-Salâm al-Ansârî (d. 78/697)
was the mufti in Medina after the Prophet’s death. His hadith were collected in an early Sahîha
(see Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:85); Dhababt, Siyâr, 3:189–94.
11 The great scholar of hadith Suﬁyân b. ‘Uyayna was born in al-Kûfa in 107/725 and died in
12 Abu “l-Zinzid” Abû Allâh b. Dhiyân al-Qurashî (ca. 65/684–130/748) lived in Medina and
was an expert in hadith, law and the Arabic language; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:405.
13 Abû Dâwûd Abû al-Rahmân b. Hurnuz al-Hashimi, known as “al-A‘raj,” was an expert in
a number of disciplines. He died in 117/735 at an advanced age; Dhababt, Siyâr, 5:69–70.
The form of the loose ḥadīth about which there is no disagreement is the ḥadīth of an early Follower (al-Tābīʿi al-kabir) - like 'Ubayd Allah b. 'Adī b. al-Khayyār, Sā'īd b. al-Musayyib and those like them who met a number of the Companions and attended their classes - when he says, "The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said." The common view is that all of the Followers (God be pleased with them) are to be treated equally in that regard.

There are also other forms regarding which there is disagreement as to whether they are really loose or not.

1. When an isnād is interrupted before reaching the Follower because it contains the relation of a transmitter who did not hear ḥadīth from the individual mentioned above him: the authority Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim and some other scholars of ḥadīth said definitively that this kind of ḥadīth is not to be called "loose" and that looseness (imāl) appertains exclusively to the Followers. Rather, they maintain that if the mention of a single transmitter is omitted before it reaches the Follower it may only be called "interrupted" (munqaṭī') and that if more than one transmitter is omitted it is called "problematic" (muḍḍal) - and the latter may also be termed "interrupted." An example of that will be given further on, God (He is exalted) willing. It is well known that in the disciplines of positive and theoretical law all of these forms are called "loose." The scholar of ḥadīth Abū Bakr al-Khattāb subscribed to the latter view and gave definite statement to it. However, he did say, "Nevertheless, from the standpoint of usage most of the ḥadīth described as being 'loose' are those a Follower related directly about the Prophet (Peace be upon him) and they call the ḥadīth that a later individual (tābīʿ al-Tābīʿi) related directly from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) 'problematic,'" God knows best.

2. When Zuhri, Abū Ḥāzim, Yaḥyā b. Saʿīd al-Anṣārī and their colleagues among the later Followers (asāghir al-Tābīʿin) say, "The Messenger of God

1 'Ubayd Allah b. 'Adī was a Medine religious scholar who died around 91/710; Dhahabi, Siyar, 3:514–15.
2 Abū Muḥammad Saʿīd b. al-Musayyib al-Makhdūm (17/634–94/713) was an active figure in a number of religious disciplines; Sezgin, GAS, 1:276.
3 'Ulam al-ḥadīth, 28.
4 Kifāya, 21.
5 Sa'lam b. Dnār al-Makhdūm (d. ca. 140/757) was a judge in Medina; Sezgin, GAS, 1:634–5.
6 Abū Saʿīd Yahyā b. Saʿīd b. Qays al-Anṣārī was an early judge who died in 143/760; Sezgin, GAS, 1:467.
(Peace be upon him) said:” Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr related that some people do not call this form “loose,” but rather “interrupted,” because these late Followers may only one or two of the Companions and most of their transmission of hadith is from other Followers. This view is derived from the doctrine of those who do not term as “loose” a hadith interrupted before it reaches the level of the Follower. The common view, stated above, is that all of the Followers are to be treated equally in regard to the application of the term “loose.” God knows best.

3. When it is said in an isnad, “X from a man,” “From a teacher from X,” or the like: the view which al-Ḥākim stated in his book Ma‘rifat al-ḥadith (The Sciences of Hadith) is that this form is not to be called “loose,” but rather “interrupted.” In some of the well-respected works on theoretical law this is counted as one of the types of loose hadith. God knows best.

Be aware that a loose hadith is treated as if it were weak unless its source is established as sound by the relation of the text through another line of transmission, as was explained in the Category on fair hadith. Thus Shafi‘i (God be pleased with him) adduced as proofs loose hadith from Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyib (God be pleased with them), because supported versions of the same texts from other lines of transmission existed. As we have seen, this in his view did not exclusively apply to the loose hadith of Ibn al-Musayyib. To whoever denies that, claiming that in this case the supported version of the hadith is actually being relied upon rather than the loose and that the loose version is itself null and useless, the response is that the soundness of the isnad containing the looseness becomes apparent by virtue of the supported version. So even though the isnad is loose, it is judged to be a sound isnad which can support a proof, as we established in Category 2. Only someone devoid of experience in this matter can deny this.

The doctrine which the majority of the experts and critics of hadith has settled on is, as was mentioned above, that a loose hadith may not be cited as a proof and is judged to be weak. They repeat this doctrine often in their works and in the introduction of the Sahih of Muslim we find the following: “The loose hadith does not constitute a proof according to the principle of my doctrine and that of those knowledgeable about reports.” Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr — the expert of the West — is one of those who transmitted that view from a group of the scholars of hadith. However, on the other side, the doctrine of Mālik and Abū Ḥanīfah and their followers is that a loose hadith may be adduced as a proof. God knows best.

7 Tamhid, 1:22.
8 Pp. 27–8.
10 Tamhid, 1:1–7.
11 Abū Ḥanīfah al-Nu‘mān b. Thabit (d. ca. 150/767) was the eponym of the Hanafite school of law; EP, 1:123–4; Sezgin, GAS, 1:409–19; EIr, 1:295–301.
We do not count as a type of the loose hadith and its analogues the hadith which in legal theory is called “a loose hadith of a Companion” (mursal al-Sa‘habi). Examples of this are the hadith which Ibn ‘Abbás and the other young Companions relate directly from (yarwihi ‘an) the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) which they did not actually hear from him. That is because these hadith are judged to be supported connected hadith (al-mawsil al-musnad), since the young Companions related from other Companions. Ignorance of the identity of the specific Companion [from whom the younger Companion learned the hadith] does not impugn the validity of the transmission because all of the Companions were upright (‘udul). God knows best.
Category 10

Interrupted Hadith

(Ma‘rifat al-munqaṭṭa')

The doctrines of the scholars of hadith and others are in disagreement over the interrupted hadith and over the difference between it and the loose hadith (mursal). One opinion is the view from al-Ḥākim – the author of the book Ma‘rifat awdū ʿulūm al-hadith – that was already given in the Category on the loose hadith to the effect that the term “loose” appertains exclusively to a Follower. In his view, one form of the interrupted is the isnād which contains, prior to reaching the level of the Follower, a transmitter who did not hear hadith from the transmitter above him while no mention, either specific or vague, is made of the individual who is omitted from between the two transmitters. Another form of the interrupted is the isnād in which one of the transmitters is designated by a vague expression, like “a man,” “a teacher” or other similar things. 1

An example of the first form is the hadith we heard from ʿAbd al-Razzāq from Sufyān al-Thawrī from Abū Ishāq from Zayd b. Yuthayā from Ḥudhayfah:1 “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, ‘If you appoint Abū Bakr as a leader, he is strong and honest ...’” When a hadithologist (ḥadithi) examines this isnād, he finds its outward form to be that of an uninterrupted hadith (mutassatt). Yet it is interrupted in two places, because ʿAbd al-Razzāq did not hear it directly from Ḥathwī. Rather he heard it from al-ʿUthmān b. Abī Shayba al-Janadī from Ḥathwī.

1 ʿUṯūm al-ḥadīth, 27–9.
3 Abū ʿAbd Allāh Sufyān b. Suʿād al-Thawrī (ca. 95/713–161/778) was an extremely influential figure in a number of scholarly domains; E.I., 9:770–72; seeīn, G.A.S., 1:518–19.
4 Abū Ishāq ʿAmr b. Abī Allāh al-Sabītī (32/653–128/746) was a resident of al-Kūfah famed for his piety and knowledge of hadith; seeīn, G.A.S., 1:283.
6 The Companion Abū ʿAbd Allāh Ḥudhayfah b. al-Yāmān (d. 35/656) served as the governor of al-Madīn under the Caliphs ʿUmar and ʿUthmān; Dhiḥāḥ, Siyar, 2:361–9.
7 Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq (d. 13/634) was a close friend of the Prophet who had the distinction of accompanying him on his migration to Mecca. He was the father of the Prophet’s most famous wife ʿAisha and succeeded him as the leader of the Muslim community; E.I., 1:100–11.
Furthermore, Thawrī did not hear it from Abū Ishāq. He instead heard it from Sharīk from Abū Ishāq.

An example of the second form is the hadith which we heard from Abū l-‘Alā b. ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Shikhkhīr10 from “two men” from Shaddād b. Aws11 from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) about the invocation in the prayer ritual, “God, I ask for a firm resolve in the matter …” God knows best.

Another interpretation of the interrupted hadith is the statement of Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr (God bless him) to the effect that the term “loose” appertains exclusively to the Followers and the term “interrupted” includes loose and other kinds of hadith with incohesive isnāds. His view is that the interrupted hadith is “everything with an incohesive isnād, whether it is ascribed to the Prophet (Peace be upon him) or to someone else.”12

Another opinion is that the interrupted hadith is identical to the loose and both terms include everything that has an incohesive isnād. This view is the most likely. Various groups of jurists and others have adopted it and it is the view that the expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭṭāb gave in his Kifāya.13 However, most of the hadith which are described in actual usage as “loose” are hadith which a Follower related directly from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) and most of the hadith that are described as “interrupted” are hadith which someone below the level of the Followers related directly from the Companions, for instance “Malik from Ibn ʿUmar” and the like. God knows best.

Another opinion is the one which Abū Bakr al-Khaṭṭāb related from a person knowledgeable in hadith to the effect that the interrupted hadith consists of an account of the words or deeds of a Follower or someone lower, halted at him.14 This last interpretation is peculiar and far fetched. God knows best.

---

9 Abu ʿAbd Allāh Shārīk b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Nakhaʾī (95/714–177/794) was the qāṭiʿ of al-Kufa; Dhahabī, Siyār, 8:200–16.
10 Abu l-ʿAlī ʿYazīd b. ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Shikhkhīr al-Baṣrī (d. ca. 110/728) was a well-respected transmitter of hadith; Dhahabī, Siyār, 4:493–4.
12 Tamhīd, 1:21.
13 Kifāya, 21.
14 Kifāya, 21.
Category 11

PROBLEMATIC ḤADĪTH

(Ma‘rifat al-mu‘ḍal)

"Problematic" is the name of a particular type of interrupted ḥadīth (munqāṣit). Every problematic ḥadīth is interrupted, but not every interrupted ḥadīth is problematic. Some people, as stated above, call interrupted ḥadīth "loose" (mursal). The problematic hadīth consists of the hadīth having an isnād lacking two or more transmitters.

The scholars of ḥadīth say, "He transmitted the hadīth as problematic (uṣūlahā)," so the form of the term is mauḍul. The derivation of this term is obscure from the standpoint of lexicography. I investigated the matter and found the phrase, amr ‘aḍīl; that is, "an extremely difficult affair." Pay no attention to the form muḍil, even if it is like ‘aḍīl in sense.

An example of a problematic hadīth is one which a student of a Follower (tābi‘ al-Tabi‘) relates saying, "The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said." Another example is a hadīth which someone lower than the students of the Followers relates directly from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) or from Abū Bakr, ‘Umar or others, without mentioning the intermediaries between that individual and himself. Abū Nasr al-Siṣṣī brought up the case of a transmitter saying, "It reached me" (halaghisti) — like Malik’s saying, "It reached me from Abū Hurayra that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, ‘The slave is due his food and clothing …’" — and said, "The scholars of ḥadīth call that ‘problematic.’" Therefore, all of the instances when the jurists and others write in their books, "The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said such and such," and the like are considered problematic. The expert Abū Bakr al-Khattīb at one point called this kind of ḥadīth "loose" and that is in conformity with the doctrine of those who call all ḥadīth with incohesive isnāds "loose," as was discussed above.

Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥākim made a type of problematic hadīth the instances when a student of a Follower relates from that Follower a hadīth halted at him while it is uninterrupted and supported (muttaṣal musnad) up to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) [from another student of the Follower].¹ An example is the hadīth we heard from al-ʿAṣmāṣī from Shaʻbī in which he said, “On the

1 Kūfya, 21.
2 Uṣūlm al-ḥadīth, 38.
3 Abū ʿAmir ʿAmr b. Sharāḍīr al-Shaʻbī al-Kaḥī (19/640–103/721) was one of the most important early transmitters of hadīth, Sezgin, GAS, 1:277.
Day of Judgement it will be said to each man, ‘You did such and such’ and he will say, ‘I did not do that,’ and his mouth will be sealed ...” Al-A’mash gave it as problematic and Sha’bi elsewhere had the hadith “[from Sha’bi] from Anas from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him),” that is, as uninterrupted and supported. This is an excellent point, because interruption through the omission of one transmitter comes under the heading of being halted (waqf). This particular hadith contains an interruption to the extent of two transmitters; that is, the Companion [that is, Anas] and the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). Therefore, it is more appropriately termed “problematic.” God knows best.

Subsidiary Issues

1. The isnād containing the word “from” (al-isnād al-mu‘ānan): this is the isnād in which “X from (‘an) Y” is said. Some people consider it loose and interrupted, until the cohesion of its isnād becomes clear through another [more explicit version of the isnād]. The correct view and that which is followed in practice is that it is a form of uninterrupted isnād. The majority of hadith authorities and others have adopted this view and those who exclusively stipulate sound hadith include hadith with “from” in the isnād in their compilations and accept them. The expert in the hadith and Qur’ān Ābu ‘Umar b. Ābd al-Barr came close to claiming that there was a consensus of the hadith experts on that and Ābd ‘Amr al-Dānī al-Muqriš did claim that there was a consensus of transmitters on it. This holds true on the condition that it is established that those to whom the transmission by “from” (‘an’ana) is ascribed met each other and were free of the taint of misrepresentation (tadlis). In that case it is interpreted in accordance with its apparent cohesion, unless something contradicting that comes to light.

In our time and in the recent past the use of “from” in licensing (ijāza) has become common among those who consider themselves to be scholars of hadith. When one of them says, “I recited to X from Y” (qarātu ‘alā fulān ‘an fulān), or something like that, it is understood from this that X related from Y by license and it is obvious that this does not keep it from being uninterrupted. God knows best.

2. There is disagreement over the interpretation of a transmitter saying, “that (anna) X said such and such.” Does it have the same status as “from” in regard to rendering the isnād cohesive, when it is established that the two transmitters

---

4 In fact, Ābn ‘Ābd al-Barr says that there was a consensus; Tāmhid, 1:12.
5 Ābn ‘Amr ‘Uthmān b. Sa‘d al-Dānī al-Muqriš (371/981–444/1053) was a renowned Andalusian scholar who began reading hadith at the age of fifteen and pursued his studies on a journey to the East. On his return, he composed a number of books and was considered to be especially expert in the Qur’ān; Brockelmann, GAL, 1:516–17, Suppl., 1:719–20; EI, 2:109–10.
6 For a discussion of this means of textual transmission, see below, Category 24.
met each other, that is, until evidence that there is an interruption in it comes to light? An example of this is “Mālik from Zuhrī that Sa’d b. al-Musayyib said such and such.” We heard that Mālik (God be pleased with him) used to regard “from X” and “that X” as equal and that Ahmad b. Ḥanbal (God be pleased with him) regarded them as different. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr related from a large number of scholars that “from” and “that” are equal and that it is not a question of particles and words but rather of the transmitters meeting, attending class, having audition and seeing each other; that is, first granting freedom from misrepresentation. If the audition of the one from the other can be established, the hadith of the one from the other is considered cohesive regardless of which term is used, until evidence of interruption appears. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr related from Abū Bakr al-Bardijī that the particle “that” is interpreted as an instance of interruption, until evidence of audition appears for that very report from another line of transmission. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr said, “In my opinion this is nonsense because of the consensus of scholars that an isnād connected with a Companion is the same, whether that Companion says in it, ‘The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said,’ or ‘That the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said,’ or ‘From the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) that he said,’ or ‘I heard the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) saying.’” God knows best.

In the superlative Musnad of the superlative Ya‘qūb b. Shayba, I found something similar to what Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr related from the expert Abū Bakr al-Bardijī. Ya‘qūb b. Shayba mentioned the hadith Abū l-Zubayr20 related from Ibn al-Ḥanafīya21 from ‘Ammār22 in which ‘Ammār said, “I went to the Prophet (Peace be upon him) while he was praying and I greeted him and he returned the greeting to me,” and Ya‘qūb b. Shayba made it a connected supported hadith (muṣnad mawṣūṭ). Ya‘qūb b. Shayba also mentioned the relation of that hadith by Qays b. Sa‘d23 “from ‘Atā’

---

7 Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. Hārūn al-Bardijī al-Bardijī (ca. 230/845–301/914) was a well-regarded transmitter of hadīth; Sezgin, GAS, 1:166–7.
8 Tacāhid, 1:26.
9 Abū Yusuf Ya‘qūb b. Shayba al-Sadūq (ca. 180/796–262/875) was a follower of the doctrine of Mālik who eventually settled in Baghda; Sezgin, GAS, 1:144.
10 Abū l-Zubayr Muḥammad b. Muslim b. Tadrīs al-Makki (d. 126/743) was an important transmitter of hadīth; Sezgin, GAS, 1:86–7.
11 Muḥammad (16/637–81/700), the son of the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭalīb, was called Ibn al-Ḥanafīya on account of his mother who was a member of the Baru Ḥanifa. After the death of al-Ḥusayn at Karbala in 61/680 and the retirement of al-Ḥasan, Ibn al-Ḥanafīya became the rallying point for the opposition to the Umayyad regime, although he seems not to have personally played any active role; EF, 7:402–3.
12 Abū l-Yaqaq ʿAmmār b. Yūsuf al-Anṣār al-Makki was one of the earliest converts to Islam and a participant at the Battle of Badr. He died at the age of ninety-three while fighting at the Battle of Siffin in 37/657, Dhahabi, Siyar, 1:406–28.
b. Abū Rabī‘ from Ibn al-Hanafīya *that* ʿAmmār passed the Prophet (Peace be upon him) while he was praying,” and he considered this version loose because Ibn al-Hanafīya said, “that ʿAmmār did something” and did not say, “from ʿAmmār.” (God knows best.) Al-Khaṭṭāb in treating this question cites as an example the hadith, “Nāfi‘ from Ibn ʿUmar *from* ʿUmar that he asked the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), ‘Is one of us allowed to go to sleep while he is in a state of ritual impurity . . . .’” In another transmission it reads, “From Nāfi‘ from Ibn ʿUmar *that* ʿUmar said, ‘Messenger of God . . . .’” He says, “The outward form of the first relation necessitates that it be considered one of the supported hadith of ʿUmar from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) and the outward form of the second necessitates that it be considered one of the supported hadith of Ibn ʿUmar from the Prophet (Peace be upon him).” This example is not relevant to what concerns us here, because in this matter — according to the doctrine of a great number of scholars — judging cohesion depends exclusively on meeting and contemporaneousness [that is, rather than on the terminology appearing in the isnād], and in this hadith these were mutual and repeated because of Ibn ʿUmar’s connection to the Prophet (Peace be upon him) and to ʿUmar (God be pleased with him), in addition to the transmitter Ibn ʿUmar’s status as a companion of both of them. Al-Khaṭṭāb’s interpretation would require, on the basis of the one line of transmission [that is, the second], that Ibn ʿUmar related the hadith from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) and, on the basis of the other, that Ibn ʿUmar related it from ʿUmar from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). God knows best.

3. We have mentioned the remarks Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr related concerning the general application of the judgement of cohesion to the hadith which a transmitter gives from someone whom he met, regardless of the term used [in the isnād]. Similarly, Abū Bakr al-Shāfi‘ī al-Šayrāfī14 gave a general statement of that and said, “The transmission of every student who is known to have heard hadith from an individual and transmitted from him is considered to be a case of audition, until it becomes known that the student did not hear from him [the particular hadith] he related. The same is also true of the transmission of every student who is known to have met an individual and transmitted hadith from him.”

Abū Bakr al-Shāfi‘ī said that regarding only those from whom no misrepresentation came to light. One argument for that — which is also applicable to the entire subject — is that if the student had not heard the hadith from his alleged teacher, he would become a misrepresenter.

---

14 *Kifāya*, 407.
by unqualifiedly relating the hadith from that individual without mentioning the intermediary between them. Freedom from the taint of misrepresentation is presumed and the remarks apply to someone who is not known to have committed misrepresentation.

One of the examples of that is the transmitter saying, “X said such and such,” like Nafi’ saying, “Ibn Umar said.” The same would apply if Nafi’ had said regarding him, “Ibn Umar mentioned,” “Ibn Umar did,” “Ibn Umar transmitted,” “Ibn Umar used to say such and such,” or other similar phrases. All of that is interpreted presumptively as indicating cohesion and that the student received the hadith from the teacher without any intermediary between them, whenever the fact that he met him is established in general.

For the fulfillment of this condition which is stipulated in these cases and similar ones, there are some who confine themselves to the actual occurrence of a meeting or audition, as we related above. Abu ‘Amr [al-Dani] al-Muqri’ said in this regard, “If the student is known to have transmitted from the teacher, [it is enough].” On this issue Abu ‘l-Hasan al-Qabisi said, “If it is clear that the student was a contemporary of the person from whom he transmitted.” Concerning transmission by “from,” Abu ‘l-Muzaffar [Manṣūr] al-Sama‘i’i said that a long acquaintance between the student and the teacher is stipulated. In the introduction to his Sahīh, Muslim b. al-Ḥajjaj reproached one of his contemporaries for stipulating the confirmation of a meeting or coming together taking place in the case of a transmission by “from.” He claimed that it was a made-up doctrine which was unprecedented and that the doctrine common and accepted among the scholars knowledgeable in reports in early and modern times was that confirmation that the student and his alleged teacher lived at the same time was enough in this regard, even if no evidence in any report ever surfaced indicating that they met and spoke to each other. There is some doubt about Muslim’s remarks. It was said that the doctrine which he rejected was that of the authorities of this science, ‘Ali b. al-Madini, Bukhārī and others. (God knows best.) I do not think that this judgement [that is, the one ascribed to ‘Ali b. al-Madini and Bukhārī] lasted past the era of the ancients, since authors say in their books in regard to the material they quote from their teachers, “X mentioned,” “X said” and the like [that is, rather than “I heard X saying,” and so forth.]. So try to understand that, for it is important and valuable. God knows best.

4. The suspension (ta’līq) which Abu ‘Abbād Allāh al-Ḥumaydī – the author of al-Jam’ bayn al-Sahihayn – and other North Africans mention in regard to some of the hadith in the Sahih of Bukhārī with cut-off isnāds (qiṣṣa isnāduhā):

Daraqzdt had earlier used the term. The isnād of the suspended hadith is interrupted in form, but it is not treated in the same way and the hadith containing the suspension does not go from being sound to weak. This is because of what is known of Bukhārī’s standard and his treatment [of the suspended hadith], as we pointed out in the sixth note of Category I.

No attention is to be paid to the Zāhirite Abū Muḥammad b. Ḥazm’s rejection of the hadith of Abū ʿĀmir — or as he is also known “Abū Malīk” — al-Ashʿarī from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) which Bukhārī included: “Verily, there will be in my Community peoples who regard silk, wine and string instruments as licit ...” on the basis that Bukhārī cited it saying, “Hishām b. ʿAmmār said,” and gave it with Hishām’s isnād. Ibn Ḥazm claimed that it is interrupted in its transmission between Bukhārī and Hishām and made that an argument against citing it as a proof for the banning of string instruments. In doing that, Ibn Ḥazm erred in several respects. The hadith is sound and is known to be uninterrupted according to the standard of the sound hadith. Bukhārī (God bless him) sometimes does something like this because the hadith is well known from several trustworthy transmitters from the individual from whom he suspended it. Other times he does this because he has mentioned the hadith in another place in his book in a supported and uninterrupted form. He also occasionally does this for other reasons unrelated to the fault of interruption. God knows best.

The verdict we mentioned concerning the aforementioned suspension refers to the hadith Bukhārī included as the principal part and substance of the text of his book, and not to the suspended hadith he included for reference citation. Included among the citations are hadith — both suspended and connected — which do not meet the standard of the sound hadith. I found the term “suspension” used for the hadith lacking one transmitter or more from the beginning of its isnād and some even use it for the omission of the entire isnād, for instance, Bukhārī saying, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said such and such,” “Ibn ʿAbbās said such and such,” “Abū Hurayra related such and such,” “Saʿīd b. al-Musayyib said from Abū Hurayra: such and such,” and “Zuhārī said

---

18 Abū Muḥammad ʿĀlī b. ʿAḥmad b. ʿAbīd (384/994–456/1064), known as Ibn Ḥazm, was the author of a number of important works in law, theology and literature; Brockelmann, GAL., 1:505–6, Suppl., 1:692–7; EF 1:790–99.
19 ʿUbayd b. Ṣalāḥ (or Wāḥib) al-Ashʿarī was the uncle of the famous Companion Abū Mūsā al-Ashʿarī. He served as a lieutenant of the Prophet before being killed in action in the year 8/629; Ibn ʿAbī al-Barr, Istīḥāb, 4:1704–5.
21 Abū ʿl-Walīd Hishām b. ʿAmmār al-Sulāmī, the khaṭīb of Damascus, was born in 153/770 and died in 245/859; Dhabāḥī, Siyar, 11:420–35.
from Abū Salama from Abū Hurayra from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) such and such.” This applies to the transmitters of the generations earlier than that of Bukhārī’s teachers. The hadith he gave from his own teachers in this fashion are of the type of hadith we just mentioned in the third of these Subsidiary Issues.

I read that one of the later North African scholars made [the instances in which Bukhārī writes regarding one of his teachers, “X said,” “X related,” and so forth] a second subcategory of suspension and also added to this subcategory the several instances where Bukhārī says in his book, “X said to me” and “X related to us.” The North African characterized all of that as suspension which is uninterrupted from the standpoint of outward form and incohesive (munfaqil) from the standpoint of sense. He said, “When you see Bukhārī saying, ‘X said to me’ and ‘X said to us,’ be aware that it is an isnād which he does not mention for citation as a proof and he mentioned it only for reference. Transmitters of hadith often use these phrases [for example, “X said to me” and “X related to us”] to indicate those hadith which pass between them in study sessions and competitions. They rarely cite as proofs the hadith mentioned in study sessions.” The allegation he makes against Bukhārī is contrary to what a scholar who is earlier and more knowledgeable in Bukhārī – namely the pious servant of God, Abū Ja‘far b. Hamdān al-Nisabūrī – said. We heard that he said, “Whenever Bukhārī says, ‘X said to me,’ it is presentation (ṣūr) and transference (munāsala).”

I have not come across any instances of the term “suspension” being used for hadith in which some of the men of the isnād are omitted from its middle or its end or for phrases like, “It is related from X” (yarawā ‘an fulān), “It is mentioned from X” (yardkaru ‘an fulān) and similar expressions lacking any definite indication that the transmitter to whom the hadith is ascribed actually said or mentioned it.

It appears that this usage of the term “suspension” is derived from the “suspension” of a wall [by removing the earth from underneath a section of it], the “suspension” of a divorce [by stipulating a hitherto unmet condition for it] and the like, on account of the common element of the rupture of cohesion present in each of them. God knows best.

22 Abū Salama b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Zuhri (ca. 20/641–94/713) was a famous Medinese transmitter of hadith from the generation of the Followers. His ism is disputed; Dhahabi, Siyār, 4:287–92.
23 Abū Ja‘far Ahmad b. Hamdān al-Nisabūrī (ca. 240/854–311/924) was a devoted scholar of hadith who traveled extensively; Dhahabi, Siyār, 14:299–303.
24 For the discussion of these two means of transmission, see below, Section 24.
5. The hadith that one reliable transmitter relates as loose and another reliable transmitter relates as uninterrupted: the scholars of hadith differ over the question of whether it should be counted as connected or loose. For instance, “No marriage without a guardian.” Isra’il b. Yūnus⁵⁰ – among others – related it in supported form from his grandfather Abū Ishāq al-Sabīṭ from Abū Burda⁵ⁱ from his father Abū Mūsā al-Ashʿarī⁵⁲ from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him); that is, as uninterrupted. Sufyān al-Thawrī and Shuʿba⁵³ related it from Abū Ishāq from Abū Burda from the Prophet (Peace be upon him); that is, as loose. The expert al-Khaṭīb said that in this case and similar ones most of the scholars of hadith rule in favor of the loose form.⁵⁴ However, it is also related from some of the scholars of hadith that the verdict is to be given in favor of the form given by the majority of transmitters. From others it is related that the judgement goes to the better-documented version. That is, if the person who transmits it as loose was superior in regard to retention to the person who transmits it as connected, the judgement is in favor of the transmitter who gives it as loose. Some say that this does not impugn the integrity or qualifications of the transmitter who gives the hadith as connected. Others do say that the integrity and acceptability of the person who gives the hadith in supported form – as well as his supported version of the hadith – are impugned when the experts give it as loose. Others say the verdict is in favor of the transmitter who gives it as supported; if he is upright and accurate, so his report is accepted, even if one or several transmitters contradict him. Al-Khaṭīb said that this last view is the correct one.⁵⁵ What he regarded as correct is the correct doctrine for the fields of positive law and legal theory. Furthermore, Bukhārī was asked about the previously mentioned hadith, “No marriage without a guardian,” and he passed judgement in favor of those who transmitted it as connected, saying, “An addition from a reliable transmitter (al-ziyāda min al-thīqa) is accepted.” Bukhārī said this despite the fact that Shuʿba and Sufyān [al-Thawrī] gave it as loose and they were towering figures possessing the highest degree of retention and exactitude.

Connected with this is the question which arises when the transmitter who gives a hadith as connected is also the one who gives it as loose, transmitting it as connected at one time and loose at another. Also related to this is the case.

---

26 Abū Yūsuf Isra’il b. Yūnus al-Sabīṭ al-Kaṭī (100/719-ca. 160/777) was best known for transmitting from his grandfather, Dhubabī, Siyār, 7:355–61.
27 Abū Burda Hānīh (or Ṭāmin) al-Ashʿarī (d. ca. 100/719) served as the qaḍī of al-Kūfa during the governorship of al-Hajjāj; EP, 1:693–4.
28 Abū Mūsā ‘Abbās Allāh b. Qays al-Ashʿarī was one of the most prolific transmitters from the Prophet. He served as the governor of al-Baṣra and al-Kūfa during the reign of ‘Umar, ‘Uthmān and ‘Ali, acting as ‘Ali’s arbiter at Siffin in 37/657. He died in al-Kūfa around the year 42/662; EP, 1:695.
29 Abū Bāṣrā Shuʿbā b. al-Ḥajjāj (82/701–160/776) was one of the most prominent transmitters of hadith in al-Baṣra; EP, 9:491–2; Sezgin, G. A.S., 1:92.
30 Kifāya, 411.
31 Kifāya, 411.
when a transmitter raises (rafa’u) a hadith to the Prophet (Peace be upon him) and someone else halts (waqafa) it at a Companion; or a single transmitter gives it as raised at one time and also gives it as halted at another. As well as can be determined, the verdict in all of these cases is in favor of what the reliable transmitter adds in terms of connectedness (waṣf) and raising (raf’), because he positively affirms [the presence of the intervening transmitter] while the other transmitter is merely silent. If the other had been positively negating, the one who affirms would still take precedence over him because he may have some information unknown to the other. This present segment has a connection to the section on the addition of a reliable transmitter to a hadith [that is, Category 16] and that will come later, God (He is exalted) willing. God knows best.
Category 12

MISREPRESENTATION AND THE TREATMENT OF MISREPRESENTED ḤADĪTH

(Maʿrifat al-tadlis wa-ḥukm al-mudallas)

There are two subcategories of misrepresentation. The first is misrepresentation in the isnād (tadlis al-insād). This consists either of a transmitter relating from someone he met hadith he did not hear from him, giving the erroneous impression that he heard the ḥadīth from him; or of a transmitter relating hadith from someone who lived at the same time as he whom he did not meet, promoting the false notion that he met him and heard the hadith from him. There may be a single individual intervening between the transmitter and his alleged teacher or there may be more. The transmitter should not say in these instances, “X informed us” (ṣakhranā fulān), “X transmitted to us” (ḥaddithanā fulān) or similar expressions. The transmitter should only say, “X said” (qāla fulān), “From X” (ʿan fulān) and the like. An illustration of that is the report we heard from ʿAli b. Khashram in which he said, “We were with [Sufyān] b. ʿUmayra and he said, ‘Zuhrī said,’ Someone asked him, ‘Zuhrī transmitted to you?’ He fell silent and then said, ‘Zuhrī said.’ Then someone asked him, ‘Did you hear it from Zuhrī?’ He said, ‘No, I did not hear it from Zuhrī, nor did I hear it from someone who heard it from Zuhrī. ʿAbd al-Razzāq related it to me from Maʿmar from Zuhrī.”

The second subcategory of misrepresentation is the misrepresentation of teachers (tadlis al-shayākh). This consists of a transmitter relating from a teacher a ḥadīth he did hear from him and referring to him by an unfamiliar name, patronymic, gentilic or a description to conceal his identity. An example of this is the story related to us about the authority Abū Bakr b. Muḥammad al-Muqrī to the effect that he related from Abū Bakr ʿAbd Allāh b. Abī Dāwūd al-Sijistānī, saying, “Abū Allāh b. Abī Ṭālib Allāh transmitted to us.” He also related from Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Naqūṣī - the Qurʾān commentator.

1 The ḥadīth expert Abu ʿI-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Khashram al-Marwazī was born in 160/776 and died 257/871; Dhahabi, Siyar, 11:552-3.
2 Abū Ḥurra Maʿmar b. Ṭāhir (96/714–154/770) was an early expert in ḥadīth and Prophetic biography; Sezgin, GAS, 1:290–91.
3 Abū Bakr Ṭāhir b. Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Baghdādi (245/859–324/936) was an expert on the variant readings of the Qurʾān and author of the famous text on the subject, Kitāb al-Safaʾi manāzil al-qurʾān, Sezgin, GAS, 1:14.
4 Abū Bakr Ṭāhir Allāh b. Abī Dāwūd al-Sijistānī (230/844–316/929) was the son of Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī, the compiler of the famous hadith collection Kitāb al-Sunan; Sezgin, GAS, 1:174–5.
5 Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Naqūṣī (266/880–351/962) was a celebrated expert in the various recensions of the Qurʾān; Sezgin, GAS, 1:445. According to the nasab al-Khaṭṭāb al-Baghdādi gives in Taʾrīkh Baghdad (2:201), Sanad was Muḥammad’s great, great, great, great-grandfather.
and reciter—saying, “Muḥammad b. Sanad transmitted to us,” naming as Muḥammad’s father one of his more remote ancestors. God knows best.

The first subcategory of misrepresentation is extremely detestable and the majority of scholars condemn it. Shuʿbā was one of the most severe in condemnation of it. We heard from the imām Shāfīʿī that Shuʿbā said, “Misrepresentation is the brother of falsehood.” We also heard that Shuʿbā said, “I would rather commit adultery than misrepresentation.” Shuʿbā’s excessive zeal to suppress and deter misrepresentation carried him into hyperbole. Scholars differ over the question of whether one may accept the transmission of someone known for this kind of misrepresentation. One faction of hadith scholars and legal experts discredits the misrepresenter, saying, “His transmission is not to be accepted under any circumstance, whether he makes clear that he heard a particular hadith from his teacher or not.” The correct course is to make a distinction. The hadith a misrepresenter relates with an equivocal expression which does not make clear the audition and cohesion of the hadith is treated like the various types of loose hadith (mursal). The hadith he relates with an expression that clearly indicates cohesion—like “I heard” (samāʿu), “He transmitted to us” (ḥaddathānā), “He informed us” (akhbāranā) and similar ones—may be accepted and employed as a proof. There are very many hadith of this kind in the two Ṣaḥīḥs and other well-respected books, like the transmissions of Qatādā, al-ʾAmash, the two Ṣufyāns [that is, Ṣufyān al-Thawri and Ṣufyān b. ʿUyya], Hushaym b. Bashir and others. This is because misrepresentation is not falsehood: rather it is a kind of deliberate obfuscation through use of an equivocal expression. The correct approach is not to accept a hadith from someone known to have misrepresented until he makes clear [that he actually heard it from his teacher by using a definitive expression]. Indeed, Shāfīʿī (God be pleased with him) applied this rule to those we know to have committed misrepresentation only a single time. God knows best.

The second subcategory of misrepresentation is less serious. It consists of the [virtual] omission of the person transmitted from and making it difficult for the person who seeks to know his state and suitability to discover his identity. The degree of repugnance of that varies according to the motive for it. Sometimes the transmitter misrepresents the name of his teacher because he was unreliable. At other times the teacher was someone who lived until relatively recent times and many students younger than the transmitter also heard hadith from him, or the teacher himself may have been younger than the transmitter. In other instances the student may transmit many hadith from a particular teacher and he may not like to mention him so many times under a single form of his name. A number of transmitters who wrote books permitted this last kind of misrepresentation, including Abū Bakr al-Khaṭṭāb. He did it often in his works. God knows best.

6 Abū l-Khaṭṭāb Qatādā b. Dīʿāma al-Ṣadūq (60/679–118/736) was one of the most important early transmitters of hadith in al-ʿAṣr; EI, 4:748; Sezgin, G.4S, 1:31–2.
7 Abū Muʿāwiya Hushaym b. Bashir al-Sulaimī (104/722–183/799) was a famous Qurʿān commentator from Baghdad; Sezgin, G.4S, 1:38.
Category 13

ANOMALOUS ḤADĪTH

(Ma‘rīfat al-shāhdhā)

We heard that Yūnus b. ‘Abd al-A‘lā said, “Shāfi‘ī (God be pleased with him) said, ‘The anomalous ḥadīth is not one which a single reliable transmitter and no one else relates. Rather, the anomalous ḥadīth is one which a reliable transmitter relates and which is in conflict with what other people relate.’” Abu Ya‘lā al-Khalīlī al-Qazwīnī related something similar to this from Shāfi‘ī (God bless him) and a number of the Ḥejazians. He said, “The view of the experts in ḥadīth is that the anomalous ḥadīth is one having only a single isnad which a single teacher, reliable or not, is ‘anomalous’ (yashidhālu) in transmitting. An anomalous ḥadīth from an unreliable transmitter is rejected and may not be accepted; one from a reliable transmitter is left in abeyance and may not be cited as a proof.” The expert Abu ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥakim said that the anomalous ḥadīth is one which a single reliable individual is alone in transmitting and which lacks a parallel version (aṣf) in agreement with the version in the hands of the reliable transmitter. He said that the anomalous ḥadīth differs from the defective ḥadīth (mu‘allal) in that a defective ḥadīth contains a known defect indicating the location of the error in it and in the case of the anomalous ḥadīth no defect in it is known in such a fashion.

There is no question that what Shāfi‘ī judged to be anomalous is a form of the anomalous ḥadīth which may not be accepted. As for the statements we gave from the others, there is some question about the ḥadīth which an upright, retentive and precise transmitter is alone in relating, like the ḥadīth, “Acts are judged by intentions.” This is an isolated ḥadīth (ḥadīth fard) which ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb (God be pleased with him) alone transmitted from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). ‘Alqama b. Waqqās’ was alone in transmitting it from ‘Umar, Muḥammad b. Ibrahīm’ was alone in transmitting it from ‘Alqama and Yahiya b. Sa‘d [al-Anṣārī] was alone in transmitting it from Muḥammad b.

1 Abu Musa Yūnus b. ‘Abd al-A‘lā al-Ṣadaqī al-Miṣrī (770/787–877) was a famous student of the imām Shāfi‘ī; Dhabah, Sīyar, 12:348–51.
2 Abu Ya‘lā al-Khalīlī b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Khalīlī al-Qazwīnī (d. 1055) was one of the greatest ḥadīth scholars of his day. His Kitāb al-Ishhād fi ma‘rīfat ‘ulamā‘ al-ḥadīth (ed. Muḥammad Sa‘d b. ‘Umar Idrīs, 3 vols., Riyadh, 1409/1990) has recently been published. He also wrote a Tadhkīrāt Qawawis and a work on the Followers, both of which seem to be lost; Brockelmann, GAL, 1:446, Suppl., 1:618.
3 Iṣḥāq, 1:176.
4 Ulūm al-ḥadīth, 119.
5 ‘Alqama b. Waqqās al-Laythī was a poorly known Medinese transmitter of ḥadīth who died around 75/694; Dhabah, Sīyar, 4:61–2.
6 Abu ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ibrahīm b. al-Ḥarīrī al-Taymi (d. ca. 738) was considered one of the great scholars of Medina; Dhabah, Sīyar, 5:294–6.
Ibrāhīm, according to what the scholars of hadith regard as correct. A clearer instance of an anomalous hadith than this is the hadith of ʿAbd Allāh b. Dmār from Ibn ʿUmar to the effect that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) forbade the sale and gifting of clientship. ʿAbd Allāh b. Dmār alone transmitted it. Another case is the hadith of Mālik from Zuhrī from Anas to the effect that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) entered Mecca with a helmet lining on his head. Mālik was alone in transmitting it from Zuhrī. All of these hadith are included in the two Sahīhs despite each having only a single isnād which a single reliable transmitter was alone in giving. There are more than a few similar cases of this in the book Gharāʾib al-ṣaḥīḥ (Rare Sound Hadith). Indeed, Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj said, “Zuhrī relates about ninety reports (ḥārij) from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) which no one else transmits with good isnāds.” God knows best.

The doctrines of the hadith authorities which we mentioned and those which we did not should make it plain to you that the question of the anomalous hadith is not as clear cut as Abū Yaʿāqūb al-Kahlīlī and al-Ḥakīm represent it. Rather, the question requires making the distinction which we will explain. We maintain that when a transmitter is alone in relating something, it should be examined. If the hadith he alone transmitted is in conflict with what someone superior to him in retentiveness of that material and accuracy related, the hadith he was alone in relating is a rejected anomalous hadith. If there is in his transmission no conflict with what someone else transmitted — and it is something he and no one else related — then the transmitter who is alone in relating it is examined. If he is upright and retentive and his exactitude and precision may be trusted, the hadith he is alone in transmitting is accepted and his being alone in transmitting the hadith does not impugn it, as was true in the case of the previous examples. If he was one of those whose retention and exactitude in transmission may not be trusted for those hadith which he is alone in transmitting, then his being alone in transmitting the hadith pierces it and tears it from the domain of sound hadith.

Beyond that, the anomalous hadith oscillate between various levels according to the state they are in. If the transmitter who was alone in relating the anomalous hadith is not far from the level of the retentive and precise transmitter whose unparalleled transmissions are accepted, we regard that hadith of his as fair and we do not put it in the category of weak hadith. If he falls far short of that level, we reject the hadith he alone transmits and it is considered an unfamiliar anomalous hadith (al-shādhdh al-munkar). From that, it may be deduced that there are two subcategories of the rejected anomalous hadith. One is the contradictory isolated hadith (al-fard al-mukhalif). The second is the isolated hadith the transmitter of which does not possess sufficient reliability and precision to counteract the unfamiliarity and weakness that isolation and anomaly engender. God knows best.

7 ʿAbd Allāh b. Dmār (d. 127/745) transmitted about two hundred hadith; Dihāḥīt, Siyār, 5:235–5.
8 A work entitled Gharāʾib al-ṣaḥīḥ wa-ʾifrādahu is ascribed to Ibn al-Salāḥ’s renowned Damascene contemporary Ǧibrīl b. Dīn al-Maqdisī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahīd (509/1173–643/1245); Katāvatīn, Risāla, 113.
Category 14
UNFAMILIAR ḤADĪTH¹
(Maʿrifat al-munkar min al-ḥadīth)

We read that the expert Abū Bakr ʿAbd b. Ḥārūn al-Bardījī wrote that the unfamiliar ḥadīth is one which a single man is alone in transmitting while its text is not known from any transmission but his, not from the line of transmission he gave nor from any other. Bardījī treated them as a group and made no distinctions. In the remarks of many of the scholars of ḥadīth, we find a blanket condemnation of the ḥadīth isolated as rejected, unfamiliar or anomalous (iḍāq al-ḥukm ʿala ʿl-taḍārīq bi-ʿl-radd aw al-nakāra aw al-shudūd).

The correct course in the matter is to make the distinction which we explained above, in the discussion of the anomalous ḥadīth. On this subject we say: unfamiliar ḥadīth fall into two subcategories, in accordance with what we said concerning the anomalous ḥadīth, for “unfamiliar” means the same thing as “anomalous.” An example of the first subcategory of the unfamiliar ḥadīth – and it is the isolated ḥadīth (munfarad) which contradicts what the reliable transmitters relate – is the relation of Mālik from Zuhri from ʿAli b. Ḥusayn from ʿUmar b. ʿUthmān from Usāma b. Zayd from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him): “A Muslim may not inherit from an unbeliever and an unbeliever may not inherit from a Muslim.” Mālik contradicted the other reliable transmitters by saying, “ʿUmar b. ʿUthmān.” Muslim – the author of the Ṣaḥiḥ – said in his Kitāb al-Ṭaʿyf (Book on Discrimination) that all of those who relate the ḥadīth from the other students of Zuhri say, “ʿAṭīr b. ʿUthmān,” and he mentioned that

¹ The term munkar is problematic and translators have differed in their rendering of it. The difficulty results from a shift in its significance over time. The earliest writers on ḥadīth used it as a synonym of general terms like daʿīf and mardūd. See, for instance, G.H.A. Juynboll’s “Muslim’s Introduction,” 269, where it is justifiably translated “rejected.” Later Muslim authors attached a more specific meaning to the word, usually one close, as here, to that of ṣāḥih; see the remarks of W. Marquès in his translation of Nawawi’s Taqrib, 56, n. 3. There can be no doubt that the usage of later writers ultimately derived from the definitions of the munkar ḥadīth provided by earlier scholars. However, where the earlier authors were describing the general characteristics of the broad class of ḥadīth they found unacceptable, the later ones interpreted these descriptions as referring to one specific type of unsatisfactory ḥadīth.

2 ʿUmar (Bukhārī, al-Tarīkh al-kabīr, 3[2]:178) and his brother ʿAmr (Dhahabi, Siyar, 4:353) were best known for being transmitters from their father, the third caliph ʿUthmān b. ʿAffān (r. 23/644-35/656).

3 Usāma b. Zayd (d. ca. 60/680) was a favorite of the Prophet and at the age of eighteen was made the commander of the Muslim forces invading Syria; Dhahabi, Siyar, 2:496-507.

4 Muslim’s Kitāb al-Ṭaʿyiṣ has not reached us wholly intact and I have not succeeded in locating this passage in either the edition of Muhammad Muṣṭafā al-Aḥṣam (Riyadh, n.d.) or that of Muhammad ʿAbd b. Ḥasan Hallāq (Alexandria, n.d.).
Malik used to point to the house of 'Umar b. 'Uthman with his hand, as if he was aware that the other transmitters disagreed with him. 'Amr and 'Umar were both sons of 'Uthman. However, this hadith comes only from 'Amr. Muslim and others adjudged Malik to have erred in it. God knows best.

An example of the second subcategory of the unfamiliar hadith – that is, the isolated hadith (jara') the transmitter of which does not possess reliability and exactitude sufficient to allow him to transmit it by himself – is the hadith we heard from Abu Zukayr Yahya b. Muhammed b. Qays from Hisham b. 'Urwa from his father from 'Aisha (God be pleased with her) that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, “Eat fresh dates with dried dates. When Satan sees that, it angers him and he says, ‘The son of Adam lived until he ate the new with the shabby.’” Abu Zukayr was alone in transmitting it. He was a pious teacher whose hadith Muslim included in his book. However, he did not attain the stature of those whose unique transmissions are suffered. God knows best.

---

5 Abu Zukayr (d. 200/816) was generally considered to be an unreliable transmitter; Dhahabi, Siyar, 9:296-9.
6 Hisham b. 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr (ca. 61/680-146/763) was a respected scholar of hadith and law; Sezgin, GAS, 1:88-9.
7 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr b. al-Awwam (ca. 25/646-ca. 95/714) was considered one of the great jurists of the city of Medina; EP, 4:1047; Sezgin, GAS, 1:278-9.
8 'Aisha (d. 58/678) was the daughter of the future caliph Abu Bakr and one of the favorite wives of the Prophet; EP, 1:307-8.
Category 15
ANALYSIS, PARALLELISMS AND ATTESTATIONS
(Ma‘rifat al-‘itibār wa-l-mutāba‘āt wa-l-shawāhid)

These are matters which scholars take up in their examination of the condition of a ḥadīth: was its transmitter alone in transmitting it or not? Is it well known or not? The expert Abū Ḥātim Muḥammad b. Ḥibbān al-Tamīmī (God—He is exalted—bless him) gave an example of the procedure for analyzing reports.

Ḥammād b. Salama1 relates an unparalleled ḥadīth (ḥadīth lam yutāba‘ ʿalayhi) from Ayyūb [al-Sakhtiyānī] from [Muḥammad] b. Sīrīn from Abū Hurayra from the Prophet (Peace be upon him). It is examined: did a reliable transmitter other than Ayyūb relate it from Ibn Sīrīn? If that is found, it is known that the report has an original version (aṣl) to which it goes back. If that is not found, then does a reliable transmitter other than Ibn Sīrīn relate it from Abū Hurayra? If not, does a Companion other than Abū Hurayra relate it from the Prophet (Peace be upon him)? If any of that is found, it is thereby known that the ḥadīth has an original version to which it goes back. If it is not found, the ḥadīth does not have one.2

An example of parallelism would be that someone other than Ḥammād relates that very same ḥadīth from Ayyūb. This is “complete parallelism” (al-mutāba‘a al-tāmma). If no one but Ḥammād relates it from Ayyūb, but someone else relates it from Ibn Sīrīn or from Abū Hurayra or if someone other than Abū Hurayra relates it from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him); that also is sometimes termed “parallelism” without qualification. But it is inferior to the first kind of parallelism to the extent it falls short of it. It may also be called an “attestation” (shāhid).

If that ḥadīth is not related at all from one of the aforementioned lines of transmission, but another ḥadīth having the same meaning is related; that is an attestation without parallelism. If another ḥadīth with the same meaning is not related, then the absolute uniqueness (al-taṣarrud al-muṭlaq) of the ḥadīth is established. Ḥadīth of this kind are divided into the rejected unfamiliar ḥadīth (marḏūd munkar) and the unrejected, as stated above. When they say regarding something like this, “Abū Hurayra was alone in transmitting it [from the Prophet], Ibn Sīrīn was alone in transmitting it from Abū Hurayra, Ayyūb was alone in transmitting it from Ibn Sīrīn and Ḥammād b. Salama was alone in transmitting

---

1 Abū Salama Ḥammād b. Salama b. Dinār al-Butr (d. 167/783) was one of the most famous transmitters of ḥadīth of his age; Dhahabi, Siyūr, 7:444–57.

it from Ayyūb;” there is an indication in that of the nonexistence of lines of transmission for parallels of the hadith.

Be aware that sometimes the relation of someone whose ḥadith should not be cited as proofs when he is by himself – indeed, he may be considered a weak transmitter – may sometimes be included for the sake of establishing parallelism or as the citation of an attestation. Bukhārī and Muslim in their books mention the ḥadith of a number of weak transmitters as parallels and attestations. Not every weak transmitter is suitable for this. For that reason Dāraqūṭni and others have said about weak transmitters, “X, his transmissions may be taken into consideration” (fulan yu’tabarū hīhi) and “Y, his transmissions may not be taken into consideration.” Something like this was pointed out above. God knows best.

The following is an example of a parallel and attestation: We heard the ḥadith of Suflān b. ‘Uyayn from ‘Amr b. Dīnār’ from ‘Aṭā’ b. Abī Rabīh from Ibn ‘Abbās in which the Prophet (Peace be upon him) said, “If they had taken its hide and tanned it, they would have derived some benefit from it.” Ibn Jurayj1 related the ḥadith from ‘Amr from ‘Aṭā and he did not mention the tanning. The expert Aḥmad al-Bayhaqi1 gave a parallel version and attestation of the ḥadith of Ibn ‘Uyayn. Usāma b. Zayd transmitted a parallel version from ‘Aṭā’. Aḥmad al-Bayhaqi related with his isnād from Usāma from ‘Aṭā’ from Ibn ‘Abbās this version in which the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, “Did you not strip its hide off and tan it, so that you could enjoy it?” Aḥmad al-Bayhaqi gave as an attestation the ḥadith of ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Wa‘lā’ from Ibn ‘Abbās, “He said, ‘The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, “Any hide that is tanned becomes ritually clean.”’” God knows best.

---

3 Abu Muhammad ‘Amr b. Dīnār (ca. 466/666–126/743) was a legal expert in Mecca; Dhahabi, Sījar, 5:306–7.
4 Abī Khalīd (or Abu Ḥamid) ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Jurayj (80/699–150/767 or 151) was one of the most prominent Ḥijazian scholars of hadith of his day; Sezgin, C.A.S., 1:91.
5 Kitāb al-Sunan al-kubrā, 1:16 (K. al-Ṭahāra, B. Ṭahārat jild al-mayyīta bi-yalaghī).
Category 16

ADDITIONS OF RELIABLE TRANSMITTERS
AND THE TREATMENT OF THEM

(Ma‘rifat ziyādat al-thiqāt wa-hukmihā)

This is a sublime discipline which deserves careful attention. The authorities Abu Bakr b. Ziyād al-Nisabūrī,1 Abu Nu‘aym al-Jurjānī2 and Abu ‘l-Walid al-Qurashi3 have been mentioned for their knowledge of the textual additions relevant to the study of law in certain hadith. According to what Abu Bakr al-Khaṭīb related, the doctrine of the majority of the scholars of law and hadith is that an addition of a reliable transmitter is acceptable when he is alone in transmitting it, irrespective of whether that addition is from a single individual who related the hadith once without the addition and another time with it or whether the addition is from someone other than the transmitter who related the hadith without the addition.4 This is contrary to the view of those scholars of hadith who reject additions without exception and the view of those who reject additions from the original transmitter but accept them from someone else. We cited above5 al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī’s relation from the majority of hadith experts to the effect that if some people give a hadith with a cohesive isnād (wasala ‘l-ḥadīth) and others give it as loose (arsalahu), the verdict is in favor of those who transmit it as loose, even if the addition rendering it cohesive is from a reliable transmitter. I have arrived at the opinion that the material a reliable transmitter is alone in relating falls into three subcategories.

1. It contradicts and is incompatible with what the rest of the reliable transmitters related. The verdict on this kind is rejection, as was previously stated in the Category on anomalous hadith.

2. It contains absolutely no incompatibility with or contradiction of what others related, like the hadith the totality of which a reliable transmitter is alone in relating and through which he does not come into conflict at all with what others relate. This kind is acceptable and al-Khaṭīb has indeed claimed that scholars agree on that. Something similar was discussed above in the Category on anomalous hadith.

---

1 Abu Bakr ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Ziyād al-Nisabūrī (d. 324/936) was considered the greatest Shafi‘ī jurist of his era in Iraq; Dihahabī, Siyār, 15:65–6.
2 Abu Nu‘aym ‘Abd al-Malik b. Muḥammad b. ‘Adī al-Jurjānī was a Shafi‘ī jurist who was born in 242/856 and died in 323/935; Dihahabī, Siyār, 14:541–6.
3 Abu ‘l-Walid Ḥasan b. Muḥammad al-Qurashī al-Nisabūrī (d. 349/960) was also a famous Shafi‘ī jurist; Dihahabī, Siyār, 15:492–6.
4 Kifṣa, 424–5.
5 See above, p. 52.
3. The cases which fall between these two levels, like the addition of a word in a hadith which the rest of those who related the hadith do not give. An example is the hadith Malik related from Nafi from Ibn Umar “that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) placed the obligation of paying the alms tax of Ramadān on all men and women, free and slave, of the Muslims” (ṣalā kull hurr aw ‘abd dhakar aw wutha min al-muslimin). Abu ʿIsā al-Tirmidhi said that Malik was alone among reliable transmitters in relating it with the addition of the words “of the Muslims.” Ubayd Allāh b. ʿUmar, Ayyūb [al-Sakhtiyānī] and others related this hadith from Nafi from Ibn Umar without this addition. More than one expert, including Shāfiʿī and Ahmad [b. Ḥanbal] (God be pleased with them) adopted the addition and cited it as a proof. God knows best.

Another example of that is the hadith, “The Earth was made a mosque for us and its soil was made a purifier for us.” Abu Malik Saʿd b. Tārīq al-Ashjaʿī was alone in giving this addition and the wording of the rest of the transmissions of the hadith is, “The Earth was made a mosque and a purifier for us.” This hadith and similar ones resemble the first subcategory of addition in the respect that the version the group relates is general and the version the individual with the addition relates is specific. It contains an accidental difference and a species of contradiction which causes the legal rulings contained in the two versions to vary. It is also like the second subcategory in that there is no [fundamental] incompatibility between the two versions.

In the case of the addition which makes the loose hadith cohesive (ziyādat al-waṣl maʿa ʿｉrād), there is a contradiction similar to the one we mentioned above, between cohesion and looseness. That question grows in importance because looseness is a form of impugnment in a hadith. Preference for the cohesive form and giving precedence to it is like giving a discrediting evaluation of a transmitter (jarḥ) precedence over an accrediting one (taʿdīl). It is justified on the basis that discrediting is given precedence because it contains an “addition” of knowledge and the addition here belongs to the transmitter who gives the hadith as cohesive. God knows best.

7 Abu ʿUthmān Ubayd Allāh b. ʿUmar b. Ḥafs al-Umār (d. 144/761 or 145 or 147) was a descendant of the caliph ʿUmar b. al-Khattāb and an important transmitter of hadith in Medina; Sezgin, G.45, 1:89.
8 Abu Malik al-Ashjaʿī was a Kufan scholar of hadith who seems to be only poorly known. He took this particular transmission from the Follower Rihā b. Ḥīrāsh (d. ca. 90/709); Dihābī, Sīyar, 6:184–5.
9 That is, the discrediting critic is presumed to possess information impugning the transmitter’s reliability unknown to his colleagues while the individual giving the isnād in cohesive form knows the identity of the additional transmitter whose inclusion renders the isnād whole.
Category 17

ISOLATED ḤADĪTH

(Maʿrifat al-աfًād)

The significant aspects of this Category have already been discussed in the immediately preceding Categories. Nevertheless, I have given this topic its own chapter, just as Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥākim did. To cover what remains to be discussed on this topic, we say: isolated hadith fall into the subcategories of absolutely isolated and isolated in relation to a particular aspect.

1. The first kind is the hadith a single transmitter and no one else relates. Its subcategories and treatment have just been covered.

2. The second kind is isolated in a relative sense. For instance, the hadith that a single reliable transmitter and no other reliable transmitter relates. This is virtually the same as the first subcategory. Other examples of this are the hadith about which the following are said: "This is a hadith which the Meccans" – or "the Syrians," or "the Kufans" or "the Khurāṣānians" – "and no one else relates;" or, "No one related it from X except Y," – even if it was related through several lines of transmission from people other than X – or, "The Baṣrāns were alone in transmitting it from the Medinese," or, "The Khurāṣānians were alone in transmitting it from the Meccans," and the like. We will not cite examples of this subcategory at length since the matter can be understood without them. Nothing along these lines necessitates that the hadith be judged as weak, unless someone applies the statements, "The Meccans were alone in transmitting it" – or, "The Baṣrāns were alone in transmitting it" – "from the Medinese," or something like that, to a hadith that only a single Meccan – or a single Baṣran, and so forth – related, ascribing the hadith to [the scholars of the city as a group], in the way the deed of a single tribesman may be ascribed figuratively to the entire tribe. Indeed, Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥākim did do this in the matter we are addressing. [If this is the case,] the hadith is treated in the same fashion as those in the first subcategory. God knows best.

---

1 ʿUllām al-ḥadīth, 96–102.
2 According to Ibn Ḥajar, in all of al-Ḥākim's examples it is a question of a single inhabitant of one city transmitting from a single inhabitant of another city, although al-Ḥākim described the transmission as, for instance, "the Baṣrāns from the Kufans;" Nukṣat, 2:707.
Category 18

Defective Hadith

(Ma‘rifat al-hadith al-mu'allal)

The scholars of hadith call this kind of hadith ma‘lul. They use that construction, as do the jurists in reference to the subject of legal analogy: “the cause and the effect” (al-sila wa-‘l-ma‘lul). The specialists in the Arabic language and lexicography disapprove of the construction ma‘lul.

Be aware that the subject of the defects (sila) of hadith is one of the most exalted, precise and noble of the sciences of hadith. Only those possessing retention, experience and penetrating intelligence can become proficient in it. The defects consist of the hidden causes of impugnment in hadith. A defective hadith is one in which a defect impugning its soundness is detected, although it outwardly appears to be free of the defect. That may apply to an isnad made up of reliable transmitters which outwardly seems to fulfil the conditions of soundness.

Someone being alone in transmitting the hadith as well as others contradicting him aid in catching the defect. Additionally, certain associated circumstances alert the expert in this matter to an occurrence of looseness in a connected hadith (insal fi ‘l-mansul), of halting in a raised hadith (waqif fi ‘l-marsif), of the interpolation of one hadith into another or of the commission of some other kind of mistake by someone. On the basis of these associated circumstances, the expert becomes suspicious about the hadith and he either passes judgement [against it] because of them or hesitates, suspending judgement about the hadith. All of these things, so long as they are present in a hadith, prevent declaring it sound. Often they declare a connected hadith to be defective on the basis of looseness. For instance, the hadith appears with a connected isnad and it also appears with an interrupted isnad which is stronger [that is, better documented, and so forth] than the isnad of the connected version. For this reason, the books on the defects of hadith include all of the chains of transmission of a hadith. Abū Bakr al-Khaṭṭāb said, “The way to discover the defect of a hadith is to collect the lines of transmission, examine the differences of its transmitters and examine their position in regard to retention and their status in regard to exactitude and precision.” It is related that ʿAbī b. al-Madint said, “Chapter: If the lines of transmission of the hadith are not gathered, its error will not become apparent.”

Sometimes – and this is more common – the defect occurs in the isnad and sometimes it occurs in the text. Sometimes the defect occurring in the isnad impugns the soundness of both the isnad and the text, as is the case when the defect of looseness and halting is detected. Sometimes the defect in the isnad impugns only the soundness of the isnad without impugning
the soundness of the text. The hadith which the reliable transmitter Ya'la b. Ubayd related from Sufyân al-Thawrî from 'Amr b. Dinâr from Ibîn Umar from the Prophet (Peace be upon him), "Both of the parties in a sale have the option of refusal …" is an example of a hadith containing a defect in its isnâd which does not impugn the soundness of the text. This is an isnâd uninterrupted through the relation of one upright transmitter from another, yet it is defective and unsound. The text is in any case sound. The defect in the transmission is in Ya'la b. Ubayd saying, "from 'Amr b. Dinâr." In fact, the hadith is from ʻAbd Allâh b. Dinâr from Ibîn Umar. The authoritative students of Sufyân al-Thawrî related it this way from him. Ya'la b. Ubayd made a mistake, saying "Amr b. Dinâr" instead of "Abd Allâh b. Dinâr," both of whom are reliable.

An illustration of a defect in a text is the phrase making explicit the prohibition of reciting "In the name of God, the Merciful and Compassionate", which Muslim was alone in including in the hadith of Anas. Some people regarded the relation of the aforementioned phrase as defective when they saw that the majority of transmitters merely said, "They used to commence their recitation with, 'Praise be to God, the Lord of the Worlds,'" without any explicit objection to saying, "In the name of God, the Merciful and Compassionate;" and this is what Bukhârî and Muslim were in agreement on including in their Šâhî. These people believed that the transmitter who related the hadith with the aforementioned phrase [prohibiting the recitation of "In the name of God, and so forth"] paraphrased the text according to his understanding of it, and he understood Anas' words, "They used to commence with 'Praise be to God,' to mean that they did not pronounce "In the name of God, the Merciful and Compassionate" and so the transmitter related the hadith in the way he understood it. The person who did that erred, because the meaning of the hadith is that the sûra [that is, chapter of the Qur'ân] they used to begin with was the Fatîha and the [original] text of the hadith contains no objection to saying, "In the name of God, the Merciful and Compassionate." A number of other matters are relevant to that, including the fact that it is established that Anas was asked about commencing with "In the name of God, the Merciful and Compassionate" and he said that he did not have anything from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) on that topic. God knows best.

Be aware that the term "defect," contrary to its original sense, is sometimes applied without qualification to the rest of the causes of impugnment – other

1 Ya'la b. Ubayd (d. 209/825) was a well-respected Kûfî transmitter of hadith; Dâhâbi, Siyar, 9:476–7.
2 Al-Jâmi‘ al-ṣâhibî, 2:12 (K. al-Salât). The additional passage which Muslim supplies is "la yâdkura bismî ‘Allâh ‘l-Rahmân ‘l-Rahîm bârî awâl qir’âna wâ-lâ bî álkhîra.
4 Fâtiha is the name of the first sûra of the Qur’ân. The second verse of the Fâtiha is "Praise be to God, and so forth." Reference to the second verse served to distinguish the Fâtiha from the other sûras, because all but one of the sûras (the ninth) begin with "In the name of God, and so forth."
than those we mentioned – which take hadith from the state of soundness to the state of weakness and keep them from being acted upon. For that reason, you find in the books on the defects of hadith a good deal of discrediting for falsehood, neglectfulness and carelessness and other similar types of discreditation. Tirmidhi even called abrogation a “defect” of hadith. Indeed, one scholar unqualifiedly applied the term “defect” to things which indisputably do not impugn – like someone transmitting as loose a hadith which a reliable and precise transmitter gives as supported (asnadahh). He even said that the “defective sound” (jahth ma‘alā) is one of the subcategories of the sound hadith, just as someone else said that the “anomalous sound” (jahth shādhīh) is one of the forms of the sound hadith. God knows best.

5 ʿIraqi in Tāgūn (p. 124) identified this individual as Abū Yaʿlā al-Khallīl, who in fact did these things in his Irshād, 1:157, 160 ff.
A disrupted ḥadīth is one transmitted in different forms. One of its transmitters relates it one way and another relates it a different way from the first. We call it “disrupted” only when the two transmissions are equal. If one of the two relations is preferable to the extent that the other can no longer stand up against it because its transmitter is more retentive, studied with the teacher longer or there exists some other cogent reason for favoring it, then the verdict is in favor of the preferable transmission. In that case, the ḥadīth may not be characterized as “disrupted” without qualification and it is not treated in the same way. Sometimes the disruption occurs in the text of the ḥadīth and sometimes in the isnād. Sometimes it comes from a single transmitter and sometimes it occurs among a number of its transmitters. Disruption makes a ḥadīth weak, since it indicates that it was not accurately preserved. God knows best.

An example of this is the ḥadīth we heard from Ismāʿīl b. Umayya from Abū ʿAmr b. Muhammad b. Ḥurayth from his grandfather Ḥurayth from Abū Hurayra from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) concerning someone who wants to pray: “If he does not find a stick to plant in the ground in front of himself, let him draw a line on the ground.” Bishr b. al-Mufaddal and Rawḥ b. al-Qāsim related it from Ismāʿīl that way. Ṣufyān al-Thawrī related it from Ismāʿīl from Abū ʿAmr b. Ḥurayth from his father from Abū Hurayra. Ḥumayd b. al-Aswad related it from Ismāʿīl from Abū ʿAmr b. Muhammad b. Ḥurayth b. Salim from his father from Abū Hurayra. Wuhaybī and ʿAbd al-Waṭrī related it from Ismāʿīl from Abū ʿAmr b. Ḥurayth from his grandfather Ḥurayth. ʿAbd al-Razzāq said, “Ibn Jurayj” said, “Ismāʿīl

---

1 Ismāʿīl b. Umayya b. ʿAmr al-Qurashi (d. 139/756) was considered to be a reliable transmitter of hadith; Bukhārī, al-Tārīkh al-kabīr, 1(1):345–6; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Ḥarīṣ, 1(1):159.
2 I did not succeed in finding any information about this individual in the sources I consulted.
4 Abū Ismāʿīl Bishr b. al-Mufaddal al-Raqqashi was a prominent Banū Harb transmitter who died in 186/802 at over eighty years of age; Dhabābī, Sīyār, 9:36–9.
5 Abī Ghiyāth Rawḥ b. al-Qāsim al-Tamīmī al-Anbarī was a Banū Harb transmitter who died around 150/767; Dhabābī, Sīyār, 6:410.
7 Abū Bakr Wuhayb b. Khalīd b. ʿAjlān al-Karabistī (d. 165/782) was a Banū Harb hadith expert; Dhabābī, Sīyār, 8:223–6.
8 Abū ʿUbaydā ʿAbd al-Waṭrī b. Saʿīd al-Tamīmī (1029/721–180/796) was a well-regarded Banū Harb hadith transmitter; Dhabābī, Sīyār, 8:300–4.
9 Abū ʿl-Walīd (or Abū Khalīd) ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Jurayj (80/699–150/767) was a Meccan expert in hadith and law; Sezgin, G.45, 1:91.
heard ḥadīth from Hurayth b. ‘Amr from Abū Hurayra.’ This ḥadīth actually contains even more disruption than we have mentioned. God knows best.
Category 20
MATERIAL INTERPOLATED INTO ḤADĪTH
(Ma'rifat al-mudraj fi 'l-ḥadīth)

There are several subcategories of interpolated material. One consists of the remarks of one of the transmitters of a hadith of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) being interpolated into the hadith itself. This happens because the Companion or someone later offered some of his own comments immediately after relating the hadith and later transmitters related those comments as a continuation of the hadith, without separating them by identifying the speaker. The matter is confusing for someone who does not know the reality of the situation and that person may erroneously believe that the entire text is from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him).

A famous example of this is the hadith we heard regarding the declaration of faith (tashahhud) from Abū Khaythama Zuḥayr b. Muḥāwiya' from al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥurr from al-Qāsim b. Mukhaymir from Ṭālqama [b. Qays] from ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd to the effect that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) taught him the way to make the declaration of faith in prayer. The Prophet said, "Say, "Greetings to God,"") and he gave the testimony of faith, concluding with, "I testify that there is no God but God and I testify that Muḥammad is the Messenger of God." When you say this, you have completed your prayer. If you would like to get up, do so. If you would like to remain seated, do so." Abū Khaythama related it that way from al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥurr and he interpolated into the hadith itself the remarks, "When you say this, and so forth." These are in fact the words of Ibn Masʿūd and not the words of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). One of the indications of this is that the reliable and ascetic transmitter ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Thābit b. Thawbān' related it that way [that is, with an indication that the concluding remarks belonged to Ibn Masʿūd] from his transmitter al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥurr. Ḥusayn al-Juʿfī, 1

1 Zuḥayr b. Muḥāwiya al-Juʿfī (95/714–173/789) was a respected transmitter of hadith; Dḥahabī, Sīyar, 8:181–7.
2 Al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥurr (d. 133/751) was a wealthy Damascene scholar known for his piety; Dḥahabī, Sīyar, 6:152–3.
3 Abū ʿUrwa al-Qāsim b. Mukhaymir al-Hamdānī al-Kāfī (d. ca. 100/719) was born in al-Kūfah and moved to Damascus; Dḥahabī, Sīyar, 5:201–4.
4 Abu Ṭāhbit b. Thawbān al-ʿAnṣāri al-Dimashqī (ca. 80/699–165/782) was a Damascene transmitter of hadith; Dḥahabī, Sīyar, 7:313–14.
5 Abū ʿAbd Allāh Ḥusayn b. Ṭāhl b. al-Walid al-Juʿfī (119/737–203/819) was a transmitter famed for his piety; Dḥahabī, Sīyar, 9:397–401.
Ibn ‘Ajlān’ and others concur in their relation from al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥurr on leaving out these remarks at the end of the ḥadīth. There is also agreement on this from all of those who related the declaration of faith from ʿAlqama and others from Ibn Masʿūd. Shāhābār related it from Abū Khaythama and he also separated [the Prophet’s words from those of Ibn Masʿūd].

Another subcategory of interpolated material is created when a transmitter has the text of a ḥadīth with a certain isnād, with the exception of a portion of the text which he has under another isnād, and his student interpolates the second portion of the text under the first isnād and omits the second isnād, relating all of it with the first isnād.

An illustration of this is the ḥadīth of [Sufyān] b. ʿUyayna and Zāʾida b. Qudāma from ʿĀṣim b. Kulyab from his father from Wāʾil b. Ḥujr concerning the description of the prayer of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), at the end of which we find: “He came in the winter and saw them raising their hands under their cloaks.” The correct version is the transmission of those who related from ʿĀṣim b. Kulyab under this isnād the description of the prayer by itself and kept separate from it the reference to their raising their hands. They related [the second part] from ʿĀṣim from Abū al-Jabbār b. Wāʾil from one of the members of his family from Wāʾil b. Ḥujr.

Another kind of interpolated material is created when part of the text of a ḥadīth is interpolated into the text of another ḥadīth with a different isnād.

An illustration of this is the relation of Saʿīd b. Abī Maryam from Malik from Zuhur from Anas in which the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, “Do not hate one another, do not envy one another, do not
oppose one another and do not compete against one another...” Ibn Abī Maryam interpolated into it the words, “do not compete against one another,” from the text of another hadith which Mālik related from Abū ‘l-Zinād from al-A‘raj from Abū Hurayra containing, “Do not snoop, do not pry, do not compete against one another and do not envy one another.” God knows best.

Another kind of interpolated material is created when a transmitter relates a hadith from a number of teachers who give different isnāds for it, and does not mention the difference, instead putting the isnāds together as a single isnād.


Be aware that it is not permissible to practice any form of the aforementioned interpolation deliberately. Abū Bakr al-Khaṭṭāb has written a book entitled ʿal-Faṣl li-ʿl-waṣīl al-mudrajdī ’l-naqīl (The Separation of Hadith Combined through Interpolation in the Course of Transmission)21 on this category of hadith, which adequately covers the subject. God knows best.

---

15 Abī Saʿīd ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. al-Mahdī (135/752–198/813) was a Basran expert in hadith; Dhahabī, Siyar, 9:192–209.
16 Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Kathīr al-ʿAbdī appears to be only poorly known. He is said to have died in 223/838, at about the age of 90; Dhahabī, Siyar, 10:383–4.
17 Abū ʿAṣār Maṃṣūr b. al-Muṭṭamir al-Sumāṭ (d. 132/750) was an important transmitter of hadith in al-Kūfah; Dhahabī, Siyar, 5:402–12.
19 Abū Waṣīl Shaṭīq b. Saʿīd al-Asadī (d. 82/701) was said to have been the greatest Kūfī expert in the hadith of Ibn Masʿūd; Dhahabī, Siyar, 4:161–6.
20 Abū Maysara ʿAmr b. Shuraḥbīl al-Hamdānī was a respected transmitter of hadith who died around 70/689; Dhahabī, Siyar, 4:135–6.
The forged hadith is the fabricated, made-up hadith. Be aware that the forged hadith is the worst kind of the weak hadith. It is not permissible under any circumstance for someone who is aware that a hadith is forged to relate it, unless coupled with a declaration that it is forged. This is different from the other kinds of weak hadith — which may possibly be fundamentally truthful — in as much as it is permissible to transmit the other kinds of weak hadith to instil virtue and inspire fear (al-taghib wa’l-turhib), as we will explain shortly. God (He is exalted) willing.

