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In the Name of God, the Beneficent, the Merciful

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-Qaradhawi, 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

Ulûm al-ḥadîth (or ʿilm al-ḥadîth, ʿulû al-ḥadîth, etc.) is the broad designation which includes all of the various disciplines making up the study of ḥadîth. 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 ḥadîth and to validate the methods of these collectors. Ibn ʿAbī al-Ḥujaj al-ʿAskalānī (773/1372–852/1449) presents a brief survey of the history of this sub-genre in the introduction to his Nuzhat al-naẓâr, his commentary on his own Nukhbat al-ṣikâr.

The ancient and modern experts had many works about the terminology of the ḥadîth scholars. Among the first to compose a work on this subject was the judge Abû Muḥammad al-Ramahumuzi. His book was al-Muḥaddith al-fāṣil. However, he was not thorough. Abû ʿAbd Allâh al-Ḥakim al-Nisâbûrî [was another one of the first] but he did not revise and properly arrange [the material]. Abû Nuʿaym al-ʿIsbâhâni followed him. He did make a supplement (mustakhraj) to the book of [al-Ḥakīm al-Nisâbûrî], but he left some things for his successors. Abû Bakr al-Khaṭîb al-Baghdâdî came after them. He composed a book he called al-ʿIṣâma' on the rules of transmission and another on the guidelines [of transmission] which he called al-Jâmî hādîth al-shaykh wa-ʾl-sâmi'. Few were aspects of ḥadîth on which he did not compose a monograph. As Abû Bakr b. Nuṣṭa' put it, “Everyone who is fair knows that the scholars of ḥadîth after al-Khaṭîb are dependant on his books.”

1 For a brief discussion of this genre, see the article “Uṣûl al-ḥadîth” in The Encyclopaedia 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 Nawawī’s al-Tawṣîh wa-ʾl-tayyir is-muṣṭafâ zu zaman al-Bashir al-Nadhīr, which originally appeared in installments in Journal Asiatique and was later issued as a separate volume under the title Le Tawṣîh de en-Nawawī (Paris, 1902).


4 Kitâb Muṣrifat ulûm al-ḥadîth, ed. al-Sayyid Muḥâzam Hûsâyn (Cairo, 1937).

5 Kitâb al-ʿIṣâma' fi ʿilm al-riwaʿya (Hyderabad, 1357).

6 (Beirut, 1417/1996).

came after al-Khaṭṭāb and took a share of this knowledge. Al-Qāḍī ʿYāṭĪ composed a short book which he called al-Ilmāʾ and Abū Ḥaṣṭ al-Mayyānī [that is al-Mayyānīṣṭ] wrote a pamphlet which he entitled Ṡāla yasaʿu al-muḥaddith jahlūhā. 8

With the perspective given him by the two centuries, Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī regards Kitiḥ Maʾrifat anwāʾ ilm al-hadith, more popularly known as the Ṣaḥīḥ, of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ al-Shahrazūrī as the most influential work on the study of hadith: “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-Ṣalāḥ’s work. Indeed, it would be no exaggeration to say that to this day most traditional hadith scholarship is directly or indirectly based on this one work.

Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ al-Shahrazūrī

The career of Taqi al-Din Abū ʿAmr Usmān b. Abd al-Rahmān al-Shahrazūrī 9 was shaped to a remarkable degree by the political currents of his age. He was

born in the village of Sharakhân¹¹ located in the region known as Shahrazûr 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-Šalâh’s
birth it was enjoying a period of great cultural efflorescence. Speaking specifically
about the area of Shahrazûr, the contemporary historian Yaqtî (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 Şâfi’îte families with roots there, the Banû ‘l-Shahrazûrî³¹ and
the Banû ‘Aṣrûn, both of which supplied judges to the Zangids, Ayyûbids and
others.¹² Ibn al-Šalâh does not seem to have been able to lay claim to any blood
connection to either of the prominent Şâfi’îte families of al-Jazîra, although his
father had studied under Sharaf al-Dîn b. Abî ‘Aṣrûn (493/1100–585/1189),
who later went on to become a very prominent figure in Zangid Syria.

Ibn al-Šalâh began his training in law under his father¹³ in Irbil, the capital of
one of the minor principalities which lay between the Khwârazmians in the
East and Ayyûbids 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 Shahrazûr, Irbil as portrayed in Târikh Irbî³⁵ of Ibn al-Mustawfî
(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-Dîn Gökbûrî.¹⁶ 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, Gökbûrî’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-Šalâh was born in the town of Shahrazûr itself.
¹² For this family, see Heinz Halm, Die Ausbreitung der Şûfi’schen Rechtsschule von den
Anfängen bis zum 8/14. Jahrhundert (Wiesbaden, 1974), 185–7 and A. Ben Abdesselem,
¹⁴ By virtue of the tutelage of his father, Ibn al-Šalâh united the “Iraqi” and “Khurçânian”
streams of Şâfi’ism. The genetics of these traditions are discussed in Abû Shâma, Mukhtasâr
Kutab al-Mutâmmid li-‘l-radd ila ‘l-amr al-a’umal in Majmû‘at al-Rasâ’il al-Munîrîyya, 4 vols
(Cairo, n.d.), 3:28–31 and Nawawî, Takhtib al-asma‘ wa-l-lughât, 4 vols (Cairo, n.d.),
He established a number of charitable foundations in Irbil, including a school of hadith named the Muṣaffariyya. 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-Ṣalihyya.

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 ʿIṣḥāq al-Shirāzī’s al-Mushadhdhab fi ʿl-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 ʿImād al-Dīn b. Yūnus (535/1140–608/1211), the leading Shafiʿite 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-ḥadīth 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 typical 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.  

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-Samrānī (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 Asadīya law school in Aleppo. Presumably he took the reins of this Shafiʿite 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.
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-Salahī 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-Ḥarāṣtānī (520/1126–614/1217), who is said to have been one of his teachers. We next find Ibn al-Salahī taking up the professorship of the Salahīyā law school in Jerusalem in 615/1218, in the wake of his predecessor who had been ousted by the Ayyūbid prince al-Muʿazzam ʿIsā in Damascus for protesting his decision to legalize the sale of wine. The Salahīyā had been established by Saladin 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-Salahī 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-Salahī joined the “great mob” who “abandoned their possessions and belongings and dispersed in every direction throughout the area.” Unexpectedly, Ibn al-Salahī 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 Saladin’s son al-Ṣāzīz and then in the name of his own father, the brother of Saladin, al-Ṣādīl. 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-Khaṭṭīb’s Liver (al-Sāmīn al-muṣṭī fi kabiṭ al-Khaṭṭīb), a polemical tract refuting the attacks against Abū Ḥanīfā (d. ca. 150/767) made by the Shāfiʿīte

---

21 Dhahabi, Sījar, 23:142.
22 Nuṣayrī, Dārī, 1:83.
24 Qayyūm, Unw, 2:41.
25 Qayyūm, Unw, 1:402.
26 Asnawī (Tahqīq, 133) and Ibn Kathīr (Tahqīq, 2:837) claim that Ibn al-Salahī did not settle in Damascus until 630. I can think of no way to account for this obviously incorrect statement.
27 Published as Kitāb al-Radd `alā Abū Bakr al-Khaṭṭīb al-Baghdādī (Cairo, 1351/1932).
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 ḫātim of the Ḥanafīs had a deficient knowledge of the Arabic language. (Of the eponyms of the four main schools of Sunnite law, Abū Ḥanīfa 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 Shāfi‘ite. When asked how he alone in his family happened to be a Ḥanafite, he flippantly 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 Ḥanafite 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 Abū Ḥanīfa stripped of the accretions of his students and later followers. Sīḥ b. 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, ‘fs b. Abī Bakr b. Ayyūb [al-Muʿāẓẓam] has completed learning [this volume].’”30 His missionary zeal led him to found a Ḥanafite law school, the Muʿāẓẓamīya, in the Ḥanbalite enclave of al-Ṣāliḥiyā 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 temporarily 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 Miʿrāt al-zamān, 8(2):645.
32 Nuʿaymi, Dāris, 2:580.
33 Sīḥ b. al-Jawzī, Miʿrāt al-zamān, 8(2):647. Ḥājjī Khalīfā says that the prince used to give money to students who mastered Shaybānī’s al-Jāmi‘ al-kabīr and his al-Jāmi‘ al-jaghīb, two works of Ḥanafite law; Kashf al-sunūn, 1:col. 568.
himself was a friend of the speculative theologian ʿAmidi (551/1156–631/1234); what al-Muʿazzam 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 Jammāṭī. 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-Walīḥ (541/1146–600/1203). Despite their suburban exile, the Ḥanbalite refugees continued to play a role within the city walls. Al-Muʿazzam 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-Ṣālah’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-Muʿazzam’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. Hanbal suffered at the hands of the ʿAbbasid caliph al-Maʾmūn and his successors, a subject he treated in a monograph. He chose Isfahan, the hometown of the Ashʿarite Abū Nuʿaym al-ʿIṣbahānī...
(336/948–430/1038), as the place to point out the one hundred and ninety mistakes the latter committed in his Kitāb Maṣrifat al-Ṣahāba.38 For this service, the local Asharites almost killed him and he fled the city wearing only a loincloth. In Mosul he taught `Uqayl’s Kitāb al-Du`a’f al-kabīr, which contains an uncomplimentary account of Abū 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-Mu`azzam’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-Mu`azzam 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-Māmūn in al-Mu`azzam.39 Alas, the prominent establishment Ḥanbalite al-Nāṣib b. al-Ḥanbalī (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-Ṣalāh. 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-Mu`azzam.

[Ilbn al-Ṣalāh] 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.39

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


39 I have been unable to locate a copy of A.A. Badawi’s Maṣmūn Bani Ayyūb: al-Muʿazzam ʿĪsā (Cairo, 1953).

40 Dhahabi, Tadākira, 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 Sayhānī 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. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ would later sourly dismiss Logic as “pompous words which God has made superfluous for all sane people.”

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 ʿĀdiliyya. 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. Sibt b. al-Jawzi refers to Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ’s predicament in his self-serving obituary of him. Sibt, 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!” Sibt 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. Sibt 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 Rawḥa, who lived in the school. After his death in 623/1226 (or 622), the famous Sufi Ibn ʿArabi (560/1165–638/1240) and Abu l-Ḥasan Khazā’al (ca. 547/1152–623/1226), the head of the shrine of ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn, Zayn al-Ṣābitin, in Damascus, came forward and claimed that Ibn Rawḥa 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,
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41 Ibn Khallīkān, Wafāyāt, 5:314; Subki, Tabaqāt, 8:382.
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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-Muʿazzam 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-Muʿazzam and al-Ashraf were born only a day apart, rarely have brothers shown more marked contrasts. While the high-flying al-Muʿazzam 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 Ayyūbid 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-Muʿazzam was al-Maʿmūn, 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-Muʿazzam b. Abū 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 ʿĀmidī 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) Shāmiya.50 The

47 Abū Shāma, Dkayl, 156.
49 Abū Shāma, Dkayl, 160; Ibn Kathīr, Bidāya, 129.
50 Ibn Shaddād, al-ʿĀlq al-Khaṭṭira: Dimashq, 232; Naʿawma, Dāris, 1:301–13; Ṭalawi, Mubṭaqar, 48–9; Ulābi, Khīṭat, 126–7. There seems to have been some confusion (see Ibn Shaddād, al-ʿĀlq al-Khaṭṭira: Dimashq, 241; Naʿawma, Dāris, 1:277; Ṭalawi, Mubṭaqar, 47) as to whether it was the Inner or Outer Shāmiya where Ibn Ṣalāḥ taught, Ibn Khallikān (Wafayāt, 3:244) explicitly says that it was the Inner.
founder of the school, Sitt al-Shām Zumurrud Khātūn, was one of the grand ladies of the Ayyūbid family. A sister of Saladin and al-Ṣādil, 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 Shāfi‘ite 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 Shāfi‘ite law where Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ taught.

Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ reached the peak of his career when al-Ashraf made him the first professor of the Dār al-ḥadīth al-Ashrafīya, one of the two schools of ḥadīth founded by al-Ashraf. One of these, the Ashrafīya al-Barrāniyya, was located in the suburb of al-Ṣāliḥiya and put under the control of the local Ḥanbalīs.¹¹ The inner Ashrafīya, where Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ taught, was located within the walls of the city of Damascus, near the main gate of the Citadel and was given to the Shāfi‘ites. It was constructed on the site of the former home of the prominent general Šārim al-Dīn Qāymāz al-Najmi (d. 596/1200), which al-Ashraf purchased in 628/1231 and renovated over the course of two years.¹² The opening of the school in 630/1233 coincided with the arrival of the elevated hadīth transmitter Ibn al-Zabīdī (d. 631/1234) from Baghdad, who was fêted by al-Ashraf during the month of Ramadan and presided over the recitation of Bukhārī’s Ṣaḥīḥ in the newly opened hadīth school.

Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ died in his chambers at the Ashrafīya on 25 Rabi‘ II 643/19 September 1245, during the Khwārazmian 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-Ṣūfīya. 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-Ṣalāḥ 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
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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.  

The *Muqaddima* began as a series of individual lectures which were only later placed in the present arrangement. In composing the *Muqaddima*, Ibn al-Šalāḥ 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 *Kitāb Maʿrifat ‘ulūm al-hadīth*. Considering this, it should not surprise us to read that at one point in his life Ibn al-Šalāḥ undertook to write a commentary on al-Ḥākim’s book. We may safely surmise that the commentary, which he never completed, grew into the *Muqaddima*. Ibn al-Šalāḥ made no attempt to conceal his debt to al-Ḥākim. He gave his work, popularly known as the *Muqaddima*, an almost identical title, *Kitāb Maʿrifat anwār ‘ilm al-hadīth*, and adopted al-Ḥākim’s conceit of dividing the study of hadith into a number of individual categories (sing. *nawā*), 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 *Muqaddima* did represent more of a departure from its predecessors was in its style. Abū Bakr b. Musaddī (ca. 593/1196–663/1264) described how it appeared to contemporary eyes:

> [Ibn al-Šalāḥ] composed a *fiqhi* book on the sciences [of hadith] and followed a theoretical course in its laws. He used to favor reason over reports (*athar*) and analogy over anecdotes (*khabar*). In [this work] he prepared principles of which no clear representation had [hitherto] been made.  

Ibn al-Šalāḥ wrote the *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 *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.
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53 *Muqaddima*, 436.  
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This Translation

I have relied largely on two modern editions of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ’s text, Nūr al-Dīn Ḥ̲r̲’s Ulūm al-ḥadīth li-Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (Damascus, 1387/1966) and the late ʿAdvishah ʿAbd al-Rahmān’s Mugaddimah Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (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 Ḥ̲r̲ 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-Ṣalāḥ 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 philonymous 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-Ṣalāḥ 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-Ṣalāḥ 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-Ṣalāḥ 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-Ṣalāḥ’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-Ṣāṭi”) 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 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
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it and someone who wanted to pursue the science of ḥadith 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 anwās ʿilm al-ḥadīth (Knowledge of the Categories of the Science of Hadith). This book divulged the hidden secrets of the science of ḥadith, 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 hadith:

1. Sound ḥadith (maʿrifat al-ṣaḥīh min al-ḥadīth)
2. Fair ḥadith (maʿrifat al-ḥasan minhu)
3. Weak ḥadith (maʿrifat al-qaṣīf minhu)
4. Supported hadith (maʿrifat al-munṣad)
5. Uninterrupted ḥadith (maʿrifat al-muttaṣil)
6. Raised ḥadith (maʿrifat al-mawṣūf)
7. Halted ḥadith (maʿrifat al-mawṣūf)
8. Cut-off ḥadith, and they are different from interrupted ḥadith (maʿrifat al-maqṭūʿ wa-huwa ghayr al-munqatiʿ)
9. Loose ḥadith (maʿrifat al-mursal)
10. Interrupted ḥadith (maʿrifat al-munqatiʿ)
11. Problematic ḥadith, and this is followed by the discussion of some subsidiary issues, including the isnād containing the word “ʿan” (from) and the suspension of ḥadith (maʿrifat al-muḍāl wa-yatiḥi tafsīrāt minhā fi ‘l-insnād al-mu’ānan wa-minhā fi ‘l-taḥqīq)
12. Misrepresentation and the treatment of misrepresented ḥadith (maʿrifat al-ṭadlis wa-ḥukm al-mudallas)
13. Anomalous ḥadith (maʿrifat al-shāhdhā)
14. Unfamiliar ḥadith (maʿrifat al-munkar)
15. Analysis, parallelisms and attestations (maʿrifat al-mubār wa-‘l-mutābāqāt wa-‘l-shawāhid)
16. Additions of reliable transmitters and the treatment of them (maʿrifat ziyyādāt al-thiqāt wa-ḥukmihā)
17. Isolated ḥadith (maʿrifat al-ṣatrād)
18. Defective ḥadith (maʿrifat al-ḥadīth al-muṣallal)
19. Disrupted ḥadith (maʿrifat al-muṣṭarib min al-ḥadīth)
20. Material interpolated into ḥadith (ma'rifat al-mudraj fi 'l-ḥadith)
21. Forged ḥadith (ma'rifat al-mawdūʿ)
22. Mixed-up ḥadith (ma'rifat al-maqlūb)
23. The characteristic of those whose transmission is accepted and those whose transmission is rejected (ma'rifat ẓifat man ṭuḥbalu riwāyatuhā wa-man turaddu riwāyatuhā)
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 ḥadith – it contains much information (ma'rifat kāyfyat samāʿ al-ḥadith wa-taḥammulihā wa-fihī rayyān ʿanwāʿ al-iḥṣāʿ wa-ahkāmihā wa-ṣūr waṣfih al-akhḍih wa-l-taḥammul wa-fihī ʿilm jann)  
25. The writing of ḥadith and the means of fixing and recording texts, and this chapter contains excellent and important information (ma'rifat kitābat al-ḥadith wa-kāyfyat qaṭṭ al-kiṭāb wa-taṣqīdihā wa-fihī ma'ārif muhimmat riqīqa)
26. The manner of relating ḥadith, the stipulation regarding the conveyance of them and related matters, and this chapter contains many of the valuable points of this science (ma'rifat kāyfyat riwāyat al-ḥadith wa-sharḥ adaʿītih wa-mā yata'āllaqu bi-dhālikā wa-fihī kathīr min naṣīfīs ḥāda ḥa'līf 'l-ṣilm)
27. Guidelines for the transmitter of ḥadith (ma'rifat ʿādāb al-muḥaddith)
28. Guidelines for the student of ḥadith (ma'rifat ʿādāb taḥāb al-ḥadith)
29. Elevated and low isnāds (ma'rifat al-insād al-ʿāli wa-l-nāzīl)
30. Famous ḥadith (ma'rifat al-mashhūr min al-ḥadīth)
31. Rare and scarce ḥadith (ma'rifat al-qarib wa-l-sāzš min al-ḥadīth)
32. Rare words in the ḥadīth (ma'rifat gharib al-ḥadīth)
33. Enchained ḥadith (ma'rifat al-masālal min al-ḥadīth)
34. Abrogating and abrogated ḥadith (ma'rifat nāsiḥ al-ḥadīth wa-mansūkhiḥ)
35. Misreadings in the isnāds and texts of ḥadith (ma'rifat al-muṣāḥhaf min asānād al-akhḍiḥ wa-mutānīhā)
36. Contradictory ḥadith (ma'rifat muḥktalif al-ḥadīth)
37. Additions to cohesive isnāds (ma'rifat al-mazīd fi mutaṣāil al-asānīd)
38. Ḥadith with hidden looseness (ma'rifat al-maraṣil al-khaṣṣ al-irṣālūhā)
39. The Companions (God be pleased with all of them) (ma'rifat al-Ṣaḥāba)
40. The Followers (God be pleased with all of them) (ma'rifat al-Tābi‘īn)
41. Older people transmitting from younger ones (ma'rifat al-akābir al-ruwāt ‘an al-ṣāḥih)
42. Symmetrical transmissions, and other instances of peers transmitting from one another (ma'rifat al-mudāḥāb wa-mā siwāku min riwāyat al-agrah bāṣīhum ‘an bāṣī)
43. Brothers and sisters among scholars and transmitters (ma'rifat al-ikhwā wa-l-akhwāt min al-iḥlām wa-l-ruwāt)
44. The transmission by fathers from their sons (ma'rifat riwāyat al-ābād ‘an al-ābnā‘)
45. The opposite of that; that is, the transmission by sons from their fathers (‘aks dhāliku ma'rifat riwāyat al-abnā‘ ‘an al-ābād)
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-riwaya 'anhu rāwiyyān mutaqaddim wa-muta‘akhkhir tabā‘ada mā bayna wa‘fatayhim)

47. Those from whom only a single transmitter related hadith (ma'rifat man lam yarwi ‘anhu illā rāwiyy wa‘hidd)

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

49. Unique names of the Companions, transmitters of hadith and other scholars (ma'rifat al-mufradāt min asmai‘ al-Ṣaḥāba wa-ruwāt wa-'l-ulama‘)

50. Names and payonymics (ma'rifat al-asma‘ wa-‘l-kunā)

51. The payonymics of those better known under their name, rather than their payonymic (ma'rifat kuna 'l-ma‘āṣin bi-‘l-asmai‘a dāna ‘l-kunā)

52. Nicknames of transmitters of hadith (ma'rifat al-āla‘ā bi-mu‘addithin)

53. Homographic [names and gentilics] (ma'rifat al-mutalif wa-'l-mukhthalif)

54. Homonymic [names and gentilics] (ma'rifat al-muttafaq wa-‘l-muṣafiq)

55. A Category composed of the two previous Categories (nawṣ yatārakkabu min hādhaymi 'l-nawṣayn)

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-mutarshābihi fi ‘l-isr wa-‘l-nasab al-mutamāyizin bi-‘l-ta‘qdim wa-‘l-ta‘khmir fi ‘l-ibn wa-‘l-ab)

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

58. Gentilics the actual significance of which differs from the apparent one (ma'rifat al-ansāb allati bāstinuḥa ‘ulā khilāf zāhirihā)

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

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

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

62. Reliable transmitters who confused their hadith at the end of their life (ma'rifat man khallaṭa fi ‘akhīr ‘umrihi min al-thiqāt)

63. The generations of transmitters and scholars (ma'rifat tabā‘īt al-ruwāt wa-‘l-ulama‘)

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

65. The residences and lands of transmitters (ma'rifat awjān al-ruwāt wa-buldānihim)

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 Hadith

(Ma'rifat al-saith min al-hadith)

Know – may God enlighten you and me – that hadith, in the view of the scholars of this discipline, fall into the divisions of “sound” (sāliḥ), “fair” (ṣaṣan) and “weak” (da'īf). The sound hadith is a “supported” hadith (al-hadith al-munṣnad), 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 hadith can be neither “anomalous” (shādīḥ) nor “defective” (muṣāliḥ). These descriptions exclude the “loose” (mursal), “interrupted” (munaqqīt), “problematic” (muṣūl) and anomalous hadith; the hadith containing an impairing defect (ṣilla); and the hadith the transmitter of which suffers from any variety of discreditation (jarr) – 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 hadith 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 hadith. When they say, “This is a sound hadith,” what is meant is that its support (sanad) is cohesive and it possesses the rest of the aforementioned characteristics. The standard of the sound hadith does not require that it be definite that the hadith 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 (akhbār) which the Community unanimously agreed to receive with acceptance. In the same way, when they say regarding a hadith 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 hadith fall into the categories of “agreed upon” (muttafaq ‘alayhi) and “disputed” (mukhtalaf fihi), as was noted above, and they also fall into the categories of “well known” (mashhur) and “rare” (gharib), and categories in between. The grades of sound hadith vary in potency according to the degree that the hadith possesses the aforementioned characteristics upon which soundness is based. In view of this, sound hadith can be divided into innumerable subcategories. For this reason, we think it is better to refrain from judging any isnād or hadith to be the absolutely most sound, although a number of the authorities in hadith have ventured into that morass and their opinions were therefore contradictory.
We heard1 that İshaq b. Rāhawayhi said, “The soundest of all isnāds is Zuhri’ from Ṣālim” from his father.” We also heard something similar from Ahmad b. Ḥanbal.2 We heard that ʿAmr b. ʿAll al-Fallas3 said, “The soundest isnād is Muḥammad b. ʾArīnāt from ʿAbdān from ʿĀli.”4 We heard something similar from ʿĀli b. al-Madīnī5 and this view was related from others as well. There are some who specify the transmitter from Muḥammad b. ʾArīnāt, some making him Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī6 and others Ibn ʿĀwn.7 One of the things we hear from Yahyā b. Maʿānī is that he

1 Ruwānā in his Tabaqat al-fuqaḥāʾ al-Shafiʿiyah (ed. Muhayt al-Din Ṣālim Najib, 2 vols, Beirut, 1413/1992, 1:77), Ibn ʿĀlphabet 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 “ruwānā,” see ʿAbd al-Ghaffar al-Nabulsi, Idāh ma lada yānni ʿāqil al-muḥaddithīn “ruwāyān,” Maktabat al-Asād (Damascus), no. 14123 ff, 29a–31b.

2 Abū Yaḥyā ʿIṣḥāq b. Rāhawayh (or Rāhawayh, 161/778–238/853) was one of the most important of the adherents of Ḥadīth of his era; EF, 3:902, Fuat Sezgin, Geschichte der arabischen Schriften, 10 vols. (Leiden, 1967–95), 1:109–10.

3 Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Muslim b. Shihāb al-Zuhāir (ca. 50/667/124–742) was an important figure in the history of Ḥadīth; 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) Ṣālim (d. 106/724), the son of ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, was famed for his piety; Dihātab, 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; EF, 1:153–4.

6 The doctrines of Abū ʿAbd Allāh Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. Ḥanbal (164/780–241/855) would eventually form the basis of the Ḥanbalī law school. His Ḥadīth criticism and legal opinions have been collected in a number of works and a very large collection of Ḥadīth, called “musnad,” is ascribed to him; EF, 1:272–7; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:502–9.

7 Abū ʿAbd Allāh ʿAmr b. Ṣāliḥ al-Fallas was born around 160/776 and died in 249/863; Dihātab, Siyar, 11:470–72.

8 Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. ʾArīnāt (ca. 33/653–110/729) was a Baṣrī authority in Ḥadīth whom later generations regarded as an expert in dream interpretation as well; EF, 3:947–8; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:1833–4.

9 Abū Muslim ʿAbdān b. ʿAmr b. Salmān (d. 72/691) was a well-respected Kīfān scholar. There is a good deal of confusion concerning the various elements of his name; Dihātab, Siyar, 4:40–4.

10 ʿAlī b. Abī Taʿlib was one of the first men to convert to Islam and the son-in-law of the Prophet Muḥammad. He served as the fourth caliph from 35/656 until his assassination in 40/661; EF, 1:381–6; EF, 1:838–48.

11 Abu Ḥasan ʿAlī b. al-Madīnī (161/777–234/849) was one of the greatest Ḥadīth critics of his generation. His judgements are preserved in his al-Ḥal (ed. Muhammad Muṣṭafā al-ʿAṣām, 2nd edn, Beirut, 1980) and in many later sources; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:108.


13 Abū ʿAmīn ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAwān al-Muzani (66/686–151/768), like Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī, was a Baṣrī scholar of Ḥadīth renowned for his piety; Dihātab, Siyar, 6:364–75.

14 The Ḥadīth criticism of Yahyā b. Maʿānī (158/775–233/847) is preserved in his Taʾrīkh (ed. Ahmad Muṣṭafā Nāṣr Sayf, 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’mash” from Ibrāhīm from ‘Alqama from ‘Abd Allāh.”¹⁵ We heard that Abū Bakr b. Abī Shayba” said, “The soundest of all isnāds is Zuhri from ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn from his father²¹ from ‘Alī [b. Abī Ṭālib].” We heard that Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Bukhārī²² – the author of the Ṣaḥīḥ (Collection of Sound Hadith) – said, “The soundest of all isnāds is Mālik²³ from Nāfi²⁴ from [‘Abd Allāh] b. ‘Umar.” The authority Abū Maṣʿūd ‘Abd al-Qāhir b. Ṭāhir al-Tamīmī²⁵ extrapolated from this that the most exalted isnād must be Ṣaḥīḥ²⁶ from Mālik from Nāfi from Ibn ‘Umar, and he cited as proof the consensus of the scholars of hadith that there was no transmitter from Mālik more exalted than Ṣaḥīḥ (God be pleased with all of them). God knows best.

¹⁵ Abū Muhammad Sulaymān b. Mihrān al-Asadī (61/681–148/765), nicknamed al-A’mash, was a prolific transmitter of hadith and expert on the Qur’ān who taught in al-Kūfah; EF, 1:431.
¹⁶ Abī Ḫaṭīrāb Ibrāhīm b. Yazīd al-Nakha’ī (ca. 50/670–ca. 96/715) was one of the most prominent of the early jurists of al-Kūfah; EF, 9:921–2; Sezgin, GAS, 1:403–4.
¹⁷ Abū Shībāl ‘Alqama b. Qays al-Nakha’ī al-Kušī (d. ca. 62/682) was a prominent Kūfī legal scholar; Dhahabī, Siyār, 4:53–61.
¹⁸ Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān ‘Abd Allāh b. Mās‘ūd al-Hudhali was an energetic teacher of the hadith of the Prophet who died in Medina in 32/653; Dhahabī, Siyār, 1:461–500.
²⁰ ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib (ca. 38/659–94/712), known as Zayn al-‘Abidīn, was the fourth imām of the Twelve 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 ‘Alī and his mother was Fāṭima. He died in the Battle of Karbalā 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 Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī (published a number of times), and a number of other important works of hadith scholarship; EF, 1:1296–7; Sezgin, 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; Sezgin, GAS, 1:457–64.
²⁴ Abū ‘Abd Allāh Nāfi (d. ca. 117/735), the client of ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar, was a prolific transmitter of hadith; EF, 7:876–7.
²⁶ Muḥammad b. Idrīs al-Shāfī‘ī (150/767–204/820) was the eponym of the Shāfi‘ī law school and an influential figure in the development of Islamic legal thought; EF, 9:181–5; Sezgin, GAS, 1:484–90.
2. When, in the personal hadith collections and other books which are in circulation, we encounter a hadith sound in regard to its isnād, but we do not find it included in either of the two Ṣaḥḥas or designated as sound in any of the other well-known and authoritative compositions (muṣannafāt) of the leaders in hadith; we do not presume to judge it conclusively as sound. These days it is no longer feasible for someone to apprehend sound hadith on his own by merely examining isnāds. This is because in every isnād of that kind of hadith 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 hadith. So, for the recognition of sound and fair hadith, the matter reverts to relying on what the authorities in hadith 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 Muhammad b. Ismāʿil al-Bukhārī al-Juʿfī, a client of the Juʿfīte tribe – was the first to compose a collection containing only sound hadith. Abū ʿl-Ḥusayn Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj al-Nisābūrī al-Qushayrī – a member of the tribe of Qushayr – followed him. Although Muslim took hadith from Bukhārī and studied under him, he did share most of his teachers. The books of Bukhārī and Muslim are the soundest books after the august book of God [that is, the Qurʾān]. The statement we repeatedly heard from Ṣaḥīḥī (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 Muslim 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


28 In addition to his *Ṣaḥīḥ* (published several times), Muslim (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; *EF*, 7:691–2; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:136-43.

29 From the fact that Muslim studied under Bukhārī, the scholars of hadith would as a matter of course have inferred that Muslim belonged to the generation after that of Bukhārī, rather than the same one, as was actually the case.
al-Nisâbûrî (the teacher of the expert Abu Abd Allah al-Ḥakîm): “There is no book on earth sounder than the book of Muslim b. al-Ḥajjâj,” 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 ḥadîth are mixed into it. After the introductory chapter of Muslim’s book, only sound ḥadîth are enumerated in it and they are not coupled with ḥadîth like those occurring in the chapter headings of Bukhârî’s book for which he did not provide isnâds meeting the standard stipulated for sound ḥadîth. 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 ḥadîth. If what is meant by these views is that the book of Muslim is sounder as a book of sound ḥadîth, it redounds against whoever says it. God knows best.

4. Bukhârî and Muslim did not include all of the sound ḥadîth in their Šâhîhs and they did not take it upon themselves to do that. In fact, we often heard that Bukhârî said, “I put into Kitâb al-Jâmi’ (Comprehensive Collection; that is, his Šâhîh) only what was established as sound and I left out some sound ḥadîth for fear of proximity.” We heard that Muslim said, “I did not place here” – that is, in his book, the Šâhîh – “all of the ḥadîth I consider to be sound. I put here only those ḥadîth they accepted unanimously.”32 He meant – and God knows best – that he only put in his book the ḥadîth which in his opinion met the standards of the ḥadîth unanimously regarded as sound, even if in the opinion of certain people some of these ḥadîth do not appear to meet these standards.

The expert Abu Abd Allah b. al-Akhram33 said, “Few are the well-established ḥadîth that escape Bukhârî and Muslim,” – that is, in their books. One should say that they are not few. Al-Mustadrak ‘ala l-Šâhîhâyin (The Supplement to the Two Šâhîhs) of Abu Abd Allah al-Ḥakîm is a large book which includes a good deal of what escaped their notice. Even if an

30 Abu Alt al-Husayn b. ‘Alt al-Nisâbûrî (277/890–349/960) was one of the great ḥadîth scholars of his age and is best known, as this passage indicates, for being the mentor of al-Ḥakîm al-Nisâbûrî; Dhababt, Siyar, 16:51–9.
31 Abu Abd Allah Muhammad b. Abd Allah (321/933–405/1014), also known as al-Ḥakîm al-Nisâbûrî and Ibn Bayyî, was one of the most prolific authors on the subject of ḥadîth during the fourth/tenth century. Two manuals of ḥadîth from his pen have survived. The larger, Kitâb Ma‘rifat ‘ulam al-ḥadîth, Ibn al-Ṣalih used as a model for the Maqa’dîma. His shorter manual, al-Madîkhî lil ma‘rifat al-Ikîl, has been edited and translated by James Rohnson (London, 1953); EF, 3:82; Sezgin, GAS, 1:221–2; EIr, 1:250–51.
33 The sources ascribe a number of works with interesting titles to Abu Abd Allâh Muhammad b. Ya‘qûb b. Yûsuf al-Shaybânî al-Nisâbûrî (250/864–344/955). Regrettably, none of them seems to have survived; Dhababt, Siyar, 15:466–9.
34 4 vols (Hyderabad, 1334–42).
argument may be made against Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥakīm regarding some of his ḥadīth, many of his sound ḥadīth remain untainted. Indeed, Bukhārī said, “I have one hundred thousand sound ḥadīth and two hundred thousand unsound.” The total in his book Sahīḥ is 7,275 ḥadīth, including some repeated ḥadīth. It has been said that with the omission of the ḥadīth duplicates the total is four thousand. In their opinion, however, this figure may include the accounts (aitḥār) of the Companions and Followers, often a single ḥadīth related with two isnāds counts as two ḥadīth.

The augmentation of the sound ḥadīth beyond the contents of the two books: those who seek this should obtain their additions from the ḥadīth clearly designated as sound in one of the famous, authoritative compositions of the leaders in ḥadīth — like Abū Dawūd as-Siṣīsī, Abū Ḥassan al-Ṭibrīzī, Abū 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Nasā'ī, Abū Bakr b. Khuza'ayma, Abū l-Ḥasan al-Dāraquṭnī and others. For this, it is not enough that the ḥadīth merely be found in the books of Abū Dawūd, Tirmidhī, Nasā'ī and the rest of those who brought together sound and other ḥadīth in their works. In contrast, the mere presence of a ḥadīth in the books of those who stipulate that the ḥadīth they collect be sound — like the book of Ibn Khuza'ayma — does suffice. We regard in the same fashion the material found in the books providing versions of the ḥadīth in the book of Bukhārī and the book of Muslim (God be pleased with them) with variant isnāds — 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 (Ṣaḥabah) were the early Muslims who had contact with the Prophet, although the exact form of contact required was disputed. The Followers (Tābi‘ūn) were the students of the Companions; see SF, 8:827–9 and 10:28–30. These two groups are discussed in depth below, in Categories 39 and 40.
37 Abū Dawūd Sulaymān b. al-ʿAbbās al-Siṣīsī (202/817–275/899) was the compiler of the famous Kitāb al-Sunan (published several times); SF, 1:114; Sezgin, GAS, 1:149–52.
38 The hadith collection of Abū Ḥassan Muhammad b. Ḥabīb b. Sa‘wār al-Tirmidhī (210/825–279/892) is commonly called al-Jāmī’ al-ṣaḥīḥ, although Ibn al-Salāḥ would prefer simply al-Jāmī’. It is available in a number of editions; SF, 7:796–7; Sezgin, GAS, 1:134–9.
39 Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān Aḥmad b. Shu‘ayb b. Mu‘āwiyah (215/830–303/915) was born in Nasr in Khurāsān and traveled extensively, collecting and teaching ḥadīth, before settling in Egypt. His famous hadith collection is now known as Kitāb al-Sunan (published several times); SF, 7:969–70; Sezgin, GAS, 1:167–9.
41 Abū l-Ḥasan ‘Aṭī b. ‘Umar al-Dāraquṭnī (306/919–385/995) composed a hadith collection named Kitāb al-Sunan (4 vols, Cairo, 1386/1966) and a number of other works concerning the study of ḥadīth; SF, 2:136; Sezgin, GAS, 1:206–9.
42 Al-kutub al-mukhtarrajā fī lāsikūtub al-Bukhārī wa-kūtub Muslim: Sākhawi defined “istiḥkār” — the form of the word later scholars preferred to takhrij — as follows: “An expert takes, for instance, the Saḥīḥ of Bukhārī and he presents the ḥadīth 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-Isfahānī, Abū Bakr al-Iṣnāḍī, 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.⁴⁶

The expert Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥākim occupied himself with augmenting the number of sound hadith 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 hadith 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-Ḥākim included the hadith 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 hadith and free in applying it. It is best that we take a moderate position regarding him. We say: A hadith 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 hadith 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 b. Ḥibbān al-Bustī (God bless all of them) is similar to it. God knows best.

5. The books providing versions of the hadith 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 hadith without addition or omission. This is

---

⁴⁵ Abū Bakr Ahmad b. Muḥammad al-Barqūnī (336/948–425/1034) was a teacher of al-Khaṭṭāb al-Baghdādī; Eṣr., 3:821. The title of the work referred to here seems to have been al-jamʿ bayn al-Ṣaḥīḥayn; see Ḥājjī Khalīfā, Kadhjīf, 1:col. 599.
⁴⁷ Abī Ḥātim Muḥammad b. Ḥibbān al-Bustī (ca. 270/884–354/965) was one of the greatest hadith scholars of the fourth/fifth century. His al-Mumad al-ṣaḥīḥ ‘ala ʿl-taqāṣīm wa-l-ʿannāt min ghayr waṣūd qaṣf fi sanadāt wa-lā thabāt jarh fi nāṣilāt was later rearranged by Abī Ḥāʾib al-Ḏin ʿAbī b. Bābīn al-Fārīst (d. 739/1339) as al-Insān fi taqāṣīm ʿṢaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān (ed. Shuʿayb al-ʿArāfī, 18 vols, 1408/1988); EF, 3:799; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:189–91.
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-kabīr (Great Book of Sunnas) of Bayhaqī, 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 archetype (asl) 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-fam' bayn al-Sahīhayn, 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 Ulūw al-isnād: The fewer intermediaries mentioned in an isnād, the more “elevated” it was considered; see below, Category 29.

49 Abū Bakr Ahmad b. al-Husayn al-Bayhaqī (384/994–458/1066) was an important Shafi‘ite who wrote a number of works on hadith, including his al-Sunan al-kabīr (published as Kutab 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-Husayn b. Mas‘ūd b. Muhammad al-Baghawi (433/1042–516/1122) was a pious scholar who worked hard to popularize the study of hadith. Sharḥ al-Sunan (ed. Shu‘ayb al-Arna‘ūt and Muhammad Zuhayr al-Sīwāṭsh, 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 Sahihī 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-Mughīth, 1:39. It has been asserted (pace Ibn al-Salāh)
The ḥadith 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” ḥadith (muḥallaq); that is, the ḥadith 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 ḥadith 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,” “Qānabī 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 ḥadith 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 ḥadith came from the person to whom it is ascribed. If the transmitter from whom the ḥadith is suspended is not a Companion, the judgement regarding the soundness of the ḥadith 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 (rawiya ʿan) the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him),” “Such and such was related from X,” “On this topic we find such and such from (ʿan) 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 ḥadith. However, Bukhārī’s inclusion of this kind of ḥadith among the sound ḥadith 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 ḥadith fail to attain the standard of the sound ḥadith and in his book these are found in certain places in the headings

---

52 Abu ʿl-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*, I:40–41; *Sezgin, GAS*, 1:25–8.
53 Abu ʿl-Ḥajjāj Mujāhid b. Ḥabīb al-Makkī (ca. 21/642–ca. 104/722) was best known as an expert in the Qurʾān; *EF*, 7:293; *Sezgin, GAS*, 1:29.
54 Abū ʿUthmān Affān b. Muslim al-Saffār (ca. 134/751–220/835) was born in al-Basyra and taught ḥadith in Baghdad; *Sezgin, GAS*, 1:102.
55 Abū ʿAbd al-Rahmān ʿAbd Allāh b. Maslama al-Qānabī (ca. 130/748–221/836) was a long-time student of Malik; Dhahabi, *Syar*, 10:257–64.
56 The Companion Abū Hurayra al-Dawāt (d. ca. 59/679) was a major transmitter from the Prophet. There is considerable controversy surrounding the other elements of his name; *EF*, I: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-Jāmiʾ al-musnad al-ṣaḥīh al-mukhtaṣar min umūr Rasūl Allāh wa-sunanhi wa-ayyāmihī (The Comprehensive Collection of Supported Sound Hadith Summarized from the Actions, Practices and Battles of the Messenger of God).

The applicability of Būkhārī’s statement, “I put into Kitāb al-Jāmiʾ 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-Sījzi,57 “Scholars, the jurists and others, unanimously agree that if a man had sworn to divorce his wife if not all of the ḥadīth related from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) in the book of Būkhārī 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-Humaydī in his book al-Jāmiʾ bayn al-Ṣaḥīhayn, “These two [that is, Būkhārī 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 Būkhārī’s chapter on the ḥadīth concerning the thigh where he relates from Ibn ʿAbbās, Jarhad,58 and Muḥammad b. Jaḥsh59 from the Prophet, “The thigh is one of the privy parts.”60 Another example is his remark in the first of the chapters concerning the major ablation, “Bahz b. Ḥākim” said from his father from his grandfather from the Prophet, “God most deserves that one have shame before Him,”61 and this definitely fails to meet Būkhārī’s standard. For that reason, Humaydī did not include it in his al-Jāmiʾ bayn al-Ṣaḥīhayn. So note that, for it is significant yet not readily apparent. God knows best.

---

57 The most important work of the anti-Asbāʿīite polemicist Abū Naṣr ʿUbayd Allāh b. Ṣaʿīd b. Ḥātim al-Wā’ilī al-Sījzi was al- Ibāna al-bukhrā, in which he argued that the Qur’ān is uncreated. He died in 444/1052 in Mecca; Dīhabat, Siyār, 1:654–7.
59 As a child, the Companion Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Jaḥsh al-Asadī joined his family in emigrating to Ethiopia. After their return to Mecca, they emigrated to Medina; Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Isrāʾifī, 3:1373–4.
61 The ḥadīth transmitter Abū ʿAbd al-Malik Bahz b. Ḥakīm al-Quraysīt died sometime before 150/767; Dīhabat, Siyār, 6:253.
62 Kitāb al-Jāmiʾ al-ṣaḥīḥ, 1:79 (K. al-Ghusl, B. Man ighatasaʾa rāyīna).
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 Bukhari and Muslim.
b. The sound hadith included only by Bukhari, that is, as opposed to Muslim.
c. The sound hadith included only by Muslim, that is, as opposed to Bukhari.
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 Bukhari, 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 Bukhari 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” (sahih muttafaq ‘alayhi). When they apply that term without qualification, they mean by it the agreement of Bukhari 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 Bukhari and Muslim and is concurrent with it, because of the agreement of the Muslim Community to receive with acceptance whatever Bukhari 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 (zann) [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 (ma‘ṣūm) from error is never wrong and the Muslim Community, when united by consensus (fi’iṭma‘īha), is protected from error. For this reason, consensus based on someone’s personal endeavor (ijtihād) is a decisive proof, and

63 Al-silm al-yaqīn al-nazari. In discussing this passage, Ibn Ḥajar noted that al-silm al-nazari differs from al-silm al-quwārī in that the former admits doubt while the latter does not. He equated yaqīn with quwārī and interpreted it to mean that Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ 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; Nukat, 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 ḥadith 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 ḥadith – like Dāraquṭnī 65 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 ḥadith is now confined to the consultation of the two Šahīhs and other authoritative books, [it will be seen that] the course open to the student who wants to act on these ḥadith or cite them as a proof – if he is one of those permitted to act on ḥadith and cite them as proofs to a partisan – is to consult a copy of the text (aṣl) 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 Dāraquṭnī’s Kitāb al-Tathhib (published with al-Izāmāt, Medina, 1397/1978).
After relating that hadith, 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 Ḥassā al-Tirmidhī (God be pleased with him) meant by “fair” is “that no one in the isnād of the hadith is accused of falsehood, that it is not an anomalous hadith (ḥadīth shādhdh) 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 hadith 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 hadīth from the sound. I have examined and researched the question of the fair hadīth 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 hadīth.

---

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 hadīth collections. His Muṣālim al-Sunan (ed. Muhammad Raghīb al-Ṭabīb, 4 vols, Aleppo, 1351/1932–1352/1934) deals with the Sunan of Abū Dawūd al-Sijistānī while Adīm al-sunan (ed. Yūsuf al-Kattānī, 2 vols, Rabat, n.d.) treats Bukhārī’s Sahīh; EF, 4:1131–2; Segrin, G.A.S., 1:210–11.

2 The word “makhraj” is not a technical term in the study of hadīth and on its own yielded very little meaning to later commentators. They tended to interpret the phrase “source of which is known” as a reference to the necessity of cohesion in the isnād of the fair hadīth, seemingly because that would otherwise be missing from Khaṭṭābī’s definition; e.g. Sakhāwī, Fath al-Mughīth, 1:62–3; Zayn al-Dīn al-Ṭrāqī, al-Tajziyā ṭalībdīnah, ed. ‘Abd al-Rahmān Muhammad ‘Uthmān (Cairo, 1389/1969), 44; Zakariyyā al-Āṣīrī, Fath al-Bāqṭ ‘alā ‘Aṣīrī al-Ṭrāqī (bound with ‘Uṣāf, al-Tahārī wa ‘l-tadhkira), ed. Muhammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Ṭrāqī al-Ḥusaynī, 3 vols (Beirut, n.d.), 1:84.


5 Bāq’ al-muṣākhkhūrin: although the division between the mutaqaddimān and the mutaqaddākān, “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 300/912 the dividing line; Mizān al-Fīlāl fī naqd al-rijāl, ed. ‘Ali Muhammad al-Bajāwī, 4 vols (Cairo, 1382/1963), 1:4; id., al-Mughīth fī ‘l-ḏaqāqa’, ed. Nūr al-Dīn al-Jurrā, 2 vols (Aleppo, 1931/1971), 1:4; Ibn Hajar, Lisan 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 Tirmidhi 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 (muʿallal), 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 Tirmidhi 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 Mattār literally means “veiled” and may be translated as “respectable.” Ibn Hajar equated mastār with majhūl al-ḥāl, Nakḥbat al-nāẓar, 87.
Whenever a Shafiite jurist regards that with skepticism, we remind him of the provision of Shafi (God be pleased with him) concerning the loose hadith (marasil) of the Followers: that he accepted a loose hadith for which there was a similar supported version (musnad). Likewise, he accepted a loose hadith if another loose hadith transmitted by someone who had not studied with the teachers of the first Follower was in agreement with it. Shafi said this in some of his remarks where he speaks of several ways of determining the soundness of the source of a loose hadith on the basis of its coming from another line of transmission. We also remind the skeptical Shafiite that Abu l-Muzaffar al-Samani and others related from one of the students of Shafi 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 Shafiite object, when for a hadith 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 hadith judged as weak, despite their having been related with many isnads through numerous lines of transmission, like the hadith, ‘The ears are part of the head,’ and similar ones. Why do you not include that hadith and the others like it in the category of fair hadith, because the various versions reinforce one another, in the fashion you previously described regarding fair hadith?” The answer to this is that not every weakness in a hadith is eliminated by the hadith coming from several lines of transmission. Rather, the situation varies. One weakness which the passage of a hadith 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 hadith he related also comes from another line of transmission, we realize that it is one of the hadith that he had retained properly and his accuracy in it was not impaired. Likewise, when the weakness of the hadith is on account of looseness (irsal), it disappears because of something along these lines — as in the case of the loose hadith 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 hadith 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 l-Muzaffar Mansur b. Muhammad al-Samani (426/1035–489/1096) was the grandfather of Ibn al-Salah’s teacher Abu Sa’id al-Samani; Brockelmann, GAL, 1:524, Suppl., 1:731.
3. If the transmitter of a ḥadith 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 ḥadith was related through more than one line of transmission, the strength of the ḥadith is reinforced from both sides and that lifts his ḥadith from the grade of fair to the grade of sound.

An instance of this is the ḥadith of Muḥammad b. ʿAmr b. ʿAmr b. ʿAlqama 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.” Muḥammad b. ʿAmr b. ʿAlqama 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 ḥadith from this standpoint is only fair. When the circumstance that the ḥadith 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 isnād was established as sound and the ḥadith attained the level of the sound hadith. God knows best.

4. The book of Abū ʿIsā al-Tirmidhī (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 Jamāʾ. 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 Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Bhūkhtārī and others.

The various copies of Tirmidhī’s book differ in his designations, “This is a fair ḥadith,” or “This is a fair and sound hadith (ḥadith hasan ṣaḥīḥ),” 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.

Dāraqṭūnī in his Sunan explicitly designates many of his hadith as fair and this designation also occurs often in the Sunan of Abū Dāwūd al-Sijīstānī (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 ḥadith known to him. He said, “I have indicated those hadith in my book that contain a severe debility. The ḥadith I do not say anything about are good (ṣaḥīḥ), and some are sounder than others.”

---

9 Abu ’l-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. ʿAmr b. ʿAlqama al-Laythī (d. ca. 145/762) was best known as the principal transmitter from Abū Salama, Dīyārābīk, Ṣiyārah, 6:136-7.
10 Abū Salama Abū ʿAbdullāh (or Ismāʿīl) b. Abū al-Rahmān al-Qurashi (ca. 20/641-94/713) was a Meṣneʿī expert in ḥadith and law; Dīyārābīk, Ṣiyārah, 4:287-92.
11 Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī (Georgetown, 1998).
IBN AL-ŠALĀḤ AL-SHĀHRAZŪRĪ

this basis, the hadith which we find mentioned in his book without any designation – if they are not in either of the two Sahīhs 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 Dawūd, 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'ūd al-Bawardi13 saying in Egypt, “It was Abū 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Nasīrī’s way to include the hadith of all of those transmitters who were not unanimously rejected,” – Ibn Manda himself added, “Abū Dawūd al-Sijistānī as well adopts the same course, including hadith having weak isnāds if he does not find anything else on the topic, because in his view they were stronger than the arbitrary opinions (rā'īy) of men.” God knows best.

