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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

I.1

The purpose of this book is to demonstrate the critical role played by hadith scholars in the articulation of Sunni Islam during the first half of third/ninth century. Despite the fact that the two most esteemed Sunni books after the Qur’an in the eyes of Sunni Muslims, namely the Sahîhs of Muhammad b. Isma’il al-Bukhârî and Muslim b. al-Ḥajjâj, are masterpieces of hadith literature, the accomplishments of individual hadith scholars have been ignored largely by European and American scholars for the past century. The quintessential Sunni disciplines of hadith compilation and criticism remain essentially unexamined by modern scholarship, perhaps partly due to Ignaz Goldziher’s assertion long ago that “the science of tradition also was past its prime with its first classics.” This study not only departs sharply from this tradition of neglect of the hadith literature, but argues that the fundamental principles of Sunni Islam

1 The only two studies of individual hadith critics of which I am aware are Christopher Melchert’s article on al-Bukhârî’s al-Târîkh al-kabîr and Eeric Dickinson’s analysis of Ibn Abî Hilâm al-Râzî’s Taqdim, see Christopher Melchert, “Bukhârî and Early Hadith Criticism,” JAOS, CXXI, 1 (2001), 7–19 and Eeric Dickinson, The Development of Early Sunni Hadith Criticism (Leiden: Brill, 2001). Juynboll’s article on the critic Shu’ba b. al-Ḥajjâj is quite idiosyncratic, since he asserts that Shu’ba invented several extremely widespread hadith and credits him with the elevation of Anas b. Mâlik to the status of a Companion of the Prophet (sahâbi), the forging of pro-Anṣâri and eschatological hadith, and even the invention of historical reports; Juynboll, “Shu’ba b. al-Ḥajjâj (d. 160/776) and his position among the traditionists of Basra,” Le Museon, 111 (1998), 187–226. A very different portrait of Shu’ba will emerge below in the fourth chapter. Harald Motzki’s ground-breaking study of ‘Abd al-Razzâq al-Ṣan’âni’s Musannaf, Die Anfänge der islamischen Jurisprudenz (Stuttgart, 1991) has been translated by Marion H. Katz as The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence: Meccan Fiqh before the Classical Schools (Leiden: Brill, 2002) and demonstrates the extraordinary potential that this early text has to shed light on the nature of hadith and law during the first two centuries of Islam.

2 Ignaz Goldziher, Muslim Studies, ed. and trans. S. M. Stern, II (Chicago: Aldine Atherton, 1971), 245. The original text was published as Muhammedanische Studien (Halle: 1869–90).
were articulated initially by a coterie of master hadīth scholars on the eve of the compilation of the Sahīths of al-Bukhārī and Muslim.

1.2 The traditional theological and legal approaches to Sunnī Islam

The primary Muslim sources that modern scholars have studied in their attempts to unravel the early history and development of Sunnī Islam have been almost exclusively of a theological or legal nature. Three of the leading scholars to embrace the theological approach are Montgomery Watt, Fazlur Rahman, and Josef van Ess. Watt acknowledges that his primary sources are the classic works of the Muslim scholars of sectarianism and divides the growth of Islamic thought into three phases entitled “Beginnings” (632–750 CE), “Century of Struggle” (750–850), and “Triumph of Sunnism” (850–945).5 His book provides a lucid presentation of the four major sectarian groups of Islam in the Umayyad period (Khawārij, Qadariyya, Murji’a, Shi’‘a) and traces their transformation in the ‘Abbāsid era into the various groups of Mu’tazila, Sunnīs, and Shi’‘a. Watt relies heavily upon an early Murji‘ī tract and the works of Abū l-Hasan al-Ash‘āri (d. 324/935–6) for his discussion of the articulation of Sunnī Islam, and postulates that “it was the early tenth century which witnessed the essential part of the process of the polarization of Islam into Sunnī and Shi‘ite.”6 The scholars of hadīth receive a scant five pages in this story, and the result is a narrative that gives excessive weight to a few theological works and ignores the major books of hadīth and prosopography that were being compiled throughout the third/ninth century.

Fazlur Rahman’s recently published posthumous work is his clearest articulation of what he calls the “formation of Sunni orthodoxy.”7

---

6 The Formative Period, 270–1. The Murji‘ī tract is al-Fiqh al-akbar, a translation of which can be found in A. J. Wensinck, The Muslim Creed: its Genesis and Historical Development (Cambridge, 1932).
7 Fazlur Rahman, Revival and Reform in Islam, ed. Ibrahim Moosa (Oxford, 2000). Chapter 1 is titled “Early sects and formation of Sunni Orthodoxy.” Fazlur Rahman’s Islam (second edition, Chicago, 1979), does contain a chapter on hadīth, but it is quite clear from its contents that he has not applied his sharp analytical mind thor-
The importance of theology in this presentation is evident in his observation that “developments within Sunni orthodoxy can be viewed as the culmination of a process that was an immediate reaction against the Mu'tazila and to some extent the Shi'i.”\(^6\) Shahristanî's interpretation of *injâ* is quoted at length in this chapter, and Fazlur Rahman considers the predestinarian feature of the Murji'a to be a critical component of the first stage of Sunnism. The second stage of Sunnism was brought about by al-Ash'arî, whose cardinal sin, in Fazlur Rahman's eyes, was that “he defined his extreme position by rejecting the idea that humanity can be validly said to act at all, let alone freely.”\(^7\) The second chapter explores the impacts of the “*injâ*-ist mentality” in the centuries following al-Ash'arî on Sunni Islam, a period that is characterized by political apathy and sheer passivity through mystical escapism. The role of *hadith* compilation and criticism in this process receives mention only in its negative capacity to supply pro-predestinarian forgeries to buttress the theological tenets of the Murji'a and proto-Sunnis in their struggles against the free will Qadariyya and Mu'tazila. While it is no doubt true that both Murji’i ideas and the seminal scholar Abu I-Hasan al-Ash'arî played roles in the articulation of Sunni Islam, these two books of Watt and Fazlur Rahman should make it clear just how limited an understanding of the development of Sunni Islam can be ascertained by merely studying the handful of relatively small classical Muslim works concerned with sectarianism and theology.

Van Ess's magisterial *Theologie und Gesellschaft* fuses both the theological approach with what might be called a prosopographical approach to the early development of Islam. His basic methodology is to assemble all of the available biographical information of every individual who is affiliated with any sectarian group in any Islamic source. Thus we find exhaustive lists of Murji'a, Qadari, and, of course, Mu'tazila, as well as any information pertaining to their theological beliefs that van Ess has managed to unearth.\(^8\) Muhammad Zaman has observed that this approach has the unfortunate consequence of

\(^{6}\) Revival and Reform, 33.
\(^{7}\) Revival and Reform, 57.
virtually ignoring the important relations between the ‘Abbasid caliphs and the “proto-Sunnis” of the third century, and it should be noted that the hadith scholars in general are largely ignored too, presumably because the vast majority of them were not affiliated with any sectarian group. In fact, it is somewhat odd to be introduced to the extraordinary Kufan hadith scholar and jurist Sufyān al-Thawrī as part of “anti-Murji‘i trends” and the extremely significant Basran hadith scholars Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī, Sulaymān al-Taymī, and ‘Abdullāh b. ‘Awn as part of “die Opposition gegen ‘Amr b. ‘Ubaid” since their identities and contributions to Islamic civilization probably had relatively little to do with being in opposition to these early sectarian groups and individuals. While van Ess has provided an immense service in his presentation of the most extensive lists of Murji‘a and Qadari‘ of the first two centuries of Islam, it has come at the cost of neglecting the creative disciplines of hadith compilation and criticism that were maturing in the shadow of the Mu’tazili florescence and the mi‘la and whose practitioners, in my opinion, articulated the core principles of Sunni Islam.

The second major approach towards the historical development of Islam focuses upon the rise of the legal schools (madhāhib). The most influential work in this domain is Joseph Schacht’s Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence. This book is based almost exclusively on an acute reading of eleven legal treatises of Muḥammad b. Idrīs al-Shāfī‘ī (d. 204/820), the Muwatta’ of Mālik b. Anas (d. 179/795) and various legal works of Muḥammad b. al-Hasan al-Shaybānī (d. 189/805). The basic picture of the historical development of Islamic law that Schacht describes consists of an initial phase of “ancient schools” in Medina, Iraq, and Syria that were deeply influenced by

---

NOTES

10 The relatively rare employment of sectarian labels by hadith critics is demonstrated below in chapter VII.6.
12 Ibid., II, 342-70.
13 The relative unimportance of the mi‘la, or “Inquisition,” inaugurated by the Caliph al-Ma‘mūn and terminated by al-Mutawakkil with regard to hadith scholarship is analyzed below in chapter V.3.
"Umayyad practice," followed by a radical transformation through the legal theories of al-Shaf'ī into what have been known to this day as the four Sunnī madhāhib, or schools of law. This periodization has been accepted widely by modern scholars, such as Marshall Hodgson, although Hodgson remarks perceptively in a footnote that "perhaps [Schacht] gives too much credit to al-Shaf'I" in this schema. Furthermore, Harald Motzki and John Burton have argued that there exists little evidence that Schacht's concept of "Umayyad administrative practice" exerted any influence on the development of Islamic law. While this basic historical outline of the development of the main Sunnī schools of law more or less follows the contours depicted by Muslim scholars, such as Abū Ishāq al-Shīrāzī (d. 476/1083), Schacht achieved a great deal of attention for his extreme opinions concerning the hadith and, given the fundamental role of hadith literature in this book, it is necessary for us to address them briefly.

Schacht, who was deeply influenced by the work of Ignaz Goldziher, argues in Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence that:

1) A great many traditions (hadith) were put into circulation only after al-Shaf'I's time.

11 Note that Schacht refers to the Sunnī schools of law as the "orthodox" schools of law (for example, Origins, p. 6); it is clear that he equates Sunnism with orthodoxy throughout this work.

12 Marshall Hodgson, The Venture of Islam, I (Chicago, 1974), 324. This periodization is presented lucidly in the "Masters of fiqh" chart on p. 319. It has been refuted strongly by Wael Hallaq, who argues that Schacht's thesis "creates a detour in early Islamic legal history, a detour that is supported by neither common sense nor the evidence of the early sources;" Wael Hallaq, "From Regional to Personal Schools of Law? A Reevaluation," Islamic Law and Society, 8.1 (2001), 1-26.

13 See Motzki, The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence, 296 and John Burton, An Introduction to the Hadith (Edinburgh, 1994), xxii. The theories of both Schacht and Goldziher are compared and mildly criticized by Burton in his introduction (ix-xxv). His personal opinion, that hadith should be understood as exegesis of various "obscurities" manifest in the Qur'an, is intriguing but not particularly convincing. Marion Katz's recent book has, pace Burton, found significant Umayyad interference in the shaping of Islamic law in the realm of ritual purity (taḥāra; see chapter three of Marion Holmes Katz, Body of Text (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002).

14 Abū Ishāq's useful little book of the history of Muslim jurists is arranged geographically prior to the foundation of five Sunnī schools of law (madhāhib), and then by school until his day. However, he discusses legal scholars from nine cities or regions in the pre-madhahīb period, as opposed to Schacht's focus on merely Iraq (Kūfah), Hijāz (Mecca and Medina), and Syria; see Abū Ishāq al-Shīrāzī, Tābaqāt al-fuqahā', ed. Iḥṣān 'Abbās (Beirut, 1970).

15 Goldziher's eight chapters on hadith in Muslim Studies will be discussed below in a few paragraphs.
2) The first considerable body of legal traditions \( \text{hadith} \) from the Prophet originated towards the middle of the second century.

3) The \( \text{isnāds} \) show a tendency to grow backwards and to claim higher and higher authority until they arrive at the Prophet.

4) The evidence of legal traditions carries us back to about the year 100 AH only.

Although several scholars have questioned and attempted to refute these main points, it is probably most instructive here to explain how Schacht arrived at such radical conclusions. The most significant errors of Schacht, in my opinion, were his choice of sources and his general understanding of \( \text{hadith} \). While it is logical to use legal treatises by a few prominent scholars in order to understand their individual styles of legal reasoning, it is a grave error to ignore entirely the evidence present in \( \text{hadith} \) collections that were compiled simultaneously with and prior to the lives of these jurists. How is it possible that a generation or two of scholars invented tens of thousands of \( \text{hadith} \) between the lifetimes of al-Shāfi‘ī (d. 204/820) and Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855)? The only way to ignore this question is to blind oneself to the 30,000-\( \text{hadith} \) \text{Musnad} of the latter and adhere to the works of scholars who are rarely, if ever, included among the lists of the great compilers and critics of \( \text{hadith} \). Indeed, the thought of

\[ {\text{ Schacht, } \text{Origins, 4-5.}} \]


This opinion has been articulated by M. M. Azami; see his \textit{Studies in Early Hadith Literature, Third edition} (Indianapolis: American Trust Publications, 1992), 247.

Mozia astutely remarks that the two earliest critical reviews of Schacht’s theories came from A. Guillaume and J. W. Fück, scholars who found a contradiction between his new ideas and their own research on the \textit{Sīra} of Ibn Ḥishāq, a work that contains \( \text{hadith} \) and predates all of the legal texts that Schacht examined; see \textit{The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence}, 28-9.

I show below in the fourth chapter that, of Schacht’s four main authorities, only Mālik b. Anas was considered a major authority in \( \text{hadith} \) by a majority of the
espousing a theory of *hadith* on the basis of a few books that have never been considered part of the genre of *hadith* literature seems to be risky at best, and methodologically unsound at worst.

Yet even if Schacht considered all of the *hadith* in the classical collections highly suspect, there is another genre of works, crucial to this book, which he should have investigated more carefully prior to his arrival at such radical conclusions. This is the genre of biographical dictionaries, enormous works which contain succinct entries on thousands of scholars in the disciplines of *hadith* transmission, law (*fiqh*), poetry, and other arts and sciences.26 The earliest extant biographical dictionary of religious scholars is *Kitāb al-ṭabaqāt al-kabīr* of Muḥammad b. Saʿd (d. 230/845), a younger contemporary of the jurist al-Shafʿī, upon whom Schacht relied so heavily for his theories.27 Ibn Saʿd's book is a veritable history of thousands of *hadith* transmitters and is arranged both geographically and chronologically. The basic unit of time is the *tabaqqa*, or generation, and Ibn Saʿd groups scholars according to their primary city or region of residence, generation by generation, back to earliest generation of Muslims, the *ṣaḥāba*, or Companions of the Prophet.28 One would almost have to consider this entire multi-volume book to be a forgery in order to subscribe to Schacht’s theses. Although Schacht cites the Leiden edition of Ibn Saʿd’s book in his bibliography, it is clear that he rejected master critics of the third through sixth Islamic centuries. Al-Shafʿī is only included in two scholars' lists (those of Ibn Ḥibbān and Ibn ‘Adi) and al-Shaybānī in one (that of al-Ḥakim al-Naysaburi). Abū Yūsuf is not mentioned at all.


27 Ibn Saʿd, *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā* (Beirut: Dar Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, 1995–6). For a discussion of the complicated publishing history of *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā* and its role in this book, see V.4.1. The only complete edition of this book is the 2001 Cairo edition edited by ʿAlī Muḥammad ʿUmar; I refer to this edition with the abbreviation TK 2001 and employ it extensively in chapters seven and eight. It should be noted that although Ibn Saʿd was a younger contemporary of al-Shafʿī (who settled in Egypt), he makes no mention of him anywhere in his book. Ibn Saʿd’s opinion of Mālik is very positive, whereas his opinions of al-Shaybānī and Abū Yūsuf are qualified by their quality of being “overwhelmed” by legal reasoning (*qiṣla bi-l-raʿya*) which diminished their accuracy in *hadith* transmission; see *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā*, V, 287–90 (Mālik); VII, 162 (Abū Yūsuf) and 164 (al-Shaybānī).

28 For a broad survey of biographical dictionaries arranged according to generations (*ṭabaqāt*) of scholars, see Ibrahim Hafsi, "Recherches sur le genre ṭabaqāt dans la littérature arabe," *Arabica*, xxiii (1976), 227–65; xxiv (1977), 1–41, 150–86. The topic of *ṭabaqāt* will be discussed in much greater detail below in II.3.
the veracity of the vast majority of its contents when he postulated his theories concerning hadith transmission. Schacht's third major error, after ignoring all of the evidence found in early hadith books and biographical dictionaries, was to base his conclusions on a very limited number of "legal" hadith. The "Index of Legal Problems" at the end of Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence reveals Schacht's preference for issues pertaining to obligations, sale, and penal law and his disinterest in laws pertaining to acts of worship, such as prayer and fasting. Indeed, this finding is not surprising, as a cursory glance at the contents of either al-Jāmi‘ al-saghīr or al-Jāmi‘ al-kabīr attributed to his primary source, al-Shaybānī, reveals little interest in pious devotion and great attention to commercial and criminal law. Finally, the fact that many hadith have nothing to do with the sharī‘a obligates the researcher to go beyond the texts of a few prominent jurists prior to the formulation of any sweeping theory of this literature.

The crucial importance of appropriate source selection for the investigation of the emergence of Sunnism in the third/ninth century should be obvious by now. It should also be clear that the relatively short theological and legal treatises that have hitherto been used to shed light on the development of the religion of Islam in its first centuries are insufficient for the task at hand. The works of Watt, Fazlur Rahman, Schacht, and even Hodgson leave us with the erroneous impression that the articulation of Sunnism was largely

---

28 Eerik Dickinson seems to have fallen into the same trap as Schacht, as he has ignored entirely the contents of Ibn Sa'd's al-Tabagat al-kabir in his recent book The Development of Early Sunnite Hadith Criticism (Leiden: Brill, 2001). I challenge his dating of the origins of hadith-transmitter criticism in chapter four.

29 This error was discerned by Burton, although he felt that it skewed Schacht's understanding of fiqh instead of the hadith; see An Introduction to the Hadith, xviii.

30 Schacht, Origins, 341-3. Part of the reason for this bias is the fact that Schacht applies modern-Western notions of legal categories to classical Islamic law and thus understates, if not ignores, vast regions of Islamic jurisprudence in addition to the extra-legal hadith literature.

31 Shaybānī's interests should be contrasted with the Muwatā‘a' of Mālik, also used extensively by Schacht, the first half of which is devoted to issues pertaining to prayer, charity, fasting, and pilgrimage.

32 Muslim b. al-Hajjāj (d. 261/874) groups hadith into three broad categories in the introduction to his Sahih: laws and regulations (sunan al-dīn wa ahrāmāt), reward and punishment in the Hereafter (al-thawāb wa l-qiyāt), and exhortations to piety (al-targīsh wa l-tarih). Sahih Muslim bi-sharh al-Nawawī, 1 (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya, 2000), 46-7. Other extra-legal categories of hadith include Qur'ānic exegesis and prophetic history.
the result of two scholars, al-As̄̄ʿarī and al-Shāfiʿī, and that a few other jurists, like Mālik b. Anas, Muhammad b. al-Hasan al-Shaybānī, the Qādī Abū Yūsuf, and Ibn Ḥanbal, played a strong supporting role in this endeavor. Van Ess, on the other hand, despite his description of hundreds of individuals, prefers to credit the emergence of Sunnism to the intellectual atmosphere of the city of Baghdad rather than to any circle of scholars in particular. It is therefore necessary to turn to the ḥadīth literature and its auxiliary disciplines in order to break the hegemony of the theological and legal approaches to the early construction of Sunnī Islam.

I.3 Sunnī ḥadīth literature: its nature and utility for this project

The Sunnī ḥadīth literature consists of three major genres of works: ḥadīth collections, biographical dictionaries of ḥadīth-transmitters, and expositions of the “ḥadīth disciplines” (ʿulūm al-ḥadīth). Muhammad Zubayr ʿṢiddiqī discusses briefly sixteen major ḥadīth collections and six biographical dictionaries in Hadith Literature. Included in this list are: the Muwatta of Mālik b. Anas, the Musnad of Ibn Ḥanbal, and al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr of Ibn Saʿd. ʿṢiddiqī also draws attention to the three other early extant ḥadīth collections of al-Ṭayālīsī (d. 203/819), ʿAbd al-Razzāq al-Ṣaḥābī (d. 211/826), and Ibn Abī Shayba (d. 235/849), only one of which has received a monograph by a Western scholar. In fact, none of the books mentioned by ʿṢiddiqī, including the ‘six canonical’ ḥadīth collections, has received a thorough published study in the West. One of the goals of this book...

---

11 Zaman remarks that van Ess credits Baghdad with causing a 'brain drain' from the older cities of Islam and providing a location for the leveling of theological differences; see Zaman, Religion and Politics under the Early 'Abbāsidīs, 161 and van Ess, Theologie und Gesellschaft, III, 29–30.
13 This exception is ʿAbd al-Razzāq's Musanāf, which, has been mentioned, is examined by Harald Motzki in The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence. Marion Katz has also made extensive use of the Musanāf of ʿAbd al-Razzāq and Ibn Abī Shayba in her previously mentioned study of ritual purity Body of Text.
14 The 'six canonical ḥadīth books' are al-Jāmiʿ al-saḥīh of al-Bukhārī, the Saḥīh of Muslim, and the Sunan works of Abū Dāwūd (d. 275/888), al-Tirmidhī (d. 279/892), al-Nasāʾī (d. 303/915), and Ibn Māja (d. 273/886). We shall see below in chapter 2, that Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (d. 643/1245) considered only the first five of these texts to be the most important ḥadīth collections. See Muqaddima Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, ed. ʿĀʾisha ʿAbd al-Rahmān bint al-Shāṝ (Cairo, 1990), 651–2.
is to facilitate future study of these extremely significant Muslim texts and offer fresh conceptual and practical approaches to this vast, misunderstood, and largely unexplored literature.\textsuperscript{37}

It is necessary that we examine briefly the most influential study on hadith in European scholarship, namely Ignaz Goldziher's eight chapters of \textit{Muhammedanische Studien} published in 1890, in order to identify some of its strengths and weaknesses.\textsuperscript{38} Goldziher continues to be recognized as one of the primary founders of the modern European discipline of Islamic Studies, and his fame lies in part because of his arguments that much of the hadith literature was fabricated.\textsuperscript{39} Unlike Schacht, Goldziher combined both impressive knowledge as to certain details of hadith scholarship along with prejudices that clouded his assertions. Examples of his accurate remarks include the differentiation between hadith and sunna,\textsuperscript{10} the recognition that hadith criticism began with Ibn 'Awn, Shu'ba b. al-Hajjaj, and Ibn al-Mubarak,\textsuperscript{4} that Ibn Jurayj and Sa'\textsuperscript{id} b. Abi 'Aruba were among the first to arrange books according to chapters,\textsuperscript{12} and that the early hadith scholars (ash\textsuperscript{ab} al-hadith) paid almost no regard to Ab\u Hanifa.\textsuperscript{13} Goldziher even uncovered a report that Ibn T\textsuperscript{\'}{\text{a}}hir al-Maqdisi was

\textsuperscript{37} It should be noted that the state of the field for Imam Sh\textsuperscript{\'}{\text{i}} hadith is not much better than that for the Sunni literature. A useful introduction to the four earliest 'canonical' hadith books of the Imam Sh\textsuperscript{\'}{\text{a}} is Robert Gleave, "Between Hadith and Fiqh: The 'canonical' Imam \textsuperscript{\'}{\text{a}} collections of \textit{ahh\textsuperscript{ab}}," \textit{Islamic Law and Society}, 6.3 (2001), 550–82. As for Im\textsuperscript{\'}{\text{a}}\textsuperscript{\'}{\text{i}}l\textsuperscript{\'}{\text{i}}, Zaydi, or Kh\textsuperscript{\'}{\text{a}}riji hadith, I am not aware of anything at this time in European languages.

\textsuperscript{38} See above note 2 for the relevant bibliographical information.

\textsuperscript{39} For testimonies of Goldziher's seminal role in the foundation of Islamic studies, see the introduction to \textit{The Jewish Discovery of Islam}, ed. Martijn Kremer (Tel Aviv: The Moshe Dayan Center for Middle Eastern and African Studies, 1999), 13–17 as well as Lawrence Conrad's essay "Ignaz Goldziher on Ernest Renan: from Orientalist Philology to the Study of Islam" contained within it (pp. 137–180). Herbert Berg credits the entire school of skepticism with regard to isnads to the work of Goldziher, whereas the school that argues for their veracity is associated with Fuat Sezgin; see Berg, \textit{The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam} (Richmond, Surrey: Curzon, 2000), 9–12 and 49–50. Berg's own low opinion concerning the authenticity of the literature can be found on page 215 of his book: "Isnads, therefore were attached to material from the beginning of the 3rd century \ldots after which these isnads, like the mains to which they were attached, continued to be subject to organic growth."

\textsuperscript{40} \textit{Muslim Studies}, II, 24.

\textsuperscript{41} \textit{Ibid.}, II, 135. This opinion is supported by our findings in chapters 4 and 8.

\textsuperscript{42} \textit{Ibid.}, II, 196. However, Goldziher felt that these books had "nothing to do with the collecting of hadith," perhaps due to his assumption that the majority of the transmitted material contained within these books did not purport to go back to the Prophet Muhammad.

\textsuperscript{43} \textit{Ibid.}, II, 81 and 235.
among the first scholars to include Ibn Māja’s *Sunan* among the most esteemed ‘six books’ of the Sunnī tradition.\(^\text{11}\)

Despite his best efforts, however, Goldziher made highly questionable assertions in *Muslim Studies*, perhaps partly due to his belief that the more “natural” and “honest” means of constructing a religious law was the approach employed by the jurists (ashāb al-ra’y), in contrast with the methods of the ḥadīth scholars.\(^\text{13}\) He asserted that “every ra’y or ḥawa, every sunna and bid’a has sought and found expression in the form of a ḥadīth” and that the “pious community was ready with great credibility to believe anything that they encountered as a traditional saying of the Prophet.”\(^\text{16}\) A potentially far more serious allegation of his, which I endeavor to refute in the seventh chapter, is that “only in rare cases was it possible to reach agreement on the degree of trustworthiness of a person.”\(^\text{17}\) Finally, Goldziher’s propositions that the last “original ḥadīth work” was the *Saḥīḥ* of Ibn Ḥibbān (d. 354/965) and that Islamic literature’s “fresh immediacy decayed as quickly as it developed . . . giving way to dry and lifeless compilation”\(^\text{18}\) not only reflect the dearth of sources that Goldziher had at his disposal when he was formulating his theories about ḥadīth, but reflect his personal antipathy towards the very tradition of ḥadīth compilation that inevitably impacted his theses that have carried so much weight over the past century.

One basic question remains, though: Why should we turn to the ḥadīth literature in order to understand the development of Sunnī Islam? The first reason is the sheer volume of the literature and number of Muslims involved in its transmission over the first several centuries of Islamic civilization. The first large books, called *muṣannaf*

\(^{11}\) Ibid., II, 240.

\(^{13}\) Ibid., II, 78.

\(^{16}\) Ibid., II, 126 and 133, respectively.

\(^{17}\) Ibid., II, 143. If by this statement Goldziher means that it was unusual for critics to apply the identical grades to transmitters, he is of course correct. Although later biographical dictionaries often include dissenting opinions concerning a transmitter’s overall reliability, we shall see in our comparison of the grades of Ibn Sa’d, Ibn Ma’in, and Ibn Hanbal in chapter seven that there was a high level of consensus as to the whether individual transmitters were trustworthy. See also the appendices of my doctoral dissertation “The Arts of Ḥadīth Compilation and Criticism: A study of the emergence of Sunnī Islam in the third/ninth century,” Unpublished Ph.D. thesis (University of Chicago, 2002), 466–506.

\(^{18}\) Ibid., II, 247 and 245, respectively. I argue below in chapter 3 that the last original ḥadīth compilations date to the fifth/eleventh century.
or taṣniʿf ("compilations arranged by categories"), in the Islamic tradition were probably hadīth works that were compiled in the middle second/late eighth century. The vast scope of these works, as well as those of the following century, indicates the deep conviction a significant number of Muslim scholars felt towards the importance of this material prior to the legal theories of al-Shāfiʿī that formally raised this corpus of literature to the status of divine revelation, albeit secondary to the Qur'ān.

A second, and more important reason to examine these texts is the remarkable persistence of value the most authoritative hadīth books have held in the Sunnī Muslim conscience. The Jāmiʿ al-ṣaḥīḥ of Muḥammad b. Ḳusayr al-Buhārī (d. 256/870) and the Ṣaḥīḥ of Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj (d. 261/874) have been considered the two most respected works after the Qur'ān since at least the fourth/tenth century. Whereas the Sunnī schools of law have fluctuated in number over the centuries and developed their own individual corpuses of texts, the two Ṣaḥīḥs of al-Buhārī and Muslim have shared a consistent degree of reverence to all Sunnī Muslims, regardless of rite. This achievement is even more impressive in light of the existence of later...
compilations of *hadith* by preeminent scholars throughout the fourth/tenth and fifth/eleventh centuries.\(^{53}\)

The success and resilience of the two *Sahih* books must be seen as being directly correlated to the high opinion in which their two compilers have been held in the field of *hadith* criticism. The process of *hadith*-transmitter criticism (*al-jarh wa'l-ta'dil*) seems to have begun in second/eighth century\(^{54}\) and the earliest extant compilations on the reliability of *hadith* transmitters include three of the primary texts that I analyze in the seventh chapter of this book: *al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr* of Ibn Sa'd, 'Abbās al-Dūrī's *Tārikh* based on the critical opinions of Yahyā b. Mā'in (d. 233/848), and the 'īdal works of Ibn Ḥanbal.\(^{55}\) Al-Bukhārī and Muslim were able to build upon the work of this preceding generation of master *hadith*-transmitter critics, some of whom were their direct teachers, and it is not a coincidence that al-Bukhārī's books of criticism have acquired the exalted position as the most authoritative books in this genre.\(^{56}\)

\(^{53}\) Many of these scholars will be mentioned in the historical overview in chapter three. The massive *hadith* collections of al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066), Ibn 'Abd al-Barr (d. 463/1071), and Abū Muhammad al-Baghawi (d. 516/1122) basically mark the end of original *hadith* collections. (Even though Ibn 'Abd al-Barr's large compilations *al-Tamhid* and *al-Iṣāba* are technically commentaries on the *Mawāqif* of Mālik, they incorporate so much additional material that they should be considered 'original' works in their own right). There seems to have been a shift in the fifth/eleventh and sixth/twelfth centuries towards the synthesis and exegesis of the earlier famous collections, so that by the seventh/thirteenth century Ibn al-Salāh remarked that *hadith* not found in earlier works should, in general, be shunned; *Mugaddima* Ibn al-Salāh, 307. The most likely practical reason for this transformation was the fact that the chain of transmitters (*iṣnād*) between the Prophet Muḥammad and the students of *hadith* had grown too long after five centuries, so as to render it unwieldy and unreliable.

\(^{54}\) Three periods of *hadith*-transmitter criticism are identified in detail in chapter four.

\(^{55}\) The various recensions of these latter two works are discussed in V.4.2 and V.4.3. Other major *hadith*-transmitter critics of this generation include 'Ali b. al-Madīnī, Ibn Rāhawayh, and Abū Haṣṣ al-Fallās; see below, chapters four and five, for more details.

\(^{56}\) These books include *al-Tārikh al-kabīr* and *al-Tārikh al-awsat*. The editor of the 1998 Riyadh edition of *al-Tārikh al-awsat*, Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Lahīdān, has demonstrated that the 1977 Aleppo edition of *al-Tārikh al-saghir* is actually *al-Tārikh al-awsat* (I, 30, 55-7). Since *al-Tārikh al-saghir* is solely concerned with the *ṣaḥīḥa*, it would be of limited value for *hadith*-transmitter criticism (the references to this book in Sezgin, GAS, I, p. 133, should probably be corrected to read *al-Tārikh al-awsat*). Another small work of criticism by al-Bukhārī that has been published is *Kitāb al-du'ā'f* al-saghir, ed. Burān al-Dannawi (Beirut, 1984). Ibn al-Salāh declares al-Bukhārī's *al-Tārikh al-kabīr* to be one of the fundamental texts in his reading list.
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1.4 Methodology

1.4.1

The two most intimidating features of the hadith literature are its sheer volume and the magnitude of the number of transmitters involved in its historical development. Given this challenging situation, it is critical to select both the proper guides and techniques for organizing the material in such a way that one has a large enough sample of reports and biographies so as to be faithful to the material. Furthermore, the transmission and criticism of hadith continues to this day, over 1400 years after the Prophet Muhammad's death, wherever Muslims are to be found. Therefore, this book is divided into two main sections, both of which involve multiple databases that I have designed in order to analyze the prosopographical material present in the biographical dictionaries that I have consulted.

1.4.2 Part I: The Construction of Conceptual and Historical Frameworks for Inquiry

Part I consists of four chapters whose purpose is to move from a broad overview of the development of the Sunni hadith literature to the narrow generation of critics who flourished just prior to al-Bukhārī and Muslim. Chapter two relies upon the classification of the hadith disciplines in 65 categories by Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (d. 643/1245) in his Muqaddima and several books of al-Dhahabi. I discuss three aspects of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's Muqaddima in order to secure the conceptual framework of this project. First, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ identifies the most significant books and scholars involved in the project of hadith transmission. For the aspiring hadith student; Muqaddima Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, 433. Christopher Melchert has published an article arguing for the authenticity of al-Tārīkh al-kabīr in order to mute the skepticism raised by Norman Calvert concerning its attribution to al-Bukhārī; see his "Bukhārī and Early Hadith Criticism" cited in the first footnote of this chapter.

An indication of the scale of the project of hadith transmission can be gleaned from the fact that Ibn Ḥajar mentions 8625 names of men and women whose names appear in the isnāds of the six canonical Sunni books (as well as other early collections; in his concise handbook Taqrib al-sahabī, Beirut, 1996).

* For a useful survey of some modern debates concerning the hadith, see Daniel Brown, Rethinking Tradition in Modern Islamic Thought (Cambridge, 1996).

Muqaddima Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, categories 28 and 60 (pp. 432-3 and 649-53).
Secondly, I examine how Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ articulates the fundamental Sunnī position with regard to the didactic authority of all ṣaḥāba.\textsuperscript{60} Finally, I show how Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ’s entire systematic categorization of the ḥadīth disciplines demonstrates the fundamental role of ḥanāfī criticism (‘ībīn al-rintāl) and the central significance of ḥadīth-transmitter criticism in the venture of Sunnī ḥadīth scholarship.\textsuperscript{61}

The second section of chapter two is devoted to the construction of a historical framework for the first seven centuries of Sunnī ḥadīth scholarship. The primary works that I use for this task are three books by the extraordinary Syrian scholar Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1348), who has been called “the Historian of Islam” (muʿarrīkh al-Īslām) by his students and successors.\textsuperscript{62} Al-Dhahabī is known not only for his magnificent works of history, many of which are arranged according to ṭabaqāt, but as a master critic of ḥadīth and its transmitters as well.\textsuperscript{63} This section discusses al-Dhahabī’s use of ṭabaqāt of varying lengths in his ḥadīth-transmitter related works, and organizes the master ḥadīth scholars of the first seven centuries whom he praises in three of his books: Mīzān al-ʿīdāl fi naqd al-rintāl, al-Muqīṣa fi ʿīm muṣṭalāḥ al-ḥadīth, and Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāż. I also clarify the utility of the ṭabaqāt form of periodization for the discussion of ḥadīth-transmitter criticism in this section, and special attention is devoted to al-Dhahabī’s use of the sobriquet Shaykh al-Īslām in Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāż.

The third chapter consists of a historical articulation of the development of Sunnī ḥadīth scholarship on the basis of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ’s and al-Dhahabī’s preferred scholars whose identities I uncover in the previous chapter. The twenty-one ṭabaqāt structure of Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāż has proven expedient for this endeavor, as all of the master scholars mentioned in the Muqaddima of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, and al-Dhahabī’s Mīzān al-ʿīdāl and al-Μuqīṣa have entries in this book. I have grouped al-Dhahabī’s twenty-one ṭabaqāt into seven phases in order to clarify

\textsuperscript{60} Muqaddima Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, category 39 (pp. 485-503).

\textsuperscript{61} Muqaddima Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, category 23 is concerned with ḥadīth-transmitter criticism (pp. 288-311). Note that ‘ḥadīth-transmitter criticism’ is the expression that I am using for the Arabic al-jarār wa l-ταδīl and that it is a more specific discipline than ‘ḥadīth criticism’, the latter of which includes criticism of both the ṭimēd and the text (matn).

\textsuperscript{62} For a list of scholars who praise him with this honorific title (laqab), see ʿAbd al-Sattār al-Shaykh, al-Ḥāfīz al-Dhahabī (Damascus, 1994), 335-9.

\textsuperscript{63} His most famous work of ḥadīth-transmitter criticism, Mīzān al-ʿīdāl fi naqd al-rintāl, contains entries for 11,053 transmitters; al-Ḥāfīz al-Dhahabī, 420-3.
the hitherto neglected historical development of hadith scholarship during the first seven centuries of Islamic civilization. The results of this chapter not only demonstrate the critical importance of the third/ninth century in this venture, but also depict the dynamic vivacity of Sunnī hadith compilation and criticism throughout the fourth/tenth and fifth/eleventh centuries, long after the compilation of the famous ‘six books.’

Chapter four builds upon this historical survey by examining the favorite master scholars of ten famous Sunnī hadith critics who flourished during the third through seventh phases of hadith scholarship. The critics whose preferences are investigated in this chapter are ‘Alī b. al-Madīnī (d. 234/849), Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj (d. 261/874), Ibn Abī Ḥātim (d. 327/939), Ibn Ḥībān (d. 354/965), Ibn ‘Ādī (d. 365/976), al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1014), al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (d. 453/1061), Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597/1201), al-Mizzī (d. 742/1341), and al-Dhahabi. The opinions of these scholars serve as a useful tool for the purpose of identifying three periods and three classes of critics in the history of Sunnī hadith-transmitter criticism and confirm the crucial role played by the scholars of the third/ninth century in general, and Ibn Maʿīn and Ibn Ḥanbal in particular. I devote special attention to the first two generations of critics, such as Shuʿba b. al-Ḥajjāj, Sufyān b. ʿUyayna, and Ibn al-Mubārak in order to ascertain whether they really were hadith critics, or whether later scholars depicted them as such in order to accord this discipline greater authority and prestige, as at least one modern scholar has suggested.64

The fifth chapter of this book zeroes in on the generation of Ibn Saʿīd, Ibn Maʿīn, and Ibn Ḥanbal, since it is first generation of critics for whom we have extensive records of their opinions. The first section of this chapter is a general survey of distinguished Muslim men of letters and religion who flourished during the first half of the third/ninth century. The primary source for this database is al-Dhahabi’s Sīyar aš-šām al-nubalāʾ, the tenth and eleventh tabaqāt of which I examine in detail. I devote particular attention to the major hadith scholars of this age, many of whom were teachers of al-Bukhārī and Muslim. The purpose of this section is to provide a sketch of

64 This is the opinion of Emeric Dickinson in his previously cited work that I endeavor to refute.
the intellectual life at the time of the emergence of Sunnī Islam, in order to better comprehend how the hadīth scholars of the generation of Ibn Saʿd, Ibn Maʿin, and Ibn Ḥanbal fit into the greater world community during this period of Islamic civilization.

The second section of chapter five consists of a brief reconsideration of the significance of the infamous mīḥna, or inquisition, that occurred during reigns of the caliphs al-Maʿmūn, al-Muʿtasim, and al-Wāthiq. This episode has, until recently, been invested with much credit towards the emergence of Sunnism and even the “separation of state and religion.” A close reading of the aforementioned prosopographical works of al-Dhahabī indicates that the impact of the mīḥna upon the formation of Sunnī Islam was little more than the reaffirmation of a single theological position that was most likely upheld by the majority of hadīth transmitters prior to the entire affair. If anything, the episode of the mīḥna has distracted Western historians from investigating the far more historically significant processes of hadīth compilation and criticism that were occurring in Baghdad during the same period.

The final section of the fifth chapter provides biographical sketches of the three primary scholars of this period—Ibn Saʿd, Ibn Maʿin and Ibn Ḥanbal—whose works are analyzed in Part II of this book. I pay careful attention to the itineraries of these three men in their quests for hadīth, as well as to the largely obscure lives of their respective primary transmitter-pupils. Thus, I also present the biographies of Ibn Saʿd’s pupils Ibn Fahm (d. 289/902) and al-Ḥārith b. Abī

---

65. These caliphs ruled from 198/813–218/833, 218/833–227/842, and 227/842–232/47, respectively. The exact termination date of the mīḥna is unclear, and Hinds has argued that it was faded out gradually during the first four or five years of the reign of al-Mutawakkil (232/847–247/861); see Martin Hinds, “mīḥna,” EI2, VII, 2–6.

66. This last quote comes from the title of Ira Lapidus’ 1975 JMES article “The Separation of State and Religion in the Development of Early Islamic Society,” and the exaggerated import of this event is easily observable in Martin Hinds’ entry on the mīḥna in the EI2. The importance of the mīḥna has been challenged by Muhammad Qasim Zaman in Religion and Politics under the ‘Abbasids. While Zaman’s book offers great insight into the relationship between the state and religious scholars, it pays far closer attention to the state’s role in religion avoids analysis of the internal dynamics and compilations of the influential hadīth scholars of this period.

67. This theological position is, of course, that the Qur’ān is the “speech of God” (kalām Allāh) and therefore not created. The innovation of the notion of the created Qur’ān is attributed to Jahm b. Ṣafwān (d. 128/746) and was accepted by the Khawārij, most of the Zaydiyya, many of the Imāmi Shiʿa, and all of the Muʿtazila; see al-Asbāḥī, Maqālāt al-ʿIlāmīyyīn, II (Cairo, 1969), 256–9.
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Usāma (d. 282/895), Ibn Maʿān’s student Abū l-Faḍl ʿAbbās al-Dūrī (d. 271/884–5), and Ibn Ḥanbal’s son and sole compiler of the Musnad, ʿAbdullāh b. Aḥmad (d. 290/903) at the conclusion of this chapter.

I.4.3 Part II: The Three Principles of Ḥadīth-Scholar Sunnism: Ṣahāba, ḥadīth-transmitter criticism, and a historical vision

Part II explores the nature of the three pillars upon which I argue Sunni Islam was constructed by the ḥadīth scholars, namely the collective authority of the saḥāba, the invention and broad application of ḥadīth-transmitter criticism, and a shared historical vision as to paths by which most ḥadīth traversed the two century gulf between the life of the Prophet Muḥammad and the compilation of books. Chapter six is devoted to the first of these pillars, namely the collective authority of the saḥāba, and begins with an extensive review of the individual saḥāba who were involved in the intra-Muslim conflict that plagued the first thirty years of the post-prophetic Islamic community. While the importance of the first fitna upon Islamic thought and group formation is hardly a new discovery, my presentation of the surprisingly large number of saḥāba who were involved actively in these early conflicts suggests that the Sunni principle of the collective probity of the saḥāba was a more radical proposition than is generally acknowledged in the secondary literature.

The next section of the sixth chapter begins with an analysis of two solutions to the problem of the intra-saḥāba conflicts that failed to capture the hearts of more than a minority of the Muslim community. The first of these solutions is that put forth by the Imamī Shiʿa, who either interpreted the concept of ridda, normally associated with the rebellious Bedouin tribes who were subdued by Abū Bakr, as a reference to the alleged mass apostasy of the saḥāba upon the death of the Prophet Muḥammad, or eliminated the saḥāba from the discourse altogether by means of superhuman Imāms and creative Qur’ānic exegesis.66 The other minority solution to the problem of the intra-saḥāba conflicts is that of the Zaydiyya and Baghdādī Muʿtazila, which accepted the authority of all of the saḥāba except those who fought against ʿAlī at Ǧifīn, and argued strongly for the

superiority of 'Ali over Abū Bakr on the basis of a comparison of their respective qualities. I discuss the reactions of the Imāmī Shi'a and the Zaydiyya/Baghdādī Mu'tazila to the intra-sahāba conflicts at some length because they demonstrate both radical and moderate alternative positions to the Sunnī principle of the collective authority of the sahāba, and may have contributed to the hardening of the Sunnī position on issues such as the superiority of Abū Bakr to 'Ali.

Three Sunnī solutions to the problem of the intra-sahāba conflicts can be discerned in the hadīth literature of the third/ninth century. The first of these solutions is the inclusion of chapters devoted to the merits (fadā'il) of the sahāba in major hadīth compilations, such as the Sahih of al-Bukhārī and Muslim and the Musannaf of Ibn Abī Shayba, that praised consistently seventeen male and three female companions of the Prophet Muḥammad, several of whom had been on opposing sides in these conflicts. The second solution, encapsulated in Ibn Sa'd's al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr, was to collect biographical information for about 1371 male and 629 female sahāba, in order to demonstrate the collective role of these men and women in the formative period of Islam, as well as distinguish those individuals who embraced Islam the earliest, excelled on the battlefield, or were gifted with superior religious knowledge, from the masses. The final Sunnī solution to the problem of the intra-sahāba violence was the utilization of these men and women strictly for the purpose of hadīth transmission. The example, par excellence, of this solution is Ibn Ḥanbal's Musnad, which includes at least one hadīth from over seven hundred sahāba as well as a substantial number of reports from thirty-two of them who were found on all sides of the earliest intra-Muslim

---


70 Ibn Sa'd's book also includes what may be the earliest definition of the term sahābi, which he attributes to his teacher al-Wāqīq; this definition is discussed in chapter VI.4.2.
conflicts. The very structure of this massive book could only affirm the Sunnī principle of the collective authority of the sahāba in a most tangible manner. My study of these three approaches to the sahāba in the Sunnī hadīth literature indicates that the belief in the collective probity of the sahāba was arrived at gradually by the articulators of Sunnism over the third/ninth century, and that books such as al-\textit{Tabaqāt al-kabīr} and the \textit{Musnad} of Ibn Ḥanbal played a greater role in its ultimate adoption than the chapters devoted to the Companions' virtues in the \textit{Sahihs} of al-Bukhārī and Muslim.

The second pillar upon which Sunnism was constructed was, in my opinion, the discipline of hadīth-transmitter criticism. I examine the absolute and relative grades employed by Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'īn, and Ibn Ḥanbal in the seventh chapter, where I uncover both individual styles of criticism as well as an overwhelming consensus regarding the reliability (or lack thereof) of over two hundred hadīth-transmitters. This chapter is of particular significance because it is the first systematic comparative study of the opinions of hadīth critics who were contemporaries of one another and reveals the vivacity of this discipline on the eve of the journeys of al-Bukhārī and Muslim.

The eighth, and final, chapter articulates the implicit historical vision as to how reports of the Prophet Muhammad's utterances and actions were transmitted across five generations, from the sahāba to the teachers of the generation of Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'īn, and Ibn Ḥanbal. This chapter makes particularly fruitful use of Ibn Sa'd's unique quantitative grades for several hundred transmitters, information which leads to the discovery of the major shift of the "capital" of hadīth scholarship from Medina to Basra and Kufa during the mid-second/eighth century. While the discipline of hadīth-transmitter criticism distinguished clearly the reliable scholars found in the \textit{isnāds} of thousands of hadīth that were ultimately systematized by Sunnī compilers of the third/ninth century, the historical vision implicit in the works of Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'īn, and Ibn Ḥanbal identified the networks of the most prominent authorities, all of whose materials served as major components of the most influential books of Sunnī Islam.
I.5 Conclusion

The goal of this book is to analyze the origins of the Sunnī articulation of Islam from the angle of the vast Sunnī hadīth literature. I have proposed, on the basis of a close reading of major works by al-Dhahabī, Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'in, and Ibn Ḥanbal, that Sunnism was premised initially upon three fundamental principles. The first of these was the collective authority of the sahāba, several of whom who, despite their bitter internal struggles during the first thirty years after the Prophet’s death, played an indispensable role in the core Sunnī venture of hadīth transmission. The second principle was the methodology of hadīth-transmitter criticism that, coupled with a high degree of consensus as to the identities of the most reliable transmitters of the first two centuries of Islam, divided the community of transmitters into those whose reports were acceptable, those whose reports were questionable, and those whose material had to be abandoned. The third, and final, principle was the implicit historical narrative behind the five-generation journey of hadīth from the sahāba to the compilers of the generation of Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'in, and Ibn Ḥanbal that unfolded in the cities of Medina, Basra, Kufa, Baghdad, and Mecca. I argue that these three basic principles explain not only the unparalleled success of the Sahīhs of al-Bukhārī and Muslim, but, even more importantly, established a minimal set of requirements for an individual’s self-identification as a Sunnī Muslim and that, in turn, may be responsible for the extraordinary popularity of Sunnī Islam over the ages.
PART ONE

THE CONSTRUCTION OF CONCEPTUAL AND HISTORICAL FRAMEWORKS FOR INQUIRY
CHAPTER TWO

TOWARDS AN INITIAL FRAMEWORK:
THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF IBN AL-ṢALĀH
AND AL-DHAHABI

Western studies of hadith have neglected to unravel the fundamental conceptual and historical frameworks employed by classical Muslim scholars proficient in this discipline. European Scholars such as Joseph Schacht and, in particular, G.H.A. Juynboll, have developed an array of esoteric terms and diagrams for hadith analysis without seriously investigating how Muslim scholars themselves understood the development of this vast literature. Studies on the hadith disciplines (ʻulûm al-hadîth) are few and far between, and I am unaware of anyone who has attempted to sketch the history of the development of the hadith literature from the death of Muhammad to its florescence in the Mamlûk era. Although the purpose of this book is to demonstrate the significant role played by the third/ninth century hadith scholars in the articulation of Sunnî Islam, it is necessary to begin this inquiry at the end of the classical period of hadith compilation in order to assemble the requisite conceptual and historical tools so that we can assess accurately the relative importance of the generation of Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'in, and Ibn Hanbal in the greater seven-century venture of Sunnî hadith scholarship.

1 Schacht’s contribution to this discourse is his common-link theory, which he believed could be used to identify the ‘inventor’ of a hadith. Juynboll expanded upon this concept and invented such concepts as “partial-common links,” “diving isnāds,” and “spiders.” For a critical review of both Schacht’s and Juynboll’s concepts of isnād analysis, see Motzki, “Qur’an hadith-Forschung?” See below in chapter eight for an alternative narrative to the insufficient and inaccurate description of the historical development of hadith put forth by Juynboll in his book Muslim Tradition, 39-76.

II.2 The Conceptual Framework: Ibn al-Salah and his articulation of the hadith disciplines

The Sunni Islamic tradition of the classification of the disciplines of hadith (siyam al-hadith) is the logical source for the establishment of a conceptual framework for hadith studies. Ibn al-Salah’s (d. 643/1245) famous book on this topic is the culmination of the efforts of a coterie of scholars who devoted themselves to the systematic explanation of the skills one must have in order to evaluate the qualities of individual hadith. The earliest treatise on this topic is the introduction to the Sahih of Muslim b. al-Hajjaj (d. 261/874), which both defends the practice of ranking hadith-transmitters and proposes a tripartite division of these men into 1) those who are free from defects and controversy, and rich in expertise (istqan); 2) those who transmit on the authority of less-than-reliable scholars; 3) those who are accused by most scholars of being suspect (munkar). Although this short text is a statement of methodology rather than a treatise of hadith disciplines, it represents the earliest conceptual approach to the compilation of hadith by an actual compiler.

The master hadith scholar Ibn Hajar (d. 852/1448) lists only six significant precursors in the field of “the conventions of the People of hadith” (istilah ahl al-hadith) prior to Ibn al-Salah’s Muqaddima: 5 Muhadithah al-fasih of Abū Muḥammad al-Rāmūmuzī (d. 360/971), al-Mawji’fi ‘ulūm al-hadith of al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1014), a work by Abū Nu’aym al-Iṣbahānī (d. 430/1039), a plethora of

---

1. Sahih Muslim bi-shah al-Nawawī, I, 49–56. The passages describing these three categories are translated and discussed in Tarif Khalidi, Arabic Historical Thought in the Classical Period (Cambridge, 1994), 41. The entire introduction has been translated by G. H. A. Juynboll in “Muslim’s Introduction to His Sahih.”

2. It is possible that Ibn Sa’d’s al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr is the earliest conceptualization of the disciplines pertaining to the history of hadith transmission, and this book is credited with being an authoritative work in both categories 63 (tabaqāt of scholars) and 65 (homelands of transmitters and their places of residence) in Muqaddima Ibn al-Salah (pp. 663–7 and pp. 672–6, respectively). Al-Shafī’i’s Risāla also contains a somewhat lengthy chapter that focuses on contradictory hadith and employs several technical terms in its discussion of this material; see Majid Khadduri, al-Jāmī’ al-Muḥammad ibn ʿIṣṭir al-Shafī’is al-Risāla fi ma’ṣīl al-fiqh: Treatise on the Foundations of Islamic Jurisprudence, second edition (Cambridge: Islamic Texts Society, 1987), 179–285. The dating of al-Shafī’i’s Risāla has generated some controversy in the Western academy, for a very brief discussion of this controversy, see Christopher Melchert, “Traditionist-Jurisprudents and the Framing of Islamic Law,” Islamic Law and Society 8.3 (2001), 394. Al-Shafī’i’s role in hadith criticism is explored below in chapter IV.3.

books by al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (d. 463/1071), al-Īma′ of al-Qāḍī ʿIyād (d. 544/1149), and a pamphlet (juzʿ) by Abū Ḥafṣ al-Mayānījī (d. 580/1184). The book of al-Ḥākīm al-Naysābūrī consists of 52 categories (nawʾ) and seems to have provided Ibn al-Ṣālāḥ with both the terminology and structure for his sixty-five category book. The book al-Kifāya fī `ilm al-riwāya of al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī also deserves special mention, as it packed with minute details concerning hadīth transmission and is cited extensively in the Muqaddima. Despite the importance of these two works, Ibn al-Ṣālāḥ’s book not only eclipsed all previous efforts towards the classification of the hadīth disciplines, but has remained unsurpassed, and enormously influential, in the field to this day.

Taqī al-Dīn Abū ’Amr ʿUthmān b. al-Ṣālāḥ al-Shahrazūrī al-Kurdi was born in 577/1181–2 in the village of Sharakhān near Shahrazūr in Irbil. His father was an important scholar in Shāfiʿī law in the region, and the two of them traveled extensively in order to acquire religious knowledge. Ibn al-Ṣālāḥ is of particular importance for hadīth scholarship because he was one of the last scholars to study with the masters of this discipline in Nishapur, Marw, and Qazvin prior to the Mongol irruption of 616–7/1220–1 that severed these Eastern cities from the central lands of Egypt and Syria. His transmission of the Sahīḥs of al-Bukhārī and Muslim and the enormous Sunan of al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066) appears to have been especially valuable to his numerous students. Both Ibn al-Ṣālāḥ and his father came to

---

6 Thirty-six of al-Ḥākīm’s categories can be found almost verbatim in the Ibn al-Ṣālāḥ’s text. It should be remarked that the latter work feels far more polished than the former, and the categories are more carefully arranged from a thematic perspective.

7 The editor of the Muqaddima has tracked down many of the citations of al-Khaṭīb taken from al-Kifāya. Many monographs of al-Khaṭīb are also mentioned in Muqaddima Ibn al-Ṣālāḥ, such as al-Fāṣil fī-l-ibād al-mudhajī fī l-naqīl, al-Mutājīq wa l-muhkāmū, Kitāb taḥkīk al-mutashābih fī l-rasm, and al-Muhdhamūt; ibid., 278, 613, 622, and 637.

8 ’A’isha ʿAbd al-Raḥman has provided a useful biography of Ibn al-Ṣālāḥ on the basis of myriad biographical dictionaries in the introduction to her edition of Muqaddima Ibn al-Ṣālāḥ (pp. 14–38). Al-Dhahabi classifies him as ‘Shaykh al-Islām’ in the eighteenth tabāqa of Tudbhirat al-tufaṣṣīl, IV, 149. The biography in Wafayāt al-ṣayār (7#411) is particularly valuable because Ibn Khallīkān (d. 681/1282) was a student of Ibn al-Ṣālāḥ for a year; see Wafayāt al-ṣayār, III (Beirut, 1998), 213–5. See also J. Robson, “Ibn al-Ṣālāḥ,” EJ2, III, 927.

9 These master teachers include: al-Mu’ayyad al-Ṭūsī (d. 617/1220), Mansūr b. ʿAbd al-Muʿmin al-Farāwī (d. 608/1211–2), and Zaynab al-Shaṭīrīyya in Nishapur; Abū l-Muẓaffar ʿAbd al-Raḥīm b. al-Samʿānī (d. 617/1220) in Marw; and Abū l-Qāsim ʿAbd al-Karīm b. Muhammad (d. 617/1220) in Qazvin; Muqaddima Ibn al-Ṣālāḥ, 17–19 and al-Dhahabi, Tudbhirat, IV, 149.
Syria prior to 616/1219, and his father accepted a teaching position at the Asadiyya madrasa (college) in Aleppo where he remained until his death in 618/1222. Ibn al-Šalāh acquired teaching positions at three madrasas, including the Ashrafiyya (opened 630/1233), in the Damascus area, and was renowned for his knowledge of hadith and Shafi'i jurisprudence. It appears that he composed and taught the Muqaddima, as well as his commentary on the Sahih of Muslim and a history of Shafi'i jurists, during this last phase of his life.\(^\text{10}\)

A brief survey of the works of scholars who thrived during the two centuries following Ibn al-Šalāh illustrates how his Muqaddima became the ‘canonical’ work of Sunni hadith disciplines. ‘Ā’isha ‘Abd al-Rahmān lists no fewer than seventeen abridgements of, commentaries on, and supplements to the Muqaddima by Mamlūk-era scholars in the useful introduction to her critical edition of this text.\(^\text{11}\) Several particularly noteworthy books among this list include al-Taqrib wa-l-taysir li-ma’rufat sunan al-bashir al-nadhīr of Ibn al-Šalāh’s famous student Muḥyī l-Dīn al-Nawawī (d. 676/1277), the Istāh Ibn al-Šalāh by Ibn Kathīr (d. 774/1373), the one thousand verse poem of al-Zayn al-‘Irāqi (d. 806/1403-4), Mahāsin al-Istilāh by al-Sirāj al-Bulqīnī (d. 805/1402-3),\(^\text{12}\) Nukat ‘alā Ibn al-Šalāh by Ibn Hajar (d. 852/1448), and Ṭadrīb al-Ruwwal of al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505). In fact, it is difficult to find any major Mamlūk-era work concerned with the hadith disciplines that does not follow the sixty-five category scheme of Ibn al-Šalāh other than the noteworthy exceptions of Ibn Daqīq al-Īd’s (d. 702/1303) al-Iqtīrib fi bayān al-‘istilāh\(^\text{13}\) and Ibn Taymiyya’s (d. 728/1328) ‘Iṣlāh al-hadīth.\(^\text{14}\)
What are the sixty-five disciplines of hadith that Ibn al-Salah authoritatively articulated in his Muqaddima over 750 years ago? I have grouped these categories into five broad self-explanatory themes that can be seen below. Most Arabic technical terms have been left untranslated and are explained in the footnotes; numbers in italics indicate the congruous chapters in al-Hakim al-Naysaburi's al-Matifa fi 'ulum al-hadith.

I. Grades of hadith

A. al-saith (sound, authoritative)

B. al-hasan (satisfactory)

C. al-da'if (weak, unauthoritative)

II. Types of hadith according to isnad

A. al-musnad

explores the meanings and variants of roughly twenty famous hadith, there are some interesting theoretical discussions, such as the categories of hadith (pp. 77-83) and the distinction between storytellers (gassis) and hadith-transmitters (pp. 493-518), that shed light on the views of this influential scholar.

Ibn al-Salah provides the following succinct definition of the term saith: a hadith with an unbroken isnad that ends at the Prophet in which all of the transmitters are reliable and precise and that is neither a unique transmission nor defective (al-hadithu al-musnadu laddh yataasibu isnadehu bi-naqi fi 'adli i-qabiti 'an al-adli i-qabiti ita munidhuhu wa la yakimu shuddhan wa la mualallar), Muqaddima Ibn al-Salah, 151.

Ibn al-Salah states explicitly that the two most sound books after the Qur'an are the Sihats of al-Bukhari and Muslim, and argues emphatically that the sum of hadith is not exhausted by the several thousand hadith found within these two books but includes reports found in later works, such as al-Hakim al-Naysaburi's Mustadrak, ibid., 160-4.