A hadith can be known to be forged only by the acknowledgement of its forger or something equivalent to his acknowledgement. Sometimes scholars come to recognize a forgery by inference from the state of the transmitter or that of the report he transmits. The feebleness of the words and sense of some long hadith bear witness to the fact that they were forged. Indeed, the individual¹ who in our time collected al-Mawdū‘át (Book of Forged Hadith) in roughly two volumes did this a lot and he included many hadith without proof of their having been forged. He should have mentioned them only under the general designation of weak hadith.

There are different types of forgers of hadith. The greatest of them in terms of the harm they do are some of those considered to be ascetics who forge hadith supporting their claims in expectation of a heavenly reward. The people accept their forgeries, putting their faith in these forgers and relying on them. Later — Praise be to God! — the great critics of hadith resolutely took on the task of exposing the defectiveness of these hadith and obliterating their disgrace. One of the things we heard from the authority Abū Bakr al-Samānī² is that some of the Karrāmites³ held the doctrine that it was permissible to forge hadith for the sake of instilling virtue and inspiring fear.

The forger sometimes made up the remarks himself and related them [as a hadith] and sometimes took the words of a wise man or someone else and falsely ascribed them to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). Sometimes someone erred and unintentionally fell into something close to forgery, as happened to the

¹ This appears to be another reference to Abū l-Faraj b. al-Jawzi and his Kitāb al-Mawdū‘át, see Ibn Ḥajar, Nukat, 2:847–8 and Lakhwī, Ajwība, 164.
² The scholar Abū Bakr Muḥammad al-Samānī (467/1074–510/1116) was the son of Abū l-Muzaffar Mānsūr; Dhahabi, Siyār, 19:371–3.
³ The Karrāmites were a sect following the doctrines of Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Karrām (ca. 190/806–255/869) which enjoyed prominence in Iran until the Mongol invasion; Efr, 4:667–9.
ascetic Thabit b. Mūaab in the hadith, “The face of whoever prays much at night becomes beautiful in the day.”

Another example: We heard that Abū Isma‘ – and he is Nūh b. Abī Maryam – was asked, “Where did you get the hadith from ‘Ikrima’ from Ibn ‘Abbās concerning the magical properties (fadhāl) of each sura of the Qur’ān?” He said, “I saw that the people had turned their backs on the Qur’ān and had come to occupy themselves with Abū Ḥanīfa’s legal doctrines and Muhammad b. Isḥaq’s stories of the Prophet’s campaigns, so I forged these hadiths as a way to gain favor with God.” The same is true of the long hadith which is related4 from ‘Ubayy b. Ka‘b from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) which describes the magical property of the Qur’ān sura by sura. One researcher investigated its source until he reached someone who confessed that he and a group of others had forged it; and indeed the mark of a forgery is clearly upon it. The truth is that the commentator Wāhidī5 and the other commentators who mention it have made a mistake in including it in their commentaries. God knows best.

4 According to Ibn Hibbān, the judge Sharīk b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Nakha‘ī (95/713–177/794) uttered the words in question immediately after reciting a hadith and it was the Kutān Abī Jum‘ah (or Abī Yazd) Thabit b. Mūaab who mistakenly interpreted them as belonging to the Prophet; Kitāb al-Majrū‘ah min al-muhaddithin wa-l-fad‘līq wa-l-marrā‘īn, ed. Mahmūd Ibrāhīm Zaydī, 3 vols (Mecca, n.d.), 1:207.
5 Abī Isma‘ Nūh b. Abī Maryam al-Mawrūzī (d. 173/789) served as the qādī of Mawr and was a severe critic of the Jahlites; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Jārīg, 4(1):484; Ibn Hibbān, Majrū‘ah, 3:48–9; Ḏhahabi, Mizān al-fe‘lāl, 4:279–80, see also 4:275–6, no. 9131; Ibn Ḥajar, Risāla al-mizān, 6:172–3, no. 609.
6 Abī ‘Abd Allāh ‘Ikrima b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Barbārī al-Madani (d. ca.105/723) was a slave belonging to Abīd Allāh b. ‘Abbās; Ḏhahabi, Siyār, 5:12–36.
7 Abī ‘Abd Allāh Muhammad b. Isḥaq b. Yāsīr (ca. 85/704–ca. 150/767) was the author of the most famous biography of the Prophet, commonly known as S̱трат ḻbn Is̱ḥaq; EI, 3:810–11; Sezgın, G.A.S., 1:288–90.
8 ‘Ubayy b. Ka‘b was one of the most famous Companions of the Prophet; Ḏhahabi, Siyār, 1:389–402.
Category 22

Mixed-up Ḥadīth

(Ma'rifat al-maqlab)
Section: We have now fulfilled our earlier promise to elucidate the types of weak hadith. (God be praised.) Let us now point out some important matters.

1. When you see a hadith with a weak isnād, you should say, “This is weak,” and mean that it is weak with that isnād. You should not say, “This is weak,” and merely on the basis of the weakness of that particular isnād mean by this that the text is weak. For sometimes a hadith is also related with a sound isnād of the kind which establishes a hadith as sound. Rather, the permissibility of declaring a text to be weak rests on one of the authorities of hadith ruling that it was not related with an isnād which establishes it as sound or ruling that it really is a weak hadith — or something similar to that — and explaining the reason for impugning it. Some remarks will come — God (He is exalted) willing — about the case when an authority makes a general declaration that a hadith is weak without providing an explanation. Note this for it is an area in which mistakes are made. God knows best.

2. In the opinion of the scholars of hadith and others, some laxity is tolerated in the provision of isnāds and in the transmission of hadith from the various categories of weak hadith — with the exception of forged hadith — without bothering to explain their weakness. This applies in topics other than the characteristics of God (He is exalted) and legal rulings concerning the permitted and forbidden, and so forth. It is valid, for instance, for sermons, stories, the descriptions of the rewards associated with the performance of various religious acts, the other types of hadith inspiring virtue and instilling fear, and the hadith on other matters having no connection to legal rulings and theological issues. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Mahdī and Ahmad b. Hanbal (God be pleased with them) are some of those we heard from who totally forbade laxity in hadith like these.

3. If you want to relate a weak hadith without an isnād, do not use, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said such and such,” or similar phrases that definitively indicate that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) said the words. Instead, you should say for it, “It is related from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), such and such,” “We read from him such and such,” “It arrived from him,” “It came from him,” “Some of them related,” or something similar to that. That is the way you should handle a hadith the soundness and weakness of which you are in doubt about. You should say, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said,” only for the hadith the soundness of which has become clear to you in the way we elucidated above. God knows best.
The generality of the experts in hadith and law unanimously agree on stipulating that the person whose transmission may be adduced as a proof be upright (adil) and accurate (dabīt) in what he relates. Specifically, he must be Muslim; adult; of sound mind; free of tendencies toward impiety and defects of character; alert; careful; retentive, if he transmits from memory; and accurate in handling his text, if he transmits from it. If he paraphrases his hadith in transmission (yuḥaddithu bi-l-ma'na), it is further stipulated that he be aware of any way the sense of a text can be altered. (God knows best.) We will clarify this general statement by addressing specific issues.

1. The integrity of a transmitter is sometimes established by an explicit endorsement of his integrity (sadāla) by those who accredit him and sometimes by general acknowledgement. For those whose integrity is well known to the transmitters of hadith and other scholars like them and who are widely praised for reliability and honesty, there is no need for evidence testifying to their reliability in the form of an explicit declaration. This is held to be correct in the doctrine of Shafī‘ī and it is relied upon in the field of legal theory (usūl al-fiqh). The expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭṭāb is one of the scholars of hadith who stated this. He cited as examples of this [exalted status] Mālik, Shu‘ba, the two Sufyānī [that is, Sufyān al-Thawrī and Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna], Awzā‘ī, Al-Layth, Ibn al-Mubarak, Wāqī‘, Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Yahyā b. Ma‘īn, ʿAli b. al-Madīni and those who were like them in terms of renown and righteousness. The integrity of these scholars and those like

---

1 Kifāya, 86–7.
2 Abū Ṭāmir ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. ʿAmr al-Awzā‘ī (ca. 88/707–157/774) was an important early Syrian legal scholar; Sezgin, GÁS, 1:516–17.
3 Abū l-Ḥārith al-Layth b. Sa‘d al-Misrī al-Fahmi (94/713–175/791) was an important Egyptian legal scholar; Sezgin, GÁS, 1:520.
4 Abū ʿAbd al-Rahmān ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Mubārak al-Marwazī al-Hanzalt (118/736–181/797) played an important role in the development of Islamic mysticism; Sezgin, GÁS, 1:95; Elt, 1:184–5.
5 Abū Sufyān Wāqī‘ b. al-Jarrāh (129/746–197/812) was a famous Kūfīan scholar of hadith, Sezgin, GÁS, 1:96–7.
them is not questioned. Those whose affair is hidden from researchers are the only ones whose reliability may be questioned. The expert Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr made a sweeping declaration on this point: “Every bearer of ḥadīth known to be attentive in this matter is considered to be upright and his integrity is assumed indefinitely until a reason for his discreditation comes to light, because the Prophet (Peace be upon him) said, ‘The upright people of each succeeding generation will bear this knowledge.’” There is some unsatisfactory vagueness in what Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr said. God knows best.

2. A transmitter comes to be recognized as accurate by the comparison of his transmissions with the transmissions of reliable scholars known for precision and exactitude. If we find that his transmissions are in agreement – even if only from the standpoint of sense – with their transmissions or that they are largely in agreement and disagreement is rare, then we know that he is accurate and trustworthy (thabat). If we find that he often contradicts them, we discover his imprecision and we do not adduce his ḥadīth as proofs. God knows best.

3. According to the sound and well-known doctrine, accreditation may be accepted without any statement of a reason for it, because the reasons for accrediting a transmitter are numerous and difficult to state. To demand the reasons would require the accrediter to say, “He did not do X, he did not commit Y and he did do Z,” and enumerate everything the commission or omission of which is impious, and that would be very burdensome.

Discrediting may not be accepted without a clear explanation of the reason, because people disagree over what discredits and what does not. Sometimes a critic discredits someone on the basis of a matter that he believes to discredit, but which does not do so in reality. He must explain his reason in order that it be seen whether it is discrediting or not. This is clearly established in the fields of positive law and legal theory. The expert al-Khaṭṭāb said that it is the doctrine of the authorities of the experts and critics of ḥadīth, like Bukhārī, Muslim and others. For that reason, Bukhārī added as proofs the ḥadīth of a number of transmitters whom others had previously discredited, like ʿIkrīma – the slave of Ibn ʿAbbās (God be pleased with them) – ʿAbd al-Ittāb, Abū Uways, ʿĀṣim b. ʿAbbās, ʿAmr b. Marzūq.

6 Tamhīd, 1:28, 59.
7 Some assert that the proper vocalization of this term is “thabat”; see, for example, Laknawi, al-Raḥī al-ṣāliḥa fī l-ṣalāt al-ṣalā, ed. ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghudda (Aleppo, n.d.), 66.
9 Abū ʿAbd Allāh ʿIsām b. Abū Uways al-ʿAṣbaḥ (139/756–226/841) was a nephew of the imām Mālik and a controversial transmitter of ḥadīth in Medina; Dihāḥ, Siyār, 10:391–5.
10 ʿĀṣim b. ʿAbbās b. ʿAbd al-ḥād (d. 221/836) was most famous for being a transmitter from Shuʿba b. al-Ḥājāj; Dihāḥ, Siyār, 9:262–5.
11 Abū ʿUthmān ʿAmr b. Marzūq al-ʿAṣbaḥ (ca. 130/747–224/839) was a prominent but controversial transmitter in al-ʿAṣbaḥ; Dihāḥ, Siyār, 10:417–20.
and others. Muslim cited as proofs the hadith of Suwayd b. Sa'îd and a number of others who were widely impugned. Abû Dawûd al-Sîjistânî did the same. This indicates that they held the doctrine that discrediting is not established unless the reason for it is explained.

The views of the critics of hadith transmitters [regarding discrediting] are obscure and contradictory. Al-Khaṭîb composed a chapter containing some stories about those who were asked to explain why they discredited someone and gave invalid reasons for it. In one Shu'â'î was asked, “Why did you forsake the hadith of X?” He said, “I saw him galloping on an old nag, so I rejected his hadith.” In another, Muslim b. İbrahîm was asked about the hadith of al-Şâliḥ al-Murîn. He said, “What can be done with Şâliḥ? One day they mentioned his name to Hammâd b. Salama and Hammâd blew his nose.” God knows best.

What if someone says, “For discrediting transmitters and rejecting their hadith, people rely on the books which the authorities in hadith wrote on impugning or on personality criticism in general (al-jarh wa-l-ta'dil), and rarely do these authorities venture to explain their reasons in them. Rather, they confine themselves merely to saying, ‘X is weak,’ ‘Y is nothing,’ and the like, or ‘This is a weak hadith,’ ‘This is not a well-established hadith,’ and the like. So stipulating that the reason must be explained leads to the negation of [the value of their opinions] and to the invalidation of the discrediting in most cases?” The answer to this is that, even if we do not rely on these kinds of declarations to assert discreditation and pass judgement, we do rely upon them to the extent that we refrain from accepting the hadith of those whom they say something like that about, on the basis that these declarations have sown in our mind doubts about the transmitters of the kind which necessitate hesitation. If the doubts of the authorities about a transmitter are removed by an investigation of his state which necessitates that we trust his integrity, we accept his hadith without hesitation. This is the case of those whom the authors of the two Şâhiḳs and others cite who were touched by this kind of discreditation from other critics. So understand that, for it is a good counter-argument. God knows best.

4. There are conflicting opinions over the question of whether a judgement of personality criticism is established as valid by the statement of a single critic, or whether two are necessary. Some maintain that two is the minimum number to

13 Kijâya, 110–14.
14 Abû 'Amr Muslim b. İbrahîm al-Azdî was an important transmitter of hadith who died in 222/836; Seqín, G.A.S, 1:103.
15 Abû Bahr al-Şâliḥ b. Bashir al-Murîn (d. ca. 172/788) was a storyteller and preacher in al- Baṣra whose reliability was disputed; Dhabati, Siyar, 8:46–8.
establish such a criticism, as is the case with the discreditation and accreditation of testimony in court. Some hold the opinion – and it is the correct view, which Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb16 and others have adopted – that it may be established by a single critic. Because no particular number of transmitters is stipulated for the acceptance of a report,17 none is stipulated for the accrediting or discrediting of a transmitter, contrary to the case of testimony in court. God knows best.

5. If a single individual is both discredited and accredited, the discreditation takes precedence because the critic who accredits him reports on his apparent state and the one who discredits him reports on a real matter which was hidden from the critic who accredited him. It is said that if the number of critics accrediting him is greater [than the number of those discrediting him], the accreditation deserves precedence. The correct view – and that held by the majority – is that the discrediting takes precedence, for the reason we gave. God knows best.

6. A declaration of accreditation made in an obscure fashion, without giving the name of the person who is being accredited, is not enough. According to what the expert al-Khaṭīb,18 the jurist Şayrāfī [that is, Abū Bakr al-Shāfī] and others stated, when a transmitter says, “A reliable person transmitted to me,” or something similar to that, limiting himself to such a statement, it is not sufficient. This is contrary to the view of others who do accept this as sufficient. A declaration made in an obscure fashion is rejected because the individual may be reliable in the opinion of that person, while someone else may have come across something that, either in his opinion alone or by consensus, discredits him. So it is necessary for the transmitter to name his teacher so that his identity can be determined. Indeed, his avoidance of naming the transmitter is itself a suspicious act, which sows doubt about him in the heart of others. If the individual who says, “[A reliable transmitter related to me,” and so forth] is a scholar, his declaration may be sufficient for those who share his views [on personality criticism], according to the opinion adopted by some thorough scholars. The expert al-Khaṭīb said, “When a scholar says, ‘Everyone I relate from is reliable, even if do not name him,’ and he then relates hadith from someone whom he does not name, he is in fact vouching for that person’s blamelessness. However, we do not act on this testimony of his blamelessness.”19 This is because of the reason we presented above. God knows best.

16 Kifṭya, 96–7.
17 The reference here is to the ḫubur al-wāḥid, the hadith related at some point in its line of transmission by a single individual. As Ibn al-Salāḥ stated above (p. 5), it was debated, especially in the first centuries of Islam, whether such a hadith could be accepted. For a general discussion, see James Robson, “Traditions from Individuals,” Journal of Semitic Studies, 9 (1964):327–40.
18 This would seem to be a reference to Kifṭya, 92, although the issue addressed there is not identical.
19 Kifṭya, 92.
7. In the opinion of the majority of the scholars of hadith and others, when an upright individual relates from a transmitter and gives his name, his relation from that transmitter is not tantamount to his accreditation of him. Some of the adherents of hadith and some of the Shafiites said that this does constitute his accreditation of that individual, because his accreditation is inherent in his transmitting from him. The correct view is the first, because it is permissible for someone to relate from a transmitter who is not upright, without his relation from him entailing his accreditation of him.

In the same way, we may say that the action of a scholar or his issuance of a legal opinion in accordance with a particular hadith does not constitute a judgement from him that the hadith is sound. Likewise, his contradiction of [what is prescribed in] the hadith is not equivalent to his impugning the soundness of the hadith itself or the person who transmitted it. God knows best.

8. Concerning the relation of an unknown transmitter (majhul): for our present purposes, there are several types of unknown people:

(a). The transmitter whose apparent integrity and real integrity are both unknown: in the view of the majority, his transmissions may not be accepted. This is in accordance with the opinion to which we earlier drew attention.\(^{20}\)

(b). The unknown transmitter whose real integrity is unknown, although he is apparently upright and outwardly acceptable (mastur): one of our authorities has said, “The outwardly acceptable transmitter is someone who is apparently upright but whose real integrity is not known.” Some of those who reject the transmission of the first type of unknown person, adduce as proofs the transmission of this type. This is the doctrine of some of the Shafiites. One of them who stated it plainly is the authority Sulaym b. Ayyub al-Razi:\(^{21}\) “Because the question of reports is based on giving the transmitter the benefit of the doubt and because the transmission of reports is in the hands of those who are incapable of gaining knowledge of a transmitter’s real integrity, limit yourself in regard to reports to knowledge of the transmitter’s apparent integrity. Reports differ from testimony in court, for the latter is before judges and they are not incapable of [discovering a witness’s real integrity], so for testimony in court analyze a witness’s apparent and real integrity.” It seems that this view was acted upon in many of the famous books of hadith in regard to a number of the transmitters who lived before the authors of the books and about whom it was impossible to obtain real first-hand knowledge. God knows best.

\(^{20}\) This seems to be a reference to the discussion in section six.

\(^{21}\) Abu 'l-Farh Sulaym b. Ayyub al-Razi (ca. 360/971–447/1055) was a well-traveled Shafiite scholar; Dhahabi, Sijar, 17:645–7.
(c). The transmitter whose identity is unknown: those who do not accept the relation of a transmitter whose identity is unknown do sometimes accept the relation of a transmitter whose integrity is unknown. Someone whom two upright transmitters relate hadith from and identify [that is, name] is not considered “unknown” in this sense. In response to some questions he was asked, Aḥāb Bākhr al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādi said, “In the view of the scholars of ḥadith an unknown transmitter is everyone whom the scholars do not know and whose hadith are only known from the line of transmission of a single student. Examples are ʿAmr Dḥū Murr, ʿAbdār al-Tāri, and QAṣd b. Dḥū Huddān, from whom only Ḥābīb al-Sabī′ transmitted; al-Haḍhrā b. Mayzān, from whom Ṣaḥābi is the sole transmitter; and ʿAbdār Quāya b. Kullayb, from whom only Qatāʿa transmitted.” In reality Ṣufyān al-Thawri also transmitted from al-Haḍhrā. Al-Khaṭīb went on, “Infrequently it does happen that the label of ‘unknown’ is lifted from a transmitter by two scholars famous in ḥadith transmitting from him. However, the verdict that he is upright is not established by their relation from him.” This is something which we explained above. (God knows best.) Bukhārī included in his Ṣaḥīḥ the hadith of a number of people from whom only one student related, including Mīrād al-ʿAlāʾ b. Ṣaḥīḥ transmitted. Likewise, Muslim included the hadith of a number of people from whom only a single student transmitted, including al-Ḥārī b. Kaḥf al-ʿAlāʾ, from whom only ʿAbd al-Salām b. Aḥāb al-Raḥmān transmitted. When Bukhārī or Muslim include the hadith of a transmitter, he may leave the state he was in of being unknown and rejected because only a single student related from him. The opposing view on that follows the previously cited line of argumentation known to have been made against the view that the statement of a single critic is enough to accredit a transmitter. (God knows best.)

9. There is disagreement over whether to accept the relation of a sectarian (muḥtādī) who does not become an infidel (lā yafkūra) through his adherence to

27 Kifāya, 88.
28 Kifāya, 88–9.
29 See section seven.
31 ʿAbī Abd Allāh Ṭaḥṣib b. Aḥāb al-Ḥāfiz ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (d. ca. 98/717) was a Kūfī Follower of the Prophet whose transmissions were considered controversial; Dāhāh, Siyār, 4:198–202.
33 See section four.
his sectarian doctrine (biḍa'). Some flatly reject his transmission, arguing that he becomes a wrongdoer (fāṣiq) because of his sectarian doctrine. [They argue that] just as the person who arrives at his false doctrine through interpretation and the person who does not are equal in sectarianism, they are also equal in wrongdoing.

Some accept the transmission of a sectarian, if he is not someone who views as licit telling lies to further his doctrine or for the sake of the adherents of his doctrine, irrespective of whether he is a proselytizer (dā'īya) for his sectarian doctrine or not. Some scholars ascribed this view to Shāfi'ī on the basis of his statement, “Accept the testimony of sectarians (ahl al-ahwā'), except the Shiite Khāṭābites," since they view as licit testifying falsely in favor of those who agree with them.”

Some people say that the sectarian’s transmission is to be accepted, if he is not a proselytizer; and it is not to be accepted, if he is a proselytizer for his sectarian belief. This is the doctrine of many — or most — scholars. One of the followers of Shāfi'ī (God be pleased with him) told of a disagreement among the imām’s followers over the acceptance of the transmission of a sectarian, when he does not proselytize for his sectarian doctrine. Shāfi'ī said, “If he is a proselytizer, there is no disagreement among them that his transmission is not to be accepted.” Abū Ḥātim b. Ḥibbān al-Bustī — one of the authorities of hadith who wrote books — said, “According to our authorities, it is absolutely forbidden to cite the hadith of a proselytizer for sectarian doctrines. I do not know of any disagreement among them on this point.” This third view is the most just and the most preferable. The first is unlikely and far from the one common among the authorities in hadith. Their books overflow with the transmissions of sectarians who were not proselytizers and there are many of their hadith in the two Sahih, both as supporting attestations and primary texts.

10. The transmitter who repents from telling lies in the hadith of the people and from other forms of wrongdoing: his transmission is accepted, unless he is repenting from deliberately lying in the hadith of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), in which case his transmission may never be accepted, even if his repentance is sincere. This is in accord with what is repeated from several

34 Al-muṣawwi' wa-ghayr al-muṣawwi': The difference seems to be that the first arrived at his false doctrine through a mistaken but “permissible and obvious interpretation” while the second is “in clear opposition to the fundamental principles of the sunna”; Sahlīt, Fath al-Maghīth, 1:303.
35 The Khāṭābites were an extremist Shi'ite sect named after Abu 'l-Khāṭāb al-Asadi, who led an uprising against the 'Abbasids in al-Kufa and was executed around the year 138/755. Little is known about the doctrines of the Khāṭābites, although they seem to have continued as a religious movement for some time after the death of the founder, EF, 4:1132–3.
36 Kifāya, 120.
37 For similar sentiments, see Ibn Ḥibbān, al-Thiqāt (Hyderabad, 1973 ff.), 6:140–1 and Majrītān, 1:81–4.
scholars, including Ahmad b. Hanbal and Abū Bakr al-Ḥumaydī, the teacher of Bukhārī. We found that the authority Abū Bakr [al-Shāfi‘i] al-Ṣayrafi made a general declaration in his commentary on Shāfi‘i’s Risāla: “We may never again accept the ḥadith of any transmitter who has a report we reject because of a falsehood we found to his discredit, even if it appears that he repented. Once we rate someone’s transmission as weak, we may not deem it strong later.” He mentioned that this is one of the points where testifying in court and transmitting ḥadith differ. The authority Abū ’l-Muẓaffar al-Sam‘ānī al-Marwazi said that all of the hadith which come from someone who lied in even a single report must be rejected. This is similar in sense to what Ṣayrafi said. God knows best.

11. When one reliable transmitter relates a ḥadith and the [alleged] teacher of the ḥadith is consulted and he disavows it: the preferred way of viewing the situation is that if the teacher is unambiguous in his disavowal, saying “I did not relate it,” “He fathered a lie on me,” or something similar to that; the two definite statements [that is, the student’s ascription of the hadith to the teacher and the teacher’s disavowal] are incompatible and the teacher who denies the hadith is the first-hand source. Thus it is necessary to reject the hadith of the second-hand source. This does not discredit the student in a fashion which necessitates the rejection of the rest of his hadith, because he also calls his teacher a liar in the matter of the disputed hadith. His teacher’s discreditation of him is more worthy of being accepted than his discreditation of his teacher, so they both fall away.

If the teacher from whom the hadith is related says, “I do not know it,” “I do not remember it,” or something similar to that; it does not necessitate the rejection of the transmission of his student. Among the generality of hadith scholars, legal scholars and speculative theologians, a teacher relating a hadith and then forgetting it does not constitute a reason not to act upon it. This is contrary to the view of some of the Hanafites who hold that the hadith must be rejected because of that.

On this they base their rejection of the hadith of Sulaymān b. Mūsā from Zuhri from ‘Urwa from ‘A’isha from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him): “When a woman marries without the permission of her guardian, the marriage is invalid …” That is because Ibn Jurayj said, “I met Zuhri and I asked him about this hadith and he did not know it.”

38 Abū Bakr ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr al-Ḥumaydī (d. 219/834) was an important transmitter of hadith; Sezgin, C.A.S., 1:101-2.
39 Sulaymān b. Mūsā al-Dimashqī (d. 119/737) was a controversial transmitter of hadith; Dihabī, Niṣar, 5:433–7.
Similar to this is the hadith of Rabi’at al-Ra’i² from Suhayl b. Abī Ṣallīh⁴ from his father⁶ from Abū Hurayra to the effect that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) ruled in a legal dispute on the basis of a single witness and an oath. ‘Abd al-‘Aziz b. Muḥammad al-Darāwadri⁸ said, “I met Suhayl. When I asked him about the hadith, he did not know it.”

The correct view is the one the generality holds, because the person from whom the hadith is related from is subject to carelessness and forgetfulness, while the student is reliable and definite [in his ascription], so his transmission should not be rejected because of the possibility [that the teacher may not have taught the hadith]. For that reason, Suhayl used to say after that occurred, “Rabi’a transmitted to me from me from my father, such and such.” Indeed, many of the greatest scholars related a few hadith which they subsequently forgot and which they later transmitted from the students who had originally heard the hadith from them. One of them used to say, “X transmitted to me from me from Y, such and such.” The expert al-Khaṭīb collected the instances of this in his book Akhbār man haddatha wa-nasiya (Stories of Those Who Transmitted and Forgot). Because a human being is susceptible to forgetfulness, some scholars – including Shāfiʿī (God be pleased with him) – disliked transmitting from living people.⁴⁰ Shāfiʿī said to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, “Beware of relating hadith from living transmitters!” God knows best.

12. Those who take money for transmitting hadith: in the view of some of the authorities in hadith, this makes it impossible to accept a scholar’s transmission. We heard that Ishāq b. Ibrāhīm – that is, Ibn Rāhawayh – was asked about the transmitter who teaches hadith for money and he said, “Hadith are not to be recorded from him.” Something similar to that is also related from Abī Ḥamad b.

---

⁴⁰ Rabi’a b. Abī ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Farūkh al-Ṭaymi was an important early jurist in Medina and Iraq; Sezin, G.A.S., 1:406–7; EIr, 1:356.

⁴¹ Abī Yazīd Suhayl b. Abī Ṣallīh al-Madani was a prolific second/eighth-century transmitter, although there seem to have been doubts about the authenticity of his hadith; Dhahabi, Siyar, 5:458–62.

⁴² The father of Suhayl was Abū Ṣallīh Dhabkān b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Samman al-Zayyāt (d. 101/720), who was an important transmitter of hadith especially famed among his contemporaries for his long beard; Dhahabi, Siyar, 5:36–7.

⁴³ Abī Muḥammad ‘Abd al-‘Aziz b. Muḥammad al-Darāwadri (d. 187/803) was a highly respected Medinese transmitter; Dhahabi, Siyar, 8:366–9.

⁴⁴ Until his teacher was dead, the student ran the risk that he would one day disavow some of his hadith. The teacher’s denial that he taught a hadith which his student ascribed to him naturally reflected negatively on the student.

⁴⁵ This would appear to be a reference to Abī ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Ḥakam (182/798–268/882), a student of Shāfiʿī and prominent Egyptian legal expert; Sezin, G.A.S., 1:474.
Hanbal and Abu Hâtim al-Razi. 46 Abû Nuṣaym al-Fadl b. Dukayn, 47 ŠAli b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz al-Makkî 48 and others were willing to make concessions in regard to taking compensation for teaching hadîth; and that is analogous to the situation regarding taking money for teaching the Qur'ân and the like. However, traditionally teaching hadîth for money has been seen as a defect of character and it reflects badly on whoever does it, unless it is coupled with an excuse which removes the bad credit. An example is the report which the teacher Abu ʿl-Muzaffar 49 transmitted to me from his father – the expert Abû Saʿd al-Samâʿî 50 – in which Abu ʿl-Fadl Muḥammad b. Nâṣîr al-Salâmi 51 said that Abu ʿl-Ḥusayn b. al-Naqâṣ 52 accepted money for teaching hadîth because the teacher Abû ʿIshaq al-Shirāzî 53 had issued a legal opinion permitting him to do so because the scholars of hadîth were keeping him from earning funds to support his dependants. God knows best.

13. The transmission of someone who is known for laxity in hearing or teaching hadîth is not to be accepted. Examples are someone who is not bothered about sleeping in the audition sessions or someone who teaches hadîth without a sound collated text. Also of this stripe are those who are known for accepting prompting 54 in hadîth. Furthermore, the relation of someone who has many anomalous

46 Abû Hâtim Muḥammad b. Iдрîs al-Razi (195/811–277/890) was one of the most respected critics of hadîth of the third/ninth century. His pronouncements are preserved in the books of his son Ibrâhîm Abû Hâtim al-Râzî and many later works; Sezîn, G.A.S., 1:153.
47 Abû Nuṣaym al-Fadâl b. Dukayn at-Taymi (130/748–219/834) was an important transmitter of hadîth; Sezîn, G.A.S., 1:101.
50 Abî Saʿd ʿAbd al-Karîm b. Abû Bakr Muḥammad b. Muḥammad (506/1113–562/1166) was the author of a number of extremely important works including al-Aṣâb (ed. ʿAbd Allah ʿUmar al-Bârî, 5 vols, Beirut, 1408/1988); Abî Ṣaʿd (ed. Max Weisweiler, Leiden, 1952) and a continuation of Al-Khâthîb al-Baghîdî’s Târiikh Baghîdî; Elîr, 8:1024–5.
51 Abu ʿl-Fadl Muḥammad b. Nâṣîr al-Salâmî al-Baghdâdî (467/1074–550/1155) started out as a Shâfiʿîte and Ashârîte, but later became a Hanbalite. One of the most popular transmitters of his day, he taught hadîth for free but charged a fee for poetry; Dihâbî, Siyâr, 20:265–71.
52 Abu ʿl-Ḥusayn Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. al-Naqâṣ (381/991–470/1078) was alone in transmitting several desirable hadîth works and therefore was in the position to charge his students for the service; Dihâbî, Siyâr, 18:372–4.
53 Abî ʿIshaq İbrahim b. ʿAli b. ʿǜṣâf al-Shirâzî (393/1003–476/1083) came to Baghdad in 415/1024 from his hometown of Firdawîsî and became one of the most renowned Shâfiʿî jurists in the city; Dihâbî, Siyâr, 18:432–64.
54 Târiikh here refers to the practice ascribed to unscrupulous and usually unannamed students of tricking a teacher who could no longer remember which hadîth he once taught – most often because old age had destroyed his memory or because he could no longer consult his notes, since he had either lost them or gone blind – into acknowledging certain hadîth as his own, although in actuality he had never heard them before.
and unfamiliar hadith may not be accepted. It is reported that Shu'ba said, "Anomalous hadith come only from anomalous men." The relation of someone who is known for extreme negligence in his transmissions may not be accepted when he does not transmit from a sound text. All of this undermines one's faith in a transmitter and his accuracy.

It is reported that Ibn al-Mubarak, Ahmad b. Hanbal, [Abū Bakr] al-Humaydī and others maintained that the transmissions of someone who makes a mistake in a hadith become void and he becomes unfit to have his hadith recorded, if when the mistake is explained to him, he does not recant but instead continues to insist on relating that hadith. There is some doubt about this. The practice is not reprehensible, if it appears that it is merely a case of stubbornness on his part or something similar. God knows best.

14. In these recent times, people have turned away from taking into consideration the totality of the standards for the transmitters and teachers of hadith which we have elucidated. They have not been bound by them in their transmissions, on account of the inability to fulfill them at the level which their predecessors attained in the past. The reason for that is, as we explained in the beginning of this book of ours (see above p. 4), that the aim in using isnāds ultimately goes back to the preservation of the special quality of this Community and vigilance against the interruption of the continuity of the isnāds. So, in regard to the aforementioned standards, let us take into consideration only those appropriate for attaining this aim in its barest form and let it suffice to qualify a teacher that he be a Muslim, adult, of sound mind and not manifestly wrong-doing or stupid. In regard to his accuracy (dabīj), let it suffice that one find the documentation that he heard the text (sama'āshīdt) recorded in the handwriting of an unimpeachable individual and that he relate from a text conforming to the text of his teacher.

The hadith expert and jurist Abū Bakr al-Bayhaqi (God – He is exalted – bless him) said something like this earlier. He said, according to what we heard, that there has been an increase in the type of student who extensively attends the hadith classes of some of the transmitters of his time who do not memorize their hadith, recite them properly from their books or recognize what is recited to them when the original of their own audition is recited to them. He justified this on the basis that the hadith which have been established as sound or which fall between soundness and sickness have been recorded and written down in the comprehensive collections which the authorities in hadith put together. It is not conceivable that any of these hadith escaped the attention of all of these authorities – even if it is possible that some of these hadith escaped the attention of some of the authorities – because of the guarantee of the legislator (ṣāhib al-shar'ā') [that is, the Prophet] that they will be preserved. Bayhaqi said, “So today when someone brings a hadith unknown to all of these authorities, it may not be accepted from him. When someone brings a hadith known to them, then he is not alone in transmitting what he relates and the proof value of his hadith is in actuality based on it being related by the others.” The point of his relating
the hadith and his hearing it is the continuous transmission of the hadith with 'He transmitted to us' and 'He informed us' and the continuance of this blessing which God specially granted this community as a token of honor to our chosen Prophet (Peace be upon him and his family).” God knows best.

15. Concerning the explanation of the terms the practitioners of this discipline employ in personality criticism: Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī15 ranked them in his book on personality criticism. He did this well and made a good job of it. We will rank them in the same way, giving what he said and adding to it the relevant material we read in other sources, God – He is exalted – willing. The terminology of accreditation has several levels.

(a). Ibn Abī Ḥātim said, “If it is said of someone that he is ‘reliable’ (thiqā) or ‘exact’ (mutqin), his hadith may be cited as proofs.” The same is true if he is called “trustworthy” (thabat) or a “proof” (hujja) and it is also the case if it is said about an upright transmitter (ṣadi) that he is “retentive” (ḥafīz) or “accurate” (ḍāhib). God knows best.

(b). Ibn Abī Ḥātim said, “If it is said that a transmitter is ‘veracious’ (ṣadiq), ‘his station is veracity’ (mahallihū al-ṣidad) or ‘there is nothing wrong with him’ (lā baṣa bīhī), he is someone whose hadith may be written down and examined. ‘This is the second rank.” What he said is correct because these expressions do not imply the stipulation of accuracy. The hadith of this kind of transmitter are examined and investigated to determine the level of his accuracy. The way to do this was explained in the beginning of this Category.46 If we cannot make an exhaustive examination [of all of his hadith] to determine whether he is essentially absolutely accurate yet we desire to adduce one of his hadith as a proof, we must – in the fashion described in Category 15 – analyze that very hadith and see whether it has an original version (ṣafi) in the transmission of someone else.

It is well known that ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Mahdī, the model in this matter, transmitted a hadith and said, “Abū Khaldūn” transmitted to us.” He was asked, “Was he reliable?” He said, “He was veracious, honest and charitable” – or, in one version: “excellent.” The reliable transmitters are Shuʾba and Sufyān.” That is contrary to what came down from Ibn Abī Khaṭhama.16 He said, “I said to Yahyā b. Māṭin,

55 Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī (240/854–327/938) wrote a number of important works on hadith and is best known for preserving the critical judgements of his father Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī and his other mentor Abū Zūr’s al-Rāzī; Sezgin, GAS, 1:178–9. The following discussion is adapted from Jarḥ, 1(1):37.
56 See the second section.
58 Abū Bakr Ahmad b. Zuhayr b. Harbī-n-Nasīh (185/801–279/892), known as Ibn Abī Khaṭhama, was an important scholar with a special interest in hadith. Only a small portion of his famous Taʾrīkh seems to have survived; Sezgin, GAS, 1:319–20.
‘You say, “There is nothing wrong with X” and “Y is weak.” ‘ He said, ‘When I say to you, “There is nothing wrong with him,” then he is reliable. When I say to you, “He is weak,” then he is not reliable and his hadith are not recorded.’ ‘ This interpretation of “There is nothing wrong with him” is not related from any other scholar of hadith. Indeed, Yahya b. Ma’in ascribed it only to himself and it is contrary to what Ibn Abi Ḥātim said. God knows best.

(c). Ibn Abi Ḥātim said, “If it is said regarding a transmitter, ‘teacher’ (shaykh), he is in the third rank. His hadith may be recorded and examined; however, he is inferior to the second.”

(d). Ibn Abi Ḥātim said, “If it is said regarding a transmitter, ‘good in hadith’ (ṣāliḥ al-hadīth), his hadith may be recorded for analysis (li-l-ṣīlah).” It is reported that Abū Ja’far Ahmad b. Sinān” said, “Sometimes the hadith of a man who had some weakness but was veracious was brought up and ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Mahdī used to say, ‘A man good in hadith.’ ‘ God knows best.

Their terms of discreditation are also on several levels.

(a). Their saying “soft in hadith” (layyin al-hadīth): Ibn Abi Ḥātim said, “When they reply regarding a man, ‘soft in hadith,’ he is one of those whose hadith may be recorded and examined for the sake of analysis.” Hamza b. Yūsuf al-Sahmī59 asked the authority Abū ‘l-Ḥasan al-Dāraquṭnī, “When you say ‘X is soft,’ what do you mean by it?” He said, “He is not ‘fallen’ (ṣaqīf) and ‘abandoned’ (matrūk) in hadith, but he is discredited (majrūḥ) by something which does not cause him to fall out of the state of integrity.”

(b). Ibn Abi Ḥātim said, “When they say, ‘He is not strong’ (layṣa bi-qa’wī), that person is in the same position as the first in regard to the recording of his hadith; however, he is inferior.”

(c). Ibn Abi Ḥātim said, “When they say, ‘weak in hadith’ (da’īf al-hadīth), that person is inferior to the second. His hadith are not thrown out, rather they are analyzed.”

(d). Ibn Abi Ḥātim said, “When they say, ‘abandoned in hadith,’ ‘wasted in hadith’ (dhāhib al-hadīth) or ‘liar’ (kadhīhāb); the man is ‘fallen’ in hadith. His hadith are not recorded. It is the fourth rank.”

Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb said, “The highest expressions for the states of transmitters are a ‘proof’ or ‘reliable.’ The lowest are ‘liar’ or ‘fallen.”’60

59 The hadith of Abū Ja’far Ahmad b. Sinān al-Wāṣiti al-Qattān (d. 256/870) were cited by a number of scholars of the next generation; Dhabahi, Siyar, 12:244–6.
61 Kifāya, 22.
Abū Bakr b. 'Abd al-Muḥāfaẓah b. Muḥṣafah al-Furāwī⁶² informed us through recitation to him in Nishapur: Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl al-Ṣaḥḥātī⁶³ informed us: the expert Abū Bakr Ahmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Bayḥaqī⁶⁴ informed us: Abū 'l-Ḥusayn b. al-Fadl⁶⁵ informed us: 'Abd Allāh b. Ja'fār⁶⁶ informed us: Ya'qūb b. Sufyān⁶⁷ told us, he said: I heard Ahmad b. Ṣaḥīḥ⁶⁸ say, "A transmitter's ḥadīth are not rejected until everyone agrees that they are to be rejected. It may be said, 'X is weak.' However, it may not be said, 'X is abandoned,' unless everyone agrees on rejecting his ḥadīth."

Some terms employed in this matter which Ibn Abī Ḥātim and others have not explained are "X, people have related from him," "X is middling" (wasat), "X is mediocre in ḥadīth" (muqārib al-ḥadīth), "X is disturbed in regard to ḥadīth" (muqārib al-ḥadīth), "X is not cited as an authority" (la yuḥtajju bihi), "X is unknown" (mājdūl), "X is nothing" (lā sha'ī), "X is not approved" (layṣa bi-dhāk). Sometimes it is said, "He is not so strong" (layṣa bi-dhāk l-qaww), "There is a weakness in X" or "in the ḥadīth of X," — and this expression is less serious in discreditation than saying, "X is weak in ḥadīth," — and "X, I do not know anything wrong about him." In accrediting, this last expression is inferior to saying, "There is nothing wrong with him." All of these phrases and the others like them have analogues which we have explained or which follow a principle that we have established. We will — God (He is exalted) willing — point them out. God knows best.

⁶² Furāwī (ca. 522/1128–608/1212) was a teacher of Ibn al-Ṣalāh who transmitted a number of important books. He had three ināyas, all of which Ibn al-Ṣalāh uses in the course of this work; Dhadab, Siyar, 21:494–6.
⁶³ Abū 'l-Maṣūh Muhammad b. Ismā'īl al-Ḥarīsī (448/1056–539/1144) was a prominent student of Bayḥaqī; Dhadab, Siyar, 20:93.
⁶⁴ Abū 'l-Ḥusayn Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad b. al-Fadl al-Qaṣṭānī (335/947–415/1024) was primarily known for having transmitted Ya'qūb b. Sufyān's Taṣrīḥ from 'Abd Allāh b. Ja'fār; Dhadab, Siyar, 17:331–2.
⁶⁵ Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh b. Ja'fār b. Durustawān al-Ḥarīsī (258/872–347/958) was an early grammarian who worked extensively in hadith; Ef, 3:758; Segzin, G.A.S., 8:106–8, 9:96–8.
⁶⁷ Abū Ja'fār Ahmad b. Ṣāḥīḥ al-Misrī (170/787–248/862) was a controversial transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhadab, Siyar, 12:160–77.
Category 24

THE METHODS OF HEARING AND RECEIVING ḤADĪTH, AND THE MANNER OF REGISTERING THESE

(Maʾrifat kayfiyat samaʿ al-hadīth wa-tahammulihi wa-sifat dabītihi)

Be aware that the ways to convey and receive hadith take various forms. Let us preface our exposition of them with the discussion of a few issues.

1. An individual may validly receive hadith before he possesses the qualifications [necessary to transmit them]. The transmission of someone who received his hadith before his conversion to Islam and transmitted them afterwards may be accepted. The same is true of the relation of someone who heard hadith before attaining adulthood and related them afterwards. Some people forbade that and they were wrong to do so, because people accepted the transmission of the young Companions – like al-Hasan b. ‘Ali, ʿAbd B. Ṭāhir, ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Ṣaʿd, and the like. Some of their fellows – without making any distinction between the hadith they received before reaching adulthood and those they received after. Furthermore, from early times until now people have continued to bring young boys to classes devoted to the transmission and audition of hadith and they credit their transmission of the hadith they heard at that age. God knows best.

2. ʿAbd ʿAbd Allāh al-Zubayr said, “It is recommended that the student begin to write hadith at the age of twenty, because that is when the intellect is formed. I like the student younger than that to occupy himself with learning the Qurʾān and his religious duties.” It is reported that Ṣufyān al-Thawrī said, “A man who wants to study hadith should first serve God twenty years.” Mūsā b. Ḥishāq was asked, “How is it that you did not write hadith from ʿAbū Nuʿaym [al-Fadl b. Dukayn]?” He said, “The Kutāfūn did not send their young sons to study hadith until they completed their twentieth year.” Mūsā b. Ḥārūn said, “The Banū Ṣamāʿa...”

1 Maʿṣūm b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Zubayr (d. 153) was the son of ʿAbd Allāh al-Zubayr and the fourth son of Ṣufyān al-Thawrī. He was a scholar and a jurist. He was known for his knowledge of hadith and his ability to distinguish between weak and strong hadith. He was also known for his collection of hadith, which is known as the Ṣaḥīḥ al-Zubayr.

2 Al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī (624-96) was the cousin and son-in-law of the Prophet Muhammad. He was one of the first caliphs of the Islamic Empire and the second caliph of the Umayyad dynasty. He was known for his piety and his role in the early Islamic community.

3 Al-ʿAbd b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Zubayr (d. 153) was a scholar and a jurist. He was known for his knowledge of hadith and his ability to distinguish between weak and strong hadith. He was also known for his collection of hadith, which is known as the Ṣaḥīḥ al-Zubayr.

4 Al-Ḥasan al-Zubayr (d. 153) was a scholar and a jurist. He was known for his knowledge of hadith and his ability to distinguish between weak and strong hadith. He was also known for his collection of hadith, which is known as the Ṣaḥīḥ al-Zubayr.

5 Al-Ḥasan al-Zubayr (d. 153) was a scholar and a jurist. He was known for his knowledge of hadith and his ability to distinguish between weak and strong hadith. He was also known for his collection of hadith, which is known as the Ṣaḥīḥ al-Zubayr.
write ḥadīth at ten years of age, the Kūfīs at twenty and the Syrians at thirty." (God knows best.)

When the preservation of the continuity of the isnād is taken into account, [it becomes clear that] one should take a child to hear ḥadīth as soon as his audition becomes valid. Children may [later] occupy themselves with writing, acquiring, registering and recording ḥadīth when they become qualified and ready for that. This varies from person to person and it is not confined to any particular age, as a number of people before us have stated. God knows best.

3. There is some disagreement over the earliest time valid for a child’s audition of ḥadīth. We have heard that Mūsā b. Ḥarūn al-Ḥammāl – one of the great experts and critics of ṭālīḥ – was asked, “When should a boy hear ḥadīth?” He said, “When he becomes able to distinguish between a cow and a riding animal” – or according to another relation, “between a cow and a donkey.” We heard that Ahmad b. Ḥanbal (God be pleased with him) was asked, “When does it become permissible for a boy to hear ḥadīth?” He said, “When he can understand and comprehend.” He was told that someone had said, “The audition of a boy is not permitted until he reaches fifteen.” He rejected that statement and said, “What a bad thing to say!” The teacher Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Asāʾī informed me from Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Ashtīrī that the expert al-Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ b. Mūsā al-Saḥḥī al-Yaḥṣībī said, “For the audition of ḥadīth, the experts have set as the youngest age that of Mahmūd b. al-Rabīʿ,” and he quoted with Bukhārī’s isnād the relation Bukhārī included in his Sahīh under the heading “When Does the audition of a Child Become Valid?” Ṭāhir b. Muḥammad b. al-Rabīʿ: “I was cognizant of a jet of water the Prophet (Peace be upon him) spurted in my face from a bucket when I was five years old.” In another relation, his age is given as four. The threshold of five is the one on which the practice of the modern scholars of ḥadīth has settled. They write for a boy five and over, “He heard” (sāmāʾi) and for someone who has not yet reached five, “He attended” (ḥadāra) or “He was brought” (uḥdīra). In this

6 Ibn al-Uṣūdī (534/1139-623/1226) was an Aleppan Shāfīʿī who heard ḥadīth from many of the prominent transmitters of the day; Dhahabi, Siyār, 22:303-4.
7 Ṭāhir (d. 561/1166) was a Mālikī expert in ḥadīth from North Africa; Dhahabi, Siyār, 20:466-7.
8 Al-Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ (476/1083-544/1149) was one of the most prominent scholars of his era in ḥadīth and law. His book al-Ḥanāfī was one of the principal sources Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ consulted in the composition of the Muqaddima; Brockelmann, G.A.L, 1:455-6, Suppl., 1:630-2; EJ, 4:289-90.
9 The Companion Abū Muḥammad (or “Abū Nuʿaym”) Maḥmūd b. al-Rabīʿ al-Khaṣrajī (d. ca. 99/718) seems to have been best known for his role in the incident described here; Dhahabi, Siyār, 3:519-20.
11 Ḥanāfī, 62-3
matter we should consider the case of each child individually. If we find that the child is more advanced than the state of one who lacks the mental development to understand what is said to him or to give an answer to what is asked of him, and the like, we regard his audition as valid, even if he is younger than five. If this is not the case, we do not regard his audition as valid, even if he is five, or, indeed, fifty.

In fact, we read that İbrahim b. Sa'id al-Jawhari\(^\text{12}\) said, “I saw a boy of four years – and he had been brought to the caliph al-Ma'mūn\(^\text{13}\) – who recited the Qur'an and looked into the question of the plausibility of human reasoning. Yet, when he became hungry, he still cried.” We heard that the judge Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh b. Muhammad al-Iṣbahānī\(^\text{14}\) said, “I learned the Qur'an when I was five years old. I was brought to Abū Bakr b. al-Muqri\(^\text{15}\) to hear hadith from him when I was four [ṣiṣ] and one of those in attendance said, ‘Do not credit him with the audition (lā tusammiṭu lahū) of what is recited, for he is too young.' Ibn al-Muqri\(^\text{16}\) said to me, ‘Recite Sūrat al-Kāfūrin,' and I recited it. Then he said, ‘Recite Sūrat al-Takāwīr,' and I recited it. Then someone else said to me, ‘Recite Sūrat al-Mursalat,' and I recited it without an error. Ibn al-Muqri\(^\text{17}\) said, ‘Grant him audition. The responsibility is mine.’”

The hadith of Maḥmūd b. al-Rabī\(^\text{18}\) indicates the validity of the audition of a five-year-old like Maḥmūd and does not indicate the lack of validity for someone younger than five or the validity of it for someone five years old who has not attained the discernment of Maḥmūd (God be pleased with him). God knows best.

An Exposition of the Types of the Means of Conveying and Receiving Hadith

There are eight types in total.

I. “Audition of the speech of the teacher” (al-samāʾ min lafẓ al-shaykh): this may be subcategorized into dictation (īmālā) of the hadith and transmitting the hadith without dictation. It makes no difference whether the teacher recites from memory or from his book. This means of transmission is the most elevated in the eyes of the masses.

\(^{12}\) Abū Iṣḥāq İbrahim b. Sa'id al-Jawhari al-Baḥḍāḍī (d. ca. 250/864) is best known for the muṣnad ascribed to him; Dhahabi, Siyār, 12:149–51.

\(^{13}\) Al-Ma'mūn was the son of Harūn al-Rashīd and the seventh 'Abbasīd caliph. He ruled from 198/813 until 201/817; ET, 6:331–9.

\(^{14}\) This seems to be a reference to Ibn al-Labban, a respected scholar who died in Isfahan in 446/1054; Dhahabi, Siyār, 17:653–4.

\(^{15}\) Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. İbrahim b. 'Alī b. 'Aṣim b. Zādīm b. al-Muqri (285/898–381/991) was a scholar of hadith who, it is surprising to note, served as the librarian of al-S̄āḥib b. ʾAbdūd; Dhahabi, Siyār, 16:398–402.
One of the things we hear from al-Qādī ʿIyāḍ b. Mūsā al-Sabti – a well-informed modern scholar – is the statement: “There is no dispute that in reference to this form of taking up ḥadīth it is permissible for the student who heard the teacher to say, ‘He transmitted to us’ (ḥaddathanā), ‘He informed us’ (akhraranā), ‘He told us’ (anbāʾanā), ‘I heard X saying’ (samātī surān yanqūlu), ‘X said to us’ (qala lanā surān) and ‘X mentioned to us’ (adhakara lanā surān).”36 There is in fact some doubt about this. Because some of these terms have come to be widely used for specifically indicating material not heard from the speech of the teacher – as we will show, God (He is exalted) willing – they should not be applied without qualification to material heard from the speech of the teacher, since they can cause misunderstanding and confusion. (God knows best.) The expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb said, “For this form of reception, the highest of these expressions is ‘I heard,’ followed by ‘He transmitted to us’ and ‘He transmitted to me.’ One rarely says ‘I heard’ for a ḥadīth received through licensing or correspondence (ahādith al-ījāza wa-l-mukātaba), or for the misrepresentation (tadlis) of ḥadīth one did not actually hear.”37

Actually, some of the scholars of ḥadīth did use to say, “He transmitted to us,” for material licensed to them. It is related that al-Ḥasan8 used to say, “Abū Hurayra transmitted to us.” This is interpreted to mean that Abū Hurayra transmitted to the people of Medina and al-Ḥasan was there at that time. However, he did not personally hear anything from Abū Hurayra. On the other hand, some scholars have asserted that al-Ḥasan did hear ḥadīth from him. God knows best.38

The phrase “He informed us” (akhraranā) comes next. It is used extensively, to the point that a number of scholars – including Ḥammād b. Salama, ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Mubārk, Hushyam b. Bashir, ʿUbayd Allāh b. Mūsā, ʿAbd al-Razzāq b. Hammām, Yazid b. Ḥarūn,20 ʿAmr b. ʿAwn,21 Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā al-Ṭamīmī,22

---

16 Ḥājdū, 69.
17 Kifāya, 284.
18 Abū Saʿdū al-Ḥasan b. Abī ʾl-Ḥasan Yaṣār al-Baṣrī (21/642–110/728) was a renowned preacher and one of the most significant early transmitters of ḥadīth; Sezgin, EP, 3:247–9; Sezgin, GAS, 1:591–4.
19 Like most of this discussion, this passage seems to have been taken from al-Khaṭīb’s Kifāya (p. 284) but there it concludes, “This is interpreted to mean that Abū Hurayra transmitted to the people of Al-Baṣra and al-Ḥasan was one of them, although he was in Medina at that time. So al-Ḥasan did not hear anything from him and did not use the phrase ‘I heard’ for any of that.”
20 Abū Khalīl Yaḥyā b. Ḥarūn (118/736–306/821) was a Qur’ān commentator from Wāsiʿ; Sezgin, GAS, 1:40.
21 Abū ʿUthmān ʿAwn b. ʿAwn b. Aws al-Sulāmī (d. 225/840) was a well-respected transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhabāhīt, Sīyar, 10:450–1.
22 Abū Zakāriyya Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā b. Bukayr al-Ṭamīmī al-Nṣābūrī (142/759–226/840) was a prominent expert in ḥadīth; Dhabāhīt, Sīyar, 10:512–19.
Iṣḥāq b. Rāhawayh, Abū Masʿūd Ahmad b. al-Furāt al-Rażī,23 Muhammad b. Ayyūb al-Rażī24 and others – almost never reported the hadith they heard from the speech of someone who transmitted to them with anything but the phrase “He informed us.” Al-Khaṭṭāb stated25 that Muhammad b. Rāfīʿ26 said, “ʿAbd al-Razzāq used to say, ‘He informed us,’ until Ahmad b. Ḥanbal and Iṣḥāq b. Rāhawayh came and said to him, ‘Say, “He transmitted to us.”’” So for everything Ṭūṣ [viz. Muhammad b. Rāfīʿ] heard with them, he said, ‘He transmitted to us;’ while for his earlier transmissions he said, ‘He informed us.’” Al-Khaṭṭāb al-Baqhdādī also stated27 that the expert Muhammad b. Abū ʿl-Fawāris28 said, “Hushaym, Yazīd b. Ḥārūn and ʿAbd al-Razzāq say only, ‘He informed us.’ When you find ‘He transmitted to us,’ it is an error of the copyist.” (God knows best.) All of this was before it became common to restrict “He informed us” to material recited to the teacher.

The terms “He told us” (anbaʿana) and “He communicated to us” (nabbaʿana) – both of which are rarely used [for material heard from the speech of the teacher29] – come after “He informed us.”

“I transmitted to us” and “He informed us” are more elevated than “I heard” in another respect. This is that “I heard” contains no indication that the teacher related the hadith to the student or addressed it to him. “He transmitted to us” and “He informed us” do contain an indication that the teacher addressed the hadith to the student and related it to him, or that he was among those to whom this was done. The expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭṭāb asked his teacher, the jurist and hadith expert Abū Bakr al-Baqāṭī (God – He is exalted – bless him), about the secret reason for his saying, “I heard,” – rather than “He transmitted to us” and “He informed us” – for the hadith he related to them from Abū ʿl-Qāsim ʿAbd Allah b. Ibrahim al-Jurjānt al-ʿAbdānṭ.30 Baqāṭī told him that Abū ʿl-Qāsim, for all his reliability and righteousness, was restrictive in regard to relating hadith. Baqāṭī used to sit where Abū ʿl-Qāsim could not see him or detect his presence so that he could hear from him the hadith he was transmitting to the person inside with him. For that reason,

23 Abū Masʿūd Ahmad b. al-Furāt al-Rażī (ca. 180/796–258/872) was a well-traveled scholar of hadith who settled in Isfahan, Dihahhit, Siyar, 12/480–88.
24 Ibn al-Durayḥ (200/816–294/906) was a scholar of hadith who wrote the book Faḍḍāl al-Qurān; Seroğ, GAS, 1/42.
25 Kifāya, 286.
26 Abū ʿAbd Allah Muhammad b. Rāfīʿ al-Quraysī (ca. 170/786–245/860) was an important scholar of hadith; Dihahhit, Siyar, 12/214–18.
27 Kifāya, 286.
30 ʿAbdānṭ (274/887–368/978) was a prominent transmitter in his day; Dihahhit, Siyar, 16/261–3.
Barqâni says, “I heard,” and not “He transmitted to us” or “He informed us,” because Abu ’l-Qâsim’s intention was to transmit only to the person inside with him.

“X said to us” (qâla lanâ fulân) or “X mentioned to us” (dhakara lanâ fulân) are like “X transmitted to us.” However, they are appropriate for the hadith the transmitter heard from someone in a study session (mudhâkara) and are more suitable for this than “He transmitted to us.” In the discussion of “suspension” (ta‘lîq) at the end of Category 11 (see above, p. 45 ff.), we recounted that many of the scholars of hadith use these expressions to designate the hadith which passed between them in study sessions and competitions (munâzarât). The most self-efficacy of the expressions for this is “X said” or “X mentioned,” without saying “to me” or “to us,” and the like. As we said above, in the section on the isnâd with “from,” scholars interpreted these and similar expressions as indicating audition, when it is known in general that the student met the teacher and heard hadith from him, especially when it is known of the student that he used “X said” only for the hadith he actually heard from the teacher.

Ḥajjâj b. Muḥammad al-‘Awarī used to relate Ibn Jurayj’s books from him, saying for them, “Ibn Jurayj said.” People took these books from him and cited his relations as proofs. He was known to have related only what he had heard.

The expert Abû Bakr al-Khaṭīb restricted interpreting the phrase “X said” as indicative of audition solely to those whose custom was known to be similar to this. The well-documented and well-known view is the one we gave above. God knows best.

II “Recitation to the teacher” (al-qirâ’a ʿala ‘l-shaykh) is the second means of taking and receiving hadith. Most of the transmitters of hadith call it “presentation” (’urd) since the reciter “presents” the hadith he recites to the teacher, just as the reciter “presents” the Qur’ān to the Qur’ān instructor. It makes no difference whether you are the reciter or someone else recites while you listen. You may recite from a book or from your memory. The teacher may have memorized the material recited to him or not. In the latter case he or some other reliable individual should hold his text. There is no disagreement that this is a valid form of transmission; that is, with the exception of the views recounted from some of those whose disagreement is not taken into account. God knows best.

There is a disagreement as to whether “recitation to the teacher” is equivalent to “audition of the speech of the teacher” in terms of rank or whether it is inferior.

---

31 See above, p. 46.
32 Some considered Abû Muhammad Ḥajjâj al-‘Awarī (d. 206/821) to be the best student of Ibn Jurayj; Dhahabi, Siyâr, 9:447–50.
33 Kifâya, 289.
or superior. Abū Ḥanīfa, Ibn Abī Dhībah, and others are said to have preferred “recitation to the teacher” to “audition of his speech,” and that is related from Mālik as well. Mālik and others are also said to have regarded them as equal. It
is said that equating them is the doctrine of most of the scholars of the Hejaz and al-Kūfah, the doctrine of Malīk, his followers and his Medinese teachers and the doctrine of Bukhārī and others. The correct view is to give preference to “audition of the speech of the teacher” and to rate “recitation to him” on a second rank. It is said that this is the doctrine of the majority of scholars in the eastern lands. God knows best.

The ways of expressing “recitation to the teacher” when transmitting on the basis of it are on several levels. The best and safest is “I recited to X” – or “It was recited to X while I was listening” – “and he acknowledged it” (qaraṭu ‘alā fulān wa qaraṭa ‘alā fulān wa-anā asma‘u fa-aqarra bihi). This is unquestionably valid. The expressions validly applied in unqualified form to “audition of the speech of the teacher” come next, provided that, when they are used in this case, they are qualified by the student saying, “X transmitted to us by means of recitation to him” (la’dathanā fulān qirā’atan ‘alayhi), “He informed us by means of recitation to him” (akhbaranā qir’ā’atan ‘alayhi) or something similar. In the same way, “He declaimed to us by means of recitation to him” (anshadanā qir’ā’atan ‘alayhi) may be used for verse.

There are several different views about the unqualified application of “He transmitted to us” and “He informed us” to an instance of “recitation to the teacher.” Some scholars of hadith forbid both of them. It is said that this was the doctrine of Ibn al-Mubarak, Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā al-Tamīmī, Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Naṣārī and others.

Some hold the opinion that it is licit. They maintain that “recitation to the teacher” is like “audition of the speech of the teacher” in regard to the permissibility of the unqualified application of “He transmitted to us,” “He informed us” and “He told us.” It is said that this was the doctrine of most of the Hejazians and Kufans; the view of Zuhri, Mālik, Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna, Yaḥyā b. Saʿd al-Qadhāī, as well as other ancient authorities; and it was the doctrine of Bukhārī – the author of the Sahīḥ – as well as a number of other transmitters. Some of these also permitted the student to say, “I heard X,” for “recitation to the teacher.”

A third doctrine differentiates between the two phrases in this regard, forbidding the unqualified application of “He transmitted to us” and permitting the unqualified application of “He informed us.” This is the doctrine of Shafi`ī and his followers. It is also transmitted from Muslim – the author of the Sahīḥ – and many of the scholars of the east. The author of Kitāb al-Inṣāf (The Book of

34 Abu I-Hārith Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Mughṭira al-Qurashi (80/699–159/776) was an early scholar famed for his asceticism and pietism; Dāhābī, Siyar, 7:139–49.
35 ‘Abd Saʿd Yaḥyā b. Saʿd al-Qadhāī al-Tamīmī (120/738–198/813) was one of the greatest critics of hadith; Dāhābī, Siyar, 9:175–88.
the Fair View), Muhammad b. al-Hasan al-Tamimi al-Jawhari al-Misri,²⁶ said, “This is the doctrine of the countless majority of the scholars of hadith. They made ‘He informed us’ a symbol occupying the place of the statement, ‘I recited it to him: he did not utter it to me.’ Abu ‘Abd al-Rahman al-Nasawi, among a number of other authorities like him who transmitted hadith to us, was one of those in our time who used to advocate this view.”

It is said that the first to make a distinction between these two terms was Ibn Wahab in Egypt. This is refuted by the fact that this is also said of Ibn Jurayj and Awza’i [who were earlier] – Abu Bakr al-Khaṭib related it about them – unless what is meant is that Ibn Wahab was the first to do this in Egypt. God knows best.

Differentiating between “He transmitted to us” and “He informed us” has become widespread, predominating among the scholars of hadith. The attempt to justify the differentiation from the standpoint of linguistic usage is labored and contrived. The best that may be said for it is that it is a convention among the scholars of hadith who sought by observing it to discriminate between the two means of receiving hadith. The first is specified by the term “He transmitted to us” because of its strong implication of pronunciation and oral communication.

One of the best things that is related about someone who subscribed to this doctrine is what the expert Abu Bakr al-Barqani related to the effect that Abu Hatim Muhammad b. Ya’qub al-Harawi – one of the chief scholars of hadith in Khurasan – was reciting the Sahih of Bukhari to a teacher from Farabri and for each hadith he said to his teacher, “Farabri transmitted it to you.” When he completed the book, he heard his teacher say that he had heard the book from Farabri by means of recitation to him. So Abu Hatim repeated the recitation of the entire book and he said to his teacher for all of it, “Farabri informed you.” God knows best.

**Subsidiary Issues**

(a). When during the recitation to the teacher his text is in the hands of someone else and this person may be relied upon, is attentive to what is recited and is qualified for this: if the teacher knows the material recited to him, it is as if his text were in his own hand, only better because of the cooperation of the mind of two people on it. If the teacher does not know the material recited to him, there

³⁶ I have not succeeded in identifying this individual.
³⁹ I have not been able to identify this individual.
⁴⁰ The long-lived Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. Yusuf al-Farabri (231/845–320/932) was the most prominent transmitter of Bukhari’s Sahih of his generation; Dahabi, *Siyar*, 15:10–13.
is some disagreement about [the validity of the transmission, when he is not holding his text]. One of the authorities in legal theory held that this form of audition is not valid. The preferred opinion is that it is valid and most of the teachers and scholars of hadith act upon it. When the teacher’s text is in the hands of the reciter and he is someone who may be relied upon in regard to his religion and knowledge, the verdict on it is the same; and it is in fact more deserving of being considered valid. When the teacher does not know the material recited to him and his text is in the hands of someone who may not be relied upon to hold it and whose neglect of what is recited may not be guaranteed against, it is the same whether he is the reciter or no, for it is not an audition which may be credited. God knows best.

(b). When the reciter says to the teacher, “X informed you,” or “You said, ‘X informed you,',' or something similar to that while the teacher remains silent, listening attentively to it, comprehending it and not objecting to it; then this behavior is sufficient to [establish the accuracy of the recitation]. Some of the Ṣahīḥītes and others have imposed the condition that the teacher must verbally assent to it. The Shāfi‘ī jurists Abū Iṣḥaq al-Shīrāzī, Abu ‘l- Faṭḥ Sulaym al-Rāzī and Abū Naṣr b. al-Ṣabbāgh⁴¹ stated this unequivocally. Abū Naṣr said, “The student may not say, ‘He transmitted to me’ or ‘He informed me,’ [without his teacher’s verbal assent]. He may act in accordance with what was recited to him, and, if he wants to relate it from his teacher, he should say, ‘I recited to him’ – or ‘It was recited to him’ – while he was listening’ (qarā‘tu ‘alayhi aw qūr? a ‘alayhi wa-huwa yasma‘u).” In contrast, it is related from some writers that one of the Zāhirītes stipulated that the teacher must express his assent upon the completion of the audition through the reciter asking him, “Is it as I recited to you?” and his saying yes. The correct view is that this is not necessary. The obvious implications suffice and the silence of the teacher in the aforementioned fashion takes the place of his explicit endorsement of the reciter. This is the doctrine of the majority of the scholars of hadith, jurists and others. God knows best.

(c). According to what we hear, the expert Abū ‘Abd Allah al-Ḥākim (God bless him) said, “In transmission, the procedure I prefer and the one I saw most of my teachers and the authorities of my era adhering to is for the student to say for the material he took verbally from the speech of the transmitter while he was alone, ‘X transmitted to me,’ and for the material he took from his speech in the presence of others, ‘X transmitted to us.’ For the material he personally recited to the transmitter, he should say, ‘X informed me,’ and for what was recited while he was merely present, ‘X informed us.’”⁴² We indeed heard something

---

⁴¹ Abū Naṣr ʿAbd al-Sayyid b. Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Wāḥib (400/1009–477/1084), known as Ibn al-Ṣabbāgh, was, with Abū Iṣḥaq al-Shīrāzī, one of the most prominent Shāfi‘ī scholars in fifth/-eleventh-century Baghdad, Dhahabī, Siyar, 18:464–5.

⁴² Ulīm al-hadīth, 260.
similar to that from ʿAbd Allāh b. Wāḥib, the disciple of Mālik (God be pleased with them). It is extremely good.

If a transmitter has doubts regarding something in his possession as to whether it falls under the heading of “He transmitted to us” or “He informed us” or under the heading of “He transmitted to me” or “He informed me,” because of his uncertainty over whether he was alone or with others at the time of the reception and the audition; it is possible for us to say: Let him say, “He transmitted to me,” or “He informed me,” because the absence of others is presumed.

However, the authority ʿAlî b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Madīnī stated from his teacher, the authority Yahyā b. Saʿīd al-Qatṭān, that the transmitter should say, “X transmitted to us,” for the material regarding which he is uncertain whether his teacher said, “X transmitted to me” or, “X transmitted to us.” This would require that the transmitter himself say, “He transmitted to us,” when he is in doubt over his own audition in such a case. In my opinion, this is possible because “He transmitted to me” is more complete in terms of rank and “He transmitted to us” is more defective. So, when the transmitter is in doubt, let him limit himself to the defective form, because the absence of the additional person[s] is presumed. This is a fine point. I found that the expert Ṭūbalar ibn al-Bayhāqī (God bless him) had chosen the view I presented above [that is, the preference for “me”], after quoting the statement of [Yahyā b. Saʿīd] al-Qatṭān.

Making this distinction [between “me” and “us”] on the principle of [Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥākim] is desirable but not mandatory. Al-Khaṭīb related this view from all of the scholars of ḥadīth. Thus, it is permissible for the student, when he hears ḥadīth by himself, to say, “He transmitted to us,” or something similar, because in the speech of the Arabs that is permissible for a single individual. Furthermore, he is permitted, when he hears ḥadīth as a part of a group, to say, “He transmitted to me,” because the teacher did transmit to him as well as transmitting to the others. God knows best.

(d). We heard that Abū ʿAbd Allāh ʿAbd b. Ḥanbal (God be pleased with him) said, “Follow the speech of the teacher in regard to his saying, ‘He transmitted to us,’ ‘He transmitted to me,’ ‘I heard,’ and ‘He informed us,’ and do go beyond it.” For the material you find in the books composed of the transmissions of people earlier than you, you may not change the ḥadīth indicated with “He informed us” in that very book to “He transmitted to us,” and the like. That is because, if there exists a disagreement over putting one term in the place of the other and there exists a precedent for making a distinction between them, it is possible that the person using one of them is one of those who does not regard them as equivalent. If you were to find an isnād of that description and you knew that its transmitters regarded the terms as equivalent, then your replacing one of them with the other would come under the heading of permitting transmission by paraphrase.

43 Ḥāfiẓ, 294.
44 Ḥāfiẓ, 294.
would be true, even if there were a well-known difference [between the terms, observed by others]. We think it best to avoid doing anything along these lines in regard to changing the contents of books and collections of hadith, as we will (God — He is exalted — willing) discuss below.

What Abū Bakr al-Khaṭṭāb said in his Kifāya about doing that is disputed and in our view it refers to the hadith a student hears from the speech of a transmitter and not something recorded in a written composition. God knows best.

(e) Scholars disagree over the soundness of the audition of someone who copies at the time of the recitation. It is reported that the authority ʿIbrāhīm al-Ḥarbī, the expert Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAdī, the professor Abū ʿIshaq al-Isfahānī — the expert in practical and theoretical law — and others rejected it. We heard that Abū Bakr Ahmad b. ʿIshaq al-Ṣibghī — one of the authorities of the Shafiʿites in Khurāsān — was asked about the student who writes during audition. He said, “He should say, ‘I attended’ (ḥadāʾartu), and not, ‘He transmitted to us,’ or, ‘He informed us.’” It is reported that Mūsā b. Ḥarūn al-Ḥammāl permitted copying during the audition and that Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī said, “I wrote in ʿArim’s class while he was reciting and I wrote in ʿAmr b. Marzūq’s class while he was reciting.” It is also reported that one text was recited to Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Mubārak while he copied another. There is no difference between the copying of the auditor and the copying of the person who validates the audition (musammīf).

Making a distinction is superior to these blanket declarations. Our opinion is that the audition is not valid when the copying is such that the student cannot comprehend what is being recited, so that sound which reaches his ears is like background noise. The audition is valid if, while copying, comprehension is not impossible for him, as was the case in what we heard regarding the hadith expert and scholar Abū ʿI-Hāsan al-Dāraquṭnī. In his youth, he attended the class of ʿIsā al-Ṣaffār. He sat copying a volume in his possession while ʿIsā al-Ṣaffār was

---

45 This may refer to Kifāya, 309-10.
46 Abū ʿIshaq ʿIbrāhīm b. ʿIshaq b. Bashir al-Ḥarbī (198/813-280/894) was an expert in hadith and law who is perhaps best known for having written a book on the rare words appearing in the hadith (gharib al-hadīth); Dāhābī, Siyar, 13:356-72.
48 Abū ʿIshaq ʿIbrāhīm b. Muḥammad b. ʿIbrāhīm al-Isfahānī (d. 418/1027) was one of the most prominent Shafiʿites of his era; Dāhābī, Siyar, 17:353-5.
49 Ṣibghī (258/872-342/953) combined expertise in law and hadith; Dāhābī, Siyar, 15:483-9.
50 Suhrāna (ca. 140/757-224/839), whose real name was Abū ʿI-Nuṣrān Muḥammad b. al-Ḥaḍr al-Suhrāna, was a prominent transmitter of hadith whom Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī studied with in 214/829; Dāhābī, Siyar, 10:265-70.
51 Abū ʿIṣā ʿIsāṣī b. Muḥammad al-Baghdādī al-Ṣaffār (247/861-341/952) was a transmitter of hadith also known for his knowledge of the Arabic language; Dāhābī, Siyar, 15:440-1.
dictating. One of those in attendance said to him, “Your audition is not valid while you copy.” Dāraquṭnī replied, “My comprehension of the dictation is different from yours.” Then Dāraquṭnī said to the man, “Do you recall how many hadīth the teacher has dictated until now?” He said no. Dāraquṭnī said, “He has dictated eighteen,” and the hadīth were counted and found to be as he said. Then Dāraquṭnī said, “The first hadīth was from X from Y and its text read such and such. The second was from A from B and its text was such and such.” He kept giving the isnāds and texts of the hadīth in the order they were dictated until he reached the last of them. The people were astonished by him. God knows best.