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


---

12 Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ishāq b. Manda (310/922–395/1005) was the author of several religious works; *EF*, 3:863.
13 Some have identified this Muḥammad b. Sa'ūd al-Bawardi as the Abū Manṣūr al-Bawardi who is mentioned as an author of a work on the Companions by Ibn Hajar, *al-Isāba fi tamaqīm al-Sahāba*, 4 vols (Cairo, 1328), 1:3 and Sākhawi, *Ṭā'līb*, 161; see, for example, Kātārī, *Rudā'a*, 128.
14 Baghawī was the author of the collection of hadith without isnāds entitled Maṣāḥīḥ al-sanma (ed. Istāhī Muhammad Ramadān, 2 vols, Beirut, n.d.). Despite Baghawī’s unique views (presented in the very brief introduction to the work), Maṣāḥīḥ was very popular and spawned considerable activity among later scholars; see Ḥajjī Khālid, *Kashf*, 2:cols 1698–702.
16 Abū Muḥammad 'Ubayd Allāh b. Mūsā al-'Abdī (d. 213/829 or 214) is said to have been the first scholar in al-白沙 to compose a musnad; Dhahābī, *Siyar*, 9:553–7.
17 The very large musnad ascribed to Ahmad b. Ḥanbal was published in six volumes (Cairo, 1311–13).
19 Abū Muḥammad 'Abd (or 'Abd al-Hamīd) b. Ḥumayd al-Kashāshī (or al-Kashāshī) was a prominent transmitter of hadith who died in 249/863. His Musnad has survived in the form
Dārīmī, Abū Ya‘lā al-Mawsīlī, al-Ḥasan b. Sufyān, Abū Bakr al-Bazzār and similar works—do not reach the level of the Five Books—that is, the two Saḥīḥs, the Sunan of Abū Dāwūd al-Siyāṣī, the Sunan of Naṣārī, the Jaʿmī of Tirmidhī—and works similar to them in that the ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth they related, without restricting themselves to the ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth sound from the standpoint of its isnād (saḥīh al-isnād)—or “fair from the standpoint of its isnād (hasan al-isnād),”—is less than their saying, “This is a sound ḥadīth”—or “a fair ḥadīth”—because sometimes it is said, “This is a ḥadīth sound from the standpoint of its isnād,” and the ḥadīth 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 (saḥīh fi nafsīh) because the lack of a defect or reason for impugnment is what is initially presumed. God knows best.

8. The statement of Tirmidhī and others, “This is a fair and sound ḥadīth” (ḥadīth hasan saḥīh) is problematic because the fair ḥadīth is inferior to the sound, as was explained above. The conjunction of these two states in a single ḥadīth is the conjunction of the negation and assertion of this inferiority. The answer here is that the expression concerns the isnād. When a single ḥadīth is


20 Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Dārīmī was born in 182/797 and died in 235/869. His Musnad—in which the ḥadīth are arranged by subject—has been published as Sunan al-Dārīmī (ed. Muḥammad Ahmad Duhmān, 2 vols., Damascus, 1349); E.F., 2:159; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:114–15.

21 Abū Ya‘lā Ahmad b. ʿAbd b. al-Mustanṣar al-Mawsīlī (210/826–307/919) was esteemed because, among other things, he taught his Musnad (ed. Ḥūsain Salīm Asad, 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, G.A.S., 1:170–71.


23 Abū Bakr Ahmad b. ʿAmr al-Bazzār died in 292/903. His musnad has been published as al-Bahir al-zakkīkhār (ed. Maḥfūẓ al-Ḥāfīẓ Zayn Allāh, Medina, 1416/1996, only vol. 8 seen); Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:162.
related with two isnâds, one of them fair and the other sound, it may properly be called a “fair and sound hadith;” that is, it is fair in relation to one isnâd 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 hadith who do not recognize fair hadith as a separate category, subsuming them in the types of sound hadith, since they are included in the types of hadith which may be adduced as proofs. The expert Abû Ṣâliḥ al-Ḥâkim’s adherence to this doctrine is apparent from his remarks in his Taṣâruqât and he indicates it also by calling the book of Tirmidhi the al-fâmiṣ al-sâliḥ (The Comprehensive Collection of Sound Hadith). The expert Abû Bakr al-Khaṭib24 also applied the name of “Ṣâliḥ” without any qualification to Tirmidhi’s book and to the book of Nâṣîrî. The expert Abû Ṭâhir al-Silaqî25 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 hadith they contain as being “weak” (daʿîf), “unfamiliar” and other similar terms descriptive of weak hadith. Abû Dâwûd [al-Sijîstânî] in the passage we quoted above clearly indicated the division of the hadith in his book into sound and other kinds of hadith 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 Abû Bakr Aḥmad b. Ṣâliḥ b. Thâlib (392/1002–463/1071), popularly known as al-Khaṭib al-Baghdâdî, was one of the towering figures of traditional Islamic scholarship and his Taṣâruqât (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, GAL, 1:400–401, Suppl., 1:562–4; EF, 4:1111–12.

25 Abû Ṭâhir Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Silaqî 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, GAL, 1:450, Suppl., 1:624; EF, 9:606–9.
Category 3
WEAK ḤADĪTH
(Ma'rifat al-qla'if min al-ḥadīth)

Every ḥadīth in which the traits of the sound ḥadīth and the fair ḥadīth mentioned above do not come together is a “weak” ḥadīth. Abū Ḥātim b. Ḥibbān al-Busti went overboard in creating subcategories of weak ḥadīth, 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 ḥadīth and make the ḥadīth that lack that trait a separate subcategory of weak ḥadīth - if there is nothing mitigating the absence of the trait in the fashion established in the Category of the fair ḥadīth. He then should make the ḥadīth that lack that trait in addition to another particular trait a second subcategory. Then he should make the ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth that lack it alone a subcategory. Another subcategory is comprised of the ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth that lack all of the traits. For the traits that have special stipulations (sharātot) do the same thing with their stipulations so that the subcategories are thereby further multiplied.

The subcategories of the weak hadīth which have well-known special appellations are the “forged” (maqādīš), the “mixed-up” (maqālāt), the “anomalous” (shādīḥ), the “defective” (mūsallā), the “disrupted” (muḍjarāb), the “loose” (mural), the “interrupted” (muqtāf) and the “problematic” (muṣ‘al). 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 hadīth into sound, fair and weak; see Ibn Ḥajar, Nukṣat, 1:504.
Category 4
SUPPORTED ḤADĪTH
(Ma‘rifat al-musnad)

The expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭṭāb (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 hadith which came from the Messenger of God (God be pleased with him), rather than the hadith which originated with the Companions and others. The expert Abū `Umar b. `Abd al-Barr stated that supported hadith are exclusively those “raised” (raṣṣa) to the Prophet (Peace be upon him). The isnād may be uninterrupted (mustaqṣil) – like Malik from Nāfi‘ from Ibn `Umar from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) – or it may be interrupted (munaqṣat) – like Malik from Zuhri from Ibn `Abbās from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). The second hadith is supported since its isnād goes to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) and it is interrupted because Zuhri did not hear hadith from Ibn `Abbās (God be pleased with them). Abū `Umar related from several scholars the view that the term “supported” applies only to the hadith with an uninterrupted isnād raised to the Prophet (Peace be upon him). The expert Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥakīm (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.

1 Al-Kifāya fī ṣilm al-riwāya (Hyderabad, 1357), 21.
2 Abū `Umar Yāsuf b. ʿAbd Allah b. ʿAbd al-Barr al-Namār al-Qurtūbī (368/978–463/1071) was an Andalusian Malikite who wrote extensively on subjects related to the study of hadith. His Tamkīt, a commentary on the Musnad of Malik, may be his most important contribution to hadith scholarship and Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ cited it often; Brockelmann, G.A.I., 1:453–4, Suppl., 1:528–9; EF, 2:874.
4 Tamkīt, 1:23.
5 Tamkīt, 1:25.
6 Ulūm al-ḥadīth, 17–19.
Category 5
UNINTERRUPTED ḤADĪTH
(Maʿrifat al-muttaṣil)

The uninterrupted ḥadīth is also called “connected” (mawsūl). The term, when used without qualification, may be applied to both raised (marfuʿ) and halted ḥadīth (mawqūf). It is the hadith with an isnād which is uninterrupted because each of its transmitters heard the hadith 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 hadith is “Mālik from Nāfiʿ 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 ḤADĪTH
(Ma‘rifat al-marfu‘)

The term “raised” applies exclusively to the ḥadīth 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” (mawqūf) is applied to the Companions and others [and not to the ḥadīth of the Prophet]. The raised ḥadīth may be uninterrupted (muttaṣil), interrupted (munaṣṣir), loose (mursal) and the like. Some people regard the raised ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth may be either interrupted or uninterrupted while the term “supported” applies only to the uninterrupted ḥadīth attributed to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). The expert Abū Bakr b. Thābit [al-Khaṭṭīb al-Baghdādī] said, “The raised ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth of the Followers (mursal al-Tabi‘īn) from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) were excluded. The scholars of ḥadīth who contrasted the raised ḥadīth with the loose meant “uninterrupted” when they said “raised.” God knows best.

1 Kifāya, 21.
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-mawsūl); and, if its isnād is not cohesive, it is called “unconnected halted” (al-mawqūf ghayr al-mawsūl). This is similar to what is known to pertain to the ḥadīth raised (marfū’ū) 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 ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth at ‘Aṭā’” – or “Tawūs” or someone similar. In the terminology of the Khurāsānī jurists, we find that the halted ḥadīth is identified with the term “account” (athār). One of them, Abu l-Qāsim al-Furānī, 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 ‘Aṭā’ b. Abī al-Raḥlār Aṣāl (27/647–114/732) was the student of a large number of Companions; Seegin, GAS, 1:31.
2 Abī ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Tāwūs b. Kaystin (d. 106/724), like ‘Aṭā’, was a prominent transmitter from the second generation of Muslims; Dhaḥabi, Siyār, 5:38–49.
Category 8
Cut-off Ḥadīth
(Maʿrifat al-maqṣūrī)

The cut-off Ḥadīth is not the same as the interrupted (munqatī) which, God (He is exalted) willing, will be discussed later. Maqṣūrī and maqṣūrī are given as the plurals of maqṣūr. The cut-off Ḥadīth is a report concerning the words and deeds of the Followers, halted at them. The expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb said about the cut-off Ḥadīth in his Ḫanāqī, “The Cut-off Ḥadīth: the cut-off Ḥadīth are those halted at the Followers.” I have also found the cut-off Ḥadīth interpreted as interrupted — that is, unconnected (qhayr mawṣūl) — in the remarks of the imām Shafīʿī, Abū ʿl-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 Ḥadīth, 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 Ḥadīth (marjīl), as the expert Abū ʿAbd Allah b. al-Bayyānī [al-Ḥākim al-Nisābūrī], other scholars of Ḥadīth and others have unequivocally stated. I read that Abū Bakr al-Barqānī asked the authority Abū Bakr al-ʿIṣmāʿīlī about that and he denied that it constitutes a raised Ḥadīth. 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 assserted to it, and his tacit assent is one of the forms of raised sunnās. The categories of raised sunnās include the words of the Prophet (Peace be upon him), his deeds, and his tacit assent to 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 Ḫanāqī, 356.
2 Abū ʿl-Qāsim Sulaymān b. Abīmad al-Ṭabarānī (260/873-360/971) was the author of a number of important works on Ḥadīth; Ṣezgin, G/AS, 1:195–7.
3 ʿUlam al-ḥadīth, 22.
4 A sunna is a practice endorsed by the precedent of an authoritative figure.
Prophet (Peace be upon him).” All of these, and similar declarations, are considered supported raised hadith (marifhi musnad) and are included in the books of supported hadith.

In regard to the report we heard from al-Mughira b. Shu’ba,1 “The Companions of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) used to tap on his door with their fingernails,” Abu Abd Allâh al-Ḥâkim 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 (mawqûf).”2 Al-Khaṭṭâb said something similar to this in his Jâmi’3 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-Ḥâkim acknowledges that as constituting raised. We used to count this as one of the things we held against al-Ḥâkim. 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 hadith 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 Abu Bakr al-Īsmâ’îl 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 Anas’ [God be pleased with him], “Bilal” was ordered to say the words of the call to prayer twice and the words of the iqâma once,” and other

---

5 The prominent Companion Abu Abd Allâh al-Mughira b. Shu’ba al-Thaqafi served as the governor of al-Asrâr and al-Kufa under the early caliphs and died of the plague in the year 50/670 at around the age of seventy; EF, 7:347.
6 Ulûm al-hadîth, 19.
7 Jami’, 335.
8 Abu ʿAbd Allâh Anas b. Malik al-Anṣârî was one of the last Companions of the Prophet to die and a prolific transmitter of hadith. He died in al-Asrâr around the year 93/712 – the exact date is disputed – at over one hundred years of age; EF, 1:482.
9 The renowned Companion Bilâl b. Rabî‘ (d. ca. 29/644), who was also known by his mother’s name as Bilâl b. Hamâma, 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 Jābir (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
scription of anything to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) are counted
as halted hadith. God knows best.

4. The hadith in the isnāds of which it is said at the mention of the Companion,
“He raises the hadith” (yafasw), “He reaches with it” (yabughu bihi),” “He
advances it” (yanmihi) or “A transmission” (riwāyat) are considered raised
hadith. An example of this is “Sufyān b. ‘Uuyayna” from Abu ’l-Zinād” from
al-A’raj from Abū Hurayra as a transmission, ‘[The Hour will not come until]
you fight a people with small eyes . . .’” and with the same isnād, “from Abū
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 (marfū‘ mursal). God knows best.

10 The Companion Abū ‘Abd Allāh Jābir b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ’Amr al-Salami al-Anṣāri (d. 78/697)
was the mufti in Medina after the Prophet’s death. His hadith were collected in an early sahiḥ
(see Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:85); Dihabat, Siyar, 3:189–94.
11 The great scholar of hadith Sufyān b. ‘Uuyayna was born in al-Kūfa in 107/725 and died in
12 Abu ’l-Zinād Abū ‘Abd Allāh b. Dhakwān al-Qurashi (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 Abū Dāwūd Abū al-Raḥmān b. Hurnuz al-Hāshimi, known as “al-A’raj,” was an expert in
a number of disciplines. He died in 117/735 at an advanced age; Dihabat, Siyar, 5:69–70.
Category 9

LOOSE ḤADĪTH

(Maʿrīfāt al-mursal)

The form of the loose ḥadīth about which there is no disagreement is the ḥadīth of an early Follower (al-Tābrī al-kabīr) — like ʿUbayd Allāh b. ʿAdī b. al-Khayyār, ʿAlī 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 aḥ 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 ʿAbd 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 (mārīf) 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” (munaṣṣib) and that if more than one transmitter is omitted it is called “problematic” (muḍall) — 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 (tābrī al-Tābrī) related directly from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) ‘problematic.’” God knows best.

2. When Zuhr, Abū Ḥāzīm, ʿAlī b. Saʿd b. al-Anṣāri and their colleagues among the later Followers (asāghir al-Tābrīn) say, “The Messenger of God

1 ʿUbayd Allāh b. ʿAdī was a Medinese religious scholar who died around 91/710; Dhahabi, Siyar, 3:514–15.
2 Abū Muḥammad Saʿd b. al-Musayyib al-Makhlūm (13/634–94/713) was an active figure in a number of religious disciplines; Sezgin, GAS, 1:276.
3 ʿUlūm al-ḥadīth, 28.
4 Kifāya, 21.
5 ʿAlī b. Saʿd al-Makhlūm (d. ca. 140/757) was a judge in Medina; Sezgin, GAS, 1:634–5.
6 Abū Saʿd Yahyā b. Saʿd b. Qays al-Anṣāri was an early judge who died in 143/760; Sezgin, GAS, 1:407.
(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 isnād, “X from a man,” “From a teacher from X,” or the like: the view which al-Ḥākim stated in his book Muhrifat ‘ulum 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 isnād containing the looseness becomes apparent by virtue of the supported version. So even though the isnād is loose, it is judged to be a sound isnād 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 Malik and Abū Ḥanīfa¹⁰ 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 Ḥanīfa al-Nu‘mān b. Thabit (d. ca. 150/767) was the eponym of the Ḥanafite 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 ḥadith and its analogues the ḥadith which in legal theory is called “a loose ḥadith of a Companion” (mursal al-Ṣaḥābi). Examples of this are the ḥadith which Ibn Ṭabīb al-Rāfi`ī and the other young Companions relate directly from (yarwihī `an) the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) which they did not actually hear from him. That is because these ḥadith are judged to be supported connected ḥadith (al-mawṣūl 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 (ṣaḥīḥ). God knows best.
Category 10

Interrupted Hadith
(Ma‘rifat al-munqatî)

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-Hâkim – the author of the book Ma‘rifat awlî ʿulûm 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 isnâd 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 isnâd 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-Razzâq from Sufyân al-Thawrî from Abû Ishâq from Zayd b. Yuthayâ from Hudhayfa: “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, ‘If you appoint Abû Bakr as a leader, he is strong and honest ...’” When a hadithologist (ḥadîthi) examines this isnâd, he finds its outward form to be that of an uninterrupted hadith (mutassîl). Yet it is interrupted in two places, because ʿAbd al-Razzâq did not hear it directly from Thawrî. Rather he heard it from al-Nu‘mân b. Abî Shayba al-Janadî from Thawrî.

¹ ʿUlûm al-hadîth, 27-9.
2 Abû Bakr ʿAbd al-Razzâq b. Hammâm al-Himyârî (126/744–211/827) was a famous hadith scholar from the Yemen; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:99.
3 Abû ʿAbd Allâh Sufyân b. Saʿîd al-Thawrî (ca. 95/713–161/778) was an extremely influential figure in a number of scholarly domains; EI, 9:770–72; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:518–19.
4 Abû Ishâq ʿAmr b. ʿAbd Allâh al-Sâbitî (32/653–128/746) was a resident of al-Kufa famed for his piety and knowledge of hadith; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:283.
6 The Companion Abû ʿAbd Allâh Hudhayfa b. al-Yanân (d. 35/656) served as the governor of al-Madâ’in under the Caliphs ʿUmar and ʿUthmân; Dhibabî, Siyâr, 2:361–9.
7 Abû Bakr al-Ṣiddîq (d. 7/634) 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 ʿAishah and succeeded him as the leader of the Muslim community; EI, 1:109–11.
Furthermore, Thawri did not hear it from Abu Ishāq. He instead heard it from Sharik from Abu Ishaq.

An example of the second form is the hadith which we heard from Abu ʿl-ʿAlī b. ʿAbd Allah b. al-Shikhkhir from “two men” from Shaddād b. Aws 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.”

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 Abu Bakr al-Khaṭṭāb gave in his Kifāya. 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 Umar” and the like. God knows best.

Another opinion is the one which Abu 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. This last interpretation is peculiar and far fetched. God knows best.

---

9 Abu ʿAbd Allah Sharīk b. ʿAbd Allah al-Nakhaʾī (95/714–177/794) was the qaṭī of al-Kufa; Dhahabi, Siyar, 8:200–16.
10 Abu ʿl-ʿAlī Yazd b. ʿAbd Allah b. al-Shikhkhir al-Baṣrī (d. ca. 110/728) was a well-respected transmitter of hadith; Dhahabi, Siyar, 4:493–4.
12 Tuhfah, 1:21.
13 Kifāya, 21.
14 Kifāya, 21.
"Problematic" is the name of a particular type of interrupted ḥadīth (munaqṣīt). Every problematic ḥadīth is interrupted, but not every interrupted ḥadīth is problematic. Some people, as stated above, call interrupted ḥadīth "loose" (mursal). The problematic ḥadīth consists of the ḥadīth having an isnād lacking two or more transmitters.

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

An example of a problematic ḥadīth is one which a student of a Follower (tābi’s al-Tabi’ti) relates saying, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said.” Another example is a ḥadīth 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 Naṣr al-Siṣṭī brought up the case of a transmitter saying, “It reached me” (balaghani) – like Mālik’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-Ḥakīm made a type of problematic ḥadīth the instances when a student of a Follower relates from that Follower a ḥadīth halted at him while it is uninterrupted and supported (muttaṣil musnad) up to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) [from another student of the Follower]. An example is the ḥadīth we heard from al-A‘mash from Shaḥī in which he said, “On the
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-īsnād al-mu‘ānān): 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 Abū Umar b. ‘Abd al-Barr came close to claiming that there was a consensus of the hadith experts on that and Abū ‘Amr al-Dānî al-Muqrî 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, Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr says that there was a consensus; *Tuhid*, 1:12.
5 Abū ‘Amr Uthmān b. Sa‘d al-Dānî al-Muqrî (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; *EF*, 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 “Ma‘lik from Zuhrī that Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyib said such and such.” We heard that Ma‘lik (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 ʿAbd 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 ʿAbd al-Barr related from Abū Bakr al-Bardījī 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 ʿAbd 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. Shaybā, I found something similar to what Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr related from the expert Abū Bakr al-Bardījī. Ya‘qūb b. Shaybā mentioned the hadith Abū I-Zubayr related from Ibn al-Ḥanafīyā in which ʿUmmār 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. Shaybā made it a connected supported hadith (muwadda‘ mawṣūl). Ya‘qūb b. Shaybā also mentioned the relation of that hadith by Qays b. Sa‘d “from ‘Atā‘.

7 Abū Bakr Abīmad b. Ḥarūn al-Bardījī al-Bardhī (ca. 230/845–301/914) was a well-regarded transmitter of hadith; Sezgin, GAS, 1:166–7.
8 Tanhīd, 1:26.
9 Abū Yāsir Ya‘qūb b. Shaybā al-Sadūs (ca. 180/796–262/875) was a follower of the doctrine of Ma‘lik who eventually settled in Baghdad; Sezgin, GAS, 1:144.
10 Abū I-Zubayr Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Tādās al-Makki (d. 126/743) was an important transmitter of hadith; Sezgin, GAS, 1:86–7.
11 Muḥammad (16/637–81/700), the son of the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭalib, was called Ibn al-Ḥanafīyā on account of his mother who was a member of the Banū Ḥanifa. After the death of al-Ḥusayn at Karbalā in 61/680 and the retirement of al-Ḥasan, Ibn al-Ḥanafīyā became the rallying point for the opposition to the Umayyad regime, although he seems not to have personally played any active role; ET, 7:402–3.
12 Abū I-Yaqqūn ʿAmr b. Ya‘qūb al-Anṣārī 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, Dihlabī, Siyar, 1:406–28.
b. Abū Rabī‘ from Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya that ʿAmmār passed the Prophet (Peace be upon him) while he was praying, and he considered this version loose because Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya 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 ḥadīth, “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 ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth 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 contemporaneity [that is, rather than on the terminology appearing in the isnād], and in this ḥadīth there 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 ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth which a transmitter gives from someone whom he met, regardless of the term used [in the isnād]. Similarly, Abū Bakr al-Shāfi‘ī al-Ṣayrafi’ gave a general statement of that and said, “The transmission of every student who is known to have heard ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth] he related. The same is also true of the transmission of every student who is known to have met an individual and transmitted ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth 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 Naṣr saying, "Ibn ʿUmar said." The same would apply if Naṣr had said regarding him, "Ibn ʿUmar mentioned," "Ibn ʿUmar did," "Ibn ʿUmar transmitted," "Ibn ʿUmar 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. Abū ʿAmr [al-Dāni] al-Muqrī said in this regard, "If the student is known to have transmitted from the teacher, [it is enough]." On this issue Abu ʿl-Ḥasan al-Qābisi said, "If it is clear that the student was a contemporary of the person from whom he transmitted." Concerning transmission by "from," Abu ʿl-Muẓaffar [Maṣūr] al-Ṣaʿmānī said that a long acquaintance between the student and the teacher is stipulated. In the introduction to his Ṣaḥīḥ, Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj 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, ʿAlī b. al-Madini, Bukhārī and others. (God knows best.) I do not think that this judgement [that is, the one ascribed to ʿAlī 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 (taʾlīq) which Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥumaydī – the author of al-Jamʿ bayn al-Ṣaḥīḥayn – and other North Africans mention in regard to some of the hadith in the Ṣaḥīḥ of Bukhārī with cut-off isnāds (qiṣṣaʾa isnāduḥā):

Darqūṭni 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 1.

No attention is to be paid to the Zāhirite Abū Muḥammad b. Ḥazm's rejection of the hadith of Abū ʿAmir — or as he is also known “Abū Malik” — 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. ʿAmmin 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 “Zuhrī said

18 Abū Muḥammad ʿAbī ʿAbdallāh Ahmad b. Saʿīd (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 3:790–99.
19 ʿUbayd b. Ṣaʿīd (or Wahḥ) 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 ʿAbd al-Barr, Istīḥāb, 4:1704–5.
from Abū Salama from Abū Khayra 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 (munjāṣal) 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. Ḥamdān al-Nisabūrī – said. We heard that he said, “Whenever Bukhārī says, ‘X said to me,' it is presentation (ṣurūq) and transference (munāṣṣala).”

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” (yurwā ‘an fīlān), “It is mentioned from X” (yudhkuru ‘an fīlān) 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; Dhahabī, Siyār, 4:287–92.
23 Abū Ja’far Ahmad b. Ḥamdān al-Nisabūrī (ca. 240/854–311/924) was a devoted scholar of hadith who traveled extensively; Dhahabī, 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. Yunus26—among others—related it in supported form from his grandfather Abū ʿIsḥāq al-Sabīʿ from Abū Burda27 from his father Abū Mūsā al-ʿAshʿarī28 from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him); that is, as uninterrupted. Sufyān al-Thawrī and Shuʿba29 related it from Abū ʿIsḥāq from Abū Burda from the Prophet (Peace be upon him); that is, as loose. The expert al-Khaṭiḅ said that in this case and similar ones most of the scholars of hadith rule in favor of the loose form.30 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-Khaṭiḅ said that this last view is the correct one.31 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 judgment 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 Yusuf Isra’il b. Yunus al-Sabīʿ al-Kuṭfi (100/719–ca. 160/777) was best known for transmitting from his grandfather, Dhuhabī, Sīyar, 7:355–61.
27 Abū Burda Ḥanīfī (or ʿAmin) al-ʿAshʿarī (d. ca. 100/719) served as the qaḍī of al-Kuṭfa during the governorship of al-Hajjāj; EP, 1:693–4.
28 Abū Mūsā ʿAbd Allāh b. Qays al-ʿAshʿarī was one of the most prolific transmitters from the Prophet. He served as the governor of al-Baṣra and al-Kuṭfa during the reign of ʿUmar, ʿUthmān and ʿAli, acting as Ali’s arbiter at Ṣiffin in 37/657. He died in al-Kuṭfa around the year 42/662; EP, 1:695.
29 Abū ʿAbd Allāh Shuʿba 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 (rafāʿa) 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 (waṣl) 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

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

There are two subcategories of misrepresentation. The first is misrepresentation in the isnād (tadlis al-isnād). 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” (akhbaran fūlān), “X transmitted to us” (ḥaddathan fūlān) or similar expressions. The transmitter should only say, “X said” (qāla fūlān), “From X” (ṭan fūlān) and the like. An illustration of that is the report we heard from ʿAlī b. Ḥashām in which he said, “We were with [Ṣufyān] b. ʿUwayna 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 Maʾmar from Zuhrī.’”

The second subcategory of misrepresentation is the misrepresentation of teachers (tadlis al-shaykh). 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 ʿAbū Bakr b. Mūḥammad al-Muqrīṣi to the effect that he related from ʿAbū Bakr ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Dāwūd al-Sijistānī, saying, “ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh transmitted to us.” He also related from ʿAbū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Naqqāṣī—the Qurʾān commentator—

1 The Ḥadīth expert ʿAbū ʾI-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Ḥashām al-Marwazi was born in 160/776 and died 268/881; Dhibabī, Siyār, 15:552–3.
2 ʿAbū Urwā Maʾmar b. ʿRāshid (96/714–154/770) was a early expert in Ḥadīth and Prophetic biography; Szegi, G.A.S. 1:390–91.
3 ʿAbū Bakr Aḥmad b. Mūsā b. ʿAbbās b. Mūḥammad al-Baghḍādi (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-Saḥfaḥ manāẓil al-qurrāʾ; Szegi, G.A.S. 1:14–5.
4 ʿAbū Bakr ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Dāwūd al-Sijistānī (230/844–316/929) was the son of ʿAbū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī, the compiler of the famous hadith collection Kitāb al-Sunan; Szegi, G.A.S. 1:374–5.
5 ʿAbū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Naqqāṣī (266/880–351/962) was a celebrated expert in the various recensions of the Qurʾān—Szegi, G.A.S. 1:446. According to the nisāb al-Khaṭṭīb al-Baghḍādi 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. Shuʿba was one of the most severe in condemnation of it. We heard from the imām Shāfiʿi that Shuʿba said, “Misrepresentation is the brother of falsehood.” We also heard that Shuʿba said, “I would rather commit adultery than misrepresentation.” Shuʿba’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 credits 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 (marshāli). The hadith he relates with an expression that clearly indicates cohesion – like “I heard” (saṃṭu), “He transmitted to us” (ḥaddathānā), “He informed us” (akbarānā) and similar ones – may be accepted and employed as a proof. There are very many hadith of this kind in the two Saḥīhs and other well-respected books, like the transmissions of Qatāda, al-Aʿmash, the two Sufyāns [that is, Sufyān al-Thawri and Sufyān b. Ḥuyayma], 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, Shāfiʿi (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-Khaṭṭīb. He did it often in his works. God knows best.

6 Abu ʿl-Khaṭṭīb Qatāda b. Diʿāma al-Sadūsī (60/679–118/736) was one of the most important early transmitters of hadith in al-Ṣaʿra; EI, 4:748; Sezgin, G. A. S., 1:31–2.
7 Abū Muʿāwiya Hushaym b. Bashir al-Suṣāmīt (104/722–183/799) was a famous Qurʾānic commentator from Baghdad; Sezgin, G. A. S., 1:38.
We heard that Yūnus b. 'Abd al-Aʿlā said, “Shafiʿi (God be pleased with him) said, ‘The anomalous hadith is not one which a single reliable transmitter and no one else relates. Rather, the anomalous hadith is one which a reliable transmitter relates and which is in conflict with what other people relate.”’ Abu Yaʿ ṣa al-Khalilī al-Qazwīnī related something similar to this from Shafiʿi (God bless him) and a number of the Hijazians. He said, “The view of the experts in hadith is that the anomalous hadith is one having only a single isnad which a single teacher, reliable or not, is ‘anomalous’ (yashidhahu) in transmitting. An anomalous hadith 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 ʿAbd Allah al-Ḥākim said that the anomalous hadith is one which a single reliable individual is alone in transmitting and which lacks a parallel version (ayī) in agreement with the version in the hands of the reliable transmitter. He said that the anomalous hadith differs from the defective hadith (muʿallal) in that a defective hadith contains a known defect indicating the location of the error in it and in the case of the anomalous hadith no defect in it is known in such a fashion.

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

1 Abu Mūsa Yūnus b. ʿAbd al-Aʿlā al-Ṣādaqī al-Miṣṣīt (170/787–264/877) was a famous student of the imām Shafiʿi; Dīlahbī, Sīyar, 12:348–51.
2 Abu Yaʿ ṣa al-Khalilī b. ʿAbd Allah al-Khalilī al-Qazwīnī (d. 446/1055) was one of the greatest hadith scholars of his day. His Kitab al-Iṣbaḥ fi muʿārifat ʿalāmāt al-ḥadīth (ed. Muḥammad Saʿdī b. ʿUmar Idrīsī, 3 vols., Riyadh, 1409/1990) has recently been published. He also wrote a Taʿrīkh Qazwīnī and a work on the Followers, both of which seem to be lost; Broeckelmann, G.L., 1:446, Suppl., 1:618.
3 Iṣbaḥād, 1:176.
4 Ulūm al-ḥadīth, 119.
5 Alqama b. Waqqas al-Ṭābiʿī was a poorly known Medinese transmitter of hadith who died around 75/694; Dīlahbī, Sīyar, 4:61–2.
6 Abu ʿAbd Allah Muḥammad b. Ibrahīm b. al-Ḥārith al-Taʿmī (d. ca. 120/738) was considered one of the great scholars of Medina; Dīlahbī, Sīyar, 5:294–6.
Ibrahim, according to what the scholars of hadith regard as correct. A clearer instance of an anomalous hadith than this is the hadith of ‘Abd Allah b. Dinar from Ibn ‘Umar to the effect that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) forbade the sale and gifting of clientship. ‘Abd Allah b. Dinar alone transmitted it. Another case is the hadith of Malik from Zuhri from Anas to the effect that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) entered Mecca with a helmet lining on his head. Malik was alone in transmitting it from Zuhri. All of these hadith are included in the two Sahihbs despite each having only a single isnad which a single reliable transmitter was alone in giving. There are more than a few similar cases of this in the book Gharib al-ṣaḥīḥ (Rare Sound Hadith). Indeed, Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj said, “Zuhri relates about ninety reports (ḥadīf) from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) which no one else transmits with good isnads.” 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 Ya‘lā [al-Khālidī] 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-mukhālif). 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.

We read that the expert Abū Bakr Ahmad b. Ḥarūn al-Bardījī wrote that the unfamiliar hadith 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 hadith, we find a blanket condemnation of the hadith isolated as rejected, unfamiliar or anomalous (išāq al-hukm ʿala ʿl-taffarrud bi-l-radd aw al-nakāra aw al-shudhūd).

The correct course in the matter is to make the distinction which we explained above, in the discussion of the anomalous hadith. On this subject we read: unfamiliar hadith fall into two subcategories, in accordance with what we said concerning the anomalous hadith, for "unfamiliar" means the same thing as "anomalous." An example of the first subcategory of the unfamiliar hadith — and it is the isolated hadith (munfarad) which contradicts what the reliable transmitters relate — is the relation of Mālik from Zuhri from 'Ali b. Ḥusayn from 'Umar 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, "'Umar b. ʿUthmān." Muslim — the author of the ʿSaḥīḥ — said in his Kitāb al-Tamyżīs (Book on Discrimination) that all of those who relate the hadith from the other students of Zuhri say, "'Amr 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 hadith used it as a synonym of general terms like daʿif and marzdū. 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 š̄uḍḥ; see the remarks of W. Marquès in his translation of Nawawī’s Taqřīb, 56, n. 3. There can be no doubt that the usage of later writers ultimately derived from the definitions of the munkar hadith provided by earlier scholars. However, where the earlier authors were describing the general characteristics of the broad class of hadith they found unacceptable, the later ones interpreted these descriptions as referring to one specific type of unsatisfactory hadith.

2 'Umar (Bukhari, al-Tariq al-kabir, 3[2]:178) and his brother 'Amr (Dhahabi, Siyār, 4:353) were best known for being transmitters from their father, the third caliph ʿUthmān b. Affān (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, Siyār, 2:496-507.

4 Muslim’s Kitāb al-Tamyżīs has not reached us wholly intact and I have not succeeded in locating this passage in either the edition of Muhammad Muṣṭafā al-ʿAṣamī (Riyadh, n.d.) or that of Muhammad Shubhī Ḥasan Hallaq (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 (jardi) 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 Yahyâ b. Mu'ayyad b. Qays from Hishâm b. 'Urwa from his father from 'Abd Allah b. 'Abd Allah b. 'Umar (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 Hishâm b. 'Urwa b. al-Zubayar (ca. 61/680–146/763) was a respected scholar of hadith and law; Sezgin, GAS, 1:88–9.
7 'Urwa b. al-Zubayar b. al-Awwâm (ca. 25/646–ca. 95/714) was considered one of the great jurists of the city of Medina; EFP, 4:1047; Sezgin, GAS, 1:278–9.
8 'Aisha (d. 58/678) was the daughter of the future caliph Abû Bakr and one of the favorite wives of the Prophet; EFP, 1:307–8.
Category 15

Analysis, Parallelisms and Attestations

(Ma'rifat al-'itibar wa-l-mutabaa'at wa-l-shawabid)

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

Ḥammad b. Salama relates an unparalleled hadith (hadith lam yatāba' salayhi) from Ayyūb [al-Sakhtiyān] 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 (aqīl) 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 hadith has an original version to which it goes back. If it is not found, the hadith does not have one.1

An example of parallelism would be that someone other than Ḥammad relates that very same hadith from Ayyūb. This is “complete parallelism” (al-mutabaa'a al-tammu'a). If no one but Ḥammad 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 hadith is not related at all from one of the aforementioned lines of transmission, but another hadith having the same meaning is related; that is an attestation without parallelism. If another hadith with the same meaning is not related, then the absolute uniqueness (al-itaflad al-matlaq) of the hadith is established. Hadith of this kind are divided into the rejected unfamiliar hadith (marada 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 Ḥammad b. Salama was alone in transmitting

---

1 Abū Salama Ḥammad b. Salama b. Dinār al-Baṣrī (d. 167/783) was one of the most famous transmitters of hadith of his age; Dḥalabī, Ṣiyār, 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 Dāraquṭnī and others have said about weak transmitters, “X, his transmissions may be taken into consideration” (fālān yuṭabaḥarū kīhi) 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 Suṭyān b. ʿUyayna from ʿAmr b. Dinār from ʿAṭāʾ b. Abī Rabāḥ from Ibn ʿAbbās 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 Jurayj related the ḥadith from ʿAmr from ʿAṭāʾ and he did not mention the tanning. The expert Aḥmad al-Bayhaqī gave a parallel version and attestation of the ḥadith of Ibn ʿUyayna. Usāma b. Zayd transmitted a parallel version from ʿAṭāʾ. Aḥmad al-Bayhaqī related with his isnād from Usāma from ʿAṭāʾ from Ibn ʿAbbās; 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-Bayhaqī gave as an attestation the ḥadith of “Abd al-Rahmān b. Waṭaʾ from Ibn ʿAbbās, “He said, ‘The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, “Any hide that is tanned becomes ritually clean.”’” God knows best.

---

3 ʿAbū Muhammad ʿAmr b. Dinār (ca. 46/666–126/743) was a legal expert in Mecca; Dhahabi, Sīyar, 5:300–7.
4 ʿAbī Khalīd (or Abu l-Walid) ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Jurayj (80/699–150/767 or 151) was one of the most prominent Hejazian scholars of hadith of his day; Sezgin, C.A.S., 1:91.
This is a sublime discipline which deserves careful attention. The authorities Abū Bakr b. Ziyād al-Nisābūrī, Abū Nuṣaym al-Jurjānī and Abu 'l-Walid al-Qurashi have been mentioned for their knowledge of the textual additions relevant to the study of law in certain hadith. According to what Abū 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. 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 above 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 (masāla 'l-ḥadīth) and others give it as loose (arsalāhā), 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 Abū Bakr 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Ziyād al-Nisābūrī (d. 324/936) was considered the greatest Shāfi‘ī jurist of his era in Iraq; Dihāḥabī, Siyyar, 15:65–6.
2 Abū Nuṣaym 'Abd al-Malik b. Muḥammad b. 'Adī al-Jurjānī was a Shāfi‘ī jurist who was born in 242/856 and died in 323/935; Dihāḥabī, Siyyar, 14:541–6.
3 Abu 'l-Walid Ḥassān b. Muḥammad al-Qurashi al-Nisābūrī (d. 349/960) was also a famous Shāfi‘ī jurist; Dihāḥabī, Siyyar, 15:492–6.
4 Kifṣaṣ, 421–5.
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 Mālik 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” (‘alā kull ḫurr aw ‘abd dhakar aw umaṭhā min al-muslimīn). Abū ʿIsā al-Tirmīdhi said that Mālik was alone among reliable transmitters in relating it with the addition of the words “of the Muslims.”6 Ubayd Allāh b. ʿUmar,7 Ayyūb [al-Sakhtiyānī] and others related this hadith from Nafi’ from Ibn Umar without this addition. More than one expert, including Shafi’i 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.” Abū Mālik Sa’d b. Ṭāriq al-Ashjā’ī 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-waṣīl ma’a ‘īrṣāl), 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 (ta’dīl). 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.8 God knows best.

7 Abū ʿUthmān Ubayd Allāh b. ʿUmar b. Ḥafṣ al-ʿUmarī (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.4S, 1:89.
8 Abū Mālik al-Ashjā’ī was a Kufan scholar of hadith who seems to be only poorly known. He took this particular transmission from the Follower Rihn b. Ḥirāsh (d. ca. 90/709); Dihābī, Sījar, 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 ḤADITH

(Maʾrīfat al-afrād)

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.¹ 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 Kūfans” or “the Khurāsānians” – “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 Başrans were alone in transmitting it from the Medinese,” or, “The Khurāsānians 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 Başrans were alone in transmitting it” – “from the Medinese,” or something like that, to a hadith that only a single Meccan – or a single Başran, 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.² [If this is the case,] the hadith is treated in the same fashion as those in the first subcategory. God knows best.

¹ Ullām al-hadīth, 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 Başrans from the Kūfans,” Nukṣūt, 2:707.
The scholars of hadith call this kind of hadith ma'rajil. They use that construction, as do the jurists in reference to the subject of legal analogy: "the cause and the effect" (al-ṣilla wa-l-ma'rajil). The specialists in the Arabic language and lexicography disapprove of the construction ma'rajil.

Be aware that the subject of the defects (ṣīla) 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 isnād made up of reliable transmitters which outwardly seems to fulfill 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 (insāl fi-l-maṣūl), or halting in a raised hadith (waqf fi 'l-marṣūl), or 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 isnād and it also appears with an interrupted isnād which is stronger [that is, better documented, and so forth] than the isnād 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 ʿAlī b. al-Madīn 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 isnād and sometimes it occurs in the text. Sometimes the defect occurring in the isnād impugns the soundness of both the isnād and the text, as is the case when the defect of looseness and halting is detected. Sometimes the defect in the isnād impugns only the soundness of the isnād without impugning
the soundness of the text. The hadith which the reliable transmitter Ya'la b. 'Ubayd related from Sufyan al-Thawri from 'Amr b. Dinâr from Ibn '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 'Abd Allâh b. Dinâr from Ibn 'Umar. The authoritative students of Sufyan al-Thawri 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 Šâhîh. 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 Quran] they used to begin with was the Fatiha 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 Kufan transmitter of hadith; Dâhâbi, Siyûr, 9:476–7.
2 Al-Jâmi' al-Šâhîh, 2:12 (K. al-Salât). The additional passage which Muslim supplies is “la yudhkurâna bismî 'llâh al-Râhîm al-Râhmân b. 'umâl qir'âna wa-la bi âkhârika.”
4 Fatiha is the name of the first sûra of the Quran. The second verse of the Fatiha is “Praise be to God, and so forth.” Reference to the second verse served to distinguish the Fatiha 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 scholar⁵ 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 (asnadaḥū). He even said that the “defective sound” (ṣaḥīḥ maʾlūḥ) is one of the subcategories of the sound hadith, just as someone else said that the “anomalous sound” (ṣaḥīḥ shāḥidh) is one of the forms of the sound hadith. God knows best.

⁵Iraqi in Tāqṣīm (p. 124) identified this individual as Abū Yaḥṣā al-Khalīlī, who in fact did these things in his Irshād, 1:157, 160 ff.
A disrupted hadith 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 hadith 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 hadith and sometimes in the isnad. Sometimes it comes from a single transmitter and sometimes it occurs among a number of its transmitters. Disruption makes a hadith weak, since it indicates that it was not accurately preserved. God knows best.

An example of this is the hadith we heard from Isma'il b. Umayya from Abū ʿAmr b. Muḥammad b. Ḥuraythah from his grandfather Ḥuraythah 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 Isma'il in that way. Sufyān al-Thawrī related it from Isma'il from Abū ʿAmr b. Ḥuraythah from his father from Abū Hurayra. Ḥumayd b. al-Aswad related it from Isma'il from Abū ʿAmr from Muḥammad b. Ḥuraythah b. Saʿlīm from his father from Abū Hurayra. Wuhaybī and ‘Abd al-Wāriṭhī related it from Isma'il from Abū ʿAmr b. Ḥuraythah from his grandfather Ḥuraythah. ʿAbd al-Razzāq said, “Ibn Jurayj” said, ‘Isma'il

---

1 Isma'il b. Umayya b. ʿAmr al-Qurashi (d. 139/756) was considered to be a reliable transmitter of hadith; Bukhārī, al-Tarīkh al-kabīr, 1(1):345–6; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Jārīḥ, 1(1):119.
2 I did not succeed in finding any information about this individual in the sources I consulted.
4 Abū Isma'il Bishr b. al-Mufaddal b. al-Raqīṣah was a prominent Baṣra transmitter who died in 186/802 at over eighty years of age; Dhaḥabi, Siyar, 9:36–9.
5 Abū Ghiyāth Rawḥ b. al-Qāsim al-Tamīmī al-Anbārī was a Baṣra transmitter who died around 150/767; Dhaḥabi, Siyar, 6:494.
7 Abū Bakr Wuhayb b. Khalīd b. ʿAjlān al-Karbītāt (d. 165/782) was a Baṣra hadith expert; Dhaḥabi, Siyar, 8:223–6.
8 Abū ʿUbayda ʿAbd al-Wāriṭh b. Saʿdīd al-Tamīmī (1027/721–180/796) was a well-regarded Baṣra hadith transmitter; Dhaḥabi, Siyar, 8:300–4.
9 Abū ʿl-Wald (or Abū Khalīd) ʿAbd al-Malīk b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Jurayjī (80/699–150/767) was a Meccan expert in hadith and law; Sezgin, G.45, 1:91.
heard ḥadīth from Hurayth b. ‘Ammar from Abū Hurayra.' This ḥadīth actually contains even more disruption than we have mentioned. God knows best.
Category 20

MATERIAL INTERPOLATED INTO ḤADĪTH

(Maʿrifat al-mudraj fi ʿl-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 ḥadīth itself. This happens because the Companion or someone later offered some of his own comments immediately after relating the ḥadīth 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 (taṣḥahhud) from Abū Khaythama Zuhayr b. Muʿāwiya1 from al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥurr2 from al-Qāsim b. Mukhaymir3 from ʿAlqama [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 ḥadīth 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-Raḥmān b. Thābit b. Thawbān4 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,5

1 Zuhayr b. Muʿāwiya al-Juʿfī (95/714–173/789) was a respected transmitter of ḥadīth; Dḥahabi, Siyār, 8:181–7.
2 Al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥurr (d. 133/751) was a wealthy Damascene scholar known for his piety; Dḥahabi, Siyār, 6:152–3.
3 Abū ʿUrwa al-Qāsim b. Mukhaymir al-Ḥamdāni al-Kūfī (d. ca. 100/719) was born in al-Kūfa and moved to Damascus; Dḥahabi, Siyār, 5:201–4.
4 Abū ʿAbd Allāh ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Thābit b. Thawbān al-ʿAnṣār al-Dīmashqī (ca. 80/699–165/782) was a Damascene transmitter of ḥadīth; Dḥahabi, Siyār, 7:313–14.
5 Abū ʿAbd Allāh Ḥusayn b. ʿAbil al-Walīd al-Juʿfī (119/737–203/819) was a transmitter famed for his piety; Dḥahabi, Siyār, 9:397–401.
Ibn ‘Ajlân’ and others concur in their relation from al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥurr on leaving out these remarks at the end of the ḥadith. There is also agreement on this from all of those who related the declaration of faith from ʿAlqama and others from Ibn Masʿūd. Shabāba 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 ḥadith 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 ḥadith of [Sufyân] b. ʿUyayna and Zaʿīda b. Qudâma from ʿĀṣim b. Kulayb, from his father from Wâ’il 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. Kulayb 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 Abî al-Jabbâr b. Wâ’il from one of the members of his family from Wâ’il b. Ḥujr.

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

An illustration of this is the relation of Saʿîd b. Abî Maryam from Malîk from Zuhri 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

---

6 The reliability of Abû ‘Abd Allâh Muḥammad b. ‘Ajlân al-Qarashi (ca. 75/694–148/765) was disputed; Dâhâhîbî, Sîyâr, 6:317–22.
7 Abû ʿAmr Shabâba b. Sawwâr al-Fâzârî (ca. 130/748–206/822) was a transmitter of ḥadîth who died in Mecca; Dâhâhîbî, Sîyâr, 9:513–16.
8 See also al-Ḥakîm al-Nisâbûrî, Ullâm al-ḥadîth, 39–40.
9 Abu ‘l-Ṣâlîf Zaʿīda b. Qudâma al-Thaqafî al-Kûfî (d. 161/777) was a ḥadîth scholar who died while campaigning against the Byzantines; Dâhâhîbî, Sîyâr, 7:375–8.
12 Abû Hunaydî Wâ’il b. Ḥujr b. Saʿîd was a Companion of the Prophet who settled in Iraq; Dâhâhîbî, Sîyâr, 2:572–4.
13 Abû al-Jabbâr b. Wâ’il b. Ḥujr is said to have transmitted from his father through the intermediary of his brother ʿAlqama; Bukhârî, al-Târîkh al-kabîr, 3(2):106–7; Ibn Abî Ḥâtim, Jarîh, 3(1):30–1.
14 Abû Muḥammad Saʿîd b. Abî Maryam al-Ḥakâm al-Mîṣrî (144/761–224/839) was considered one of the finest of the Egyptian transmitters of his era; Dâhâhîbî, Sîyâr, 10:327–30.
oppose one another and do not compete against one another..." Ibn Abi Maryam interpolated into it the words, "do not compete against one another," from the text of another hadith which Mālik related from Abū ʻl-Zinād from al-Aʻraj 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 al-Faṣl li-ʻl-waṣīl al-mudraj fi ʻl-naql (The Separation of Hadith Combined through Interpolation in the Course of Transmission)18 on this category of hadith, which adequately covers the subject. God knows best.

---

15 Abū Saʿīd ʻAbd al-Rahmān b. al-Mahdī (135/752–198/813) was a Basrān expert in hadith; Dhahabī, Siyār, 9:192–209.
16 Abū ʻAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Kathīr al-ʻAbdī al-ʻAṣrī appears to be only poorly known. He is said to have died in 223/838, at about the age of 90; Dhahabī, Siyār, 10:383–4.
17 Abū ʻAṣrāb Mansūrī b. al-Muṭṭamir al-Suḥrī (d. 132/750) was an important transmitter of hadith in al-Kufa; Dhahabī, Siyār, 5:402–12.
19 Abū Wāfi al-Ṣaḥtīq b. Saʿīdī al-Asadī (d. 82/701) was said to have been the greatest Kufan expert in the hadith of Ibn Masʻūd; Dhahabī, Siyār, 4:161–6.
20 Abū Maysara ʻAmr b. Shuraḥbīl al-Ḥamādānī was a respected transmitter of hadith who died around 70/679; Dhahabī, Siyār, 4:135–6.
Category 21
FORGED ḤADĪTH
(Maṭrīfat al-mawdūʿ)

The forged ḥadīth is the fabricated, made-up ḥadīth. Be aware that the forged ḥadīth is the worst kind of the weak ḥadīth. It is not permissible under any circumstance for someone who is aware that a ḥadīth is forged to relate it, unless coupled with a declaration that it is forged. This is different from the other kinds of weak ḥadīth — which may possibly be fundamentally truthful — in as much as it is permissible to transmit the other kinds of weak ḥadīth to instil virtue and inspire fear (al-taghrīb wa-l-turīḥ), as we will explain shortly, God (He is exalted) willing.

A ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth bear witness to the fact that they were forged. Indeed, the individual who in our time collected al-Mawdūʿīt ([Book of] Forged Ḥadīth) in roughly two volumes did this a lot and he included many ḥadīth without proof of their having been forged. He should have mentioned them only under the general designation of weak ḥadīth.

There are different types of forgers of ḥadīth. The greatest of them in terms of the harm they do are some of those considered to be ascetics who forge ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth resolutely took on the task of exposing the defectiveness of these ḥadīth and obliterating their disgrace. One of the things we heard from the authority Abū Bakr al-Samʿānī is that some of the Karrāmites held the doctrine that it was permissible to forge ḥadīth for the sake of instilling virtue and inspiring fear.