Ibn al-Salah struggles to harmonize the incomplete definitions of this type of hadith proposed by al-Khaqabi and al-Tirmidhi: a) a hadith whose isnad is not free from men whose precise integrity is concealed (masta) and cannot be verified, although they are not known for serious lapses of memory, numerous errors, or receiving accusations of mendacity; b) a hadith that is neither unique (shaddhu wa munkar) nor defective (mualal), and whose isnad is complete with men of known integrity, but who are not at the level of the transmitters found in the authoritative books due to shortcomings of memory (hijaz) and expertise (istagun); Muqaddima Ibn al-Salah, 175-6. Ibn al-Salah mentions that this term was employed most frequently by al-Tirmidhi in his Sunan, and also endeavors to solve this compiler's use of the problematic term hasan saith with the explanation that al-Tirmidhi probably knew of two isnads for hadith which receive this evaluation, one of which was hasan, and the other of which was saith. He also reports an anonymous opinion that the term hasan in these cases is not a technical term but merely means "that to which the soul inclines and the heart does not disdain;" mii tamulu istaghi i-qafsu wa la ya'bahu l-qalbi; ibid., 180 and 185.

Any hadith that is neither saith nor hasan; Muqaddima Ibn al-Salah, 188.

An unbroken isnad that ends at the Prophet (marfu' and mutaṣar) for Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, it is any isnad that starts with the Prophet; for al-Khaqabi, it is any unbroken isnad; Muqaddima Ibn al-Salah, 190.
B. al-muttaṣīl

C. al-marjūf

D. al-mawqūf

E. al-maqtūf

F. al-mursal

G. al-munqait

H. al-muṣalla

I. al-maṣlaḥa

J. al-insnād al-ʿāli wa l-naṣīl

K. al-musalsaf

III. Types of hadīth according to matn and/or insnād

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matn</th>
<th>Isnād</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. al-shādīḥ</td>
<td>al-matrūk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. al-munkar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. al-afraḍ</td>
<td>al-mufrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. al-muʿalla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

19 An insnād in which every transmitter could have heard the text (matn) from the previous one.

20 An insnād that ends at the Prophet Muhammad.

21 An insnād that ends at a saḥābi and whose matn does not include a Prophetic act or location.

22 An insnād that ends at a ʿābīʾ and reports his or her act or location.

23 An insnād that ends at the Prophet and lacks a saḥābi.

24 An insnād in which any two adjacent transmitters could not possibly have met; an insnād with a lacuna.

25 An insnād with a lacuna of two or more generations between transmitters.

26 Two types: 1) the act of transmitting a hadīth from a contemporary from whom one did not actually hear the report; 2) the use of an obscure name in order to camouflage the presence of an unreliable transmitter in the insnād.

27 Five types of al-ʿalī: 1) insnād with the lowest number of transmitters; 2) insnād containing an imām of hadīth; 3) presence of a transmission (riwaya) in one of the "Five Books" (al-Bukhārī, Muslim, Abu Dawūd, al-Tirmidhī, al-Nasāʾī); 4) insnād with the longest-lived member of a particular generation of transmitters; 5) insnād with the earliest date among contemporaries of transmission from a teacher. The hadīth al-naṣīl is considered to be the opposite of each of these five categories; Muqaddima Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, 437–49.

28 An insnād with a feature common to all transmitters; for example, all of the transmitters are Kufans.

29 A unique transmission from a reliable transmitter; Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ divides this topic into four categories: 1) If it is unique and contradicts the reports from better transmitters, it is rejected; 2) if it is not contradicted and the transmitter is reliable, it might be saḥīḥ; 3) if it is not contradicted and the transmitter is mediocre, it is hasan; 4) if the transmitter is unacceptable (munkar), it is rejected; Muqaddima Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, 237–43.

30 A transmission with a unique matn; same four categories as shādīḥ (#13).

31 A unique transmission from the perspective of all transmitters (shādīḥ or munkar) or just those of a certain region.

32 Any defect in a hadīth, whether the insnād or matn.
E. al-mudtariib
F. al-mudraj
G. al-mawdū‘ (fabricated hadith)
H. al-maqlub
I. al-mashhur and al-mutawiitir
J. al-ghanib wa l-‘azīz
K. gharib al-alfāz

IV. Arts and techniques of hadith transmission
A. Isnād examination
B. Recognition of textual additions to a hadith made by trustworthy transmitters
C. Hadith-transmitter criticism

The weaker of two variants of the same hadith.

Erroneous inclusion or confusion of words or names; three types: 1) explanatory word by a later transmitter is included in the location of the Prophet; 2) two mains, each having its own isnād, are transmitted with only one isnād; 3) a hadith heard from different groups with variants is transmitted as if there was consensus upon its wording or isnād. Muqaddima Ibn al-Salah, 274–78.

Inversion of isnāds with the incorrect mains; Ibn al-Salah also makes three important statements concerning this category: 1) The main of a hadith might be salīh even if the isnād is weak; 2) it is permissible, according to the ahl al-hadith, to be less stringent with isnāds for hadith that do not concern the attributes of God and divine Law (ṣifat Allāh ‘a‘lā in sahāba al-bay‘un al-hadīth wa l-salāh); 3) if one quotes a weak hadith, one must say something to the effect that “it was reported on the authority of the Messenger of God” rather than “the Messenger of God said” (qala rasūl Allāh); Muqaddima Ibn al-Salah, 286–7.

Hashīir is a term employed only by the hadith transmitters that refers to multiple transmissions of the same main. Mutawiitir is a term used by the jurists that refers to a main for which multiple transmitters at each stage of the isnād exist. Since most hadith trace back through only one or two sahāba or tābi‘un, the challenge is to find those hadith which, for example, twenty or more sahāba transmitted. The fact that very few hadith fulfill this rigorous stipulation has led Wael Hallaq recently to the conclusion that most Muslim experts of legal theory (usul al-fiqh) allowed for the possibility that the vast majority of the hadith were not authentic centuries prior to the arguments of Orientalists such as Goldzieher and Schacht. Hallaq’s argument is convincing from the perspective of the legal theorists, but, given the situation that few legal theorists are recorded as being experts of hadith criticism, it seems as though he may have fallen in the same trap as Schacht, namely making vast generalizations about the hadith on the basis of literature external to the scholarly tradition of the hadith scholars; see Wael Hallaq, “The Authenticity of Prophetic Hadith: a Pseudo-problem,” Studia Islamica, 89 (1999), 75–90.

If a hadith has a unique main or isnād from a famous transmitter, it is gharib; if there are two or three versions of it, it is ‘azīz; otherwise it is mawdū‘. Ibn al-Salah warns that the majority of gharib hadith are not authoritative (ghayn salīh) and quotes Ibn Hanbal as urging students not to write them down for this reason; Muqaddima Ibn al-Salah, 456.

The presence of an obscure word in the main of a hadith.
D. Proper method for hadith acquisition (24)
E. Writing hadith (25)
F. Correct transmission (riwāya) (26)
G. Etiquettes of the hadith-transmitter (27)
H. Etiquettes of the student (28)
I. Abrogation (34) (21)
J. Orthography (tashīf) (35) (34–35)
K. Differences (mukhtalif) between hadith (36) (30)
L. Erroneous additions to isnāds (37)
M. Hidden marāsil (38)

V. Isnād Criticism (ibn al-rijāl)

A. Classes of Transmitters
1) al-sahāba (singular: sahābi)39 (39) (7)
2) al-tābi’un (singular: tābi’ī)40 (40) (14)
3) al-thiqāt and al-du‘ā’ī41 (61)
4) al-thiqāt who made errors in old age (62)
5) tabaqāt of scholars42 (63)

B. Types of Transmission
1) Transmission of senior transmitters from their juniors (41)
2) Transmission from scholars of the same generation (42)
3) Brothers and sisters who are hadith transmitters (43) (36)
4) Transmission from sons to their fathers (44)
5) Transmission from fathers to their sons (45)
6) Two scholars whose death dates are distant who transmit hadith from the same teacher43 (46)
7) Transmitters from whom only one student transmitted hadith (47) (37)

39 Any Muslim who saw the Prophet Muhammad; often translated as “Companions.”
40 Any Muslim who saw or heard from a sahābi; often translated as “Successors.”
41 Reliable and unreliable (literally “weak”) transmitters.
42 Classes or generations of people, depending on the context. This topic is discussed thoroughly in the next section of this chapter.
43 Ibn al-Ṣalāh explains that this discipline is useful for identifying elevated isnāds
C. **Disciplines of Names**

1) Transmitters who are known by multiple names

2) Unique names, *kunyas* (agnates), and honorifics

3) Names and their *kunyas*

4) *Kunyas* of those who are known by names

5) Honorifics of *hadith* transmitters

6) Consensus and disagreement over names, *kunyas* and honorifics (*al-mu'talif wa l-mukhtalif*)

7) Consensus and disagreement over names and lineages (*ansiib*)

8) *Mutashabih* (combination of 6 and 7)

9) Bearers of the same name and lineage (*nasab*)

10) Those whose *nasab* is not their father's name

11) Deceptive lineages

12) Unclear male and female transmitters

13) *Mawāli* and those affiliated with a tribe

D. **Time and Space**

1) Important birth and death dates and travels of transmitters

2) Origins of transmitters and their places of residence

The purpose of this excursus through all sixty-five disciplines of *ḥadīth* is to demonstrate the fundamental roles of *ḥadīth*-transmitter criticism and the broader categories of *ismāl* criticism (*īlm al-rijāl*) in the tradition of Sunnī *ḥadīth* scholarship. Twenty-six of the categories and gives the example of Mālik b. Anas, from whom both al-Zuhrī and Zakariyyā b. Durayd al-Kindī transmitted *ḥadīth*. These latter two men died at least 137 years apart from one another; *Muqaddima Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ*, 550-1. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ reports that al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī has an entire book devoted to this topic titled *Kūṭab al-sābiq wa l-lāhiq*. 
consist of pure biographical information of transmitters, ranging from the type of knowledge that Ahmad b. Hanbal is actually the grandson of Ḥanbal and the son of Muḥammad b. Ḥanbal (category 57), to the knowledge of the contemporaries of each individual scholar (category 63). All twenty-two disciplines of the “Types of hadīth according to isnād” and “Types of hadīth according to maṣnun and/or isnād” require a high degree of familiarity with the qualities and lives of hundreds, if not thousands, of hadīth-transmitters. It is not possible to answer even the most basic question—is this hadīth authoritative (ṣaḥīḥ)?—without substantial prosopographical knowledge. While the intellectual and cultural significance of the isnād and knowledge of the names found within it has been acknowledged by several astute scholars, such as Tarīf Khalidi, an enormous amount of research remains to be done into the lives and reputations of a significant number of hadīth transmitters of the formative period of Islam.

A few of these categories merit closer examination because of their role in shaping the topics of investigation in this book. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ identifies whom he deems to be the masters of the tradition of hadīth scholarship and even outlines a curriculum for the aspiring student of hadīth in his Muqaddima. Category 60, “Important birth and death dates of transmitters,” includes the names and dates of the Prophet Muḥammad, the ten ṣaḥāba promised paradise, two ṣaḥāba who lived both prior to and after the advent of Islam, five founders of

11 The greatest skill that, in Mamlūk times at least, distinguished a ‘master hadīth scholar’ (muḥaddith) from a ‘jurist hadīth scholar’ (muḥaddith al-fuqaha’) was the ability to identify the ‘elevated’ isnād (al-ṭāli‘; category 29) of any particular maṣnun that had multiple chains of transmission. This skill was entirely dependent upon an exhaustive knowledge of the relative qualities and reputations of hundreds of hadīth transmitters. That this skill was not considered by everyone to be necessary in order to achieve the rank of ‘master hadīth scholar’ can be seen in al-Suyūṭī’s defense of Ibn Kathīr, whom Ibn Hajar criticized as being merely a ‘jurist hadīth scholar’ because he lacked the skill to identify the ‘elevated’ isnād. Al-Suyūṭī claims that this skill is not a prerequisite for the attainment of the title of muḥaddith; see his Dhayl included in the 1998 edition al-Dhahabi’s Tadhkira al-dhuffāż, V, 238–9.

12 Khalidi discusses the cultural impact of the isnād in the context of his description as to how the Islamic historical tradition grew out of the tradition of hadīth compilation. He declares the isnād to be “a unique product of Islamic culture” and suggests that its natural growth served as a catalyst for the compilation of books; Khalidi, Arabic Historical Thought, 17–29.


14 Ḥākim b. Hīzām (d. 54/674) and Ḥāsān b. Thābit (d. 54/674).
TOWARDS AN INITIAL FRAMEWORK

legal schools (madhâhib), the compilers of the five ‘canonical’ hadith books, and seven later scholars who produced useful books concerning hadith. This last group of men is particularly interesting because it covers the first two-thirds of the three-hundred year gap between the last of the five ‘canonical’ compilers, namely al-Nasâ’î (d. 303/915), and Ibn al-Ṣalâh, and, at the same time, raises the question as to what took place during the century prior to the birth of the author of the Muqaddima.

The reading list for the aspiring student of hadith described by Ibn al-Ṣalâh in category 28 confirms the importance of the genre of books devoted to the study of hadith-transmitters that I study in the second half of this book. This list suggests that the student should begin with the five ‘canonical’ hadith collections prior to advancing to the musnad works, such as the Musnad of Ibn Ḥanbal, and books that contain a mixture of hadith and reports of the sahâbas and tâbi’un, such as the Muwatta of Malik b. Anas. The next stage of pedagogy involves works that uncover defects (‘ilal) in hadith, and the works of Ibn Ḥanbal and al-Dāraquṭnî are explicitly mentioned. Ibn al-Ṣalâh then urges the student of hadith to study the histories of hadith-transmitters in general, and al-Târîkh al-kabîr of al-Bukhârî and al-Jâhiz wa t-ta’âlî of Ibn Abî Ḥatîm in particular. The final category of books that merits attention is the one concerned with accurate orthography of names, such as the Ikmâl of Abû Naṣr Ibn Mâkûlâ. This list not

18 Sufyân al-Thawrî (d. 161/778), Malik b. Anas (d. 179/795), Abû Ḥanîfa (d. 150/767), al-Shâfi‘î (d. 204/820), Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855).
19 Ibn al-Ṣalâh does not consider the Sunan of Ibn Mâja to be of the same caliber of the other five ‘canonical’ books mentioned in the previous chapter (note 35). The expression “the six books” (al-kutub al-sitta) does not appear to have gained widespread currency until the century after his death.
21 This list is derived from Muqaddima Ibn al-Ṣalâh, 432-3.
22 Various recensions of the ‘ilal works of Ibn Ḥanbal have been published in the past decade and can be found in the bibliography. The previously mentioned encyclopedia of his opinions appears to be a useful alternative to these cumbersome and chaotic ‘ilal books. The ‘ilal book of al-Dâraquṭnî was published by Dâr Tayyibî in Riyadh in 1984 under the title of al-I’ilal al-wârîdâ fi l-ṣhadîth al-Nabawîyya. See also Fuat Sezgin, GAS, 1, 207.
23 There is much uncertainty concerning Ibn Mâkûlâ’s death date; the numbers range from 475/1082-3 to 486/1092-3.
only emphasizes the obligation of the student of hadith to devote serious study to the biographies of thousands of hadith transmitters, but also reaffirms the value of several third/ninth and fourth/tenth century books for this task.

Another discipline of critical importance for the understanding of how the Sunnis articulated their vision of Islam is the knowledge of the sahâba. Ibn al-Salâh divides this category into the following seven sub-topics:

1) Who is a sahâbî?
2) The universal probity (’adâla) of the sahâba;
3) The sahâba with the greatest number of transmissions;
4) The number of sahâba who transmitted hadith;
5) Rankings of the sahâba according to excellence;
6) Who was the first sahâbî to embrace Islam?
7) The last sahâbî to die in each of the major cities.

Ibn al-Salâh identifies Abû Hurayra as the sahâbî with the largest amount of hadith transmissions and quotes Ibn Ḥanbal’s identification of six sahâba who excelled quantitatively in hadith transmission and lived to a ripe old age. Three other early Iraqi opinions are also cited on this topic. The first is the Basran ‘Ali b. al-Madînî (d. 234/849), who praises the juridical contributions (fiqh) of Ibn Mas’ûd, Zayd b. Thâbit, and Ibn ‘Abbâs. The Kufân tâbî’î Masrûq b. al-Ajda‘ (d. 63/683) identifies six great sahâba and then reduces this list to just ‘Ali b. Abî Ta’lib and Ibn Mas’ûd. Finally, the Kufan tâbî’î al-Sha‘bî (d. after 100/718) lists two groups of three sahâba each as the sources of religious knowledge (ilm). These reports offer

---

54 Category 39, Mughaddima Ibn al-Salâh, 485-505.
56 Ibn Sa’d, al-Ta’baqât al-kubrâ, VI, 398; al-Dhahabi, Tadhkira, I, 40.
58 His name is ’Amir b. Sharaḥîl al-Hamdânî; al-Ta’baqât al-kubrâ, VI, 479 and Tadhkira, I, 63. Neither Ibn Sa’d nor al-Dhahabi give his death date. Ibn Qutayba puts it at 105 or 4, whereas Ibn Hajar merely says he died after 100; see Ibn Qutayba, al-Ma’ârij, ed. Tharwa ‘Akasha (Cairo, 1960), 449 and Ibn Hajar, Taqrib, 230.
59 The first group consists of ‘Umar, Ibn Mas’ûd, and Zayd b. Thâbit and the latter of ‘Ali, Abû Mûsâ I-Ash’arî, and Ubayy b. Ka’b. Al-Sha‘bî states that “the knowledge of some of them [in each group] resembles that of others, and they shared knowledge freely from among themselves” (yushbihu ‘ilmu ba’dihim ba’dan, wa kâna yaqtabisu ba’dihum min ba’din). These groupings are particularly interesting because
shreds of evidence of a core of what can be called ‘primary sahāba’ whose identities are further explored in chapter six of this book.

The fifth sub-topic of category 39 shatters any illusion that the sahāba are all qualitatively equal. The Muqaddima declares that Abu Bakr is unequivocally the greatest (aṣdāl) sahābī, and ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb is the second greatest.60 The fact that master hadith scholars, such as Sufyān al-Thawrī (d. 161/778) and Ibn Khuzayma (d. 311/923),61 believed that ‘Ali was superior to ‘Uthmān forces Ibn al-Ṣalāh to acknowledge that it is possible to hold this opinion despite the unanimous opinion of the madhāhib of ‘companions of hadith’ (aṣhāb al-hadīth) and ‘people of the sunna’ (ahl al-sunna) that ‘Uthmān was superior to ‘Ali.62 Ibn al-Ṣalāh attempts to mitigate these polemical rankings by closing the sub-topic with ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādi’s (d. 429/1037) five-class structure of descending excellence:

1) The first four caliphs
2) The six remaining sahāba promised paradise63
3) Those who fought at the Battle of Badr (2/624)
4) Those who fought at the battle of Uhud (3/625)
5) Those who gave the oath of allegiance to the Prophet at Ḥudaybiyya (6/628)64

What is clear from these two sub-topics is that the classification and ranking of the sahāba is a critical element of Sunnism and merits the rigorous examination it receives in chapter six of this study.

they transcend the usual divisions of geography, and they indicate the unique diversity of teachings from the sahāba in Kufa.

60 This opinion can be found in eleven of the twelve Sunni creeds translated and collated by Montgomery Watt in Islamic Creeds: A Selection (Edinburgh, 1994), 32, 33, 38, 44, 55, 58, 65, 72, 79, 84, 88.


62 The belief that ‘Ali is superior to ‘Uthmān is called iṣbahayn and is discussed in detail in chapter VII.6. The two examples of adherents to this belief mentioned are explicitly articulated in the Muqaddima, and Ibn al-Ṣalāh also observes that this is the common opinion of the ahl al-sunna of Kufa; Muqaddima Ibn al-Ṣalāh, 495.

63 See above, footnote 46, for a list of these ten men. Ibn Ḥanbal opens his Musnūd with the transmissions of each of these men.

64 This event is called bayʿat al-ridwān and is mentioned in the Qur‘ān in Sūrat al-Fatḥ (48):10, 18. Presumably there is a sixth class, as the majority of sahāba, including Abu Ḥurayra, embraced Islam after Ḥudaybiyya and prior to the Prophet’s death in 11/632.
The final hadīth discipline of crucial significance for this project is the one pertaining to hadīth criticism titled “the knowledge of the attribute of one whose transmission is accepted and one whose transmission is rejected, as well as that which is affiliated with this topic pertaining to censure, unreliability, reliability, and authority.”65 This is one of the longest chapters in the Muqaddima, and Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ divides it into fifteen sub-topics:

1) Probity of the transmitter (‘adlāt al-rā′i)
2) Techniques for establishing the probity of a transmitter
3) Necessity of evidence for a transmitter to be classified as unreliable
4) Number of negative ratings necessary to be classified as unreliable
5) Precedence of ranking of the status of ‘unreliable’ to that of ‘reliable’
6) Insufficiency of the expression haddathānī al-thiqatu if the thiqa is not named in the isnād
7) Transmission of a known, reliable transmitter does not necessarily mean that the other names in the isnād are also reliable
8) Unknown transmitters (majhūl)
9) Transmitters affiliated with innovative sectarianism (mubtadi‘)
10) Acceptance of the repentance of one who falsifies religion (kadhib)66 unless it was related to hadīth
11) If a transmitter forgets what he has transmitted at a later date, the hadīth is still authoritative if his students pass it on
12) The rejection of the transmission of any scholar who accepts compensation (qir) in exchange for transmitting hadīth67
13) Unacceptability of the reports of scholars who are lenient (tasāḥul) in transmission (sama‘) and who transmit many odd (shawādhdh) and suspect (manākir) hadīth

65 Category 23: ma‘rifatu šifati man taqbalu riwāyatuhu wa man taraddu riwāyatuhu wa wa sāratullu bi-dhalla min qaddih wa jaddin wa tawthiqi wa lādīna, Muqaddima Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, 288-311.

66 The word kadhib literally means “lie” and is used extensively in both the Qurʾān and hadīth literature in the sense of the deliberate denial and falsification of the divine truth. The classical literature on this topic is vast, and several of the scholars whose opinions are studied in chapter 4 discuss it in detail.

67 Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ reports that this is the classical opinion of the Imāms of hadīth, but that Abū ʿIshāq al-Shfrazf (whose Tabāqāt al-fuqahā‘ was mentioned in the introduction) issued a fatwā that contradicts this opinion in the case of the scholar who teaches hadīth in order to support his family, Muqaddima Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, 305-6.
14) The 'modern' conditions for the acceptance of hadith transmission. The foundation of this entire pyramid of sub-topics pertaining to the verification of the reliability of hadith transmitters is the testimony of a core of master critics whose own probity is unassailable. Ibn al-Shalih cites eleven examples of these master scholars on the authority of al-Khaṭib al-Baghdādi, but does not give any indication as to their total number. The opinions of these scholars carry an extraordinary amount of weight, for if one of them evaluates a transmitter as 'unreliable,' this rating must be considered for eternity (subtopics 4 and 5), and if none of them knows a transmitter, all of the hadith in which his name appears in the isnād become weak (subtopic 8). This category reinforces the argument of the centrality of both hadith criticism in the entire conceptual scheme of the hadith disciplines, and indicates the sublime influence of a small group of impeccable master critics, whose critical opinions have been permanently etched into the Sunni tradition of hadith transmission. Perhaps this is why Tarif Khalidi observed that “one of the most urgent tasks for researchers in this field is the exhaustive examination of the rise and development of the critical methodologies employed by the hadith scholars themselves.”

The goal of this section has been to establish a conceptual framework for the study of hadith compilation and criticism. The Muqaddima

---

58 Ibn al-Shalih indicates in this sub-topic that “the times have changed” in the field of hadith transmission from the days of the earlier authorities, as the sole responsibility for the ‘modern’ scholar of hadith is to find a reliable, upright teacher and become the next link in the isnād of the book that he is teaching. The reason for this is that “all authoritative and semi-authoritative hadith have been collected and written in the books that the Imams of hadith compiled. It is not possible that anything has escaped all of them, although it is possible that it has escaped some of them... Anyone who brings forth a hadith not found in any of them will not have it accepted.” [wa wujhu dhālika anna l-ṣiṣḥatiy balt gud saḥḥat aw wayyati bayna l-ṣiḥḥati wa l-sayami gud damiːti lwa kultab fi l-jawāmiːl lwa jamāːda d-immahā l-hadith wa l-yuyuṣu an yaddhaba shayʾun minha ‘ala jamāːda tam wa in ḥaːna an yaddhaba ‘ala baʾḏikim... fa-mun ʃaː l-jamāːda bi-hadīthin lā yuṣayu linda jamāːda tam yuqbal minhu; Muqaddima Ibn al-Shalih, 307].

59 This category is explored at great length in chapter seven.

60 Literally, “overflowing” (isṭifāda).

61 These eleven men are Mālik b. Anas, Shuʿba b. al-Hajjāj, Suṭyān al-Thawrī, Suṭyān b. ‘Uyyayn, al-Awzaʾi, al-Ḥāfiz b. Saʿd, Ibn al-Mubārak, Wāḍiʿ b. al-Jarrāḥ, Ibn Ḥanbal, Ibn Maʿīn, and ‘Alī b. al-Madini; Muqaddima Ibn al-Shalih, 289. All of these critics will be encountered in chapter four; see below, Table 4.3.

72 Khalidi, Arabic Historical Thought, 27.
of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ is a useful tool for this task because it is the most authoritative articulation of the hadīth disciplines in the Sunni tradition. The importance of ḡnasīd criticism is graphically illustrated by the fact that only five of the sixty-five topics do not rely in some measure upon a high degree of prosopographical proficiency. The elevated status of a small group of master hadīth scholars can be ascertained from the curriculum cited in category 28 and the eleven Imāms listed in category 23.1. The radical Sunnī assertion of the unquestionable probity of all saḥāba is clearly promoted in the Muqaddima, although it is tempered significantly by the identification of certain men (and one woman) of distinction in the fields of hadīth transmission, religious knowledge, and general excellence. This brief overview of the Muqaddima of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ clearly demonstrates the importance of the identification of the master hadīth critics, a reclassification of the saḥāba on the basis of their individual contributions to hadīth transmission, and a thorough examination of the critical techniques employed by some of the earliest critics in order for one to understand the development of the Sunnī hadīth literature.

II.3 Towards a historical framework: The identification of al-Dhahabi’s favorite hadīth scholars

The task of this section is to select the appropriate books from Shams al-Din al-Dhahabi’s (d. 748/1348) vast corpus for the purpose of ascertaining the identities of the hadīth scholars whom he most admired. Al-Dhahabi’s mastery of the two primary historiographical techniques in the Islamic tradition—tārīkh (annale) and ṭabaqa (generation)—and his preference of the latter in his works devoted exclusively to religious scholars is significant and calls for a brief examination into the nature of ṭabaqat works in general. The identification of al-Dhahabi’s favorite hadīth scholars is a necessary first step towards the articulation of an original seven-phase historical essay of the first seven centuries of Sunnī hadīth scholarship that is the subject of the next chapter.

11 These five topics are #24-28 and are concerned with the practical technique for the ‘modern day’ transmission of hadīth from the classical books.
12 These topics are discussed below in chapters 4-8, respectively.
Shams al-Dīn Abū ‘Abdullāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. ʿUṯmān al-Dhahābī was the youngest member of a group of four Syrian scholars whose teachings and compositions left an indelible stamp on the Islamic intellectual tradition. Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328) is the senior and by far the most famous member of this illustrious clique, and his fierce championing of the salafī approach to Islamic law and theology was viewed with serious consternation by the Shāfiʿī-Ashʿarī religio-political elite of the Mamlūk empire. The salafī approach advocated by Ibn Taymiyya sought to break the near monopoly of the four officially sanctioned legal ḫāhibīḥ and one theological ṣadḥab (Ashʿarism) of Sunnism by means of a careful reconstruction of law and theology on the sole basis of the Qurʾān, ḥadīth, and the opinions of the ‘pious ancestors’ (salaf) of the first three centuries of Islam. It also maintained a vigorous polemic against philosophy, Shiʿism, and radical mysticism. The painstaking scholarship of the third of these four scholars, Abū al-Ḥajjāj Yusuf b. ‘Abd al-ʿRahmān al-Mizzī (d. 742/1341), greatly facilitated this task and set a standard in the field of ḫadīth criticism that remains unsurpassed to this day. Abū Muḥammad al-Qāsim b. al-Bahāʾ...
Muhammad al-Birzali (d. 739/1338), the fourth of this quartet of Damascene scholars, was renowned for his massive encyclopedia (mu’jam) of hadith he heard from over three thousand teachers.\(^7^9\) Al-Dhahabi appears to have been less politically vocal than his masters Ibn Taymiyya and al-Mizzi, both of whom were imprisoned at various times for their salafi beliefs, but he did forfeit a high post at the prestigious Ashrafiiyya madrasa because of his uncompromising refusal to profess the Ash’ari creed in public.\(^8^0\)

It is most likely due to the influence of these three proponents of salafi Sunnism that al-Dhahabī directed his talents toward the fields of hadith criticism, history, and Qur’anic recitation. Al-Dhahabī’s family included a few minor scholars, and his father achieved a degree of prosperity as a goldsmith in Damascus. His early studies were in the ‘seven readings’ of the Qur’an, and his first academic post involved teaching this subject at the Umayyad mosque in 693/1294. The unstable political climate brought on by the Ilkhānid and other Turco-Mongol armies caused al-Dhahabī’s father to prohibit him from the customary ‘travel for the acquisition of knowledge’ (al-rīḥā fi ṭalab al-‘ilm) of every aspiring scholar, although he was allowed short trips to Ba’labakk in 693/1294 and Cairo (probably in 695/1295). Al-Dhahabī does not appear to have been particularly eager to travel even after his father passed away in 698/1299, although he did take the opportunity to study with several scholars in the Hijāz after his performance of the pilgrimage to Mecca that same year.\(^8^1\)

Al-Dhahabī’s first regular job seems to have been as the khaṭīb in a small village outside of Damascus, and it was during this time (703–29/1304–29) that he wrote many of the books that established his reputation. He accepted a position at the dār al-hadith section of the Zāhirīyya madrasa in Damascus in 729/1329, and succeeded his teacher al-Birzali’s post at the Nafīsa madrasa when al-Birzali passed for every name found in the ʾisnād of the ‘six canonical books.’ Al-Mizzi states in his introduction that he added about 1700 entries to this original work, and he provides useful lists of teachers and pupils for each of the transmitters it contains. The ʾiṭrāf is a type of index to the ‘six books’ and lists all ʾisnād for each key phrase in the muḥta of a hadith (the ʾiṭrāf).

\(^{11}\) Tadhkira, V, 235.

\(^{12}\) These three most important teachers of al-Dhahabī have been singled out in Siyar, I, 35 and al-Hāfīz al-Dhahabi, 85–7. See also E12, II, 214 for references to his unwillingness to sign the Ash’ari creed.

\(^{13}\) Siyar, I, 30.
away a decade later. This same year witnessed al-Dhahabi's additional appointment to the newly constructed madrasa al-Tankaziyya. Despite his loss of eyesight around 741/1340-1 or 744/1343, al-Dhahabi continued to teach at five schools until his death in 748/1348.

Three of the 128 books described by 'Abd al-Sattār al-Shaykh elevated al-Dhahabi’s status to the highest pinacles of Muslim scholarship. The earliest of these was an enormous history of the first seven centuries of Islam, titled Tārikh al-Islam, the ‘first draft’ of which was composed in 714/1314. This work remains one of the most ambitious histories of the entire world of Islam, and contains both biographical notices for tens of thousands of religious and secular notables, as well as reports of historical events. The book is arranged in tabaqāt of ten years each, a period of time that is too short to be considered a “generation;” this observation has led both Bashshar ‘Awwād and 'Abd al-Sattār al-Shaykh to classify the Tārikh among Dhahabi’s annalistic works.82

The second exceptional composition by al-Dhahabi is Mizān al-‘idāl fi naqṣ al-rījāl, an encyclopedia of over eleven thousand tarnished hadith-transmitters that he rather miraculously assembled in four months in 724/1324. Al-Dhahabi explains in the introduction that he has followed the example of Ibn ‘Adi (d. 365/976)83 and included everyone about whom anything negative was said, with the exception of the saḥāba and the Imāms of the madhāhib, such as Abū Ḥanīfa and al-Shāfi‘i.84 He also provides the useful service of identifying twenty-three experts of hadith-transmitter criticism and explaining his critical terminology in the introduction of the Mizān. This encyclopedia is arranged alphabetically, and therefore is not considered usually among al-Dhahabi’s historical works, despite the inclusion of much material of relevance to this discipline.

Al-Dhahabi’s final book of extraordinary magnitude and erudition is the Siyar a‘lām al-nubalā’. This work is far more than a mere abridgement of the gargantuan Tārikh, and is rather a unique effort to create a universal work of Islamic history on the basis of tabaqāt.

---
82 Siyar, I, 103; al-Hafiz al-Dhahabi, 450.
83 Compiler of the famous work al-Kāmil fi‘l-ru’uf al-rija’il, this book is discussed below in chapter four.
84 Mizān al-‘idāl fi naqṣ al-rījāl, ed. ‘Alī Muḥammad al-Bajāwī, I (Cairo, 1963), 2-3. This last category is particularly interesting, as several critics are somewhat harsh on Abū Ḥanīfa; this topic is discussed in more detail in chapter VIII.4.
It was probably first compiled in 715/1315 in the wake of Tārikh al-Islam, and underwent revisions throughout the 730's. Al-Dhahabi identifies 5925 notables, the majority of whom are hadīth transmitters, and incorporates much biographical material from his vast historical readings in many of the entries. The Siyar is possibly the largest book in the Muslim tradition arranged entirely according to tabaqāt, and can be interpreted as al-Dhahabi's boldest attempt to narrate the growth of the most influential men and women of Islamic civilization, generation by generation, from the period following the Prophet Muhammad to his own day.

Al-Dhahabi employed the tabaqāt structure in several of his important works concerned with Qur'ān reciters, theology ('aqīda), and hadīth transmission. His Ma'rifat al-qurā' al-kabīr 'alā l-tabaqāt wa l-aṣār, composed in 717/1317, was one of the first works devoted exclusively to the history of the master reciters of the Qur'ān from the saḥāba to his day. The book consists of 1266 entries across eighteen tabaqāt and was incorporated in its entirety in Ibn al-Jazari's (d. 833/1429) exhaustive biographical dictionary of Qur'ān reciters, Ghayat al-muhāyun.

Al-Dhahabi applied his vast knowledge of history and proficiency with the tabaqa periodization to support his unabashed salafi position regarding the attributes of God in the brief treatise al-'Uluww li-l-'alā' al-ghaffār. The 'correct' opinions of nearly 150 scholars from the tābi‘un through the Andalusi Qur'ānic exegete Abū 'Abdullāh al-Qurṭubi (d. 671/1272) are arranged into a mere nine tabaqāt. The transcendental quality of the salafi movement is vivid in al-'Uluww, as it includes citations from the seven eponyms of the Sunni legal madhāhib, Ja‘far al-Sādiq (d. 148/765), half of the compilers of the

---

<sup>55</sup> Al-Dhahabi states that the "most elevated iswād today, the year [7]35, passes through al-Hasan b. 'Arāfa (d. 257/871);" Siyar, XI, 550.
<sup>56</sup> It is unfortunate that volume XIV covering years 661–700 was not included in the published edition. However, the 23 volumes that have been published remain largely untapped in Western historical studies of Islamic civilization.
<sup>57</sup> The first published edition has 734 entries, whereas the 1997 edition by Ahmad Khān includes an additional 335 names. Most of these additions occur in the twelfth through sixteenth tabaqāt; see the introduction to Tabaqāt al-qurā' (Riyadh, 1997).
<sup>58</sup> Shams al-Dīn Abū l-Khayr Muhammad b. Muhammad al-Dimasheqī al-Shāfi‘ī, known as Ibn al-Jazari, taught in Anatolia prior to his recruitment by Timūr, who made him qādi of Shīrāz; see al-Suyūṭī, Dhayl tabaqāt al-huffāz, appended to Tadhkira, V, 249.
<sup>59</sup> Al-Dhahabi, al-'Uluww li-l-`alīyy al-ghaffār (Riyadh, 1995).
'six canonical' hadīth books, both Abū l-Hasan al-Ash‘arī and, more surprisingly, Abū Bakr al-Baqillānī (d. 403/1012), as well as a chorus of master Arabic grammarians and linguists. This work confirms not just the polemical utility of the tabaqāt structure, but also demonstrates its unlimited potential for rethinking the traditional understanding of historical development (or, in this case, continuity) within the Islamic tradition.

Three short treatises and one substantial history of hadīth-transmitters and critics arranged by tabaqāt can be found in the literary corpus of al-Dhahabī. The first of these is a list of 715 scholars “whose opinions are accepted in hadīth-transmitter criticism” that is arranged into twenty-two tabaqāt.90 The second treatise, al-Muqīqa, is a two-part list, the first of which extends from Abū Hurayra (d. 58/678) through Ibn al-Sharqī (d. 325/937) in nine tabaqāt, followed by fifteen tabaqāt from ‘Ubayd Allāh b. ‘Umar (d. 147/764) through Abū l-Fatḥ Muḥammad b. Muḥammad (d. 734/1334), grandson of Ibn Sayyid al-Nāṣ (d. 659/1261).91 Each tabaqā in al-Muqīqa consists of nothing more than the names of one to four exemplary scholars of each generation, and it may be one of the last works written (or dictated) by al-Dhahabī.92

A far longer list of hadīth-transmitters arranged by tabaqāt is al-Mu‘īn fi tabaqāt al-muhaddithīn. Al-Dhahabī warns in the succinct introduction of this book that it is not a comprehensive list of great hadīth

90 Dhihir man yu‘ramad qa‘dah fi l-jash wa l-sa‘dil, found in ‘Abd al-Fattāh Abū Glucka, Abū‘ rasū‘īl fi ‘ulūm al-hadīth (Beirut, 1401). This book has not been accessible to me. The description of this epistle can be found in al-Hāfiz al-Dhahabī, 396–7 and al-Muqīqa, 68 (footnote 2).

91 The editor of al-Muqīqa has interpreted somewhat misleadingly these two lists to be a unitary twenty-four tabaqiil whole. There is a somewhat awkward interpolation immediately following Ibn al-Sharqī’s name of the sentence: “And among those who are described as possessing a strong memory and proficiency is a group of the saḥāba and tābi‘in” (wa min man yuṣṣafū bi-l-hifṣī wa l-taqāmum jamā‘atu mun al-saḥāba wa l-tabī‘īn; p. 71). The initial group of nine tabaqāt is introduced merely by the expression “wa l-hifṣī tabaqāt” (p. 69). I have labeled below the first nine tabaqiil as list “a” and the remaining fifteen as list “b.” Since list “b” begins with contemporaries of the third tabaqā in list “a,” the numbers in list “b” range from tabaqāt 3–17. Note that this list is not found in Ibn Daqiq al-‘Id’s al-Iqārāt fi bayān al-‘islāmīh, and so it can be assumed that al-Dhahabī inserted it into al-Muqīqa in the course of his abridgement of Ibn Daqiq al-‘Id’s book.

92 Al-Muqīqa lacks the trademark meticulous organization and clarity of al-Dhahabī’s major works, and it reads like an extemporaneous lecture on the subject of the basic hadīth disciplines for a class of novice students. Despite this atypical sloppiness, the book is particularly valuable for the task of identifying al-Dhahabī’s favorite scholars, since it preserves what may have been his final opinions on this topic.
scholars, but rather one that seeks to include the names of those whose names are well known throughout the Islamic world and with which every aspiring student of hadith should be familiar. This book is just a list of 2,443 names over twenty-eight tabaqāt, and the quality of the transmitter is mentioned only occasionally. The Mu‘in, like al-Muqīza, appears to be a late, unpolished work that may have been dictated from memory, and is of interest only insofar as it provides another historical vision of the history of the first seven centuries of hadith transmission.

The most important tabaqā-work by al-Dhahābī for the historical framework of this project is his Tadhkira al-huffāz. This book contains a modest amount of biographical information for 1,222 scholars whose opinions one consults in matters of reliability of transmitters and authenticity of the material. The term hāfiz, when combined with the expression thabt, is explicitly included among the highest ratings for a hadith transmitter in Mizān al-‘īdadāl, whereas the expression thiqa hāfiz is considered the second highest category in al-Muqīza. This expression is further clarified in the entry of Abū Zur‘a al-Rāzī al-ṣaghār (d. 375/985–6), in which al-Dhahābī disagrees with al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī’s evaluation of Abū Zur‘a as a hāfiz because he “transmitted suspect hadith (manākīr), as other huffāz do, but did not identify them as such; this is something that denigrates one from the status of hāfiz.” This quotation indicates that a hāfiz is free to trans-
mit many weak *hadith*, but that he must be capable of identifying them as suspect, and, presumably, explain the causes of their weakness to his students.

Al-Dhahabi's embrace of the *tabaqāt* form of periodization in all of his historical presentations of *hadith*-transmitters suggests the utility of a closer examination of the manifestation of the *tabaqāt* structure in Muslim historical writings. The words *tabaq* and *tibāq* are found in the Qur'ān in three verses where they appear twice in connection with the seven seamless heavens, and once in a somewhat ambiguous passage alluding to either the states of creation or the soul's ascension to heaven. İbrahim Hafsi has articulated the semantic breadth of the word *tabaqa*, which can mean class, value, generation, merit, degree, and group, as well as hierarchy, covering, and all-embracing. Franz Rosenthal has suggested that the *tabaga* division is "genuinely Islamic" and the "oldest chronological division which presented itself to Muslim historical thinking." Tarif Khalidi has clarified the deeper differences beneath the superficial similarities between Arabic genealogical works and *tabaqāt* books, and emphasizes the role of Muḥammad b. ‘Umar al-Wāqidi (d. 207/823) in the inauguration of the *tabaqāt* structure in his lost texts, some of which served as the platform for *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr* of his student and scribe, Ibn Sa’d. The salient features of the *tabaqāt* format expressed in these studies, as well as the books of al-Dhahabi, are 1) its inherent facility to depict teacher-pupil relationships across time; 2) its capability to carve broad groups out of vast numbers of scholars across three continents; 3) its flexibility, in that the historian can select as many 'generations' as he or she deems necessary for the types of scholars so evaluated. The *tabaqāt* system of organization, in short, provides a far smoother narrative of the evolution of the Muslim community, phase by phase, than the antinomian effect of the annalistic histories, in which each year ends with a deluge of obituaries that inevitably obscures the greater story of the transmission of knowledge across time.

---

100 See Qur’ān 84:19 for the use of *tabaq* and 67:3 and 71:15 for the use of *tibāq*. 
102 Frantz Rosenthal, *History of Muslim Historiography* (Leiden, 1952), 93. Despite his identification of the importance of the *tabaqqa* approach to history, Rosenthal inexplicably devotes little more than two pages to it in his book. 
103 Khalidi, *Arabic Historical Thought*, 44–49.
Ibrahim Hafsi's catalog of works that are based on the tabaqat historiographical framework demonstrates its application to myriad fields of Arabo-Islamic civilization and the religious disciplines in particular in the centuries preceding al-Dhahabi. Ibn Sa'd's al-Tabaqat al-ka'bîr is the earliest work in this style to have survived, and was closely followed by the book of Khalîfa b. al-Khayyât al-Ustûrî (d. 240/854) and 'Abd al-Mâlik b. Habîb al-Andalusî (d. 238/853). The works of Ibn Hibbân al-Bustî (d. 354/965) and Abu l-Shaykh 'Abdullâh b. Muhammad al-Ishbâhî (d. 369/979) dominate the tabaqat books of hadith-transmitters in the fourth/tenth century, and one of the most comprehensive lists of master authorities arranged by tabaqat can be found in the introduction of Ibn 'Adî's al-Kâmil fi 'lla'iff al-rijâl. Important hadith-transmitter biographical dictionaries of the following two centuries include the large Hilyat al-awliyyâ of Abu Nu'aym al-Ishbâhî (d. 430/1039), Tabaqat al-fuqahâ' of Abu Ishâq al-Shirazi (d. 476/1083), Tabaqat al-hujjâz min ahl al-hadith of Yusuf b. 'Abd al-'Azîz al-Dabbagh al-Andalusî (d. 546/1151) and the Tabaqat al-nawâî bi sanâdîq al-hukm of Ibn al-Jawzi (d. 597/1201). Al-Dhahabi even informs us in Siyar al-dâ'în al-nubalîn that the direct inspiration for his compilation of Tadhkirat al-hujjâz was the favorable opinion he had of 'Ali b. Mu'âsad al-Maqdisî's (d. 611/1214) Kitâb al-arba'în al-murattaba 'alâ tabaqat al-arba'în. This brief survey

104 Hafsi, I, 247-8. Both of these works have been published: Khalîfa b. Khayyât, Kitâb al-Tabaqat (Baghdad, 1967); Ibn Habîb, Kitâb al-ta'hîl (Madrid, 1991).
105 Hafsi, I, 250; Tadhkira, 89; Câfî, I, 189-91. Ibn Hibbân is particularly famous for his twelve-volume encyclopedia of the tabiîn entitled Kitâb al-tabîîn (Hafsi mislabels this work as Kitâb al-ta'bîîn) and might be responsible for their classification into three tabaqat (pace Hafsi, who credits al-Dhahabi with this achievement, p. 258).
107 This text is analyzed below in chapter four.
108 Siyar, XXII, 65; al-Hâfîz al-Dhahabi, 460. This book has survived in manuscript and consists of four scholars per tabaqat for ten tabaqat down to the fifth/eleventh century. Al-Dhahabi cites this work in several places in Tadhkira al-hujjâz, such as
of major historical works concerned with hadith-transmitters shows both the deep impact of Ibn Sa'd’s *Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr* and al-Dhahabi’s elevation of the genre to new heights with *Siyar a'īlm al-nubalā‘* and *Tadhkira al-hufāz*.

The next task at hand is to analyze three of al-Dhahabi’s books in order to articulate a preliminary historical periodization of the history of master hadith-transmitter critics. The two easiest books with which to commence this quest are *Mīzān al-ṣīdāl* and *al-Mūqīza*. Al-Dhahabi identifies the following twenty-three scholars in five groups as his primary sources of hadith-transmitter criticism in the introduction to *Mīzān al-ṣīdāl*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Death Date</th>
<th>Group/Book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yahyā b. Sa’īd al-Qātān</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahyā b. Ma’in</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Khayyāma, Zuhayr b. Ḥarb</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Alī b. ‘Abdullāh al-Madīnī</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Ḥanbal, Ahmad b. Muḥammad</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Fālāś, Abū Ḥafs ‘Amr b. ‘Alī</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Bukhārī, Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrāhīm b. Ya’qūb al-Ẓujajānī</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad b. al-Ḥajjāj</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī, Muḥammad b. Idrīs</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Tirmidhī, Abū ‘Īsā Muḥammad b. ‘Isā</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Nasā‘ī, Ahmad b. Shu‘ayb</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Dulābī, Abū Bishr Muḥammad b. Muḥammad</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Khuzayma, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Ishāq</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Uqaylī, Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad b. ‘Amr</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Abī Ḥātim, ‘Abd al-Rāḥmān b. Muḥammad</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>Book 110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

when he mentions that ‘Ubayd Allāh b. ‘Umar, Mālik, Shu‘ba, and Sufyān al-Thawrī comprise the second *ṭabaqa*, that Ibn al-Mubārak, Yahyā l-Qātān, ‘Abd al-Rāḥmān b. Mahdī, and Ibn Wāḥib comprise the third *ṭabaqa*, and that al-Shāfi‘ī, Ibn Ḥanbal, Ibn al-Madīnī, and Ibn Ma‘īn are the four members of the fourth *ṭabaqa* according to Ibn al-Muṣāḏqal; *Tadhkira*, 1, 121, 204, and 266.

110 Presumably his famous work *al-jarḥ wa l-ta’dīl*. 
There are three aspects of this list that are of particular interest. The first is that al-Dhahabi, following a quotation of Ibn Ḥanbal, places the prominent Basran scholar Yahya b. Sa'id al-Qattān at the head of the list of hadith-transmitter critics. The second observation is that all but the first and last men on this list lived the greatest portions of their lives in the third/ninth and fourth/tenth centuries. Particularly conspicuous is the century and a half gap between al-Ḥakim al-Naysaburi and Ibn al-Jawzi and the nearly two century lacuna between Ibn al-Jawzi and al-Dhahabi. Finally, it is important to recognize that only six of these master critics lived prior to al-Bukhari, and ten of them flourished in the century following the compilation of what came to be known as the ‘six canonical’ Sunni hadith books. While the introduction to Mizan al-itidāl provides several clues as to the identities of the most important hadith scholars in the eyes of al-Dhahabi, it is clear that we must cast the net further in order to obtain a more complete grasp of the most distinguished scholars of this tradition.

1 As the Mizan is particularly concerned with blemished transmitters, this probably refers to his book of weak scholars, Kitāb al-majrāhin.

2 This probably refers to his large compilation of weak transmitters (da'afī') mentioned in al-Tadhkira, III, 117. Sezgin does not mention it in GAS, I, 199–200.

3 This almost certainly refers to his Kitāb al-da'afī' wa l-marrākin that al-Dhahabi abridged once and enlarged on two separate occasions; al-Hafiz al-Dhahabi, 398.

4 Yahya l-Qattān was fortunate to have studied closely with the great Basran scholar Shu'ba b. al-Ḥajjaj and even offered his home as a ‘safe house’ to Sufyān al-Thawrī during the latter’s period of hiding in Basra from the ‘Abbāsid caliphs around the year 160/777; see Ibn Sa'd, al-Ṭabaqat al-kubri, VI, 539. Yahya’s contribution to hadith-transmitter criticism is discussed in detail in chapter four.
Al-Mūqīza, despite its brevity and unevenness, provides several useful indications of al-Dhahabi’s favorite scholars. The most unambiguous statement on this topic is that “the sources of knowledge of the reliable transmitters (al-thiqāt) are al-Tārikh of al-Bukhārī, [al-]Jām’ wa l-ta’dīl of Ibn Abī Hātim, [Kiṭāb al-thiqāt] of Ibn Hibbān, and Tahdhīb al-kamāl [of al-Mizzī].”115 Al-Dhahabi also identifies three classes of critics: severe (hādd), fair (mu’tadil), and lenient (mutasāhul)—and names a select few transmitters to each of them. Yahyā b. Sa’īd al-Qaṭṭān, Ibn Ma’in, Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī, and Ibn Khirāsh116 are placed in the ‘severe’ category, Ibn Ḥanbal, al-Bukhārī, and Abū Zur‘a al-Rāzī are ‘fair,’ and al-Tirmidhī, al-Hākim al-Naysābūrī, and, on occasion, al-Dārāqūṭī, are considered ‘lenient.’117 These three gradations of severity are also found in Dhikr ma‘n yu’tamad qawluh fī l-jarḥ wa l-ta’dīl, although it is important to note that Ibn ‘Adī is included among the category of the ‘fair’ critics in this treatise.118 Note that all of the scholars mentioned in this paragraph, with the exceptions of al-Mizzī and Ibn Khirāsh, are also found in the list of critics presented in Mīzān al-‘ītīlāl and shed little light on the recently mentioned lacunae in the historical record of master critics.

The two skeletal lists discussed above in the introductory description of al-Mūqīza provide a nearly unbroken series of master hadith scholars (huffāz) of some prestige from the time of the Prophet Muḥammad to the eighth/fourteenth century.

Table 2.2: Master hadith scholars in al-Mūqīza

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Death Date</th>
<th>Tabaqa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abū Hurayra al-Dawsī</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa’īd b. al-Musayyab</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Zuhrī, Muḥammad Ibn Shibāb</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ubayd Allāh b. ‘Umar b. Hafs b. ‘Āṣim</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn ‘Awn, ‘Abdullāh b. Arqabān</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>3b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

116 Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Yūsuf al-Marwazī, then al-Baghdādī (d. 283/896) is identified as “the critic” (al-naqīd) in the Tadhkira (II, 185).
117 Al-Mūqīza, 83.
118 The strictest critics mentioned in this treatise are Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī, Ibn Ma’in, and Ibrāhīm b. Ya‘qūb al-Juzajānī; the lenient ones are al-Tirmidhī, al-Hākim al-Naysābūrī, and al-Bayhaqī; and the fair ones (al-mu‘ta’dīlun al-mutasāhūn) are al-Bukhārī, Ibn Ḥanbal, Abū Zur‘a al-Rāzī, and Ibn ‘Adī; al-Hāfiz al-Dhahābi, 396–7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Death</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Tabaqa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6  Mis'ar b. Kidām, ʿAbū Salama</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Shu'ba b. al-Hajjāj</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Zā'ida b. Qudāma, ʿAbū l-Ṣalt</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Sufyān b. Sa'īd al-Thawri</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 al-Layth b. Sa'īd</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>4b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Hammād b. Zayd</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>4b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mālik b. Anas</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Ibn al-Mubārak, ʿAbdullāh</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Ibn Wahb, ʿAbdullāh b. Wahb al-Fihrī</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>5b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Waki b. al-Jarrāḥ</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Yahyā b. Sa'īd al-Qattān</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Mahdī</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 ʿAbū Usāma, Hammād b. Usāma</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>5b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Yazīd b. Hārūn b. Zādḥān al-Wāsīf</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>5b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Yahyā b. Mārīn, ʿAbū Zakariyyā</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>6a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 ʿAbū Khaythama, Zuhayr b. Ḥarb</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>6b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 ʿAli b. ʿAbdullāh al-Madīnī</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>6a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Ibn Numayr, Muḥammad b. ʿAbdullāh</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>6b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Ibn Abī Shayba, Abū Bakr ʿAbdullāh b. Muḥammad</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>6b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Ibn Rāhawayh, ʿIsāq b. Ibrāhīm</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>6a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Ibn Ḥanbal, Ḥamīd b. Muḥammad</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>6a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 ʿAbd b. Ṣāliḥ al-Ṭabarī</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>6b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 al-Bukhārī, Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Muḥammad b. al-Hajjāj al-Naysābūrī</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Abū Zur'a al-ʾRāzī, ʿUbayd Allāh b. ʿAbd al-Karīm</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Ibn Wāra, Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-ʾRāzī</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 ʿAbbās b. Muḥammad al-Dūrī</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī, Sulaymān b. al-ʾAsh'ath</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Abū Ḥātim al-ʾRāzī, Muḥammad b. ldrīs</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Ibn Abī Khaythama, Abū Bakr Ḥamīd b. Zuhayr</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 al-ʾTirmikhī, Abū ʾIsā Muḥammad b. ʾIsā</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 ʿAbdullāh b. ʾAbd b. Ḥanbal</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Ṣāliḥ b. Muḥammad Jazara, Abū ʿAlī</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>8a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Abū ʾImrān, Mūsā b. Hārūn al-Bazzāz</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>8a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 al-ʾNasāʾī, ʾAbd b. Shu'ayb</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>8a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Ibn al-Akhram, Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. al-ʾAbbās</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>8b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Ibn Khuzayma, Muḥammad b. ʾIshāq</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>8a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Tabaqa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Sā'id, Abū Muḥammad Yāḥyā b. Muḥammad</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>8b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Jawṣa, Abū 1-Ḥasan Ahmad b. 'Umayr</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>8b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Ziyād, Abū Bakr 'Abdullāh b. Muḥammad</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>8b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn al-Sharqī, Abū Ḥāmid Ahmad b. Muḥammad</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn 'Adī, Abū Ahmad 'Abdullāh</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>9b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-ISMĀ'IL, Abū Bakr Ahmad b. Ibrāḥīm</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>9b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥākim, Abū Ahmad Muḥammad b. Muḥammad</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>9b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Munda, Abū 'Abdullāh Muḥammad b. Iḥsāq</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>10b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Ḥāzm al-ʿAbdawī, 'Umar b. Ahmad</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>11b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Barqānī, Abū Bakr Ahmad b. Muḥammad</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>11b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Bayhaqī, Abū Bakr Ahmad b. al-Ḥusayn</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>12b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Abū 'Umar Yūsuf</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>12b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥurnaydī, Abū 'Abdullāh Muḥammad b. Abī Naṣr</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>13b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Tāhir al-Maqdisī, Abū l-Faḍl Muḥammad</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>13b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Samʿānī, Abū Saʿd 'Abd al-Karīm b. Muḥammad</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>14b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Silāfī, Abū Tāhir Ahmad b. Muḥammad</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>14b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥāzmī, Abū Saʿd Muḥammad b. Mūsā</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ruhāwī, 'Abd al-Qādir b. 'Abdullāh al-Ḥanbalī</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḍiyā', Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Wāḥid</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>16b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Sayyid al-Nās, Muḥammad b. Ahmad</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>16b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū l-Faṭḥ, Muḥammad b. Muḥ. Ibn Sayyid al-Nās</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>17b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several observations can be gleaned from these seventeen *tabaqāt*. It is probably appropriate that Abū Hurayra, the *sahābi* whom Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ credits with the greatest aggregate of transmissions, and his son-in-law Saʿīd b. al-Musayyab, crown this list of illustrious hadīth scholars. The generations of al-Zuhrī and Shuʿba b. al-Ḥajjāj form the bridge from the senior *tābiʿīn* to the master critic Yāḥyā b. Saʿīd al-Qaṭṭān and his contemporaries (*tabaqā 5*). The third/ninth century makes another strong showing in this selection, and includes twenty-
six scholars from Ibn Ma'in (tabaqā 6) through Ibn al-Sharqī (tabaqā 9a). Five new scholars of the fifth/eleventh century appear in this list, two of whom hail from al-Andalus.\textsuperscript{119} There remains an irritating lacuna in the first half of the sixth century between Ibn Tāhir al-Maqdisī (d. 507/1113–4) and Abū Sa'd al-Sam'ānī al-Marwazi (d. 562/1167). Likewise, the gap between the Andalusī Ibn Sayyid al-Nās (d. 659/1261) and his grandson Abū l-Fath Muḥammad b. Muḥammad begs for an explanation. While the Mūqīţa has narrowed the historical abysses manifest in the list of master hadith-transmitter critics in Mīzān al-`īdāl, it is apparent that an investigation of the Tadhkīr al-hujjāz is necessary in order to gain a more complete understanding of al-Dhahabī’s favorite scholars in this field during the first seven centuries of Islamic civilization.

How do we sort the sublime hāfiz from the merely good hāfiz in Tadhkīr al-hujjāz? One technique would be to extract only the scholars who are of the highest grade of excellence according to the criteria articulated in al-Mūqīţa, namely those scholars evaluated as imām, ḥujja, ṣabiq, ḥābīd, or thiqā thiqā.\textsuperscript{120} Unfortunately, this approach does not reduce the number of entries to a manageable number, as it seems that roughly half of the men included in the Tadhkīra are classified as imāms.\textsuperscript{121} Fortunately, there is an undefined term of distinction employed by al-Dhahabī a mere fifty-four times in the Tadhkīra that occurs at least once in nineteen of the twenty-one `atabqā whose importance shall be made clear in the next few paragraphs: Shaykh al-Islām.\textsuperscript{122}

\textsuperscript{119} Ibn `Abd al-Barr (#54) and al-Ḥumaydī (#55).
\textsuperscript{120} Al-Mūqīţa, 75.
\textsuperscript{121} A sampling of `atabqā from the second half of the Tadhkīra yields the following imām percentages: tābaqa 11 is 44\% imāms; tābaqa 13 is 52\% imāms; tābaqa 15 is 60\% imāms; and tābaqa 17 is 71\% imāms. The total number of imāms in these four tābaqa is 112 out of 220 entries (51\%). This high yield is not surprising because it is in line with the Ibn Taymiyya salāfī articulation of transcendental Sunnism that seeks as diverse a group of scholarly role models as possible, in contrast to the narrow legal madḥahib approach of the mediocre masses of jurists. It should not be forgotten that the salāfī Sunnis did not have a monopoly on this universalistic spirit, for any intellectually oriented jurist would have to be well versed in the teachings of the imāms of the three Sunni madḥahib to which he did not belong. Note that al-Dhahabī does appear to be much more selective with the terms hujja, ṣabiq, thiqā, and especially ḥābīd.
\textsuperscript{122} The word ‘Shaykh’ is a term of respect and honor, usually reserved for elders in general, and master teachers in particular. The term in English reads something like ‘The Senior Islamic Scholar.’
The term Shaykh al-Islām has a rich history as an honorific for "the most admired of influential 'ulamā' in their milieus."\(^{123}\) It seems to have originated in Khurāsān towards the end of the fourth/tenth century and eventually became an actual office in the following century in the East. Bulliet observes that the term does not appear to have been strictly honorific in Syria and Egypt, and mentions the example of Ibn Taymiyya as someone who received this title from his admirers but not his detractors. The Shaykh al-Islām acquired an unequivocal bureaucratic status under the Ottoman Empire, as the muftī of the capital, as far back as the turn of the eighth/nineteenth century.\(^{124}\) Neither Bulliet's article, nor the modern biographies by Bashshār 'Awād Ma'rūf and 'Abd al-Sattār al-Shaykh even mention al-Dhahabī's usage of this term, and, since al-Dhahabī does not elucidate its meaning in either *Miṣān al-īḍāl* nor *Mağqīza*, a brief discussion about its significance is in order.