(f). The distinction which we described in regard to copying applies equally to the cases when the teacher or the auditor is holding a conversation, or the reciter speaks too quickly or murmurs so that some of the words are inaudible, or the auditor is too far from the reciter, and similar cases. It is obvious that in, each of these cases, missing a small amount – a word or two – may be excused. [If this is the case,] it is recommended that the teacher permit all of the auditors to transmit the entire volume or book which they heard, even if the term “audition” (sama‘) is to be applied to all of it. When he grants his written authorization (khāṣf) for that book to one of them, he should write: “He heard this book from me and I hereby give him permission to relate it from me,” or something like this, just as some of the earlier teachers used to do. One of the things we hear from the Andalusian jurist Abū Muhammad b. Abī ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAṭṭab̄ was that his father1 (God be pleased with both of them) said, “In audition licensing is indispensable, because sometimes the reciter makes mistakes and the teacher ignores it; or the teacher makes mistakes, if he is reciting, and the auditor ignores it. So the portion the student misses is restored to him by the licensing.” What we have mentioned is an excellent solution. Indeed, we heard that Ṣāliḥ b. Ahmad b. Ḥanbal4 (God bless them) said, “I said to my father, ‘When the teacher slurs a word – it is known to be such and such and this is not understood from him – do you think that the student should relate the correct wording from him?’ He said, ‘I hope that there will be no difficulty in his doing that.’”

On the other hand, we read that Khalaf b. Ṣālim al-Mukharrimi52 said, “I heard Ibn ʿUyayna saying, ‘ʿAmr b. Dīnār to us’ (nā ṣ̣̲̅aman ibn Dinār), meaning ‘ʿAmr b. Dīnār transmitted to us’ (ḥaddathānā); however he

52 Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Abī ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. ʿAṭṭab al-Qurṭubī (453/1061–520/1126) was one of the great hadīth transmitters of al-Andalus; Dhabhāb, Siyar, 19:514–15.
53 Abī ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. ʿAṭṭab b. Muḥsin (383/994–462/1069) was an expert in a number of disciplines; Dhabhāb, Siyar, 18:328–30.
54 Abu ʿl-Fadl Ṣāliḥ (203/818–265/878) was one of the two talented sons of the imām Ahmad b. Ḥanbal who played a large role in the propagation of his teaching; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:510.
55 Abū Muḥammad Khalaf b. Ṣālim al-Mukharrimi al-Baghdādī (d.231/846) was considered to be an expert in hadīth; Dhabhāb, Siyar, 11:148–50.
limited himself to the \textit{nūn} and \textit{alif} of \textit{haddathānā}. When he was told, ‘Say, “Amr transmitted to us.”’ he said, ‘I will not say it, because I did not hear three letters of his utterance of \textit{haddathānā} – and they were \textit{haddathā} – on account of the great crowd.’”

The crowds in the classes of many of the greatest transmitters of \textit{ḥadith} used to be very large, sometimes reaching thousands and thousands. Repetitors (\textit{mustamālūn}) conveyed the \textit{ḥadith} from the teachers to the crowds so the students actually wrote the \textit{ḥadith} down from the teachers through the intermediary of the conveyance of the assistants. More than one of the experts permitted students to relate that material from the dictactor [without mentioning the intervening repetitor]. We heard that al-A‘mash (God be pleased with him) said, “We were attending the class of ʿIbrāhīm [al-Nakhrī] and the teaching circle became very large. Many times he related a \textit{ḥadith} and those at a distance from him could not hear it, so they asked one another what he had said. Then they related these \textit{ḥadith} [directly from him] as well as those they actually did hear from him.” We heard that a man asked Ḥammād b. Zayd about a similar situation, saying, “Abū Ismā‘īl, what is your opinion?” He said, “Ask those around you.” We also heard that the repetitor Abū Muslim\textsuperscript{54} said to Ibn ʿUyayna, “Many of the people cannot hear the \textit{ḥadith}.” He said, “Can you hear them?” He said yes and Ibn ʿUyayna replied, “Then make them hear them.”

Others rejected that. We heard that Khalaf b. ʿTamīm\textsuperscript{55} said, “I heard about ten thousand \textit{ḥadith} from Sufyān al-Thawrī and I used to ask my companion in class [for the ones I did not hear clearly]. I told that to Zāhid and he said to me, ‘Transmit from these \textit{ḥadith} only what you have preserved with your heart and heard with your own ears.’ So I cast them away.” We also heard that Abū Nuʿaym [al-ʿAdal b. Dukayn] felt it necessary to transmit from his fellow students the \textit{ḥadith} from Sufyān and al-A‘mash from which he missed a single word or name he had to ask his fellows for, not thinking that anything else was possible for him.

The first view\textsuperscript{56} represents an extreme lack of rigor. Indeed, we heard that the expert Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. Manda al-Iṣbahānī said to one of his students, “X, for you smelling a \textit{ḥadith} is enough for audition!” This statement should either be interpreted [to refer to something else] or be left with the person who said it. I found from the expert ʿAbd al-Ghani b. Saʿīd\textsuperscript{57} from the expert Ḥamza b. Muhammad\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{56} Ibn al-Salāḥ seems to have in mind here the views of ʿIbrāhīm al-Nakhrī and Ḥammād b. Zayd, who, it would appear, allowed the student to transmit any amount of material directly from the teacher without mentioning the intermediary whom he had to consult.
\textsuperscript{57} Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Ghani b. Saʿīd al-Azdi al-Miṣrī (332/944–409/1018) appears to have been a very important figure in the history of \textit{ḥadith} scholarship, although none of his surviving works have been published yet; Sərgiń, \textit{GAS}, 1:223–5.
\textsuperscript{58} Abū Muḥammad Ḥamza b. Muḥammad al-Kinānī (275/888–357/968) was a scholar of \textit{ḥadith}, born in Egypt; Sərgiń, \textit{GAS}, 1:192–3.
— with his isnād — that ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Mahdī said, “Smelling a hadith is enough for you.” ‘Abd al-Ghani said, “Ḥamza said to us, ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Mahdī means that when that person was asked about the beginning of something [that is, a hadith], he recognized it. It does not refer to laxity in audition.’” God knows best.

(g). Audition from someone behind a barrier is valid, if, when he relates the ḥadīth personally, his4th voice is recognized. It is also valid when the hadith are being recited to him, if his presence behind the barrier is known to one of those being granted the audition by him. For recognizing the teacher’s voice or presence, one should be permitted to rely upon the word of someone trustworthy. They used to hear ḥadīth from Aḥīsa and the other wives of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) from behind a barrier and they related these hadith from them on the basis of their voice. The expert ‘Abd al-Ghani b. Sa‘īd cited as proof of the permissibility of this practice the statement of the Prophet (Peace be upon him), “Bilāl will call out at night, so eat and drink until Ibn Umm Maktūm calls out.”41 ‘Abd al-Ghani also related, with his isnād, that Shūbā said, “When someone transmits hadith to you and you do not see his face, do not relate from him. Perhaps it is a devil who has taken his shape,” saying, ‘He transmitted to us’ and ‘He informed us.” God knows best.

(h). When a student hears a hadith from a teacher and the teacher then says to him, “Do not relate it from me,” or “I do not grant you permission to relate it from me;” or he says, “I did not inform you of it” — or “I recant from my informing you of it” — “so do not relate it from me,” without his ascribing that to his having made an error in the hadith, having doubts about it or something like that — but rather he forbids the student to relate from him despite being unequivocal that it is his hadith: that does not nullify the student’s audition or form an obstacle to the student’s relating from him. The expert Abū Sa‘īd b. ‘Alīyak al-Nisābūrī47

61. Despite the masculine pronouns, it is a question of women here. They normally transmitted out of the view of their male students.

62. Although the interpretation of this report was not disputed, the justification of this interpretation was: Ibn Umm Maktūm — the other elements of his name are variously given, see Dhahabi, Siyār, 1:360-3 — and Bilāl shared the duty of calling the Muslim Community to prayer during the lifetime of the Prophet. The text refers to the fast of the month of Ramadān when Muslims are permitted to eat and drink only between the evening and the dawn prayer. Suyūṭī (Tadhkīr al-rāwī, 2:28) pointed to the fact that people who could not see Ibn Umm Maktūm were obliged to act upon his call to prayer. Noting that Ibn Umm Maktūm had lost his sight as a child, Ibn Ḥajar (Nakāt, 2:879) argued that he was therefore obliged to rely on the voice of a person whom he could not see to learn of the advent of daylight.

63. As Sakhāwī points out, it would have made slightly better sense if Shūbā had said “voice” (ṣaḥīh) here rather than “shape” (ṣāḥa), Fath al-Mughīth, 2:52.

64. Abū Sa‘īd (or Abū Sa‘īd) ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Ḥusayn (or al-Ḥasan) b. ‘Alīyak al-Nisābūrī was a hadith collector who died in 431/1039 at an advanced age; Dhahabi, Siyār, 17:509.
asked the professor Abū Ishāq al-Isfārāyini (God bless both of them) about the transmitter who intends his audition for a particular group and someone else comes and hears hadith from him without his knowledge of it: “Is it permissible for that unintended student to transmit the hadith from him?” He answered that it is permissible and that—even if the transmitter had said, “I am informing you and I am not informing X,” it would not harm X. God knows best.

III Licensing (ijāza) is the third means of conveying and receiving hadith. It takes several forms.

(a). Licensing a specific text to a specific person: for instance, the teacher says, “I hereby license book X” — or “the contents of this book list of mine (fihris’t)” — “to you.” This is the highest form of licensing lacking the transference of the text (munāwala). Some claim that there is no dispute regarding the permissibility of this form of licensing and that the Zāhirites did not dispute it; rather their dispute was over some other type of transmission. The judge Abu 'l-Walid al-Ḥajjā al-Mālikī66 went further and categorically denied the existence of any dispute. He said, “There is no dispute regarding the permissibility of transmitting by license among the forebears of this Community or their successors,”67 and he asserted that there was total unanimity on this. He then mentioned the dispute over whether one could act upon the material transmitted this way. God knows best.

This is false. Large numbers of hadith scholars, jurists and legal theorists have indeed held contradictory opinions over the permissibility of transmitting by license. The view which holds licensing as invalid is represented in one of the two transmissions from Shāfi`i (God be pleased with him) on that topic. It was related that his disciple al-Rabī' b. Sulaymān said, “Shāfi`i did not use to allow licensing for hadith, and I disagree with Shāfi`i on that.” A number of other Shāfi`ites, including the judges Ḥusayn b. Muhammad al-Marwardī68 and Abu 'l-Ḥasan al-Māwardi,69 regarded licensing as invalid. Māwardi stated as much unequivocally in his al-Ḥāwi and traced it back to the doctrine of Shāfi`i.

65 Fihris, fahras, tahafat and karnāmaj were names applied to the works listing the books a scholar was permitted to transmit and the teachers from whom he received them; EI, 2:743–4, s.v. Fehrass.
66 Sulaymān b. Khalaf b. Sa'd (403/1013–474/1081) was a renowned Andalusian scholar who wrote works in a number of disciplines, including hadith and law; Dhabah, Siyur, 18:535–45.
67 Al-Qādi 'Iyyād, Ilm haq', 89.
68 Abu Muhammad al-Rabī' b. Sulaymān al-Murādī (ca. 174/790–270/884) was one of the pupils of Shāfi`i most responsible for preserving his teachings; Dhabah, Siyur, 12:587–91.
69 Abu 'Alī Ḥusayn b. Muhammad al-Marwardī (d. 462/1069) was one of the great Shāfi`ite scholars of Khurṣīdān; Dhabah, Siyur, 18:260–2.
70 The career of Abu 'l-Ḥasan 'Alī b. Muhammad b. Iḥābb al-Māwardi (364/974–450/1058) reached its apogee when he was appointed the chief judge of Baghdad. Among his works on Shāfi`i law is Kītab al-Aṣkhām al-sulṭāniyya, a seminal work on public law; Dhabah, Siyur, 18:64–7.
Both of them said, “If licensing were licit, traveling to collect ḥadith would become pointless.” This expression is also related from Shuʿba and others. The authority Ibrahim ibn Ḳibla, Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Īṣābānī—nicknamed “Abu ʾl-Shaykh”—and the expert Abū Naṣr al-Waṭṭabi al-Sijzi were among the scholars of ḥadith who regarded licensing as invalid. Abū Naṣr related declarations of its incorrectness from a number of those he met, saying “I heard a number of scholars saying, ‘The implication of a transmitter saying, ‘I hereby license you to relate from me,’ is I hereby license you to do something which is not allowed by the law, because the law does not permit the transmission of material which was not heard.’” Similar to this is what Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Thābit al-Khujandī—one of the Shāfiʿīs who regarded licensing as invalid—related from Abū Ṭāhir al-Dabbās—of the Ḥanafīs. He said, “When someone says to someone else, ‘I hereby license you to relate from me what you did not hear,’ it is like his saying, ‘I hereby license you to ascribe lies to me.’”

The established practice and the doctrine of large numbers of scholars of ḥadith and others are in favor of permitting licensing and allowing transmission on the basis of it. However, there is some obscurity in the argument made for this. We may say: when the teacher licenses the student to relate his transmissions from him, he has communicated them to him collectively (jumlatan), and it is the same as if he had communicated them to him word by word (tafsilān). As in the case discussed above regarding “recitation to the teacher,” the validity of the teacher’s communicating his transmissions to his students does not rest upon his explicit verbal declaration. Rather, the aim is for the teacher to make the student understand [that this is the material he transmits] and for the student to comprehend this; and that occurs through the act of licensing which creates this understanding. God knows best.

Just as relation on the basis of licensing is permitted, acting upon the material transmitted that way is necessary. This is in conflict with the doctrine of those Zāhīrites and the others who have followed them who held that it is not necessary to act upon it, and that a ḥadith transmitted this way is the same as a loose ḥadith (mursal). This is incorrect, because there is nothing in the act of licensing that impairs the cohesiveness or trustworthiness of the material transmitted in this way. God knows best.

---

71 Abu ʾl-Shaykh (274/887–369/979) was one of the greatest scholars of ḥadith of the fourth/tenth century; Seein, G.A.S., 1:200–1.
73 Abū Ṭāhir Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Ṣufyān al-Dabbās (d. ca. 340/951) was one of the most prominent Ḥanafīs in Iraq; Lakanawt, Fawā'id, 187.
74 See p. 103.
75 See Sakkāwī, Fatḥ al-Maṣḥīth, 2:64.
(b). Licensing an unspecified text to a specific person: for instance, the teacher says, “I hereby license everything I heard”— or “everything I relate” — “to you,” or something similar. The dispute over this type of licensing is stronger and more common. The majority of scholars, including transmitters of hadith, jurists and others, permit transmitting by this means as well as the first and also deem it necessary to act on the material related in this way in accordance with its stipulation.\textsuperscript{76} God knows best.

(c). Licensing an unspecified person under a general designation: for instance, the teacher says, “I hereby license the Muslims,” or “I hereby license everyone,” or “I hereby license my contemporaries,” or something similar. This is a form which the modern proponents of permitting licensing in principle discussed and the permissibility of which they disputed. If it is coupled with a restrictive designation or the like, it is more likely to be permitted. The expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭṭāb was one of those who permitted every form of it.\textsuperscript{77} We heard that the expert Abū ‘Abd Allāh b. Manda said, “I hereby license everyone who says, ‘There is no God but God.’” According to what al-Khaṭṭāb related, the judge Abū l-Tayyib al-Tabarî\textsuperscript{78} — one of the expert jurists — permitted the licensing of all Muslims alive at the time the act of licensing takes place.\textsuperscript{79} Abū Muḥammad b. Saʿīd\textsuperscript{80} — one of the greatest of the teachers of al-Andalus — licensed every student of hadith who entered Cordova. A number of scholars, including Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. ‘Attāḥ (God be pleased with them), concurred with him in permitting that. Someone who asked Abū Bakr al-Hāzim\textsuperscript{81} about this form of global licensing (al-iḥāṣa al-ṣīma) told me that one of things he said in reply was that the experts of his time, like the expert Abū l-ʿAlā\textsuperscript{82} and others, leaned towards permitting it. (God knows best.) We have not seen nor heard of anyone who is

\textsuperscript{76} Bi-sharīṭah: It is difficult to determine what this phrase refers to. Nawawī omits it in his abridgement and most commentators ignore it. Sakhāwī suggests that it is “the stipulation of licensing” (shart al-iḥāṣa) to be discussed below; Sakkāwā, Fath al-Majhīḥ, 2:66 (and repeated in Zakariyā al-Anṣārī, Fath al-Bāṣī, 2:64). This would appear to be the stipulation — which Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ rejects (see below, p. 117) — that licensing is valid only when “the licensor is knowledgeable regarding what he is licensing and the licensee is a scholar.”


\textsuperscript{78} Abū l-Tayyib Tahir b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Taḥarī (348/959-450/1058) was an important Shāfiʿite jurist; \textit{EF}, 10:15–16; Sezgin, \textit{GAS}, 1:502; \textit{ElR}, 1:390.

\textsuperscript{79} Iḥāṣa, 80.

\textsuperscript{80} Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh b. Saʿīd al-Shahtūjī al-Qurṭubī was a respected transmitter of hadith who spent a number of years in Mecca. He died in Cordova in 436/1045; Ibn Bashkuwāl, Kitāb al-Ṣilāḥ, 2 vols (Cairo, 1966), I:271–3.

\textsuperscript{81} Abū Bakr Muhammad b. Mūṣab b. ʿUthmān al-Ḥākimī (548/1153–581/1185) was a Shāfiʿite who settled in Baghdad. He specialized in hadith and his most famous works may be Kitāb al-Nāṣīḥ wa-ʾl-mansūkah and Sharḥ al-ṣīma; Dhahabī, \textit{Syār}, 21:167–72.

\textsuperscript{82} Abū l-ʿAlāʾ al-Ḥasanī b. Ahmad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ḥamadhānī (488/1095-569/1173) was an expert in hadith and in several other religious sciences; Dhahabī, \textit{Syār}, 21:80–7.
worthy of emulation actually using this form of licensing and relating by it, not even the small group of late-comers who viewed it as valid. Licensing in principle is a weakness. By this extension and relaxation, it becomes a much greater weakness which should not be tolerated. God knows best.

(d). Licensing an unknowable person (majhul) or an unknowable text, and the question of an act of licensing bearing a condition, are appended to this discussion: for instance, the teacher says, “I hereby license Muḥammad b. Khālid al-Dimashqī,” and at that time there are a number of people who share this name (īsm) and lineage (nasab) and the one being licensed is not specified. Or the teacher says, “I hereby license X to relate from me Kītāb al-Sunan (The Book of Sunnas),” and he transmits a number of books of sunnas known by this title and he does not specify which is meant. This is a defective and worthless form of licensing.

This is not the same as the case when someone licenses a number of people whose name and lineage are specified, while he is ignorant of their identity and is not acquainted with them. That does not impair the validity of the licensing, just as a teacher not knowing a student who attended his class does not affect the validity of that student’s audition. (God knows best.) Even if the teacher licenses those whose names are designated in a letter requesting licensing (istijāza) and he is ignorant of their identity and their lineage, not even knowing how many of them there are and without having scrutinized their names one by one; the licensing should also be considered valid. This is analogous to the validity of the audition of those who attended a teacher’s class to hear ḥadīth from him, even if the teacher does not know them at all, does not know how many of them there are and does not scrutinize their persons one by one.

When the teacher says, “I hereby license whomever X wants,” or the like, it contains unknowability (jahāla) [in regard to the identity of the individuals being licensed] and the stipulation of a condition. So the presumption is that it is not valid. The judge Abu ʿl-Ṭayyib al-Ṭabarī al-Shafīʿi gave a legal opinion to that effect, when the expert al-Khaṭṭāb asked him about this.83 He reasoned that it is licensing an unknowable person and it is as if he had said, “I hereby license some people,” without any specification. Sometimes it is argued that it is invalid because it also bears a condition. Whatever is vitiated by unknowability is also vitiated by the stipulation of a condition, according to what is known to be the opinion of some people. (The Shafīʿite) al-Khaṭṭāb related that Abū Yaʿṣūf b. al-Farrāʾ al-Ḥanbalī and Abū ʿl-Fadl b. ʿUmarūs al-Mālikī permitted this form of licensing.

---

83 Ijāza, 81–2.
84 Abū Yaʿṣūf b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad al-Farrāʾ (380/990–458/1066) was a very prominent Hanbalite legal scholar in Baghdad; Dhahabi, Siyār, 18:89–91.
85 Abū ʿl-Fadl Muḥammad b. ʿUbayd Allāh b. ʿUmarūs al-Mālikī (372/983–452/1060) was one of the leading Mālikite scholars in Baghdad; Dhahabi, Siyār, 18:73–4.
and these three were leaders of their respective schools at that time in Baghdad.66 The unknowability in this form of licensing arises in the second part of the clause due to the presence of volition, in contrast to unknowability occurring in the case when the teacher licenses “some people.” When the teacher says, “I hereby license whoever wants it,” it is the same as if he had said, “I hereby license whomever X wants.” (God knows best.) Rather, the former contains more unknowability and is more diffuse from the standpoint that—in contrast to the latter—it is conditional on the volition of innumerable people. This is also true in the case where the teacher licenses whoever wants to be licensed by him.

If the teacher licenses whoever desires to transmit from him, this is closer to being permissible because the delegation of transmission by the license to the volition of the licensee is a necessary component of every act of licensing. Despite the fact that this formula is in the form of a stipulation, it is merely a clarification of what is necessary to carry out the transmission and a description of the circumstance, and in reality there is no imposition of a condition.

For this reason, some Shāfi‘ite authorities permit the seller to say in a commercial transaction, “I hereby sell you this for such-and-such price, if you desire,” with the purchaser saying, “I hereby accept.”

The following was found in the handwriting of the expert Abu ‘l-Faṭḥ Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Azdi al-Mawṣūlī:67 “I hereby license the transmission of that to everyone who wants to transmit it from me.” When the teacher says, “I hereby license such and such to X, if he desires to transmit it from me,” or “to you, if you desire,” or “you like,” or “you want;” the most obvious and strongest view is that this is permissible, since the element of unknowability and the reality of the imposition of a stipulation have disappeared and only their form remains. Knowledge belongs to God (He is exalted).

(e). Licensing a yet-to-be-born person (maḍām), and let us discuss along with this the licensing of young children: this is a type of licensing which some modern scholars have discussed extensively and they have disagreed over its permissibility. An example of it is when you say, “I hereby license whoever will be born to X.” If he links the yet-to-be-born person to a living person (mawjūd) by saying, “I hereby license X and whoever will be born to him,” or “I hereby license you, your sons and your descendants for as long as they continue to reproduce;” it is closer to being permitted than the first example. For a similar reason, the Shāfi‘ites permit the second kind and not the first in the establishment of a charitable trust (waqf). The Malikites and Ḥanafites—or at least some of them—permit both kinds in a charitable trust. Ābū Bakr b. Ābī Dāwūd al-Sijistānī

66 Ḥāfaẓ, 82.
67 Abu ‘l-Faṭḥ Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Azdi al-Mawṣūlī (d. 374/985) wrote works on a number of aspects of the study of hadith; Sezgin, GAS, 1:199–200.
was one of the early hadith scholars who performed this second kind of licensing. We heard that he was asked for licensing and said, “I hereby license you, your children and the offspring of the offspring,” meaning those who had not yet been born.

The expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb deemed it permissible to license a yet-to-be-born individual in the first instance without any link to a living person.\(^{88}\) He said that he heard Abū Ya‘la b. al-Farrā’ al-Ḥanbalī and Abu ʿl-ʿAbd b. Umās al-Malikī permitting that.\(^{89}\)

The jurist Abū Naṣr b. al-Ṣabbāgh also related the permissibility of that. He said, “Some people are of the opinion that it is permissible to license someone not yet created. This is the opinion only of those who believe that licensing is the granting of permission (iḥān) to transmit and not an instance of face-to-face communication (maḥādatā).”\(^{90}\)

Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī then explained the argument for invalidating this kind of licensing, and this was the view his teacher, the judge and authority Abu ʿl-Ṭayyib al-Ṭabari, settled on.\(^{91}\) That is the correct view and no other is appropriate, because licensing falls under the heading of communicating the licensed material collectively, as we said above in the discussion of the validity of the general principle of licensing. Just as communicating information to a yet-to-be-born person cannot be valid, licensing a yet-to-be-born person cannot be valid. If we had judged licensing to be granting permission, that would still not be valid for a yet-to-be-born person, just as granting permission in regard to the deputation of a yet-to-be-born person is not valid, because the yet-to-be-born person is in a state in which the act permitted was not valid from him.

This also necessarily renders void the licensing of a young child whose audition is not valid. Al-Khaṭīb said, “I asked the judge Abu ʿl-Ṭayyib al-Ṭabari about licensing a small child: ‘Is the child’s age or his capacity for discrimination taken into consideration for determining its validity in the way they are taken into consideration in determining the validity of his audition?’ He said, ‘They are not taken into consideration.’ I then said to him, ‘One of our colleagues said, “Licensing is not valid for those whose audition is not valid.” ’ He said, ‘Sometimes it is valid for the teacher to license someone who is absent while that person’s audition would not be valid.’”\(^{92}\) Al-Khaṭīb cited as evidence for the validity of licensing a child the fact that licensing is only the licensor allowing the licensee to transmit from him, and it is valid to allow someone who has reached the age of reason and someone who has not. He said, “In accordance with this, we saw all of our teachers licensing children who were absent, without inquiring about their age and level of discrimination. We never saw them under any circumstance license

\(^{88}\) Ḥāza, 81.

\(^{89}\) Ḥāza, 81.

\(^{90}\) Ḥāza, 80–81.

\(^{91}\) Kyāya, 325.
anyone who was not yet born.\textsuperscript{92} It seems that they regarded a child fit for this way of receiving hadith so that he could validly transmit on the basis of it after he had attained the qualifications necessary for transmitting. This arose from their desire to expand the means of perpetuating the isnād – which has been granted to this Community alone – and to bring the child closer to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). God knows best.

(f). Licensing something the licensor has not yet heard or received at all to a licensee to relate when the licensor afterward receives it: someone who reported from the judge Ɂyād b. Mūsā – one of the illustrious figures of his age in North Africa – informed me that he said, “I have not seen any of the teachers of old speak about this and I saw some of the modern scholars and our contemporaries doing it. It is said that Abu Ɂ-Walid Yūnus b. Mughīth\textsuperscript{93} – the judge of Cordova – was asked to license all of the material he had related up to that date and all of what he would later relate, and he refused. The person who asked him became angry and one of his colleagues said to him, ‘He should give you something he has not taken? That is impossible!’” Ɂyād said, “This is the correct view.”

This view can be supported whether licensing is judged to be communicating the licensed material collectively or to be granting permission. If licensing is considered to be communication, this kind of licensing is not valid, because how can a person communicate something he has no information about? If licensing is considered to be granting permission, the invalidation rests upon the dispute over the validation of granting permission in deputation for something that the person giving the permission – the deputizer – does not yet possess. An instance of this would be someone appointing an agent to sell a slave which he intends to buy. Indeed, some Shāfi‘ites permitted that. The correct view is that this kind of licensing is invalid. So, it is incumbent on whoever wants to transmit by license from a teacher who has granted him license for, for instance, all of what he has heard to undertake an investigation in order to ascertain that the material he wants to transmit from him is something which the teacher heard before the date of the licensing.

When the teacher says, “I hereby license to you everything I heard which seems valid to you and will seem valid to you” (ajaziu laka mā sāhba wa-yasīḥhu ‘indaka mīn masūdatt), it is not like the above case. Indeed, Dāraqūṭni and others did do this. It is permissible for the student to transmit from his teacher by virtue of that formula whatever after the granting of the license becomes established in his mind as being something the teacher heard before the licensing. That is permitted, even if the teacher

\textsuperscript{92} Kifāya, 326.
\textsuperscript{93} Abu Ɂ-Walid Yūnus b. Mughīth al-Qurṭubi (338/949–429/1038) held a number of positions of religious authority in Muslim Spain; Dḥabābi, Sīyar, 17:569–70.
\textsuperscript{94} Iltān, 106.
saying only, “everything which seems valid to you,” without, “and will seem valid.” This is because what is meant is, “I hereby license you to transmit from me everything which seems valid to you,” and the point to be taken into consideration in that case is the validity of that material in the student’s mind at the time he relates it. God knows best.

(g). Licensing previously licensed material: For instance, the teacher says, “I hereby license you the materials licensed to me,” or, “I hereby license you to transmit everything I was licensed to transmit.” Some modern scholars whose views are not taken into consideration have forbidden this. The correct view—and the one which is followed in practice—is that it is permissible. It is not comparable to the forbidden practice of deputizing an agent without the permission of the original deputizer. I read that the North African expert Abū ʿAmr al-Saḥiqūṣī said, “I heard the expert Abū Nuʿaym al-Iṣḥābānī say, ‘Licensing on the basis of licensing is effective and permissible.’” The expert al-Khaṭṭīb related that the ḥadīth expert and authority Abū ʿI-Ḥasan al-Daraqūṭī, the expert Abū ʿI-ʿAbbās—known as Ibn ʿUqda al-Kūfī—and others permitted it. The jurist and ascetic Naṣr b. Ibrāḥīm al-Maqdīṣī used to transmit by licensing from licensing, sometimes to the extent of putting together three consecutive licencings in his transmission.

The student who transmits previously licensed material on the basis of a license should study the particulars and dictates of the licensing granted by the teacher of his teacher in order that he does not transmit by it something that does not properly come under it. When, for example, the licensing of the teacher’s teacher takes the form, “I hereby license to him everything I heard which seems valid to him,” and the student has seen some of the material heard by the teacher of his teacher, he may not transmit this material from his own teacher from his teacher until it becomes clear that it is something which in the view of his teacher belonged to the material heard by the teacher who licensed him. The mere fact that the material now seems valid to the student is not enough to fulfill the words

96 Abū Nuʿaym Ahmad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Iṣḥābānī (336/947–430/1038) was one of the great scholars of ḥadīth. He is best known for his biographical dictionary of the scholars of Isfahan, Dīrāk uṣbahār Isbāhān (ed. S. Dederding, 2 vols., Leiden, 1931), and his work on the most prominent Sufis, Ḥiyāt al-ʿawṣiyā wu-ṣabqāt al-ʿawṣiyā (Cairo, 1351/1932–1357/1938); EIr, 1:142–3; EIr, 1:354–5.
97 Abū ʿI-ʿAbbās Abū Qūṣ al-Kūfī (249/863–333/944) was a ḥadīth expert famous for his Shiʿite leanings; Sezgin, G. A. S., 1:182.
98 Kāfīya, 349–50.
99 Naṣr b. Ibrāḥīm al-Maqdīṣī al-Nabulwī (before 410/1019–490/1096) was a very prominent Shiʿīte who ended his career in Damascus; Dāḥabī, Stīr, 19:136–43.
and stipulation of his teacher’s teacher. The blunders of those who do not understand this and similar matters will be many. God knows best.

These are the types of licensing which require explanation, and other types can be derived from them. Those who study the matter will be able to figure out how the other types should be dealt with on the basis of what we have dictated, God (He is exalted) willing. We will now draw attention to some other matters.

1. We heard that the author and litterateur Abu ‘l-Ḥasan Aḥmad b. Fāris\(^{100}\) (God bless him) said, “The meaning of ‘licensing’ (**ṭjāṣa**) in the speech of the early Arabs is derived from ‘the giving of a quantity of water’ (**jumāz al-māʾ**) whereby the livestock and crops in someone’s possession may be watered. It is said, ‘I asked X to give me a quantity of water (**istajāzu**) and he gave me a quantity of water (**ajāzant**)’ when he gives you water for your land and your livestock. In the same fashion, the student asks the scholar ‘to give him a drink’ of his knowledge and he ‘gives him a drink’ of it.” In accordance with this interpretation, the licensor should say, “I hereby license X everything I heard” or “everything I relate” (**ajāzu fi-l-fuṭūn masmaʿātī aw marutūyītī**), making it transitive, without any preposition, there being no need to mention the phrase “the transmission of” or anything similar. Those who equate “licensing” with allowing, granting permission or authorizing need to do that; and that is recognized. The licensor should then say, for instance, “I hereby license to X the transmission of everything I heard.” (**ajāzu li-fuṭūn niḥyata masmaʿātī**) Some advocates of this view nevertheless say, “I hereby license to him everything I heard” (**ajāzu laḥū masmaʿātī**). This is a form of ellipsis the like of which is not obscure. God knows best.

2. Licensing is recommended only when the licensor is knowledgeable regarding what he is licensing and the licensee is a scholar, because licensing is a facilitation and a concession suitable for scholars because of the pressing need for it. Some of them have gone too far in this regard and made this recommendation a stipulation (**shart**) for licensing. Abu ‘l-ʿAbbās al-Walīd b. Bākr al-Malikī\(^{101}\) related such a view from Mālik (God be pleased with him). The expert Abu ʿUmar [b. ʿAbd al-Barr] said, “The correct view is that licensing is only permitted for the person skilled in the craft and for something specific, without problems in its isnād.”\(^{102}\) God knows best.

3. When the licensor writes his license, he should pronounce it out loud. If he merely writes it, it is still a permissible form of licensing when it is coupled with the intention of licensing. However, it is inferior in status to the license.

\(^{100}\) Ibn Fāris (d. 395/1005) was the author of numerous works on the Arabic language; Sezgin, G.45, 7:360–1, 8:209–14, 9:194.


\(^{102}\) *Jaʿmī hayān al-ṭilmi wa-fadlīthi*, ed. ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Khaṭīb (Cairo, 1975), 480.
spoken out loud. Reckoning that kind of licensing as sound is not far-fetched, because merely writing the license belongs to the same class of transmission as “recitation to the teacher” which – although the teacher does not pronounce the material recited to him – has been made tantamount to his communicating to the student the material recited to him, as was explained above. God knows best.

IV Transference (munāwala) is the fourth means of receiving and taking up hadith. It has two forms.

(a). Transference coupled with licensing: this is the absolutely highest kind of licensing. It takes several forms. One of them is the teacher handing the student the original text of his audition or a copy collated against it, saying, “This is my audition” – or “my transmission” – “from X. Transmit it from me” – or “I hereby license you to relate it from me,” and then placing it in his possession; or the teacher saying, “Take it, copy it, collate your copy against it and then return it to me,” or something similar.

Another form is the student bringing the teacher a book or personal collection of his hadith and presenting it to him. The teacher – assuming he is cognizant and alert – examines it and returns it to him, saying to him, “I have read what is in this and they are my hadith from X” – or “my transmission from my teachers is in it” – “so transmit it from me” – or “I hereby license you to transmit it from me.” Several of the authorities in hadith have called this “presentation” (ṣard). In our earlier discussion of “recitation to the teacher,” we said that it is also called “presentation.” So let us call that “presentation by recitation” (ṣard al-qirā’ā) and let us call this “presentation by transference” (ṣard al-munāwala). God knows best.

This transference coupled with licensing occupies the place of audition in the opinion of Mālik and a number of the authorities in hadith.

The expert Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥākim al-Nisābūrī related from many of the early scholars that the aforementioned “presentation by transference” is equal to audition. This applies as well to similar forms of transference coupled with licensing. Among those from whom al-Ḥākim related this view were a number of Medinese, including Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhri, Rabīʿat al-Raʿy, Yahyā b. Saʿīd al-Anṣārī and the imām Mālik b. Anas; some Meccans, including Mujāhid, Abu ʿl-Zubayr [al-Makki] and Ibn ʿUyayna; some Kūfīans, including ʿAlqama [b. Qays] al-Nakhaʾī, Ibrahim al-Nakhaʾī and Shaḥbī; a group of Baṣrans, including Qatāda, Abu ʿl-ʿAlīya and Abu ʿl-Mutawakkil al-Nāṣiri; a number of Egyptians, including Ibn

103 Abū ʿl-ʿAlīya Rūfayb b. Mīrān al-Riyābī converted to Islam in the caliphate of Abu Bakr and became one of the great experts in the proper recitation of the Qurʾān. The sources date his death variously between 90/709 and 106/724; Dhahabi, Siyar, 4:207–13.
104 Abū ʿl-Mutawakkil ʿAlī b. Dāwūd al-Nāṣirī was an obscure transmitter who died in 102/720; Dhahabi, Siyar, 5:8–9.
Waḥb, Ibn al-Qāsim\textsuperscript{105} and Ashhab;\textsuperscript{106} and others in Syria and Khūrāsān. Al-Ḥākim also saw that a number of his own teachers subscribed to that view.\textsuperscript{107} There is some confusion in Al-Ḥākim’s discussion because he has in some cases confounded remarks regarding “presentation by recitation” with comments on “presentation by transference” and treated them the same.

The correct view is that “transference by presentation” cannot take the place of audition, and that it is inferior in status to verbal transmission and communication through recitation. Indeed, al-Ḥākim himself said about this kind of presentation, “The jurists of Islam who gave opinions over the permissible and the forbidden did not regard it as equal to audition. Shafi‘i, Azwâjī, Buwayti,\textsuperscript{108} Muzant,\textsuperscript{109} Abū ʿAfnâ, Sufyân al-Thawrî, Ahmad b. Hanbal, Ibn al-Mubârak, Yahyâ b. Yahyâ and Ishâq b. Rahawayh advocated that opinion. We observed our authorities adhering and subscribing to it, and we do too.”\textsuperscript{110} God knows best.

Another form of transference with licensing is when the teacher “transfers” his book to the student and licenses him to relate it from him, and then the teacher keeps the book in his possession and does not give it to the student. Because the student does not come into possession of the material he receives and it is absent from him, this form of transference falls short of the previously mentioned ones. It will be permissible for the student to relate the material from the teacher when he takes possession of the book or a copy collated with it in a fashion which convinces him of its agreement with the material the license covered. However, this is still considered to be a form of licensing lacking actual transference. Thus, transference in a case like this hardly possesses any advantage over a case of licensing a specific text without the act of transference. Indeed, several jurists and legal theorists have concluded that it possesses no [special] efficacy or benefit. Nevertheless, the expert scholars of ḫadîth in early and modern times – or at least some of them – believe it to have a considerable advantage. Knowledge belongs to God (He is exalted).

Another form of transference with licensing is a student bringing a book or a personal ḫadîth collection to a teacher and saying, “This is your transmission, so transfer it to me and license me to transmit it,” and the teacher agreeing to this without looking at the text and making certain that he transmitted all of it. This

\textsuperscript{105} Abû ʿAbd Allâh Abû al-Râhmân b. al-Qâsim al-Utaqî (132/749–191/806) was a Mâlikî legal scholar whose views are recorded in a madhâbî work; Sezgin, G.S., 1:465–6.

\textsuperscript{106} Abû ʿAmr Ashhab b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz al-Qayyîrî (145/762–204/819) was an important Egyptian Mâlikî legal scholar; Sezgin, G.S., 1:466–7.

\textsuperscript{107} Ulûm, 257–8.

\textsuperscript{108} Abû Yaqîb Yûsuf b. Yahyâ al-Buwaytî (d. 231/845) was one of the students of the imâm Shafi‘î responsible for the spread of his teachings; Sezgin, G.S., 1:491.

\textsuperscript{109} Abû ʿIbrahim Isma‘îl b. Yahyâ al-Muzant (175/792–264/877) was a disciple of the imâm Shafi‘î and his Makhtasir is one of the fundamental works of Shafi‘î law; Sezgin, G.S., 1:492–3.

\textsuperscript{110} Ulûm al-ḥadîth, 259–60.
[by itself] is impermissible and invalid. If the information and the knowledge of the student may be trusted, it is permissible to rely on him in that regard. This is a permissible form of licensing, just as reliance on a student is permissible in "recitation to the teacher" to the extent that he may be the one reciting from the original text, when he is someone whose knowledge and religion may be trusted. Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb (God bless him) said, "If the teacher were to say, 'Transmit the contents of this book from me, if they are my hadith. I am not responsible for any error or misapprehension,' that would be permissible and good." God knows best.

(b). Transference without licensing: here the teacher transfers the book to the student – as described above in the beginning – merely saying, "These are my hadith," or "my audion," without saying, "Transmit it from me," or "I hereby license you to transmit it from me," or something similar. This is a defective form of transference and transmission by it is not permissible. More than one of the jurists and legal theorists have found fault with the transmitters of hadith who permitted it and allowed transmission by it. Al-Khaṭīb related that a number of scholars regarded it as sound and allowed transmission by it. We will mention – God (He is praised and exalted) willing – the opinion of those who permitted transmission on the basis of the teacher’s mere declaration (ṭālam) to the student that a particular book is what he heard from X. This form of transference is better than the declaration by itself and it is superior because of the element of transference it contains, since the act of transference itself is not devoid of the implication that the teacher is granting permission to transmit the text. God knows best.

Remarks on the way a transmitter should express transference and licensing

It is related that some early scholars and some of those who came after them permitted the unqualified application of "He transmitted to us" (ḥaddathāna) and "He informed us" (akhkaranā) to transmission by transference. That is related from Zuhri, Malik and others. It is in accordance with the doctrine of all of the scholars cited above who made "presentation by transference" coupled with licensing equivalent to audion. Something similar was also related from some people in regard to transmission by licensing. The expert Abū Nuṣayn al-Iṣbahānī – the author of many works on the science of hadith – used to apply "He informed us" without qualification to the hadith he related by license. We heard that he said, "When I say, ‘He transmitted to us’ it is audion. When I say, ‘He informed us,’ without further qualification, it is an instance of licensing, even if I do not say, ‘by licensing’ (ṭālaṣṣatān), ‘by writing’ (kitābaṭān), ‘he wrote to me’ (katāba ṭalayya), or, ‘he granted me permission to transmit from him’ (adhina li fi ‘l-rūwiya ‘anhu)." The historian Abū Ubayd Allāh

111 Kifāya, 328.
al-Marzubānī\(^{112}\) — the author of a number of works of secular history — used to relate most of the material in his books by license without audition and he used to say for licensing, “He informed us,” without further elucidation. According to al-Khatīb, that was something for which Marzubānī was criticized.\(^{113}\)

The sound and preferred view which the majority follow in practice and which the earnest and scrupulous have adopted is to forbid the unqualified application of “He transmitted to us,” “He informed us” and similar expressions to material received by transference or licensing and to designate that material with qualified versions of these expressions which indicate the true situation. The transmitter should say, “X informed us” — or “transmitted to us” — “by transference and by license” (munāwalatan wa-ijāzatan), “He informed us by license,” “He informed us by transference,” “He informed us by granting permission (idhnān),” “Under his grant of permission is” (fi idhnihī), “One of the things he granted me permission for is” (fi mā adhina li fihī), or “One of the things which he gave me leave to transmit from him is” (fi mā atlaqa li riwāyatuhu ta'nhū). Or he should say, “X licensed to me” (ajāza li fulān), “X licensed me such and such” (ajāzāni fulān kadhā wa-kadhā), “X transferred to me” (nāwalāni fulān) and similar expressions.

Some people have designated licensing with terms which have not kept them safe from misrepresentation or at least a trace of it. Examples are someone saying for licensing, “He informed us verbally (mushahāfatān),” when the teacher had only spoken the license out loud to him; or, saying “X informed us by writing” — or “in what he wrote to me,” or “in his letter” (fi kitiḥāti) — when the teacher had only written out the license for him. Even if a number of modern hadith scholars have employed these expressions technically, they are still not free of a trace of misrepresentation on account of the ambiguity they contain and their similarity to what a student says when the teacher writes the hadith themselves to him in a letter.

It is reported that Awzān designated licensing by saying, “He apprised us” (khabbarānā) and he designated recitation to him by saying, “He informed us.” Many modern scholars have adopted the convention of applying “He told us” (anbā'ānā) without further qualification to licensing, and that is the preference of al-Walid b. Bakr — the author of al-Wajāza fī [rajutāz] al-ijāza (The Epitome in [declaring] Licensing [to be Valid]). In earlier times people viewed “He told us” as the same as “He informed us.” The exacting expert Abū Bakr al-Bayhaqī inclined toward this when he used to say, “X told me by licensing” (anbā'āni fulān ijāzatan), and this also complies with the convention of modern scholars. (God knows

---

\(^{112}\) Abū 'Ubayd Allāh Muhammad b. Imrān b. Mūsā al-Marzubānī (290/903–384/994) was a Mu'tazilī scholar from Baghdad who composed a vast number of books on historical and literary subjects; Breckmann, G.A.L., Suppl. 1: 190; EF, 6:634–5.

\(^{113}\) Tārīkh Baghdad, 3:135–6.
best.) We heard that the expert Abū ʿAmr Muḥammad b. Abū Ḥāmid al-Mādhūbī (God bless him) said, “The view I prefer and the one which I saw most of my teachers and the authorities of my age following is for the student to say, “X told me,” for the material which was presented to the transmitter and which the transmitter orally licensed the student to transmit. The student should say, “X wrote to me,” for the material which the transmitter sent to him from another city without orally licensing him. We heard that Abū ʿAmr b. Abū Jaʿfar b. Ḥamdān al-Nisabūrī” said, “I heard my father saying, ‘Whenever Būkhārī says, “X said to me,” it is an instance of presentation and transference.’” It is reported that some transmitters expressed licensing by saying, “X informed us that (anna) Y transmitted to him” — or “Y informed him.” We read that the authority Abū Sulaymān al-Khaṭṭābī preferred this or related it. This is terminology that does not even remotely indicate licensing. It is more appropriate for when the student hears only the isnād from the teacher and the teacher licenses to him the text which follows it. The word “that” in the phrase, “X informed me that Y informed him” implies the presence of the principle of communication, even if the informant treated the material collectively and did not mention it word by word.

Modern transmitters often indicate an instance of licensing which took place in the transmission of someone above the teacher who granted the audition to them with the word “from” (ṣan). So when some of them is given audition by a teacher on the basis of his license from his teacher, he says, “I recited to X from Y.” If the student heard hadith from his teacher on the basis of his teacher's license from his teacher and there was no audition [between the student’s teacher and his teacher or] the student is in doubt [as to whether the transmission between his own teacher and his teacher was audition or merely licensing], application of the word “from” is reasonable. “From” may be applied with equal accuracy to both audition and licensing. God knows best.

Be aware that the impermissibility of the unqualified application of “He transmitted to us” and “He informed us” to licensing is not negated by the licensor granting permission to apply it, as some teachers are wont to do. When granting a license to someone, they say, “If the student wishes, he may say, ‘He transmitted to us’ and if he wishes, he may say, ‘He informed us.’” So let that be known. Knowledge belongs to God (He is blessed and exalted).

V Correspondence (mukātaba) is the fifth means of conveying and taking up hadith. It consists of the teacher sending some of his hadith in his own handwriting.

114 Abū ʿAmr Muḥammad b. Abū Jaʿfar Ahmad b. Ḥamdān al-Nisabūrī (283/896–376/987) was a famous hadith transmitter from Nishapur who was also renowned as an expert in the Arabic language; Sezgin, GA5, 1:204.
115 Sakhāwī, Fath al-Maghīth, 2:120.
to an absent student, or the teacher writing them for him while he is present. Associated with this is the case when the teacher orders someone else to send the hadith from him to the student. This means of receiving hadith also takes two forms. One of them is correspondence without licensing. The second is correspondence coupled with licensing, with the teacher sending the hadith to the student and saying, “I hereby license to you the material I wrote for you” (ājażu laka mā kaṭabūḥū laka) – or “the material I sent to you” (mā kaṭabī bihi īlayka), or some other expression of licensing similar to this.

Many early and modern scholars, including Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī, Manṣūr [b. al-Muṣṭamīr] and al-Layth b. Sa‘d, permitted transmission by means of the first type of correspondence – and it is the case when the teacher limits himself to correspondence [that is, without licensing]. A number of the Shafiʿites subscribed to that opinion and one of them, Abu ’l-Muẓaffar al-Samʿānī, rated correspondence by itself stronger than licensing. Some legal theorists have also adopted this view. A number of others rejected it. Among the Shafiʿites, the judge Māwardi adopted the latter view and stated it unequivocally in his book al-Hāwi. The first doctrine is the correct one and it is well known among the adherents of hadith. Often in their hadith collections and writings one finds them saying, “X wrote to me (kaṭaba īlayya ṣulān).” He said, “Y transmitted to us,” by which is meant correspondence. In their opinion, this is effective and the hadith transmitted this way are connected supported (al-musnad al-manṣūl). Correspondence itself contains a strong implication of licensing. Even if it is not explicitly coupled with licensing, it does imply the substance of licensing.

In the case of correspondence, it is enough that the student to whom the hadith are sent recognize the handwriting of the correspondent, even if no clear proof that it actually is his handwriting exists. There are some people who say, “One person’s handwriting looks like another’s so it is not permissible to rely on that.” This is unsatisfactory, because it is rare that one person’s handwriting does resemble someone else’s. The presumption is that one person’s handwriting does not resemble anyone else’s and that there is no ambiguity about it.

More than one of the learned and leading scholars of hadith, including al-Layth b. Sa‘d and Manṣūr, subscribed to the doctrine that it is permissible to apply “He transmitted to us” and “He informed us” without qualification to transmission by correspondence. The preferred position is the doctrine of those who say for it, “X wrote to me. He said, ‘Y transmitted to us such and such.’” This is the correct view and the one appropriate for those possessing earnestness and probity. It would be equally valid if they had said, “He informed me of it by correspondence” (mukātabat) – or “in writing” or some other similar expression. Correspondence coupled with an explicit license is comparable to transference with licensing in terms of validity and efficacy. God knows best.

VI The sixth means of taking and conveying hadith is the declaration of the transmitter (ḥām al-rāwi) to the student that a particular hadith or a particular book is his audition or his transmission from X, merely saying that without going
on to say, "Transmit it from me," "I hereby give you permission to transmit it," or the like. In the eyes of many, this is a permissible way to relate and convey such material. This view was related from Ibn Jurayj and certain other transmitters of hadith, jurists, legal theorists, and Zahirites. The Shafiite Abu Naṣr b. al-Ṣabbagh stated it unequivocally and preferred it. Abu ʿAbd al-Walid b. Bakr al-Ghamri al-Maliki supported him in his book al-Wajza fi tajwiz al-jaza. The judge Abu Muḥammad b. Khallad al-Ramahurmuzi16—the author of the book al-Fāṣil bayn al-rāwi wa-ʿl-wāṣi—related that one of the Zahirites subscribed to this doctrine and argued for it. He added, "If his teacher were to say to him, 'This is my relation, but do not transmit it from me,' he could still transmit it from him. Just as it would not affect him if he were to hear a hadith from him and afterward he said to him, "Do not transmit it from me," or, "I do not license it to you."117

The justification for the doctrine of these people is that they consider "declaration of the transmitter" to be equivalent to "recitation to the teacher." When the student recites some of the teacher's hadith to him and the teacher silently assents that it is his transmission from X b. Y, it is permissible for the student to transmit the hadith from him, even if he did not hear the hadith from his teacher's lips and the teacher did not say to him, "Transmit it from me" or "I hereby grant you permission to relate it from me." God knows best.

The preferred view is the one ascribed to a number of the scholars of hadith and others to the effect that transmission on this basis is not permitted. The Shafiite teacher Abu Ḥamid al-Tusi18 stated this unequivocally and did not mention any other possibility. This is because the material may be something the teacher heard and transmitted, but he does not grant permission for it to be transmitted from him, because he does not view its transmission as permissible on account of a defect he knows it to contain. His enunciation of the material is not present, nor anything equivalent to his enunciation of it. It is because of the enunciation of the reciter to him, while he is listening and silently assenting to it, that the transmitter from him who heard that may truthfully say, "He transmitted to me," or, "He informed us," even if the teacher did not grant him permission.

---

116 Abu Muḥammad al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Khallad al-Ramahurmuzi (d. ca. 360/970) was a judge in Khuzistan who was an expert in hadith and literature. His most famous work, al-Mukaddith al-fāsil, is generally considered to be the first comprehensive work written in the genre of usul al-fadhl; Sezgin, GAS, 1:193-4.

117 Mukaddith al-fāsil, 452.

118 Abu Ḥamid Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Tusi, better known as Ghazālī, was born in Tus in 450/1058. An outstanding career led him to the Niẓāmya in Baghdad in 484/1091. Four years later in the midst of a spiritual crisis he resigned his post and became a mystic. In 499/1106 he returned to teaching, taking a post at the Niẓāmya in Nishapūr. He died in Tus in 505/1111; Brockelmann, GAL, 1:355-46, Suppl., 1:744-56; EI, 2:1058-41.
for that. Rather, in the case of "declaration of the transmitter" the transmitter is like a witness. When he gives testimony outside of the courtroom regarding some matter, it is not valid for someone who heard it to bear witness regarding his testimony, when he neither grants him permission to do so nor deputizes him to bear witness for him. This is one of the instances in which testifying in court and transmission are alike, because their substance unites them in that regard; even if they differ in other respects. Nevertheless, when the isnād is sound, the student must act in accordance with whatever his teacher mentions to him, even if his transmission from the teacher is not permitted. This is because the soundness of the hadith in themselves is sufficient for that. God knows best.

VII. Bequeathing books (al-waṣīya bi-'l-kutub) is the seventh of the categories of taking and receiving hadith. It consists of a transmitter upon his death or upon his departure for a journey bequeathing to someone a book which he relates. It is related that some of the forebears (God be pleased with them) permitted the legatee to transmit such material from the bequeathing transmitter on that basis. This is highly implausible. It is either a lapse on the part of those scholars or interpreted to mean that they were referring to transmission by way of discovery (waṣīda), which will be explained (God - He is exalted - willing). One scholar argued for the validity of this form of transmission and likened it to declaration and transference,119 but that is not correct. There is a justification, which we mentioned, for the doctrine of those who permit transmission solely on the basis of declaration and transference. Nothing similar applies here and bequeathing is not close to either in that respect. God knows best.

VIII. Discovery (waṣīda).

Waṣīda, the verbal noun of wajada - yajdu, is a neologism unknown to the early Arabs. We heard from al-Muṣṭfa b. Zakariya al-Nahrawānī120 - the great expert in a number of sciences - that later writers coined the word waṣīda for reference to the knowledge taken from a written source (sahifa) without audition, licensing or transference. This was done on the basis of the distinctions the early Arabs made between the various verbal nouns of wajada to discriminate between the different meanings of the verb. That is, when the early Arabs said, "He came across his camel which had strayed," the verbal noun is wajād; when they said, "He found the thing he was seeking," the verbal noun is wujād; for anger, the verbal noun is ma'wida; for wealth, wujd; and for love, wajd.121

119. Al-Qadi Iyad does this in Ilm, 115.
120. Abu 'l-Faraj al-Muṣṭfa b. Zakariya al-Nahrawānī (305/917–390/1000) was a Baghdadi judge. He was the most prominent exponent of the legal doctrines of Tabarit of his time; Sezgin, GAS, 1:522–3.
121. For a more complete discussion of this, see Edward Lane, Lexicon, 8:2924.
An example of discovery is when a student comes across someone else’s book in that individual’s own handwriting containing some hadith which he relates, and the student has never met him – or he did meet him but did not hear from him the hadith which he has found recorded in his handwriting – and he does not have a license from him or anything similar. He should say, “I found (waṣa’idatu) in the handwriting of X” – or “I read in the handwriting of X,” or “In the book of X in his handwriting is” – ‘Y b. Z, informed us.’” Then he should mention his teacher and give the rest of the isnād and the text. Or he should say, “I found” – or “I read” – “in the handwriting of X from Y,” and mention the person who transmitted to him and those above him. This has been continuously practiced in early and modern times. It falls under the heading of “interrupted” (munaqṣīt) and “loose” (mursaḥ), however it is tinctured with “cohesion” on account of the statement, “I found in the handwriting of X.” Sometimes someone commits misrepresentation (dallasa) by saying regarding the individual whose handwriting he found, “I found from X,” or, “X said.” That is a disgraceful misrepresentation when it is such that it falsely promotes the impression that he heard the material from the teacher, as was discussed above in the Category on misrepresentation. Some people speak carelessly and unqualifiedly apply “He transmitted to us” or “He informed us” to instances of discovery. Whoever does that opens himself up for criticism.

When the student finds a hadith in someone’s composition and the composition is not in the handwriting of that individual, he should say, “X mentioned” – or “X said” – ‘Y informed us,’” or, “X mentioned from Y.” This is interrupted and does not contain any trace of cohesion.122

All of the above applies when the student is confident that it is the handwriting of the individual mentioned or his book. If this is not the case, then let him say, “It reached me from X” (balagahī ‘an fulān), “I found from X” (waṣa’idatu ‘an fulān), or similar expressions. Or let him plainly indicate the means of transmission he relied upon in that regard by using the expressions of some earlier scholars; for example, “I read in the book of X in his handwriting and Y informed me that it was the handwriting of X” or “I found in a book which I thought was in the handwriting of X” or “In a book the writer of which says that he is X b. Y is” or “In a book which is said to be in the handwriting of X is.”

When the student wishes to transmit hadith from a book ascribed to an author, let him not say, “X said such and such,” until he becomes confident of the authenticity of the copy by his own collation of it – or some other trustworthy person’s – with numerous other texts. We indicated this earlier at the end of

122 Although there can be no doubt about the accuracy of the text here, later writers tended to postpone the treatment of the point addressed in this passage to the general discussion below of texts not in their author’s handwriting; e.g. Ḥanāfī, al-Tahāra wa-ʾl-tahākira, ed. Muhammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Ḥanāfī al-Ḥusaynī, 3 vols (Beirut, n.d.), 2:115.
Category 1. When that, or something like it, does not happen, let the student say, “It reached me from X that he said such and such,” “I found in a copy of book X,” or other similar expressions.

In these times most people have become lax, applying without qualification unequivocal terminology to this kind of material without research or verification. One of them reads a book ascribed to a certain author and transmits from it hadith from the author without becoming certain of the authenticity of the copy, saying, “X said such and such” or “X mentioned such and such.” The correct course is the one presented above.

If the reader is knowledgeable and astute to the extent that, for the most part, omissions, slips and transpositions are not hidden from him, we hope that he will be permitted to apply without qualification an unequivocal expression [like “X said” or “X mentioned’”] to the material he relates from that transmitter. So far as I can tell, many authors have been pleased to do that for the material they transmitted from the books of other people. Knowledge is with God (He is exalted).

All of this discussion concerns the particulars of transmitting by means of discovery. In regard to the permissibility of putting into practice the discovered material one has confidence in, we heard from one Malikite that most of the Malikite transmitters of hadith, jurists and others do not regard this as valid. It is said that Shafi’i and certain of his thoughtful disciples endorsed the validity of acting on the material transmitted this way. One of the thorough, Shafi’ite scholars in theoretical law unequivocally ruled in favor of the necessity of acting upon the material once confidence in the ascription is attained. He said, “If what we said were presented to the majority of the scholars of hadith, they would reject it.” The opinion he unequivocally gave in favor of it is the only one possible in later ages. If putting a doctrine into practice did depend on its proper transmission (riwaya), it would become impossible to act on transmitted material, because of the infeasibility of meeting the standards of transmission in our time. This was discussed earlier in Category 1. God knows best.
al-Fārābī informed us. He said, The expert Abū Bakr al-Bayhaqi informed us. He said, Abu ʿUmar b. Bishrān⁸ informed us. He said, Abū ʿAmr b. al-Samīmāk⁹ informed us. He said, Hanbal b. Ishāq⁸ transmitted to us. He said, Sulaymān b. Ahmad⁰ transmitted to us. He said, al-Walid—thats is, Ibn Muslim¹¹—transmitted to us. He said, “Awzāʿi used to say, ‘This knowledge is a noble one which men received among themselves. When it went into books, those unworthy of it came among them.’” The disagreement over writing hadith has disappeared and Muslims have come to agree unanimously on allowing and permitting it. If the hadith had not been recorded in books, they would have become obliterated in later ages. God knows best.

Those who write and collect hadith are under an obligation to focus their efforts on recording clearly the transmitted material they write down—exactly as the transmitters related it, using the vowel signs and diacritical points necessary to eliminate ambiguity. Often someone confident of his intelligence and attentiveness is disdainful of this and that has unfortunate consequences. People are susceptible to forgetfulness and the first to forget was the first person. Providing the diacritical marks in a text prevents it from becoming unintelligible and marking the vowel signs prevents ambiguity. No one should concern himself with indicating those obvious things that are almost never doubtful. Indeed, whoever said, “Vocalize only what is obscure,” spoke well. I read in the handwriting of ʿAli b. Ibrahīm al-Baghdādī in his book Simāṭ al-khawāṣ wa-ruqūmuhā¹² (The Characteristics and Forms of Script) that scholars dislike marking the diacritical points and inflectional vowels unless the word is ambiguous. On the other hand, someone else recounted from some people that unambiguous words should be vocalized as well as the ambiguous. That is because the beginner and the non-expert in the discipline cannot distinguish an ambiguous word from an unambiguous one, or correct inflectional vowels from incorrect. God knows best.

The following is a discussion of some useful points related to the above:

---

⁸ Abū ʿUmar b. Muhammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Bishrān (328/939–415/1024) was a well-respected transmitter in Baghdad; Sezgin, GAS, 1:227.
⁹ Abū ʿAmr b. Ahmad b. Ahmad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Daqqīq (d. 344/955), known as Ibn al-Samīmāk, was a hadith scholar in Baghdad; Sezgin, GAS, 1:188–6.
¹¹ Abū Muhammad Sulaymān b. Ahmad al-Dimashqī was a respected transmitter of hadith who could count a number of very distinguished scholars as his students. Late in his life he moved to Wasīf and slid into a life of dissipation; Bukhārī, al-Tarākh al-kabir, 2(2):3; Ibn Abī Ḥāmid, Jarb, 4 (1):101.
¹² Abu ʿAbdās al-Walid b. Muslim al-Umawī (119/737–195/810) lived in Damascus and was an expert in the hadith of the Syriants; Sezgin, GAS, 1:293.
¹³ I have not succeeded in identifying this individual. His book is described in Hājjī Khalīfa, Kasāf, 2:col. 1001.
1. One should take more care to clarify [with diacritical marks, vowel signs, and so forth] doubtful proper names rather than other doubtful words, because proper names cannot be figured out by the sense of the passage and their correct reading cannot be inferred from the context.

2. For ambiguous words, it is recommended that one clarify them first in the body of the text and then write them in unconnected letters in the margin opposite that place in the text. This is the fullest way to make them clear and the way furthest from ambiguity. The diacritical points and vowel signs of other words sometimes intrude from above and below on the words which one clarifies within the lines of the text, especially when the handwriting is small and the lines are narrow. This is the advice of a number of careful scholars. God knows best.

3. Tiny handwriting is condemned when there is no reason requiring it. We heard that Ḥanbal b. Ishāq said, “Ahmad b. Ḥanbal saw me writing in a small hand and said, ‘Do not do that. The thing you need the most will betray you.’” We read that when one teacher saw an instance of small handwriting, he said, “This is the handwriting of someone who is not convinced that God (He is exalted) will provide a replacement [for the sheets of paper he was using].” A valid excuse for writing in a small hand is, for instance, that the writer does not find enough room on the paper, or that he is a traveler who needs to make his handwriting small so that the burden of his book will be lighter for him or something like that. God knows best.

4. Precision, without either excessive looseness or excessive compression, is preferred in the student’s handwriting. We read from Ibn Qutayba that ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb (God be pleased with him) said, “The worst handwriting is scrawling and the worst recitation is spluttering. The best handwriting is the clearest.” God knows best.

5. Just as the letters with diacritical points are made clear by pointing, so should the letters without diacritical points be fixed with a sign to indicate the absence of pointing. The way that people clarify these letters varies. Some invert the points, putting the points which belong above the pointed letters under the

---

14 Sakhawī explains that in this way a further degree of clarity is attained since there are a number of Arabic letters which appear similar when written in connected form but differ considerably in their unconnected form; Fath al-Maghīth, 2:149.


16 Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh b. Muslim b. Qutayba al-Dinawarī (213/828–276/889) was a polymath who made important contributions to a number of disciplines; EP, 3:844–7; Sezgin, GAS, 8:161–5.
analogous unpointed letters. So they place points under rā, sād, šá, wāy and the other unpointed letters like them. One of the practitioners of this said that the points under the unpointed sin should be spread out in a row while those which are over the pointed shin should be arranged like a tripod. Some people make the sign indicating the absence of pointing over the unpointed letters in the shape of a nail paring resting on its back. Some put under the unpointed hā a small unconnected ḥā, and do the same under the dāl, tā, sād, sin, wāy and the rest of the ambiguous unpointed letters. These are the widespread and well-known forms of the signs indicating that a letter is unpointed. There are also signs found in numerous old books which many people do not understand, like the sign of those who make a small line over an unpointed letter and that of those who put something shaped like a hamza under an unpointed letter. God knows best.

6. No one should employ a personal system of signs in his book which no one else can understand and which throws others into confusion. Some who collect in their book several different transmissions of a text and signal the relation of each transmitter with one or two letters from his name and the like do this. If the writer explains in the beginning or the end of his book what he means by those signs and symbols, there is no problem. Nevertheless, it is better that the writer avoid using symbols. He should write for each transmission the name of its transmitter completely in a shortened form and not merely write a sign for some of it. God knows best.

7. The student should place a circle between two hadith to separate and distinguish them. We read that Abu 'l-Zinād, Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Ibrāhīm b. Ishaq al-Ḥarbī and Muḥammad b. Jarīr al-Ṭabarī10 (God be pleased with them) were among the authorities who did that. The expert al-Khaṭṭāb [al-Baghdādī] recommended that the circles be hollow. When he collated the text, he put a dot in the circle that followed each hadith he had finished collating or he drew a line through its center. He said, "Some scholars did not use to count something as part of what they had heard unless it was marked that way," or words to that effect.11 God knows best.

8. It is reprehensible for someone to write a name like "Abd Allāh, the son of X, the son of Y" with ʿAbd at the end of a line and the rest at the beginning of the next line. In the same way, it is reprehensible with "Abd al-Ḥamān, the son of X" — and the rest of the names containing ʿAbd with a name of God (He is exalted) — that the ʿAbd be written at the end of a line with the name of God and the rest of the lineage at the beginning of the next line. Similarly, it is

17 Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. Jarīr al-Ṭabarī (ca. 224/839–310/923) was one of the greatest religious scholars in Islam. He composed significant works in a number of fields, including history, Qurʾān commentary, law and hadith; EFP, 10:11–15; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:323–8.
18 Ḥamza, 136.
undesirable for “The Messenger ... said” (qala Rasūl) to be written at the end of a line with “of God, May God – He is exalted – bless and save him and his family (Allahу ślalla ʔlähū taʿāfēla ʿalayhi wa-ʔlīhi wa-sallama), and the like, being written at the beginning of the next line. God knows best.”

9. The student should make sure to write “May God bless and save him” upon the mention of the name of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) and not tire of repeating the invocation upon each repetition of it. Indeed, that is one of the greatest benefits which the collectors and copyists of ḥadith can readily accrue and whoever neglects it misses a great opportunity. We have heard some good dreams regarding those who did that. Every time someone writes the invocation it is a prayer which he invokes anew, rather than words which he just transmits. For that reason, in this matter the copyist is not bound by what he is relating and is not limited to what appears in the original text. The same is true for praising God (He is praised) upon the mention of His name with “He is mighty and great” (ızza wa-jallā), “He is blessed and exalted” (tabaraka wa-taʿāfēla) and similar expressions. When it is found that one of these invocations already appears in the relation, the care to set it down and make it clear should even be greater.

Surviving documents in the handwriting of Abū ʿAbd Allāh Ahmad b. Ḥanbal (God be pleased with him) show that he sometimes neglected to write the invocation after the mention of the name of the Prophet (Peace be upon him). The reason for that may have been that in this matter he preferred to limit himself to the text as it appeared in the transmission and attaching the invocations for every transmitter who preceded him was too much for him. Abū Bakr al-Khaṭib said, “I read that he used to invoke blessings on the Prophet (Peace be upon him) verbally rather than in writing. Other early authorities disagreed with Ahmad b. Ḥanbal in that matter. It is related that ʿAbd b. al-Madīnī and ʿAbbās b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīm al-ʿAnbārī19 said, ‘We never gave up invoking the blessing on the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) in every hadith we heard. Sometimes we were in a hurry and we would then leave spaces for the invocations in each hadith in the book, so we could go back later to write them in.’” God knows best.

---

19 The fear here is that a reader could inadvertently interpret the expressions in an impious fashion. In the first case, if the reader did not see the previous line with ʿAbd, he would read the blasphemy phrase, “God, the son of X, the son of Y, said” In the second case, if he did not see “The Messenger of – said,” he would read the formula, “God, may God – He is exalted! – bless him and save him and his family,” which at best is theologically confusing.

20 Abu ʾl-Fauḥ ʿAbbās b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīm al-ʿAnbārī (d. 246/860) was a hadith expert from al-Basra; Dhibabī, Siyar, 12:302-3.

21 Jāmīʿ, 133–6.
In writing the invocations, the student should avoid two deficiencies: (a) writing them abbreviated in form, representing them symbolically with a couple of letters, or something similar; (b) writing them abbreviated in sense, not writing "and save him" (wa-sallama), although examples of this are found in the handwriting of some early scholars.

I heard Abu 'l-Qāsim [or Abu 'l-Fath or Abu Bakr] Maṣūr b. 'Abd al-Munṣim and Umm al-Muʿayyad bint Abi 'l-Qāsim," through my recitation to them. They said, We heard Abu 'l-Barakāt 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Furāṭī verbally say, I heard the Qurān reciter Zārif b. Muḥammad saying, I heard the expert Abū Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Iṣaḥāq say, I heard my father saying, I heard Ḥamza al-Kinānī saying, "I used to write hadith and upon the mention of the Prophet, I wrote, 'May God bless him,' without writing 'and save him.' Then, I saw the Prophet (Peace be upon him) in a dream and he said to me, 'Why do you not complete the invocation of blessings on me?' After that I never wrote 'May God bless him,' without writing 'and save him.'" It is also detestable for the student to limit himself to writing "May peace be upon him" (salayhi 'l-salām). God knows best.

10. The student should collate his book with the book that he actually heard (aṣl samāʿī) and the book of his teacher (aṣl shaykhī) which he is actually relating from him, even in a case of licensing. We heard that Urwa b. al-Zubayr (God be pleased with them) asked his son Ḥishām, "You wrote?" and he answered yes. Then Urwa asked, "Did you collate your book?" He answered no and Urwa replied, "You did not write!" We heard that the imām Shafiʿi and Yaḥyā b. Abī Kathīr said, "Someone who writes and does not collate is like someone who uses the privy and does not wash afterwards." We heard that al-Akhfashīb said, "When a book is copied without collation and then another uncollated copy is made from that copy, the text stops being Arabic."

The best collation is the student's personal collation of his book against that of his teacher, in the presence of the teacher while he is transmitting the text to him from his own book, on account of the elements of care and exactitude which

---

22 Umm al-Muʿayyad Zaynab bint Abi 'l-Qāsim Abī al-Raḥmān (d. 615/1218) was transmitter of hadith in Nishapur who was sought out by her contemporaries; Dḥahabi, Śiyār, 22:85-6.
23 Abu 'l-Barakāt 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Furāṭī was the grandfather of Ibn al-Ṣāḥib's teacher Maṣūr b. 'Abd al-Munṣim. He was a respected transmitter and died of starvation and exposure in 549/1155 during the attack of the Ghuzz on Nishapur; Dḥahabi, Śiyār, 20:227-8.
24 Abu 'l-Ḥasan Zārif b. Muḥammad al-Ḥṣī was a scholar of hadith from Nishapur who died in 517/1124 at the age of eighty-eight; Dḥahabi, Śiyār, 19:375-6.
25 This appears to be Abu 'l-Ḥasan Abū Allāh (or 'Ubayd Allāh) b. Muḥammad b. Iṣaḥāq (d. 462/1070), the son of Abū 'Abd Allāh b. Manda; EI, 3:863; Dḥahabi, Śiyār, 18:355.
26 This al-Akhfashī (literally, "dim-eyes") appears to have been Abī 'Abd Allāh Abīmād b. 'Imrān b. Salāma (d. ca. 260/874), a grammarian, lexicographer and poet from Syria; Sezgin, G.AS, 8:241.
that procedure brings together from the two sides [that is, the student’s eyes and his ears]. The collation lacking these characteristics falls short of the level of the prescribed collation to the extent that it lacks them. What we mentioned is superior to the blanket declaration of the expert Abu ’l-Faḍl al-Jarūdī al-Harawi:28 “The most truthful collation is alone by yourself.”

The auditors who do not possess a copy of the text should sit with someone else and look into his copy, especially if they want to transmit from it. Indeed, it has been related that Yahyā b. Maʿīn was asked about someone who did not look in the book while the transmitter was reciting: “Is it permissible for him to transmit that book from his teacher?” He said, “In my opinion it is not permissible, however the audition of the generality of teachers is that way.” This is one of the dictates of those strict in transmission and their doctrine will be mentioned below (God – He is exalted – willing). The correct view is that this is not stipulated and the audition is valid, even if the student does not look in the book at all at the time of the recitation. Furthermore, it is not stipulated that the student personally collate his text. Rather, it is enough for him that his copy be collated with the original text of the transmitter, even if that does not take place at the time of the recitation and even if someone else does the collating, if that person is reliable and one may be confident that he will be accurate.

It is also permissible for the student’s text to be collated against a copy (furūʿ) which had been collated in the prescribed manner with the text of his teacher, the text used in the audition. The same is true if he collates his text with the original text which the text of his teacher was collated with, because the desired aim is that the text of the student be in conformity with the text heard at his audition and the text of his teacher, irrespective of whether that occurs through an intermediary or not. This is not enough for those who say, “The student’s collation with anyone but himself is not valid. He may not rely on anyone else and there must not be any intermediary between him and the book of the teacher. So let him personally collate his copy with the original, letter by letter, so that he becomes confident and certain that his copy agrees with the teacher’s.” This is an abandoned doctrine. It is one of the doctrines of strict scholars that is repudiated in our age. God knows best.