The forger sometimes made up the remarks himself and related them [as a ḥadīth] 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 one erred and unintentionally fell into something close to forgery, as happened to the

1 This appears to be another reference to Abu ʿI-Faraj b. al-Jawzd and his Kitāb al-Mawdūʿīt, see Ibn Ḥajar, Nukat, 2:847–8 and Laknawī, Ajwība, 164.
2 The scholar Abū Bakr Muḥammad al-Samʿānī (467/1074–510/1116) was the son of Abu ʿI-Muẓaffār Mansūr; Dhaḥabī, Siyar, 19:371–3.
3 The Karrāmites were a sect following the doctrines of Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Karrām (ca. 190/806–255/869) which enjoyed prominence in Iran until the Mongol invasion; EJ, 4:667–9.
ascetic Thabit b. Mūsā in the hadith, “The face of whoever prays much at night becomes beautiful in the day.”

Another example: We heard that Abū ʿĪsma – and he is Nuḥ b. Abī Maryam – was asked, “Where did you get the hadith from ʿIkrīma from Ibn ʿAbbās concerning the magical properties (fuṣūl) of each sūra of the Qurʾān?” He said, “I saw that the people had turned their backs on the Qurʾān and had come to occupy themselves with Abū Ḥanīfa’s legal doctrines and Muḥammad b. Ishaq’s stories of the Prophet’s campaigns, so I forged these hadith as a way to gain favor with God.” The same is true of the long hadith which is related from ʿUbayy b. Kaʿb from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) which describes the magical property of the Qurʾān sūra by sūra. 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 forgery is clearly upon it. The truth is that the commentator Wāhidī⁴ 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 Shārīk b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Nakhaʿi (95/713–177/794) uttered the words in question immediately after reciting a hadith and it was the Kūfī Abū ʿUmayr (or Abū Yazīd) Thābit b. Mūsā who mistakenly interpreted them as belonging to the Prophet; Kitāb al-Majrūḥān min al-muhaddithīn wa-l-ṣaṣṣāfīn wa-l-marrākin, ed. Māmūd Ibrāhīm Zayīd, 3 vols (Mecca, n.d.), I:207.

⁵ Abū ʿĪsma Nuḥ b. Abī Maryam al-Marwazi (d. 173/789) served as the qādi of Marw and was a severe critic of the Jahmites; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Ṭabīb, 4(1):484; Ibn Hibbān, Majrūḥān, 3:48–9; Dīḥāḥīt, Misāan al-faṣūlī, 4:279–80, see also 4:275–6, no. 9131; Ibn Ḥajār, Liṣān al-maḥān, 6:172–3, no. 609.

⁶ Abū ʿAbd Allāh ʿIkrīma b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Barbāt al-Madānī (d. ca.105/723) was a slave belonging to Abī ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbbās; Dīḥāḥīt, Sīyār, 5:12–36.

⁷ Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ishaq b. Yaṣīr (ca. 85/704–ca. 150/767) was the author of the most famous biography of the Prophet, commonly known as Kitāb Ibn Ishaq; El, 3:810–11; Sīrīn, G.A.S., 1:288–90.

⁸ ʿUbayy b. Kaʿb was one of the most famous Companions of the Prophet; Dīḥāḥīt, Sīyār, 1:389–402.

⁹ Abū ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAbd b. Abī Ṭābīb Muhammad al-Wāḥīdī (d. 468/1075) wrote a number of works of Qurʾānic exegesis; Brockelmann, G.II, 1:524; Suppl., 1:730–31.
Category 22
MIXED-UP ḤADITH
(Maʿrifat al-maqālāt)

An example of a mixed-up hadith would be, for instance, a hadith well known from Ṣālim which was made to be from Nāfiʿ so that it would thereby become rare and desirable. Similar to this is the account we heard of Bukhārī’s (God be pleased with him) arrival in Baghdad. Before his class some of the scholars of hadith met together and took one hundred hadith and mixed up their texts and isnāds. They attached the text of one isnād to the isnād of another and the isnād of that text to the text of another. Then they went to Bukhārī’s class and presented the hadith to him. When they finished presenting these mixed-up hadith to him, Bukhārī turned to them and restored each text to its proper isnād and each isnād to its text. They conceded his superiority.

An example of this—and it also serves as an example of a defective hadith (muʿallal)—is the hadith we heard from Ishāq b. ʿIsa [b.] al-Ṭabbaṭ. He said, Jarir b. Ḥāzim informed us from Thābit from Anas that he said, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, ‘When the second call to prayer is given, do not stand up until you see me.’” Ishāq b. ʿIsa said, “I went to Hammād b. Zayd and asked him about the hadith. He said, ‘Abu ʿl-Naḍr [Jarir b. Ḥāzim] was mistaken. We were all in the class of Thābit al-Bunāt and Ḥajāj b. Abī Uthmān was with us. Ḥajāj al-Ṣawwāf transmitted to us from Yāḥyā b. Abī Kathīr from ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī Qutada’ from his father that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, ‘When the second call to prayer is given, do not stand up until you see me.’ Abu ʿl-Naḍr—that is Jarir b. Ḥāzim—thought that it was one of the hadith Thābit related to us from Anas.’” God knows best.

2 Abu ʿl-Naḍr Jarir b. Ḥāzim al-Baṣrī (85/704-170/786) was an early historian and transmitter of hadith; Sezgin, G. A. S., 1:310-11.
3 Abī Muḥammad Thābit b. Aslam al-Bunātī was a Follower who died in al-Baṣra around 123/741; Dihābī, Sīyar, 5:220-5.
4 Abī Ismāʿīl Hammād b. Zayd b. Dīrham (d. 179/795) was one of the great hadith critics in al-Baṣra, Dihābī, Sīyar, 7:456-64.
5 Ḥajāj b. Abī Uthmān al-Ṣawwāf was a Baṣra transmitter who died in 143/760; Dihābī, Sīyar, 7:75.
6 Abī Naṣr Yāḥyā b. Abī Kathīr (d. 129/747) was considered one of the great hadith scholars of his age. His father’s ism was disputed; Dihābī, Sīyar, 6:27-31.
8 Abī Qutada al-Ḥārith b. Ribāh al-Salāmī was a Companion who died in 54/674 at the age of seventy, in either Medina or al-Kūf. His ism is alternately given as al-Nuṭmān or ‘Amr; Dihābī, Sīyar, 2:449-56.
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. Hanbāl (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.
Category 23

The Characteristic of Those Whose Transmission is Accepted and Those Whose Transmission is Rejected, and the Allied Subjects of Impugning and Discrediting, and Certifying and Accreditng

(Ma‘rifat šifat man tuqbalu riwayatuhū wa-man turaddu riwayatuhū wa-mā yata‘allaqu bi-dhālika min qadh wa-jarlī wa-tawthiq wa-ta‘dīl)

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 (ṣâdīl) and accurate (dâbîl) 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‘ānî), 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 (ṣâdīlā) 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 Shâfî and it is relied upon in the field of legal theory (uṣûl al-fiqh). The expert Abû Bakr al-Khaṭīb is one of the scholars of hadith who stated this. He cited1 as examples of this [exalted status] Mâlik, Shu‘ba, the two Sufyân [that is, Sufyân al-Thawrî and Sufyân b. ‘Uyaynah], Awzâ’î,2 al-Layth,3 Ibn al-Mubârak,4 Wâkit,5 Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Yahyâ b. Ma‘ṣîn, ʿAlî b. al-Madînî 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 Abû Amr ʿAbd al-Rahmân b. ʿAmr al-Awzâ’î (ca. 88/707–157/774) was an important early Syrian legal scholar; Sezgin, GAS, 1:516–17.
3 Abû ‘-Hârîth al-Latîh b. Sa’d al-Miṣrî al-Fâhmi (94/713–175/791) was an important Egyptian legal scholar; Sezgin, GAS, 1:520.
4 Abû ʿAbd al-Rahmân ʿAbd Allâh b. al-Mubârak al-Marwâzî al-Hanzâlî (118/736–181/797) played an important role in the development of Islamic mysticism; Sezgin, GAS, 1:95; EI, 1:184–5.
5 Abû Sufyân Wâkit b. al-Jarrâh (129/746–197/812) was a famous Kufîan scholar of hadith, Sezgin, GAS, 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 ḥadith 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 hadith 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 ḥadith, like Bukhārī, Muslim and others. For that reason, Bukhārī addeduced as proofs the hadith of a number of transmitters whom others had previously discredited, like ʿIkrima — the slave of Ibn ʿAbbas (God be pleased with them) — Ismāʿil b. ʿAbī Uways, ʿĀṣim b. ʿAli, (Amr b. Marzūq)

---

6 Tamhīd, 1:28, 59.
7 Some assert that the proper vocalization of this term is "thabīt," see, for example, Laknawi, al-Raḍī wa-l-taknīla fi ḥijrāt wa-l-taḍāl, ed. ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghudda (Aleppo, n.d.), 66.
9 Abū ʿAbd Allāh Ismāʿīl b. Abī Uways al-ʾAṣbāḥī (139/756–226/841) was a nephew of the imām Ṭalābī and a controversial transmitter of ḥadīth in Medina; Dīḥah, Sīyar, 10:391–5.
10 ʿĀṣim b. ʿĀlī b. ʿĀṣim (d. 221/836) was most famous for being a transmitter from Shurba b. al-Ḥajjāj; Dīḥah, Sīyar, 9:262–5.
11 Abū ʿUḍlāmān ʿAmr b. Marzūq al-ʾAṣbāḥī (ca. 130/747–224/839) was a prominent but controversial transmitter in al-ʾAṣbāḥī; Dīḥah, Sīyar, 10:417–20.
and others. Muslim cited as proofs the hadith of Suwayd b. Sa'īd and a number of others who were widely impugned. Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī 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-Khaṭṭīb 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 Shābīna 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. Ibrāhīm was asked about the hadith of al-Ṣāliḥ al-Murrī. He said, "What can be done with Šāliḥ? One day they mentioned his name to Ḥammād b. Salama and Ḥammād 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-jarrh 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 Šāfi'is 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

---

14 Abū 'Amr Muslim b. Ibrāhīm al-Azdī was an important transmitter of hadith who died in 222/836; Sezgin, G.A.S, 1:103.
15 Abū Bahr al-Ṣāliḥ b. Bashir al-Murrī (d. ca. 172/788) was a storyteller and preacher in al-Baṣra whose reliability was disputed; Dhahabi, 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-Khaṭīb⁶ 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,⁷ 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,⁸ the jurist Šayrāf (that is, Abū Bakr al-Shāfī')⁹ 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 I 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.”¹⁰ This is because of the reason we presented above. God knows best.

---

16 Ḫiya, 96–7.
17 The reference here is to the khabar al-wāhid, the hadith related at some point in its line of transmission by a single individual. As Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ 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 Ḫiya, 92, although the issue addressed there is not identical.
19 Ḫiya, 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 (masūr): 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. Ayyūb al-Rāzī.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-Fath Sulaym b. Ayyūb al-Rāzī (ca. 360/971–447/1055) was a well-traveled Shafiite scholar; Dhahabi, Sīyar, 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, 'Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī said, "In the view of the scholars of hadith 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 'Amr Dhū Murr, 22 Jābbār al-Tānī, 23 and Sa'd b. Dhi Huddān, 24 from whom only 'Abū Ishāq al-Sabīṭī transmitted; al-Haḍzhāz b. Mayzan, 25 from whom Sha'aib is the sole transmitter; and Jurāyī b. Kulayb, 26 from whom only Qatāda transmitted. In reality Sufyān al-Thawrī also transmitted from al-Haḍzhāz. Al-Khaṭīb went on, "Infrequently it does happen that the label of 'unknown' is lifted from a transmitter by two scholars famous in hadith transmitting from him. However, the verdict that he is upright is not established by their relation from him. 27 This is something which we explained above." (God knows best.) Bukhārī included in his Sahīh the hadith of a number of people from whom only one student related, including Mīrād b. al-Aslāmī, 28 from whom only Qays b. 'Abī Hāzīm 29 transmitted. Likewise, Muslim included the hadith of a number of people from whom only a single student transmitted, including Rabi'a b. Ka'b al-Aslāmī, 30 from whom only 'Abū Salāmā b. 'Abd 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. 31 God knows best.

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

27 Kifāya, 88.
28 Kifāya, 88–9.
29 See section seven.
31 'Abū 'Abd Allāh Qays b. Abī Hāzīm Ḥusayn b. 'Awf (d. ca. 98/717) was a Kifāan Follower of the Prophet whose transmissions were considered controversial; Dāhābī, Siyar, 4:198–202.
32 Abū Firas Rabi'a b. Ka'b al-Aslāmī was a Companion of the Prophet; Bukhārī, al-Tārīkh al-kabīr, 2(1):280; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Jarb, 1(2):472.
33 See section four.
his sectarian doctrine (bid'a). Some flatly reject his transmission, arguing that he becomes a wrongdoer (fasiq) 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 (da'īya) for his sectarian doctrine or not. Some scholars ascribed this view to Shafi'i on the basis of his statement, "Accept the testimony of sectarians (ahl al-ahwā), except the Shiites Khaṭṭābītes since they view as licit testifying falsely in favor of those who agree with them." 36

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 Shafi'i (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. Shafi'i said, "If he is a proselytizer, there is no disagreement among them that his transmission is not to be accepted." Abū ʿAbd al-Haqq b. ʿAbd al-Rahman b. ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Qazzāz – 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." 37 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 Sahihs, 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-muṣtaʿawwil wa-ghayr al-muṣtaʿawwil: 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”; Sakhawi, Fatḥ al-Maghīth, 1:303.

35. The Khaṭṭābītes were an extremist Shiite sect named after Abu ʿUbaydah bin ʿAbd Allāh al-Khaṭṭāb al-Asadi, who led an uprising against the ‘Abbāsid Caliph ʿAbd al-Razzaq in al-Kufa and was executed around the year 138/755. Little is known about the doctrines of the Khaṭṭābītes, although they seem to have continued as a religious movement for some time after the death of the founder, EF, 4:1132–3.

36. Kifayat, 120.

scholars, including Ahmad b. Ḥanbal and Abū Bakr al-Ḥumaydī, the teacher of Bukhārī. We found that the authority Abū Bakr [al-Shāfi‘ī] al-Ṣayrāfī made a general declaration in his commentary on Shāfi‘ī’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 Abu ʿl-Muqaffar al-Samā‘āl al-Marwazī said that all of the ḥadith which come from someone who lied in even a single report must be rejected. This is similar in sense to what Ṣayrāfī 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 ḥadith to the teacher and the teacher’s disavowal] are incompatible and the teacher who denies the ḥadith is the first-hand source. Thus it is necessary to reject the ḥadith of the second-hand source. This does not discredit the student in a fashion which necessitates the rejection of the rest of his ḥadith, because he also calls his teacher a liar in the matter of the disputed ḥadith. His teacher’s discreditation of him is not more worthy of being accepted than his discreditation of his teacher, so they both fall away.

If the teacher from whom the ḥadith 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 ḥadith scholars, legal scholars and speculative theologians, a teacher relating a ḥadith and then forgetting it does not constitute a reason not to act upon it. This is contrary to the view of some of the Ḥanafīes who hold that the ḥadith must be rejected because of that.

On this they base their rejection of the ḥadith of Sulaymān b. Mūsā from Zuhrī from ʿUrwa from ʿAṭīsha 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 Zuhrī and I asked him about this ḥadith and he did not know it.”

38 Abū Bakr ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubayr al-Ḥumaydī (d. 219/834) was an important transmitter of ḥadith: Sezgin, C.A.S, 1:101-2.
39 Sulaymān b. Mūsā al-Dīnashqī (d. 119/737) was a controversial transmitter of ḥadith; Dhahabī, Niṣār, 5:433-7.
Similar to this is the hadith of Rabî’ at-Ra’î from Suhayl b. Abî Ṣâliḥ from his father from Abû 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-‘Azîz b. Muḥammad al-Darâwîdî 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, “Rabî’ 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-Khaṭṭîb collected the instances of this in his book Akhâr man haddatha wa-nasiya (Stories of Those Who Transmitted and Forgot). Because a human being is susceptible to forgetfulness, some scholars – including Shâfi‘î (God be pleased with him) – disliked transmitting from living people. Shâfi‘î 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 Ḥaqq b. Ibrâhîm – that is, Ibn Râhawayh – 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 Abûṣâmîd b.

40 Rabî’ a b. Abû ‘Abd al-Rahmân Farîd al-Tayymi was an important early jurist in Medina and Iraq; Segîn, G.A.S., 1:406–7; Elîr, 1:356.
41 Abû Yazîd Suhayl b. Abî Ṣâliḥ al-Madâni was a prolific second/eighth-century transmitter, although there seem to have been doubts about the authenticity of his hadith; Dhabâbî, Siyar, 5:458–62.
42 The father of Suhayl was Abû Ṣâliḥ Dâkhânî b. ‘Abd Allâh al-Sâmmân al-Zayyat (d. 101/720), who was an important transmitter of hadith especially famed among his contemporaries for his long beard; Dhabâbî, Siyar, 5:36–7.
43 Abû Muhammad ‘Abd al-‘Azîz b. Muḥammad al-Darâwîdî (d. 187/803) was a highly respected Medînî transmitter; Dhabâbî, 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 Abû ‘Abd Allâh Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allâh b. ‘Abd al-Ḥakam (182/798–268/882), a student of Shâfi‘î and prominent Egyptian legal expert; Segîn, G.A.S., 1:474.
Hanbal and Abû Hâtim al-Râzî. Abû Nu’aym al-Fâdî b. Dukayn, Alî b. ‘Abd al-‘Azîz al-Mâkki and others were willing to make concessions in regard to taking compensation for teaching hadith; and that is analogous to the situation regarding taking money for teaching the Qur’ân and the like. However, traditionally teaching hadith 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 ‘l-Muzaффar transmitted to me from his father — the expert Abû Sa’d al-Samâ‘î in which Abu ‘l-Fâdî Muḥammad b. ‘Nâṣîr al-Salâmî said that Abu ‘l-‘Hasayn b. al-Naqâфф accepted money for teaching hadith because the teacher Abû Ishâq al-Shirrâzî had issued a legal opinion permitting him to do so because the scholars of hadith 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 hadith is not to be accepted. Examples are someone who is not bothered about sleeping in the audition sessions or someone who teaches hadith without a sound collated text. Also of this stripe are those who are known for accepting prompting in hadith. Furthermore, the relation of someone who has many anomalous

46 Abû Hâtim Muḥammad b. Idrîs al-Râzî (195/811–277/890) was one of the most respected critics of hadith of the third/ninth century. His pronouncements are preserved in the books of his son Ibn Abû Hâtim al-Râzî and many later works; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:153.
47 Abû Nu’aym al-Fâdî b. Dukayn al-Taymi (130/748–219/834) was an important transmitter of hadith; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:101.
50 Abî Sa’d Abî al-Karîm b. Abî Bakr Muḥammad b. Muṣṭâr (505/1111–562/1160) was the author of a number of extremely important works including al-Anâb (ed. ‘Abî Allah ‘Umar al-Bârî, 5 vols, Beirut, 1408/1988); Abî al-imâr wa-t-tâ’ât (ed. Max Weissweiler, Leiden, 1952) and a continuation of Al-Khaṭîb al-Baghdâdî’s Ta’tîrîkh Bağdâdî; Elîr, 8:1024–5.
51 Abu ‘l-Fâdî Muḥammad b. ‘Nâṣîr al-Salâmî al-Baghdâdî (467/1074–550/1155) started out as a Shâfi‘î and Ashâ‘îrî, but later became a Hanbalî. One of the most popular transmitters of his day, he taught hadith for free but charged a fee for poetry; Duhâbi, Siyâr, 20:265–71.
52 Abu ‘l-‘Hasayn Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. al-Naqâфф (381/991–470/1078) was alone in transmitting several desirable hadith works and therefore was in the position to charge his students for the service; Duhâbi, Siyâr, 18:372–4.
53 Abî Ishâq Ibrahim b. Alî b. Yusuf al-Shirrâzî (393/1003–476/1083) came to Baghdad in 415/1024 from his hometown of Fîrûţâbâd and became one of the most renowned Shâfi‘î jurists in the city; Duhâbi, Siyâr, 18:452–64.
54 Ta’ilqîn here refers to the practice ascribed to unscrupulous and usually unnamed students of tricking a teacher who could no longer remember which hadith 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 hadith 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-Mubārák, Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, [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 (dabāt), let it suffice that one find the documentation that he heard the text (ṣama'āsh), 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-sharī'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 ḥadīth and his hearing it is the continuous transmission of the ḥadīth 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 ‘Abd al-Ḥāfīẓ b. Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī 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’ (thiqāt) or ‘exact’ (mutaqin), his hadīth may be cited as proofs.” The same is true if he is called “trustworthy” (thabat) or a “proof” (ḥujja) and it is also the case if it is said about an upright transmitter (ṣādiq) that he is “retentive” (ḥafīz) or “accurate” (dāhib). God knows best.

(b). Ibn Abī Ḥātim said, “If it is said that a transmitter is ‘veracious’ (ṣadīq), ‘his station is veracity’ (maḥalluhū al-ṣidq) or ‘there is nothing wrong with him’ (la baṣṣa bihi), 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 hadīth 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 hadīth] to determine whether he is essentially absolutely accurate yet we desire to adduce one of his hadīth as a proof, we must – in the fashion described in Category 15 – analyze that very hadīth and see whether it has an original version (ṣafī) in the transmission of someone else.

It is well known that ‘Abd al-Ḥaṣmān b. Mahdī, the model in this matter, transmitted a hadīth and said, “Abū Khalda” 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 Shu‘bā and ʿUṣayn.” That is contrary to what came down from Ibn Abī Khaythama.47 He said, “I said to Yahyā b. Ma‘ṣn,

53 Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī (240/854–327/938) wrote a number of important works on hadīth and is best known for preserving the critical judgements of his father Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī and his other mentor Abū Zayr’s al-Rāzī; See, GAS, 1:178–9. The following discussion is adapted from Jarḥ, 1(1):37.
54 See the second section.
56 Abū Bakr Ahmad b. Zayr’s al-Nasqūt (185/801–279/892), known as Ibn Abī Khaythama, was an important scholar with a special interest in hadīth. Only a small portion of his famous Tawārikh seems to have survived; See, 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, Yahyā b. Maṣrīn ascribed it only to himself and it is contrary to what Ibn Abī Ḥātim said. God knows best.

(c). Ibn Abī 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 Abī Ḥātim said, “If it is said regarding a transmitter, ‘good in hadith’ (ṣaḥīḥ al-hadīth), his hadith may be recorded for analysis (li-ʾl-ʾṭibār).” It is reported that Abū Jaʿfar Ahmad b. Sinān” said, “Sometimes the hadith of a man who had some weakness but was veracious was brought up and ‘Abd al-Rahmān 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 Abī 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-Sahmī asked the authority Abū ʾl-Ḥasan al-Dāraquṭnī, “When you say ‘X is soft,’ what do you mean by it?’ He said, “He is not ‘fallen’ (ṣāqi) 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 Abī Ḥātim said, “When they say, ‘He is not strong’ (layṣa bi-qawṣ), that person is in the same position as the first in regard to the recording of his hadith; however, he is inferior.”

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

(d). Ibn Abī Ḥātim said, “When they say, ‘abandoned in hadith,’ ‘wasted in hadith’ (dhāhib al-hadīth) or ‘liar’ (kadhūb); 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.””

59 The hadith of Abū Jaʿfar Ahmad b. Sinān al-Wāṣītī al-Qāṭānī (d. 256/870) were cited by a number of scholars of the next generation; Dhababī, Siyar, 12:244–6.


61 Kifāya, 22.
Abū Bakr b. ʿAbd al-Muʿtām al-Ṣāḥib al-Furāwī informed us through recitation to him in Nishapur. Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl al-Fārisī informed us: the expert Abū Bakr Ahmad b. al-Husayn al-Bayhaqī informed us: Abū l-Ḥusayn b. al-Fadlī informed us: ʿAbd Allāh b. Jaʿfarī informed us: Yaʿqūb b. Sufyānī told us, he said: I heard Ahmad b. ʿAlī say, “A transmitter’s hadith 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 hadith.”

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 hadith” (maqārib al-hadīth), “X is disturbed in regard to hadith” (muqārib al-hadīth), “X is not cited as an authority” (la yuḥtajju bihi), “X is unknown” (majjāh), “X is nothing” (lā shayʾ), “X is not approved” (layṣa bi-dhāk). Sometimes it is said, “He is not so strong” (layṣa bi-dhākā l-qawṣ), “There is a weakness in X” or “in the hadith of X,” – and this expression is less serious in discreditation than saying, “X is weak in hadith,” – 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 Abī Ḥātim who transmitted a number of important books. He had three imāmas, all of which Ibn Abī Ḥātim uses in the course of this work, Dḥabaḥt, Siyār, 21:494–6.
63 Abu l-Maʿṣūm Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl al-Fārisī (448/1056–539/1144) was a prominent student of Bayhaqī, Dḥabaḥt, Siyār, 20:93.
64 Abu l-Ḥusayn Muḥammad b. al-Husayn b. Muḥammad b. al-Fadl al-Qaṣṭānī (335/947–415/1024) was primarily known for having transmitted Yaʿqūb b. Sufyān’s Taʾrikh from ʿAbd Allāh b. Jaʿfar, Dḥabaḥt, Siyār, 17:331–2.
65 Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh b. Jaʿfar b. Durustawayh al-Fārisī (258/872–347/958) was an early grammarian who worked extensively in hadith; EJ, 3:758; Seqīn, G.Å.Ś., 8:106–8, 9:96–8.
67 Abu Jaʿfar Ahmad b. ʿAlī al-Mṣīḥī (170/787–248/862) was a controversial transmitter of hadith; Dḥabaḥt, Siyār, 12:160–77.
Category 24

The Methods of Hearing and Receiving Hadith, and the Manner of Registering These
(Ma'rifat kayf liyat sama' al-hadith wa-tahammulihi wa-sifat dabihi)

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, Ibn 'Abbás, ['Urwā] b. al-Zubayr, al-Nu'mān b. Bashīr2 and 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. Abū 'Abd Allah al-Zubayr3 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 Qur'ān and his religious duties.” It is reported that Sufyān al-Thawrī said, “A man who wants to study hadith should first serve God twenty years.” Mūsā b. Ishaq was asked, “How is it that you did not write hadith from Abū Nu‘aym [al-Fadl b. Dukayn]?” He said, “The Kufans did not send their young sons to study hadith until they completed their twentieth year.” Mūsā b. Ḥārūn4 said, “The Banū

---

1 Al-Hasan b. 'Aḥṭ (3/625–49/669) was the beloved grandson of the Prophet. His father was the third caliph 'Ali and the Prophet's daughter Fāṭima. He posed a threat to the Umayyad caliph Mu'awiya until he was persuaded to renounce his claims. He died in Medina; EF 3:240–43.
2 Abū 'Abd Allāh (or Abū Muhammad) al-Nu'mān b. Bashīr b. Sa'd al-Khazrajī was born around the time of the Prophet's emigration to Medina and served as a governor under the Umayyads. He died late in 64/684; Dhababī, Siyar, 3:411–12.
3 Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Zubayr b. Ahmad b. Sulaymān al-Zubayrī (d. 317/929) was a blind Shafiite who wrote a number of works on legal topics; Szczeliniec, QAŚ, 1:495.
4 Abū Bakr Mūsā b. Ishaq (ca. 200/815–297/909) was a Shafiite scholar who served as a judge in Nishapur and al-Ahwaz; Dhababī, Siyar, 13:579–81.
5 Abū 'Imān Mūsā b. Ḥārūn al-Ḥammād (214/829–294/907) was considered one of the greatest experts in hadith of his era; Dhababī, Siyar, 12:116–19.
write ḥadith at ten years of age, the Kūfans 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 ḥadith as soon as his audition becomes valid. Children may [later] occupy themselves with writing, acquiring, registering and recording ḥadith 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 ḥadith. We have heard that Mūsā b. Ḥarūn al-Ḥamnāl – one of the great experts and critics of ḥadith – was asked, “When should a boy hear ḥadith?” 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 ḥadith?” 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-Asadī informed me from Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Ashārī that the expert al-Qāḍī ʿIyād b. Mūsā al-Sabīt al-Yaḥṣībī said, “For the audition of ḥadith, the experts have set as the youngest age that of Maḥmūd b. al-ʿRabīʾ,” and he quoted with Bukhārī’s isnād the relation Bukhārī included in his Šabīth under the heading “When Does the Audition of a Child Become Valid?” from Maḥmūd b. al-ʿRabīʾ: “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 ḥadith has settled. They write for a boy five and over, “He heard” (ṣamāʿa) and for someone who has not yet reached five, “He attended” (ḥadāra) or “He was brought” (uḥdāra). In this

6 Ibn al-Uṣūdī (534/1139-623/1226) was an Aleppan Shafiʿite who heard ḥadith from many of the prominent transmitters of the day; Dhahabi, Siyār, 22:303-4.
7 Ashīrī (d. 561/1166) was a Mālikite expert in ḥadith from North Africa; Dhahabi, Siyār, 20:466-7.
8 Al-Qāḍī ʿIyād (476/1083-544/1149) was one of the most prominent scholars of his era in ḥadith and law. His book al-Ḥimṣ was one of the principal sources Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ consulted in the composition of the Maqaddima; Brockelmann, GAL, 1:455-6, Suppl., 1:630-2; EF, 4:289-90.
9 The Companion Abū Muḥammad (or “Abū Nuṣaym”) Maḥmūd b. al-ʿRabīʾ al-Khazzārī (d. ca. 99/718) seems to have been best known for his role in the incident described here; Dhahabi, Siyār, 3:519-20.
11 Ḥimṣ, 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 Ibrahim b. Sa'id al-Jawhari12 said, “I saw a boy of four years – and he had been brought to the caliph al-Ma'mun13 – 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 Abu Muhammed 'Abd Allah b. Muhammad al-Isbahani14 said, “I learned the Qur'an when I was five years old. I was brought to Abu Bakr b. al-Muqri15 to hear hadith from him when I was four [sic] and one of those in attendance said, ‘Do not credit him with the audition (la tasmii 'ala) of what is recited, for he is too young.’ Ibn al-Muqri15 said to me, ‘Recite Sūrat al-Kāfīrin,’ and I recited it. Then he said, ‘Recite Sūrat al-Takwir,’ and I recited it. Then someone else said to me, ‘Recite Sūrat al-Mursalat,’ and I recited it without an error. Ibn al-Muqri15 said, ‘Grant him audition. The responsibility is mine.’”

The hadith of Mahmūd b. al-Rabi14 indicates the validity of the audition of a five-year-old like Mahmūd 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 Mahmūd (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-samā' min lafiq al-shaykh): this may be subcategorized into dictation (inmā') 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 Abu Ishāq Ibrahim b. Sa'id al-Jawhari al-Baghdadi (d. ca. 250/864) is best known for the muqadd ascribed to him; Dha'hab, Siyar, 12:149–51.
13 Al-Ma'mūn was the son of Harūn al-Rashid and the seventh 'Abbāsid caliph. He ruled from 198/813 until 211/827; EI, 6:331–9.
14 This seems to be a reference to Ibn al-Labban, a respected scholar who died in Isfahan in 446/1054; Dha'hab, Siyar, 17:653–4.
15 Abu Bakr Muhammad b. Ibrahim b. 'Ali b. Ḍā'im b. Zadham b. al-Muqri (285/898–381/991) was a scholar of hadith who, it is surprising to note, served as the librarian of al-Sāhīb b. Ḍā'im; Dha'hab, Siyar, 16:398–402.
One of the things we hear from al-Qaṭīfī Ţuyd b. Mūsā al-Sabtī - a well-informed modern scholar - is the statement: "There is no dispute in reference to this form of taking up hadith it is permissible for the student who heard the teacher to say, 'He transmitted to us' (ḥaddathānā), 'He informed us' (akbaranā), 'He told us' (anba'anā), 'I heard X saying' (samātu ṣulānan yagālu), 'X said to us' (qāla lānā ṣulān) and 'X mentioned to us' (dhakara lānā ṣulān)." 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-Khaṭib 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 hadith received through licensing or correspondence (abādith al-iżāra wa-l-mukātubā), or for the misrepresentation (tadīs) of hadith one did not actually hear."

Actually, some of the scholars of hadith did use to say, "He transmitted to us," for material licensed to them. It is related that al-Ḥasan 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 hadith from him. God knows best.


16 Ḥadd, 69.
17 Kifāya, 284.
18 Abū Saʿūd al-Ḥasan b. Abī l-Ḥasan Yuzdar al-Baṣrī (21/642-110/728) was a renowned preacher and one of the most significant early transmitters of hadith; Sezgin, E.P., 3:415; Sezgin, GAS, 1:591-4.
19 Like most of this discussion, this passage seems to have been taken from al-Khaṭib's Kifāya (p. 284) but there it concludes, "This is interpreted to mean that Abū Hurayra transmitted to the people of al-Ṭār 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 Khalid Yazid b. Ḥārūn (118/736-206/821) was a Quran commentator from Wasi; Sezgin, GAS, 1:40.
21 Abū ʿUthmān ʿAbd b. ʿAwn b. Aws al-Sulami (d. 225/840) was a well-respected transmitter of hadith; Dihabiti, Sīyar, 10:450-1.
22 Abū Zakariya Yahyā b. Yahyā b. Bukayr al-Tamīmī al-Nṣābūrī (142/759-226/840) was a prominent expert in hadith; Dihabiti, Sīyar, 10:512-19.
Ishāq b. Rāhawayh, Abū Masʿūd Ahmad b. al-Furāt al-Rāzi,23 Muhammad b. Ayyūb al-Rāzi24 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, “Abd al-Razzāq used to say, ‘He informed us,’ until Ahmad b. Ḥanbal and Ishāq b. Rāhawayh came and said to him, ‘Say, ‘He transmitted to us.’’” So for everything I [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-Baghdādī also stated27 that the expert Muhammad b. Abī ʿl-ʿFawāris28 said, “Hushaym, Yazīd b. Ḥārūn and ‘Abd 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” (anbaʿanā) and “He communicated to us” (nabbaʿanā) — both of which are rarely used [for material heard from the speech of the teacher29] — come after “He informed us.”

“He 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 ʿBakr al-Barqānī (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 Abu ʿl-Qāsim ʿAbd Allah b. Ibrahim al-Jurjānī al-Abāndūnī.30 Barqānī told him that Abu ʿl-Qāsim, for all his reliability and righteousness, was restrictive in regard to relating hadith. Barqānī used to sit where Abu 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 Abī Masʿūd Ahmad b. al-Furāt al-Rāzi (ca. 180/796–258/872) was a well-traveled scholar of hadith who settled in Isfahan; Dāhibi, Siyar, 12:480–88.
24 Ibn al-Durays (200/816–294/906) was a scholar of hadith who wrote the book Fadāil al-Qurān; Sargin, G.A.S, 1:42.
25 Kisāʾ, 286.
26 Abī ʿAbd Allah Muhammad b. Rāfīʿ al-Qurayshī (ca. 170/786–245/860) was an important scholar of hadith; Dāhibi, Siyar, 12:214–18.
27 Kisāʾ, 286.
30 Abāndūnī (274/887–368/978) was a prominent transmitter in his day; Dāhibi, Siyar, 16:261–3.
Barqānī says, "I heard," and not "He transmitted to us" or "He informed us," because Abu 'l-Qāsim's intention was to transmit only to the person inside with him.

"X said to us" (qāla lanā fulān) or "X mentioned to us" (dhakara lanā fulān) are like "X transmitted to us." However, they are appropriate for the hadith the transmitter heard from someone in a study session (mudhakara) and are more suitable for this than "He transmitted to us." In the discussion of "suspension" (ta'til) 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 (munāṣarat). 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 iṣnād 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.

Hajjāj b. Muḥammad al-A'warī 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 Abū Bakr al-Khaṭḥīb 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-qirā'a 'ala 'l-shaykh) is the second means of taking and receiving hadith. Most of the transmitters of hadith call it “presentation” (ʿarḍ) since the reciter “presents” the hadith he recites to the teacher, just as the reciter “presents” the Qurān to the Qurān 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 Abū Muhammad Hajjāj al-A'warī (d. 206/821) to be the best student of Ibn Jurayj; Dhahabi, Siyar, 9:447–50.
33 Kifāya, 289.
or superior. Abu Hanifa, Ibn Abi Dhūbi 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-Kufa, the doctrine of Mālik, 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" (qurā'tu 'alā fulān wa qurā' 'alā fulān wa-anā asma'u fa-aqarrab 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" (ḥadhāthānā fulān qirā'atan 'alayhi), "He informed us by means of recitation to him" (akhbāranā qirā'atan 'alayhi) or something similar. In the same way, "He declaimed to us by means of recitation to him" (ansḥādanā qirā'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 ḥadīth forbid both of them. It is said that this was the doctrine of Ibn al-Mubārak, Yahyā b. Yahyā al-Tamimī, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Nasāʾī 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 possibility 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, Ṣufyān b. ʿUyayna, Yahyā b. Saʿd al-Qaṭṭān as well as other ancient authorities; and it was the doctrine of Bukhārī – the author of the Sahih – 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 Shafiʿī and his followers. It is also transmitted from Muslim – the author of the Sahih – and many of the scholars of the east. The author of Kitāb al-Injāf (The Book of

34 Abu ʿl-Hārith Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. al-Mughīrah al-Qurashi (80/699–139/776) was an early scholar famed for his asceticism and piety; Dīhāḥāt, Siyar, 7:139–49.
35 Abu Saʿd Yahyā b. Saʿd al-Qaṭṭān al-Tamimī (120/738–198/813) was one of the greatest critics of hadith; Dīhāḥāt, Siyar, 9:175–88.
"the Fair View), Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Tamṭīr al-Jawharī al-Miṣrī,\textsuperscript{36} said, “This is the doctrine of the countless majority of the scholars of hadith. They made ‘I informed us’ a symbol occupying the place of the statement, ‘I recited it to him: he did not utter it to me.’ Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Nasrī,\textsuperscript{37} 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 Wahb\textsuperscript{38} in Egypt. This is refuted by the fact that this is also said of Ibn Jurayj and Awza'ī [who were earlier] – Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb related it about them – unless what is meant is that Ibn Wahb 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 Abū Bakr al-Barqānī related\textsuperscript{39} to the effect that Abū Ḥātim Muḥammad b. Ya'aqūb al-Harawi\textsuperscript{40} – one of the chief scholars of hadith in Khurāsān – was reciting the Sahīh of Bukhārī to a teacher from Farābī\textsuperscript{41} and for each hadith he said to his teacher, “Farābī transmitted to you.” When he completed the book, he heard his teacher say that he had heard the book from Farābī by means of recitation to him. So Abū Ḥātim repeated the recitation of the entire book and he said to his teacher for all of it, “Farābī informed you.” God knows best.

\textit{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

\textsuperscript{36} I have not succeeded in identifying this individual.

\textsuperscript{37} Abū Muḥammad ʻAbd Allah b. Wahb al-Miṣrī (125/743–197/812) was a prominent early Egyptian scholar \textit{EP} 3.963; \textit{Sezgin, G.4S}, 1:466.

\textsuperscript{38} Al-Khaṭīb al-Ǧahānī, \textit{Kīfiyyu}, 303–4.

\textsuperscript{39} I have not been able to identify this individual.

\textsuperscript{40} The long-lived Abū ʻAbd Allah Muḥammad b. Yūsūf al-Farābī (231/845–320/932) was the most prominent transmitter of Bukhārī’s \textit{Saḥīh} of his generation; \textit{Dhahabi, 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 Zahirites and others have imposed the condition that the teacher must verbally assent to it. The Shafiite jurists Abu Ishaq al-Shirazi, Abu ‘l-Fadhl Sulaym al-Razi and Abu Naṣr b. al-Šabbagh⁴¹ stated this unequivocally. Abu 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’ (qarātu ‘alayhi aw qarī‘a ‘alayhi wa-huwa yasa‘ā‘a).” In contrast, it is related from some writers that one of the Zahirites 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 Abu ‘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 Abu Naṣr ‘Abd al-Sayyid b. Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Wāhid (400/1009–477/1084), known as Ibn al-Šabbagh, was, with Abu Ishaq al-Shirazi, one of the most prominent Shafiite scholars in fifth-/eleventh-century Baghdad, Dhatab, Siyar, 18:464–5.
⁴² Ulūm al-hadith, 260.
similar to that from ʿAbd Allāh b. Wahb, 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 ʿAlī b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Madīnī stated from his teacher, the authority Yahyā b. Saʿīd al-Qāṭṭān, 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 Ahmad 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-Qāṭṭān.

Making this distinction [between “me” and “us”] on the principle of [Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥakīm] is desirable but not mandatory. Al-Khaṭīb related this view from all of the scholars of hadith. Thus, it is permissible for the student, when he hears hadith 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 hadith 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 Ahmad 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 hadith 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. This

43 Kīfīya, 294.
44 Kīfīya, 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-Khaṭīb 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 Ibn al-Habīb, the expert Abū Ahmad b. ‘Adī;' the professor Abū Isḥāq al-Isfahānī – the expert in practical and theoretical law – and others rejected it. We heard that Abū Bakr Ahmad b. Isḥāq al-Ṣibghī – one of the authorities of the Shāfi‘ites in Khurāsān – was asked about the student who writes during audition. He said, “He should say, ‘I attended’ (ḥadāṣtu), and not, ‘He transmitted to us,’ or, ‘He informed us.’” It is reported that Mūṣa b. Ḥarūn al-Ḥammāl permitted copying during the audition and that Abū Ḥānim al-Rāzī said, “I wrote in ʿArīm’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 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 (muṣammīf).

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 l-Ḥasan al-Dāraqūṭī. In his youth, he attended the class of Ḫasan al-Ṣaffār. He sat copying a volume in his possession while Ḫasan was

45 This may refer to Kifāya, 309-10.
46 Abū Isḥāq Ibn al-Habīb b. Isḥāq b. Bashṭr al-Ḥabīb (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 (gharīb al-hadīth); Dihābī, Siyar, 13:356-72.
48 Abū Isḥāq Ibn al-Habīb b. Muḥammad b. Ibn al-Habīb (d. 418/1027) was one of the most prominent scholars of his era; Dihābī, Siyar, 17:353-5.
49 Ṣibghī (258/872-342/953) combined expertise in law and hadith; Dihābī, Siyar, 15:483-9.
50 ʿArīm (ca. 140/757-224/839), whose real name was Abū ʿl-Nuṣrān Muḥammad b. al-Ḥāfiẓ al-Sadūq, was a prominent transmitter of hadith whom Abū Ḥājin al-Rāzī studied with in 214/829; Dihābī, Siyar, 10:265-70.
51 Abū l-Ḥasan al-Ṣaffār (247/861-341/952) was a transmitter of hadith also known for his knowledge of the Arabic language; Dihābī, Siyar, 15:440-1.
dictating. One of those in attendance said to him, “Your audition is not valid while you copy.” Daraqušṭǎn replied, “My comprehension of the dictation is different from yours.” Then Daraqušṭǎn said to the man, “Do you recall how many hadith the teacher has dictated until now?” He said no. Daraqušṭǎn said, “He has dictated eighteen,” and the hadith were counted and found to be as he said. Then Daraqušṭǎn said, “The first hadith 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 hadith 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” (ṣama`a) is to be applied to all of it. When he grants his written authorization (khattāf) 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. Ablʿ ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAţṭabā 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 missed is restored to him by the licensing.” What we have mentioned is an excellent solution. Indeed, we heard that Ṣaḥīb 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. Sālim al-Mukharrimī5 said, “I heard Ibn ʿUyayna saying, ‘Amr b. Dīnār to us’ (nāʿ ʿAmr ibn Dīnār), meaning “Amr b. Dīnār transmitted to us’ (haddathānā); however he

52 Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-ʿRahmān b. Ablʿ ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. ʿAţṭab al-Quṭubah (432/1041–520/1126) was one of the great hadith transmitters of al-Andalus; Dhabah, Sīyar, 19:514–15.
53 Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. ʿAţṭab b. Muḥsin (383/994–462/1069) was an expert in a number of disciplines; Dhabah, Sīyar, 18:328–30.
54 Abū ʿAlī Fāḍil Ṣaḥīb (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, GAS, 1:510.
55 Abū Muḥammad Khalaf b. Sālim al-Mukharrimī al-Baghdadī (d.231/846) was considered to be an expert in hadith; Dhabah, Sīyar, 11:148–50.
limited himself to the *nūn* and *alif* of *ḥaddathānā*. 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 *ḥaddathānā* – and they were *ḥaddātha* – on account of the great crowd.’”

The crowds in the classes of many of the greatest transmitters of *ḥadīth* used to be very large, sometimes reaching thousands and thousands. Repetitors (*mustaqlīb*) conveyed the *ḥadīth* from the teachers to the crowds so the students actually wrote the *ḥadīth* 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 dictator [without mentioning the intervening repetitor]. We heard that al-A‘mash (God be pleased with him) said, “We were attending the class of Ibrāhim [al-Nakha‘ī] and the teaching circle became very large. Many times he related a *ḥadīth* and those at a distance from him could not hear it, so they asked one another what he had said. Then they related these *ḥadīth* [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 ‘Isām, what is your opinion?” He said, “Ask those around you.” We also heard that the repetitor Abū Muslim said to Ibn ‘Uayym, “Many of the people cannot hear the *ḥadīth*.” He said, “Can you hear them?” He said yes and Ibn ‘Uayym replied, “Then make them hear them.”

Others rejected that. We heard that Khalaf b. Tamīm said, “I heard about ten thousand *ḥadīth* 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 Zā‘īda and he said to me, ‘Transmit from these *ḥadīth* only what you have preserved with your heart and heard with your own ears.’ So I cast them away.” We also heard that Abū Nu‘aym [al-Pudl b. Dukayn] felt it necessary to transmit from his fellow students the *ḥadīth* 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 represents an extreme lack of rigor. Indeed, we heard that the expert Abū ‘Abd Allāh b. Manda al-Iṣbahānī said to one of his students, “X, for you smelling a *ḥadīth* 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 Abū al-Ghanī b. Sa‘īd from the expert Ḥanẓa b. Muhammad⁵⁰

---

⁵⁸ Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ seems to have in mind here the views of Ibrāhim al-Nakha‘ī 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.
⁵⁹ Abū Muḥammad Abū al-Ghanī b. Sa‘īd al-Aṣūlī al-Misrī (332/944-409/1018) appears to have been a very important figure in the history of *ḥadīth* scholarship, although none of his surviving works have been published yet; Sezgin, *G.A.S.*, 1:223-5.
⁶⁰ Abū Muḥammad Ḥanẓa b. Muḥammad al-Kīmānī (275/888-357/968) was a scholar of *ḥadīth* born in Egypt; Sezgin, *G.A.S.*, 1:192-3.
— with his isnād — that ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Mahdī said, “Smelling a hadith is enough for you.” ʿAbd al-Ghani said, “ʿAmza said to us, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān 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 hadith personally, his 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 hadith from ʿĀʾisha 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 ʿAbd al-Ghani b. Saʿīd cited as proof of the permissibility of this practice the statement of the Prophet (Peace be upon him), “Bīlāl will call out at night, so eat and drink until Ibn Umm Maktūm calls out.”

61 “ʿAbd al-Ghani also related, with his isnād, that Shurba 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 Saʿīd b. ʿAlīyak al-Nisabūrī

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 Dḥāḥāḥāḥ, Siyār, 1:360–3 – and Bīlāl 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 Rāmāḍān when Muslims are permitted to eat and drink only between the evening and the dawn prayer. Suyūṭī (Tadhkīr al-nārī, 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 (Nakat, 2:679) 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 Sakhāḥ points out, it would have made slightly better sense if Shurba had said “voice” (ṣāḥa) here rather than “shape” (ṣīra), Fath al-Mughith, 2:52.

64 Abū Saʿīd (or Abū Saʿīd) ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. al-Ḥusayn (or al-Ḥasan) b. ʿAlīyak al-Nisabūrī was a hadith collector who died in 431/1039 at an advanced age; Dḥāḥāḥāḥ, 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 (fihrisī)” — “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-Bāṭī 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,”214 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 Shafi’i (God be pleased with him) on that topic. It was related that his disciple al-Rabi’ b. Sulaymān65 said, “Shafi’i did not use to allow licensing for hadith, and I disagree with Shafi’i on that.” A number of other Shafi’ites, including the judges Ḥusayn b. Muhammad al-Marwārī66 and Abu ‘l-Ḥasan al-Māwardi,67 regarded licensing as invalid. Māwardi stated as much unequivocally in his al-Ḥawī and traced it back to the doctrine of Shafi’i.

65 Fihris, fihras, thahat 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. Fathara.
66 Sulayman b. Khalaf b. Sa’id (403/1013–474/1081) was a renowned Andalusian scholar who wrote works in a number of disciplines, including hadith and law; Dhabahat, *Siyar*, 18:535–45.
68 Abu Muhammad al-Rabi’ b. Sulaymān al-Murādī (ca. 174/790–270/884) was one of the pupils of Shafi’i most responsible for preserving his teachings; Dhabahat, *Siyar*, 12:587–91.
69 Abu ‘Ali Ḥusayn b. Muhammad al-Marwārī (d. 462/1069) was one of the great Shafi’ite scholars of Khurṣinda; Dhabahat, *Siyar*, 18:260–2.
70 The career of Abu ‘l-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. Muhammad b. Iḥāb al-Māwārdī (364/974–450/1058) reached its apogee when he was appointed the chief judge of Baghdad. Among his works on Shafi’ite law is *Kitāb al-Aṣkām al-sulṭaniyya*, a seminal work on public law; Dhabahat, *Siyar*, 18:64–7.
Both of them said, “If licensing were licit, traveling to collect hadith would become pointless.” This expression is also related from Shu’ba and others. The authority Ibrāhīm b. ʿIshaq al-Ḥarbi, Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-ʿIṣbahānī72 — nicknamed “Abū ʿI-Shaykh” — and the expert Abū Naṣr al-Waʿṣī al-Sijzi were among the scholars of hadith 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-Khujandī73 — one of the Shafīʿites who regarded licensing as invalid — related from Abū Ṭāhir al-Dabbāsī74 — one of the authorities of the Ḥanafites. 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 hadith 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 (tafsīlan). 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 Zāḥirites and the others who have followed them who held that it is not necessary to act upon it, and that a hadith transmitted this way is the same as a loose hadith (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 Abū ʿI-Shaykh (274/887–369/979) was one of the greatest scholars of hadith of the fourth/tenth century; Segin, G.A.S, 1:200–1.
73 Abū Ṭāhir Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Sufyan al-Dabbāsī (d. ca. 340/951) was one of the most prominent Ḥanafites in Iraq; Luknawī, Futūḥ, 187.
74 See p. 103.
75 See Sakhāt, Fath al-Muqaddith, 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. 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 Abu Bakr al-Khaṭīb was one of those who permitted every form of it. 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-Khaṭīb related, the judge Abu l-Ṭayyib al-Ṭabarî⁵⁴ – one of the expert jurists – permitted the licensing of all Muslims alive at the time the act of licensing takes place. Abū Muḥammad b. Saʿīd⁵⁶ – one of the greatest of the teachers of al-Andalus – licensed every student of hadith who entered Cordova. A number of scholars, including Abū ʾAbd Allāh b. ʿAttāb (God be pleased with them), concurred with him in permitting that. Someone who asked Abū Bakr al-Ḥāzimī⁵⁷ about this form of global licensing (al-ijāza al-ṣimma) told me that one of things he said in reply was that the experts of his time, like the expert Abu l-Ṭārīf and others, leaned towards permitting it. (God knows best.) We have not seen nor heard of anyone who is

⁵⁶ Bi-sharṭī: 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” (ḥart al-ijāza) to be discussed below; Sakhāwī, Fatḥ al-Muğīb, 2:66 (and repeated in Zakariyyā’ al-Ashtar, Fatḥ al-Ṭāriqī, 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.”