Al-Dhahabī employs a colorful array of honorifics in *Tadhkira al-ḥuffāz* that include either the word "Shaykh" or "Islam."\(^{125}\) The use of the former is far more common than that of the latter, and the majority of examples involving the term Shaykh are used in conjunction with either a geographical location or category of scholars. Abū ‘Amr al-Hirī (d. 317/929) is identified as the Shaykh of Nishapur,\(^{126}\) Ibn al-Jabbāb Aḥmad b. Khālid (d. 322/934) as the Shaykh of al-Andalus,\(^{127}\) Abū l-Qāsim al-Zanjānī (d. 471/1078-9) as the Shaykh of al-Haram al-Sharīf (Mecca),\(^{128}\) Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Fīryābī (d. 212/827) as the Shaykh of Syria,\(^{129}\) and al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066) as the Shaykh of all of Khurāsān.\(^{130}\) Among the masters of certain


\(^{125}\) The only occurrence of the expression 'shaykh' in the technical sense meaning "head of a religious school" is the case of the nineteenth-"tabaqā" scholar Ibn al-Sābūnī (d. 604/1207-8), who is identified as Shaykh Dār al-Nūriyya; *Tadhkira*, IV, 170.

\(^{126}\) *Tadhkira*, III, 15.

\(^{127}\) *Tadhkira*, III, 25.

\(^{128}\) *Tadhkira*, III, 243. The prominent student of the mystic al-Junayd, Ibn al-A'rābī (d. 340/951-2; *tabaqā 13*), is also identified as a Shaykh al-Ḥaram; *ibid.*, III, 47-8.

\(^{129}\) *Tadhkira*, I, 275. Another 'Shaykh of the people of Syria' of the same generation is Abu Mushir 'Abd al-Alā' b. Mushīr (d. 218/833) who fell victim to the miḥną; *ibid.*, I, 279.

\(^{130}\) *Tadhkira*, III, 219. An earlier 'Shaykh of Khurāsān' is al-Bukhārī's teacher
classes of scholars, we find Muḥammad b. Dāwūd (d. 342/953) as the Shaykh of the Sufis, Ibn al-Husayn (d. 619/1222) as the Shaykh of the Qurʾān reciters (al-qurrāʾ), and al-Dimyāṭī (d. 705/1306) as the Shaykh of the ḥadīth scholars (muḥaddithūn). Two special cases are Ibn al-Zubayr (d. 708/1308-9), who is the Shaykh of both the ḥadīth scholars and Qurʾān reciters in al-Andalus, and al-Barqānī (d. 425/1034), Shaykh of the jurists (fuqahāʾ), ḥadīth scholars, and all of Baghdad.

Three other types of compound honorifics employing the word Shaykh can be found in Tadhkirat al-bzif/ii. The first of these is one that acknowledges a scholar's accomplishments in a particular art or skill outside of the core disciplines of Qurʾān recitation, ḥadīth transmission, and jurisprudence, as can be seen in the cases of the Shaykh of belle-lettres (adab), Ibn al-Anbārī (d. 328/940), and the Shaykh of Melkite theology (iʿtisāl), al-Samman (d. 445/1053). Secondly, al-Diyāʾ Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Walīd al-Maqdisī (d. 643/1245) is identified as ‘Shaykh al-Sunna,’ which probably indicates a mastery of Sunnī ḥadīth or theology. The final compound honorific of interest is that of a temporal nature, and two examples of this type found in Tadhkirat al-bzif/ii are the “Shaykh of the time (al-waqt)” Abu Bakr Makki b. Ibrāhīm (d. 215/830) who returned to Balkh after a decade in Mecca; ibid., I, 268. Note also Ibn Rāhawayh’s sobriquet ‘Shaykh of the people of the East’; ibid., II, 17.

Tadhkira, III, 212. The case of al-Samman is particularly interesting, not just because he is a Muʿtazilī who was gifted with proficiency in the arts of ḥadīth transmission, but because al-Dhahabi “denigrates” him from the rank of Shaykh al-Islām. This denigration was probably due to the fact that al-Dhahabi could not accept any champion of speculative theology (kalām), whether Muʿtazilī or Ashʿarī, among the most elite master scholars of Islamic civilization.

Tadhkira, IV, 133. Another case of ‘Shaykh al-Sunna” is the Kufan Warqa’ b. ‘Umar (d. around 160/777) who settled in al-Madāʾin; ibid., I, 169. Compound honorifics with the word Sunna are extremely rare in the Tadhkira, other examples are the ‘Sign of the Sunna’ (al-ṣign al-sunna) Abū Naṣr al-Siyāzī (d. 444/1052-3), and the ‘Reviver of the Sunna’ (muhīyat i-sunna) Abū Muḥammad al-Baghawi (d. 516/1122); ibid., III, 211 and IV, 37.
al-Firyabî (d. 301/913) and the Egyptian "Shaykh of his era" (‘asribh), Ibn Haddâd (d. 344/956).

Al-Dhahabî appears to be extremely conservative in his use of compound honorifics with the word ‘Islam’ in Tadhkira al-kuffâz. Abû ‘Alî al-‘Hasayn b. ‘Alî al-Naysabûrî (d. 349/960) and ‘Abd al-Ghanî b. ‘Abd al-Wâhid al-Maqdisî (d. 600/1204) are the only two post-canonical master hadîth scholars to be praised with the expression Muḥâddith al-Islâm. One of the only other example of a glorification based on the word “Islam,” other than Shaykh al-Islâm, is reserved for the “Crown of Islam” (taq al-Islâm) Abu Sa’d al-Sam’ânî (d. 562/1167), whose encyclopedia al-Anṣâr proved to be invaluable in al-Dhahabi’s own historical investigations.

This brief analysis of the terms ‘Shaykh’ and ‘Islam’ demonstrates how al-Dhahabî restricted the fairly broad former expression with the latter one in his compound honorific ‘Shaykh al-Islâm,’ but it sheds little light on his criteria for inclusion in this elite coterie of scholars. A closer look at the fifty-four members of this group reveals four primary qualities that appear to be at work in al-Dhahabi’s discerning mind. The first quality is that all of these men are qualified as Imâm in addition to Shaykh al-Islâm, while this is not always the case among other scholars who are identified as Shaykh. The second trait, which might be related to the first, is the overt rejection of all forms of speculative theology (kalâm), whether of a Mu‘tazîlî or state-sanctioned Ash‘arî variety. The third characteristic is a degree of exceptional erudition in at least two of the following four disciplines: Qur’anic readings, general hadîth criticism (‘ilal), hadîth-transmitter criticism (al-jarb wa l-ta’dîl), and jurisprudence. The
fourth and final quality is a serious degree of asceticism and even "moderate Şufi"m of the types associated with Ibn al-Mubārak (d. 181/797) and 'Amīyya b. Sa'īd al-Andalusi (d. 408/1017-8 in Mecca), respectively. The following chart of al-Dhahabi's fifty-four Shuyūkh al-İslām found in Tadhkira al-huffāz brings us one step closer to the goal of our quest for a historical framework of the first seven centuries of Sunnī hadīth scholarship.¹¹¹

Table 2.3: Shuyūkh al-İslām in Tadhkira al-huffāz

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Death Date</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Tabqa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyab</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 al-Ḥasan b. Abī l-Ḥasan al-Basrī</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Muhammad b. al-Munkadir</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Yahyā b. Sa‘īd al-ʾAnṣārī</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Sulaymān al-Taymī</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 al-ʾA’mash, Sulaymān b. Mihrān</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 al-Awzāʿī, ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ʿAmr</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Shu’ba b. al-Ḥajjāj</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Sufyān b. Sa‘īd al-Thawrī</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Ḥarmād b. Salama</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Mālik b. Anas</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹¹¹ Note that al-Dhahabi is not consistent with his employment of the term Shaykh al-İslām in Tadhkira al-huffāz, Siyar al-ʾālim al-nubalāʾ, and Tarikh al-İslām. For example, of the first 49 Shuyūkh al-İslām listed in the Tadhkira, the following 17 men do not receive this sobriquet in their respective entries in Siyar al-ʾālim al-nubalāʾ: Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyab, al-Ḥasan al-Basrī, Yahyā b. Sa‘īd al-ʾAnṣārī, Shu’ba b. al-Ḥajjāj, Abu ʾIsḥāq al-Fāzārī, al-Husayn al-Ju’fī, Abū ʾĀsim, al-Muqrī, al-Ṣūrī, Hishām b. ʾAmrīnī, al-ʾAshājī, al-Dārimī, al-Bukhārī (?), Ibn Abī Ḥātim, ‘Arba’īya b. Sa‘īd, al-Đāni, and Abū Mūsā al- Ḍālinī. We shall see also in chapter five that certain scholars are identified as Shaykh al-İslām in the Siyar but not in the Tadhkira. Finally, al-Dhahabi is extremely conservative with his use of the expression Shaykh al-İslām in Tarikh al-İslām, as only Sufyān al-Thawrī, Mālik b. Anas, Ibn al-Mubārak, al-Fudayl b. ʿIyād, Ibn ʿUyayna, ʿAbdullāh al-ʾAnṣārī, and al-Nawawī receive this designation among the 54 Shuyūkh al-İslām found in the Tadhkira. Despite al-Dhahabi’s inconsistent application of this sobriquet, it does appear that he reserves it for the very best and most pious hadīth scholars, and it is thus a useful signifier for his favorite experts of this discipline.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Τabaqa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 'Abdullah b. al-Mubarak</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Khurasan,</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Abū Ishâq al-Fazârî</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 al-Fuqâyî b. Ḥyâd</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Abū Bakr b. 'Ayyâsh</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Sufyân b. 'Uiyâna</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Yazîd b. Hârûn</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>Wâsiṭ</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 al-Husayn b. 'Ali al-Ju'fî al-Muqrî</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Abū 'Aṣîm al-Ḍâhhâk b. Makhlaḍ</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 al-Muqrî, Abū 'Abd al-Rahmân</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>Basra, Mecca</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 al-Ṣârî, Muḥammad b. al-Mubârak</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 al-Qa'na'bî, 'Abdullah b. Maslama</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>Basra, Mecca</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Ibn Hanbal, Ahmad b. Muḥammad</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Hishâm b. 'Amâmar</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 al-Asbajjî, Abû Sa'îd 'Abdullah</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 al-Dârimî, 'Abdullah b. 'Abd al-Rahmân</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>Samarqand</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 al-Bukhârî, Muḥammad b. Ismâ'îl</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>Bukhara</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 al-Dhuhîlî, Muḥammad b. Yahyâ</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>Nishapur</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Ismâ'îl al-Qâdi', Abû Ishâq</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 al-Ḥarîrî, Abû Ishâq Ibrâhîm b. Ishaq</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Baqîyy b. Makhlaḍ al-Qurrûbi</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>Andalusia</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Muḥammad b. Naṣr al-Marwaḍî</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>Samarqand</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 al-Nasâ'î, Ahmad b. Shu'ayb</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>Syria, Egypt</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Ibn Khuzayma, Muḥammad b. Ishaq</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>Nishapur</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Ibn Suraqî, al-Qâdi Abû l-'Abbâs</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Ibn Abî Ḥattîm, 'Abd al-Rahmân</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>Rayy</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Abû l-Nâdjî al-Ṭūsî, Muḥammad</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>Ṭûs</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 al-Ismâ'îlî, Abû Bakr Ahmad</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>Jurfân</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Ibn Mihrân, Abû Muslim</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 al-Dîrâqumî, 'Alî b. 'Umar</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 'Aṭîyya b. Sa'îd al-Ṣufî</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>Andalusia,</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 al-Dânî, 'Uthmân b. Sa'îd</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>Cordoba</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, Abû 'Umar</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>Andalusia</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Abû Ismâ'îl 'Abdullah al-Anṣârî</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>Herat</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 al-Taymî, Abû l-Qâsim Ismâ'îl</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>Isfahan</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Abû l-'Alî al-Hamadhâhî</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>Hamadhan</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 al-Silâfî, Abû Ṭahîr Ahmad</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>Isfahan, 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most important qualities of this elite group of master Sunnī scholars are its near-continuous nature and the geographical diversity of its members. Only two of the twenty post-ṣaḥīḥa ʿtabaqāt are absolutely bereft of at least one Shaykh al-Īslām (ʿtabaqāt 17 and 19), and none has more than six (ʿtabaqā 6). The proximity of these two defective ʿtabaqāt, the first on the eve of the Mongol irruption, and the second in the generation after the infamous sack of Baghdad (656/1258) not only suggests the massive damage of these Central Asian conquerors upon Sunnī ḥadīth erudition, but indicates a radical disjunction in the rich six century, sixteen ʿtabaqāt, far-flung global network of Muslim scholars. The master ḥadīth scholars of this network were limited to the Ḥijaz and Iraq for the first four ʿtabaqāt, and flourished in Syria from the fifth to the tenth ʿtabaqāt. Baghdad enjoyed the presence of a Shaykh al-Īslām in each of the eighth through twelfth ʿtabaqāt (except 10), but appears to have declined after the lives of Ibn Mihrān and al-Dāraquṭnī. The ninth ʿtabaqā vividly illustrates the dramatic rise in the quality of the scholars in the Eastern Iranian lands and Transoxania, a situation that persisted through ʿAbdullāh al-Anṣārī in Herat (ʿtabaqā 15). The coterie of elite Sunnī scholars first achieved its global status in the tenth ʿtabaqā, when Baqīyy b. Makhład established a standard of erudition in al-Andalus that reached its apogee with the extraordinary scholars of Ibn ʿΑbd al-Barr and Abū ʿΑmr al-Dānī in the fourteenth ʿtabaqā, as illustrated by their presence in each of the eleventh through fourteenth ʿtabaqāt.

---

145 It is interesting that the five Shuyūkh al-Īslām who lived in Syria prior to the Mongols flourished under ʿAbbāsid, and not Umayyad, rule.
and continued to produce first rate scholars down to al-Dhahabi's time. Finally, the investment of the Seljuqs in Western Iran in general, and Isfahan in particular, is evidenced by the monopoly of this region among the Shuyukh al-Islam of the fifteenth and sixteenth tabaqat.147

II.4 Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to construct both conceptual and historical frameworks for the inquiry into the development of Sunni hadith scholarship during its first seven centuries of creative compilation. Ibn al-Salah's Muqaddima furnished the necessary conceptual framework by means of an array of technical terms, several of which had been established since the third and fourth centuries of Islamic civilization, and demonstrated the centrality of imad criticism (‘ilm al-najj) to the hadith disciplines. Al-Dhahabi’s lists and books provided a skeletal outline of the historical development of Sunni hadith scholarship that stretched across the Dar al-Islam from Cordoba to Samarqand. Since the major lacunae that we encountered prior to and after Ibn al-Jawzī in the initial list of hadith-transmitter critics found in Mizan al-ītīdāl were narrowed far enough by our investigations into al-Muqiza and Tadhkirat al-huffaz, it is now possible to articulate a seven-phase periodization of the first seven centuries of Sunni hadith scholarship, which will help illuminate the relationship of the generation of Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'in and Ibn Ḥanbal to the greater story of this literature.148

146 Al-Dhahabi remarks at the end of al-Muin that the only places that still host strong Sunni hadith scholars in his day are Syria, Egypt, the Maghrib, and al-Andalus; al-Muin, 232.
147 These findings are explored in far richer detail in the next chapter.
148 Note that al-Dhahabi includes all of the previously cited men in Mizan al-ītīdāl and al-Muqiza in Tadhkirat al-huffaz, and that, when these two lists are juxtaposed with the Shaykh al-Islam list, there is at least one master scholar for each of the twenty-one tabaqāt in the Tadhkira.
CHAPTER THREE

A HISTORICAL NARRATIVE: AL-DHAHABI’S VISION OF THE FIRST SEVEN CENTURIES OF SUNNI HADITH SCHOLARSHIP

III.1

How might a Sunni scholar in Mamlûk Syria articulate the evolution of the hadith literature from the time of the Prophet Muhammad to his own milieu? The twenty-one tabaqât structure of al-Dhahabi’s Tadhkimat al-huffaz answers this very question, as it describes the historical process of hadith scholarship by carving a manageable number of ‘generations’ out of a seven hundred year period across a vast geographical area. It is necessary, however, prior to the presentation of this condensed articulation of al-Dhahabi’s historical vision in seven phases, to clarify how this narrative contributes to the general understanding of the key role of hadith scholars in the emergence of Sunni Islam in the third/ninth century.

The first reason for this excursus is that I have chosen to study the emergence of Sunnism from the angle of several early books that fall under the rubric of hadith literature. It has been demonstrated in the introduction of this book that Western scholarship has been concerned overwhelmingly with the question of authenticity of hadiths and shown little or no interest in its historical development.¹ This chapter seeks to elucidate how the generation of Ibn Sa‘d, Ibn Ma‘in, and Ibn Hanbal fits into the broader tradition of Sunni hadith scholarship that crystallized only during al-Dhahabi’s lifetime, in part due to his own scholarship.

A second major reason for this historical journey is that I believe that it is necessary to understand one master hadith scholar’s vision prior to the formulation of ‘theories’ concerning the literature in

¹ Even the useful overview Hadith Literature: Its Origin, Development, and Special Features by Muhammad Zubayr Siddiqi sheds relatively little light on the on the historical development of Sunni hadith scholarship, although it does identify most of the important published works of this literature.
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There is a dangerous habit, as was indicated in the introduction, for Western scholars to read small clippings of a very wide range of large tomes without ever studying one author’s book in its entirety. It is somewhat striking that an accessible, modest length book like Tadhkirat al-huffáz, which has been published for at least a century, has never been analyzed as a composite whole, or read as al-Dhahabi’s critical understanding of his own intellectual genealogy. This chapter, then, is an effort to grasp one insightful Muslim scholar’s historical vision of hadith scholarship in the hopes that it will illuminate the impact of the intense third/ninth century activity in hadith compilation and criticism upon the subsequent centuries of Islamic civilization, as well as provide a solid reference point from which researchers can, in the future, develop their own theories concerning the development of this rich tradition.

III.2 Phase 1: Origins of hadith (c. 1–140/622–757)

The founders of Sunni hadith literature are located among the generation of the authoritative sahiba and the three tabaqát of tabi’ün. The sahiba and their roles in hadith transmission are discussed in great detail in chapters six and eight of this book, and so it is sufficient to recall here that al-Dhahabi singles out Abū Hurayra in al-Maqiṣa and only twenty-three people in Tadhkirat al-huffáz for special attention. He also appears to have whole-heartedly embraced Ibn Hibban’s tripartite division of the tabi’ün, and is not particularly concerned with them in the Tadhkira.2 Abū Hurayra’s son-in-law,

2 The second tabaqa has only 42 entries, the third tabaqa consists of merely 30 men, and the fourth tabaqa has 58. Despite these small numbers, a remarkably high percentage of these transmitters contributed material to all of the ‘six Sunni hadith books’ according to al-Dhahabi. Examples of these indispensable men from the second tabaqa include the Kufans ‘Alqama b. Qays, Masriiq b. al-Ajda’, ‘Abdīda b. ‘Amr al-Aswad b. Yazīd, Suwayd b. Ghafala, Zīr b. Ḥubaysh, ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Abī Laylā (father of the famous judge Ibn Abī Laylā), Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Sulami, and Abū Wā’il; the Syrians Umm al-Dardā’, Abū Idris al-Khawlānī, and Qābīa b. Ḥuwayb (originally from Medina); the Basrans Abū l-‘Alīya l-Riyāfī, Abū ‘Uthmān al-Nahdi, and Abū Rājā al-‘Uṭāridī; and the Medinans ‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr, Abū Salama b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān, and Abū Bakr b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Hārīrī; Tadhkira, 1, 39–54. All thirty men of the fourth tabaqa passed on hadith that were included in each of the ‘six books’. Examples of master scholars from this generation include Abū l-Sha’thā and Abū Qilāba of Basra; Ibrāhīm al-Nakha‘ī, Sa‘īd b. Jābiyar, and al-Sha’bī of Kufa; ‘All b. al-Ḥusayn Zayn al-‘Abidīn, ‘Ubayd
Sa'id b. al-Musayyab, of Medina, and al-Hasan al-Baṣrī are elevated among the masses of ḥāibīn listed over two pages of the Tadhkira at the end of the third tabaqā. These first three tabaqāt of scholars lived under the expansionist Umayyad rulers whom al-Dhahabi describes very favorably, although he does criticize the oppressive regime of al-Hajjāj (ruled 75-95/694-714) in Iraq.

The members of the fourth tabaqā in Tadkhira al-ḥuffāẓ were the final generation of scholars to have witnessed or studied with the ḥāib. Most of them lived through the 'Abbasid revolution, and, as al-Dhahabi reminds us, the dawn of innovative religious ideas regarding free will and the nature of God. Two of the four Shuyukh al-Islām of this tabaqā, the ascetic Muḥammad b. al-Munkadir (d. 130/747-B) and the qādī Ṣa'īd al-Anṣārī (d. 143/760), flourished in Medina, which also happened to be the educational center for the Umayyad court scholar Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhri (d. 124/742). These


Tadkhira, I, 79-81. The relatively limited roles of Sa'id b. al-Musayyab and al-Hasan al-Baṣrī in hadith scholarship is discussed below in chapter eight; their brief entries can be found in the Tadkhira, I, 44 and 57.

Tadkhira, I, 56. It is remarkable that no mention is made of either the first or second ḥāib in this sketch; rather, the conquests under al-Walid, as well as 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz's retreat from Constantinople, are praised. The importance of the first ḥāib is discussed below in chapter VI.2.

Al-Dhahabi explicitly mentions the following five 'innovators': the two founders of the Mu'tazila, 'Amr b. 'Ubayd (d. 144/761) and Wiwilī b. 'Aṣim (d. 131/748), who were former students of al-Ṯānain al-Baṣrī, Jahm b. Sa'fwan (d. 128/746), ‘Abd al-Malik b. Sulaymān (d. 150/767), the famous Qur'ānic exegete from Balkh who was accused of anthropomorphism; Tadkhira, I, 119-20.

Yaḥyā l-Anṣārī is counted by Ṣufyān al-Thawrī as one of the 'four ḥuffāẓ of his generation; Tadkhira, I, 104 (the other three ḥuffāẓ are Ismā'īl b. Abī Khālid, 'Aṣim al-Ajlūwāl, and 'Abd al-Malik b. Abī Sulaymān; ibid., I, 113). His teachers include the saḥābin Ṣa'id b. al-Musayyab, and al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad, while his pupils include Shu'ba, Malik, Ibn al-Mubārak, and Yaḥyā l-Qatān.

Tadkhira, I, 95 (Muḥammad b. al-Munkadir) and 83 (al-Zuhri). Al-Zuhri was brought to the capital in Syria by 'Abd al-Malik and served the royal family in various capacities until his death during the reign of Hishām; see Michael Lecker, "Biographical Notes on Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhri," Journal of Semitic Studies 41 (1996), 21-63. Al-Dhahabi reports that al-Zuhri's four majors sources (ḥudūr) were 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr, Sa'id b. al-Musayyab, Abū Salama b. 'Abd al-Rahmān, and 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Abdullāh b. 'Utbā, Tadkhira, I, 51. See below, chapter eight, for more details about these men who are usually counted among the 'seven jurists of Medina.

It is intriguing that al-Dhahabi does not consider al-Zuhri a Shaykh al-Islām.
former two scholars studied with *ṣaḥāba* such as Abū Hurayra, Anas b. Mālik, and Ibn ‘Abbās, and their students include several of the Shuyūkh al-Īslām of the fifth *ṭabaqa*, such as Shu‘ba, Sufyān al-Thawrī, and Mālik b. Anas. Al-Zuhḥī studied with the *ṣaḥāba* who were young during the lifetime of the Prophet, such as Ibn ‘Umar and Anas, and senior *tābi‘ūn* like Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyab. His students include major scholars of the fifth *ṭabaqa*, like al-Awzā‘ī, al-Layth b. Sa‘īd, and Mālik, as well as the sixth *ṭabaqa* ḥadīth master Sufyān b. Uyayna. 8

The other major center of religious knowledge at this time, Iraq, enjoyed the erudition of the famous Qurʾān reciter and *ḥadīth* transmitter, al-A’mash (d. 148/765), in Kufa, and the *ḥadīth* scholars Sulaymān al-Taymī (d. 143/760) and Ibn ‘Awn (d. 151/768) in Basra. Al-A’mash saw Anas b. Mālik and heard *ḥadīth* from the last living *ṣaḥābi* in Kufa, Ibn Abī Awfā (d. 86/705), in addition to important Kufan *tābi‘ūn*, such as Ibn ‘Umar and Anas, and senior *tābi‘īn* like Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyab. His students include major scholars of the fifth *ṭabaqa*, like al-Awzā‘ī, al-Layth b. Sa‘īd, and 1 turbulent Kufan scholars of the sixth *ṭabaqa*, like Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna, as well as the master Kufan scholars of *ḥadīth* like Wāqī b. al-Jarrāḥ and Abū Nu‘aym al-Faḍl b. Dukayn. 9 Sulaymān al-Taymī also studied with the long-lived Anas b. Mālik, as well as the Shaykh al-Īslām al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, and his students include Shu‘ba, the two Sufyāns, the two

8 Abū Dāwūd puts the number of reports transmitted by al-Zuhrī at 2200, half of which were *ḥadīth* *Tadkhira*, I, 83. Al-Dhahabī quotes Ibn Ḥanbal’s opinion that the Zuhrī material transmitted by the Syrian Shu‘ayb b. Abī Hamza (d. 163/779-80) was superior to that of his two contemporaries ‘Uqayl b. Khālid (d. 144/761) and Yūnus b. Yazīd al-Ayš (d. 152/769); *Tadkhira*, I, 162-3 (Shu‘ayb), 121 (‘Uqayl), and 122 (Yūnus). He adds that Shu‘ayb wrote down al-Zuhrī’s dictations (*imāla*) in an elegant script for the caliph Hisām b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, al-Bukhārī acquired some 200 Zuhrī *ḥadīth* from Shu‘ayb’s pupil Abū l-Yamān al-Ḥakam b. Nāfi’ (d. 221/836) in Hims. Sezgin, *Bukhārī’nin Kaynakları* (Istanbul: İbrahim Horoz Basımevi, 1936), 241-50. For the al-Dhahabī’s opinion of Abū l-Yamān, see *Tadkhira*, I, 301 (*ṭabaqa* 7).

9 *Tadkhira*, I, 116 (al-A’mash); 113 (Sulaymān al-Taymī), 117 (Ibn ‘Awn). Two other major scholars of this *ṭabaqa* who lived in neither Medina nor Iraq are ‘Amr b. Dinār of Mecca and Yāḥyā b. Abī Kathīr of Yamāma; *ibid.*, I, 85 and 96, respectively. Special mention must also be made of the prolific Medinan Hisām b. ‘Urwa who settled late in life in Baghdad and whom Ibn Ma‘tūn declared equal in status with al-Zuhrī; *ibid.*, I, 108-9.

10 *Tadkhira*, I, 48 (Abū Wā’il), 46 (Zirr), 59 (Ibn Ḥanbal).

11 Al-Madīnī puts the number of al-A’mash’s *ḥadīth* at 1300; *Tadkhira*, I, 116. For Wāqī, see *ibid.*, II, 223; for Abū Nu‘aym, see *ibid.*, II, 273. Other major Kufan scholars of the fourth *ṭabaqa* of *Tadkhira* al-ḥifẓ are Abū Ishāq al-Sabī‘ī, the ‘Shaykh al-Kufa’ al-Ḥakam b. ‘Uṭayba, and Manṣūr b. al-Mu’tamīr; *ibid.*, I, 86-7, 88-9, and 107.
Ibn al-Mubārak and the master hadīth scholar of Wasit, Yazīd b. Hārūn. Ibn ‘Awn’s status as a tābi‘ī is somewhat tenuous, as al-Dhahabi does not list any saḥāba among his teachers; he did, however, study with preeminent tābi‘un of Iraq, such as Abū Wā’il, Ibrāhīm al-Nakha‘ī, and al-Shā‘bī, as well as the famous Meccan pupil of Ibn ʿAbbās, Mughīth b. Jabr.12 His pupils include Yazīd b. Hārūn and Shu‘ba, the latter of whom claimed “I never saw anyone equal to Ayyūb [al-Sakhtiyānī], Ibn ‘Awn, and Yūnus [b. ‘Ubayd].”13

One final transformation that occurred at the end of Phase I during this fourth tabaqah and is articulated by al-Dhahabi is the transfer of knowledge from memory to books. He says: “Prior to this time, the knowledge of the saḥāba and tābi‘un was in the hearts, as they were storehouses of knowledge for them (May Allah be pleased with them).”14 The impact of this transformation was felt almost immediately in the disciplines of hadīth compilation and can be seen to have ushered in a new era in our periodization of its history.

III.3 Phase 2: Early Compilation and Criticism
(c. 140–200/757–815)

The second phase of the history of hadīth scholarship enjoys the highest number of Shuyūkh al-Islām in Tadhkirat al-ḥuffaz, as well as some of the most important Qur’ān reciters, jurists, and historians (akhbārs). Three of the five Shuyūkh al-Islām of the fifth tabaqah—al-Awzā‘ī, Sufyān al-Thawrī, and Mālik b. Anas—inspired schools of Islamic law (madhāhib), and the latter’s famous text, al-Muwatta, continues to

12 Tadhkira, I, 71 (Mughīth).
13 Tadhkira, I, 117–8. These latter two scholars were pupils of al-Ḥasan al-ʿAṣrī and Muḥammad b. Sīrīn. Al-Dhahabi evaluates Ayyūb b. Abī Tamīma al-Sakhtiyānī as Imām and Yūnus b. ‘Ubayd al-ʿAbdī as Imām, ibid., I, 96 and 109. “Abī b. al-Madhinī estimates the number of hadīth transmitted by Ayyūb at 800; ibid., I, 96. Another significant Basran ḥafiz of the fourth tabaqah is Qatāda b. Di‘āmā; ibid., I, 92–3.
14 wa innamā kāna qaḍā ḥaštqa ḫalīla ‘ilmu l-saḥābah wa l-tābi‘īn fī l-sudūrī fī l-hadhra kānat ḫaṣṣāṣa l-ilmu l-ḥamn, radda ‘Allahu ‘anhum; Tadhkira, I, 120. The survival of Muqatil b. Sulaymān’s tafsīr and the Sira of Ibn ʿĀshā seem to support al-Dhahabi’s assertion. See also al-Tirmidhī’s observation that the earliest compilations (tasrif) were by the students of the scholars of this phase, such as Ḥishām b. Ḥassān (d. 148/765), Ibn Īrānī, Sa‘īd b. Abī ‘Arūba, Mālik, Ḥāmīdī b. Sāmīma, Ibn al-Mubārak, Yahyā b. Abī Ẓā‘īda, Wāsī and Ibn Mahdī; al-Tirmidhī, at-‘Imrāt, al-Sakht wa kawā Sunan al-Tirmidhī, V (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī, no date), 738.
be venerated by Sunni scholars of all schools of law to this day. The remaining two Shuyukh al-Islam, Shu'ba and Ḥammād b. Salama, cemented Basra's reputation as a major hadith center and transmitted thousands of hadith that can be found in all of the major Sunni collections. Egypt's first significant hadith scholar, al-Layth b. Sa'd (d. 175/791), flourished at this time, as did the master of analogical reasoning and eponym of a madhhab, Abū Ḥanīfa (d. 150/767), in Kufa. This generation coincided with the early florescence of the 'Abbāsid caliphate, although the new capital Baghdad did not have a dominant role in the venture of hadith transmission until the next third phase.

Al-Awza'ī's books appear to be lost, although many of his opinions can be found in al-'Imrān of al-Shafi'i and several of his epistles are preserved in the Taqdima of Ibn Abī Hātim. A recent study of al-Awza'ī's legal opinions is Anke Bouzenita, 'Abderrahman al-Juzā'ī: ein Rechtsgelehrter des 2. Jahrhunderts d. H. und sein Beitrag zu den Syrer (Berlin, 2001). Ibn al-Nadīm mentions several books of Sufyān al-Thawrī, none of which is extant; Kitāb al-fihrist li-l-Nadīm, ed. Reza Tajadod (Tehran, n.d.), 281. Al-'Tirmidhī includes many of al-Thawrī's legal opinions in his canonical ḥamāmi, and he identifies his source for this material as Muhammad b. 'Uthmān al-Kūfī (d. 236/850), who was a bookbinder (warraq) for al-Thawrī's pupil 'Ubayd Allāh b. Musa (d. 213/828): al-Ḥamāmi, V, 736. (For muhammad b. 'Uthmān, also known as Ibn Kārānu, see al-Dhahabī, Siyar, XII, 296–8; for 'Ubayd Allāh, see Tadhkira, I, 259.) Other important sources for al-Thawrī's legal opinions and transmitted materials include the Muṣannaf of 'Abd al-Razzāq (see Motzki, The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence, 58–62) and Ibn Abī Shayba, as well as the ikhālāf al-fuqāqā' works of Ibn al-Mundhir and al-Taḥāwī (abridged by al-Jassās). Murāniyyī mentions that al-Thawrī's al-jamin al-kabīr made it to al-Andalus via 'Aī b. Ziyād (d. 183/799) and Shu'ba b. Ṣa'īd al-Ma'āfīrī of Qayrawān; Murānī, Beitrag zur Geschichte der Hadīth- und Rechtsgelehrsamkeit der Mālikiyya in Nordafrika bis zum 5. Jh. D. H., (Wiesbaden, 1997), 9–10 and 66–7. Yasin Dutton has published a useful study of the Muṣannaf called The Origins of Islamic Law (Richmond, Surrey, 1999); see pp. 22–24 of his book for a description of nine recensions of this text.

↑ For more on Shu'ba, see below chapter IV.4.2. Ḥammād b. Salama, as I mentioned earlier, is credited by al-Dhahabī (along with Sa'īd b. Abī 'Arūba), with composing the first "categorical compilations" (taṣnīf), none of which appear to have survived; Tadhkira, I, 151. Several other critically important Basran hadith scholars of this tāḥāwa are Ḥishām al-Dastavāhī, Sa'īd b. Abī 'Arūba, Ma'mar b. Rāshīd, Ḥammād b. Sa'd, and Wuhayb b. Khālid; ibid., I, 124, 133–4, 143, 167–8, and 172–3. Major Kūfān of the fifth tāḥāwa in addition to Sufyān al-Thawrī include Miṣ'ar b. Kādīm, Zā'īda b. Qūdāma, al-Ḥasan b. Sāliḥ, Shariq b. 'Abdullāh, and Zuhār b. Mu'āwīya; ibid., I, 141–2, 158, 159, 170, 171.

↑ Tadhkira, I, 165 (al-Layth), 126 (Abū Ḥanīfa). Al-Dhahabī identifies one of al-Layth's teachers, Abū Raja' Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb (d. 128/746), as the first scholar to bring religious knowledge of a legal nature (al-'ilm wa l-māsid 'ilā l-halāl wa l-harām) to Egypt, which in turn replaced the earlier hadith that were limited to exhortations to piety (targhib) and apocalyptic calamities at the end of time (al-mahālim wa flavon); Tadhkira, I, 97. Yazīd studied with several master scholars of the Hijāz, such as Sa'īd b. Abī Hind, 'Ikrīm, Nāfi', and 'Asa b. Abī Rabīh; Siyar, VI, 10.
Al-Dhahabi reminds us in Tadhkira al-huffaz that the middle tabaqah of this phase includes scholars who witnessed the destructive Amīn-Ma’mūn civil war (the fourth fitna), as well as the phenomenal rise of speculative theology (kalām), and the Arabization of Greek philosophy.\(^{16}\) Despite the rapid spread of the 'cancer' of speculation, more Shuyukh al-Islām are identified in this tabaqah than in any other. Mecca was graced with the towering figures of Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna (d. 198/813) and al-Fuqayl b. ‘Ilīya (d. 187/803) from Khurasan.\(^{19}\) The master Qur’ān reciter and hadith-transmitter Abū Bakr b. ‘Ayāsh (d. 193/809) taught in Kūfa, and Yazīd b. Ḥārūn (d. 206/821) transmitted large amounts of hadith in nearby Waṣīt.\(^{20}\) The remaining two Shuyūkh al-Islām, Abū Īsāq al-Fazārī (d. 185/801) and Ibn al-Mubāraḵ (d. 181/797), settled in the frontier city of Maṣṣūṣa, where they set the tone for hadith-transmitter criticism and asceticism.\(^{21}\)

16 Tadhkira, I, 240. For a new introduction to the history of the translation movement that translated nearly the entire classical Greek corpus from Syriac into Arabic from the time of the caliph al-Manṣūr until the fourth/tenth century, see Dimitri Gutas, Greek Thought, Arabic Culture (New York, Routledge, 1998). It is somewhat puzzling as to why al-Dhahābī discusses the infamous muḥma in this historical sketch, since most of the scholars who were tried are located in the eighth tabaqu. Perhaps he is doing so with the hopes of indicating the perilous outcome of the study of speculative theology?

19 Tadhkira, I, 193 (Ibn ‘Uyayna), 180 (al-Fudayl). The long-lived Ibn ‘Uyayn was of Kūfan origins, but lived almost his entire life in Mecca. He was one of al-Zuhri’s youngest pupils, and shared ḥadīth with several of his teachers, such as al-A’mash and Shu’bā. His pupils include Ibn al-Mubāraḵ, al-Shāhī, and most major scholars of the generation of Ibn Ḥanbal and Ibn Ma’in (tabaqah 3). Al-Fudayl was born in Samarqand and educated in Kūfa. His students include his contemporaries Ibn al-Mubāraḵ, Yaḥyā b. Sa’īd al-Qaṣṭān, and al-Qa’naḥī. The quality of his ḥadīth was criticized by ’Abd al-Raḥmān b. Mahdī who declared him to be less than a ṭābi’, ibid., I, 180. Note that both men are two of the only scholars whom al-Dhahābī lauds with the sobriquet Shaykh al-Islām in his three major works Tadhkira al-huffāz, Siyar allām al-nabaita‘, and Tārikh al-Islām.

20 Tadhkira, I, 194 (Ibn ‘Ayyāsh), 231 (Yaḥyā). Abū Bakr b. ‘Ayāsh has the distinction of being one of the few Qur’ān reciters to have been both a pupil and teacher of two of the seven canonical Qur’ān reciters (‘Aṣīm and al-Kisā‘), respectively. He studied hadith with major Kūfan tabī’ī, like Abū Īsāq al-Sabī‘ī, and taught Ibn al-Mubāraḵ, Abū Dāwūd al-Taylīlī, and Ibn Ḥanbal. Yazīd b. Ḥārūn’s students include major eighth tabaqah compilers, such as Ibn Ḥanbal, ‘Aḥī b. al-Madīnī, Abū Khaythama, and Ibn Abī Shayba. The strict critic Abū Hāṭam al-Rāzī declared him to be ṭābi‘, ibid., 1, 232. He also is reported to have gone blind at the end of his life.

21 Tadhkira, I, 200 (Abū Īsāq), 202 (Ibn al-Mubāraḵ). Abū Īsāq taught both Ibn al-Mubāraḵ and al-Awezī, and held classes in Damascus as well as Maṣṣūṣa. Ibn al-Mubāraḵ’s global list of teachers and students is “immeasurable” according to al-Dhahābī, who also notes Ibn al-Mubāraḵ’s composition of books into chapters (da’wana l-‘ilmā fi l-atwād) on the topics of fiqh, warfare (ghazw), asceticism, and
Other leading scholars of this generation include the previously mentioned master hadith-transmitter critic Yahyā b. Sa‘īd al-Qaṭān of Basra, and the exceptionally gifted hadith memorizer, Wāki‘ b. al-Jarrāḥ (d. 197/813) of Kūfa.22

The continuous primacy of Iraq during the second phase can be gleaned from the list of the Shuyūkh of Islam of the seventh tābaqa of Tadhkirat al-khuffāj, from which one can detect a shift from Kūfa to Basra during this time.23 The master Qur’ān reciter al-Husayn al-Ju‘fī (d. 203/818–9) flourished in Kūfa, while Basra was adorned with Abū ‘Āṣim al-Dāhīkāk (d. 212/827), Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Muqri (d. 213/828), and al-Qa‘nabī (d. 221/836), the latter two who lived their final years in Mecca. Al-Husayn al-Ju‘fī studied the Qur’ān with the canonical reader ʿAmmānī b. Ṣā‘īd al-Qānān of Basra, and the exceptionally gifted badrāth memorizer, Wākt b. al-Jarrāḥ (d. 197/813) of Kūfa.22

The master Qur’ān reciter al-Iṣma‘īl b. Iḥlās b. Abī Ṣalāmā (d. 221/835) of Basra, who was a student of al-A‘mash, Sufyān al-Thawrī, and Mālik, is reported to have taught the material of Sulaymān al-Taymī and Ibn Jurayj,25 among others, to Ibn Ḥanbal.

“softening the heart” ʿaraq‘i‘. Note that his famous book of ascetic hadith and reports entitled Kifā ʿal-zuhd has been published. Ibn al-Mubārak lived the archetypical life of the militant ascetic, and consequently found martyrdom in battle on the frontier with Byzantium.

22 Tadhkira, I, 218 (Yahyā). 223 (Wāki‘). Yahyā b. Sa‘īd al-Qaṭān studied with several Shuyūkh al-Islām, including Sulaymān al-Taymī and al-A‘mash, and counted among his students Ibn Mahdī, Ibn Ḥanbal, ʿAflān b. ʿAbd al-Madīnī. Ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Muqri (d. 213/828), and al-Qa‘nabī (d. 221/836), the latter two who lived their final years in Mecca. Al-Husayn al-Ju‘fī studied the Qur’ān with the canonical reader ʿAmmānī b. Ṣā‘īd al-Qānān of Basra, and the exceptionally gifted badrāth memorizer, Wākt b. al-Jarrāḥ (d. 197/813) of Kūfa.22

23 One of the subtle and substantial differences between the sixth and seventh tābaqa of Tadhkirat al-khuffāj is that the none of the scholars in the sixth tābaqa appears to have lived long enough to teach either al-Bukhārī or Muslim, whereas nearly thirty of al-Bukhārī’s most senior teachers are found in the seventh tābaqa. Examples of these men, about whom I will have more to say in the fifth chapter, include Abū Nu‘aym al-Fadl b. Ḥujjāt, Ṣaffār b. al-Rabbānī, Ṣafī al-Mahārī, Abī Ṣalāmā b. Ḥarib, Abū Salama al-Tabūdhakī, Abī ʿAbd al-Jalāl b. ʿAbd al-Qahtān Mālik b. Ismā‘īl, and Abī Khalīfa al-Makhlūd. Tadhkira, I, 273-4, 275, 278-9, 287-8, 289, 294, 295, and 298. Note that al-Bukhārī includes hadith from these latter two Kūfan in his Sahih despite their unabashed sympathies for ʿAlī ʿtasayyūf).22

24 ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz b. ʿAbd al-Malik b. Jurayj (d. 150/767) is called “Faqīḥ al-Haram” by al-Dhahabī and was a pupil of the prominent jurist ʿAbī ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Ju‘fī (d. 114/732) as well as ʿAmr b. Dīnār (d. 126/744), and al-Zuhārī. He taught the two
al-Dārīmī, and al-Bukhārī from memory. Al-Muqri seems to have earned his nisba from his close association with the canonical Qurʾān reciter ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Madanī (d. 167/784), and claimed to have taught Qurʾān in Basra and Mecca for thirty-six and thirty-five years, respectively. Al-Qa‘nabī, who was born in Medina, studied in Basra, and then adopted an ascetic lifestyle in Mecca. He was renowned for his unique edition of Malik’s Muwatta’, which he obtained from the master directly without the interference of his reciter, Habīb. Finally, the one non-Iraqi Shaykh al-Islām of this tabaqa, Muhammad al-Shūrī al-Qalānāsī (d. 215/830), was another pupil of Malik and described by his student Ibn Ma‘in as the “Shaykh of Damascus and second to Abū Mushir (d. 218/833).”

Several other scholars of this generation merit special attention. Two more Basran scholars of particular acumen in the disciplines of hadith transmission and criticism were ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Mahdī (d. 198/814) and the compiler of one of the earliest musnad books, Abū Dāwūd al-Tayālīsī (d. 203/819). San‘ā’, the remote capital of Sufyān, Wāki’, and ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Ṣan‘ānī; Tadhkira, I, 128. For a detailed analysis of the portions of his book preserved in ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s Muwatta’, see Morzki, The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence, in particular see pp. 206–44 (his sources) and 268–85 (his depiction in the classical Islamic biographical literature).

Tadhkira, I, 268–9. His proper name is al-Dāhībāk b. Makhīl. Tadhkira, I, 269. Al-Muqri also studied hadith with the Basran masters Ibn ‘Awn and Shu‘ba, and passed this knowledge on to al-Bukhārī, Ibn Hānbal, Ibn Rāḥawī, and ‘Abbās al-Dūrī. Al-Dhahabī mentions that his primary educator in the discipline of fiqh was Abū Hanīfa.

Several recensions of the Muwatta’ are discussed below in chapter five.

Tadhkira, I, 283. Abū Mushir ‘Abd al-A‘lā b. Mushir al-Ghassānt al-Dīnahqī was also a student of Malik and is famous for having been violently coerced into declaring the Qurʾān to be created during the miḥāna instigated by al-Ma‘mūn. He died in prison after a hundred days of incarceration. Al-Dhahabī declares him to be Shaykh ahl al-Shī‘ah wa ‘ilmuhum; ibid., I, 279–80.

Tadhkira, I, 241 (Ibn Mahdī), and 257 (al-Tayālīsī). Al-Dhahabī reports Ibn Hānbal as saying that ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Mahdī was better at fiqh than Yahyā l-Qāṭān and more reliable (ashba‘) with hadith than Wāki’ because he was more familiar with writing it down (aqrabu ‘ihtīyāt bi-l-kitāb). His teachers include Shu‘ba and Sufyān al-Thawrī, and most major scholars of the eighth tabaqa can be found
Yemen, hosted a brief florescence of a group of hadith scholars that included Ibn Jurayj, Ma'mar b. Rashid (d. 153/770) and, very briefly, Sufyan al-Thawri, the fruits of which have been preserved in the massive Musnad and substantial Taṣfīr of 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Ṣanʿānī (d. 211/826). Two of Ibn Sa'd's primary teachers, both of whom were considered weak in hadith but invaluable in history (akhbār) and genealogy, are Hishām Ibn al-Kalbī (d. 207/822) and Muhammad b. 'Umar al-Waqīdī (d. 207/823), and it is interesting that al-Dhahabī includes both of them in the Tadhkira with, of course, the caveat that their hadith is not to be trusted. Finally, the scholar whose theories of jurisprudence left an irrevocable stamp on Islamic thought, Muhammad b. 'Idrīs al-Shāfī', composed his most important works in Egypt during this period and receives the unique accolade of the "Rabbi of the Community" (ḥibr al-'umma) in the Tadhkira. Although among his pupils, Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī was a companion of Ibn Mahdī, and received strong praise from the critic al-Fārābī. However, al-Dhahabī warns us that he made several errors when he dictated from memory. Siddiqi notes that al-Ṭayālīsī's Musnad consists of 2,767 hadith and argues that its actual compiler was al-Ṭayālīsī's pupil Yūnus b. Ḥabīb (d. 267/880) of Isfahan. Hadith Literature, 45 and al-Dhahabī, Siyar, XII, 596-7 (taṣwīr 'an Abī Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī musnadān fi muqallad kabīr). Note that Ibn Ṭalḥa is quoted as identifying the earliest musnad in Kufa as the work of Yaḥyā b. 'Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Ḥimānī (d. 228/843) and in Basra as the musnad of Musaddad b. Musāhār (d. 228/843); Ibid., II, 8-10. See below, chapter V.2.5, for more details about these two men.

4 Tadhkira, I, 142 (Ma'mar b. Rashid). 266 (Abd al-Razzaq). Ma'mar was a student of Zuhri and the Basran Qatada b. Di'āma (d. 117/735; Ibid., I, 92), and transmitted hadith to major scholars such as the two Sufyāns. 'Abd al-Razzāq claims to have studied with Ma'mar for seven years and is reported to have been a proponent of moderate tashayyu' who 'loved Ḥārī and despised those who fought him. See the groundbreaking study of 'Abd al-Razzāq's Musnad by Motzki, The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence. Yemen more or less disappeared from the map, so to speak, of hadith transmission and compilation after Ibn Ḥanbal, Ibn Ma'in and other Iraqis sojourned there to obtain the Musnad from 'Abd al-Razzāq and to study with his contemporaries, the qādis of San`ā', Hishām b. Ṣu`ūf (d. 197/813; Tadhkira, I, 253). I have come across only one other Yemeni in the Tadhkira—Rabī'a b. al-Ḥasan al-San`ānī (d. 609/1212-3)—although he became prominent for his work in Isfahan; Ibid., IV, 124.

5 Tadhkira, I, 250 (Ibn al-Kalb); and 254 (al-Waqidi).

5 Tadhkira, I, 263. It is somewhat astonishing that al-Dhahabī, a purported adherent to the Shāfī'ī madhhab, does not honor al-Shāfī'ī with the sobriquet Shaykh al-ʿIlmām. Perhaps it was his revulsion to the crass madhhab partisanship of his day that led him to do this, or else, the fact that al-Shāfī'ī was somewhat limited in his hadith transmissions. Note al-Dhahabī's warning after praising al-Shāfī'ī's knowledge of hadith defects ('īdāh): "no [hadith] is accepted from him except that which is reliable on his authority; had he lived longer, [the number of his hadith] would have increased" (la yaghrabu minhu illā mā thabara 'anhu, wa laka tāla 'umrulla, la-zahāda minhu; Ibid., I, 265). The topic of al-Shāfī'ī's hadith expertise is discussed in some detail below in chapter IV.5.
only a few major books of the master scholars of the second phase of hadith transmission were ever composed or have survived, the massive collections of hadith and ēthār of men such as Shu'ba and Yazīdb. Hārūn served as the raw materials for the most authoritative hadith books in Sunnī Islam that were synthesized by the scholars of the third phase.

III.4 Phase 3: The age of the “six books” (c. 200-300/815-912)

The borders that have been adopted for this phase of hadith scholarship are indicated by al-Dhahabī himself, who limits the second volume of Tadhkirat al-bu.ffa~ to the eighth through tenth ābaqāt. Two salient trends characterize this century of energetic hadith compilation and synthesis: systematic transmitter-criticism and globalization. The former was necessary in order to distinguish the most reliable material from that which was obscure and spurious. It relied primarily upon two processes: 1) the collection of a vast quantity of hadith in order to discern the unique, obscure, or impossible details and expressions from the core text, later called taraf (plural is atrāf); 2) an extraordinary knowledge of the approximate birth and exact death dates, teachers, students, and probity of every name found in tens of thousands of īsnāds. A total lifetime’s dedication to this task was a prerequisite for this awesome task, and the relatively small number of scholars who became recognized as authorities in hadith scholarship indicates the hardships this achievement involved.34

The second trend of the third phase, globalization, is a much more complex phenomenon that cannot yet be explained satisfactorily. The destabilizing events in the central lands of Islam during this time—the ‘anarchy of Samarra,’ Zanj revolt, and the Šaffārid adventures in Iraq and Khurāsān—seem to have contributed to the decline of the earlier hadith centers of Basra and Kufa, and led to a consolidation of this activity in the cosmopolitan city of Baghdad. Most, if not all, great scholars, passed through Baghdad at one time or another, in order to acquire knowledge and disseminate it back home in Syria, Iran, Transoxania, or al-Andalus. The cities of Mosul, Rayy, Qazvin, Nishapur, Herat, Samarqand, Bukhara and even

34 This topic is explored in great detail in the following chapter.
Cordoba blossomed with highly erudite hadith scholars and critics during this period. How much this global network was due to economic factors, such as trade between these major cities, or to the annual pilgrimage to Mecca, or to a religious zeal, bordering on obsession, to collect as much of this sacred material as possible, is a question that is beyond the pale of this book. All that can be said with certainty is that the diffusion of hadith literature to the furthest corners of the Islamic world in the third/ninth century was not due to any perceivable government intervention, or, as some have suggested, the legal theories of al-Shafi'i, but rather must be seen as the result of a number of highly pious, erudite, and devoted individual scholars who, through their process of hadith acquisition, composed several of the most fundamental books of Sunn\textit{i} Islam.

The third phase commences with the eighth tabaqa of the \textit{Tadhkira}, which is the largest one in the entire book and of particular interest for this project.\textsuperscript{35} The first Shaykh al-Islam hailing from Baghdad, Ahmad b. Hanbal, anchors this generation, and his life and teachings inspired both a legal school and theological persuasion that bear his name.\textsuperscript{36} The remaining two Shuy\textit{\={u}}kh al-Islam flourished in the traditional cities of hadith scholarship of Damascus and Kufa. Hish\textit{\={a}}m b. \textquote{Am\textsuperscript{m}m\textsuperscript{\={a}}}r (d. 245/859-60), yet another student of Malik b. Anas, served as the \textit{ka\textquoteleft ti\textquoteleft h}, Qu\textsuperscript{r}\textsuperscript{\={a}}n reciter, hadith-transmitter, and mu\textit{t}a\textsuperscript{i} of Damascus and passed hadith on to al-Bukh\textsuperscript{r}r, Ab\textsuperscript{u} D\textsuperscript{\={a}}w\textsuperscript{i}d al-Sij\textsuperscript{s}t\textsuperscript{\={a}}n\textsuperscript{i}, and al-Nas\textsuperscript{\={a}}r.\textsuperscript{37} The second of these master scholars, \textquote{Abdull\textsuperscript{\={a}}h b. Sa\textsuperscript{\={i}}\textsuperscript{\={d}} al-Ashajj (d. 257/871), studied with Ab\textsuperscript{u} Bakr b. \textquote{Ayy\textsuperscript{\={a}}sh}, taught two of the Shuy\textit{\={u}}kh al-Islam of the eleventh tabaqa, Ibn

\textsuperscript{35} Many members of this tabaqa are discussed in greater detail below in chapter V.2.


\textsuperscript{37} \textit{Tadhkira}, II, 79.
Khuzayma and Ibn Abi Hatim, and composed, among other works, a moderately famous Qur'anic exegesis (tafsir).  

The importance of this tabaqa for the art of hadith-transmitter criticism is evidenced by the fact that it is the location of the first substantial group of authorities cited in al-Dhahabi's Mizan al-'idāl. Ibn Hanbal, 'Ali b. al-Madini, Yahyā b. Ma'in and Abū Khaythama (d. 234/848) established the primacy of Baghdad in this discipline. The final member of this group, 'Amr b. 'Ali al-Fallas (d. 249/863), transmitted hadith to all six of the canonical compilers, as well as such prominent scholars as Abū Zur'a al-Rāzī, Muḥammad b. Jarīr al-Tabarī, and Ibn Sā'id. Despite the fact that only 'Ali b. al-Madini appears to have written organized books on hadith-transmitter criticism at this time, the students of these scholars, such as al-Bukhārī, 'Abbās al-Dūrī, and Abū Sa'id 'Uthmān al-Dārimī, often arranged their myriad opinions into functional texts.

Four other scholars of this tabaqa demand mention for their influence upon Sunnī hadith literature. Abū Bakr 'Abdullāh b. al-Zubayr al-Ḥumaydī (d. 219/834) composed one of the earliest musnads in Mecca, and Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī considered him the most reliable source of Ibn 'Uyayna's hadith. Ibn Sa'id composed al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr by...
synthesizing the material of not just Ibn al-Kalbi and al-Waqidi, but also Yazid b. Harun, Waki b. al-Jarrah, Abu Nu‘aym al-Faqli b. Dukayn, and ‘Affan b. Muslim. The Kufan Abū Bakr Ibn Abi Shayba (d. 235/849) composed his enormous Musannaf from the material he obtained from Ibn al-Mubarak, Ibn ‘Uyayna, Waki, and scores of other men found in Tadhkirat al-Huffaz, and his students include Muslim, Abū Dāwūd, and the first Andalusī Shaykh al-Islām, Baqiy b. Makhlad. Finally, the Marwāzī ‘Shaykh of the East,’ Ibn Rāhawayh (d. 238/853), studied with al-Fudayl b. ‘Īyād and others, prior to settling in Nishapur. His students include all of the six canonical compilers, except Ibn Māja, and it is he whom the Sunnī tradition credits with the suggestion to a young Muḥammad b. Ismā’īl al-Bukhārī to compile a concise book consisting solely of authoritative (ṣaḥīḥ) hadith.

The transformation of Sunnī hadith literature from a somewhat disorganized, oral-written tradition to one based upon rigorously researched and categorically organized books was completed during the ninth and tenth tābaqāt of the third phase. Al-Dhahabī identifies five Shuyūkh al-Islām, as well as several other scholars, who contributed significantly to this project. The most famous of these is Muḥammad b. Ismā’īl al-Bukhārī (d. 256/870), whose early journey for example, the hadith of female Companions are closer to the front, and the first ten entries include the ‘ten promised paradise’ with the curious substitution of Ibn Mas‘ūd for Ṭalḥa.


The largest chapters are devoted to prayer, sales, and pilgrimage. This text appears to be the recension transmitted by Baqiy b. Makhlad. Two fragments of Ibn Abi Shayba’s Musannaf have also been published recently in Riyadh.

This story is mentioned with a complete isnād at the opening of Ibn Hajar’s introduction to his commentary on the Sahih of al-Bukhārī; see Ḥady al-sūri muzaddimat fith al-hāri (Beirut, 1996), 7.
with his mother in the quest for knowledge brought him in contact with luminaries such as ‘Affān b. Muslim in Baghdad, the Shaykh al-Islām al-Muqri in Mecca, and Abū Mushir in Damascus. Al-Bukhārī’s two most important books are his Ḥadm al-saḥīḥ and al-Tārīkh al-kabīr, although he composed many short books that have been preserved to this day. The roster of al-Bukhārī’s students includes major scholars of the tenth jābaqa such as al-Tirmidhī, Muḥammad b. Naṣr al-Marwazī, Ibn Khuzayma, Ṣāliḥ b. Muḥammad Jazara, Ibn Abī Dawūd, Ibn Ṣa‘īd, Abū Ḥāmid Ibn al-Sharqī, and the primary transmitter of the Ṣaḥīḥ, Abū ‘Abdullāh Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Firabrī (d. 320/932). Al-Bukhārī’s books seem to have achieved a prestigious status from an early date, as we find many scholars of the fourth/tenth century subjecting them to rigorous analysis and meticulous transmission.

Baghdad maintained its prominence in the disciplines of hadith erudition during the ninth jābaqa. The Shaykh al-Islām Abū Ishāq al-Ḥarbī (d. 285/898) studied hadith with al-Fadl b. Dukayn and ‘Affān b. Muslim, and is counted among one of Ibn Ḥanbal’s finest companions in the field of fiqh. His pupils reflect his expertise in the disciplines of fiqh, hadith, and adab, for they include the Baghdādī Ibn Ṣa‘īd and the master philologist Tha‘lab (d. 291/904). Ismā‘īl al-Qādī (d. 282/895), a great-great grandson of the Basran master Ḥadīth scholar ʿAbdullāh b. Zayd, was a master of the Mālikī madhhab and acquired the Muwatṭa‘ from the Shaykh al-Islām al-Qa‘nabī. He appears to have been very interested in the disciplines of the Qur’ān, in addition to hadith and Mālikī jurisprudence, and al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī mentions three titles of works in this field that appear

---

49 Tadhkira, II, 104. Other important teachers explicitly mentioned by al-Dhahabī are Abū l-Mughīra and al-Firabrābī in Syria, Adam in ‘Aṣqalān, and Abū l-Yarmān in Hijāz. Bukhārī is also purported to have memorized Ibn al-Mubārāk’s works as a child. For a quantitative analysis of al-Bukhārī’s sources, see Sezgin, Bukhārī’nin Kaynakları, 203–304.


51 Tadhkira, II, 123.

52 Tadhkira, II, 149. His full name is Abū Ishāq Ismā‘īl b. Ishāq. See also Melchert, The Formation of the Sunni Schools of Law, 170–5.
to be lost.\(^\text{34}\) Finally, Ahmad b. Abī Khaythama (d. 279/892) followed in his father's footsteps and composed a large history, a fragment of which recently has been published.\(^\text{35}\) Al-Khaṭīb’s description of his education vividly illustrates the intellectual richness of the 'Abbāsid capital during this time:  

He received his knowledge of hadīth from Ibn Ḥanbal and Ibn Ma‘īn, of genealogy from Muṣāb [al-Zubayrī; d. 236/851], of history from ‘Abī b. Muḥammad al-Muṣāfin (d. 224/839), and of literature (adab) from Muḥammad b. Sallām al-Jumaḥī (d. 231/846).