When the student does not collate his book against the original: the professor Abū Ištāq al-Isfārāyīnī was asked about the permissibility of a student’s relation from a text of this description and he permitted it. The expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb also permitted it and explained his condition. He stated that it is stipulated that the student’s copy must be transmitted from the original and that, when he relates

28 Despite the inherent implausibility, the sources maintain that there were two hadith scholars named “Abu ’l-Faḍl Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Jarūdī al-Harawi” living a century apart. The first is known as “al-Shahīd” (the martyr) because he supposedly died a heroic death at the hands of the Qarmatians in Mecca in 317/930; Dhahabi, Sīyar, 14:538–40. The second is said to have died in 413/1023; Dhahabi, Sīyar, 17:384–6.
it, he must make clear that he did not collate it. He related that his teacher Abū Bakr al-Barqānī asked Abū Bakr al-İsmā‘īlī, “May someone transmit something he wrote from a teacher and did not collate with his original text?” He said, “Yes, but he must make clear that he did not collate it.” Al-Khāṭib said, “This is the doctrine of Abū Bakr al-Barqānī. He transmitted to us many hadith for which he said, “X informed us, and I did not collate it with his original text.” A third condition is also necessary and this is that the transmitter of the copy made from the original should not be poor in transmitting but should rather be a sound transmitter who makes few mistakes. (God knows best.) The student should also direct his attention to his teacher’s book vis-à-vis those above him, in a fashion similar to what we described in reference to his own book. He should also not be like certain students who regard as valid the audition of a book recited to a teacher from any copy which happens to be at hand. God knows best.

11. The preferred method of supplying a textual omission in the margins — and it is called an “addendum” (lāḥaq) — is for the student to make a line going up from the spot of the omission in the line of text and then curve it for a short distance between the two lines of text in the direction of the spot in the margin where he will write the addendum. He should begin writing the addendum in the margin opposite the curved line. Let that be in the right margin. If it is near the middle of the page, let the addendum be written — if there is room for it — going up toward the top of the page, and not down toward the bottom. When the addendum is two or more lines long, the student should not begin the lines going from the bottom to the top, but rather begin them going from the top to the bottom, so that the end of the lines is in the direction of the center of the page, when the insertion is on the right margin; and when they are on the left margin, their end is toward the edge of the page. “It is correct” (ṣaḥḥa) should be written at the end of the addendum. Some people write “It returned” (raja‘a) with “It is correct.”

At the end of the addendum, some people write the word which occurs next to it at the place of the insertion inside the text to indicate the continuity of the passage. This is the preference of some of the North African practitioners of this craft and that of an Easterner, the judge Abū Muhammad b. Khallād39 — the author of the book al-Fāṣil bayn al-rāwi wa-l-wā‘ī — among certain others. That is not satisfactory, since many times words are actually repeated in a passage, so this repetition sometimes causes some people to think mistakenly that this is an instance of that. The judge Ibn Khallād also recommended in his book that the curve of

29 Kitāb, 239.
30 Althoughṣaît would appear to be the logical antecedent here, the text requires a grammatically feminine form.
31 Muḥaddith al-fāṣil, 606–7.
the line for supplying the omission be extended from its place in the
text to connect it with the beginning of the addendum in the margin.\(^{32}\)
This is also unsatisfactory. While it does more clearly indicate where the
addendum belongs, it blackens the book and marks it up, especially if
there are many addenda. God knows best.

We recommended that the addendum be written going toward the top of the
page, lest another omission should have to be supplied later. If the student were
to write the first addendum going down toward the bottom, he would not find
the margin opposite the next omission free for its addendum. When he writes the
first addendum going up, he finds the opposite margin free for whatever omissions
he encounters after that. We also said that he should supply the addendum on
the right side, because, if he were to put it on the left, often another omission
appears further on in the same line.\(^{33}\) If he also puts the second addendum on the
left side opposite the line, the two addenda will become mixed-up. If he supplies
the second addendum on the right side, the curve for supplying the addendum
on the left side and the one on the right side will meet or face each other such
that it will look like the words between them are being struck out. On the other
hand, when the student supplies the first addendum on the right side and then
supplies the second on the left, they do not meet and no confusion is entailed.
However, if the omission occurs at the end of the line, there is no reason then
for not supplying it on the left, because of the proximity of the omission to the
margin and because the above-mentioned justification no longer holds, since we
do not fear the appearance of another omission further on in the same line. When
the omission is at the beginning of the line, the necessity of supplying it on the
right side is further confirmed on account of the issue of proximity we brought
up, in addition to the other reasons discussed above.

Commentary, the notation of errors and variant readings from different
transmissions or different copies of the text or similar material not part of the
original text which is to be supplied in the margins: the expert al-Qadi`Iyad (God
bless him) held the view that a line of insertion should not be used for this kind
of material. This way ambiguity does not arise with this foreign material being
considered part of the original text. The line is to be used only for what belongs
to the original text itself. However, to mark the word for which the additional
material was intended, a sign like the "latch" (\(\ddot{d}abha\)) or the one indicating that the
word is correct (\(\text{ta\'shith}\))\(^{34}\) is sometimes placed over it.\(^{35}\) I say: the line of insertion
is better and clearer. The character of this supplementary material inherently
eliminates any ambiguity. This supplement differs from the other kind belonging
to the original text in that the line of the latter comes between the two words

\(^{32}\) Mu\(\text{haddith al-}\(\dddot{f}\)\(\text{a\(\text{i}\)l}, 606--7.

\(^{33}\) Arabic is written from right to left.

\(^{34}\) For these signs, see the next section.

\(^{35}\) \(\text{Ilma}\), 164.
bracketing the omission and the line of the former occurs over the actual word for the sake of which the supplementary material in the margin is cited. God knows best.

12. One of the concerns of skillful and exact students is to take care in “marking as correct” (taṣḥīḥ), “latching” (taḏḥīḥ) and “marking as faulty” (tamrīḏ). “Marking as correct” consists of writing “It is correct” (ṣaḥḥa) above the reading or in its vicinity. This is done only for something that is correct in regard to transmission and sense but that is open to doubt or dispute. “It is correct” is written above it so that it be known that it has not been overlooked and that it has been accurately written and that it is correct in that form.36

The symbol of “latching” – it is also termed “marking as faulty” – is placed over a reading which is established as appearing that way from the standpoint of transmission, but is corrupt in form or sense, or is weak or defective. It may, for instance, be impermissible in terms of Arabic usage or seem odd to speakers of Arabic, with most of them rejecting it. It may also have been misread (muṣḥāf) [by a previous copyist]; or one word or more may have been omitted from the passage; or something along those lines. A line, the beginning of which is like the letter ẓād, is extended above something like this. It is not written on the indicated word lest it be thought that the word is being struck out. It is like the letter ẓād of the word ṣaḥḥa with an extension rather than the ḫa. It is written in this way to distinguish between what is absolutely correct, from the standpoint of transmission and in other ways, and what is correct from the standpoint of transmission but not in any other way. For this reason, “It is correct” is not written in complete form over it. Writing the word “defective” (nāqīs) over a defective word also indicates its faultiness and deficiency, despite the soundness of its transmission and relation. This alerts anyone who looks in the book that the copyist noticed the defective word and has conveyed it as he found it. Perhaps, someone else will give him a correct reading or the reading which does not now seem correct to him will seem correct later on. If he had changed the word and corrected it to the best of his understanding at the time, he would be liable to what has befallen more than one imprudent scholar who changed a text and the correct reading turned out to be the one they rejected and the corrupt reading the one they “corrected” it to.

In regard to calling that symbol a ḍabba [literally, a door latch or the piece of material patched over a crack or break; for example, in a vessel or a piece of wood], we read from the lexicographer Abu ‘l-Qāsim Ibrāhīm b. Muhammad – known as Ibn al-Ḥifīl7 – that this is because the word

36 For an instance of this which found its way into a printed text, see Sakhāwī, Fath al-Mukhtār, 3:13, l. 19.
is “locked up” by it and not readable, as if the door latch were locked. (God knows best.) Because the *dabba* occurs over a reading containing imperfections, it is also like the piece of material which is placed over a crack or break. So the name of this symbol was taken from that word. Borrowings of this kind are not unheard of.

One of the other places for “latching” is the point in an isnād where “looseness” (*irštā*) or “interruption” (*maqtā*) occurs. “Latching” the point of looseness and interruption is customary for scholars. That is similar to what was mentioned above about “latching” a defective reading.

In some old ḥadīth manuscripts in isnāds containing a number of transmitters whose names are placed in conjunction with one another, one finds a symbol similar to the *dabba* between the names. Someone with little experience may mistakenly believe that it is a *dabba* when it is not. It seems that it is the symbol of connection between them which was written to confirm their conjunction for fear that “*an*” (from) would be put in the place of “*maw*” (and). (Knowledge belongs to God. He is exalted). Some copyists occasionally abbreviate the symbol “It is correct” so that its shape comes to resemble that of the “*dabba*.” Perspicacity is one of the best things that can be bestowed on a person. God knows best.

13. When something that does not belong occurs in a book, it is eliminated by striking out (*qabb*), scratching out (*ṣakk*), erasure9 or some other way. Striking out is superior to scratching out and erasing. We heard that the judge Abū Muḥammad b. Ḥallād (God bless him) said, “Our colleagues say, ‘Scratching out is an accusation.’”64 Someone informed me that al-Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ said, “I heard our teacher Abū Bahr Suṭyān b. al-ʿAṣḥṣāʾi al-Asadī65 relating that one of his teachers used to say, ‘The teachers of old used to disapprove of bringing a knife to a ḥadīth class, in order that nothing be peeled away, because sometimes something that is peeled away in one class is established as sound in another transmission. The book may be heard another time from a different teacher with what was peeled off or scratched away from the transmission of the first teacher being correct in the transmission of the other. So then the student needs to restore it after it was peeled off. When a line is drawn over the reading on account of the transmission of the first teacher and it is established as being correct by the second teacher, the symbol standing for the second teacher above it is enough to establish its correctness.”

---

38 Ṣakhāwī defines “*maḥa*” as “the removal of words without scraping, where that is possible because the writing is on a tablet or on parchment or freshly written on very polished paper.”

This he explains is done with one’s fingers or a rag; *Fiṭḥ al-Mughthīb*, 2:180.


40 Abū Bahr b. al-ʿAṣḥṣāʾi was an Andalusian grammarian who died in 520/1126 at over eighty years of age; *Dhahabī, Sījar*, 19:515–16.

41 *Iṣbāʾ*, 170.
There is disagreement over the best method of striking out. We heard that Abū Muhammad b. Khallād said, “The best striking out does not obliterate the word being struck out. Rather writing a good clear line above the word indicates that it is invalid and the word can still be read under the line.” We heard from al-Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ something to the effect that the preferences of precise writers differ regarding striking out. Most of them favor extending a line over the portion of the text to be struck out, through the struck-out words. That is also called “splitting” (shaqq). Others do not draw the line through the portion of text, but rather fix it above it. However, they curve the ends of the line over the beginning and the end of the passage to be struck out. Some others regard that as a disfigurement and view it as marking up and defacing the page. Instead, they enclose the beginning of the passage to be struck out with half a circle and do the same at the end. When the passage to be struck out is long, sometimes they do that at the beginning and the end of each line of the passage. However, sometimes it suffices entirely to enclose the beginning of the passage and its end. There are some teachers who regard both striking out and bracketing the passage with half circles as disfiguring. They are content with a small circle at the beginning and the end of the superfluous passage. They call the small circle a “zero” (ṣifr), as the arithmeticians do. Occasionally some scholars wrote “no” (lā) at the beginning of the passage to be deleted and “until” (īlā) at the end of it. Something like this works well for what is established in one relation and omitted in another. God knows best.

The striking out of unintentionally repeated words: the judge Abū Muhammad b. Khallād al-Rāmahurmūzī (God bless him for his precedence) has anticipated us in the discussion of this. We heard that he said, “Some of our colleagues stated, ‘Of the two occurrences of the word, the one more deserving of being invalidated is the second, because the first was properly written and the second was written by mistake. So the mistake is more deserving of invalidation.’ Others said, ‘The book is a symbol of what is to be read. The occurrence of the word more clearly indicative of what is to be read and the finer of them in terms of shape is more deserving of preservation.’” Finally, al-Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ came and made an excellent distinction. He opined that, if the repetition of the word is found at the beginning of a line, let the second occurrence be struck out, to protect the beginning of the line from markings and defacement. If the repetition is found at the end of a line, the first occurrence should be struck out, to protect the end of the line. Keeping the beginnings and the ends of the lines free from that is

42. Muḥaddith al-fāsīl, 606.
43. Ilmār, 171.
44. For writing the zero in Arabic as a circle instead of the more usual dot, see Franz Rosenthal, The Technique and Approach of Muslim Scholarship (Rome, 1947), 16. n. 1. This fundamental study contains a translation (pp. 8–18) of the chapter concerning books and writing from ʿAlmawi’s al-Maṣūd fi adab al-mufṣīd wa-ʾl-mustafīd, which amplifies many of the points discussed in this Category.
45. Muḥaddith al-fāsīl, 607.
best. If one occurrence of the repeated word comes at the end of a line and
the other at the beginning of the next line, let the one at the end of the line be
struck out, because it is more important to respect the beginning of a line. If the
repetition occurs in the second or first term of a genitive construction, or in an
adjective or the word it modifies, or something similar, we no longer take into
account the beginning or the end of the line, but rather we respect the continuity
between the two terms of the genitive construction, and so forth, in drawing the
line. So, we do not separate them with the striking out and we strike out the outer
word of the repetition, rather than the inner one.

Erasing is like scraping46 in regard to the treatment that was discussed
above. There are various ways to do it. One of the strangest — although it is the
safest — is what is related from Sahhn b. Sa‘d al-Tanûkhi47 — the Malîkite
authority — to the effect that he sometimes wrote something and then licked it
off. What we heard about Ibrâhîm al-Nakha’î (God be pleased with him) saying,
“Ink on a man’s clothes and lips is a sign of good character,” also refers to that.
God knows best.

14. For works containing differing transmissions of the same text, let the student
undertake to record accurately the differences in his book and make a clear
distinction between them, so that the transmissions do not become mixed up
and confused and do not trip him up. The way to do this is for him to put down
first the text of his book according to one particular transmission. Then, either in
the margins or somewhere else, he attaches the additions from another relation,
signals the omissions and records the differences. In each case he should designate
everyone who related it, giving his full name. If he uses a symbol of one or more
letters for the name, then he should, as was said above, explain what the symbol
means at the beginning or end of his book, in case he forgets with the passage
of time or his book comes into the possession of someone else who will fall into
confusion and error because of his symbols. When there are many different
relations, one is sometimes compelled to limit oneself to symbols.

For discriminating between different transmissions, some scholars felt it
was enough to designate the supplementary relation with red ink. The Easterner
Abû Dharr al-Harrâwî48 and the Westerner Abu ’l-Hasan al-Qâbîsi did that, as
did many other early teachers and recorders of hadîth. When there is an addition

46 Kask, according to Sakkhâwî, is “scraping the paper with a knife or something similar;” Path
al-Mughîth, 2:180.
47 This is somewhat oddly phrased since “scraping” has not been mentioned until now. Ibn
al-Salâh may have regarded kask as a synonym of kakk.
240/855) was the author of the influential legal guide al-Mudawwana al-tuhra; EI, 8:843–5;
Sezgin, GAS, 1:468–71.
49 Abû Dharr ‘Abd b. Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Harrâwî (ca. 355/966–434/1043) was a Malîkite
in law and a conservative Ashûrîite in theology. He composed a number of works on hadîth;
Sezgin, GAS, 1:231.
in the supplementary relation of the text of the book, the student writes it in red. If there is an omission in the supplementary relation and the additional material is in the relation recorded in the main text of the book, he brackets that material in red. Whoever does this should make clear at the beginning or the end of the book to whom the relation marked with red belongs, as was stated above. God knows best.

15. For the most part, the writers of hadith have come to confine themselves to using symbols for ḥaddāthānā (He transmitted to us) and ʿakhbaranā (He informed us). That has spread and taken over to the point where it is hardly ever confusing. For ḥaddāthānā the last half is written; that is, ʿālif, nūn, alif; and sometimes only the pronoun is written; that is, nūn and alif. For ʿakhbaranā, the aforementioned pronoun is written with an initial alif. It is not good the way certain scholars write ʿakhbaranā with an alif in addition to the first symbol of ḥaddāthānā we mentioned, even if Bayhaqī was one of those who did this.* Occasionally a rāʾ is written after the alif in the symbol for ʿakhbaranā and a dāl at the beginning of the symbol for ḥaddāthānā. The expert Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥakīm, Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī⁵ and the expert Ahmad al-Bayhaqī (God be pleased with them) are some of those in whose handwriting I have seen a dāl in the symbol for ḥaddāthānā. God knows best.

When a hadith has two or more isnāds, at the transition from one isnād to another some scholars write a symbol shaped like a ḫāʾ; that is, an unpointed, unconnected letter ḫāʾ. We have received no [convincing] explanation for this from any reliable person.

However, I have found in the handwriting of the professor and hadith expert Abū ʿUthmān al-Ṣabūnī,⁶ the expert Abū Muslim ʿUmar b. ʿAbī al-Layth al-Bukhārī⁷ and the jurist and hadith scholar Abū Saʿd al-Khaliḥi⁸ (God bless them) the word saḥīḥa (It is sound) unambiguously written in

---

* Written without pointing, the ʿālif-nūn-alif of ḥaddāthānā is identical to the ḫāʾ-nūn-alif of this abbreviation of ʿakhbaranā. Sayyūţī (Tadhkīr al-rāʾīf, 2:87) felt that alif-ḥāʾ-nūn-alif might be mistaken for the abbreviation of ḥaddāthānā while Sakhāwī (Fath al-Mughīth, 2:190) suggested that Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ feared that it might be read as ḥanānā or an abbreviation of it.

⁵ Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Muhammad b. al-Husayn al-Sulamī (325/936 or 330–412/1021) was one of the greatest of the early Sufis and the author of a number of important works on topics related to mysticism, including the biographical dictionary Tabaqāt al-Sufiyā (ed. J. Pedersen, Leiden, 1960); EJ, 9:111–12; Sezgin, GES, 1:671–74.

⁶ Abū ʿUthmān Ismāʿīl b. Abū al-Raḥmān b. Ahmad al-Ṣabūnī (373/983–449/1057) was a scholar famed for his piety and knowledge; Dihākhī, Siyār, 18:40–44.

⁷ Abū Muslim ʿUmar b. ʿAbī al-Layth al-Bukhārī (d. 466/1074 or 468) composed a work entitled Munāzal ad-Sahīḥayn; Dihākhī, Siyār, 18:407–9.

place of the ḥāʾ, and this suggests that the ḥāʾ is an abbreviation of saḥḥā. It is good to place saḥḥā here so that no one mistakenly believes the ḥadīth that goes with the isnād has been omitted and to prevent the two isnāds from being combined into a single isnād. Someone whom I met on a journey in Khurāsān related to me from an Isfahāni whom he described as possessing merit that it is an unpointed letter ḥāʾ from the word taḥwil (transition); that is, from one isnād to another. I once consulted a North African scholar about it. I related to him from a ḥadīth scholar I had met that the unpointed ḥāʾ represents the word al-ḥadīth. He said to me, “The people of North Africa – and I do not know of any disagreement among them – write it as an unpointed ḥāʾ and when one of them encounters it in reciting, he says, ‘al-ḥadīth.’” He told me that he had heard a Baghdādi also say that it is an unpointed ḥāʾ and that when some of them come across it in their recitation, they say, “ḥāʾ,” and continue. I asked the well-traveled expert Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Qādir b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ruḥawī (God bless him) about it. He said that it is the ḥāʾ from ḥāʾil (divider); that is, it separates two isnāds. He said, “Nothing is said when one comes across it in reciting.” He denied that it is from the word al-ḥadīth or the other words. He was not acquainted with anything else from any of his teachers and they included a number of the ḥadīth experts of his day. I think it best – and God is the one who grants success – that the reciter say, “ḥāʾ,” when he comes across it and continue. This is the most cautious way and the most equitable. Knowledge belongs to God (He is exalted).

16. The expert al-Khaṭṭīb stated “that after the phrase ‘In the name of God, the Compassionate and Merciful,’ the student should write the name (ism) of the teacher from whom he heard the book, his paidonymic (kunya) and lineage (nasab) and then put forth what he heard from him verbatim.” Al-Khaṭṭīb went on to add: “When he comes to write the book he heard, he should write over the words ‘In the name of God,’ and so forth, the names of those who heard the book with him and the date of the audition. If he likes, he may alternatively write that information in the margin of the first page of the book. Our teachers did it both ways.” Writing the list of auditors (īṣāʿ) where he is said is safest and most appropriate because it will not be hidden from those in need of it. There is also nothing wrong with writing it at the end of the book, on the outside of it or wherever it can be easily found. The list of auditors should be in the script of a trustworthy person whose handwriting is not unknown. There is no harm then in the teacher granting the audition not endorsing the list of auditors in his own
hand. Likewise, there is nothing wrong with the owner of the book, if he is trustworthy, merely recording his audition in his own hand. Reliable scholars have long done this.

The teacher Abu 'l-Muẓaffar, the son of the expert Abū Sa‘īd al- Меrawzī [al-Samā‘ī] – transmitted to me in Marv from his father from an inhabitant of Isfahan who transmitted to him that in Baghdad ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Aḥt ʿAbd Allāh b. Mandaī recited a ḥadīth monograph to Abū Ahmad al-Faraḍī and requested that he sign it as a guarantee for it. Abū Ahmad said to him, “My son, you must be veracious. When you become known for that, no one will call you a liar and you will be regarded as truthful in what you say and transmit. When that is not the case, if they were to say to you, ‘This is not the handwriting of Abū Ahmad al-Faraḍī,’ what would you say to them?”

The writer of the list of auditors must be attentive and careful. He should make clear in unambiguous terms the identity of the auditor, the material heard and the teacher from whom it was heard. He must avoid laxity in recording the names of the auditors and beware of leaving out the name of any of the auditors for an impure motive. There is nothing wrong if the writer of the list of auditors (muthabbat al-samā‘) does not personally attend the entire audition, but draws it up relying on information from someone who was present and whose word he can trust (God – He is exalted – willing).

It is shameful for the owner of a book to conceal it from someone whose name is inscribed in the list of auditors and to prevent him from transferring the record of his audition (naql samā‘ī) and copying the book.

When the owner does lend it to him, the borrower should not be slow in returning it. We heard that Zuhri said, “Beware of the ghulūl of books!” Someone asked him, “What is ‘the ghulūl of books’?” He said, “Withholding them from their owners.” We heard that al-Fudayl b. Qyād (God be pleased with him) said, “It is not the act of a pious man nor that

---

57 The transmitter would customarily endorse the certificate of audition by personally writing ḥadīth taḥqīq or something to that effect and signing his name; see Ṣahih al-Dīn al-Mu‘arrūjī, “Ijtīḥād al-samā‘ fi `l-muḥkījat al-qadima,” Revue de l’Institut des Manuscrits Arabes, 1 (1975/1955):235-6. This article is a great aid in understanding the issues raised in this section, although it should be noted that its title is somewhat misleading for the document al-Mu‘arrūjī terms ijtīḥād al-samā‘ is more properly called samā‘, taṣmī‘ or ṭabqa.
58 Abu ʿl-Qasim ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Muḥammad b. Manda (381/991-470/1078), the brother of Abu ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAbd Allāh, was a controversial expert in ḥadīth and the author of a number of books; EF, 3:863-4.
59 Abū Ahmad Ubayyīd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Faraḍī al-Mu‘arrūjī was a ḥadīth transmitter who died in 406/1016 at more than eighty years of age; Dhahabi, Siyār, 17:212-14.
60 Abū ʿAli al-Fudayl b. Qyād al-Tamīmī (105/723-187/802) was born in Samarrā, studied in al-Kufa and died while resident in Mecca. Although a respected transmitter of ḥadīth, he is best remembered for his great piety; Sezgin, CAS, 1:636.
of a wise man to take the record of audition of a man and withhold it from him. Whoever does this harms himself"—or according to another relation: "It is not the act of a scholar to take the record of audition and book of a man and withhold it from him."

What if he does happen to forbid this to him? We heard that a man in al-Kūfa laid a claim against another man for a record of audition which he withheld from him. They took their dispute to the judge there, Ḥafṣ b. Ghiyāth. He said to the owner of the book, "Bring us your books. We impose on you the books with the record of audition of this man recorded in your hand. We exempt you from the books with the record of audition of this man recorded in his hand." Ibn Khallād said, "I asked Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Zubayrī about this and he said, "There is no ruling better than this on that issue, because the handwriting of the owner of the book indicates that he consented to his colleague listening with him.' Someone else said, 'It is worthless.'" The expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb related that the judge Ismāʿīl b. Ishaq was consulted about this and he lowered his head in thought for a long time and then said to the defendant, "If the record of his audition is recorded in your book in your handwriting, you are obliged to lend it to him. If his record of audition in your book is recorded in the hand of someone else, then you know best." Hafṣ b. Ghiyāth is counted among the first generation of the followers of Abū Ḥanīfa. Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Zubayrī was one of the authorities of the Shāfiʿites. Ismāʿīl b. Ishaq is the spokesman of the Mālikites and their authority. Their statements back one another up in that matter and the upshot of them is that the owner of a book which contains with his acknowledgement the audition of someone else is compelled to lend the book to that person. Originally, the reason for this was not evident to me. Then I reasoned that the owner’s recording the man’s name in the book is equivalent to having testimony in his favor in his possession, so he has to produce it on the basis of the substance of the testimony, even if it involves expending his own property. Similarly, the bearer of testimony in court is compelled to produce it, even if he has to put himself out by running to the court to do so. Knowledge belongs to God (He is blessed and exalted).

When the student copies a book, he should transfer the record of his audition to his copy only after a satisfactory collation. Likewise, one should not transfer a

---

62 Muhaddith al-taşālī, 589.
64 ʿĀlim, 117.
list of auditors to any copy of a book until the book is collated in a satisfactory manner with the copy which was actually heard nor record the list of auditors in the copy automatically at the time of the audition. That way no one will be misled by the uncollated copy. This holds unless it is made clear that the copy is uncollated during the transfer of the record of audition and upon the inscribing it.66 God knows best.

65 See Ḥaráqī, Tahāra, 2:161.
ON THE MANNER OF RELATING HADITH AND THE STIPULATIONS REGARDING THE CONVEYANCE OF THEM, AND RELATED MATTERS

(Fī ʿishārat riwāyat al-hadīth wa-shart adāʾihī wa-mā yataʿallaqu bi-dhālika)

Many of the matters relevant to this topic have already been discussed in the previous two Categories. Some people are excessively strict in relating hadith and others are excessively lax. One example of strictness is the doctrine of those who say, “A hadith may not be cited as a proof unless the transmitter relates from his memory and recollection.” That is related from Mālik and Abū Ḥanīfah (God be pleased with them). Abū Bakr al-Ṣaydānī al-Marwazī was a Shāfiʿite who subscribed to this view. Another excessively strict doctrine is that of those who permit a scholar to rely on his book when transmitting, but would not view the relation from it as valid, if he had lent it out or let it out of his possession, on account of its absence from him.

We have already related the views of those who tolerate laxity and the refutation of them in the course of the preceding explication of the means of receiving and taking up hadith. One group of lax transmitters are those who hear certain compositions and are remiss to the extent that, when they grow old and come to be needed, ignorance and greed lead them to relate the texts from purchased or borrowed copies which are unsound and have not been collated. The expert Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥākim included those people in the ranks of discredited transmitters. He said, “They mistakenly believe that they are truthful in their relation. This happens often among people. Certain leading scholars and people known for their piety practice it.”

ʿAbd Allāh b. Lahīʿ al-Mīṣrī was a lax transmitter. Despite his augustness, citing his relations as proofs was rejected on account of his laxity. It was said that Yahyā b. ʿĀṣim saw a group of people who had a personal

1 Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Dāwūd al-Ṣaydānī al-Dāwūdī (fl. sixteenth/twelfth century) was known exclusively for his commentary on Muzani’s Mudhakkār; Subkt, Taḥqīqāt, 4:146–9.
2 The fear was that, while the book was out of the transmitter’s possession, it would be surreptitiously altered and he would not be able to detect the changes since he had not memorized the text; al-Khanīb al-Iṣḥāqī, Kifāya, 227; al-Qādī ʿIyād, Ilmāʾ, 136.
3 Madkhal, 40 (Arabic), 39–40 (English).
4 Abū ʿAbd al-Rahmān ʿAbd Allāh b. Lahīʿ al-Mīṣrī (97/715–174/790) served as a judge in Egypt and was a prolific transmitter, although, as the passage indicates, his reliability was questioned; Sczgln, CAG, 1:94.
5 Abū Zakaryāʾ Yahyā b. ʿĀṣim b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Maṣūrī (144/761–208/823) was a student of a number of popular transmitters and died in Egypt; Dḥālābī, ʿIṣyār, 10:127–30.
collection of ḥadith (juz') which they heard from Ibn Lahi'a. He examined the text and not a single ḥadith in it belonged to Ibn Lahi'a. He went to Ibn Lahi'a and told him that. He said, "What can I do? They bring a book and say, 'This contains your ḥadith,' so I transmit it to them." Something similar occurs among the teachers of our day. A student brings a personal collection or a book to a teacher and says, "This is your relation." Then the teacher lets him recite it to him, trusting him blindly, without undertaking any investigation to ascertain the truth of the ascription.

The correct view is the one the majority adhere to and it is the middle path between excessive strictness and excessive negligence. When a transmitter meets the stipulations which were explicated above for receiving and taking up ḥadith and he collates his book and fixes his audition in the fashion described above, it is permissible for him to transmit from it. This holds even if he had lent his book to someone and it was out of his possession, when it is probable that the book is free from alteration and changes. In particular, this is true when the transmitter is one of those who for the most part would recognize whether the text had been altered or changed. That is because in the field of the relation of ḥadith, we depend on likelihood. When this obtains, it is enough and nothing more than this is stipulated. God knows best.

Some Subsidiary Issues

1. When the transmitter is blind and did not memorize his ḥadith from the mouth of the teacher who transmitted to him, but instead sought the aid of some trustworthy people to make precise his audition and commit the book to memory and in transmitting the text asked for their help in the recitation of the book to him: his relation is sound when he takes care in that regard to the best of his ability, so that the likelihood is that there is no alteration. However, he is more liable to be challenged or forbidden from something like this than a person who can see. However, the expert al-Khaṭib said, "Audition from a sighted, illiterate person who did not memorize from the transmitter the ḥadith he heard from him – rather it was written down for him – is the same as audition from a blind person who did not memorize his ḥadith from the transmitter. Some scholars have forbidden it and some have permitted it." God knows best.

2. When a student hears a book and then wants to relate it from a copy of the text which does not contain a record of his audition and was not collated with the copy he heard, although his teacher gave audition from this copy to others: it is not licit for him to relate from that copy. The authority and jurist Abū Naṣr b. al-Ṣabbāgh stated this unequivocally in something of his we read. In the same way, if the copy contained the record of his teacher’s audition or a reliable person

6 Kitāba, 338.
related from it from his teacher, it would still not be permissible for the student to relate from it, relying merely on that, since he would not be certain that it did not contain additions not present in the copy which he heard. I found that al-Khaṭṭāb has related corroboration of this from most of the scholars of ḥadīth. He stated that when the student finds the text of the transmitter and the student’s audition is not recorded in it or he finds a copy written from his teacher the authenticity of which he has no qualms about, the generality of the scholars of ḥadīth forbid him to transmit from it. On the other hand, it is said that Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī and Muhammad b. Bakr al-Bursānī allowed it.⁷

That holds true unless the student has a global license (ijāza ... ʿamma) or something similar from his teacher for the material he relates. In this case it is permissible for him to relate from that copy, since it is nothing more than the relation of those additions [which may be found in the copy of the text the student wants to use] under the term “He informed us” or “He transmitted to me” by virtue of the license without an explanation that the additions are transmitted by license. That is a minor matter, the like of which may be tolerated. Indeed, we related above that licensing is necessary for every audition so that the words and passages which were omitted due to inattention or for some other reason may be transmitted by virtue of the license, even if they were not actually spoken.⁸

If the copy of the text [which the student wants to use] instead contains the record of the audition of his teacher’s teacher — or it was heard from the teacher of his teacher or related from the teacher of his teacher: in that case to relate from it the student should have a comprehensive license (ijāza shāmila) from his teacher and his teacher should have a comprehensive license from his teacher. This is a good facilitation which God — and praise belongs to Him — led us to and the need for it is very pressing in our time. God knows best.

3. When someone who has memorized a text finds in his book something in conflict with what he memorized, the matter is examined. If he memorized the text from that book, let him go back to what is in his book. If he memorized it from the mouth of the transmitter, let him rely on his memory rather than on what is in his book, when he has no doubts about his recollection of it. It is a good idea for him to mention the two versions in his relation, saying, “My recollection is such and such and in my book it is such and such.” That is what Shuʿba and others did. Likewise, when another person who memorized the text contradicts him regarding what he memorized, let him say, “My recollection is such and such and X said for it such and such,” or “someone else said such and such for it,” or some other phrase like that. That is what Sufyān al-Thawrī and others did. God knows best.

---

⁸ Kifāya, 237.
⁹ See above, p. 106.
4. When a transmitter finds a record of his audition in his book and he does not remember having heard it: it is reported that Abu Ḥanifa (God bless him) and some of the followers of Shafi'i (God bless him) did not permit the transmitter to relate the book. The doctrine of Shafi'i and most of his followers, Abu Yusuf and Muhammad is that he is permitted to transmit it. This disagreement ought to be addressed in the light of the disagreement just treated above over the permissibility of the transmitter relying on his book to retain (dahī) what he heard. Retaining the text used in the audition is like retaining the material actually heard. The correct view and that of the majority of the scholars of hadith is to permit reliance on a well-guarded book to retain the material heard. Thus, the transmitter is permitted to relate the contents, even if he does not recall each and every hadith in it. So let that be true, if the following condition is met: the record of audition must be in his handwriting or in the handwriting of someone he has confidence in and the book must be well guarded to the extent that it is likely to be free from the touch of forgery and alteration, in the fashion previously described for that. This applies when he has no doubts about it and has no qualms regarding its correctness. If he does have doubts about it, reliance on the book is not permitted. God knows best.

5. When the student wants to relate what he has heard in paraphrase rather than verbatim: if he is not a scholar who is knowledgeable in words and what they mean, familiar with what changes their sense and in possession of insight into the shades of difference between them, there is no disagreement that he is not permitted to do that. He should relate what he heard only in the same terms in which he heard it, without any alteration. The permissibility of this, if he is a scholar who is knowledgeable in these matters, is one of the things the pious forebears, the scholars of hadith, and the greatest authorities in practical and theoretical law have disagreed about. Some of the transmitters of hadith, certain Shafi’i experts in positive and theoretical law and others permitted it. Some of them forbade it for the hadith of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) and allowed it for other material. The most correct view is to permit it for everything, if the transmitter knows what we described and states plainly that he is passing on the sense of the words which reached him, because that is what the affairs of the Companions and early forebears testify to. They often used to transmit a single

10 Abu Yusuf Yaqūb b. Ibrahīm al-Kūfī (113/731–182/798) was one of the most prominent students of the imām Abu Ḥanifa and he served as the chief judge in Baghdad; EJ, 1:164–5; Sezgin, GHS, 1:419–21.
11 Abu Abd Allah Muhammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Shaybānī (132/750–189/805) was, like Abu Yusuf, one of the most prominent early Hanafites. His writings form the foundation of Hanafite law; EJ, 9:392–4; Sezgin, GHS, 1:421–33.
12 Sirāj al-Dīn al-Balqīnī writes that the antecedent of this pronoun may be either “the record of the audition” (sawā‘) or “the touch of forgery and alteration” (ṣurrūq al-tazawwur wa-l-taghyir al-ilah). Maḥāzīn al-nilāyah wa-nuqūdūn Kitāb Ibn al-Ṣalāh, ed. Yāhia ‘Abd al-Rahmān with Maqaddimah, 2nd edn (Cairo, 1989), 394.
notion about a particular matter with different words and that was only because they relied on the sense rather than the wording.

We do not think that this disagreement is active any more and people do not practice transmission by paraphrase, so far as we know, with the contents of books. No one has the right to alter the wording of anything in an authored book and replace it with another word having the same meaning. Rather, those who permitted transmission by paraphrasing did so on account of the difficulty and hardship faced by the Companions and early forebears in rendering the words exactly and rigidly sticking to them. That problem does not exist for the contents of papers and books, because even if someone does possess the authority to change a spoken word, he does not possess the authority to change the composition of someone else. God knows best.

6. Someone who paraphrases a hadith should say after it, “or however he put it” (wa kamul qala), “or something like that” (wa nahwu hadda), and similar expressions. That practice was related from the Companions Ibn Mas'ud, Abu 'l-Dardā'13 and Anas (God be pleased with them). Al-Khaṭīb said, “The Companions were masters of the language and were the people most knowledgeable in semantics. They used these expressions only out of fear of error on account of their recognition of the danger inherent in transmission by paraphrasing.”14

Whenever someone reciting a text comes across something that seems obscure to him, he should read the dubious form and then say, “or however he put it.” This is a good idea and it is the correct course in a matter like this, because the transmitter's licensing the student and permitting him to relate the correct form from him, when it becomes evident, are inherent in his saying, “or however he put it.” It is not necessary for the transmitter to pronounce the license specifically for the doubtful reading, for the reason we just explained. God knows best.

7. Is it permissible to abridge a hadith and transmit only part of it? Scholars disagree about that. Some forbid it outright on the basis of the doctrine of absolutely forbidding transmission by paraphrasing. Some forbid it despite allowing transmission by paraphrasing, when the transmitter has not related the hadith in its complete form at some other time and it is not known that someone else related it in its complete form. Some permit it without any restrictions and make no distinctions. Indeed, we heard that Muḥāhid said, “Leave out whatever you want from a hadith but never add anything to it.” The correct approach is to make a distinction. Abridging is permissible for a knowledgeable and informed transmitter when what he omits can be separated from what he transmits and is not dependent on it, so that the meaning does not become defective and the legal point of what he transmits is not altered by the omission. This should be permitted,

---

13 Abu 'l-Dardā' al-Anṣārī al-Khazzajī (the rest of his name is disputed) was an important Companion of the Prophet who died in Damascus around 32/653; Dhahabi, Siyar, 2:335–53.
14 Jāmi‘, 251.
even if transmission by paraphrasing is not permitted, because under these
circumstances the part he omits [and the part which he relates] are tantamount
to two separate reports on two matters, neither dependant on the other.

This applies if the transmitter’s stature is so elevated that an accusation
will not be lodged against him for transmitting it first completely and then in a
shortened form or for transmitting it first in shortened form and then completely.
If his stature is not so elevated, the expert al-Khaṭīb has said that whoever relates
a hadith in its complete form and is afraid that if he relates it another time with
an omission he will be accused of having the first time added something he had
not heard or of having the second time forgotten the rest of the hadith on account
of his lack of precision and his propensity to err, must banish this suspicion from
himself.16 The authoritative jurist Abu ‘l-Faṭḥ Sulaym b. Ayyūb al-Rāzī said that
this constitutes an excuse to omit and conceal the addition for whoever relates
part of a report and then wants to relate it completely, if he is one of those who
will be accused of having added something to his hadith. In my opinion, someone
like this should not, from the start, relate hadith incompletely, if he has been
enjoined to give it completely. This is because if he initially relates it incompletely,
he excludes the rest of it from being cited as a proof. He ends up oscillating
between not relating it at all, thereby forfeiting it entirely, and relating it and
being accused [of putting a false addition in it] for doing so, thereby wasting any
benefit from it because of the destruction of its value as a proof. Knowledge
belongs to God (He is exalted).

If an author breaks up the text of a single hadith and distributes its parts
under various legal topics in his book, it is closer to being permitted and further
from being forbidden. Indeed, Mālik, Bukhārī and more than one of the other
authorities in hadith did that, although it is not completely reprehensible. God
knows best.

8. A transmitter should not relate his hadith through the recitation of someone
prone to grammatical mistakes and misreading. We heard that al-Nadr b. Shumayl15
(God be pleased with him) said, “Originally these hadith came in good Arabic.”
Abū Bakr [or Abu ‘l-Faṭḥ or Abu ‘l-Qāsim] b. Abī ‘l-Ma‘ṣāli al-Furāwī informed
us by recitation to him. He said, My great-grandfather, the authority Abū Ḥādī
Allāh Muhammad b. al-Fadl al-Furāwī17 informed us. He said, Abu ‘l-Husayn
‘Abd al-Ghāfir b. Muhammad b. al-Farīsī18 informed us. He said, The authority

15 Kifāya, 193.
16 Abu ‘l-Ḥasan al-Nadr b. Shumayl al-Māzinz was born in Marv around 122/740. As a boy, he
taveled to al-Bagha with his father and studied under the great grammarian Khālid b. Ahmad.
He later returned to Marv, where he served as judge. He died there either on the last day of
the year 203/819 or near the beginning of 204; Sezgin, G.45, 8:39.
17 Abu Ḥādī Allāh Muhammad b. al-Fadl al-Furāwī (ca. 441/1049–530/1136) was a famous
transmitter of several major hadith collections; Dhabhāt, Siyār, 19:615–19.
18 Abu ‘l-Husayn ‘Abd al-Ghāfīr b. Muhammad b. al-Farīsī (ca. 350/961–448/1056) was one of
the great hadith transmitters of his generation; Dhabhāt, Siyār, 18:19–21.
Abū Sulaymān Ḥamd b. Muḥammad al-Khaṭṭābi informed us. He said, Muḥammad b. Muṣṭahf "transmitted to me. He said, One of our teachers informed us from Abū Dāwūd al-Sinjī." He said, I heard Aṣma'ī saying, "The greatest fear I have for a student of hadith—if he does not know grammar—is that he fall under the general designation of the statement of the Prophet (Peace be upon him), ‘Whoever ascribes a lie to me, let him take his seat in Hell,’ because the Prophet (Peace be upon him) did not make grammatical mistakes. Whenever you relate a hadith from him and make a grammatical mistake in it, you ascribe a lie to him.”

The student of hadith has a duty to learn enough grammar and lexicography to avoid the shame and ignominy of grammatical mistakes and miswriting. We heard that Shu‘ba said, “Whoever studies hadith and does not comprehend the Arabic language is like someone who wears a burnous without a hood,” or however he put it. We heard that Ḥammād b. Salama said, “Someone who studies hadith and does not know grammar is like a donkey wearing a nosebag with no barley in it.” The way to avoid misreading is to take hadith from the mouth of people possessing knowledge and accuracy. Whoever is deprived of that and instead takes and learns his hadith from books is likely to corrupt the hadith and is unable to keep from changing and misreading the text. God knows best.

9. When a grammatical mistake or an instance of misreading occurs during the relation of a hadith: there is a disagreement over what to do. Some people used to hold the opinion that the student should relate it with the mistake, just as he heard it. The Followers Muḥammad b. Strīn and Abū Ma‘āmīr ‘Abd Allāh b. Sakhbara 23 subscribed to that. This is an extreme manifestation of the doctrine of adhering to the exact wording of the recitation and forbidding transmission by paraphrasing. Others recommend altering and correcting the mistake and relating it in its correct form. We heard that view from Āwza‘i, Ibn al-Mubārak and others, and it is the doctrine of beginning and advanced scholars of hadith. Advocating this for a grammatical mistake which does not change the sense of the hadith and similar cases is a necessity according to the doctrine which permits the transmission of hadith by paraphrase, and, as just stated, this is the doctrine of the majority.

The right way to correct and change a mistake found in both a book and the original it was copied from is to leave it and report what occurs in the original as

19 Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad b. Muṣṭahf al-Harawī was a student of Abū Dāwūd al-Sinjī. He died in 316/928 at over ninety years of age; Dhahabi, Siyar, 14:484–5.
20 Abū Dāwūd Sulaymān b. Ma‘bad al-Sinjī (d. 257/871) is described as a litterateur and poet; Ibn al-Athir, Lākūn, 2:147.
22 Abū Ma‘āmīr ‘Abd Allāh b. Sakhbara al-Azdī was a Kūfī transmitter of hadith who was born during the lifetime of the Prophet and died during the governorship of ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād; Dhahabi, Siyar, 4:133–4.
it is while placing a “latch” (dabba) on it and indicating the correct form on the margin of the page. That is the most useful and least damaging way.

We heard that one scholar of hadith was seen in a dream. Something passed from his lips — or from his tongue. He was asked about this and said, “It is a word from a hadith of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him and his family) which I changed on my own volition, so this was done to me.”

Often we see that something which many scholars mistakenly believe to be an error — and they often change it — is correct with sound justification, even if it is obscure and may be considered peculiar. This occurs in particular in what they consider an error from the standpoint of good Arabic. That is because of the numerosity of the dialects and the sub-dialects of the Arabs.24 We heard that ‘Abd Allāh b. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal25 said, “When my father came across a grievous error, he corrected it. When it was a minor mistake, he left it and said, ‘So said the teacher.’ ” One of our teachers informed me of something to the same effect from someone who informed him from the expert al-Qaḍī ʿIyāḍ.26 In a word, the practice to which most of the teachers of old adhered was to transmit the relation as it reached them, without changing it in their books.

Even the variant readings of the Qurʾān continue to be transmitted in books — without being considered anomalous — in conflict with the universally accepted recitation. Some of that also occurs in the two Sahih, the Mawsīʿ and other works.

However, the more knowledgeable teachers point out these errors in these books when the text is heard and recited and in the margins of the books while still reporting what is in the texts in the way it reached them.

Some, including Abu ’l-Walīd Hishām b. Aḥmad al-Kinānī al-Waqqasī,27 had the audacity to alter books and correct them. Because of his wide reading, his mastery of several disciplines, his penetrating intellect and his keen intelligence, he ventured to make many corrections and he did make mistakes in some instances. The same is true of others who did the same thing.

The best way is to forbid all alteration and correction so that someone who is not competent will not venture to do it. The first way [that is, reproducing the text as found] accompanied by a clarification is the safest. So at the audition, the

23 See below, pp. 138–9.
24 The Prophet addressed the various Arab tribes in their own dialect; al-Qaḍī ʿIyāḍ, Ilmāʿ, 182.
26 Ilmāʿ, 185–6.
27 Abu ’l-Walīd Hishām b. Aḥmad al-Kinānī al-Waqqasī (408/1017–489/1096) was an Andalusian scholar praised for his expertise in a number of disciplines; Dīhāʾ, Siyar, 19:134–6.
transmitter should give the mistake as it occurs and then state the form which is correct, either with regard to sound Arabic usage or with regard to transmission. If he wants, he may recite it first in its correct form and then say, “Such and such is the way it is found with our teacher” — or “in our relation,” or “by way of X.” In fact this is better than the first way, since the transmitter does not ascribe to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) something he did not say.

The most appropriate procedure to rely on when making a correction is to mend the false form with something found in other hadith. Whoever does this is safe from ascribing to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) something which he did not say. God knows best.

10. When the correction consists of adding something that was omitted: if the addition is such that it does not change the sense, then it is treated in the fashion described above. That is similar to what is related from Mālik (God be pleased with him). He was asked, “Do you view as valid a hadith of the Prophet (Peace be upon him) to which the letters māw and alif were added, while the meaning remains the same?” He said, “I hope that it will be considered insignificant.”

If the correction by the addition entails a meaning different from what occurs in the text, the well-established verdict is for the transmitter to mention the wording as it appears in the text coupled with a notification of what was omitted. This way he will be safe both from the shame of the error [that is, the omission] and from ascribing to his teacher something he did not say. Abū Nuʿaym al-Faḍl b. Dukayn transmitted a hadith from a teacher of his in which he said, “From Buhayna.” Then Abū Nuʿaym said, “He really is Ibn Buhayna,” but my teacher said, “Buhayna.” When someone below the occurrence of the omitted material is known to have provided the material and someone else later on omitted it, it is treated differently. The student should supply the omission in its correct place in the book with the phrase “that is” (yaʿāni). This is what the expert al-Khaṭīb did when he related from Abū ʿUmar b. Māhdi99 from al-Qāḍī al-Maḥāmili,9 with his isnād, from Urwa from ʿAmra bint ʿAbd al-Raḥmān — that is from ʿUsha — that she said, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) used to put his head near to me so that I could comb it.” Al-Khaṭīb said, “The text of Ibn Māhdi read from ʿAmra that she said, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) used to put his head near to me . . .” So we added to it the mention of

28 Kifāya, 253.
29 Abū ʿUmar ʿAbd al-Wāhid b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Mahdi (318/930–410/1019) was best known for being the principal transmitter of the hadith of al-Qāḍī al-Maḥāmili; Dhahabi, Siyār, 17:221–2.
30 Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥusayn b. Ismāʿīl al-Dabbī (235/849–330/941) served as a judge in al-Kufa for sixty years and held a salon for scholars of law and hadith in his house; Sezgin, ĠAS, 1:180–1.
31 ʿAmra bint ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Anṣāriya (d. ca. 100/719) was a student of ʿUsha and an authority on law in her own right; Dhahabi, Siyār, 4:507–8.
Ā'isha since it was indispensable and we knew that Maḥmūl related it that way. However, the mention of Ā'isha was omitted in the book of our teacher Abū ʿUmar b. Mahdī. We said, ‘That is from Ā'isha,’ in the isnād because Ibn Mahdī did not say that to us. I have seen a number of our teachers doing the same thing in similar cases.” Then he mentioned, with his isnād, that Āḥmad b. Hanbal (God be pleased with him) said, “I heard Wāḥib saying, ‘In ḥadīth I call upon “that is” for help.’”

This is true when his teacher has related it to him incorrectly. When it is the case that the omission is found in the student’s book and it seems likely to him that the omission occurs only in the book and is not from his teacher, then correcting it both in his book and in his relation when he transmits it is justified. Abū Dāwūd [al-Siṣṭānī] said that he told Āḥmad b. Hanbal, “I found in my book, ‘Iṣaḥāq [b. Muḥammad al-Awār] from Jurayj from Abū ʿl-Zubayr [Muḥammad b. Muslim b. Tadrīs].’ Is it permissible for me to correct it to ‘Ibn Jurayj?’” He said, “I hope that there is nothing wrong with doing that.” God knows best.

This is similar to the case when part of an isnād or text is effaced in the student’s book. It is permissible for him to supply the missing text from someone else’s book, when he knows that it is correct and he has no doubts that it actually is what is missing from his book. However, there are some transmitters who do not view this as permissible. One of those who did replace missing text this way was Nuʿaym b. Hammād,32 according to what Yaḥyā b. Maʿīn related from him. The expert al-Khaṭib said, “It would have been better, if he had made that clear at the time of the relation.”33 The same verdict applies to the transmitter who relies on his memory who seeks to verify something he has doubts about in someone else’s book or his own recollection. It is related that a number of the scholars of ḥadīth did that, including ʿAṣīm,” Abū ʿAwāna [al-Isfārāyīn] and Āḥmad b. Hanbal. Some of them used to note the material someone else verified, saying, “X transmitted the hadīth to us and Y verified it for me.” For example, it is related that Yazīd b. Hārūn said, “ʿĀṣīm informed us — and Shuʿbā verified it for me — from ʿAbd Allāh b. Sarīj.”34 This is also required when the transmitter finds in the original of his book a rare Arabic word or something incompletely written which puzzles him. It is licit for the student to ask well-informed scholars about it and relate it in accordance with what they tell him. Something similar to this was related from Iṣbāq b. Ṭahāwī, Āḥmad b. Hanbal and others (God be pleased with them). God knows best.

---

32 Abū ʿAbd Allāh Nuʿaym b. Hammād al-Khuṣābī (d. ca. 228/844) was a scholar of ḥadīth and opponent of the Ḥanafīs who is best known for his book Kitāb al-Fitan; Səxğin, GASA, 1:104–5.
33 Kif ʿāmu, 254.
34 Abū ʿAbd al-Rahmān ʿAṣīm b. Sulaymān al-Tamīmī al-Baṣrī, known as ʿAṣīm al-Āhwāl, was a transmitter of ḥadīth who died around 140/757; Dhuhaḥī, Siyar, 6:13–15.
11. When the transmitter has a hadith from two or more teachers and there is a difference in the wording between their relations, but the meaning is the same: he may join them together in a single isnād and then quote the hadith according to the particular wording of one of them and say, “X and Y informed us and the wording is that of X;” or “this is the wording of X” — “he” or “they” — “said, ‘Z informed us,’” or other similar expressions. Muslim — the author of the Sahih — also has another good expression for this. He says for instance, “Abū Bakr b. Abī Shayba and Abū Sa‘īd al-Asヒajj transmitted to us, both of them from Abū Khalīl.” Abū Bakr said, “Abū Khalīl al-Aḥmar transmitted to us from al-A‘mash,” and he quoted the hadith. His repetition of the reference to one of them in particular is an indication that the wording given was his.

When the transmitter does not single out one of the two teachers for mention, but instead takes portions from each and says, “X and Y informed us and they were similar in wording. They said, ‘Z informed us:’” this is not forbidden, according to the doctrine which permits relation by paraphrase. The statement of Abū Dāwūd [al-Siṣīṣṭānī] — author of the Sunan — “Musaddad” and Abū Tawba transmitted the sense to us. They said, “Abū ‘l-ʾAḥwaṣ transmitted to us,” and things similar to this in his book may be instances of the first method; that is, the wording is that of Musaddad and Abū Tawba agrees with him in sense. It is also possible that they are instances of the second procedure; that is, Abū Dāwūd has not given the wording of one of them in particular but rather he has related it by paraphrase from both of them. This possibility is more likely when he says, “Muslim b. Ibrahīm and Mūsā b. Ismā‘īl transmitted to us. The sense is the same. They said, ‘Abān transmitted to us.’”

When the transmitter combines a number of teachers who have given the same sense and the text he produces is not the wording of every one of them and he says nothing to clarify that: this is something which Bukhārī and others

---

36 Abū Allah b. Muḥammad b. Ibrahīm (159/775–235/849), known as Abū Bakr b. Abī Shayba, was best known for his hadith collection known as Musannaf; Sezgin, G.A.S, 1:108.
37 Abū Sa‘īd ‘Abd Allah b. Sa‘īd b. Ḥuṣayn al-Asヒajj (167/783–257/871) was an important early transmitter of hadith; Sezgin, G.A.S, 1:134.
38 Abū Khalīl Sulaymān b. Ḥayyān al-Aḥmar (114/732–189/805) was considered to be a reliable transmitter of hadith; Dīhābī, Siyar, 9:19–21.
39 The hadith of the Baṣraḥ Abū ‘l-Ḥasan Musaddad b. Musarḥad al-Asadi (ca. 150/767–228/843) were collected in a couple of small musnad; Dīhābī, Siyar, 10:591–5.
40 The transmitter Abū Tawba b. Ṣaffās b. Ṣulaymān al-Ḥanāfī (ca. 150/767–241/855) was sought out by a number of his most important contemporaries; Dīhābī, Siyar, 10:653–5.
41 Abū ‘l-ʾAḥwaṣ Saffās b. Ṣulaymān al-Ḥanāfī (d. 179/795) transmitted a large number of hadith; Dīhābī, Siyar, 8:281–4.
42 Abū Sa‘īd Mūsā b. Ismā‘īl al-Minzārī (d. 223/838), known as “Tabī‘iḥākī, was considered one of the finest hadith experts of his day in al-Baṣra; Dīhābī, Siyar, 10:360–5.
43 Abū Yazd Abān b. Yazd b. ʾAṭṭār was a Baṣraḥ transmitter of hadith who seems to have died around 164/781; Dīhābī, Siyar, 7:431–3.
condemn. There is nothing wrong with it under the doctrine which permits transmission by paraphrase.

When the transmitter hears a composition from a number of teachers and then collates his copy with the text of just one of them and he wants to mention all of them in the isnad and say, “The wording is that of X,” as stated above: on the one hand, this may be permitted like the first case because he had heard the text which he gave with that particular reading from the person to whom he attributed the wording. On the other hand, it may be forbidden because he possesses no knowledge of the particulars of the relations of the others which would enable him to provide information about those relations. This is in contrast to the earlier case where the transmitter was acquainted with the relations of the teachers other than the one whom he ascribed the wording to and he knew that they agreed in regard to the sense, and so provided that information. God knows best.

12. The student should not add to the lineage (nasab) his teacher has given for the men above him in the isnad, interpolating the additional information into the isnad without any distinguishing break. If he makes a break, saying something like, “He is the son of X, from such-and-such place” (huwa ibn fulān al-fulānī), or, “That is the son of X” (ya‘ni ibn fulān); it is permissible. The hadith expert and authority Abū Bakr al-Barqānī (God bless him) said in his Kitāb al-Luqāt (Book of Gleanings), with his isnad, that ‘Ali b. al-Madnī said, “When a man transmits to you and says, ‘X transmitted to us,’ without providing the rest of his lineage, I think it best that you provide the rest of it. So say, ‘He transmitted to us that (amma) X b. Y transmitted to him.’” God knows best.

What if his teacher gave the lineage or description of his teacher at the beginning of the book or personal hadith collection with the first hadith from him, and for the later hadith restricts himself to giving the name of his teacher or just part of his lineage? For instance, I relate a personal hadith collection from Furāwī and I say at the beginning of it, “Abū Bakr Manṣūr b. ‘Abd al-Munīm b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Furāwī informed us. He said, ‘X informed us,’” and I say for the rest of his hadith, “Manṣūr informed us, Manṣūr informed us.” Is it licit for someone who heard that collection from me to relate separately from me some of the hadith after the first hadith and say for each of them, “X [that is, Ibn al-Salāb] informed us. He said, ‘Abū Bakr Manṣūr b. ‘Abd al-Munīm b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Furāwī informed us.’ He said, ‘Y informed us,’” on the basis of my having mentioned Furāwī’s full name at the beginning, even if I did not give it for each of the hadith? The expert al-Khaṭib has related that most scholars permitted this and for some the preferred way was to say, “That is the son of X.”

44 In Arabic, as in English, the nominalizing particle indicates that the material which follows is not a direct quotation. By using it the transmitter shows that he is paraphrasing the words of his teacher and thus avoids falsely ascribing to him something that he did not actually say.
He related, with his isnād, that Āḥmad b. Hanbal (God be pleased with him) said, "That is the son of X," when the name of a man appeared without the lineage.\(^{45}\)

Al-Khaṭṭīb al-Baghdādī related from Barqānī, with the latter’s isnād, the statement we mentioned above from ‘Alī b. al-Madīnī. Then he said that he saw Āḥmad b. ‘Alī al-Iṣbahānī\(^{46}\) – the sojourner in Nishapur, and he was one of the excellent experts and a pious and religious man – doing the same. Al-Khaṭṭīb al-Baghdādī asked him about many of the ḥadīth he related to him, saying for them, “Āḥmad b. ‘Alī Hamdān informed us that Āḥmad b. ‘Alī al-Muthannā b. Mawsīlī informed them,” “Āḥmad b. al-Muqrī\(^{47}\) informed us that Ḥabīb b. Ḥamīd b. Naṣīr\(^{48}\) transmitted to them,” and, “The expert Āḥmad b. ‘Aḍī\(^{49}\) informed us that Āḥmad b. Yūsuf Muḥammad b. Ṣufyān al-Ṣafār\(^{50}\) informed them.” He replied to him that they were ḥadīth which he had heard by recitation to his teachers from a number of texts at the beginning of which the teachers gave the lineages of those who transmitted the ḥadīth to them and the teachers limited themselves to mentioning just the name of the transmitters for the remainder of the ḥadīth.\(^{51}\) Al-Khaṭṭīb al-Baghdādī said, “Others used to say in cases like this, ‘X informed us. He said, ‘Y informed us’ – he is the son of Z,’ and then quote his lineage to its end. This is what I think is preferable because some transmitters used to say for the material licensed to them, ‘X informed us that Y transmitted to them.’”\(^{52}\)

All of these ways are permissible and the best is to say, “He is the son of X,” or “That is the son of X.” Next best is to say, “That X b. Y.” The third best is to provide the exact form of the name given at the beginning of the volume without any break. God knows best.

13. In writing, it has become customary to omit “He said” (qāla) and the like between the transmitters of an isnād. Nevertheless, “He said” must be pronounced out loud when the text is recited. One of the things like this which is neglected is when “It was recited to X. Y informed us” appears in the course of an isnād. The person reciting should say for it, “[It was recited to X.] ‘Y informed us, was said to him.’” “It was recited to X. Y informed us,” is sometimes found. “He said” should be included in this. What should be said is, “It was recited to X. He said, ‘Y transmitted to us.’” Indeed, this appears clearly written in some of the texts which have been related to us. When the word “He said” is repeated – as in the book of Bukhārī, “Ṣalih b. Ḥayyān transmitted to us. He said, ‘Āmir al-Shaḥī said’” (ḥaddathānā Ṣalih ibn Ḥayyān qāla qāla ‘Āmir al-Shaḥī) – they

\(^{45}\) Kifṭiya, 215.

\(^{46}\) Āḥmad b. ‘Alī al-Iṣbahānī (347/958–428/1036), known as Ibn Manṣūrwayh, composed a number of books based on the major ḥadīth collections; Sezgin, G.45, 1:230.

\(^{47}\) Muḥammad Iṣḥāq b. Āḥmad b. Ḥabīb b. Naṣīr al-Khaḍīr died in Mecca in 308/921; Diḥābī, Siyār, 14:289.

\(^{48}\) I have not succeeded in finding any information about this individual.

\(^{49}\) Kifṭiya, 215–16.

\(^{50}\) Kifṭiya, 216.
omit one of them in writing. Nevertheless, the reciter must pronounce both of them. God knows best.

14. The famous nuskhas containing a number of hadith with a single isnād, like the nuskhah of Hammām b. Munabbīh from Abū Hurayra, by the relation of Abū Bekr al-Razzāq from Mā'mar [b. Rāshīd] from Hammām, and similar nuskhas and personal hadith collections: some people mention the isnād anew at the beginning of each hadith from these works. That is found in many old texts and it is the safest course. Others are satisfied to mention the isnād at the beginning of the text with the first hadith or in the beginning of each of the sessions of audition, subsuming the rest of the hadith under it and saying for each succeeding hadith, “With the same isnād” (bi-'l-isnād), or “With it” (bi-hū). That is the more common and predominant way.

When someone who heard the hadith this way wants to separate those hadith and relate each with the isnād given at the beginning of the text: he is allowed to do this in the view of most people, including Wāqif b. al-Jarrāh, Yahyā b. Maʿṣūm and Abū Bakr al-Isāfārīnī. This is because all of the hadith are attached to the first hadith so the isnād given in the beginning of the text is as good as mentioned for each hadith. It is tantamount to dividing the text of a single hadith between several subject headings under the isnād given at the beginning of the hadith. (God knows best.) Some transmitters of hadith reject presenting individually any of those hadith subsumed under an isnād mentioned in the beginning and regard it as misrepresentation. One scholar of hadith asked the professor Abū Iṣḥāq al-Isāfārīnī – the expert in practical and theoretical law – about this and he said that it is impermissible.

The person who heard something this way should also follow the same procedure. The correct way is for him to explain and relate the hadith as it came. Muslim did this in his Sahih for the sahiṣa of Hammām b. Munabbīh, saying, “Muḥammad b. Ṭāfī informed us. He said, ‘Abū al-Razzāq informed us. He said, Māʾmār told us from Hammām b. Munabbīh. He said, ‘This is what Abū Hurayra transmitted to us,’ and he mentioned some of the hadith, including ‘The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, “The lowest seat of one of you in heaven is that He says to him, ‘Hope for something,’ ”’ and so forth.” Many compilers did that. God knows best.

15. When the transmitter gives the text of a hadith – or the text of the hadith and part of the isnād – before the isnād and then gives the isnād immediately after:

51 Nuskha and sahiṣa appear to have been more or less interchangeable terms for the primitive hadith collections bearing a single isnād; see M.M. Azami, Studies in Early Hadith Literature (Indianapolis, 1978), 29–30.
52 This famous nuskhah (or sahiṣa) was the hadith collection of Abū ‘Uqba Hammām b. Munabbīh al-Ṣanʿānī (ca. 40/660–ca. 101/719); Saffih, G.A.S., 1:86.
53 Jamiʿ al-Sahih, 1:114 (K. al-Imām, B. Maʿriafat šartq al-ruʿya).
for instance, the transmitter says, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said such and such,” or “Amr b. Dinâr related from Jâbir from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) such and such,” and he then says, “X informed us of it. He said, ‘Y informed us,’” and gives the isnâd to the point where it connects with what he gave before.

That is related to the case where the student places the isnâd [which his teacher gave after the text] before the text so that with the isnâd he makes the text “supported” rather than “loose.”

It has been reported that one of the earlier scholars of hadîth permitted someone who heard a hadîth from his teacher in this way to put the entire isnâd in front of the text, putting the pieces together in that fashion, if he were to desire that.

It is natural that there is a difference of opinion over this like the one over placing part of the text ahead of another part of the text. Indeed, Al-Khaṭîb related54 that some people forbid that on the basis of the doctrine that relation by paraphrase is impermissible and that other people permit it on the basis of the doctrine that relation by paraphrasing is permissible – for there is no difference in that regard between [rearranging the elements of the text of a hadîth and moving the isnâd given after the text in front of the text]. God knows best.

The practice of some of scholars of repeating the isnâd at the end of the book or volume after giving it in the beginning: this does not stir up the controversy discussed above in connection with giving the isnâd individually with each hadîth when it is related, because here the isnâd is not connected with each one of them. Rather, it serves as a confirmation and safety measure [in case the first page of the text becomes lost] and enjoys a full authorization of the highest type. God knows best.

16. When a transmitter relates a hadîth with an isnâd, follows it with another isnâd and says at the end of that isnâd, “A text like the previous one” (mithlulhû): if his student wants to give only the second isnâd and provide the wording of the hadîth given after the first isnâd, this is most obviously forbidden. We heard that the expert Abû Bakr al-Khaṭîb (God bless him) said, “Shu'ba used not to permit that. Some scholars said that that is permitted, when it is known that the original transmitter was accurate, mindful and believed in recognizing differences in wording and comparing texts letter for letter. If he is not known to be so, it is not permitted. More than one scholar, when they related something like that, used

54 This would happen when the transmitter recited the hadîth without an isnâd and his auditors then asked him for the isnâd; see Al-Khaṭîb al-Baghdâdî, Kifâyât, 211–12.
55 Kifâyât, 170–1. For Al-Khaṭîb’s discussion of rearranging the words in the text of a hadîth, see Kifâyât, 173–7.
to give the isnād and say, ‘A ḥadīth like the previous one. Its text is such and such,’ and then provide the text. This also applies when the transmitter says, ‘A text similar to the previous one’ (nahwu muhā). This is the procedure I prefer.”


When a transmitter says, “a text like the previous one,” in this situation, some regard it as if he had said, “a text like the previous one.” It was communicated to us, with an isnād, that Wāqi’ said, “Sufyān [al-Thawrī] said, ‘When a transmitter says, “a text similar to the previous one,” it is a valid ḥadīth,’ while Shu‘ba said, “a text similar to the previous one” contains doubt.” Yahyā b. Ma‘ān permitted what we stated above in regard to “a text like the previous one” and did not permit it for “a text similar to the previous one.” Al-Khaṭīb said, “This statement is in accordance with the doctrine of those who do not permit relation by paraphrase. According to the doctrine of those who permit it, there is no difference between ‘a text like the previous one’ and ‘a text similar to the previous one.’”

This has a connection to what we heard from Mas‘ūd b. ‘Alī al-Sijzi “to the effect that he heard the expert Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḵākim saying, “One of the forms of accuracy and exactitude which is incumbent on a

56 Kifāya, 212.
57 Dīya’ al-Din Abū Ahmad ‘Abd al-Wahhab b. Abī Manṣūr ‘Alī b. ‘Alī al-Baghdādī (519/1125–607/1210), known as Ibn Sukayna, was, as indicated in the passage, a teacher of Ibn al-Ṣaḥābāt. During his lifetime, he was famed for his elevated ḥadīth transmissions and his piety; Dīya’ al-Din, Siyyar, 21:502–5.
58 Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Ṣaḥīfī (384/994–469/1076) was a preacher in the mosque of Ṣaṭṭāf, a village near Baghdad. Many students sought him out as a transmitter of ḥadīth; Dīya’ al-Din, Siyyar, 18:330–2.
59 Abū ‘l-Qāsim Ḥabāb Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Isḥāq b. Sulaymān b. Ḥabāb al-Baghdādī (300/913–389/999) was a poorly known transmitter of ḥadīth; Dīya’ al-Din, Siyyar, 16:548–9.
60 Abū ‘l-Qāsim al-Baghwālī (214/829–317/929), also known as “Ibn bint [Abūd b.] Manṭī,” was a prominent transmitter of ḥadīth in Baghdad. He was a nephew of ‘Alī b. Abū al-‘Arab al-Makki; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:175.
62 Kifāya, 320.
63 Kifāya, 213–14.
64 Abū Sūfī b. Mas‘ūd b. ‘Alī al-Sijzi was a transmitter of ḥadīth praised for his accuracy who died in Nishapur in 477/1084; Dīya’ al-Din, Siyyar, 18:332–5.
hadithologist (ḥadith) is to differentiate between using ‘a text like the previous one’ and ‘a text similar to the previous one.’ It is not licit for him to say ‘a text like the previous one,’ until he learns that the texts are identical in wording while he may say ‘a text similar to the previous one,’ if they have the same sense.” God knows best.

17. When a teacher gives the isnād of a hadith, provides only the beginning of its text and then says, “And he [that is, his teacher] mentioned [the rest of] the hadith” (wa-dhakara ‘l-ḥadīth) or, “And he mentioned the hadith in its entirety” (wa-dhakara ‘l-ḥadīth bi-jāliḥt); if his student wants to relate the hadith from him in its full and complete form, it is more properly forbidden than the aforementioned case of the transmitter saying, “a text like the previous one,” or, “a text similar to the previous one.” The correct course is to make the situation clear by fully recounting what his teacher said, saying, “He said, ‘And he gave the hadith in its entirety,’” and then say, “The hadith in its entirety is such and such,” quoting it to its end. One of the scholars of hadith asked Abū ʿIshāq ʿĪsā b. Muḥammad al-Shāfiʿī [al-Isfarayinī] – the prominent expert in positive law and legal theory – about this. He said, “It is not permissible for someone who heard a hadith in this fashion to relate the hadith with its full wording.” Abū Bakr al-Barqūqī, the hadith expert and jurist, asked the hadith expert and jurist Abû Bakr al-İsmāʿīlī about someone who recited the isnād of a hadith to a teacher and then said, “And he mentioned [the rest of] the hadith.” Is it permissible for him to relate the entire hadith? He said, “When the transmitter and the reciter know that hadith, I hope it will be permitted. The evidence is best that he would give it accurately.” When we permit this, the reasoning is that the portion which the teacher did not mention is being transmitted by licensing. However, it is a certain and strong licensing in many respects. Therefore, in combination with the audition of the beginning of the text, the student is permitted to insert the remainder of the text without a license being specifically pronounced for it. God knows best.

18. It is obvious that it is not permissible to change “from the Prophet” (ṣan al-Nabi) to “from the Messenger of God” (ṣan Rasūl Allāh) (Peace be upon him), and the reverse is also true, even if transmission by paraphrase is permitted. In transmission by paraphrase, it is stipulated that the meaning [of the original wording and the paraphrased version] should not differ, but the meaning in this case is different. It is established that when “the Prophet” was in a book and the transmitter said, “from the Messenger of God” (Peace be upon him), ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿĀlī b. Ṭanbal saw his father strike out “the Prophet” and write “from the Messenger of God” (Peace be upon him). Abû Bakr al-Khaṭṭāb said, “This is unnecessary. Ahmad preferred adhering to the wording of the transmitter. However, his doctrine actually was to allow people to change the terms.”

Kifāya, 244.
al-Khaṭṭāb al-Baghdādī stated, with his isnād, that Ṣāliḥ b. Ahmad b. Ḥanbāl said, “I said to my father, ‘What do you think when “the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said” appears in a hadith and someone changes it to “the Prophet (Peace be upon him) said”?’ He said, ‘I hope that there will be nothing wrong with it.’”66 On the other hand, al-Khaṭṭāb stated, with his isnād, that Ḥammād b. Salama was transmitting hadith while ‘Affān and Bāḥz67 were before him. They began changing “the Messenger of God” (Peace be upon him) to “the Prophet” (Peace be upon him) and Ḥammād said to them, “You two will never understand.”68 God knows best.

19. When the audition of a student is in some way defective: he must state this during his subsequent transmission of that material, and neglecting to do so is a form of misrepresentation. We have examples of this from the past. One of these is when the teacher transmits to the student from memory in the course of an informal session.69 In that case, let the transmitter say, “X transmitted to us as a part of an informal session” (ḥaddathāna fīna mudhākaratun), or, “X transmitted to us in the course of an informal session” (ḥaddathāna fī i‘mudhākara). More than one of the earlier scholars used to do this. A number of experts, including ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Maḥdī and Abū Zur‘a al-Rāzī,70 used to forbid that anything be taken from them in an informal session. We also heard that from Ibn al-Mubāarak and others. That is because of the laxity which prevails in an informal session, coupled with the fact that the human memory is treacherous. For this reason, a number of prominent experts, including Ahmad b. Ḥanbal (God be pleased with all of them), used their books to transmit the material they had memorized. God knows best.

20. When a hadith is from two men, one of whom is discredited – for instance, a hadith from Thābit al-Bunā’ī and Abān b. Abī Ṭāīs from Anas – omitting the discredited transmitter from the isnād and mentioning only the reliable one “is not condoned. This is out of fear that the hadith contains something from the discredited transmitter which the reliable transmitter did not give. Ahmad b. Ḥanbal and later Abū Bakr al-Khaṭṭāb said something similar to this. Al-Khaṭṭāb said, “In cases like this, Muslim b. al-Hajjāj sometimes omitted the discredited

66 Kīfāya, 244.
67 This seems to be a reference to the transmitter Abu ‘l-Aṣwad Bahz b. Asad al-Ḍarṣ, who died in 978/813; Dāhibi, Siyār, 9:192.
68 Kīfāya, 244–5.
71 Abī Ḥanīfah Abān b. Abī ‘Ayyāsh Fāyrūz was a Basran transmitter of hadith from the second/eighth century. He was the less reliable transmitter of this pair; Bukhari, al-Tūrekkh al-kaḥīr, 1(1):454; Ibn Abī Hātim, jāmī‘, 1(1):295–6.
transmitter from the isnād, mentioning the reliable transmitter and then saying, ‘And someone else’ (wa-ākhar), in allusion to the discredited transmitter. This declaration is valueless.\(^{72}\)

In the same way, when the ḥadīth is from two reliable transmitters, the student should not omit one of them, because of the aforementioned possibility affecting it, even if in this case the danger posed by the omission is less. Refraining from the omission of a transmitter in these two scenarios is not the same as refraining from something absolutely forbidden, because the presumption is that the two relations do agree and the aforementioned possibility [that one transmission contains material not included in the other] is remote and unlikely. It is a kind of interpolation the intentional commission of which is not permitted, as was discussed above in the Category on the interpolated ḥadīth. God knows best.

21. When the student hears one part of a ḥadīth from one teacher and the other part from another, confounds them so that he is no longer able to distinguish between the two parts and ascribes the ḥadīth to both of them, explaining that part of it is from one of them and part from the other: this is permissible.