⁵⁸ Abu l-Ṭayyib Tahir b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ṭabarī (348/959–450/1058) was an important Shāfī’ī jurist; EF, 10:15–16; Sezgin, GAS, 1:502; EIr, 1:390.

⁵⁹ Ijāza, 80.

⁶⁰ Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh b. Saʿīd al-Shanṭājlī al-Qurṭubī was a respected transmitter of hadith who spent a number of years in Mecca. He died in Cordova in 436/1045; Ibn Bashkawal, Kitāb al-Ṣila, 2 vols (Cairo, 1966), 1:271–3.

⁶¹ Abu Bakr Muhammad b. Mūsā b. ʿUthmān al-Ḥāzimī (548/1153–581/1185) was a Shāfī’ī who settled in Baghdad. He specialized in hadith and his most famous works may be Kitāb al-Nāṣīḥ wa-l-mansūk and Shurūṭ al-dīnma; Dhahabi, Siyar, 21:167–72.

⁶² Abu l-Ṭārīf al-Hasan b. Ahmad b. al-Hasan al-Hamadhānī (488/1095–569/1173) was an expert in hadith and in several other religious sciences; Dhahabi, Siyar, 21:40–7.
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 (majhūl) 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 (ism) and lineage (nasab) and the one being licensed is not specified. Or the teacher says, "I hereby license X to relate from me Kitāb 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 hadith 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 1-Ṭayyib al-Ṭabari al-Shafīʾi gave a legal opinion to that effect, when the expert al-Khaṭṭīb 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-Khaṭṭīb related that Abū Yaʿqūb b. al-Farrāʾ al-Ḥanbalī 84 and Abū ʿl-Ṭābī b. ʿUmrūs al-Mālikī 85 permitted this form of licensing.
and these three were leaders of their respective schools at that time in Baghdad.\footnote{Iṣāṣa, 82.} 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 Shāfīites 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-Fath Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Āzdī al-Mawṣīlī:\footnote{Abu ‘l-Fath Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Āzdī al-Mawṣīlī (d. 374/985) wrote works on a number of aspects of the study of hadith; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:199–200.} “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 (maḍīm), 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 Shāfīīes permit the second kind and not the first in the establishment of a charitable trust (waqf). The Mālikīes and Ḥanafīes – or at least some of them – permit both kinds in a charitable trust. Abū Bakr b. Abī Dāwūd al-Sijistānī
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-Khaṭṭīb deemed it permissible to license a yet-to-be-born individual in the first instance without any link to a living person. He said that he heard Abū Ya’l b. al-Farrā’ al-Ḥanbālī and Abu ‘l-‘Aḍīl b. Umar al-Malikī permitting that.

The jurist Abū Naṣr b. al-Ṣabbāḥ 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 (iḥsin) to transmit and not an instance of face-to-face communication (muḥāḍatha).”

Al-Khaṭṭīb al-Baghdādī then explained the argument for invalidating this kind of licensing, and this was the view his teacher, the judge and authority Abu ‘l-Ṭayyib al-Ṭabartī, settled on. 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-Khaṭṭīb said, “I asked the judge Abu ‘l-Ṭayyib al-Ṭabartī 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.’” Al-Khaṭṭīb 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
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anyone who was not yet born. 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 Ḥyād 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 l-Walid Yūnus b. Mughithi — 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!' " Ḥyād 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" (ajazī laka mā saḥāba wa-yasīrhu 'indaka mīn musnīrati), it is not like the above case. Indeed, Dāraquṭnī 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
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says 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 Amr al-Sağqūst95 said, "I heard the expert Abū Nu‘aym al-Iṣkhānī96 say, 'Licensing on the basis of licensing is effective and permissible.'" The expert al-Khaṭīb related that the ḥadīth expert and authority Abū 'l-Ḥasan al-Dāraqqūmī, the expert Abū 'l-ʿAbbās - known as Ibn Uqda al-Kūfī97 - and others permitted it.98 The jurist and ascetic Naṣr b. Iбраhīm al-Maqdīsī99 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 Nu‘aym Ahmad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Iṣkhānī (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, Dīkhr abkār Iṣbahān (ed. S. Dedering, 2 vols, Leiden, 1931), and his work on the most prominent Sufis, Ḥīyāt al-aʿwāyīb wa-sābaqātī al-aṣīfyāb (Cairo, 1351/1932-1357/1938), Ep, 1:142-3; Ef, 1:354-5.
97 Abū ʿl-ʿAbbās Ahmad b. Muhammad b. Saʿd b. ʿUqda al-Kūfī (249/863-333/944) was a ḥadīth expert famous for his Shiʿite leanings; Sezgin, G-AS, 1:182.
98 Kyūy, 349-50.
99 Naṣr b. Ibrahīm al-Maqdīsī al-Nabulusī (before 410/1019-490/1096) was a very prominent Shafiʿite who ended his career in Damascus; Dhaḥabi, Ṣiyār, 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-Hasan Aḥmad b. Fāris100 (God bless him) said, “The meaning of ‘licensing’ (ījāza) in the speech of the early Arabs is derived from ‘the giving of a quantity of water’ (jawāz al-mā’), 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 (istajaztu) 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” (ajazatu fulānan masmū‘ātī aw maruwyātī), 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” (ajazatu li-fulānin riwayata masmū‘ātī). Some advocates of this view nevertheless say, “I hereby license to him everything I heard” (ajazatu lahū masmū‘ātī). 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. Bakr al-Mālikī101 related such a view from Mālik (God be pleased with him). The expert Abū 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 iṣnād.”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 Ḥāmiʿ bayān al-ʿilm wa-fadilīhī, ed. ʿAbd al-Karim 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 ḥadith. 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 ḥadith 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 ḥadith 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 ḥadith 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’a) 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 ḥadith.

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, Rabiʿat al-Raʿy, Yahyā b. Saʿīd al-Anṣārī and the imām Mālik b. Anas; some Mecceans, including Muhājir, Abū ʿl-Zubayr [al-Makkī] and Ibn ʿUyayna; some Kufans, including ʿAlqama [b. Qays] al-Nakhaʿī, ʿIbrahīm al-Nakhaʿī and Shaḥbī; a group of Basrans, including Qatāda, Abū ʿl-Ṣālihī and Abū ʿl-Mutawakkil al-Nāḥī; a number of Egyptians, including Ibn

103 Abū ʿl-Ṣālihī Rufayl b. Mihrān al-Riyābī converted to Islam in the caliphate of Abū 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 ʿAh b. Dīwūd al-Nāḥī was an obscure transmitter who died in 102/720; Dhahabi, Siyar, 5:8–9.
 Wahb, Ibn al-Qasim, and Ashhab, and others in Syria and Khurāsān. Al-Ḥākim also saw that a number of his own teachers subscribed to that view. 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, Awzā‘i, Buwayti, Muzant, Abū Ḥanifa, Sufyān al-Thawrī, Ahmad b. Hanbal, Ibn al-Mubārak, Yahyā b. Yahyā and Ishaq b. Rahawayh advocated that opinion. We observed our authorities adhering and subscribing to it, and we do too.” 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 hadith 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 hadith 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

---
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[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 audition,” 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 (pīlam) 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” (ḥaddāthānā) and “He informed us” (akhkharanā) 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 audition. 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 audition. When I say, ‘He informed us,’ without further qualification, it is an instance of licensing, even if I do not say, ‘by licensing’ (ijāzātān), ‘by writing’ (kitābātān), ‘he wrote to me’ (kataba ṣlayyā), or, ‘he granted me permission to transmit from him’ (adhina li fī l-rīwāya ʿanhu).” The historian Abū Ubayd Allāh
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al-Marzubānī112 – 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-Khatib, 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” (munawalatan wa-iżāzatan), “He informed us by license,” “He informed us by transference,” “He informed us by granting permission (idhna’),” “Under his grant of permission is” (fi idhnihi), “One of the things he granted me permission for is” (fīma adhina li fihi), or “One of the things which he gave me leave to transmit from him is” (fīma ațlaqa li riwāyatāhū šāhī). Or he should say, “X licensed to me” (ājāza li fulān), “X licensed me such and such” (ājāzāni fulān kadā wa-kadā), “X transferred to me” (nāwālāni 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 kitābihi) – 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 Awzāḥ designated licensing by saying, “He apprised us” (khabbaranā) and he designated recitation to him by saying, “He informed us.” Many modern scholars have adopted the convention of applying “He told us” (anba’āna) without further qualification to licensing, and that is the preference of al-Walid b. Bakr – the author of al-Wajāz fi [rajuz] al-iżāza (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-Bayhaqi inclined toward this when he used to say, “X told me by licensing” (anba’āni fulān iżāzatan), 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’tazilite scholar from Baghdad who composed a vast number of books on historical and literary subjects; Breckmann, G.A.L, Suppl. 1: 190; E.F, 6:634–5.
best.) We heard that the expert Abū ‘Amr Muhammad b. Abū Bakr Ahmad b. Hamdān al-Nisabūrī 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 ‘Amr b. Abī Ja‘far b. Hamdān al-Nisabūrī said, “I heard my father saying, ‘Whenever Bukhārī 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” (῾an). So when one 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 ‘Amr Muhammad b. Abī Ja‘far Ahmad b. Hamdān al-Nisabūrī (283/896–376/987) was a famous hadith transmitter from Nishapur who was also renowned as an expert in the Arabic language; Sogin, GĀS, 1:204.
115 Sakhāwī, Fath al-Mağāriṣ, 2:120.
tu 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” (ajazatu laka mā katabtabī laka) – or “the material I sent to you” (mā katabtu bihi ilayka), 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. Saʿd, 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 Shāfiʿites subscribed to that opinion and one of them, Abu ʿl-Muṣṭafār 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 Shāfiʿites, the judge Māwardī 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 (katabtu ilayya fulān).” 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. Saʿd 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” (mukātabatun) – 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 (fīlām 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 Shafi‘ite Abu Naṣr b. al-Ṣabbagh stated it unequivocally and preferred it. Abu ʿI-ʾAbbas al-Walid b. Bakr al-Ghamri al-Maliki supported him in his book al-Wajaza fi tajwiz al-jaza. The judge Abū Muḥammad b. Khallād al-Ramahurmuzī116 – the author of the book al-Fāṣil bayn al-rāwī wa-ʾI-ʾawāqī – 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 Shafi‘ite teacher Abū Ḥamīd al-Ṭūsī118 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 Abū Muhammad al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Khallād al-Ramahurmuzī (d. ca. 360/970) was a judge in Khuzestân who was an expert in hadith and literature. His most famous work, al-Mukaddith al-ḥāsil, is generally considered to be the first comprehensive work written in the genre of usul al-hadith; Scezín, GAS, 1:193–4.

117 Mukaddith al-ḥāsil, 452.

118 Abū Ḥamīd Muhammad b. Muḥammad al-Ṭūsī, better known as Ghazâlî, was born in Tus in 450/1058. An outstanding career led him to the Nizâmîya in Baghdad in 484/1091. Four years later in the midst of a spiritual crisis he resigned his post and became a mystic. In 490/1100 he returned to teaching, taking a post at the Niṣāmîya in Nishapur. He died in Tus in 505/1111; Brockelmann, GAL, 1:533–46, 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 isnaād 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 (wajīda), 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,” 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 (wajīda).

Wajīda, the verbal noun of wajada – wajidu, is a neologism unknown to the early Arabs. We heard from al-Muṣṭafī b. Zakariya b. al-Nahrawānī119 – the great expert in a number of sciences – that later writers coined the word wajīda for reference to the knowledge taken from a written source (ṣahifa) 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 wajīda; when they said, “He found the thing he was seeking,” the verbal noun is wujād; for anger, the verbal noun is maṣwīda; for wealth, wujād; and for love, wajīd.”

119 Al-Qādi ‘Iyād does this in Ilmā’, 115.
120 Abu ‘l-Faraj al-Muṣṭafī b. Zakariya b. al-Nahrawānī (305/917–390/1000) was a Baghdadi judge. He was the most prominent exponent of the legal doctrines of Ṭabart of his time; Sezgin, G.A.S, 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 (waqadtu) 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” (munqafī) and “loose” (mursal), however it is tainted 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, “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” (balaghami ‘an fulān), “I found from X” (waqadtu ‘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. ʿIraqī, ʿAbd al-ʿAbd al-ʿIraqī al-Iṣābāʿuwa-Māʾṣūmah, ed. Muhammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-ʿIraqī al-Iṣābāʿu, 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 Maliki that most of the Maliki 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-Fârîṣî informed us. He said, The expert Abû Bakr al-Bayhaqî informed us. He said, Abû 'l-Husayn b. Bishrân⁸ informed us. He said, Abû 'Amr b. al-Sammâk⁹ informed us. He said, Hanbal b. Ishâq⁹ transmitted to us. He said, Sulaymân b. Ahmad¹⁰ transmitted to us. He said, al-Wâlîd – that is, Ibn Muslim¹² – transmitted to us. He said, “Awzâ'î 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 hadîth has disappeared and Muslims have come to agree unanimously on allowing and permitting it. If the hadîth had not been recorded in books, they would have become obliterated in later ages. God knows best.

Those who write and collect hadîth are under an obligation to focus their efforts on recording clearly the transmitted material they write down – or obtain in the handwriting of someone else – 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 ‘Ali b. İbrahim al-Bağdâdî in his book Simât al-khâṣṣ wa-raqûmûkhîb¹¹ (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:

---

⁹ Abû 'Amr 'Uthmân b. Ahmad b. 'Abd Allah al-Dauqîqî (d. 344/955), known as Ibn al-Sammâk, was a hadîth scholar in Baghdad; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:188–9.
¹¹ Abû Muhammad Sulaymân b. Ahmad al-Dimashqî was a respected transmitter of hadîth who could count a number of very distinguished scholars as his students. Late in his life he moved to Wâṣîr and slid into a life of dissipation; Bukhârî, al-Târîkh al-kabîr, 2(2):3; Ibn Abî Hâtim, Jârîh, 4 (1):101.
¹² Abû 'l-Abdâs al-Wâlîd b. Muslim al-Umawî (119/737–195/810) lived in Damascus and was an expert in the hadîth of the Syrians; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:293.
¹³ I have not succeeded in identifying this individual. His book is described in Hâjjî Khalîfî, Kasîf, 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 sheet 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 ‘Umar 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 Sakhawi 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-Maghthth, 2:149.


16 Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṭayyab al-Dinawarī (213/828–276/889) was a polymath who made important contributions to a number of disciplines; EF, 3:844–7; Sezgin, GAS, 8:161–5.
analogous unpointed letters. So they place points under rā, sād, ṭā, wāy and the other unpointed letters like them. One of the practitioners of this said that the points under the unpointed sīn 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 ḫā, and do the same under the dāl, ṭā, sād, sīn, 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 a sign for some of it. God knows best.

7. The student should place a circle between two ḥadīth to separate and distinguish them. We read that Abu 'l-Zīnād, Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Ibrāhīm b. Ishāq al-Ḥarbī and Muḥammad b. Jarīr al-Ṭabarī10 (God be pleased with them) were among the authorities who did that. The expert al-Khaṭīb [al-Baghdādī] recommended that the circles be hollow. When he collated the text, he put a dot in the circle that followed each ḥadīth 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 “Abū 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 “ʿAbd al-Rahmān, 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 ḥadīth; ET, 10:11–15; Sezgin, G.A.S, 1:323–8.
18 Jāma', 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 (Allahu salla 'llāhu ta'ālā 'alayhi wa-ālihi 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 great 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” (azza wa-jalla), “He is blessed and exalted” (tabaraka wa-ta‘ālā) 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-Khaṭīb 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 ʿAlī b. al-Madini and ʿAbbās b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīm al-ʿAnbarī54 said, ‘We never gave up invoking the blessing on the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) in every ḥadīth we heard. Sometimes we were in a hurry and we would then leave spaces for the invocations in each ḥadīth in the book, so we could go back later to write them in.’”55 God knows best.

54 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 blasphemous 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.

55 Abu ʿAbd Allāh Ṣaʿīd b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīm al-ʿAnbarī (d. 246/860) was a hadith expert from al- Başra; Dhahabi, Siyūr, 12:302-3.

56 jam‘, 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-Fatha or Abū Bakr] Mansūr b. 'Abd al-Mun'im and Umm al-Mu'ayyad bint Abī 'l-Qāsim,22 through my recitation to them. They said, We heard Abu 'l-Barakāt 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Furāwī23 verbally say, I heard the Qurān reciter Zārīf b. Muḥammad24 saying, I heard the expert ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Ishāq25 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 samāʻihi) and the book of his teacher (aṣl shaykhīhi) which he is actually relating from him, even in the case of licensing. We heard that Urwa b. al-Zubayr (God be pleased with them) asked his son Hishām, “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 Shāfi‘ī and Yahyā 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-Akhfashī26 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-Mu'ayyad Zaynab bint Abī 'l-Qāsim 'Abd al-Rahmān (d. 615/1218) was transmitter of hadith in Nishapur who was sought out by her contemporaries; Dhahabi, Siyār, 22:85-6.
23 Abū 'l-Barākāt 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Furāwī was the grandfather of Ibn al-'Arabī's teacher Mansūr b. 'Abd al-Mun'im. He was a respected transmitter and died of starvation and exposure in 549/1155 during the attack of the Ghuzz on Nishapur; Dhahabi, Siyār, 20:227-8.
24 Abū 'l-Ḥasan Zārīf b. Muḥammad al-'Arī was a scholar of hadith from Nishapur who died in 517/1124 at the age of eighty-eight; Dhahabi, Siyār, 19:375-6.
25 This appears to be Abū 'l-Ḥasan 'Abd Allāh (or 'Ubayd Allāh) b. Muḥammad b. Ishāq (d. 462/1070), the son of Abd 'Abd Allāh b. Manda; EI, 3:863; Dhahabi, Siyār, 18:355.
26 This al-Akhfash (literally, “dim-eyes”) appears to have been Abū 'Abd Allāh Abīmad b. 'Imrān b. Salama (d. ca. 260/874), a grammarian, lexicographer and poet from Syria; Sezgin, G.A.S., 8:241.
that procedure brings together from the two sides [that is, the student’s eyes and his ears27]. 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 Yāḥyā b. Mā'īn 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 (furū') 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 ʿIṣḥāq 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-Khaṭṭāb 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; Dāhābī, Siyār, 14:538–40. The second is said to have died in 413/1023; Dāhābī, Siyār, 17:384–6.
it, he must make clear that he did not collate it. He related that his teacher Abu Bakr al-Barqani asked Abu Bakr al-Isma’ili, “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-Khaṭṭāb said, “This is the doctrine of Abu Bakr al-Barqanī. 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” (laḥaqq)—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” (ra’ā) 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 Abu Muhammad b. Khallād—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 *Kifḥya*, 239.
30 Although *ṣaḥḥa* would appear to be the logical antecedent here, the text requires a grammatically feminine form.
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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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-Qāḍī `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” (\textit{dabba}) or the one indicating that the word is correct (\textit{taṣṣīh})\textsuperscript{34} is sometimes placed over it.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{32} \textit{Muhaddith al-ṣiqāl}, 606–7.
\textsuperscript{33} Arabic is written from right to left.
\textsuperscript{34} For these signs, see the next section.
\textsuperscript{35} \textit{Ilmā'}, 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” (tasbiḥ), “latching” (taṣbih) and “marking as faulty” (tamrid). “Marking
as correct” consists of writing “It is correct” (ṣahha) 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 (musahhaʃ)
[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 ʃad, 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
ṣad of the word ʃahha with an extension rather than the ʃa. 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” (naqis) 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 dabbha [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-Qasim Ibrâhim
b. Muhammad – known as Ibn al-‘Ilîl37 – that this is because the word

36 For an instance of this which found its way into a printed text, see Sakhâwî, Fatîh al-Mughîṭh,
3:13, l. 19.
37 Ibn al-‘Ilîl (352/963–441/1050) combined expertise in grammar and lexicography with
a broad knowledge of poetry and rhetoric. Qiftî, Iḥâk al-nawâ’i ʿils anâba al-nubâh, ed.
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” (irslāl) or “interruption” (naṣṣa') 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 “wa” (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 (darb), scratching out (ḥakk), erasure or some other way. Striking out is superior to scratching out and erasing. We heard that the judge Abū Muḥammad b. Khallād (God bless him) said, “Our colleagues say, ‘Scratching out is an accusation.’”80 Someone informed me that al-Qāḍī ʿIyād said, “I heard our teacher Abū Bahr Sufyān b. al-Qāṣī al-Asadr81 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.”82

80 Šāhāwī defines “μαφα'” 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; Fisāḥ al-Mughāth, 2:180.

81 Mahadīth al-fāsıl, 606.

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

83 ʿInār, 170.
There is disagreement over the best method of striking out. We heard that Abu Muhammad b. Khallâd 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-Qâdi ʿIyâd 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” (shâqq). 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” (ṣif), as the arithmeticians do. Occasionally some scholars wrote “no” (lâ) at the beginning of the passage to be deleted and “until” (ilâ) 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 Abu Muhammad b. Khallâd al-Râmahurî (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-Qâdi ʿIyâd 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-fāṣil,* 606.
43 *Ilim,* 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 ʿAlmaṭi’s *al-Muʿād fi adab al-muṣlîm wa-l-must ❁ al Muscle, which amplifies many of the points discussed in this Category.
45 *Muḥaddith al-fāṣil,* 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.⁴⁷ There are various ways to do it. One of the strangest — although it is the safest — is what is related from Ṣahḥān b. Sa‘īd al-Tanukhi⁴⁸ — the Mālikite authority — to the effect that he sometimes wrote something and then licked it off. What we heard about ʿĪbrāhīm al-Nakhāṭ (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 Abū Dharr al-Harawī⁴⁹ and the Westerner Abū ʾl-Ḥasan al-Qābisi did that, as did many other early teachers and recorders of hadith. When there is an addition

⁴⁶ Kaḥḍt, according to Sakhḥāt, is “scrapping the paper with a knife or something similar;” Fush al-Mughith, 2:180.
⁴⁷ This is somewhat oddly phrased since “scrapping” has not been mentioned until now. Ibn al-Salāḥ may have regarded kaḥḍt as a synonym of ḫkṣk.
⁴⁹ Abū Dharr ʿAbd b. ʿAbd al-Muḥammad al-Harawī (ca. 355/966–434/1043) was a Mālikite in law and a conservative Ashʿarite in theology. He composed a number of works on hadith; 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 akhbarānā (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, thā, nūn, alif; and sometimes only the pronoun is written; that is, nūn and alif. For akhbarānā, the aforementioned pronoun is written with an initial alif. It is not good the way certain scholars write akhbarānā 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 ṭāʾ is written after the alif in the symbol for akhbarānā and a dāl at the beginning of the symbol for ḥaddāthānā. The expert Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥakim, Abū ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Sulamī, and the expert Ahmad al-Bayhaqī (God be pleased with them) are some of those 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 ḥāʾ; that is, an unpointed, unconnected letter ḥāʾ. 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-Ṣābūnī, the expert Abū Muslim ʿUmar b. ʿAlī al-Laythī al-Bukhārī and the jurist and hadith scholar Abū Saʿd al-Khālīfī (God bless them) the word saḥḥa (it is sound) unambiguously written in

50 Written without pointing, the thā-nūn-alif of ḥaddāthānā is identical to the ṭāʾ-nūn-alif of this abbreviation of akhbarānā. Sayyīdī (Ṭadhib al-rāsīt, 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 ankhānā or an abbreviation of it.

51 Abū ʿAbd al-Rahmān 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-Ṣūfiyya (ed. J. Pedersen, Leiden, 1960); EF, 9:811–12; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:671–74.

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

53 Abū Muslim ʿUmar b. ʿAlī al-Laythī al-Bukhārī (d. 466/1074 or 468) composed a work entitled Mawād al-Saḥīhān; Dhabḥab, Siyār, 18:407–9.

place of the ḥāʾ, and this suggests that the ḥāʾ is an abbreviation of saḥḥa. It is good to place saḥḥa here so that no one mistakenly believes the hadith 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 Khurasan related to me from an Isfahani 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 hadith scholar I had met that the unpointed ḥāʾ represents the word al-hadith. 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-hadith.’” He told me that he had heard a Baghdadi 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-Ruhāwī55 (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-hadith or the other words. He was not acquainted with anything else from any of his teachers and they included a number of the hadith 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 plaidonymic (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 (ismf) where he 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

55 Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Qādir b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ruhāwī (536/1142–612/1215) was one of the greatest hadith transmitters in the region of the Jazira during his lifetime; Dihabat, Siyar, 22:71–5.

56 Siyar, 133.
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-Mu'azzar, the son of the expert Abū Sa'd al-Maráwaz [al-Samāṭa] - transmitted to me in Marv from his father from an inhabitant of Isfahan who transmitted to him that in Baghdad 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Abī 'Abd Allah b. Mandaī recited a ḥadith monograph to Abū Ahmad al-Farāḍī 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-Faradī,' 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 (muthābit al-samāt) 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 (nadl samātīhi) 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 ghulul of books!" Someone asked him, "What is 'the ghulul 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 ḥadith taḥkīy or something to that effect and signing his name; see Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Munajjid, "Iṣāṣat al-samāt fi l-mukkhaṣṣat 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-Munajjid terms Ḥażāfat al-samāt is more properly called samāt, tasīf or tabaqa.
58 Abu 'l-Qāsim ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Muḥammad b. Manda (381/991-470/1078), the brother of Abu 'l-Ḥasan ʿAbd Allah, was a controversial expert in hadith and the author of a number of books; ʿEF, 3:863-4.
59 Abū Ahmad ʿUbayd Allah b. Muḥammad al-Farāḍī al-Muqri was a hadith transmitter who died in 406/1016 at more than eighty years of age; Dāhahib, Siyār, 17:212-14.
60 Abū ʿAlī al-Fudayl b. Qyād al-Tamīmī (105/723-187/802) was born in Samarqand, studied in al-Kūf and died while resident in Mecca. Although a respected transmitter of hadith, he is best remembered for his great piety; Sezgin, C.A.S., 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, Hāfṣ 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 Khallad 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.'" 62 The expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭṭāb related that the judge Ismaʿīl b. Ishaq 63 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." 64

Hāfṣ 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 Shāfiʿīites. Ismaʿīl b. Ishaq is the spokesman of the Ḍālīkites 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 Muḥammad al-Ṭabar, 589.
64 Jamiʿ, 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.65 God knows best.

65 See Ḥārāqī, Tahiṣra, 2:161.
Category 26
ON THE MANNER OF RELATING ḤADĪTH AND THE STIPULATIONS REGARDING THE CONVEYANCE OF THEM, AND RELATED MATTERS
(Fī ṣīfat riwāyat al-ḥadīth wa-shart adā'ihī wa-mā yata'allaqu 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 ḥadīth may not be cited as a proof unless the transmitter relates from his memory and recollection." That is related from Mālik and Abū Ḥanīfa (God be pleased with them). Abū Bakr al-Ṣaydānt al-Mawzūt 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.2

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 ḥadīth. 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."3

ʿAbd Allāh b. Lahīṣ al-Miṣrī 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. Ḥassān saw a group of people who had a personal

1 Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Dāwūd al-Ṣaydānt al-Dāwūdī (fl. sixteenth/twelfth century) was known exclusively for his commentary on Muzani’s Makḥṣas; Subkt, Taḥqīq, 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-Kharth al-Ḍāḥalālī, Kfāya, 227; al-Qādī ʿIyād, Ilmāʿ, 136.
3 Makḥalī, 40 (Arabic), 39–40 (English).
4 Abū ʿAbd al-Rahmān ʿAbd Allāh b. Lahīṣ al-Miṣrī (97/715–174/790) served as a judge in Egypt and was a prolific transmitter, although, as the passage indicates, his reliability was questioned; Scogin, C.E.S., 1:94.
5 Abū Zakariyya Yahyā b. Ḥassān al-Ḥāṣrī (144/761–208/823) was a student of a number of popular transmitters and died in Egypt; Dālahā, Siyār, 10:127–30.
collection of hadith (juz') which they heard from Ibn Lahi'a. He examined the text and not a single hadith 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 hadith,' 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 hadith 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 hadith, 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 hadith 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 hadith 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 hadith 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 Kifāya, 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.\textsuperscript{14}

That holds true unless the student has a global license (iqāza ... ‘amma) 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.\textsuperscript{7}

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 (iqāza shāmla) 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 Ṣhūʿba 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.

\textsuperscript{7} Abū ‘Abd Allāh (or Abū ʿUthmān) Muhammad b. Bakr al-Bursānī died in al-_),ṣ_ār_ in 203/819; Dhahabī, Siyar, 9:421–2.
\textsuperscript{8} Kifāya, 237.
\textsuperscript{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'ite 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 Ya'qūb b. Ibrāhīm al-Kufī (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; EI, 1:164–5; Sezgin, GAS, 1:419–21.
11 Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. al-Hasan 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; EI, 9:392–4; Sezgin, GAS, 1:421–33.
12 Sirāj al-Dīn al-Balqī writes that the antecedent of this pronoun may be either “the record of the audition” (sawma) or “the touch of forgery and alteration” (tajarruq al-tazwīr wa-l-taghyīr ilayhi). Muḥāzir al-ṭairāl wa-l-taḍīm min Kitāb Ibn al-Salāḥ, ed. Aḥmaṣ ‘Abd al-Rahmān with Muqaddima, 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 ḥadith should say after it, “or however he put it” (aw kamā qallā), “or something like that” (aw nahwū ḥādāḥ), and similar expressions. That practice was related from the Companions Ibn Masʿūd, Abu ʿl-Dardāʾ, 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.”

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 ḥadith 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 ḥadith 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 Mujāhid said, “Leave out whatever you want from a ḥadith 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 ʿl-Dardāʾ al-ʿAnsārī al-Khaṭṭārī (the rest of his name is disputed) was an important Companion of the Prophet who died in Damascus around 653; Dāhibī, Sīyar, 2:335–33.
14 Jāmī, 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. The authoritative jurist Abu 'l-Fath 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. Shumayl (God be pleased with him) said, “Originally these hadith came in good Arabic.” Abū Bakr [or Abu 'l-Fath or Abu 'l-Qasim] b. Abī 'l-Maʿāraḥ al-Furāwī informed us by recitation to him. He said, My great-grandfather, the authority Abū 'Abd Allāh Muhammad b. al-Fadl al-Furāwī informed us. He said, Abu 'l-Husayn 'Abd al-Ghāfir b. Muhammad b. al-Farisi informed us. He said, The authority

15 Kifṭa, 193.
16 Abū 'l-Ḥasan al-Nadr b. Shumayl al-Māzin was born in Merv around 122/740. As a boy, he traveled to Būṣra with his father and studied under the great grammarian Khālid b. Ahmad. He later returned to Merv, 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, 8:59.
17 Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muhammad b. al-Fadl al-Furāwī (ca. 441/1049–530/1136) was a famous transmitter of several major hadith collections; Dhabhāt, Sīyar, 19:615–19.
18 Abū 'l-Husayn 'Abd al-Ghāfir b. Muhammad b. al-Farist (ca. 350/951–448/1056) was one of the great hadith transmitters of his generation; Dhabhāt, Sīyar, 18:19–21.
Abū Sulaymān Ḥamd b. Muḥammad al-Khaṭṭābī informed us. He said, Muḥammad b. Muʿādh transmitted to me. He said, One of our teachers informed us from Abū Dāwūd al-Sinnī. He said, I heard Ḫayr b. Aṣmaʾī saying, “The greatest fear I have for a student of hadīth — 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 hadīth from him and make a grammatical mistake in it, you ascribe a lie to him.”

The student of hadīth has a duty to learn enough grammar and lexicography to avoid the shame and ignominy of grammatical mistakes and miswriting. We heard that Shuʾbā said, “Whoever studies hadīth 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 ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṣalāma said, “Someone who studies hadīth 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 hadīth from the mouth of people possessing knowledge and accuracy. Whoever is deprived of that and instead takes and learns his hadīth from books is likely to corrupt the hadīth 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 hadīth: 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. Ṣirīn and Abū Maʿāmīr ʿAbd Allāh b. Sakhbara 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 Awzāʾī, Ibn al-Mubārak and others, and it is the doctrine of beginning and advanced scholars of hadīth. Advocating this for a grammatical mistake which does not change the sense of the hadīth and similar cases is a necessity according to the doctrine which permits the transmission of hadīth 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 Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. Muʿādh al-Harawī was a student of Abū Dāwūd al-Sinnī. He died in 316/928 at over ninety years of age; Dhahābī, Sīyar, 14:484–5.
20 Abū Dāwūd Sulaymān b. Maʿbad al-Sinnī (d. 257/871) is described as a litterateur and poet; Ibn al-Ascrīr, Lajāb, 2:147.
22 Abū Maʿāmīr ʿAbd Allāh b. Sakhbara al-ʿAzdi was a Kūfī transmitter of hadīth who was born during the lifetime of the Prophet and died during the governorship of ʿUbayd Allāh b. Ziyād; Dhahābī, Sīyar, 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 numerousness of the dialects and the sub-dialects of the Arabs.24 We heard that ‘Abd Allâh 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-Qâdi ʿIyâd.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 Qur’ân 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 Ṣaḥīḥs, the Muwatta27 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 ʿl-Walîd Hishâm b. Aḥmad al-Kinānî al-Waqqaṣî,28 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-Qâdi ʿIyâd, Ilmâ, 182.
25 ʿAbd Allah (213/828–290/903), unlike his older brother Salih, remained in Baghdad with their father, the imâm Aḥmad; Dhahabi, Ṣiyar, 13:516–26.
26 Ilmâ, 185–6.
27 Abu ʿl-Walîd Hishâm b. Aḥmad al-Kinânî al-Waqqaṣî (408/1017–489/1096) was an Andalusian scholar praised for his expertise in a number of disciplines; Dhahabi, Ṣiyar, 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 maw 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” (yaʿānī). This is what the expert al-Khaṭīb did when he related from Abū Umar b. Māhdi, al-Qāḍī al-Maḥāmīlī, with his isnād, from Urwa from ʿAmr bint ʿAbd al-Raḥmān – that is from ʿUthma – 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 Umar 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-Maḥāmīlī; Dhahabi, Siyar, 17:221–2.
30 Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥusayn b. ʿIsā b. ʿAbd al-Dabbā (235/849–330/941) served as a judge in al-Kūfa for sixty years and held a salon for scholars of law and ḥadith in his house; Sezgin, C.45, 1:180–1.
31 ʿAmra bint ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Anṣārī (d. ca. 100/719) was a student of ʿUthma and an authority on law in her own right; Dhahabi, Siyar, 4:507–8.
Aisha since it was indispensable and we knew that Mahamill related it that way. However, the mention of Aisha was omitted in the book of our teacher Abu Umar [b. Mahdi]. We said, ‘That is from Aisha,’ in the isnad because Ibn Mahdi 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 isnad, that Ahmad b. Hanbal (God be pleased with him) said, “I heard Waki saying, ‘In hadith 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. Abu Dawud [al-Sijistani] said that he told Ahmad b. Hanbal, “I found in my book, ‘[ajjaj b. Muhammad al-A`war from Jurajj from Abu l-Zubayr [Muhammad b. Muslim b. Tadrus].’ Is it permissible for me to correct it to ‘Ibn Jurajj?’” 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 isnad 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 Nu`aym b. Hammad, according to what Yahya b. Ma`in related from him. The expert al-Khatib said, “It would have been better, if he had made that clear at the time of the relation.” 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 hadith did that, including Asim, Abu `Awana [al-Isfarayini] and Ahmad b. Hanbal. Some of them used to note the material someone else verified, saying, “X transmitted the hadith to us and Y verified it for me.” For example, it is related that Yazid b. Hakim said, “Asim informed us – and Shu`ba verified it for me – from `Abd Allah b. Sarjis.” 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 Ishaq b. Rawaiah, Ahmad b. Hanbal and others (God be pleased with them). God knows best.

32 Abu `Abd Allah Nu`aym b. Hammad al-Khuza`i (d. ca. 228/844) was a scholar of hadith and opponent of the Hanafites who is best known for his book Kitab al-Fitan; Szejnig, G.A.S., 1:104–5.
33 Kifliyya, 254.
34 Abu `Abd al-Rahman `Asim b. Sulayman al-Tamimi al-Bagrit, known as Asim al-A`wali, was a transmitter of hadith who died around 140/757; Duhahabi, Siyarat, 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 isnad 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. Abi Shaybā” and Abū Sa‘īd al-Asḥajj transmitted to us, both of them from Abū Khalīl.” Abū Bakr said, “Abū Khalīl al-Aḥmar transmitted to us from al-ʿAمش,” 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-Sīṣīstānī] — author of the Sunan — “Musaddad” and Abū Tawba transmitted the sense to us. They said, ‘Abu ‘l-Aḥwaṣ” 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. Ibrāhīm 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 be produces is not the wording of every one of them and he says nothing to clarify that: this is something which Bukhārī and others
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 isnād 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 isnād, interpolating the additional information into the isnād 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-fulān), 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 isnād, 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 (anna) 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-Munṭūm 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-Ṣalāh] informed us. He said, ‘Abū Bakr Manṣūr b. ‘Abd al-Munṭūm 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-Khaṭīb 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 ʿAlī 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 Barqūq, with the latter’s isnād, the statement we mentioned above from ʿAlī b. al-Madīnī. Then he said that he saw ʿAbū Bakr ʿAlī b. ʿAlī al-ʿIṣbahānī⁴⁶ – 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 ḥadith he related to him, saying for them, “ʿAbū ʿAmr b. Hamdān informed us that ʿAbū Yaḥyā Ahmad b. ʿAlī b. al-Muthannā al-Mawṣīlī informed them,” “ʿAbū Bakr b. al-Muqrī informed us that ʿIṣḥāq b. Ḥamīd b. Nāṣir⁴⁷ transmitted to them,” and, “The expert ʿAbū Ḥamīd [b. ʿAdī] informed us that ʿAbū Yūsuf Muḥammad b. Suflān al-Ṣaflānī informed them.” He replied to him that they were ḥadith 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 ḥadith to them and the teachers limited themselves to mentioning just the name of the transmitters for the remainder of the ḥadith.⁴⁸ 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.’”⁴⁹

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 you” appears in the course of an isnād. The person reciting should say for it, “[It was recited to X.] ‘Y informed you,’ 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, “Ṣalīḥ b. Ḥayyān transmitted to us. He said, ‘ʿAmir al-Shaʿbī said’” (haddathana Ṣalīḥ ibn Ḥayyān qāla qāla ʿAmīr al-Shaʿbī) – they

⁴⁵ Kifāya, 215.
⁴⁶ ʿAbū Bakr Ahmad b. ʿAlī al-ʿIṣbahānī (347/958–428/1036), known as Ibn Manṣūrwayh, composed a number of books based on the major ḥadith collections; Sezgin, G:45, 1:230.
⁴⁷ ʿAbū Muḥammad ʿIṣḥāq b. Ḥamīd b. Nāṣir al-Khaṭṭarī died in Mecca in 308/921; Dhahabi, Siyās, 14:289.
⁴⁸ I have not succeeded in finding any information about this individual.
⁴⁹ Kifāya, 215–16.
⁵⁰ Kifāya, 216.
omit one of them in writing. Nevertheless, the reciter must pronounce both of them. God knows best.

14. The famous nuskha⁵ containing a number of hadith with a single isnād, like the nuska of Hammām b. Munabbih⁶ from Abū Hurayra, by the relation of ‘Abd al-Razzāq from Maʿmar [b. Ṭāhid] 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-insād), or “With it” (bi-hā). 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 Wāqī b. al-Jarrāḥ, Yahyā b. Maʿṣūn and Abū Bakr al-ismaʿīlī. 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 ʿIshaq al-Isfahānī— 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 sahih of Hammām b. Munabbih, saying, “Muḥammad b. ʿAfī informed us. He said, ‘Abd al-Razzāq informed us. He said, Maʿmar told us from Hammām b. Munabbih. 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:

---

⁵ Nuska and sahih 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.

⁶ This famous nuska (or sahih) was the hadith collection of Abū ‘Uqba Hammām b. Munabbih al-Ṣan‘ānī (ca. 40/660–ca. 101/719); Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:86.

for instance, the transmitter says, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said such and such,” or “Amr b. Dinār related from Jābir 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 isnād to the point where it connects with what he gave before.

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

It has been reported that one of the earlier scholars of hadith permitted someone who heard a hadith from his teacher in this way to put the entire isnād 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-Khaṭṭīb 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 [rerearranging the elements of the text of a hadith and moving the isnād given after the text in front of the text]. God knows best.

The practice of some of scholars of repeating the isnād 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 isnād individually with each hadith when it is related, because here the isnād 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 hadith with an isnād, follows it with another isnād and says at the end of that isnād, “A text like the previous one” (mithlūhā): if his student wants to give only the second isnād and provide the wording of the hadith given after the first isnād, this is most obviously forbidden. We heard that the expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭṭīb (God bless him) said, “Sha'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 hadith without an isnād and his auditors then asked him for the isnād; see al-Khaṭṭīb al-Baghdādi, Kifāya, 211–12.
⁵⁵ Kifāya, 170–1. For al-Khaṭṭīb’s discussion of rearranging the words in the text of a hadith, see Kifāya, 175–7.
to give the isnād and say, ‘A hadith 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’ (nahwuwa‘ī). This is the procedure I prefer.’

Abū Ahmad ʿAbd al-Wahhāb b. Abī Maṣṣūr ʿAlī b. ʿAlī al-Baghdādí — the leading teacher in Baghdad — informed us through my recitation to him there. He said, My father (God bless him) informed me. He said, Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Ṣarifīnī50 informed us. He said, Abū ʿl-Qāsim b. Ḥababābī informed us. He said, Abū ʿl-Qāsim Abī ʿAlī b. Muḥammad al-Baghwārī transmitted to us. He said, ʿAmr b. Muḥammad al-Naqīdī transmitted to us. He said, Waki transmitted to us. He said, “Shuʿba said, ‘‘X from Y: A text like the previous one’ does not work.’” Waki also said, “Sufyān al-Thawrī said, ‘It does work.’”

When a transmitter says, “a text similar to 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 Waki said, “Sufyān [al-Thawrī] said, ‘When a transmitter says, “a text similar to the previous one,” it is a valid hadith,’ while Shuʿba said, ‘‘a text similar to the previous one” contains doubt.”52 Yahyā b. Maʾān 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 Masʿūd b. ʿAlī al-Sijzī54 to the effect that he heard the expert Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥākim saying, “One of the forms of accuracy and exactitude which is incumbent on a

56 Ḳifāya, 212.
57 Dīyaʾ al-Dīn Abū Ahmad ʿAbd al-Wahhāb b. Abī Maṣṣūr ʿAlī b. ʿAlī al-Baghdādí (519/1125–607/1210), known as Ibn Sukayna, was, as indicated in the passage, a teacher of Ibn al-Salāḥ. During his lifetime, he was famed for his elevated hadith transmissions and his piety; Dhahabi, Siyar, 21:502–5.
58 Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Ṣarifīnī (384/994–469/1076) was a preacher in the mosque of Sarṭfīn, a village near Baghdad. Many students sought him out as a transmitter of hadith; Dhahabi, Siyar, 18:330–2.
59 Abū ʿl-Qāsim Ubayd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥababā b. ʿAbd al-Baghdādí, 300/913–389/999) was a poorly known transmitter of hadith; Dhahabi, Siyar, 16:548–9.
60 Abū ʿl-Qāsim al-Baghwālī (214/829–317/929), also known as “Ibn bint [ʿAbd Allāh b.] Manī,” was a prominent transmitter of hadith in Baghdad. He was a nephew of ṬABI b. ʿAbd al-ʿAţī al-Makki; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:175.
62 Ḳifāya, 320.
63 Ḳifāya, 213–14.
64 Abū Saʿīd Masʿūd b. ʿAlī al-Sijzī was a transmitter of hadith praised for his accuracy who died in Nishapur in 477/1084; Dhahabi, Siyar, 18:332–5.
hadithologist (hadith) 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-hadith) or, “And he mentioned the hadith in its entirety” (wa-dhakara ‘l-hadith bi-falih). 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 Ishāq Ibrāhīm 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-Barqā’ī, the hadith expert and jurist, asked the hadith expert and jurist Abū Bakr al-Isma‘īlī 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” (‘an al-Nabī) to “from the Messenger of God” (‘an 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), ‘Abd Allāh b. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal saw his father strike out “the Prophet” and write “from the Messenger of God” (Peace be upon him). Abū 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.”

65 Kifāya, 244.
al-Khaṭṭāb al-Baghdādī stated, with his isnād, that Ṣāliḥ b. Ahmad b. Hanbal said, "I said to my father, 'What do you think when "the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said" appears in a ḥadith and someone changes it to "the Prophet (Peace be upon him) said"?' He said, 'I hope that there will be nothing wrong with it.'" On the other hand, al-Khaṭṭāb stated, with his isnād, that Ḥammād b. Salama was transmitting ḥadith while ʿAffān and ʿAbdārāfī hadī 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." 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. In that case, let the transmitter say, "X transmitted to us as a part of an informal session" (ḥaddathānā ūlān mudhākărātun), or, "X transmitted to us in the course of an informal session" (ḥaddathāna fi 'l-mudhākara). More than one of the earlier scholars used to do this. A number of experts, including ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Mahdi and Abū Zurʿa al-Rāzzi, used to forbid that anything be taken from them in an informal session. We also heard that from Ibn al-Mubārak 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 hadīth is from two men, one of whom is discreditable – for instance, a hadīth from Thābit al-Bunānī and Abān b. Abī ʿAyyāsh 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 hadīth 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, Muslimī b. al-Ḥajjāj sometimes omitted the discredited

66 Kifāya, 244.
67 This seems to be a reference to the transmitter Abū l-Aswād Bahz b. Asad al-Baṣrī, who died in 197/813; Dīhahābī, Siyār, 9:192.
68 Kifāya, 244–5.
70 Abū Zurʿa ʿUbayd Allāh b. Abī al-Karīm al-Rāzī (200/815–264/878) was a prominent authority in hadīth from the city of al-Rayy; Sezgin, GāS, 1:145.
71 Abī Ismāʿīl Abān b. Abī ʿAyyāsh Fayyūzī was a Baṣrī transmitter of hadīth from the second/eighth century. He was the less reliable transmitter of this pair, Bukhārī, al-Tārīkh al-kabīrī, 1(1):454; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Ḥājīb, 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.\textsuperscript{72}

In the same way, when the hadith 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 hadith. God knows best.

21. When the student hears one part of a hadith 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 hadith 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 Hadith of the Lie (hadith al-īfā)\textsuperscript{73} which he related from ‘Urwa, Ibn al-Musayyib, ‘Alqama b. Waqqās al-Laythī and ‘Ubayd Allah b. ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Uthmān from ‘Ā’isha (God be pleased with her). He said, “All of them transmitted to me a portion of her hadith. They said, ‘She said …’”

The entire contents of that kind of hadith 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 hadith. It is also impermissible for anyone after the mixing of the contents of the hadith to omit the mention of either of the two transmitters and relate the hadith solely from the other. Rather, it is necessary to mention them both and make a clear declaration that part of the hadith is from one of them and part from the other. God knows best.

\textsuperscript{72} Kīyā, 378.
\textsuperscript{73} For this famous story, see Alfred Guillaume, \textit{The Life of Muhammad: A Translation of Ibn Istāq’s Sirat Rṣūl Allāh} (Oxford, 1955), 494.
\textsuperscript{74} Abu ‘Abd Allah ‘Ubayd Allah b. ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Uthmān al-Hudhaifī (d. 98/717) was a prominent legal scholar in Medina” Dhahabi, \textit{Siyar}, 4:475-9.
Category 27
GUIDELINES FOR THE TRANSMITTER OF ḤADĪTH
(Maṣrifat ʿadab al-muḥaddith)

Some of these guidelines have already been treated where required in the previous Categories. The science of ḥadith 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 ḥadith 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 ḥadith and to be appointed to relate them. Our view is that, when the need arises for the ḥadith 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 ʿAbū Muḥammad b. Ḥallād [al-Rāmahurmuz] (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 ḥadith 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-Qaḍi ʿIyāḍ disagreed with Ibn Ḥallād over this and said, “How many of the early pious forebears and other transmitters never reached that age, dying before then, but still spread ḥadith and knowledge beyond calculation? ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz died before forty and Saʿīd b. Jubayr did not reach fifty,

1. The famous poet Suḥaym b. Wathil al-Riyāḥī was born before the advent of Islam and died around the year 40/661; Sezgin, GAS, 2:202-3.
2. Rāmahurmuz, Muḥaddith al-faṣil, 352-3.
3. ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, sometimes referred to as ʿUmar II, was the sole representative of the Umayyad Dynasty respected by later religious scholars. He ruled in Damascus from 99/717 until his death in 101/720 at about thirty-eight lunar years of age; EF, 3:977-9; Sezgin, GAS, 1:594.
4. ʿAbd Allāh Saʿīd b. Jubayr al-Asadī was a Follower and expert on Qur’anic commentary. He was born in 45/665 and executed by the Umayyad governor al-Hajjāj in 95/714; Sezgin, GAS, 1:28-9.
and the same is true of Ibrahim al-Nakhaṭt. 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.1 (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 Uyayna 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.”2 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-Razzāq and Sa'd b. Abi Arūba.3 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,4 and ‘Abd Allah b. Abi Awfā,5 as well as Malik b. Anas, al-Layth b. Sa'd,1 [Sufyān] b. Uyayna and ‘Ali b. al-Ja'd,6 among a large number of early

5 Inṣā', 200–8.
6 Rāmahurmuzī, Muḥaddith al-fā'il, 354.
7 Abu Ḥanīfa b. Abi Ḥanīfa, al-Adawī (ca. 70/689–156/773) was a Follower and renowned transmitter of hadith in al-Baṣra until his reliability declined; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:91–2.
8 Abu Ḥanīfa b. Abi Ḥanīfa, al-Adawī (ca. 90/709) was the last Companion of the Prophet to die in Medina; Dhahabi, Siyar, 3:422–4.
9 ‘Abd Allah b. Abi Awfā was the last living Companion in al-Kūfa. He died around the year 86/705 at nearly one hundred years of age; Dhahabi, Siyar, 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-Qāsim al-Baghdawi, Abū Ishaq 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 İbrahim [al-Nakha’î] and Sha‘bî met, İbrahim 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. Ma‘in said, “When I transmit hadith in a city containing someone like Abū Mus‘îrî,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 ‘Ali al-Hasan b. ‘Arafa (150/767–257/871), known as Jâz Ibl ‘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 ‘Ali al-Ra‘îmî b. Ahmad al-Bukhârî found the Bay‘an Abû Ishaq İbrahim b. ‘Ali 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; Dhuhab, Sârî, 15:525–6.