A final major scholar of Baghdad whom we shall be looking at more closely in chapter five is ʻAbd al-Dīrī (d. 271/884-5), a disciple of Ibn Ma‘īn, who not only synthesized the hadīth-transmitter criticism opinions of his master, but also taught all four compilers of the canonical sunna books during their individual visits to Baghdad.\(^\text{36}\)

The city of Rayy also flourished as a center of hadīth-transmitter criticism at this time due to the learning of three of its sons.\(^\text{37}\) Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī (d. 277/890), one of the critics considered by al-Dhahābī to have been ‘severe’ in his opinions, studied with important figures such as ‘Affān and al-Fādī b. Dūkayn, and had the good fortune to have a son who devoted himself to the alphabetical organization of his knowledge in the famous book ʻal-jāh wa l-tdā’il.\(^\text{38}\) Abū Zur‘a al-Rāzī (d. 264/878) is honored by al-Dhahābī with the sobriquet ‘Hāfiz of the Age’ and acquired an extraordinary volume of hadīth from al-Qā’nabī, al-Fādī b. Dūkayn, Ibn Abī Shayba, and al-Falās, among many others.\(^\text{39}\) His students include the famous com-


\(^{26}\) Tadhkira, II, 130. Al-Dhahābī evaluates Ibn Abī Khaythama as Imām and Ḥujja.

\(^{27}\) Tadhkira, II, 119. Dūrī claims to have obtained 30,000 hadīth from the master Basran scholar Abū Salama al-Tabūdahī, ibid., I, 289. For more about al-Dūrī, see below, chapter V.4.2.

\(^{28}\) The master Ḥanafī scholar al-Ṭahāwī (d. 321/933), whom we shall meet in the fourth phase, is quoted by al-Dhahābī as having identified these three men of Rayy as ‘unique,” thalathat bi-l-Rayy lam yakan fi l-arḍ mithlukum; Tadhkira, II, 117.

\(^{29}\) Tadhkira, II, 112. Abū Ḥātim Muḥammad b. Idrīs also taught Abū Dawūd al-Sijistānī and al-Nasā‘ī.

\(^{30}\) Tadhkira, II, 105. Abū Zur‘a also claims to have examined 30,000 hadīth of Ibn Wahib while in Egypt; ibid., I, 222.
pillers Muslim, al-Tirmidhi, al-Nasâ'i, Ibn Majâ, Ibn Abî Dâwûd, Abû 'Awânâ, and Ibn Abî Hâtim. The third member of this trio of master Râzi hadîth scholars is Ibn Wâra (d. 270/883-4), a pupil of the Shaykh al-Îslâm Abû ‘Âsîm and al-Fâdî b. Dukayn, as well as teacher of al-Bukhârî, al-Nasâî, and Ibn Abî Hâtim.60

Further east, the Khurasan city Nishapur also enjoyed a florescence of hadîth scholarship in the wake of the path blazed by Abu Iblâq Ibn Râhawayh. The ‘Hâfîz of Nishapur’ and Shaykh al-Îslâm, Abû ‘Abdullâh Muḥammad b. Yahyâ al-Dhuhrî (d. 258/872), devoted so much attention to the hadîth transmitted by al-Zuhrî (of the fourth tabaqâ) that ‘Ali b. al-Madârî called him the “the heir (wârîth) of al-Zuhrî.”61 However, al-Dhuhîrî managed to not only exile Bukhârî from Nishapur, but also to offend gravely Nishapur’s other leading muhaddîth of the time, Muslim b. al-Ḥajjây (d. 261/874). This friction seems to have developed over the theological question concerning the nature of the articulation (lafz) of the Qur’ân.62 Al-Dhahabi includes a report in the Tadhkîra that Muslim left al-Dhuhîrî’s session (majlîs) when the latter said “Whoever believes that my articulation of the Qur’ân is created, let him not attend this session!”63 Most of al-Dhulî’s students do not appear to have taken this advice, as we find Ibn Khuzayma, Ibn Abî ‘Awana, and Ibn Abî Hâtim among Muslim’s pupils.64 Indeed, it appears that the extraordinary popularity of the Sahîh of Muslim thoroughly vindicated the authority of its compiler.65

60 Tadhkîra, II, 117.
62 For a discussion of the doctrine of lafz, see Watt, The Formative Period of Islamic Thought, 281-85.
64 Tadhkîra, II, 125.
65 The 2000 Dâr al-Kutub al-Îlimiya reprint of Muḥammad Fu’âd ‘Abd al-Bâqi’s edition of Sahîh Muslim bi-sharh al-Nawawî consists of 3033 hadîth without repetitions in 55 chapters (there are two chapter 40’s in this edition). The organization of Muslim’s book has proven to be particularly popular, as al-Dhahabi reports several scholars in the subsequent centuries who followed his format and substituted essentially the same hadîth with more elevated isnâds (see above, II.1, for the meaning of ‘elevated isnâds’) in a process known as takhrîj. Already in the eleventh tabaqa,
Even further east, two scholars in addition to al-Bukhārī contributed substantially to Sunni hadith scholarship. Since both scholars are known by their nisba al-Dārīmī, it is particularly important to distinguish between them. Al-Dhahābī considers Abū Muḥammad ‘Abdullāh b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Dārīmī (d. 255/869) to be a Shaykh al-Islām, and his Musnad is included among Ibn Hājar’s ten most important hadith books after the canonical six. Al-Dārīmī traveled from his home in Transoxania to the major hadith centers in Khurāsān, Iraq, and Syria, and Yazīd b. Hārūn can be named among his more prominent teachers. He taught scholars such as Muslim, Abū Dāwūd, and ‘Abdullāh b. Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, prior to his return to Samarqand, where he served briefly as a qādī for the Sāmānīds. The second Dārīmī, Abū Sa‘īd ‘Uthmān b. Sa‘īd, a native of Herat, has been mentioned above in connection with his systematic organization of Ibn Ma‘īn’s hadith-transmitter criticism opinions; he also composed a musnad that helped lay the foundation for an impressive series of hadith scholars in Herat.

Two final scholars of the ninth tabāqa require brief notices. Abū Dāwūd Sulaymān b. al-Ash‘āth al-Sijistānī (d. 275/888), compiler of the Sunan that is particularly valued for its legal reports (ḥākim), stud-

we find books modeled on Muslim’s Sahih by Abū ‘Awāna Ya‘qūb b. Isḥāq al-Astarāvānī (d. 316/928), Abū ‘Imrān al-Juwaynī (d. 323/935) and Ibn al-Athram (d. 344/955), and in the twelfth tabāqa we find Abū ‘Alī al-Māṣarjīsī (d. 368/978) of Nishapur producing his personal versions of each of the two Sahīhs, Tadhkira, III, 3, 27, 55, and 110–1, respectively. Abū ‘Awāna’s book has been published and is one of the ten books included by Ibn Hājar in his 16 volume book Ḥaḥf al-mahāra br-l-fawā’id al-muhkamā min al-farā’if al-‘ashara (Riyadh, 1994). The remaining nine books in Isḥāq al-mahāra are the Sunan of al-Dārīmī, Sahih of Ibn Khuzayma, al-Munawqū of Ibn al-Jārūd, Ibn Bulbān al-Fārisī’s (d. 739/1338-9) abridgement of the Sahih of Ibn Hibbān entitled al-Ihsan fi taqriḥ saḥīḥ Ibn Hibbān, the Mustadrāk ‘alā l-sahihayn of al-Hākim al-Naysābūrī, the Muṣṭafī‘ of Mālik, Abū l-‘Abbās al-Asāmm’s (d. 346/957–8) Munād of al-Shāfi‘i, the Musnad of Ibn Ḥanbal, and Sharh ma‘ānī al-albār of al-Tahhāwī. We have already encountered the books of Mālik (tabāqa 6) and Ibn Ḥanbal (tabāqa 8), and shall be introducing all of the remaining scholars, with the exceptions of al-Asāmm and Ibn Bulbān al-Fārisī, in the remainder of this chapter.

*Tadhkira, II, 90. ‘Abdullāh al-Dārīmī’s Musnad is also called Sunan because it is arranged according to legal topics and not sahība. See the previous footnote for more information about Ibn Hājar’s Ḥaḥf al-mahāra. The 2000 Dār al-Ḥadīth edition of Sunan al-Dārīmī has a 649-report introduction which is followed by 2854 hadith and 8 other in 23 chapters.

*Tadhkira, II, 146. Al-Dhahābī evaluates Abū Sa‘īd as Imām, ḥujja and ‘the Muḥaddith of Herat.’ This Dārīmī also composed a theological tract that has been published as Radd al-imām al-Dārīmī ‘alā Bishr al-Mansī al-‘anīd.
ied with al-Qa‘nabī and Ibn Hanbal and settled in Basra after the ‘Abbāsid caliph al-Mu‘tamid’s brother al-Muwaffaq (d. 278/891) extinguished the destructive Zanj revolt of 255-70/869-83.68 His students include the famous compilers al-Tirmidhī, al-Nasā‘ī, Abū ‘Awāna, and his own son Abū Bakr.69 Finally, a freed slave of Ibn Ḥanbal’s known as al-Juzjānī (d. 259/873), disseminated such strong anti-‘Alī views in Damascus that the Shaykh al-’Īslām al-Nasā‘ī felt obliged to compose a book in defense of the merits of ‘Ali.70

The tenth tabaqa of huffāz is of capital importance because it marks the first time that al-Dhahābī identifies an Andalusī hadith scholar as a Shaykh al-’Īslām. Baqiyy b. Makhład (d. 276/889) was hardly the first serious Andalusī scholar of hadith, but he did set a new standard of excellence with two works, al-Musnad al-kabīr and al-Tafsīr.71 Baqiyy heard the Muwatta’ directly from its prime transmitters in al-Andalus, Yahyā b. Yahyā al-Laythī (d. 234/848) and also hauled the Muṣannaf of Ibn Abī Shayba back to Cordoba from Kufa. His erudition was not appreciated by many of the Andalusī jurists who were less than enthusiastic about hadith, and it is unlikely that his teachings would have had much impact had it not been for the protection of the Amīr Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān (ruled 238-73/852-86). The Andalusī historian and muhaddith Ibn al-Faraḍī (d. 403/1012-3) credits Baqiyy with having “filled al-Andalus with hadith,”72 a consequence of which was the prominence of Iberian scholars in the fifth phase of this survey.

Four major scholars of this tabaqa either originated from or settled in the region of Transoxania. The Shaykh al-’Īslām Ahmad b. Shu‘ayb al-Nasā‘ī (d. 303/915) studied with Muḥammad b. Naṣr al-Marwazī and Ibn Rāhawayh in Khurāsān prior to settling in Egypt under the Tūlūnīds.73 Al-Nasā‘ī developed a reputation for being a particularly
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harsh *hadith*-transmitter critic, and al-Dhahabi quotes the Meccan scholar al-Zanjani's statement that his conditions for reliability were even stricter than those of al-Bukhari and Muslim. A student who traveled in the opposite direction from al-Nasa'i and settled in Bukhara is the 'Shaykh of Transoxania,' Abū Ṣalih b. Muhammad Jazara (d. 293/906). Jazara was famous for his exceptional memory, and transmitted the knowledge he obtained from Ibn Ma'in and Ibn Ḥanbal after the death of al-Bukhari, this region's most illustrious scholar.

The two remaining Transoxanian scholars of the tenth *tabaga* who returned home after their studies are the Shaykh al-Islam Muhammad b. Naṣr al-Marwazi and Abū Īsā al-Tirmidhī. Muhammad b. Naṣr was particularly famous as a jurist, although he studied *hadith* with the great Nishapurian Ibn Rāhawayh, among others. He entered into the service of the Sāmānids at their capital in Samarqand in 275/888, and his reputation as a master scholar was so great that even the brilliant nonconformist Ibn Ḥazm praised him a century and a half later all the way from al-Andalus. The final Central Asian scholar of this period, Abū Īsā al-Tirmidhī (d. 279/892), was a close disciple of al-Bukhari, acquired fame as the compiler of a canonical *Sunan* work, a book of *ṣūrah*, and a book of the Prophet Muhammad’s ethics.

Kitab *al-sunan al-kabîr* and compiled them under the title *Kitab al-sunan al-mujtaba*. This latter title is considered to be among the six canonical Sunni *hadith* books. The 1995 Dar al-Fikr edition of *Sunan al-Nasā’ī al-musammā bi-l-mujtaba bi-sharh al-hafiz Jalal al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī wa ḥāshiyat al-Imām al-Sindi* contains 3769 *hadith* in 52 chapters.

15 *Tadhkira*, II, 195.

16 *Tadhkira*, II, 165: 6; The *Formation of the Sunni Schools of Law*, 99. His succinct book on the differences of the jurists *ikhtilāf al-fuṣûl* has been published by Subhi al-Samarrā‘ī as *Ikhilāf al-‘ulamā* (Beirut: ‘Ālam al-Kutub, 1986). It is striking that al-Marwazi refers to over twenty-five jurists by their names, such as Abū Thawr, Ibn Ḥanbal, and Ṣawmān al-Shaybānī, and yet consistently employs the term *al-‘ulamā* instead of Abū Hanifa, Muhammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Shaybānī, or Abū Yusuf. See below, in chapter eight, for the significance of this observation in the discussion of the problem of the authority of Abū Hanifa in the eyes of the *hadith* scholars.

17 *Tadhkira*, II, 165.

18 *Tadhkira*, II, 154. Note that al-Dhahabi does not mention the third work, *al-Sha‘bān* in his notice. The Dār Iḥyā’ al-Turāth edition of *al-Jami‘ al-Sahih wa hana Sunan al-Tirmidhī* that was initiated under the editorial guidance of Ahmad Muhammad Shākir (volumes I–II), continued by Muhammad Fu‘ād ‘Abd al-Bāqī (volume III), and completed without *takhrij* or commentary by Ibrāhīm ‘Atwa ‘Awd (volumes IV–V) consists of 3936 *hadith* in fifty chapters, plus a final chapter on
Three scholars continued the strong tradition of Iranian ḥadīth scholarship throughout the tenth ṣaḥāqa. The most prominent of them, and a particular favorite of al-Dhahabī, is Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Iṣḥāq b. Khuzayma (d. 311/923) of Nishapur. A student of al-Bukhārī, al-Dīlūlī, and Muḥsin, Ibn Khuzayma composed both a Sahīh collection that is included among Ibn Ḥajar’s ‘ten books,’ and a significant ḥadīth-based theological book called al-Tawḥīd. The reason for this latter theological book was more than mere intellectual curiosity, as Ibn Khuzayma was attacked by many of the Kullābiyya of his day. It is quite clear from the Tadhkira that his uncompromising anti-kalām polemic resonated strongly with al-Dhahabī’s salafī sensitivities.

Two other scholars of Iranian cities had a more modest impact on Sunnī ḥadīth tradition than Ibn Khuzayma. Abū Bishr al-Dūlābī (d. 310/923) was an important ḥadīth-transmitter critic in Rayy who helped educate the most famous scholars of the eleventh ṣaḥāqa, like Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Ibn ‘Adī, Ibn Hibbān, and al-Ṭabarānī. His prosopographical book al-Asmāʾ wa l-kunā preserves a great many opinions of the master critic of some interest for this book, Ibn Maʿīn. Abū ʿAbdullāh Ibn Mājā (d. 273/886) hailed from the city of Qazvin, and his Sunan ultimately achieved the elevated status of the sixth of the six canonical Sunnī ḥadīth books. Ibn Mājā also composed a ḥadīth-transmitter criticism and methodology. Two significant unique features of al-Tirmidhī’s book are: 1) the regular inclusion of the legal opinions of Sufyān al-Thawrī, Mālik, Ibn al-Mubārak, al-Shāhī, Ibn Ḥanbal, Ibn Rāhawayh, the “People of Kufa” (Abū Ḥanīfa and his disciples), and many saḥāba; 2) the evaluation of the authenticity of each ḥadīth in the collection, often with useful notes about names of transmitters and variant versions of the text and isnād. Many of these notes come from his teacher al-Bukhārī.

The Kullābiyya seem to be the precursors to the Ashʿarīs; see Maqāṣid al-islāmiyya, II, 225-28 for a description of some of their theological beliefs.

"Tadhkira, II, 230.
"Tadhkira, II, 155. As we noted in the introduction, Goldziher astutely identified the Zāhirī Ibn Tahir al-Maqdīsī of the fifteenth ṣaḥāqa of Tadhkira al-hujjāz (IV, 27-30) as the first scholar to include Ibn Mājā along with the other five books; Muḥsin Studies, II, 240 (this view is seconded by Siddiqī in Ḥadīth Literature, 73). We also saw, in the previous chapter, that Ibn al-Ṣaḥīh did not recognize Ibn Mājā’s Sunan as the same rank of the other five books. The 1983 Riyadh edition of Sunan Ibn Mājā edited by M. M. al-Aʿzarnī contains 4397 ḥadīth.
tafsir and a history, both of which appear to have been lost since al-Dhahabi’s day.83

Baghdad retained its eminence during the tenth tabaqat due to the labors of several scholars. Ibn Ḥanbal’s son ‘Abdullāh (d. 290/903) distinguished himself as the sole transmitter of the 30,000-hadith Musnad, a supposed 120,000-hadith Qur’ānic exegesis, and thousands of ṣalāt reports from his illustrious father.84 Another son of a famous hadith scholar of this time was Abū Bakr Ibn Abī Dāwūd al-Sijistānī (d. 316/929), who composed his own Musnad and Sunan books.85 Ibn Abī Dāwūd appears to have developed a quarrel with his father, as well as with one of the most prominent scholars of Baghdad, Ibn Sā‘īd (d. 318/930).86 Al-Dhahabi reports that the Shaykh of Nishapur, Abū ‘Alī al-Naysābūrī, declared that Ibn Sā‘īd possessed a superior comprehension of hadith to his rival Ibn Abī Dāwūd, even if the latter had memorized a larger amount of the material. The work of these four scholars not only systematized the erudition of the luminaries of the preceding two tabaqāt, but can be seen as the catalysts for the climactic period of Baghdādī hadith scholarship in the fourth phase that is approaching rapidly.

Two final scholars deserve mention for their majestic literary contributions to Sunnī hadith literature and Islamic civilization in general.87 Abū Ya’lā Ahmad b. ‘Alī al-Mawṣili (d. 307/919-20) helped establish the tradition of hadith scholarship in the province of northern Iraq (al-Jazīra), and he composed a large muṣjam of his teachers, in addition to his 7553-hadith Musnad.88 His student Ibn Hibbān

83 GAS, I, 147-8.
84 Tadhkira, II, 173. Melchert cites al-Dhahabi’s serious doubts in the Siyar that a 120,000-hadith tafsir existed; The Formation of the Sunni Schools of Law, 153.
85 Tadhkira, II, 235. Al-Dhahabi praises Ibn Abī Dāwūd as the “exemplar (qudwa) of the muḥaddithūn,” and his students include al-Dāraquṭnī, Ibn Shāhīn, and Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Hākim al-Naysābūrī.
86 Tadhkira, II, 240. One of Ibn Sā‘īd’s most prominent students was al-Dāraquṭnī.
87 Four other important compilers of the tenth tabaqat of the Tadhkira al-hujjā, whose names can be mentioned only in passing are: 1) Abū Bakr Ahmad b. ‘Amr al-Bazzār (d. 292/905 in Ramla), whose Musnad has been published; 2) Qādī Ibrāhīm b. Maṭqī al-Nasafi (d. 295/908), a major transmitter of al-Bukhārī’s Sahih, as well as a compiler of his own musnad and tafsir; 3) al-Ḥasan b. Ṣufyān (d. 303/915 near Nasā), the ‘Shaykh of Khurasān’ who transmitted the works of Ibn Abī Shayba, Ibn Rāhawayh and Abū Thawr, and composed a large musnad and collection of forty hadith of his own; and 4) Abū Bakr al-Rūyānī (d. 307/919), whose short musnad has been published; Tadhkira, II, 156-7, 186, 197-8, and 225, respectively.
88 Tadhkira, II, 199. The muṣjam book was a compilation in which a single hadith
praised him for his reliability and precision, and two of his other students, Abū 'Ali al-Naysābūrī and Abu Bakr al-Ismā'īlī contributed greatly to the fourth-century florescence of hadith scholarship in Iran. The final scholar of the tenth jābāya of unique erudition is the historian, Qur'ānic exegete, and jurist Abū Ja‘far Muhammad b. Jarir al-Ṭabarî (d. 310/923).89 Al-Dhahabī commented that “had I wished, I could have written twenty pages about the life of this imām” and al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādi, no stranger to literary composition, claimed that al-Ṭabarī “gathered diverse types of knowledge that none of his age had ever synthesized.”90 Despite the fact that some Hanbalis made life very unpleasant for al-Ṭabarī, Ibn Khuzayma reports that they wronged him and that he knew of no one more knowledgeable than him.91 While al-Ṭabarī did not live to complete his ambitious hadith book Tahdhib al-āthār,92 his tafsīr, Jāmi‘ al-bayān fi tafsīr āy al-Qur‘ān, contains a vast array of hadith and āthār, and, according to al-Suyūṭī, has never been surpassed in its genre.93

with an elevated imād from each of the student's teachers was arranged alphabetically. These books became increasingly popular in the later phases of hadith transmission.


91 Tadhkira, II, 202.

92 This book is described by Rosenthal, who mentions that the preserved fragments of the musnad of ‘Ali and Ibn ‘Abbās have been published in three volumes by Mahmūd Shākir (1962) and that the musnad of ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb remains to be published; Rosenthal, General Introduction, 128–30.

93 Al-Suyūṭī, al-Jāmi‘ fi ‘uṣūm al-Qur‘ān, II (Beirut: Dār Ibn Kathīr, 1996), 1237. He quotes al-Nawawī as saying kālib Ibn Jarir fi tafsīr lam yusumū al-‘ahdāt mišlabu. Note that Herbert Berg’s recent study of this tafsīr, or, to be more precise, his study of 997 reports transmitted on the authority of Ibn ‘Abbās, led him to the sweeping conclusions that “it may well be that the mythic status of Ibn ‘Abbās actually preceded any attribution of exegetical material to him” and that “as to when [Ibn ‘Abbās’] material was actually produced and when the isnads were attached, a determination is impossible from the data of my study;” Berg, The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam, 214–15. Since many of Ibn ‘Abbās’s principle students died around 100/718 and al-Ṭabarī began dictating “a substantial portion” of his tafsīr in 270/883 in Baghdad (Rosenthal, General Introduction, 106), there does not seem to be more than a 150-year window during which the material could have possibly come into circulation. A more promising piece of research is the isnad analysis found in Heribert Horst: “Zur Überlieferung im Korankomentar al-Ṭabarīs,” ZDMG 103 (1953), 290–307. Horst’s investigation uncovers several isnads that are cited so frequently that they most likely indicate early books which al-Ṭabarī synthesized in his tafsīr;
A brief review of the literary accomplishment of the third phase of hadith scholars is in order prior to the discussion of the even more extraordinary fourth period. In addition to the composition of the six most revered Sunnī hadith books of al-Bukhārī, Muslim, Abū Dāwūd, al-Tirmidhī, al-Nasāʿī, and Ibn Māja, there appeared the Sunan of al-Dārimī, the Musnad of Ibn Ḥanbal/Abdullāh b. Ḥāmid, the Musnad of Abū Ya’lā al-Mawṣili, the Sahih of Ibn Khuzayma, the Musannaf of Ibn Abī Shayba, and the tafsīr of al-Ṭabarī. The compilation of the first historical-critical book of the tabaqāt genre by Ibn Saʿd took place during this time, along with the most authoritative book of hadith-transmitter criticism, al-Tārikh al-kabīr of al-Bukhārī, multiple recensions of Ibn Maʿīn’s critical opinions, and al-Dǔlabī’s book of names and kānyas. Finally, two works of general hadith defects (‘ilal) also arrived on the scene, namely those of Ibn Ḥanbal/Abdullāh b. Ḥāmid and al-Tirmidhī. This list only consists of significant works that have survived to this day in the Sunnī tradition, and the collective mass of these books provided a secure foundation for the following two phases of intense compilation and criticism.

III.5 Phase 4: The triumph of Baghdad and Iran  
(c. 300-400/912-1009)

The achievements in the disciplines of hadith, in general, and Sunnī hadith-transmitter criticism, in particular, are so remarkable in the fourth and fifth phases of this narrative, that one could question Hodgson’s description of this period as the “Shi’ī century.” Indeed, the pro-Shi’ī Daylamite Buyids and their courtier princes appear to have done little to hinder the remarkable scholarly activity in the arts of Sunnī hadith compilation and criticism, which flourished throughout this period in Baghdad and the great cities of Iran. Some

the most prominent example is the material of Qatāda that is transmitted by Saʿīd b. Abī ‘Artiba, to Yaʿqūb b. Zuray’, to Muʿādh b. Bishr that is cited 3060 times. Note that the first three scholars in this isnād are all Basrans mentioned by al-Dhahabī in Tadhkīrat al-khullāz. The second most frequently cited isnād in al-Ṭabarī’s tafsīr, Yūnus b. ‘Abd al-A’lā → Ibn Wahb → ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Zayd, also contains two scholars—Yūnus and Ibn Wahb—who are honored in Tadhkīrat al-khullāz.

54 Hodgson, The Venture of Islam, 11, 36. This phrase was initially coined by V. Minorsky, although Hodgson does not provide a reference for it.
light will be shed as well on the situation in al-Andalus and Egypt during this time, as the former experienced a florescence and the latter a period of severe repression during the following phase of hadith literature.

Eight late third/early fourth (ninth/tenth) century scholars who flourished in Baghdad demand our immediate attention. 86 The Shafi'i master jurist, Shaykh al-Islam, and "renewer (mujaddid) of religion" Abū l-ʿAbbās Ibn Surayj (d. 306/918) acquired an elevated proficiency in hadith disciplines from ʿAbbās al-Dūrī and Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī.87 Another important jurist who also excelled at hadith was the founder of the Hanbali madhhab, Abū Bakr Ahmad b. Muhammad, known as al-Khallal (d. 311/923). His Kitāb al-sunna has survived and al-Dhahabi credits him with the systematic organization the religious knowledge of Ibn Ḥanbal. A final major jurist of the first half of the fourth/tenth century who invested much time in hadith studies was the 'Shaykh of Baghdad' al-Qāsim al-Ḥusayn b. Iṣmāʿīl al-Maḥamili (d. 330/942). 88 He served in the capacity of judge for some sixty years in Kufa and al-Dhahabi counts al-Dāraqūṭnī among his pupils.

Baghdad nurtured another four master hadith scholars during the twelfth tabaga. Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusyan al-ʿAjurrī (d. 360/971) composed a theological book of hadith titled Kitāb al-shariʿa fi l-sunna and his knowledge disseminated throughout the Islamic world due to his prolonged stay in Mecca at the end of his life.89 The Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Miḥrān (d. 375/985-6) studied with his fellow tenth tabaga Baghdādī Ibn Ṣāʿīd, composed a large musnad, and lived

86 A ninth scholar, whom I have not included, is the hadith-transmitter critic Abū l-Fath al-Azāf of Mosul (d. 374/984-5) who settled in Baghdad. Despite his studies with Abū Yaʿlā l-Mawsīlī and al-Ṭabarī, certain later scholars, such as al-Barqūnī, considered him to be weak. Al-Dhahabi mentions his large book of unreliable transmitters (dāʿiṣ), and complains that he criticized many scholars without any justification; Tadhkira, III, 117.

87 Tadhkira, III, 23. Melchert credits Ibn Surayj with the accomplishment of found ing the classical Shafi'i madhhab and notes that none of his books has survived; The Formation of the Sunni Schools of Law, 88–102. Al-Dhahabi counts the great Palestinian hadith scholar al-Ṭabarānī among his students.

88 Tadhkira, III, 6; The Formation of the Sunni Schools of Law, 143–50.

89 Tadhkira, III, 31. The critic al-Fallās was among his teachers.

90 Tadhkira, III, 99. One of his students is Abū Nuʿaym al-Isbāḥānī of the thirteenth tabaga. Abū Bakr al-ʿAjurrī’s book has been published in six volumes as Kitāb al-shariʿa (Riyadh: Dār al-Waṣān, 1997).
for thirty years in the area of Bukhara and Samarqand. A Baghdadí collector of hadith who chose to stay in his hometown is Abū Ḥāfīz Ibn Shāhīn (d. 385/995), and al-Dhahabī adorns him with the honorific ‘Shaykh of Iraq.’ He is reported to have composed an enormous tafsīr, a biographical dictionary, and a staggering collection of hadith from the tenth tabaqā scholar Abū l-Qāsim al-Baghawi (d. 317/929). Ibn Shāhīn represents an interesting case of a hadith scholar who unabashedly refused to study jurisprudence (fiqh) and would brazenly reply to the question “what is your madhhab?” with the answer “that of Muḥammad.”

The most exceptional scholar of this phase, in the eyes of al-Dhahabī, is the Shaykh al-Islām and ‘Ḥāfiz of the age’ Abū l-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. ‘Umar al-Dāraquṭnī (d. 385/995). His education consisted of the seven Qur’ānic readings from the man who codified them, Ibn al-Mujāhid (d. 326/936), and hadith from numerous scholars, such as Ibn Abī Dāwūd and Ibn Ṣā‘īd. His modest book entitled Sunan has enjoyed a high degree of prestige among the authoritative Sunnī works, and his opinions concerning hadith-transmitter criticism and general hadith criticism (‘ilal) have been valued by all Sunnī scholars. Finally, his roster of students is the envy of any teacher, as it includes many of the great names we shall be encountering in the fifth phase: al-Hākim al-Naysārī, ‘Abd al-Ghānī b. Sa‘īd al-Misrī, Abū Baqr al-Barqānī, Abū Dharr al-Harawi, and AbūNu‘aym al-Isbahānī.

The triumph of the cities of Iran during the fourth phase should be seen as the culmination of a process that had its roots back in the eighth tabaqā with Ibn Rāhawayh and the ninth one with al-Dhuhli, Muslim, Abū Hātim, Abū Zur‘a, and Ibn Wara. The master critic (nāqid) and Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī (d. 327/939) synthesized the teachings of the three master critics of Rayy into his book entitled al-Farh wa l-ta‘dil. Despite the fact that he did not

101 Tadhkira, III, 118. His full name is Abū Muslim ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Muḥammad and Abū ‘Abdullāh al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī is one of his pupils.
102 Tadhkira, III, 217. He should not be confused with the famous fifteenth tabaqā scholar Abū Muḥammad al-Baghawi al-Shāfī‘ī, whom we shall encounter in the sixth phase.
103 Tadhkira, III, 129. Al-Dhahabī lists al-Barqānī among Ibn Shāhīn’s pupils.
104 Tadhkira, III, 34. For a somewhat superficial study of the introduction of this
travel to Khurāsān, Abū Ahmad al-Ḥākim of Nishapur came to him, as did a seminal scholar of Isfahan, Abū l-Shaykh b. Ḥayyān.

The city of Jurjān in the province of Tabaristān enjoyed a brief international florescence due to the erudition of two of her native twelfth tabāqa sons. Abū Ahmad 'Abdullāh b. 'Adī (d. 365/976) compiled one of the most prestigious books of tarnished transmitters, titled al-Kāmil fi dh'afī al-rijāl, that ultimately served as the platform for al-Dhahābī’s own critical masterpiece, Miẓān al-ṭādirī. Al-Dāraquṭnī is reported to have answered a request that he compile a dictionary of unreliable hadīth transmitters with the curt reply “Do you not have the Kāmil of Ibn ‘Adī?” When they replied in the affirmative, he said “It is sufficient; there is nothing to add to it.” Ibn ‘Adī’s contemporary in Jurjān who led his funeral prayers was the Shaykh al-Īslām Abū Bakr al-Īsmā‘īlī (d. 371/981-2). Al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī reports that al-Īsmā‘īlī was the “Shaykh of the muḥaddithūn and the fuqahāʾ,” and al-Dhahābī mentions that he was a leader of the Shāfī’ī madhhab in this region.

The Khurāsānī city of Nishapur was the only serious rival to Baghdad during the fourth phase of hadīth scholarship. Abū ‘Awānā Ya‘qūb b. Ishaq (d. 316/928) studied in his home city with al-Dhuhūlī prior to settling in Isfarāyīn, where he introduced the Shāfī’ī madhhab. Another student of al-Dhuhūlī, Abū ‘Amr al-Ḥīrī (d. 317/929), acquired book. See Erik Dickinson, The Development of Early Sunni Hadith Criticism (Leiden: Brill, 2001). I address Dickinson’s rather sweeping arguments concerning Ibn Abī Ḥātim’s misrepresentation of the first two generations of hadīth-transmitter critics in the following chapter.

165 Two ninth tabāqa master hadīth scholars who lived in Jurjān a century earlier and composed musnads are ‘Ammār b. Rajā’ al-Āstārābādī (d. 267/880) and Ishaq b. Ḥibrāhīm al-Wazdūfī (d. 259/873), Tadhkira, II, 108-9. Al-Dhahābī mentions that some of al-Wazdūfī’s hadīth are found in Abū Bakr al-Īsmā‘īlī’s Šaḥib; Siyar, XII, 507-8.


167 Tadhkira, III, 105. A portion of al-Īsmā‘īlī’s large three volume muṣjam has been published recently (Mecca, c. 1990-5) and his teachers include al-Nasa‘ī and Ibn Khuzayma.

168 Tadhkira, III, 3. His students include Ibn ‘Adī, Abū Bakr al-Īsmā‘īlī, and Abū
hadith from Abū Zur'a al-Rāzī and the Musnad of Abū Sa'īd al-Dārīmī. A third major hadith scholar of Nishapur in the first decades of the fourth/tenth century is the critic (al-naqīd) Ibn al-Jārūd (d. 307/919-20), a close companion of Ibn Khuzayma, who composed a short book of legal hadith called al-Munāqa fi l-āhkhām. The final major Nishapurian scholar of the eleventh isabqa is Ibn al-Sharqī (d. 325/937), the disciple and authoritative (ḥujja) compiler of Muslim’s Sahih. These four master scholars not only compiled valuable Sunni hadith books, but also transmitted their knowledge to another generation of exceptional scholars, two of whom maintained this high standard in Nishapur. Abū ‘Alī al-Husayn b. ‘Alī al-Naysābūrī (d. 349/960) has already received some attention due to his rare sobriquet ‘Muḥaddith al-Islām.’ His extensive travels netted him a large library of hadith, and some of his more prominent teachers include al-Nasa’ī, Abū Ya’la, and, closer to home, Ibn al-Sharqī. The other twelfth isabqa master hadith scholar of significance is Abū Ahmad Muhammad b. Muḥammad al-Hākim (d. 378/988), the ‘Muḥaddith of Khurāsān,’ who was an expert in the standards used by al-Bukhārī and Muslim for the inclusion of material in their respective Sahih books. A student of Ibn

Tadhkira. III, 15. Al-Dhahabi recognizes him as the ‘Shaykh of Nishapur,’ and his students also include Abū Bakr al-Insārī and Abū ‘Alī al-Naysābūrī.


Another important Nishapurian student of Ibn Khuzayma is the hadith-transmitter critic Abū Ja’far Muḥammad b. ‘Amr al-‘Uṣaylī (d. 322/934) who settled in the Hijāz; Tadhkira. III, 36-7. His large book consisting solely of unreliable transmitters, Kitāb al-du’afā’ī, was one of the first systematic books of its kind and has published in four volumes in Riyadh by Dār al-Sumayyī (2000).

Tadhkira. III, 79. His students include the exceptional hadith scholar al-Hākim Abū ‘Abdullāh al-Naysābūrī, as well as the prominent Isfahānī Abū ‘Abdullāh Ibn Manda and the Sūfī Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Sulāmī. Tadhkira. III, 123. He is reported to have made his own personal editions (kahrawa ‘alā) of the two Sahīhs, the Jamī of al-Tirmidhī, and the Mukhtasar of al-Muzārī. Al-Dhahabi includes a fascinating anecdote relating Abū Ahmad’s surprise in Rayy at a reading of al-Jān wa l-tādīl to its compiler Ibn Abī Hātim, and said
Khuzayma, and a skilled jurist of the Shafi'i madhhab, Abu Ahmad served as qadi of Shash (now Tashkent) from 333-37/944-48 and Tus from 337-45/948-56. The remainder of his life was spent in Nishapur, where he taught hadith and general hadith criticism (i'tal) to, among others, the previously mentioned al-Hakim Abu 'Abdullah al-Naysaburi.

Two additional Khurasan master scholars of the fourth phase must be included in this historical survey. Abu Naqr Muhammad b. Muhammad al-Tusi (d. 344/955-6), an eleventh tabaga Shaykh al-Islam, also acquired the honorific of 'Shaykh of the Shafi'i madhhab' due to his mastery of jurisprudence. Al-Dhahabi mentions that al-Hakim al-Naysaburi visited Abu Naqr twice in Tus, where he observed that he spent a third of the night compiling books, another third reading Qur'an, and a third asleep. The other master hadith scholar of considerable interest for this book is the 'renaissance mukaddith' Abu Hatum Ibn Hibban al-Busti (d. 354/965-6). His student al-Hakim al-Naysaburi reports that he passed through Nishapur several times, served as a qadi briefly in Nasã, built a khanaqah in which he read all of his books, and returned home to Sijistan in 340/951. Ibn Hibban is a particularly interesting case, as he is one of the few hadith scholars to have achieved a proficiency in non-religious sciences, and his khanaqah is one of the few references to such a structure in the entire Tadhkira.

The final Iranian city that achieved a worldwide level of prominence for hadith scholarship during the fourth phase is Isfahan. In fact, just as the tradition in Nishapur was beginning to lose steam in the twelfth tabaga, Isfahan received an extraordinary foundation...
in the form of two scholars. Abū l-Qāsim Sulaymān b. Ahmad al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971), the authority (huja) and ‘Musnad of the temporal world (dunyā)’ spent the final seven decades of his long life in his adopted city of Isfahan. The largest of his three hadīth encyclopedias, al-Muḥjam al-kabīr, is really a musnad work (minus the musnad of Abū Hurayra) that contains at least 30,000 hadīth. Al-Ṭabarānī also achieved notoriety in the hadīth competitions (mudhākara) he held in 349/960 with the master Baghdādi scholar Ibn al-Jī‘ābī (d. 355/966). The other important hadīth scholar of Isfahan during this time was Abū Bakr b. Abī ‘Āsim Abū l-Shaykh (d. 369/979-80). Al-Dhahābī recognizes Abū l-Shaykh as the ‘Musnad of his time’ and includes an anecdote on the authority of “some ‘ulamā’” that they always found al-Ṭabarānī laughing or joking when they visited him, whereas Abū l-Shaykh was always praying.

It is also necessary to pay a brief visit to Cordoba in order to introduce a few of the scholars who bridge the gap between the tenth tabaqā Shaykh al-Islām Baqiyy b. Makhlād and the fourteenth tabaqā Shuyukh al-Islām al-Dānī and Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr. One early scholar of the eleventh tabaqā is the ‘Mubaddith of al-Andalus’ Abū ‘Abdullāh Ibn Ḥayyūn (d. 305/917). Despite his predilection for tashayyūr, Ibn Ḥayyūn is evaluated as an Imam by al-Dhahābī, and it is quite likely that he brought a copy of Ibn Ḥanbal’s Musnad back to al-Andalus with him after his time in Baghdād with Ibn Ḥanbal’s son ‘Abdullāh. A second ‘Shaykh al-Andalus’ of the eleventh tabaqā is Abū ‘Umar Ibn al-Jabbāb al-Qurtubī (d. 322/934). Ibn al-Jabbāb studied with Baqiyy b. Makhlād, excelled at Maliki jurisprudence, and is reported to have composed a book on the stories of the prophets. The final major Andalusī scholar of this phase who must be mentioned is al-Qāsim b. Aṣbagh al-Qurtubī (d. 340/951-2), another student of Baqiyy b. Makhlād. Qāsim traveled to Baghdād

---

116 Tadhkira, III, 85. His insatiable quest for hadīth led him from his hometown ‘Akka in Palestine to nearly one thousand teachers, including the Shaykh al-Islām al-Nasāʾī in Egypt, throughout the lands of Islam.
117 His intermediary muṣjam, al-Muṣjam al-ʿasṣaf, contains over 10,000 hadīth.
118 Ibn al-Jī‘ābī was a student of Ibn ʿAbībān who taught al-Dāraquṭnī, Ibn Ṣāḥib, and Abū ‘Alī al-Naysābūrī prior to his conversion to speculative theology or Ḥaṭṭī fi Ṣīṣīism near the end of his life; Tadhkira, III, 92-4.
119 Tadhkira, III, 105.
120 Tadhkira, III, 4.
in order to acquire knowledge from Ismā‘īl al-Qaḍī and the history of Ibn Abī Khaythama; Ibn Ḥazm considered his hadīth book al-Muntaqā to be of the same status as al-Muntaqā of Ibn al-Jārūd al-Naysābūrī and the Sahīh collections of al-Bukhārī and Muslim.¹²⁴

A final scholar of the fourth phase who should not be overlooked is Abū Ja‘far Ahmad b. Muḥammad al-Ṭahāwī (d. 321/933). Al-Dhahabī reports that al-Ṭahāwī adopted the Ḥanafī madhhab after his uncle, the famous Ṣāḥīḥī jurist al-Muzānī, insulted him by saying “By God! Nothing good will come of you!”¹²⁵ Al-Ṭahāwī’s extraordinary knowledge of hadīth in addition to Ḥanafī jurisprudence is evident from his significant book Kitāb ma‘ānī al-āthār,¹²⁶ and his concise creed (‘aqīda) has also achieved a prominent place among most Sunnī scholars to this day.

The fourth phase of Sunnī hadīth scholarship demonstrates a remarkable continuity in both scope and quality with the preceding one. Four of the ten books synthesized by Ibn Ḥajar in his lṭḥāf al-mahāra were composed during this period and the Baghdādī scholars al-Khālil, al-ʾAjūrī, and al-Dāraquṭnī all left impressive compilations of hadīth that have survived to this day. Al-Ṭabarānī’s al-Mujām al-kabīr remains one of the largest hadīth books ever compiled, and both Abū Bakr al-ʾIsḥāqī’s books and al-Qāsim b. Abī Ṭabī’s al-Muntaqā exerted a deep influence in their respective regions of the Islamic Community. Furthermore, the fourth phase witnessed a remarkable proliferation of the standard Sunnī hadīth-transmitter criticism books by Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī, Ibn ʿAdī, Ibn Hibbān, al-ʾUqaylī and Abū ʿl-Fāṭih al-ʾAzdī. Finally, the careful attention paid to the Sahīhs of al-Bukhārī and Muslim by scholars such as Ibn al-Sharqī, Abū

¹²⁴ Tadhkira, III, 49 and 227. His Andalusī students were the teachers of Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr. Al-Dhahabī reports that Ibn Asbagh compiled a hadīth book arranged according to the topics of Muslim’s Sahīh; ibid., III, 49.

¹²⁵ Tadhkira, III, 21. wa-llīhi, lā jī‘u minka shayʿan! This book is included among the ten books in Ibn Ḥajar’s lṭḥāf al-mahāra. The large four-volume 1996 Dār al-Kutub al-ʾIlmiyya edition Sharḥ ma‘ānī l-āthār lacks a numerical counter, although it is safe to say that the book contains several thousand hadīth in its twenty-nine chapters. This book is critically important for hadīth studies because al-Ṭabarānī methodically collects clusters of hadīth related to a single legal topic and explains which version of the report is the most authoritative on the basis of hadīth-transmitter criticism and his profound knowledge of the differing opinions of most of the major early Muslim jurists. Al-Ṭabarānī’s other famous hadīth book, Sharḥ muskhil al-āthār, has been edited with extensive notes by Shu‘ayb al-ʿArnāʾūṭ (Beirut: Muʿassasa al-Risāla, 1994). Note that ʿIṣāqī does not mention al-Ṭahāwī in Ḥadīth Literature.
Bakr al-Ismā‘īlī, and Abū ʿAlīmad al-Ḥakim demonstrates that these books achieved an unparalleled degree of prestige within less than a century of their compilation. Given the large number of original hadith books that Muslim scholars compiled from the second to fourth phases of this survey, it is perhaps not surprising that far more attention was devoted to the composition of biographical dictionaries and books concerning the hadith disciplines during the next phase of Sunnī hadith scholarship.

III.6 Phase 5: The age of specialization (c. 400–480/1009–1087)

The presence of six of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ’s seven “scholars who compiled useful compositions” in the fields of hadith scholarship in the fifth phase of this historical survey is eloquent testimony to its significance. The four Shuyūkh al-Islām of this phase thrived in al-Andalus, and the fact that one of them never traveled east for educational purposes indicates the self-sufficient excellence of hadith scholarship that had developed from the time of Baqīyy b. Makhlad. The fourth Shaykh al-Islām of this period lived in Herat, which was also the birthplace of the most elevated transmitter of the Sahih of al-Bukhārī. Two cities of Iran—Isfahan and Nishapur—continued to produce illustrious scholars, as did Baghdad. The arrival of the Ismā‘īlī Fatimid caliph challenged the hadith scholarship of Egypt and Mecca, which had achieved a high level of quality under the Ikhshidids and the more or less independent Hijāz. In many ways, the fifth phase of hadith criticism and transmission completes the period of original books of hadith literature that began back in the middle of the second/eighth century of Islamic civilization.

Four major Andalusī scholars contributed to the venture of hadith transmission in a manner that deeply effected both the western and central lands of the Muslim world. The Ṣūfī Shaykh al-Islām ‘Aṭīyya b. Sa‘īd (d. 408/1017–8) traveled all the way to Transoxania in order to hear the Sahih of al-Bukhārī from a student of the original compiler of the book, al-Firābī. ‘Aṭīyya transmitted the Sahih in his adopted home of Mecca, where he also shared his expertise in

127 See above, II.1.
128 Tadhkira, III, 192.
the variant readings of the Qur'an (qir'ātāt) and mysticism. A second Andalusī Shaykh al-Islām, Abu ‘Amr ‘Uthmān b. Sa‘īd al-Dānī (d. 444/1052), was also a world class expert of qir'ātāt and is reported to have composed 120 books. The third and final Shaykh al-Islām of this period, Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr (d. 463/1071), is distinguished as the sole Andalusī among Ibn al-Ṣalāh's list of 'seven compilers of useful books' and left an extraordinary textual legacy.

Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr’s biographical dictionary of the sahāba, Kitāb al-istīrāb, was considered the premier book of its type by Ibn al-Ṣalāh, and his monograph Jāmi‘ bayān al-ilm wa-fadlīl was one of the first systematic articulations of the hadith disciplines. Two exhaustive commentaries of al-Muwatta', the Tamhīd and al-Istidhkiir, unequivocably secured Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr’s spot among the most august Sunnī scholars. These accomplishments are all the more impressive considering that Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr never left al-Andalus, and indicate the high level of indigenous hadith erudition of his numerous teachers, many of whom had studied with Ibn al-Jabbāb and al-Qāsim b. Aṣbāgh.

The final Andalusī scholar who requires attention is the iconoclastic genius ‘All b. Anmād Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1064). Despite his early life of privilege as the son of a wazīr, Ibn Ḥazm developed an unquenchable thirst for religious knowledge in his early twenties. His unique articulation of the Zāhirī madhhab earned him the title mujtahid from al-Dhahābī, and his multi-volume legal book al-Muballig bi-l-isti‘īr was one of the few texts in its day to be grounded almost exclusively upon the Qurʾān and the authoritative hadith books instead of the opinions of earlier master jurists. Ibn Ḥazm’s efforts

---

129 ‘Aṭīyya was a disciple of the famous mystic Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Sulāmī in both Nishapur and Baghdad.
130 Tadhkira, III, 211.
131 Tadhkira, III, 217. Al-Dhahābī quotes Ibn Ḥazm’s praise of Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr’s large commentary on the Muwatta’, al-Tamhīd, as well as its large abridgement, al-Istidhkiir.
132 Muqaddima Ibn al-Ṣalāh, 485.
133 All four of these books have been published: 1) al-Istīrāb fi ma‘rifat al-ashab (Cairo, 196-); 2) Jāmi‘ bayān al-ilm wa-fadlīl (Cairo, 1975); 3) al-Tamhīd li-mā fi l-Muwatta’ min al-ma‘ām wa l-asānīd, 26 vols. (Rabat, 1974–92); 4) al-Istidhkiir al-jāmi‘ li-maddahih fiqahat al-‘amīr wa ‘ulumā‘ al-‘aqīd fīmā tada‘ammamahu “al-Muwatta’” min ma‘ām al-‘a‘y wa al-‘āthār, 30 vols. (Beirut: Dār Qutaybah and Cairo: Dār al-Wa‘y, 1993).
134 Tadhkira, III, 227–9. The undated Dār al-Fikr edition of this book consists of 2312 topics, the first 91 of which are theological, the following 18 of which are concerned with legal principles (uṣūl), and the remainder of which cover all aspects
to articulate a genuinely Sunni 'hadith folk' legal madhab not only influenced the paradigm-shifting mystic Muḥyī l-Dīn Ibn 'Arabī, but appears to have anticipated the salafi movement of Ibn Taymiyya by three centuries. Unfortunately, Western scholarship has focused almost exclusively on Ibn Hazm's enjoyable, but largely inconsequential treatise on love, and thus our understanding of his creative efforts remains in its infancy.

Meanwhile, in Herat there flourished another Sufi Shaykh al-Islām as well as another master transmitter of al-Bukhārī's Sahīh. Abū Ismā'īl 'Abdullāh al-Anṣārī (d. 481/1088), author of the famous Sufi guide Manāẓīr al-sā'īrin, is honored by al-Dhahabī with the sobriquet Shaykh al-Islām for his profound knowledge of hadith, staunch antspeculative theology stance, and ability to rise above the Ḥanafī-Šāfi`ī quarrels of his day. The second most prestigious scholar of Herat was Abū Dharr al-Harāwī (d. 434/1042-3) who synthesized three recensions of al-Bukhārī's Sahīh and transmitted it from the central location of Mecca. Abū Dharr studied briefly with al-Daraqūṭnī in Baghdad on his way to Mecca, and his choice of the Malikī legal school of Islamic law. Note that al-Dhahabī studied al-Muhallā closely and made an abridgment of this book.

Two books that move beyond the seductive Tawq al-hamāma are Goldziher's The Zāhirīs (translated and ed. by Wolfgang Behn, Leiden: Brill, 1971), and R. Arnaldez's Grammaire et théologie chez Ibn Hazm de Coudoue (Paris: J. Vrin, 1956). The El2 article by Arnaldez is also very insightful. The relationship between the post-Ibn Hazm Zāhirīs and Ibn Taymiyya's salafi movement has not, to my knowledge, been confirmed, although the ideological similarities between the two groups are striking. Al-Dhahabī's defense of Ibn Hazm in the Tadhkira against his numerous adversaries, as well as the fact that he designated him and Ibn Taymiyya as mujtahids in this book indicates Ibn Hazm's deep influence upon him.
madhhab with the Ash'ari theological one struck many of his contemporaries as odd, especially given his Central Asian roots.\footnote{Tadhkira, III, 201.}

Two particularly strong Iranian scholars in the city of Isfahan built upon the foundation established by al-Tabarani and Abu l-Shaykh at this time. Abu 'Abdullah Ibn Manda (d. 395/1005) collected an extraordinary amount of hadith during a journey during which he supposedly encountered 1,700 shuyukh.\footnote{Tadhkira, III, 157. The four sources are Abu Sa'id Ibn al-A'rabî (d. 340/951-2) of Mecca, al-A'sam of Nishapur, Khaythama b. Sulaymân (d. 343/955) of Syria, and al-Haytham b. Kulayb of Samarqand. All but the latter have entries in Tadhkira, III, 47, 53, and 51, respectively.} Ibn 'Asâkir identifies four major sources of Ibn Manda's hadith and remarks that his famous biographical dictionary of sahaba contained many errors.\footnote{Tadhkira, III, 195. Abu Nu'aym studied with the master hadith scholar al-Tabarani and he passed his knowledge on to al-Khaṭîb al-Baghdâdî and numerous teachers of Abu Tâhir al-Silâfî.} Ibn Manda is reported to have been involved in a vicious dispute with his fellow 'Muhaddith of the Age' and hometown rival, Abu Nu'aym Ahmad b. 'Abdullah al-Iṣbahānî (d. 430/1039) due to their differences in madhhab.\footnote{Tadhkira, III, 219; III, 157, 238 and IV, 33. All four members of the Ibn Manda dynasty lived in Isfahan.} His most famous book is the 689-entry biographical dictionary of pious scholars and mystics entitled Ḥifṣyat al-awliyā' that is both a rich source of historical information concerning Hodgson's elusive 'piety-minded' Muslims of early Islamic history, and probably was, in its day, the largest work arranged by tabaqat that was composed after Ibn Sa'd's al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr.\footnote{Tadhkira, III, 201.}


Abu Nu'aym's adoption of the tabaqat structure was probably due to the influence of his fellow

\footnote{Tadhkira, III, 201.}


\footnote{Abu Nu'aym, Ḥifṣyat al-awliyā' wa ṭabaqāt al-awliyā' (Cairo, 1967-8). Abu Nu'aym's adoption of the tabaqat structure was probably due to the influence of his fellow.
The city of Nishapur, so prominent in the third and fourth phases, housed its final ‘Imām of the muhaddithun’ in the thirteenth jāhāna. Al-Ḥākim Abū ‘Abdullāh (d. 405/1014) studied with a vast number of shuyukh, although his primary master was the previously discussed Abū ‘All l-Naysābūrī. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ honors al-Ḥākim as one of the ‘seven compilers of useful compositions,’ and he has the distinction of being one of the few men to have compiled significant works in all three genres of ḥadīth literature. The Mustadrak ‘alā al-Saḥīḥayn is the only ḥadīth compilation of the fifth phase to be included in Ibn Ḥajar’s lThaqf al-mahara, although al-Ḥākim’s incorporation of many forged ḥadīth in its pages led several scholars to question his competence. Al-Ḥākim’s biographical dictionary Tārīkh Naysābūr, was, rather surprisingly, the first significant history of his hometown. Finally, al-Ḥākim’s slightly disjointed Ma’rifat ʿulūm al-ḥadīth was a major milestone in the tradition of systematic articulations of the ḥadīth disciplines and probably served as a model for Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ’s Muqaddima. A final interesting quality of al-Ḥākim is his mild adherence to tashīyūn at this late date in the development of Sunnism, although the hostile reactions of several of his contemporaries clearly indicate this position was severely condemned in most Sunnī quarters.

The final major ḥadīth scholar who flourished during the fifth phase in the lands of Iran is the remarkable ‘Shaykh of Khurāsān’ Abū Bākr ‘Abdullāh al-Husayn al-Bayhāqī (d. 458/1066). Despite the fact that al-Bayhāqī never studied the Sunan of al-Nasāʾī, the Jāmī of al-Tirmidhī, nor the Sunan of Ibn Māja, he acquired a massive amount of material from his primary master, al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, and composed several large ḥadīth books, four of which are particularly significant. Each one of these tomes indicates a degree of specialization that is typical of this age:

Sīfī al-Sulamī’s Famous Tabaqāt al-sāḥibayn, although it seems quite likely that he was familiar with Ibn Sa’d’s book in the course of his research for Kitāb ma’rifat al-sahāba.

Tadhkira, III, 162.

It is therefore necessary to read the Mustadrak with al-Dhahabi’s commentary on it. Tārīkh al-mustadrak, which, fortunately, has been included in the Hyderabad, Riyadh, and Cairo editions of al-Ḥākim’s al-Mustadrak. See, for example, al-Mustadrak ‘alā l-saḥīḥayn, 5 vols. (Cairo, 1997).

Only a fragment of a later Persian translation survives of this book, although al-Dhahabi quotes the Arabic original with great frequency in his historical works.

1) al-Asmāʾ wa l-sifāt, a clarification of the nature of the divine attributes;
2) Shuʿab al-imān, an investigation into the 'branches' of faith;
3) Dala’il al-nubuwwa, an elucidation of the Prophet Muhammad’s miracles and ethics;
4) al-Sunan al-kubrā, a truly enormous Shafi'i fiqh book that is saturated with thousands of hadiths with full isnāds.148

It has already been suggested that al-Bayhaqī is the last of the compilers of ‘original’ hadith books, although it must be born in mind that the absence of any studies of his or later scholars’ hadith books renders this hypothesis pure speculation.149

Baghdad also nurtured two exceptional scholars during the fifth phase of hadith scholarship. The ‘Shaykh of the jurists and hadith scholars,’ Abū Bakr Ahmad b. Muḥammad al-Khwārazmī al-Shāfiʿī, know as al-Barqānī, followed the example of Ibn Surayj a century and a half earlier by achieving a high proficiency in jurisprudence and hadith.150 He is reported to have reorganized the Ṣahīhs of al-Bukhārī and Muslim as a musnad book (i.e., according to sahābu), and his numerous students include Abū Bakr al-Bayhaqī, Abū Ishāq al-Shifāzī, and the other extraordinary Baghdādī of this period, Abū Bakr Ahmad b. ʿAlī al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (d. 463/1071). A student of Abū Nuʿaym al-Iṣbahānī, among many others, al-Khaṭīb earned the honorific ‘Muhaddith of Syria and Iraq’ from Al-Dhahabī due to his eleven year sojourn in Damascus and Aleppo. Many of his monographs on various hadith disciplines have been mentioned in the previous chapter’s discussion of Ibn al-Salah’s Muqaddima, and his most famous work is unquestionably the 7831-biography history of Baghdad. Al-Khaṭīb’s vast corpus seems to have closed the era of Baghdad’s primacy in hadith scholarship that began in the eighth tabāqa with

148 It was a common practice among jurists to quote fragments of the ma’ānī of famous hadiths without mentioning their isnāds in the interests of brevity. Al-Bayhaqī’s Sunan al-kubrā follows the pattern of sunan hadith books like those of Abū Dāwūd and al-Nasāʾī, and thus includes full isnāds for each hadith, for a vast array of legal topics. The 1925 Hyderabad edition of al-Sunan al-kubrā is based upon the recension that Ibn al-Salah transmitted from his teachers in Khurāsān.

149 The honor of being the last ‘original’ musannif might actually belong to the sixth phase scholar al-Baghawi, whose 4200-hadith book, Sharḥ al-sunna, and 2840-hadith work Masāʾibīh al-sunna, merit closer investigation.

150 Tadhkira, III, 183. Al-Barqānī studied with the Shaykh al-Īslām Abū Bakr al-Isnāʾīli.

Egypt was blessed with two master ḥadīth scholars during the fifth phase who lived under very different circumstances. 'Abd al-Ghanī b. Sa'id al-Azdi (d. 409/1018) is the final one of Ibn al-Ṣalābī's 'seven compilers of useful compositions' and reportedly studied with and taught al-Dāraquṭnī. 151 'Abd al-Ghanī was praised by al-Barqānī, and was a teacher of the second major Egyptian ḥadīth scholar of this period, Abū Ishāq al-Habbāl (d. 482/1089). Al-Dhahabī recognizes al-Ḥabbāl, a bookseller of Andalusī origin, as the 'Muḥaddith of Egypt,' and mentions that he was prevented from teaching ḥadīth to many students during the Fāṭimid period due to official state policies. These restrictions appear to be similar to those which suppressed the 'Shaykh of the Ḥaram al-Sharī‘ī' in Mecca, Abū l-Qāsim Sa'd b. 'Alī al-Zanjānī (d. 471/1078-9). 152 Both scholars managed to teach a few students in their own homes during this time, and it is unclear from the Tadhkira exactly what effect the Fāṭimid caliphs had on Sunnī ḥadīth scholarship in general.

A review of the additions to our ḥadīth library that were composed during the fifth phase of my interpretation of al-Dhahabī's Tadhkira al-kuffāz indicates a shift in emphasis from general compilations to more specialized biographical and technical works. The only major ḥadīth compilations that have been added to the collection from the past two jābaqāt are the Mustadrak of al-Ḥākim, the four large books of al-Bayhaqī, the Tamhīd of Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, and the Muḥallā of Ibn Hazm. Three biographical dictionaries of saḥāba were compiled in this period for reasons that are not entirely clear. 153 Al-Ḥākim's history of Nishapur, Abū Nu'aym's encyclopedia of 'piety-minded' scholars, and al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī's history of Baghdad elevated the genre of biographical dictionaries to new heights. Finally, the hitherto undeveloped genre of ḥadīth disciplines received comprehensive articulations by Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī,

151 Tadhkira, III, 167. His fame rested largely on his book al-Mu'talif wa l-mukhtalif that was useful for discerning the identities of ḥadīth transmitters in the isnāds, as well as for establishing the correct orthography of thousands of names.