Zuhri did this in the Ḥadīth of the Lie (ḥadīth al-īfē)\(^{73}\) which he related from ‘Urwa, Ibn al-Musayyib, ‘Alqama b. Waqqās al-Layth and Ubayd Allah b. ‘Abd Allah b. Uthma” from ‘Ā’ishah (God be pleased with her). He said, “All of them transmitted to me a portion of her ḥadīth. They said, ‘She said …’”

The entire contents of that kind of ḥadīth is to be treated as if the teacher had related it ambiguously from one of the two men, so that when one of them is discredited, it is not permissible to cite any part of the ḥadīth. It is also impermissible for anyone after the mixing of the contents of the ḥadīth to omit the mention of either of the two transmitters and relate the ḥadīth solely from the other. Rather, it is necessary to mention them both and make a clear declaration that part of the ḥadīth is from one of them and part from the other. God knows best.

---

\(^{72}\) Kiyāya, 378.

\(^{73}\) For this famous story, see Alfred Guillaume, The Life of Muhammad: A Translation of Ibn Ishaq’s Strat Rasul Allah (Oxford, 1955), 494.

\(^{74}\) Abu ‘Abbād Allāh Ubayd Allāh b. ‘Abbād Allāh b. Uthba al-Hudaili (d. 98/717) was a prominent legal scholar in Medina” Dhahabi, Siyar, 4:475-9.
Some of these guidelines have already been treated where required in the previous Categories. The science of hadith is a noble science consistent with good morals and virtuous habits and incompatible with bad morals and shameful habits. It is one of the sciences of the hereafter and not of this world. Let whoever seeks to take up teaching hadith and lecturing on some of its sciences first make his intention sound and pure and cleanse his heart of earthly aims and their stains. Furthermore, let him be on guard against the affliction which comes from the love and heedlessness of rank.

There used to be disagreement over the age when it becomes suitable for a transmitter to take up teaching hadith and to be appointed to relate them. Our view is that, when the need arises for the hadith in his possession, it becomes desirable for him to take up relating and spreading them, no matter what his age is. We heard that the excellent judge Abū Muḥammad b. Khallad [al-Ramahurmuzi] (God bless him) said, “On the basis of report and reflection, it seems correct to me that the appropriate age for a transmitter to begin teaching hadith is fifty years because that is the end of middle age and when physical maturity is realized. Suḥaym b. Wathil said,

[I am] fifty years old, at the height of my powers.

The trickery of events has given me experience.

There is nothing wrong with his transmitting at forty because that is the threshold of maturity and the apogee of perfection. The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) was informed of his mission when he was forty. At forty a person’s resolution and strength reach their peak and his intellect becomes abundant and his judgement is improved.” Al-Qāḍī ‘Iyād disagreed with Ibn Khallad over this and said, “How many of the early pious forebears and other transmitters never reached that age, dying before then, but still spread hadith and knowledge beyond calculation? ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz died before forty and Sa‘īd b. Jubayr did not reach fifty,
and the same is true of Ibrahim al-Nakha’i. Malik b. Anas conducted classes for the people in his early twenties – some say at seventeen years – and the people in his class were numerous, and this was while his own teachers were still alive. Likewise, Muhammad b. Idris al-Shafi’i taught at a young age and was appointed to do that.” (God knows best.) What Ibn Khallad said is not objectionable. It should be understood that he said it regarding those who take up the transmission of hadith without the necessary proficiency in the science on their own impulse which prematurely came upon them before the age he mentioned. In that case, they should teach hadith only after attaining the age mentioned, for that is the time when there will probably be a need for their hadith. As for those whom ‘Iyad mentioned who transmitted before that, it is obvious that this was because of their precocious proficiency in this science. In combination with this early proficiency, the need for them to teach became manifest to them or they were asked to do so, either by an explicit request or through the concatenation of circumstances, so they came to transmit before the stipulated age.

The age a transmitter should desist from relating hadith: it is the age when it is feared that he may be senile or doting and that he will confuse hadith and relate hadith which are not his own. People differ according to personal circumstances as to when they reach this age. Likewise, let the transmitter who goes blind and fears that hadith that are not his own will be imposed on him desist from transmitting. Ibn Khallad said, “What pleases me the most is that he desist at eighty, because that is the threshold of senility. However, if his mind remains firm and his judgement intact, and if he knows his hadith and still occupies himself with them, taking care to transmit them in expectation of a heavenly reward; I wish the best for him.” The reason for what he said is that in most cases the condition of an eighty-year-old has become weakened, and confusion and erring are to be feared from him, and this will not be detected in him until after he has confounded his hadith. This happened to more than one reliable transmitter, including ‘Abd al-Razzag and Sa’d b. Abi ‘Aruba. Many people have taught hadith after surpassing this age and good fortune aided them and well-being accompanied them. These include the Companions Anas b. Malik, Sahl b. Sa’d, and ‘Abd Allah b. Abi Awfa, as well as Malik [b. Anas], al-Layth [b. Sa’d], [Sufyân] b. ‘Uuyayna and ‘Ali b. al-Ja’d, among a large number of early

6 Rhahurmuzi, Muhaddith al-fasîl, 354.
7 Abu ‘l-Nadr Sa’d b. Abi ‘Aruba Mihrân al-A’dad (ca. 70/689–156/773) was a Follower and renowned transmitter of hadith in al-Bagha until his reliability declined; Sezgin, G.A.S, 1:91–2.
8 Abu ‘l-‘Abbas Sahl b. Sa’d b. Malik al-Khazraj (d. ca. 90/709) was the last Companion of the Prophet to die in Medina; Duhâhib, Siyâr, 3:422–3.
9 ‘Abd Allah b. Abi Awfa was the last living Companion in al-Kûfa. He died around the year 86/705 at nearly one hundred years of age; Duhâhib, Siyâr, 3:428–30.
and late scholars. Their number includes several who transmitted hadith after attaining the age of one hundred, including al-Hasan b. 'Arafa,11 Abu 'l-Qasim al-Baghwâ, Abû Ishâq al-Hujaymi12 and the judge Abu 'l-Ṭayyib al-Ṭabarî (God be pleased with all of them). God knows best.

A transmitter should not transmit in the presence of someone more deserving of that than he. When Ibrahim al-Nakhaî and Shabî met, Ibrahim did not say anything. Someone added: “He disliked relating hadith in a city where there was a transmitter more deserving than he on account of age or some other reason.” We heard that Yahya b. Ṭa'în said, “When I transmit hadith in a city containing someone like Abû Musîhir,13 my beard should be shaved off [that is, his status as a scholar should be revoked].” We also heard from him, “Whoever transmits hadith in a town containing someone more deserving to transmit than him is stupid.” When a transmitter is asked for something which he knows to be in the possession of someone else in his city or elsewhere with a more elevated isnâd than his or an isnâd preferable for some other reason, he should tell the student about that person and guide him to him. Giving good advice is part of religion.

The transmitter should not refrain from relating hadith to someone on account of that person having an impure motive for learning hadith, for it is to be hoped that he will obtain the necessary intention later on. We heard that Ma'mar said, “People used to say, ‘Knowledge should be refused to the man who seeks it for something other than the sake of God in order that knowledge be for God (He is great and exalted).’” On the contrary, let the transmitter eagerly spread his knowledge, striving for a rich reward. Some of the pious forebears used to attract people to their hadith, including 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr (God be pleased with them). God knows best.


11 The collection of the hadith of Abû 'Abbâ al-Ḥasan b. 'Arafa (150/767–257/871), known as Jâz al-Ḥum 'Arafa, was one of the most popular works during the Ayyûbid era. At one point in his life he claimed to be 110 years old, although none of the birthdates or deathdates given for him allow this; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:134.

12 When 'Abû 'Abbâ al-Râjîm b. Ahmad al-Bukhârî found the Banû Abû Ishâq Ibrahim b. 'Abbâ al-Hujaymi (ca. 252/866–351/963), he was wearing a turban made up of a cloth wrapped around his head 103 times, indicating that he was 103 years old. He claimed that Hujaymi did not even begin to transmit until he reached the age of one hundred. Obviously there are problems with his dates; Dhuâbâb, Sâqir, 15:515–6.

13 Abû Musîhir al-Ḥaçâm b. Musîhir al-Dimâshiqa (140/757–218/833) was one of the great critics of hadith of his day; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:100–1.
Muḥammad al-Shaʿrānī informed me. He said, My grandfather transmitted to us. He said, Ismāʿīl b. Abī Uways transmitted to us. He said, "When Mālik b. Anas wanted to transmit, he used to perform his ablutions, sit on the edge of his bed and comb his beard. He sat erect, displaying gravity and reverence, and transmitted. He was asked about that and said, 'I like to honor the hadith the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). I transmit only in a state of ritual purity and sitting up straight.' He used to dislike transmitting hadith in the street or while standing or in haste. He said, 'I like to try to understand what I transmit from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him)." It is also related that before teaching hadith he used to perform the major ablution, fumigate his beard with incense and put on scent. If someone raised his voice in his class, he scolded him saying, "God (He is exalted) said, 'Those of you who believe do not raise your voice over that of the Prophet.'" Whenever someone raises his voice during the recitation of the hadith of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), it is as if he raised his voice over that of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him)."

We heard, or read, that the jurist Muhammad b. Ahmad b. ‘Abd Allah said, "When the reciter of the hadith of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) stands up for anyone [out of special respect, when that person enters the room], a sin is recorded against him." It is better for him, as well as the participants in his class, to follow what was reported from Ḥabib b. Abī Thābit, who said, "It is a sunna for a person to receive people, all of them, in a kindly fashion when he transmits hadith to them." God knows best.

The transmitter should not reel off the hadith in such a fashion that some of them cannot be grasped.

Let the transmitter open and close his class with an invocation and prayer appropriate for the occasion. One of the most eloquent ways to open a class is by saying, "The most perfect praise belongs to God, Lord of the Worlds, under all circumstances. The most complete prayers and peace on the chief of the Messengers, whenever the heedful remember him and whenever the heedless neglect to remember him. God, pray over him, his family, the rest of the prophets, the family of each of them and the rest of the righteous to the greatest extent that it is right to ask for."

---

14 Abu ‘l-Ḥasan Ismāʿīl al-Shaʿrānī was best known for his hadith transmissions from his father and grandfather. He died in Baybaq in 347/958; Samān, Anṣār, 3:433.
15 Abu Muhammad al-Fadl b. Muhammad al-Shaʿrānī (d. 282/895) claimed that he had studied hadith in every part of the Islamic world, with the exception of al-Andalus. He was a chief transmitter of a number of significant works; Dīghah, Sīyar, 13:317–19.
16 Qurʾān 49:2.
17 Abu Zayd Muhammad b. Ahmad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Marwazi (301/914–371/982) was an important figure in the history of the Shafīʿite law school; Dīghah, Sīyar, 16:313–15.
18 Abu Ya‘lā al-Ḥabīb b. Abī Thābit al-Qurashi (d. ca. 120/738) was one of the chief hadith transmitters in al-Kūf; Dīghah, Sīyar, 5:288–91.
It is desirable for a knowledgeable transmitter to convene a session for the dictation of hadith, for it is one of the highest classes of transmitters. Audition in such a session is one of the best and strongest ways to take up hadith. When the crowd is large, let him take on a repetitor (mustamîl) to broadcast from him. That is the custom of the greatest transmitters who undertook something like this. It was related that Malik, Shu'ba, Waki', Abu 'Aashim, Yazid b. Harun and a large number of other prominent earlier figures did that. Let his repetitor be educated and alert, in order that what we heard about Yazid b. Harun not befal him. Yazid was asked about a hadith and said, “Several (‘amma) transmitted it to us.” His repetitor shouted to him, “Abu Khalid, who is ‘several’s’ father?” He replied, “Several, son of May I lose you!” Let the repetitor do his repeating elevated on a chair or something similar. If he cannot find anything suitable, let him perform his duty standing. He has to adhere to the wording of the transmitter and pass it on completely without any divergence. The benefit of the action of the repetitor is that someone who hears the words of the dictator from a distance attains an understanding and confirmation of what he is saying through the announcing of the repetitor. Those who hear only the speech of the repetitor [that is, those who cannot hear the dictator at all] do not thereby gain permission to relate the material directly from the dictator without explaining the circumstances. A discussion of that appeared above, in Category 24.

It is recommended that the class be opened with someone reciting part of the exalted Qur'an. When he finishes, if there is some noise, the repetitor should ask the participants in the class to be silent. Then he should say, “In the name of God, the Compassionate and Merciful,” praise God (He is blessed and exalted) and invoke blessings on the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), trying to be as eloquent as possible in that, and turn to the transmitter and say, “Whomever you mention or whatever you mention, may God bless you” – or, “may God have mercy on you” or something similar. God knows best.

Every time the transmitter mentions the Prophet (Peace be upon him), he should invoke blessings upon him. Al-Khatib said that he should raise his voice for that. When he comes across a mention of a Companion, he should say, “God be pleased with him” (râdiya Allahu ‘anhu).

It befits the transmitter to praise his teacher appropriately when he relates from him. Indeed, several of the pious forebears and scholars did that. For example, it is related that when Aba b. Abi Rabah transmitted from ‘Abd Allah b. Abbas (God be pleased with them), he said, “The sea [of knowledge] (al-bahr) transmitted to me;” and that Waki’ said, “Sufyân [al-Thawri], the prince of the

19 Fa-‘insha min al-a‘la mara‘ith al-rāwin; the meaning of his clause is unclear to me. Nawawi replaced al-rāwin with al-risāyā (transmission) in this passage; al-Taqrîb is-‘l-Nawawi (Cairo, 1388/1968), 38.
20 Aba ‘Aashim al-Dahhak b. Mahkâd b. al-Dahhak al-Shaybânî al-Nabîl (122/740-ca. 212/827) was a respected transmitter of hadith; Dhahabi, Sîyar, 9:480-8.
21 Same, 297.
believers in ḥadith, transmitted to us." More important than that is the prayer for the teacher at the mention of his name. Let the transmitter not neglect that.

There is nothing wrong with the transmitter referring to someone he relates from with a nickname (laqab) he is known by, as Ghundar (troublemaker) is the nickname of Muhammad b. Ja'far,\(^{22}\) the student of Shu'ba, and Luwāy r (party-colored) is the nickname of Muḥammad b. Sulaymān al-Miṣṣīṣi.\(^{22}\) Or he may refer to his teacher by a maternal reference he is known by. For instance, Munya was the mother — or, it was said, the paternal grandmother — of the Companion Ya' ḥ b. Munya,\(^{22}\) and his father was Umayya. He may also refer to his teacher by reference to a bodily infirmity he was known for, for instance Sulaymān al-A'mash (Bleary-eyed Sulaymān) and 'Aṣim al-Abwal (Cross-eyed 'Āṣim). All of this may be done unless the person referred to dislikes it. That was the case with Ismā'īl b. Ibrāhīm,\(^{23}\) known as "Ibn Ulayya." Ulayya was his mother — or, it was said, his maternal grandmother. We heard that Yahya b. Ma'in used to say, "Ismā'īl b. Ulayya transmitted to us," and Ahmad b. Hanbal forbade it. He said, "Say, 'Ismā'īl b. Ibrāhīm.' I read that he did not use to like being referred to by the name of his mother."\(^{24}\) Yahyyā b. Ma'in replied, "We accept that from you, teacher of what is good."

It has been recommended that the transmitter dictate ḥadith from a number of his teachers, giving first the one with the most elevated isnād or the best for some other reason. He should dictate a single ḥadith from each of his teachers, choosing the ḥadith with elevated isnāds and short texts. That is best and most appropriate procedure. He should be discriminating in the ḥadith he dictates and carefully consider the material he is to teach. He should draw attention to the lesson and elevation of the ḥadith and what makes it special. He should avoid those things which the intellect of those present cannot grasp and those things he fears will introduce a misconception into their thinking.

It was the custom of some of those we have mentioned to conclude the session of dictation with stories, humorous tales and verses, with their isnāds; and that is fine. God knows best.

When the transmitter finds himself incapable of bringing forth a ḥadith he wants to dictate, there is nothing wrong with his asking one of the experts present at that moment for help and his bringing it forth for him. Al-Khaṭīb said, "A number of our teachers used to do that."\(^{25}\)

\(^{22}\) Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Hudhālī al-Ṭairī (ca. 110/728–193/809) studied with Shu'ba for twenty years; Dhabāb, Siyār, 9:98–102. The story behind his nickname is discussed in Category 52.

\(^{23}\) Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Sulaymān was a scholar of ḥadith who died in Adana around 245/859 at, it is said, over one hundred years of age; Sezgin, G.A.S, 1:112.

\(^{24}\) Ya' ḥ b. Munya (d. ca. 60/680) transmitted about twenty ḥadīths; Dhabāb, Siyār, 3:100–1, s.n. Yā ḥ b. Umayyya.

\(^{25}\) Abū Bishr Ismā’īl b. Ibrāhīm b. Miṣṣam al-Asadī (110/728–193/809) was one of the greatest transmitters of his era; Dhabāb, Siyār, 9:107–20.

\(^{26}\) When a person was referred to with the name of his mother, there was sometimes an implication that his birth was illegitimate and the identity of his father was unknown.

\(^{27}\) Al-Khaṭīb al-Ṯirā'ī discusses this question in Kīfāya, 216–17.
When the session of dictation is finished, there is no dispensing with collating the material, checking that it is accurate and correcting what became corrupted by a slip of the pen or an ink blot.

These are the key guidelines for the transmitter. We will be content with them in order to avoid prolixity by discussing matters which are either less important or obvious and unambiguous. God is the one who grants success. He knows best.
Category 28

GUIDELINES FOR THE STUDENT OF ḤADĪTH
(Maʿrīfah adab ṣalib al-ḥadīth)

Some of these have already been treated above. The first thing incumbent on the student is to achieve true sincerity and to be on guard against taking up the study of ḥadīth as a means to gain some worldly aim. We heard Ḥammād b. Salama (God be pleased with him) said, "Whoever studies ḥadīth for a reason other than for the sake of God is deluded." We heard that Sufyān al-Thawrī (God be pleased with him) said, "I know of no deed better than studying ḥadīth for someone who seeks God through it." We also heard something similar from Ibn al-Mubārak (God be pleased with him). One of the most likely reasons for making correct one's intention in the study of ḥadīth is the one we heard from Abū ʿAmmār Ismāʿīl b. Nuṭayd. He asked Abū Jaffār Ahmad b. Ḥamdān - and they were both righteous men - "With what intention should I write ḥadīth?" He said, "Do you not see that blessings come down at the mention of righteous people?" He said yes and Abū Jaffār said, "The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) is the chief of the righteous people." So let the student ask God (He is blessed and exalted) for help, support, success and guidance. Let him adopt for himself pure morals and pleasing manners. Indeed, we heard that Abū ʿĀṣim al-Nabīl said, "Whoever studies these ḥadīth studies the most elevated of religious matters. He needs to be the best kind of person."

There is a difference of opinion which was discussed above, at the beginning of Category 24, over the recommended age to begin hearing and writing ḥadīth. When the student starts to study ḥadīth, let him buckle down and work hard. He should begin by hearing ḥadīth from the teacher in his city with the best isnad and the one most worthy from the standpoint of knowledge, fame, nobility, and so forth, and then the next most worthy. When he finishes hearing the elevated and important ḥadīth of his own town, let him travel to other lands. We heard that Yahyā b. Maʿīn said, "There are four people in whom you cannot detect any proper behavior: the watchman of a street, the herald of a judge, the son of a ḥadīth transmitter and the man who writes ḥadīth in his own land and does not travel to study ḥadīth." We heard that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (God be pleased with him) was asked, "Should a man travel to acquire elevation in ḥadīth?" He said, "Yes, by God! Energetically!" Ḥadīth from ʿUmar [b. al-Khaṭṭāb] (God be pleased with him) used to reach ʿAlqama [b. Qays] and al-Aswād and they were not satisfied with them until they went to ʿUmar and heard them from him directly."

1 Abū ʿAmmār Ismāʿīl b. Nuṭayd al-Sulami (272/885–365/975) was a transmitter of ḥadīth known for his piety; Sezgin, G.4S, 1:183.
2 Abū Sallam al-Aswād b. Ḥilāl al-Kuṭbī (d. 84/703) was a Follower born in pre-Islamic times; Dīlahābi, Šijar, 4:257.
God knows best. We heard that Ibrāhīm b. Adham al-Ḥāljī (God be pleased with him) said, “God (He is exalted) deflects adversity from this Community through the traveling of the scholars of hadith.”

Acquisitiveness and greed should not cause the student to become lax in audition and taking up hadith and fail to achieve what is stipulated for him in that regard in the fashion explained above.

Let the student put into practice the hadith he hears pertaining to prayer, praising God and other virtuous acts. That is the tithe of hadith, according to what we heard from the righteous man Bishr b. al-Ḥarīth al-Ḥāljī (God be pleased with him). We also heard that he said, “Scholars of hadith, pay the tithe of these hadith! For every two hundred hadith, put five into practice.” We heard that ‘Amr b. Qays al-Mu‘ādz (God be pleased with him) said, “When you read about something good, do it. Even if you do it only once, you will be a practitioner of it.” We heard that Wāḥib said, “If you want to learn hadith, put them into practice!”

Let the student exalt his teacher and whomever else he hears hadith from. That is part of the glorification of hadith and knowledge. He should not pester his teacher, nor take up so much of his time that he annoys him. It is feared that whoever does that will be kept from receiving any benefit. Indeed, we heard that Zuhri said, “When the class goes on too long, the Devil takes part in it.”

The student who succeeds in acquiring the audition of a particular teacher and conceals it from others so that he alone will be distinguished by it is unworthy of benefiting from it. That is one of the forms of wickedness into which ignorant and low students fall.

Teaching is one of the first benefits of studying hadith. We heard that Mālik (God be pleased with him) said, “One of the blessings of hadith is teaching one another.” We heard that Ishaq b. Ibrāhīm b. Rāhawayh said to one member of a group that heard hadith from him, “Copy the hadith I have recited from their book.” The student replied, “They will not let me.” ‘Abd al-Rahawayh said, “Then, by God, they will not prosper. We have seen many people who forbade this audition, and, by God, they did not prosper or find success!” We too have seen people who forbade audition and they did not prosper or find success. We ask God for well-being. God knows best.

Let the student not be one of those whom bashfulness or pride keep from collecting large numbers of hadith. We heard that Muṣṭafā (God be pleased with him) said, “The bashful person and the prideful person cannot acquire knowledge.” We heard that ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb and his son (God be pleased

3 Abū Ishaq Ibrāhīm b. Adham al-Ḥāljī was a famous early mystic. He was born in Balkh around 112/730 and is said to have been a prince. He moved to Syria and led a wandering existence living off the fruits of his own labor until his death around 161/778; *EF*, 3:985–6.

4 Abū Nasr Bishr b. al-Ḥarīth al-Ḥāljī (ca. 150/767–ca. 227/841) was an influential early mystic; *EF*, 1:1244–6; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:638.

with them) said, “Whosoever’s face is soft [that is, whosoever is bashful], his knowledge is soft.” He should not be too haughty to write hadith from which he will derive benefit from someone inferior to him. We heard that Waki’ b. al-Jarrāh (God be pleased with him) said, “A scholar of hadith does not become noble until he writes hadith from someone superior to him, someone of the same rank and someone inferior to him.

Someone who wastes any of his time trying to study with many teachers merely to acquire the reputation of having had many teachers and the fame that comes with that will not be successful. The words of Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī do not refer to this; that is, “When you write hadith, take everything. When you transmit, be selective.”

Let the student write and hear the books and personal collections that he comes across in their entirety, not just excerpts. Ibn al-Mubārak (God be pleased with him) said, “I never made excerpts of a scholar’s hadith without regretting it later.” We heard that he also said, “Someone cannot take excerpts from the transmission of a scholar without it being a sin.” We heard or read that Yahyā b. Ma’in said, “Those who excerpt hadith will come to regret it later when their regret will do them no good.” If circumstances make it difficult for the student to take all of a transmitter’s hadith and he is compelled to be selective and make excerpts, he should take that on personally, if he is qualified, discriminating and knowledgeable of the hadith suitable for selection and excerpting. If he is not up to that, he should seek the help of one of the experts to make the excerpts for him. A number of experts used to engage in selecting the hadith of their own teachers while the students listened to and recorded their selections, including Ibn Abī Ḥātim b. Uramah al-İşbahānī,6 Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-İ-Husayn b. Muḥammad – known as ‘Ubayd al-İjāl’ – Abū ’l-İ-Ḥasan al-Dāraquṭnī and Abū Bakr al-İjābī, among others. The prevailing custom was for the expert to draw a sign on the selected hadith in the text of the teacher. Abū ’l-İ-Ḥasan al-İ-Nu‘aymī used to mark his selections with an elongated letter şād; Abū Muḥammad al-Khallāl7 with an elongated letter šād and Abū ’l-İ-Fadl al-İ-Falakī8 with the shape of two hamzas. All of them made their

6 Abī İsaq İbrahim b. Uramah (or Urame) al-İşbahānī was an early expert in hadith who died at the end of 266/880; Dhabayh, Sijar, 13:145–6.
7 ‘Ubayd al-İjāl was a student of Yahyā b. Ma’in who died in 294/907 in his eighties. Other sources give his ikhya as Abī ‘Ali; Dhabab, Sijar, 14:90–1.
8 Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. ʿUmar b. Muḥammad al-İjābī (284/897–355/966) was a Shiite scholar of hadith who served as a judge in Mosul; Dhabab, Sijar, 16:88–92.
signs in ink in the right margin of the page. Dāraquṭnī marked the chosen ḥadīth with a broad line of red ink in the left margin and the expert Abu ‘l-Qāsim al-Lālakāh composed used to mark them with a short penstroke in red at the beginning of the isnād of the selected ḥadīth. There is no problem with any of that; to each his own.

The student of ḥadīth should not limit himself to hearing ḥadīth and writing them down, without trying to gain knowledge from them and understand them. Then he would have worn himself out without accomplishing anything and without entering into the ranks of the scholars of ḥadīth. Rather, he would not become anything more than one of the deficient imitators who attempt to adorn themselves with something they actually lack. Abu ‘l-Muẓaffar, the son of the expert Abū Sa‘d al-Sumṣānti (God bless him), personally declaimed to me in the city of Marv. He said, My father declaimed to us, either personally or by recitation to him. He said, Muḥammad b. Naṣir al-Salāmī himself declaimed to us. He said, The surpassing litterateur Fāris b. al-Ḥusayn himself declaimed to me

Student whose time has come to transmit,
In transmitting, pay attention to transmitting and understanding
Transmit only a few ḥadīth and husband them carefully
for knowledge is infinite.

Let the student first direct his attention to the two Ṣaḥīḥs [that is, those of Bukhārī and Muslim], then Abū Dāwūd’s Sunan, Naṣāḥ’s Sunan and the book of Tirmidhī, mastering their difficulties and attempting to understand their obscurities. He should not be misled about Bayhaqī’s Kitāb al-Sunan al-kabīr, for we do not know the like of it in its field. Then, he should devote himself to the rest of the works a scholar of ḥadīth has need of, including the musnads, like Musnad Ahmad [ibn Hanbal]; the comprehensive collections arranged by legal topic containing supported and unsupported ḥadīth and Malik’s Muwāṣṣa is the foremost of these; the books on the defects in ḥadīth (ṣilal al-ḥadīth) – Abūl Ḥanīfa’s Kitāb al-Tilāl” (The Book of Defects) and Dāraquṭnī’s Kitāb al-Tilāl” are among the finest of these; the books containing information about transmitters and when they lived – Bukhārī’s al-Tarīkh al-kabīr (Great History) and Ibn Abī Ḥātim’s Kitāb al-Jarḥ wa-l-ta’dīl (Book of Personality Criticism) are among the best of these; and the books on clarifying

---

13 The sources I consulted take no notice of this poet.
14 Kitāb al-Tilal wa-mu‘ārifat al-rijāl, 2 vols (İstanbul, 1987).
problematic names – the most complete of these is *al-Ikmāl* (Perfection) of Abū Naṣr b. Mākūlā.¹⁶

Whenever the student encounters a problematic name or difficult word in a ḥadith, let him research it and commit it to memory. That way he will easily gain a good deal of knowledge.

Let him memorize ḥadith gradually, little by little, over several days and nights. That is the best way for him to master the material to be learned. That practice is reported from a number of early experts in ḥadith, including Shu'ba, Ibn ʿUlayya and Maʿmār. We heard that Maʿmar said, “I heard Zuḥrī saying, ‘Whoever seeks knowledge as a whole, loses it as a whole. Knowledge is acquired only a ḥadīth or two at a time.’”¹⁷

Let exactitude be the student’s concern. ‘Abd al-ʿRaḥmān b. Māhīṯ said, “Learning is exactitude.”

Repeating to others ḥadith one is trying to memorize is one of the most powerful ways to master them. We heard that ʿAlqama [b. Qays] al-Nakhaṭ said, “Repeat the ḥadith amongst yourselves! They live through being spoken,” and “Whoever is pleased to learn ḥadīth, let him transmit them; even if he has to transmit them to someone who does not desire them.”

Let the student occupy himself with compiling, composing and arranging, when he becomes ready and qualified for that. As the expert al-Khaṭib said, “It makes the memory firm, kindles the heart, hones one’s character, improves clarity, uncovers the unclear, brings good repute and immortalizes one to the end of time. Rarely does one become adept in the science of ḥadīth, fathom its obscurities and discern its hidden points without doing that.”¹⁸ The expert Sūrī – Muḥammad b. ‘Alī¹⁹ – transmitted, saying, “I saw the expert Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Ǧāḥī b. Saʿīd in a dream and he said to me, ‘Abū ʿAbd Allāh, compile and arrange before it becomes impossible for you. This is my case. You see that it has become impossible for me.’”¹⁹

The scholars of ḥadīth followed two courses in arranging the material.

1. Arrangement by legal topic (ʿalaʾl-ʿubāb): this is the inclusion of ḥadith according to the legal issue, and so forth that they address, and grading them by type,²⁰

---


¹⁷ *Jāmiʿ*, 415.


¹⁹ This is a curious anecdote. The implication would seem to be that ‘Abd al-Ǧāḥī b. Saʿīd died without writing anything, although that was far from being the case.

²⁰ *Wu-tawwāfuhu wa-wawdān*: it is very difficult to divine what the *wa-waw* are supposed to be here. This section is closely based on al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādi’s *Jāmiʿ* (pp. 417–18), where *wa-waw* is
brining together the relevant material for each legal issue and each type, subject by subject.

2. Arrangement of the hadith by musnad (الMasā'id) and the collection of the hadith of each Companion individually, even if the types of the hadith differ: those who choose this approach may order the Companions alphabetically by name. He may also order them by tribe, beginning with the Banū Hāshim [that is, the tribe of the Prophet], and then the closest in regard to blood ties to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) and then the next closest. He may also order the Companions by the various measures of precedence applied to them. So he should begin with the Ten [who were granted the glad tidings of their acceptance into Paradise]; then the Muslim participants in the battle of Badr, then the people of al-Ḥudaybiya, then those who converted to Islam and went to Medina after the time of al-Ḥudaybiya and before the conquest of Mecca. He should conclude with the youngest Companions, like Abu ʿUṯmān and his peers, and finally the women. This is the best way, and the first [that is, alphabetical arrangement] is the easiest. There are also other arrangements.

One of the most elevated ways to arrange hadith is the analytical (muqalla) which collects the chains of transmission for each hadith and notes the differences in the transmitters of it. Yaʿqūb b. Shayba did this in his Musnad.

Another kind of composition with which some occupy themselves is the collection of teachers (jam' al-shuyukh); that is, the collection of the hadith of particular teachers, each one of them separately. ʿUṯmān

---

1. used both as a synonym of ḥab (legal topic) and in reference to the quality of the isnād attached to the hadith; that is, he says that the two nauwās are supported (musnad) and unsupported (maqūf and mursāl).
21. In addition to the four caliphs, Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUṯmān, and ʿAlī, the Ten included Tāhā, al-Zubayr, ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. ʿAwf, Saʿd b. Abī Waqqās and Saʿd b. Zayd. There was a disagreement as to whether the tenth was Abī Ubayd b. al-Jarrāḥ or the Prophet himself; EF, 1:693.
22. In the year 6/628, during the negotiations with the pagans of the village of al-Ḥudaybiya outside of Mecca, the Muslims made the Pledge of Good Pleasure (bayʿat al-rafāʿ), promising to obey the Prophet; EF, 3:539.
24. This work is described in al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Taʾrīkh Baghdad, 14:281 and Ḥāfiz Khālidī, Kashf, 2:cols. 1678–9 (as Musnad Ibn Shayba Yaʿqūb al-hāfīz). If it had been completed, it would have been enormous. The portion which has survived was published in Beirut in 1940. According to Sakhāwī, the purpose of this approach was to facilitate the exposure of anomalies in the lines of transmission; for instance, hidden cases of irād (looseness); Fath al-Muquth, 2:342–3.
b. Sa‘id al-Dārimi\textsuperscript{25} said, "It is said that whoever does not collect the hadith of these five is bankrupt in hadith: Sufyān [al-Thawrī], Shu‘ba, Mālik, Ḥammād b. Zayd and [Sufyān] b. Uwayna. They are the bases of right religion." The scholars of hadith collect the hadith of many people beside those Dārimi mentioned, including Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī, Zuhārī and Awza‘ī. 

They also collect "headings" (tarājim) and these are isnāds, singling out the texts they appear with and collecting them in book form, like the heading of Mālik from Nāṣirī from [‘Abd Allah] b. ‘Umar, the heading of Suhayl b. ‘Abī Salīh from his father [that is, ‘Abī Salīh Dhakwān] b. ‘Abd Allah al-Sammān] from Abū Hurayra, the heading of Fīshām b. ‘Urwa from his father [‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr] from ‘Ā’isha and there are many similar ones. 

They also collect individual chapters from the comprehensive books arranged according to legal issue, for instance the chapter on seeing God (He is great and exalted) in the hereafter (ru‘yāt Allāh), the chapter on raising the hands in prayer (ra‘ al-yadayn), the chapter on recitation behind the prayer leader (al-qirā‘a khalfā ‘l-imām), and so forth. Then they put them separately in book form, so they become individual monographs.\textsuperscript{26}

They also treat certain hadith separately, collecting their lines of transmission in individual monographs, like the lines of transmission of the hadith regarding the taking away of knowledge (qabāl al-‘ilm) and the hadith regarding the major ablution on Friday (al-ghusl ‘aynu ‘l-jum‘a), and so forth.

Earlier scholars collected and arranged in monographs the hadith belonging to many of the Categories treated in this book of ours. 

In all of this, the student must make his purpose sound and be on guard against the aim of merely striving for large numbers and the like. We read that Ḥamza b. Muḥammad al-Kinānī published a single hadith with about two hundred lines of transmission and was pleased with that. He saw Yahyā b. Ma‘ān in a dream and mentioned that to him. Yahyā b. Ma‘ān replied, "I fear this comes under the heading of ‘Your goal is competition in quantity.’"\textsuperscript{27}


\textsuperscript{26} Sakhawi lists a number of such books in \textit{Fath al-Mukhtār}, 2:343.

\textsuperscript{27} Qur‘ān, 102:1.
Let the student be careful to bring forth his compositions to the public only after he has polished, refined and reviewed them again and again.

Let the student be on guard against collecting something he is not yet qualified for in an attempt to reap the fruit and seize the profit of collecting it. This way the verdict against him will not be the one we heard from ʿAli b. al-Madini, “When you see a youth who, the first time he records hadith, collects the hadith regarding the major ablution (hadith al-ghusl) and the hadith ‘Whoever ascribes a lie …’ (hadith man kadhaba) write on the nape of his neck, ‘He will not prosper.’”

This book is an entryway into the study of hadith, an attempt to make clear its main and secondary issues and to explain the terminology, aims and concerns of its practitioners. Ignorance of these matters greatly impairs a transmitter. This book is — God willing — worthy of receiving attention before any other. We beseech God (He is praised) for His great grace. He knows best.
In the first place, the principle of the isnād is an excellent characteristic of this community and an outstanding example of a confirmed sunna. I heard from more than one source that ʿAbd Allah b. al-Mubārak (God be pleased with him) said, “The isnād is part of religion. If it were not for the isnād, whoever wanted would have said whatever he wanted.” Seeking elevation (ṣulūq) in ḥadīth is also a sunna. For that reason, undertaking journeys was recommended, as stated above.1 Ahmad b. Ḥanbal (God be pleased with him) said, “Seeking an elevated isnād is a sunna from those who came before.” Indeed, we heard that in his final illness Yahyā b. Maʿīn (God be pleased with him) was asked, “What do you desire?” He replied, “An empty house and an elevated isnād.”

Elevation keeps defectiveness away from the isnād, because it is possible for defectiveness to come, either inadvertently or deliberately, from every transmitter in the isnād. Therefore, a small number of transmitters represents a small number of sources of defectiveness and a large number of men represents a large number of sources of defectiveness. This much is patently clear. The elevation sought in the transmission of ḥadīth has five subcategories:

1. Proximity (qurh) to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) through a clean, unweak isnād;2 that is one of the most noble types of elevation. We heard that the ascetic and scholar Muḥammad b. Aslam al-Ṭust3 (God be pleased with him) said, “Proximity in the isnād is proximity” — or “a means to gain proximity” — “to God (He is exalted and great).” He is right, because proximity in the isnād is proximity to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) and proximity to him is proximity to God (He is exalted and great).

2. The second subcategory is the one the expert Abū ʿAbd Allah al-Ḥākim mentioned,4 that is, proximity to one of the authorities of ḥadīth, even if there are a large number of intermediaries between that authority and the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him): when that is found in an isnād, it is described as elevation in view of its proximity to that authority, even if it is not elevated in relation to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). The remarks of al-Ḥākim

---

1 See p. 173.
2 Bi-isnād nazīf ghayr ḍalīf: This does not seem to have been a technical formulation, although its basic significance seems clear.
3 Abū ʿl-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. Aslam al-Ṭust (ca. 180/796–242/856) was an early mystic; Dhahabi, Siyar, 12:195–207.
4 Ulūm al-ḥadīth, 11.
create the false impression that proximity to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) is not counted as a desirable form of elevation at all. This is an error regardless of who says it, because proximity to the Prophet (Peace be upon him) with a clean, unweak isnad is more deserving of being called “elevation” and no one who possesses a grain of knowledge can dispute that. It would seem that al-Ḥakīm sought by these remarks of his to establish the validity of elevation in an isnad based on its proximity to an authority, even if the isnad is not close to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), and to censure those who in this regard pay attention to the mere proximity of the isnad to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), even if it is a weak isnad. For that reason, he gave the hadith of Abu Hudha, Dīnār, al-Ashārī and their peers as examples of proximity to the Prophet. God knows best.

3. Elevation in relation to the transmission of one or both of the Sahīhs [that is, those of Bukhārī and Muslim] or the other famous, authoritative books: the “agreements” (munāfaqāt), “substitutions” (adāl), “equivalence” (musāwāt) and “hand-shaking” (muṣāfaha) which have lately become famous refer to this. Later transmitters of hadith have come to pay a good deal of attention to this type of elevation. Some of those whom I found mentioning this type of elevation in their remarks are the expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb, some of his teachers, Abū Naṣr b. Makūla, Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥumaydī and others of their generation as well as those who came after them.

Agreement (munāfaqā): it is when a hadith comes to you from the teacher who transmitted it to Muslim, for instance, with an elevated isnad with fewer intermediaries than the hadith has when you relate it from Muslim from his teacher.

Substitution (ḥadāl): an example of this would be that for a particular hadith the same elevation described above comes to you from a teacher other than the teacher of Muslim. Sometimes “substitution” is called

---

5 This is a reference to a passage in Ulum al-Hadith (pp. 9–10). All of these individuals were shameless liars who claimed to be much older than they actually were in order to make their hadith attractive to gullible students seeking short isnads. Abu Hudha Ibnthum b. Hudha al-Fiṭrāl died shortly after the year 200/816 and claimed to be a student of the Companion Anas b. Malik (d. ca. 90/709); Dhadhab, Mizān, 1:71–2; Ibn Hajar, Lisan, 1:119–21. Similarly, in the year 249/865 Abu Mīkīyās Dīnār b. ‘Abd Allāh (not “Abd Allāh b. Dīnār” as in Ulum al-Hadith) al-Khaṭīb written directly from Anas; Dhadhab, Mizān, 2:30–1; Ibn Hajar, Lisan, 2:424–5. According to al-Ḥakīm, Abu ‘I-Dunya ‘Uthmān b. al-Khaṭīb b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Asārī al-Maghribī maintained that he had been a servant of the caliph ‘Alī and was kicked by his mule.

6 This, of course, is rather vague and later writers on the subject do not offer much help. As in the example Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ provided, it appears that this term was most often applied to cases where the student’s and the compiler’s isnads intersect at the level of the teacher of the compiler’s teacher. An example cited by Suyūṭī seems to indicate that the intersection could also occur earlier in the line of transmission; Tadhkīr al-Rāwī, 2:166.
“agreement” so the example we cited may be said to be “an elevated agreement in respect to the teacher of Muslim’s teacher.” Even if the isnād had not been elevated, it still would have been an instance of “agreement” and “substitution.” However, [in practice] these terms would not be applied to a unelevated isnād, because there is no interest in that kind of hadith.

*Equivalence (musāwāh):* in our day, it is when the number of intermediaries in your isnād is fewer, not to the teacher of Muslim and his peers nor to the teacher of his teacher, but rather to someone more remote than that, like the Companion or someone near him – and this may even be to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) – so that the number of intermediaries between you and, for instance, the Companion is the same as the number between Muslim and that Companion. So you are therefore “equal” (musāwiyān) to, for instance, Muslim in regard to proximity of isnād and the number of transmitters in the isnād.

*Hand-shaking (musāfaha):* This is when the “equivalence” we described belongs to your teacher rather than to you. So you have “hand-shaking” because it is as if you had in that ḥadith “met” Muslim and “shook hands with him” through it, on account of your having met your teacher who is “equal” to Muslim. If the “equivalence” belongs to the teacher of your teacher, the hand-shaking goes to your teacher. So you can say, “It is as if my teacher heard Muslim and shook his hand.” If the “equivalence” belongs to the teacher of your teacher’s teacher, then the hand-shaking belongs to your teacher’s teacher. Then you can say regarding it, “It is as if the teacher of my teacher heard Muslim and shook his hand.” It is better that you do not mention any connection to yourself for that, but rather say, “It is as if X heard it from Muslim,” without saying for it, “My teacher” or “The teacher of my teacher.”

It will not remain hidden to someone who gives it some thought that, in a case of “equivalence” and “hand-shaking” accruing to you, your isnād and the isnād of Muslim, or someone like him, will converge only at a distance from the teacher of Muslim; for example, on the Companion or someone close to him. If the “hand-shaking” which you mention does not belong to you, but rather to one of the transmitters above you in your isnād, the convergence of the two isnāds can happen at the teacher of Muslim or his peers and the “hand-shaking” then is mixed with “agreement.” The sense of “agreement” refers to a special form of “equivalence” and “hand-shaking” since it means that one of the earlier transmitters of your elevated isnād was “equal” to or “shook hands” with Muslim or Bukhārī, because that transmitter heard the hadith from someone who heard it from the teacher of Bukhārī or Muslim [in the case of “hand-shaking”], despite the posteriority of that transmitter’s generation in relation to theirs. For the reason we gave, one finds instances of “hand-shaking” along with the
“agreements” and “substitutions” in many of the elevated ḥadith supplied by those who first spoke about this Category and their contemporaries.

Be aware that this type of elevation is elevation dependant on lowness (nuzūl), since if it were not for the lowness of the authority in his isnād, you would not be elevated in your isnād. In Marv I had recited to our prolific teacher Abu ʿl-Mazażāf̄r ʿAbd al-Raḥmān – the son of the author Abū Saʿd al-Sanʿānī (God bless them) – from the Collection of Forty Ḥadith (arbaʿī) of Abu ʿl-Barakāt al-Furāṭi a ḥadith regarding which Furāṭi claimed that it was as if he himself – or his teacher – had heard it from Bukhārī. The teacher Abu ʿl-Mazażāf̄r said, “It is not elevated in relation to you, rather it is low in relation to Bukhārī.” This is a good and clever response which takes this type of elevation down a notch. God knows best.

4. One of the types of elevation is the elevation derived from a transmitter dying early. An illustration of this is a ḥadith I relate from a teacher who informed me from someone else from the expert Bayhaqi from the expert Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥakīm. It is more elevated than my relation of that same hadith from a teacher who informed me from someone from Abū Bakr b. Khalaf7 from al-Ḥakīm, despite both isnāds having the same number of intermediaries, because Bayhaqi predeceased Ibn Khalaf. Bayhaqi died in 458 [1066 AD] and Ibn Khalaf in 487 [1094 AD]. We heard that the expert Abū Yaʿlā al-Khalīfī b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Khalīfī (God – He is exalted – bless him) said, “Sometimes one isnād is more elevated than another because its transmitter died earlier, even if both are equal in the number of intermediaries.” As an example of this he cited one of his own hadith similar to the one I mentioned above. This is a discussion of elevation based on priority of death derived from the comparison of one teacher with another and the measuring of one against another.

As for elevation derived solely from your teacher dying early without regard to measuring him against another transmitter, one of the people concerned with this made the threshold fifty years. That is what we heard from Abū ʿAli al-Ḥāfiz al-Nisābūrī. He said, “I heard Aḥmad b. ʿUmayr al-Dimashqī – and he was one of the pillars of ḥadith – saying, “The isnād of fifty years from the death of the teacher is an isnād possessing elevation.” One of the things that we hear from the expert Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. Mānaṣir is that he said, “When thirty years elapse on an isnād, it is elevated.” This threshold is broader than the first. God knows best.

9 Abū ʿl-Ḥasan Ahmad b. ʿUmayr al-Dimashqī (d. 320/932), popularly known as Ibn Jawaṣ, was the most important transmitter of his day in Damascus; Dīwān, Siyār, 15:15–21.
5. Elevation derived from earliness of audition: we were informed from the expert Muhammad b. Nāṣir that the expert Muhammad b. Ṭahir had said, "Priority of audition is part of elevation." Much of this comes under the previously mentioned category, but there are some aspects that do not and indeed they distinguish it. For instance, two people hear a hadith from a single teacher. The audition of one of them was, let us say, sixty years ago and the audition of the other forty years ago. When the isnāds up to the two people contain the same number of transmitters, the isnād to the first—the one whose audition was earlier—is more elevated.

These are the types of elevation fully explained and satisfactorily clarified. All praise belongs to God (He is praised and exalted). (God knows best.) As for the verse of Abū Ṭahir al-Silafi (God bless him) we heard:

Rather, among those possessing retention and exactitude

elevation in hadith consists of soundness in the isnād.

and the remark we heard from the vizier Niẓām al-Mulk,11 "In my opinion the elevated hadith is the one established as sound from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), even if the number of its transmitters [that is, intermediaries] reaches one hundred;" these and other statements like them do not refer to elevation as the scholars of hadith commonly use the term. It is elevation only in the everyday sense of the word [that is, in the sense of "excellence"]). God knows best.

Section: Lowness (nuzūl) is the opposite of elevation. Each of the subcategories of elevation has as its opposite a subcategory of lowness. There are therefore five subcategories of lowness and a detailed understanding of these may be derived from the classification of the subcategories of elevation given above.

Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Hakim said, "Someone may say, 'Lowness is the opposite of elevation and whoever knows elevation also knows its opposite.' It is not so. Lowness has levels known only to the students of this discipline," and so forth.12 This does not refute the claim that lowness is the opposite of elevation in the way I mentioned. Rather, it is a refutation of the claim that lowness may be known though knowledge

---

10 Abu ʿl-Fadl Muhammad b. Ṭahir al-Maqdisi (448/1056-507/1113), known as Ibn al-Qaysarānī, was an expert in Sufism and hadith and wrote several works; Dhahabi, Sījar, 1:361–71.
11 The Saljuq vizier Abū ʿAli al-Hasan b. ʿAli al-Tūsī, known as Niẓām al-Mulk, was born in a village near Tus in 408/1018 and is best known for the colleges he founded to teach Shafiʿite law and Ashʿarite theology in Baghdad and other cities. He was assassinated in 485/1092; EP, 8:59–73.
12 ʿUlam al-hadith, 12.
of elevation. That warning is appropriate for what he mentioned regarding elevation, for he was brief in his explanation and short on details. That is not the case regarding what we said about elevation, because ours is a detailed explication which also clarifies the levels of lowness. Knowledge belongs to God (He is blessed and exalted).

Lowness is inferior and undesirable. Superiority belongs to elevation, as was explained and demonstrated above. Ibn Khallād related that one insightful person said, "Being low (tanazzul) in an isnād is best," and he gave as proof an argument to the effect that personal exertion and study are needed to accredit and discredit each transmitter. When the number of intermediaries increases, the exertion is greater and the reward is therefore greater. This is a weak doctrine, weakly supported. Indeed, we heard that ‘Ali b. al-Madini and Abū ‘Amr al-Mustamīlī al-Nisabūrī said, "Lowness is a calamity." This and similar statements condemning lowness are directed at certain aspects of lowness. However, when lowness is specified instead of elevation as a means to obtain a benefit superior to the benefit of elevation, it is to be preferred and is not to be scorned. God knows best.

13 *Muhaddith al-fāsid*, 216.
14 In addition to being a repeitor, Abu ʿAmr Ahmad b. al-Mubarak al-Nisaburi taught ḥadīth on his own. He died in Nishapur in 264/879, *Dhahabi, Siyar*, 13:373–5.
The meaning of the word “fame” (shu'ra) is commonly understood. Famous hadith fall into the subcategories of sound – for instance the statement of the Prophet (Peace be upon him), “Actions are judged by intentions,” and the like – and unsound – like the hadith, “Seeking knowledge is a duty incumbent upon every Muslim.”

Likewise, we read that Ahmad b. Hanbal (God be pleased with him) said, “There are four hadith from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) circulating in the marketplaces which have no authenticity, ‘Whoever gives me the glad tidings of the departure of the month of Dhūr I will give glad tidings of heaven,’ ‘On the Day of Resurrection, I will be the enemy of whoever harms a protected non-Muslim,’ ‘Your sacrifice is the day of your fast,’ and ‘The supplicant has a right [to alms], even if he comes riding on a horse.’”

Alternatively, famous hadith fall into the subcategories of the hadith famous among the scholars of hadith and others – for instance the statement of the Prophet (Peace be upon him), “A Muslim is someone from whose tongue and hand other Muslims are safe,” and the like – and the hadith famous exclusively among the scholars of hadith and no one else – like the hadith we heard from Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allah al-Anṣāri from Sulaymān al-Taymī from Abū Mīlāz from Anas [b. Malik] to the effect that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) made a personal prayer (qunūt) after the inclinations (rūkū’ī) for a month, invoking curses on the tribes of Riq‘ and Dhakwān. This hadith is famous among the scholars of hadith and included in the Ṣaḥīḥ. Other transmitters beside Abū Mīlāz transmitted it from Anas; others beside Taymī transmitted it from Abū Mīlāz; others beside Anṣārī transmitted it from Taymī. Only the practitioners of the craft know that. Others sometimes consider it unusual because

1 Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allah al-Anṣārī (118/736–215/830) served as a judge in al-Baṣra and Baghdad. The famous collection of elevated hadith known as Jāz al-Anṣārī goes back to him; Dhabābi, Siyār, 9:532–8.
2 Abu ‘U-Mu’tamir Sulaymān b. Tirkhān al-Taymī was a pious and well-respected transmitter of hadith who died in al-Baṣra in 143/761; Sezgin, Gās, 1:255–6.
4 Ḥadīth to this effect are in fact found in both Bukhārī, Kitāb al-Jāmī’ al-ṣaḥīḥ, 1:254 (K. al-Witr, B. al-Qunūr qabl al-rukū’ wa-ba’daḥā); and Muslim, al-Jāmī’ al-ṣaḥīḥ, 2:136 (K. al-Ṣaḥāb).
Taymi (normally) relates directly from Anas while here he relates from Anas through an intermediary.

One kind of famous hadith is the "widespread," which the scholars of practical and theoretical law mention. The scholars of hadith do not give it a special name indicating its particular meaning. Although the expert al-Khaṭṭāb al-Baghdādī did mention it, there are indications in what he said which show that he was not following the scholars of hadith in doing so. That may be because [the concept] is something which their craft does not include and [hadith of this type] are rarely found in their relations. The widespread hadith consists of a report conveyed by transmitters knowledge of whose veracity reaches the level of incontrovertibility (dārūra). This condition must be met continuously in its transmitters from the beginning of its isnād to its end.

Anyone asked to produce an example of a widespread hadith from among the hadith in circulation will be severely taxed by its requirements. For instance, the hadith, "Acts are judged by intentions," is not by any means of that kind, even if it is transmitted by more than the number of individuals required to meet the standard for being widespread (tawātūr). This is because the required number of transmitters occurs in the middle of its isnād and it is not found in its early stages in the fashion discussed above. To be sure, we do view as an example of that the hadith, "Whoever deliberately ascribes a lie to me, let him find a seat for himself in hell." Many Companions (God be pleased with them) convey it and in the two Sahīḥ it is related from a number of them. The exalted expert Abū Bakr al-Bazzār in his Musnad stated that around forty of the Companions related it from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). One of the hadith experts said that sixty-two Companions related it from the Messenger of God

5 Mutawānir: traditionally, the principal feature of this kind of hadith was that its transmitters were so numerous in each generation that under normal circumstances it would have been impossible for all of them to enter into a conspiracy to put a lie in circulation; see, for instance, al-Khaṭṭāb al-Baghdādī, Kifāya, 13; Ibn Ḥajar, Nuzhat al-naẓar, 9–17. Edward E. Salisbury translated "mutawānir" as "reiterated" ("Contributions from original sources to our knowledge of the science of Muslim tradition," Journal of the American Oriental Society, 7 [1862]:103) and Maqrīzī followed him with "replet" (Taqrib, 201). A more literal translation would be "consecutive," although that does not accord well with the common understanding of the term. This may suggest that its original sense was close to that of mutaṣṣal and muṣāṣl.

6 It is true that the discussion be presents in Kifāya (pp. 16–18) owes a good deal to the early opponents of theṣbāḥ al-ḥadīth.

7 This would seem to be the only possible meaning of this sentence, and Nawawi (Taqrib, 41) understood it this way. However, other scholars stressed that knowledge of the veracity of the hadith – rather than of its transmitters – was what was obtained through tawātūr; e.g., al-Khaṭṭāb al-Baghdādī, Kifāya, 16.

8 For a detailed study of this hadith and its lines of transmission, see G.H.A. Juynboll, Muslim Tradition: Studies in Chronology, Provenance and Authorship of early Hadith (Cambridge, 1983), 108–33.

9 Abu ʾl-Faraj b. al-Jawzī said that sixty-one Companions transmitted this hadith from the Prophet, Kitāb al-Mawādah, 1:56.
(Peace be upon him), including the Ten to whom the Prophet bore witness of their entrance into Paradise. This expert said, “This is the only hadith the transmitters of hadith have in the world which all of the Ten transmit and the sole hadith known to have been related from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) by more than sixty Companions.” Some scholars of hadith count even more Companions than that—even a fraction of this constitutes the number required for widespreadness—and the number of its transmitters increased continually from then on with each successive level of transmission. God knows best.
Category 31

RARE AND SCARCE ḤADĪTH

(Ma’rifat al-gharib wa-’l-’aztz min al-ḥadīth)

We heard that the expert Abū ʿAbd Allah b. Manda al-Iṣbahānī said, “The rare ḥadīth is like those of Zuhri, Qatāda and the other authorities whose ḥadīth are collected. When a single transmitter is alone in relating a particular ḥadīth from them, it is called ‘rare.’ When two or three transmitters relate from them and they all have a single ḥadīth, it is called ‘scarce.’ When a group relates a ḥadīth from them, it is called ‘famous’ (mashhūr).’ The ḥadīth which one transmitter (baṣf al-ruvūt) is alone in transmitting is described as “rare.” The same is true for the ḥadīth which one of them is alone in transmitting with features, whether in its text or in its isnād, which others do not give. Not everything that is considered isolated (min awwāf al-afrād) is considered rare, this being the case with the isolated ḥadīth ascribed to certain lands discussed above.

Rare ḥadīth are divided into the subcategories of sound – for instance, the isolated hadith included in the Ṣaḥīḥ – and unsound, and these predominate among the rare ḥadīth. We heard that Āḥmad b. Ḥanbal (God be pleased with him) said more than once, “Do not write down these rare ḥadīth. They are rejected (manākīr) and the generality of them are from weak transmitters.”

The rare hadith can also be subcategorized in another way. Some are rare in regard to both the text and the isnād. This is the hadith the text of which a single transmitter is alone in transmitting. Some are rare in regard to the isnād, but not the text, for instance, a hadith the text of which is well known and related from a group of Companions. When someone is alone in relating it from another Companion, it is rare in regard to that line of transmission, although its text is not rare. Of that type are the sound texts which the great teachers have with rare isnāds. This is the kind Tirmidhi calls “rare in regard to this line of transmission” (gharib min hādha ’l-wajh).

I do not think that the reverse of this type can exist. There is therefore nothing rare in respect to the text and not rare in respect to its isnād, except when an isolated ḥadīth is famous from someone who was alone in transmitting it and a large number of students then related it from him. So it becomes a famous rare ḥadīth (gharib mashhūr), rare in respect to its text and not rare in respect to its isnād – rather in regard to one of the two ends of its isnād. This is because its isnād is characterized by rarity in its beginning and by fame in its other end, like the ḥadīth, “Acts are judged by intentions,” and the rest of the rare ḥadīth which the famous compositions contain. God knows best.

1 See above, p. 55.
Rare words in the ḥadīth consist of words that occur in the texts of some ḥadīth which are obscure and difficult to understand because they are rarely used. This is an important discipline, ignorance of which is shameful for students of ḥadīth in particular and scholars in general. Immersion in it is no light matter and those who would undertake it should investigate scrupulously and proceed with care.

We heard from Maymūnī that Ahmad b. Ḥanbal was asked about one of the rare words of the ḥadīth. He said, “Ask the experts in rare words. I dislike discussing the utterances of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) supposititiously for fear that I will make a mistake.” We read that Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Malik b. Taʾriḵī said, Abū Qilāba ʿAbd al-Malik b. Muḥammad transmitted to me. He said, “I said to ʿAṣmaʿī, ʿAbū Saʿīd, what is the meaning of the statement of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), “The neighbor has a greater right to his ṣabaq”? He said, “I do not comment on the ḥadīth of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). However, the ancient Arabs assert that ṣabaq is the same as lazīq (that is, the adjacent property).”

Scholars have composed excellent books on this subject. We heard that the expert Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥakīm said, “The first in the history of Islam to compose a work on rare words was al-Nadr b. Shumayl.” Some disagreed with him and said, “The first to compose a book on this subject was Abū ʿUbayd Maʿmar b. al-Muthannā.” Both of their books are short. Later, Abū ʿUbayd al-Qāsim b. Sallām composed his famous book. He brought the material together and thoroughly examined it in an excellent fashion and so attained an exalted reputation among scholars and became a model in this matter. Qutaybī then tracked down the material Abū ʿUbayd missed and composed his famous book

---

1. Abū ʿI-Hāṣan ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd al-Maymūnī (d. 274/887) was a student of the muʿtadī Ahmad b. Ḥanbal and acted as μου BitSet in the city of al-Raqqa; Dhahabī, Siyār, 13:89–90.
2. Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Malik al-Sarrāj was a third/ninth-century litterateur who was called “Taʾriḵī” because of his interest in dates; al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdāḍī, Taʾriḵ Baghdāḍ, 2:348.
4. ʿUṯūm al-Ḥadīth, 88.
5. The philologist Abū ʿUbayd Maʿmar b. al-Muthannā (d.10/728– ca. 210/825) wrote a number of important books. The work referred to here was entitled Gharīb al-ḥadīth; Sezīn, GAS, 8:67–71.
on the subject. Then Abū Sulaymān al-Ḫaṭṭābī tracked down what they both missed and wrote his famous book on this matter. These three books are the principal works composed on the subject. After them, other compilations appeared which contain many additions and useful remarks on the subject. However, these are not to be accepted unquestioningly unless their authors were exalted authorities.

In explicating the rare words in ḥadīth, the greatest reliance should be placed upon what is explicated in one of the relations of the ḥadīth.

For instance, it was related in the ḥadīth of Ibn Ṣayyād that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) said to him, "I have hidden a secret for you. What is it?" and Ibn Ṣayyād replied, "The ḅukkẖ." The meaning of the word is obscure and problematic and many have explicated it incorrectly. In al-Ḫākim’s Maʿrīfāt ʿulām al-ḥadīth, we read that it is ḅukkẖ with the sense of ṣaḥḥẖ, which is sexual intercourse. This is an egregious mix-up which exasperates both the scholar and the ordinary believer. Rather, the sense of the ḥadīth is that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) said to him, "I have concealed a hidden thing for you. What is it?" and he replied, "The ḅukkẖ," meaning "smoke." (Ḏukkẖān). ḅukkẖ means "smoke" in one Arabic dialect since one of the versions of the ḥadīth contains something specifying that. The Messenger of God said, "I have hidden a secret for you," and he hid for him "a day the sky will be filled with visible smoke," and Ibn Ṣayyād said, "It is the ḅukkẖ." Then the Messenger of God said, "Scram! You will never exceed your capacity." This ḥadīth is well established and sound. Tirmidhī and others included it in their ḥadīth collections. In accordance with the custom of the soothsayers of wrestling only part of a thing from the devils, Ibn Ṣayyād took from (the verse of the Qurʿān) this word alone, without understanding the whole statement. For that reason, the Prophet said to him, "Scram! You will never exceed your capacity," meaning: You have no more capacity to understand than the soothsayers. God knows best.

---

6 This is a reference to Ibn Qutayba's Kitāb Gharīb al-ḥadīth (ed. ʿAbd Allāh al-Jubārī, Baghdad, 1977).
7 Ḫaṭṭābī’s Kitāb Gharīb al-ḥadīth has survived in several manuscripts; Sezgin, GAS, t:211.
8 The primary question regarding Ṣaf b. Ṣayyād (or Ibn Ṣaʿīd) was whether he was the anticrist. See Mujīm, al-Ṯāmī al-qāḥī, 8:189-94 (K. al-Fitan); Abū Dawūd al-Siṣiṣānī, Kitāb al-Sunan, 4 vols., ed. Muḥammad Muḥyī al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd (Beirut, n.d.), 4:120-1 (K. al-Malḥīm, B. Ḥabar Ibn Ṣaʿīd).
9 This passage does not appear in the text of the Cairo edition of al-Ḫākim’s book. See the comments of Prof. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān in Muḥaddīmāt, 460, n. 2.
10 Qurʿān 44:10.
Enchained Hadith
(Ma'rifat al-musalsal min al-hadith)

Enchainment (tasalsul) is one of the attributes of isnāds and consists of the
consecutive succession of the transmitters of the isnād and their common
adherence, one after another, to a single state or condition. It is subcategorized
into enchainment in the manner of relating and taking up the hadith and
enchainment in regard to the state and condition of the transmitters. Taking into
consideration words, actions and the like, the states and conditions of transmitters
can be divided into innumerable subcategories for that purpose. The expert Abū
'Abd Allāh al-Ḥakim listed eight types.4 However, the instances he mentioned
are only eight basic forms or examples. They cannot, as we have said, be limited
to eight.5

An example of enchainment in regard to the manner of relating and taking
up the hadith is the isnād which is enchained with “I heard X say, ‘I heard Y
say, ’” to the end of the isnād; or with “He transmitted to us” – or “He informed
us” – to its end; or with “X, by God, informed us. He said, ‘Y, by God, informed
us,’” to its end.6 An example of enchainment in reference to the states of the
transmitters, their words and the like, is the isnād of the hadith, “God, make
me remember to thank you, think of you and worship you well,” enchained with
the transmitters saying, “I love you, so say, ‘[God, make me remember ...].’”

Another example is the hadith of joining hands7 and the hadith of counting on
the fingers.8 We relate several things similar to that and many are in circulation.
The best of them are those containing an indication of the continuity of audition
and the lack of misrepresentation. One of the special merits of enchainment is
that it implies a greater precision on the part of the transmitters.

Rarely are the enchained hadith totally free from weakness, I mean, in respect
to the enchainment, not the authenticity of the text. In some enchained hadith,
the enchainment is interrupted in the middle of the isnād and that is a defect in
it. This is the case with the hadith enchained with, “[This is] the first hadith I
heard [from X],”9 according to the correct view on the subject. God knows best.

1 Ulūm al-hadīth, 29-34.
2 This sentence is missing from the edition of Prof. Ābd al-Raḥmān.
3 See, for example, Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Dāqr al-ʿAyūbī, al-Manāhīl al-sulhīah fi ʿl-hadīth
   al-musalsala (Beirut, 1403/1983), 182.
4 ʿAyūbī, Manāhīl, 24-7.
5 ʿAyūbī, Manāhīl, 38-62.
6 ʿAyūbī, Manāhīl, 63-5.
7 ʿAyūbī, Manāhīl, 6-11.
This discipline is important and regarded as difficult. We heard that Zuhri (God be pleased with him) said, “It wears out legal scholars and makes it impossible for them to distinguish the abrogating hadith of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) from the abrogated.” Shafi’i (God be pleased with him) had great influence and precedence in this subject. We heard that Ahmad b. Hanbal said to Muhammad b. Muslim b. Wara’ – one of the authorities in hadith – as soon as the latter arrived from Egypt, “Did you copy the books of Shafi’i?” He said no. Ibn Hanbal replied, “You were remiss. We did not learn to distinguish the general from the particular, or the abrogating hadith of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) from the abrogated until we studied with Shafi’i.” Some of the scholars of hadith who have occupied themselves with this discipline have included in it what does not properly belong, because of the obscurity of the meaning of abrogation and what constitutes it. It consists of the Legislator [that is, the Prophet Muhammad] abolishing an early ruling of his with a later ruling from him. This is a definition I came across which is free from some of the objections that are lodged against others.

The abrogating and abrogated hadith fall into various subcategories. One of these consists of the instances of abrogation recognized through an explicit declaration from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). An example of this is the hadith of Buraya in Muslim’s Sahih in which the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, “I had forbidden you to visit graves. Visit them!” and similar instances.

Another kind consists of the instances of abrogation recognized on the basis of a statement of a Companion. Examples of this are the hadith which Tirmidhi and others related in which Ubay b. Ka’b (God be pleased with him) said, “The major ablution was optional in the case of a seminal emission in the beginning of Islam and then the option was forbidden;” and the hadith Nasai’s included in which Jabir b. ‘Abd Allah said, “The last of the two orders from the Messenger

1 Ibn Wara’ (d. 270/884) was one of the great critics of hadith in the city of al-Rayy; Dhahabi, Siyar, 13:28-32.
2 Presumably in Baghdad.
3 Buraya b. al-Husayb al-Aslami (d. ca. 62/682) was a Companion who transmitted about one hundred and fifty hadith from the Prophet; Dhahabi, Siyar, 2:469-71.
5 Sahih al-Tirmidhi, 1:124 (K. al-Tahara, B. Ma jara’f anna al-ma’ min al-ma’).
of God (Peace be upon him) was abandoning the ablution for what is touched by fire.” There are other similar instances.

Another subcategory consists of the instances of abrogation recognized by dates. This is the case with the ḥadīth of Shaddad b. Aws and others in which the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, “The cupper and the cupped break their fast,” and the ḥadīth of Ibn ‘Abbās depicting the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) being cupped while fasting. Šafī‘ī explained that the second ḥadīth abrogated the first, because it is related in the ḥadīth of Shaddad that he was with the Prophet (Peace be upon him) at the time of the conquest of Mecca. The Prophet saw a man being cupped in the month of Ramadan and said, “The cupper and the cupped break their fast.” It was related in the ḥadīth of Ibn ‘Abbās that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) was cupped while he was in the state of ritual consecration for entering the precincts of Mecca (muḥārīm) and fasting. It thereby became clear that the first ḥadīth was from the time of the conquest in year 8 [629 AD] and the second was during the Farewell Pilgrimage in year 10.

Another subcategory consists of the instances of abrogation made known through consensus. An example is the ḥadīth prescribing the execution of the wine drinker for his fourth offense. [The ruling in this ḥadīth] is abrogated and its abrogation became known through the achievement of a consensus on the abandonment of the practice. Consensus [by itself] may neither abrogate nor be abrogated. However, it does indicate the existence of another agency of abrogation. God knows best what is correct.
Category 35

MISREADINGS IN THE ISNĀDS AND TEXTS OF ḤADĪTH
(Maʿrifat al-muṣāhhab min asānīd al-aḥādīth wa-muṣāniha)

This is a noble discipline which only the most skillful experts undertake. Dāraqūṭī is one of them and he has a useful book on it.1 We heard that Ahmad b. Ḥanbal (God be pleased with him) said, "Who is safe from error and misreading?"

An example of misreading in an isnād is the ḥadith of Shuʿba from al-ʿAwām b. Murājim from Abū ʿUṭmān al-Nahḍī from ʿUṭmān b. Affān in which the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, "Convey rights to those who deserve them, and so forth." Yahyā b. Maʿin misread it and said, "Ibn Muzāḥim," and he was refuted. It is really "Ibn Murājim." Another example is what we heard from Ahmad b. Ḥanbal. He said, Muhammad b. Jaʿfar [that is, "Ghundar"] informed us. He said, Shuʿba transmitted to us from "Malik b. Urṭuṭa" from Abū Khayr b. Qaysha, "The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) forbade the gourd and skin smeared with pitch." Ahmad said, "Shuʿba misread it. ‘Malik b. Urṭuṭa’ is supposed to be Khālid b. ‘Alqama.’" Indeed, Zayd b. Qudāma and others have related it in accordance with what Ahmad said. We read from Dāraqūṭī that Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī said, "Among the members of the Banū Sulaym who related from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) is ‘Uṯba b. al-Buddhār,”2 and he related a ḥadith of his. The name is supposed to be Ibn al-Nuddār.3

An example of misreading in a text is the ḥadith Ibn Lahīḍa related from the letter of Mūsā b. ʿUqba3 to him, with the latter’s isnād, from Zayd b. Thābit that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) ṣūqajama (was cupped) in the mosque. Instead, it should read: "He ṣūqajamā (made an enclosure) in the mosque," with a shanty or a mat, in which he prayed. Ibn Lahīḍa misread it because he had taken it from a written source [that is, the letter of Mūsā b. ʿUqba] without audition. Muslim mentioned this in his Kitāb al-Tamyiz.4

---

1 This apparently is a reference to Dāraqūṭī’s now-lost Kitāb taṣḥīḥ al-nuḥaddithin mentioned in Ibn Khayr al-Iṣbīlī, Fihrist maʿ rāwīhu ‘an shaykhāhīn, 2nd edn (Cairo, 1382/1963), 204.
3 Abū ʿUṭmān ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Mull (the vocalization of “Mull” is variously given) al-Nahḍt was a Follower who died in 100/719; Dhhābbī, Siyār, 4:175–8.
6 ‘Uṯba b. al-Nuddār al-Shāmī was a Companion who died in 84/703; Dhhābbī, Siyār, 3:417.
7 Abū Muhammad Mūsā b. ʿUqba (d. 141/758) is best known for his Kitāb al-Maghāzī treating the military campaigns of the Prophet. This work has not survived intact; Sezgin, GAS, 1:286–7. EI.
[Other examples of misreading:]
We read from Dāraquṭnī regarding the ḥadith of Abū Sufyān in which Jābīr [b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥarāmī al-Anṣārī] said, “On the Day of the Parties [that is, the Battle of the Trench], Ubayy was wounded on the vein on the back of his hand and the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) cauterized it,” that Ghundar said in it, abī (my father). Rather, it is “Ubayy b. Kaʿb.”

We also read from Dāraquṭnī regarding the ḥadith of Anas, “Whoever says, ‘There is no God but God,’ and has in his heart as much goodness as a dharra (atom) weighs will then leave hell,” that Shu`bā said for it dhura (kernel of corn). This pronunciation was ascribed to misreading.

In addition, we read from Dāraquṭnī regarding the ḥadith of Abū Dharr,10 “So you will help the ṣāḥi (skillful person),” that Ḥishām b. ʿUrwa pronounced it ʿā ṣāḥi (poor man). It is a case of misreading. The correct form is what Zuhri related, ṣāḥi, the opposite of clumsy.

We read from Abū Zurʿa al-Rāzī that Yahyā b. Sallām12 — he is the Qurʾān commentator — transmitted regarding the passage from the Qurʾān, “I will show you the abode of wrongdoers,”13 from Saʿd b. Abī ʿArūba that Qatādā said, “That is Miṣr (Egypt).” Abū Zurʿa was shocked and disgusted by this. He said that in the commentary of Saʿd from Qatādā it is maṣīrahūm (their fate).

We read from Dāraquṭnī that Abū Mūsā Muḥammad b. al-Muthannā al-ʿAnazi14 transmitted the ḥadith of the Prophet (Peace be upon him), “On the Day of Resurrection, none of you will come with a lowing cow,” and he said in it, “or a sheep which ṭaʿṣārū (grunts).” It is supposed to be ṭaʿṣārū (bleats).

We also read from Dāraquṭnī that ʿAnazi said to them one day, “We are a people who possess nobility. We belong to the tribe of ʿAnaza. The Prophet (Peace be upon him) prayed toward us,” having in mind what was related regarding the Prophet (Peace be upon him) praying toward

9 Abū Sufyān Taḥfa b. Nāṣir al-Iskāfī was a Follower who claimed to have spent several months with Jābīr in Mecca; Dhahabi, Sīyar, 5:293–4.
10 Abū Dharr Jundub b. Junāda (his ism and nasab are disputed) al-Ghifārī (d. 32/653) was a Companion and prominent transmitter of ḥadith; Dhahabi, Sīyar, 2:46–78.
11 According to al-Qāḍī al-Ṭūyādī, this is the form which Ibn ʿUrwa misread; Maṣḥarih al-anwār ʿalā saḥīh al-ṭāhir, 2 vols (Beirut, n.d.), 2:47.
12 Abū Zakariyāʾ Yahyā b. Sallām al-Taymi (124/742–200/815) was a well-traveled scholar best known for his knowledge of the Qurʾān; Sezgin, GĀS, 1:39.
13 7:145.
14 Abū Mūsā Muḥammad b. al-Muthannā al-ʿAnazi (167/783–252/866) was a respected scholar of ḥadith in al-Baṣra; Dhahabi, Sīyar, 12:123–6.
an 'anaza. He mistakenly believed that he prayed toward their tribe. The 'anaza here is a spear which was stuck in the earth in front of him and which he prayed toward.\textsuperscript{15}

More humorous than that is what we heard from Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Kākim\textsuperscript{16} regarding a Bedouin who claimed that when the Prophet (Peace be upon him) prayed, a sheep — that is, an 'anza — was set in front of him. That is, the Bedouin misread 'anaza (spear) by not pronouncing the letter nān with a vowel.