13 Abû Mus‘îrî (Abd al-‘A’î b. Mus‘îrî al-Dimashqî (140/757–218/833) was one of the great critics of hadith of his day; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:100–1.
Muhammad al-Sha'rānī informed me. He said, My grandfather transmitted to us. He said, Ismā'īl b. Abī Usāwī transmitted to us. He said, "When Mālik b. Abū 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. Abī Usāwī 'Abd Allāh 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 'Alā'ī 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 Ismā'īl al-Sha'rānī was best known for his hadith transmissions from his father and grandfather. He died in Bayhaq in 347/958; Samānī, Anṣārī, 3:433.
15 Abū Muhammad al-Faḍl b. Muhammad al-Sha'rānī (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; Dīwān, Siyar, 13:317–19.
16 Qurʾān 49:2.
17 Abū Zayd Muhammad b. Abī Usāwī 'Abd Allāh al-Marwazī (301/914–371/982) was an important figure in the history of the Shi'aīte law school; Dīwān, Siyar, 16:313–15.
18 Abī Yaḥya 'Alī b. Abī Thābit al-Qurashi (d. ca. 120/738) was one of the chief hadith transmitters in al-Kūfah; Dīwān, Siyar, 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.\(^{19}\) 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 (mustamālī) to broadcast from him. That is the custom of the greatest transmitters who undertook something like this. It was related that Mālik, Shu‘ba, Wāsit, Abū ʿĀṣim,\(^{20}\) Yazid b. Ḥarūn 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. Ḥarūn not befall him. Yazid was asked about a hadith and said, “Several (fadda) transmitted it to us.” His repetitor shouted to him, “Abū 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 announcement 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’ān. 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-Khaṭīb said that he should raise his voice for that.\(^{21}\) When he comes across a mention of a Companion, he should say, “God be pleased with him” (raḍiyā Allāhu ‘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 ʿAbd b. Abī Rabāḥ transmitted from [Abū Dllāh] b. ʿAbbas (God be pleased with them), he said, “The sea [of knowledge] (al-bāḥr) transmitted to me;” and that Wāsit said, “Sufyān [al-Thawrī], the prince of the

---

\(^{19}\) Fa-imnāhū min ʿālā marāṭib al-rāwīn: the meaning of his clause is unclear to me. Nawawī replaced al-rāwīn with al-rīsāliya (transmission) in this passage; Al-Taqrīb li-l-Nawawī (Cairo, 1388/1968), 38.

\(^{20}\) Abū ʿĀṣim al-Daḥḥāk b. Makkālād b. al-Daḥḥāk al-Shaybānī al-Nabīl (122/740-ca. 212/827) was a respected transmitter of hadith; Dāhābī, Siyār, 9:480–5.

\(^{21}\) Jāmiʿ, 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 Ghundur (troublemaker) is the nickname of Muhammad b. Ja'far,22 the student of Shu‘ba, and Luwāyn (party-colored) is the nickname of Muḥammad b. Sulaymān al-Miṣṣāṣī.23 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 maternal grandmother — of the Companion Ya‘lā b. Munya,24 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 ‘Āsim al-Abwal (Cross-eyed ‘Āsim). All of this may be done unless the person referred to dislikes it. That was the case with Ismā‘il b. Ibrāhim,25 known as “Ibn Ulayya.” Ulayya was his mother — or, it was said, his maternal grandmother. We heard that Yahyā b. Ma‘īn used to say, “Ismā‘il b. Ulayya transmitted to us,” and Ahmad b. Ḥanbal forbade it. He said, “Say, ‘Ismā‘il b. Ibrāhim.’ I read that he did not use to like being referred to by the name of his mother.”26 Yahyā b. Ma‘īn 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 hadith with elevated isnāds and short texts. That is best and most appropriate procedure. He should be discriminating in the hadith he dictates and carefully consider the material he is to teach. He should draw attention to the lesson and elevation of the hadith 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 hadith 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.”27

22 Abu ‘Abd Allāh al-Hudhaif al-Baṣrī (ca. 110/728–193/809) studied with Shu‘ba for twenty years; Dhabah, Siyar, 9:98–102. The story behind his nickname is discussed in Category 52.
23 Abu Ja‘far Muhammad b. Sulaymān was a scholar of hadith 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‘lā b. Munya (d. ca. 60/680) transmitted about twenty hadith; Dhabah, Siyar, 3:100–1, s.n. Ya‘lā b. Umayya.
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-Baghdadī discusses this question in Kifāya, 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 ṭalib 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 hadith as a means to gain some worldly aim. We heard that Ḥammād b. Salama (God be pleased with him) said, “Whoever studies ḥadith 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 ḥadith for someone who seeks God through it.” We also heard something similar from Ibn al-Mubarak (God be pleased with him). One of the most likely reasons for making correct one’s intention in the study of hadith is the one we heard from Abū ʿAmr Ismāʿil b. Nujayd. He asked Abū Jaʿfar ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥamdān – and they were both righteous men – “With what intention should I write hadith?” He said, “Do you not see that blessings come down at the mention of righteous people?” He said yes and Abū Jaʿfar 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-Nabil said, “Whoever studies these ḥadith 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 hadith. When the student starts to study ḥadith, let him buckle down and work hard. He should begin by hearing ḥadith 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 ḥadith 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 ḥadith transmitter and the man who writes ḥadith in his own land and does not travel to study ḥadith.” We heard that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (God be pleased with him) was asked, “Should a man travel to acquire elevation in ḥadith?” He said, “Yes, by God! Energetically!” Hadith from ʿUmar [b. al-Khaṭṭāb] (God be pleased with him) used to reach ʿAlqama [b. Qays] and al-Aswad and they were not satisfied with them until they went to ʿUmar and heard them from him directly.”

1 Abū ʿAmr Ismāʿil b. Nujayd al-Sulami (272/885–365/975) was a transmitter of hadith known for his piety; Sāgin, G/AS, 1:183.
2 Abū Ṣallām al-Aswād b. Ḥiḍāl b. Kūfī (d. 84/703) was a Follower born in pre-Islamic times; Dīsahb, Sīyar, 4:257.
God knows best. We heard that Ibrahim b. Adham (God be pleased with him) said, “God (He is exalted) deflects adversity from this Community through the traveling of the scholars of ḥadith.”

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

Let the student put into practice the ḥadith he hears pertaining to prayer, praising God and other virtuous acts. That is the title of ḥadith, according to what we heard from the righteous man Bishr b. al-Ḥarith al-Ḥāfi (God be pleased with him). We also heard that he said, “Scholars of ḥadith, pay the title of these ḥadith! For every two hundred ḥadith, put five into practice.” We heard that ‘Amr b. Qays al-Mulâf (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 Wakî said, “If you want to learn ḥadith, put them into practice!”

Let the student exalt his teacher and whomever else he hears ḥadith 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 ḥadith. We heard that Malik (God be pleased with him) said, “One of the blessings of hadith is teaching one another.” We heard that Isḥaq b. Ibrahim b. Râhawayh 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.” Ibn Râhawayh 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 Mujâhid (God be pleased with him) said, “The bashful person and the prideful person cannot acquire knowledge.” We heard that ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭāb and his son (God be pleased

---

3 Abū Isḥaq Ibrahim b. Adham al-Ḥāfi 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; E/P, 3:985-6.

4 Abū Nâṣr Bishr b. al-Ḥarîth al-Ḥâfi (ca. 150/767-ca. 227/841) was an influential early mystic; E/P, 1:1244-6; Seeqin, G45, 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-Jarrāḥ (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. Maṣ'īn 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 Ibrāhīm b. Uramn al-Īshāhānī, Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad — known as Ubayd al-‘Ijlī — Abū l-Ḥasan al-Dāraquṭnī and Abū Bakr al-Jāfābī 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-Ḥasan al-Nu‘aymī used to mark his selections with an elongated letter sād; Abū Muḥammad al-Khallālī with an elongated letter ṣād and Abū l-Fadl al-Falākī with the shape of two hamsas. All of them made their

6 Abū Ishaq Ibrāhīm b. Uramn (or Uramn) al-Īshāhānī was an early expert in hadith who died at the end of 266/880; Dihabah, Siyar, 13:145–6.
7 Ubayd al-‘Ijlī was a student of Yahyā b. Maṣ'īn who died in 294/907 in his eighties. Other sources give his kunya as Abū ‘Alī; Dihabah, Siyar, 14:90–1.
8 Abū Bakr Muhammad b. Umar b. Muḥammad al-Jāfābī (284/897–355/966) was a Shi'ite scholar of hadith who served as a judge in Mosul; Dihabah, Siyar, 16:88–92.
signs in ink in the right margin of the page. Dāraquṭṭānī marked the chosen ḥadith with a broad line of red ink in the left margin and the expert Ābu ʿĪ-Qāsim al-Lālakārī12 used to mark them with a short penstroke in red at the beginning of the isnād of the selected ḥadith. There is no problem with any of that: to each his own.

The student of hadith should not limit himself to hearing ḥadith 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 hadith. Rather, he would not become anything more than one of the deficient imitators who attempt to adorn themselves with something they actually lack. Ābu ʿĪ-Muṣṭafī, the son of the expert Ābu Saʿīd al-Samarrāʿī (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. Naṣīr al-Salāmī himself declaimed to us. He said, The surpassing litterateur Fāris b. al-Ḥusayn13 himself declaimed to me

Student whose time has come to transmit,
In transmitting, pay attention to transmitting and understanding
Transmit only a few ḥadith 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 Ābu Dawūd’s Sunan, Naṣāʾī’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 hadith has need of, including the musnad[s], like Musnad Ahmad [ibn Ḥanbal]; the comprehensive collections arranged by legal topic containing supported and unsupported hadith and Mālik’s Muwāṣṣa is the foremost of these; the books on the defects in hadith (ṣīl al-ḥadīth) – Ahmad b. Ḥanbal’s Kitāb al-ṣīl (The Book of Defects) and Dāraquṭṭānī’s Kitāb al-ṣīl are among the finest of these; the books containing information about transmitters and when they lived – Bukhārī’s al-Tarikh al-kabīr (Great History) and Ibn Abī Ḥātim’s Kitāb al-Jārī wa-l-taḍīl (Book of Personality Criticism) are among the best of these; and the books on clarifying

---

12 Ābu ʿĪ-Qāsim Hībat Allāh b. al-Ḥasan al-Lālakārī (d. 418/1027) composed a famous collection of credal statements entitled Shārīf ushūl fiqhī uṣūl al-sunnah wa-l-ʿamalī (ed. Ahmad Saʿīd Ḥamdān, 2nd edn, 4 vols, Riyadh, 1411); Sezgin, GAS, 1:501.

13 The sources I consulted take no notice of this poet.

14 Kitāb al-ṣīl wa-muṣṭafat al-ṣīl, 2 vols (İstanbul, 1987).

problematic names—the most complete of these is *al-Ikmāl* (Perfection) of ʿAbū 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 Shuʿba, Ibn ʿUlayya and Maʿmar. 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 ḥadith or two at a time.’”

Let exactitude be the student’s concern. ʿAbd al-ʿRāmhān b. Mahdī 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-Nakhaʿī said, “Repeat the ḥadith amongst yourselves! They live through being spoken,” and “Whoever is pleased to learn ḥadith, 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-Khaṭīb said, “It makes the memory firm, kindles the heart, honeς 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 ḥadith, fathom its obscurities and discern its hidden points without doing that.”¹⁷ The expert Ṣūrī – Muḥammad b. Āliʿ¹⁴ transmitted, saying, “I saw the expert Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Ghānī 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.’”¹⁸

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

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

---


17 *Ṣanāʾi*, 415.


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

20 *Wa-tanwīʿthuḥa anuwaʾān*: it is very difficult to divine what the *anuwaʾ* are supposed to be here. This section is closely based on al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī’s *Ṣanāʾi* (pp. 417–18), where *nuwaʾ* is
bringing together the relevant material for each legal issue and each type, subject by subject.

2. Arrangement of the hadith by musnad (‘ala ‘l-masāni‘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 Hashim [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];\(^\text{21}\) then the Muslim participants in the battle of Badr; then the people of al-‘Uraybiya;\(^\text{22}\) then those who converted to Islam and went to Medina after the time of al-‘Uraybiya and before the conquest of Mecca. He should conclude with the youngest Companions, like Abu ‘l-‘Uthayl\(^\text{19}\) 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 (mu‘allal) which collects the chains of transmission for each hadith and notes the differences in the transmitters of it. Ya‘qūb b. Shayba did this in his Musnad.\(^\text{24}\)

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

---

\(^{19}\) used both as a synonym of kāb (legal topic) and in reference to the quality of the isāni‘id attached to the hadith; that is, he says that the two nau‘s are supported (musnad) and unsupported (maqāf and mursal).

\(^{20}\) In addition to the four caliphs, Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, ‘Uthmān and ‘Alī, the Ten included Ĥalib, al-Zubayr, Abū al-Rahmān b. ‘Awf, Sa‘d b. Abī Waqqās and Sa‘d b. Zayd. There was a disagreement as to whether the tenth was Abū Ubayd b. al-Jarriḥ or the Prophet himself; \(\text{EF}^\text{1}, 1:693\).

\(^{21}\) In the year 6/628, during the negotiations with the pagans at the village of al-‘Uraybiya outside of Mecca, the Muslims made the Pledge of Good Pleasure (hay‘at al-rif‘āt), promising to obey the Prophet; \(\text{EF}^\text{1}, 3:539\).

\(^{22}\) Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, \(\text{Iṣṭafāh}, 2:798–9, 4:1696–7\).

\(^{23}\) This work is described in al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādi, \(\text{Tārikh Baghdād}, 14:281\) and Hajjī Ḥalīlī, \(\text{Kaḥf}, 2:cols. 1678–9\) as \(\text{Munād Ibn Shayba Ya‘qūb al-hāfizq}\). If it had been completed, it would have been enormous. The portion which has survived was published in Beirut in 1940. According to Sāḥib, the purpose of this approach was to facilitate the exposure of anomalies in the lines of transmission; for instance, hidden cases of iršal (looseness); \(\text{Fatḥ al-Mughith}, 2:342–3\).
b. Sa‘d al-Dārīmi” 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. ‘Umayna. 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, Zuhrī and Awzā‘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 Ṣā‘īdī from [‘Abd Allāh] b. Ṣa‘īd, the heading of Suhayl b. Abī Salih from his father [that is, Abū Ṣalih Dakhwān] b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Sammān] from Abū Hurayra, the heading of Fīshām b. ‘Urwa from his father [‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr] from ‘Ā‘ishah 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 (ra’yat Allāh), the chapter on raising the hands in prayer (raṣ al-yadāt), the chapter on recitation behind the prayer leader (al-qirā’at khalṣa ‘l-imām), and so forth. Then they put them separately in book form, so they become individual monographs.25

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 yawma ‘l-jumā), 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. Mā‘īn in a dream and mentioned that to him. Yahyā b. Mā‘īn replied, “I fear this comes under the heading of ‘Your god is competition in quantity.’”27

26 Sakhawi lists a number of such books in Fath al-Maghtith, 2:343.
27 Qur‘ān, 10:21.
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 ‘Ali 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.
Category 29

ELEVATED AND LOW ISNĀDS

(Maʿrifat al-Isnād al-tālī wa-l-naẓīl)

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 (ṣuʿūb) in ḥadīth is also a sunnah. For that reason, undertaking journeys was recommended, as stated above. Ahmād b. Ḥanbal (God be pleased with him) said, “Seeking an elevated isnād is a sunnah 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; that is one of the most noble types of elevation. We heard that the ascetic and scholar Muḥammad b. Aslam al-Ṭūstī (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, 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 ʿIṣnād nazzīf ghāyar ḍafīf: This does not seem to have been a technical formulation, although its basic significance seems clear.
3 Abū ʿl-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. Aslam al-Ṭūstī (ca. 180/796–242/856) was an early mystic;
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 isnād 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 isnād based on its proximity to an authority, even if the isnād 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 isnād to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), even if it is a weak isnād. For that reason, he gave the hadith of Abū Hudha, Dīnār, al-As"ahjī 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 Ṣaḥīḥs [that is, those of Bukhārī and Muslim] or the other famous, authoritative books: the “agreements” (muwaṣṣaqa), “substitutions” (ṣadīd), “equivalence” (muṣawwāh) and “hand-shaking” (muṣafāhah) which have lately become famous with regard 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-Khaṭṭīb, some of his teachers, Abū Naṣr b. Makūla, Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥumaydī and others of their generation as well as those who came after them.

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

Substitution (ṣadīd): 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 Ulūm al-ḥadīth (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 hadiths attractive to gullible students seeking short isnāds. Abū Hudha ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥudha al-Farāj died shortly after the year 200/816 and claimed to be a student of the Companion Anas b. Malik (d. ca. 90/709); Dhahabi, Mizān, 1.71–2; Ibn Hajar, Isāf, 1:119–21. Similarly, in the year 240/855 Abū Mūṣṭariṣ Dīnār b. ʿAbd Allāh (not “ʿAbd Allāh b. Dīnār” as in Ulūm al-ḥadīth) al-Ḥabashī transmitted directly from Anas; Dhahabi, Mizān, 2:30–1; Ibn Hajar, Isāf, 2:344–5. According to al-Ḥakīm, Abū ʿAbd Allāh ʿUthmān b. al-Khaṭṭīb b. ʿAbd Allāh al-As"ahjī al-Maḡribī maintained that he had been a servant of the caliph ʿAlī 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-ʿĀṣār provided, it appears that this term was most often applied to cases where the student’s and the compiler’s isnāds intersect at the level of the teacher of the compiler’s teacher. An example cited by Suṣṭī seems to indicate that the intersection could also occur earlier in the line of transmission; Taḥārist al-rāʾī, 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" (musāwīyān) 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 hadith "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 ‘l-Mu‘azzafar ʿAbd al-Raḥmān – the son of the author Abū Sa‘d al-Sam‘ānī (God bless them) – from the Collection of Forty Ḥadith (arba‘ī) of Abu ‘l-Barakāt al-Farāwī a hadith regarding which Furāwī claimed that it was as if he himself – or his teacher – had heard it from Bukhārī. The teacher Abu ‘l-Mu‘azzafar 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 hadith I relate from a teacher who informed me from someone else from the expert Bayhaqī 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 Bayhaqī predeceased Ibn Khalaf. Bayhaqī died in 458 [1066 AD] and Ibn Khalaf in 487 [1094 AD]. We heard that the expert Abū Ya‘lā al-Khalīl b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Kalīlī (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 ʿAlī al-Ḥāfiz al-Nisābūrī. He said, “I heard ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar 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. Manda is that he said, “When thirty years elapse on an isnād, it is elevated.” This threshold is broader than the first. God knows best.

7 Abū Bakr ʿAbdād b. ʿAlī b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Shuṭrūṭ al-Nisābūrī (398/1008–487/1094), known as Ibn Khalaf, was an expert in literature and ḥadith; Dāhābī, Siyār, 18:478–9.
9 Abū ʾl-Ḥasan ʿAbdād b. ʿUmar al-Dimashqī (d. 320/932), popularly known as Ibn Jawāṣ, was the most important transmitter of his day in Damascus; Dāhābī, 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. Tahir 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 Tahir al-Silaḥi (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-Ḥakim 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 l-Fadl Muhammad b. Tahir al-Maqdisi (448/1056–507/1113), known as Ibn al-Qayṣarānī, was an expert in Sufism and hadith and wrote several works; Dhabhat, Sijar, 19:361–71.
11 The Saljuq vizier Abū ʿAli al-Ḥasan b. ʿAli al-Tos, known as Niẓām al-Mulk, was born in a village near Ṭūs 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 Ḫulm al-ḥadīth, 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 ʿAlī b. al-Madīnī and Abū ʿAmr al-Mustamīl al-Nisābūrī14 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-fāṣil, 216.
14 In addition to being a repetitor, Abū ʿAmr Ahmad b. al-Mubarak al-Nisābūrī taught ḥadīth on his own. He died in Nishapur in 284/897; Dihābī, Siyar, 13:373–5.
Category 30

FAMOUS ḤADITH

(*Maʿrifat al-mashhūr min al-ḥadîth*)

The meaning of the word “fame” (*shuḥra*) is commonly understood. Famous ḥadîth 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 ḥadîth, “Seeking knowledge is a duty incumbent upon every Muslim.”

Likewise, we read that Ahmad b. Ḥanbal (God be pleased with him) said, “There are four ḥadîth 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 Ādhar 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 ḥadîth fall into the subcategories of the ḥadîth famous among the scholars of ḥadîth 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 ḥadîth famous exclusively among the scholars of ḥadîth and no one else – like the ḥadîth we heard from Muhammad b. ʿAbd Allâh al-Anṣârî1 from Sulaymân al-Taymî2 from Abû Mîlazî3 from Anâs [b. Mâlik] to the effect that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) made a personal prayer (*qunūţ*) after the inclinations (*rukkî*) for a month, invoking curses on the tribes of Rîḍî and Dhâkwân. This ḥadîth is famous among the scholars of ḥadîth and included in the Ṣâḥîh.4 Other transmitters beside Abû Mîlazî transmitted it from Anâs; others beside Taymî transmitted it from Abû Mîlazî; others beside Anṣârî transmitted it from Taymî. Only the practitioners of the craft know that. Others sometimes consider it unusual because

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 (darūra). 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 (tawāṣīr). 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 Sahīḥs it is related from a number of them. The exalted expert Abū Bakr al-Bazzār in his Masnad 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, 16; Ibn Ḥajar, Nuzhat al-nazar, 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 Marçais followed him with “repete” (Taṣrib, 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 mutaṣḥīl and muḥāfīl.

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

7 This would seem to be the only possible meaning of this sentence, and Nawawi (Taṣrib, 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 tawāṣīr; 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 'l-Faraj b. al-Jawzī said that sixty-one Companions transmitted this hadith from the Prophet; Kitāb al-Mawdūdah, 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
(Maʿrifat al-gharib wa-ʿl-ʿazīz min al-ḥadīth)

We heard that the expert Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. Manda al-Iṣbāḥānī said, “The rare ḥadīth is like those of Zuhrī, 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 (baṣīf al-ruwāt) 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 awāz 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 ḥadīth included in the Šaḥīḥ – and unsound, and these predominate among the rare ḥadīth. We heard that Abū ʿAbd Allāh 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 ḥadīth can also be subcategorized in another way. Some are rare in regard to both the text and the isnād. This is the ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth 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 Tirmidhī calls “rare in regard to this line of transmission” (gharib min ḥadda ʿl-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 hadith consist of words that occur in the texts of some hadith 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 hadith 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 Maymunl that Ahmad b. Hanbal was asked about one of the rare words of the hadith. 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 Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Malik al-Tarikhi said, Abu Qilaba ‘Abd al-Malik b. Muhammad transmitted to me. He said, “I said to Asma’t, ‘Abu Sa’id, what is the meaning of the statement of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), “The neighbor has a greater right to his sabaq”’? He said, ‘I do not comment on the hadith of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). However, the ancient Arabs assert that sabaq is the same as laziq [that is, the adjacent property].’

Scholars have composed excellent books on this subject. We heard that the expert Abu ‘Abd Allah al-Hakim said, “The first in the history of Islam to compose a work on rare words was al-Nadr b. Shumayl.” Some disagree with him and said, “The first to compose a book on this subject was Abu Ubayda Ma’mar b. al-Muthanna.” Both of their books are short. Later, Abu ‘Ubayd al-Qasim b. Sallam 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. Qutaybi then tracked down the material Abu ‘Ubayd missed and composed his famous book.

---

2. Abu Bakr Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Malik al-Sarraj was a third/ninth-century litterateur who was called “Tarikhi” because of his interest in dates; al-Khaṭṭib al-Baghdadi, Taʾrīkh Baghdādī, 2:348.
5. The philologist Abu ‘Ubayda Ma’mar b. al-Muthanna (410/728–ca. 210/825) wrote a number of important books. The work referred to here was entitled Gharib al-hadith; Sezgin, GAS, 8:67–71.
on the subject. Then Abū Sulaymān al-Khaṭṭābī 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 Ḥabīb ibn Ṣayyād that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) said to him, “I have hidden a secret for you. What is it?” and Ḥabīb ibn Ṣayyād replied, “The ḏukkh.” The meaning of the word is obscure and problematic and many have explicated it incorrectly. In al-Ḥakīm’s Maʿrijat ulūm al-ḥadīth, we read that it is ḏakkh with the sense of ṣukkh, 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 ḏukkh,” meaning “smoke” (ḏukkhān). ḏukkh 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 Ḥabīb ibn Ṣayyād said, “It is the ḏukkh.” 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 wresting only part of a thing from the devils, Ḥabīb ibn Ṣayyād took from the verse of the Qurʾān 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 Gharib al-ḥadīth (ed. ʿAbd Allāh al-Jubūrī, Baghdad, 1977).
7 Khaṭṭābī’s Kitāb Gharib al-ḥadīth has survived in several manuscripts; Sezgin, GAS, 1:211.
8 The primary question regarding Ṣaf b. Ṣayyād (or Ibn Ṣaʿīd) was whether he was the antichrist. See Musām, al-Jāmī’ al-yahshīb, 8:189–94 (K. al-Fitan); Abū Dawūd al-Sijistānī, Kitāb al-Sunan, 4 vols., ed. Muḥammad Muḥyī al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd (Beirut, n.d.), 4:120–1 (K. al-Malāḥīm, B. Khabīr Ibn Ṣaʿīd).
9 This passage does not appear in the text of the Cairo edition of al-Ḥakīm’s book. See the comments of Prof. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān in Muqaddima, 460, n. 2.
10 Qurʾān 44:10.
Category 33

ENCHAIND 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 ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥākim listed eight types. However, the instances he mentioned are only eight basic forms or examples. They cannot, as we have said, be limited to eight.2

An example of enchainment in regard to the manner of relating and taking up the hadith is the isnād which is enchainated 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.3 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,” enchainated with the transmitters saying, “I love you, so say, [‘God, make me remember …’].”4

Another example is the hadith of joining hands and the hadith of counting on the fingers.5 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 enchainated hadith totally free from weakness, I mean, in respect to the enchainment, not the authenticity of the text. In some enchainated 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 enchainated with, “[This is] the first hadith I heard [from X],”5 according to the correct view on the subject. God knows best.

---

1 ʿUlim al-hadith, 29–34.
2 This sentence is missing from the edition of Prof. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān.
3 See, for example, Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Bāʿṭ al-Ayyūbī, al-Manāḥil al-sahala fi l-arbaʿ adaḥith al-musalsala (Beirut, 1403/1983), 182.
4 Ayyūbī, Manāḥil, 24–7.
5 Ayyūbī, Manāḥil, 58–62.
6 Ayyūbī, Manāḥil, 63–5.
7 Ayyūbī, Manāḥil, 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 Nasafi 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; Dihabib, Sihah, 13:28–32.
2 Presumably in Baghdad.
3 Buraya b. al-Husayn al-Aslami (d. ca. 62/682) was a Companion who transmitted about one hundred and fifty hadith from the Prophet; Dihabib, Sihah, 2:469–71.
5 Sahih al-Tirmidhi, 1:124 (K. al-Tabara, B. Mā jā'a fi anna al-mā min al-mā').
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 hadith 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 hadith of Ibn ‘Abbās depicting the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) being cupped while fasting. Shāfi‘ī explained that the second hadith abrogated the first, because it is related in the hadith 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 hadith 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 (muhārim) and fasting. It thereby became clear that the first hadith 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 hadith prescribing the execution of the wine drinker for his fourth offense. [The ruling in this hadith] 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 Isnads and Texts of Hadith

(Ma‘rifat al-muṣāḥḥaf min asānīd al-aḥādīth wa-muruṣiḥa)

This is a noble discipline which only the most skillful experts undertake. Dāraquṭnī is one of them and he has a useful book on it. 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 hadith of Shu‘ba from al-Awāmī b. Murājīm from Abū ‘Uthmān al-Nahdī from ‘Uthmān 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. Ma‘in misread it and said, “Ibn Muzā‘im.” and he was refuted. It is really ‘Ibn Murājīm.” Another example is what we heard from Ahmad b. Ḥanbal. He said, Muhammad b. Ja‘far [that is, “Ghundar”] informed us. He said, Shu‘ba transmitted to us from “Malik b. Urfaṭa” from Abū Khayr from Ḥiša, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) forbade the gourd and skin smeared with pitch.” Ahmad said, “Shu‘ba misread it. ‘Malik b. Urfaṭa’ 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 Dāraquṭnī 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 ‘Uthba b. al-Budhḍar,” and he related a hadith of his. The name is supposed to be Ibn al-Nuddar.

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

---

1 This apparently is a reference to Dāraquṭnī’s now-lost Kitāb taṣḥīḥ al-muḥaddithīn mentioned in Ibn Khayr al-Iṣbili, Fihrist ma‘ rawāthu an shayākhīhī, 2nd edn (Cairo, 1382/1963), 204.
3 Abū ‘Uthmān ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Mull (the vocalization of “Mull” is variously given) al-Nahdī was a Follower who died in 100/719; Dhabhī, Siyar, 4:175–8.
6 ‘Uthba b. al-Nuddār al-Shāmi was a Companion who died in 84/703; Dhabhī, Siyar, 3:417.
7 Abī Muhammad Mūsā b. ‘Uqba (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, CAS, 1:286–7. EI.
We read from Dāraqūṭnī regarding the hadith of Abū Sufyān in which Ḥabīb b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥaramī al-Anṣārī said, “On the Day of the Parties [that is, the Battle of the Trench], Ḫubayy 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, ʿabī (my father). Rather, it is “Ḫubayy b. Ka‘b.”

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

In addition, we read from Dāraqūṭnī regarding the hadith of Abū Dharr,10 “So you will help the sāmi (skillful person),” that ʿUrwā pronounced it lāḥīṭ (poor man). It is a case of misreading. The correct form is what Zuhri related, sāmi, the opposite of clumsy.

We read from Abū Zur’a al-Rāzī that Yaḥyā b. Sallām12 – he is the Qurān commentator – transmitted regarding the passage from the Qurān, “I will show you the abode of wrongdoers,”13 from ʿAṣid b. Abī ʿArūba that Qatāda said, “That is Miṣr (Egypt).” Abū Zur’a was shocked and disgusted by this. He said that in the commentary of ʿAṣid from Qatāda it is maṣṭirahum (their fate).

We read from Dāraqūṭnī that Abū Mūsā Muḥammad b. al-Muthannā al-ʿAnāzī1 transmitted the hadith 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 tan’aru (grunts).” It is supposed to be tay’aru (bleats).

We also read from Dāraqūṭnī that ʿAnāzī 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 Ṭafhā b. Nāṣir al-Iskāf was a Follower who claimed to have spent several months with Ḥabīb in Mecca; Dhahabi, Siyar, 5:293–4.
10 Abū Dharr Ǧurdub b. Junāda (his ism and nasab are disputed) al-Ghifārī (d. 32/653) was a Companion and prominent transmitter of hadith; Dhahabi, Siyar, 2:46–78.
11 According to al-Qāṭīʿ ʿIlī, this is the form which Ibn ʿUrwā misread; Mašāhīrq al-anwār ʿalā ṣabīḥ al-ṭihar, 2 vols (Beirut, n.d.), 2:47.
12 Abū Zakariyyā Yaḥyā b. Sallām al-Taymi (124/742–200/815) was a well-traveled scholar best known for his knowledge of the Qurān; Sezgin, GAS, 1:39.
13 7:145.
14 Abū Mūsā Muḥammad b. al-Muthannā al-ʿAnāzī (167/783–252/866) was a respected scholar of hadith in al-ʿBaṣra; Dhahabi, Siyar, 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 ʿAbd Allāh al-Kākim\textsuperscript{16} regarding a Bedouin who claimed that when the Prophet (Peace be upon him) prayed, a sheep—that is, an ‘anaza—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-Ṣūlī\textsuperscript{17} dictated in the congregational mosque\textsuperscript{18} the ḥadith of Abū Ayyūb,\textsuperscript{19} “Whoever fasts the month of Ramadan and follows it for 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-İsmāʿīlī according to what they read about him—used to say in the ḥadith of Aḥīa from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) regarding the soothsayers, “the pouring out (qarr) of a zujījā (glass bottle),” and it should be, “[the cackling of] a daījījā (hen).”\textsuperscript{20}

We also read in regard to the ḥadith related from Muṣḥaḡī b. Abī Sufyān,\textsuperscript{21} “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) cursed those who carefully enunciate their sermons (yushqāqīʿna al-khujab) in the manner of poetry,” that Dāraquṭnī said that on one occasion Wāqī\textsuperscript{1} [b. al-Jarrāḥ] pronounced khujab as ḥastāb [that is, making the phrase mean “those who split firewood”]. Abū Nuʿaym [al-Fāḍl b. Dukayn] was present and he repeated it to Wāqī\textsuperscript{1} with khutan. 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 taḥṣif were invented in order to entertain the reader or to warn him of possible pitfalls”; Technique, 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, G. S., 1:330–31.

\textsuperscript{18} This would seem to be a reference to the Mosque of al-Manṣūr in Baghdad.


\textsuperscript{20} The question is not as simple as the author represents it. See Bukhārī, Kitāb al-jāmiʿ al-taḥṣif, (K. al-Adab, B. Qāwī al-rajul fi-i-šayāb laya bi-i-šayāb) and (K. al-Ṭibb, B. al-Kāhānā).

\textsuperscript{21} Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Muṣḥaḡī 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; EIP, 7:263–9.

\textsuperscript{22} Abī Hāfīẓ ʿUmār b. ʿAbdād (297/909–385/995), known as Ibn Shāhīn, was the author of a number of important works in the field of ḥadīth, Sezgin, G. S., 1:209–10.
regarding that hadith, “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 (tasīf al-bāṣar) – like the hadith cited above from Ibn Lahtā – and this is more common, and the second is aural “misreading” (tasīf al-tam), as was the case in the hadith of ʿĀṣim al-Ahwāl. One person related it, saying, “from Wasil al-Aḥdab.” 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 more common, and “misreading” pertaining to the sense, not the wording, as was the case with the hadith cited above from Muhammad b. al-Muthanna on the praying toward an ṣana. 23 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, ṣana was the correct word, but Abu Mosā al-Anazi chose the wrong meaning of it.
Category 36
Contradictory Ḥadīth
(Maʿrifat 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 Qutayba'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 (mutaḍḍāḍdāyn) ḥadīth with sound isnāds were related from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). Whoevers has [seemingly contradictory ḥadīth], let him bring them to me for me to harmonize.

2. The ḥadith are so antithetical that they cannot be combined: that takes two forms: (a) it appears that one of the ḥadith 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 ḥadith 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 ḥadith 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 (Ḥe is praised) knows best.
An example of this is the hadith related from 'Abd Allah b. al-Mubarak. He said, Sufyan informed us from 'Abd al-Rahman b. Yazid b. Jabir. He said, Busr b. Ubayd Allah' transmitted to me. He said, I heard Abu Idris' saying, I heard Watheila b. al-Aasqat saying, I heard Abu Marthad al-Ghanawi' 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 Sufyan in this isnad is an addition and a mistake, just as the mention of Abu Idris is. The mistake in mentioning Sufyan was made by someone after Ibn al-Mubarak, because a number of reliable transmitters related it from Ibn al-Mubarak directly from Ibn Jabir himself. Some of these transmitters make explicit use of the phrase "He informed us" between them there. The mention of Abu Idris in the isnad is a mistake attributable to Ibn al-Mubarak. This is because a number of reliable transmitters related it from Ibn Jabir and they did not mention Abu Idris between Busr and Watheila. Some of them explicitly mention there the audition of Busr from Watheila. Abū Ḥatim al-Rāzī said, "They hold the opinion that Ibn al-Mubarak made a mistake in this. Busr often transmits from Abu Idris. Ibn al-Mubarak erred when he supposed that this was something that was related from Abu Idris from Watheila. Indeed, Busr heard this hadith directly from Watheila himself."

The expert al-Khaṭib has composed a book on this Category which he called Kitāb Tamyiz al-mazid fi muttaṣil al-asānīd (Detecting Additions in Cohesive Isnāds). There is some doubt regarding much of what he discussed. This is because an isnad lacking the additional transmitter should be judged to contain looseness (isnāl), if the transmission is marked by the word "from" ('an). Furthermore, with the isnad in which the additional transmitter is mentioned, the hadith should be regarded as defective (mu‘allaf), in accordance with what is

1 Abu 'Uba 'Abd al-Rahman b. Yazid b. Jabir (d. ca. 153/770) was a transmitter of hadith in Damascus; Duhabi, Siyar, 7:176-7.
2 Very little seems to be known about the Damascene religious scholar Busr b. 'Ubayd Allah al-Haḍrami (d. ca. 110/728); Duhabi, Siyar, 4:592.
3 Abu Idris 'Abd Allah b. 'Abd Allah al-Khawālīn (d. 80/699) was a prominent figure in early Muslim Damascus; Duhabi, Siyar, 4:272-7.
4 Watheila b. al-Aasqat (his kunya was disputed) was the last surviving Companion in Damascus. He died around 85/704; Duhabi, Siyar, 3:383-7.
5 Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, Isra'd, 3:1333-4.
6 In this context, it is impossible to determine whether Sufyan al-Thawrī or Sufyan b. Uwayma is meant.
7 Ibn Abu Ḥatim al-Razī, 'Ilat al-hadith, 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,⁸ 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 Idrīs 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-Mubārak is alleged to have said, "Ṣufyān informed us," and Busr, "I heard Abū Idrīs saying."
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-Khaṭṭib wrote Kitāb al-Taṣāwīl li-maḥām al-marāṣil (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-ʾAwwām b. Ḥawshab1 from (ʿun) ʿAbd Allāh b. Abī Awaḏ 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-ʾAwwām did not meet Ibn Abī Awaḏ.”

Another kind is the hadith 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 hadith mentioned in Category 10 from Ṣād al-Raẓzaq [b. Hammām] from [Ṣuḥayl] al-Thawrī from Abū Iṣḥāq [Ṣulaymān b. Abī Sulaymān al-Shaybānī]. Interruption and looseness were judged to exist between Ṣād al-Raẓzaq and Thawrī, because it is related that Ṣād al-Raẓzaq said, “Al-Nuʿmān b. Abī Shayba al-Janadī transmitted to me from Thawrī from Abū Iṣḥāq.” It is also judged to be loose between Thawrī and Abū Iṣḥāq, because the same hadith is also related from Thawrī from Sharīk [b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Nakhaṭ] from Abū Iṣḥāq.

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.

---
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 (aḥḥārīyin), rather than the transmitters of ḥadīth, his Kitāb al-Istāb [fi ma‘rifat al-ᾀṣāba] (Comprehensive Book [of Companions]) would have been one of the most pleasant and useful works on the subject. Proximity 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 (ṣaḥīh). The well-known practice of the adherents of ḥadīth is to regard every Muslim who saw the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) as a Companion. Bukhārī said in his Ṣaḥīh, “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-Muẓaffar al-Samānī al-Marwazi said, “The scholars of ḥadīth apply the term ‘Companion’ without qualification to all of those who related from the Prophet a ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth from him. This is the doctrine of the experts in legal theory.

Indeed, we heard that Ṣaḍīq 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 Jarir b. ‘Abd Allāh

1 2:416 (K. Faḍḥill asḥāb al-Nabi).
al-Bajahl\(^2\) 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-Sabālant\(^1\) — 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-'l-tawātur); in some cases by numerous testimonies (bi-'l-istiṣfā'ā) 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.\(^3\) 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,”\(^4\) 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.\(^5\) Many of the texts of the sunna also testify to that, including the ḥadith of Abū Saīd [al-Khudrī] — 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\(^6\) [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 Āmīr (or Abū ‘Abd Allāh) Jarīr b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Bajahl converted to Islam only forty days prior to the death of the Prophet. He died around 50/670; Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Ḥabīb, 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 (jitan) 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 conveyors of the Holy Law (al-sharfa). 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 Abü Hurayra. That judgement was related from Sa‘īd b. Abī ‘l-Ḥasan and Abū Ḥamīd b. Hanbal, and it is an obvious fact not hidden from any hadithologist. He was the first scholar of hadith (sahih hadith). We read that Abū Bakr b. Abī Dāwūd al-Sijjātī said, “I saw Abū Hurayra in a dream while I was in Sijjāt arranging his hadith. I said, ‘I love you.’ He said, ‘I was the first scholar of hadith in the world.’” We also heard that Abū 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, ʿĀqīsha, Jabīr b. ʿAbd Allah, Ibn ʿAbbās 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 (futūd) related from him is Ibn ʿAbbās. We read that Abū Ḥanbal said, “None of the Companions of the Prophet (Peace be upon him) has more legal opinions related from him than Ibn ʿAbbās.” We also heard that Abū Ḥanbal was asked, “Who are the ‘ʿAbd Allah’s?’ and he replied, “ʿAbd Allah b. ʿAbbās, ʿAbd Allah b. ʿUmar, ʿAbd Allah b. al-Zubayr and ʿAbd Allah b. Amr.” He was asked, “And Ibn Masʿūd?” He said, “No, ʿAbd Allah b. Masʿūd is not one of the ‘ʿAbd Allāhs.’” The expert Abī Ahmad 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 Allah,” and they number about two hundred and twenty. God knows best.

We heard that ʿAlī 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, Zayd b. Thābir and Ibn ʿAbbās (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 Masrūqī said, “I found that the knowledge of the

---

8 Sa‘īd b. Abī ‘l-Ḥasan Yasār al-Ǧaṣīr (d. 100/719) was the brother of the famous al-Ḥasan al-Ǧaṣīr, Dharīḥ, Siyar, 4:588–9.
9 Abū Khubayb ʿAbd Allah b. al-Zubayr b. al-ʿAwāmī al-Qurāshī (2624–73/692) was the grandson of the caliph Abū Bakr. He led an uprising against the Umayyads and died in the siege of Mecca; EJ, 1:54–5.
10 Siyar, 42.
11 Abū ʿĀqāṣa Masrūq b. al-Ajdāʾ al-Ḥamdānī (d. ca. 63/683) was a prominent Follower who converted to Islam during the lifetime of the Prophet; Dharīḥ, Siyar, 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-Darda’ and ‘Abd Allâh b. Mas‘ûd. Then the knowledge of these six went to two, ‘Ali and ‘Abd Allâh.” We heard something similar from Mu’tarrijî from Shabî from Masrûq, but he mentioned Abû Mûsâ instead of Abu ‘l-Darda’. We heard that Shabî said, “Knowledge was taken from six of the Companions of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), ‘Umar, ‘Abd Allâh [b. Mas‘ûd] and Zayd were similar in knowledge and they used to borrow from one another. The knowledge of ‘Ali, [Abû Mûsâ] al-Ash’ârî and Ubayy was similar and they used to borrow from one another.” We heard that the expert Ahmad al-Bayhaqî said that Shabî mentioned the Companions in the original version of his Treatise (Risâlatih al-qadima), praised them appropriately and then said, “They are above us in every branch of knowledge, in personal striving (iijihad), 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 Abû Zur‘a al-Razî 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 Tabûk with him.” We also heard that Abû Zur‘a was asked, “Is it not said that the hadîth of the Prophet (Peace be upon him) number four thousand?” He said, “May God loosen the canine teeth of whomever says that. This is a doctrine of the heretics. Who can count the hadîth 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 hadîth from him” – or according to another relation, “who saw him and heard hadîth from him.” He was asked, “Abû Zur‘a, those? Where were they? Where did they hear hadîth 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 hadîth from him at Mt. ʿArâfa.”

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 Abû Bakr (or Abû ‘Abd al-Raḥmân) Muṭarrij b. Ṭārîf al-Kaﬁ (d. ca. 143/760) was a highly respected transmitter of hadîth; Dhabâbî, Ṣâ’rîn, 6:127-8.
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 Tabûk 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 ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥakim put them into twelve ranks\(^7\) 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 ʿAli. The Sunnite inhabitants of al-Kūfa gave ʿAlī precedence over ʿUthmān. A number held this doctrine, including Ṣufyān al-Thawrī at first. He then went back to granting precedence to ʿUthmān. Ḥaṭṭābī related that from Ṣufyān al-Thawrī and from the other Sunnites of al-Kūfa. [Abū Bakr] Muḥammad b. Ḥishāq b. Khuzayma is one of the adherents of ḥadith who was reported to have given ʿAlī precedence over ʿUthmān. The doctrines of the scholars of ḥadith 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. Tāhir] al-Baghdādī al-Tānimī said, “Our teachers unanimously agreed that the best of them were the four Caliphs,\(^9\) 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,\(^9\) then those who participated in the battle of ʿUḥud, then those who took the Pledge of Good Pleasure at al-Ḥudaybya.” In the text of the Qurʾān, preference was granted to “the first Muhājirs and Ansarites having precedence.”\(^9\) 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.\(^2\) According to the statement of Shaḥīb they were the Companions who witnessed the Pledge of Good Pleasure. It is reported that Muḥammad b. Kaḥf al-Quraḍī\(^2\) and ʿAṭāʾ b. Yāsār\(^2\) said they were the participants in the battle of Badr. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr related that from them in something I found from him.\(^2\) 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 ʿUṭmān 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 Meccans; *EF*, 1:867–8.
20 This is a reference to Qurʾān, 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; *EF*, 5:82–3.
22 Muḥammad b. Kaḥf b. Sulaym al-Quraḍī was an expert commentator on the Qurʾān who died surrounded by his students in an earthquake around the year 120/738; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:32.
23 ʿAṭāʾ b. Yāsār, the brother of Sulaymān, died around 100/719; Dḥababī, *Siyar*, 4:448–9.
24 *Istāfāʾ, 1:14.*
渗透 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-Ghifārī], al-Miqdād7 and others. Abū `Abd Allāh al-`Ijākim said, “I know of no disagreement among the writers of histories (āshāb al-tawārikhī) that Ali b. Abī Ṭalib was the first of them to convert to Islam.” That is to be rejected from al-Ḥakim. Some said that the first to convert to Islam was Zayd b. Ḥāritha. For instance, Ma'amar [b. Rāshīd] 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. Ishāq b. Yasār and a number of others, in addition to being related from Ibn `Abbās. The Qurʾān commentator Tha'labī9 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 Abū `l-Ṭufayl Ṭāmir b. Wathila. 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. `Abd Allāh. Ahmad b. Ḥanbal related this from Qatāda. Others said Sahl b. Sa'd or al-Sā'ib b. Yazid. The last to die in Mecca was Abū Allāh b. `Umar. Jābir b. `Abd Allāh is also named. Ali b. al-Madīnī said that Abū `l-Ṭufayl died in Mecca and therefore he was the last one there. The last Companion to die in al-ṣaṣrā was Anas b. Mālik. Abū `Umar b. Abī al-Bara' said, “I do not know of anyone, other than Abū `l-Ṭufayl, who saw the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) who

25 Hassan b. Thabit b. al-Mundhir b. Ḥartām al-Anṣārī (d. ca. 60/680) was a poet who employed his gift to promote Islam; E, 3:271–3.
27 The Companion al-Miqdād b. Anur b. Tha'labah al-Kindī (d. 33/654), known as al-Miqdād b. al-Aswad, was an important transmitter of ḥadīth from the Prophet; Dhahabi, Siyar, 1:385–9.
28 Ulūm al-ḥadīth, 22–3.
29 Zayd b. Ḥāritha 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; E, 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; E, 3:898–9.
31 Abū Tālib Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Tha'lībī (d. 427/1035) was an expert in Qurʾānic commentary and the Arabic language; Brockelmann, G.A., 1:350; Suppl., 1:592.
32 Abū `Abd Allāh (or Abū Yazid) al-Sā'ib b. Yazid al-Kindī al-Madīnī is said to have died around 94/713; Dhahabi, Siyar, 3:437–9.
died after him." The last of them to die in al-Kufa was ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī Awfā and in Syria, ‘Abd Allāh b. Busr— and Abū Umāma—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 Allāh b. al-Jārīth b. Ja‘z al-Zubaydī, in Palestine, Abū Ubayy b. Umm Ḥarām, in Damascus, Wathila b. al-Asqa; in Homs, ‘Abd Allāh b. Busr; in al-Yamāma, al-Hirmās b. Ziyād; in al-Jazīra [that is, northern Iraq], al-Urs b. ‘Amira; in Ifīqiyya, Ruwayfā b. Thābit; and among the Bedouins in the desert, Salama b. al-Akwa‘ (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 Ruwayfā in Ifīqiyya is not correct. He died in the city of Barqa and his grave is there. Salama came to Medina a few nights before his death and died there. God knows best.

33 Ittāh, 1:111.
34 Abū Sa‘fāwān ‘Abd Allāh b. Busr al-Māzint is said to have died around the year 90/709; Dhaḥabi, Siyar, 3:430–3.
35 Abū Umāma al-Bahili died in Homs around the year 86/705; Dhaḥabi, Siyar, 3:359–63.
36 Abū ‘l-Jārīth ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Jārīth b. Ja‘z al-Zubaydī was present at the conquest of Egypt and settled there until his death around the year 85/704; Dhaḥabi, Siyar, 3:387–8.
38 Abū Hudayr al-Hirmās b. Ziyād b. Mālik al-Bahili seems to have still been alive around the year 90/709; Dhaḥabi, Siyar, 3:450–1.
40 Ruwayfā b. Thābit al-Anṣārī died in the year 56/676; Dhaḥabi, Siyar, 3:36.
42 Historically, there was no precise delineation of the boundaries of the geographical designations Ifīqiyya and al-Maghrib. Ibn al-Ṣalāh may have been one of those who considered Barqa (that is, Barqa, modern-day al-Marj in Libya) to be part of al-Maghrib.
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 (ṣahība) a Companion.” Its unqualified application is specific to “the Follower who performs good deeds.” A single Follower may equally be called ṭābiʿ or ṭābir. The remarks of Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥākim 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.

These are some important points regarding this Category.

1. The expert Abū ʿAbd Allāh [al-Ḥākim] said that the Followers have fifteen levels. 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 Saʿd b. al-Musayyib, Qays b. Abī Ḥaṭum, Abū ʿUthmān al-Nahdī, Qays b. Ṭubād, Abū Sāsān Ḥudayy b. al-Mundhir, Abū Wāʾil [Shaqqīq b. Salama al-Kūfī], Abū Ṣajāʾ al-ʿUṯāridī and others.  

He is wrong about some of these. Saʿd 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 Saʿd b. Abī Waqqāṣ,” is established.” Saʿd was the last of them to die. Before his remarks mentioned above,  

1 Ḥāfaẓ, 22.  
2 Qurʾān 9:100.  
3 It would appear that Ibn al-Ṣaḥāb regarded being a “companionship” of someone as more demanding than being a “follower.”  
4 Umm al-hadith, 42.  
5 Abū ʿAbd Allāh Qays b. Ṭubād al-Minqār al-Qays came to Medina during the time of ʿUmar and met a number of the important Companions there; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Ṣarḥ, 3(2):101.  
7 Abū Ṣajāʾ ʿImām b. Miḥān (or Taym) al-ʿUṯāridī died around 10/723 at about one hundred and twenty years of age; Dhahabi, Siyār, 4:253–7.  
8 Umm al-hadith, 42.  
9 The prominent Companion Saʿd b. Abī Waqqāṣ (d. ca. 65/675) played a leading role in most of the important events of the early days of Islam; EI’, 8:669–70.
al-Ḥakim said thatSa‘īd lived at the same time as ʿUmar and those after him, through the last of the Ten [to die]. He also said, “Sa‘īd and Qays b. Abī Ḥānim 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 Ḥānim died 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. Khirāsh12 said that. We also heard or read from him – and from Abū Dāwūd al-Siįṣṭānī – that he said that Qays b. Abī Ḥānim 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 Ṭalḥa,14 Abū Umāma ʿAskād b. Sahl b. Ḥunayf,15 Abū ʿIdris al-Khawlānī and others.