152 Tadhkira, III, 253 (al-Ḥabbāl; 243 (al-Zanjānī).

A tempting explanation for this phenomenon would be that the dramatic rise of both Fāṭimī and Imāmī Shi‘ism, both schools of which were known for their hostility towards the saḥāba, stimulated a Sunnī reaction in the form of encyclopedias honoring the lives of the saḥāba. Early Imāmī Shi‘ī attitudes towards the saḥāba are discussed below in chapter VI.3.1.
and al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, as well as dozens of specialized books by the latter and al-Muṭalīf wa l-mukhtalīf of the Egyptian ‘Abd al-Ghanī b. Saʿīd. It appears that the ‘classical sources’ of Sunnī hadīth literature were more or less completed by the the end of the fifth phase, and that the primary task for succeeding generations of hadīth scholars was to transmit and synthesize the daunting library of erudition that was compiled by several dozen scholars over a three century period.

III.7 Phase 6: Transition and the loss of the East (c. 480-600/1087-1203)

The intensity and volume of hadīth compilation of the preceding five phases being what it was, a period of notably less impressive achievements can be seen, perhaps, as having been inevitable. We have already observed that al-Dhahābī identifies a mere four Shaykh al-Islām in the first century of this phase and that the seventeenth tabāqa is the first one totally devoid of any scholars of this caliber. This qualitative decline is particularly surprising due to its occurrence during a period of staunchly Sunnī Seljuq rule. Why did Sunnī hadīth scholarship drop so precipitously during an age that is known to be an age of Sunnī revival?

One hypothesis might be that the Seljuk institution of the madrasa critically wounded the traditional networks of learning. This argument immediately loses some credibility in light of George Makdisi’s observations that the curriculum of these schools was hardly standardized and that study of hadīth was practically inevitable.154 Daphna Ephrat has argued that the impact of the institution of the madrasa was not particularly significant in Baghdad during this ‘age of transition’ and that traditional scholarly networks continued to thrive.155 Given all of the challenges faced by the scholars mentioned in the previous five phases, it does seem difficult to believe that a few well endowed schools could be held responsible for the small number of useful contributions to hadīth literature composed during this period.

A second potential culprit for this qualitative drop in hadith scholarship is the rise of tariqa Sufism. Many of al-Dhahabi's Shuyukh al-Islam, such as 'Atiyya b. Sa'iid of al-Andalus and 'Abdullāh al-Anṣārī of Herat, were highly committed Sūfīs who expressed their piety by means of both esoteric spiritual exercises and exoteric dedication to the great Sunnī hadith books. The virtual absence of any mystical Shuyukh al-Islam from the fifteenth to twenty-first tabaqāt is interesting, but can hardly be interpreted as an impact of the poorly understood transformation of local Sūfī groups into worldwide orders.\(^\text{156}\)

My opinion, in the absence of any clear explanation from al-Dhahabi, is that the library of hadith books had grown so large over the course of three centuries of frenetic compilation that scholars had to devote the bulk of their energy to the preservation and organization of their predecessors' accomplishments. Many works had been lost during the course of this venture, such as most of the books of 'Alī b. al-Madīnī,\(^\text{157}\) and it seems quite feasible that most scholars would shift their attention towards abridgements, commentaries, and reference works in order to facilitate the acquisition of the greatest diversity of this literature as was humanly possible. The transition away from the compilation of hadith books can be seen already between the fourth and fifth phases, as only al-Ḥākim al-Naysabūrī and al-Bayhaqī composed hadith books 'from scratch,' whereas those of Ibn Ḥazm and Ibn 'Abd al-Barr were extensive commentaries on relatively short legal works.\(^\text{158}\) It should not be surprising, then, that the majority of the noteworthy compositions of the sixth phase of hadith scholarship are biographical in nature, just as they were in the phase that preceded it.\(^\text{159}\)

\(^{156}\) Whether the Shaykh al-Islām al-Nawawī was a mystic or ascetic is something for his biographers to decide: al-Dhahabi, at least, describes his pious asceticism, as well as his erudition in the Ṭadhkira.

\(^{157}\) Sīar, XI, 60. Al-Dhahabi cites a long list of Ibn al-Madīnī's books according to what al-Ḥākim al-Naysabūrī heard from the Qāḍī Muhammad b. Sāliḥ al-Ḥāshimī; at the end of this list, al-Dhahabi reports al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī's observation that he had only seen four or five of these books (fā-jam‘ûn hadithīn l-kutub ṭanawwad; rd‘ayn minhum arbetsan aw khamis).

\(^{158}\) Ibn Ḥazin's al-Muhallā is a commentary on his own one-volume fīq̣ book entitled al-Mulgālī, Ṭadhkira, III, 231.

\(^{159}\) An even more mundane yet plausible explanation for the end of 'original' hadith books could be that the ismāl had grown far too long by this time for com-
Several master scholars elevated the Western Iranian cities of Isfahan and Hamadhan to the highest levels of Sunni hadith erudition during the fifteenth and sixteenth tabaqāt of al-Dhahabi's Tadhkira al-hujjāz. The Shaykh al-Islām Abū l-Qāsim Iṣmā‘īl b. Muḥammad al-Taymī (d. 535/1140-1) of Isfahan was a master of both hadith and Qur’ānic exegesis, and educated important sixth-phase scholars such as Abū Sa‘d al-Samānī, Ibn 'Asākir, and Abū Ṭāhir al-Silāfī. The second of these three scholars, al-Silāfī (d. 576/1180), was a Shaykh al-Islām in his own right and played a critical role in the transmission of religious knowledge from Isfahan to Alexandria. Al-Silāfī compiled three mu‘jams of hadith with elevated ('āli) isnāds that were highly valued by his students, like the important seventh-tabāqa scholars Muḥammad Ibn Ṭāhir al-Maqqāsī, ‘Abd al-Ghānī b. Abī al-Wāḥid al-Maqqāsī, and Abī al-Qādir al-Ruḥawlī. The final Isfahanī Shaykh al-Islām of this period is Abū Musā al-Madīnī (d. 581/1185), the compiler of the fourth of the four sahāba biographical dictionaries that were synthesized by the famous historian Izz al-Dīn Ibn al-Ṭāhir in his standard work Usd al-Ghiyāb. Finally, the pilation to be a practical task. Certainly the numerous ‘elevated’ isnāds of hadith cited throughout al-Dhahabi’s books occupy far more space than most of the actual texts and are of little interest for all save the most dedicated hadith specialists.


Tadhkira, IV, 50-2. Al-Dhahabi reports that the slightly younger Shaykh al-Islām Abū Muṣā l-Madīnī knew of no scholar at the turn of the six century who was more knowledgeable of hadith than Abū l-Qāsim al-Taymī, and that he composed Qur’ānic commentaries in both Arabic and Persian. Abū Muṣā also mentions that al-Taymī refused to associate with the political rulers (salṭānīn) or even other scholars who did so. Tadhkira, IV, 63. Al-Silāfī lived in Alexandria the last sixty-five years of his century-long life.

The first mu‘jam consisted of scholars of his home city Isfahan, the second of Baghdad, and the third of those he met during his ten year travel. The last of these three books has been published: Mu‘jam al-safar (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr, 1993).
sixteenth-tabqa Shaykh al-Islâm 'Abû l-'Alâ' al-Hamadhânî (d. 569/1173-4) was a master of Arabic grammar and the variant Qur’anic readings, and his major pupil al-Ruhâwî reports that his books were popular in Khwârazm and Syria.\textsuperscript{165} Three excellent Andalusi scholars also flourished during this period in the wake of al-Dânî, Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, and Ibn Hazm. Abû 'Abdullâh Muḥammad b. Abû Naṣr al-Ḥumaydî (d. 488/1095) was a close disciple of Ibn Hazm on the island of Majorca and dispersed his unique Zâhirî teachings and books throughout the central and eastern Islamic lands.\textsuperscript{166} Al-Ḥumaydî is reported to have devoted many years of his life to the examination of the two Sahîhs of al-Bukhârî and Muslim and also exerted himself to compose a universal history of Muslim scholars arranged by their death dates. Abû 'Alî al-Ḥasan al-Jayyânî al-Ghassânî (d. 498/1104-5) never left al-Andalus, although his study of the hadîth-transmitters found in the Sahîhs of al-Bukhârî and Muslim achieved a high degree of popularity in the East.\textsuperscript{167} Finally, the ‘Scholar (‘ālim) of the Maghrib,’ al-Qâdi ‘Iyâd b. Muṣâ al-Sabû (d. 544/1149) composed several important works,\textsuperscript{168} and his study of the obscure expressions (al-gharâ’îb) found in the Muwatta’ and the two Sahîh books is further evidence of the shift of the scholarly focus of the sixth phase from the compilation of large original hadîth books to the elucidation of the most exalted books of the Sunnî hadîth tradition.


\textsuperscript{165} Tadhkira, IV, 80. One final scholar from this region found in Siyar al-âm al-mubâla‘ but not in Tadhkira al-ḫufâq is Abû l-Khayr al-Ṭalqânî, Ahmad b. Ismâ’îl (d. 590/1194). Al-Ṭalqânî was born in Qazvîn, studied in Nîshâpûr, and taught in his native city and the prestigious Nizâmîyya college in Baghdad. Ibn al-Najîr reports that al-Ṭalqânî transmitted the Sahîh of al-Ǧâ’far al-Ṣāliḥ, the Sunnî al-Bayhaqî, and al-M潩rîkh al-mubâla‘. Siyar al-âm al-mubâla‘, XVI, 190-5.

\textsuperscript{166} Tadhkira, IV. 13. He also studied with Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, al-Khaṭîb al-Baghdâdî, and the famous transmitter of the Sahîh of al-Bukhârî, Karîma al-Marwaziyya, in Mecca.

\textsuperscript{167} Tadhkira, IV. 23. Al-Jawâfî was a student Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr. The title of this book is Taqâd al-mahmûl wa-tamyrî al-mushkil and was published in 1997 in Morocco by al-Wîzarat al-Awqaf wa-l-Shu’un al-Islâmiyya.

\textsuperscript{168} These books include a study of the ethics of the Prophet (al-Shîfâ’), a comprehensive biographical dictionary of Mâlikî jurists (Tartîb al-mudâriki wa-taqîb al-masalîk), a history of al-Andalus and the Maghrib, and a commentary on the Sahîh of Muslim (al-Imâh fi sharî‘ Muslim).
The knowledge of al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī extended another generation in his home city in large part due to the labors of the Amir Ibn Mākūla. The most famous book of this colorful personality, al-Ikmāl has already been encountered in the previous chapter in the connection with Ibn al-Salāḥ’s curriculum for the aspiring hadīth scholars. His teachers include the son of Ibn Shāhīn, and he received praise in Egypt from al-Ḥabbāl for his knowledge of hadīth and adab. Despite the uncertainty surrounding the location and date of his death, there is consensus that Ibn Mākūla was the victim of foul play by his Turkish bodyguard, a fate quite unusual among al-Dhahābī’s selection of huffaz.

The city of Marw in Khurāsān also enjoyed a florescence of hadīth scholarship during this generally lackluster period. The Shāfi‘ī ‘Reviver of the Sunna’ and mujtahīd Abū Muḥammad al-Husayn b. Maṣʿūd al-Baghwā (d. 516/1122) composed four major works, two of which are large hadīth collections. Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Maṣūr al-Samʿānī (d. 510/1116) taught public preaching (wāʿīz) for several years at the Nizāmiyya madrasa in Baghdad, was a companion of the Shaykh al-Islām al-Silāfī, and read al-Kaṭīb’s massive history of Baghdad. He passed away in middle age when his son, Abū Saʿd, was a mere five-year old, but fortunately his knowledge was transmitted to him via another prominent Marwāzi scholar, Abū Ṭāhir Muḥammad b. Ābī Bakr al-Subīḥ (d. 548/1153). Al-Dhahābī provides an

---

169 Tadhkīra, IV, 3. Al-Dhahābī reports a total lack of consensus as to this scholar’s death date. Ibn ʿAsākir puts it at about 470 in Jurjān, Abū Saʿd al-Samʿānī suggests 485 or 486 in al-Ahwāz, Ibn al-Najjār posits 475, Ibn al-Jawzī reports it at 475 or 486, and Ibn Khallīkān offers 479 and 487.

170 Tadhkīra, IV, 37. These two books are Shaḥīf al-sunna and Maṣābīḥ al-sunna. This latter book included 4,719 hadīth, 2,251 of which came from either al-Bukhārī or Muslim, according to Robson. Wāfī al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ‘Abdullāh al-Mīrāzī (d. around 738/1337) added 1,511 hadīth to this collection in his popular collection Masikhāt al-majāhib, and this book was translated into English by Robson as Miskhatt al-masāḥib (Lahore: S. M. Ashraf, 1950–4). Note that al-Baghwā does not include the ismāʾ of the hadīth in either Maṣābīḥ al-sunna nor Miskhatt al-masāḥib, but merely indicates whether or not they were saḥīḥ or hasan. Ibn al-Salāḥ is particularly critical of al-Baghwā’s innovation of restricting the term saḥīḥ exclusively to the hadīth from the Sahīhs of al-Bukhārī and Muslim, and his employment of hasan for all other material extracted from books, such as the Sunan of Abū Dāwūd and Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhī, even if the individual hadīth that he has selected from these latter two sources is considered by most critics as authoritative; Muqaddima Ibn al-Salāḥ, 182.

171 Tadhkīra, IV, 43.

172 Tadhkīra, IV, 73.
insightful list of some of the *hadith* books that al-Subhî taught both Abû Sa’d al-Sam’âni and Abû Sa’d’s son, ‘Abd al-Rahîm, that includes the *Sahîh* of Muslim, the *Sunan* of al-Nasâ’î, the *Raqâ’iq* of Ibn al-Mubârak, and *Hilyat al-a‘lîyâ* of Abû Nu‘aym al-Isbahâni. The ‘Crown of Islam,’ Abû Sa’d ‘Abd al-Karîm al-Sam’âni (d. 562/1167), traveled to hear scholars from Bukhara to Damascus, and even entered Jerusalem during the time of its occupation by the Latin Crusader Kingdom. His famous biographical dictionary, *al-Ansâb*, is arranged by *nisba* and aided greatly al-Dhahabi’s own historical inquiries. Although Abû Sa’d’s son ‘Abd al-Rahîm does not receive an individual biographical notice in the *Tadhkira*, it should be clear from what al-Dhahabi mentioned of his studies with al-Subhî and his father why Ibn al-Šalâh traveled all the way to Marw to study with him.

Two final scholars of the first two *fâhûqât* of the sixth phase of *hadith* scholarship merit mention for the volume of their studies in Syria. Abî l-Fadl Muhammad b. Tâhîr al-Maqdisî (d. 507/1113–4) spent a good portion of his life walking around the Eastern lands and even served as a paid copyist of the *hadith* books of al-Bukhârî, Muslim, Abû Dâwûd, and Ibn Mâja. His two favorite teachers are reported to have been Sa’d b. ‘Ali al-Zanjânî in Mecca and the mystic ‘Abdullâh al-Ansârî in Herat. Ibn Tâhir was an adherent to the Zâhirî madhhab, and despite his detailed studies of the six canonical *hadith* books, his reputation was tarnished by his numerous grammatical errors.

The other major Syrian scholar of this period is the ‘Boast of the imāms’ (*fakhr al-a‘immân*) Abû l-Qâsim ‘Ali b. al-Hasan Ibn ‘Asâkir (d. 571/1175). His famous eighty-volume biographical dictionary

---

173 *Tadhkira*, IV, 75. His students include his son ‘Abd al-Rahîm and Abû l-Qâsim Ibn ‘Asâkir.
175 Recall that Goldziher keenly suggested that Ibn Tâhir’s large *qârid* book based on the compilations of al-Bukhârî, Muslim, Abû Dâwûd, al-Tîrmdhî, al-Nasâ’î, and Ibn Mâja established the foundation for the institution of the ‘six canonical Sunnî *hadith* books’ since it predates by at least a century the *Jami‘ al-a‘shî* of Majd al-Dîn Ibn al-Âthîr and the *Kamâtî* of ‘Abîl-Ghânî al-Maqdisî, two books that might also be credited with this accomplishment. This is also the opinion of Muhammad ‘Abd al-Ra’uf; see his article ‘*Hadith Literature*’ in *The Cambridge History of Arabic Literature: Arabic Literature to the End of the Umayyad Period*, I (Cambridge, 1983), 287.
176 *Tadhkira*, IV, 82. Al-Dhahabi reports that Ibn ‘Asâkir studied with 1300 male and over 80 female scholars in the course of his lifetime.
Tārikh madinat Dimashq has earned the distinction of being one the largest books in Islamic civilization, and his studies with Abū ‘Alī al-Hamadhānī and Abū Sa‘d al-Sam‘ānī facilitated the spread of the knowledge of elevated isnads throughout Syria.

The final tabaqā of the sixth phase, as noted previously, is the first one totally bereft of a Shaykh al-Islām in Tadhkirat al-hujjāz. Al-Dhahabī does identify three master scholars in al-Muqīqa who lived during this period, and I have selected three other scholars of distinction from Tadhkirat al-hujjāz in order to connect this historical survey to the seventh, and final, phase. The first of these men is the Scholar of Iraq and Preacher of the horizons Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597/1201).177 Al-Dhahabī reports that he had never seen any scholar who composed the sheer number of books as this Baghdadī Hanbālī teacher did. Ibn al-Jawzī’s book of tarnished hadīth transmitters has been mentioned in the previous chapter as a source for al-Dhahabī’s Mizān al-tīdāl, and his books on Qur’ānic disciplines, exegesis, and history are standard works of the Islamic library. Al-Dhahabī warns us, though, that the large output of Ibn al-Jawzī was accomplished at the high cost of inaccuracy, and that many of his books are plagued with errors.

The second seventeenth-tabaqa scholar mentioned in al-Muqīqa is Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Mūsā al-Ḥāzīmī (d. 594/1188) who inherited the knowledge of Abū l-‘Alā’ al-Hamadhānī.178 Al-Ḥāzīmī left his hometown of Hamadhān and settled in Baghdad, where he devoted his considerable talents in the disciplines of hadīth scholarship to the elucidation of the fundamental Shāfī’ī legal book al-Muḥaddidhab by Abū imentos al-Shirāzī. He also composed a book concerning the abrogation of hadīth by other hadīth, expanded the Ikmāl of Ibn Mākūlā, and shared his mastery of genealogies with numerous students.

The final scholar of this period mentioned by al-Dhahabī in al-Muqīqa is the Ḥanbālī ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Ruhāwī (d. 612/1215). Born a slave, al-Ruhāwī was manumitted and studied hadīth with Abū l-‘Alā’ al-Hamadhānī, Ibn ‘Asākir, and al-Sīlahī.179 His student Ibn Nuqta reports that he was reliable but reluctant to teach hadīth. Some of the fortunate scholars to benefit from his erudition in Harran

---

177 Tadhkīra, IV, 92.
178 Tadhkīra, IV, 105.
179 Tadhkīra, IV, 121.
were the Andalusí al-Zakí al-Birzálí and al-Ḍiyá’ al-Maqdisí, both of whom settled in Syria and contributed to the ‘Triumph of Syria’ in the seventh phase.

Three other scholars of the rather lackluster seventeenth tabaqa warrant brief comments. Ibn Bashkuwal Khalaf b. ‘Abd al-Malik (d. 578/1182) achieved the title ‘Muhaddith al-Andalus’ from al-Dhahabi and preserved much useful information about western Islamic scholarship in his history Šila Tārīkh Ibn al-Faradi. Another Andalusí of some importance is the ‘Shaykh of the Maghrib’ Abū Muhammad Ibn ‘Ubayd Allāh (d. 591/1195) of Almeria, who continued the highly refined tradition of the major Qur’ānic readings and achieved a mastery of the Sahih of Muslim. Finally, ‘the Muhaddith al-Islām’ ‘Abd al-Ghānī b. ‘Abd al-Wahid al-Maqdisí (d. 600/1204) synthesized the erudition of al-Silāfi and Abū Mūsā al-Madīnī, and his biographical dictionary al-Kāmil contributed to the institution of the six canonical Sunnī hadith books. His students unquestionably contributed to the ‘triumph of Syria’ in the seventh phase, as they included the recently mentioned ‘Abd al-Qādir Ruhāwī, al-Ḍiyā’ al-Maqdisí, and Abū ‘Abdullāh al-Yunīnī.

It is clear from this brief historical survey that the master hadith scholars of the sixth phase devoted their energies to the compilation of biographical dictionaries and analyses of what gradually became known as the ‘six canonical Sunnī hadith books.’ While Ibn ‘Asākir and Ibn al-Jawzi may have set new records in size and quantity of book production, few men left works that were not thoroughly reworked and improved by master scholars during the Mamlūk period. The seminal books of Abū Muḥammad al-Baghwī, Abū Sa’d al-Sam‘ānī and Qadī ʿIyād did stand the test of time, although these appear to be exceptions to the rule. While the sixth phase of hadith scholarship does include several dozen scholars of a high caliber, it appears to have been primarily a period of transition from the

\[180\] Tadhkira, IV, 90. The list of Ibn Bashkuwal’s book titles indicates his interest in the lives of important early hadith scholars, such as al-Aʿmash, Ibn al-Mubārak, Ibn ʿUyayna, and al-Nasāḥ.

\[181\] Tadhkira, IV, 110.

\[182\] Tadhkira, IV, 111.

\[183\] Two examples that first come to mind are the Ikhtilāl of Ibn Mālikā, which was ultimately rendered irrelevant by the prosopographical works of al-Nawawi, al-Dhahabi, and Ibn Hajar, and the Kāmil of ‘Abd al-Ghānī al-Maqdisī, which was edited meticulously and vastly expanded by some 1700 entries by al-Mizzī.
age of original composition and criticism to one of synthesis, organization, and historical reflection.

III.8 Phase 7: The triumph of Syria (c. 600–720/1203–1320)

Al-Dhahabi devotes remarkably little space in *Tadhirat al-huffaz* to the scholars of the four final *tabaqaat*. It appears that the catastrophic impact of the Mongol invasions of the cities of Central Asia and Khurasan may be the most likely cause for the nearly total absence of master *hadith* scholars from anywhere east of Iraq during this period. These calamities in the east, as well as the fall of Cordoba and Seville in the west, appear to have led to a consolidation of *hadith* scholars in Syria as well as Egypt. Four of the six Shuyukh al-Islam of the last four *tabaqaat* lived in Syria, and the remaining two spent the better parts of their lives in Egypt. The impact of the *madrasa* is also visible in this period, as the majority of the scholars in this section appear to have held teaching posts at many of these new schools. Finally, the trends of synthesis and historical compilation seem to have fully eclipsed the tradition of *hadith* compilation during this period, and there is a marked rise in quality and quantity of books concerning the *hadith* disciplines.

Six master scholars of the eighteenth and nineteenth *tabaqaat* dominated the field of *hadith* scholarship. I have already discussed the importance of the Shaykh al-Islam Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ in the course of my discussion of his authoritative classification of the *hadith* disciplines earlier in this book, and have stressed the importance of his role in the transfer of works such as al-Bayhaqi’s *al-Sunan al-kubra* from pre-Mongol Khurasan to Ayyūbid Syria. The other Shaykh al-Islam of this period, ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. ʿAbd al-Qawiyy al-Mundhiri (d. 656/1258) left his native Gaza to teach at al-Dār al-Kāmilyya in Cairo and

---

181 The devastation of the Mongols in the form of the the first Muslim Ilkhan, Ghāzān, even reached Damascus in 699/1299–300, as al-Dhahabi lists several dozen casualties in the twenty-first *tābqa* of *Tadhirat al-huffaz* and claims to have mentioned over 190 scholars who perished during this year in *Tarikh al-Islām*; *Tadhkira*, 186–7. The Ilkhanid occupation lasted barely five months, although Ghāzān did invade Syria again in the winter of 700/1300–1 and in 702/1303; see P. M. Holt, *The Age of the Crusades* (New York: Longman, 1986), 110–11. For more about Ghāzān, see David Morgan, *Medieval Persia 1040–1797* (New York: Longman, 1988), 72–7.
compiled a famous hadith work in the genre of pious exhortations titled *Kitâb al-targhib wa l-tarhib*. The ‘Shaykh of the Sunna’ al-Diyâ’ Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Wâhid (d. 643/1245) studied with Ibn al-Jawzî and ‘Abd al-Rahîm b. Abî Sa’d al-Samâ’î, and is reported to have made two trips to the sixth-phase capital of hadith erudition, Isfahan. Abû ‘Abdullâh Muhammad al-Bâ’ibakki al-‘Hanbali (d. 638/1261), known as al-Yûnînî, was a major student of ‘Abd al-Ghannî al-Maqdîsî and was rumored to have memorized both the *Sahîh* of Muslim and the better part of the *Musnad* of Ibn ‘Hanbal. Another Hanbali of renown during this period was the ‘Mubaddith of Iraq’ Ibn Nuqta (d. 629/1232), a pupil of Ibn al-Jawzî and al-Ruhaîî, and the compiler of a supplement to Ibn Mâkûla’s *Ikmal*. Finally, the ‘scholar of the Maghrib,’ Ibn Sayyid al-Nâs (d. 659/1261), is the only nineteenth-tabaqa scholar identified in al-I’lâmî and was held in particularly high esteem for his transmission of Abû Dharr al-Harawî’s recension of the *Sahîh* of al-Bukhârî. The total absence of original hadith compilations by these master scholars is evident, and appears to confirm Ibn al-‘Alâ’î’s previously cited opinion in the *Jâfaddima* concerning the inadmissibility of hadith that are not found in any of the major books of the earlier eras.

The universal reluctance of the master hadith scholars of the eighteenth and nineteenth tabaqât to compile hadith books stimulated a major resurgence in biographical dictionaries and histories. The most famous historian of this period was the ‘Boast of the scholars,’ ‘Izz

---
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196 Tadhkîra, IV. 133.

197 Tadhkîra, IV. 135. Al-Yûnînî appears to have been a mystic, for al-Dhahâbî states that he “combined the disciplines of divine law (sharî’a) and mystical verification (hadîqa).”

198 Tadhkîra, IV. 138.

199 Tadhkîra, IV, 161–2. Al-Dhahâbî obtained Ibn Sayyid al-Nâs’s transmission of Abû Dharr’s recension of al-Bukhârî’s *Sahîh* by *jâza* from one of Ibn Sayyid al-Nâs’s pupils.

al-Dīn Ibn al-Athlīr (d. 630/1233), author of the universal history al-Kāmil, and the dictionary of saḥāba based upon the books of Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Ibn Manda, Abū Nu‘aym al-Isfahānī, and Abū Mūsā al-Madīnī. One of Ibn al-Athlīr’s students, the ‘Historian of Iraq’ Abū ‘Abdullāh Muḥammad al-Dubaythī (d. 637/1240), composed a large history of Wāṣīt and an appendix to Abū Sa‘d al-Sam‘ānī’s history of Baghdad. The ‘Historian of the Age’ Ibn al-Najjār (d. 643/1245) followed in the path of his teacher Ibn al-Jawzī and composed a plethora of historical-biographical works, including a sixteen volume addition to al-Khaṭīb’s Tārīkh Baghdād. Much of the historical material of these latter two scholars probably was lost during the infamous sack of Baghdad by Hulegu in 656/1258, and the severe consequences of this traumatic event on the Sunnī tradition of ḥadīth scholarship are perhaps nowhere better illustrated than in al-Dhahabī’s agonizing list of obituaries at the end of the biographical notice of al-Mundhīrī.

Given the paucity of information that al-Dhahabī provides for the master ḥadīth scholars of the final two tabaqāt of the Tadhkira, and the fact that the majority of them were his teachers or contemporaries, it is appropriate to close this historical survey of the first seven centuries of Sunnī ḥadīth scholarship by returning to a basic question: How does this name-saturated discussion contribute to the primary goal of this book, namely the investigation into the emergence of Sunnī Islam in the third/ninth century? Why were we wandering around Herat and Cordoba in the fifth/eleventh century when the primary sources for the remainder of this book are third/ninth century books by three Baghdādī scholars?

The first justification for this historical adventure is that it is a direct response to the overwhelmingly ahistorical approach to the ḥadīth literature in Western Islamic Studies. One searches in vain for a description of the history of Sunnī ḥadīth scholarship over its first six or seven centuries in a European language. Modern academics are not entirely to blame for this situation, since one of the most popular books of ḥadīth criticism, Ibn Ḥajar’s Tahdhib al-tahdhib, is itself ahistorical in its mode of presentation: an entry often contains critical opinions of a scholar from the eighth tabaqī, like Ibn Ḥanbal, followed
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191 Tadhkira, IV, 129.
192 Tadhkira, IV, 139. He was also a master of the variant Qur’ānic readings, poetry and adab.
193 Tadhkira, IV, 147.
194 Tadhkira, IV, 154.
by one from the tenth tabaqa, like al-Nasā'i, juxtaposed with the likes of Ibn Ḥibbān (twelfth tabaqa), Abū Ḥātim al-Rāżī (ninth tabaqa) and Yahyā al-Qāţān (seventh tabaqa). While alphabetically-arranged Mamlūk-era critical biographical dictionaries are extremely useful reference works for the identification of names in isnāds, they are of limited utility for the historian of the earlier periods of Islamic civilization who wishes to comprehend how a particular scholar fits into the greater narrative of Sunni hadith transmission.

A second reason for this survey is to demonstrate that the history of Sunni hadith scholarship is far more than the story of the compilation of the 'six canonical books.' It is imperative for the student of Islam to recognize that the Sunni hadith literature entered its richest phases after the compilation of these exalted books. My historical investigation vividly illustrates the explosive growth in the hadith library that occurred in the fourth/tenth and fifth/eleventh centuries, as well as the shift from 'original' compilations to historical works during the course of the fourth through sixth phases. Finally, the fact that the peak period of hadith-transmitter criticism took place during the century after the compilation of the two Sahīhs of al-Bukhārī and Muslim demonstrates the importance of investigating the origins of this two-century process in order to understand the foundation upon which these later scholars constructed their books.

The final goal of this seven-century survey is to demonstrate the existence of individual personalities in the history of hadith transmission. Hodgson's largely faceless 'piety-minded' scholars and al-Mizzī's endless lists of names tend to obscure the humanity of hadith scholars and their personal qualities that make them distinct from one another. Al-Dhahabī's Tadhkirat al-Muqātī offers a truly eclectic crowd of hadith scholars, from Sūfis to qādīs, and Mālikīs to Ḥāfīzīs, and sheds light on individuals with charismatic personalities, such as Ibn al-Mubārak, Ibn Hanbal, Ibn Ḥibbān, and Ibn Ḥazīm. Certainly any of the major scholars whose books are found in the Sunni hadith library merits the sort of attention that Western academics invest in al-Shāfi‘ī, al-Ghazālī, Ibn ‘Arabī, and Ibn Khaldūn, for there is much more to Islamic thought than the principles of jurisprudence, mystical states, and the philosophy of history.

---

195 Note that Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb was the primary text studied by Juynboll for his book Muslim Tradition.
CHAPTER FOUR

IDENTIFICATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE MASTER SUNNĪ ḤADĪTH CRITICS

IV.1

The goal of this chapter is to identify and analyze the most significant ḥadīth critics of the nascent Sunni tradition. While the seven-phase periodization that I articulated in the previous chapter relied exclusively upon the opinions of al-Dhahābi, this new task involves listening to the opinions of an additional nine scholars who were his predecessors. These ten sources yield a group of ninety-two men who lived in three century-long periods that dovetail more or less with the second through fourth phases of the aforementioned periodization. I have identified three qualitative grades of critics, namely primary, secondary, and ‘other,’ on the basis of the frequency by which each individual scholar is mentioned in the ten sources. The final section of this chapter elucidates the nature of the first period critics, reviews the role of al-Shafi‘ī in the development of ḥadīth scholarship, and argues for the plausibility of the historical narrative concerning the second/eight century origins of ḥadīth criticism as depicted in the classical Sunni tradition.

IV.2 Sources

The sources for this chapter include seven lists and three ṭabāqāt presentations. Each list consists of little more than the names of a set of master ḥadīth scholars who are usually identified as critics. The ṭabāqāt presentations are substantially larger and two of them preserve both biographical information and critical opinions of each scholar. The ṭabāqāt presentations tend also to include a greater number of entries than the lists, and two of them even include entries for saḥāba and tābi‘īn. The following outline provides an overview of the ten sources, each of which shall be described in the next few pages.
I. Lists

A) 'Ali b. al-Madini (d. 234/849)\(^1\) 24 men
B) Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj (d. 261/874)\(^2\) 5 men
C) al-Ḥakim al-Naysabūrī (d. 405/1014)\(^3\) 9 men
D) al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (d. 463/1071)\(^4\) 16 men
E) Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 397/1201)\(^5\) 16 men
F) al-Mizzī (d. 742/1341)\(^6\) 10 books
G) al-Dhahābī (d. 748/1348)\(^7\) 23 men

II. Tabaqāt presentations

A) Ibn Abī Ḥātim (d. 327/939)\(^8\) 4 generations, 18 men
B) Ibn Hibbān (d. 354/965)\(^9\) 7 generations, 44 men
C) Ibn 'Adi (d. 365/996)\(^10\) 6 generations, 73 men

IV.2.1 Lists

'Ali b. al-Madīnī's list enjoys the distinction of being both the earliest and most widely cited list in both Muslim and non-Muslim works. It consists of three groups of scholars and has been presented by Dickinson as the following:\(^11\)

These sources include: Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī, Taqdimā (Hyderabad, 1952), 17, 129, 187, 220, 234–5, 252, 264 (all fragmentary except that found on 234–5); Ibn Hibbān, Khūb al-majātīn, I (Aleppo: Dār Wāy, 1396), 55; Ibn 'Adī, al-Kāmil fi dā'yāt al-nāṭātā, I (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1985), 132, 167 (in a truncated variant); al-Dhahābī, Siyās al-am al-nukhālī, XI, 78. Western sources include Nabīja Abbott, Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri, vol. II, 80; Juynboll, Muslim Tradition, 164; and Erikk Dickinson, The Development of Early Sunnite Ḥadith Criticism, 50–1. These latter two scholars report that they have obtained this list from a 1974 Beirut publication of the Ḥal of Ibn al-Madīnī that I have not been able to consult.

\(^1\) Sahlī Muslim bi-sharh al-Ya'qūbī, I, 59.
\(^2\) Marjat 'utūm al-ḥadīth, 46–7.
\(^3\) Al-Kījīya fi 'ilm al-nuṣūḥ, ed. Ahmad 'Umar Ḥāshim (Beirut, 1986), 109.
\(^6\) See above, Table 2.1.
\(^7\) Taqdimā, 11–574.
\(^8\) Khūb al-majātīn, I, 25–60.
\(^9\) Al-Kušb, I, 59–147.
\(^10\) Dickinson, The Development of Early Sunnite Ḥadith Criticism, 50–1. (Some dates have been modified.)
The *imād* revolves around:

1) Medina: al-Zuhārī (d. 124/742)
2) Mecca: ʿAmr b. Dīnār (d. 126/744)
3) Basra: Qatāda b. Diʿāma (d. 117/735)
4) Basra: Yahyā b. Abī Kathīr (d. 132/749)
5) Kufa: Abū ʿĪsāq al-Sabīʿī (d. 127/745)
6) Kufa: al-ʿAʿmash (d. 148/765)

Those who composed books:

1) Medina: Mālik b. Anāṣ (d. 179/795)
2) Medina: Muḥammad b. Ishāq (d. 150/767)
3) Mecca: Ibn Jurayj (d. 150/767)
4) Mecca: Ibn ʿUyayna (d. 198/813)
5) Basra: Saʿīd b. Abī ʿArūba (d. 156/773)
6) Ḥammād b. Salama (d. 167/784)
7) Abū ʿAwāna (d. 176/792)
8) Shuʿba b. al-Ḥajjāj (d. 160/776)
9) Maʿmar b. Rāshid (d. 153/770)
10) Kufa: Sufyān al-Thawrī (d. 161/778)
11) Damascus: al-Awzāʾī (d. 157/774)
12) Wāsīṭ: Hushaym b. Bashīr (d. 183/799)

Their knowledge went to:

1) Yahyā b. Saʿīd al-Qattān (d. 198/813)
2) Yahyā b. Abī Zāʿida (d. 182/798)
3) Wākī b. al-Jarrāḥ (d. 197/813)
4) Ibn al-Mubārak (d. 181/797)
5) ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Mahdī (d. 198/814)
6) Yahyā b. ʿĀdām (d. 203/818)

Two of the sources indicate that the knowledge of all of these men was transmitted to Ibn Maʿin, and al-Dhahabi adds the following epilogue:

[This knowledge also passed on to] Ibn Hanbal, Abū Bakr Ibn Abī Shayba, and ʿAlī b. al-Madīnī; then to al-Bukhārī, Abū Hātim, Abū Zurʿa, and Abū Dāwūd; then to al-Nasāʾī, Muḥammad b. Naṣr al-Marwazi, Ibn Khuzayma, Ibn Jaʿīr (al-Ṭabarī); then it began to decrease, little by little, and there is no might save by God!12

---

It is significant to note that 'Ali b. al-Madīnī does not claim that any of these scholars were hadīth critics per se, rather, he indicates only that they were major compilers of the material. We shall see in the course of our analysis that ten of these twenty-four men are mentioned only in this list and, consequently, do not appear to have been considered critics by later generations of Sunnī scholars.

The second list is found in the introduction of Muslim b. al-Hajjāj's Sāhīḥ, a work that I have mentioned is one of the most prestigious Sunnī books in our discussion of the third phase of hadīth compilation. Muslim identifies five men—Shu'ba b. al-Hajjāj, Malik b. Anas, Ibn 'Uayyna, Yahyā b. Sa‘īd al-Qaṭṭān, and ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Mahdī—as the “Imāms of the hadīth folk” who “criticize” (dhamma) the transmission of hadīth from “ignoramuses” (aghbiyyīn) and “unsatisfactory people” (qaum ghayr mardiyīn). This list is the shortest of our ten sources, although Muslim makes it clear that it is not exhaustive. Despite its brevity, Muslim’s list is particularly important because it is the earliest one to identify explicitly a group of scholars as hadīth critics, and it does so a mere two generations after the deaths of two of the men enumerated in it, namely Yahyā l-Qaṭṭān and Ibn Mahdī.

The third list comes from the end of the fourth period of hadīth compilation and is found in the fifteenth topic of al-Hākim al-Naysābūrī’s paradigm-setting book of hadīth disciplines, Ma‘rifat ‘ulūm al-hadīth. Al-Hākim uses the same language as his predecessor Ibn Hibbān in describing Mālik, al-Awza‘ī, Sufyān al-Thawrī, Shu’ba and Ibn Jurayj as “Imāms of the Muslims and jurists of the new Islamic cities (amsār).” The remaining four scholars include the pri-
mary critics Yahyā l-Qāṭṭān and Ibn al-Mubārak as well as the unique mention of the jurist Muhammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Shaybānī and ascetic Ibrāhīm b. Ṭahmān. Although al-Ḥakīm does not elucidate what exactly he means by the expression “Imāms of the Muslims,” his usage of the expression “Imām” is in itself of interest, and I shall endeavor to shed some light on its implications in the third section of this chapter.

Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī’s list includes all five of the Imāms mentioned by Muslim in the introduction to his Saḥīḥ in addition to six of the nine men recorded by al-Ḥakīm al-Naysābūrī. The sixteen men of this list are described as being “so widely recognized as sound and reliable that one cannot dispute the integrity of [their] probity.” This list extends from Al-Awza‘ī to Ibn Ḥanbal, and the fact that only two of the men included are unique to it among the ten sources indicates that it contains a very high percentage of hadīth critics.

We observed earlier that the author of the next list, Ibn al-Jawzī, was one of the few sixth-period master hadīth scholars and the only authoritative critic listed by al-Dhahabī in Mizān al-ʿīdāl after al-Ḥakīm al-Naysābūrī. Fourteen of Ibn al-Jawzī’s sixteen “great Imāms . . . who declared [weak hadīth transmitters] unreliable (jarrāḥāhām)” are included among al-Dhahabī’s twenty-three critics in the Mizān, a finding that indicates a high degree of consensus between these later critics.

The final new list in this chapter consists of books instead of men. Abu Yūsuf al-Mīzī identifies four primary and six secondary sources of classical hadīth-transmitter criticism upon which he has based his chef d’oeuvre, the massive Tahdhīb al-kamāl. The four primary sources are Ibn Abī Ḫāṭır’s al-Jāfī wa l-ʿadālāt, Ibn “Adī’s al-Kāmil fi ʿdāfī . . . the Islamic conquests and were more significant in the long run as centers of Islamic civilization than military outposts.

16 bābu l-muhaddithi l-mashkūr bi-l-ʿadālih wa l-thiqatī wa l-amīnī lī l-yuhdījū lā tazkhiyātī al-muʿaddīlī; al-Khaṭīb, al-Kīfaya, 109. Recall that Ibn al-Sāḥīḥ selected the best critics from among this list in his Mughaddimah; see above, II.2, note 71.


18 The only two critics whom al-Dhahabī does not mention in Mizān al-ʿīdāl are ʿAli b. Husayn b. Junayd al-Rāzī (d. 291/904) and Zakariyyā b. Yahyā al-Sāǧī (d. 307/919) and are unique to Ibn al-Jawzī’s list.
al-rijāl, al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī’s Tārīkh Baghdaḍ, and Ibn ‘Asākir’s Tārīkh madinat Dimashq. Al-Mizzi advises the ambitious hadīth scholar who remains insatiated after these hundred or so volumes to consult the following six books for critical opinions of early scholars: Ibn Sa’īd’s al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr, Ibn Abī Khaythama’s Tārīkh, Ibn Hibbān’s al-Thiqāt, Abū Sa’īd ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAlī’s Tārīkh Mīr, al-Ḥakīm al-Naysābūrī’s Tārīkh Naysābūr, and Abū Nuʿaym al-Iṣbahānī’s Tārīkh Isbāḥān. I have already mentioned the majority of these books in the course of our seven-period periodization of hadīth compilation, and four of these authors furnished lists or ṭabaqāt presentations that I made use of in this chapter.

IV.2.2 Ṭabaqāt presentations

The three ṭabaqāt presentations are by scholars who were contemporaries with one other and bridge the one and a half century lacuna between the lists of Muslim b. al-Hajjāj and al-Ḥakīm al-Naysābūrī. Ibn Abī Ḥātim’s Taqdimā is, paradoxically, by far the longest of the three ṭabaqāt presentations and yet consists of the smallest number of men. The eighteen entries are identified explicitly as “expert scholar critics” (al-‘ulamī’ al-jahābīdha al-nuqqād) and are arranged into four generations. The greater part of the volume is allotted for the six first-generation master critics, namely Mālik b. Anas, Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna, Sufyān al-Thawrī, Shu‘ba b. al-Hajjāj, Ḥammād b. Zayd, and al-Awzā’ī. The second generation consists of six prominent students of these master scholars who in turn taught Ibn Ḥanbal, Ibn Maʿīn, ‘Alī b. al-Madīnī, and Ibn Numayr. Only Abū Zur‘a al-Rāzī and Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī grace the fourth and final ṭabaqa of Taqdimā, a fact that testifies to their deep influence upon their virtuoso pupil Ibn Abī Ḥātim. Despite the fascinating array of material preserved in the Taqdimā, ranging from nine letters sent by al-Awzā’ī to various ‘Abbāsid administrators, to 139 reports of Shuʿba’s hadīth-transmitter criticism, to an elegy for Ibn Maʿīn, Eerik Dickinson is correct in his observation that “nowhere does Ibn Abī Ḥātim explicitly delineate the criteria he employed in selecting the scholars

for the *Taqdima.*" 20 This ambiguity has led Dickinson to a rather radical, and, in my opinion, weak, argument that Ibn Abī Hātim cast the first generation of scholars as *hadīth* critics in order to give the discipline of *hadīth* criticism a greater veneer of authenticity and historical depth. 21 Despite my skepticism regarding Dickinson's hypothesis, I do agree that the question he has raised concerning the authenticity of the critical nature of the first generation of Ibn Abī Hātim's *hadīth*-transmitter critics is a most valid line of inquiry and one that I will address in the appropriate place in this chapter.

Ibn Hibbān's *tabaqāt* presentation in *Kitāb al-majrūḥin* is the most useful *tabaqāt* presentation for this project because it includes a description of the activities of each of the seven generations of scholars. The first generation consists of three *sahāba* who merely "scrutinized" (*fattasha*) the men in transmissions and was followed by a group of ten Medinan *tābi‘un.* 22 The third generation includes four additional Medinan scholars who "selected men (*inqilā‘* al-rija‘l) and traveled to collect *sunan,*" and Ibn Hibbān explicitly states that the greatest of them was al-Zuhrī. 23 Ibn Hibbān asserts that the fourth generation not only preserved the material and techniques of their teachers, but introduced the practices of declaring weak transmitters unreliable (*al-qadh i fī l-du‘afā‘* ) and "transmitter criticism" (*intiqād al-rija‘l*). He identifies eight members of a "group of Imāms of the Muslims and jurists of religion" and explicitly credits Mālik, Shu‘ba, and Sufyān al-Thawrī

---

20 Dickinson, *The Development of Early Sunnite Hadith Criticism*, 49.

21 "Although the association of *hadith* criticism with certain famous figures increased its prestige, this association did carry a price since it undermined the integrity of *hadith* criticism. In making early scholars like Mālik, Awzā‘ī and Shu‘ba critics, Ibn Abī Hātim and his colleagues brought upon themselves the obligation of coming to terms with the alleged critical judgments, many of which were wholly inconsistent with findings of later critics" (emphases mine); Dickinson, *The Development of Early Sunnite Hadith Criticism*, 128.


23 The other three scholars are Sa‘īd b. Ibrahim b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Awf, Yaḥyā b. Sa‘īd b. Anṣārī, and Hishām b. ‘Urwa; *Kitāb al-majrūḥin*, 1, 39. Note that these men collected "*sunan*" and not *hadīth*; the plural form of *sunna* is often equated with *hadīth* (for example, the four canonical *Sunan* books are *hadīth* compilations) but seems to have a narrower meaning more akin to "laws" than the broader concept of *hadīth*, which includes reports and actions attributed to the Prophet on any conceivable topic.
with the transformation of general hadith criticism into a craft (ṣinā'ā). Ibn Hibbān informs us that the fifth generation of scholars learned "how to scrutinize the paths of transmission" and he identifies Yahyā l-Qattān and Ibn Mahdī as the two men who "[performed] the most investigation (tafaqīḥ), and were the most willing to reject weak and rejected transmitters, to the point that they made this discipline into a craft (ṣinā'ā)." This craft reached an even higher level of scrutiny (tafṣīsh) and clarification (tabyzūn) in the hands of seven "Imams" of the sixth generation, three of whom were distinguished by the magnitude of their erudition in the field of hadith-transmitter criticism. Ibn Hibbān concludes his ṣabaqāt presentation in Kitāb al-majrūḥin with six equally skilled teachers among his own instructors who perpetuated the "technique of criticizing reports and examining transmitters." The significance of Ibn Hibbān's seven-ṣabaqāt presentation should be clear from the author's insightful descriptions of the members of each generation as well as the identification and biographical information of nine exceptional critics among the forty-four men.

The final source for this effort to elucidate the emergence of Sunnī hadith criticism through the identification of the master critics is Ibn 'Abī Ḥātim and is a useful piece of evidence in support of the traditional narrative of the origins of Sunnī hadith criticism.
of al-Kāmil fī ḍuṣafā' al-rijāl. Ibn ‘Adi states at the end of his seventy-three man list that

I have mentioned the names of those scholars among the Companions, Successors, and the following men, generation by generation to our day, who, in their own right, are allowed to give opinions concerning [ḥadīth] transmitters or who assert themselves to be qualified to do this and who memorize the [names of the] reliable and unreliable transmitters.26

Only seven of the seventy-three scholars receive substantial entries from Ibn ‘Adi: al-Zuhri, Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī, and al-Arnāsh among the tābi‘īn; Shu‘ba and Sufyān al-Thawrī in the following generation; and ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Mahdī and al-Shāfi‘ī in the fourth one.27 Twenty-four of the names of scholars who died after 120/738 are found exclusively in Ibn ‘Adi’s tabaqāt presentation, an observation that suggests a rather loose standard for inclusion on the part of the author.

IV.3 Analysis: Three periods and seven generations of Sunnī ḥadīth critics

The ninety-two names generated by these ten sources that have just been introduced can be arranged easily into three chronological periods and a tripartite hierarchy. The first period extends from 100–200 AH (718–815), the second one from 200–300 (815–912), and the final one from 300–400 (912–1009).30 The second and third periods of critics are identical to the third and fourth phases that I articulated in the previous chapter, while the first period of critics includes the senior members of the first phase along with the entire second phase. The hierarchy of critics is based upon the frequency by which names are mentioned among the sources, although it is important to note that only al-Dhahabī’s list in Mīzān al-‘indāl includes

---


27 Note that seven of these seventy-three scholars are tābi‘īn and twenty-two are tābi‘īn.

30 I have selected 120/738 as a cut-off death date for this analysis in order to exclude the numerous saḥīha and tābi‘īn who are recorded in the tabaqāt presentations of Ibn Hibbān and Ibn ‘Adi and are probably included because of the nature of the tabaqāt structure and not for their roles in the ‘craft’ of ḥadīth criticism.
at least one scholar in all three periods.\footnote{Seven sources include multiple scholars in the first period: the lists of Ibn al-Madini (IM), Muslim (M), al-Kharib al-Baghdadi (KH), al-Hakim al-Naysaburi (HA) and the tabaqat presentations of Ibn Abi Hayam (IHF), Ibn Hibban (IH), and Ibn 'Adi (IA). Al-Dhahabi's list in the Mizan only includes one first-period name (Yahya b. Qa'qan). The second period is covered by KH, Ibn al-Jawzi (IJ), al-Mizzfi (MI), al-Dhahabi (DH), and the three tabaqat presentations. The third period is covered only by IJ, MI, and DH.} The following tables clarify the primary and secondary critics of the three periods of hadith criticism gleaned from these ten sources.\footnote{Tables for the 'other' critics who are mentioned in only one of the ten sources can be found below in the Appendix A.} 

Table 4.1: Primary Critics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Death Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al-Awzā', 'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Amr</td>
<td>157/774</td>
<td>Syria, Beirut</td>
<td>All but Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shu'ba b. al-Ḥajjāj</td>
<td>160/776</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>All seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufyān b. Sa'īd al-Thawri</td>
<td>161/778</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>All but Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālik b. Anas</td>
<td>179/795</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>All seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abdullāh b. al-Mubārak</td>
<td>181/797</td>
<td>Khurasan</td>
<td>All but Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufyān b. Uwayna</td>
<td>198/813</td>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td>All but al-Hākim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wāqi b. al-Jarrāḥ</td>
<td>197/813</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>All but M and HA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd al-Rahmān b. Mahdi</td>
<td>198/814</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>All but al-Hākim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahyā b. Sa'īd al-Qaṭṭān</td>
<td>198/813</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>All seven\footnote{Yahyā b. Sa'id al-Qaṭṭān is also the first name mentioned in al-Dhahabi's list in Mizan al-Ṣiddāt.}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Period 2 (200–300/815–912)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yahyā b. Ma'in</td>
<td>233/848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ali b. 'Abdullāh al-Madini</td>
<td>234/849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Hanbal, Ahmad b. Muhammad</td>
<td>241/855</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.1. (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Death Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al-Bukhārī, Muhammad b. Isma'il</td>
<td>256/870</td>
<td>Bukhara</td>
<td>IH, IA, IJ, DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Zur'a al-Rāzī, 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Karīm</td>
<td>264/878</td>
<td>Rayy</td>
<td>All but KH and MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Hātim al-Rāzī, Muhammad b. Idrīṣ</td>
<td>277/890</td>
<td>Rayy</td>
<td>IAH, IA, IJ, DH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Period 3 (300–400/912–1009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Death Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Abī Hātim, 'Abd al-Rahman</td>
<td>327/939</td>
<td>Rayy</td>
<td>All three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn 'Adī, Abū Ahmad 'Abdullāh</td>
<td>365/976</td>
<td>Jurjān</td>
<td>All three</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.2: Secondary Critics

#### Period 1 (100–200/718–815)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Death Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al-Zuhārī, Muhammad b. Muslim</td>
<td>124/742</td>
<td>Medina, Syria</td>
<td>IM, IH, IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-'Amāsh, Sulaymān b. Mihrān</td>
<td>148/765</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>IM, IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Jurayj, 'Abd al-Mālik b. 'Abd al-'Azīz</td>
<td>150/767</td>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td>IM, HA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥāmmād b. Salāma</td>
<td>167/784</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>IM, IH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Layth b. Sa'd</td>
<td>175/791</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>IH, KH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥāmmād b. Zayd</td>
<td>179/795</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>IAH, IH, KH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hushaym b. Bashīr</td>
<td>183/799</td>
<td>Wāṣīṭ</td>
<td>IM, IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Shāfi'i, Muhammad b. Idrīṣ</td>
<td>204/820</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>IH, IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Mushir 'Abd al-A'lā b. Mushir</td>
<td>218/833</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>IAH, IA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Period 2 (200–300/815–912)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Death Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad b. 'Abdullāh b. Numayr</td>
<td>234/848</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>IAH, IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Khaythama Zuhayr b. Harb</td>
<td>234/848</td>
<td>Nāṣā, Baghdad</td>
<td>IH, DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Abī Shayba, Abū Bakr 'Abdullāh b. Muhammad</td>
<td>235/849</td>
<td>Kufa, Wāṣīṭ</td>
<td>IH, IA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2. (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Death Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Rāhawayh, Ishaq b. Ibrahīm</td>
<td>238/853</td>
<td>Nishapur</td>
<td>IH, IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Falās, Abū Ḥāṣṣ 'Amr b. 'Ali</td>
<td>249/863</td>
<td>Basra, Baghdad</td>
<td>IA, IJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahīm b. Yaʿqūb al-Jūzajānī</td>
<td>259/873</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>IJ, DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim b. al-Hājaj</td>
<td>261/874</td>
<td>Nishapur</td>
<td>IH, IJ, DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Nasā'ī, Ahmad b. Shuṭayb</td>
<td>303/915</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>IA, DH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Death Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al-ʿUqaylī, Muḥammad b. ʿAmr</td>
<td>322/934</td>
<td>Hijāz</td>
<td>IJ, DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn ʿIbīnān, Abū Ḥātim</td>
<td>354/965</td>
<td>Khurasan</td>
<td>MI, DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Azdī, Abū l-Fath</td>
<td>374/984-5</td>
<td>Jazīra</td>
<td>IJ, DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad b. al-Husayn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Dāraquṭnī, Ṣalīb b. ʿUmar</td>
<td>385/995</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>IJ, DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Hākim, Abū ʿAbdullāh</td>
<td>405/1014</td>
<td>Nishapur</td>
<td>MI, DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad b. ʿAbdullāh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Naysābūrī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are a few important findings in this sea of names that merit discussion prior to the re-articulation of these three periods into a seven-tahāqīt framework. The first observation is the extraordinary dominance of Iraqi scholars in general, and Baghdadi ones in particular, in the first two periods of ḥadīth criticism, a finding not entirely unexpected given my appellation of the fourth phase of ḥadīth compilation as the “The Triumph of Baghdad and Iran.” A second point is that all five of Muslim’s ʿĪmāms’ are primary critics, and all but one of Ibn Abī Ḥātim’s “master ḥadīth critics” are either primary or secondary critics. A final general observation is the fact that only eighteen of the ninety-two scholars are also included in al-Dhahabi’s list of fifty-four Shuyukh al-Islam that was discussed in the second chapter, a finding that reinforces my hypothesis that acumen with regard to ḥadīth criticism was only one of several of al-

43 Forty-three of the critics of the first two periods hail from Iraq, seventeen of whom lived in Baghdad.

44 The one critic who is unique to Ibn Abī Ḥātim’s tastes is Abū Iṣḥāq al-Fazārī.
Dhahabi’s criteria for inclusion in his list of elite Sunni scholars in Tadhkira al-huffaz.

The second level of analysis of the critics identified by the ten sources is to convert the unwieldy tables on the previous pages into a crisp presentation of the most important hadith critics. This task will be accomplished by dividing each of the three periods into multiple generations of scholars in order to clarify the historical development of this discipline. Finally, all geographical and necrological details shall be eschewed in order to provide an unobstructed view of the individual master critics in their historical context.

Table 4.3: The master Sunni hadith critics: A tabaqat approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period 1 (100-200 AH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tabaqa 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Critics: al-Zuhri, al-A'mash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tabaqa 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Critics: al-Awzây, Shu'ba, Sufyân al-Thawrî, Mâlik, Ibn 'Uyayna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tabaqa 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Critics: Ibn al-Mubârak, Wâki', Yahya b. Sa'id al-Qattân, Ibn Mahdî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Critics: al-Shâfi'i, Abû Mushir 'Abd al-A'llâ b. Mushir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period 2 (200-300 AH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tabaqa 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Critics: Ibn Ma'in, 'Alî b. al-Madînî, Ibn Ḥanbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tabaqa 5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Critics: al-Bukhârî, Abû Zur'a al-Râzî, Abû Ḥâtim al-Râzî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Critics: Ibrâhîm al-Jûzajâni, Muslim b. al-Ḥajjâj, al-Nâṣîr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period 3 (300-400 AH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tabaqa 6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Critics: Ibn Abî Ḥâtim, Ibn 'Adî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Critics: al-'Uqayli, Ibn Hibbân</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tabaqa 7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Critics: Abû l-Fath al-Azîr, al-Dâraquṭnî, al-Ḥâkim al-Nâṣîbûrî</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This clear presentation of the historical development of Sunnī hadith criticism and identification of the most profound critics merits a few more general observations. First, it is noteworthy that the first and seventh generations consist solely of ‘secondary critics’, while the middle five all contain a more or less equal number of primary and secondary ones. Secondly, the fact that no generation has more than five primary critics is indicative of the highest degree of authority vested in a strikingly small and geographically diverse coterie of master hadith scholars. Finally, there can be little skepticism concerning the role of any of the primary critics or most of the secondary critics in the second and third periods of Sunnī hadith criticism given the textual evidence that has survived. This evidence includes the five published recensions of Ibn Ma‘īn’s Tarikh, several volumes of Ibn Ḥanbal’s I’ilal, and al-Bukhārī’s al-Tarikh al-kabīr.66 Indeed, it is not a coincidence that half of the ten sources consulted for this chapter come from the pens of scholars found in the second and third periods of this list.

The obvious problem that remains, however, is that of the first period. I have alluded previously to Eerik Dickinson’s recent argument that the scholars whom I have identified as primary critics in the second generation were misleadingly depicted as critics by Ibn Abī Ḥātim in order to give later hadith critics a greater veneer of authenticity. Put succinctly, Dickinson asks the question “were famous jurists like al-Awzā‘ī and Mālik b. Anas really hadith critics?” Certainly the evidence provided by Ibn Abī Ḥātim in the Taqdima is thin, especially in contrast with the substantial evidence he offers in his discussions of Sufyān al-Thawrī and Shu‘ba b. al-Ḥajjāj. The only way to answer this question is to examine the depictions of the nine ‘primary critics’ of the second and third jubqātī in several early books of hadith-transmitter criticism in order to elucidate why so many later generations of critics considered these scholars as the Imāms and founders of this discipline.67

66 I mentioned in the first footnote of the first chapter that the authenticity of al-Tarikh al-kabīr was championed recently by Christopher Melchert; see his article “Bukhārī and Early Hadith Criticism.”
67 This chapter is not the place to access the critical roles, if any, of the ten sec-
IV.4 The origins of Sunni hadith criticism: An examination of the first two generations of primary critics

IV.4.1

The goal of this section is connected intimately to the fundamental task of this book, namely the elucidation of the emergence of Sunni Islam in the third/ninth century. I argued in the introduction of this project that several major hadith scholars in general, and Ibn Ḥanbal, Ibn Ma‘īn, and Ibn Sa’d in particular, played a major role in this endeavor. The fact that both Ibn Ḥanbal and Ibn Ma‘īn are primary critics of the fourth generation is of course beneficial to my argument but it is necessary to understand the ‘state of the field’ of hadith criticism that they inherited from their teachers, such as Waki’ b. al-Jarrāḥ, Yaḥyā l-Qañān, and Ibn Mahdī, in order to evaluate their own roles in its development. Since it appears that hadith criticism began only with the generation prior to the teachers of Ibn Ḥanbal and Ibn Ma‘īn, an analysis of the nine scholars whom I have just recognized as ‘primary critics’ of Period I seems to be a necessary step in order to sharpen our understanding of the origins of the discipline that I am arguing shaped the articulation of Sunni Islam in the third/ninth century.