We also read from Dāraquṭnī that Abū Bakr al-Ṣuhī\textsuperscript{17} dictated in the congregational mosque\textsuperscript{18} the ḥadīth of Abū Ayyūb,\textsuperscript{19} “Whoever fasts the month of Ramadan and follows it for sitt (six [days]) from the month of Shawwāl,” and said shay\textsuperscript{2} (some).

In addition, we read from him that the authority Abū Bakr al-Ismā'īlī — according to what they read about him — used to say in the ḥadīth of ʿAḥmed from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) regarding the soothsayers, “the pouring out (qarr) of a zujāja (glass bottle),” and it should be, “[the cackling] of a daijā (hen).”\textsuperscript{20}

We also read in regard to the ḥadīth related from Muṭawwila b. Abī Sufyān,\textsuperscript{21} “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) cursed those who carefully enunciate their sermons (yushaqqiūna al-ḥujab) in the manner of poetry,” that Dāraquṭnī said that on one occasion Waktī [b. al-Jarrāḥ] pronounced ḥujab as ḥaṭab [that is, making the phrase mean “those who split firewood”]. Abū Nu'aym [al-Faḍl b. Dukayn] was present and he repeated it to Waktī with ḥuṭab. I read in the handwriting of one author that in the Mosque of al-Manṣūr in Baghdad Ibn Shāhīn\textsuperscript{22} said

\textsuperscript{15} In examining these alleged misreadings, we should heed the warning of Prof. Rosenthal, “Strange cases of tashfīf were invented in order to entertain the reader or to warn him of possible pitfalls”; Technik, 24.
\textsuperscript{16} Uṣūm al-ḥadīth, 148–9.
\textsuperscript{17} Abū Bakr Muhammad b. Yahyā al-Ṣūlī (d. 335/946) was a historian and litterateur with a dominating interest in poetry. A number of his works have survived and been published; Sezgin, GAS, 1:330–31.
\textsuperscript{18} This would seem to be a reference to the Mosque of al-Manṣūr in Baghdad.
\textsuperscript{19} The Companion Abu Ayyūb Khalīb b. Zayd al-Anṣārī died around the year 50/670; Djahabi, Siyār, 2:402–13.
\textsuperscript{20} The question is not as simple as the author represents it. See Bukhārī, Kitāb al-jami' al-tahīf, (K. al-Adab, B. Qawāl al-rajal bi-l-shay, lāsya bi-l-shay) and (K. al-Ṭibb, B. al-Kahāna).
\textsuperscript{21} Abū 'Abd al-Rahmān Muṭawwila b. Abī Sufyān was a Companion of the Prophet and the founder of the Umayyad dynasty. He ruled in Damascus from 41/661 until 60/680; EI, 3:263–9.
\textsuperscript{22} Abī Ḥaṣūf 'Umar b. Ahmad (297/909–385/995), known as Ibn Shāhīn, was the author of a number of important works in the field of ḥadīth, Sezgin, GAS, 1:209–10.
regarding that ḥadith, “The Prophet (Peace be upon him) prohibited the splitting of firewood,” and one wit said, “Folks, what will we do when this is necessary?”

Instances of misreading fall into two subcategories. The first of them is misreading in the text and the second in the isnad. Alternatively, they fall into two other subcategories. One is visual misreading (tāṣḥif al-bāṣar) — like the ḥadith cited above from Ibn Laḥtā — and this is more common, and the second is aural “misreading” (tāṣḥif al-tamṣīḥ), as was the case in the ḥadith of ʿĀṣim al-Aḥwal. One person related it, saying, “from Wāṣil al-Aḥdah.” Dāraquṭnī said that this is a case of aural, and not visual, misreading. It seems that he maintained — and God knows best — that aural misreading refers to words which are not written similarly. Rather, the sense of hearing of the person who related it caused the mistake. By a third subdivision, misreading falls into the subcategories of misreading of the wording, and it is the more common, and “misreading” pertaining to the sense, not the wording, as was the case with the ḥadith cited above from Muhammad b. al-Muthannā on the praying toward an ṣūnāt. Calling some of what we mentioned “misreading” is figurative. (God knows best) For much of the misreading transmitted from the greatest of the splendid scholars, there are excuses which those transmitting the misreading did not pass on. We ask God for success and protection. God knows best.

23 That is, ṣūnāt was the correct word, but Abū Mosā al-ʿAnazi chose the wrong meaning of it.
Category 36

**Contradictory Hadith**

*(Maṣrifat mukhtalif al-ḥadīth)*

Only the authorities who bring together the the crafts of ḥadīth and positive law and profoundly study the subtle shades of meaning of different ḥadīth can completely master the study of contradictory ḥadīth. Note that the ḥadīth mentioned in this chapter fall into two subcategories.

1. It is possible to combine the two ḥadīth and it is not impossible to bring out some aspect which removes their mutual negation: in that case, it is obligatory to direct one’s attention to that aspect and endorse both of the ḥadīth. An example of this is the ḥadīth, “There is no contagion nor evil fortune,” along with the two ḥadīth, “The owner of sick camels should not take his camels for watering where the owner of well camels is present,” and, “Flee from a leper as you would from a lion.” The two [views on contagion; that is, the one represented in the first ḥadīth and the one in the second and third ḥadīth] may be combined because these illnesses are not by their nature infectious, but God (He is blessed and exalted) made a person sick with these illnesses coming into contact with a well person a means of infecting the well person with his sickness. Sometimes this fails to cause the sickness, as is the case with the rest of the causes. In the first ḥadīth, the Prophet (Peace be upon him) refuted the belief of the ignorant that illness is contagious by nature and for that reason he said, “Who infected the first person [to have the disease]?” In the second [that is, the latter two ḥadīth] note that God (He is praised) made contact a means of infection and warned of the harm which is likely to take place through the action of God (He is praised and exalted) where the illness occurs. Of this there are many examples in the ḥadīth.

Ibn Quṭayba’s *Kitāb Mukhtalif al-ḥadīth* (Book of Contradictory Ḥadīth) treats this topic. Although in a certain respect he has done a good job, he handled poorly other things which he was not up to. Others produced better and stronger works.

We heard that the authority [Abū Bakr] Muḥammad b. Iṣḥāq b. Khuzayma said, “I am not aware that two [genuinely] antithetical (*mutaḍāddayn*) ḥadīth with sound isnāds were related from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). Whoever has [seemingly contradictory ḥadīth], let him bring them to me for me to harmonize.

---

2. The ḥadīth are so antithetical that they cannot be combined: that takes two forms: (a), it appears that one of the ḥadīth is abrogating and the other is abrogated. The abrogating one is acted upon and the abrogated is ignored, and (b). There is no indication which ḥadīth is the abrogating and which is the abrogated. Recourse is then made to determining which is to be preferred and the more preferred and better established is the one to be put into practice. The determination of preference may be made, for instance, on the basis of one of the ḥadīth having a greater number of transmitters or on the basis of the characteristics of the transmitters. There are fifty or more ways of determining preference and the task of detailing them is best left for another place. God (He is praised) knows best.
An example of this is the hadith related from ‘Abd Allah b. al-Mubārak. He said, Sufyān informed us from ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Yazīd b. Jābig. He said, Busr b. ‘Ubayd Allah’ transmitted to me. He said, I heard Abū Īdrīs saying, I heard Wāthila b. al-Āṣiya‘ saying, I heard Abū Marthad al-Ghanawī‘ saying, I heard the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) saying, “Do not sit on graves and do not pray toward them.” The mention of Sufyān in this isnād is an addition and a mistake, just as the mention of Abū Īdrīs is. The mistake in mentioning Sufyān was made by someone after Ibn al-Mubārak, because a number of reliable transmitters related it from Ibn al-Mubārak directly from Ibn Jābig himself. Some of these transmitters make explicit use of the phrase “He informed us” between them there. The mention of Abū Īdrīs in the isnād is a mistake attributable to Ibn al-Mubārak. This is because a number of reliable transmitters related it from Ibn Jābig and they did not mention Abū Īdrīs between Busr and Wāthila. Some of them explicitly mention there the audition of Busr from Wāthila. Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī said, “They hold the opinion that Ibn al-Mubārak made a mistake in this. Busr often transmits from Abū Īdrīs. Ibn al-Mubārak erred when he supposed that this was something that was related from Abū Īdrīs from Wāthila. Indeed, Busr heard this hadith directly from Wāthila himself.”

The expert al-Khaṭīb has composed a book on this Category which he called Kitāb Tamyīz al-mazīd fi muttaṣīl al-asānīd (Detecting Additions in Cohesive Isnāds). There is some doubt regarding much of what he discussed. This is because an isnād lacking the additional transmitter should be judged to contain looseness (insāl), if the transmission is marked by the word “from” (‘an). Furthermore, with the isnād in which the additional transmitter is mentioned, the hadith should be regarded as defective (mu‘allal), in accordance with what is

---

1 Abū ʿUthmāb al-Raḥmān b. Yazīd b. Jābig (d. ca. 153/770) was a transmitter of ḥadīth in Damascus; Dhabahī, Siyār, 7:176–7.
2 Very little seems to be known about the Damascene religious scholar Busr b. ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Ḥārāmī (d. ca. 110/728); Dhababī, Siyār, 4:592.
3 Abū Īdrīs al-Qādh Allāh b. Abū Allāh al-Khāwānī (d. 80/699) was a prominent figure in early Muslim Damascus; Dhababī, Siyār, 4:272–7.
4 Wāthila b. al-Āṣiya‘ (his kunya was disputed) was the last surviving Companion in Damascus. He died around 85/704; Dhabahī, Siyār, 3:383–7.
6 In this context, it is impossible to determine whether Sufyān al-Thawrī or Sufyān b. ʿUywāna is meant.
7 Ibn Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī, Ḥațl al-ḥadīth, 2 vols (Cairo, 1343–4), 1:80.
known about the Category of the defective hadith, as will be mentioned – God (He is exalted) willing – in the following Category.

If there is a clear statement of audition or informing, as in the example we gave above, it is possible that the transmitter heard it from someone else from his [alleged] teacher and then heard it directly from the teacher himself. So it may be that Busr heard this hadith from Abū Idris from Wāthila and then he met Wāthila and heard it directly from him. Something like this is made explicit in other instances. This applies unless an indication is found which shows that this is a mistake, along the lines of what Abū Ḥātim mentioned in the example above. The obvious course of action for someone to whom something like that has occurred would be to mention the two auditions [that is, the audition directly from the teacher and the one from an intermediary from the teacher]. When he says nothing of this kind, we interpret it as the aforementioned kind of addition. God knows best.

8 That is, Ibn al-Mubarak is alleged to have said, “Sufyān informed us,” and Busr, “I heard Abū Idris saying.”
Category 38

Hadith with Hidden Looseness

(Ma’rifat al-marastl al-khaft irsaluha)

This is an important and extremely useful Category which is mastered through collecting many hadith and gathering their lines of transmission in combination with a good deal of experience. The expert al-Khaṭṭāb wrote Kitāb al-Taṣāfī lā-nuḥām al-marastl (Clarification of Obscure Loose Hadith) about it. Mentioned in this regard are the hadith recognized as loose through the knowledge that a transmitter in the isnād did not hear or meet his alleged teacher. This is the case with the hadith related from al-‘Awwām b. Ḥawshab1 from (ṣan) ʿAbd Allāh b. Abī Awfā in which he said, “When Bilal said, ‘It is time to pray!’ the Prophet (Peace be upon him) rose and said, ‘God is great!’” It is related that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal said regarding it, “Al-‘Awwām did not meet Ibn Abī Awfā.”

Another kind is the hadīth judged to be loose due to its appearance in another line of transmission with the addition of one individual or more in the spot where the looseness is alleged to be. An example is the hadīth mentioned in Category 10 from ʿAbd al-Razzāq [b. Hammām] from [Ṣuyfān] al-Thawrī from Abū Isḥāq [Ṣulaymān b. Abī Sulaymān al-Shaybānī]. Interruption and looseness were judged to exist between ʿAbd al-Razzāq and Thawrī, because it is related that ʿAbd al-Razzāq said, “Al-Nu‘mān b. Abī Shayba al-Janādī transmitted to me from Thawrī from Abū Isḥāq.” It is also judged to be loose between Thawrī and Abū Isḥāq, because the same hadīth is also related from Thawrī from Sharīk [b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Nakha’ī] from Abū Isḥāq.

This Category and the preceding one are in opposition, because each of them can be raised as an objection against the other, as was indicated above. God knows best.

---

1 Abī ʿIsā al-‘Awwām b. Ḥawshab b. Yazīd al-Raḥlī died in 148/765; Dāhābi, Šīyār, 6:354-5.
Category 39

THE COMPANIONS (GOD BE PLEASED WITH ALL OF THEM)

(Ma’rifat al-Ṣaḥāba)

This is a vast science on which people have written many books. If it had not been for Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr’s disgraceful inclusion of a large amount of material concerning the disputes that flared up between the Companions and his relations from the secular historians (akhlāq, riyāḍ) rather than the transmitters of hadith, his Kitāb al-Iṣṭa‡āb [fi ma’rifat al-Ṣaḥāba] (Comprehensive Book [of Companions]) would have been one of the most pleasant and useful works on the subject. Prolificity and confusion prevail in what the secular historians relate. I will present here some useful points (God – He is exalted – willing) which the authors of the books on the Companions should have at the outset turned their attention to in the introduction to their books.

1. Scholars disagree over what constitutes a Companion (ṣaḥāba). The well-known practice of the adherents of hadith is to regard every Muslim who saw the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) as a Companion. Bukhārī said in his Ṣaḥīḥ, “Every Muslim who associated with (ṣaḥība) the Prophet (Peace be upon him) or saw him is one of his Companions.” We read that Abu ‘l-Mu‘azzaf al-Sam‘ānī al-Marwazi said, “The scholars of hadith apply the term ‘Companion’ without qualification to all of those who related from the Prophet a hadith or even a single word, and they allow so much latitude in this that they count as a Companion anyone who saw the Prophet even just once. It is on account of the nobility of the status of the Prophet (Peace be upon him) that they grant Companionship to all of those who saw him.” He said that the term “Companion” from the standpoint of common parlance and literal sense applies only to those who associated with the Prophet (Peace be upon him) for an extended length of time, studied extensively under him as a follower of his and took many hadith from him. This is the doctrine of the experts in legal theory.

Indeed, we heard that Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyib did not regard as a Companion anyone who had not stayed with the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) for at least a year or two and fought with him on one or two campaigns. It seems that the meaning of this – if it is related correctly from him – refers to what is related from the legal theorists. However, there is some difficulty in his choice of expression because it necessitates that we not regard as a Companion Ja‘far b. ‘Abd Allāh

1 2:416 (K. Faḍā’il ṣaḥāb al-Nabi).
al-Bajahl and others like him who fall short of fulfilling the letter of what he stipulated, including some whose inclusion among the Companions has never to our knowledge been challenged. We heard from Shu'ba that Mūsā al-Sabalantı – and he was highly spoken of – said, “I went to Anas b. Malik and said, ‘Are any of the Companions of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) beside you still alive?’ He said, ‘Some Bedouins who saw him are still alive. As for those who associated with him, no.’” The isnād of the report is good and Muslim related it in the presence of Abū Zur'a [al-Rāzi].

In some cases an individual is known to be a Companion by means of universal acknowledgement (bi-ʿl-tawātir); in some cases by numerous testimonies (bi-ʿl-istifāqa) falling short of universal acknowledgement; in some cases by a few of the Companions relating that he is a Companion; and in some cases by his own statement or report – after his integrity is established – that he is a Companion. God knows best.

2. The Companions, all of them, possess the special trait that the integrity of none of them may be questioned. Rather, it is a settled matter, because of their being declared upright without qualification in texts from the Qurān and the sunna and by the consensus of those who are taken into consideration in the consensus of the Community. God (He is blessed and exalted) said, “You were the best community which was brought forth to men,” and so forth. It is said that the commentators agree that this verse refers to the Companions of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). God (He is exalted) said, “Thus, we made you a Community in the middle so you can be witnesses against the people,” and this is speech addressed to those living at that time. He (I praise Him) also said, “Muhammad, the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), and those who are with him are severe against the infidels,” and so forth. Many of the texts of the sunna also testify to that, including the hadith of Abū Sa‘īd [al-Khudr] – which is agreed to be sound – that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, “Do not insult my Companions! By the One who holds my life in His hand, if one of you were to spend a pile of gold the size of Uhud [on good works], he would still not attain a small measure of [the honor of] one of the Companions or even a half of that measure.” The Community agrees unanimously on declaring all of the Companions to be upright. On the basis of the consensus of those

2 Abū ʿAmr (or Abū ʿAbd Allāh) Jarir b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Bajahl converted to Islam only forty days prior to the death of the Prophet. He died around 50/670; Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Isrāfīl, 1:236–40.
3 I have not been able to identify this person.
4 Qurān 3:110.
5 Qurān 2:143.
6 Qurān 48:29.
7 Uhud is a mountain a short distance to the north of Medina where the Muslims suffered a setback at the hands of the pagan Meccans in the year 3/625; EP, 3:970–1.
scholars who are taken into account in determining a consensus, the same is held to be true of those who were involved in the discords (fitan) on account of their high esteem and the glorious deeds which were set out for them. It would seem that God (He is praised and exalted) ordained the consensus on that because they were the conveyers of the Holy Law (al-sharī'ah). God knows best.

3. The most prolific of the Companions in terms of transmitting hadith from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) was Abū Hurayra. That judgement was related from Sa'īd b. Abī 'l-Ḥasan and Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, and it is an obvious fact not hidden from any hadithologist. He was the first scholar of hadith (ṣāhib ḥadīth). We read that Abū Bakr b. Abī Dāwūd al-Sijistānī said, “I saw Abū Hurayra in a dream while I was in Sijistān arranging his hadith. I said, ‘I love you.’ He said, ‘I was the first scholar of hadith in the world.’” We also heard that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (God be pleased with him) said, “Six of the Companions of the Prophet (God bless him) related much from him and were granted a long life, Abū Hurayra, Ibn ‘Umar, Ṭalḥa b. ‘Abd Allāh, Ibn ‘Abbās and Anas. Abū Hurayra was the most prolific of them in terms of hadith and reliable transmitters took hadith from him.”

The most prolific of the Companions in terms of the legal responsa (futūā) related from him is Ibn ‘Abbās. We read that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal said, “None of the Companions of the Prophet (Peace be upon him) has more legal opinions related from him than Ibn ‘Abbās.” We also heard that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal was asked, “Who are the ‘ʿAbd Allāh’s?’” and he replied, “ʿAbd Allāh b. ‘Abbās, ‘Abd Allāh b. ʿUmar, ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubayr and ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṭalḥa.” He was asked, “And Ibn Masʿūd?” He said, “No, ‘ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd is not one of the ʿAbd Allāhs.” The expert Aḥmad al-Bayhaqī — in something that we heard from him and I read in his own handwriting — said, “That is because Ibn Masʿūd died early. Those others lived until their knowledge was needed. When they agree on something, it is said, ‘This is the doctrine of the ʿAbd Allāhs,’ or, ‘This is what they did.’” Ibn Masʿūd shares this status with the rest of the Companions named “ʿAbd Allāh,” and they number about two hundred and twenty. God knows best.

We heard that Ṣalīb b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Madīnī said, “Only three of the Companions of the Prophet had students who took up their doctrine in law, ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd, Ẓayd b. Ṭalḥa and Ibn ‘Abbās (God be pleased with them).” Each of them had students who took up his doctrine and gave legal opinions to the people. We heard that Masrūq said, “I found that the knowledge of the

8 Sa‘īd b. Abī ‘l-Ḥasan Yaṣār al-Baṣrī (d. 100/719) was the brother of the famous al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, Dhadab, Sīyar, 4:588–9.
9 Abū Khubayb ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubayr b. al-Qawām al-Quraṣṭ (2/624–73/692) was the grandson of the caliph Abū Bakr. He led an uprising against the Umayyads and died in the siege of Mecca; EI, 1:54–5.
10 Ṣūfī, 42.
11 Abū ʿAbbās Maṣrūq b. al-Ajdār al-Ḥamdānī (d. ca. 63/683) was a prominent Follower who converted to Islam during the lifetime of the Prophet; Dhahabī, Sīyar, 4:63–9.
Companions of the Prophet (Peace be upon him) ended up in the hands of six of them, 'Umar, 'Ali, Ubayy, Zayd, Abu 'l-Dardā and 'Abd Allāh b. Mas'ūd. Then the knowledge of these six went to two, 'Ali and 'Abd Allāh." We heard something similar from Muṭarrijī from Shabīrī from Masrūq, but he mentioned Abū Mūsā instead of Abu 'l-Dardā. We heard that Shabīrī said, "Knowledge was taken from six of the Companions of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), 'Umar, 'Abd Allāh [b. Mas'ūd] and Zayd were similar in knowledge and they used to borrow from one another. The knowledge of 'Ali, [Abū Mūsā] al-Ashʿarī and Ubayy was similar and they used to borrow from one another." We heard that the expert Ahmad al-Bayhaqī said that Shabīrī mentioned the Companions in the original version of his Treatise (Risālatthī al-gadima), praised them appropriately and then said, "They are above us in every branch of knowledge, in personal striving (ijtihād), in piety, in intelligence and in any matter through which knowledge is attained and derived. To us their legal opinions are the most praiseworthy and theirs are better for us than the ones we have for ourselves." God knows best.

4. We heard that Abū Zurʿa al-Razī was asked how many people transmitted from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) and said, "Who can determine that exactly? Forty thousand witnessed the Farewell Pilgrimage with the Prophet (Peace be upon him) and seventy thousand witnessed Tabūk with him." We also heard that Abū Zurʿa was asked, "Is it not said that the ḥadīth of the Prophet (Peace be upon him) number four thousand?" He said, "May God loosen the canine teeth of whoever says that! This is a doctrine of the heretics. Who can count the ḥadīth of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him)? [Through his death] the Prophet was taken from 114,000 Companions who related from him and heard ḥadīth from him" — or according to another relation, "who saw him and heard ḥadīth from him." He was asked, "Abū Zurʿa, Those? Where were they? Where did they hear ḥadīth from him?" He said, "The inhabitants of Medina, the inhabitants of Mecca, those living between the two cities, the Bedouin and those who witnessed the Farewell Pilgrimage with him — that is, everyone who saw him and heard ḥadīth from him at Mt. 'Arafāa."

People differ over the number of the levels and types of Companions. For that, precedence in conversion to Islam, participation in the Emigration and witnessing the other great scenes with the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) — by our

13 Abū Bakr (or Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān) Muṭarrij b. Ṭarīf al-Kaftī (d. ca. 143/760) was a highly respected transmitter of hadith; Dhahabī, Siyar, 6:127–8.
14 'Ali b. al-Madīnī al-'Hājī, 41.
15 In the year 10/632, the Prophet led the pilgrimage to Mecca and set down its rites for later generations; EF, 3:33.
16 In the year 9/630 Muhammad led an expedition from Medina to the town Tabūk to subdue the local Arab tribes; EF, 10:50–1.
fathers, mothers and ourselves he (Peace be upon him) is the Messenger of God! – are taken into consideration. Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥakim put them into twelve ranks\(^\text{17}\) and others have added more. We will not take the time to set that out in detail.

5. The best of the Companions in absolute terms was Abū Bakr followed by ʿUmar. At this point, the majority of the forebears put ʿUthmān before ʿAlī. The Sunnite inhabitants of al-Kūfah gave ʿAlī precedence over ʿUthmān. A number held this doctrine, including ʿUfyān al-Thawrī at first. He then went back to granting precedence to ʿUthmān. Ḳhaṭṭābī related that from ʿUfyān al-Thawrī and from the other Sunnites of al-Kūfah. [Abū Bakr] Muḥammad b. Ḳhāqān b. Ḳhuṣaymā is one of the adherents of ḥadīth who was reported to have given ʿAlī precedence over ʿUthmān. The doctrines of the scholars of ḥadīth and the Sunnites have settled on granting precedence to ʿUthmān.

In regard to the best Companions as a type, Abū Manṣūr [ʿAbd al-Qāhir b. Ṭahār] al-Baghdādī al-Tamīmī said, “Our teachers unanimously agreed that the best of them were the four Caliphs,\(^\text{18}\) then the remaining six who make up the Ten [who were granted the glad tidings that they would enter Paradise], then the Muslims present at the battle of Badr,\(^\text{19}\) then those who participated in the battle of Uhud, then those who took the Pledge of Good Pleasure at al-Ḥudaybihya.” In the text of the Qurān, preference was granted to “the first Muhājirīn and Ansārīs having precedence.”\(^\text{20}\) According to the statement of Saʿīd al-Musayyib and certain others, the people referred to in the verse were those who prayed to the two qiblas.\(^\text{21}\) According to the statement of Shaβbī they were the Companions who witnessed the Pledge of Good Pleasure. It is reported that Muḥammad b. Kaḥf al-Qaṣwāṭ\(^\text{22}\) and ʿĀṭaʾ b. Yaṣār\(^\text{23}\) said they were the participants in the battle of Badr. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr related that from them in something I found from him.\(^\text{24}\) God knows best.

6. The forebears disagreed over who was the first of the Companions to convert to Islam. Some said Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq, and this was related from Ibn ʿAbbās,

\(^{17}\) ʿUṭūm al-ḥadīth, 22–5.
\(^{18}\) That is, Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUthmān and ʿAlī.
\(^{19}\) In the year 2/624 the Muslims under Muḥammad defeated a much larger force of pagans at Mecca, E.I, 1:867–8.
\(^{20}\) This is a reference to Qurān, 9:100.
\(^{21}\) The qibla is the direction to which Muslims orient themselves during their prayers. They originally prayed toward Jerusalem and in the year 2/623 were enjoined to pray in the direction of Mecca, E.I, 5:82–3.
\(^{22}\) Muḥammad b. Kaḥf b. Sulaym al-Qaṣwāṭ was an expert commentator on the Qurān who died surrounded by his students in an earthquake around the year 120/738; Sezgin, GAS, 1:32.
\(^{23}\) ʿĀṭaʾ b. Yaṣār, the brother of Sulaymān, died around 108/721; Dzhahābī, Sijur, 4:448–9.
\(^{24}\) Isfāḥān, 1:14.
Hassan b. Thabit, Ibrahim al-Nakha'i and others. Some said that Ali was the first to convert to Islam, and this was related from Zayd b. Arqam, Abū Dharr [al-Ghifari], al-Miqdad and others. Abū Abd Allah al-Jākim said, “I know of no disagreement among the writers of histories (ašāb al-tawārikh) that Ali b. Abī Taib was the first of them to convert to Islam.” That is to be rejected from al-Ḥākim. Some said that the first to convert to Islam was Zayd b. Hāritha. For instance, Maʿmar [b. Rāshid] mentioned something similar to this from Zuhri. Some said that the first to convert to Islam was Khadija, the Mother of the Believers. That is related through several lines of transmission from Zuhri. It is also the doctrine of Qatāda, Muhammad b. Ishaq b. Yasār and a number of others, in addition to being related from Ibn ʿAbbas. The Qurʾān commentator Thaʿlabah—according to what we heard or read from him—claimed that scholars agreed that the first to convert to Islam was Khadija and that their disagreement pertained only to who was the first to convert after her. The most scrupulous course is to say that the first free man to convert was Abū Bakr, the first boy or youth was Ali, the first woman was Khadija, the first client was Zayd and the first slave was Bilal. God knows best.

7. The last of the Companions to die in absolute terms was Abu ʿl-Ṭufayl ʿAmir b. Warthila. He died in the year 100 after the Emigration [719 AD]. In regard to specific regions, the last Companion to die in Medina was Jābir b. ʿAbd Allah. Ahmad b. Ḥanbal related this from Qatāda. Others said Sahil b. Saʿd or al-Saʿib b. Yazid. The last to die in Mecca was ʿAbd Allah b. ʿUmar. Jābir b. ʿAbd Allah is also named. ʿAli b. al-Madini said that Abu ʿl-Ṭufayl died in Mecca and therefore he was the last one there. The last Companion to die in al-ṣāra was Anas b. Mālik. Abū ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-Barr said, “I do not know of anyone, other than Abu ʿl-Ṭufayl, who saw the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) who

25 Hassan b. Thabit b. al-Mundhir b. Ḥartam al-Anṣāri (d. ca. 60/680) was a poet who employed his gift to promote Islam; Ep, 3:271–3.
27 The Companion al-Miqdad b. Amr b. Thaʿlabah al-Kindi (d. 33/654), known as al-Miqdad b. al-Aswad, was an important transmitter of hadith from the Prophet; Dhahibi, Syiar, 1:385–9.
28 ʿUlam al-hadith, 22–3.
29 Zayd b. Hāritha was the freedman and adopted son of the Prophet. He served as a commander in the early Muslim armies and died in action in the year 8/629 at about the age of fifty-five; Ep, 4:1194.
30 Khadija (d. 19/640) was the first wife of the Prophet. She was one of the first and staunchest supporters of his mission; Ep, 3:898–9.
31 Abu Ishaq Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Thaʿlabi (d. 427/1035) was an expert in Qurʾānic commentary and the Arabic language; Brockelmann, GAII, 1:350; Suppl., 1:592.
32 Abu Abu al-ʿAbd Allah (or Abu Yazid) al-Saʿib b. Yazid al-Kindi al-Madani is said to have died around 94/713; Dhahibi, Syiar, 3:437–9.
died after him." The last of them to die in al-Kufa was 'Abd Allah b. Abī Awfā and in Syria, 'Abd Allah b. Busr24 – and Abū Umāma25 is also named. One author went further, saying, "The last of the Companions of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) to die in Egypt was 'Abd Allah b. al-Jāriḥ b. Ja'z al-Zubaydī,26 in Palestine, Abū Ubayy b. Umm Ḥarām,27 in Damascus, Wathila b. al-Asqa'28 in Homs, 'Abd Allah b. Busr; in al-Yamāma, al-Hirmās b. Ziyād;29 in al-Jazira [that is, northern Iraq], al-'Urs b. 'Amira;30 in Ifriqiya, Ruwayfat31 b. Thābit;32 and among the Bedouins in the desert, Salama b. al-Akwa'33 (May God be pleased with all of them)." There are disagreements over some of what we said here which we have passed over. The statement about Ruwayfat31 in Ifriqiya is not correct. He died in the city of Barqa and his grave is there.34 Salama came to Medina a few nights before his death and died there. God knows best.

33 Ittā'āb, 1:111.
34 Abū Sa‘ūdīn 'Abd Allah b. Busr al-Māzīnī is said to have died around the year 90/709; Dhabāhī, Siyar, 3:430–3.
35 Abū Umāma al-Bahīlī died in Homs around the year 86/705; Dhabāhī, Siyar, 3:359–63.
36 Abū l-Jāriḥ b. Abī Awfā al-Jāriḥ b. Ja'z al-Zubaydī was present at the conquest of Egypt and settled there until his death around the year 85/704; Dhabāhī, Siyar, 3:387–8.
38 Abū Hudayr al-Hirmās b. Ziyād b. Malik al-Bahīlī seems to have still been alive around the year 90/709; Dhabāhī, Siyar, 3:450–1.
40 Ruwayfat b. Thābit al-Anṣārī died in the year 56/676; Dhabāhī, Siyar, 3:36.
41 Abū 'Amir (or Abū Muslim or Abū Iyās) Salama b. 'Amr b. al-Akwa' al-Aslāmī died in the year 74/693; Dhabāhī, Siyar, 3:326–31.
42 Historically, there was no precise delineation of the boundaries of the geographical designations Ifriqiya and al-Maghrib. Ibn al-Ṣalāh may have been one of those who considered Barqa (that is, Barca, modern-day al-Marj in Libya) to be part of al-Maghrib.
Category 40

THE FOLLOWERS

(Ma'rifat al-Tābi'īn)

This and knowledge of the Companions form a fundamental source of reference for distinguishing loose (mursal) and supported hadith (musnad). The expert al-Khaṭṭāb said, “A Follower is someone who associated with (sahiba) a Companion.” Its unqualified application is specific to “the Follower who performs good deeds.” A single Follower may equally be called tābi’ or tābi’t. The remarks of Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥakīm and others indicate that to be a Follower it is enough to hear hadith from a Companion or meet him, even if what is commonly understood to be companionship never existed between them. Mere meeting and seeing are more likely to suffice for attaining the status of a Follower than that of a Companion in view of the requirements of the two terms.¹

These are some important points regarding this Category.

1. The expert Abū ‘Abd Allāh [al-Ḥakīm] said that the Followers have fifteen levels.² The first is those who had contact with the Ten [who were given the glad tidings of their entrance into Paradise], [that is,] the Followers Sa’īd b. al-Musayyib, Qays b. Abī l-Jāzīm, Abū Uthmān al-Nahdi, Qays b. Ubād,³ Abū Sāsān Ḥudayn b. al-Mundhir,⁴ Abū Wā’il [Shaqiq b. Salama al-Kūfī], Abū Ra'ā al-Uṭairīdī⁵ and others.⁶

He is wrong about some of these. Sa’īd b. al-Musayyib does not belong here, because he was born in the Caliphate of ʿUmar [b. al-Khaṭṭāb] and did not hear hadith from most of the Ten. Indeed, someone said, “His relation from none of the Ten, except Sa’īd b. Abī Waqqās,” is established.” Sa’īd was the last of them to die. Before his remarks mentioned above,

¹ Kifāya, 22.
² Qurʾān 9:100.
³ It would appear that Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ regarded being a “companion” of someone as more demanding than being a “follower.”
⁴ Ulūm al-hadīth, 42.
⁵ Abū ‘Abd Allāh Qays b. Ubād al-Minqār al-Qays came to Medina during the time of ʿUmar and met a number of the important Companions there; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Jarb, 3(2):101.
⁷ Abū Ra’ā Imrān b. Mālīhān (or Taym) al-Uṭairīdī died around 105/723 at about one hundred and twenty years of age; Dhahabi, Siyār, 4:253–7.
⁸ Ulūm al-hadīth, 42.
⁹ The prominent Companion Sa’īd b. Abī Waqqās (d. ca. 55/675) played a leading role in most of the important events of the early days of Islam; EI2, 8:669–70.
al-Ḥākim said that Saʿīd lived at the same time as ʿUmar and those after him, through the last of the Ten [to die]. He also said, “Saʿīd and Qays b. Abī Ḥāzim were the only Followers who lived at the same time as all of the Ten and heard hadith from them.” That does not give with what we quoted from him above.11 True, Qays b. Abī Ḥāzim did hear hadith from the Ten and related from them. He was the only Follower to relate from all of the Ten. The expert ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Yūsuf b. Khirāṭ12 said that. We also heard or read from him — and from Abū Dawūd al-Siṣjāṣṭānī — that he said that Qays b. Abī Ḥāzim related from nine of them and did not relate from ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAwf.13

After those Followers come the children of Companions who were born during the lifetime of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), like ʿAbd Allāh b. Abī ʿṬalḥa,14 Abū ʿUmāma Asʿad b. Sahl b. Ḥunayfī,15 Abū Idrīs al-Khawlānī and others.

2. The “severed” Followers (al-mukhadaḍramūn min al-Tābīʿīn) were those who lived in both pre-Islamic times (al-jāhiliya) and during the lifetime of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), converted to Islam and did not have Companionship. One of them is called a mukhadram, as if he khudra; that is, “were cut off” from his peers who attained Companionship and other things. Muslim mentioned them and counted twenty of them, including Abū ʿAmr al-Shaybānī,16 Suwayd b. Ghafla al-Kindī,17 ʿAmr b. Maymūn al-Awdī,18 ʿAbd Khārīr b. Yazīd al-Khaywāntī, Abū ʿUthmān ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Mull al-Nahdī and Abū ʿl-Ḥalāl Rabiʿa b. Zurār al-ʿAtakī.19 Abū Muslim ʿAbd Allāh b. Thuwaṭab

10 ʿUlam al-hadīth, 25.
11 That is, because Saʿīd b. al-Musayyid was not born until the caliphate ʿUmar, he was not alive during the lifetime of Abī Bakr.
12 Abū Muhammad ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Yūsuf b. Saʿīd b. Khirāṭ al-Marwazī (d. 283/896) was an expert in hadith who is reported to have had Shiʿite leanings; Dīwāḥabī, Siyār, 13:508–10.
13 Abū Muhammad ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAwf (d. ca. 325/653) was a prominent early convert to Islam who fought with the Prophet at most of his major battles; EF, 1:84.
14 Abū ʿAmr b. Abī ʿ Ṭalḥa Zaydī was the half-brother of the famous Companion Anas b. Malik; Dīwāḥabī, Siyār, 3:482–4.
15 Some were of the opinion that Abū ʿUmāma Asʿad b. Sahl b. Ḥunayfī al-Ansārī saw the Prophet. He is said to have died in 100/719; Dīwāḥabī, Siyār, 3:517–19.
16 Abū ʿAmr Saʿīd b. Iyās al-Shaybānī was a Kūfī who died around 91/710; Dīwāḥabī, Siyār, 4:173–4.
17 Abū ʿUmayya Suwayd b. Ghafla b. ʿAwṣaṭa al-Kindī al-Kuṭbī was born about the same time as the Prophet and died around 81/700. He transmitted hadith from a number of the most important Companions; Dīwāḥabī, Siyār, 4:69–73.
al-Khawlānī and al-Ḥanafī b. Qays were among those whom Muslim did not mention. God knows best.

3. “The Seven Jurists of Medina” (al-fuqaha al-sab'a min ahl al-Madina) – namely Saʿīd b. al-Musayyib, al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad,20 Urwa b. al-Zubayr, Khārijī b. Zayd,21 Abū Salama b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān, ʿUbayd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUrba and Sulaymān b. Yāsār – were among the older Followers (akabīr al-Tāhirīn). We heard that the expert Abū ʿAbd Allāh [al-Ḥākim] said, “In the opinion of most of the Hijāzī scholars, these are the Seven Jurists. We heard that Ibn al-Mubārak said, “The Medinese jurists whose legal views they promulgate were seven in number,” and he named these. However, he gave Sālim b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmār instead of Abū Salama b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān. We heard Abu l-Zinād’s enumeration of them in his book about them and he mentioned these. However, he gave Abū Bakr b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān24 instead of Abū Salama and Sālim.

4. It is reported that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal said, “Saʿīd b. al-Musayyib was the best Follower.” When he was asked, “And ‘Alqama [b. Qays] and al-Aswad?” he replied, “Saʿīd b. al-Musayyib, ‘Alqama and al-Aswad.” It is also reported that he said, “I do not know of another Follower like Abī ʿUthmān al-Nahdī and Qays b. Abī Hāzim.” It is also reported that he said, “The best Followers were Qays, Abū ʿUthmān, ‘Alqama and Masrūq. These were excellent and in the upper stratum of Followers.” I liked what I found in a book of the teacher and ascetic Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. Khāṭib al-Shīrāzī.25 “People disagree over the best of the Followers. The Medinese say, ‘Saʿīd b. al-Musayyib.’ The Kūfans say, ‘Uways al-Qarant.’” The Bāṣrans say, ‘Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī.’”

We read that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal did say, “Al-Ḥasan and ʿĀṭaʾ [b. Abī Rabāh] gave the most legal judgements;” that is, from among the

---

20 Abū Muslim al-Khawlānī was a Yemenite who entered Medina during the caliphate of Abū Bakr. He died in 62/662 while campaigning against the Byzantines; Dhahabi, Siyyar, 4:7–14.  
21 Abū Baṣr al-Ḥanafī b. Qays b. Muʿāwiyah al-Tamānī (his ism is disputed) was one of the first inhabitants of al-Ḥaṣra. He fought in the eastern conquests and died in 67/687 fighting the Shiʿite rebel al-Mukhtar; EF, 1:304–4.  
22 Al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad (ca. 37/657–ca. 110/728) was the grandson of the caliph Abū Bakr. He was famed for his piety and expertise in ḥadīth; Sezgin, GAS, 1:279.  
24 Sulaymān b. Yaṣār (d. ca. 109/727) was a client of the Prophet’s wife Maymūna; Dhahabi, Siyyar, 4:444–8.  
25 Abū Bakr b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. ʿAbd al-Hārith b. Hishām al-Makhtūnt (d. ca. 95/714) was, among other things, a prolific transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabi, Siyyar, 4:416–19.  
26 Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Khāṭib al-Shīrāzī (ca. 268/882–371/982) was a well-traveled Sufi; Sezgin, GAS, 1:663–4.  
27 Abū Ṭāhir Uways b. Ṭāhir al-Qarant (d. 37/657) was a famous early ascetic; Dhahabi, Siyyar, 4:19–33.
Followers. He also said, “Aṭā was the legal expert who was consulted in Mecca (muṣṭi Makka) as al-Ḥasan was in al-Ḥaṣa. The people often solicited their legal judgements as well as their opinions.”

We read that Abū Bakr b. Abī Dāwūd said, “The two leading women of the Followers were Ḥafṣa bint Strīm and Amrā bint ʿAbd Al-Raḥmān and the third – and she was not the equal of the first two – was Umm al-Dardā. God knows best.

5. We heard that Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥakim said,40 “There is also a level the people consider to be Followers although none of them has an established audition from the Companions. They include the jurist Ibrāhim b. Suwayd al-Nakhaṭī and he is not the jurist Ibrāhim b. Yazīd al-Nakhaṭī – Bukayr b. Abī ʿl-Samīṭ and Bukayr b. ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Aswājī, and he mentioned others.

Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥakim added,41 “Furthermore, there is a level the people consider to be followers of the Followers although they met some of the Companions. These include Abu ʿl-Zinād ʿAbd Allāh b. Dhakhwān, who met ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar, Anas [b. Mālik] and Hishām b. Urwā. He was brought before ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar, Jabir b. ʿAbd Allāh and Mūsā b. Uqba and was alive during the lifetime of Anas b. Mālik and Umm Khālid bint Khālid b. Saʿīd b. al-Ṣāṣī.”

Comments can be made about some of what Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥakim has said. There are also some people who are considered Followers while they are really Companions. The most surprising instance of that is Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥakim regarding al-Ḥafṣīn and Suwayd,42 the sons of Mūqarrīn Al-Muṣān, as Followers, when he mentions the Brothers who were Followers.43 They are well known to be Companions and frequently mentioned among the Companions. God knows best.

28 Umm al-Hudhayl Ḥafṣa (d. after 100/719) was the sister of the famous Muḥammad b. Strīm. She was a pious woman respected for her knowledge of hadith, law and the Qurʾān; Duhahb, Siyar, 4:198.
29 Huṣayma (or Huṣayma) al-Waqāṣṭīya, known as Umm al-Dardā’ al-Ṣughrā, was the wife of Abu ʿl-Dardā’ and an expert in religious law. She died after 81/700; Duhahb, Siyar, 4:277-9.
30 Ulm al-hadith, 45.
33 Bukayr b. ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Aswājī (d. ca. 127/745) was a transmitter of hadith who seems to have ended his days in Egypt; Duhahb, Siyar, 6:770-74.
34 Ulm al-hadith, 45-6.
35 According to Duhahb, Umm Khalīd bint Khalīd (d. ca. 90/709) was the last of the female Companions to die; Duhahb, Siyar, 3:370-71.
36 Abī Ḥakīm (or Abī ʿAmr) al-Ḥafṣīn b. Muqarrīn b. ʿAlī b. the standard bearer of his tribe at the conquest of Mecca; Duhahb, Siyar, 2:536-8.
38 Ulm al-hadith, 154.
Category 41
OLDER PEOPLE TRANSMITTING HADITH FROM YOUNGER ONES
(Ma'rifat al-akabir al-ruwât 'an al-aşâghîr)

One benefit from this Category is that it will not be mistakenly assumed that the person being transmitted from is older than or superior to the person transmitting on the basis that in most instances that is the case. [If that is automatically assumed], their true status will not be known. It has been established that 'A'ishah (God be pleased with her) said, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) ordered us to put people in their proper place.” Such cases take several forms.

One is that the transmitter is older and belongs to an earlier generation than the person from whom he transmitted hadith. That was the case of Zuhri and Yahyâ b. Sa'dî al-Anşârî in their relation from Malik. It was also the case of the later scholar Abu 'l-Qâsim Ubayd Allah b. Ahmad al-Azhârî— one of the teachers of al-Khaṭîb [al-Baghdâdî]— who transmitted from al-Khaṭîb in some of his works, and al-Khaṭîb was at that time in the prime of his youth and his days as a student.

Another form is that the transmitter is greater in stature than the person from whom he related hadith, because he is a knowledgeable expert and the person he transmits from is only a teacher (shaykhî) who just transmits. This was the case with Malik in his relation from 'Abd Allah b. Dinâr; and Ahmad b. Hanbal and Ishâq b. Râhawayh in their relation from Ubayd Allah b. Mûsâ. There are many instances of that.

Another form of this is that the transmitter is greater in both respects. Examples of this are the many scholars and experts who relate from their students and pupils; for instance, the relation of the expert 'Abd al-Ghanî [b. Sa'dî] from Muhammad b. 'Ali al-Ṣûrî, the relation of Abû Bakr al-Barqûqî from al-Khaṭîb, the relation of al-Khaṭîb from Abû Naṣr b. Makûla. Similar cases are numerous.

Subsumed under this Category are the instances of a Companion transmitting hadith from a Follower which are cited, like the relation of the 'Abd Allahs and other Companions from Ka'b al-Aḥbâr. The same is true of the relation of a Follower from a follower of a Follower, for instance the relation of Zuhri and [Abû Sa'd Yahyâ b. Sa'dî] al-Anşârî from Malik, which we mentioned above. The same was true of 'Amr b. Shu'ayb b. Mûhammad b. 'Abd Allah b. 'Amr b.

---

1 Abu 'l-Qâsim al-Azhârî (355/966-435/1043) was a respected and prolific scholar of hadith; al-Khaṭîb al-Baghdâdî, Ta'rikh Baghdâd, 10:385; Dhabâbî, Siyar, 17:578.
2 Needless to say, few would agree with the author that Abû Bakr al-Barqûqî, for all his merits, was of greater stature than al-Khaṭîb al-Baghdâdî.
3 The authority on the Bible Abû Ishaq Ka'b b. Mâti (d. 32/652 or 34/654), popularly known as Ka'b al-Aḥbâr, was a Yemenite Jew who converted to Islam; EF, 4:316-17; Sezgin, CAS, 1:304-5.
al-Äšā'ī. He was not a Follower, yet more than twenty Followers transmitted from him. The expert 'Abd al-Ghani b. Sa'îd collected the names of those Followers in a small book. I read in the handwriting of the expert Abû Muḥammad al-Ṭabarî in one of his compilations that he-said, “Amr b. Shu'ayb was not a Follower, yet some seventy Followers transmitted hadîth from him.” God knows best.

4 Abû ʻIbrâhîm 'Amr b. Shu'ayb was an expert in law and hadîth who lived in al-Ṭabâf. He was a member of the generation after the Followers, although his exact dates do not seem to have been recorded; Dhahabî, Siyar, 5:165–80.

5 This appears to be a reference to Muhammad b. Abî Ja'far al-Ṭabarî, whose kunya is usually given as “Abu Ḥaṭîf.” He was a Sufi who died in Tabas in 482/1089, Brockelmann, GAL, 1:496; Suppl., 1:907.
Category 42

Symmetrical Transmissions, and Other Instances of Peers Transmitting from One Another

(Ma’rifat al-mudabbaj wa-mā ‘adāhu min riwayat al-aqrān ba’dihim ‘an ba’d)

Peers are those who are alike in regard to age and [their relative position] in isnāds. Occasionally Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim was satisfied with their being alike in regard to isnāds, even if there was no similarity in regard to their age. Be aware that the relation of one peer from another falls into different subcategories.

One is the “symmetrical,” and this is two peers relating from each other. An example of this from the Companions is ‘A’isha and Abū Hurayra, each of whom related from the other. An example from the Followers is the relation of Zuhri from ‘Umar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAziz and the relation of ‘Umar from Zuhri. An example from the followers of the Followers is the relation of Mālik from Awzā’ī and the relation of Awzā’ī from Mālik. An example from the followers of the followers [of the Followers] is the relation of Ahmad b. Ḥanbal from ʿAli b. al-Madhī and the relation of ʿAlī from Aḥmad. Al-Ḥākim gave as an example of the last the relation of Ahmad b. Ḥanbal from ʿAbd al-Razzāq [b. Hammām] and the relation of ʿAbd al-Razzāq from Aḥmad, and that is not satisfactory.²

An example of the relation of peers which is not symmetrical consists of one of the peers relating from the other while the other — so far as we know — did not relate from him. An example of this is the relation of Sulaymān al-Taymi from Misʿar.³ They were peers and we do not know of a case of Misʿar relating from Taymi. There are many examples like this. God knows best.

---

¹ This translation is based on the derivation of mudabbaj Ibn Hajar proposes in Nuzhat al-naṣar, 110.
² Ullām al-ḥadīth, 218. Ibn al-Ṣalīḥ may have been objecting to regarding them as peers because ʿAbd al-Razzāq was already thirty-eight lunar years old at the time of Aḥmad’s birth. This would then be an example of al-Ḥākim ignoring ages.
³ Abū Salama Misʿar b. Kidām b. Zuhayr al-Kūfī (d. 155/772) was considered by some to be the greatest transmitter of his day in al-Kūf; Dahlabi, Sīyar, 7:163–73.
Category 43

BROTHERS AND SISTERS AMONG SCHOLARS AND TRANSMITTERS

(Ma‘rifat al-ikhwa wa-l-akhawat min al-ulama wa-l-ruwāt)

This is one of the branches of knowledge which the scholars of hadith have treated in independent works. 'Ali b. al-Madini,1 Abu ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Nasawi [that is, Nasrī], Abu 'l-Abbās al-Sarrāj and others composed books on it.

Examples of two siblings from the Companions are the brothers 'Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd and 'Utbah b. Mas‘ūd,1 the brothers Zayd b. Thābit and Yazīd b. Thābit,2 and the brothers 'Amr b. al-‘Āṣ and Hishām b. al-‘Āṣ.3 Examples from the Followers are Abū Maysara 'Amr b. Shurāhbi and his brother Arqam b. Shurāhbi,4 both of whom were among the finest students of [Abū Allāh] b. Mas‘ūd. Huzayl b. Shurāhbi5 and Arqam b. Shurāhbi were two other brothers who were also students of Ibn Mas‘ūd.

1 This appears to be a reference to Ibn al-Madini’s Tasmīyat man ruwaya ‘anhu min awwād al-shura wa-ghayrihim min Aḥbāb Rasūl Allāh, which contains a section on brothers and sisters. This work has been published with Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī’s Tasmīyat al-ikhwa al-ladihina ruwaya ‘anhum al-hadith in a volume entitled al-Rawāt min al-ikhwa wa-l-akhawāt, ed. Basīm Faysal al-Jawābī (Riyadh, 1408/1988).
2 Muhammad b. Isḥāq al-Thaqafī al-Sarrāj al-Nṣābīrī (216/831–313/925) was a famous scholar of hadith and a prolific author. Among his works was a mawṣūd and a ta‘rīkh, which Buhkārī is said to have used; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:173.
3 Dhomrāb, Sīyar, 1:500.
5 Abū ‘Abd Allāh ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ al-Sahmī was a Qurayshite from Mecca who converted to Islam in the year 8/629. He led the invasion of Egypt which culminated in the capture of Alexandria in 21/642 and then served as the governor of Egypt until the caliph Uthmān removed him. He aided the founder of the Umayyad dynasty Mu‘awiya in defeating the caliph ‘Ali and resumed his position in Egypt until his death around 42/663; E.F., 1:451.
6 Hishām was an early convert to Islam who participated in a number of the famous battles and died in combat; Dhomrāb, Sīyar, 3:77–9.
7 Ibn al-Salāḥ seems to have been under the impression that there were two Arqam b. Shurāhbi, one the brother of ‘Amr and the other the brother of Huzayl. The sources only know a single Arqam b. Shurāhbi – e.g., Buhkārī, al-Tārīkh al-kabīr, 1(2):46; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Jarḥ, 1(1):310 – and the notion of two Arqams was explicitly rejected by later commentators; e.g., Iṣrāq, Taqyīd, 337–8.
8 Buhkārī, al-Tārīkh al-kabīr, 3(2):245.
Examples of three brothers are Sahl, 9 'Abbād, 10 and ‘Uthmān, 11 the sons of Ḥunayf; and ʿAmr b. Shuʿayb, ʿUmar, 12 and Shuʿayb, 13 the sons of Shuʿayb b. Muhammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmr b. al-‘Āṣ. 14

An example of four brothers is Suhayl b. Abī Ṣāliḥ al-Sammān al-Zayyāt and his brothers ʿAbīd Allāh 15 – who was also called ʿAbbād – Muḥammad 16 and Ṣāliḥ. 17

An example of five is what we hear from Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥakīm. He said, "I heard the expert Abū ʿAli al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAli more than once say, ʿĀdam b. ʿUayna, ʿĪmrān b. ʿUayna, Muḥammad b. ʿUayna, Sufyān b. ʿUayna and Ibrāhīm b. ʿUayna transmitted ḥadīth from up to the last of them." 122

An example of six are the children of Sirīn, six Followers. They are Muḥammad, Anas, 22 Yahyā, 23 Maṣḥad, 24 Ḥaṣa and Kartma. 25 Abū ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Nasawi gave them thus – and I transmitted it from a copy of his book which was written in what I think is the handwriting of Dāraquṣṭī. That is also related from Yahyā b. Maṣḥad and al-Ḥakīm gave them thus in Kitāb Maʿrifā 26 that is, Kitāb maʿrifā ʿalām al-ḥadīth. 23 However, he said in what we hear from his Taʾrīkh, 28 through our isnād from him, that he heard the expert Abū ʿAli al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAli mention the Banū Sirīn as five siblings: Muḥammad b. Sirīn; the eldest of them, Maṣḥad b. Sirīn; Yahyā b. Sirīn; Khālid b. Sirīn; 26 Anas b.

9 Sahl b. Ḥunayf b. Wāḥib al-Anṣārī (five different kunyās are suggested for him), like his brother ‘Uthmān, was considered a Companion. He served as a lieutenant of ʿAli and died in al-Kufa in 38/658; Dhuḥabā, Sīyār, 2:325–9.
10 I have not succeeded in locating ʿAbbād in any of the sources I consulted.
11 Abū ʿAbd Allāh ʿUthmān (d. ca. 50/670) served as a governor under ʿUmar and ʿAli and played an important role in the development of the taxation policy of the Muslim empire; Dhuḥabā, Sīyār, 2:320–2.
12 I have not found any information about ʿUmar.
14 Dhuḥabā suggested that the father Shuʿayb died after the year 80/699; Sīyār, 5:181.
21 Ibrāhīm (ca. 120/738–199/815) was a good man and an average transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhuḥabā, Sīyār, 8:475.
22 al-ʿUlam al-ḥadīth, 155.
23 Dhuaḥabā, Sīyār, 4:622–3.
26 I have not located her in the sources.
27 Anas is given as "Anas" (or "Unayz") in the printed text of al-ʿUlam al-ḥadīth, 153.
28 This would appear to be a reference to al-Ḥakīm’s Taʾrīkh Nisābūr, although it is not clear why the ʿAbāṣan Ibn Sirīn family would be discussed in that book.
29 I have not found Khālid in the sources.
Sirtn; and the youngest of them, Ḥafṣa bint Sirtn." It was related from Muhammad from Yaḥya from Anas from Anas b. ʿAmir that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, "God, we respond in all sincerity, subservient like slaves!" This is an oddity which someone made into a riddle by asking, "Which three brothers related from one another?"

An example of seven is al-Nuʿmān b. Muqarrin and his brothers Maʿqil,10 ʿAqil,11 Suwayd, Sinān,22 ʿAbd al-Raḥmān13 and a seventh who is not named for us. The Banū Muqarrin al-Muzantyūn are seven brothers who participated in the Emigration from Mecca to Medina and associated with the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). According to Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr34 and a number of others, no one else shared this excellent distinction with them. It has been said that all of them were present at the Battle of the Trench.

Sometimes there is some disagreement regarding the exact number of the siblings. We will not lengthen our book with groups of siblings numbering more than seven, because of their rarity and the irrelevance of that to our present purpose. God knows best.

---

30 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istīʿāb, 3:1452.
31 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istīʿāb, 3:1079.
32 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istīʿāb, 2:659.
33 I have not uncovered any information about ʿAbd al-Raḥmān.
34 Istīʿāb, 3:1432.
Category 44
THE TRANSMISSION BY FATHERS FROM THEIR SONS
(Ma'rifat riwayat al-ābā bi'an al-abnā')

Al-Khaṭṭāb has a book on this. As an example of this, we heard the hadith from al-ʿAbbās b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib’ from his son al-Fadl’ (God be pleased with them) regarding the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) combining the two prayers at al-Muzdalifā.

We also heard in this regard from Wa'il b. Dāwūd' from his son Bakr b. Wā'il' - and they are both reliable - several hadith, including the hadith from [Sufyān] b. 'Uyayna from Wa'il b. Dāwūd from his son Bakr from Zuhrt from Sa'id b. al-Musayyib from Abū Hurayra. He said, "The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, 'Delay your religious duties, our hands are suspended and our feet tied.'" Al-Khaṭṭāb said, "So far as we know, this hadith is not related from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) by anyone but Bakr and his father.'"

We heard that Mu'tamīr b. Sulaymān al-Taymī said, "My father transmitted to me, saying, 'You transmitted to me from me from Ayyūb [al-Sakhitiyyān] from al-Ḥasan [al-Hasan].' He said, "'Woe is a word of blessing.'" This is an unusual report which embraces several Categories. We heard around sixteen hadith from Abū Umār Ḥafṣ b. 'Umar al-Dūrī al-Muqrī' from his son Abū Ja'far Muhammad b. Ḥafṣ' and that is the most we heard a father have from his son.

The last and most recent instance of this Category is the hadith Abū 'l-Muzaffār 'Abd al-Rahīm, the son of the expert Abū Sa'īd ['Abd al-Karim al-Samānī] al-Marwazi, (God bless them) personally transmitted to me in Marv. He said, My father informed me from me in what I read in his handwriting. He said, My son Abū 'l-Muzaffār 'Abd al-Raḥīm transmitted to me personally and from his written original. Abū Sa'īd gave it with his instād from Abū Umāma [As'ād b. Sahl b. Ḥunayf] that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, "Supply your table with cabbage for it drives away the devil when 'In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate' is spoken."

2. Al-ʿAbbās (d. 32/653) was the paternal uncle of the Prophet; Dhabāt, Siyar, 2:78–103.
3. Abū Muḥammad al-Fadl (d. 18/639) was the eldest child of Abū ʿAbbās; Bukhārī, al-Tārikh al-kabīr, 4(1):114; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Jārīb, 3(2):63.
6. Mu'tamīr, the son of the famous Sulaymān b. Tarkhān al-Taymī al-Baṣrī, was born in 106/724 and died in al-Ṭayy in 187/803; Dhabāt, Siyar, 8:477–9.
7. Abū Umār al-Dūrī (d. ca. 246/860) was an expert in the Qur'ān; Dhabāt, Siyar, 11:541–3.
The hadith which we heard from Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddiq from [his daughter] ʿAṣima in which the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, “In the black seed is a cure for every disease,” is an error from one of those who related it. Rather, it is from Abū Bakr b. Abī ʿAṭīq from ʿAṣima, and this Abū Bakr is ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Abī Bakr al-Ṣiddiq. Those people are the ones about whom Mūsā b. Uqba said, “We do not know of four — they and their descendants — who lived at the same time as the Prophet (Peace be upon him) except those four,” and he named Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddiq, his father, Abī Bakr’s son ʿAbd al-Rahmān and the last’s son Abū ʿAṭīq Muḥammad” [sic]. God knows best.

9 Ibn Abī ʿAṭīq was known for his sharp wit; EP, 3:682.
10 Abū Qubās ʿUthmān b. ʿAmir converted to Islam upon the conquest of Mecca and is considered a Companion. He died in 14/635 at the age of ninety-seven; Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istīḥāṣ, 4:1732–3.
11 Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Rahmān, the son of Abū Bakr and the brother of the Prophet’s wife ʿAṣima, died in 53/673; Dhahabi, Siyar, 2:471–3.
12 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istīḥāṣ, 3:1374.
THE TRANSMISSION BY SONS FROM THEIR FATHERS

(Ma‘rifat riwayat al-abnâ‘ an al-ābâr)

The expert Abū Naṣr al-Wa‘îli [al-Sijzi] has a book on this.¹ The most critical instances are when the actual name of the father or grandfather is not given. They fall into two categories.

1. The relation of a son from a father from a grandfather: an example is “Amr b. Shu‘ayb from his father from his grandfather.”² Amr has a large nuskhah with this isnād, which consists mostly of excellent hadith on legal topics. Shu‘ayb is the son of Muhammad b. ʿAbd Allah b. Amr b. al-ʾĀs.³ Most of the scholars of hadith cite his hadith as proofs, interpreting the unqualified designation of “grandfather” in the isnād as a reference to the Companion ʿAbd Allah b. Amr b. al-ʾĀs, rather than ʿAbd Allah’s son Muḥammad, the father of Shu‘ayb,⁴ on account of the instances of ʿAbd Allah being designated as that person which they came across.⁵

Similar to this is “Bahz b. Ḥakīm from his father from his grandfather.” Bahz related a fine large nuskhah with this isnād. “His grandfather” is Muḥammad b. ʾIlayy al-Qushayrī.⁶

A further example is “Ṣalḥ b. Muṣarrīf from his father from his grandfather” and “his grandfather” is Amr b. Kaḥb al-Ŷami, or, it is said, Kaḥb b. Amr.⁷

The most amusing example of that is the relation of the Ḥanbalite jurist Abu ʿl-Ḥaraj ʿAbd al-Wahhāb al-Tamīmī – and he had a circle for

¹ Kitāb riwayat al-abnâ‘ an al-ābâr; Katāmat, Risāla, 163.
² Muḥammad al-Sahmī seems to have been primarily known for his transmissions from his father; Dhahabī, Siyar, 5:181–3.
³ The question here revolves around the correct interpretation of the Arabic word jādīd, which commonly means “grandfather” but may validly be applied to more remote ancestors as well.
⁴ If they did not take the Companion ʿAbd Allah to be the “grandfather,” they would not have been able to cite the hadith because they would have been “loose.”
⁵ That is, ʿAbd Allah is actually named in some of the isnāds attached to these hadith; see Bulqīnī, Muṣannaf, 541.
⁶ Muḥammad b. Ḥaydā al-Qushayrī was a Companion of the Prophet. He was the grandfather of Bahz’s father; Buhārī, al-Tārīkh al-kabīr, 4(1):329; Ibn Abī Ḥatīm, Jāhīr, 4(1):376.
⁷ ʿAbd Muḥammad Ṣalḥ b. Muṣarrīf al-Ŷamī al-Handānī was an unusual Ḥanfī who liked the caliph ʿUthmān and regarded nahḍah as forbidden; Dhahabī, Siyar, 5:191–3. According to the nuskhah of Ṣalḥ given by Buhārī, Kaḥb was his grandfather; al-Tārīkh al-kabīr, 2(2):346.
⁸ This Companion appears both ways in isnāds; Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Isrā‘īl, 3:1199, 1322–3.

Those from Whom Two Transmitters, One Early and One Late with a Great Difference Between Their Dates of Death — so there is a great difference in the time between them — both relate, even if the later one of them is not regarded as a contemporary of the first or a member of his generation.

(Ma’rifat man ishtaraka fi l-riwâya ‘anhu râwi’ân mutaqaddim wa-muta’akkhîr tabâyana waqt waftâyhim tabâyûnan shadidan fa-ha’asala baynahum amad ba’id wa-in kâna al-muta’akkhîr minhumâ ghayr ma’dûd min mu’âsirî l-awwal wa-dhawi tabaqatihi)

One of the uses of this Category is to fix the sweetness of elevated isnâds in human hearts. Al-Khaṭṭîb devoted a fine book to this subject called Kitâb al-Sâbiq wa-l-lâhîq (The First and Last Students of Transmitters). An example of this is Muhammad b. Ishaq al-Thaqafi al-Sarrâj al-Nsâbûrî. The authority Bukhârî related from him in his Ta’rîkh and Abu l-‘I’lîsayn Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Khaṭṭîb al-Nsâbûrî also related from him. There is a span of 137 [lunar] years or more between their deaths, since Bukhârî died in 256 [870 AD] and al-Khaṭṭîb died in either 393 [1002 AD], 394 or 395.

Another example is the imâm Malik b. Anas. Zuhri and Zakarya b. Duwayd al-Kindî transmitted hadîth from him and there is a span of 137 [lunar] years or more between their deaths. Zuhri died in 124 [742 AD]. Malik was favored with many transmissions belonging to this Category. God knows best.

---

1 Hâjit Khalifa, Kaskîf, 2:cd. 973.
2 Al-Khaṭṭîb was one of the most elevated transmitters of hadîth of his era; Dhahabi, Siyar, 16:481-2.
3 According to Ibn Hibbân, "he used to tour Syria, transmitting [his forgeries] to the inhabitants and claiming that he was one hundred and thirty-five years old;" Majrîhân, 1:314–15.
Muslim has a book on this subject which I have not seen. The following are some examples from the Companions:

Wahb b. Khanbashī was a Companion from whom Shafi'i alone related hadith. He appears as "Harim b. Khanbash" in the books of al-Ḥakīm and Abū Nuʿaym al-Iṣbahānī on the sciences of hadith and this form of his name is an error originating in the relation of Dawūd al-Awdi from Shafi'i.

The same is true of ʿAmir b. Shahrī, ʿUrwa b. Muṭarris, Muḥammad b. Ṣafwān al-Anṣārī and Muḥammad b. Ṣayf al-Anṣārī—these last two are not the same person, although some people said that they were. These were also Companions from whom only Shafi'i related hadith.

Qays b. Abī Ḥāzin was alone in relating hadith from his father,6 Dukayn b. Saʿīd al-Muzaż,7 al-Ṣunābī b. al-ʿAṣarī and Mirdās b. Mālik al-Aslāmī, all of whom were Companions.

Qudāmā b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Kilābī13 is also one of them. Only Ayman b. Nābil19 related hadith from him.

1 Kitāb al-Munfaḍād wa-l-wahdān, ed. ʿAbd al-Ghaflār Sulaymān al-Bundari (Beirut, 1408/1988).
2 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Isṭāfā, 4:1560.
3 ʿUlam al-hadith, 158.
4 According to Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, Abū Nuʿaym wrote a mustakhruj on al-Ḥakīm’s work; Nuṣḥat al-nasār, 4.
6 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Isṭāfā, 2:792.
7 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Isṭāfā, 3:1067.
8 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Isṭāfā, 3:1370.
9 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Isṭāfā, 3:1371.
10 ʿAwfi (or ʿAwwf) b. al-Ḥārīth b. Ṣaʿīd al-Anṣārī; Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Isṭāfā, 3:1225–6, s.n. ʿAww b. ʿAfra.
11 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Isṭāfā, 2:462.
12 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Isṭāfā, 2:740.
Among the Companions there is a group from whom only their sons related hadith, including

Shakal b. Ḥumayd: 15 his son Shutayr 16 is the only one who related hadith from him.

One of them is al-Musayyib b. Ḥazn al-Qurashi 17 his son Saʿīd b. al-Musayyib was the only one to relate hadith from him.

Muʿāwiya b. Ḥayda: his son Ḥakm, 18 the father of Bahz, was the only one to relate hadith from him.

Qurra b. Iyās: 19 no one related hadith from him beside his son Muʿāwiya. 20

Abū Laylā al-ʾAnṣārī: 21 his son ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Laylā 22 was the only one to relate hadith from him.

Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-ʾIkrim in al-Makki fi Kitāb al-Iklīl 23 (Introduction to The Book of the Crown) expressed the opinion that Bukhārī and Muslim did not include in their Sahīh the hadith of anyone of this type. He was criticized for that claim and it is refuted by Bukhārī’s including in his Sahīh the hadith of Qays b. Abī Ḥārizm from Mirdās al-ʾAslami, “The righteous will disappear one by one.” 15 Qays was the only transmitter from Mirdās al-ʾAslami. It is also refuted by Bukhārī’s inclusion 16 — rather the inclusion by both Bukhārī and Muslim 17 — of the hadith of al-Musayyib b. Ḥazn on the death of Abū Ṭalib, 28 although his son [that is, Saʿīd b. al-Musayyib] was the sole transmitter from him. It is further refuted by Bukhārī’s inclusion of the hadith of al-Ḥasan al-ʾBaṣrī from ʿAmr b. Ṭaghlib, 29 “I give to a man … and the one I omit is dearer to me.” 30 Al-Ḥasan was the only one who related hadith from ʿAmr. Similarly, Muslim

15 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Jāmiʿ, 2:710.
19 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Jāmiʿ, 3:1280.
21 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Jāmiʿ, 4:1744.
22 ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Laylā (d. ca. 83/702) was a prominent religious scholar in the city of al-Kufa; Dāhahib, Siyar, 4:262–7.
26 1:40 (K. al-Inmān).
27 Abū Ṭalib was the Prophet’s uncle and the father of Allāh. As the chief of the clan of Hashim, he protected the Prophet until his death around 619, although he does not seem to have converted to Islam; EF, 1:152–3.
included in his Ṣaḥīḥ the hadith of Rāfīʿ b. ‘Amr al-Ghifari 30 while ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Sāmīn 31 was the only one to relate hadith from him. Muslim also included the hadith of Abū Rifaʿa al-ʿAdawi 32 despite the fact that Ḥumayd b. Ḥilāl al-ʿAdawi 33 was the only one to relate hadith from him. Muslim also included the hadith of al-Agharr al-Muzant 34 “My heart is covered” 35 and Abū Burda 36 was the only one to relate hadith from him. Bukhārī and Muslim have many hadith of this type in their books. 37 That indicates their belief that a transmitter sometimes emerges from being unknown and rejected (maḥfūl mardīd) through the relation of a single person from him. I discussed this earlier in Category 23. [Nevertheless] I have read through discovery (waṣiʿatān) that Abū ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-Barr al-Andalusi said, “They consider everyone from whom only a single person transmits hadith unknown, unless that person is famous for something other than transmitting hadith, as Mālik b. Dinār 38 was famous for asceticism and ʿAmr b. Maʿdī Karīb 39 for valor.”

Regarding some of those whom we mentioned as having only a single transmitter, be aware that there is sometimes a dispute over whether that transmitter was truly alone. This is the case with Qudāma b. ʿAbd Allāh. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr said 40 that Ḥumayd b. Kullāb 41 also related hadith from him. God knows best.

An example of this Category from the Followers is Abu ʿl-ʿUshārāʾ al-Dārīmī. So far as is known, no one but ʿHammād b. Saʿlāma related hadith from him. Al-Ḥākim cited Muḥammad b. Abī Suṭyān al-Thaqāfi 42 as an example of a

---

30 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, al-ṣaḥīḥ, 2:482.
31 Bukhārī, al-ṭāʾīrīkh al-kabīr, 3:118; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, ḥarīq, 2:84.
33 Abī Naṣr Ḥumayd b. Ḥilāl b. Suwayd al-ʿAdawi (d. ca. 120/738) was one of the most respected hadith transmitters in al-Baṣra; Dīnārī, Siyar, 5:309–11.
34 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, isṭāfā, 1:102.
35 8:72 (K. al-Dhūkār wa-1-deʾaʾ).
36 The son of Abu ʿUmar, the son of the famous Companion Abū Mūsā al-Aswārī, is said to have been Amr (see below, Category 30). He served as judge in al-Kufa and died around 230/722, Dīnārī, Siyar, 4:343–6, 5:5–7.
37 As Prof. Abū al-Rahmān points out, the examples in this paragraph were taken from Ibn al-Qaysarīn, Shurūq al-ṣimma al-mūtta (bound with Ḥarīqīn, Shurūq al-ṣimma al-khamṣa), ed. Muḥammad Zāhid al-Kawthārī (Cairo, n.d.), 17.
38 Abī Yahyā Mālik b. Dinār al-Sāmī al-ʿNajī (d. 311/748) was, as indicated here, a famous early ascetic, Siyar, 1:634.
39 Abī Thawr ʿAmr al-Zubayyī converted to Islam in the year 9/630 (or 10) when he accompanied a delegation to the Prophet. He distinguished himself in the conquest of Iraq, where he died around the year 21/642; Bukhārī, al-ṭāʾīrīkh al-kabīr, 3:312; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, ḥarīq, 3:1260; Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, isṭāfā, 3:1201–5.
40 Isṭāfā, 3:1279.
41 I could not locate this transmitter in any of the sources I consulted.
Follower in this Category and said that, so far as he knew, only Zuhrī related hadith from him. He said, "In the same way, Zuhrī was alone in transmitting hadith from some twenty Followers from whom no one else transmitted. The same was true of 'Amr b. Dinār who was also alone in transmitting hadith from a number of Followers. It was also true of Yahyā b. Sa'īd al-Ansārī, Abū Ishaq al-Sabī'ī, Hishām b. 'Urwa and others." Al-Hākim elsewhere named some of the Followers from whom they alone transmitted." Among those from whom 'Amr b. Dinār was alone in transmitting hadith were 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Maʿṣūd and 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Farrūkh. 'Amr b. Abān b. Uthmān and Sinān b. Abī Sinān al-Duʿāḥ were among those from whom Zuhrī was alone in transmitting hadith. Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. Unays al-Anṣārī was someone from whom Yahyā was alone in transmitting hadith.

Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Hākim cited al-Miswar b. Rifaʿa al-Qurashi as an example of a follower of a Follower and said that only Malik related hadith from him. In the same way, Malik was alone in relating from about ten of the teachers of Medina. I fear that al-Hākim was relying on surmise and misapprehension in his placing some of the transmitters he mentioned in the position he put them. God knows best.

43 Ulūm al-hadith, 160.
44 What al-Hākim says in Ulūm al-hadith (p. 160) is, "It is too much to mention them in this place."
51 Ulūm al-hadith, 160.
Category 48

Those who are referred to by different names or varying epithets, so that someone lacking experience with them supposes that these names or epithets refer to a number of different people

(Ma'rifat man dhukira bi-asma' mukhtalifa aw nu'ut muta'addida fa-qa'anna man la khibra lahu biha anna tilka 'l-asma' aw al-nu'ut li-jama'at mutafarriqin)

This is a difficult discipline, although the need for it is pressing. Through it misrepresentation (tadlis) is exposed and, indeed, most instances of it stem from attempts to misrepresent. The expert 'Abd al-Ghani b. Sa'id al-Misri' and others have composed books on this topic. An example of this is Muhammadi b. al-Sa'ib al-Kalbi,' the author of the Qur'an commentary. He is the “Abu 'l-Naq'd” from whom Muhammad b. Ishaq b. Ya'qub related the hadith of Tamim al-Dari' and 'Abd b. Badda. 2 He is the “Hammâd b. al-Sa'ib” from whom Abû Usâma related the hadith, “A hide becomes purified when it is tanned.” He is also the “Abû Sa'id” from whom 'Atiya al-Aswâf related Qur'an commentary. He misrepresented Kalbi by giving the false impression that he was Abû Sa'id al-Khudrî.