2. The “severed” Followers (al-mukhaḍramān min al-Tābiʿīn) were those who lived in both pre-Islamic times (al-jāhiliyya) 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 mukhaḍram, as if he khudrima; 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 Khāyr b. Yazīd al-Khaywānī, Abū ʿUṯmān ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Mull al-Nahdī and Abū ʿl-Ḥalāl Rabiʿa b. Zurāra al-ṣ-Atākī.19 Abū Muslim ʿAbd Allāh b. Thuwāb

---

10 ʿUlam al-hadīth, 25.
11 That is, because Sa‘īd 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. Sa‘īd b. Khirāsh al-Marwarī (d. 283/896) was an expert in hadith who is reported to have had Shiite leanings; Dhibāḥī, 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 ʿAbd Allāh b. Abī Ṭalḥa Zayd was the half-brother of the famous Companion Anas b. Malik; Dhibāḥī, Siyār, 3:482–4.
15 Some were of the opinion that Abū Umāma ʿAskād b. Sahl b. Ḥunayf al-Anṣārī saw the Prophet. He is said to have died in 100/719; Dhibāḥī, Siyār, 3:517–19.
16 Abū ʿAmr Sa‘īd b. Iyās al-Shaybānī was a ʿAbān who died around 91/710; Dhibāḥī, Siyār, 4:173–4.
17 Abū ʿUmayya Suwayd b. Ghafla b. Awwajī al-Kindī al-Kufī 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; Dhibāḥī, Siyār, 4:69–73.
al-Khawlānī20 and al-Ahnaf b. Qays21 are among those whom Muslim did not mention. God knows best.

3. “The Seven Jurists of Medina” (al-fuqahā' al-sab'a min ahl al-Madīna) – namely Sa'īd b. al-Musayyib, al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad,22 Urwa b. al-Zubayr, Khārijā b. Zayd,23 Abū Sa‘lama b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān, ‘Ubayd Allāh b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Uthma and Sulaymān b. Yasār24 – were among the older Followers (akābīr al-Tābirīn). We heard that the expert Abū ‘Abd Allāh [al-Ḥakīm] said, “In the opinion of most of the Hijāzi scholars, these are the Seven Jurists. We heard that Ibn al-Mubarak said, “The Medine jurists whose legal views they promulgate were seven in number,” and he named these. However, he gave Sālim b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar instead of Abū Sa‘lama b. ‘Abd 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. ‘Abd al-Rahmān25 instead of Abū Sa‘lama and Sālim.

4. It is reported that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal said, “Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyib was the best Follower.” When he was asked, “And ‘Alqama [b. Qays] and al-Aswad?” he replied, “Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyib, ‘Alqama and al-Aswad.” It is also reported that he said, “I do not know of another Follower like Abū ‘Uthmān al-Nahḍī and Qays b. Abī Hāzim.” It is also reported that he said, “The best Followers were Qays, Abū ‘Uthmān, ‘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 ‘Abd Allāh b. Khafīf al-Shirāzī.26 “People disagree over the best of the Followers. The Medine say, ‘Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyib.’ The Kūfīans say, ‘Uways al-Qarant.’” The Baṣrīans say, ‘Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī.’"

We read that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal did say, “Al-Ḥasan and ‘Aṭṭā’ [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 62/682 while campaigning against the Byzantines; Dīhāḥabī, Sīyār, 4:7-14.
21 Abū Bāyār al-Ahnaf b. Qays b. Mu‘awiya al-Tarmīn (his isnād is disputed) was one of the first inhabitants of al-Ḥarij. He fought in the eastern conquests and died in 67/687 fighting the Šī‘ite rebel Abī al-Mukhtar; Ṣezgin, GāS, 1:279.
22 Al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad (ca. 37/657-110/728) was the grandson of the caliph Abū Bakr.
24 Sulaymān b. Yāṣar (d. ca. 109/727) was a client of the Prophet’s wife Maymūna; Dīhāḥabī, Sīyār, 4:444-8.
25 Abū Bakr b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Ḥārith b. Hishām al-Makhzūmī (d. ca. 95/714) was, among other things, a prolific transmittor of hadīth; Dīhāḥabī, Sīyār, 4:416-19.
27 Abū ‘Amr Uways b. Amīr al-Qarant (d. 37/657) was a famous early ascetic; Dīhāḥabī, Sīyār, 4:19-33.
Followers. He also said, “Aṭār was the legal expert who was consulted in Mecca (mũṣṭi Makka) as al-Ḫāṣan was in al-Ḵaṣra. 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 ‘Ābd Al-Raḥmān and the third — and she was not the equal of the first two — was Umm Al-Dardū.” God knows best.

5. We heard that Abū ‘Ābd Allāh al-Ḫākim said,30 “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 Ibrāhīm b. Suwayd al-Nakha’ī — and he is not the jurist Ibrāhīm b. Yazīd al-Nakha’ī — Bukayr b. Abī ʿīr-Samīt31 and Bukayr b. ‘Ābd Allāh b. al-Âshâjī,”32 and he mentioned others.

Abū ‘Ābd Allāh al-Ḫākim added,33 “Furthermore, there is a level the people consider to be followers of the Followers although they met some of the Companions. These include Abu ʿīr-Zinād ʿĀbd Allāh b. Dhakiwān, who met ʿĀbd Allāh b. ʿUmar, Anas [b. Mālik] and Hishām b. Urwa. He was brought before ʿĀbd Allāh b. ʿUmar, Jābir b. ʿĀbd Allāh and Mūsā b. ʿUqba and was alive during the lifetime of Anas b. Mālik and Umm Khalīd bint Khalīd b. ʿĀṣhī b. al-Âṣī.”34

Comments can be made about some of what Abū ʿĀbd Allāh al-Ḫākim has said. There are also some people who are considered Followers while they are really Companions. The most surprising instance of that is Abū ʿĀbd Allāh al-Ḫākim regarding al-Nuʾrān35 and Suwayd,36 the sons of Mūqarrin al-Muzani, as Followers, when he mentions the Brothers who were Followers.37 They are well known to be Companions and frequently mentioned among the Companions. God knows best.

28 Umm al-Hudhayl Ḥafṣa (d. after 100/709) was the sister of the famous Muḥammad b. Strīm. She was a pious woman respected for her knowledge of hadith, law and the Qurʾān; Dāhābī, Sīyār, 4:198.
29 Hujayma (or Ḥujayma) al-Waṣqāthiyya, known as Umm al-Dardū al-Ṣughra, was the wife of Abu ʿīr-Dardū and an expert in religious law. She died after 81/700; Dāhābī, Sīyār, 4:277–9.
30 Qāsim al-Ḥādīth, 45.
33 Bukayr b. ʿĀbd Allāh b. al-Âshājī (d. ca. 127/745) was a transmitter of hadith who seems to have ended his days in Egypt; Dāhābī, Sīyār, 6:170–74.
34 Qāsim al-Ḥādīth, 45–6.
35 According to Dāhābī, Umm Khalīd bint Khalīd (d. ca. 90/709) was the last of the female Companions to die; Dāhābī, Sīyār, 3:370–71.
36 Abī Ḥākim (or Abī Ḥumayr) al-Nuʾrān b. Mūqarrin b. ʿĀridh (d. 21/642) was the standard bearer of his tribe at the conquest of Mecca; Dāhābī, Sīyār, 2:356–8.
38 Qāsim al-Ḥādīth, 154.
Category 41
OLDER PEOPLE TRANSMITTING ḤADĪTH FROM YOUNGER ONES
(Maʿrifat al-akābir al-ruwāt `an al-aṣāghir)

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 Ḥayāna (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 Ḥadith. That was the case of Zuhri and Yaḥyā b. Saʿīd al-Anṣārī in their relation from Mālik. It was also the case of the later scholar Abu ʿl-Qāsim Ubayd Allāh b. Ḥāmid al-Azhari1 – one of the teachers of al-Khaṭṭīb [al-Baghḍādī] – who transmitted from al-Khaṭṭīb in some of his works, and al-Khaṭṭīb 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 Ḥadith, because he is a knowledgeable expert and the person he transmits from is only a teacher (shaykh) who just transmits. This was the case with Mālik in his relation from ʿAbd Allāh b. Dīnār; and Ḥāmid b. Ḥanbal and Iṣḥāq b. Rāhawayh in their relation from Ubayd Allāh b. Mūsā. 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 ʿAbd al-Ghāni [b. Saʿīd] from Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Ṣūrī, the relation of Abū Bakr al-Barqūnī from al-Khaṭṭīb,2 the relation of al-Khaṭṭīb from Abū Naṣr b. Makūlā. Similar cases are numerous.

Subsumed under this Category are the instances of a Companion transmitting Ḥadith from a Follower which are cited, like the relation of the ʿAbd Allāhs and other Companions from Kaʿb al-Aḥbār.3 The same is true of the relation of a Follower from a follower of a Follower, for instance the relation of Zuhri and [Abū Saʿīd Yaḥyā b. Saʿīd] al-Anṣārī from Mālik, which we mentioned above. The same was true of Amr b. Shuʿayb b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmr b.

---

1 Abu ʿl-Qāsim al-Azhari (355/966–435/1043) was a respected and prolific scholar of Ḥadith; al-Khaṭṭīb al-Baghḍādī, Taʾrīkh Baghḍad, 10:385; Dḥababi, Siyār, 17:578.
2 Needless to say, few would agree with the author that Abū Bakr al-Barqūnī, for all of his merits, was of greater stature than al-Khaṭṭīb al-Baghḍādī.
3 The authority on the Bible Abū Iṣḥāq Kaʿb b. Māṭā (d. 32/652 or 34/654), popularly known as Kaʿb al-Aḥbār, was a Yemenite Jew who converted to Islam; EoF, 4:316–17; Sezgin, GNon, 1:304–5.
al-‘Āṣ. He was not a Follower, yet more than twenty Followers transmitted from him. The expert ‘Abd al-Ghani b. Sa’d collected the names of those Followers in a small book. I read in the handwriting of the expert Abū Muhammad al-‘Ṭabāsī in one of his compilations that he said, “Amr b. Shu‘ayb was not a Follower, yet some seventy Followers transmitted hadīth from him.” God knows best.

4 Abū Ibrāhīm ‘Amr b. Shu‘ayb was an expert in law and hadīth who lived in al-Ṭabāsī. He was a member of the generation after the Followers, although his exact dates do not seem to have been recorded; Dhahabi, Siyar, 5:165–80.
5 This appears to be a reference to Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Abī Ja‘far al-Ṭabāsī, whose kunya is usually given as “Abū ‘l-Faḍl.” He was a Sufi who died in Tabas in 482/1089, Brockelmann, G.A.L., 1:496; Suppl., 1:907.
Category 42

SYMMETRICAL TRANSMISSIONS,1 AND OTHER INSTANCES OF PEERS TRANSMITTING FROM ONE ANOTHER

(Marifat al-mudabbaj wa-mâ addâhu min riwayat al-aqrân ba’dihim ‘an ba’d)

Peers are those who are alike in regard to age and [their relative position] in isnâds. Occasionally Abû ‘Abd Allâh al-Ḥâkim was satisfied with their being alike in regard to isnâds, 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 ʿAʾisha and Abû Hurayra, each of whom related from the other. An example from the Followers is the relation of Zuhri from ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz and the relation of ʿUmar from Zuhri. An example from the followers of the Followers is the relation of Mâlik from Awzâʿî and the relation of Awzâʿî from Mâlik. An example from the followers of the followers [of the Followers] is the relation of Ahmad b. Ḥanbal from ʿAlî b. al-Ḥadîm and the relation of ʿAlî from Ahmad. Al-Ḥâkim gave as an example of the last the relation of Ahmad b. Ḥanbal from ʿAbd al-Razzâq [b. Hammâm] and the relation of ʿAbd al-Razzâq from Ahmad, 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 Sûlâyân al-Taymi from Mîṣâr.3 They were peers and we do not know of a case of Mîṣâr relating from Taymi. There are many examples like this. God knows best.

---

1 This translation is based on the derivation of mudabbaj Ibn Ḥajar proposes in Nuskhat al-naṣar, 110.
2 ʿUlam al-hadîth, 218. Ibn al-Ṣâlîh may have been objecting to regarding them as peers because ʿAbd al-Razzâq was already thirty-eight lunar years old at the time of Ahmad’s birth. This would then be an example of al-Ḥâkim ignoring ages.
3 Abû Salama Mîṣâr b. Kidâm b. Zuhayr al-Kûfî (d. 155/772) was considered by some to be the greatest transmitter of his day in al-Kûfâ; Dhalabi, Sīyar, 7:163–73.
This is one of the branches of knowledge which the scholars of hadith have treated in independent works. 'Ali b. al-Madini,\(^1\) Abu ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Nasawi [that is, Nasr], Abu ʿl-ʿAbbās al-Sarrāj\(^2\) and others composed books on it.

Examples of two siblings from the Companions are the brothers ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd and ʿUtbah b. Masʿūd,\(^3\) the brothers Zayd b. Thābit and Yazd b. Thābit,\(^4\) and the brothers ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ and Hishām b. al-ʿĀṣ.\(^5\) Examples from the Followers are Abū Maysara ʿAmr b. Shurahbil and his brother Arqam b. Shurahbil,\(^6\) both of whom were among the finest students of ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd. Huzayl b. Shurahbil\(^7\) and Arqam b. Shurahbil were two other brothers who were also students of Ibn Masʿūd.

---

1 This appears to be a reference to Ibn al-Madini’s ʿTasmiyat man ruwwaʿa suna min awlād al-wahra wa-qhayrim min Aḥbāb Rasūl Allāh, which contains a section on brothers and sisters. This work has been published with Abu Dāwūd al-Sijistānī’s ʿTasmiyat al-ikhwā alladīna ruwwaʿa ʿanhum al-hadīth in a volume entitled ʿAl-Rawāt min al-ikhwā wa-l-akhwāt, ed. Basim Fayṣal al-Jawābah (Riyadh, 1408/1988).
2 Muḥammad b. Isḥāq al-Thaqafi al-Sarrāj al-Nisabhūrī (216/831–313/925) was a famous scholar of hadith and a prolific author. Among his works was a masnad and a taʾriḵ, which Bukhārī is said to have used; See, G.A.S., 1:173.
3 Dḥahabī, Siyār, 1:500.
5 ʿAbd Allāh ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ al-Sahmi 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 ʿUthmān removed him. He aided the founder of the Umayyad dynasty Muʿawiya in defeating the caliph ʿAli and resumed his position in Egypt until his death around 42/663; EF, 1:451.
6 Hishām was an early convert to Islam who participated in a number of the famous battles and died in combat; Dḥahabī, Siyār, 3:77–9.
7 Ibn al-Salāḥ seems to have been under the impression that there were two Arqam b. Shurahbils, one the brother of ʿAmr and the other the brother of Huzayl. The sources only know a single Arqam b. Shurahbil — e.g., Bukhārī, ʿAl-Taʾrīḵ al-kahīr, 1(2):46; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Ḥarīḥ, 1(1):310 — and the notion of two Arqams was explicitly rejected by later commentators; e.g., Ḥarīṭ, Taḡyīr, 337–8.
Examples of three brothers are Sahl, 'Abbād, and 'Uthmān, the sons of Ḥunayf; and 'Amr b. Shu'ayb, 'Umar, and Shu'ayb b. Muhammad b. 'Abbāl Allāh b. 'Amr b. al-Ḳāṣ. An example of four brothers is Suhayl b. Abī Ṣāliḥ al-Sammān al-Zayyāt and his brothers 'Abīd Allāh—who was also called 'Abbād—Muḥammad and Ṣāliḥ. An example of five is what we hear from Abū 'Abbāl Allāh al-Ḫākim. He said, “I heard the expert Abū ʿAlī al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī more than once say, ʿĀdam b. ʿUyayn,”[3] ʿĪmrān b. ʿUyayn, Muḥammad b. ʿUyayn,[7] ʿAlī b. ʿUyayn and Ibrāhīm b. ʿUyayn transmitted ḥadith from up to the last of them.”[12]

An example of six are the children of Sirīn, six Followers. They are Muḥammad, Anas,[32] Yahyā,[34] Maḥbūb,[34] Ḥāfṣa and Karima.[34] Abū ʿAbbāl al-Rahmān al-Nasawī gave them thus—and I transmitted it from a copy of his book which was written in what I think is the handwriting of Dāraqūṭn. That is also related from Yahyā b. Maʿīn and al-Ḫākim gave them thus in Kitāb Maʾrifāt [that is, Kitāb maʾrifāt ʿalām al-ḥadīth]. However, he said in what we hear from his Taʾrīkh, through our isnād from him, that he heard the expert Abū ʿAlī al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī mention the Banū Sirīn as five siblings: Muḥammad b. Sirīn; the eldest of them, Maḥbūb b. Sirīn; Yahyā b. Sirīn; Khālid b. Sirīn; Anas b. Sirīn.

9 Sahl b. Ḥunayf b. Wāḥib al-Anṣārī (five different kunyās are suggested for him), like his brother ʿUthmān, was considered a Companion. He served as a lieutenant of ʿAlī and died in al-Kufa in 8/658; Dīhāḥabī, Siyar, 2:325–9.
10 I have not succeeded in locating ʿAbbād in any of the sources I consulted.
11 Abū ʿAbbāl Allāh ʿUthmān (d. ca. 50/670) served as a governor under ʿUmar and ʿAlī and played an important role in the development of the taxation policy of the Muslim empire; Dīhāḥabī, Siyar, 2:320–2.
12 I have not found any information about ʿUmar.
14 Dīhāḥabī suggested that the father Shu'ayb died after the year 83/699; Siyar, 5:181.
21 Ḥātim (ca. 120/738–199/815) was a good man and an average transmitter of ḥadīth; Dīhāḥabī, Siyar, 8:475.
22 Ulūm al-ḥadīth, 155.
23 Dīhāḥabī, Siyar, 4:622–3.
26 I have not located her in the sources.
27 Anas is given as “Anis” (or “Unays”) in the printed text of Ulūm al-ḥadīth, 153.
28 This would appear to be a reference to al-Ḫākim’s Taʾrīkh Nisāḥab, although it is not clear why the Ǧabarīn Ibn Sirīn family would be discussed in that book.
29 I have not found Khālid in the sources.
Sirin; and the youngest of them, Ḥafṣa bint Sirīn." It was related from Muhammad from Yaḥya from Anas from Anas b. Mālik 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 Maʿṣīl, ʿAqīl, Suwayd, Sinān, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān 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-Barr 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, 3:1432.
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.
Al-Khaṭṭāb has a book on this. As an example of this, we heard the ḥadith from al-ʿAbbās b. ʿAbd 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-Muzdalīfā.

We also heard in this regard from Waʾil b. Dāwūd’ from his son Bakr b. Waʾil’ — and they are both reliable — several ḥadīths, including the ḥadīth from [Sufyān] b. ʿUyayna from Waʾil b. Dāwūd from his son Bakr from Zuhrt from ʿAmīr 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 ḥadīth is not related from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) by anyone but Bakr and his father.”

We heard that Muṭṭamir b. Sulaymān al-Taymī said, “My father transmitted to me, saying, ‘You transmitted to me from me from Ayyūb [al-Sakhtiyān] from al-Ḥasan [al-ʿAbdī]. He said, ‘Woe is a word of blessing.’” This is an unusual report which embraces several Categories. We heard around sixteen ḥadīths from Abū Ṣādār al-Muqrī from his son Abū Ṣaffar 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 ḥadīth Abu ʿl-Muẓaffar ʿAbd al-Raḥīm, the son of the expert Abū Saʿd [ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Saʿdī] al-Marwizi, (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 Abu ʿl-Muẓaffar ʿAbd al-Raḥīm transmitted to me personally and from his written original. Abū Saʿd gave it with his iṣnād from Abū Umāma [Asʿad b. ʿAbd al-Raḥīm b. Hūnafi] 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; Ḍhahabi, Siyar, 2:78–103.
3. Abū Muḥammad al-Fadl (d. 18/639) was the eldest child of Abū ʿAbbās; Bukhārī, al-Tārīkh al-kabīr, 4(1):114; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Ḥarb, 3(2):63.
6. Muṭṭamir, the son of the famous Sulaymān b. Ṭarkhān al-Taymī al-ʿAbdī, was born in 106/724 and died in al-Bayra in 187/803; Ḍhahabi, Siyar, 8:477–9.
7. Abū Ṣādār al-Dūrī (d. ca. 246/860) was an expert in the Qurʾān; Ḍhahabi, Siyar, 11:541–3.
The hadith which we heard from Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddiq from [his daughter] Ḥāʾishah 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. Ḥāʾishah, and this Abū Bakr is ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddiq. Those people are the ones about whom Mūsā b. ʿUqba 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,10 Abū Bakr’s son ʿAbd al-Rahmān11 and the last’s son Abū ʿAtiq Muḥammad12 [sic]. God knows best.

9 Ibn Abī Ṭāṭī was known for his sharp wit; *EP*, 3:682.
10 Abū Qaḥṭa Ṭūḥmān 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 Ṭā ṣāl al-Barr, *Iṣrāʾīl*, 4:1732–3.
11 Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Rahmān, the son of Abū Bakr and the brother of the Prophet’s wife Ĥāʾishah, died in 53/673; Dhahabī, *Sīyar*, 2:471–3.
THE TRANSMISSION BY SONS FROM THEIR FATHERS

(Ma‘rifat riwayat al-abnā‘ an al-ābā‘)

The expert Abū Naṣr al-Wa‘īli [al-Siḥzi] 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. ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ.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 ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ, rather than ‘Abd Allah’s son Muhammad, the father of Shu‘ayb,4 on account of the instances of ‘Abd 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 Mu‘āwiyah b. Ḥayda al-Qushayri.6

A further example is “Ṭalḥa b. Muṣarrif” from his father from his grandfather” and “his grandfather” is ‘Amr b. Ka‘b al-Yami, or, it is said, Ka‘b b. ‘Amr.7

The most amusing example of that is the relation of the Ḥanbalite jurist Abu ‘l-Faraj ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Tamimi8 – and he had a circle for

---

1 Kithār Riwayat al-abnā‘ an al-ābā‘im; Kattāmī, Risāla, 163.
2 Muhammad al-Sahmī seems to have been primarily known for his transmissions from his father; Dhahabī, Siyār, 5:181–3.
3 The question here revolves around the correct interpretation of the Arabic word jādd, which commonly means “grandfather” but may validly be applied to more remote ancestors as well.
4 If they did not take the Companion ‘Abd Allah to be the “grandfather,” they would not have been able to cite the hadith because they would have been “loose.”
5 That is, ‘Abd Allah is actually named in some of the isnāds attached to these hadith; see Bulqīnī, Maḥāsin, 541.
6 Mu‘āwiyah b. Ḥayda al-Qushayri was a Companion of the Prophet. He was the grandfather of Bahz’s father; Bukhārī, al-Tārikh al-kabīr, 4(1):329; Ibn Abī Ḥatīm, Ṣaḥīḥ, 4(1):376.
7 Abū Muhammad Ṭalḥa b. Muṣarrif al-Yami al-Handānī was an unusual Kāfan who liked the caliph ‘Uthmān and regarded nahdah as forbidden; Dhahabī, Siyār, 5:191–3. According to the nuskhah of Ṭalḥa given by Bukhārī, Ka‘b was his grandfather; al-Tārikh al-kabīr, 2(2):346.
8 This Companion appears both ways in isnāds; Ibn Ṣaad al-Barr, Istīḥāb, 3:1199, 1322–3.
preaching and issuing legal opinions in the Mosque of Mansur in Baghdad — from his father with nine of his ancestors in succession. The teacher Abu 'l-Hasan Mu'ayyad b. Muhammad b. 'Ali al-Nasaburi10 informed me of it through my recitation to him in Nishapur. He said, Abu Mansur 'Abd al-Rahman b. Muhammad al-Shaybani informed us in his letter to us. He said, the expert Abu Bakr Ahmad b. 'Ali [that is, al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādi] informed us. He said, ‘Abd al-Wahhab b. 'Abd al-'Aziz b. al-Harith b. Asad b. al-Layth b. Sulaymān b. al-Aswad b. Sufyān b. Yazid b. Ukhayna b. 'Abd Allāh al-Tamimī personally transmitted to us. He said, I heard my father saying, I heard my father saying, I heard my father saying, I heard my father saying, I heard my father saying, I heard my father saying, I heard my father saying, I heard my father saying, I heard my father saying, I heard my father saying. He was asked about “the Merciful Giver” (al-‘amīn al-mannān). He said, “Merciful” is the one who turns toward someone who turns away from him. ‘Giver’ is the one who gives a gift before it is requested.” The last of them is Ukayna, and he is the one who heard ‘Ali (God be pleased with him).12

Abu 'l-Muzaffar 'Abd al-Rahim, the son of the expert Abu Salīm al-Samā'ī, transmitted to me in Marv al-Shahjan from Abu 'l-Nasr 'Abd al-Rahman b. 'Abd al-Jabbar al-Fātimi.13 He said, I heard the descendent of the Prophet Abu 'l-Qasim Mansur b. Muhammad al-'Alawī saying, “Part of a [good] isnād is elevated transmitters and part of it is noble features. A man saying, ‘My father transmitted to me from my grandfather,’ is one of the noble features.”

2. The relation of a son from his father without the grandfather: this is a vast topic. An example is the relation of Abu ‘l-'Usharā al-Dārimi from his father from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). His hadith are well known but his identity has been disputed. The best-known view is that Abu ‘l-'Usharā is Usama b. Malik b. Qiqām. According to what I transmitted from the handwriting of Bayhaqī and others, the name of his grandfather is pronounced “Qiqām.” “Qiqām” is also given. It is also said that Abu ‘l-'Usharā al-Dārimi is 'Uṯūrid b. Barz. It is also pronounced “Baraz.” Some instead say “Ibn Balz.” There are also other disagreements concerning his name and the name of his father.14 God knows best.

10 Abu ‘l-Hasan Mu‘ayyad b. Muhammad b. ‘Ali al-Tast al-Nasabī (524/1130–617/1220) received several major collections of hadith at an early age and then lived long enough to become a sought-after transmitter of them; Dihabah, Siyar, 22:104–7.
11 Known as al-Qazzaq (453/1061–535/1141), he transmitted Turākh Baghdad from al-Khaṭīb; Dihabah, Siyar, 29:69–70.
12 Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādi, Turākh Baghdad, 11:32.
14 I have not been able to identify this individual.
Category 46

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-riwāya ‘anhu rāwiyān mutaqaddim wa-muta’akhhir tabāyana waqt wafâtayhim tabāyunan shadidan fa-ḥaṣala baynahum amad ba‘id wa-in kāna al-muta’akhhir minhumā ghayr ma‘dūd min mu‘āširi ‘l-awwal wa-dhawī ṭabaqatihi)

One of the uses of this Category is to fix the sweetness of elevated isnāds in human hearts. Al-Khaṭṭāb devoted a fine book to this subject called Kitāb al-Sābiq wa-‘l-lāḥiq (The First and Last Students of Transmitters). An example of this is Muhammad b. İṣḥaq al-Thaqafi al-Sarrāj al-Nisābūri. The authority Bukhārī related from him in his Ṭarā‘īkh and Abu ‘l-Ḥusayn Aḥmad b. Muhammad al-Khaḍaf al-Nisābūri also related from him. There is a span of 137 [lunar] years or more between their deaths, since Bukhārī died in 256 [870 AD] and al-Khaḍaf died in either 393 [1002 AD], 394 or 395.

Another example is the imām Malik b. Anas. Zuhri and Zakarti both b. Duwayd al-Kindī transmitted hadith 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 Ḥajīt Khalīfa, Kaskf, 2:col. 973.
2 Al-Khaḍaf was one of the most elevated transmitters of hadith of his era; Dhahabi, Siyar, 16:481-2.
3 According to Ibn Ḥibbān, “he used to tour Syria, transmitting [his forgeries] to the inhabitants and claiming that he was one hundred and thirty-five years old,” Majrīḥūn, 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. Khanbash is a Companion from whom Sha'bi alone related hadith. He appears as “Harim b. Khanbash” in the books of al-Hākim and Abū Nu‘aym al-Iṣbahānī on the sciences of hadith and this form of his name is an error originating in the relation of Dāwūd al-Awdī from Sha'bi.

The same is true of ‘Amir b. Shahr, ‘Urwa b. Muḍarris, 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 Sha'bi related hadith.

Qays b. Abī Ḥātim was alone in relating hadith from his father, Dukayn b. Sa‘dī al-Muzanī, al-Ṣu‘ābīḥ b. Al-‘Aṣarī, and Mīrād b. Mālik al-Āslamī, all of whom were Companions.

Qudāma b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Kilābī is also one of them. Only Ayman b. Nābil related hadith from him.

---

3. ‘Ulam al-hadith, 158.
Among the Companions there is a group from whom only their sons related hadith, including

Shakal b. Ḥumayd\(^\text{15}\) his son Shutayr\(^\text{16}\) is the only one who related hadith from him.

One of them is al-Musayyib b. Ḥazn al-Qurashi\(^\text{17}\) his son Saʻīd b. al-Musayyib was the only one to relate hadith from him.

Muṣawiyah b. Ḥayda: his son Ḥakim,\(^\text{18}\) the father of Bahz, was the only one to relate hadith from him.

Qurra b. Iyās:\(^\text{19}\) no one related hadith from him beside his son Muṣawiyah.

Abū Laylā al-ʿAnṣāri,\(^\text{20}\) his son ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Laylā\(^\text{21}\) was the only one to relate hadith from him.

Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥākim in al-Madkhal fi Kitāb al-Ikhlīṣ\(^\text{22}\) (Introduction to The Book of the Crown) expressed the opinion that Bukhārī and Muslim did not include in their Ṣahih the hadith of any individual of this type. He was criticized for that claim and it is refuted by Bukhārī’s including in his Ṣahih the hadith of Qays b. Abī Ḥātim from Mirdās al-ʿAslami, “The righteous will disappear one by one.”\(^\text{23}\) Qays was the only transmitter from Mirdās al-ʿAslami. It is also refuted by Bukhārī’s inclusion\(^\text{24}\) – rather the inclusion by both Bukhārī and Muslim\(^\text{25}\) – of the hadith of al-Musayyib b. Ḥazn on the death of Abū Ṭaḥlib,\(^\text{26}\) although his son (that is, Saʻīd b. al-Musayyib) was the sole transmitter from him. It is further refuted by Bukhārī’s inclusion of the hadith of al-Ḥasan al-ʿBayr from ʿAmr b. Ṭaghlīb,\(^\text{27}\) “I give to a man … and the one I omit is dearer to me.”\(^\text{28}\) Al-Ḥasan was the only one who related hadith from ʿAmr. Similarly, Muslim

\(^{15}\) Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Ṣiyāḥ, 2:710.

\(^{16}\) Bukhārī, al-Tārīkh al-kabīr, 2:265; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Ṣiyāḥ, 2:387

\(^{17}\) Bukhārī, al-Tārīkh al-kabīr, 4:106-7; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Ṣiyāḥ, 4:194-5.

\(^{18}\) Bukhārī, al-Tārīkh al-kabīr, 2:11; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Ṣiyāḥ, 1:207.

\(^{19}\) Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Ṣiyāḥ, 3:1280.


\(^{21}\) Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Ṣiyāḥ, 4:1744.

\(^{22}\) ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Laylā (d. ca. 83/702) was a prominent religious scholar in the city of al-Kufa; Duhaybi, Ṣiyāḥ, 4:262-7.

\(^{23}\) P. 11 (Arabic), 14-15 (English).


\(^{26}\) 1:40 (K. al-Imān).

\(^{27}\) Abū Ṭaḥlib was the Prophet’s uncle and the father of ʿAli. 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.

\(^{28}\) Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Ṣiyāḥ, 3:1166-7.

\(^{29}\) 4:494 (K. al-Tawḥīd, B. Qawl Allāh imma al-insān khuliqa halūṣan ḍajūra).
included in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* the hadith of Rāfīʾ b. ‘Amr al-Ghifārī while ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Sāmī was the only one to relate hadith from him. Muslim also included the hadith of Abū Rifa‘a al-‘Adwārī despite the fact that Ḥumayd b. Ḥilal al-‘Adwārī was the only one to relate hadith from him. Muslim also included the hadith of al-Agharr al-Muzaniyy “My heart is covered” and Abū Burdah was the only one to relate hadith from him. Bukhārī and Muslim have many hadith of this type in their books. That indicates their belief that a transmitter sometimes emerges from being unknown and rejected (majhūl mardīd) through the relation of a single person from him. I discussed this earlier in Category 23. Nevertheless I have read through discovery (waqādatan) that Abū Umār b. ‘Abd 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 was famous for asceticism and ‘Amr b. Ma‘dī Karib 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. ‘Abd Allāh. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr said that Ḥumayd b. Kullāb also related hadith from him. God knows best.

An example of this Category from the Followers is Abu 'l-‘Ushārāt al-Ḏarimī. So far as is known, no one but Ḥammād b. Salama related hadith from him. Al-Ḥākim cited Muḥammad b. Abī Suflān al-Thaqāfī as an example of a

---

33 Abī ‘Umar Ḥumayd b. Ḥilal b. Suwayd al-‘Adwārī (d. ca. 120/738) was one of the most respected hadith transmitters in al-Ṭarāṣṭ; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 5:309–11.
35 8/72 (K. al-Du‘āk wa-l-de‘rīn).
36 The son of Abū Burdah, the son of the famous Companion Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī, is said to have been ‘Amir (see below, Category 30). He served as judge in al-Kufa and died around 104/722; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:343–6, 5:5–7.
37 As Prof. ‘Abd al-Rahman points out, the examples in this paragraph were taken from Ibn al-Qaysarīn, *Sharḥ al-ṣhimma al-sittā* (bound with Ḥākimī, *Sharḥ al-ṣhimma al-khamsa*), ed. Muḥammad Zāhid al-Kawthārī (Cairo, n.d.), 17.
38 Abū Yahyā Mālik b. Dinār al-Sāmī al-Najî (d. 131/748) was, as indicated here, a famous early ascetic, Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:634.
40 *Iṣṭiḥāb*, 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 ḥadīth from him. He said, “In the same way, Zuhrī was alone in transmitting ḥadīth from some twenty Followers from whom no one else transmitted. The same was true of Ḥārī b. Dīnār who was also alone in transmitting ḥadīth from a number of Followers. It was also true of Yahyā b. Saʿīd al-Anṣārī, Abū Ishaq al-Sabīʿī, Hishām b. Ḫirwa and others.” 43 Al-Ḥākim elsewhere named some of the Followers from whom they alone transmitted. 44 Among those from whom Ḥārī b. Dīnār was alone in transmitting ḥadīth were Ḥāmid b. Rāḥmān b. Maḥdī and Ḥāmid b. Rāḥmān b. Farākh. 45 Ḥārī b. Abūb b. ‘Uthmān 46 and Sinān b. Abī Sinān al-Du‘alah were among those from whom Zuhrī was alone in transmitting ḥadīth. ‘Abd Allāh b. Unays al-Anṣārī 47 was someone from whom Yahyā was alone in transmitting ḥadīth.

Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim cites Al-Miswar b. Rifa‘a al-Qurazī 48 as an example of a Follower of a Follower and said that only Mālik related ḥadīth from him. In the same way, Mālik was alone in relating from about ten of the teachers of Medina. 49 I fear that al-Ḥākim 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 Ulum al-ḥadīth, 160.
44 What al-Ḥākim says in Ulum al-ḥadīth (p. 160) is, “It is too much to mention them in this place.”
51 Ulum al-ḥadīth, 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'tt muta'addida fa-'ann lā khibra lahu bihā anna tilka 'l-asma' aw al-nu'tt li-jamā'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 Abu 'Abd al-Ghani b. Sa'id al-Misri and others have composed books on this topic. An example of this is Muhammad b. al-Sa'ib al-Kalbi, the author of the Qur'ān commentary. He is the "Abu 'l-Nadżd" from whom Muhammad b. Isḥāq b. Yasar related the hadith of Tamim al-Dārī and 'Adī b. Badr. He is the "Hammād b. al-Sa'ib" from whom Abu Usama related the hadith, "A hide becomes purified when it is tanned." He is also the "Abū Sa'id" from whom 'Atiya al-Awfi related Qur'ān commentary. He misrepresented Kalbi by giving the false impression that he was Abū Sa'id al-Khuḍrī.

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 Dāqiq al-Ṣādiq al-Iṣṭiglāl fi 'l-ḥikāya bi-ridāqāt, ed. Amir Ḥasan Šabr (Beirut, 1417/1996), 218.
2 This would seem to be a reference to his Iṣṭiglāl fi 'l-ḥikāya bi-ridāqāt mentioned in Brockedmann, 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 EP, 4:494–5; Sezgin, CAG, 1:34–5.
4 The Companion Abū Rāqayya Tamim b. Aws al-Dārī (d. 400/660) was best known for his expertise in the Qur'ān; Dhaḥabi, Siyyar, 2:442–8.
5 Ibn Ḥajar, Isāba, 2:467.
6 Hammād b. Usama b. Zayd al-Kufrī (ca. 120/738–201/817) was a highly respected transmitter of hadith; Dhaḥabi, Siyyar, 9:277–9.
7 That Abu 'l-Ḥasan 'Atiya b. Sa'id b. Junaid al-Awfi (d. 111/729) was a student of Kalbi is inherently improbable, although not impossible, given that 'Atiya, 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 Ḥātim al-Raṣī (in his son's Jarḥ, 3[1]:383) introduces the assertion that 'Atiya took the commentary from Kalbi with the somewhat circumspect balaghani. He does not, by the way, mention that 'Atiya called him "Abū Sa'id." For 'Atiya, see Sezgin, CAG, 1:30–1.
Another example is “Ṣālim,” the transmitter from Abū Hurayra, Abū Saʿīd al-Khuḍrī and ʿĀisha (God be pleased with them). He is “Ṣālim Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Madīnī,” “Ṣālim, the client of Mālik b. Aws b. al-Ḥadathān al-Naṣrī” and “Ṣālim, the client of Shaddād b. al-Ḥād al-Naṣrī.” In some relations he is called “Ṣālim, client of the two Naṣrīs,” in others “Ṣālim, the client of Maḥrī,” in others “Ṣālim Ṣabālān;” in others “Abū ‘Abd Allāh, the client of Shaddād b. al-Ḥād;” in others “Ṣālim Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Dawārī,” and in some “Ṣālim, the client of the Dawārī.” Abū al-Ghanī b. Saʿīd mentioned all of that.


---

8 Ṣālim is described as “one of the scholars of the city of Medina,” Ḥababī, Siyar, 4:595–6.
9 Abu ʿl-Qāsim al-Tanūkhī (365/976–447/1055) was a hadith expert who served as a judge in a number of cities; al-Khaṭṭāb al-Baghdādī, Taʾrīkh Baghdad, 12:115.
Category 49

Unique Names, Nicknames and Pseudonyms of the Companions, Transmitters of Hadith, and Other Scholars

(Ma‘rifat al-mufradat al-ahad min asma‘ al-Šahaba wa-ruwat al-hadith wa-l-'alama‘ wa-alqābihim 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\(^1\) and they also wrote monographs on it.

The book of Ahmad b. Ḥarūn al-Bardijāi al-Bardha‘i entitled al-Asma‘ al-mufrada‘ (Unique Names) is one of most famous works on the topic. More than one expert, including Abū ‘Abd Allāh b. Bukayr,\(^1\) objected and made corrections to much of it. One criticism is that many of the names Bardiji 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 (asma‘) 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-Ajlāh al-Ḵindī” (the bald member of the tribe of Kinda) was a nickname given to that man on account of his baldness and his name is Yahyā, and there are many Yahyās. Another example is Šughdī b. Sinān.\(^1\) His name is ‘Umar, and “Šughdī” [a Šughdīan; that is, a man from the town of Šughd, near Samarkand] is a nickname. Furthermore, there are other Šughdīs, 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 Bukhārī’s al-Tārīkh al-kabīr and Ibn Abī Ḥātim’s Kitāb al-farr wa-l-tsādīl, 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-Ṯābaqtī fi ’l-asma‘ al-mufrada min asma‘ al-šulāma‘ wa-asfāb al-hadith in Sezgin, GAS, 1:166–7.
Some of the useful examples of this are

_Ajmād_ b. ʿUyyān al-ʿIjamāt:

He was a Companion whom Ibn Yūnūs mentioned. We used to think it was “Ijjiyān,” following the pattern of “Iliyyān.” Then I found it in the handwriting of Ibn al-Furāt — and he is authoritative — as “Uyyān,” on the pattern of “Susyān.”

_Awsāf_ b. ʿAmr al-Bajāli:

_Awsāf_ is a Companion.

 además b. Ṣubayh al-Kalābī: He transmitted hadith from Tubay b. ʿAmir al-Kalābī.9 His name is also given as “Yadām,” although the correct form is “Yadām.”

_Jubayb_ b. al-Ḥarīth:


Abu ʿl-Ghāṣm al-Duḍayn b. Thābit: it was claimed that he was the well-known Juḥā.10 It is more likely that he was somebody else.

_Zīr_ b. Hubaysh: the early Follower.

_Sūyūr_ b. al-Khīm: he was alone in regard to his name and the name of his father.

_Sandar_ al-Khaṣṭ, the client of Zinbat al-Jadhāmi: he was a Companion.

The Companion Shakāl b. Ḥumayd.

6 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, _Ittīṣāb_, 1:144.
10 He was better known as Tubay b. Imrāʿat Kaḥb al-Aṣṣār; Dhahabi, _Siyār_, 4:413–14.
11 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, _Ittīṣāb_, 1:271.
13 Dhahabi, _Siyār_, 8:1723.
14 Juḥā 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 Qurʾān; Dhahabi, _Siyār_, 4:166–70.
17 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, _Ittīṣāb_, 2:688.
18 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, _Ittīṣāb_, 2:564–5.
Abū Rayhān Ibn al-Salāh al-Shahrāzūrī

Abū Rayhān Shamsīn b. Zayd: 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 Umāma Ṣaudī b. ʿAjlān.

The Companion Ṣanābīh b. al-ʿĀṣar. Whoever called him “Ṣanābīh” has erred.

Abū ʿl-Salih Dūrayb b. Nuqayr b. Sumayr al-Qaysī al-Baṣrī: he related
from Muʿādha b. ʿAdāwiyah and others. Nuqayr was his father. His name
is also given as “Nufayr” and “Nufayl.”


Qarthaʿ al-Ḍabbī: a Companion.

Kalada b. Ḥanbal: a Companion.

The Companion Lubayy b. Labā al-ʿAsadī: the first name is on
the pattern of “Ubayy.” The second name is on the pattern of the word ṣasā
(stick). Make a note of this name, for it is sometimes given incorrectly.

Mustamirr b. al-Rayyān: he saw Anāṣ [b. Malik].


Namf al-Bikāl: a Follower belonging to the Bikāl, one of the subtribes
of the Ḥimyar. Most of the scholars of ḥadith [erroneously] pronounce
it “Bakkāl.”

The Companion Wābiṣa b. Maʿbad.


---

20 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istīʿāb, 2:736.
21 For this question, see Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istīʿāb, 2:740; Suyūṭī, Tadhkīr al-ʾawārī, 2:272–3.
23 Muʿādha bint ʿAbd Allāh (d. ca. 83/702) was famed for her piety; Dihāʾ, Siyar, 4:508–9.
27 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istīʿāb, 3:1340.
31 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istīʿāb, 4:1563.
32 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istīʿāb, 4:1548.
Some unique paidonymics are

**Abu l-`Ubaydayn:** his name is Muḥāwiya b. Sabra and he was one of the students of Ibn Masʿūd. He has two or three ḥadith.

**Abu l-`Usharār al-Dārimi:** he was mentioned above.

**Abu l-Mudīlla:** His name is not known. Al-Aʿmash, Ibn `Uyayna and a number of others related ḥadith from him. We do not know of anyone who agrees with the contention of Abu Nuʿaym [al-љahān?] that his name is Ubayd Allāh al-Madāni.

**Abū Marāya al-Ŷil:** his name is `Abd Allāh b. `Amr. He was a Follower from whom Qatāda related ḥadith.

**Abū Muʿayyid:**7 he is Ḥāfs b. Ghaylān al-Hamdāni. He related ḥadith from Makḥūṭ8 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.

**Sabān b. Saḥd al-Tanākh al-Qayrawānī:** he is author of the *al-Mudāmwdūn* ([Legal] Register) on the school of Malik. This is a unique nickname and his name is `Abd al-Salām.
Also of that ilk are Muḥayyūn al-Ḥaḍrami,14 Mushkādānā al-Juʿfī15 and others whom we will mention in the Category on nicknames (God – He is exalted – willing). He knows best.
Category 50

NAMES AND PAIDONYMICS

(Ma‘rîfat al-asma‘ wa-‘l-kûnâ)

There are many books on names and paidonymics, including the works of ‘Ali b. al-Madini,1 Muslim,2 Nasâ’î3 and the expert Abû Ahmad al-Ḥâkim al-Kabîr.4 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr has several excellent short books on various aspects of this subject.5 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 hadîth 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 paidonymic 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 Abû Bakr b. ʿAbd al-Rahmân b. al-Ḥârîth b. Hishâm al-Makhzûmî, one of the seven legal experts of Medina. He used to be called “the monk of the tribe of Quraysh.” His name is Abû Bakr and his paidonymic is Abû ʿAbd al-Rahmân. The same is true of Abû Bakr b. Muḥammad b. ʿAmr b. Ḥazm al-Anṣârî.6 His name is said to have been Abû Bakr.

---

2 Kitâb al-Kûnâ wa-‘l-asnâ‘ (Damascus, 1984).
3 Ḥâjî Khâlífâ, Kashf, 1:col. 87.
4 Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Abûn (ca. 290/903–378/988), known as “al-Ḥâkim al-Kabîr,” was recognized as the greatest scholar of hadîth of his era. His Kitâb al-Asmâ‘ wa-‘l-kûnâ seems to be the work referred to here; Sezgin, CAS, 1:203–4.
5 This description of Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr’s contribution to this discipline puzzled later writers (for example, Buq̲̀stant, Maḥâsa 570). His Kitâb al-İstîghnû fi ma‘rîfat al-makhbûrûn min hamâyat al-‘ilm bi-‘l-kûnûn (ed. Abû Allâh Maḥbûl al-Sawâlima, 3 vols, Riyâd, 1405/1985) is anything but last and it seems to be the only work he wrote on the subject. As the editor of the İstîghnû 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 kitâb with its own introduction.
6 Abû Bakr b. Ḥazm (d. ca. 120/738) served as the governor and judge in the city of Medina; Dhahabî, Siyâs, 5:313–14.
AN INTRODUCTION TO THE SCIENCE OF THE HADITH

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 Ḥāzm 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'ārī, the transmitter from Ṣharīk and others. It was related from him that he said, “I do not have a name. My name and my paidonymic are the same.”17 This is also the case of Abū Ḥaṣīn 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.”18

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.19

He is also given the gentilic “Dīlī,” from the tribe of Abū ʿAswad al-Dīlī. “Dīlī” occurs as “Duʿālī” in the lineage (nasab) given by some of the experts in the Arabic language and others anomalously give it as “Duʿūlī.”

Other examples from the Companions are Abū Muwaiyaiba,20 the client of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), and Abū Shayba al-Khudri,21 who died in the siege of Constantinople and was buried there.

Examples from after the Companions are

Abū ʿI-Abyaḍ,22 the transmitter from Anas b. Malik.

Abū Bākr b. Ṣaʿdī23 – Ṣaʿdī was the client of Ibn ʿUmar: Mālik and others transmitted from him.

Abū ʿI-Nājib,24 the client of ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmr b. al-Ṣāṣ: his paidonymic is alternatively given as Abū ʿI-Tujayb.

Abū Ḥarīb b. Abī ʿI-Aswad al-Dīlī.25

---

9 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Isrāʾīl, 4:1605, s.n. Abū Iyās.
11 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Isrāʾīl, 4:1690.
12 Buhārī, Kūnāḥ, 8; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Jarḥ, 4(2):336, 3(1):293, s.n. Ṭālāʾ.
Abū Ḥartūz al-Mawqifī\textsuperscript{16} and al-Mawqif is a place in Egypt. Ibn Waḥb and others transmitted ḥadīth from him. God knows best.

3. Those whose nickname is a paidonymic [in form] and who also bear other paidonymics and names. For example

‘Alī b. Abī Ṭalīb (God be pleased with him); he was nicknamed Abū Turāb (father of earth) and his paidonymic was Abū ʾl-Ḥasan.

Abū ʾl-Zinād ʿAbd Allāh b. Dhakwān; his paidonymic was Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, and Abū ʾl-Zinād (father of the fire sticks) was a nickname. The expert Abū ʾl-Faḍl al-Falākī, according to what we read from him, said that ʿAbd Allāh b. Dhakwān used to be angered by the nickname “Abū ʾl-Zinād.” He was a versatile scholar.

Abū ʾl-Riǧāl Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Anṣārī\textsuperscript{17}; his paidonymic was Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, and Abū ʾl-Riǧāl (father of the men) is a nickname he was given because he had ten children, all of them “men.”

Abū Tūmayla Yaḥyā b. Wādīh al-Anṣārī al-Marwazī\textsuperscript{18}; his paidonymic was Abū Muḥammad, and Abū Tūmayla was a nickname. Yaḥyā b. Maṣīn and others endorsed his reliability and Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī criticized\textsuperscript{19} Bukhārī for including him in his book of weak transmitters.

The expert Abū ʾl-Āḏān ʿUmar b. Ibrāhīm\textsuperscript{20}; he had the paidonymic Abū Ḍakr and he was nicknamed Abū ʾl-Āḏān (father of the ears) because he had big ears.

The expert Abū ʾl-Shaykh Ḥāfiz b. Muḥammad al-Iṣbahānī\textsuperscript{21}; his paidonymic was Abū Muḥammad, and Abū ʾl-Shaykh was a nickname.

The expert Abū Ḥāzīm ʿUmar b. Ṭalḥah al-Ḥaddīṣī\textsuperscript{22}; his paidonymic was Abū Ḥafīṣ, and Abū Ḥāzīm was a nickname. We learned that from Falākī’s book on nicknames\textsuperscript{23}; God knows best.

\textsuperscript{16} Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Ḥarāb, 4(2):362.
\textsuperscript{17} Bukhārī, Kunnā, 87; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Ḥarāb, 3(2):317.
\textsuperscript{18} Abū Tūmayla died around the year 190/806; Dḥahabi, Ṣiyar, 9:210–11.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Ḥarāb, 4(2):194.
\textsuperscript{20} Abū ʾl-Āḏān died in the year 290/903 at the age of sixty-three years; Dḥahabi, Ṣiyar, 81–2.
\textsuperscript{21} Abī Ḥāzīm was a prominent scholar of ḥadīth who died in 417/1026; Dḥahabi, Ṣiyar, 17:333–6. The nisba “Abdūwī” is also pronounced “Abdūwī” and “Abdūyī,” see Ibn al-Aṯr, Ḥabab, 2:313.
\textsuperscript{22} Mārifat al-ḥās al-muḥaddithīn; Ḥṣīṭ Khallīfa, Kāshf, 2:col. 1739.
4. Those who have two or more paydonyms. Some examples are


ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar b. Ḥafṣ al-ʿUmarī,12 the brother of ʿUbayd Allāh: it is related that he had the paydonym Abū ʿl-Qāsim. He renounced it and adopted Abū ʿAbd al-Rahmān as his paydonym.


5. Those whose name is well known, but whose paydonym is disputed so that two or more different paydonyms are given for them. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAjāf al-ʾIbrāhīmī al-Harawī13 – 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 paydonym is variously given as Abū Zayd, Abū Muḥammad, Abū ʿAbd Allāh and Abū Khārijja.

ʿUbayy b. Kaʿb: Abū ʿl-Mundhir and Abū ʿl-Ṭūsayl are given.

Qābita b. Dhuʿayb:14 Abū Iṣḥāq and Abū Saʿīd are given.