There are a few features common to all nine of these men that deserve serious attention prior to the evaluation of their statuses as master hadith critics. The most salient feature of all of the first generation members of this group is an extremely high reputation for the transmission of hadith from one, two, or three major scholars of the previous generation, collectively known as the tabi‘īn. Al-Awzā‘i is famous for his transformation of the knowledge of Yaḥyā b. Abī Kathīr (d. 132/749) into books, in addition to his limited transmission of hadith from al-Zuhārī.38 Shu‘ba had an outstanding reputation...
for the transmission of material from Qatada b. Di‘ama, al-Hakam b. ‘Utayba (d. 115/733), and Abu Ishaq al-Sab‘i. Sufyan al-Thawri was widely acknowledged as an even stronger authority than Shu‘ba on the hadith of Abu Ishaq and al-A‘mash. Malik’s transmission of al-Zuhri received the highest accolades, and he is depicted in the sources as the inheritor of both Nafi‘ mawla Ibn ‘Umar’s (d. 117/735) erudition and teaching circle (halqa). Finally, Ibn ‘Umayna was the most prolific collector of hadith from ‘Amr b. Dinar (d. 126/744), and was held in high regard for his transmission of material from al-Zuhri by all save Ibn Ma‘in.

Al-Dhahabi describes al-Hakam as the “Shaykh of Kufa” and records Ibn Hanbal as calling him the most reliable scholar of Ibrahim al-Nakha‘i’s transmissions; Tadkira, I, 88-9. Note that the other two men, Qatada and Abu Ishaq, are included in the first group of men “around whom the ustad revolves” in Ibn al-Madini’s list that I included among the ten sources for this chapter.

Shu‘ba’s transmission from Qatada is praised by his students Abu Daud al-Tavabi and Ibn Mahdi in the Taqdim (pp. 128 and 160, respectively) and by Ibn Ma‘in in ‘Uthman b. Sa‘id al-Darimi’s Tarikh ([Beirut, 1980], 151), while that from al-Hakam is praised by Ibn Hanbal; Taqdim, 128, 161-2. Shu‘ba is considered among Abu Ishaq’s companions in al-Darimi’s Tarikh (p. 59) and although Ibn Ma‘in considers his transmission inferior to that of Sufyan al-Thawri, both men are considered the most erudite of his students. This identical opinion of Ibn Ma‘in, which is also found in the Taqdim, is seconded by ‘Ali b. al-Madini on the authority of Mu‘adh b. Mu‘adha, and further confirmed by Ibn Mahdi and Abu Zur‘a al-Razi: Taqdim, 162-3. See also the next footnote for more references.

‘Ali b. al-Madini declares al-Thawri to have the most ‘ilm of these two scholars as well as of the entire madhab of Ibn Mas‘ud and, in another report, heard Mu‘adh b. Mu‘adha identify Shu‘ba and al-Thawri as the two soundest (ahhbar) students of Abu Ishaq; Taqdim, 38 and 65. Abu Zur‘a identifies Shu‘ba, al-Thawri, and Isra‘il as the soundest companions of Abu Ishaq; Taqdim, 66. Sufyan al-Thawri’s superior knowledge of al-A‘mash’s transmissions is testified to by Ibn Hanbal, Abu Ha‘im, and Ibn Ma‘in (Taqdim, 64-5); for Ibn Ma‘in’s opinion that al-Thawri’s transmission from al-A‘mash is superior to that of Shu‘ba, see also al-Darimi, Tarikh, 51; for Ibn Hanbal’s identical opinion, see Taqdim, 64.

All three of the tabaqat presentations I studied in the previous section include the report that Shu‘ba came to Medina the year after Nafi‘’s death and saw Malik sitting in his place—leading the class; Taqdim, 26, Kitab al-nuquob, I, 44 and al-Kamil, I, 104. Malik’s transmission from Nafi‘ is also praised by Ibn Mahdi and ‘Ali b. al-Madini includes him among his three best students; Taqdim, 15-16. Ibn Ma‘in is reported to have said that Malik was the most reliable (ahhbar) companion of al Zuhri and that his knowledge from Nafi‘ was more reliable than that of ‘Ubayd Allah b. ‘Umar and Ayyub al-Sakhtiyani (Taqdim, 16; also al-Darimi, Tarikh, 41) for his opinion that Malik was preferable to Ma‘mar, Yusuf, and ‘Uqayl with respect to the teachings of al-Zuhri. Malik’s precedence with respect to al-Zuhri is also attested by ‘Abdullah b. Ahmad b. Hanbal, Ibn Hanbal, al-Fallasa, and Abu Ha‘im in the Taqdim, 15-17.

Ibn ‘Umayna was seen in his youth with ‘Amr b. Dinar by Shu‘ba and Hammad b. Zayd, Ibn Ma‘in considers him to have the largest amount of hadith material
The salient feature of the third generation of critics in the first period is a deep attachment to these five major scholars as well as several of the secondary critics of this generation. Ibn al-Mubarak studied with Sufyān al-Thawrī and two anecdotes record his deep admiration for his teacher. The Kufan Wārī b. al-Jarrāḥ is considered to be one of the most reliable disciples of Sufyān al-Thawrī and numerous anecdotes testify to both Ibn Ma‘īn and Ibn Ḥanbal’s deep respect for him. Yahyā b. Sa‘īd al-Qaṭṭān spent twenty years with Shu’bā and was a major student of Sufyān al-Thawrī. He receives the highest accolades from Ibn Ḥanbal and Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī, and is praised by al-Bukhārī as the scholar with the best skills of distinguishing Sufyān al-Thawrī’s saḥīḥ hadith from his ṭadlis. Finally, ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Mahdī excelled in the transmission of knowledge from Malik b. Anas and Ḥammād b. Zayd, and was considered a significant student of both Sufyān al-Thawrī and Shu’bā.
His list of "four Imāms" is reproduced numerous times in all three tabaqāt presentations studied in this chapter, and comprises al-Awza'ī, Sufyān al-Thawrī, Mālik b. Anas, and Hammād b. Zayd.\textsuperscript{19}

The second major quality shared by most of these nine master scholars is a high degree of proficiency in a discipline other than mere hadith compilation. Al-Awza’ī, Sufyān al-Thawrī, and Mālik all became eponyms for schools of jurisprudence and were among the earliest compilers of legal texts.\textsuperscript{20} Ibn al-Mubārak, who is reported to have been the ‘jurist of the Arabs’ after Sufyān al-Thawrī,\textsuperscript{21} excelled in traveling to study with an unprecedented number of scholars, and literally wrote the book on Sunnī ascetism (zuḥūd). Ibn ‘Uyayna is reported by al-Shāfī‘ī, Ibn Wahh (d. 179/795)\textsuperscript{22} and Nu‘aym b. Ḥammād (d. 228/843) to have had a remarkable degree of erudition with regard to Qur’ānic exegesis.\textsuperscript{23} As for Shu‘bā, Ibn Mahdī, and Yāḥyā l-Qaṭṭān, their specialty seems to have been hadith-transmitter criticism (al-jāri‘a wa l-ta‘dīl), and a couple of anecdotes in Ibn ‘Adī’s book indicate the innovative nature of Shu‘bā’s practice of including negative comments of transmitters in the course of his

were the most reliable (auḥaq) students of al-Thawrī; Taqdimā, 233. Abū Hātim declares Ibn Mahdī to be the most reliable (iḥābi) companion of Ḥammād b. Zayd and there is a rather surprising report that Ibn ‘Uyayna took reports on the authority of his contemporary Mālik b. Anas from his own young pupil Ibn Mahdī; Taqdimā, 255 and 257. Al-Zurqānī mentions that a group of scholars claim that Ibn Mahdī had a recension of Mālik’s Muwatta’ and that Ibn Ḥanbal incorporated much of this version of the Muwatta’ in his Musnad. Zurqānī, Shahr al-Zurqānī ‘alā Muwatta’ al-Imām Mālik, 1, 9 and 11. Note that Ibn Mahdī studied with Shu‘bā for ten years, but that something happened to his notebooks and he lost a third of his materials; Ibn ‘Adī, al-Kāmil, I, 120.

\textsuperscript{20} Taqdimā, 11, 118, 177, 203, 245 (Ibn al-Mubārak is substituted for al-Awza‘ī in this version): Kitāb al-najrūhīn, I, 44; Ibn ‘Adī, al-Kāmil, I, 80, 100. See also al-Tirmidhī, al-‘Jāmi‘ al-sahīh, V, 750.

\textsuperscript{21} Al-Awza‘ī is reported by ‘Abd al-Razzāq to have been among the first to compile a book (tadhkīr), namely the notebooks of Yāḥyā b. Abī Kathīr (Taqdimā, 185; Ibn ‘Adī, al-Kāmil, I, 100); Sufyān al-Thawrī’s Jāmi‘ is the first work listed in Ibn Nadim’s Fihrist under the chapter of the madhhab of asḥāb al-hadīth; and Mālik’s Muwatta’ remains one of the most venerated Sunnī books to this day. It is interesting to note that Yāḥyā l-Qaṭṭān is said to have followed the madhhab of al-Thawrī/Ibn Mas‘ūd, while his Basran contemporary Ibn Mahdī followed the madhhab of Mālik/Ibn ‘Umar; Taqdimā, 234 and 252.


\textsuperscript{23} Al-Dhahabī calls ‘Abdullāh b. Wahb b. Muslim al-Miṣrī an Imām and jurist; Taḥkīrā, 1, 229-3.

\textsuperscript{24} Taqdimā, 32.
classes (majús). The only special quality of Waki' that I have come across is that he inherited the prestigious teaching post pillar in the main mosque of Kufa which had been the place of unbroken instruction from the time of 'Abdullāh b. Mas'ūd to his own teacher Sufyān al-Thawrī.

The third major feature shared by these nine men is the frequent appellation of the sobriquet 'Imām.' The lists of Muslim and al-Hākim al-Naysābūrī, and the taṣāqāt of Ibn Abī Hātim, Ibn Hibbān, and Ibn 'Adi all refer to these men as Imāms, and I just mentioned the oft-cited report of Ibn Mahdī's 'four Imāms.' What exactly does this term mean? We have already seen that Muslim sheds a little light on this topic by indicating that his five exemplary Imāms are men "who criticize the transmission of hadith from unsatisfactory people." The most explicit definition of this term occurs twice in Ibn 'Adi's al-Kūmil fi du'āfā' al-rijāl and is attributed to the primary critic Ibn Mahdī:

An Imām is one who does not transmit all that he has heard, nor transmits from all whom he has heard, nor transmits all the questions he has been asked, nor transmits to all who ask him.

This rather vague definition of Imām describes a scholar who is both selective in his transmission of hadith and his choice of students, and is considered an authority to whom questions are addressed by his contemporaries. It appears as though a closer examination of the...
nine first period primary critics is a necessary undertaking if we are to assess accurately whether these men are truly critics rather than mere transmitters of hadith.

IV.1.2 al-Awza’i

The evidence for al-Awza’i’s role in hadith criticism is particularly thin. In fact, he does not even appear to have been a particularly strong transmitter of hadith, as al-Fallās remarks that he was reliable (thabt) only with what he heard directly from a teacher and Abū Ḥātim calls him a “jurist who follows that which he has heard.” I have already mentioned his key role in compiling multi-topic books and Ibn Ḥanbal calls him an Imām of the companions of Yahyā b. Abī Kathīr. Al-Awza’i’s purported favorite students of al-Zuhrī baffled Ibn Abī Ḥātim, who suggests that the Syrian scholar did not have access to the more famous works of Ma’mar, Yūnus, and ‘Uqayl. Ibn ‘Adī reports that al-Awza’i taught that al-Zuhrī would use the expression suriqa whenever he encountered a hadith with which he was unfamiliar. Al-Bukhārī refers to his opinions only once in his Kitāb al-rfu’u’ al-ṣaḥīḥ, and there do not appear to be any references to his critical opinions in Ibn Sa’d’s al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr. Finally, Ibn Mahdī’s appellation of al-Awza’i as “Imām of the Sunna” suggests that he considered his teacher to be more a model of Islamic practice than a master of hadith.

---

51 Anke Bouzenita has found references in the Tārikhs of Abū Zu’fā al-Dimashqī and Ibn ‘Asākir to al-Awza’i’s employment of the technical terms thiqa and ḍafī in her recent study ‘Abdarrahmān al-Awza’i—ein Rechtsgelehrter des 2. Jahrhunderts d. H. und sein Beitrag zu den Spur. 34–55. It is striking that al-Awza’i’s remarks of this type do not appear in the early critical books outside of Syria, although it is possible that a few critical comments of his are buried somewhere in Ibn Abī Ḥātim’s Kitāb al-ṣaḥīḥ wa l-ṭabīḥ.

52 Taqdirna, 185 (al-Fallās); faqīh muttaqī b-mā samī’a; 186 (Abū Ḥātim).


54 These students include Qurra b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān, Muḥammad b. Wallīd al-Zubaydī, and the books of Wallīd b. Manyd; Taqdirna, 205.

55 Ibn ‘Adī, al-Kāmil, 1, 70.

56 Al-Bukhārī, Kitāb al-ṣaḥīḥ wa l-ṭabīḥ; Taqdirna, 203. Note that Ibn Mahdī is reported as having identified three types of Imāms: 1) Imām of sunna and hadith; 2) Imām of sunna but not hadith; 3) Imām of hadith, but not sunna; Taqdirna, 118. Al-Awza’i appears to belong to the second category.
IV. 3 Shu'ba b. al-Hajjāj

In stark contrast to al-Awzā'ī, the evidence in support of Shu'ba's role in both hadith criticism and hadith-transmitter criticism is overwhelming. His entry is by far the largest in all three of the tabaqāt presentations, and I shall analyze his 139 critical opinions arranged alphabetically by Ibn Abī Ḥātim in the Taqdima below. Ibn Sa'd includes several dozen reports on the authority of Shu'ba, several of which indicate a concern with whether a tābiʿī really heard hadith from specific saḥāba, and a few in which he declares a transmitter weak. Al-Bukhārī also includes a very modest number of opinions ascribed to Shu'ba in al-Du'afāʾ al-saghrūn. Ibn 'Adī reports that al-'Amash would ask Shu'ba about the hadith of Qatada during his visits to Kufa and that he criticized Shu'ba for teaching hadith to the masses by saying "Shame on you! Does one put pearls around the necks of swine?" There are also several references to Shu'ba warning his students to be careful of Sufyān al-Thawrī's examples of tadlis, as well as to his small party (ṣī'a) of favorite hadith scholars. Ḥammāḍ b. Zayd's quote that "I rejected any of my hadith that differed with those of Shu'ba (in wording)" is further testament to Shu'ba's selectivity, and there are numerous indications that Shu'ba was one of the few scholars who insisted upon hearing the same hadith numerous times prior to teaching it to his students. Finally several sources...
record Shu’ba’s technique for ascertaining whether Qatada’s hadith were worth writing down or not on the basis of whether Qatada said hadathana or sam’tu or whether he used a different verb.\textsuperscript{69}

Ibn Abi Ḥātim’s collation and alphabetical organization of reports that record Shu’ba’s opinions concerning ninety men warrants a closer examination because it is unique to any of the ten sources examined in this chapter and it is by far the strongest testimony to Shu’ba’s pivotal role in the history of hadith criticism.\textsuperscript{70} Each of the 139 reports is complete with an isnād that consists of only three names in the overwhelming majority of the cases. Ibn Abi Ḥātim collated this material from twenty-eight sources, although the majority of it comes from only three men: his father, Muḥammad b. Yahyā,\textsuperscript{71} and Ẓalih b. Ahmad b. Hanbal. Fourteen of his informants transmitted only one report to him, and eight transmitted fewer than five reports. The following table provides an overview to these twenty-eight sources:

---

\textsuperscript{69} Ibn Sa’d is the earliest source I have come across to record this statement: Shu’ba said: “I know what Qatada heard [directly from his teachers] and what he did not: If he said hadathana Anas, Ḥasan, Sa’id, or Muṭarrif, [he heard from them]; but if he had not heard from them, he would say qatā Sa’id, qatā Abū Qilāba.” \textit{al-Tabaqāt al-kubrā}, VII, 119. Ibn Abi Ḥātim includes a report from one of his most common chains of authority in the \textit{Taqdima}, namely Ẓalih b. Ahmad b. Hanbal → ‘Ali b. al-Madīn → Ibn Mahdī, that Shu’ba wrote down hadith when Qatada said hadathana or sam’tu, but did not do so when he said hadathha fulān; \textit{Taqdima}, 160. For another slight variation in which the key word that divulges the lack of direct transmission is hadīth (also on the authority of Ibn Mahdī), see Ibn ‘Adī, \textit{al-Kāmil}, I, 81.

\textsuperscript{70} These opinions are found in \textit{Taqdima}, 132–57.

\textsuperscript{71} Rif‘at Fawżī identifies two teachers of Ibn Abi Ḥātim named Muḥammad b. Yahyā in his study \textit{Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī wa athānā fi ‘ilm al-hadith} (Cairo: Maktabat al-Khānjī, 1994), 367. The more likely of these two men is Muḥammad b. Yahyā b. ʿUmar al-Wāsīfī who settled in Baghdad: Ibn Abi Ḥātim is quoted as saying “I wrote from him with my father” and he evaluates him as sāḥīh, sāḥīq fi l-hadīth. The other scholar is Muḥammad b. Yahyā b. Muḥammad al-Harrānī who “wrote to us a little hadīth” (kataba ilānā bi-shay’in min al-hadīth). It is also possible that this Muḥammad b. Yahyā is none other than the famous Shaykh al-‘Ilm of Nishapur al-Dhuḥlī, although Ibn Abi Ḥātim is not normally identified as one of his pupils.
Table 4.4: Ibn Abi Ḥāsim’s sources for Shu‘ba’s critical opinions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of reports</th>
<th>Special features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>All from ‘Alī b. al-Madini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ṣalih b. ʿAlī b. Ḥanbal</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Half from Ibn Hanbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Muhammad b. Yahyā</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Three from Ibn Hanbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>‘Alī b. al-Ḥasan al-Ḥasnajānī</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>All from ‘Amr b. ‘Alī al-Fallās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ibn Abī Khaythama</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>All from Baqiyah b. al-Walid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Muhammad b. Ibrāhīm</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>All from ‘Amr b. ‘Alī al-Fallās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bishr b. Muslim al-Ḥimṣī</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Both from Ibn Ḥanbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ahmad b. Salama al-Naysābūrī</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Both from Ibn Ḥanbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Muhammad b. Saʿīd al-Muqri</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Both from Ibn Ḥanbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Abū Saʿīd al-Ashajj</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Both from Ibn Ḥanbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ismāʿīl b. Abī l-Ḥarīth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Both from Ibn Ḥanbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Muhammad b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd-Allāh b. Ḥanbal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Both from Ibn Ḥanbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Muhammad b. al-Ḥasan/ al-Ḥusayn b. Ishkāb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Both from Qurād</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yūnus b. Ḥabīb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Both from Ibn Ḥanbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>‘Abbās al-Dūrī</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Both from Ibn Ḥanbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ʿAbdullāh b. ʿAlī b. ʿAbdullāh b. Ḥanbal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(no intermediary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Abū ‘Alī b. Daysam al-ʿAskarī</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>from Ibn Maʿīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Abū Zur'ā al-Dimashqī</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ahmad b. Manṣūr al-Ramādī</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ahmad b. Sinān</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Abū Zur'ā al-Rāzī</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Hudba b. Khālid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ḥusayn b. Ḥasan al-Rāzī</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ibrāhīm b. Yaʿqūb al-Juḍājānī</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Muhammad b. ‘Ammār al-Rāzī</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It appears from this list that Ibn Abî Hātim followed in his father's footsteps by continuing the project of collecting critical reports attributed to Shu'ba and that he more than doubled the number of reports that he inherited. Abû Hātim's list was based upon the material of thirty-three informants, only eight of whom provided him with more than a single report. The forty-seven reports that Abû Hātim collected contained Shu'ba's critical evaluations for thirty-nine men, only four of whom receive multiple opinions. These findings indicate that Abû Hātim struggled much harder than his son in his effort to collect Shu'ba's critical opinions and, paradoxically, came up with far less material if his son included all of the reports that he did in fact collect.

In contrast to Abû Hātim's painstaking collection of Shu'ba's critical opinions through oral communication, Ibn Abî Hātim clearly derived a significant amount of material from Sâlih b. Ahmad's books of his teacher 'Ali b. al-Madînî. This material is particularly valuable to Ibn Abî Hātim not only due to the prestige of Ibn al-Madînî as a hadith critic, but because a large amount of his material is derived from the two Basran primary critics Yâhya b. Sa'id al-Qaṭṭân and 'Abd al-Rahmân b. Mahdî.

The third and final major informant from whom Ibn Abî Hātim benefited in the course of his quest to collect Shu'ba's critical opin-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of reports</th>
<th>Special features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Muḥammad b. Muslim al-Raḍî</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Muslim b. al-Hajjāj</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>'Umar b. Shabba</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

12 These eight men are Ahmad al-Dawraqî (4 reports), Ibn Ghaylân (2), Mujâhid b. Mūsâ (2), Muqattî b. Muḥammad (3), Muḥammad b. Ibrâhim (3), Abû l-Walîd al-Tavâlistû (2), Suḥaym b. Harb (2), and Suḥaym b. al-Qâsim al-Harrânî (2).

13 These four men are Abî Ishâq al-Hamdânî (3 reports), Ayyûb b. Abî Tamîma al-Sâkhtâyînî (2), Ibn Ishâq (4), and Qays b. Râbi'î (2).

14 Thirteen of the twenty reports in Sâlih's transmission concerning Shu'ba trace back to Yâhya l-Qaṭṭân and four to Ibn Mahdî. We shall see below that this isnad is very prominent in the sections in the Taqdimî devoted to Sufyân al-Thawrî, and that Ibn al-Madînî heard over thirty critical reports directly from Ibn 'Uyayna.
ions is Muḥammad b. Yahyā. This scholar supplied Ibn Abī Ḥātim with nineteen reports from only seven sources, the most prominent of which is Mahmūd b. Ghaylān (d. 239/854). This collection contains one opinion of Shu'ba for seventeen scholars each and two for Qays b. Rabī'.

The purpose of this miniature exercise in source-criticism is to support the assertion that Ibn Abī Ḥātim did not merely forge the critical opinions of Shu'ba preserved in the Taqdimā in order to invent a ḥadīth critic named Shu'ba, as suggested by Dickinson. It seems safe to assume that these reports were in circulation in the early third/ninth century, half a century after the death of Shu'ba. There does not appear to have been an easily accessible book nor collection of Shu'ba's critical opinions, although Ibn Abī Ḥātim was greatly aided by the work of his father, his teacher Muḥammad b. Yahyā, and 'Alī b. al-Madīnī. It is also clear from the ṣinā'īd analysis that Ibn Abī Ḥātim was keen to acquire five reports that were transmitted by the secondary critic al-Fallas from Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm, as well as two reports that were transmitted by Ibn Rāhawayh from Muḥammad b. Muhammad b. Rajā'. Finally, the list of scholars from whom Ibn Abī Ḥātim received only one report includes several luminaries, such as 'Abbās al-Dūrī, Abū Zur'a al-Rāzī, Ibrāhīm al-Jūzajānī, and Muslim b. al-Hajjāj; it would have been very tempting for the unscrupulous scholar to forge additional reports of Shu'ba's opinions from any of these four men. Indeed, the fact that both Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī and his son appear to have encountered such difficulty to obtain a mere 139 critical reports on the authority of Shu'ba testifies in favor of the proposition that this father-son team did not fabricate these reports. The paucity of critical opinions of Shu'ba that were accessible to as thorough a scholar as Ibn Abī Ḥātim in the late third/ninth century further suggests two possible interpretations: 1) either Shu'ba never really articulated very many critical opinions, or 2) his opinions became marginal in the wake of the extensive efforts of his successors who relied more upon their intimate

---

8 Five of the reports are on the authority of Mahmūd b. Ghaylān, a prominent scholar from Marw who was imprisoned during the course of the mihmā. He studied with Ibn 'Uyayna, Wakī' b. al-Jarrāḥ, and his transmissions are found in all six of the canonical Sunnī ḥadīth books except the Sunan of Abū Dāwūd; al-Dhahabi, Tadhkira, II, 47.
knowledge of the material than upon the opinions of their predecessors in the course of their evaluations.\(^5\)

When we examine the short opinions of Shu‘ba that have been preserved we notice both an absence of contradictory reports with regard to an individual scholar and a consistency within his language in general. Both ‘Ali b. al-Ja‘d and Ibn Ma‘in report that Shu‘ba said that Hishâm al-Dastawâl had greater erudition concerning the material of Qatada than himself,\(^7\) three of Shu‘ba’s students give anecdotes indicating his infamous dislike of Abû l-Zubayr al-Makki,\(^78\) and Abû l-Walîd al-Ṭayâlîsî reports Shu‘ba’s respect for Ayyûb al-Sakhtiyâni by means of two different expressions.\(^79\) Shu‘ba took at least three opinions that were controversial in his day, namely his rejection of ‘Abd al-Malik b. Abî Sulaymân’s hadîth and his support for the Shi‘a Jabir al-Ju‘fi and Ibn Ishâq, who was labeled by Malik b. Anas as “an antichrist among the antichrists.”\(^80\)

No less than twelve of the reports assembled by Ibn Abî Ḥatîm consist of little more than Shu‘ba’s recommendation to a student to study with a famous teacher, often with the mere Arabic phrase ‘alqyka bi-\(,\) or to avoid his hadîth.\(^81\) Finally, there are several examples of what Dickinson

\(^{5}\) A striking feature of the books of Ibn Sa‘d, Ibn Ma‘in, and Ibn Hanbal that I analyze in the seventh chapter below is the relatively infrequent recourse to the opinions of previous generations of hadîth critics and, instead, a major reliance upon individual research on the part of the master critics. In fact, the role of the master critic starting in the generation of these three scholars appears to be analogous to that of a mujtahid in jurisprudence, namely one in which the opinions of previous scholars tend to be of rather limited importance.

\(^{7}\) Taqdimn, 155.

\(^{78}\) Suwâyd b. ‘Abd al-‘Azîz reports that Shu‘ba criticized him because he did not pray well, Hushaym reports that Shu‘ba shredded his book of hadîth from Abû l-Zubayr, and Abû Dâwûd al-Ṭayâlîsî reports that Shu‘ba said “nobody was more favorable to me prior to meeting him [than after having done so] than Abû l-Zubayr in Mecca;” Taqdimn, 151.

\(^{79}\) The expression in the first report is sayyid al-faqâhî while the second one is “there is nobody like Ayyûb, Yûnis, and Ibn ‘Awn;” Taqdimn, 133.

\(^{80}\) Taqdimn, 20 (Malik’s abusive insult of Ibn Ishâq); 136 (two reports in defense of Jabir); 132 (five positive reports from four sources about Ibn Ishâq). Shu‘ba purportedly “fled from” ‘Abd al-Malik’s hadîth because they were “too perfect” (miy humuhu fararrâ); ibid., 145.
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has identified as 'comparative criticism', such as Shu'ba's opinion that 'Āṣim b. Sulaymān is favorable to Qatāda, Ḥarmād b. Abī Sulaymān has more ḥijz than al-Ḥakam, and that Yahyā b. Abī Kathīr was preferable to al-Zuhri.\(^{82}\)

The most striking finding with regard to this analysis of the texts of Shu'ba's transmission is the correlation between the first transmitter in the isnād (Shu'ba's student) and the style of the language of his comments. There are numerous colorful anecdotes in the transmissions of Shu'ba's students who never achieved much of a reputation for hadith criticism, whereas those who were more prominent scholars or critics include some technical language. Examples of the former category include the use of the non-technical terms sayyid and "best of people" (khuyār al-nās), the remark "leave me, I do not want to vomit" with regard to Abū Bakr al-Hudhallī, the observation that the precision (iṣqān) of 'Abd al-Warith b. Saʿīd was "clear from his backside" (qaqāhū), and two particularly harsh anecdotes with regard to Abān b. Abī 'Ayyāsh.\(^{83}\) The technical term sādīq (sincere) is found in both of the reports from Ibn 'Ulayya,\(^{84}\) and the term thiqa (reliable) is found in a mere five reports with reference to eight men, half of whom include the men whom I identified as Shu'ba's favorite scholars earlier in this section of this chapter.\(^{85}\) The students who employ the term thiqa in their transmission from Shu'ba include Ibn Idrīs, Jarīr b. 'Abd al-Hamīd, Sulaymān b. Ḥarb, and Yahyā b. Saʿīd al-Qaṭṭān. This latter scholar is also the only one who uses the expression yuḍa'āfi (he declared weak) with regard to Shu'ba, and it is shocking that none of the reports include an evaluation in which Shub'a explicitly employs the term ḥaṭf or one of its derivatives.\(^{86}\) The most severe technical term with a negative valence, taraka

\(^{82}\) Taqāma, 145, 137, and 156-7, respectively. Dickinson identifies three styles of criticism, namely, absolute, comparative, and conditional in his study of the Taqāma; Dickinson, The Development of Early Sunni Hadith Criticism, 93.

\(^{83}\) These anecdotes are "Had I not been shy, I would not have prayed at his funeral" and "I would rather commit seventy major sins than transmit hadith from Abān," Taqāma, 134. For Abū Bakr al-Hudhallī, see ibid., 143 (Sulmā b. 'Abdullāh) and for 'Abd al-Warith, see ibid., 146.

\(^{84}\) Taqāma, 135 (Mahdī b. Maymūn) and 152 (Ibn 'Isāq).


\(^{86}\) This observation is also consistent with my findings in al-Ṭabqāt al-kabīr and al-Du‘afā’ al-saghib, namely that the exact language that Shu'ba used to declare a
(to reject, abandon), occurs with regard to only five scholars and is found only once in the first person. It is probably not a coincidence that all but one of these reports are transmitted by three special pupils of Shu'ba, namely Mu'adh b. Mu'adh, Jarir, and Yahya l-Qattan.

The evidence in support of the identification of Shu'ba b. al-Ḥajjāj as a hadith critic is quite strong. The sources unanimously depict him as a master critic of hadith and a modest body of his hadith-transmitter opinions has survived. The bulk of these opinions is preserved in Ibn Abi Ḥātim's Taqdima, and my analysis of the ināds of the 139 reports failed to produce any evidence of overt forgery on the part of the compiler. The argument for the authenticity of these opinions was augmented by my analysis of the texts themselves due to the observations that they were both consistent in the cases of multiple transmissions for a single scholar, and that only those reports passed on by students of Shu'ba who were themselves critics contained the technical terms that gained widespread currency by the early third/ninth century. While it would be desirable to know the actual language employed by Shu'ba in his negative criticisms of hadith scholars, it is apparent from the surviving reports that his more critically minded students understood what their teacher meant and, perhaps out of respect, chose to conceal it with the unambiguous expression yuda'ifu.

IV.4.4 Sufyān al-Thawrī

There do not appear to have been many religious scholars in the early phases of Islam who received a higher degree of honor from their contemporaries and students than the Kufan Sufyān b. Sa'id.
al-Thawri. I have mentioned already that his knowledge of the reports of Abū Ishḥaq al-Sabri and al-A'mash was considered superior to that of Shu'ba, as well as two anecdotes that record Ibn al-Mubarak's praise of him. Yaḥyā l-Qaṭṭān was particularly devoted to him and is reported to have said that al-Thawri was superior to Mālik in everything and that nobody had more material memorized (ḥifẓ) than him.88 Ibn Malī ḍ boasted that al-Thawri's unique opinion was more reliable than the consensus of four of his prominent contemporaries, a report that appears in a hyperbolic form in Ibn Abī Ḥātim's Taqdima.89 Even the strict critic Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī was impressed with al-Thawri's erudition:

Sufyān is a jurist, ḥifẓ, and ascetic. He is the Imām of Iraq, most perfect (aṣqān) of the companions of Abū Ishḥaq, and has more ḥifẓ than Shu'ba; if these two differ, al-Thawri is correct.90

While there can be little doubt that Sufyān al-Thawri was a remarkable ḥadīth scholar, his status as a ḥadīth critic requires a careful examination of the sources. There are not any references to him in al-Bukhārī's al-Ju'fiq, al-ṣaghīr, and there are only three opinions of his found in Ibn Sa'd's al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr, none of which involve the criticism of an individual transmitter.91 There is a report from ʿAbd al-Razzāq that al-Thawri would reply to inquiries about names in the isnād by saying “he spoke well” (kīna ḥasan al-khīṭāb) and another one from his Kufan student Abū Nuʿaym that he would scowl (qaṭṭāb) whenever he related ḥadīth from a weak transmitter.92 These reports

88 Sufyān faqih Mālik fi kulli shay'; Taqdima, 57, Kitāb al-majrūhin, I, 51. For al-Thawri's incomparable ḥifẓ, see Taqdima, 62–3, Kitāb al-majrūhin, I, 49, and Ibn ʿAdī, al-Kāmil, I, 97. Yaḥyā l-Qaṭṭān is reported to rank the three scholars with the most ḥifẓ as al-Thawri, Shu'ba, and Hushaym in the first two of these sources. It is important to recall the reports we cited earlier that indicate that Yaḥyā l-Qaṭṭān, despite being a Basran, was a follower of the madhhab of Sufyān al-Thawri.

89 Kitāb al-majrūhin, I, 51; the four scholars are ʿAbd al-Razzāq, Abī ʿAlī Ḥaqq, Ḥaqq, and Shariṭ. The exaggerated report is transmitted by al-Fallaṣ and put in the mouth of Yaḥyā l-Qaṭṭān: “Even if there were 4000 like these [four scholars], al-Thawri would be more reliable (ṣaḥḥāt) than them!” Taqdima, 78–9.

90 Sufyān faqihun, ḥifẓun, zāhidun imamū ahli l-ʿirāq, wa al-qānun asbābī Abī Ishḥaq, wa hawā ahfajū mun Shu'ba, wa idhā ikhlāṣa l-Thawri wa Shu'ba, fa'l-Thawri; Taqdima, 66.

91 Al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, VI, 523 (ḥadīth of ʿAbd al-Aʿlā b. ʿAmr from Ibn al-Ṭānaisiya from a book, not saṃāʿ); VI, 528 (names of the four ḥifẓ in his opinion); VI, 528 (how to distinguish Jabir al-Juṣṭi's ṣadīq from his sound ḥadīth). Parallel versions of all three of these reports are also found in the Taqdima, 71, 72 (only three of the four names), and 73, respectively.

indicate, at best, an informal method of hadith-transmitter criticism and may help explain the near total absence of any negative opinions of individual scholars in these early sources.\textsuperscript{93}

Ibn Abī Hātim has distinguished himself again, as in the case of Shu'ba, with the most substantial collection of critical reports on the authority of Sufyān al-Thawrī.\textsuperscript{94} He collated seventy-three reports from a variety of sources, the most important by far of which is Sālih b. Ahmad b. Hanbal's transmission of Ibn al-Madini's collection of comments from Yahyā l-Qaṭṭān and Ibn Mahdī.\textsuperscript{95} All of the positive opinions are devoid of technical terms, and the negative ones are almost exclusively with respect to a faulty line of transmission and not a transmitter.\textsuperscript{96} This former category of opinions range from calling al-Mu'āṣā b. 'Imrān the "sapphire of the scholars" (yiṣṣāt al-ulamā');\textsuperscript{97} identifying Maṣūr, 'Abd al-Karīm al-Jazari, Ayyūb, and 'Amr b. Dīnār as "sources free from doubt,"\textsuperscript{98} and commenting that the ever-controversial Jābir al-Ju'fī was "most pious with regard to hadith."\textsuperscript{99} Ibn Abī Hātim has even found a report in which al-Thawrī refused to write hadith from a Mūjir judge in Jurjān, but decided

\textsuperscript{93} The only cases in which al-Thawrī explicitly declares an individual weak ṣadaqāṣīḥūn that I have so far come across are: 1) on the authority of Yahyā l-Qaṭṭān with regard to 'Abd al-Hamīd b. Ja'far b. 'Abdullāh al-Anṣārī and 2) that he called 'Abbād b. Kathīr a liar ḥadhīḥīḥāb; see Muwāt' at aqwal al-Imām Ahmad, II, 310 and Saḥīḥ Muslim bi-sharh al-Nawawī, I, 86, respectively. Abū Nu'aym al-Iṣbahānī also includes al-Thawrī's opinion of 'Abbād in his Kitāb al-dā'ifā' (p. 122; #176) and this is the only negative opinion attributed to al-Thawrī among the 289 entries of his book.

\textsuperscript{94} Taqdimā, 69 83.

\textsuperscript{95} Thirty-one of the reports are of this iṣnād; other sources include his father (10 reports), Muhammad b. Yahyā (7 reports), 'Abī b. al-Ḥasan al-Ḥasajān (4 reports), and Muḥammad b. Sa'īd al-Mu'āṣir (4 reports).

\textsuperscript{96} Six of these reports consist of hadith that al-Thawrī declared suspect (ṣaraṣṣārā) due to the fact that certain men in the iṣnād never met each other or were inaccurate; Taqdimā, 70, 1, 81-2. Note that all of these reports come from either Yahyā l-Qaṭṭān or Ibn Mahdī. The only case of al-Thawrī using the term "liar" (ḥadhīḥīḥāb; is with regard to 'Abd al-Walhāb b. Muḥājīd; Taqdimā, 76. Note, however, that when al-Thawrī is asked about this same scholar in another report, he merely turns his face away and does not say anything. The only other negative phrases that I have come across are "it is odd (ayyāb) that x would transmit from y" with regard to Dāwūd b. Yazīd and al-Kalbī, and the expression wāṣīyan (forgetful) with respect to Abū b. 'Ayyās; Taqdimā, 73, 77.

\textsuperscript{97} Taqdimā, 75.

\textsuperscript{98} ha'īna waqātū fī l-hadīth; Taqdimā, 72-3.

\textsuperscript{99} kāna wasfarūn fī l-hadīth; Taqdimā, 72. Another version reads: mā ra'aytu rajulān ayyūb fī l-hadīth min Jābir al-Ju'fī, wāl la Maṣūr; Taqdimā, 77.
none-the-less to take his material from this judge’s student! Even a report concerning the reliability of Muhammad al-Kalbi is crafted in a manner so that the word “mendacious” (khadhib) appears in the mouth of al-Kalbi with reference to his own transmission from Abu Shālih on the authority of Ibn ‘Abbas.

There are three important findings that can be gleaned from Sufyān al-Thawrī’s critical reports in the Taqdima. First, al-Thawrī’s criticism is confined almost exclusively to defective isnāds instead of defective transmitters. In this sense he could perhaps be considered more of a hadīth editor than a critic. Secondly, while al-Thawrī is conservative with negative criticisms, he is lavish in his praise and willing, like Shu‘ba, to defend a controversial scholar such as Jābir al-Ju‘fi. The third, and perhaps most significant finding is that the only technical terms of hadīth criticism that appear are in the mouths of his students. These findings are consistent not only with the analysis of the critical opinions of Shu‘ba, but support the argument of Ibn Ḥibbān in Kitāb al-mujrīhīn that the second “craft” of hadīth criticism, namely hadīth-transmitter criticism (al-jarah wa l-ta’dīl) only began with the pupils of Sufyān al-Thawrī and his generation.

IV.4.5 Mālik b. Anas

Mālik’s reputation in the eyes of later generations of Sunnī master hadīth critics revolves around his reliability in general, and his book, al-Muwatta’, in particular. Despite the earlier citation that Yahyā l-Qaṭṭān universally favored Sufyān al-Thawrī to Mālik, we find that Ibn Mahdi considered Mālik to be the most sound scholar of hadīth,
and that neither Ibn Hanbal nor Ibn Ma'in criticized a man from whom Mālik took reports. 105 Both Ibn Mahdī and al-Shāfi‘ī are reported as calling the Muwatta’ the most sound book after the Qur‘ān, and the latter jurist is reported to have said “if a hadith of Mālik comes to you cling to it with all your might.” 106 ‘Ali b. al-Madini went so far as to declare that every Medinan from whom Mālik did not transmit hadith had some sort of defect (baddhāhi thiqa‘), 107 and reports that Mālik’s response to Bishr b. ‘Umar al-Zahrā‘ī’s question about the probity of a transmitter was “Do you see him in my notebooks? Were he reliable (thiqa), you would have seen him [there].” 108

This last anecdote illustrates a unique feature of Mālik’s hadith criticism, namely the employment of several technical terms that became normative for this discipline. Despite the paucity of critical reports found in Ibn Abī Ḥātim’s Taqdima, the term thiqa appears no fewer than ten times in the chapter devoted to Mālik, seven of which are in the negative (layya bi-thiqa). 109 The technical expression thiqa ma‘mūn is also found in a comment concerning Ayyūb al-Sakhūyā‘ī’s selectivity of hadith-transmitters in al-Kāmil fi du‘afā‘ al-rijāl. 110 Three other standard critical terms are present among Mālik’s opinions in the Taqdima, 111 as well as the unique term for which he is most particularly famous, namely “an antichrist among the antichrists” (dajjal min dajjilā), for Ibn Isḥaq. 112 Ibn ‘Uyayna is quoted as declaring Mālik to be the strictest of the critics with regard to transmitters as his own notebooks. 113

105 Taqdima, 17 (Ibn Mahdī), 18 (Ibn Ḥanbal and Ibn Ma‘īn; see also Ibn ‘Adī, al-Kāmil, 1, 102: “we do not mind not asking about [the reliability] of a man from whom Mālik transmits”). Note that there are also reports that Yahya l-Qattān considered Mālik to be the most sound (asāhhū) scholar (ibid., 1, 102), although Ibn Abī Ḥātim’s interpretation of qawm to refer to al-Thawrī and Ibn ‘Uyayna in the report ma‘ fi l-qawm asāhhū hadithan may be incorrect; Taqdima, 15.

106 Allah ja‘ari hadithu Mālikin fu‘ashdud bi-hi iyi dayakta; Ibn ‘Adī, al-Kāmil, 1, 103 and Taqdima, 14, for a similar report. For the Muwatta’ as second to the Qur‘ān, see Kūthib al-majritīn, 1, 41–2.

107 Ibn ‘Adī, al-Kāmil, 1, 103.

108 hal ra‘aytuhu fi kutubī? qultu la qāla biw kāna thiqa‘an la-ra‘aytuhu; Taqdima, 24; Ibn ‘Adī, al-Kāmil, 1, 103. This report dates back at least to the introduction of Muslim’s Sahih; see Sahih Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī, 1, 107.

109 Taqdima, pp. 19, 22, 24 (six examples of replies to Bishr b. ‘Umar’s questions). Five of these opinions can be found in the Introduction to Muslim’s Sahih; see Sahih Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī, 1, 107.

110 Ibn ‘Adī, al-Kāmil, 1, 74.

111 These terms include layya bi-dhāk, zālih, and kadhāhāb; Taqdima. 19 and 21.

112 Taqdima, 20.
and there is a report that Malik urged his students to shun the hadith from any of the following four types of people: one who is senile, a proselytizer of religious innovation (sectarianism), a liar, and "a pious Shaykh who does not understand what he is saying." In conclusion, the evidence we have scrutinized in these sources not only testifies to Malik's status as a bona fide hadith critic, but indicates that Malik was one of the first scholars to engage in hadith-transmitter criticism and employ its technical vocabulary.

IV.4.6 Sufyān b. 'Uyayna

If my hypothesis that hadith-transmitter criticism emerged from general hadith criticism during the second half of the second/eighth century is correct, then one would expect to find technical terms associated with the long-lived Meccan scholar Ibn 'Uyayna. Although Ibn 'Uyayna is not counted among the "three men who made hadith criticism into a craft" according to Ibn Hibban, his presence among Muslim's five Imāms who criticized weak transmitters is significant. Ibn 'Uyayna has more opinions preserved in al-Bukhāri's al-Du'ā'ī al-saghir than any other member of his generation, and three of them explicitly state "he declared [the transmitter] to be unreliable" (yu'da'afā'uhu). Ibn 'Adī reports that Sufyān al-Thawrī asked Ibn 'Uyayna about the scholars of the Hijāz and that no scholar compiled a greater amount of material (jam') than he. The most important early source for the preservation of Ibn 'Uyayna's critical opinions is, not surprisingly, Ibn Abī Haṭīm's collection of eighty-six reports in the Taqdima.

The critical opinions of Ibn 'Uyayna found in the Taqdima are of

113 lā yu'khādhu l-'ilmu min arba'a, wa khudhū minnum sīwā dhālīka; lā yu'khādhu min saḥīhin mu'tinin bi-sefahīhi, wa in kāna anuwa l-nās; lā min saḥīhi hawnan yadū l-nās ilā hawwāhi; lā min kāna adhā adhā ilā l-nāsī, wa in kāna lā tattahinahu an yakhāba 'alā rasūli l-'ilm; lā min shaykhin lahu 'ibādatun wa fadīmin idhā kāna lā ya'rifū ma raddātihi; Ibn 'Adī, al-Kāmil, I, 103. Ibn 'Uyayna's opinion can be found in the Taqdima, 23 and al-Kāmil, I, 102; note that the 'imāds in both sources include 'Ali b. al-Madīnī and Sālih b. Ahmad.

114 Muslim also cites Ibn 'Uyayna's criticisms of the Shi'ī (rāfī'ī) beliefs of Jābir al-Ju'fī in the introduction of his Sāhhā, see Sahih Muslim bi-sharh al-Nawawī, I, 92–3. These three examples are located on pages 29, 63, 252 of al-Du'ā'ī al-saghir. The other four opinions include identifying two Qadarīs, one Ibādi, and one person as "sub-hafi"; ibid., 134, 191, 92, and 283, respectively.

capital significance because they include several technical terms and indicate the context in which these terms were articulated. The expression *thiqa* (reliable) occurs in eight different reports, all of which indicate that this comment was uttered by Ibn *Uyayna immediately after he mentioned a name in the isnād of a particular hadīth.\(^{117}\) The term *sadiq* appears once and two reports contain expressions based on the term *sidq* (sincere).\(^{118}\) Another report includes both of these positive critical terms in the superlative form, namely “most reliable and most sincere of the people.”\(^{119}\) There is a unique example of *yudtufuhu* in the mouth of Ibn *Uyayna’s* student Na‘aym b. Ḥammād and a report on the authority of ‘Alī b. al-Madīnī that Ibn *Uyayna* rejected *(luraka)* the transmissions of another scholar.\(^{120}\) Another example of negative criticism is Ibn *Uyayna’s* advice to his students not to listen to legal hadīth from Bāqīyya b. al-Walīd, but to listen to his material pertaining to the rewards of the Hereafter and other topics.\(^{121}\) A final example of hadīth-transmitter criticism, albeit a non-technical one, is the quote of Ibn *Uyayna* that “when I used to hear al-Ḥasan b. Umārna transmit [hadīth] on the authority of al-Zuhri and ‘Amr b. Dinār, I would put my fingers in my ears!”\(^{122}\)

\(^{117}\) The comment “and he was reliable” *(wa kāna thiqa)*, occurs almost always in the context of an isnād which Ibn *Uyayna* is relating for a hadīth whose muta is never included in the report. An example for this is hadāthānān ʿUṣayn b. ‘Uyayna *‘an al-Abwas ibn Ḥabīb wa kāna thiqa; Taqdirma,* 41. Other examples can be found of pages 42-5 of the Taqdirma. Only in one case does Ibn *Uyayna* repeat the word *thiqa* three times in what is clearly an effort, if authentic, to praise his beloved master-teacher ‘Amr b. Dinār: *Taqdirma,* 49.

\(^{118}\) For *sadiq,* see Taqdirma, 37; for *al-sadiq,* 41; and *ma‘ādin al-sadiq,* 42.

\(^{119}\) *Haddāthānān ʿIrābī b. ʿAlī ʿan Māyṣara, wa kāna aṣṣāqā l-nāḥi wa awthāqum; Taqdirma,* 41.

\(^{120}\) *Taqdirma,* 42, 46, respectively. Note that Ibn *Uyayna* was the only scholar of his generation whom ‘Alī b. al-Madīnī was able to study with directly without the intermediary of Yahyā l-Qaṭṭān or Ibn Mahdī. Twenty-one of the reports in this section of the Taqdirma were transmitted from him through Ibn Hanbal’s son Sulḥ to Ibn ʿAbī Hāṭim; it is somewhat surprising that none of them include the technical term *thiqa.* Although this might be due to the fact that they were specific answers to Ibn al-Madīnī’s questions and we have just observed that Ibn *Uyayna* may have preferred to use the term in the course of relating hadīth.

\(^{121}\) In tasmāʾin min Bāqīyya wa kāna fi sonna, wa-insnāʾum minhu wa kāna fi shahādāt wa ghayrihi: *Taqdirma,* 41. Note that this differentiation with regards to the reliability of the transmitter between legal and piety-inducing hadīth is found also in the Introduction of Muslim’s Sahīh. If this report is authentic, it may be one of the earliest examples of a critic who relied upon the nature of the content of the muta of hadīth to determine the degree of strictness that one should apply to the isnād; in other words, the transmitters in the isnād had to be of the highest level in the cases of legal hadīth, and of a medium level with regard to non-legal reports.

\(^{122}\) Ḥanūf idhnun sannu al-Ḥasan ibn Umārna jarah ʿan al-Zuhri wa ʿAmr ibn Dinār jaʿallu isbāʾī fi udhnuh; *Taqdirma,* 44.
Ibn 'Uyayna qualifies as a genuine hadith-transmitter critic on the basis of the evidence I have subjected to analysis. He followed the lead of Shu‘ba, in that he was willing to criticize transmitters instead of individual hadith, and to employ technical terms that came into circulation on a rather limited scale in the circles of Malik. Ibn 'Uyayna’s demonstrated willingness to engage in hadith-transmitter criticism distinguishes him from his senior contemporary namesake Sufyân al-Thawrî and may explain why Muslim included the former Sufyân among his list of five Imâms instead of the arguably more illustrious Sufyân al-Thawrî.

IV.4.7 'Abdullâh b. al-Mubberî

The evidence in favor of the identification of Ibn al-Mubberî as a hadith critic is similar to that which I presented with respect to Ibn 'Uyayna. The initial impression of Ibn al-Mubberî that one might receive from the ten primary sources of this chapter is that of a pious militant scholar who is an unlikely candidate for the appellation of critic, especially in light of the report that he “never rejected the hadith of a man until he was informed of something that made it impossible for him to defend [the transmitter].” 1123 Despite this caveat, it is significant to observe that al-Bukhârî mentions seven men whose hadith Ibn al-Mubberî rejected (tarâka) and one man whom he is reported to have declared unreliable (yudâ‘ifuhu). 1234 Ibn Abî Ḥâtim also records the names of four men whose hadith Ibn al-Mubberî was observed by his pupils to reject, as well as two reports in which the technical term thiqa is present. 1235 Ibn al-Mubberî also states his preference for the Zuhûrî material transmitted by Yûnus al-‘Aylî for its accuracy due to the fact that it was copied directly from

1123 kâna Ibn al-Mubberî lâ yatuqti hadithu l-rajulî hattâ yahlughahu ‘anhu l-sâyûl hadithî lâ yosoasfu m yudâ‘ifuhu; Taqdimî, 270. The version of this report on page 274 substitutes yattakû for yatuqti.

1234 Al-Dî‘sîfî al-saghîr, 28, 34, 38, 61, 120, 333; 65 (yudâ‘ifuhu). Three additional critical reports involving Ibn al-Mubarâk can be found in this book on pages 57 (ahlû l-Bûra yudâ‘ifun [hu]); 73 (nusabahu), and 146. This last example is an anecdote that Ibn al-Mubarâk was eager to hear from a scholar until he heard a suspect hadith regarding taxation and then decided not to go and study with him. Several critical opinions of Ibn al-Mubarâk are also sprinkled throughout Muslim’s introduction to his Sahîh, see Sahîh Muslim bi-sharh al-Nawawî, I, 80–2, 86, and 106.

1235 The four transmitters rejected by Ibn al-Mubarâk can be found in the Taqdimî, 271–4; the thiqa reports are 273–4. There are also unique reports that include the terms sâlih and sadûq; ibid., 271, 274.
the teacher's notebooks, even though he acknowledges that the student with the largest quantity of Zuhri reports is Ma'mar.126 Despite some initial skepticism as to whether Ibn al-Mubarak can accurately be described as a hadith critic, our analysis of his opinions preserved by al-Bukhari and Ibn Abi Hatim makes his case as strong, if not stronger, than for those of Ibn 'Uyayna and Malik.127

IV.4.8 Waki' b. al-Jarrāh

The evidence in support of Waki's critical capacity is congruous to that which I just extracted for Ibn al-Mubarak. There is one report in Ibn Sa'd's al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr in which Waki' declares Sulaymān b. Buraydā to be "sounder and more reliable with regard to hadith than his brother ('Abdullāh)" and that employs the superlative form of the technical terms sahih and thiqā.128 Al-Bukhari reports two men whose hadith Waki' rejected, one whom he declared unreliable, and another individual whom he declared to be thiqā.129 Ibn Abi Hatim reports no fewer than sixteen reports in which Waki' employs the technical term thiqā as well as two of the earliest examples of the term thabaṭ. The fact that several of these examples in which Waki' evaluates a transmitter occur in the course of his recitation of the isnaḍ of a hadith is consistent with our finding with regard to the practice of Ibn 'Uyayna and suggests that this was the method by which the first hadith-transmitter critics informed their students of the reliability of their predecessors. There are a few negative reports, including one example of yuḏahīfū and another in which Waki' remarks that "al-Mu'allā b. Hilāl came to us and his books were among the soundest (asahhi) books; then several things became clear and we were

126 Taqdima, 272. If the report that Ibn al-Mubarak called Yūnus's book "sound" (sahih) is authentic, this might be the earliest reference to a sound book in the Islamic tradition.
127 Al-Bukhari's pupil al-Tirmidhi also includes a list of a dozen men whose hadith Ibn al-Mubarak rejected; see al-Tirmidhi, al-Jami' al-sahih, V, 740.
128 kānn asahhihuma hadithan wa athqaqahuma; Ibn Sa'd, al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr, VII, 115.
129 Al-Bukhari, al-Du'afā' al-ṣaghīr, 64 and 108 (taraḍaκu); 348 (thiqā). Waki' is also quoted as saying that "the people say that 'Abd al-Wahhab b. Mujahid b. Jābir did not hear anything from his father," that he "spoke cautiously" (yata'alamu fih) about Yahyā b. al-'Alā' al-Rāzī, and that he declared Yamān b. al-Mughirā to have suspect (munkar) hadith; ibid., 156, 253, and 259.
no longer able to transmit anything on his authority." The inescapable conclusion from the evidence gleaned from these three early sources is that Wâkî was a hadîth-transmitter critic in the same style as his senior contemporaries Ibn ‘Uyayna and Ibn al-Mubârak, even though he seems to have been relatively reluctant to reject and swift to praise his erudite predecessors found in the isnâds of the hadîth which he transmitted.

IV.4.9 Yahyâ b. Sa‘îd al-Qaṭṭân and ‘Abd al-Rahmân b. Mahdî

The final primary critics of the first period, Yahyâ l-Qaṭṭân and Ibn Mahdî, are the two scholars whom Ibn Hibbân identified as the founders of the craft of hadîth-transmitter criticism in his tabaqât presentation in Kitâb al-majrûhîn. Their presence in many of the isnâds of critical reports that preserve the opinions of their teachers Shu‘ba and Sufyân al-Thawrî in the Taqdimî has been indicated throughout this chapter. Ibn ‘Adî includes at the beginning of the third tabaqâ in al-Kâmîl ǧî du‘âfa’ al-nâjîl both Ibn Mahdî’s list of four Imâms and three reports in which Yahyâ l-Qaṭṭân mentions that he asked al-Awzâ‘î, al-Thawrî, Ibn ‘Uyayna, Shu‘ba, and Mâlik what one should do about the transmitter who makes errors in his hadîth.

The universal response, “clarify his state/condition” (bayyin amrahu), can be seen as a pseudo-legal responsum for the permissibility of hadîth-transmitter criticism from the most prominent religious scholars of the generation prior to Yahyâ l-Qaṭṭân. The significance of this anecdote is not whether Yahyâ l-Qaṭṭân actually asked each of these scholars for their blessing prior to criticizing many transmitters, but...
rather that later critics cast him in the role of a petitioner before the most eminent religious scholars of his day and thus saw him as the champion of a new practice whose potential for causing strife (fitna; clearly worried many of its practitioners).

Ibn Mahdi is also the earliest scholar to explain how an expert of hadith engages in criticism. He is quoted as stating that "I know the sound from the weak hadith like a doctor can determine whether a person is insane" in all three of the tabaqāt presentations, and he employs the analogy of a coin trader in Ibn 'Adi's book. This latter explanation is transmitted by 'Ali b. al-Madini to al-Bukhari and includes the important argument that the means by which one becomes proficient at hadith criticism is through "lengthy [hadith] sessions, debates, and experience." That this justification for the technique of hadith criticism is associated with Ibn Mahdi in all three of our tabaqāt presentations is a particularly strong indication of his role as a hadith-transmitter critic in the eyes of the third/ninth century hadith scholars, even though relatively few of his critical comments appear to have survived.

The absence of Ibn Mahdi's critical opinions in our hitherto most fecund source for them, namely Ibn Abī Hātim's Taqdima, is compensated for partially by al-Bukhari's al-Du'afa' al-saghīr. Ibn Mahdi's presence is a little smaller than what one might expect, as he is cited in only seven cases, a mere two of which involve actively rejecting a transmitter. Yaḥyā l-Qaṭṭān, by contrast, dominates al-Du'afa' al-saghīr. Al-Bukhari mentions ten men whom Yaḥyā l-Qaṭṭān rejects, five whom he declares unreliable, two from whom he does not transmit hadith, and another thirteen mostly negative opinions.

---

111 This idea is stated explicitly in the last report in this section from Abū Mushir who replied "no" to the question "Do you consider [clarifying the transmitter's condition] a type of sedition (jilna)?" Ibn 'Adi, al-Kamil, I, 80.

112 hanū yaḥyā l-tabībī l-majūša; Taqdima, 252; Ibn Hibban, Kūb al-majūshin, I, 32; Ibn 'Adi, al-Kamil, I, 118. A more sophisticated explanation of the necessary skills for this craft from the mouth of Abū Hātim can be found in the Taqdima, 249-50.

113 li-tlībī l-majūša wa l-munāzūra wa l-khibra; Ibn 'Adi, al-Kamil, I, 118.

114 Al-Bukhari, al-Du'afa' al-saghīr, 33, 52 (reading "Yaḥyā wa Ibn Mahdi" instead of "Yaḥyā ibn Mahdi" in the printed text), 165, 210, 237, 239, and 258.

115 Ibid., 33, 49, 73, 152, 163, 170, 181, 231, 257.

116 Ibid., 133, 135, 173, 232, 250.


118 Ibid., 78, 82, 115, 132, 133, 146, 154, 164, 176, 177, 220, 229, 233.
The whole gamut of technical terms that we have been watching carefully is present in the succinct remarks of both Ibn Mahdi and Yahyā I-Qāṭān found in al-Bukhari’s small book, and it is clear that these two men played a major role as the bridge between their teachers who were hesitant to criticize individual transmitters, at least on a large scale, and their relentlessly inquisitive pupils whose work I shall be analyzing in the second part of this study.

IV.5 What about al-Shāfi‘i?

Since the topic of *hadith* is a constant theme in the legal writings of Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Shāfi‘i (d. 204/820), one may have expected to find al-Shāfi‘i listed among the master *hadith* critics in the ten sources that I examined. Joseph Schacht reconstructed the complexities and some of the paradoxes of al-Shāfi‘i’s articulation of the elevated legal authority of *hadith* over half a century ago in *Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*. The paradoxes that Schacht correctly identified include: 1) al-Shāfi‘i’s frequent reliance upon *sahāba* reports as evidence despite his inability to provide a theoretical reason for the intrinsic authority of anything less than a prophetic *hadith*; 2) his acceptance of the *mursal* *hadith* from senior *tābi‘ūn*; and 3) his “careless” citation of *insād*. Schacht’s observation of most interest for this chapter is that al-Shāfi‘i and his contemporaries were aware of technical terms of *hadith* criticism that “had been developed by the specialists on traditions” and that “it was left to al-Shāfi‘i to introduce as much of the specialized criticism as existed in his time into legal science.”