1 Scholars frequently referred to transmitters by varying forms of their name, either to disguise an unreliable transmitter's identity or to give the impression that they were quoting a number of different sources, when they depended heavily on a single transmitter; Ibn Dâqiq al-Idâ, al-Iṣâbâ fî hadîm al-iṣâbâ, ed. Amir Hasan Sabri (Beirut, 1417/1996), 218.

2 This would seem to be a reference to his li'dâh al-istikâl fî l-ruwâyât mentioned in Brockelmann, GAL., Suppl., 1:950.

3 Kalbi (d. 146/763) was considered an unreliable transmitter, in fact a liar. Therefore those who found in his commentary an interpretation they wanted to use were tempted to conceal its connection to him so that it would not automatically be discredited. For Kalbi, see El, 4:494-5; Sezgin, GAS, 1:34-5.

4 The Companion Abû Ragâya Tamim b. Aws al-Dari (d. 40/660) was best known for his expertise in the Qur'an; Dhababi, Siyar, 2:442-8.

5 Ibn Hajar, Isâba, 2:467.

6 Hammâd b. Usâma b. Zayd al-Kuftî (ca. 120/738-201/817) was a highly respected transmitter of hadith; Dhababi, Siyar, 9:277-9.

7 That Abu 'l-Hâsân 'Atîya b. Sa'id b. Junûd al-Aswâf (d. 111/729) was a student of Kalbi is inherently improbable, although not impossible, given that 'Atîya, according to most authorities, predeceased Kalbi by three decades and appears as a major source in Kalbi’s work. It may be worth noting that Abu 'Hâtim al-Razi (in his son’s tarj, 3:1:383) introduces the assertion that 'Atîya took the commentary from Kalbi with the somewhat circumspect balaghannî. He does not, by the way, mention that 'Atîya called him “Abû Sa'id.” For 'Atîya, see Sezgin, GAS, 1:30-1.
Another example is "Sālim," the transmitter from Abū Hurayra, Abū Sa‘īd al-Khuḍrī and ‘Ā‘isha (God be pleased with them). He is “Sālim Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Madīnī,” “Sālim, the client of Mālik b. Awṣ b. al-Ḥadathān al-Naṣrī” and “Sālim, the client of Shaddād b. al-Ḥād al-Naṣrī.” In some relations he is called “Sālim, client of the two Naṣrīs,” in others “Sālim, the client of Mahīt;” in others “Sālim Sabalān;” in others “Abū ‘Abd Allāh, the client of Shaddād b. al-Ḥād;” in others “Sālim Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Dawṣī;” and in some “Sālim, the client of the Daws.” ‘Abd al-Ghānī b. Sa‘īd mentioned all of that.


8 Sālim is described as “one of the scholars of the city of Medina;” Dhababī, Sīyār, 4:595–6.
9 Abu ‘l-Qāsim al-Tanūkhī (365/976–447/1055) was a hadith expert who served as a judge in a number of cities; al-Khaṭṭīb al-Baghdādi, Tārīkh Baghdad, 12:115.
Category 49

Unique Names, Nicknames and Pseudonyms of the Companions, Transmitters of Hadith, and Other Scholars

(Maʿrifat al-mufradāt al-aḥad min asmaʾ al-Ṣahāba wa-ruwat al-hadith wa-l-iʿulamāʾ wa-alqābihirum wa-kunāhum)

This is an estimable and interesting Category found in the books the experts composed on hadith transmitters. They collected this material separately at the ends of the chapters of these books and they also wrote monographs on it.

The book of Ahmad b. Ḥarūn al-Bardjī al-Bardhāʾī entitled al-ʿAsmaʾ al-mufradāʾ (Unique Names) is one of most famous works on the topic. More than one expert, including Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. Bukayr, objected and made corrections to much of it. One criticism is that many of the names Bardji claimed were unique were in reality borne by two, three or more people. According to our understanding of his aim, he intended to occupy himself only with the names (asmaʾ) of the Companions, scholars and transmitters of hadith. So he received criticism for some of the unique appellations he cited on the basis that they are nicknames (alqāb) rather than actual names. For instance, “al-Ajlāḥ al-Kīndī” (the bald member of the tribe of Kinda) was a nickname given to that man on account of his baldness and his name is Yāḥyā, and there are many Yāḥyās. Another example is ʿUghdī b. Sinān. His name is ʿUmar, and “ʿUghdī” [a ʿUghdīan; that is, a man from the town of ʿUghd, near Samarqand] is a nickname. Furthermore, there are other ʿUghdīs, therefore this instance does not properly come under the heading of this Category. The truth is that this is a discipline in which it is difficult to make definitive statements and whoever does so runs the risk of error and criticism, because it is a vast and diffuse subject.

1 In the early biographical dictionaries, like Buhārī’s al-Taʾrīkh al-kabīr and Ibn ʿAbī Ḥātim’s Kitāb al-fawr wa-l-taṣdīl, the more common names are treated first within the sections devoted to each letter of the alphabet.

2 The title of this work is given as al-ʿTabaqāt fi l-ʿasmaʾ al-mufrada min asmaʾ al-iʿulamāʾ wa-ṣāḥib al-hadīth in Sezgin, GAS, 1:166–7.


Some of the useful examples of this are

*Ajmād* b. ‘Ujjān al-‘Ijamān: He was a Companion whom Ibn Yūnūs mentioned. We used to think it was “‘Ijīyān,” following the pattern of “Iliyān.” Then I found it in the handwriting of Ibn al-Furāt6 — and he is authoritative — as “‘Ujjān,” on the pattern of “Sufyān.”

*Awsāf* b. ‘Amr al-Bajāli: A Follower.

*Tādīm b. Subayh al-Kalāl*: he transmitted hadith from Tubay‘ b. ‘Amir al-Kalāl.7 His name is also given as “Yadūm,” although the correct form is “Tādūm.”


Abū ‘l-Ghūṣn al-Dujayn b. Thābit:8 it was claimed that he was the well-known Ḫuṣa.9 It is more likely that he was somebody else.

*Zīr* b. Hubaysh: the early Follower.

*Sūṭayr* b. al-Khims: he was alone in regard to his name and the name of his father.

*Sundar al-Khaṣṣ*10, the client of Zinbā‘ al-Judhām:11 he was a Companion.

The Companion *Shakal* b. Ḥumayd.

---

10 He was better known as Tubay‘ b. Imrā‘a‘at Ka‘b al-Aṣḥāb; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:413–14.
14 Ḫuṣa is the central figure in innumerable humorous stories; *EF* 2:590–92.
15 The contemporaries of Zīr (d. ca. 81/700) regarded him as an expert in the Arabic language and the Qur‘ān; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:166–70.
Abū Rayhānā Shamʿūn b. Zayd:19 his name is also given as "Shamghūn." Abū Saʿīd b. Yūnus said, "To my mind, 'Shamghūn' is more likely to be correct." He was one of the great Companions.

The Companion Abū Umama Ṣudayy b. 'Ajlān.20

The Companion Ṣunābīh b. al-Aʿṣar. Whoever called him "Ṣunābīḥi" has erred.21

Abū ʿl-Salīl Durrāb b. Nuqayr b. Sumayr al-Qaysi al-Brāṣī:22 he related from Muʿādh b. ʿAdawīla23 and others. Nuqayr was his father. His name is also given as "Nufty" and "Nufayl."

ʿĀzwān b. Zayd al-Raqāshī:24 a good man and Follower.

Qarthaʾ al-Ḍabbī.25

Kalada b. Ḥanbal:26 a Companion.

The Companion Lubayy b. Labā al-Asadī:27 the first name is on the pattern of "Ubayy." The second name is on the pattern of the word ṣāṣā (stick). Make a note of this name, for it is sometimes given incorrectly.

Mustamīr b. al-Rayyān:28 he saw Anas [b. Malik].

Nubayshat al-Khayr:29 a Companion.

Namf al-Bikālī:30 a Follower belonging to the Bikāl, one of the subtribes of the Ḥimyar. Most of the scholars of hadith [erroneously] pronounce it "Bakkāl."

The Companion Wābiṣa b. Maʿbad.31

Hubayb b. Mughfīl:32 a Companion.

---

19 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istīʿāb, 2:711–12, s.n. Shamʿūn b. Yazīd.
20 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istīʿāb, 2:736.
21 For this question, see Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istīʿāb, 2:740; Suyūṭī, Tadrīb al-rāwī, 2:272–3.
23 Muʿādh bint ʿAbd Allah (d. ca. 83/702) was famed for her piety; Dibahb, Siyar, 4:508–9.
25 Ibn Abī Hātim, Jarḥ, 3(2):147.
27 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istīʿāb, 3:1340.
31 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istīʿāb, 4:1563.
32 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istīʿāb, 4:1548.
Hamadhān,

the agent (barid) of 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb: Ibn Bukayr and others gave it as “Hamadhān” and some of those who wrote about the book of Bardūj gave it as “Hamdān.”

Some unique paidonymics are

Abu ‘l-'Ubaydayn: his name is Mu‘awiya b. Sabra and he was one of the students of Ibn Mas‘ūd. He has two or three ḥadith.

Abu ‘l-'Ushariq al-Dārimi: he was mentioned above.

Abu ‘l-Mudillah: His name is not known. Al-A‘mash, Ibn ‘Uyayna and a number of others related ḥadith from him. We do not know of anyone who agrees with the contention of Abu Nu‘aym [al-İşbāḥān?] that his name is Ubayd Allāh al-Madani.

Abū Marāya al-Qiūt: his name is ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr. He was a Follower from whom Qatāda related ḥadith.

Abū Mu‘ayd: he is Ḥāfṣ b. Ghaylān al-Hamdāni. He related ḥadith from Makhtūm and others.

Some examples of unique nicknames are

Safīna, the client and Companion of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him): it is a unique nickname. The claim that his name is Mihrān is disputed.

Mindal b. ‘Alt: this is the correct pronunciation according to al-Khaṭṭib and others. Some also often give it as “Mandal.” It is a nickname and his name is ‘Amr.

Saḥmān b. Sa‘íd al-Tanākhī al-Qayrawānī: he is author of the al-Mudawwana (Legal Register) on the school of Malik. This is a unique nickname and his name is ‘Abd al-Salām.

35 Bukhārī, Kitiḥ al-Kūnā (Hyderabad, 1360), 74; Ibn Abī Hātim, Jarb, 4(2):444. Ibn al-Salāb’s claim that al-A‘mash and Ibn ‘Uyayna transmitted from Abu ‘l-Mudilla was regarded as a mistake; see Suyūṭī, Tadhrib al-rāsīl, 2:277.
38 The Follower Makhtūb b. Abī Muslim Shurāb al-Dimashqī (d. ca. 112/730) was considered the greatest Syrian scholar of his day; Sesgin, GAS, 1:404.
Also of that ilk are Muṣṭayyān al-Ḥadramī,14 Mushkaddāna al-Ju'fī15 and others whom we will mention in the Category on nicknames (God – He is exalted – willing). He knows best.

41 Abu Ja'far Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah b. Sulaymān al-Ḥadramī (202/817–297/910) composed a masnad and ta'rikh, neither of which seems to have survived. Abu Nuṣaym al-Faḍl b. Dukayn is said to have given him this nickname, meaning “muddy,” when he was a child; Sefgīn, GAS, 1:163.

42 In Category 52, Ibn al-Ṣalāh explains that the nickname of Abu 'Abd al-Rāhāmīn 'Abd Allah b. 'Umar (d. 239/853) means “grain of musk” or “musk holder” in Persian. He is said to have received this name because he attended the class of Abu Nuṣaym wearing perfume; Dhahabi, Siyār, 11:155–6.
Category 50

NAMES AND PAIDYNMICS

(Ma’rifat al-asma wa-’l-kunā)

There are many books on names and paidonymics, including the works of ‘Ali b. al-Madini,1 Muslim,2 Nasā’ī3 and the expert Abū Ahmad al-Ḥākim al-Kabīr.4 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr has several excellent short books on various aspects of this subject. What is meant by the title of this Category is the identification of the names of the bearers of paidonymics. Writers on this topic arrange their books by paidonymic, identifying the names of the bearers of each. This is a much-needed discipline to which those knowledgeable in hadith still direct their attention. They study it, discuss it amongst themselves and inveigh against those who are ignorant of it. I have formulated a fine new analysis of the material. I say: the bearers of paidonymics fall into several subcategories.

1. Those who are named by their paidonymic so that their name is their paidonym and they have no other name. These fall into two subcategories.

(a). Those who have a paidonymic other than the paidonymic which is their name, so that it is as if the paidonymic has a paidonymic: that is interesting and surprising. This is like the case of Abū Bakr b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. al-Ḥārith b. Hishām al-Makhzūmi, one of the seven legal experts of Medina. He used to be called “the monk of the tribe of Quraysh.” His name is Abū Bakr and his paidonymic is Abū ʿAbd al-Rahmān. The same is true of Abū Bakr b. Muḥammad b. ʿAmr b. Ḥazm al-Anṣārī.5 His name is said to have been Abū Bakr.

---

2 Kītāb al-Kunā wa-ʾl-asma (Damascus, 1984).
3 Ḥaḍīth Khalīfa, Kauthf, 1:col. 87.
4 Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Ahmad (ca. 290/903–378/988), known as “al-Ḥākim al-Kabīr,” was recognized as the greatest scholar of hadith of his era. His Kītāb al-Asma wa-ʾl-kunā seems to be the work referred to here; Sezgin, GAS, 1:203–4.
5 This description of Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr’s contribution to this discipline puzzled later writers (for example, Buḥṣint, Muḥāsān 570). His Kītāb al-Iṣṭiḥnā’ fi ma’rifat al-mashhārin min hamalat al-šām ki-ʾl-kunā (ed. Abū llāh Marjān al-Sawālima, 3 vols, Riyadh, 1405/1985) is anything but lajak and it seems to be the only work he wrote on the subject. As the editor of the Istiḥnā’ has suggested (1:51), the confusion probably resulted from Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr’s adoption of the conceit of presenting each of the three sections of the work as a separate kītāb with its own introduction.
6 Abū Bakr b. Ḥazm (d. ca. 120/738) served as the governor and judge in the city of Medina; Dhahabi, Sījār, 5:313–14.
and his paidonymic was Abū Muḥammad. Al-Khaṭīb said that there were no others like these two in that regard. It has also been said that [the aforementioned] Ibn Ḥazm had no paidonymic other than the one which was his name.

(b). Those who have no paidonymic other than the one which is their name: An example of this is Abū Bilāl al-Ash'art, the transmitter from Sharīk and others. It was related from him that he said, “I do not have a name. My name and my paidonymic are the same.” This is also the case of Abū Ḥaṣīm b. Yahyā b. Sulaymān al-Rāzī. A number of transmitters related hadīth from him, including Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī. Abū Ḥātim asked him, “Do you have a name?” and he replied, “No, my name and my paidonymic are the same.”

2. Those who are known by their paidonymic and their name is not known and it is not known whether this appellation is their paidonymic or something else: one Companion exemplifying this is Abū Anās al-Kinānī.

He is also given the gentilic “Dīlī,” from the tribe of Abu ’l-Aswad al-Dīlī. “Dīlī” occurs as “Du’ā’il” in the lineage (nasab) given by some of the experts in the Arabic language and others anomalously give it as “Du’ā’il.”

Other examples from the Companions are Abū Muwayhiba, the client of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), and Abū Shayba al-Khudrī, who died in the siege of Constantinople and was buried there.

Examples from after the Companions are

Abū ’l-Alīya, the transmitter from Anas b. Malik.
Abū Bākār b. Nāfi’ – Nāfi’ was the client of Ibn Umar: Mālik and others transmitted from him.
Abū ’l-Naṣīḥ, the client of ‘Abd Allāh b. ’Amr b. al-Ṣāfī: his paidonymic is alternatively given as Abu ’l-Tujayb.

9 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Istīḥāḥ, 4:1605, s.n. Abū Iyās.
11 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Istīḥāḥ, 4:1690.
12 Bukhārī, Kand, 8; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Ṣahr, 4(2):336, 3(1):293, s.n. Ṭūrāya.
Abū Ḥartṣ al-Mawqīfī and al-Mawqif is a place in Egypt. Ibn Walib and others transmitted hadith from him. God knows best.

3. Those whose nickname is a paodynamic [in form] and who also bear other paodynamic and names. For example

ʻAlī b. Abī Tālib (God be pleased with him); he was nicknamed Abū Turāb (father of earth) and his paodynamic was Abū ʻl-Ḥasan.

Abu ʻl-Zinād ʻAbd Allāh b. Dhakwān: his paodynamic was Abū ʻAbd al-Raḥmān, and Abū ʻl-Zinād (father of the fire sticks) was a nickname. The expert Abu ʻl-Faḍl al-Falaki, according to what we read from him, said that ʻAbd Allāh b. Dhakwān used to be angered by the nickname “Abū ʻl-Zinād.” He was a versatile scholar.

Abu ʻl-Riḍāl Muḥammad b. ʻAbd al-Raḥmān al-Anṣārī: his paodynamic was Abū ʻAbd al-Raḥmān, and Abū ʻl-Riḍāl (father of the men) is a nickname he was given because he had ten children, all of them “men.”

Abū Tumayla Yaḥyā b. Wādih al-Anṣārī al-Marwazī: his paodynamic was Abū Muḥammad, and Abū Tumayla was a nickname. Yaḥyā b. Maṣīn and others endorsed his reliability and Abū Ḥatīm al-Raḥīm criticized Bukhārī for including him in his book of weak transmitters.

The expert Abu ʻl-Ādhān ʻUmar b. Ibrāhīm; he had the paodynamic Abū Bakr and he was nicknamed Abu ʻl-Ādhān (father of the ears) because he had big ears.

The expert Abu ʻl-Shaykh ʻAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Iṣbahānī: his paodynamic was Abū Muḥammad, and Abū ʻl-Shaykh was a nickname.

The expert Abū Ḥāzin ʻUmar b. ʻAlmad al-ʻAbdūwī: his paodynamic was Abū Ḥafṣ, and Abū Ḥāzin was a nickname. We learned that from Falaki’s book on nicknames. God knows best.
4. Those who have two or more paidonymics. Some examples are


‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar b. Ḥafṣ al-‘Umari,23 the brother of ‘Ubayd Allāh: it is related that he had the paidonymic Abu ‘l-Qāsim. He renounced it and adopted Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān as his paidonymic.


5. Those whose name is well known, but whose paidonymic is disputed so that two or more different paidonymics are given for them. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Aṭā’ al-Ibrāhīmi al-Harawi24 – one of the later scholars – has a brief work on this.

Usāma b. Zayd, the dear friend of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him): his paidonymic is variously given as Abū Zayd, Abū Muḥammad, Abū ‘Abd Allāh and Abū Khārida.


Qabiṣa b. Dhu‘ayb:25 Abū Iṣḥāq and Abū Sa‘īd are given.


Sulaymān b. Bilāl al-Madani:26 Abū Bilāl and Abū Muḥammad are given.

Some of those mentioned in this subcategory could in actuality also be placed in the previous one.

6. Those whose paidonymic is known and whose name is disputed. Examples of this from among the Companions are

---

23 ‘Abd Allāh (d. 171/787), unlike his brother ‘Ubayd Allāh, was not unreservedly endorsed as a transmitter of hadith; Dhahabi, Siyār, 7:339–41.
24 Ibrāhīmi (d. 476/1083) was a transmitter of hadith and a preacher; Ibn al-Athir, Luhāh, 1:24.
25 Qabiṣa was born in the year 8/629 and rose to hold high offices under the Umayyad caliph ‘Abd al-Malik. He was a prolific transmitter of hadith and died in 86/705 (or 87 or 88); Dhahabi, Siyār, 4:282–3.
26 Sulaymān (100/719–172/788) was an expert in the hadith of the Medinese; Dhahabi, Siyār, 7:425–7.
Abū Baṣra al-Ghifāri: his paidonymic is pronounced in the same way as the city “al-Baṣra.” It is said that his name is Jāmil b. Baṣra. Ḥumayl is also given and it is more likely to be correct.

Abū Ṣuḥayl al-Suwāʔi: his name is variously given as Wahb b. ‘Abd Allah and Wahb Allāh b. ‘Abd Allah.

Abū Hurayra al-Dawṣ: his name and the name of his father are hotly disputed, more than the name of anyone else before or after the advent of Islam. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr27 said that there are about twenty claims about his name and that of his father and that, because of the great confusion, in his opinion nothing reliable can be established regarding his name, except that one can feel confidence that ‘Abd Allāh or ‘Abd al-Raḥmān was his name during the Islamic era. It is said on the authority of Muḥammad b. Iṣḥaq that his name was ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ṣakhr and a number of those who have written on names and paidonymics relied on that. Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥakim said, “To our mind, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ṣakhr is the opinion regarding the name of Abū Hurayra which is most likely to be correct.”

Among those who lived after the Companions are

Abū Burda b. Abī Mūsā al-Asgharī: Most experts believe that his name was ‘Āmir. [Yahyā] b. Maṣīn said that his name was al-Ḥārith.

Abū Bakr b. ‘Ayyāsh,28 the transmitter of the Qurʾān recension of ‘Āṣim: his name is disputed and eleven opinions regarding it are given. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr said that if it is true that he had a name, it was Shuṭa and none other; and this is the one which Abū Zur‘a [al-Rāzī] regarded as correct.29 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr said, “It was said that his name was his paidonymic. That – God willing – is the view most likely to be correct because it is related from Abū Bakr al-‘Ayīṣ himself that he said, ‘I have no name other than Abū Bakr.’”30 God knows best.

7. Those whose paidonymic and name are both disputed, and that is uncommon. An example of this is Saḥīfa, the client of the Messenger of God (Peace be

29 Istiṣāḥ, 4:1768–72.
30 Abū Bakr al-‘Ayīṣ (95/714 or 97–193/809) was respected as an expert in the Qurʾān, but is said to have made many mistakes in his ḥadith transmissions; Sezgin, GĄS, 1:10–11.
32 Istiṣnā‘, 1:445.
upon him). 'Umayr, Šālih and Mihrān are variously given as his name. His paidonymic is given variously as Abū Ābd al-Rahmān and Abu 'l-Bakhtārī. God knows best.

8. Those whose paidonymic and name are not disputed and are both known and famous. Examples of this, among many others, are the imāms of the law schools, those bearing the paidonymic Abū Ābd Allāh, [that is,] Mālīk, Muḥammad b. Idrīs al-Shāfiʿī and Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal; and Abū Ḥanīfā al-Nuʿmān b. Thābit.

9. Those who are famous under their paidonymic, rather than their name, despite the fact that their name is not unknown to those knowledgeable in ḥadīth. Ibn Ābd al-Barr has a fine work concerning people like this who lived after the generation of the Companions.33 Examples of this are:

Abū Idrīs al-Khwālīnī: His name is Āḥid Allāh b. Ābd Allāh.

Abū ʿIṣḥāq al-Sabīʿī: His name is ʿAmr b. ʿAbd Allāh.

Abu 'l-Asbath al-Sanʿānī—his gentilic refers to the village of Ṣanʿānī near Damascus; his name is Sharāḥil b. ʿAda. Some pronounce his father’s name as “Udda.”

Abu 'l-Duḥā Muslim b. Ṣubaḥī.35

The ascetic Abū ʿAṣīm al-Aʿrāf, the transmitter from Sahl b. Saʿd and others: his name is Salama b. Dinar.

The examples of this are innumerable. God knows best.

---

33 This appears to be a reference to the third section of his Isīghanā.
34 Abu 'l-Asbath is said to have died after the year 100/719; Dhuḥabī, Siyār, 4:357–9.
35 Abu 'l-Duḥā died around the year 100/719; Dhuḥabī, Siyār, 5:71.
Category 51

THE PAIDONYMICS OF THOSE BETTER KNOWN UNDER THEIR NAME, RATHER THAN THEIR PAIDONMIC

(Ma'rifat kuna 'l-ma'rafîn bi-''l-asma' dana 'l-kuna)

In one respect, this Category is the opposite of the previous one. This material, in contrast, is typically arranged by name and then the paidonymics of the people bearing that name are identified. In another respect, this Category does accord with the previous one because it is [sometimes] treated as one of the subcategories of that Category since this Category is one of the subcategories of the bearers of paidonymics. Rarely does anyone write about this topic on its own, although we did read that Abî Ḥātim b. Ḥibbân al-Bustî composed a book on it. By way of providing examples, let us gather groups of transmitters under a single paidonymic to clarify the basic concept.

Some of the Companions (God be pleased with all of them) of this type bearing the paidonymic "Abî Muḥammad" are

Ṭalha b. Ubayd Allâh al-Taymi
Abd al-Rahmân b. Awf al-Zuhri
al-Ḥasan b. Alî b. Abî Ṭalib al-Ḥâshimi
Thâbit b. Qays b. al-Shammâs al-Ansârî
Abd Allâh b. Zayd al-Ansârî, who was known for the call to prayer
Ka'b b. 'Ujra
al-Asârîth b. Qays
Ma'qil b. Sinân al-Ashja'î
Abd Allâh b. Ja'far b. Abî Ṭalib
Abd Allâh b. Buḥayna
Abd Allâh b. Amr b. al-Âs
Abd al-Rahmân b. Abî Bakr al-Ṣiddîq
Jubayr b. Muṣîm
al-Faḍîl b. al-Abbâs b. Abî al-Muṭṭalib

1 Kitâb Kunâ man yu'rafa bi-''l-asna'; Yaqût, Maṣjam al-buldân, 1:616.
2 Ṭalha was a very early convert to Islam and a central figure in the early struggles. He died while leading a revolt against the caliph Alî in 36/656; EF, 10:161–2.
5 Ibn Abî al-Barr, Istifâh, 3:1321.
6 Ibn Abî al-Barr, Istifâh, 1:133–5.
9 Ibn Abî al-Barr, Istifâh, 3:871.
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Ḥuwayṭīb b. ʿAbd al-ʿUzzay
Maḥmūd b. al-Raḥīm
ʿAbd Allāh b. Thaqāfa b. Ṣuʿayr

Some of the Companions bearing the paidonymic “Abū ʿAbd Allāh” are

al-Zubayr b. al-ʿAwwām
al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭalib
Ṣalāmān al-Fārist
ʿAmīr b. Ṭabīʿa al-ʿAdawi
Ḥudhayfah b. al-Yamān
Kāb b. Mālik
Rāfiʿ b. Khadijah
ʿUmāra b. Ḥazm
al-Nuʿmān b. Bashir
Jabir b. ʿAbd Allāh
ʿUthmān b. Ḥunayf
Ibrāhīma b. al-Nuʿmān

The following seven are Ansarites:

Thawbān, the client of the Messenger of God (God be pleased with him)
al-Mughira b. Shuʿba
Shuraṭbīl b. Ḥasana
ʿAmr b. al-Ṣāḥib
Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Jaʿsh
Maʿqīl b. Yaṣār al-Muzani
ʿAmr b. ʿAmīr al-Muzani

Some of the Companions bearing the paidonymic “Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān” are

ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd

---

13 Al-Zubayr was a cousin of the Prophet and a nephew of his wife Khadija. Like Talha, he died in the Battle of the Camel in 36/656; *EP*, 4:1235–6.
16 Rāfiʿ b. Khadijah was a prominent Medinese religious authority who died in the year 74/693 at the age of eighty-six; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 3:181–3.
22 There seems to have been no such person. Prof. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān suggests that Abū ʿAbd Allāh ʿAmr b. ʿAwf al-Muzant (Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Isfāḥān*, 3:1196) was meant; *Muqaddima*, 582.
Mu‘ādh b. Jabal\textsuperscript{23}
Zayd b. al-Khaṭṭāb,\textsuperscript{24} the brother of ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb
ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb
Muḥammad b. Maslama al-Anṣārī\textsuperscript{25}
ʿUwaym b. Sāʿīda\textsuperscript{26}
Zayd b. Khalīd al-Juhānī\textsuperscript{27}
Bilāl b. al-Ḥārith al-Muzānī\textsuperscript{28}
Mu‘āwiya b. Abī Sufyān
al-Ḥārith b. Ḥishām al-Makhzūmī\textsuperscript{29}
al-Miswar b. Makhrama\textsuperscript{30}

There are other opinions regarding the paidonymic of some of those whom we have mentioned above. God knows best.
There are many instances of this and someone not acquainted with them may almost come to think that the nicknames are names (asāmi) and thus place a person referred to by his name in one place and the same person referred to by his nickname in another place, as two separate individuals. This befell many writers. The expert Abū Bakr Ahmad b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Shirāzi and the expert Abu ʿI-Fadl b. al-Falaki were among those who composed works on this subject. Nicknames are subcategorized into those which may permissibly be applied—these are the ones the person nicknamed does not object to—and those which are impermissible—and these are the ones the person nicknamed dislikes. The following is an illustrative sample of both types.

We heard that the expert ʿAbd al-Ghani b. Saʿīd said, “Two distinguished men to whom ugly nicknames stuck were Muʿāwiya b. ʿAbd al-Karim al-Dālī (the misguided)1— he went astray only on the road to Mecca—and ʿAbd Allah b. Muḥammad al-Ḍaʿīf (the weak)2—he was only physically weak and not weak in his ḥadīth.” A third is ʿĀrim (vicious) Abu ʿI-Nuṣīm Muḥammad b. al-Fadl al-Sādūsī and he was a pious man who was far from vicious.

Al-Ḍaʿīf [that is, ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad] is Abū Muḥammad al-Ṭarsūsī. He heard ḥadīth from Blind Abū Muʿāwiya3 and others. Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī wrote ḥadīth from him4 and Abū Ḥātim b. Ḥibbān claimed that he was [antiphrasically5] called “al-Ḍaʿīf” on account of his exactitude and accuracy.6

Ghundar (troublemaker) was the nickname of Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar al-Baṣrī. The reason for it which we heard was that Ibn Jurayj came to al-Baṣra

---

5 Abū Muʿāwiya Muḥammad b. Khāzīm al-Kūf (113/731–194/810 or 195) was considered to be particularly strong in the ḥadīth of his teacher al-ʿArāmah; Dhahabi, Sīyar, 9:73–8.
6 Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Jarb, 2(2):163.
7 Suyūṭī, Tadhkīr al-ṣawāf, 2:290.
8 Tīghāt, 8:362.
9 The other sources I consulted give his kunya as “Abū ʿAbd Allāh.”
and transmitted the hadith of al-Hasan al-Basri to the Basrans. They censured him for that and stirred up trouble. Muhammad b. Ja'far agitated a lot and Ibn Jurayj said to him, "Be quiet, ghundar!" The Hejazians term someone who incites discord ghundar. There were other "Ghundars" after him, each of whom bore it as a nickname, including

Abu 'l-Husayn Muhammad b. Ja'far al-Razi, Ghundar: he transmitted hadith from the expert Abu Hatim al-Razi and others.

Abu Bakr Muhammad b. Ja'far al-Baghdadi, Ghundar, the widely traveled expert: the expert Abu Nu'aym [al-Ishahani] and others transmitted hadith from him.

Abu 'l-Tayyib Muhammad b. Ja'far b. Durrân al-Baghdadi, Ghundar: he transmitted hadith from Abu Khalifa al-Jumahi and others.

There were others who bore that nickname who were not named "Muhammad b. Ja'far."

- Ghunjär (Persian: ghunjär, rouge) was the nickname of an early transmitter, Abu Ahmad 'isa b. Musa al-Taymi al-Bukhari. He transmitted hadith from Malik, [Sufyan] al-Thawri and others. He was nicknamed "Ghunjär" because of his rosy cheeks.

Another "Ghunjär" was a later transmitter, namely the expert Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Bukhari. He was the author of Ta'rikh Bukhara (History of Bukhara) and died in the year 412 [1021 AD]. God knows best.

- Sha'iq (thunderbolt): he was the expert Abu Yahiya Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahim Bukhari and others transmitted hadith from him. The expert Abu 'Ali [al-Husayn b. 'Ali al-Nisaburi] said that he was nicknamed

---

10 Apparently the Basrans felt that it was presumptuous for an out-of-towner to try to teach them the hadith of their local hero.
11 Dhababi, Sijar, 16:217, no. 149.
12 Ghundar al-Warrâq died in 370/981; Dhababi, Sijar, 16:214–15, no. 145.
13 He was a Sufi who moved to Egypt and died there in 357/968 or 358; Dhababi, Sijar, 16:215–16, no. 146.
14 Abu Khalifa al-Fadl b. al-Hubâb al-Jumah (206/821–305/917) was an expert in hadith as well as secular literature; Dhababi, Sijar, 14:7–11.
15 He was a prominent transmitter in Bukhara who died at the end of 186/802; Dhababi, Sijar, 8:487–8.
16 Not much seems to have been recorded about this Ghunjär (337/948–412/1021). He is said to have received his nickname on account of his great interest in the hadith of the earlier Ghunjär, although he was not, of course, a student of his; Sezgin, C.A.S., 1:353.
17 Hājji Khalifa, Kashf, I col. 286.
18 Sha'iq (185/801–255/869) was a respected transmitter of hadith; Dhababi, Sijar, 12:295–6.
“Ṣafiqa” because of his learning and the intensity of his study and pursuit [of ḥadīth].

- Shabab (youthfulness) was the nickname of Khalifa b. Khayyāt al-ʿUṣfūr, the author of al-Tārīkh (History). He heard ḥadīth from [the earliest] Ghundar and others.

- Zunayj (little black man) was the nickname of Abū Ghassan Muhammad b. ʿAmr al-Rażī. Muslim and others related ḥadīth from him.

- Rusta (Persian: sprout) was the nickname of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿUmar al-Iṣbahānī.

- Sunayd was the nickname of al-Ḥusayn b. Dāwūd al-Miṣṣṭ, the author of the Qurʾān commentary. The experts Abū Zuraʿa [al-Rażī], Abū ʿĤattīm [al-Rażī] and others related ḥadīth from him.

- Bundar (Persian: wholesaler) was the nickname of Muḥammad b. Bashshār al-Baṣrī. Bukhārī, Muslim and many others transmitted ḥadīth from him. Ibn al-Falaki said that he was given this nickname because he was the “wholesaler” of ḥadīth.

- Qayṣar (caesar) was the nickname of the well-known Abu ʿl-Naḍr Hashim b. al-Qāsim. Ahmad b. Hanbal and others transmitted ḥadīth from him.

- Al-Akhfash (dim-eyes) was the nickname of several people, including the grammarian ʿAlμad b. ʿImrān al-Baṣrī. An early scholar of ḥadīth, he transmitted from Zayd b. al-Ḥubab and others. He has a book entitled Gharib al-Muwaṭṭa (Rare Words in Mālik’s Muwaṭṭa). There were three famous Akhfashees who were grammarians.

The earliest was Abu ʿl-Khaṭṭāb ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd b. ʿAbd al-Majīd and he was the one Sibawayhi mentioned in his Kitāb (Book).


21 Abu ʿl-Farāj ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar al-Iṣbahānī (d. 250/864) was an important student of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Mahdi, Dhahabi, Siyār, 12:242–3.

22 Sunayd died in 226/841; Dhahabi, Siyār, 10:627–8. “Sunayd” would appear to be the diminutive form of tanad, prop, support, etc. Nothing I have read sheds any light on the origin or exact sense of this unusual nickname.

23 Abū Bakr Muhammad b. Bashshār al-Baṣrī (167/784–252/866) was one of the most prominent transmitters of ḥadīth in his day; Dhahabi, Siyār, 12:144–9.

24 Abu ʿl-Naḍr Hashim b. al-Qāsim al-Laythī al-Khūrāsānī (134/752–207/822) was an important transmitter in Baghdad; Dhahabi, Siyār, 9:545–9.

25 Zayd (ca. 130/748–203/819) left his hometown of Merv and traveled extensively to collect ḥadīth. It is said that he even reached al-Andalus; Dhahabi, Siyār, 9:393–5.

26 Little seems to have been recorded about the grammarian known as al-Akhfash al-Akbar; Qīfīt, Inbāḥ al-ruwaṭ, 2:158–9.

27 Sibawayhi (d. ca. 180/796) was the father of Arabic grammar; E.F., 9:524–31; Sezgin, G.A.S., 9:51–63.
The second was Abu ʿl-Ḥasan Saʿīd b. Masʿūda and he is the one who related Kitāb Sibawayh (The Book of Sibawayh) and was a student of Sibawayh.

The third is Abu ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAll b. Sulaymān, the student of the two grammarians bearing the patronymic “Abu ʿl-ʿAbbās,” namely ʿAbd b. Yaḥyā, nicknamed “Thaʿlab,” and Muḥammad b. Yazīd, nicknamed “al-Mubarrad.”

- *Murabbā* (man with bushy eyebrows) was the expert Muḥammad b. ʿĪrāhīm al-Baghdādi.
- *Jasara* (carrot) was the nickname of the expert Ṣāliḥ b. Muḥammad al-Baghdādi. He was nicknamed this because he heard from one of his teachers what was related from ʿAbd Allāh b. Busr to the effect that he used to employ a *kharasā* (bead) as a magical charm [to cure sick people]. He misread it, saying, *jazara*, and it stuck to him. He was a wag about whom humorous stories are related.
- “ʿubahd al-ʿIjl” (little believer, the calf) was the nickname of the expert Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad b. Ḥātim al-Baghdādi.
- *Kīlāja* (a unit of weight equaling about five-and-three-quarter pounds) is the expert Muḥammad b. Ṣāliḥ al-Baghdādi.
- *Mā Ghammahā* (he – or it? – did not sadden him), consisting of the negation [that is, *mā*] and the verb *ghamma*, was the nickname of ʿAllān b. ʿAbd al-Ṣamad. He is the expert ʿAlī b. al-Ḥasan b. ʿAbd al-Ṣamad al-Baghdādi. The two nicknames are combined and he is called “Allān Mā Ghammahā.”

We heard that Yahyā b. Maʿṣīn gave these five Baghdadis their nicknames and they were early students of his and experts in ḥadīth.

---

28 Known as al-Akhfash al-Aswāq (d. 215/830), he wrote works on the vocabulary of the hadith and Qurʾān; Seegin, G.45, 8: 90; 9: 9–9.
29 Al-Akhfash al-Asghar (ca. 235/849–315/927) lived in Baghdad and was an expert in grammar and lexicography; Seegin, G.45, 8: 174; 9: 961.
30 Thaʿlab (200/815–291/904) was one of the most celebrated grammarians of his age; Seegin, G.45, 8: 141–7; 9: 140–2.
31 The grammarians al-Mubarrad (210/826–285/898) was born in Baṣra and spent most of his life teaching in Baghdad, where he and Thaʿlab competed for dominance; EF 7: 279–82.
32 Murabbā (d. 256/870) was a prominent student of Yahyā b. Maʿṣīn; al-Khaṭṭīb al-Baghdādi, Tāriḵ Baghdādī, 1:388. 9. Lane writes that the epithet “murabbā” is applied to “a man whose eyebrows have much hair; as though he had four eyebrows;” Leston sv.
33 Jazara was born in Baghdad in 205/821. He moved to Bukhara in 266/880 and lived there until his death in 293/906; Dhabahī, Sīyar, 14: 23–33.
34 Kilāja (or perhaps Kaylāja) died in Mecca in 291/904; Dhabahī, Sīyar, 12: 524–6.
35 He was a minor transmitter of hadith who died in 289/902. He is said to “have had many hadith but little character.” His nickname is sometimes given as “Mā Ghammahā;” Dhabahī, Sīyar, 13: 429.
36 That is, Murabbā, Jazara, ʿubahd al-ʿIjl, Kilāja and Mā Ghammahā; see al-Khaṭṭīb al-Baghdādi, Tāriḵ Baghdādī, 1: 388.
The famous *Sajīda* (prayer rug) was al-Ḥasan b. Ḥammād. He heard ḥadith from Wakī and others.

*Mushkadhān* — its meaning in Persian is "grain of musk" or "musk holder" — was the nickname of ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar b. Muḥammad b. Abān.

*Mutayyan* (muddy) is the nickname of Abū Jaʿfar al-Ḥārāmī. Abū Nuʿaym al-Ḥaḍī b. Dukayn addressed Mushkadhān and Mutayyan with these nicknames and they stuck.

ʿAbdān (two "Abds") is the nickname of a number of transmitters, the earliest of whom was ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUthmān al-Marwazi, the student of Ibn al-Mubārak and the main transmitter from him. We heard from Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir al-Maqdisī that he was called "ʿAbdān" because his paidonymic was Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān and his name was ʿAbd Allāh, so the two "ʿAbds" came together in his paidonymic and name. That is not correct. Rather, his nickname is due to the way the common people alter and fracture the name of a person when he is young and similar practices. In the same way, for "ʿAllāt," they say "ʿAllān; for ʿAhmad b. Yūsuf al-Sulāmī" and others, they say "Ḥamdān," and for Ṭāhir b. Baqiya al-Wāsīṭī, they say "Wahlān." God knows best.

---

37 Abū ʿAlī al-Ḥasan b. Ḥammād al-Baghdādī (d. 241/855) seems to have been a well-respected scholar of ḥadith, *Dhahabi, Siyār*, 11:392–3.
38 ʿAbdān (ca. 140/757–221/836) was one of the greatest ḥadith scholars of his day in Marv; *Dhahabi, Siyār*, 10:270–72.
39 Ḥamdān (182/798–264/878) was a well-traveled transmitter of ḥadith from Khurāsān; *Dhahabi, Siyār*, 12:384–8.
40 Wahbān was a scholar of ḥadith who died in Wāsīt in 239/854; *Dhahabi, Siyār*, 11:462–4.
Category 53

HOMOGRAPHIC NAMES AND GENTILICS, AND RELATED MATTERS

(Ma‘rifat al-mu‘talif wa-l-mukhtalif min al-asma‘ wa-l-ansāb wa-yaltahiqu bihā)

This Category concerns those names and gentilics which are uniform – that is, agree – in regard to their written form but differ in their pronunciation.1 This is an exalted discipline and those transmitters who are ignorant of it stumble often and never want for someone to make them feel shame. This information is diffuse and there is no general rule to which one can make recourse for most of it. Exactness is attained only by mastering specific data. Many useful books have been written on this Category and one of the most complete, despite its shortcomings, is Abū Naṣr b. Makūlā’s Ikmal. The following are some of the oft-mentioned things which come under the heading of accurately recording words. Accuracy in this area consists of two subcategories, the general and the particular.2

Subcategory 1

Examples are Sallām and Salām. All of the instances of this name which you will encounter will be “Sallām,” except five and they are

- Salām, the father of the Companion ʿAbd Allāh b. Salām al-Isrāʿīlī,3
- Salām, the father of Muhammad b. Salām al-Bikandi al-Bukhārī,4 the teacher of Bukhārī: Al-Khaṭṭīb [al-Baghdādī] and Ibn Makīlā mention him solely as “Salām.” The author of al-Maṭāliʾ5 (The Rising Places) said, “Some pronounce it ‘Salām’ and others pronounce it ‘Sallām,’ and the latter is more common.” “Salām” is better established and it is what Ghunjār [that is, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Bukhārī] mentioned in his Tārīkh Bukhārā, and he knew the inhabitants of his region best.

---

1 That is, the instances where the basic consonantal skeletons of the words are the same, or very similar, so the words have to be differentiated by close attention to vocalization and pointing.
2 It will be seen that “the particular” Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ means the instances of homography which occur in the Ṭabarqāt of Mālik and the Sāhiḥs of Bukhārī and Mūsām.
4 Muhammad b. Salām was a sedulous student of Ḥadīth who died in 225/830, Dhahabi, Siyar, 10:628–30.
5 This is an allusion to Abū Ishāq Ibrahīm b. Yūsuf, known as Ibn Qarqal (505/1111–569/1174); Brockelmann, G.sh., I:370–1; Suppl. 1:633. His Maṭāliʾ al-anwār was an abridgement of al-Qādir Iyād’s Mašāqiʿ al-anwār; see Ḥājī Jiḥāf, Kashf, 2 vols. 1687, 1715.
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- Saʿlām, the grandfather of the Muʿtazilite speculative theologian Abū ʿAlī Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Waḥhab b. Saʿlām al-Jubbāṭī. 7
- Al-Mubarrad said in his Kāmil, "There is no Arab named 'Saʿlām,' except the father of [the Companion] Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. Saʿlām and Saʿlām b. Abī ʾl-ʾIṣṣaṣyāq." Others add Saʿlām b. Mishkam, 8 a wine merchant who lived in pre-Islamic times. However, the well-known form of his name is "Saʿlām." God knows best.

Umāra and ʾImāra: we do not have an "ʾImāra" except the Companion Ubayy b. ʾImāra 9 and some even pronounce his name "Umāra." Everyone else is "Umāra." God knows best.

Kariz and Kurayz: Abū ʿAlī al-Ghassānī 10 related in his book Taqvīd al-muhmal (Fixing Unpointed Words) from Muḥammad b. Waḍḍāḥ 11 that "Kariz" occurs in the tribe of Khuzāʾa and "Kurayz" is used in the tribe of Ṭabd Shams b. Ṭabd ʿAbd Allāh. "Karayz" is also found elsewhere. We do not add Ayyūb b. Kurayz, 12 the transmitter from Abū ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Qamī, 13 to the "Karizes" on the basis that Abū al-Ghany b. Saʿd rendered his father's name as "Kariz," since it was actually "Kurayz," as Dāraquṭni and others gave it.

Hizām is the form used among the tribe of Quraysh and Ḥaran among the Anṣārites. God knows best.

---

6 Abū Ṭālib Ahmad b. Naṣr b. Ṭālib al-Baghdādī was a teacher of Dāraquṭni. He died in Baghdad in 323/935 at over seventy years of age; Dāhahabī, Siyar, 15:68.
8 Jubbāṭī (235/849–303/915) was one of the most celebrated Muʿtazilite theologians of the third/ninth century; EJ, 2:569–70; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:621–2.
10 Ibn ʾIṣḥāq said that he was the chief of the Jewish tribe of the Banu ʾl-Naḍīr during the time of the Prophet's mission; The Life of Muhammad, 361.
11 Ibn ʾAbī al-Barr, Ṣafāfī, 1:70.
13 Muḥammad b. Waḍḍāḥ (199/815–286/899) was a scholar from Cordova; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:474–5.
15 The Caliph ʿUmār sent Abū ʾAbd al-Rahmān b. Qamī (d. 78/697) to Syria to teach religious law. Scholars disagreed as to whether he was a Companion or a Follower; Dāhahabī, Siyar, 4:45–6.
Abū 'Ali b. al-Burdānī stated that he heard the expert al-Khaṭīb saying, "The āyahīs are Başrans, the Ābīs Kūfāns and the Ānīs Syrians." Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim had said this before him.17 This does hold true in most cases. God knows best.

Abū 'Ubayda is always "'Ubayda." We read that Dāraquṭnī said, "We do not know of anyone with the paidonymic 'Abū 'Abīda.'"

The following are some things the exact pronunciation of which I worked hard to determine in the course of my investigation of those mentioned by Dāraquṭnī, Abū al-Ghani and Ibn Makhūla.

Al-Safār and al-Safār: I found that as a paidonymic it is "al-Safār" and elsewhere "al-Safār." Nevertheless, some North Africans pronounce it "al-Safār" for Abū l-Safār Saʿīd b. Yūḥayn.18 That is contrary to the opinion of the scholars of ḥadīth as recorded by Dāraquṭnī.

'Īsā and 'Āsāl: I found that all of them are of the first kind – including ʿĪsā b. Suḥyān19 – except the secular historian "Āsāl b. Ḍhakwān al-Bāṣrī.20 He is "'Āsāl" and Dāraquṭnī and others give it that way. I did find his name as "'Īsā" in the handwriting of the authority Abū Maṣūr al-Azhārī in his book Ṭahāṣīb al-lugha. I do not think that he recorded it accurately. God knows best.

Ghannām and 'Adhām: we do not know of any instance of the second form except 'Adhām b. 'Alī al-Ṣāmīrī al-Kūfī, the father of ascetic 'Alī b. 'Adhām.21 The rest belong to the first form, including Ghannām b. Aws,22 a Companion who fought in the battle of Badr. God knows best.

Qumayr and Qamīr: all of them are "Qumayr" – including Makkī b. Qumayr,23 who transmitted ḥadīth from Jaʿfār b. Sulaymān24 – except the wife of Masrūq b. al-Ajdā, Qamīr bint 'Amr.25 God knows best.

17 'Ulim al-ḥadīth, 221.
18 Abū l-Safār died in 113/731; Dhahabi, Siyar, 5:70.
20 I have not found any information about this person.
21 Abū Maṣūr al-Azhārī (282/895–370/980) wrote a number of lexicographical works; EF, 1:822.
22 'Alī b. 'Adhām died in 228/843 in Tarsus; Dhahabi, Siyar, 10:569–71.
23 This appears to be the Ghannām. Ibn Abī al-Barr identifies as "rayṣ al-ṣin al-ṣahāba maḍīkṭūr fi al-ladīb," Istiḥāl, 3:1255–6.
24 I have not located this transmitter in any of the sources I consulted.
25 This appears to be a reference to the prominent Ṣīḥi transmitter of ḥadīth Abū Sulaymān Jaʿfār b. Sulaymān al-Dubāʿi al-Bāṣrī (d. 178/794); Dhahabi, Siyar, 8:197–200.
26 I have not succeeded in uncovering any information about this woman.
Musawwar and Missar. "Musawwar" is the form of the name of the Companion Musawwar b. Yazid al-Malik al-Kahili\(^2\) and Musawwar b. `Abd al-Malik al-Yarbūqī\(^3\) from whom Ma'ān b. Ṭāʾsu\(^4\) related hadith. Bukhārī mentioned him. So far as we know, the rest are "Missar." God knows best.

Al-Ḥammāl (porter) and al-Jammāl (camel driver): we do not know among the transmitters of hadith – or at least those mentioned in the books of hadith in general circulation – of an instance of "al-Ḥammāl" as either an attribute or a name, except in the case of Hārūn b. `Abd Allāh al-Ḥammāl,\(^5\) the father of the expert Mūsā b. Hārūn al-Ḥammāl.

The expert `Abd al-Ghanī related that Hārūn was a dealer in hawks (ḥazzāz) and, when he renounced the world, he became a porter. Khallīl\(^6\) and Ibn al-Falaki claimed that Hārūn was nicknamed "al-Ḥammāl" because of the great amount of knowledge he carried. I do not regard what they said as correct.

The others are "al-Jammāl," including Muḥammad b. Muḥrān al-Jammāl,\(^7\) from whom Bukhārī, Muslim and others transmitted hadith. God knows best.

Sometimes in this Category one encounters names in which it is impossible to make a mistake and one is correct no matter how one pronounces them, as is the case, for example, with Ṭāʾsu b. Abī Ṭāʾsu al-Ḥannāt.\(^8\) He is also called "al-Khabābī" and "al-Khāyyāṭ," however, he is famous as "Ṭāʾsu al-Ḥannāt." He was a tailor (khāyyāṭ) and then abandoned that and became a dealer in wheat (ḥaṭaṭ). Later, he left that too and became a camel-fodder merchant (khabābī), selling the mixture of leaves (khabaṭ) which camels eat. The same is true of Muslim al-Khabbābī\(^9\) in whom the three attributes are also united. The authority Dāraquṣī related that these attributes came together in these two individuals. God knows best.

---

27 Ibn `Abd al-Barr, Istāḥlāl, 3:1400.
28 I have not succeeded in identifying this Musawwar.
29 Ma'ān (d. 198/814) was one of the most prominent students of the imām Malik; Dhahabi, Siyar, 9:304–6.
30 Hārūn al-Ḥammāl (171/788 or 172–243/858) was regarded as a reliable transmitter of hadith; Dhahabi, Siyar, 12:115–16.
31 Irshād, 2:599–600.
32 Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Muḥrān al-Jammāl al-Rāzī (d. 239/853) was considered one of the greatest hadith transmitters of Khurāsān in his day; Dhahabi, Siyar, 11:143.
33 Bukhārī, al-Ṭārīkh al-kabīr, 3(2):404–5, no. 2793, s.n. Ṭāʾsu b. Maysara al-Ghifārī; 405, no. 2794, s.n. Ṭāʾsu b. Abī Ṭāʾsu (see also note 3 on that page regarding Ṭāʾsu b. Maysara b. Hayyān); Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Jarrh, 3(1):290, no. 1606, s.n. Ṭāʾsu b. Maysara al-Ghifārī.
Subcategory 2

The accurate pronunciation of homographs in the two Ṣaḥīḥs or in those two books and Mālik’s Muwatta’ in particular. For instance,

Bashshār the father of Bundār, Muḥammad b. Bashshār. The rest of those in the two books are “Yasār.” Abū ʿAṭī al-Ghassānī said this in his book, Sayyār b. Salāmā and Sayyār b. Abī Sayyār Wardān appear in both of the Ṣaḥīḥs. However, “Sayyār” is not in this exact shape, although it is similar. God knows best.

Everything in the two Ṣaḥīḥs and the Muwatta’ with the form of “Bishr” is pronounced “Bishr,” with four exceptions and they are “Busr.” They are the Companion ‘Abd Allāh b. Busr al-Māzīn, Busr b. Saʿīd,36 Busr b. Ubayd Allāh al-Ḥadrāmī and Busr b. Mīḥjan al-Dīthī.37 For Ibn Mīḥjan, “Bishr” is also given. Ahmad b. Ṣāḥib al-Misrī related the pronunciation “Bishr” from a number of Ibn Mīḥjan’s children and members of his tribe. Mālik and the majority of the experts gave the first version of the name [that is, “Busr”]. God knows best.

Everything in these books with the form of “Bashir” is “Bashr” with four exceptions. Two of them are “Bushayr” and they are Bushayr b. Kaḥ al-ʿAdawī and Bushayr b. Yāsār.” The third is Yūsifr b. ʿAmr,42 who is also called “Usayr.” The fourth is Qaṭān b. Nusayr.43 God knows best.

Everything in these books with the form “Yazid” is “Yazīd,” with three exceptions:

1. Burayd b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Abī Burda.44

2. Muḥammad b. ʿArṣara b. al-Birind in Kitāb “Umdat al-muḥaddithin” (The Hadith Transmitters’ Guide) and elsewhere it is given as “Barand.”

36 Sayyār b. Wardān (d. 122/740) was famed for his piety; Dhahabi, Ṣiyār, 5:391–2.
37 That is, the consonantal outline of “Sayyār” differs slightly from that of “Bashshār” and “Yasār.”
38 The ascetic Busr b. Saʿīd died in the year 100/719; Dhahabi, Ṣiyār, 4:594–5.
40 Dhahabi, Ṣiyār, 3:451, no. 131.
41 Dhahabi, Ṣiyār, 4:591–2.
42 The Follower Yusayr died around the year 85/704. Shuʿba was the one who called him “Usayr”; Bukhārī, al-Taʾrīkh al-kabīr, 4(2):422; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Ṣiyār, 4(2):308.
43 Abī ʿAbbād Qaṭān b. Nusayr al-Ghāhrī al-Baṣrī was known as “al-Dhārī” (the wine skin); Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Ṣiyār, 3(2):138.
44 Burayd (d. ca. 140/757) was a controversial transmitter of hadith; Dhahabi, Ṣiyār, 6:251–2.
46 The anthropomorphist Ḥanbalite Abū Muḥammad Abī ʿAbd al-Ghānī b. Abī al-Wāḥid al-Maḍīṣī (541/1146–600/1203) was the author of this work; Ḥijjī Khalīfa, Kashf, 2:col. 1171.
The first pronunciation is more common and Ibn Mākūlā mentioned nothing else.

3. ‘All b. Ḥāshim b. al-Barid.⁴⁷ God knows best.

Everything appearing in the books with the form of “al-Ḥarīr” is “Barā,” except Abū Ma’shar al-Barā⁴⁸ and Abu ‘l-‘Aliya al-Barā.⁴⁹ A “barā”⁵⁰ is someone who fashions (yabri) lutes. God knows best.

In the two Sahīhs and Mawāḍī’u, there is no “Jāriya,” except Jāriya b. Qudāma⁵¹ and Yazīd b. Jāriya.⁵² The others are “Ḥāritha.” God knows best.

In these books there is no “Ḥarīr,” except Ḥarīr b. ʿUṭmān al-Raḥibī al-Ḥimṣī⁵³ and the judge Abū Ḥarīr ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Ḥusayn,⁵⁴ the transmitter from Ikrīma and others. The others are “Jarīr.” Often they are confused with “Ḥudayr,” and in these books the Ḥudayrīs are the father of ʿImrān b. Ḥudayr⁵⁵ and the father of Zayd b. Ḥudayr⁵⁶ and Ziyād b. Ḥudayr.⁵⁷ God knows best.

In these books there is no “Ḥirāsh,” except the father of Ribʿ b. Ḥirāsh.⁵⁸ The rest of those whose name takes this form are “Khirāsh.” God knows best.

In these books there is no “Ḥāṣīn,” except Abū Ḥāṣīn ʿUṭmān b. ʿAṣīm al-Asadī.⁵⁹ The rest are “Ḥusayn.” All of these are “Ḥusayn,” except Abū Saʿād b. Ḥudayn b. al-Mundhir. God knows best.

Everything in these books with the form of “Ḥāṣim” and “Abū Ḥāṣim” is pronounced “Ḥāzim,” except Abū Muʿāwiya Muḥammad b. Khāṣim al-Ẓarīḥ. God knows best.

---

⁴⁷ The Shiite transmitter ʿAlī b. Ḥāshim died around 180/796; Dabahibī, Siyar, 8:342–5.
⁵² Although Ḥarīr (80/699–163/780) was rated a reliable transmitter of hadith, there was a suspicion that he hated the caliph ʿAlī; Dabahibī, Siyar, 7:79–81.
⁵⁴ ʿImrān b. Ḥudayr was a Bayān transmitter of hadith who died in 149/766; Dabahibī, Siyar, 6:263–4.
⁵⁵ In the works I consulted, I could find no entry on Ziyād’s brother Zayd.
⁵⁷ It is said that the Follower Ribʿ b. Ḥirāsh never told a lie; Dabahibī, Siyar, 4:359–62.
⁵⁸ Abū Ḥāṣīn (d. ca. 128/746) was a highly regarded Kutān transmitter of hadith; Dabahibī, Siyar, 5:412–17.
Those who appear in these books as "Hābbān" are Ḥabbān b. Munqidh⁵⁹—who was the father of Wāsi⁵ b. Ḥabbān,⁶⁰ the grandfather of Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā b. Ḥabbān⁶¹ and the grandfather of Ḥabbān b. Wāsi⁵ b. Ḥabbān⁶²—and Ḥabbān b. Ḥilāl,⁶³ who is referred to with and without his lineage and who was a transmitter from Ṣuḥba[b. al-Ḥajjāj], Wuhayb [b. Khalid], Hammām b. Yaḥyā,⁶⁴ Abā b. Yazid, Sulaymān b. al-Mughira⁶⁵ and Abū ʿAwāna.⁶⁶ Those in these books who are "Hibbān" are Hibbān b. ʿĀṭya⁶⁷ and Hibbān b. Mūsā;⁶⁸ that is, the "Hibbān" who is referred to without a lineage as a transmitter from ʿAbd Allāh—and "Abū Allāh" here is ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Mubārak. The name of Ibn al-ʿAriqa⁶⁹ is also "Hibbān." The rest are "Ḥayyān." God knows best.

Those who appear in these books as "Khubayb" are Khubayb b. ʿAdī,⁷⁰ Khubayb b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Khubayb b. Yaṣāf⁷¹—and he is the "Khubayb" referred to without any lineage as a transmitter from Ḥaṣṣ b. ʿAṣim⁷² and from ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Maʿīn⁷³ and Abū Khubayb ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubayr. The rest are "Ḥabīb." God knows best.

In these books there is no "Ḥukaym" except Ḥukaym b. ʿAbd Allāh⁷⁴ and Ruzayq b. Ḥukaym.⁷⁵ God knows best.

Everything in these books written as "Rabāḥ" is "Rabāḥ," except Ziyād b. Riyāḥ⁷⁶ and he is Abū Qays, the transmitter from Abū Hurayra on the portents of the Day of Judgement and the dissolution of the unity of the Community. The

---

⁵⁹ Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istīḥāṣ, 1:318.
⁶¹ Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā died in 121/739; Dhahabi, Siyār, 5:186-7.
⁶³ Abū Ḥabīb Ḥabbān b. Ḥilāl al-Bahālī (ca. 130/748-216/831) was a respected Baṣrī transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabi, Siyār, 10:239-40.
⁶⁴ Abū Bakr (or Abū ʿAbd Allāh) Hammām b. Yaḥyā b. Dīnār al-ʿAwdhī (d. 164/781) was a controversial Baṣrī transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabi, Siyār, 7:296-301.
⁶⁵ Sulaymān b. al-Mughira (d. 165/782) was also a prominent transmitter of ḥadīth in al-Ṭabāṣrā; Dhahabi, Siyār, 7:415-19.
⁶⁶ Abū ʿAwāna al-Waddāb b. ʿAbd Allāh (d. 176/792) also transmitted ḥadīth in al-Ṭabāṣrā; Dhahabi, Siyār, 8:217-22.
⁶⁷ I have not found an entry on this Ḥabbān in the sources I consulted.
⁶⁸ Ḥabbān b. Mūsā b. Ḥabbān al-Dimashqī died in 231/846; Dhahabi, Siyār, 11:11.
⁶⁹ I have not found any information about Ibn al-ʿAriqa.
⁷⁰ Khubayb b. ʿAdī was a Companion; Dhahabi, Siyār, 1:246-9.
majority of scholars pronounce it “Riyāḥ,” although Bukhārī did give it both ways, “Rabhā” and “Riyāḥ.” God knows best.

“Zubayd” and “Zuyayd” do not appear in the two Ṣahih, with the exception of Zubayd b. al-Ḥārith al-Yāmī.77 In the Muwatta’, there is only Zuyayd and he is Zuyayd b. al-Sāḥ.78 God knows best.

There is a single “Salīm” in these books and he is Salīm b. Ḥayyān.79 The rest are “Sulaym.” God knows best.

In these books are Salīm b. Zarīr,80 Salīm b. Qutayba,81 Salīm b. Abī ‘l-Dhawayl82 and Salīm b. Abī al-Rahmān.83 The rest are “Salīm.” God knows best.

In these books are Surayj b. Yūnus,84 Surayj b. al-Nuṣrānī85 and Abīmad b. Abī Surayj.86 The rest are “Shurayh” in these books. God knows best.

In these books are Salmān al-Faṭrīsī, Salmān b. Āmīr,87 Salmān al-Aghārī88 and Abī al-Rahmān b. Salmān.89 The rest are “Sulaymān.” Abū Ḥāzim al-‘Ashjā’ī90 – the transmitter from Abū Hurayra – and Abū Rabī’91 – the client of Abū Qilāba – both bore the name “Salmān,” but are referred to by their patronymic. God knows best.

In these books “Salīma” is ‘Amr b. Salīma al-Jarmī,92 the prayer leader of his people. The Banū Salīma were a tribe of the Anšārites. The rest are “Salama.”

77 Zubayd (d. 122/740) was famous for his asceticism; Dhaḥabī, Siyāra, 5:296–8.
86 Abū Ja’far Abīmad b. Abī Surayj ‘Umar al-Raṣī died around the year 240/854 at over 80 years of age; Dhaḥabī, Siyāra, 11:552.
90 Abū Ḥāzim al-‘Ashjā’ī (d. ca. 100/719) was a prolific transmitter from Abū Hurayra; Dhaḥabī, Siyāra, 5:7–8.
However, "Abd al-Khāliq b. Salama" in the book of Muslim is given there as both "Salima" and "Salama." God knows best.


"Ubayd" is pronounced "Ubayd" wherever it occurs in these books.

Likewise, "Ubāda" is pronounced "Ubāda" wherever it occurs, except in the case of Muḥammad b. Abūdā al-Wāṣiṭī, one of the teachers of Bukhārī. God knows best.

"Abda" is pronounced "Abda" wherever it occurs in these books, except in the case of Āmīr b. Abīda - who is mentioned in the introduction to Muslim's book - and Bajāla b. Abīda. However, there is disagreement regarding them. Some also give them as "Abda." Some of the transmitters of Muslim's book have "Āmīr b. Abīd" and that is incorrect. God knows best.

In these books "Abbād" is pronounced "Abbād," except in the case of Qays b. Ubād. God knows best.

There is no "Uqayl" in these books, except Uqayl b. Khalīlī, Yaḥyā b. Uqayl, and Bān Uqayl for the tribe. The rest are "Agīl." God knows best.
There is no “Waṣiat” at all in these books. Every instance in them is “Waṣiud.” God knows best.

Gentilies

The expert al-Qāḍī ʿIyād said that these books do not contain an “ʿUbūlī” and everything with this form is to be pronounced “ʿAyīh.” In fact, Muslim related many hadith from Shaybān b. Fārrūkhī and he is “ʿUbūlī.” However, as he nowhere in Muslim’s work appears with the gentilic, ʿIyād cannot be faulted. God knows best.

In the two ʿṢaḥīḥs we do not know of an “al-Bazzār,” except Khalaf b. Hishām al-Bazzārī and al-Ḥasan b. al-Ṣabbāḥ al-Bazzārī. Muhammad b. al-Ṣabbāḥ al-Bazzārī and everyone else in the two books are “al-Bazzār.” God knows best.

There are only three people with the gentilic “Naṣīrī” in the two ʿṢaḥīḥs and the Muwāṭṭa. They are Mālik b. Aws b. al-Ḥadathān al-Naṣīrī, ʿAbd al-Wahhāb b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Naṣīrī and Sālim, the client of the Naṣīris. The rest of the names in those books with this form are “Baṣrī.” God knows best.

In these books there is only a single “Tawwazzūt” and he is Abū Yaḥyā Muḥammad b. al-Ṣālt al-Tawwazzūtī, who appears in the book of Bukhārī in the chapter on apostasy. Everyone else is “Thawrī,” including Abū Yaḥyā Mundhīr b. Yaḥyā al-Thawrī, whose hadith both Bukhārī and Muslim included. God knows best.

Saʿd al-Jurayrī, ʿAbbās al-Jurayrī and the Jurayrī who is not further named but who transmitted from Abū Naḍrā are the only ones having this gentilic in

---

106 Abū Muḥammad Shaybān b. Abī Shayba Fārrūkh (140/757–236/851) was one of the most elevated transmitters of his day; Dhadhabī, Siyar, 11:101–2.
107 Khalaf b. Hishām (150/767–229/844) was an expert in the Qur’ān; Dhadhabī, Siyar, 10:576–80.
109 Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. al-Ṣabbāḥ al-Dīlahī (151/768–227/841) is best known for the Sunan he composed; Dhadhabī, Siyar, 10:670–72.
110 Mālik b. Aws was born before the advent of Islam and died in the year 92/711; Dhadhabī, Siyar, 4:171–2.
116 Dhadhabī claimed that Saʿd al-Jurayrī transmitted hadith from Abū Naḍrā al-Mundhīrī b. Mālik al-ʾAbdī (d. 108/726 or 107); Siyar, 4:529–32.
these books. These works also contain a “Hariri,” namely Yahya b. Bishr, the teacher of Bukhari and Muslim. God knows best. They also contain a “Jariri,” namely Yahya b. Ayyub al-Jariri in the book of Bukhari, one of the descendants of Jarir b. Abul Allah al-Bajali.

“Jarir” in these books is a single individual and he is the Sa’d[19] whose gentilic refers to al-Jar, a seaport on the coast of Medina, by Judda [that is, modern-day Jidda]. God knows best. Everyone else is “Hariri.” God knows best.

“Hizami” is pronounced “Hizami” wherever it occurs. God knows best.

“Salami,” when it is applied to an Anzarite, is “Salami,” a gentilic referring to the Banu Salama. Jabir b. Abul Allaha and Abul Qasim are representatives of them. The experts in the Arabic language pronounce the gentilic form “Salami,” like “Namari,” “Sadafi” and similar ones. Most of the scholars of hadith pronounce it “Salami” — in accordance with the original name [that is, Salima] — and that is a solecism. God knows best.

“Hamadhan” does not occur in the two Sahis and the Muwatta. Everything in them with this shape is “Hamidi.” Abul Nasir b. Maktul has said, “Hamidi Among the ancients ‘Hamidi’ predominated and among the moderns ‘Hamadhani’ is more common.” He is right. God knows best.

This is merely an outline. If a student were to travel to study this material, it would be a worthwhile journey, God — He is exalted — willing. It is the duty of the hadithologist to commit these homographs to the inmost part of his being. Regarding some of them there is a threat of undoing some of the previously mentioned unique names. I relied on the book of al-Qadi ‘Uyad[20] for some of them. I seek refuge in God for this and for all of my affairs. He — be He praised — knows best.

117 Abul Zakariya Yahya b. Bishr al-Hariri was a merchant who died in al-Kufa in 229/844 (or 227); Dhabab, Siyar, 10:647–8.
118 Yahya b. Ayyub al-Jariri died around the year 160/777; Dhabab, Siyar, 8:10.
120 This would seem to be a reference to Mashariq al-anwar.
Category 54

HOMONYMIC NAMES, GENTILICS, AND SO FORTH

(Ma‘rifat al-muttaṣiq wa-‘l-mustariq min al-asmā‘ wa-‘l-ansāb wa-naḥwiḥā)

This Category concerns the names and gentilics which are pronounced and written the same. This is in contrast to the previous Category, in which the names and gentilics had the same written form but differed in pronunciation. In the study of theoretical law, this phenomenon comes under the rubric of what is called “shared” (mushtarak). More than one of the greats has erred because of it and “sharing” remains a breeding ground of mistakes in every discipline. Al-Khaṭṭāb has a book on it, Kitāb al-Muttaṣiq wa-‘l-Mustariq (Homonyms), which, despite its ample size, does not exhaustively treat the subcategories which I will mention, God – He is exalted – willing.

1. Different people who share the same name and whose fathers share the same name: an example of this is “al-Khalil b. Aḥmad.” There are six of them and al-Khaṭṭāb missed the last four.

The first of them was the Başrân grammarian and inventor of prosody. He transmitted ḥadīth from 5ʿāshim al-Aḥwal and others. Abu ʿl-ʿAbbās al-Mubarrad said, “If someone searched, he would not find anyone after our Prophet (Peace be upon him) whose name was ‘Aḥmad’ before the father of al-Khalil b. Aḥmad.” The historian Abū Bakr [b. Abī Khaythama] stated that he still heard the genealogists and secular historians saying that they do not know of anyone earlier. “Abu ʿl-Safār Saʿd b. Aḥmad” was cited against al-Mubarrad – on the basis of the statement of Yahyā b. Maṭīn regarding the name of his father – and he was earlier. Al-Mubarrad responded that most scholars say that he was “Saʿd b. Yuḥmiḥ.” God knows best.

The second was Abū Bishr al-Muzant,1 also a Başrân. He transmitted ḥadīth from al-Mustanir b. Akhḍar2 from Muʿāwiya b. Quraṣra. Al-ʿAbbās [b. ʿAbd al-ʿAẓīm] al-ʿAnbarī and a number of others related from him.

The third was an Isfahānī3 who related ḥadīth from Rawḥ b. ʿUbāda.4

2 Although both Bukhārī and Ibn Abī Ḥātim mentioned this individual in their entry on this al-Khalil b. Aḥmad, they do not seem to have provided an entry for him.
3 This would appear to be the Abu ʿl-ʿAbbās al-Khalīl b. Muḥammad al-Qāḥir who transmitted ḥadīth from Rawḥ b. ʿUbāda; Abū Nuʿaym al-Isbahānī, Kītāb Dhihr akhkhār ʿIsbahān, 1:307–8.
4 Abū Muḥammad Rawḥ b. ʿUbāda al-Qayṣ al-ʿArṣī (d. 205/820) knew an enormous number of ḥadīth and wrote several works on religious subjects; Sezgin, GAD, 1:39–40.
The fourth was Abū Saʿīd al-Sījī, the famous Ḥanafite judge and legal scholar in Khuрастān. He transmitted ḥadīth from [Abū Bakr b. Khuzayma, Ibn Saʿīd], [Abū ʿl-Qāsim ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad] al-Baghawi and other expert transmitters of ḥadīth.

The fifth was the judge Abū Saʿīd al-Bustī al-Muhallabī. He was an excellent man who related ḥadīth from the aforementioned al-Khalīl al-Sījī. He transmitted Ibn Abī Khaythama’s Taʾrīkh (History) from Ahmad b. al-Muẓaffar al-Bakrī as well as ḥadīth from other scholars. The expert Bayhaqī related ḥadīth from him.

The sixth was also an Abū ʿl-Saʿīd al-Bustī but he was “al-Shafiʿī.” He was an excellent man and active in several disciplines. He traveled to Andalusia and transmitted ḥadīth. He was born in 360 [971 AD]. He related from Abū Ḥāmid al-Isfārayini and others. Abū ʿl-Abbās al-Uḍhrī and others transmitted ḥadīth from him. God knows best.

2. Different people who share the same name, whose fathers share the same name and whose grandfathers or even earlier ancestors share the same name: one example of this is “Ahmad b. Jaʿfar b. Ḥamdān.” There were four of them, all living in the same era.¹²

   One of them was Abū Bakr al-Qaṭṭāl al-Baghdādī, the transmitter from ʿAbd Allāh b. Ahmad b. Ḥanbal.

   The second was Abū Bakr al-Saqāṭī al-Baṣrī, who also relates ḥadīth from an “ʿAbd Allāh b. Ahmad,” but in this case he is ʿAbd Allāh b. Ahmad b. Ibrāhīm al-Dawraqī.¹³

---

¹ This al-Khalīl b. Ahmad was born in 289/902 and died in Farghāna in 378/988. He served as judge in Samarqand and was one of the most prominent Ḥanafite figures of his day; Dihābī, Siyar, 16:437–9.

⁶ Abū Muhammad Yāḥyā b. Muḥammad b. Saʿīd al-Baghdādī (228/842–318/930) was one of the great ḥadīth experts in Baghdad; Sezgin, G4S, 1:176.

⁷ I could not find this al-Khalīl b. Ahmad in the sources I consulted.

⁸ I have been unable to locate any information about this individual.

⁹ I have found no information about this figure.

¹⁰ Abū Ḥāmid Ahmad b. Abī Ṭahir Muḥammad al-Isfāraynī (344/955–406/1016) was the head of the Shāfiʿites in Baghdad; Dihābī, Siyar, 17:193–7.

¹¹ Abū ʿl-Abbās Ahmad b. ʿUmar b. Anas al-Uḍhrī (393/1003–478/1085) was an Andalusian scholar who spent eight years in Mecca; Dihābī, Siyar, 18:567–8.

¹² Contemporaries sharing the same name were accorded special attention because they could not be distinguished by their relative place in isnāds.

¹³ Ahmad b. Malik al-Qaṭṭāl (d. 368/979) was best known for transmitting Ahmad b. Ḥanbal’s Musnad from his son ʿAbd Allāh; Sezgin, G4S, 1:200.

¹⁴ I could not find this Ahmad b. Malik in the sources I consulted.