Sulaymān b. Bilāl al-Madani:15 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 paydonym is known and whose name is disputed. Examples of this from among the Companions are

---

23 ʿAbd Allāh (d. 171/787), unlike his brother ʿUbayd Allāh, was not unreservedly endorsed as a transmitter of ḥadīth; Dḥahabi, Siyar, 7:339–41.
24 ʾIbrāhīmī (d. 476/1083) was a transmitter of ḥadīth and a preacher; Ibn al-ʿArīf, Ḥadīth, 1:24.
25 Qābita was born in the year 8/629 and rose to hold high offices under the Umayyad caliph ʿAbd al-Malik. He was a prolific transmitter of ḥadīth and died in 86/705 (or 87 or 89); Dḥahabi, Siyar, 4:282–3.
26 Sulaymān (100/719–172/788) was an expert in the ḥadīth of the Medinese; Dḥahabi, Siyar, 7:425–7.
**Abū Baṣra** al-Ghifārī: his payonymic is pronounced in the same way as the city "al-Baṣra." It is said that his name is Jamīl b. Baṣra. Ḥumayil is also given and it is more likely to be correct.

**Abū Juhayfā** al-Suwāṭī: his name is variously given as Wahb b. ʿAbd Allah and Wahb Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh.

**Abū Hurayra** al-Dawāt: 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 ʿAbd al-Barr\(^{28}\) 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 ʿAbd Allāh or ʿAbd al-Raḥmān was his name during the Islamic era. It is said on the authority of Muḥammad b. Iṣḥāq that his name was ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Ṣakhr and a number of those who have written on names and payonymics relied on that. Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥakīm said, "To our mind, ʿAbd 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. Abi Mūsā al-Asbāṭī: Most experts believe that his name was ʿĀmir. [Yahyā] b. Maṣān said that his name was al-Ḥārith.

**Abū Bakr** b. ʿAyyāsh,\(^{29}\) the transmitter of the Qurʿān recension of ʿĀṣim: his name is disputed and eleven opinions regarding it are given. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr said that if it is true that he had a name, it was Shuʿba and none other; and this is the one which Abū Zurʿa [al-Rāzī] regarded as correct.\(^{30}\) Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr said, "It was said that his name was his payonymic. That – God willing – is the view most likely to be correct because it is related from Abū Bakr al-ʿAyyāsh himself that he said, 'I have no name other than Abū Bakr.'”

7. Those whose payonymic and name are both disputed, and that is uncommon. An example of this is Saʿūna, the client of the Messenger of God (Peace be

---

30 Abū Bakr al-ʿAyyāsh (95/714 or 97–193/809) was respected as an expert in the Qurʿān, but is said to have made many mistakes in his hadīth transmissions; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:10–11.
up on him). Úmayr, Šālih and Mihrān are variously given as his name. His
pseudonymic is given variously as Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān and Abu ‘l-Bakhtarī. God
knows best.

8. Those whose pseudonymic 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 pseudonymic Abū ‘Abd Allah, [that is,] Mālik,
Muḥammad b. Idrīs al-Shāfi‘ī and Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal; and Abū Ḥanīfā al-Nu‘mān
b. Thābit.

9. Those who are famous under their pseudonymic, rather than their name,
despite the fact that their name is not unknown to those knowledgeable in
ḥadīth. Ibn ‘Abd 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-Khawlānī: His name is ʿĀidh Allah b. ‘Abd Allah.

Abū ʿIsḥāq al-Sabī‘ī: His name is ʿAmr b. ‘Abd Allah.

Abu ‘l-Ask‘āth al-Ṣan‘ānī 34 – his gentilic refers to the village of Ṣan‘āʼ
near Damascus; his name is Sharāhil b. ʿĀda. Some pronounce his father’s
name as “Udda.”

Abu ʿl-Duḥā Muslim b. ʿṢubayḥ. 35

The ascetic Abū Ḥāzin al-Aʿraj, the transmitter from Sahl b. Saʿd and
others: his name is Salama b. Dīnār.

The examples of this are innumerable. God knows best.

33 This appears to be a reference to the third section of his Isīghat al-
34 Abu ʿl-Ask‘āth is said to have died after the year 100/719; Dhahabi, Siyār, 4:357–9.
35 Abu ʿl-Duḥā died around the year 100/719; Dhahabi, Siyār, 5:71.
Category 51

THE PAIDYNMICS OF THOSE BETTER KNOWN UNDER THEIR NAME, RATHER THAN THEIR PAIDYNMIC

(Ma’rifat kuna 'l-ma’rūlin bi-’l-asma’ dūna 'l-kunā)

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 Abū Ḥātim b. Ḥibbān al-Bustī 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 “Abū Muḥammad” are

Ṭalḥa b. Ubayd Allāh al-Taymi
‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ṣawf al-Zuhri
al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭalib al-Ḥāshimi
Thābit b. Qays b. al-Shammās al-Anṣārī
‘Abd Allāh b. Zayd al-Anṣārī, ‘who was known for the call to prayer
Ka‘b b. ‘Ujra
al-‘Ash‘ath b. Qays
Ma‘qil b. Sinān al-‘Ashja‘ī
‘Abd Allāh b. Ja‘far b. Abī Ṭalīb
‘Abd Allāh b. Buḥayna
‘Abd Allāh b. Amr b. al-‘Āṣ
‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr al-Ṣiddiq
Jubayr b. Muṭṭim
al-Faḍl b. al-‘Abbās b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib

1 Kitāb Kunā man yu’rafi bi-’l-asma’; Yaqtān, Muṣjam al-buldān, 1:616.
2 Ṭalḥa was a very early convert to Islam and a central figure in the early struggles. He died while leading a revolt against the caliph ‘Alī in 36/656; EF, 10:161–2.
5 Ibn Abī al-Barr, Istifāf, 3:1321.
6 Ibn Abī al-Barr, Istifāf, 1:133–5.
9 Ibn Abī al-Barr, Istifāf, 3:871.
Halwaytib b. ʿAbd al-ʿUzzay
Maḥmūd b. al-Rabīʿ
ʿAbd Allah b. Thaʿlabah b. Ṣuʿayr

Some of the Companions bearing the paidonymic “Abū ʿAbd Allah” are

al-Ẓubayr b. al-ʿAwwām
al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭalib
Salām al-Fārist
ʿAmīr b. Rabīʿa al-ʿAdawī
Ḥudhayfa b. al-Yamān
Kaʿb b. Mālik
Rafīʿ b. Khadijī
ʿUmar b. Ḥazm
al-Nuʿmān b. Bashir
Jabir b. ʿAbd Allah
ʿUthmān b. Hūayfah
Hāritha b. al-Nuʿmān

The following seven are Ansārites:

Thawbān, the client of the Messenger of God (God be pleased with him)
al-Mughīra b. Shuʿba
Shuraḥbīl b. Ṣibān
ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ
Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allah b. Jaḥsh
Maʿqīl b. Yassār al-Muzani
ʿAmr b. ʿĀmir al-Muzani

Some of the Companions bearing the paidonymic “Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān” are

ʿAbd Allah b. Masʿūd

---

11 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istāʿab, 1:399–400.
12 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istāʿab, 3:876.
13 Al-Ẓubayr was a cousin of the Prophet and a nephew of his wife Khadija. Like ʿAlī, he died in the Battle of the Camel in 36/656; ĖP: 4:1235–6.
16 Rafīʿ b. Khadijī was a prominent Medine religious authority who died in the year 74/693 at the age of eighty-six; Dhahābī, Siyar, 3:181–3.
17 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istāʿab, 3:1141.
19 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istāʿab, 1:218.
22 There seems to have been no such person. Prof. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān suggests that Abū ʿAbd Allah ʿAmr b. ʿAwf al-Muzant (Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istāʿab, 3:1196) was meant; Muqaddima, 582.
Mu'ādh b. Jabal\textsuperscript{23}
Zayd b. al-Khaṭṭāb,\textsuperscript{24} the brother of 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb
'Abd Allāh b. 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb
Muḥammad b. Maslama al-Anṣāri\textsuperscript{25}
'Uwaym b. Sā'ida\textsuperscript{26}
Zayd b. Khalīd al-Juhānī\textsuperscript{27}
Bilāl b. al-Ḥārīth al-Muzānī\textsuperscript{28}
Muʿāwiya b. Abī Sufyān
al-Ḥārīth b. Hishām 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 ʿAbd Bakr Ahmad b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Shirāzī 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 Muʿāwiyah b. ʿAbd al-Karim al-Dālī (the misguided) — he went astray only on the road to Mecca—and ʿAbd Allah b. Muḥammad al-Daʿīf (the weak) — he was only physically weak and not weak in his ḥadith.” A third is ʿĀrim (vicious) Abu ʿI-Nuʿmān Muḥammad b. al-Fadl al-Sadūq and he was a pious man who was far from vicious.

Al-Daʿīf [that is, ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad] is Abū Muḥammad al-Tarsūṣī. He heard ḥadith from Blind Abū Muʿāwiyah and others. Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī wrote ḥadith from him and Abū Ḥātim b. Ḥibbān claimed that he was [antiphrasically] called “al-Daʿīf” on account of his exactitude and accuracy.

Ghundar (troublemaker) was the nickname of Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar al-Baṣri. The reason for it which we heard was that Ibn Jurayj came to al-Baṣra

---

5 Abū Muʿāwiyah Muḥammad b. Khāzīm al-Kūfī (113/731–194/810 or 195) was considered to be particularly strong in the ḥadith of his teacher al-Aʿmash; Dāhibī, Siyar, 9:73–8.
6 Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Jarb, 2(2):163.
7 Soyrū, Tadhrib al-rawī, 2:290.
8 Thiqat, 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-Ishbahani] and others transmitted hadith from him.

Abu 'l-Tabyib Muhammad b. Ja'far b. Durrani al-Baghdadi, Ghundar: he transmitted hadith from Abu Khalifa al-Jumauni and others.

There were others who bore that nickname who were not named “Muhammad b. Ja'far.”

- Ghunjär (Persian: ghanjär, rouge) was the nickname of an early transmitter, Abu Ahmad b. Masa al-Taymi al-Bukhari. He transmitted hadith from Malik, al-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 Tariikh Bukhara (History of Bukhara) and died in the year 412 [1021 AD]. God knows best.

- Sā'īqa (thunderbolt): he was the expert Abu Yahya 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 Dhabhdt, Siyar, 16:217, no. 149.
12 Ghundar al-Warrag died in 370/98; Dhabhdt, Siyar, 16:214–15, no. 145.
13 He was a Sufi who moved to Egypt and died there in 357/968 or 358; Dhabhdt, Siyar, 16:215–16, no. 146.
14 Abu Khalifa al-Fadl b. al-Hubab al-Jumauni (206/821–305/917) was an expert in hadith as well as secular literature; Dhabhdt, Siyar, 14:7–11.
15 He was a prominent transmitter in Bukhara who died at the end of 186/802; Dhabhdt, Siyar, 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, GAS, 1:353.
17 Haji Khalifa, Kashf, 1 col. 286.
18 Sā'īqa (185/801–255/869) was a respected transmitter of hadith; Dhabhdt, Siyar, 12:295–6.
“Ṣaʿīqa” because of his learning and the intensity of his study and pursuit [of ḥadith].

- Şhabāb (youthfulness) was the nickname of Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ al-ʿUṣfūrī, the author of al-Ṭārīkh (History). He heard ḥadith from [the earliest] Ghundar and others.

- Zunayj (little black man) was the nickname of Abū Ḥassan Muhammad b. ʿAmr al-Rāzī. Muslim and others related ḥadith from him.

- Rusta (Persian: sprout) was the nickname of ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. ʿUmar al-Iṣbahānī.

- Sunayd was the nickname of al-Ḥusayn b. Dāwūd al-Miṣṭāḥ, the author of the Qurʾān commentary. The experts Abū Zurʿa [al-Rāzī], Abū Ḥatim [al-Rāzī] and others related ḥadith from him.

- Bundar (Persian: wholesaler) was the nickname of Muḥammad b. Bashshār al-Baṣrī. Bukhārī, Muslim and many others transmitted ḥadith from him. Ibn al-Falāki said that he was given this nickname because he was the “wholesaler” of ḥadith.

- Qayṣar (caesar) was the nickname of the well-known Abu ʾl-Naḍr Hashim b. al-Qāsim. Ahmad b. Hanbal and others transmitted ḥadith from him.

- Al-Akhfash (dim-eyes) was the nickname of several people, including the grammarian Aḥmad b. ʿImrān al-Baṣrī. An early scholar of ḥadith, he transmitted from Zayd b. al-Ḥubāb and others. He has a book entitled Ghariḥ al-Muwaṭṭa (Rare Words in Mālik’s Muwaṭṭa). There were three famous Akhfashees who were grammarians.

The earliest was Abu ʾl-Khaṭṭāb ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd b. ʿAbd al-Majīd and he was the one Sibawayhi mentioned in his Kitāb (Book).

---


21 Abū ʾl-Farāj ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar al-Iṣbahānī (d. 250/864) was an important student of ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Mahdī, Dihābī, Sīyār, 12:242–3.

22 Sunayd died in 226/841; Dihābī, Sīyār, 10:627–8. “Sunayd” would appear to be the diminutive form of naṣad, 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 ḥadith in his day; Dihābī, Sīyār, 12:144–9.

24 Abū ʾl-Naḍr Hashim b. al-Qāsim al-Laythī al-Khūrīsānī (134/752–207/822) was an important transmitter in Baghdad; Dihābī, Sīyār, 9:545–9.

25 Zayd (ca. 130/749–203/819) left his hometown of Merv and traveled extensively to collect ḥadith. It is said that he even reached al-Andalus; Dihābī, Sīyār, 9:393–5.

26 Little seems to have been recorded about the grammarian known as al-Akhfash al-Akhbar; Qift, Inbāḥ al-rwaṭ, 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 'l-Ḥasan Sa'īd b. Masʿūda\textsuperscript{28} and he is the one who related Kitāb Sibawayh (The Book of Sibawayh) and was a student of Sibawayh.

The third is Abu 'l-Ḥasan 'Ali b. Sulaymān,\textsuperscript{29} the student of the two grammarians bearing the byname of “Abu 'l-ʿAbbās,” namely Ṭahār b. Yaḥyā,\textsuperscript{30} nicknamed “Ṭhaʿlab,” and Muḥammad b. Yazīd,\textsuperscript{31} nicknamed “al-Mubarrad.”

- \textit{Murabbā} (man with bushy eyebrows) was the expert Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Baghdādi.\textsuperscript{32}
- \textit{Jazara} (carrot) was the nickname of the expert Ṣaḥīḥ b. Muḥammad al-Baghdādi.\textsuperscript{33} He was nicknamed this because he heard from one of his teachers what was related from 'Abd Allāh b. Burṣ to the effect that he used to employ a \textit{kharasa} (bead) as a magical charm [to cure sick people]. He misread it, saying, \textit{jazara}, and it stuck to him. He was a wag about whom humorous stories are related.
- \textit{‘Ubayd al-Ḥij} (little believer, the calf) was the nickname of the expert Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad b. Ḥātim al-Baghdādi.
- \textit{Kilaja} (a unit of weight equaling about five-and-three-quarter pounds) is the expert Muḥammad b. Ṣaḥīḥ al-Baghdādi.\textsuperscript{34}
- \textit{Mā Ghammahā} (he—or it?—did not sadden him), consisting of the negation [that is, \textit{mā}] and the verb \textit{ghamma}, was the nickname of ‘Allān b. ‘Abd al-Ṣamād. He is the expert ‘Ali b. Ṣaḥīḥ b. ʿAbd al-Ṣamād al-Baghdādi.\textsuperscript{35} The two nicknames are combined and he is called “Allān Mā Ghammahā.”

We heard that Yaḥyā b. Maʿīn gave these five Baghdadis\textsuperscript{36} their nicknames and they were early students of his and experts in ḥadīth.

\textsuperscript{28} Known as al-Akhfash al-Awsaq (d. 215/830), he wrote \textit{works} on the vocabulary of the ḥadīth and Qurʾān; Sezgin, G.45, 8:80; 9:68–9.
\textsuperscript{29} Al-Akhfash al-Aśghar (ca. 235/849–315/927) lived in Baghdad and was an expert in grammar and lexicography; Sezgin, G.45, 8:174; 9:161.
\textsuperscript{30} ʿThaʿlab (200/815–291/904) was one of the most celebrated grammarians of his age; Sezgin, G.45, 8:141–7; 9:140–2.
\textsuperscript{31} The grammarian al-Mubarrad (210/826–285/898) was born in al-ʿAsra and spent most of his life teaching in Baghdad, where he and ʿThaʿlab competed for dominance; \textit{EP} 7:279–82.
\textsuperscript{32} Murabba\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{2}} (d. 256/870) was a prominent student of Yaḥyā b. Maʿīn; al-Khaṭṭīb al-Baghdādi, \textit{Tawārikh Baghdād}, 1:388–9. Lane writes that the epithet “murabba” is applied to “a man whose eyebrows have much hair; as though he had four eyebrows;” \textit{Lexicon ar}. 256.
\textsuperscript{33} Jazara was born in Baghdad in 205/821. He moved to Buhara in 266/880 and lived there until his death in 291/906; Dhabah, \textit{Siyar}, 14:23–33.
\textsuperscript{34} Kilaja (or perhaps Kayla) died in Mecca in 291/904; Dhabah, \textit{Siyar}, 12:524–6.
\textsuperscript{35} He was a minor transmitter of hadith who died in 289/902. He is said to “have had many ḥadīth but little character.” His nickname is sometimes given as “Mā Ghammahā;” Dhabah, \textit{Siyar}, 13:429.
\textsuperscript{36} That is, Murabba\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{2}}, Jazara, ʿUbayd al-Ḥij, Kilaja and Mā Ghammahā; see al-Khaṭṭīb al-Baghdādi, \textit{Tawārikh Baghdād}, 1:388.
The famous "Sajjāda" (prayer rug) was al-Ḥasan b. Ḥammād. He heard ḥadīth from Wālicer others.

"Mushkādāna" — its meaning in Persian is "grain of musk" or "musk holder" — was the nickname of ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar b. Muḥammad b. Abān.

"Mutayyān" (muddy) is the nickname of Abū Jaʿfar al-Ḥaḍramī. Abū Nuʿaym al-Faḍl b. Dukayn addressed Mushkādāna and Mutayyān 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-Mawazı, 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 "ʿAlī," they say "ʿAllān; for Ahmad b. Yūsuf al-Sulāmī" and others, they say "Ḥamdān," and for Wāḥib b. Baqīya al-Wāsītī, they say "Wāḥibān." God knows best.

37 Abū ʿAlī al-Ḥasan b. Ḥammād al-Baḥdādī (d. 241/855) seems to have been a well-respected scholar of ḥadīth, Dhabāhi, Siyār, 11:392–3.

38 ʿAbdān (ca. 140/757–221/836) was one of the greatest ḥadīth scholars of his day in Marv; Dhabāhi, Siyār, 10:270–72.

39 Ḥamdān (182/798–264/878) was a well-traveled transmitter of ḥadīth from Khurasān; Dhabāhi, Siyār, 12:384–8.

40 Wāḥibān was a scholar of ḥadīth who died in Wāsīt in 239/854; Dhabāhi, Siyār, 11:462–4.
Category 53

Homographic Names and Gentilics, and Related Matters

(Ma'rifat al-mu'talif wa'l-mukhtalif min al-asma\(\)a
wa'l-ans\(\)ab wa-yaltahiq bihi)

This Category concerns those names and gentilics which are uniform – that is, agree – in regard to their written form but differ in their pronunciation. 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. Mākulā's Ikna'il. 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.

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 ‘Abd Allāh b. Salām al-Isrā'īlī.
- Salām, the father of Muhammad b. Salām al-Bikanḍī al-Bukhārī's the teacher of Bukhārī: Al-Khaṭīb [al-Baghdādī] and Ibn Mākulā mention him solely as “Salām.” The author of al-Maṭā'lī (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 ‘Abd 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 by “the particular” Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ means the instances of homography which occur in the Mawaṣṣaṭ of Mālik and the Ṣaḥīḥs of Bukhārī and Muslim.

\(\)3 Ibn Ṭābir al-Bārī, Ẓarāḥ, 3:921-3.

\(\)4 Muhammad b. Salām was a sedulous student of Ḥadīth who died in 225/830; Dhatābī, Siyar, 10:628-30.

\(\)5 This is an allusion to Abū Ishaq Ibrahim b. Yusuf, known as Ibn Qarqāl (505/1111-569/1174); Brockelmann, G.A.L., 1:370-1; Suppl. 1:633. His Maṭā'lī al-anwār was an abridgement of al-Qaḍī ʾIyāḍ's Masāḥaṣīb al-anwār; see ʾAbū al-Khalīfa, Kashf, 2:cols. 1687, 1715.
Salām b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Maqdisī: the expert Abū ʿṬālib6 and Ṭabarānī related hadith from him and Ṭabarānī called him “Salāma.”

Salām, the grandfather of the Muʿtazilite speculative theologian Abū ʿAṭī Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhab b. Salām al-Jubbaṭī.7

Al-Mubarrad said in his Kāmil, “There is no Arab named ‘Salām,’ except the father of [the Companion] ‘Abd Allāh b. Salām and Salām b. Abī ʾl-ʾUṣayyiq.” Others add Salām b. Mishkam,8 a wine merchant who lived in pre-Islamic times. However, the well-known form of his name is “Sallām.” God knows best.

ʿUmāra and ʿImāra: we do not have an “ʿImāra” except the Companion Ubayy b. ʿImāra9 and some even pronounce his name “ʿUmāra.” Everyone else is “ʿUmāra.” God knows best.

Kurayz and Kurayzī: Abū ʿAli al-Ghassānī10 related in his book Taqyid al-muhmal (Fixing Unpointed Words) from Muḥammad b. Wadḏāh11 that “Kurayz” occurs in the tribe of Khuzāʿa and “Kurayz” is used in the tribe of ʿAbd Shams b. ʿAbd Muṭṭaf. “Kurayz” is also found elsewhere. We do not add Ayyūb b. Kurayz, “the transmitter from Abī al-Raḥmān b. Ghann,12 to the “Kurayzes” on the basis that Abī al-Ghaṭī [b. Saʿīd] rendered his father’s name as “Kurayz,” since it was actually “Kurayz,” as Dāraquṭnī and others gave it.

Hizām is the form used among the tribe of Quraysh and Ḥarām among the Ṭabārīt. God knows best.

6 Abū ʿṬālib Ahmad b. Naṣr b. ʿṬālib al-Baghdādī was a teacher of Dāraquṭnī. He died in Baghdad in 323/935 at over seventy years of age; Dīhābī, Siyyar, 15:68.
8 Jubbaṭī (235/849–303/915) was one of the most celebrated Muʿtazilite theologians of the third/ninth century; ET, 2:569–70; Sezgin, G–S, 1:621–2.
10 Ibn Iṣḥāq said that he was the chief of the Jewish tribe of the Banu ʾl-ʾNāḏīr during the time of the Prophet’s mission; The Life of Muḥammad, 361.
11 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Iṣṭāfā, 1:70.
12 Abī ʾl-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad (427/1035–498/1105), perhaps better known as Abī ʾAbī al-Jayyānī, was an Andalusian expert in the Arabic language; Dīhābī, Siyyar, 19:148–51. His Taqyid al-muhmal wa-samāya al-muḥkāt set down the correct pronunciation of the problematic names in Bukhārī and Muslim; see Hāji Khalifa, Kashf, 4, col. 420, Sezgin, G–S, 1:141. The section of the work concerned with nicknames has recently been published as Kizākh al-ʾAṣāfīr, ed. Muḥammad Abī ʾl-ʾFāṣal (al-Muḥammadīya, 1416/1996).
13 Muḥammad b. Wadḏāh (199/815–286/899) was a scholar from Cordova; Sezgin, G–S, 1:474–5.
15 The Caliph ʿUmār sent Abī al-Raḥmān b. Ghann (d. 78/697) to Syria to teach religious law. Scholars disagreed as to whether he was a Companion or a Follower; Dīhābī, Siyyar, 4:45–6.
Abū ‘Alī b. al-Burdaṇī stated that he heard the expert al-Khaṭīb saying, “The ʿAyyāsīs are Baṣrans, the ʿAbīṣīs Kufans and the ʿAnṣīs Syrians.” Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥākim had said this before him. This does hold true in most cases. God knows best.

Abū ʿUbayda is always “ʿUbayda.” We read that Dāraquṭnī said, “We do not know of anyone with the paydonymic ‘Abū ʿAbīḍa.’”

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, ʿAbd al-Ghanti and Ibn Mākūlā.

**Al-Safr and al-Safar:** I found that as a paydonymic it is “al-Safar” and elsewhere “al-Safr.” Nevertheless, some North Africans pronounce it “al-Safr” for Abū ʿI-Safar Saʿīd b. Yūḥmīd. That is contrary to the opinion of the scholars of ḥadīth as recorded by Dāraquṭnī.

**ʿIsīl and ʿAsāl:** I found that all of them are of the first kind – including ʿIsīl b. Suṭyān – except the secular historian ʿAsāl b. Dhakwān al-Baṣrī. He is “ʿAsāl” and Dāraquṭnī and others give it that way. I did find his name as “ʿIsīl” in the handwriting of the authority Abū Maṣūr al-Azhari in his book *Tahdik al-lugha*. I do not think that he recorded it accurately. God knows best.

**Ghannām and ʿAthāmām:** we do not know of any instance of the second form except ʿAthāmām b. ʿAlī al-ʿArīrī al-Kūfī, the father of ascetic ʿAlī b. ʿAthāmām. The rest belong to the first form, including Ghannām b. Aws, a Companion who fought in the battle of Badr. God knows best.

**Qumayr and Qamīr:** all of them are “Qumayr” – including Makkt b. Qumayr, who transmitted ḥadīth from Jaʿfar b. Sulaymān – except the wife of Masrūq b. al-Aṣdā; Qamīr bint ʿAmr. God knows best.

---

17 ʿUthmān al-ḥadīth, 221.
18 Abū ʿI-Safar died in 113/731; Dhaḥabi, *Siyar*, 5:70.
20 I have not found any information about this person.
21 Abū Maṣūr al-Azhari (282/895–370/980) wrote a number of lexicographical works; *EF*, 1:822.
23 This appears to be the Ghannām Ibn Abū al-Barr identifies as “rayd min al-Ṣaḥāba maḏkūr bi ahl Badr,” *Istīḥāb*, 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 Shiite transmitter of ḥadīth Abū Sulaymān Jaʿfar b. Sulaymān al-Dubṣī al-Baṣrī (d. 178/794); Dhaḥabi, *Siyar*, 8:197–200.
26 I have not succeeded in uncovering any information about this woman.
Musawwar and Miswar: “Musawwar” is the form of the name of the Companion Musawwar b. Yazid al-Mālik al-Kāhilī\textsuperscript{27} and Musawwar b. ‘Abd al-Malik al-Yarbūqī\textsuperscript{28} from whom Ma‘n b. Ṭis‘a\textsuperscript{29} related hadith. Bukhārī mentioned him. So far as we know, the rest are “Miswar.” 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,\textsuperscript{30} the father of the expert Mūṣa 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. Khalilī\textsuperscript{31} and Ibn al-‘Aqīqī 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. Mīhrān al-Jammāl,\textsuperscript{32} 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 Ṭis‘a b. Abī Ṭis‘a al-Ḥannāt.\textsuperscript{33} He is also called “al-Khabbāt” and “al-Khayyāt,” however, he is famous as “Ṭis‘a al-Ḥannāt.” He was a tailor (khayyāt) and then abandoned that and became a dealer in wheat (ḥannāt). Later, he left that too and became a camel-fodder merchant (khabbāt), selling the mixture of leaves (khabbat) which camels cat. The same is true of Muslim al-Khabbāt\textsuperscript{34} in whom the three attributes are also united. The authority Dāraquṭnī related that these attributes came together in these two individuals. God knows best.

\textsuperscript{27} Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Irshād, 3:1400.
\textsuperscript{28} I have not succeeded in identifying this Musawwar.
\textsuperscript{29} Ma‘n (d. 198/814) was one of the most prominent students of the imām Mālik; Dhababī, Siyar, 9:304–6.
\textsuperscript{30} Hārūn al-Ḥammāl (171/788 or 172–243/858) was regarded as a reliable transmitter of hadith; Dhababī, Siyar, 12:115–16.
\textsuperscript{31} Irshād, 2:599–600.
\textsuperscript{32} Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad b. Mīhrān al-Jammāl al-Rāzī (d. 239/853) was considered one of the greatest hadith transmitters of Kūraṣān in his day; Dhababī, Siyar, 11:143.
\textsuperscript{33} Bukhārī, al-Tārikh al-kabīr, 3(2):404–5, no. 2793, s.n. Ṭis‘a b. Maysara al-Ghiṣrī; 405, no. 2794, s.n. Ṭis‘a b. Abī Ṭis‘a (see also note 3 on that page regarding Ṭis‘a b. Maysara b. Hayyān); Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Jārīh, 3(1):290, no. 1606, s.n. Ṭis‘a b. Maysara al-Ghiṣrī.
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 ‘Ali al-Ghassāni said this in his book, Sayyār b. Salama” and Sayyār b. Abi Sayyār Wardān” appear in both of the Ṣaḥīḥs. However, “Sayyār” is not in this exact shape, although it is similar.7 God knows best.

Everything in the two Ṣaḥīḥs and the Muwatta’ with the form of “Bisḥr” is pronounced “Bishr,” with four exceptions and they are “Busr.” They are the Companion ‘Abd Allāh b. Busr al-Māzīn, Busr b. Sa’d,8 Busr b. Ubayd Allāh al-Ḥadrāmī and Busr b. Mīḥjān al-Dīhī. For Ibn Mīḥjān, “Bishr” is also given. Ahmad b. Ṣaḥīḥ al-Miṣrī related the pronunciation “Bishr” from a number of Ibn Mīḥjān’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 “Bashir” with four exceptions. Two of them are “Bushayr” and they are Bushayr b. Ka‘b al-‘Adawī9 and Bushayr b. Yaṣār.10 The third is Yusayr b. ‘Amr,11 who is also called “Usayr.” The fourth is Qatān b. Nusayr.12 God knows best.

Everything in these books with the form “Yazid” is “Yazid,” with three exceptions:

2. Muḥammad b. ‘Ar’āra b. al-Birind:14 In Kitāb ‘Umdat al-muḥaddithin15 (The Hadith Transmitters’ Guide) and elsewhere it is given as “Barand.”

---

36 Sayyār b. Wardān (d. 122/740) was famed for his piety; Dhabbat, Siyar, 5:391–2.
37 That is, the consonantal outline of “Sayyār” differs slightly from that of “Bashshār” and “Yasār.”
38 The ascetic Busr b. Sa’d died in the year 100/719; Dhabbat, Siyar, 4:594–5.
40 Dhabbat, Siyar, 4:351, no. 131.
42 The Follower Yusayr died around the year 85/704. Shu‘ba was the one who called him “Usayr”;} Buhārī, al-Tābrīkh al-kabīr, 4(2):422; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Jarb, 4(2):308.
43 Abī ‘Abbād Qatān b. Nusayr al-Ghurbārī al-‘Atṣari was known as “al-Dhābi” (the wine skin); Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Jarb, 3(2):138.
44 Burayd (d. ca. 140/757) was a controversial transmitter of hadith; Dhabbat, Siyar, 6:251–2.
46 The anthropomorphist Hanbalite Abū Muḥammad Abī al-Ghānī b. Abī al-Wahhīb al-Maḍīṣī (541/1146–600/1203) was the author of this work; Ḥāḍīt Khalīfa, Kāshf, 2:col. 1171.
The first pronunciation is more common and Ibn Mākūlā mentioned nothing else.


Everything appearing in the books with the form of “al-Barā’” is “Barā’,” except Abū Maṣhar al-Barā’īqī and Abu l-Ṣāliḥ al-Barā’ī. A “barrā’” is someone who fashions ( yabri) lutes. God knows best.

In the two Sahīhs and Musnad, there is no “Jāriya,” except Jāriya b. Qudāma and Yazīd b. Jāriya. The others are “Hāritha.” God knows best.

In these books there is no “Hāriz,” except Ḥāriz b. Uthmān al-Rahbī al-Himsī and the judge Abū Ḥarīz Abīd Allāh b. al-Husayn, the transmitter from ʿIkrima and others. The others are “Jarir.” Often they are confused with “Hudayr,” and in these books the Hudayryrs are the father of ʿImrān b. Hudayr and the father of Zayd b. Hudayr and Ziyād b. Hudayr. God knows best.

In these books there is no “Hirāsh,” except the father of Ribā b. Hirāsh. The rest of those whose name takes this form are “Khirāsh.” God knows best.

In these books there is no “Haṣin,” except Abū Haṣin Uthmān b. ‘Alī al-Asadī. The rest are “Husayn.” All of these are “Husayn,” except Abū Sāsān Ḥudayn b. al-Mundhir. God knows best.

Everything in these books with the form of “Hāzim” and “Abū Ḥāzim” is pronounced “Ḥāzim,” except Abū Muṭṭawiya Muḥammad b. Khāzim al-Ḍārī. God knows best.

47 The Shi’ite transmitter ʿĀlī b. Ḥāshim died around 180/796; Dhat Alī, Siyar, 3:342–5.
52 Although Ḥartoza (80/699–163/780) was rated a reliable transmitter of ḥadīth, there was a suspicion that he hated the caliph ʿĀlī; Dhat Alī, Siyar, 7:79–81.
54 ʿImrān b. Hudayr was a Bayān transmitter of ḥadīth who died in 149/766; Dhat Alī, 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 Ribā b. Ḥirāsh never told a lie; Dhat Alī, Siyar, 4:359–62.
58 Abū Haṣin (d. ca. 128/746) was a highly regarded Kutān transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhat Alī, Siyar, 5:412–17.
Those who appear in these books as “Habbān” are Ḥabbān b. Munqidh⁵⁹ — who was the father of Wāsi' b. Ḥabbān,⁶⁰ the grandfather of Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā b. Ḥabbān⁶¹ and the grandfather of Ḥabbān b. Wāsi' b. Ḥabbān⁶² — and Ḥabbān b. Ḥilāl,⁶³ who is referred to with and without his lineage and who was a transmitter from Ṣuḥbā[b. al-Ḥajjāj], Wuhayb [b. Khalid], Hammām b. Yaḥyā,⁶⁴ Abū b. Yazid, Sulaymān b. al-Mughira⁶⁵ and Abū ʿAwāna.⁶⁶ Those in these books who are “Ḥibbān” are Ḥabīb b. ʿAṭṭya⁶⁷ and Ḥibbān b. Mūṣa;⁶⁸ that is, the “Ḥibbān” who is referred to without a lineage as transmitting from ʿAbd Allāh — and “ʿAbd Allāh” here is ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Mubārak. The name of Ibn al-ʿAriqa⁶⁹ is also “Ḥibbān.” 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. Maʿmūr⁷³ — and Abū Khubayb ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubayr. The rest are “Ḥabib.” 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 “Rabbāh” is “Rabīḥ,” except Ziyād b. Riyyāb⁷⁶ 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, Jamiʿ, 1:318.
⁶¹ Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā died in 121/739; Dhahabi, Siyār, 5:186–7.
⁶³ Abū Ḥabīb Ḥabīb b. Ḥilāl b. Abī Ḥabīlī (ca. 130/748–216/831) was a respected Basrī transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabi, Siyār, 10:239–40.
⁶⁴ Abū Bakr (or Abū ʿAbd Allāh) Hammām b. Yaḥyā b. Dīnār al-ʿAwdhī (d. 164/778) was a controversial Basrī 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-ṣaṣrā; Dhahabi, Siyār, 7:415–19.
⁶⁶ Abū ʿAwāna al-Waddāb b. ʿAbd Allāh (d. 176/792) also transmitted ḥadīth in al-ṣaṣrā; Dhahabi, Siyār, 8:217–22.
⁶⁷ I have not found an entry on this Ḥabīb in the sources I consulted.
⁶⁸ Ḥabīb b. Mūsā b. Ḥabīb 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, “Rabāḥ” and “Riyāḥ,” God knows best.

“Zubaydah” and “Zuyaydah” do not appear in the two Sahīhs, with the exception of Zubayd b. al-Ḥarīth al-Yāmī.77 In the Muwatta78, there is only Zuyayd and he is Zuyayd b. al-Sak.79 God knows best.

There is a single “Salim” in these books and he is Salīm b. Ḥayyān.80 The rest are “Sulaym.” God knows best.

In these books are Salīm b. Zarīr,81 Salīm b. Qutayba,82 Salīm b. Abī ‘l-Dhayyal83 and Salīm b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān.84 The rest are “Salīm.” God knows best.

In these books are Surayj b. Yūnus,85 Surayj b. al-Nuṣrān86 and Ahmad b. Abī Surayj.87 The rest are “Shuraykh” in these books. God knows best.

In these books are Salmān al-Fārist, Salmān b. ‘Āmir,88 Salmān al-Agharr89 and ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Salmān.90 The rest are “Sulaymān.” Abū Ḥāzim al-‘Ashja‘91 – the transmitter from Abū Hurayra – and Abū Rajā‘92 – the client of Abū Qilāba – both bore the name “Salmān,” but are referred to by their pāyonymic. God knows best.

In these books “Salīma” is ‘Amr b. Salīma al-Jarmī,93 the prayer leader of his people. The Banū Salīma were a tribe of the Anṣārites. The rest are “Salama.”

77 Zubayd (d. 122/740) was famous for his asceticism; Dḥahabi, Siyār, 5:296–8.
86 Abū Ja‘far Ahmad b. Abī Surayj Umar al-Rāzī died around the year 240/854 at over 80 years of age; Dḥahabi, Siyār, 11:552.
90 Abū Ḥāzim al-‘Ashja‘ (d. ca. 100/719) was a prolific transmitter from Abū Hurayra; Dḥahabi, Siyār, 5:7–8.
However, "Abd al-Khaliq b. Salama" in the book of Muslim is given there as both "Salima" and "Salama." God knows best.

These books include Sinan b. Abi Sinan al-Durail, Sinan b. Salama, Abu Rab'ah Sinan, Ahmad b. Sinan, Umm Sinan and Abu Sinan Dirar b. Murra al-Shaybani. The others are "Shayban." God knows best.


"Ubayd" is pronounced "Ubayd" wherever it occurs in these books.

Likewise, "Ubada" is pronounced "Ubâda" wherever it occurs, except in the case of Muhammad b. 'Abâda al-Wâsîthi, one of the teachers of Bukhari. God knows best.

"Abda" is pronounced "Abda" wherever it occurs in these books, except in the case of 'Amir b. 'Abâda who is mentioned in the introduction to Muslim's book - and Bajala b. 'Abâda. However, there is disagreement regarding them. Some also give them as "Abda." Some of the transmitters of Muslim's book have "Amir b. 'Abd" and that is incorrect. God knows best.

In these books "Abbâd" is pronounced "Abbâd," except in the case of Qays b. 'Ubâd. God knows best.

There is no "Uqayl" in these books, except Uqayl b. Khalid, Yahya b. Uqayl, and Banu Uqayl for the tribe. The rest are "Agil." God knows best.

96 Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, Isbat, 4:1941.
104 The respected transmitter Abu Khalid Uqayl b. Khalid al-Ayyu died in al-Fusul in Egypt around the year 144/761; Dhahabi, Siyar, 6:301–3.
There is no “Wājīd" at all in these books. Every instance in them is “Wājud.” God knows best.

Gentilities

The expert al-Qaṭīʿīyyād said that these books do not contain an “Ubūlit" and everything with this form is to be pronounced “Aylūt.” In fact, Muslim related many ḥadith from Shaybān b. Farrākhī and he is “Ubūlit.” However, as he nowhere in Muslim’s work appears with the gentilic, Ṣiyād cannot be faulted. God knows best.

In the two Ṣaḥīḥs we do not know of an “al-Bazzār,” except Khalaf b. Hishām al-Bazzār and al-Hasan b. al-Ṣabīṭah al-Bazzār. Muhammad b. al-Ṣabīṭah al-Bazzāz and everyone else in the two books are “al-Bazzār.” God knows best.

There are only three people with the gentilic “Naṣīr” in the two Ṣaḥīḥs and the Muṣṭafīq. They are Malīk b. Aws b. al-Ḥadathān al-Naṣīr, ʿAbd al-Wahīd b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Naṣīr and Sālim, the client of the Naṣīr. The rest of the names in those books with this form are “Baṣrī.” God knows best.

In these books there is only a single “Tawwaza” and he is Abū Yaʿlà Muḥammad b. al-Ṣalt al-Tawwaza, who appears in the book of Bukhārī in the chapter on apostasy. Everyone else is “Thawrī,” including Abū Yaʿlà Mundhir b. Yaʿlà al-Thawrī, whose ḥadith both Bukhārī and Muslim included. God knows best.

Saʿīd al-Jurayrī, ʿAbbas 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 Farrākh (40/757–236/851) was one of the most elevated transmitters of his day; Dāhahibī, Siyār, 11:101–2.
107 Khalaf b. Hishām (150/767–229/844) was an expert in the Qurān; Dāhahibī, Siyār, 10:576–80.
109 Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. al-Ṣabīṭah al-Dīlābī (151/768–227/841) is best known for the Sunan he composed; Dāhahibī, Siyār, 10:670–72.
110 Malīk b. Awaṣ was born before the advent of Islam and died in the year 92/711; Dāhahibī, Siyār, 4:171–2.
116 Dāhahibī claimed that Saʿīd al-Jurayrī transmitted ḥadith from Abū Naḍrā al-Mundhir b. Malīk al-Abspī (d. 108/726 or 107); Siyār, 4:529–32.
these books. These works also contain a “Hariri,” namely Yahiya b. Bishr, the teacher of Bukhari and Muslim. God knows best. They also contain a “Jariri,” namely Yahiya b. Ayyub al-Jariri in the book of Bukhari, one of the descendants of Jarir b. ’Abd Allâh [al-Bajali].

“Jarir” in these books is a single individual and he is the Sa’d whose gentilic refers to al-Jarî, 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.

“Salamî,” when it is applied to an Anṣârite, is “Salamî,” a gentilic referring to the Banu Salima. Jabir b. ’Abd Allâh and Abu Qatada are representatives of them. The experts in the Arabic language pronounce the gentilic form “Salami,” like “Namarti,” “Sadaft” and similar ones. Most of the scholars of hadith pronounce it “Salmi” — in accordance with the original name [that is, Salima] — and that is a solecism. God knows best.

“Hamadhani” does not occur in the two Sahîhs and the Muwatta. Everything in them with this shape is “Hamdani.” Abu Nasr b. Maktab has said, “Hamdani: Among the ancients ‘Hamdani’ 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 al-‘Iyad for some of them. I seek refuge in God for this and for all of my affairs. He – be He praised – knows best.

117 Abu Zakariya’ Yahiya b. Bishr al-Hariri was a merchant who died in al-Kufa in 229/844 (or 227); Dhahabi, Siyar, 10:647–8.
118 Yahiya b. Ayyub al-Jariri died around the year 160/777; Dhahabi, Siyar, 8:10.
120 This would seem to be a reference to Masharih al-anwar.
Category 54  
HOMONYMIC NAMES, GENTILICS, AND SO FORTH  
(Ma'rifat al-muttaqiq wa-'l-mustariq min al-asma' 
wa-'l-ansâb wa-na'wiha)  

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 credited because of it and “sharing” remains a breeding ground of mistakes in every discipline. Al-Khaṭṭāb has a book on it, Kitāb al-Muttaqiq 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 Başrān grammarian and inventor of prosody. He transmitted hadith from ʿAṣim al-Aḥwal and others. Abu ʿl-ʿAbbâs 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-Safar Saʿd b. Aḥmad” was cited against al-Mubarrad – on the basis of the statement of Yahyā b. Maʿin regarding the name of his father – and he was earlier. Al-Mubarrad responded that most scholars say that he was “Saʿd b. Yūḥān.” God knows best.

The second was Abū Bishr al-Muzantī, also a Başrān. He transmitted hadith from al-Mustanir b. Ṭhāfar from Muʿāwiyah b. Qorra. Al-ʿAbbâs [b. ʿAbd al-ʿAṣim] al-Anbarī and a number of others related from him.

The third was an Isfahāni who related hadith from Rawḥ b. Ḫubāda.^

---

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-ʿAbbâs al-Khalil b. ʿAṣammad al-Qāši who transmitted hadith from Rawḥ b. Ḫubāda; Abū Nuʿaym al-ʿIṣbahānī, Kitāb Dhiṭr akhkhār Isbāhānī, 1:307–8.
4 Abū Muḥammas Rawḥ b. Ḫubāda al-Qaṣṣ al-Ḏarī (d. 205/820) knew an enormous number of hadith and wrote several works on religious subjects; Sezgin, GAS, 1:39–40.
AN INTRODUCTION TO THE SCIENCE OF THE ḤADITH

The fourth was Abū Saʿīd al-Sijzī,5 the famous Ḥanafite judge and legal scholar in Khurāsān. He transmitted ḥadith from [Abū Bakr] b. Khuzayma, Ibn Sāʿīd,6 [Abu ʿl-Qāsim ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad] al-Baghwā and other expert transmitters of ḥadith.

The fifth was the judge Abū Saʿīd al-Bustī al-Muhallabī.7 He was an excellent man who related ḥadith from the aforementioned al-Khalīl al-Sijzī. He transmitted Ibn Abī Khaythama’s Taʾrīkh (History) from Ahmad b. al-Muzaffar al-Bakrī8 as well as hadith from other scholars. The expert Bayhaqi related ḥadith from him.

The sixth was also an Abū ʿl-Saʿīd al-Bustī but he was “al-Shafīʿī.”9 He was an excellent man and active in several disciplines. He traveled to Andalusia and transmitted hadith. He was born in 360 [971 AD]. He related from Abū Ḥāmid al-Īsārāyīnī10 and others. Abū ʿl-ʿAbbas al-Ūdhrī11 and others transmitted ḥadith 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 “Abdullāh b. Jāfār b. Ṣaḥābān.” There were four of them, all living in the same era.12

One of them was Abū Bakr al-Qaṭṭār al-Baghdādī,13 the transmitter from ʿAbd Allāh b. Āḥmad b. Ḥanbal.

The second was Abū Bakr al-Saqāṭī al-Baṣrī,14 who also relates hadith from an “ʿAbd Allāh b. Āḥmad,” but in this case he is ʿAbd Allāh b. Āḥmad b. Ibrahim al-Dawraqi.15

---

5 This al-Khalīl b. Āḥmad was born in 289/902 and died in Farghāna in 378/988. He served as judge in Samarkand and was one of the most prominent Ḥanafite figures of his day; Dhahabī, Sīyar, 16:437–8.
6 Abū Muhammad Yahyā 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. Āḥmad 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 Āḥmad b. Abī Ẓahir Muḥammad al-Īsārāyīnī (344/955–406/1016) was the head of the Shafīʿites in Baghdad; Dhahabī, Sīyar, 17:193–7.
11 Abū ʿl-ʿAbbas Āḥmad b. ʿUmār b. Anas al-Ūdhrī (393/1003–478/1085) was an Andalusian scholar who spent eight years in Mecca; Dhahabī, Sīyar, 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 Āḥmad b. Mālik al-Qaṭṭār (d. 368/979) was best known for transmitting Āḥmad b. Ḥanbal’s Musnad from his son ʿAbd Allāh; Sezgin, G4S, 1:200.
14 I could not find this Āḥmad b. Mālik in the sources I consulted.
The third was a Dinawarī who related hadīth from ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Sīnān from Muḥammad b. Kāthīr, the student of Sufyān al-Ṭawrī.

The fourth was a ʿṬarsūsī who related the Taʾrikh (History) of Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā [b.] al-Ṭabba from ʿAbd Allāh b. Jābir al-Ṭarsūsī.

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 ʿAbd Allāh al-ʿAsammn and the other was Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Ḳhaṭṭār al-Ḥaybāni, 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. Ḥābib and the name of the second was Musā b. Sahl, a Baṣrī who lived in Baghdad and related hadīth from Ḥishām b. ʿAmrā and others. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥaṭṭārī and others transmitted from him.

“Abū Bakr b. “Ayyāsh” is a similar case. There were three of them.

The first is the Qurʾān reciter and transmitter of hadīth. The difference of opinion regarding his name (ism) has already been mentioned.

The second is Abū Bakr b. “Ayyāsh al-Ḥimṣī, from whom Jaʿfar b. ʿAbd al-Wāḥid al-Ḥaṭṭārī transmitted hadīth. He is “unknown” and Jaʿfar was not reliable.

The third is Abū Bakr b. “Ayyāsh al-Sulaimān al-Bahīdārī, the author of Kitāb Gharīb 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. Muhammad b. Sīnān in any of the sources I consulted.
18 I have no information on this individual.
19 Abū Jaʿfar Muhammad b. ʿĪsā al-Ṭabba al-Baḥḍādī (d. 224/839), the brother of Ishaq, is said to have known around forty thousand hadīth; Dhahabī, Siyar, 10:386–9.
20 I have not located any information on this person.
21 As a boy, Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-ʿAsamm (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; Dhahabī, Siyar, 5:255–6.
23 Musā b. Sahl died in 307/919 at an advanced age; Dhahabī, Siyar, 14:261.
24 Abū Muhammad Daʿīj b. Ahmad al-Sijistānī (ca. 259/873–351/962) was a wealthy merchant who gained an impressive reputation in the fiel of hadīth; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:188.
25 See above, p. 253.
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-Tawâma 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 ḥadīth from ‘Alī and Ā'isha and Khalīl b. Umar transmitted from him. The fourth was Ṣāliḥ b. Abī Ṣāliḥ, the client of ‘Amr b. Hurayth. He related ḥadīth from Abū Hurayra and [the Qur'ān reciter and transmitter of ḥadīth] 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 Anṣārīite, the judge Abū ‘Abd Allāh, from whom Bukhārī and many others related ḥadīth. The patronymic of the second was Abū Salama and he was weak in ḥadīth. God knows best.

6. Cases of "sharing" in regard to the name or the patronymic 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 Khalīl: "When ‘Arīm [that is, Abu ‘l-Nu‘mān Muhammad b. al-Faḍl al-Sadūsī] and Sulaymān b. Ḥarb (both) say, ‘Hamīd transmitted to us,' it is Hamīd b. Zayd. When [Mūsā b. Ismā‘īl] al-Ṭabūdhakī and al-Kalajjī..."

28 This is another name I was unable to identify.
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.
b. Minḥāl77 say, ‘Ḥammād informed us,’ it is Ḥammād b. Salama. When ʿAffān says, ‘Ḥammād informed us,’ it can be either of them.78 Then I found the report from Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā al-Dhuhili 79 in which ʿAffān [b. Muslim] said, “When I say to you, ‘Ḥammād informed us,’ and I do not give the name of his father, it is Ibn Salama.” With the exception of the remarks on Tabūdhakī, Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā said what Ibn Khallād said.

Similar to that is what we heard regarding Salama b. Sulaymān to the effect that he transmitted ḥadith one day and said, “ʿAbd Allāh told us.” He was asked, “The son of whom?” He said, “God be praised! Will you not be satisfied until I say for every ḥadith, ‘Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Mubārak al-Ḥanḍalī, who lived in Sikkat Ṣughd, informed us?’” Then Salama said, “When ‘ʾAbd Allāh’ is mentioned in Mecca, it is Ibn al-Zubayr. When ‘ʾAbd Allāh’ is mentioned in Medina, it is Ibn ʿUmar. When ‘ʾAbd Allāh’ is mentioned in al-Kūfah, it is Ibn Masʿūd. When ‘ʾAbd Allāh’ is mentioned in al-ʿAsrār, it is Ibn ʿAbbās. When ‘ʾAbd Allāh’ is mentioned in Khurāṣān, it is Ibn al-Mubārak.” The expert Abū Yaḥyā al-Khaṭṭāt al-Qazwīnī said, “When an Egyptian says, ‘from ʾAbd Allāh,’ without naming the man’s father, it is Ibn ʿAmr; that is, [ʿAmr] b. al-ʿĀsh. When a Meccan says, ‘from ʾAbd Allāh,’ without naming the father, it is Ibn ʿAbbās.”