From whom did al-Shāfi‘i obtain this knowledge of *hadith* criticism? Schacht does not offer any suggestions in these chapters, but,

---

142 Note that Ibn Ḥanbal quotes Yahyā I-Qāṭān in numerous critical reports, the vast majority of which are negative; for example, *Mawṣūl‘at ʿaqrāb al-Iṣām Ahmad*, I, 38–40 (Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad), 154 (Bishr b. Ḥarb), 173–4 (Ṭābit al-Bunānī); II, 141 (Sharīk al-Qādī), 314 (Abū Shihāb al-Ḥamdānī), 322 (ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Ḥarmalā); III, 8 (ʿAṣr b. Abī Maymūna), 159 (Fitr b. Khalīfa), 267 (Layyi b. Abī Sulaym); 358 (Matar b. Tahmānī); IV, 180 (Ṭūnus b. Yaḥyā al-Ayyūbī), 193 (Abū Bakr b. ‘Ayyāsh).

143 See chapters 3 and 5.

144 These terms include *thābit*, *mashhūr*, *mutaṣādīl*, *mangajī*, *mursal*, *dā‘if*, and *munkar*. Schacht, *Origins*, 36. One should also add *thiqā* to this list.
given the preponderance of hadith in the Risāla from his teachers Mālik and Ibn ‘Uyayna, whose credentials as critics are highly plausible, it would appear that these two Hijāzī authorities introduced al-Shāfi‘ī to this new discipline. The necessity of a good education in the discipline of hadith criticism in al-Shāfi‘ī’s jurisprudence is obvious from his core principle that

![Image of text](image_url)

Furthermore, al-Shāfi‘ī explicitly rejects the practice of the imprecise transmission of hadith (bi-l-ma‘nā) and comes out strongly against the practice of tadžs in the Risāla. Finally, al-Shāfi‘ī’s definition of the irregular (shādhdh) hadith left a deep imprint on the Sunnī disciplines of hadith (‘ulum al-hadīth), as it is found in the books of Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Ibn ‘Adī, and even Ibn al-Salāḥ’s Muqaddima that I discussed above in the second chapter.

---


146 Scacht, Origins, 12.

15 Khadduri, al-Risāla, 239-40. There is a serious mistake in this edition concerning the definition of tadžs; the text should read “He must not be an interpolator, attributing to someone whom he has met that which he has not heard from him” instead of “someone whom he has not met;” ibid., 240. The Arabic reads: baryyan min an yakīna mudallisun—yuhaddithu ‘an man laqyya mà lam yasmu minhu; al-Shāfi‘ī, al-Risāla, ed. ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ Kabbārah (Beirut: Dār al-Nafā’is, 1999), 197. For more references to al-Shāfi‘ī’s comments on tadžs, see Schacht, Origins, 37.

147 Al-Shāfi‘ī’s definition of a shādhdh hadith, that it is “not a hadith that only one reliable transmitter transmits, but rather a hadith which many reliable transmitters transmit, one of whom transmits it in a unique and contradictory manner” (layya l-shādhdhu min al-hadīth an yarwiyā l-thiqatu hadīthan lam yarwih ġayrīku innāna l-shādhdhu min al-hadīth an yarwiyā l-thiqatu hadīthan fa-yashedhdha ‘anhum wa‘anhum fa-yashkūlī fahum); Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Adhā al-Shāfi‘ī wa manāqibuhu (Cairo, 1954), 233, Ibn ‘Adī, al-Kindī, I, 124 (slightly different wording), and Muqaddima Ibn al-Salāḥ, 237 (another slight variant).
The most important question that arises is whether or not al-Shafi‘i was himself a hadith critic. Wael Hallaq has answered this question unequivocally in the negative with his assertion that “[al-Shafi‘i] was neither a loyal traditionist nor an outstanding traditionist.” Melchert observes that al-Shafi‘i “calls on traditionists as outside experts rather than engaging directly, himself, in hadith criticism.” This finding is supported by several of the authors whose works I have examined in this chapter. Ibn Abī Ḥātim does not include al-Shafi‘i among among his master critics in the Taqdimī, and his book devoted to the virtues and manners of al-Shafi‘i includes an insubstantial number of critical comments, which are occasionally quite colorful, regarding individual hadith transmitters. Ibn ‘Adi, who provides a relatively extensive entry for al-Shafi‘i among critics of the fourth tabaqā of hadith experts, reports only two examples of his grades, one of which is “unknown” (lā yu‘rafa) and the other of which isḥāfī, in al-Kāmil fi ḍu‘afā‘ al-rijāl. Neither al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī nor al-Mizzī include any evidence of al-Shafi‘i’s acumen in hadith-transmitter criticism in their biographical notices, and the latter reports that al-Bukhārī only included two of al-Shafi‘i’s legal definitions in his Sakhīh, and that neither he nor Muslim incorporated any of al-Shafi‘i’s hadith in their books. Despite the lack of evidence of al-Shafi‘i’s influence upon the discipline of hadith-transmitter criticism, he is remembered quite fondly in the books of the fourth/tenth

138 Wael Hallaq, “Was al-Shafi‘i the Master Architect of Islamic Jurisprudence?” IJMES, 25 (1993), 593. Hallaq’s reasoning for this comment comes from al-Shafi‘i’s association with several Mu’tazila, and from the facts that he “betrayed his comrades when he insisted on the essential role of gijas in the law” and that his basic knowledge of hadith was “flawed.”

139 Melchert, “Traditionist-Jurisprudents and the Framing of Islamic Law,” 393-4.

140 Examples include al-Shafi‘i’s opinion that the hadith of Ḥarām b. ‘Uthmān is “illicit” (harām); that Abū ‘Aliya al-Riyāḥī’s ḥadith is “hot air” (riyāh, literally “wind”), and that the books of al-Waqīqī are mendacious (kaḥīb); see Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Adīb al-Shafi‘ī, 217-21. Some less colorful comments are al-Shafi‘i’s declaration of Dāwūd b. Shābūr as among the reliable transmitters (min al-thiqāt) and ‘Abd al-Ra‘ūfan b. Zayd b. Aslam as weak (da‘afahu); ibid., 223, 227.


143 Ibid., 380-1. Al-Shafi‘i’s legal definitions are found in the chapters on zakāt (ḥāḥ fi ḍ-rikāz al-khums) and sales (ḥiṣāf; ḥāḥ tafṣīr al-‘arāya), see Ibn Ḥajar, Fatḥ al-bārī, IV, 133 and V, 134.
century hadith scholars and their successors, presumably because of the importance he attached to their research that was unappreciated by most aspiring jurists of this era.

IV.6 Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter has been to elucidate the narrative of the emergence of hadith criticism on the basis of the appropriate texts of the Sunni hadith literature and to evaluate its plausibility. I selected ten major sources and accumulated ninety-two names of potential critics. The analysis of these men included both chronological and hierarchical tripartite divisions that transformed the raw data into clearly identifiable categories. The second level of analysis involved translating the unwieldy tables into a one-page summary of seventeen primary and twenty-two secondary critics, whom I arranged into seven generations in order to clarify the historical narrative of this discipline. I argued on the basis of the extant textual evidence that the major Sunni hadith critics of the second and third periods of our historical development scheme were unequivocal critics, but I felt obliged to affirm the accuracy of this appellation for the nine primary critics of the first period. This defense was necessary due to a recent Western scholar’s skepticism of the critical credentials of contemporaries of Shu’ba and Sufyan al-Thawri, and, more significantly, because these scholars were the immediate predecessors to the authors of the three major third/ninth century texts which I subject to a rigorous analysis in the second part of this book.

I found a remarkable degree of consistency between the major

...
early sources and both Muslim’s list of five Imams and the story of
the two-phase development of the craft of hadith criticism as articulated by Ibn Hibbân in his Kitâb al-majrûhin. My analysis of the rise
in the application of technical terms of hadith-transmitter criticism
found primarily in Ibn Abî Ḥâtim’s Taqdima and al-Bukhârî’s al-
Du‘afâ’ al-saghir was the strongest testimony for the plausibility of Ibn Hibbân’s explanation of the two-stage development of hadith criticism. The three senior primary critics, al-Awzâ’î, Shu’ba, and Sufyân al-Thawrî do not appear to have employed any technical terms in
the sources that I surveyed, whereas Malik and Ibn ‘Uayna did so on a limited scale. Since the careers of al-Awzâ’î, Shu’ba, and Sufyân al-Thawrî overlap those of Malik and Ibn ‘Uayna, it is quite conceivable that they too employed some of these technical terms as early as the first half of the second/eighth century. If Dickinson’s argument that Ibn Abî Ḥâtim attempted dishonestly to cast Shu’ba and his contemporaries as critics is tenable, it is remarkable that Ibn Abî Ḥâtim did not include any examples from his vast repertoire of
reports in which these men use the term thiqa and yet did choose to include multiple thiqa reports on the authority of a scholar like Waki’. The only scholar of the nine primary critics whose capacity as a critic is not supported strongly by the limited selection of early texts I have studied is that of the eldest one, al-Awzâ’î; as he is neither included in the list of the five Imams of Muslim nor among Ibn Hibbân’s three “founders of the craft of hadith criticism,” I would like to suggest tentatively that his juridical acumen and intuition of
the sunna caused later Eastern scholars to bestow an “honorary doctorate” of hadith critic upon him despite the absence of clear evidence in support of his proficiency in this discipline.156

The findings of this chapter have serious implications for both this
book and the general approach to hadith literature in Western scholar-
ship. The most significant finding is that the eight primary critics
for whom the evidence in support of their practice of hadith criticism is credible all lived prior to the composition of al-Shâfi‘î’s Risâla. I remarked in the introduction of this book that Schacht and his
followers have credited this treatise that was composed near the end

156 Recall, however, that Bouzenita’s study of al-Awzâ’î cited above in note 57 provides examples of al-Awzâ’î’s employment of critical terms extracted from two Syrian sources.
of al-Shāfi‘ī’s life with sublime powers and immediate global influence. The sources I have engaged, which are all significant works located within the Sunnī tradition of hadīth scholarship, tell a radically different story, namely that the first multi-topic hadīth books (taṣnīf or muṣan-naf) were compiled between the deaths of al-Zuhri and al-Awzā‘ī (c. 120–150/738–767) and that the rise of hadīth criticism at the level of the individual hadīth (Sufyān al-Thawrī) and occasionally at the level of transmitter (Shu‘ba) was simultaneous with this development. The basic technical term for reliable, thiqa, appears in the opinions of Malik and Ibn Uuyayna, whereas the term for rejection, taraka, was used by their pupils. The last major term to enter circulation appears to be the one for unreliable transmitters, namely da‘if, since it is only found in the third person, usually in the mouths of Yahyā al-Qāṭān (d. 198/813), Ibn Mahdī (d. 198/814), or their contemporaries. Despite the small sample of critical reports upon which this argument is based, the combination of the high degree of consensus as to the identities of the nine primary critics across the centuries of the ten primary sources analyzed in this chapter with the actual critical reports preserved in books like the Taqdima and al-Du‘afā‘ al-saghīr leaves us with a plausible narrative of the first two generations of master hadīth critics who set the stage for the major works of Ibn Sa‘d (d. 230/845), Ibn Ma‘īn (d. 233/848), and Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855). We can only hope that future research will uncover more examples of the critical opinions of these early scholars, the majority of which seem to have been either forgotten or overshadowed by the accomplishments of the critics of the third/ninth century, in order to bury all doubts as to the authenticity of the periodization that I have proposed in this chapter.

15 These books would have included much that was not hadīth, such as ṭabī‘r and historical akhībār, but they are being called hadīth books merely due to the presence of some Prophetic hadīth within their pages.
CHAPTER FIVE

THE GENERATION OF IBN SA'D, IBN MA'IN, AND IBN ḤANBAL: A PROSOPOGRAPHICAL STUDY

V.1

We have arrived at the generation in which the three scholars whose texts I shall examine in the remaining chapters of this book flourished. This generation corresponds closely with the eighth ṭabaqa of the Tadhkira al-ḥuffāz which I described briefly at the beginning of the third phase of ḥadīth scholarship in the third chapter.1 It also follows immediately after the first generation of ḥadīth critics whose contributions to the crafts of ḥadīth criticism and ḥadīth-transmitter criticism I have just assessed in the previous chapter of this study. The goal of this chapter is to provide a panoramic view of the religious and intellectual milieu of the first half of the third/ninth century during which Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'in and Ibn Ḥanbal studied and taught prior to a rigorous analysis of their texts in Part II of this book.

The first section of this chapter consists of an analysis of the five basic groups of men into which the 345 entries of the eleventh and twelfth ṭabaqāt of al-Dhahabi's Siyar a'lim al-nubalā' fall and devotes special attention to the topics of literary production and individual contributions to ḥadīth transmission.2 The first group consists of the political leaders, poets, and masters of belle lettres (udabī') of this generation, while the second one consists of theologians who specialize in dialectics (kalām). The third category of men is a group of virtuous ascetics (zuhhād) and an early mystic (ṣūfī), most of whom, like the members of the previous two groups, played little role in ḥadīth transmission. The sixteen judges (qādīs) and thirty-six jurists (fuqahā') and mustāfs comprise the fourth group and are of particular importance for this study because their biographical notices shed light on the

1 See above, III.4.
2 Note that these five groups are not mutually exclusive, and that several scholars are members of two or even three of them.
poorly understood relationship between the disciplines of jurisprudence (fiqh) and hadith scholarship during this period prior to the crystallization of the Sunni schools of law (madhāhib). The final group of men, the hadith scholars, is, ironically perhaps, the hardest group to pinpoint, and our analysis focuses primarily upon the scholars whom al-Dhahabi evaluates as ḥujja or Shaykh al-Islam, or whose hadith is present in all six of the canonical Sunni books, or who compiled hadith books on their own. This section concludes with a synthesis of the myriad names extracted from al-Dhahabi’s Siyar into a coherent portrait of the centers of hadith scholarship on the eve of the compilation of the unparalleled Sahis of al-Bukhari and Muslim.

The second section of this chapter provides a brief reexamination of a historical event of this period that has generated some attention in the modern secondary literature, namely the miḥna (inquisition) inaugurated during the last four months of al-Ma’mūn’s reign and executed until the early years of al-Mutawakkil. This episode is accorded major significance by Western scholars such as Ira Lapidus, Martin Hinds, and John Nawas, several of whose opinions display an uncamouflaged contempt for the pious religious scholars whose lives were disrupted for little obvious benefit to the caliphate. This event has been approached almost exclusively through the lens of the Muslim chroniclers in general, and al-Tabari in particular, and has been described by Lapidus, Hinds, and Nawas as a watershed event in the relationship between the religious scholars and the caliphate. A more subtle and convincing analysis has been put forth recently by Muhammad Qasim Zaman, but he too devotes the bulk of his study to caliphal policies and relies primarily upon the books of the famous Muslim historians instead of the works of hadith literature. My investigation departs from this scholarship by means of its fresh focus upon the impact of the miḥna on the fields of hadith compilation and criticism, and we demonstrate the negligible effect that an ‘incorrect’ response to the nature of the Qur’ān had upon individual hadith transmitters’ reputations in the eyes of their illustrious pupils like al-Bukhari and Muslim.

1 Meckhorn dates the foundation of the Ḥanafi madhāhab to Abū ʿl-Ḥasan al-Karkhi (d. 340/952), the Shafi’i one to Ibn Suryaj (d. 306/918), and the Hanbali to al-Khallal (d. 311/923); The Formation of the Sunni Schools of Law, 125, 87–92, and 147–55, respectively. The Mālikī school is somewhat harder to date; it appears to have emerged quite early in al-Andalus and Qayrawān, but ultimately failed in Baghdad, ibid., 133–77.
The final section of this chapter provides biographical sketches for Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'in, and Ibn Hanbal, the three scholars whose critical hadith works are subjected to rigorous analyses in the remaining chapters of this book. I also include a sketch of each of the primary transmitters of the texts we are studying: Ibn Fahm and al-Harith b. Abi Usama for Ibn Sa'd's al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr, 'Abbās al-Duri for Ibn Ma'in's Tārikh, and Ibn Hanbal's son, 'Abdullah, who is the sole transmitter of the Musnad and many of his critical opinions ('iql). This section serves as a bridge between the preliminary studies of hadith transmission and criticism that occupied the preceding three chapters to the analyses of critical texts that played a fundamental role in the emergence of Sunni Islam that occupy the remainder of this study.

V.2 A Prosopographical panorama of the first half of the third/ninth century

V.2.1

The primary source for this broad introduction to third/ninth century Islamicate civilization is the Siyar a'īm al-nubalā' of our Mamluk-era guide al-Dhahabi that I discussed above in the first chapter. I have constructed a database of the 345 men found in the eleventh and twelfth tabaqāt of the Siyar, and all but eleven of the men whose death dates were recorded passed away between the years 211-250/826-864. It should come as no surprise that al-Dhahabi's collection

---

1 There are actually 343 men and two royal women, Zaynab bint al-Amir Sulayman and Zubayda, the famous wife of Harūn al-Rashīd (Siyar, X, 238 and 241) mentioned in the eleventh and twelfth tabaqāt of the Siyar, for the sake of convenience, I shall refer to this aggregate as “345 men” when necessary in the remainder of this chapter. Note also that one man, Ahmad b. 'Asim al-Anjākī, has two entries, one under his nisba and one under his first name (ism); ibid., XI, 409 and X, 487, respectively.

5 These entries are located in Siyar, X, 209 through XI, 515. Al-Dhahabi neglects to mention a death date in only twenty-seven of the 345 entries. Note that these two tabaqūt will be considered as one generation for this study because it is quite clear that all of these men were contemporaries and that few of the twelfth tabaqā scholars transmitted material from members of the eleventh one. A few prominent members of the thirteenth tabaqā who lived during the first half of the third/ninth century, such as al-Jāhiz, will be considered in the appropriate sections that follow.
of 'notables' is heavily weighted towards hadith scholars in light of our discussion of his interests and approach to Islam in the second chapter of this study. However, the Siyar, in contrast to Tadhkira al-hujjâz, contains numerous biographies of men who had either a lukewarm or nonexistent role in the venture of hadith transmission and thus is an ideal work for the panoramic view of Islamic cultural life during the time of Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'ân, and Ibn Ḥanbal.

V.2.2 Caliphs, Governors, Poets, and Men of Letters

Only seven of the 345 entries of the eleventh and twelfth tabaqat of al-Dhahabi's Siyar al-'ālam al-nubalâ' are members of the royal 'Abbâsid household. The three caliphs of the age, al-Ma'mûn, al-Mu'tâsim, and al-Wâthiq are presented in succession in the Siyar and their relatively brief entries contain little more than outlines of major events, such as natural disasters and battles, that occurred during each of their respective reigns. The bulk of the information about the miḥna, in which these rulers played a major role, is to be found in the lengthy entry devoted to Ibn Ḥanbal, although the biography of al-Wâthiq does include the famous story of an anonymous Shaykh who convinced him of the error of the doctrine of the created Qur'ān by means of rather simple arguments. Manṣûr b. al-Mahdî (d. 236/850-1), a brother of Harûn al-Rashîd, receives a notice presumably for his role as governor in Basra during his brother's caliphate and governor of Damascus during the brief reign of al-A'mîn (193-8/853-54).

1 Siyar, X, 272-89 (al-Ma'mûn); 290-305 (al-Mu'tâsim); 306-14 (al-Wâthiq).
2 Siyar, X, 308-9. The gist of the story is the following: The shaykh asks the caliph if the Messenger of God, Abu Bakr, 'Umar, and the caliphs knew that the Qur'ān was created or not. Al-Wâthiq takes the bait and says "They did not know this," to which the clever shaykh replies "Praise be to God! [There is] something that they did not know but that you do!" Al-Wâthiq asks for a second chance and the shaykh repeats the initial question. This time al-Wâthiq says "Yes, the Prophet knew that the Qur'an was created," to which the shaykh replies "He knew this, but he did not teach it to the people?" Al-Wâthiq says "yes," at which point the shaykh inquires "And was this sufficient for him (i.e. not to teach this knowledge)?" Al-Wâthiq replies in the affirmative, allowing the shaykh to spring the final trap and say "Is not that which is sufficient for you that which is sufficient for the Prophet, and the caliphs who followed him?" Al-Wâthiq left the company of the shaykh at this time, entered the hall of his courtiers, repeated the shaykh's argument and ordered the cessation of miḥna. Al-Dhahabi notes at the end of this anecdote with his characteristic candor that "there are unknown transmitters in the isnâd of this story, and God only knows whether it is sound."
Finally, the talented singer and poet Ibrāhīm b. al-Mahdī (d. 224/839) also thrived during this period, and he appears to have dedicated his time to his artistic endeavors after al-Ma'mūn pardoned him for his brief bid for the caliphate in 202/817. The two final ʿAbbāsid, Zaynab (d. after 210/825) and Zubayda (d. 216/831), are the only women included in this generation and al-Dhahābī tells us precious little about their lives.

Only four governors of this period, in addition to the two sons of al-Mahdī mentioned in the previous paragraph, impressed al-Dhahābī enough to warrant inclusion in Siyar al-ʿālām al-nubalā. Ishāq b. Ibrāhīm (d. 235/849-50) ruled Baghdad for thirty years and received a rather unsavory image due to his abuse of Ibn Ḥanbal and other scholars during the miḥra. Abū Dulaf al-Qāsim (d. 225/840) receives praise for his bravery, generosity and poetry during his competent administration of Damascus for al-Muʿtaṣim. Asad b. al-Furat (d. 213/828) was a unique combination of jurist, warrior, and governor under the Aghlabid rulers of Ifriqiyya and achieved fame for his leadership role in the difficult conquest of Sicily. Finally, the greatest non-caliphal patron of high culture of the age was ʿAbdullāh b. Tāhir (d. 230/845), who was granted Egypt and Ifriqiyya by al-Maʾmūn and later proved fundamental in the establishment of Nishapur as a center of Islamicate civilization.

8 Siyar, XI, 449-50. Al-Dhahābī reports that the people of Damascus asked him to seek the caliphate, but that he in fact declined their request.
9 Siyar, X, 557-61.
10 Zaynab, a cousin of the caliph al-Mansūr, is remembered primarily for her longevity, as she was a child when the ʿAbbāsid were in Ḥumayma prior to the revolution and lived through the reign of al-Maʾmūn, who is reported to have honored her greatly (kāna yakhmīlah wa jufīlahā); Siyar, X, 298. Al-Dhahābī's brief notice for Zubayda, daughter of al-Mansūr and wife of Hārūn, merely describes her wealth, patronage of the pilgrimage, the presence of a hundred slave girls in her palace that had memorized the Qurʾān, and an anecdote in which she praises al-Maʾmūn despite the fact that one of his generals killed her son al-Amīn in the civil war; ibid., X, 241.
11 Siyar, XI, 171. Al-Dhahābī remarks that his son Muḥammad succeeded him in this post.
12 Siyar, X, 563-4.
13 Siyar, X, 225-8. His controversial role as a jurist will be discussed below; note that he is reported to have transmitted a version of the Muwatta' that is mentioned neither by Sezgin nor Yasim Dutton; see GAS, I, 459-60 and The Origins of Islamic Law, 23-4.
14 Siyar, X, 684-5. Two of the most prominent scholars to receive his patronage were the philologist Abū ʿUbayd al-Qāsim b. al-Sallām, whom we shall hear about
Al-Dhahabi identifies nine Arabic poets of the first half of the third/ninth century in the Siyar. These include the 'Abbasid prince Ibrāhīm b. Mahdi and the governor Abū Dulaf whom we just mentioned, and the notorious prosecutor of the mihna, Ahmad b. Abī Duwād (d. 240/854). 13 Abū l-Yanbaghi (no date) specialized in panegyrics and satire at the courts of al-Manṣūr to al-Mu'tasim, 16 Dīk al-Jinn (d. 233-6/849-51) was a Shi'i poet in Himṣ who gained notoriety for the murder of his former slave wife out of jealousy, 17 and Muhammad b. `Ubayd al-Allāh al-`Utbī (d. 228/843) excelled in history, verse, and drinking. 18 Māhmūd al-Warrāq (no date) is of particular interest because he is the only one of these nine men reported to have composed poems of a religious nature (fi l-mawā'id), although al-Dhahabi does not record any examples of this kind of verse in his entry. 19 Finally, Saʿīd b. `Ufayr (d. 226/841) excelled in the disciplines of history, genealogy, and even hadith in addition to poetry to such a degree that Ibn Maʿān stated “There are three wonders in Egypt: the Nile, the pyramids, and Saʿīd b. `Ufayr!” 20

Two poets of this period tower above their contemporaries and both of them enjoyed the munificent patronage of the highest echelons of the ‘Abbasid court. The founding father of Arabic music, poet, and self-appointed jurist of the courts from Hārūn al-Rashīd to al-Wāthiq was Ishaq b. Ibrāhīm al-Mawṣili (d. 235/850). 21...
Dhahabi neglects to mention the major incident of jealousy and rivalry between Ishāq and the ‘Abbasid prince Ibrāhim b. al-Mahdī (who had a rather high opinion of his own talents) that had to be mitigated by al-Rashīd’s stern efforts, but does include a truncated version of an insightful report of Ishāq’s daily schedule:

I spent a part of my life going to Hushaym or another ḥadīth scholar each morning prior to sunrise, and then to al-Kisā’i or al-Farra’ or Ibn Ghazāla in order to read a juzʿ of the Qur’ān. I would then proceed to Abū Mansūr Zalzal and he would teach me two or three melodies [on the ‘ūd (lute)], and then I would learn a song or two (sawf) from ‘Āsika bint Shahda. Then I would proceed to al-‘Aṣmā’i and Abū ‘Ubayda and benefit greatly from their knowledge. [Then I would go to my father and tell him what I had done and whom I had seen that day and have dinner with him.] Then I would attend the evening session (majlis) of [the caliph Harūn] al-Rashīd.

Although Ishāq al-Mawsili is reported to have been embarrassed by his fame as a singer, the anecdote that al-Ma’mūn “would have made him a qaṭf” had he not been such a well-known singer indicates where his primary talents lay. He also appears to have been both an avid book collector and compiler, as al-‘Aṣmā’i was amazed by the sixteen trunks of books that he hauled with Harūn al-Rashīd to the summer palace at Raqqa, and Yāqūt mentions no fewer than thirty-two of his own works.

The most extraordinary poet of the age was the Christian convert to Islam, Abū Tammām Ḥabīb b. Aws (d. 231/845 or 228/843).
Abū Tammām’s fame first emerged from his panegyrics to al-Mu’taṣim and his courtiers and may have peaked with his most famous qasīda in honor of the victory at Amorium whose opening lines are:

The sword is more veracious than the book,
Its cutting edge splits earnestness
From sport.
The white of the blade, not the black of the page,
Its broadsides clarify uncertainty
And doubt.
Knowledge lies in the bright spears gleaming
Between two armies, not in the seven
Gleaming stars.\(^{31}\)

Among the verses selected by al-Dhahabī in the Sīyar are the following:

Were sustenance attained only by those with intelligence
The beasts would then perish out of their ignorance!
Just as east and west cannot join with facility,
Neither can a man who clings to wealth be of nobility.\(^{34}\)

Abū Tammām’s ‘modern’ style of poetry has never ceased from its inception to elicit strong reactions from literary critics, Muslim and Western alike, and a thorough discussion of this topic is far beyond the scope of this book.\(^{32}\)

The final group of scholars to whom we shall turn in this section is that of the masters of adab, or belle lettres.\(^{33}\) Ḥājib b. al-Walīd (d. 228/843) and Muḥammad b. Ḥātim al-Zamānī (d. 246/861) are

---

\(^{30}\) Suzanne Pickney Stetkevych, Abū Tammām and the Poetics of the ‘Abbāsid Age (Leiden: Brill, 1991), 187. Al-Dhahabī includes the first and third of these lines in his entry on al-Mu’taṣim, Sīyar, X, 303. The Arabic is: al-sayfu asdaqu anīna mina l-khimā ḕađdhi l-ḥaddū bayna l-jiddī wa l-la’ithi biḍu l-saḥā’i lī sūru l-saḥā’i fil mutanāhinna jilā’u l-shakki wa l-rivabi; wa l-alim fi shuhubi l-armāhi lāmī’atan/bayn l-khamisayn lī fi l-saḥā’i l-shuhabī; Stetkevych, Abū Tammām, 375.

\(^{31}\) wa lāw kanālā l-aṣūq an nāw l-iḥyā’/ḥalaqna ilāhān min jahrīhinna l-bahā’imu; wa lam yaṣāni’ sharqun wa gharbu l-qasīda wu lā l-majdū fi kaffi-nūn wa l-darāhīnu; Sīyar, XI, 66. The verses come from a qasīda in praise of Ibn Ābī Duwād in the Dīwān of Abū Tammām; the translation is mine.

\(^{34}\) A historical outline of these opinions can be found in the article “Abū Tammām” by Helmut Ritter in the EJ2, 1, 153–55.

\(^{32}\) Five additional scholars of prominence in the eleventh and twelfth tabaqaṭ of the Sīyar who do not fit into any of these categories are Muḥammad b. Ziyād Ibn al-Aʿrābī (d. 231/846), Abū Mūsā Qalūn (d. 220/835), ‘Abd al-Malik b. Hishām (d. 218/833), Abū ‘Umar al-Jarnī (d. 225/840), and Abū l-Rabī’ al-Zahrānī (d. 234/848–9). Ibn al-Aʿrābī was a pupil of al-Kisāḥī and educated the sixteenth tabaqa literateur Thaʿlab (d. 291/904) for nineteen years, while Qalūn was skilled in gram-
identified as private tutors (mu‘addib) and they both have hadith transmissions in at least one of the six canonical Sunni books. Ibn al-Zayyāt (d. 233/848), the famous wazīr of al-Mu’tasim and al-Wathiq whose feud with Ibn Abī Duwād led to his fall from favor under al-Mutawakkil, was renowned for his literary talents. ‘Alī b. ‘Aththām (d. 228/843) is a particularly interesting case of a jurist-adīb who emigrated from Kufa to Nishapur and achieved prominence for his refusal to join Ibn Tāhir’s court. Al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī described this pious scholar as one who “was reluctant to teach hadith and from whom students took many stories (ḥikayāt), tales of asceticism, exegesis, and hadith-transmitter criticism.” Muḥammad b. Sallām al-Jumāhī (d. 231/846) came to Baghdad in 222/837 and is credited with one of the earliest books of the tabaqāt genre which has survived to this day. Finally, the Basran ‘Alī b. Muḥammad al-Madā‘īnī (d. 224/839) befriended Iḥṣāq al-Mawṣili in Baghdad and composed hundreds of presumably short works of history and genealogy all of which appear to have been lost.

mar in addition to his fame as a disciple of the Qur’ān-reciter Nāṣī. Ibn Hishām’s abridgement of Ibn Iṣḥāq’s al-Snra al-nabawiyya has remained one of the most popular texts in Islamic civilization to this day. Al-Jarmī is considered to have had the best understanding of Ṣibawayhi’s Kītāb and al-Zahrānī composed a well-known work of variant readings of the Qur’ān; Syar, X, 667–8, 926–7, 428–9, 561–5, 676–8, respectively.

‘Alī’s hadith can be found in Muslim’s Ṣāḥib; the latter has material in the books of al-Ṭirmidhī and al-Nasā’ī. Ḥājis lived in Baghdad and Muḥammad al-Zamīn served at the court in Samarrah. The former has ṣaddithu illī bi-l-juḥṣu wa ma wkhāba ‘anku al-ḥikayātwa la-zuhdīyātu wa l-ḥadīyātu wa l-infīrū, wa l-jarhu wa 1-talātu; Syar, X, 570.

An alternative death date is 231/846. His book Tabaqāt al-shu‘āra is divided into three sections: pre-Islamic poets (ten tabaqāt plus elegists), poets of the Arab towns, and the Islamic poets (ten tabaqāt); Tabaqāt al-shu‘āra’ (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-‘Istīl, 1988).

Al-Dhahābī mentions sixteen titles and remarks that the entire list would fill five and a half pages. Yāqūt divides ‘Alī’s vast corpus into the categories of 1) reports of the life of the Prophet, 2) reports of the Quraysh, 3) reports of the marriages of the noble tribesmen and reports of women, 4) reports of the caliphs, 5) reports of battles (ṣaddith), 6) reports of the conquests, 7) reports of the Bedouins, and 8) reports of the poets; Muṣam al-udabā’, IV, 223–227. For surviving fragments of his works in later sources, see GāS, I, 314–5.
The most significant member of this class of scholars for this study is Abū 'Ubayd al-Qāsim b. Ṣallām (d. 224/839). A tutor in the service of the family of the general Harthama b. A'yān, Abū 'Ubayd moved to Ibn Ṭāhir's court in Nishapur where he composed several of his most famous works. These compositions include the legal work Kitāb al-amwāl,40 Ḥadīth al-Qur'ān, and his two major lexicons of exotic Arabic words, Gharīb al-mushāmaf and Gharīb al-hadīth.41 Al-Dhahabī states that Gharīb al-mushāmaf was composed over a forty year period, that the first scholar to hear this book was Abū 'Ubayd's longtime friend Yāḥyā b. Ma'in, and that Abū 'Ubayd spent a third of the night in prayer, a third asleep, and a third composing books.42 Abū 'Ubayd served as a qādī for eighteen years in Tarsus and boasted that he convinced the great hadīth critic Yāḥyā b. Sa'id al-Qāṭṭān to abandon his Murji'ī practice of recognizing the legitimacy of only the first two caliphs, Abū Bakr and 'Umar.43 Finally, al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī's observation that Abū 'Ubayd was intimate with the hadīth scholars of his day while the slightly later Ibn Qutayba (d. 276/889) failed to earn their respect indicates a qualitative difference between these two jurist-adībbs, both of whom composed books of relevance for hadīth studies.44

The last master adīb must not be forgotten, 'Amr b. Baḥr al-Jāhiz (d. 255/868), landed in the thirteenth tabaqah of the Siyar due to his longevity, but flourished during the period under discussion.45 A master stylist of Arabic prose, compiler, and Mu'tazilī theologian, al-Jāhiz's influence and achievements can hardly be reduced to a single paragraph with any degree of justice. Goldziher cited long ago al-

40 For Abū 'Ubayd's Kitāb al-amwāl see the excellent study by Andreas Görke, Das Kitāb al-Ammāl des Abū Ubayd al-Qāsim b. Ṣallām. Entstehung und Werküberlieferung, PhD thesis, Hamburg 2000. (Thanks to the anonymous reviewer for this reference.)
41 All four of these works have been published. Note also his theological work Kitāb al-imān which has been studied by Wilferd Madelung in "Early Sunni Doctrine Concerning Faith as Reflected in the Kitāb al-imān of Abū Ubayd al-Qāsim b. Ṣallām (d. 224/839)," Studia Islamica 32 (1970), 233-54.
42 Siyar, X, 496-9.
43 Siyar, X, 498 and 501.
44 Ibn Qutayba has received a thorough study by Gérard Lecomte, a summary of which can be found in his entry "Ibn Qutayba" in the EI2. Although Ibn Qutayba sought to defend his contemporary hadīth scholars against the attacks of the Mu'tazila, there does not appear to have been much appreciation on the part of the hadīth scholars for his labors; see below, note 208.
45 Siyar, XI, 526-30.
Jāhiz’s most insightful observation regarding hadīth scholars that is worth quoting in full:46

Our experience is that a person studies [hadīth] for nearly fifty years, concerns himself with exegesis of the Koran and lives among religious scholars, without being counted among the fuqahā‘ or being able to obtain the office of judge. This he can only achieve if he studies the works of Abū Ḥanīfa and the like and learns by heart the practical legal formulæ (shurū‘); all this can be done in one or two years. In only a very short time such a person will be appointed as judge over a town or even a whole province.

A suggestive anecdote that testifies to al-Jāhiz’s fundamental role in the development of Islamic civilization is the fact that the strict critic al-Dhahabi, no friend of the Mu‘tazila, offers a supplication for divine forgiveness on his behalf at the end of his entry in the Siyar. Whether the rationally guided al-Jāhiz would have really desired this anti-intellectual pupil of Ibn Taymiyya to request divine forgiveness on his behalf, is, of course, an altogether different question.

It should be clear from this brief survey of extra-religious cultural figures why Marshall Hodgson identified this age as the ‘golden age’ of Arabic adab in the Venture of Islam. The munificence of the ‘Abbāsid courts in Baghdad and Sāmarra’, and Ibn Ṭāhir’s patronage in Nishapur fostered a climate of creativity and brilliance in the fields of poetry, music, belle lettres, history, and philology. Abū Tammām, Ishāq al-Mawsilī, Abū l-Ḥasan b. al-Madainī, Abū ‘Ubayd, and al-Jāhiz set standards of excellence in their respective fields that were rarely surpassed by their successors. The textual legacy of the period includes works by these five luminaries as well as the Tabaqāt fuhūl al-shu‘arā‘ of al-Jumaḥi and the lost histories of Sa‘īd b. ‘Ufayr, and the fact that so much of it has survived to this day indicates the value Muslims have accorded it over the centuries. Finally, it is interesting to note that a few of these men, such as Abū ‘Ubayd, Sa‘īd b. ‘Ufayr, ‘Alī b. ‘Aththām, Ḥājib b. al-Walīd, and Muḥammad b. Ḥātim contributed to the vast enterprise of hadīth compilation that was rapidly gathering momentum during this period of literary florescence.

46 Muslim Studies, II, 215–6. The source of this quote is al-Jāhiz’s Kitāb al-hayawan.
V.2.3 Mu'tazila and other theologians

The period under discussion is perhaps most renowned for the speculative dexterity of numerous independent-minded theologians lumped under the name Mu'tazila. Most of these scholars hailed from Basra and found a welcome reception at the 'Abbāsid court under the protection of Yaḥyā I-Barmakī as early as the period of Ḥārūn al-Rashīd. The hard labors of Richard Frank, Wilferd Madelung, Hans Daiber, and Josef van Ess over the past several decades have clarified the positions of major thinkers of this period, such as Abū l-Hudhayl al-ʿAllāf, Abū ʿIsḥāq al-Nazzām, Muʾammad b. ʿAbbād, and Jaʿfar b. Ḥarb, whose numerous books survive for the most part only in fragments of later theological works. It is critically important to realize that the Muʾtazila of this period were unified merely in their methodology and that the two classical schools of the Muʾtazila, the Basran and Baghdādi, did not mature until the period after the one under consideration.

Despite al-Dhahabi's manifest aversion to all speculative theology, Muʾtazilī or Ashʿarī, he felt obliged to include a ghetto of nineteen theologians in Siyar dīʿām al-nubalāʾ if only because the entire ordeal of the miḥna makes little sense without their existence. He offers very little in the way of explanation of their beliefs, and the following humorous anecdote that he gleaned from the philologist al-Mubarad (d. 285/898) serves as his strongest suggestion as to why the entire Muʾtazilī project failed to appeal to either the masses or the hadith scholars:

A man said to Hishām al-Fuwātī "How many years do you number?" Hishām replied "From one to over a thousand." The man said "I did not mean that. How much age (sinn) do you have?" Hishām replied "I have thirty-two teeth (sinn)." The man said "How many years do you have?" Hishām replied "None, they all belong to God." The man asked "So what is your age?" Hishām replied "Great (ʿaṣm)."

---

4 See Josef van Ess, "Dirar b. 'Amr," Supplement, E12, 225 for a description of the circle of the Barmakids that included Dirar, the Shi'i Hishām b. al-Hakam, the Ḥanbalī ʿAbdullāh b. Yazīd, and the Zaydi Sulaymān b. Jarir.
5 These four men all receive brief notices in the Siyar, X, 541-50.
6 See the excellent E12 article by D. Gimaret "Muʾtazila."
7 Siyar, X, 541-56.
8 Each of the following questions is a commonly accepted method of asking "How old are you?" in Arabic; the anecdote only works with a literal translation of the questions.
A few general observations about individuals located in this short section of *Siyar aṭ-ṭām al-nubalā’* will suffice for this chapter. First, Abū Mūsā l-Mardār (d. 226/841) and Abū Mujālid Ahmad b. al-Ḥusayn (d. 268/882) are reported to have been ascetics in addition to being theologians, and the latter is also reported to have been a jurist. Secondly, Abū Mūsā Isā b. al-Haytham is one of the only men of this generation whom al-Dhahabi identifies as a Sūfī and can be seen as a precursor to the extraordinary Mu’tazili-Sūfī al-Ḥārith al-Muḥāsibī (d. 243/857) who flourished during this time as well. Thirdly, the first steps towards a Sunni speculative theology can be seen in the works of al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad al-Najjār (d. around 240/854) and Ibn Kullāb (d. 240/854), the latter of whom composed a book entitled *Refutation of the Mu’tazila*. Finally, sixteen theologians are credited by al-Dhahabi with having composed books, virtually none of which have survived, and, perhaps less surprising, none of them transmitted a single hadīth that found its way into any of the six canonical Sunni books.

V.2.4 Ascetics

The third category of notables in *Siyar aṭ-ṭām al-nubalā’* transports us from the legendary ‘Abbāsid palaces associated with the poets, *udabā’, and theologians of the previous sections to the humble houses of renunciation and pious supplication. Eighteen men are identified explicitly by al-Dhahabi in the eleventh and twelfth *ḥaqaqāt* of *Siyar aṭ-ṭām al-nubalā’* as either ascetics (ṣāḥid) or specialists in asceticism.

---

51 The correct question is *kam madāʾ min ṭamārka? Siyar, X, 547.*
52 *Siyar, X, 548* and 553. A third particularly pious Mu’tazili of this period is Ja’far b. Ḥarb (d. 236/850), who left the sessions of al-Wāthiq and refused to pray behind the caliph, although the reason for this is not explained by al-Dhahabi; *Siyar, X*, 549-50.
53 Abū Mūsā’s reputation was tarnished by the fact that he was a teacher of the notorious heretic (muḥād) Ibn al-Rawandi; *Siyar, X*, 552. The Baghdādī al-Ḥārith b. Asad al-Muḥāsibī is located in the thirteenth *ḥaqaqa of the Siyar* and is identified as Shaykh al-Ṣūfiyya; *Siyar, XII*, 110-2.
54 *Siyar, XI*, 144-6.
We have just encountered three of these men among the theologians who avoided the ‘Abbasid and Tahirid courts, and remarked that Abū Mūsā ‘Īsā b. al-Haytham is the only Sufi mentioned among the members of this generation. The following table provides an overview of these eighteen ascetics of the first half of the third/ninth century:

Table 5.1: Ascetics of the eleventh and twelfth tabaqāt of the Syar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Hadith legacy*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Abu Mujālid Ahmad b. al-Husayn</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>Mu‘tazili (none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Abū Mūsā ‘Īsā b. al-Haytham</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>Mu‘tazili (none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Abū Naṣr al-Tammār, ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Nasā, Baghdad</td>
<td>M, N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Ahmad b. Ḥarīb b. Fayrūz</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>Nishapur, Mecca</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ahmad b. Khidrawayh al-Balkhī</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>Balkh, Baghdad</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 al-Antākī, Ahmad b. ‘Āşim</td>
<td>c. 230</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 al-Barjulānī, Muḥammad b. Husayn</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Bishr al-Hāfī b. al-Ḥārīth</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Faith al-Ma‘wšīlī Abū Naṣr b. Sa‘īd</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>Vosol, Baghdad</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 al-Ghāzzi, Muḥammad b. ‘Amr</td>
<td>c. 240</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 al-Ḥakam b. Mūsā</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>M, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Ḥātim al-Asamm b. ‘Anwān al-Balkhī</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>Balkh, Baghdad</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 al-Haytham b. Khārīja</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>B (1), N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Ibrāhīm b. ‘Abdullāh al-Harawi</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>T, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Khalaf b. Tarnīm</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>Kufa, Maṣṣīṣa</td>
<td>N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 al-Mardār Abū Mūsā ‘Īsā b. Ṣābih</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>Mu‘tazili (none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Mujāhid b. Mūsā al-Khwarazimī</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>M, D, T, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 al-Ramādī, Ibrāhīm b. Bashshār</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>D, T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The following abbreviations are used: B: Bukhārī, M: Muslim, D: Abū Dāwūd, T: Tirmidhī, N: al-Naṣṣā‘ī, and Q: Ibn Mā‘ṣīsī al-Qazvīnī. The numbers in parentheses refer to the number of hadith included by al-Bukhārī in his Sahīh, according to Sezgin’s Buhārī’nin Kaynakları.

Sezgin, Buhārī’nin Kaynakları, 239 (#101).
Two of the most influential ascetics of this period are Bishr al-Hāfi and Ḥātim al-Asamm, neither of whom transmitted hadith. Al-Dhahabi lauds Bishr al-Hāfi with the sobriquet Shaykh al-Islām, even though he concedes that Bishr did not really understand the Arabic language. Despite his studies with the likes of Mālik b. Anas, Ḥammād b. Zayd, and al-Fudayl b. ʿIyād, Bishr’s excuse for not transmitting hadith is telling: “I desire to transmit hadith, but anything that I desire, I renounce.” Bishr appears to have adopted an extreme form of asceticism that included celibacy, something which led Ibn Ḥanbal to remark “Had Bishr married, he would have perfected himself.” Among the aphorisms attributed to Bishr al-Hāfi found in al-Dhahabi’s entry are the following:

He who loves the thighs of women will not achieve salvation.
You will not find the sweetness of worship until you put a barrier between you and desires.
No one who loves the temporal world wishes for death; he who abstains from the temporal world longs for the meeting with his Protector.
Do not act in order to be mentioned—conceal the good deeds just as you conceal the bad ones.

Al-Dhahabi includes an even greater number of wise sayings of the “Luqmān of this Community,” Ḥātim al-Asamm, than of Bishr al-Hāfi in the Siyar. After he remarks that al-Asamm did not transmit anything on the authority of the Prophet (musnadan), al-Dhahabi demonstrates his familiarity with al-Asamm’s spiritual guidelines, including the following reports:

It was said to him: Upon what to you build your reliance upon God (tawakkul)? He replied: Upon four qualities: I know that only I will eat...
my sustenance, and that calms my soul (nafs); I know that only I perform my action (‘amal), and I am occupied with it; I know that my death will come suddenly, and I shall fall upon it; I know that I cannot escape from the eye of God, and so I am modest.\footnote{\textit{Siyar}, XI, 478. His \textit{tadflh} are found in the books of \textit{ai-Tirmidhf} and Ibn Maja.}

Whoever wakes up with four qualities will be well: Understanding (tafaqquh), then reliance upon God (tawakkul), then sincerity (ikhlās), and then knowledge (ma’rifat).\footnote{\textit{Siyar}, XI, 485.}

The believer cannot be concealed from five things: God, the Decree (al-qadā’), sustenance, death, and Satan.\footnote{\textit{Siyar}, XI, 485.}

Despite the fact that neither Bishr al-Hāfi nor Hātim al-Asamī transmitted hadith, the ascetics as a whole are the first category of distinguished Muslims of this generation to have played a modest role in the venture of hadith transmission and compilation. Seven of the eighteen ascetics transmitted materials found in at least one of the six canonical Sunnī books, and Mujāhid b. Mūsā al-Khwārāzī’s hadith can be found in all six of these books save the Sahīh of al-Bukhārī. Ibrāhīm b. ‘Abdullāh al-Hārāwī is accorded the honorific Shaykh al-Islām by al-Dhahābī and is reported to have been one of the most important pupils of Ibn Ḥanbal’s first major teacher Hushaym b. Basīr.\footnote{\textit{Siyar}, XI, 487. Ibn Ma’āfī reports that Khalaf was āthārī, and Abu Hātim declared him to be thiqa.} Abū l-Qāsim al-Baghāwī (d. 317/929) arranged two juz’ of hadith from the ascetic Abū Naṣr al-Tammār,\footnote{\textit{Siyar}, X, 213. Ibn Ma’āfī reports that Khalaf was saduq, and Abū Hātim declared him to be thiqa.} Khalaf b. Tamīm acquired roughly ten thousand hadith from Sufyān al-Thawrī’s pupils,\footnote{\textit{Siyar}, X, 511.} and Ibrāhīm al-Ramāḍī’s bizarre transmissions from his companion Ibn ‘Uyayn led Ibn Ḥanbal to remark “It is as if the Sufyān from whom Ibrāhīm transmits reports is not Ibn ‘Uyayn!”\footnote{\textit{Siyar}, XI, 485.} While it is clear from this survey that several ascetics did take an active interest in the transmission of hadith, the majority of them expressed little...
interest in the temporal universe of *ismād* analysis and textual compilation and preferred to teach timeless truths pertaining to the disciplining of the soul and preparation for the inevitable encounter with the Creator.

V.2.5  *Judges, Jurists, and Miftās*

The generation of Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'in, and Ibn Hanbal witnessed a number of legal scholars of a high caliber, several of whom laid the foundations for what would become three of the four schools of Sunni law. It is somewhat perplexing that al-Dhahabī explicitly identifies only three of the sixteen judges (*qādis*) as jurists,

The fact that 58% (21) of the jurists transmitted *hadīth* found in the 'six books' while a mere 37.5% (6) of the judges did so indicates that the Muslim judges of this period were not the most expert legal minds, although there is too little evidence to venture any sweeping theory on this topic.

The following table provides an overview of the sixteen men whom al-Dhahabī identifies as judges during the first half of the third/ninth century:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Hadīth legacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Abdān 'Abdullāh b. 'Uthmān</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>Mārwr (Juzjān)</td>
<td>B (111), M, D, T, N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abdullāh b. Sawwār</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu Ḥassān al-Ziyādī</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Muṣ'ab Abīmad b. Abī Bakr al-Zuhīrī</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>B (3), M, D, T, N, Q</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These men are Abū Muṣ'ab al-Zuhīrī (d. 242/856), Bishr b. al-Walīd (d. 238/852-3), and 'Īsā b. Abān (d. 221/836).

This figure is to be contrasted with the identification of nine of the twelve miftās as jurists. Is it a coincidence that all three non-jurist miftās—Muhammad b. Bakkār, Muḥammad b. Wahb, and al-Murri—were residents of Damascus?

This finding is consistent with al-Jāḥiz's observation cited above (p. 167) that judges did not need to study *hadīth* in order to obtain their jobs.
Table 5.2. (cont.):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Hadith legacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5  Abū 'Uhayd al-Qāsim b. Sallām</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>Nishapur</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Ālīmad b. Abī Duwād</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>Basra, Baghdad</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Abū Asad b. al-Furāt b. Sinān</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>Iṣfahān</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Bishr b. al-Walīd al-Kindī</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Ibn Abī l-Aswad, Abū Bakr</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>B (14); D, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Ibn al-Rammāh, Abū Muhammad</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>Nishapur</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Ibn Samā‘a, Abū ‘Abdullāh</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 ‘Īsā b. Abān</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Khalīd b. Khalī, Abū l-Qāsim</td>
<td>c. 220</td>
<td>Hims</td>
<td>B (1); N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Muhammad b. Bakkār b. Bilāl</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Sulaymān b. Harb</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>Basra (Mecca)</td>
<td>B (133); M, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Yahyā b. Abī l-Khaṣīb al-Rāzī</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rayy</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| City in parentheses is the city where the scholar served as qādī if it is different than his native land.
| See above, Table 3.1, note a.
| Sezgin, Bahārīnīn Kaynaklari, 217 (#31).
| Sezgin, Bahārīnīn Kaynaklari, 239 (#39).
| Sezgin, Bahārīnīn Kaynaklari, 219 (#11).
| Sezgin, Bahārīnīn Kaynaklari, 247 (#131).

The prominent judges from this period range from the notorious prosecutor of the miḥna, Ibn Abī Duwād, to the master hadith scholar Sulaymān b. Harb. ‘Abdullāh b. Sawwar of Basra is the only case of a judge who followed in the family profession of his father and grandfather, and it should be noted that his son Sawwār (d. 245/859) succeeded him in this post after his death.75 ‘Īsā b. Abān, Ibn Samā‘a, Abū Asad b. al-Furāt, and Bishr b. al-Walīd were pupils of Qādī Abū Yūsuf and Muhammad b. Hasan al-Shaybānī, the two most famous pupils of the eponym of the Hanafi madhhab. Al-Dhahabi identifies

75 Siyar, X, 434–5.
Abū Muṣʿab al-Zuhri as an expert in his teacher Malik’s jurisprudence, and both he and the previously mentioned Asad b. al-Furat are reported to have transmitted recensions of the *Muwatta*. The judge of Jūzjan ʿAbdān was both an important teacher of al-Bukhārī as well as an admirer of Ibn al-Mubārak, whose books he is reported to have copied with a single pen. Ibn Abī l-Aswād transmitted a significant amount of material from his maternal uncle ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Mahdi, whose importance in the discipline of *hadīth* criticism has been demonstrated in the previous chapter. Finally, Sulaymān b. Ḥarb is remembered primarily for his role in the transmission of *hadīth* from his teachers Shuʿba and Ḥammād b. Zayd, and Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī records his amazement at the multitudes of pupils who attended his classes in Baghdad prior to his five-year term as judge in Mecca (214-9/829-833).

The following table of the thirty-six jurists and *muftīs* located in the eleventh and twelfth *tabaqāt* of *Sīyar al-dāām al-muballā* demonstrates both the geographical permeation of jurisprudence throughout the Islamic dominions, as well as the significant role played by several jurists in the process of *hadīth* transmission during the first half of the third/ninth century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>City</th>
<th><em>Hadīth</em> legacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ʿAbd al-Ghaffār b. Dāwūd</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>Basra, Egypt</td>
<td>B (2), D, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAbd al-Hakam b. ʿAbdullāh</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAbd al-Malik b. Maslama</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAbdullāh b. ʿAbd al-Hakam</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Abū Muṣʿab is the great-great-great grandson of the early companion ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. ʿAwf and his *Muwatta* was edited by Bashshār Awwād Maʿrūf and Maḥmūd Muḥammad in two volumes (Beirut, 1413/1993).*

*Siūr, X, 270-2. He is reported also to have transmitted a large amount of *hadīth* from his father from the master *hadīth* scholar and critic Shuʿba b. al-Ḥajjāj.*

*Siūr, X, 330-4. Sulaymān studied with Shuʿba during the last two years of his life (158-60/774-6) and then with Ḥammād until the latter’s death nineteen years later. Note that al-Dhahābī identifies Sulaymān as a Shāṭibī al-Īslām in the *Siūr* but not in the *Tadhkira.*

*Names in bold are *muftīs.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Hadith legacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5  ‘Abdullāh b. Nāfi‘ al-Šā‘īgh</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>M, D, T, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  ‘Abdullāh b. Nāfi‘ al-Žubayrī</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Abū Mujālid Ahmad b. al-Ḥusayn</td>
<td>268</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Abū Muṣ‘ab Aḥmad b. Abī Bakr</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>B (3), M, D, T, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Abū Mushir ‘Abd al-‘A‘lā b. Mushir</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>B, c M, D, T, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Ahmad b. Hanbal</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>B, d M, D, T, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Aḥmad b. Harb b. Fayrūz</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>Nishapur, Mecca</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 ‘Alī b. ‘Aṭṭhām al-Ḳilābī</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Kufa, Nishapur</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 ‘Alī b. Ma‘bad b. Shaddād</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>Raqqā, Egypt</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 ‘Amr al-‘Nāqid b. Muḥammad</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>Baghdad, Raqqā</td>
<td>B (16), c M, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Asbagg b. al-Faraj</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>B (21), c T, N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Bishr b. al-Walīd</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Ḥarrūna b. Yahyā al-Tuṣibī</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>M, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Hishām b. ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Rāzī</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>Rayy</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 al-Ḥumaydī, ‘Abdullāh b. al-Žubayr</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td>B (33), g D, T, N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Ḥusayn b. Ḥafṣ b. al-Faḍl</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Kufa, Isfahan</td>
<td>M, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Ibn Rāhawayh, Ishāq b. Ibrāhīm</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>Nishapur</td>
<td>B (101), h M, D, T, N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Ibrāhīm b. ‘Abdullāh, Abū Shayba</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Ibrāhīm b. Yūsuf b. Maymūn</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>Balkh</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 ‘Īsā b. Abān</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>Baṣra</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 ‘Īsā b. Dīnār al-Ghāṣiqī</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Cordoba</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Ja‘far b. Muhāshshir al-Thaqafī</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Mu‘allā b. Mansūr al-Rāzī</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>M, D, T, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Muḥammad b. Wahb b. ‘Atiyya</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>B, i Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Muḥammad b. Abān al-Sulami</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>Wāṣīt</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.3. (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Hadith legacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31 Muhammad b. Bakkär b. Bišāl</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 al-Murrī, Junāda b. Muhammad</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Saʿīd b. Abī Maryam al-Hakam</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>B (61), M, D, T, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 al-Ṣūrī, Muḥammad b. al-Mubārak</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>B, M, D, T, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 al-Wuḥāzī, Abū Zakariyya Šāhīh</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>B, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Yahyā b. Yahyā al-Laythī</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>Córdoba</td>
<td>None; a Muwatta'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See above, Table 5.1, note a.

† Sezgin, *Buḥārīnīn Kaynaklari*, 207 (#5).

‡ Sezgin does not identify any hadith which al-Bukhārī heard directly from Abū Mushīr in his Saḥīḥ.

§ Sezgin does not identify any hadith which al-Bukhārī heard directly from Ibn Ḥanbal, although he does mention one that was transmitted to al-Bukhārī by Ahmad b. al-Ḥasan; *Buḥārīnīn Kaynaklari*, 220 (#443).

Sezgin identifies one ‘Amr b. Muhammad b. Ḥasan, although no such person with this name is found in al-Bukhārī’s Saḥīḥ, according to Ibn Ḥajar (Taqriṣ, 363). Therefore, I am assuming that this ‘Amr b. Muhammad is al-Naqid and that Sezgin has made an error; see Sezgin, *Buḥārīnīn Kaynaklari*, 231 (#79).

† Sezgin, *Buḥārīnīn Kaynaklari*, 232 (#82).


§ Sezgin, *Buḥārīnīn Kaynaklari*, 252 (#144).

Muhammad b. Wahb does not appear to have been a direct teacher of al-Bukhārī.


§ Al-Ṣūrī does not appear to have been a direct teacher of al-Bukhārī.

k Al-Wuḥāzī does not appear to have been a direct teacher of al-Bukhārī.

The geographical distribution of these scholars indicates a relatively even dispersion of jurists in the central lands of Egypt and Iraq as well as a handful of men in the “edge” territories of al-Andalus and Iran, many of whom were pupils of one or more of the second/eighth century master jurists Mālik, Abū Yūsuf, and al-Shaybānī.80 ‘Abdullāh

80 For the concept of “edge,” see Richard Bulliet, *Islam: The View from the Edge* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994). The only expert of Shāfi‘ī jurisprudence in this generation is Ḥarmāla b. Yahyā, although it should be remembered that the primary transmitters and compilers of al-Shāfi‘ī’s teachings, Yūsuf b. Yahyā
b. ‘Abd al-Ḥakam is credited with the foundation of the Mālikī school of law in Egypt according to Ibn Ḥībbān, and Aṣbāgh b. al-Faraj was considered by Ibn Ma'in to be the most knowledgeable scholar of Mālik's opinions. Mālik's legal sessions were continued in Medina after his death by his pupil ‘Abdullah b. Nafi' al-Ṣā'igh, and two of his prominent pupils, the mufti Ibn al-Majishūn and the judge Abū Muṣ'ab, propagated his teachings in his home city. Another significant development during this time was the spread of Mālik's legal teachings as far west as Cordoba due to the efforts of the mufti ‘Isa b. Dīnār and the most famous transmitter of the Muwatta', Yahyā b. Yahyā al-Laythī. The importance of Mālik's Muwatta' during this period cannot overestimated, although it is interesting to note that only three of the seven transmitters of this text were labeled jurists by al-Dhahabī.