The third was a Dinawari\textsuperscript{16} who related hadith from ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Sinān\textsuperscript{17} from Muḥammad b. Kathīr, the student of Sufyān al-Ṭahwīl.

The fourth was a Ṭarsūṣī\textsuperscript{18} who related the Tārīkh (History) of Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā [b.] al-Ṭabba\textsuperscript{19} from ʿAbd Allāh b. Jābir al-Ṭarsūṣī.\textsuperscript{20}

Another example of this is “Muḥammad b. Yaʿqūb b. Yūsuf al-Nisāḥūrī.” There were two of them, both in the same era. Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥakim and others relate hadīth from both of them. One of them was known as Abū ʿl-ʿAbbās al-Asamm\textsuperscript{21} and the other was Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Akhrām al-Shaybānī, and he – not the first – is known as “al-Ḥāfiẓ.” God knows best.

3. Instances of different people sharing both the same payonymic and gentilic: an example of this is “Abū ʿImrān al-Jawnt.” There were two. One of them was the Follower Abū al-Malik b. Ḥabīb\textsuperscript{22} and the name of the second was Mūsā b. Sahl,\textsuperscript{23} a Basrī who lived in Baghdad and related hadīth from Hishām b. ʿAmr and others. Daʿājī b. Aḥmad\textsuperscript{24} and others transmitted from him.

“Abū Bakr b. ʿAyyāsh” is a similar case. There were three of them.

The first is the Qurān reciter and transmitter of hadīth. The difference of opinion regarding his name (isn) has already been mentioned.\textsuperscript{25}

The second is Abū Bakr b. ʿAyyāsh al-Ḥimṣī, from whom Jaʿfar b. ʿAbd al-Wāḥid al-Ḥashimi\textsuperscript{26} transmitted hadīth. He is “unknown” and Jaʿfar was not reliable.

The third is Abū Bakr b. ʿAyyāsh al-Sulami al-Bājaddāl,\textsuperscript{27} the author of Kitāb Gharib al-ḥadīth (Rare Words in the Ḥadīth). His name is

---

16 I have not located this person.
17 I have not located ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Sinān in any of the sources I consulted.
18 I have no information on this individual.
19 Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā al-Ṭabba al-Baghdādī (d. 224/839), the brother of Ishaq, is said to have known around forty thousand hadīth; Dīhāḥ, Siyar, 10:386–9.
20 I have not located any information on this person.
21 As a boy, Abū ʿl-ʿAbbās al-Asamm (247/861–346/957) traveled extensively with his father to study hadīth and eventually became one of the foremost experts of his era; Sezgin, G.A.S, 1:186.
22 The hadīth of this Abū ʿImrān al-Jawnt (d. 123/741 or 128) are found in most of the major collections; Dīhāḥ, Siyar, 5:255–6.
23 Mūsā b. Sahl died in 307/919 at an advanced age; Dīhāḥ, Siyar, 14:261.
24 Abū Muḥammad Daʿājī b. Ahmad al-Sijistānī (ca. 259/873–351/962) was a wealthy merchant who gained an impressive reputation in the field of hadīth; Sezgin, G.A.S, 1:188.
25 See above, p. 253.
27 Abū Bakr al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAyyāsh al-Sulami al-Bājaddāl (d. 204/820) was a poorly known transmitter of hadīth; Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib al-Tahdhib, 12 vols (Hyderabad, 1325–7), 2:362–3.
4. The reverse of the previous type: an example of this is “Ṣāliḥ b. Abī Ṣāliḥ.” There were four of them.

One of them was the client of al-Tawāma bint Umayya b. Khalaf. The second was the son of Abū Ṣāliḥ Dhakwān al-Sammān [al-Zayyāt], the transmitter from Abū Hurayra.

The third was Ṣāliḥ b. Abī Ṣāliḥ al-Sadūsī. He related hadith from ‘Alī and Khālid b. ‘Umar transmitted from him.

The fourth was Ṣāliḥ b. Abī Ṣāliḥ, the client of ‘Amr b. Hurayth. He related hadith from Abū Hurayra and [the Qur’ān reciter and transmitter of hadith] Abū Bakr. ‘Ayyāsh transmitted from him. God knows best.

5. Different people who share their name, the name of their father and their gentilic: an example of this is “Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Anṣārī.” There were two in nearly the same generation. One of them was the famous Anṣārīte, the judge Abū ‘Abd Allāh, from whom Bukhārī and many others related hadith. The païdronymic of the second was Abū Salama and he was weak in hadith. God knows best.

6. Cases of “sharing” in regard to the name or the paidronymic alone, which are nevertheless equivocal because these individuals are not referred to by any other part of their name: an example of this is what we heard from the expert and judge Ibn Khallād: “When Ārim [that is, Abū ‘l-Mu’mān Muhammad b. al-Faḍl al-Sadūsī] and Sulaymān b. Harb say, ‘Hammaḏ transmitted to us,’ it is Hammād b. Zayd. When [Mūsā b. Ismā’īl al-Tabūdhaki and al-‘Alājī]

28 This is another name I was unable to identify.
29 The ism of his father was Nabāh; Bukhārī, al-Tārīkh al-kabīr, 2(2):291–2; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Jarḥ, 2(1):416–18.
30 She seems to have been known only for her relationship to Sāliḥ.
32 I have not found this person in the works I consulted.
33 The ism of his father is given as Mihrān; Bukhārī, al-Tārīkh al-kabīr, 2(2):283, no. 2823; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Jarḥ, 2(1):413, no. 1814.
36 For about five years, Abū Ayyāsh Sulaymān b. Ḥarb al-Wāṣibī (140/757–224/839) served as a judge in Mecca; Dhahabi, Siyār, 10:330–4.
b. Minhâl [say, ‘Hammâd informed us,’ it is Hammâd b. Salama. When ‘Affân says, ‘Hammâd informed us,’ it can be either of them.” Then I found the report from Muhammad b. Yahyâ al-Duhêlî in which ‘Affân [b. Muslim] said, “When I say to you, ‘Hammâd informed us,’ and I do not give the name of his father, it is Ibn Salama.” With the exception of the remarks on Tabûdhakî, Muhammâd b. Yahyâ said what Ibn Khallâd said.

Similar to that is what we heard regarding Salama b. Sulaymân to the effect that he transmitted hadîth one day and said, “Abd Allah told us.” He was asked, “The son of whom?” He said, “God be praised! Will you not be satisfied until I say for every hadîth, ‘Abû ‘Abd al-‘Rahmân ‘Abd Allah b. al-Mubârak al-‘Hanîlî, who lived in Sikkat ‘Ushghî, informed us?’” Then Salama said, “When ‘Abd Allah’ is mentioned in Mecca, it is Ibn al-Zubayr. When ‘Abd Allah’ is mentioned in Medina, it is Ibn ‘Umar. When ‘Abd Allah’ is mentioned in al-Kûfah, it is Ibn Mas‘ûd. When ‘Abd Allah’ is mentioned in al-Baṣra, it is Ibn ‘Abbâs. When ‘Abd Allah’ is mentioned in Khurâsân, it is Ibn al-Mubârak.” The expert Abû Ya‘âlî al-Khâlîfî al-Qazwînîî said, “When an Egyptian says, ‘from ‘Abd Allah,’ without naming the man’s father, it is Ibn ‘Amr; that is, [‘Amr] b. al-‘Abîn. When a Meccan says, ‘from ‘Abd Allah,’ without naming the father, it is Ibn ‘Abbâs.”

Another case is “Abû 1-‘Hamza” from Ibn ‘Abbâs, when the paydonymic is given without further specification. One expert said that Shu‘bî related from seven “Abû ‘Hamzas” from Ibn ‘Abbâs. All of them are “Abû ‘Hamza” except one and he is Abû Jamra Naṣr b. Imrân al-Duba‘î. They can be distinguished when Shu‘bî says just, “from Abû ‘Hamza [that is, Jamra] from Ibn ‘Abbâs.” Then it is from Naṣr b. Imrân. When he relates from the other “Abû ‘Hamzas,” he mentions their names and lineages. God knows best.

7. Homonymns in regard to the gentilic alone: one example of this is “Amul.” It may be the gentilic referring to the city of Āmul in Tabarastân. Abû Sa‘îd al-Sâmînî said, “Most of the scholars of Tabarastân are from Āmul.” Or it may be the gentilic referring to Āmul by the river Jayhûn. The gentilic of ‘Abd Allah b. Hammâd al-‘Amulî refers to this Āmul. Bûkhârî related hadîth from him
in his *Sabīl*. The North Africans Abū ʿAli al-Ghassānī and later al-Qāḍī ʿIyād are incorrect in saying that his paidonymic refers to Āmul in Ṭabarastān. God knows best.

Another instance of that is “Ḥanāfī.” This may be the gentilic referring to the tribe of the Banū Ḥanāfī. Or it may be the gentilic referring to the legal school of Abū Ḥanīfa. The bearers of both of these gentilics are numerous and well known. Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir al-Maqdīsī [that is, Ibn al-Qaysarān], many scholars of hadīth and others used to make a distinction between the two meanings of the gentilic, saying in reference to the legal school, “Ḥanīfī.” I have only come across one grammarian, the authority Abū Bakr b. al-Aḥbār, 45 who endorsed that. He did so in his book *al-Kāfī*. Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir [that is, Ibn al-Qaysarān] has a book entitled *Kitāb al-ʾAnsāb al-muttaṣaţ qaːa* (Homonymic Gentilics) on this type of homonym.

Beyond these types there are others which we need not mention. Homonyms do not exist without something to clarify them. The intended individual is sometimes uncovered by the examination of his transmissions. Often he is distinguished in some of them. Sometimes his identity is uncovered by examination of the condition of his student and his teacher. Occasionally scholars venture an opinion in that regard on the basis of a shaky guess.

One day al-Qāsim al-Muṭarrīzī transmitted a hadīth from Abū Hammāmū 46 – or someone else – from al-Walid b. Muḥammad from Sufyān. The expert Abū Ṭālib b. Naṣr asked him, “Who is this ‘Sufyān’?” He said, “This is Sufyān al-Thawrī.” Abū Ṭālib said to him, “On the contrary, he is Sufyān b. Ḫuṣayn.” Al-Muṭarrīzī asked him, “On what basis do you say that?” He said, “Because al-Walid related only a few well-documented hadīth from Thawrī while he was ‘full’ of Ibn Ḫuṣayn.” God knows best.

---

48 The transmitter Abū Hammām al-Walid b. Abī Badr Shuqūtī (d. 243/857) is said to have collected a hundred thousand hadīth from reliable transmitters; Dhaḥabī, *Ṣayr*, 12:23–4.
Category 55

A CATEGORY COMPOSED OF THE TWO PREVIOUS CATEGORIES

(Naw‘ yatarakkabu min al-naw‘ayn alladhayni qablahu)

This Category consists of the instances in which the homonymy mentioned in the Category which we just finished occurs in the names of two individuals or the paIdonomyics which they are known by and the homography discussed in the Category before that occurs in their lineages or gentilities; or it consists of the reverse, with their names being homographic while their gentilities or their lineages, either in terms of names or paIdonomyics, are homonymic. In this regard, words which are similar and resemble one another are counted as homographs, even if they differ in some of their letters when written. Al-Khaṭṭāb composed a book on this subject, which he entitled Kitāb Ta'khīṣ al-mutashabīh fī 'l-rasūl (Summary of the Names which Resemble One Another in Written Form), and it is one of his finest books. However, the title he gave his book does not indicate as clearly as ours what its subject is.

One of the examples of the first form:

Mūsā b. 'Ali and Mūsā b. 'Ulayy: there are a number of the first, including Abū ʿIsā al-Khuttali from whom the Qur'ān reciter Abū Bakr b. Miṣqam, Abū Ṭalā b. al-Ṣāwawāf and others related ḥadith. The second is Mūsā b. 'Ulayy b. Rabāḥ al-Lakhmī al-Miṣrī, whose father's name is known to be “Ulayy.” On the other hand, we heard that he forbade people to call him “Ulayy.” It is said that the Egyptians used to pronounce it “ʾAlī” for that reason and the Iraqis used to pronounce it “Ulayy.” One expert used to say that “ʾAlī” was his name and “Ulayy” (little ʾAlī) was his nickname. God knows best.

An example of homonymy in the name or paIdonomyic with homography in the gentilic:

Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Mukharrīmī was a famous transmitter of ḥadith. His gentilic refers to the Mukharrim section of Baghdad.

2 Not much seems to have been known about this transmitter. See Samānī, Anāb, 2:322.
3 Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Ṭālā b. Yaqtīb al-Baghdādī al-Maṭṭar (265/879-354/965), known as Ibn Miṣqam, wrote a number of books on the Qur’ān; Brockelmann, G. A., Suppl., 1:183
4 Abū ʿAlī Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Baghdādī (270/884-359/970), known as Ibn al-Ṣāwawāf, was a highly praised transmitter of ḥadith; Dhabāb, Siyar, 16:184–6.
6 Al-Khaṭṭāb al-Bağhdādī described Mukharrīmī (ca. 170/787–234/868) as “one of the most knowledgeable people in reports and most learned in ḥadith”; Taʾrīkh Baghdād, 5:423.
Muhammad b. ʿAbd Allah al-Makhrami was not famous. He related ḥadith from the imām Shāfiʿī. God knows best.

A case in which the names are similar and resemble each other despite some difference in their shape:

Thawr b. Yazīd al-Kalāṭ al-Shāmī and Thawr b. Zayd al-Dīl al-Madani: the second is the one from whom Mālik related and his ḥadith are present in both of the Sahīhs. The ḥadith of the first are found only in Muslim. God knows best.

An example of homonymy in the paidonymic and homography in the gentilic:

ʿAbū ʿAmr al-Shaybānī and ʿAbū ʿAmr al-Saybānī were two Followers who differ in that the first is “Shaybānī” and the second is “Saybānī.” The name of the first is “Saʿd b. ʿĪyās” and the lexicographer ʿAbū ʿAmr al-Shaybānī, that is, ʿĪyās b. ʿIyās, shares his paidonymic and gentilic. The name of the second is “Zuʿrā” and he is the father of Yaḥyā b. ʿAbī ʿAmr al-Saybānī al-Shāmī. God knows best.

Various examples of the second subcategory – which is the reverse of the first:

ʿAmr b. Zarāra and Ṭūʿar b. Zarāra: there are a number of the first, including Abū Muhammad al-Nisābūrī, from whom Muslim related ḥadith. The second is known as “al-Ḥadathī” and he is the one from whom [Abu ʿl-ʿQasim] al-Baghwātī al-Maʿmūrī transmits ḥadith. We read in Dāraqaṭnī that he was from a city on the Byzantine frontier called “al-Ḥadathī.” We heard from the expert Abū Ahmad al-Ḥākim al-Kabīrī that he was one of the inhabitants of the town of al-Ḥaditha [in northern Iraq] and his gentilic refers to it. God knows best.

ʿUbayd Allah b. ʿAbī ʿAbd Allah and ʿAbd Allah b. ʿAbī ʿAbd Allah: the first is the son of Abū ʿAbd Allah Salmān al-Agharr, the student of Abū Hurayra from whom Mālik related ḥadith. There are a number of the second, including the Qurān reciter ʿAbd Allah b. ʿAbī ʿAbd Allah

7 I have not found any information about this scholar. The gentilic “Makhrami” was applied to the descendants of al-Miswar b. Makhrama b. Nawfāl al-Qurashi; Ibn al-ʿAthir, Lāhījā, 3:178.
8 Contemporaries suspected that the otherwise excellent transmitter Thawr (d. 153/770 or 155) was a Qedarite; Dḥahabi, Siyar, 6:344–5.
10 ʿĪyās b. ʿIyās (or Marāt) died in 210/825; al-Khaṭṭāb al-Baghdādī, Tārīkh Baghdād, 6:329–32.

Ḥayyān al-ʿAsadī and Ḥanān al-ʿAsadī. An example of the first is Ḥayyān b. Ḥuṣayn,15 the Follower who related ḥadīth from Šamār b. Yāsir. The second is Ḥanān al-ʿAsadī,16 a member of the tribe of the Banū Ṭāsiṣ b. Ṣurayk. He is the uncle of Musarhad, the father of Musaddad. Dāraqūṭṭi said this. He transmits ḥadīth from Abū Ṭūḥmān al-Nahdī. God knows best.

Category 56

Transmitters Resembling One Another in Name and Lineage Who Are Distinguished by the Relative Position of the Names of the Son and Father

(\textit{Ma'rifat al-ruwāt al-mutashābīhīn} fi 'l-īsm wa-'l-nasāb
\textit{al-mutumāyīyīn} bi-'l-taqqīm wa-'l-ta'khīr fi 'l-ībn wa-'l-āb)

An example of this is Yazīd b. al-Aswād and al-Aswād b. Yazīd. The first is the Companion Yazīd b. al-Aswād al-Khuzaā'ī and Yazīd b. al-Aswād al-Jurāshī, who was born in pre-Islamic times, converted to Islam, lived in Syria and enjoyed a reputation for piety so great that [the Umayyad caliph] Mu'āwiya asked him to pray for rain for the sake of the people of Damascus. Mu'āwiya said, “God, today we beseech you for intercession through the best and most excellent of us [that is, Yazīd b. al-Aswād].” It started raining immediately, almost before they could get back to their homes. The second was the excellent Follower al-Aswād b. Yazīd al-Nakha'ī.

\textit{Al-Walīd} b. \textit{Muslim} and \textit{Muslim} b. \textit{al-Walīd} are also an example of this. The first is the Follower al-Walīd b. Muslim al-Ḍaṣrī, the transmitter from Jundub b. 'Abd Allāh al-Bajāli, and the renowned al-Walīd b. Muslim al-Dimashqī, the student of Awnā'ī, from whom Ahmad b. Ḥanbal and many other people related ḥadith. The second is Muslim b. al-Walīd b. Rabīḥ al-Madānī, who transmitted ḥadith from his father and others. 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Darāwarī and others related from him. Bukhārī mentioned him in his \textit{Tārīkh (History)} and reversed his name and lineage, saying “al-Walīd b. Muslim,” and he was reproached for that.

Al-Khaṭṭīb composed a book on this Category which he called \textit{Kitāb Rāfī' al-irīyāb} fi 'l-maqālāt min al-asmā' wa-'l-anṣāb (The Dispeller of Doubt in Cases of Reversed Names and Lineages). Several times this title has given people the mistaken impression that its contents exclusively concern errors like the one mentioned in the second example [that is, Bukhārī’s mistake]. That was not stipulated for the book and most of its contents do not concern that. Therefore the title we have given to this Category is more appropriate. God knows best.

3 Al-Aswād b. Yazīd al-Nakha'ī (d. ca. 75/694) was the uncle of the famous Kūfa jurist Ibrahim al-Nakha'ī; Dhahabī, \textit{Siyār}, 4:50–3.
5 The Companion Jundub (d. ca. 70/689) is said to have lived in al-Kūfa and al-Ḍaṣrī; Dhahabī, \textit{Siyār}, 3:174–5.
8 That is, the word \textit{maqālāt} in al-Khaṭṭīb’s title implies that the elements of the names were erroneously reversed.
There are several varieties of this.

1. Those whose lineage refers to their mother. These include

Muṣṭāḥ b. ʿĀfrāʾ, Muṣṭawwīd b. ʿĀfrāʾ and ʿAwdh b. ʿĀfrāʾ: she was their mother and their father was al-Ḥārīth b. Rīfāʿa al-Anṣārī. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr said that the name of ʿAwdh was actually “ʿAwd” and that that form is found more often in ǧāḥiḍ transmissions.1 God knows best.

The muezzin Bilāl b. ʿHāmāma: ʿHāmāma was his mother and his father was Rabāḥ.

Suhayl b. ʿBaydāʾ (literally, a fair-complexioned woman) and his two brothers Sahl and Saʿwān: she was their mother and her name (ism) was “Daʿūd.” Their father’s name was “Wahb.”

Ṣūrāḥbīl b. Ḥasanā: she was his mother and his father was ʿAbd Allāh b. al-ʿAbd al-Kindī.

ʿAbd Allāh b. Buḥayna: she was his mother and his father was Malik b. al-Qishb al-ʿAzīd al-Asṭlī.

Saʿd b. Ḥabīb al-Anṣārī: she was his mother and his father was Bahīr b. Muṣṭāwīya. Saʿd was an ancestor of the judge Abū Yūṣuf [Yaʿqūb b. Ibrāhīm al-Kūfī].

The preceding were Companions (God be pleased with all of them). Other examples are

Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīya (literally, the woman belonging to the tribe of the Bāntī ʿḤanīfa): she was his mother and her name was “Khawla.” His father was ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭalīb (God be pleased with him).

---

2 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Ḫudhūk, 4:1442.
6 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Ḫudhūk, 2:723.
7 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Ḫudhūk, 2:584–5.
Isma'îl b. 'Ulayya: she was his mother and his father was Abû Ishâq Ibrâîhim.

Ibrâîm b. Hirâsa: 'Abd al-Ghani b. Sa'îd said, “She was his mother and his father was Salama.” God knows best.

2. Those whose lineage refers to their grandmother.

The Companion Ya'la b. Munya: according to al-Zubayr b. Bakkâr, she was his paternal grandmother and his father was Umayya.

Another is the Companion Bashîr b. al-Khaṣṣâiyâ. He was Bashîr b. Ma'bad and al-Khaṣṣâiyâ was the mother of his great-great-grandfather.

A more recent example of that was our teacher Abû Aḥmad 'Abd al-Wâhhab b. Abî al-Bâghdâdî, who was known as “Ibn Sukayna.” She was his grandmother on his father's side. God knows best.

3. Those whose lineage refers to their grandfather.

Abû 'Ubayda b. al-Jarrâh, one of the Ten [given the glad tidings of their acceptance into heaven]: Abû 'Ubayda was 'Amir b. 'Abd Allâh b. al-Jarrâh.

The Companion Ḥamâl b. al-Nâbigha al-Hudhali: he was Ḥamâl b. Malik b. al-Nâbigha.


Ibn Jurayj: he was 'Abd al-Malik b. 'Abd al-'Azîz b. Jurayj.

The “sons” of al-Mâjishûn, including Yûsîf b. Ya'qûb b. Abî Salama al-Mâjishûn: Abû 'Ali al-Ghassâni said, “'Al-Mâjishûn was the
nickname of Ya’qūb b. Abī Salama\textsuperscript{15} and it was also applied to his sons and the sons of his brother ʿAbd Allāh b. Abī Salama.\textsuperscript{16} The preferred interpretation is that “mājishān” means “rosy-cheeked” [either in the dialect of the people of Medina or in Persian\textsuperscript{17}].

Ibn Abī Dalīl: he was Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. al-Mughira b. Abī Dīrāb.

The jurist Ibn Abī Laylā\textsuperscript{18} he was Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Laylā.

Ibn Abī Mulayka\textsuperscript{19} he was ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUbayd Allāh b. Abī Mulayka.

The imām Ahmad b. Ḥanbal: he was Abū ʿAbd Allāh Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ḥanbal.

The “sons” of Abū Shayba; that is, the hadith experts Abū Bakr and ʿUthmān\textsuperscript{20} and their brother al-Qāsim.\textsuperscript{21} Abū Shayba was their grandfather. His name was “Ibrāhīm b. ʿUthmān” and he was an inhabitant of Wāṣīt. Their father was Muḥammad b. Abī Shayba.

A later example was Abū Saʿīd b. Yūnus, the author of Tārīkh Mīṣr (The History of Egypt). He was ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Aḥmad b. Yūnus b. ʿAbd al-ʿĀla al-Ṣadafi. God knows best.

4. Those whose lineage refers to a man other than their father on the basis of a non-blood tie. These include

Al-Miṣqād b. al-ʿAwad: he was al-Miṣqād b. ʿAmr b. Thaqīfa al-Kindi – and it is said, “al-Bahrānī.” He was one of the kin of al-ʿAwad b. ʿAbd Yāghūṭ al-Zuhri, who adopted him. Al-Miṣqād’s lineage refers to him.

Al-Ḥasan b. Dinār: he is actually Ibn Wāṣil and Dinār was the husband of his mother. It seems that this was unknown to Ibn Abī Ḥātim when he called him “al-Ḥasan b. Dinār b. Wāṣil,” making Wāṣil his grandfather.\textsuperscript{22} God knows best.

\textsuperscript{15} Abū Yūsuf Ya’qūb b. Abī Salama Dinār (or Maymūn) died around 120/738; Dhahabi, Siyar, 5:370.
\textsuperscript{16} Bukhārī, al-Tārīkh al-kabīr, 3(1):100; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Jārīh, 2(2):70.
\textsuperscript{17} Samʿānī, Anṣār, 5:157.
\textsuperscript{18} This, the most famous, Ibn Abī Laylā (74/693–148/765), the son of the hadith transmitter ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Laylā, is best known for his contributions to the field of law; Sezgin, GAS, 1:518.
\textsuperscript{19} The hadith transmitter Ibn Abī Mulayka died in 117/793 at over eighty years of age; Dhahabi, Siyar, 5:88–90.
\textsuperscript{20} Abī Bakr’s brother ʿUthmān (d. 239/853) was a highly respected transmitter of hadith; Dhahabi, Siyar, 11:151–4.
\textsuperscript{21} I was unable to locate any information about this brother.
\textsuperscript{22} Jārīh, 1(2):11–12.
Category 58

GENTILICS THE ACTUAL SIGNIFICANCE OF WHICH DIFFERS FROM THE APPARENT ONE WHICH FIRST COMES TO MIND

(Ma‘rīfat al-nisab allatī bātīnuhā ‘alā khilāf zāhirīhā
alladhi huwa al-sābiq ila ‘l-fahm minhā)

For example:

Aḥmad b. ‘Amr al-Badrī: the majority of experts hold that he did not fight at the battle of Badr. Instead, he settled in the vicinity of the well of Badr and was given the gentilic on that basis.

Sulaymān b. Ṭīrkān al-Taymī: he lived with the tribe of Taym, but he was not one of them. He was a client of the Banū Murra.

Abū Khalīd Yazīd b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Dalā‘ī: he was an Asadī; that is, a client of the Banū Asad. He lived with the Banū Dalān, a subtribe of the Hamdān, and was given the gentilic in reference to them.

Ibrāhīm b. Yazīd al-Khūzī: he was from the region of al-Khūz. Rather, he lived on the pass of al-Khūz in Mecca.

‘Abd al-Malik b. Abī Sulaymān al-‘Arzamī: he lived in the cemetery of the ‘Arzam in al-Kūfā. The ‘Arzam were a tribe considered part of the Fazāra and it is said that the gentilic is pronounced ”‘Arzamī” rather than ”‘Arzamī.”

Abū Bakr Muhammad b. Sinān al-‘Awaqī al-Baghdādī: he was a Bāhili who lived among the al-‘Awaqī, and they are a subtribe of the ‘Abd al-Qays. He was given his gentilic in reference to them.

Aḥmad [that is, Hamdān] b. Yūsuf al-Sulamī: he was a noble individual from whom Muslim and others related hadith. He was actually an Azdī. He was known as ”al-Sulamī” because, as he himself said, his mother was named ”Sulayma” [that is, he had no connection to the Banū Sulaym].

1 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Isrāfīl, 3:1074–5.
2 Abū Khalīd was considered to be a very unreliable transmitter of hadith; Samṣārī, Ansāb, 2:450.
4 Abū ʿAbd Allāh (or Abū Muḥammad or Abī Sulaymān) ʿAbd al-Malik b. Abī Sulaymān Māṣara al-ʿArzamī was a transmitter of hadith who died in 145/762; Dhahabī, Sīyar, 6:107–9.
5 Awaqī died in 223/838 at over ninety years of age; Dhahabī, Sīyar, 10:383–6.
Abū ʿAmr [Ismāʿīl] b. Nujayd al-Sulami: he was known as “al-Sulami” for the same reason. He was the grandson of Ahmad b. Yūsuf al-Sulami.

Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sulami, the writer of books for Sufis: his mother was the daughter of the aforementioned Abū ʿAmr so he was given the gentilic “Sulami.” He was also an Azdī. His grandfather was the paternal cousin of Ahmad b. Yūsuf.

Similar to that phenomenon and connected with it are

Miqsam, mawla Ibn ʿAbbās: he was actually the client (mawla) of ʿAbd Allah b. al-Hārith b. Nawfal. He was inseparable from ʿAbd Allah b. ʿAbbās and was called “mawla Ibn ʿAbbās” because of this association with him.

Yazid al-Faqīr (the poor): he was one of the Followers and he was called that because he had been wounded in the spine (faqīr zahrīki). It hurt him so badly that he walked with a stoop.

Khālid al-Hādhāḥi (the cobbler): he was not a cobbler and he was called that because he sat among the shoemakers. God knows best.

7 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Isrāʾīl, 3:885–6.
8 Abū ʿUthmān Yazid b. Ṣuhayb al-Kūfī is best known for having been a teacher of the imām Abū Hanīfa; Dhahabi, Siyār, 5:227–8.
9 Abū ʿl-Munāzīl Khālid b. Mihrān was a Baqra transmitter of hadith who died around 141/758; Dhahabi, Siyār, 6:190–3.
This is the discipline concerning the names of those men and women who are referred to obscurely in hadith. The expert ʿAbd al-Ghani b. Saʿd, al-Khaṭṭāb [al-Baghdādī] and others wrote books on this subject. The identity of the obscure individual becomes known through the appearance of his name in other versions of the ḥadith. However, the names of many of these individuals were never discovered.

This phenomenon take several forms. One of them—and it is one of the most obscure—is where the individual is referred to merely as “a man” or “a woman.”

One example of this is the ḥadith of Ibn ʿAbbās (God be pleased with them [that is, Ibn ʿAbbās and his father]) to the effect that “a man” (rajud) said, “Messenger of God, does the pilgrimage take place every year?” This man was al-Aqrā' b. Ḥābis. Ibn ʿAbbās identified him in another version of the ḥadith.

Another example is the ḥadith of Abū Saʿd al-Khudrī regarding some of the Companions of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) who passed by a tribe and the members of the tribe did not treat them as guests, so their leader was stung [by a scorpion]. “One of them” (rajud minhum) recited the first sūra of the Qurʾān in exchange for thirty sheep, and so forth. The one who made the incantation was the transmitter Abū Saʿd al-Khudrī.

Another example is the ḥadith of Anas to the effect that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) saw a rope tied between two of the pillars in the mosque [of Medina] and asked about it. They replied, “‘A certain woman’ (fūlāna) prays here. When she is overcome, she holds onto the rope.” This woman is variously identified as Zaynab bint Jaḥsh; the wife of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him); her sister Ḥamma bint Jaḥsh; and Maymūna bint al-Ḥārith; the mother of the believers [that is, the wife of the Prophet].

Another example is “the woman” (al-marʾa) who asked the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) about the major ablution for menstruation and

1 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istifāḥ, 1:103.
3 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istifāḥ, 4:1813.
4 Maymūna (d. 61/681) was the last wife the Prophet married; EI, 6:918.
he said, “Take a bit of musk.” She was the Ansârite Asmâ‘ bint Yazîd b. al-Sakan. She used to be called the “Preacher of the Women.” In a version of the hadith given by Muslim she is identified as “Asmâ‘ bint Shakal.” God knows best.

Another form of this phenomenon consists of those who are obscure because they are called “the son of X,” “the son of the Xite,” “the daughter of X” and the like.

An example of this is the hadith of Umm ʻAṭîya,6 “One of the daughters of the Messenger of God” (iḥdâ banât Rasûl Allâh) (Peace be upon him) died and he said, “Wash her with water and lotus tree leaves, and so forth.” She was Zaynab,7 the wife of Abu ʻl-Ṣâṣ b. al-Rabî‘.8 She was the Prophet’s eldest daughter (Peace be upon him and his family). It is also said that the eldest of his daughters was Ruqayya.9 God knows best.

“Ibn al-Lutbiya” (the son of the Lubite woman): Muḥammad b. Sa‘d10 – the author of [Kitâb] al-Ṭabaqât [al-kabîr]11 (The Great Book of Generations) – stated that his name is “ʻAbd Allah” and that the gentilic “al-Lutbiya” refers to the Banu Luth, a subtribe of the Asd – and the Asd are the same as the Azd. He is also called “Ibn al-Ultibiya,” and that is wrong.

“Ibn Mirbâz al-Ansârī,”12 whom the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) dispatched to the people at ʻArafah and said, “Keep to your shrines;” his name was “Zayd.” Wâqidî13 and his amanuensis Ibn Sa‘d said, “His name was “ʻAbd Allah.”14

9 Ibn ʻAbd al-Barr, Isti‘âb, 4:1839–43.
10 ʻAbd Allah Muḥammad b. Sa‘d (ca. 168/784–230/845) was born in al-ṣārî and settled in Baghdad where he served as the secretary of the famous biographer of the Prophet Wâqīḍî; EF, 3:922–3; Szegin, GÅS, 1:300–1.
11 Although Ibn al-Lutbiya’s connection to the Aṣz is mentioned in Ibn Sa‘d’s work (al-Ṭabaqât al-kabîr, ed. Ibân ʻAbbas, 9 vols, Beirut, 1380/1960–1388/1968, 2:169), I have not located the passage where he identifies his inst.
13 Although Abn ʻAbd Allah Muḥammad b. ʻUmar al-Wâqîdî (130/747–207/823) was not universally considered a reliable transmitter of hadith, he was much esteemed for his expertise in the fields of Prophetic biography and History; Szegin, GÅS, 1:294–7.
14 Ibn ʻAbd al-Barr regarded ʻAbd Allah as a brother of Zayd; Isti‘âb, 3:986.
The blind muezzin "Ibn Umm Maktūm:" his name is given variously as "Abd Allāh b. Zādīda," "Amr b. Qays," and so forth. The name of Umm Maktūm was "Aṭīka bint ʿAbd Allāh."

"The girl" (al-ibna) whom the tribe of the Bant Hishām b. al-Mughira wanted to wed to ʿAli b. Abī Ṭālib (God be pleased with him) was al-ʿAwrāb bint Abī Jahl b. Hishām. God knows best.

Another form of this phenomenon concerns uncles, aunts and the like. Examples are

Rāfī b. Khadijī from "his paternal uncle" (ʿammiḥī) in the hadith regarding the contract to cultivate a field in exchange for a portion of its yield (mukhābara): His paternal uncle was Zuhayr b. Rāfiʾ al-Ḥarīthī al-Anṣāri.\textsuperscript{15}

Ziyād b. Ṭlaqa\textsuperscript{16} from "his paternal uncle:" the uncle was Quthra b. Mālik al-Ṭhaʿlabī.\textsuperscript{17}

"The paternal aunt" (ʿamma) of Jābir b. ʿAbd Allāh who began to weep for his father on the Day of the Battle of Uhud. Her name was "Fāṭima bint ʿAmr b. Ḥarūm." Waqīdī called her "Hind." God knows best.

Another form of this phenomenon concerns husbands and wives. [Examples are]

The ḥadith of Subayā al-Aslamīya\textsuperscript{18} to the effect that she gave birth a few days after the death of "her husband" (zawjīhā): He was Saʿd b. Khaῲla,\textsuperscript{19} whom the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) described during his eulogy as dying in Mecca. He fought at the Battle of Badr.

["The husband" of] Barwa bint Wāshiq:\textsuperscript{20} the lexicographers pronounce her name as "Barwa" while the scholars of ḥadith generally pronounce it "Birwa." The name of her husband was "Iflāl b. Murra al-Asḥaṭ" according to what we have heard from more than one source.

"The wife" (zawja) of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. al-Zabīr,\textsuperscript{21} who had been the wife of Rifaʿa b. Samawāl al-Quraṣṭ\textsuperscript{22} before he divorced her: her name was "Tamīma bint Wahb" and it is also given as "Tumayma" and "Suḥayma." God knows best.

\textsuperscript{15} Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istifāk, 2:778.
\textsuperscript{16} Ziyād died around the year 125/743 at over one hundred years of age; Dhahabi, Sīyar, 5:215-16.
\textsuperscript{17} Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istifāk, 3:1383.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istifāk, 4:1859.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istifāk, 2:586-8.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istifāk, 4:1795.
\textsuperscript{21} Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istifāk, 2:833.
\textsuperscript{22} Rifaʿa divorced his wife Tamīma three times. So that he could legally marry her again, she first married ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. al-Zabīr, who divorced her without relations taking place; Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istifāk, 2:500.
These dates include the death dates and birth dates of the Companions, transmitters of hadith and other scholars, as well as how long they lived and the like. We heard that Sufyân al-Thawrî said, "When transmitters use falsehood, we employ dates (al-ta'rikh) against them." We heard that Ḥâfiz b. Ghiyâth said, "When you have suspicions about a teacher, settle his account by years." — that is, reckon his age and the age of those from whom he wrote hadith. This is similar to what we heard from Ismâ'îl b. ʿAyyâsh: "I was in Iraq and the scholars of hadith came to me and said, 'There is a man who transmits hadith from Khâlid b. Ma'dân' over there.' I went to him and said, 'In which year did you write hadith from Khâlid b. Ma'dân?' He said, 'In the year 13' — that is, 113 [731 AD]. I said, 'Do you claim that you heard hadith from Khâlid b. Ma'dân seven years after his death?'"

Ismâ'îl said that Khâlid died in 106. We heard a similar story which transpired between ʿUfayr b. Ma'dân' and someone who transmitted from Khâlid b. Ma'dân. There ʿUfayr stated that Khâlid died in 104.

We heard that Abû ʿAbd Allâh al-Ḥâkim said, "When Abû Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. Ḥâtim al-Kashshî came to us and transmitted hadith from ʿAbd b. Ḥumayd, I asked him about the year of his birth. He said that he was born in 260 [874 AD]. I said to our fellows, 'This teacher heard hadith from ʿAbd b. Ḥumayd thirteen years after his death.'"

We read that Abû ʿAbd Allâh al-Ḥumaydî al-Andalusi said something the gist of which was: there are three elements of the sciences of hadith to which the student should first turn his attention:

1. Defects found in hadith (ṣilâf): the best book written on this is Dâraquṭni's.

---

1 Abû ʿUtbâ Ismâ'îl b. ʿAyyâsh al-Himîsî (ca. 108/726–ca. 181/797) was a famous Syrian hadith expert; Dhahabi, Syar, 8:312–28.
2 The renowned expert in hadith and practical law, Abû ʿAbd Allâh Khâlid b. Ma'dân al-Himîsî was also known for his piety. As will be seen, the exact year of his death was disputed; Dhahabi, Syar, 4:336–41.
4 Very little was known about Muḥammad b. Ḥâtim; Dhahabi, Syar, 15:380–1.
5 This does not accord with the date usually given for the death of ʿAbd b. Ḥumayd, namely 249/863.
2. Homographic [names and gentilics]: the best book written on that is Ibn Mākāla's *al-Imāl*.

3. The deathdates of teachers: there is no book on this.

There has in fact been more than one book written on the subject of deathdates; however, they are neither exhaustive nor comprehensive. The books on the "dates" (*tawārikh*) of the transmitters of hadith include deathdates and, for that and similar reasons, they were called "Dates." This title is not appropriate for the personality criticism and the like which they also contain. God knows best. Let us now mention the essentials of this subject.

1. The correct age of our lord, the lord of mankind, the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) and his Companions Abu Bakr and Umar [at the time of their death] was sixty-three [lunar] years. The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) was taken up on the morning of Monday, the 12th of Rabī' al-Awwal, of the year 11 after the Emigration [7 June 632].

Abū Bakr passed away in Jumādā al-Ūlā of the year 13 [August 634].

Umar died in Dhu ḫ-Ḥijja of the year 23 [October 644].

Uthmān died in Dhu ḫ-Ḥijja of the year 35 [June 656] at the age of eighty-two – the age of ninety and others are also given.

Alī died in the month of Ramaḍān of the year 40 [January 661] at the age of sixty-three – sixty-four and sixty-five are also given.

Talha and al-ズabayr both died in Jumādā al-Ūlā of the year 36 [December 656]. We heard from Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥakim that they were the same age, sixty-four years. Others have contradicted al-Ḥakim.

Saʿd b. Abi Waqqās died, according to the best opinion, in the year 55 [675 AD] at the age of seventy-three.

Saʿd b. Zayd died in the year 51 [671 AD] at the age of seventy-three or seventy-four.

ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. ʿAwwād died in the year 32 [653 AD] at the age of seventy-five.

---

7 This date was actually a Sunday.
8 *Ulim al-ḥadith*, 203.
Abū Ubayda b. al-Jarrāḥ died in the year 18 [639 AD] at the age of fifty-eight.

There are disagreements which I have not brought up concerning some of what I have said. God knows best.

2. Two Companions lived [about] sixty years in pre-Islamic times and [about] sixty years in Islam and both died in Medina in the year 54 [674 AD]. One was Ḥākīm b. Ḥizām and he was born inside the Kaaba thirteen years before the Year of the Elephant. The second was the Anšārite Ḥassān b. Thābit b. al-Mundhir b. Ḥarām. Ibn Iṣḥāq related that he, his father Thābit, al-Mundhir and Ḥarām all lived one hundred and twenty years. The expert Abū Nuʿaym [al-Iṣbahānī?] said that he did not know the like of this among the Arabs. Alternatively some say that Ḥassān died in the year 50. God knows best.

3. The eponyms of the five legal schools having followers.

Abū ʿAbd Allah Sufyān b. Saʿīd al-Thawrī indisputably died in al-Baṣra in 161 [778 AD] and his birth was in the year 97 [716 AD].

Mālik b. Anas (God be pleased with him) died in Medina in 179 [795 AD] — a year before 180. His birthdate is disputed. The years 93 [712 AD], 91, 94 and 97 have all been suggested. God knows best.

Abū Ḥantfā (God bless him) died in 150 [767 AD] in Baghdad at the age of seventy.

Shafīʿ (God bless him) died at the end of Rajab of the year 204 [January 820] in Egypt and he was born in 150 [767 AD].

Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ḥanbal died in Baghdad in Rābiʿ al-Ākhir of the year 241 [August 855] and he was born in 164 [780 AD]. God knows best.

4. The authors of the five reliable books of ḥadīth.

Abū ʿAbd Allah al-Bukhārī was born on Friday — after the Friday prayer — the 13th of Shawwal of the year 194 [20 July 810]. He died in Khartoum, in the vicinity of Samarqand, the night of the 9d al-Fitr in the year 256 [1 September 870]. His age was thirteen days short of sixty-two years.

---

12 The Year of the Elephant was traditionally dated 570 AD.
13 This last clause was apparently included to prevent the misreading of “seventy” for “ninety,” which when written out in Arabic look very similar. In this regard, Dhabāḥ noted, “How often seven is misread for nine!” Siyār, 10:648.
Muslim b. al-Ḥajjaj al-Nisābūrī died in Nishapur on the 25th of Rajab of the year 261 [5 May 875] at the age of fifty-five.

Abū Dāwūd Sulaymān b. al-Asbāṭh al-Sijjīstānī died in al-Baṣra in Shawwāl of the year 275 [February 889].

Abū ʿIsā Muḥammad b. ʿIsā al-Sulami al-Tirmidhi died in Tirmidh on the 13th of Rajab of the year 279 [9 October 892].


5. Seven later experts who composed excellent books which have proved useful in our times.

Abu ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAlt b. ʿUmar al-Dāraquṭnī al-Baghdādī died in Baghdad in Dhu ʿl-Qaṣ`da of the year 385 [December 995]. He was born in Dhu ʿl-Qaṣ`da of the year 306 [April 919].

Then came Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Bayyiʿ al-Ḥakim al-Nisābūrī who died in Nishapur in Šafar of the year 405 [August 1014]. He was born there in the month of Rabīʿ al-Awwal of the year 321 [March 933].

Then came the ḥadīth expert of Egypt, Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Ghānī b. Saʿūd al-Azdī, who was born in Dhu ʿl-Qaṣ`da of the year 332 [June 945]. He died in Egypt in Šafar of the year 409 [July 1018].

Then came the expert Abū Nuṣaym Aḥmad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Iṣbahānī, who was born in 334 [946 AD]. He died in Šafar of the year 430 [November 1038] in Isfahān.

In another generation there was the ḥadīth expert of the North Africans Abū ʿAmr b. ʿAbd al-Barr al-Namārī, who was born in Rabīʿ al-ʿAkhīr of the year 368 [November 978]. He died in Shāṭiba in al-Andalus in the month of Rabīʿ al-ʿAkhīr of the year 463 [January 1071].

Then came Abū Bakr Ahmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Bayḥaqī, who was born in the year 384 [994 AD]. He died in Nishapur in Jumāda al-ʿUṣā of the year 458 [May 1066]. His body was taken to Bayḥaq and buried there.

Then came Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. ʿAlt al-Khaṭṭīb al-Baghdādī, who was born in Jumāda al-ʿAkhīr of the year 392 [April 1002] and died in Baghdad in Dhu ʿl-Ḥijja of the year 463 [September 1071]. God bless them, us and all Muslims. God knows best.
Category 61
RELIABLE AND WEAK TRANSMITTERS OF HADITH

(Ma‘rifat al-thiqāt wa-‘l-du‘afā’ min ruwat al-ḥadith)

This is one of the most exalted and grandest disciplines. It is the staircase to knowledge of the soundness and sickness of hadith. The hadith scholars have many works on it. Some are devoted exclusively to weak transmitters of hadith, like Bukhārī’s Kitāb al-Du‘afā’ (Book of Weak Transmitters), Nasrī’s al-Du‘afā’, ʻUqaylī’s al-Du‘afā’2 and others. Some concern only reliable transmitters, like Abū Ḥātim b. Ḥibbān’s Kitāb al-Thiqāt (Book of Reliable Transmitters). Some cover both reliable and unreliable transmitters, for instance Bukhārī’s Ta‘rikh (History), Ibn Abī Khayyāma’s Ta‘rikh—How rich it is in useful information!—and Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī’s Kitāb al-Jarh wa-‘l-ta‘did (Book of Personality Criticism).

We heard that the expert ʻAlī b. Muḥammad, nicknamed “Jazara,” said, “The first person to talk about hadith transmitters was Shu‘ba b. al-Ḥajjāj. Yahyā b. Sa‘īd al-Qāṭṭān followed him and Ahmad b. Ḥanbal and Yahyā b. Ma‘in came after that.” And these, he means that Shu‘ba was the first to apply himself seriously to this and concern himself with it. However, speaking about transmitters, to accredit and discredit, has an established precedent from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) and from many of the Companions and Followers as well as those after them. Personality criticism was made permissible in order to defend the Holy Law (al-sharī‘a) and to banish error and falsehood from it. Discrediting transmitters is licit just as is discerning witnesses in court. I heard that Abū Bakr b. Khalīl b. Sa‘īd al-Qāṭṭān, ‘Are you not afraid that those people whose hadith you have rejected will become your adversaries before God on the Day of Resurrection?’ He replied, ‘I prefer having them as my adversaries to having the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) as my adversary and saying to me, “Why did you not protect my hadith from falsehood?”’

2 Abū Ja‘far Muhammad b. ʻAmr b. Ṭūsī al-ʻUqaylī (d. 322/934; Sezgin, G. 45, 1:177) was a hadith scholar best known for his Kitāb al-Du‘afā’ al-kabīr, ed. Ābd al-Muḥdī ʻAmin Qalṣājī (4 vols, Beirut, 1404/1984).
4 What this means is unclear. See Prof. Ābd al-Raḥmān’s comment in Muqaddima, 655, n. 1.
5 Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Jarīḥ, 3(2):246.
6 Abū Turāb ‘Askar b. al-Ḥusayn al-Naḥshabī (d. 345/859) was a highly respected mystic; Dhahābī, Siyār, 11:545–6.
heard some remarks critical of transmitters from Ahmad b. Hanbal and said to him, "Teacher, do not slander scholars!" Ahmad b. Hanbal replied, "Woe to you! This is good advice, not slander."

The beginner in personality criticism should fear God (He is blessed and exalted), proceed with caution and be on guard against laxness, to avoid discrediting a sound individual and imputing something bad to an innocent man, the shame of which will remain with him for ages. I think that Abu Muhammad ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Abī Ḥātim and they say he used to be considered a saint (min al-abdāl) - feared something similar to what I mentioned. According to the report we heard or read, Yūsuf b. al-Hasayn al-Rāzī - that is, the Sufi - went up to ʿAbd al-Rahmān while he was reciting his book [that is, his Kitāb al-Jarḥ wa-l Tadlīl] and said to him, "How many of these people unsaddled their mounts in heaven a century or two ago while you talk about them and slander them?" ʿAbd al-Rahmān wept. He also read that Yahyā b. Maʿīn was quoted to him while he was reciting that book of his to the people: "Truly we are defaming people who may have unsaddled their mounts in heaven more than two centuries ago." ʿAbd al-Rahmān wept and his hands trembled so much that the book fell from them.

More than one critic has made mistakes about people, falsely discrediting them. An example of this is Abu ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Nasawi's discreditation of Ahmad b. Śalih. The latter was a reliable expert and authority to whom no discredit can adhere: Bukhārī included his ḥadīth in his Sahīh. An instance of impoliteness on the part of Ahmad b. Śalih toward Nasawi corrupted the latter's heart against him. We heard that the expert Abu ʿYaṣīrah al-Khalīlī said, "The experts agree that Nasawi's condemnation of him was a case of personal prejudice and the remarks of the likes of Nasawi cannot impugn Ahmad b. Śalih." Nasawi was in fact an authoritative guide in personality criticism. When something like this is ascribed to someone like him, the reason is that anger has blinded him so that good qualities appear to be bad ones. Someone like Nasawi does not deliberately discredit a transmitter for something he knows to be false. So note this for it is a significant and precious point. Remarks on the rules of personality criticism have already appeared in Category 23. God knows best.

7 It is unclear to me whether the shame will stick to the falsely criticized transmitter or his accuser.
8 Abu ʿYaṣīrah Yūsuf b. al-Hasayn al-Rāzī (d. 304/917) was a disciple of the great Egyptian mystic Dhu ʿl-Nūn; Dhahabī, Siyār, 14:248–51.
9 Irshād, 1:424.
Chapter 62
RELIABLE TRANSMITTERS WHO CONFUSED THEIR HADITH AT THE END OF THEIR LIFE
(Ma’rifat man khallata fi akhir ‘umriht min al-thiqāt)

I am not aware that anyone has written a monograph on or seriously concerned himself with this valuable and important discipline, although it is very deserving of that. Those who confuse their hadith at the end of their life fall into various subcategories. These include those who confused their hadith on account of their becoming disordered and senile and those who became confused because of losing their eyesight or some other reason. The verdict regarding them is that the hadith of someone who studied with them before they became disordered are acceptable. One cannot accept the hadith of someone who studied with them after they became disordered or someone whose case is unclear; that is, it is not known whether he studied with the transmitter before he became disordered or after. For instance,

‘Āqīb b. al-Sā’īb became disordered at the end of his life. Scholars cite as proofs the relations of his older students, like Sufyān al-Thawrī and Shu’bā [b. al-Hajjāj], from him, because they heard hadith from him when he was sound. Scholars do not cite the relation of someone who heard from him at the end of his life. Yaḥyā b. Saʿīd al-Qattān said about Shu’bā, “[The hadith Sufyān and Shu’bā transmitted from him are sound,]” except two regarding which Shu’bā used to say, “I heard them at the last [from ‘Āqīb] from Zādhān.”

Abū Ishaq al-Sābīrī also became disordered. It is said that Sufyān b. ‘Uuyayna heard hadith from him after he became disordered. Abū Yaḥyā al-Khalīlī stated this.

Saʿīd b. Iyās al-Jurayrī became disordered and his retention went bad before his death. Abū ʿl-Walīd [Sulaymān b. Khālaf] al-Baṭī al-Malikī said that Naṣīḥī said, “His hadith became worthy of rejection in the days of the Plague.” In our opinion, he – that is, what was heard from him

1 ‘Āqīb b. al-Sā’īb al-Kūfī (his kunya is disputed) died in 136/754; Dhababi, Siyar, 6:110–14.
2 Dhababi, Siyar, 6:111.
3 Abū ʿUmar Zādhān al-Kindī was born during the lifetime of the Prophet and died in 82/701; Dhababi, Siyar, 4:289–1.
4 Ithārād, 1:355.
5 Abū Maʿṣūd Saʿīd b. Iyās al-Jurayrī (d. 144/761) was a Baṣrī expert in hadīth; Dhababi, Siyar, 6:153–6.
6 Nothing I have read identifies which plague is meant here. The Plague of Salm b. Qurayba which struck al-Baṣra in 131/749 and was especially deadly would appear to be a likely candidate, if indeed a specific event was intended.
before the time of the Plague — was more trustworthy than Khalid al-Ḥadidhāʾ.

Saʿīd b. Abī ʿArūba: Yahyā b. Maʿmūn said, “Saʿīd b. Abī ʿArūba confused his ḥadīth after the defeat of Ibrāhīm b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥasan b. Ḥasan in the year 42, that is 142 [759 AD].” Those who heard ḥadīth from him after that are worthless. The audition of Yazīd b. Ḥārīm from him is sound. He heard ḥadīth from him in Wāṣiṭ while Ibn Abī ʿArūba was on his way to al-Ḵufa. The most trustworthy person who heard ḥadīth from him was ʿAbdād b. Sulaymān.” Wāḥi ʿb. al-Jarrāḥ] and al-Muṭṭa b. ʿImrān al-Mawsīlī are among those who are known to have heard ḥadīth from him after he became disordered. We read that Ibn ʿAmma b. al-Mawsīlī — one of the experts — said, “Their relation from him is worthless. They heard ḥadīth from him after he became disordered.” We heard that Yahyā b. Maʿmūn said to Wāḥi, “You transmit ḥadīth from Saʿīd b. Abī ʿArūba and you heard from him only while he was disordered?” He replied, “Have you seen me transmit anything but good ḥadīth from him?”

Masʿūdī is one of those who became disordered. He is ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUbba b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd al-Hudhal, the brother of Abu l-ʿUmays ʿUtba al-Masʿūdī. Ṣuhayl ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥākim stated in Kitāb al-Muṣaffāt li-l-rumāṭ that Yahyā b. Maʿmūn said, “Whoever heard ḥadīth from Masʿūdī in the time of the caliph Abū Jaʿfar al-Mansūr, r. 136/754–158/775 has a sound audition. Whoever heard ḥadīth from him in the days of the caliph ʿAbd Allāh al-Mahdī [r. 158/775–169/785] has a worthless audition.” Ḥanbal b. Iṣḥāq said that Abū Ḥāmid b. Ḥanbal said, “The auditions of ʿĀṣim — he is Ibn ʿAlī — Abu l-Naḍr [Ḥāshim b. al-Qāsim, nicknamed “Qaysar”] and those others from Masʿūdī date from after he became disordered.

Rabiʿat al-Raʾy b. Abī ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, the professor of al-Mālik said that he went bad at the end of his life and that reason reliance on him is unacceptable.


7 The revolt of Ibrāhīm and his brother Muhammad, known as “al-Nāṣfa al-Zakīya,” against the Caliph al-Mansūr actually took place in 145/762–3; EF, 3:983–5.
8 Abū Muhammad ʿAbāda (the pronunciation “Abda” also seems to be possible) b. Sulaymān al-Kāfi b. al-Ḵuf died in 188/804 in al-Ḵufa; Dhahabi, Siyār, 8:511.
9 Abū ʿAmma b. ʿImrān al-Mawsīlī was a historian who wrote a Taʾrīḥ Mawsīl; Ṣaḥiḥ, G.A.S., 1:348.
10 Abū Jaʿfar Muhammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmma b. Mawsīlī (d. 242/856 or 231) wrote a work on transmitters and the defects in ḥadīth; Dhahabi, Siyār, 11:469–70.
11 Masʿūdī (d. 160/777) was a prominent ḥadīth transmitter and jurist; Dhahabi, Siyār, 7:93–5.
12 Abū l-Umays died around 150/767, Dhahabi, Siyār, 7:20.
Hībbān said, “He went bad in 125 [743 AD]. His late hadith became mixed up with his early ones and cannot be separated. Therefore, they should be rejected.”

Ḥuṣayn b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Kūfī was one of those who became disordered and went bad. Nasāʿī and others said this. God knows best.

ʿAbd al-Wahhāb al-Thaqāfī: Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī said that Yahyā b. Maʿṣūn said, “He became disordered in the end.”

Sufyān b. ʿUayyna: I came across the remark of Muhammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmrār al-Mawsīlī that he heard Yahyā b. Maʿṣūn saying, “I swear that Sufyān b. ʿUayyna became disordered in [197] [813 AD]. The audition of those who heard him in that year and afterwards is worthless.” Sufyān b. ʿUayyna died about two years later, in 199.

ʿAbd al-Razzāq b. Hammām: Ahmad b. Ḥanbal said that he went blind at the end of his life. He used to be prompted and he responded to it. The audition of those who heard hadith from him after he became blind is worthless. Nasāʿī said, “There are doubts regarding him on account of those who wrote hadith from him at the last.” The statement of ʿAbd b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz [al-ʿAnbarī] made upon his return from Sana refers to this: “By God, I went to great trouble to see ʿAbd al-Razzāq and he is a liar. Even Wāqīḍī is more veracious than he.” In what is related from Tabarānī I came across some hadith from Ishāq b. Ibrāhīm al-Dabari from ʿAbd al-Razzāq which I vehemently reject. I attribute the state of those hadith to that circumstance. Dabari heard hadith from him very late. Ibrāhīm al-Ḥarbī said, “When ʿAbd al-Razzāq died, Dabari was six or seven years old.” [NB] There are also doubts regarding many of the elevated hadith coming from those who heard from Sufyān b. ʿUayyna and those like him late in their life.

ʿArīm, that is, Abu l-Nuʿmān Muhammad b. al-Fadl, became disordered at the last. The hadith which Bukhārī, Muḥammad b. Yahyā al-Dhuhlī and the other experts related from him must have been taken from him before he became disordered.

---

13 Majrūḥ, 1:366.
14 The sources maintain that there were a number of notable individuals named “Ḥuṣayn b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Kūfī” living at the same time. The one in question here may be Abu l-Hudhayl al-Sulami (ca. 43/663–130/748); Dhahabi, Siyār, 5:422–4.
15 Abu Muhammad ʿAbd al-Wahhāb b. ʿAbd al-Majīd al-Thaqāfī (ca. 108/726–194/810) is said to have gone bad three or four years before his death; Dhahabi, Siyār, 9:237–41.
16 Ṣafī, 3(1):71.
Abū Qilāba ʿAbd al-Malik b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Raqāṣi: we heard that the authority Ibn Khuzayma said, “Abū Qilāba transmitted ḥadīth to us in al-Ṣaʿrā before he became disordered and went to Baghdad.”

Later scholars whom we read that about.

Abū Aḥmad al-Ghiṭrīḥī al-Jurjānī⁴⁸ and Abū Ṭāhir,⁴⁹ the grandson of the authority Ibn Khuzayma. The expert Abū ʿAlī al-Bard̲āʿī – and later “al-Samarqandī – said in his Muḥjam that he read that they became disordered at the end of their life.

Abū Bakr b. Mālik al-Qāṭīʿ – the transmitter of the Musnad and other works of Ahmad [b. Ḥanbal] – declined at the end of his life and became senile to the extent that he could not recognize anything that was recited to him.

Be aware that on the whole we know that the ḥadīth of the transmitters of this type cited in one or both of the Sahīhs have been separated [from their weak ḥadīth] and were taken from them before they became disordered. God knows best.

---

⁴⁸ Abū Ahmad Muḥammad b. Ahmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Ghiṭrīḥī al-Jurjānī (ca. 280/893-377/987) was a well-traveled transmitter of hadith; Sezgin, GAS, 1:203.
⁴⁹ Muḥammad b. al-Fāḍīl b. Muḥammad b. Isḥāq b. Khuzayma al-Nisābūrī (d. 387/997) was regarded as an expert in his grandfather’s ḥadīth; Dhabahh, Siyar, 16:490–1.
Category 63

The Generations of Transmitters and Scholars

(Ma'rifat ṭabaqāt al-ruwāt wa-ʾl-ʿulamāʾ)

This is one of the important subjects, ignorance of which has disgraced several writers and other scholars. Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabir of Muḥammad b. Ṣaʿd – the amanuensis of Wāqīḍi – is full of useful information. Muḥammad b. Ṣaʿd is reliable despite the fact that in his book he relates many reports from weak transmitters including Wāqīḍi – and he is the “Muḥammad b. ʿUmar” whose gentilic Ibn Ṣaʿd does not give.

In common parlance, “generation” signifies a group of people with something in common. Given this, there may often be two people who belong to a single generation because they are alike in one respect and who belong to different generations in relation to something else which they do not have in common. Thus, Anas b. Mālik al-Anṣārī and other younger Companions belong to the same generation as the Ten [who were given the glad tidings of their entrance into heaven] and the other early Companions, when we examine their similarity in respect to the basic principle of the attribute of “Companionship.” Reckoned thus, all of the Companions are a first generation, the Followers are a second generation, the followers of the Followers are a third generation and so on. When we examine the differences of the Companions in regard to their relative priority and rank, they are, as we mentioned earlier, distributed through more than ten generations. By this measure, Anas and the other younger Companions are not in the same generation as the Ten, but rather they are several generations below them. The researcher working in this discipline needs to know the birthdates and deathdates of hadith transmitters as well as who their teachers were and who their students were, and the like. God knows best.
Category 64
TRANSMITTERS OF HADITH AND OTHER SCHOLARS WHO WERE CLIENTS
(Ma‘rifat al-mawāli min al-ruwāt wa-‘l-‘ulamā’)

The most important aspect of this subject is the recognition of those clients who bear tribal gentilities with no qualification. The presumption regarding someone bearing a gentilic referring to a certain tribe — for instance when one says, “X, the Qurashite” — is that he is connected by blood to them. For that reason, it is crucial to make clear regarding someone called a “Qurashite” that he was called this because he was a client of theirs. Be aware that when a transmitter or scholar is described as “the client of X” or “the client of the tribe of X,” this most often means that he was a freedman (mawla ‘l-‘ataga).

The term “client” is applied to some transmitters with the sense of “cleritage by conversion to Islam” (wa‘lā ‛al-islām). An example is Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Bukhārī. He is Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl al-Ju‘fī, a client of the Ju‘fites. He bears the gentilic “Ju‘fī” because one of his ancestors — and I think that he was the one called “al-A‘māf” and he had been a Majān — converted to Islam at the hand of al-Yamān b. al-Akhnas al-Ju‘fī; that is, the ancestor of ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Musnād al-Ju‘fī, one of the teachers of Bukhārī. Another example is al-Ḥasan b. ‘Īsā al-Maṣarījī, the client of ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Mubārak. He was a client of Ibn al-Mubārak because he converted to Islam at his hands. He had been a Christian.

Some others were clients on the basis of cleritage of alliance and protection (wa‘lā ‛al-hilf wa-‘l-mawālāt), like the imām Mālik b. Anas. His folks were Ḥimyarite Aṣḥāḥites by blood. They were clients by alliance of the Taym of the Qurashites. Some say this was because his grandfather, Mālik b. Abī ‘Amir, was an ‘asīf — that is a “hired hand” — of Ṭalḥa b. Ṭubayy Allāh al-Taymī and Ṭalḥa used to travel about as a trader. Others say that Mālik b. Abī ‘Amir was called “the client of the Taymītes” because of his being with Ṭalḥa b. Ṭubayy Allāh al-Taymī. This is a fourth subcategory of cleritage. It is similar to what we said above [in Category 58] about Muṣsam, namely that he was described as “the client of Ibn ‘Abbās” because of his close association with him.

The following are examples of clients who bear tribal gentilities.

The Follower Abū ‘l-Bakhtārī Sā’dī b. Fāyrūz al-Ṭāfī. He was a client of the tribe of Ṭayā‘.

1 Abū Ja‘far al-Musnādī was described as “the hadith authority in Transoxiana in his era.” He died in 229/844 at over ninety years of age; Dhaḥabi, Siyār, 10:658–60.
2 Abū ‘Abd al-Ḥasan b. Ṭas b. Maṣarījī al-Ṭusābīrī (d. 240/854 or 239) was a popular teacher in Baghdad; Dhaḥabi, Siyār, 12:27–30.
3 Abū ‘l-Bakhtārī was a jurist who died in the Battle of al-Janā’īm in 82/701; Dhaḥabi, Siyār, 4:279–80.
The Follower Abu 'l-ʿAlīya Rufayāʾ al-Riyāḥi al-Tamīmī. He was the client of a woman of the Banū Riyāḥ.

Abū Dāwūd ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Hurrūz al-Aʿraj al-Hāshimī, the transmitter from Abū Hurayra, Ibn Buhayna and others. He was a client of the Banū Hāshim.

Al-Layth b. Saʿd al-Miṣrī al-Fahmī was a client of the subtribe of Fahm.

ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Mubārak al-Marwāzī al-Hāzālī was a client of the tribe of Ḥāzāla.

ʿAbd Allāh b. Wāḥb al-Miṣrī al-Qurashī was a client of the Quraysh.

ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṣāliḥ al-Miṣrī al-Juhanī - the amanuensis of al-Layth b. Saʿd - was a client of the tribe of Juḥayna.

Sometimes a transmitter bore the gentilic of a tribe because he was the client of a client of that tribe. An example is Abu ʿl-Ḥubāb Saʿd b. Yasār al-Hāshimī, the transmitter from Abū Hurayra and [ʿAbd Allāh] b. ʿUmar. He was a client of a client of the Banū Hāshim because he was the client of Shuqrān, the client of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him).

We heard that Zuhri said,

I went to [the caliph] ʿAbd al-Malik b. Marwān and he said, “Zuhri, where are you coming from?” I said, “From Mecca.” He said, “Whom did you leave there to lead the people of Mecca?” I said, “Atāʾ b. Abī Rabīḥ.” He said, “Is he an Arab or a client?” I said, “He is a client.” He said, “How did he come to lead them?” I said, “By religiosity and transmission.” He said, “It is right for those possessing religiosity and transmissions to lead. Who leads the people of the Yemen?” I said, “Ṭawās b. Kaysān.” He said, “Is he an Arab or a client?” I said, “He is a client.” He said, “How did he come to lead them?” I said, “The same way Atāʾ came to lead.” He said, “That is the way it should be. Who leads the people of Egypt?” I said, “Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabbā.” He said, “Is he an Arab or a client?” I said, “He is a client.” He said, “Who leads the people of Syria?” I said, “Makhūl.” He said, “Is he an Arab or a client?” I said, “He is a client, a Nubian slave of a Ḥudhaylīte woman who eventually freed him.” He said, “Who leads the people of al-Jazīra?” I said, “Maymūn b. Mīhrān.”

4 Dhahabi, among others, had doubts about the reliability of ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṣāliḥ (157754-223837) as a transmitter of hadith; Siyar, 10:405-16.
6 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istīlāḥ, 2:709-10.
7 This highly respected transmitter died in 128/746; Dhahabi, Siyar, 6:31-3.
8 Abū Ayūb Maymūn b. Mīhrān al-Jazīrat al-Raqīṭ (40/660-117/735 or 116) was a respected authority in law and hadith; Dhahabi, Siyar, 5:71-8.
He said, “Is he an Arab or a client?” I said, “He is a client.” He said, “Who leads the people of Khurásan?” I said, “Al-Dahhak b. Muzahim.” He said, “Is he an Arab or a client?” I said, “He is a client.” He said, “Who leads the people of al-Basra?” I said, “Al-Hasan b. Abi ‘l-Hasan.” He said, “Is he an Arab or a client?” I said, “He is a client.” He said, “Woe to you! Who leads the people of al-Kūfah?” I said, “Ibrāhim al-Nakha‘ī.” He said, “Is he an Arab or a client?” I said, “He is an Arab.” He said, “Woe to you, Zuhr! You relieved me. By God, the clients lord over the Arabs to the extent that they preach to them from on top of the minbars while the Arabs are below them.” I said, “Prince of the Believers, it is a matter of God and His religion. Whoever keeps it leads and whoever loses it falls.”

We hear that ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Zayd b. Aslam⁹ said, “When the “ʿAbd Allāh”¹⁰ died, the law in all of the cities, except Medina, went to the clients. God specially blessed Medina with a Qurāshite and the jurist of the inhabitants of Medina, was, without a doubt, Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyib.” There is some bias in this. At that time, there were other famous Arab jurists in addition to Ibn al-Musayyib, including Sha‘bī and Nakha‘ī. All of the “Seven Jurists,”¹¹ including Ibn al-Musayyib, were Arabs, except Sulaymān b. Yāsīr. God knows best.

---

⁹ Al-Dahhak (d. 102/721 or 105 or 106) was best known for his expertise in Qurān commentary; Dhadhab, Siyār, 4:598–600.
¹⁰ ʿAbd al-Rahmān died in 182/798; Dhadhab, Siyār, 8:349.
¹¹ See above, Category 39.
¹² See above, Category 40.
This is one of the matters which the experts of ḥadīth need to know for many of their activities, and Ibn Sa'd’s Ṭabaqāt is one of the prime sources for this information. The Arabs used to take their gentilics only from their tribe. When Islam appeared and most of them settled in villages and cities, they started to derive their gentilics from their place of residence, just as the non-Arabs had been doing. Many of them lost their [original tribal] gentilics and were left with only the ones referring to their place of residence.

If someone moves from one place to another and wants to include both places as his gentilic, let him begin with the first place and then give the second one he moved to. It is a good idea for the word “then” (thumma) to be added to the second. So for someone who moved, for instance, from Egypt to Syria, one should say, “X, the Egyptian, then the Damascene.” An inhabitant of a village in the vicinity of a town may use the gentilic of the village and that of the town, as well as that of the region where the town is located.

Let us follow the example of the expert Abū ʿAbd Allah al-Ḥakim and relate ḥadīth with their isnāds, drawing attention to where the transmitters lived. It is commendable for the expert to give the ḥadīth with its isnād and then mention the homelands of its transmitters and other facts about them, one by one, [for example]


1 This is the famous Ibn Tabarrazd al-Baghdādī (516/1123–607/1210), who possessed short isnāds for a number of important ḥadīth collections; Dhahabi, Siyār, 21:507–12.
2 This transmitter, popularly known as Qādi ʿI-L-Māristīn (442/1050–535/1141), studied many subjects before repenting and devoting himself to the study of ḥadīth; Dhahabi, Siyār, 20:23–8.
3 Abū ʿIshaq al-Barmakī (361/972–445/1054) was another long-lived transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabi, Siyār, 17:605–6.
4 Ibn Māsī was born in 274/887 and died in 369/980; Dhahabi, Siyār, 16:252–3.
5 Kajjī (ca. 190/806–292/904) was a popular transmitter because he had a number of ḥadīth, like the one cited here, in which only three intermediaries separated him from the Prophet; Dhahabi, Siyār, 13:423–5.
Sulaymān [b. Ṭarkhān] al-Taymi informed us from Anas [b. Malik]. He said, the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, “There is no disassociation among [quarrelling] Muslims for longer than three days,” or he said, “three nights.”

[2a] The teacher and great transmitter Abu ʿI-Hasan al-Muʿayyad b. Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Muqrī (God bless him) informed me by my recitation to him in Nishapur, once beginning anew with the recitation at the head of the grave of Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj. The jurist of the Holy City Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. al-Faḍl al-Furāwī informed us at the grave of Muslim. Ḥā

[2b.] Umm al-Muʿayyad Zaynab bint Abī ʿI-Qāsim ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. al-Hasan al-Shaʿrī [sic] (God bless her) informed me, once through my recitation to her in Nishapur and another time through the recitation of someone else. I said, Ismāʿīl b. Abī ʿI-Qāsim b. Abī Bakr al-Qārī informed you through recitation to him.

[Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Furāwī and Qārī] said, Abū Ḥafṣ ʿUmar b. Ahmad b. Masrūr informed us: Abū ʿAmr Ismāʿīl b. Nujayd al-Sulamī informed us: Abū Muṣlim Ibrāhīm b. Abī Allāh al-Kajjī informed us: Muḥammad b. Abū Allāh al-Anṣārī informed us: Humayd al-ʿTawīl" transmitted to me from Abū Ḥafṣ ʿUmar. He said, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, ‘Help your brother when he is doing wrong or being wronged.’ I said, ‘Messenger of God, I will help him when he is wronged, but how can I help him when he is doing wrong?’ He said, ‘Keep him from doing wrong. That is your help to him.’”

These two ḥadīth are elevated in audition with clean isnāds and sound texts. In the first, Anas and those after him until Abū Muṣlim are Başrans. Those after Abū Muṣlim to our teacher are Baghdadis. In the second ḥadīth, Anas and those after him until Abū Muṣlim are, as we said, Başrans. Those after him, from Ibn Nujayd until our teacher, are Nishapuris.

[3.] The pure teacher Abu ʿI-Faṭḥ Maṣṭūr b. ʿAbd al-Munṣīm b. Abī ʿI-Barakāt (God bless him) – the son of the authority Abū ʿAbd

---

6 For this, see above pp. 142–3.
8 The famous transmitter of ḥadīth Abū ʿUbayda Humayd b. Abū Humayd al-Baṣrī (68/687–142/759), known as Humayd al-ʿTawīl (Tall – or Long – Humayd), was not actually tall, although his hands were said to be “long”; Sezgin, GAS, 1:89.
Allah Muhammad b. al-Fadl al-Furawi — informed me through my recitation to him in Nishapur: My grandfather Abū 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. al-Fadl informed us: Abū 'Uthmān Sa'id b. Muḥammad al-Bahtrī9 (God bless him) informed us: Abū Sa'id Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. Ḥamdūn10 informed us. He said, Abū Ḥātim Makki b. 'Abdān11 informed us: 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Bishr12 informed us: 'Abd al-Razzāq [b. Hammām] informed us: Ibn Jurayj informed us. He said, 'Abada b. Abī Lubāba13 informed me that Warrād,14 the client of al-Mughira b. Shu'ba, informed him that al-Mughira b. Shu'ba wrote to [the caliph] Mu'āwiya — Warrād wrote that letter for him — "When the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) completed his prayer, I heard him say, 'There is no god but God alone. He has no companion. Sovereignty and praise are His. God, no one can forbid when You give and no one can give when You forbid. No one's fortunate position in the world can help him.'"

Al-Mughira b. Shu'ba, Warrād and 'Abada were Kūfans. Ibn Jurayj, Makki and 'Abd al-Razzāq were from the city of Sana in the Yemen. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Bishr, our teacher and all of those between them were Nishapuriṣ.

To God (be He praised) belongs the most complete praise for the blessing He liberally bestows to the extent one requests and the degree one hopes for. The finest prayers and peace on our lord Muhammad and his family and the rest of the prophets and their families. Amen! Amen! Amen!

10 I have not found any information about this transmitter.
11 Makki b. 'Abdān died in 325/937 at over eighty years of age; Dhahabi, Siyar, 15.70–1.
12 As a young man 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Bishr traveled extensively with his father to hear hadith. He returned to Nishapur where he taught until his death in 260/874; Dhahabi, Siyar, 12:340–4.
13 The merchant and hadith transmitter 'Abada (or 'Abda) b. Abī Lubāba (d. ca. 127/745) settled in Damascus; Dhahabi, Siyar, 5:229–30.
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