Another case is “Abū ʿl-Ḥamzah” from Ibn ʿAbbās, when the paidonymic is given without further specification. One expert said that Shuʿba related from seven “Abū Ḥamzas” from Ibn ʿAbbās. All of them are “Abū Ḥamza” except one and he is Abū Jamra Naṣr b. Imrān al-ʿDubāṭ”. They can be distinguished when Shuʿba says just, “from Abū Ḥamza [that is, Jamra] from Ibn ʿAbbās.” Then it is from Naṣr b. Imrān. When he relates from the other “Abū Ḥamzas,” he mentions their names and lineages. God knows best.

7. Homonyms in regard to the gentilic alone: one example of this is “Āmulī.” It may be the gentilic referring to the city of Āmul in Tabarastān. Abū Saʿd al-Samʿānī said, “Most of the scholars of Tabarastān are from Āmul.” Or it may be the gentilic referring to Āmul by the river Jāyḥān. The gentilic of Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥammād al-Āmulī refers to this Āmul. Bukhārī related ḥadith from him

---

77 Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥaḍālī b. Minḥāl al-Anmāṣī was a Başra ḥadith transmitter who died in either 216/831 or 217; Dhahabi, Siyār, 10:352-4.
78 Muḥaddith al-Ṭāḥil, 284.
79 Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā al-Dhuhili al-Nisābūrī (ca. 170/787–258/872) was called “the leader of the ḥadith scholars of Khurāṣān;” Dhahabi, Siyār, 12:23–85.
80 Very little seems to have been known about Salama b. Sulaymān (d. ca. 200/816); Dhahabi, Siyār, 9:433.
81 Abū Jamra was a Başra ḥadith transmitter who died around 127/745; Dhahabi, Siyār, 5:243–4.
82 The consonantal skeletons of “ʾAbū Ḥamza” and “ʾAbū Jamra” are identical; thus, when the student encountered these paidonymics in a written text, he could not distinguish them. Of course, when Shuʿba originally recited the ḥadith, he pronounced them differently.
83 Anṣārī, 1:67.
84 Abū Allāh b. Ḥammād died in either 273/886 or 269; Dhahabi, Siyār, 12:611.
in his *Sahih*. The North Africans Abū ʿAlī al-Ghassāni and later al-Qāḍī ʿIyād are incorrect in saying that his paيدونымic refers to Āmul in Tābarastān. God knows best.

Another instance of that is “Hanafī.” This may be the gentilic referring to the tribe of the Banū Ḥanifa. Or it may be the gentilic referring to the legal school of Abū Ḥanifa. The bearers of both of these gentilics are numerous and well known. Muḥammad b. Ṭahir al-Maqdisī [that is, Ibn al-Qaysarānī], many scholars of ḥadith and others used to make a distinction between the two meanings of the gentilic, saying in reference to the legal school, “Hanafī.” I have only come across one grammarian, the authority Abū Bakr b. al-Anbārī,45 who endorsed that. He did so in his book al-ʿKāfī. Muḥammad b. Ṭahir [that is, Ibn al-Qaysarānī] has a book entitled Kitāb al-Ansāb al-muttafaqūn (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-Muttaṣirī transmitted a hadith from Abū Hammām47 – or someone else – from al-Walīd b. Muslim from Sufyān. The expert Abū ʿṬalib b. Naṣr asked him, “Who is this ‘Sufyān’?” He said, “This is Sufyān al-Thawri.” Abū ʿṬalib said to him, “On the contrary, he is Sufyān b. ʿUyayna.” Al-Muttaṣirī asked him, “On what basis do you say that?” He said, “Because al-Walīd related only a few well-documented hadith from Thawrī while he was ‘full’ of Ibn ʿUyayna.” God knows best.

---

45 Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Qāsim al-Anbārī (271/885–327/939) was a renowned grammarian who lived in Baghdād; Sezgin, G.AS. 8:151-4; 9:144-7.
48 The transmitter Abū Hammām al-Walīd b. Abī Bāḍr Shuʿṣṭī (d. 243/857) is said to have collected a hundred thousand hadith from reliable transmitters; Dhaḥabi, Ẓijr, 12:23–4.
Category 55

A Category Composed of the Two Previous Categories
(Nāwī yatarakkabū min al-nawāyin al-ladhayni qablāhū)

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 paidonymics which they are known by and the homography discussed in the Category before that occurs in their lineages or gentilics; or it consists of the reverse, with their names being homographic while their gentilics or their lineages, either in terms of names or paidonymics, 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-Khaṭīb composed a book on this subject, which he entitled Kitāb Ta’lkhīṣ al-mutashābih fī ‘l-rasmī (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. ‘Alī and Mūsā b. ‘Ulayy: there are a number of the first, including Abū ʿĪsā al-Khuttabi from whom the Qur’ān reciter Abū Bakr b. Miṣqam,1 Abū ʿAlī b. al-Ṣawwāf2 and others related hadith. The second is Mūsā b. ‘Ulayy b. Rābāh al-Lakhmī al-Miṣrī,3 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 “‘Alī” for that reason and the Iraqis used to pronounce it “Ulayy.” One expert used to say that “‘Alī” was his name and “Ulayy” (little ‘Alī) was his nickname. God knows best.

An example of homonymy in the name or paidonymic with homography in the gentilic:

Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Mukhtarī4 was a famous transmitter of hadith. His gentilic refers to the Mukhtarim section of Baghdad.

2 Not much seems to have been known about this transmitter. See Sam‘ī, Anāb, 2:322.
3 Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. Ya‘qūb al-Baghdādī al-‘Aṣār (265/872–354/965), known as Ibn Miṣqam, wrote a number of books on the Qur’ān; Brockelmann, G.A.I., Suppl., 1:183
4 Abū ʿAlī Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Baghdādī (270/884–359/970), known as Ibn al-Ṣawwāf, was a highly praised transmitter of hadith; Dhahabi, Siyar, 16:184–6.
6 Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī described Mukharrimī (ca. 170/787–254/868) as “one of the most knowledgeable people in reports and most learned in hadith”; Taʾrīkh Baghdad, 5:423.
Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah al-Makrami was not famous. He related hadith from the imām Shāfi‘ī. 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-Kalā‘ī al-Shāmi and Thawr b. Zayd al-Dīl al-Madani: the second is the one from whom Mālik related and his hadith are present in both of the Ṣaḥīḥs. The hadith of the first are found only in Muslim. God knows best.

An example of homonymy in the paidonymic and homography in the gentilic:

Abū ʿAmr al-Shaybānī and Abū 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. Yūsūf” and the lexicographer Abū ʿAmr al-Shaybānī, that is, Ishāq b. Mirrār, shares his paidonymic and gentilic. The name of the second is “Zur‘a” and he is the father of Yahyā b. Abī ʿAmr al-Saybānī al-Shāmi. God knows best.

Various examples of the second subcategory – which is the reverse of the first:

ʿAmr b. Zārūrā and ʿUmar b. Zārūrā: there are a number of the first, including Abū Muhammad al-Nisābūrī, from whom Muslim related hadith. The second is known as “al-Ḥadathah” and he is the one from whom [Abu ʿl-ʿQasīm] al-Baghwāt al-Ma’ānī transmits hadith. We read in Dāraqūṭnī that he was from a city on the Byzantine frontier called “al-Ḥadathah.” 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 Allāh b. Abī ʿAbd Allāh and ʿAbd Allāh b. Abī ʿAbd Allāh: the first is the son of Abū ʿAbd Allāh Salmān al-Agharr, the student of Abū Hurayra from whom Mālik related hadith. There are a number of the second, including the Qurān reciter Abī Allāh b. Abī ʿAbd Allāh

---

7 I have not found any information about this scholar. The gentilic “Makrami” was applied to the descendants of al-Miswar b. Makhrama b. Nawfā al-Qurashī; Ibn al-ʿAthir, Lāḥib, 3:178.
8 Contemporaries suspected that the otherwise excellent transmitter Thawr (d. 153/770 or 155) was a Qadarite; Dhahabi, Siyār, 6:344–5.
10 Ishāq b. Mirrār (or Mīrār) died in 210/825; al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādi, Tārīkh Baghdād, 6:329–32.

Hayyān al-Asadi and Hanān al-Asadi. An example of the first is Ḥayyān b. Ḥuṣayn,15 the Follower who related ḥadīth from ʿAmmār b. Ṭāṣir. The second is Ḥanān al-Asadi,16 a member of the tribe of the Banū Asad b. Shurayk. He is the uncle of Musarhad, the father of Musaddad. Dāraqūṭī said this. He transmits ḥadīth from Abū ʿUthmān al-Nahdi. God knows best.

Transmitters Resembling One Another in Name and Lineage Who Are Distinguished by the Relative Position of the Names of the Son and Father

(Maʿrifat al-ruwāt al-mutashābihin fi ʾl-ism wa-ʾl-nasab
al-mutumāyiztn bi-ʾl-taqdim wa-ʾl-taʾkhir fi ʾl-ibn wa-ʾl-اب)

An example of this is Yazīd b. al-Aṣwad and al-Aṣwad b. Yazīd. The first is the Companion Yazīd b. al-Aṣwad al-Khurzānī and Yazīd b. al-Aṣwad al-Jurashi, 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] Muʿāwiya asked him to pray for rain for the sake of the people of Damascus. Muʿāwiya said, “God, today we beseech you for intercession through the best and most excellent of us [that is, Yazīd b. al-Aṣwad].” It started raining immediately, almost before they could get back to their homes. The second was the excellent Follower al-Aṣwad b. Yazīd al-Nakhaʿī.

Al-Walid b. Muslim and Muslim b. al-Walid are also an example of this. The first is the Follower al-Walid b. Muslim al-Baṣrī, the transmitter from Jundub b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Bajāljī and the renowned al-Walid b. Muslim al-Dimashqī, the student of Awzāʿī, from whom ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib b. Ḥanbal and many other people related hadith. The second is Muslim b. al-Walid b. Rabāḥ al-Madānī, who transmitted hadith from his father and others. ʿAbd al-Fatīḥ al-Darāwīdhī and others related from him. Bukhārī mentioned him in his Tārīkh (History) and reversed his name and lineage, saying “al-Walid b. Muslim,” and he was reproached for that.

Al-Khaṭīb composed a book on this Category which he called Kitāb Rāḥiʿ al-irtiyāb fi ʾl-maṣlaḥ min al-asmaʿ wa-ʾl-ansāb (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.

1 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Isāfāt, 4:1571.
2 The Follower Jurashi lived in the countryside near Damascus; Dhahabi, Sīyar, 4:136–7.
3 Al-Aṣwad b. Yazīd al-Nakhaʿī (d. ca. 75/694) was the uncle of the famous Kufan jurist Ibrahim al-Nakhaʿī; Dhahabi, Sīyar, 4:50–3.
5 The Companion Jundub (d. ca. 70/689) is said to have lived in al-Kufa and al-Baṣra; Dhahabi, Sīyar, 3:174–5.
8 That is, the word maṣlaḥ in al-Khaṭīb’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

Mu‘ād b. ‘Afraw1, Mu‘āwwidh b. ‘Afraw2 and ‘Awadh b. ‘Afraw: she was their mother and their father was al-‘Iṣārī b. Rifa‘a al-Ansārī. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr said that the name of ‘Awadh was actually “‘Awd” and that that form is found more often in hadith transmissions.3 God knows best.

The muezzin Bilāl b. Ḥamāma: Ḥamāma was his mother and his father was Rabāḥ.

Suhayl b. Bayḍā’4 (literally, a fair-complexioned woman) and his two brothers Sahl and Saftwān:5 she was their mother and her name (ism) was “Da‘īd.” Their father’s name was “Wahb.”

Ṣhuraḥbil b. Ḥasana: she was his mother and his father was ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Muḥāfīz al-Kindī.

ʿAbd Allāh b. Buḥayna: she was his mother and his father was Malik b. al-Qishb al-Azdi al-Aṣmī.

Sa’d b. Ḥabta al-Ansārī:6 she was his mother and his father was Bahīr b. Mu‘āwiyah. Sa’d was an ancestor of the judge Abū Yūsuf [Ya‘qūb 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 Bantū Ḥanafī): she was his mother and her name was “Khawla.” His father was ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭalib (God be pleased with him).

2 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Istārākh, 4:1442.
6 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Istārākh, 2:723.
7 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Istārākh, 2:584–5.
Ismā'il b. 'Ulayya: she was his mother and his father was Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm.

Ibrāhīm b. Hirāsā: 'Abd al-Ghani' b. Sa'id said, “She was his mother and his father was Salama.” God knows best.

2. Those whose lineage refers to their grandmother.

The Companion Ya'qūb b. Munya: according to al-Zubayr b. Bakkar, she was his paternal grandmother and his father was Umayya.

Another is the Companion Bashir b. al-Khaṣṣaṣiyya. 8 He was Bashir b. Maḥmad and al-Khaṣṣaṣiyya was the mother of his great-great-grandfather.

A more recent example of that was our teacher Abū Ḥamīd 'Abd al-Wahhāb b. Ḥāl al-Baghdādī, who was known as “Ibn Suyayn.” She was his grandmother on his father’s side. God knows best.

3. Those whose lineage refers to their grandfather.

Abū 'Ubayda b. al-Jarrāh, 9 one of the Ten [given the glad tidings of their acceptance into heaven]: Abū 'Ubayda was 'Āmir b. 'Abd Allāh b. al-Jarrāh.

The Companion Ḥamāl b. al-Nābigha al-Hudhali:12 he was Ḥamāl b. Malik b. al-Nābigha.


Ibn Jurayj: he was 'Abd al-Malik b. 'Abd al-'Azīz b. Jurayj.

The “sons” of al-Majīshūn, including Yusuf b. Yaṣqūb b. Abī Salama al-Majīshūn:14 Abū 'Alī al-Ghassāni said, “‘Al-Majīshūn’ was the...
nickname of Ya‘qūb b. Abī Salama and it was also applied to his sons and the sons of his brother ʿAbd Allāh b. Abī Salama. The preferred interpretation is that “mājishūn” means “rosy-cheeked” [either in the dialect of the people of Medina or in Persian].

Ibn Abī Dhīḥr: he was Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. al-Mughīra b. Abī Dhīḥr.

The jurist Ibn Abī Laylā: he was Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Laylā.

Ibn Abī Mūlayka: he was ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUbayd Allāh b. Abī Mūlayka.

The imām Ahmad b. Ḥanbāl: he was Abū ʿAbd Allāh Ḥāmid b. Muḥammad b. Ḥanbāl.

The “sons” of Abū Shayba; that is, the hadith experts Abū Bakr and ʿUthmān and their brother al-Qāsim. Abū Shayba was their grandfather. His name was ʿIbrāhīm 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 Taʿrīkh Miṣr (The History of Egypt). He was ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥāmid b. Yūnus b. Abū al-ʿAql al-Ṣadāfī. 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-Miqdād b. al-Aswad: he was al-Miqdād b. ʿAmr b. Thaqīf b. al-Kindi – and it is said, “al-Bahrānī.” He was one of the kin of al-Aswad b. ʿAbd Yāghūth al-Zuhri, who adopted him. Al-Miqdād’s lineage refers to him.

Al-Ḥasan b. Dinār: he is actually Ibn Wāṣīl 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. Wāṣīl,” making Wāṣīl his grandfather. God knows best.

15 Abū Yūsuf Ya‘qūb b. Abī Salama Dinār (or Maymūn) died around 120/738; Dhahabi, ʿIḥyāʾ, 5:370.
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, G.A.S., 1:518.
19 The hadith transmitter Ibn Abī Mūlayka died in 117/793 at over eighty years of age; Dhahabi, ʿIḥyāʾ, 5:88–90.
20 Abū Bakr’s brother ʿUthmān (d. 239/853) was a highly respected transmitter of hadith; Dhahabi, ʿIḥyāʾ, 11:151–4.
21 I was unable to locate any information about this brother.
22 ʿIḥyāʾ, 1(2):11–12.
Category 58

GENTILICS THE ACTUAL SIGNIFICANCE OF WHICH DIFFERS FROM THE APPARENT ONE WHICH FIRST COMES TO MIND

(Ma‘rifat al-nisab allati ba’tinuhā ‘ala khilaf zāhirīhā
alladhi huwa al-sāhib ila ‘l-fahm minhā)

For example:

Abū Mas‘ūd ‘Uqba 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.

Ṣulaymān b. Ṭūkhrān al-Ṭaymī: he lived with the tribe of Taym, but he was not one of them. He was a client of the Banū Murra.

Abū Khālid Yazīd b. Abū al-Raḥmān al-Dalānī: 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 not from the region of al-Khūz. Rather, he lived on the pass of al-Khūz in Mecca.

‘Abd al-Malik b. Abī Sulaymān al-‘Arzmānī: he lived in the cemetery of the ‘Arzm in al-Kūf. The ‘Arzām were a tribe considered part of the Fazāra and it is said that the gentilic is pronounced “‘Arzmānī” rather than “‘Arzmānī.”

Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Sinān al-‘Awaqī al-Baghrī: he was a Bāhilī who lived among the al-‘Awaqa, and they are a subtribe of the ‘Abd al-Qays. He was given his gentilic in reference to them.

Aḥmad [that is, Ḥamdān] b. Yūsuf al-Sulāmī: he was a noble individual from whom Muslim and others related hadith. He was actually an Azdī. He was known as “al-Sulāmī” because, as he himself said, his mother was named “Sulayma” [that is, he had no connection to the Banū Sulaym].

2 Abū Khālid was considered to be a very unreliable transmitter of hadith; Samī‘, Anṣāb, 2:450.
4 Abū ‘Abd Allāh (or Abū Muḥammad or Abī Sulaymān) ‘Abd al-Malik b. Abī Sulaymān Maysara al-‘Arzmānī was a transmitter of hadith who died in 145/762; Dhahabi, Siyar, 6:107–9.
5 ‘Awaqī died in 223/838 at over ninety years of age; Dhahabi, Siyar, 10:383–6.
Abū 'Amr [Isma'īl] b. Nujayd al-Sulami; he was known as "al-Sulami" for the same reason. He was the grandson of Ahmad b. Yusuf al-Sulami.

Abū 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Sulami, the writer of books for Sufis; his mother was the daughter of the aforementioned Abū 'Amr so he was given the gentilic "Sulami." He was also an Azdī. His grandfather was the paternal cousin of Ahmad b. Yusuf.

Similar to that phenomenon and connected with it are

Miqsam, mawla Ibn 'Abbās; he was actually the client (mawla) of 'Abd Allah b. al-Hārith b. Nawfal. He was inseparable from ['Abd Allah] b. 'Abbās and was called "mawla Ibn 'Abbās" because of this association with him.

Yazid al-Faqir (the poor); he was one of the Followers and he was called that because he had been wounded in the spine (faqīr zahrihi). It hurt him so badly that he walked with a stoop.  
Khālid al-Ḥadhākh (the cobbler); he was not a cobbler and he was called that because he sat among the shoemakers. God knows best.

7 Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, Isrāfīl, 3:885–6.
8 Abū ʿUthmān Yazid b. Ṣuhayb al-Kūfī is best known for having been a teacher of the imām Abū Hanifa; Dhahabi, Sīyar, 5:227–8.
9 Abū ʿl-Munāzīl Khālid b. Mihrān was a Bāqra transmitter of hadith who died around 141/758; Dhahabi, Sīyar, 6:190–3.
This is the discipline concerning the names of those men and women who are referred to obscurely in hadith. The expert ‘Abd al-Ghanī b. Sa‘dī, al-Khaṭīb [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 hadith. However, the names of many of these individuals were never discovered.

This phenomenon takes 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 hadith of Ibn ‘Abbās (God be pleased with them [that is, Ibn ‘Abbās and his father]) to the effect that “a man” (rajul) said, “Messenger of God, does the pilgrimage take place every year?” This man was al-Aqrā‘ b. Ḥābīs. Ibn ‘Abbās identified him in another version of the hadith.

Another example is the hadith of Abū Sa‘īd 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” (rajul minhum) recited the first sūra of the Qurān in exchange for thirty sheep, and so forth. The one who made the incantation was the transmitter Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī.

Another example is the hadith 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’ (julūna) prays here. When she is overcome, she holds on to the rope.” This woman is variously identified as Zaynab bint Ja‘sh, the wife of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him); her sister Ḥamma bint Ja‘sh; and Maymūna bint al-Ḥārith, the mother of the believers [that is, the wife of the Prophet].

Another example is “the woman” (al-marda) who asked the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) about the major ablution for menstruation and

---

1 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Istīlāḥ, 1:103.
3 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Istīlāḥ, 4:1813.
4 Maymūna (d. 61/681) was the last wife the Prophet married; EF, 6:918.
he said, “Take a bit of musk.” She was the Ansârite Asmâ‘ bint Yazid 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 ʻAtiya,5 “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 lote tree leaves, and so forth.” She was Zaynab,6 the wife of Abu ʻl-ʻAṣî b. al-Rabî‘a.7 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.8 God knows best.

“Ibn al-Lutbiya” (the son of the Lutbite woman): Muḥammad b. Sa‘d9 – the author of [Kitâb] al-Ṭabaqât [al-kabîr]10 (The Great Book of Generations) – stated that his name is “Abd Allah” and that the gentilic “al-Lutbiya” refers to the Banû Luth, a subtribe of the Asd – and the Asd are the same as the Azd. He is also called “Ibn al-Ultbiya,” and that is wrong.

“Ibn Miṣrâf al-Anṣârî,”12 whom the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) dispatched to the people at ʻArafa and said, “Keep to your shrines;” his name was “Zayd.” Waqîdî13 and his amanuensis Ibn Sa‘d said, “His name was “Abd Allah.”14

---

5 Ibn ʻAbd al-Barr, Istîfâb, 4:1787–8.
7 Ibn ʻAbd al-Barr, Istîfâb, 4:1853–4.
9 Ibn ʻAbd al-Barr, Istîfâb, 4:1839–43.
10 Abū ʻAbd Allâh Muḥammad b. Sa‘d (ca. 168/784–230/845) was born in al-ṣârîra and settled in Baghdad where he served as the secretary of the famous biographer of the Prophet Wâqîdî; EI, 3:922–3; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:300–1.
11 Although Ibn al-Lutbiya’s connection to the Aṣd is mentioned in Ibn Sa‘d’s work (al-Ṭabaqât al-kabîra, ed. Ihsân ʻAbbâs, 9 vols, Beirut, 1380/1960–1388/1968, 2:160), I have not located the passage where he identifies his ʻism.
13 Although Abû ʻAbd Allâh Muḥammad b. ʻUmâr al-Wâqîdî (130/747–207/823) was not universally considered a reliable transmitter of hadîth, he was much esteemed for his expertise in the fields of Prophetic biography and History; Sezgin, G.A.S., 1:294–7.
14 Ibn ʻAbd al-Barr regarded ʻAbd Allâh as a brother of Zayd; Istîfâb, 3:986.
The blind muezzin Ibn Umm Maktūm: his name is given variously as ‘Abd Allāh b. Zā'ida,” “Amr b. Qays,” and so forth. The name of Umm Maktūm was “‘Ātika bint ‘Abd Allāh.”

“The girl” (al-‘iba) whom the tribe of the Bant Hishām b. al-Mughira wanted to wed to ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭalīb (God be pleased with him) was al-‘Awra bint Abī Jahl b. Hishām. God knows best.

Another form of this phenomenon concerns uncles, aunts and the like. Examples are

Rāfi b. Khadij from “his paternal uncle” (sannīhi) in the hadith regarding the contract to cultivate a field in exchange for a portion of its yield (mukhabara): His paternal uncle was Zuhayr b. Rāfi‘ al-‘Arīthī al-‘Ansārī.\(^{15}\)

Ziyād b. ‘Ilaq from “his paternal uncle;” the uncle was Qutha b. Malik al-Tha‘labī.\(^{16}\)

“The paternal aunt” (samma) of Jābir b. ‘Abd Allāh who began to weep for his father on the Day of the Battle of Uhud. Her name was “Fatīma bint ‘Amr b. ‘Harām.” Wāqidi called her “Hind.” God knows best.

Another form of this phenomenon concerns husbands and wives. [Examples are]

The hadīth of Subay‘a al-Aslamiyya\(^{17}\) to the effect that she gave birth a few days after the death of her husband (zawjiha): He was Sa‘d b. Khawla,\(^{18}\) 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 Wāshi qu:\(^{19}\) the lexicographers pronounce her name as “Barwa‘” while the scholars of hadīth generally pronounce it “Birwa‘.” The name of her husband was “Tīfāl b. Murra al-Ashja‘” according to what we have heard from more than one source.

“The wife” (zawja) of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. al-Zabīr,\(^{20}\) who had been the wife of Rifa‘a b. Samaw‘al al-Quraṣī\(^{21}\) before he divorced her: her name was “Tamīma bint Wahb” and it is also given as “Tumayma” and “Suhayma.” God knows best.

---

16 Ziyād died around the year 125/743 at over one hundred years of age; Dāhib, Sīyar, 5:215–16.
17 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Istifāk, 3:1383.
18 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Istifāk, 4:1859.
20 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Istifāk, 4:1795.
21 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Istifāk, 2:833.
22 Rifa‘a 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 ‘Abd al-Barr, Istifāk, 2:500.
Category 60

THE DATES OF TRANSMITTERS

(Ma‘rifat tawārikh al-ruwāt)

These dates include the deathdates and birthdates of the Companions, transmitters of hadith and other scholars, as well as how long they lived and the like. We heard that Sufyān al-Thawrī said, “When transmitters use falsehood, we employ dates (al-ta‘rikh) against them.” We heard that Ḥāfṣ b. Ghiyāth 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 Ismā‘īl b. ‘Ayyāsh: “I was in Iraq and the scholars of hadith came to me and said, ‘There is a man who transmits hadith from Khālid b. Ma‘dān’ over there.’ I went to him and asked, ‘In which year did you write hadith from Khālid b. Ma‘dān?’ He said, ‘In the year 13’ – that is, 113 [731 AD]. I said, ‘Do you claim that you heard hadith from Khālid b. Ma‘dān seven years after his death?’”

Ismā‘īl said that Khālid died in 106. We heard a similar story which transpired between ‘Ufayr b. Ma‘dān’ and someone who transmitted from Khālid b. Ma‘dān. There ‘Ufayr stated that Khālid died in 104.

We heard that Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥākim said, “When Abū Ja‘far Muhammad b. Ḥātim al-Kashshā‘ī 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 Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥumaydī al-Andalūsī 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 (ṣilāḥ): the best book written on this is Dāraqṭnī’s.⁶

---

1 Abū ʿUtbā Ismā‘īl b. ‘Ayyāsh al-Himṣī (ca. 108/726–ca. 181/797) was a famous Syrian hadith expert; Dīhabī, ʿṣayr, 8:312–28.
2 The renowned expert in hadith and practical law, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Khālid b. Ma‘dān al-Himṣī was also known for his piety. As will be seen, the exact year of his death was disputed; Dīhabī, ʿṣayr, 4:536–41.
4 Very little was known about Muhammad b. Ḥātim; Dīhabī, ʿṣayr, 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 Mākālā’s [al-Ikmāl].

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" (tamārikh) of the transmitters of ḥadīth 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].

Abu Bakr passed away in Jumādā al-Ūlā of the year 13 [August 634].

Umar died in Dhu 'l-Hijja of the year 23 [October 644].

Uthmān died in Dhu 'l-Hijja of the year 35 [June 656] at the age of eighty-two – the age of ninety and others are also given.

Abū Ṭalā‘ī 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.

Ṭalḥa and al-Zubayr both died in Jumādā al-Ūlā of the year 36 [December 656]. We heard from Abu ʿAbd Allāh al-Hākim that they were the same age, sixty-four years. Others have contradicted al-Hākim.

Sa‘d b. Abī Waqqāṣ died, according to the best opinion, in the year 55 [675 AD] at the age of seventy-three.

Sa‘d b. Zayd died in the year 51 [671 AD] at the age of seventy-three or seventy-four.

Abū Ṭalā‘ī died in the year 32 [653 AD] at the age of seventy-five.

---

7 This date was actually a Sunday.
8 Ulūm al-ḥadīth, 203.
10 Ibn Abī al-Barr, Istārah, 2.844-50.
Abū ʿ Ubayd 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 Ḥakīm b. Ḥizām \textsuperscript{11} and he was born inside the Kaaba thirteen years before the Year of the Elephant. \textsuperscript{12} The second was the Anṣārī Hassan b. Thābit b. al-Mundhir b. Ḥarām. Ibn Ḥishāq 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 Hassan died in the year 50. God knows best.

3. The eponyms of the five legal schools having followers.

Abū ʿAbd Allāh Sufyān b. Saʿīd al-Thawrī indisputably died in al-BAṣra in 161 [778 AD] and his birth was in the year 97 [716 AD].

Malik b. Anas (God be pleased with him) died in Medina in 179 [795 AD] – a year before 180. \textsuperscript{13} His birthdate is disputed. The years 93 [712 AD], 91, 94 and 97 have all been suggested. God knows best.

Abū Ḥanīfā (God bless him) died in 150 [767 AD] in Baghdad at the age of seventy.

Shafīʿī (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].

Al-Ḥāmad b. Muḥammad b. Ḥanbal died in Baghdad in Rabī‘ 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 Allāh al-Bukhārī was born on Friday – after the Friday prayer – the 13th of Shawwāl 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.

\textsuperscript{11} Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Iṣbahānī, 1:362–3.
\textsuperscript{12} The Year of the Elephant was traditionally dated 570 AD.
\textsuperscript{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, Dhahabi remarked, “How often seven is misread for nine!” Sīyar, 10:648.
Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj al-Nisabūrī 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-Ashʿath al-Sijistānī died in al-Baṣra in Shawwāl of the year 275 [February 889].

Abū ʿIsā Muḥammad b. ʿIsā al-Sulamī al-Tirmidhī died in Tirmidh on the 13th of Rajab of the year 279 [9 October 892].

Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Ahmad b. Shuʿayb al-Nasāʿī died in the year 303 [915 AD]. God knows best.

5. Seven later experts who composed excellent books which have proved useful in our times.

Abū ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAlt b. ʿUmar al-Daraquṭnī al-Baghdādī died in Baghdad in Dhu ʿl-Qaʿda of the year 385 [December 995]. He was born in Dhu ʿl-Qaʿda of the year 306 [April 919].

Then came Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Bayyīs al-Ḥākim al-Nisabūrī who died in Nishapur in ʿSafar 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 ḥadith expert of Egypt, Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Ghanī b. ʿSaʿd al-Azdī, who was born in Dhu ʿl-Qaʿda of the year 332 [June 945]. He died in Egypt in ʿSafar of the year 409 [July 1018].

Then came the expert Abū Nuʿaym Aḥmad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-ʾIṣbāḥānī, who was born in 334 [946 AD]. He died in ʿSafar of the year 430 [November 1038] in Isfahān.

In another generation there was the ḥadith expert of the North Africans Abū ʿAmr b. ʿAbd al-Barr al-Namāri, who was born in Rabiʿ al-ʾĀkhir of the year 368 [November 978]. He died in Shāṭibī in al-Andalus in the month of Rabiʿ al-ʾĀkhir of the year 463 [January 1071].

Then came Abū Bakr Ahmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Bayhaqī, who was born in the year 384 [994 AD]. He died in Nishapur in Jumādā al-ʿUlā of the year 458 [May 1066]. His body was taken to Bayhaq and buried there.

Then came Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. ʿAlt al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, who was born in Jumādā al-ʾĀkhir 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 ḤADĪTH

(Maʿrifat al-thiqāt wa-l-duʿāʾīl min ruwāt al-ḥadīth)

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-Duʿāʾīl (Book of Weak Transmitters), Nasrī’s al-Duʿāṣafāʾ, ʿUqaylī’s al-Duʿāṣafāʾ and others. Some concern only reliable transmitters, like Abū Ḥātim b. Ḥābīb’s Kitāb al-Thiqāt (Book of Reliable Transmitters). Some cover both reliable and unreliable transmitters, for instance Bukhārī’s Taʾrīkh (History), Ibn Abī Khayyāmah’s Taʾrīkh – How rich it is in useful information! – and Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī’s Kitāb al-Jarḥ wa-l-taʿṣīl (Book of Personality Criticism).

We heard that the expert ʿAlī b. Muḥammad, nicknamed “Jazara,” said, “The first person to talk about hadith transmitters was Shuṭbā b. al-Ḥajjah. Yahyā b. Saʿīd al-Qatṭān followed him and Ahmad b. Ḥanbal and Yaḥyā b. Maʿīn came after that.” And these, ‘He means that Shuṭbā 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-sharīʿa) and to banish error and falsehood from it. Discrediting transmitters is licit just as is discrediting witnesses in court. I heard that Abū Bakr b. Khallād said, ‘I asked Yaḥyā b. Saʿīd [al-Qatṭān], ‘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?’”’ We heard or read that the ascetic Abū Turāb al-Nakhsibī"
heard some remarks critical of transmitters from Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal and said to him, “Teacher, do not slander scholars!” Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal 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 Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Ḥātim – and they say he used to be considered a saint (min al-ābdāl) – feared something similar to what I mentioned. According to the report we heard or read, Yūsuf b. al-Ḥusayn al-ruzūl – that is, the Sufi – went up to ‘Abd al-Raḥmān while he was reciting his book [that is, his Kitāb al-Jarīh ma’l-īغdil] 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?” ‘Abd al-Raḥmān wept. He also read that Yaḥyā b. Ma‘ān 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.” ‘Abd al-Raḥmān 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 Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, al-Nasāṣī’s discreditation of Aḥmad b. Ṣāliḥ. 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 Aḥmad b. Ṣāliḥ toward Nasāṣī corrupted the latter’s heart against him. We heard that the expert Abū Yaḥyā al-Khalīlī said, “The experts agree that Nasāṣī’s condemnation of him was a case of personal prejudice and the remarks of the likes of Nasāṣī cannot impugn Aḥmad b. Ṣāliḥ.” Nasāṣī 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 Nasāṣī 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 Abū Yaḥyā Yūsuf b. al-Ḥusayn al-Raṣī (d. 304/917) was a disciple of the great Egyptian mystic Dhu ‘l-Nūn; Dhahabi, Siyūr, 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 ākhīr umrih 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,

‘Aṭā’ b. al-Sā‘ib1 became disordered at the end of his life. Scholars cite as proofs the relations of his older students, like Sufyān al-Thawrī and Shu‘ba [b. al-Ḥajjāj], 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. Ya‘yā b. Sa‘īd al-Qattān said about Shu‘ba, “[The hadith Sufyān and Shu‘ba transmitted from him are sound,] except two regarding which Shu‘ba used to say, ‘I heard them at the last [from ‘Aṭā’] from Zādhān.’”

Abū Ishaq al-Sab‘ī also became disordered. It is said that Sufyān b. ‘Uuyayna heard hadith from him after he became disordered. Abū Ya‘qūb al-Khalīlī stated this.

Sa‘īd b. Iyās al-Jurayrī1 became disordered and his retention went bad before his death. Abū Ḥalāl [Sulaymān b. Khalaf] al-Bahtājī al-Malikī said that Nasēfī 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 ‘Aṭā’ b. al-Sā‘ib al-Kāfī (his kunya is disputed) died in 136/754; Dhabābi, Siyar, 6:110–14.
2 Dhabābi, Siyar, 6:111.
3 Abū ‘Umar Zādhān al-Kindī was born during the lifetime of the Prophet and died in 82/701; Dhabābi, Siyar, 4:289–1.
4 Irshad, 1:355.
5 Abū Mas‘ūd Sa‘īd b. Iyās al-Jurayrī (d. 144/761) was a Bayān expert in hadith; Dhabābi, Siyar, 6:153–6.
6 Nothing I have read identifies which plague is meant here. The Plague of Salm b. Quraybā which struck at 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 Khālid al-Ḥadidhā?

Saʿīd b. ʿAbbās ʿArūba: Yahyā b. Maʿṣūm said, “Saʿīd b. ʿAbbās ʿArūba confused his hadith after the defeat of Ibrāhīm b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥasan b. Ḥasan in the year 42, that is 142 [759 AD].” Those who heard hadith from him after that are worthless. The audition of Yazīd b. Ḥārūn from him is sound. He heard hadith from him in Wāsiṭ while Ibn ʿAbbās was on his way to al-Kūfah. The most trustworthy person who heard hadith from him was ʿAbd Allāh b. Sulaymān.14 Wākiʿ b. al-Jarrāḥ and al-Muʿātta b. ʿImrān al-Mawsīlī are among those who are known to have heard hadith from him after he became disordered. We read that Ibn ʿAbbās al-Mawsīlī10 — one of the experts — said, “Their relation from him is worthless. They heard hadith from him after he became disordered.” We heard that Yahyā b. Maʿṣūm said to Wākiʿ, “You transmit hadith from Saʿīd b. ʿAbbās ʿArūba and you heard from him only while he was disordered?” He replied, “Have you seen me transmit anything but good hadith from him?”


Rabīʿ al-Raʿy b. ʿAbbās al-Raḥmān, the professor of Mālik: it is said that he went bad at the end of his life and for that reason reliance on him is unacceptable.


---

7 The revolt of Ibrāhīm and his brother Muḥammad, known as “al-Nasr al-Zakiya,” against the Caliph al-Maṣṣūrī actually took place in 145/762–3; EF, 3:983–5
8 Abū Muhammad ʿAbdāl-ʿAbd Allāh (the pronunciation “ʿAbdāl” also seems to be possible) b. Sulaymān al-Kūfī al-Kifī died in 188/804 in al-Kūfah; Dhahabi, Siyār, 8:511.
9 Al-Muʿātta b. ʿImrān al-Mawsīlī was a historian who wrote a Taʾrikh Mawsīlī; Seğin, GĀS, 1:343.
10 Abū Jaʿfar Muhammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbbās al-Mawsīlī (d. 242/856 or 231) wrote a work on transmitters and the defects in hadith; Dhahabi, Siyār, 11:469–70.
11 Maṣṣūdī (d. 160/777) was a prominent hadith transmitter and jurist; Dhahabi, Siyār, 7:93–5.
12 Abū ʿl-Umayr died around 150/767; Dhahabi, Siyār, 7:20.
Hibbān 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.”

Husayn b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Kūfī was one of those who became disordered and went bad. Nasāʾī and others said this. God knows best.

ʿAbd al-Wahhāb al-Thaqafi: Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī said that Yahyā b. Maʿīn said, “He became disordered in the end.”

Sufyān b. ʿUayyna: I came across the remark of Muhammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmmār al-Mawṣili that he heard Yahyā b. Maʿīn 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. Ijanbal 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. Nasāʾī said, “There are doubts regarding him on account of those who wrote hadith from him at the last.” The statement of ʿAbbās b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz [al-ʿAnbārī] 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 Waqīdi is more veracious than he.” In what is related from Ṭabarānī I came across some hadith from ʿIsḥāq b. Ibrāhīm al-Dabārī from ʿAbd al-Razzāq which I vehemently reject. I attribute the state of those hadith to that circumstance. Dabārī heard hadith from him very late. Ibrāhīm al-Ḥarbī said, “When ʿAbd al-Razzāq died, Dabārī 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.

ʿĀrim, that is, Abu l-Nuʿmān Muhammad b. al-Fadl, became disordered at the last. The hadith which Bukhārī, Muhammad b. Yahyā al-Dhuḥlī and the other experts related from him must have been taken from him before he became disordered.

13 Majrūḥin, 1:366.
14 The sources maintain that there were a number of notable individuals named “Husayn 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); Dhabhāt, Sīyar, 5:422-4.
15 Abū Muhammad ʿAbd al-Wahhāb b. ʿAbd al-Majīd al-Thaqafi (ca. 108/726-194/810) is said to have gone bad three or four years before his death; Dhabhāt, Sīyar, 9:237-41.
Abū Qī‘āba Ṭabd al-Malik b. Muḥammad b. Ṭabd Allāh al-Raqāshī: we heard that the authority Ibn Khuzayma said, “Abū Qī‘āba transmitted ḥadīthth to us in al- Баšra before he became disordered and went to Baghdad.”

Later scholars whom we read that about.

Abū ʿAlī Ahmad al-Ghiṭrīfī al-Jurjānī18 and Abū Ṭāhirī,19 the grandson of the authority Ibn Khuzayma. The expert Abū ʿAlī al-Bardhaʿī – and later “al-Samarqandī – said in his Muʿjam that he read that they became disordered at the end of their life.

Abū Bakr b. Mālik al-Qatīʿī – 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 ḥadīthth of the transmitters of this type cited in one or both of the Sahīhs have been separated [from their weak ḥadīthth] and were taken from them before they became disordered. God knows best.

19 Muḥammad b. al-Faḍīl b. Muḥammad b. ʿIṣḥāq b. Khuzayma al-Nisabūrī (d. 387/997) was regarded as an expert in his grandfather’s ḥadīthth; Dīhah, Sīyār, 16:490-1.
This is one of the important subjects, ignorance of which has disgraced several writers and other scholars. *Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr* of Muḥammad b. Saʿd – the amanuensis of Wāqīḍī – is full of useful information. Muḥammad b. Saʿd is reliable despite the fact that in his book he relates many reports from weak transmitters including Wāqīḍī – and he is the “Muḥammad b. ‘Umar” whose gentilic Ibn Saʿd 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-Anṣāri 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-ruwat wa-l-‘ulamā‘)

The most important aspect of this subject is the recognition of those clients who bear tribal gentilics 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-‘atāqa).

The term “client” is applied to some transmitters with the sense of “clientage by conversion to Islam” (mawla al-islām). An example is Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Bukhārī. He is Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl al-Ju‘fī, a client of the Ju‘fītes. He bears the gentilic “Ju‘fī” because one of his ancestors - and I think that he was the one called “al-Aḥma” and he had been a Majian – converted to Islam at the hand of al-Yamān b. al-Akhnas al-Ju‘fī; that is, the ancestor of Ḥabīl Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Musnaḍī al-Ju‘fī, one of the teachers of Bukhārī. Another example is al-Ḥasan b. ʿĪsā al-Māṣarjīsī, the client of ʿAbd 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 clientage of alliance and protection (wala‘ al-hilf wa-l-muwālāt), like the imām Mālik b. Anas. His folks were Ḥimyarite Aṣḥābites by blood. They were clients by alliance of the Taym of the Qurashites. Some say this was because his grandfather, Mālik b. Abī ʿAmīr, was an ‘asfī – that is a “hired hand” – of Ṭalḥa b. ʿUbayd Allāh al-Taymī and Ṭalḥa used to travel about as a trader. Others say that Mālik b. Abī ʿAmīr was called “the client of the Taymites” because of his being with Ṭalḥa b. ʿUbayd Allāh al-Taymī. This is a fourth subcategory of clientage. It is similar to what we said above [in Category 58] about Miṣqam, namely that he was described as “the client of Ibn ʿAbbās” because of his close association with him.

* The following are examples of clients who bear tribal gentilics.

The Follower Abū ‘l-Bakhtarī Sa‘īd b. Fayrūz al-Ṭayy. He was a client of the tribe of Ṭayy.

---

1 Abū Ja‘far al-Musnaḍī was described as “the ḥadīth authority in Transoxiana in his era.” He died in 229/844 at over ninety years of age; Dhahabi, Siyar, 10:658–60.
2 Abū ʿAbd al-Ḥasan b. ʿIṣa b. Māṣarjīs al-Nisabūrī (d. 240/854 or 239) was a popular teacher in Baghdad; Dhahabi, Siyar, 12:27–30.
3 Abū ‘l-Bakhtarī was a jurist who died in the Battle of al-Jamājīm in 82/701; Dhahabi, Siyar, 4:279–80.
The Follower Abu 'l-Áliya Rufay' al-Riyâḥi al-Tamîmi. He was the client of a woman of the Banû Riyâḥ.

Abû Dâwûd 'Abd al-Raḥmân b. Hurmuz al-Árâj al-Áhshimî, the transmitter from Abu Hurayra, Ibn Buhayna and others. He was a client of the Banû Hâshim.

Al-Layth b. Sa'd al-Miṣrî al-Fahmi was a client of the subtribe of Fahm.

'Abd Allah b. al-Mubârak al-Marwâzi al-Áhâzalt was a client of the tribe of Áhâzâla.

'Abd Allah b. Wâb al-Miṣrî al-Qurashi was a client of the Quraysh.


Sometimes a transmitter bore the gentilic of a tribe because he was the client of a client of that tribe. An example is Abu 'l-Áhûbâb Sa'd b. Yasâr al-Áhshimî, the transmitter from Abu Hurayra and [Abd Allah] b. 'Umar. He was a client of a client of the Banû Hâshim because he was the client of Shuqrân, the client of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him).

We heard that Zuhri said,

I went to [the caliph] 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwân 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, “Átâ' b. Abî Rabîh.” 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, “Átâ’ b. Áhssân.” 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 Átâ’ came to lead.” He said, “That is the way it should be. Who leads the people of Egypt?” I said, “Yazîd b. Abî Ḥabîb.” 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, “Makhûl.” He said, “Is he an Arab or a client?” I said, “He is a client, a Nubian slave of a Hûdhayîlî woman who eventually freed him.” He said, “Who leads the people of al-Jazîra?” I said, “Maymûn b. Mîhrân.”

---

4 Dhahâbî, among others, had doubts about the reliability of 'Abd Allah b. Šâlih (157/754-223/837) as a transmitter of hadîth; Sîyâr, 10:405-16.
6 Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, Istîbâl, 2:709-10.
7 This highly respected transmitter died in 128/746; Dhahabî, Sîyâr, 6:31-3.
8 Abû Ayyûb Maymûn b. Mîhrân al-Jazîrî al-Raqîq (40/660-117/735 or 116) was a respected authority in law and hadîth; Dhahabî, Sîyâr, 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 Khurasan?” 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-Kufa?” I said, “Ibrahim al-Nakha’i.” 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 ‘Abd al-Rahman b. Zayd b. Aslam\(^9\) said, “When the ‘‘‘Abd Allahs’’\(^10\) died, the law in all of the cities, except Medina, went to the clients. God specially blessed Medina with a Qurashiite and the jurist of the inhabitants of Medina, was, without a doubt, Sa’id 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 Shafi’i and Nakha’i. All of the “Seven Jurists,”\(^11\) including Ibn al-Musayyib, were Arabs, except Sulayman b. Yasir. God knows best.

---

9 Al-Dahhak (d. 102/721 or 103 or 106) was best known for his expertise in Qur’ān commentary; Dhahabi, Siyar, 4:598–600.
10 ‘Abd al-Rahman died in 182/798; Dhahabi, Siyar, 8:349.
11 See above, Category 39.
12 See above, Category 40.
Category 65

THE RESIDENCES AND LANDS OF TRANSMITTERS

(Ma'rifat awtân al-ruwât wa-buldânihim)

This is one of the matters which the experts of hadith need to know for many of their activities, and Ibn Sa'd's Tabaqât 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 Abû ʿAbd Allah al-Ḥakim and relate hadith with their isnâds, drawing attention to where the transmitters lived. It is commendable for the expert to give the hadith with its isnâd and then mention the homelands of its transmitters and other facts about them, one by one, [for example]


1. This is the famous Ibn Tabarrzâd al-Baghâdî (516/1123-607/1210), who possessed short isnâds for a number of important hadîth collections; Dhahabi, Siyyar, 21:507-12.
2. This transmitter, popularly known as Qâdi ʿI-Mariṣîn (442/1050-535/1141), studied many subjects before repenting and devoting himself to the study of hadîth; Dhahabi, Siyyar, 2023-8.
3. Abû Ishâq al-Barmakî (361/972-445/1054) was another long-lived transmitter of hadîth; Dhahabi, Siyyar, 17605-6.
4. Ibn Mâsî was born in 274/887 and died in 369/980; Dhahabi, Siyyar, 16252-3.
5. Kajî (ca. 190/806-292/904) was a popular transmitter because he had a number of hadîth, like the one cited here, in which only three intermediaries separated him from the Prophet; Dhahabi, Siyyar, 13423-5.
Sulaymān [b. Ṭarkhān] al-Taymī informed us from Anas [b. Malik]. He said, the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, “There is no disassociation among [quarreling] Muslims for longer than three days,” or he said, “three nights.”

[2a] The teacher and great transmitter Abu ʿl-Ḥasan 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-Ḥafīẓ al-Fūrāwī informed us at the grave of Muslim. Ḥaṣān b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Qāsim b. Abū Bakr al-Qārī informed us through recitation to him.

[2b.] Umm al-Muʿayyad Zaynab bint Abī ʿl-Qāsim ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. al-Ḥasan 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, Ḥaṣān b. Abī ʿl-Qāsim b. Abī Bakr al-Qārī informed us through recitation to him.

[Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Fūrāwī and Qārī] said, Abū Ḥafṣ Umar b. Ahmad b. Masrūr informed us: Abū ʿAmr Ḥaṣān b. Nūjayd al-Sulami informed us: Abū Muslim Ibrāhīm b. Abū Allāh al-Kajjī informed us: Muḥammad b. Abū Allāh al-Ansārī informed us: Ḥumayd al-Ṭawīl transmitted to me from Anas b. Malik. 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 ḥadith are elevated in audition with clean isnāds and sound texts. In the first, Anas and those after him until Abū Muslim are Başrans. Those after Abū Muslim to our teacher are Baghdādis. In the second ḥadith, Anas and those after him until Abū Muslim are, as we said, Başrans. Those after him, from Ibn Nūjayd until our teacher, are Nishapūris.

[3.] The pure teacher Abu ʿl-Fāṭih Mānṣūr b. ʿAbd al-Muʿṭim b. Abī ʿl-Barakāt (God bless him) – the son of the authority Abū ʿAbd

---

6 For this, see above pp. 142–3.
8 The famous transmitter of hadith Abū ʿUbaydāl Humayd b. Abī Humayd al-Ṭall (68/687–142/759), known as Ḥumayd al-Ṭallī (Tall – or Long – Humayd), was not actually tall, although his hands were said to be “long”; Sezgin, GAZ, 1:89.
Allāh Muḥammad b. al-Fadl al-Furāwī — informed me through my recitation to him in Nishapur: My grandfather Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. al-Fadl informed us: Abū ʿUthmān Saʿīd b. Muḥammad al-Bahtrī⁹ (God bless him) informed us: Abū Saʿīd Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥamḍūn⁸™ informed us. He said, Abū Ḥātim Makkī b. Ṭābān¹⁺ informed us: ʿAbd al-Rāḥmān b. Bishr¹² informed us: ʿAbd al-Razzaq [b. Hammām] informed us: Ibn Jurayj informed us. He said, ʿAbāda b. Abī Lubāba⁴ informed me that Warrād,⁴ the client of al-Mughira b. Shuṭba, informed him that al-Mughira b. Shuṭba wrote to [the caliph] Muʿāwiya — 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.’”¹³

Al-Mughira b. Shuṭba, Warrād and ʿAbāda were Kūfans. Ibn Jurayj, Makkī and ʿAbd al-Razzaq were from the city of Sana in the Yemen. ʿAbd al-Rāḥmān b. Bishr, our teacher and all of those between them were Nishapurīs.

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 Muḥammad 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 Makkī b. ʿAbdān died in 325/937 at over eighty years of age; Dhahabi, Sīyar, 15:70–1.
¹² As a young man ʿAbd al-Rāḥmān b. Bishr traveled extensively with his father to hear ḥadīth. He returned to Nishapur where he taught until his death in 260/874; Dhahabi, Sīyar, 12:340–4.
¹³ The merchant and ḥadīth transmitter ʿAbāda (or ʿAbda) b. Abī Lubāba (d. ca. 127/745) settled in Damascus; Dhahabi, Sīyar, 5:229–30.
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