Several prominent students of the founders of the Ḥanafī school of law also flourished during this time. Al-Dhahabī identifies ‘Ali b. Ma'bad al-Shaddād of Egypt and Raqqā as a transmitter of al-Jamā' al-kabīr and al-Jamā' al-saghir from its compiler Muḥammad b. Ḥasan al-Shaybānī, and ‘Abd al-Ghaffār b. Dāwūd brought his erudition of Ḥanafī jurisprudence and hadith from Basra to Egypt. The mufti of Baghdad Mu'allā b. Mansūr al-Rāzī was both a sound transmitter of the teachings of Abū Yūsuf and al-Shaybānī as well as a jurist whose hadith were included in all six of the canonical Sunnī
books, according to al-Dhahabi.87 Hishām b. 'Ubayd Allāh had the honor of having al-Shaybānī pass away in his house in Rayy, and al-Wuḥāzī is reported to have accompanied al-Shaybānī to Mecca.88 Perhaps the most controversial advocate of Ḥanafi jurisprudence of this age was the muftī of Balkh, Ibrāhīm b. Yūṣuf, whose quarrel with the master hadith scholar Qutayba b. Saʿīd led to the latter's expulsion from Balkh to the village of Baghūl.89 Finally, the judge Bishr b. al-Walī (d. 238/852-3) is reported to have transmitted materials from his teacher Abū Yūsuf, and the 'jurist of Iraq' Ḥusayn b. Abān (d. 221/836) was a pupil of al-Shaybānī.90

Two individual scholars on this list deserve special mention for the fact that their legal teachings elevated them to the status of eponyms for schools of law. The case of Ibn Ḥanbal will be discussed in detail in the last section of this chapter, and that of Ḥishāq b. Rāhawayh has been mentioned only briefly in the course of the seven-phase narrative of hadith transmission in the third chapter. Ibn Rāhawayh embarked upon an odyssey of hadith study in all of the major centers of the Islamic world starting in the year 184/800 and acquired knowledge from such luminaries as Ibn ʿUmayna, Wāki b. al-Jarrāḥ, Yazīd b. Hārūn, Yahyā l-Qattān, Ibn Mahdī, and ʿAbd al-Razzāq al-Ṣanʿant.91 He is reported to have been in Baghdad in 199/815 with his pupil Muḥammad al-Dhuḥlī and to have led the teaching session in the presence of Ibn Ḥanbal, Ibn Maʿīn, and other hadith scholars.92 Ibn Khuzayma praised Ibn Rāhawayh for his jurisprudence, and al-Dhahabi observed that he was an “Imām of taṣfīr, leader in jurisprudence, and among the Imāms of yāḥēd.”93 Finally, al-Dhahabi was deeply impressed with Ibn Rāhawayh's extraordinary memory, and observed that he made only two errors in the corpus of seventy-thousand hadith that he had memorized.94

88 Siyār, X, 446-7 (ʿUbayd Allāh) and X, 453-6 (al-Wuḥāzī).
89 Siyār, XI, 61-2. Note that Ḥishām was also a pupil of Mālik.
90 Siyār, X, 673-6 (Bishr) and 440 (Ḥusayn).
91 Siyār, XI, 359.
92 Siyār, XI, 381.
93 Siyār, XI, 375.
The contribution of this group of jurists to the global project of hadith transmission is striking. The transmissions of Abū Muṣʿab, Abū Mushir, Ibn Ḥanbal, Muʿāllā b. Mańṣūr, Saʿīd b. Abī Maryam, and Mūḥammad al-Ṣūrī are found in all six of the canonical Sunnī books, and three additional jurists submitted material to more than half of these books. Either al-Bukhārī or Muslim includes hadith from seventeen of these thirty-six scholars, and al-Nasāʾī incorporates material from no fewer than sixteen of them in his Sunan al-mujtabā. When we add the results obtained from our analysis of judges to these findings, we find another scholar, Sulaymān b. Ḥarb, whose hadith are also found in all six books, as well as another three teachers of al-Bukhārī. This study of the eleventh and twelfth tābaqāt of al-Dhahābi’s Siyar aʿlām al-nubalāʾ reveals the significant role of a modest number of prominent legal experts in the transmission of both the juristic teachings of Mālik, Abū Yūsuf, and al-Shaybānī, and the broader venture of hadith compilation during the first half of the third/ninth century.

V.2.6 Ḥadīth scholars

The most important category of men of the eleventh and twelfth tābaqāt of Siyar aʿlām al-nubalāʾ for this project, the hadith scholars, poses a unique challenge in that there is not a single keyword which one can employ to identify members of this group. Nine of the ten scholars who were mentioned in the eighth tābaqa of Tadhkirat al-hujjāż in the third chapter of this book are also situated in this generation of the Siyar, as are eight master hadith critics whom I identified in the previous chapter. The goal of this section is to identify and analyze the roles of the most important contributors to the global phenomenon of hadith transmission and compilation on the basis of al-Dhahābi’s qualitative opinions in the Siyar, the distribution of an individual scholar’s transmissions among the six canonical Sunnī hadith books, and the textual legacies of these men.

Al-Dhahābi employs several tantalizing qualitative terms related to hadith transmission in the Siyar whose meanings were discussed.

previously in the second chapter.96 One hundred and sixty men are identified as ḥāfiz in the eleventh and twelfth tabaqāt of the Siyar, and 117 of these individuals are also identified as ʿImām. The largest concentrations of these hujjāz are found in Baghdad (48), Basra (42), and Kufa (21), and at least sixteen other cities enjoyed the presence of a dozen or fewer of these high caliber scholars during this period.97 It is clear from these findings that the term ḥāfiz is too broad to be of much assistance to our goal of identifying the most important hadith scholars of the age of Ibn Saʿd, Ibn Maʿin, and Ibn Ḥanbal, and so it is to other terms that we shall direct our attention.

The first of these terms that is indicative of an elevated status of hadith acumen is ḥujja, a word that means “proof” or “evidence.”98 Al-Dhahabi identifies a mere thirty scholars hailing from eight cities with this label, and the following table provides an overview of these men.

| Table 5.4: Ḥujja Hadīth scholars of the eleventh and twelfth tabaqāt of the Siyar |
|---|---|---|---|
| Name | Date | City | Hadīth legacy |
| 'Abdī b. al-Walīd al-Naršt | 237 | Basra | B, b, M, N |
| Abū Ghassān Mālik b. Ismāʿil | 219 | Kufa | B (25), c M, D, T, N, Q |
| Abū Khaythama Zuhayr | 234 | Baghdad | B (12), d M, D, N, Q |
| Abū ʿl-Yaman al-Ḥakam | 221 | Ḥirnsh | B (257), e M, D, T, N, Q |
| Ahmad b. ʿAbdullāh b. Yūnus | 227 | Kufa | B (65), f M, D, T, N, Q |

Note that many scholars spent time in multiple cities, so the sum is greater than 160; these figures should merely be taken as a rough idea as to the number of hujjāz found in a particular region during this time: Marw (14), Egypt (10), Damascus (7), Nishapur (6), Mecca (6), Rayy (5), Ḥirnsh (4), Samarra (3), Balkh (3), Medina (3), Bukhara (2), Wasiq (2), Harran (2), Māṣṣiqa (2), Qazvin (2), Mosul (1).

96 See above, II.3. One must bear in mind that the al-Dhahabi explicitly devotes Tadhkira al-hujjāz to major hadith scholars, whereas Siyar al-ʿālam al-nubalāʾ includes numerous luminaries who played absolutely no role in this process; it is also quite clear that some terms, such as Shaykh al- İslām, had stricter criteria in the Tadhkira than the Siyar.

97 Note that many scholars spent time in multiple cities, so the sum is greater than 160; these figures should merely be taken as a rough idea as to the number of hujjāz found in a particular region during this time: Marw (14), Egypt (10), Damascus (7), Nishapur (6), Mecca (6), Rayy (5), Ḥirnsh (4), Samarra (3), Balkh (3), Medina (3), Bukhara (2), Wasiq (2), Harran (2), Māṣṣiqa (2), Qazvin (2), Mosul (1).

98 wa l-ḥujjāt baḥrānun, wa qilā l-ḥujjāt mā ḍīṣṣa bīhi l-khāṣṣ, wa qilā l-ʾAshāri: al-ḥujjāt l-wāqhu lilādī yakūn bīhi l-zafarū ʿinda l-khāṣṣā; Lisan al-ʿarab, 11, 228.
Table 5.4. (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Hadith legacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 'Ali b. 'Abdullah al-Madini</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>Basra, Baghdad</td>
<td>B (294), T, N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 'Ali b. Hujr b. Iyās</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>Marv, Baghdad</td>
<td>B (2), M, T, N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 'Ali b. al-Ja'd b. 'Ubayd</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>B (13), D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 'Amr al-’Naqid b. Muḥammad</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>Baghdad, Raqqā</td>
<td>B (16), M, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 'Amr b. Khālid b. Farrūkh</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>B (21), Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Habbān b. Ḥilal al- Баṣrī</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>B, M, D, T, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Hajjāj b. al-Minhāl al-Аmāṭī</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>B (53), M, D, T, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 al-Ḥakam b. Missā</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>M, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Hannād b. al-Ṣārī</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>M, D, T, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 al-Ḥasan b. al-ṣabbār</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>B (6), M, D, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Hibbān b. Mūsā b. Sawwār</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>Marv</td>
<td>B (22), M, T, N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 al-Ḥusayn b. Hurayth</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>Marv, Qarmisin</td>
<td>B (1), M, D, T, N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Ibn Numayr, Muḥammad b. 'Abdullāh</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>B (15), M, D, T, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Ibn Sa'd, Muḥammad b. Sa'd</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Khalaf b. Ḥishām b. Tha’lab</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>M, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Mu'āllā b. Asad Abū l-Haytham</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>B (35), M, T, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Muḥammad b. 'Abdullāh b. 'Ammār</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>Mosul</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Muḥammad b. al-Ṣabbāh al-Ḍulābī</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>B (9), M, D, T, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Musaddad b. Musarhad</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>B (38), M, D, T, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 al-ṣabbār b. Yahyā b. Miqsam</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>B (3), D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 al-Ṣūrī, Muḥammad b. al-Muḥārak</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>B, M, D, T, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 al-Ṭabūdhakī, Mūsā b. Ismā'īl</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>B (23), M, D, T, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 'Ubayd b. Ya'ish al- Маḥāmīl</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>M, N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 al-Uwaysi, 'Abd al-ʿAzīz b. 'Abdullāh</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>B (92), D, T, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 al-Zammār, Yahyā b. Yusuf</td>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
<td>B (4), Q</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* See above, Table 5.1, note a.

*b* 'Abbās does not appear to have been a direct teacher of al-Bukhārī.
The most striking feature of this coterie of scholars is the deep permeation of their hadith transmissions throughout the most prestigious Sunni hadith collections. Nine of these men contributed to all six of the canonical Sunni books, five appear in five of the six books, and the materials of an additional four scholars are located in four of these books. Al-Bukhārī obtained over one thousand hadith from Abū l-Yaman, 'Ali b. al-Madīnī, Musaddad, and al-Tabudhakī for his Sahih, and only one of these thirty scholars, Ibn Sa'd, failed to make it into any of the six canonical books for the very likely reason that he was more interested in the history of hadith transmission than its actual practice, and also because a significant amount of his material came from the "unreliable" transmitter al-Wāqīḍī. While we
cannot be certain of the precise intention of al-Dhahabi’s term *hujja*, it is clear that the thirty men to whom al-Dhahabi affixed this term in *Siyar al-ālam al-nubalā’* were among the most influential *hadith* transmitters of their day.

The second qualitative term of interest is one that was employed fruitfully in the second and third chapters of this book, namely Shaykh al-Islām. Al-Dhahabi bestows this title upon a mere fifteen of the 345 men of the eleventh and twelfth *tabaqāt* of the *Siyar*, although this is significantly higher than the number of Shuyūkhs al-Islām found in the *Tadhkira* for the same period.\(^{100}\)

### Table 5.5: Shuyūkh al-Islām of the eleventh and twelfth *tabaqāt* of the *Siyar*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>City</th>
<th><em>Hadith</em> legacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abū Qudāra al-Sarakhī, 'Ubayd Allāh b. Sa‘īd</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>Nishapūr</td>
<td>B (15), M, N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū l-Walīd al-Ṭayālīsī, Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>B (112), M, D, T, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmād b. Ḥanbāl</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>Bagdad</td>
<td>B, M, D, T, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Alī b. ‘Aththām al-Kilābi</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Kufa, Nishapūr</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishr b. al-Ḥārīth al-Ḥāfi</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Settled</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Numayr, Muḥammad b. ‘Abdullāh</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>Bagdad</td>
<td>B (15), M, D, T, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Shabbūya, Ahmād b. Muḥammad</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Marw, Tarsus</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrāhīm b. ‘Abdullāh b. Ḥātim al-Harawi</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>Bagdad</td>
<td>T, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khalaf b. Hishām al-Bazzār</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Bagdad</td>
<td>M, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Qa‘nābī, ‘Abdullāh b. Maslama</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>Basra, Mecca</td>
<td>B (131), M, D, T, N; a <em>Muwaffa‘a</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{100}\) The Shuyūkh al-Islām present in the *Tadhkira* are Ibn Ḥanbāl, Hishām b. ‘Ammār, and ‘Abdullāh b. Sa‘īd al-Asḥajj. Al-Dhahabi’s opinion on Hishām seems to have changed, as he is not called a Shaykh al-Islām in the *Siyar*. Al-Asḥajj receives the somewhat unusual sobriquet ‘Shaykh of the time (al-waqt)’ in the *Siyar*, and al-Dhahabi mentions that he saw his one-volume *taṣfīr* that is no longer extant; *Siyar*, XII, 182–5; *GAS*, I, 134. Note that al-Asḥajj’s *hadīth* are found in all six canonical Sunni books and those of Hishām are found in all but Muslim’s *Sahih*. 
Table 5.5. (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Hadith legacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qutayba b. Sa'd al-Balkh</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>Bālkh,</td>
<td>B (304), M, D, T, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baghūl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadaqa b. al-Fadl</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>Marw</td>
<td>B (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulaymān b. Ḥarb al-Azdi</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>Basra,</td>
<td>B (133), M, D, T, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baghūd,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Tabūḏhakī, Abū Salama</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>B (239), M, D, T, N, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūsā b. Ismā'il</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahyā b. Yahyā l-Tamīmī</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>Nishapur</td>
<td>B (3), M, T, N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See above, Table 5.1, note a.
' Sezgin, *Buhārī'nin Kaynāklari*, 239 (#102). Seventy-eight of these hadith come from Shu'ba.
" See above, Table 5.3, note d.
' See above, Table 5.4, note r.
' Sezgin, *Buhārī'nin Kaynāklari*, 208 (#9). A total of 101 of these hadith come from Mālik.
' Sezgin, *Buhārī'nin Kaynāklari*, 290 (#250). Sulaymān was also found in Table 5.2.
' Sezgin, *Buhārī'nin Kaynāklari*, 280 (#223). Al-Tabūḏhakī was also found in Table 5.4.
' Sezgin, *Buhārī'nin Kaynāklari*, 299 (#281). Ibn Hajar does not record a Yahyā b. Yahyā b. Bukār al-Hanzalī among al-Bukhārī's teachers, which is the name printed in *Buhārī'nin Kaynāklari*. I assume that the correct name is Yahyā b. Yahyā b. Bukār al-Tamīmī; see *Taqrib*, 528.

The roles of these fifteen Shuyūkh al-Īslām in hadīth transmission resembles closely those of the men whom al-Dhahabī recognized as ḥujja. Six of these scholars contributed material to all six of the canonical Sunni books and an additional three men are found in at least half of these books. Al-Bukhārī included over 350 hadīth from Abū l-Walīd al-Ṭayālīsī, al-Qa'īnābī, Sulaymān b. Ḥarb, and over 500 hadīth from Qutayba b. Sa'īd and al-Tabūḏhakī, in his Sahīh. Only one Shaykh al-Īslām, the ascetic Bishr al-Ḥāfī, did not contribute to the process of hadīth transmission, and at least one reason for his not having done so was mentioned in our recent discussion of ascetics of this generation.

The final approach towards the task of the identification of the major hadīth scholars of the first half of the third/ninth century prior to the synthesis of the information present in these charts is that of
textual compilation. Al-Dhahabi mentions nine men who compiled *musnads*, although only fragments of those by al-Ḥumaydī and Ibn Abī Shayba have survived to this day and been published. ¹⁰¹ Seven recensions of Māliḵ’s *Mutawwaf* were circulated by members of this generation, although two of them were done so by men who were strictly jurists and did not play any role in the greater enterprise of *ḥadīth* transmission.¹⁰² Two books bearing the title *Sunan* were composed during this period by the wine Muhammad b. al-Ṣabbāḥ al-Dūlābī and the Marwāzī Saʿīd b. Mansūr who followed the pious tradition of settling in Mecca.¹⁰³ Two of the earliest *tabaqīt* books of *ḥadīth* scholars were also compiled by Khalifa b. al-Khayyar and Ibn Saʿd, and another prosopographical work of significance dating to this time is Ibn Abī Khaythama’s *al-Tārikh al-kabīr*.¹⁰⁴ The final major *ḥadīth* book of this generation is the enormous *Munawwar* of Ibn Abī Shayba, a work whose serious study is a prerequisite for any fair understanding of the nature of Islam during the first two centuries following the death of the Prophet Muhammad.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰¹ The other seven compilers of *musnads* are Ahmad b. Manṣūr of Marw and Bāghdād (d. 244/858), Ibn Kāsīb of the Hījāz (d. 241/855), Mūsamad b. Mūsarhad of Bāṣra (d. 228/843), Nuʿaym b. Hammad, Sahīl b. Zanjāk of Rayy and Bāghdād (d. 238/852–3), Abū Iṣḥāq Ibrāhīm b. Naṣr al-Sinīrīn of Nīṣapur (d. 213/828 or 210/825), and the Kūfī Yahyā b. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd al-Himmānī (d. 238/852–3). Ibn Ḥajar included the Musnads of Mūsamad and Ahmad b. Manṣūr in his *Maḥālib al-ḥadīth bi-zawāʾid al-musnads al-thānīyya*. None of these books is mentioned by Sezgin in G.S. Four volumes of Ibn Rūḥawayh’s *musnad* have been published recently as well. One could add the *Musnad* of Ibn Ḥanbal to this list, although it is really the product of his son ‘Abdullāh.

¹⁰² These men are Asad b. al-Furāt and Yahyā b.-Laythī, both of whom were discussed in the section devoted to judges, jurists, and *mufassils* in this chapter.

¹⁰³ Al-Dūlābī’s *Sunan* was seen by al-Dhahabi, *Sīrār*, X, 670–2. Saʿīd b. Mansūr’s *Sunan* is discussed below.

¹⁰⁴ We observed in the previous chapter that these latter two works were declared to be among the ten primary sources for *ḥadīth*-transmitter criticism by al-Mizzī in the introduction to his *Tahdīth al-kamīl*.

It is time to synthesize these various tables of hadith scholars into a cogent narrative of the world of hadith transmission on the eve of the compilation of the six canonical Sunnī hadith books. The center of this universe was Iraq in general, and Baghdad and Basra in particular. Abū ‘Ubayd’s observation that hadith erudition is located among four scholars—Ibn Ḥanbal, Ibn Ma‘in, ‘Alī b. al-Madīnī, and Ibn Abī Shayba—is indicative of the primacy of Iraq in this field of scholarship. Baghdad housed the Shuyūkh al-īslām Ibn Ḥanbal, Ibrāhīm b. ʿAbdullāh al-Harawī, Sulaymān b. Ḥarb, and Khalāf b. Hishām, and four additional scholars whose hadith is present in all six books elected to make it their new homes. Ibn Saʿd, ‘Alī b. al-Madīnī, Ibn Abī Khaythama, Aḥmad b. Manṣūr, Muhammād al-Dīlābī, and Sahl b. Zanjala all composed hadith-related books, many of which have survived, in Baghdad and established the foundation of hadith scholarship that was to last well into the Middle Periods of Islamic civilization.

The city of Basra was the only rival of Baghdad in the realm of hadīth scholarship, and may have been its superior. The scholars of this period built upon the foundation established in the second/eighth century by Shuʾba b. al-Ḥajjāj, Hammād b. Salama, Hammād b. Zayd, and their contemporaries. No fewer than ten Basran scholars contributed to all six of the Sunnī canonical books, and one in particular, al-Ṭabūdhakī, was praised as both a Shaykh al-islām and ḥujja in the Siyar. Abū I-Walīd al-Ṭayālisī was considered to have some of the most reliable transmissions from his teacher Shu’ba and Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī had access to both

106 These scholars are Muʿāllā b. Manṣūr al-Rāzī, Muʿāwiya b. ʿAmr, Saʿduwayḥ, and ʿAflān b. Muslim.
107 His musnad is included in Ibn Ḥajar’s al-Mutāsāb al-ṭāhir; see II, 52–3.
108 This observation contradicts van Ess’s statement that Basra and Kufa suffered from a “brain-drain” by the beginning of the third/ninth century due to the rise of Baghdad; Theologie und Gesellschaft, III, 29; these observations by van Ess are cited by Zaman in Religion and Politics under the early Abbāsidās, 161.
109 Al-Dhahabī identifies ten Imāms of Basra belonging to this generation: Yazīd b. Zurayʿ (d. 182/796), Hammād b. Zayd (d. 179/795), ʿAbd al-Wāris b. Saʿd (d. 180/796), Muʿtāmir b. Sulaymān (d. 187/803), ʿAbd al-Wāḥid b. Ziyād (d. 176/792), Jaʿfar b. Sulaymān (d. 178/794), Wuhayb b. Khalīl (d. 165/781), Khalīl b. al-Ḥarīth (d. 186/802), Bishr b. al-Muʿtaḍdal (d. 186/802), and Ibn ʿUlayyā; see Siyar, VIII, 296.
110 Siyar, X, 360–5.
Musaddad's *al-Musnad al-kabir* and *al-Musnad al-jaghîr.*111 'Ali b. al-Madînî was heir to the critical discipline founded by his teachers Yahyâ l-Qâtîfân and 'Abd al-Rahmân b. Mahdî, and his contemporary 'Amr b. 'Aliî al-Fallâs continued this tradition as well. It is interesting that Basran scholars made only a modest textual contribution to the earliest Sunnî *hadîth* literature, although its native sons Musaddad and Ibn Sa'd are clear exceptions to this observation.

The Iraqi city of Kufa continued the high standards of *hadîth* scholarship that had been established by Sufyân al-Thawrî and his student Wâhî b. al-Jarrâh, among others. Ibn Numayr was awarded the sobriquet Shaykh al-Islam by al-Dhahabî and contributed to all six of the canonical Sunnî *hadîth* books. Abû Ghassân, Abû Kurayb, Ahmad b. Yûnus, and al-Ḥasan b. al-Rabî` also influenced these six books, despite the fact that the first of these was an adherent to *tâshayyu`* and that Abû Kurayb acknowledged the doctrine of the createdness of the Qur`ân during the *mīhna*. Ibn Abî Shayba set a new standard of compilation with his massive *Musannaf* as well as his *Musnad* and Qur`ânic exegesis, and the somewhat controversial Yahyâ b. 'Abd al-Ḥamîd al-Ḥimmâni (d. 228/843) composed what may have been the first *Musnad* of Kufa.112 Despite the long shadow cast by Baghdad and Basra, Kufa's role in *hadîth* transmission during the first half of the third/ninth century was impressive, and no serious compiler appears to have been foolish enough to neglect studying with its most prominent teachers.

The regions to the west of Iraq contained surprisingly few high caliber *hadîth* scholars.113 Mecca benefited from its status as a place of pilgrimage and pious retreat and its one native master scholar, al-Ḥumaydî, was augmented by Sulaymân b. Ḥarb, al-Qa`nabî, and

---

111 Ibn Ḥajar includes these books in his massive *al-Maqiṣîb al-`aliyya*; for the *ismâds* of these texts, see II, 29–37.

112 Yahyâ l-Himmâni was declared to be unreliable by Ibn Ḥanbal and reliable by Ibn Ma`īn. Ibn `Adî is reported to have examined Yahyâ's *Musnad* and found it to be devoid of suspect *hadîth*, and Abû Hâtim praised him for the accuracy of his transmission of material from Sufyân al-Thawrî. Nonetheless, none of Yahyâ's *hadîth* were included in any of the 'six books.' Al-Dhahabî includes a report that Yahyâ was of the opinion that Mu`awiyah died a non-Muslim, an opinion that would find sympathy in Kufa and antagonism in the rest of the Islamic world; *Siyar*, X, 526–40.

113 Note that al-Dhahabî did not include a record of any serious *hadîth* scholar from west of Egypt during this period.
the Khurāsānī Saʿīd b. Mašūr. The situation in Medina was even more precarious, as the only major hadīth scholars in our survey of the Sīyār were the native sons al-ʿUwaysī and Abū Muṣʿab al-Zuhrī. Egypt hosted only one scholar found in all six of the authoritative Sunnī hadīth books, Saʿīd b. Abī Maryam, and two of its other prominent hadīth scholars, Nuʿaym b. Ḥammād and Abū Ṣāliḥ ʿatīb al-Layth b. Saʿīd (d. 223/838), had a penchant of transmitting suspect material.114 The only bright spot west of Iraq for hadīth scholarship was Syria, as al-Ṣūrī, Abū Mushir, and Hishām b. ʿAmmār flourished in Damascus and Abū l-Mughīrah and Abū ʿAli Yaman put Ḥimṣ on the map for the compilers of the six books. Two other scholars of significance in Syria include the Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Shabūyya in Tarsus and ʿAmr b. Abī Salama who settled in Tinnīs and also contributed a small number of hadīth to all six of the canonical Sunnī compilations.

The relative mediocrity of the lands west of Iraq in the field of hadīth studies was more than compensated for by the activity in the Eastern lands. Indeed, it is little wonder that five of the six compilers of the canonical hadīth books hailed from cities east of Rayy. The first master hadīth scholar of this region in the eyes of al-Dhahabī was the Nishapurian Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā ʿal-Tamlīmī, who received the title Shaykh al-Islām, studied with an enormous array of scholars, and whose hadīth left a deep impact on Muslim’s Sahīh.115 Ibn Rāhawayh traveled to Iraq in 184/800 to collect material and led a hadīth session in Baghdad in 199/815 that was attended by no less than Ibn Ḥanbal and Ibn Maʿīn. His material left an indelible mark upon the books of al-Bukhārī, Muslim and al-Nasāʾī. Two other Shuyūkh al-Islām flourished during this time in Nishapur, the Kufan adīb ʿAlī b. ʿAththām and the ‘propagator of the Sunna’ Abū Qudāma al-Sarakhsī.116

114 Several examples of Abū Ṣāliḥ’s forgeries have been preserved in the Sīyār, X, 405–16. One of the more interesting ones for this project is the following: “God chose my Companions over all other people except prophets and messengers and then chose four of my companions. All of my Companions are good—Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUthmān, and ʿAli. [God also] chose my community over all other communities;” (inna ḫalāha ikhṭāra asḥābi ʿala jamīʿi l-ʿalamāna ma khalt l-naṣīṣtāna wa l-mursāliyn wa ikhṭāra miṣr asḥābi arbaʿtan wa fī kulli asḥābi khayrūn: Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUthmān, wa ʿAli; wa khṭāra ummati ʿala sāʿirī l-umam; ibid., X, 415.

115 Sīyār, X, 512.

116 This expression is based on the following statement attributed to Ibn Ḥibbān:
Two other Khurasani scholars both foreshadowed and educated the compilers of the six canonical Sunni books. Qutayba b. Sa’id left his homeland of Balkh in 172/788–9 at the age of 23 and was able to study with Malik b. Anas, Hammad b. Zayd, and Ibn al-Mubarak in their twilight years.117 There is a report of his hadith session in Baghdad in 216/831, which was attended by Ibn Hanbal and Ibn Ma’in, as well as another all-night affair during which the young Abū Ḥātim watched Qutayba, Ibn al-Numayr, and Ibn Abi Shayba select (intakhaba) the best hadith that they had accumulated. There is even a report preserved in the Siyar a’lam al-nubalā’ in which Qutayba explains to an inquisitive student that the hadith he has written in red ink are from Ibn Hanbal and those which he has in green ink are from Ibn Ma’in.118 Even Qutayba’s altercation with the judge of Balkh, Ibrāhim b. Yūsuf, to which we already alluded in our discussion of jurists of this period, and his subsequent exile to the town of Baghlul is a remarkable precursor to al-Bukhari’s forced exile from his native city less than half a century later.

The other scholar whose trajectory foreshadows that of the Eastern scholars who came to dominate the disciplines of hadith scholarship in the period immediately following the generation of Ibn Sa’d, Ibn Ma’in, and Ibn Hanbal is Sa’id b. Manṣūr. A native of Marw,119 Sa’id traveled throughout the lands of Islam in his youth, studied with a multitude of scholars, including Malik and Ibn ‘Uyayna, and ultimately settled in Mecca. In addition to his contributions to all six of the canonical Sunni hadith books, Sa’id composed his own book of Sunan that was transmitted by a scholar of Herat named Aḥmad b. Najda b. al-‘Uyān.120 This book, which appears to be...

[Abū Qudāma] huwa lādhi aqchara ṭ-sumata bi-Qarabhs wa dī’ta l-nāsa daykā; Siyar, X, 406.

117 Al-Dhahabi includes a report in which Qutayba identifies four ḥuffaz— Ibn ‘Ulayya, ‘Abd al-Wārid b. Sa’id, Wuḥayb b. Khālid, and Yāzd b. Zūray’—all of whom were Basrans and presumably influenced him immensely; Siyar, VIII, 224.

118 Siyar, XI, 17.

119 Two other master hadith scholars who lived in Marw during this period were the Shaykh al-Islāmi Ṣadāqa b. al-Fadl and ‘Ali b. Ḥujr (d. 244/858), the latter of whom spent a large part of his life in Baghdad prior to his return to his hometown.

120 A fragment of this book was published by Ḥabīb al-Rahmān al-A‘zāmi as kitāb al-Sunah li-Sa’id b. Manṣūr (Dabhil [India]: Majlis-Ilmi, 1967). Another fragment of this book has been edited by Sa’id b. ‘Abdullāh b. Ḥabib al-A‘zāzi in five volumes as Sunah Sa’id ibn Mansur (Riyadh: Dār al-Sumayy, 1993).
similar in structure to the the *Muwatṭa* of Mālik and the *Muṣannaf* of Ibn Abī Shayba, included reports from the Prophet Muḥammad, the *sahāba*, and prominent *tābiʿūn*, and probably was overshadowed rapidly by the 'six books' that consisted solely of prophetic *ḥadīth*.

V.2.7

The goal of this section has been to sketch the religious and intellectual milieu in which Ibn Saʿd, Ibn Maʿin, and Ibn Ḥanbal engaged in their intense cultivation of *ḥadīth* criticism. The courts of the ‘Abbāsids in Iraq and Ibn Ṭāhir in Nishapur inspired a high culture of poetry, music, dialectic theology, and *belles lettres* that elevated the Arabic language to dizzying heights of eloquence and intellectual sophistication. This was also a period of ascetic experimentation and witnessed some of the earliest seeds of Islamic mysticism. While many jurists of the age devoted their energies towards the elucidation and propagation of the teaching of Mālik, al-Shaybānī, and Abū Yūsuf, others such as Ibn Rāhawayh, Abū ‘Ubayd, and Ibn Ḥanbal engaged in independent legal reasoning. Many of these scholars also played a major role in *ḥadīth* scholarship in addition to their contributions to the growing body of legal scholarship.

Al-Dhahabi's obsession with the lives of *ḥadīth* scholars is manifest in the eleventh and twelfth *tabaqāt* of *Siyar aṭ-ṭāhir al-nubalāʾ*. I have attempted to isolate the most significant of these erudite men among the hundreds of entries of individuals who played at least a marginal role in the transmission of prophetic material by means of selecting those scholars whom al-Dhahabi praises as *ḥujja* or Shaykh al-Īslām, or who themselves compiled books. This process has reduced the field of scholars to a manageable number, the majority of whom either lived or spent significant parts of their lives in Baghdad, Basra, or Kufa. We have observed a great imbalance between the somewhat lackluster state of *ḥadīth* scholarship in the Hijāz, Egypt, and Syria and the major accomplishments of eastern scholars such as

---

121 This period also witnessed the great translation project of Greek scientific literature into Arabic, as well as the first Arabic philosopher, al-Kindī (d. about 256/870), whose treatise *On First Philosophy* (*Fi ḥalāsafa i-ʿulā*) was dedicated to the caliph al-Muʿtaṣim.

122 Note that Dhū l-Ḥāḍir al-Miṣrī (d. 246 or 248/860 or 862), often credited as the first gnostic in Islam, is located in the thirteenth *tabaqāt* of the *Siyar* (XI, 532–5).
Yahyā b. Yahyā l-Tamīmī, Ibn Rāhawayh, Qutayba b. Sa‘īd, and Sa‘īd b. Maṣūr. This analysis of al-Dhahabi’s Sīyar aḥām al-nubalā‘ demonstrates the cultural florescence at the courts and in the hadith sessions in the mosques during the time of Ibn Sa‘d, Ibn Ma‘īn, and Ibn Ḥanbal that emanated from Iraq to Egypt in the west and Balkh in the east, and which witnessed the compilation of several great textual achievements of Islamic civilization.

V.3 The miḥna and its impact upon Sunnī ḥadīth scholarship

It is necessary that we make one last digression prior to the formal introduction of the three scholars and their primary transmitters whose texts I analyze in the second half of this book. The “inquisition” (miḥna) set in motion by the caliph al-Ma‘ūn (ruled 198–218/813–33) has attracted the attention of several Western scholars over the past century and has achieved an almost mythic status in the literature. After I review briefly the little historical information that has been preserved in the classical Islamic sources about this episode, I shall summarize the main points of Lapidus, Hinds, Nawas, Patton, and Zaman. This section concludes with a reconsideration of the significance of the miḥna from the hitherto neglected angle of its impact upon ḥadīth scholarship in both the long and short runs of Islamic civilization.

Martin Hinds has assembled the most coherent narrative of the sixteen-to-nineteen-year episode known as the miḥna in his article “miḥna” in the new edition of the Encyclopaedia of Islam. Only the origins of the miḥna during the last four months of al-Ma‘ūn’s life (218/833) can be recovered with any clarity, thanks to al-Ṭabarī’s inclusion of three caliphal letters explaining the goals of this unusual event in his chronicle under the year 218. The language of these letters borders on the hysterical, as can be seen in the following two passages:

The Commander of the Faithful considers that these people are the worst of the Muslim community and the chief ones in error, the ones

123 Martin Hinds, “Miḥna,” EI2, XII, 2–6.
who are defective in their belief in the divine unity and who have an imperfect share in the faith. They are vessels of ignorance, banners [or milestones, ‘a‘lām] of mendaciousness and the tongue of Iblis, who speaks through his companions and strikes terror into the hearts of his adversaries, the people of God’s own religion.\textsuperscript{125}

But by their utterances concerning the Qur’ān, these ignorant people have enlarged the breach in their religion and the defect in their trustworthiness; they have made the way easy for the enemy of Islam, and have confessed perversion of the Qur’ānic text and heresy against their own hearts; they have made known and described God’s work of creation and His action by that form of description which belongs to God alone and have compared Him with it, whereas it is only His creation that is the fitting subject of comparison.\textsuperscript{126}

The original “test” of the mihna was of a strictly theological nature, namely the testimony that the Qur’ān was a created text, an opinion shared by numerous early sectarian groups including the Mu’tazila, Khawārij, most of the Zaydiyya and Murji’ā, and many of the Imāmī Shi’a (Rāfī’dā).\textsuperscript{127} Al-Ma’mūn struggled to “prove” the createdness of the Qur’ān by means of numerous Qur’ānic verses in the first and third of his letters,\textsuperscript{128} although his argument was handicapped by the absence of any Qur’ānic verse in which God explicitly created (khalāqa) the Qur’ān.\textsuperscript{129} The first group of seven hadith scholars subjected to the mihna included both Ibn Sa’d and Ibn Ma‘in, and all of them are reported to have accepted the doctrine of the created Qur’ān in Raqqa without a struggle.\textsuperscript{130} This outcome was not the case with

\textsuperscript{125} Reunification, 203. This excerpt is taken from the first of al-Ma’mūn’s mihna letters.

\textsuperscript{126} Reunification, 208. This passage is from the third letter of al-Ma’mūn which purportedly was read to the second group of scholars that included Ibn Hanbal, Qurayba b. Sa’īd, and ‘Abī b. al-Ja’d.

\textsuperscript{127} Al-Ash’ārī, Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyān, II, 256. Al-Ash’ārī reports another thirteen opinions in this chapter on pages 256–9. Melchert makes the interesting suggestion that the Inquisition should be “identified less with the Mu’tazila than with the nascent Hanafī school of law” in his article “The Adversaries of Ahmad Ibn Hanbal,” Arabic Studies XLIV.2 (1997), 239.

\textsuperscript{128} Reunification, 199–204 and 205–9; see especially pp. 201 and 207–8.

\textsuperscript{129} The closest verb to khalāqa in relationship to the “creation” of the Qur’ān is ja‘ala found in the verse “verily We have made it a Qur’ān in the Arabic language” (43:3). Al-Ma’mūn cites this verse in his first and third mihna letters; Reunification, 201 and 207.

\textsuperscript{130} The remaining five men are Abu Khaythama, ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Mustamli (d. 224/839), Ahmad b. Ibrahim al-Dawraqi (d. 246/860), and Ismā‘īl b. Abī Mas‘ūd (death date unknown). These men are names in al-Ma’mūn’s brief second letter; Reunification, 204–5; Patton, Ahmed Ibn Hanbal and the Mihna, 64.
the second group of men, a large number of whose identities are unclear, and al-Ma'mūn’s fourth letter not only cuts through their elusive answers but even threatens several individuals with the sword should they not answer in strict accordance to the Caliph’s dogma. Only two men, Ibn Ḥanbal and Muhammad b. Nūh, are reported to have adhered to their rejection of the doctrine of the created Qurʾān after this threatening letter, and were consequently “loaded with fetters” and sent to al-Ma’mūn in Tarsus by Isḥāq b. Ibrāhīm. The fifth, and final, mihna letter arrived shortly after Ibn Ḥanbal’s departure and al-Ma’mūn summoned the group of men who had previously passed the test to for further questioning to Tarsus; this trip was aborted near Raqqa at the news of the caliph’s death.

Virtually nothing is known about the mihna during the nine-year reign of al-Mu’taṣim and the five-year one of al-Wāthiq. Al-Ṭabari is silent with regard to the infamous flogging of Ibn Ḥanbal in either 219/834 or 220/835 by al-Mu’taṣim and his cronies, although it is recorded dutifully by Ibn Ḥanbal’s nephew Ḥanbal and son Ṣāliḥ, as well as al-Jāḥiẓ in his epistle on the topic of the createdness of the Qurʾān. The only other individuals whom al-Mu’taṣim persecuted and whose identities are known are the Egyptians Nu‘aym b. Yūsuf al-Buwayṭī; both men were transported to Baghdad around the year 226/841 where they ultimately died in prison. Hinds has found evidence of an intensification of the mihna under al-Wāthiq in Egypt, although the primary victim of this affair in Baghdad, Ahmad b. Naṣr al-Khuza‘i, was more likely executed for his botched insurrection than his belief in an uncreated Qurʾān. Even the beating of the master Mālikī scholar Ṣaḥnūn (d. 240/854) in Qayrawān appears to be more a result of local power politics than a serious extension of the mihna. Despite a widespread report that al-Wāthiq abandoned the doctrine of the created Qurʾān after an anonymous Shaykh bested Ibn Abī Duwād in an argument,

---

131 “If they do not then recant and repent of their errors, [al-Ma’mūn] will consign them en bloc to the sword, if God wills;” Reunification, 220.
132 Reunification, 220–1.
133 Reunification, 221–2. Al-Ṭabari reports that Isḥāq b. Ibrāhīm set the party free upon their return to Baghdad.
134 These accounts are studied by Cooperson in Classical Arabic Biography, 125–8.
136 This story was discussed briefly above in note seven.
Hinds has argued convincingly that al-Mutawakkil gradually terminated the miḥna between the years 234/848 and 237/851.\textsuperscript{137} The predominant trend among Western scholarship has been to interpret this short affair as a watershed moment in Islamic history. The very title of Lapidus' 1975 article, “The Separation of state and religion in the development of early Islamic thought” contains two conceptual categories, namely ‘state’ and ‘religion’ whose definitions are far from clear in any period of Islamic civilization and is contradicted by two reports that al-Mutawakkil ordered several prominent hadith scholars in the year 234/848-9 to disseminate anti-Mu'tazili hadith in the congregational mosques of Baghdad and Samarra' after he had brough the miḥna to a close.\textsuperscript{138} Hinds' interpretation also ventures into the territory of hyperbole:

[The miḥna] brought to a decisive end any notion of a caliphal role in the definition of Islam and it permitted the unchecked development of what in due course would become recognizable as Sunnism. The Mu'tazila and what they stood for was discredited, while populist sentiments and what passed as Prophetic hadith were the order of the day. It was now unquestionably the 'ulama', rather than the caliphs, who were “the legatees of the prophets;” and henceforward it would be they who, armed with this spiritual authority, and at a distance from those who held temporal power, elaborated classical Islam.\textsuperscript{138}

This understanding of the miḥna not only contradicts the lengthy historical alliance between Sunni ‘ulama’ and temporal Muslim rulers from at least the period of the Seljuqs (fifth/eleventh century) through the modern day, but also suggests insidiously that Islam transformed from a “rational” religion to one of the vulgar “populists” who traded in “what passed for hadith” (i.e. spurious goods) and, in a way, stole the role of religious authority from the caliphs. Hinds' lack of appreciation for the massive project of hadith compilation and criticism,

\textsuperscript{137} Hinds, “Miḥna”, 4•5.

\textsuperscript{138} Al-Dhahabi reports that the hadith scholar Ibn Abī Shawārib (d. 244/858) was present when al-Mutawakkil forbade dialectic theology (kalām) and commanded a group of religious scholars to spread hadith in Samarra; Syar, XI, 104. He also mentions that al-Mutawakkil commissioned Muṣ'ab b. 'Abdullāh al-Zubayrī, Ishaq b. Abī Isā'il, Ibrāhīm b. 'Abdullāh al-Ḫarahwī, and the brothers Abū Bakr and Uṯmān Ibn Abī Shayba to spread hadith that “refuted the Mu'tazila and Jahmiyya” in the year 234/848-9; Syar, XI, 125. Al-Dhahabi's source for this report is Ibrahim Nifawayh.

\textsuperscript{138} Hinds, “Miḥna”, 6.
the elucidation of which is the goal of this book, is not unusual for many Western scholars raised on the theories of Goldziher and Schacht that were mentioned in the first chapter, and these interpretive shortcomings do not in any way diminish the fruits of the labor Hinds undertook to provide what is probably the most accurate narrative of the events of the mihna currently in circulation.

A particularly unbalanced presentation of these events is found in the article “The Mihna of 218/833 Revisited: An empirical study” by John Nawas. Although the article is concerned fundamentally with the question as to the strategic motives behind al-Ma’mún’s decision to undertake the mihna in the first place, it fails to offer any form of critique of al-Ma’mún’s arguments and authority. For example, Nawas writes:

The traditionists were a threat. Al-Ma’mún saw them sowing the seeds of destruction, menacing for who they were, for what they had come to be within the social fabric, and for the kinds of activities they were carrying out. The sheer numbers of these self-appointed spokesmen for Islam, involved in an enterprise to which they had not been commissioned and without any control from above, made them a force no ruler could afford to ignore. The traditionists were no ordinary men harmlessly busying themselves within the confines of ivory towers but “deluded . . . depraved . . . untrustworthy . . . heretics . . . the tongue of Iblis (the devil) . . . making a pretense of piety and knowledge” in order to “lead the masses astray”—expressions continuously used by the caliph in his mihna letters . . .

Nawas follows this vivid depiction of al-Ma’mún’s perception of the menacing hadith scholars with the rather remarkable assertion that the caliph “ordered the mihna in order to acquire the authority of the ulema, to secure for himself and future caliphs unquestioned supremacy on issues of faith.” Nowhere does Nawas seek to under-


\[\text{\textsuperscript{111}}\] “The mihna of 218/833 revisited,” 705-6. Note also Nawas’ earlier observation that “Had [the] authority of the ulema continued unchecked, it would eventually have led to a ‘house divided’ and a caliphal institution adrift. Endowed by God with authority over all that concerned Muslims, it was only a caliph who was entitled to exercise it,” “A Reexamination of Three Current Explanations for al-Ma’mún’s Introduction of the Mihna,” 622.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{112}}\] “The Mihna of 218/833 Revisited,” 708. While al-Nawas’ argument that the
stand the true nature of the project of the hadith scholars or ascertain the validity of al-Ma'mun's accusation that they were seeking political authority at the expense of the caliph. Nor does he address the simple fact that one is hard pressed to find a caliph after 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz (d. 101/720) who devoted serious attention to Islamic law. If a century of caliphs prior to al-Ma'mun showed little active involvement in the actual articulation of Islamic law, should not pious Muslims have been grateful that at least the "self-appointed spokesmen for Islam," such as hadith scholars and jurists, were converting the teachings of the Prophet and first generations into books arranged by legal topics? And who was al-Ma'mun to demand obedience to the caliph when he himself had raised a military insurrection against the caliph al-Amin, his own brother, who was killed at the hands of his general Tahir? None of these issues is raised by Nawas who, in his enthusiasm to solve the riddle of the miḥna, overlooks entirely the constructive role of hadith scholars in the articulation of Sunni Islam, and offers little evidence to balance al-Ma'mun's paranoid perspective of these men.

primary goal of the miḥna was to strengthen the caliphal authority is more convincing than the "Mu'tazilite/Shi'ite genre of hypotheses," it must be admitted that al-Ma'mun made a strikingly poor selection of interrogatees, since Nawas was able to find information on merely twenty-eight of the purported "hundreds" of men subjected to the miḥna. Clearly al-Ma'mun missed many of the best and brightest hadith scholars! How Nawas arrives at the number of victims of the miḥna in the "hundreds" is also a mystery, since he does not offer any source for this figure in either article.

Ibn Sa'd's entry for 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz is the longest notice in al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr and includes many of his legal opinions; al-Tabaqāt al-kubrā, V, 160-206. See also Crane and Hinds, God's Caliph, 73-80.

Crone and Hinds argue for caliphal intervention on legal issues in God's Caliph, but they muster little evidence post-'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz; note that the caliph Hishām (ruled 724-43) is mentioned only four times in the entire book. For the "surprisingly nonchalant" attitude of the early 'Abbāsids towards the development of the sharia, see ibid., 80-93.

Note also that Nawas' suggestion that the "daunting task" of establishing standards for the authentication of hadith was "shouldered largely by the four emerging schools of jurisprudence" and that the primary tool wielded by these men was consensus (ijma) is puzzling since there is little evidence to suggest that most jurists were concerned with hadith criticism in any of the classical sources examined in this book. While it is true that Mālik and especially Ibn Hanbal were involved in hadith criticism, it is striking that none of the jurists whom Melchert has identified as founders of the three Eastern madhāhib (Ibn Surayj, al-Khallal, and al-Karkhi) played any discernable role in the disciplines of hadith criticism.
This cursory survey of a few somewhat dramatic Western interpretations of the *miḥna* demonstrates vividly the insights of Walter Patton and Muhammad Qasim Zaman. The former, who, over a century ago observed that, "as an attempt to stamp out by force moral convictions, [the *miḥna*] was a failure from the start" evaluated the entire ordeal in the following manner:

Judging from a modern point of view neither side had very strong points; but, judged from a Muslim standpoint, the disputations . . . show that the orthodox* had the great argument of the Word of God and the tradition and could wield these as well or better than their opponents.*

While Patton’s sensitive reading of these events may have fallen out of favor during the past three decades, Zaman’s careful study of the complex relationships between the caliphate and the religious scholars is a critical contribution to this discussion. Zaman traces the webs of ‘Abbāsid patronage of the “proto-Sunni” elite during this period and observes that

al-Ma’mūn’s *Mihna* ought to be seen not as the culmination of a struggle over religious authority between the caliphs and the ‘ulama’, but only as an interregnum which disturbed but did not destroy, and in its failure only reaffirmed, the earlier pattern of state-‘ulama’ relations.*

The sole remaining task in this book related to the *miḥna* is to ascertain the impact of this event upon the greater narrative of Sunni hadith scholarship. One of the most striking outcomes of the entire *miḥna* episode is that none of the hadith scholars who acknowledged the createdness of the Qur’ān under the threat of caliphal punishment suffered any discernable loss of prestige or integrity in the eyes of their pupils. Four of the scholars who were tried by al-Ma’mūn transmitted hadith that are found in all six of the canonical Sunni books,* and another eleven contributed material to at least one of

---

*Patton, 124.

*By “orthodox” Patton means the hadith scholars in general, and Ibn Hanbal in particular.

*Patton, 125-6.

*Zaman, 11.

*These four men are Abu Mushir ‘Abd al-A‘lā, Ibn Hanbal, Qutayba b. Sa‘īd, and Sa‘dwayh according to al-Dhahabi’s *Siyar*. Note that Nawas (703) states that there are five such scholars, but neglects to disclose their identities; a perusal of the twenty-eight men reveals that Ibn Ma‘in was considered to have material in
these books.\textsuperscript{131} Two of the most important hadith-transmitter critics of the age, Ibn Ma'in and 'Ali b. al-Madini, retained their authoritative status in this discipline despite their lack of endurance in the face of caliphal pressure and intimidation.\textsuperscript{132} Finally, it is important to note that the mihna did not even graze Basra, the city we have shown to have been of major significance for hadith scholarship during this period, and there is little evidence that it had any success in the Eastern lands from where the greatest Sunni hadith scholars were emerging at this time.

While the mihna did not affect the reputations of individual hadith scholars, it did have both an immediate positive and negative impact upon this group of men. The positive change was the fame that Ibn Hanbal received which paralleled in many ways the elevation of Malik b. Anas whose prestige increased less than a century earlier in the wake of a sound whipping for his unwillingness to give the oath of allegiance to the caliph al-Manṣūr.\textsuperscript{133} Although most of the all six books according to Ibn Ḥajar (Ṭayīb, 527) pace al-Dhahabi, who reports that he contributed hadith only to the books of al-Bukhari, Muslim, and Abū Dawūd; Siyar, XI, 71.

\textsuperscript{131} These men are: Abū Naṣr al-Tammār (M, N), Abū Khaythama (B, M, D, N, Q), 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Yūnis al-Mustamili (B), Ahmad b. Ibrāhīm al-Dawraqī (M, D, T, Q), 'Ali b. al-Ja'd (B, D), 'Āṣim b. 'Ali al-Wasīqī (B, T, Q), al-Ḥasan b. Ḥammād al-Sajjāda (D, N, Q), Ishaq b. Abī Isrā'il Ibrāhīm (D, N), Isrā'il b. Ibrāhīm al-Harawi (B, N), Muhammad b. Ḥātim (M, D), 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Umar al-Qawārī (B, M, D, N), and Ibn Ma'in (all six). Nawas alludes to one more scholar whose materials are in one of the six books, but since he does not name these individuals, it is not clear exactly whom he means; my personal hypothesis is that it is Ibn Sa'd, since I have already mentioned in a footnote that al-Mizzī and Ibn Ḥajar count his non-hadith report found in the Sunan of Abū Dawūd but al-Dhahabi does not.

\textsuperscript{132} It is not clear when 'Ali b. al-Madini's inquisition took place, but it is certain that he aided the caliph and received a handsome stipend from the chief judge Ibn Abī Duwad; Patton, 87 and Siyar, X, 400–2. al-Dhahabi also disproves an anonymous rumor on the authority of 'Abdullah b. Ahmad b. Hanbal that Ibn Hanbal did not transmit any hadith from 'Ali after the mihna by the fact that many of 'Ali's hadith are found in the Musnad; Siyar, XI, 59. Note also Hurvitz's wildly off the mark assertions that "the tragic downfall of Ibn al-Madini... illustrates how the mihna crushed the intellectual leadership of the Traditionists" and that "after the mihna, his career was in shambles;" Hurvitz, The Formation of Hanbalism: Piety into Power (London: Routledge Curzon, 2002), 151. Given the importance of Ibn al-Madini's hadith to al-Bukhari (nearly 300 hadith in the Sahih) and his critical opinions to Ibn Abī Ḥātim, this interpretation is clearly untenable.

\textsuperscript{133} Ibn Sa'd reports this episode on the authority of al-Waqīqī, who may have been an eye-witness to Mālik's beating at the hands of al-Mansūr's governor Ja'far b. Sulaymān; al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, V, 289.
fame of both of these men must be credited to their vast learning and the texts that were sculpted from their teachings by their most dedicated pupils. Their extraordinary will in the face of torture surely impressed those Muslims who were not particularly interested in the acquisition of copious amounts of hadith.

The negative outcome of this brief ordeal was the result of two rival positions with regard to the implications of the dogma that the Qur'an is uncreated. Al-Dhahabî elucidates the argument that split the Sunni hadith scholars into three camps, two of which were considered by him to be sound, in his entry for 'Ali b. Hujr in the Siyar:

The vast majority of the Imâms, pious ancestors, and succeeding generations are of the opinion that the Qur'an is the speech of God, sent down (munaa.al) and uncreated. The Jahmiyya, Mu'tazila, [Caliph] al-Ma'mûn, [Judge] Ahmad b. Abî Duwâd, and a group of the speculative theologians and Imâmi Shi'a (Râfida) are of the opinion that the Qur'an is the speech of God, sent down, and created. Then a group (ta'ifa) emerged that believed that the Qur'an was the speech of God, exalted, sent down, and uncreated, but that our enunciations of it are created. In other words, their utterances, voices, writing, and the like [are created]. This was the opinion of Hûsayn al-Karabî and his followers, and was rejected by Ibn Hânbal and the Imâms of hadith. It is true that Ibn Hânbal said “[the adherents of this doctrine] (i.e. the Lafziyya) are Jahmîs!” A group that included Dâwûd al-Zâhirî also said that the Qur'an is an event (muâdâbî), and Ibn Hânbal labeled them innovators. As for al-Bukhârî, one of the greatest and most...
intelligent scholars, he said: "I am not of the opinion that our speech of the Qur’an is created, but rather their (sic) movements, voices, and actions are created; the Qur’an that is heard, recited, articulated, and written in the books is the uncreated speech of God." Al-Bukhārī composed a book explaining this position entitled Ḥṣāl al-ʿibād,157 but a group of scholars who did not understand it rejected it. [These scholars included] al-Dhuhlr, Abū Zur’ā [al-Rāzi], Abū Ḥātim [al-Rāzi], and Abū Bakr al-A’yan.158 Then the Kullābiyya emerged, followed by the Ash’arīs; they argued that the Qurʾān was a self-sufficient concept (ma’na) . . . and they expanded the topics related to this and attached more and more issues and shades (alwān) to the point that abandoning [this topic], By God, is what is best for one’s faith!

I have already mentioned the tension that this doctrine caused between al-Dhuhlī and Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj in Nishapur in the third chapter, and it, like the misunderstanding between the master hadīth critics in Rayy and al-Bukhārī, appears to have been of little importance to the succeeding generations of scholars who happily copied the books of all of these scholars and worried little about theological hairsplitting with regard to the speech of God.

It has been necessary to address the episode of the miḥna in this book due to the historical significance several Western scholars have vested in it. Relatively few of the prominent hadīth scholars outside of Baghdad whom we have discussed appear to have been targeted, and those who did affirm the createdness of the Qurʾān under obvious coercion maintained their integrity in the eyes of their pupils and successive generations of hadīth scholars. Even the myriad opinions of hadīth-transmitter critics Ibn Ma’in and ‘Alī b. al-Madīnī have retained their authoritative aura to this day. The only obvious damage caused by the miḥna to the hadīth scholars was the deaths of Abū Mushir, Nu‘aym b. Ḥammād, and al-Buwayṭī in prison, as well as the rift described by al-Dhahabī between al-Dhuhlī, Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī, and Abū Zur’ā al-Rāzī on one side and al-Bukhārī and Muslim on the other. This cleavage, however, was short-lived and far easier to bridge than the one that persists to this day between

---


158 His remark denigrating al-Bukhārī is the entire reason for al-Dhahabī’s excursus at this juncture on the different opinions concerning the nature of the Qurʾān; Ṣiyar, XI, 509.
the Sunnī proponents of speculative theology (the Ash'ārīs and Matūridīs) and the ḥadīth-scholar Sunnīs, like al-Dhahabī, who recommend that the pious Muslim direct his or her energies towards the study of the Qur'ān and ḥadīth and away from speculative theology. It is to be hoped that the insignificance of the miḥna with respect to ḥadīth scholarship has been demonstrated in a convincing manner, and that future research on the first half of the second/ninth century will focus more on the emergence of the Sunnī articulation Islam in places outside of the palaces of al-Ma'mūn and the pages of al-Ṭabarī's chronicle.

V. 4 Biographical sketches of Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'īn, and Ibn Ḥanbal and their primary transmitter-pupils

The preceding pages should have convinced even the most skeptical reader of the significance of Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'īn, and Ibn Ḥanbal in the epic venture of Sunnī ḥadīth scholarship. Ibn al-Ṣalāh advocates the importance of the books of Ibn Ḥanbal and Ibn Sa'd in categories 28, 63, and 65 of his Mughaddima, and al-Dhahabī includes all three of these scholars in the eighth tabaqāt of Tadhkirat al-huffāz. Ibn Ma'īn and Ibn Ḥanbal were consistently ranked among the most important ḥadīth-transmitter critics in the relevant sources I studied in the second chapter, and Ibn Sa'd's al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr was considered by al-Mizzi to be one of the ten primary sources of critical opinions. The consensus of the primacy of the critical opinions of Ibn Ma'īn and Ibn Ḥanbal was rendered all the more impressive by our prosopographical study of the eleventh and twelfth tabaqāt of al-Dhahabī's Siyar al-'lām al-nubalā' that revealed the vast network of ḥadīth scholars who were their contemporaries and did not achieve their level of erudition in the disciplines of ḥadīth criticism. The remaining pages of this chapter provide brief biographical sketches of these three extraordinary scholars, along with the primary transmitter-pupils of their books that I shall be subjecting to a careful examination in the remaining chapters of this study.
Very little information has survived about Ibn Sa'd's life. He was born around the year 168/784 in Basra and traveled to Baghdad to serve as a scribe for the prominent historian and judge Muhammad b. 'Umar al-Wāqīdī and died there in 230/845. Ibn Sa'd was a mawla either of Banū Hāshim or Banū Zuhra, and is thus called occasionally al-Hāshimī or al-Zuhārī. His primary teachers included historians (ahl al-khbans) such as al-Wāqīdī, 'Ali b. al-Madā’īnī, and Hishām b. al-Kalbī, as well as major hadith scholars, including Ibn 'Uyayna, Waki' b. al-Jarrāh, Abū Nu‘aym al-Fadl b. Dukayn, Abū l-Walīd al-Tayālisi, and 'Affān b. Muslim. He was evaluated by Abū I'latīm al-Razī as "truthful" (yāduqu), classified by al-Khatīb al-Baghdādi as being among the "people of virtue and knowledge" (ahl al-fadl wa l-'ilm) as well as "the people of probity" (ahl al-'adāla), and al-Dhahabī lauded him as no less than a bi'ja, great scholar ('allāma), and authority (hujja). These positive opinions further support the argument in the preceding section regarding the insignificance of the mīhna vis-à-vis hadith scholarship since Ibn Sa'd was among the first group of seven who assented to al-Ma'mūn’s doctrine of the created Qurʾān without protest in 218/833.

Ibn Sa'd’s primary contribution to Islamic civilization is unquestionably his book al-Taḥqīq al-kabīr, a work which inspired even the erudite al-Dhahabī to remark “whoever looks through [it] is humbled by his knowledge.” The first section of the book is concerned...
with the biography of the Prophet Muhammad and is of little importance for this study. The second section consists of 1389 biographies of male sahaba arranged into five classes according to the time of each individual’s conversion to Islam, and it is important to note that the text of the fourth and fifth classes has been published only in the past decade. The third section proceeds generation by generation in each of the major Muslim cities, starting with Medina and ending with al-Andalus, and mentions 3513 men. The last section contains 629 biographies of women, most of whom are sahaba, and includes several legal and exegetical opinions of al-Waqidi regarding feminine topics, such as veiling and beating. The book lacks a formal introduction, but Ibn Sa’d does inform the reader at the beginning of the sahaba section that he has assembled the names we have acquired of the companions of the Messenger of God among the Muhajirun, the Ansar, and others. [It also includes] their sons and followers among the people of fiqh, knowledge [of the sunnah] (‘ilm), and transmission of hadith. [It encompasses] that which has reached us concerning their full names, genealogies, kuryas, and attributes, generation by generation.

Ibn Sa’d follows this brief introduction with isnads from nine prominent teachers whose material was of capital importance for al-Tabaqat al-kabir. The first seven isnads all begin with al-Waqidi and trace back to his various Medinan sources, including one that passes through al-Zuhri to ‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr. Ibn Sa’d received the maghaz materials of Abū Ma’shar from al-Husayn b. Bahram (d. 213 or 214/828–9),

of Ibn Sa’d’s to survive is his Kitāb al-tabaqāt al-saghīr that remains in a sixth-century manuscript in the Istanbul Archaeology Museum (#455); GÅSH, I, 301.

The fourth tabaq of the sahāba was first published by ‘Abd al-Aziz Salāmī in 1995 in Ta’if; the fifth one was published by Dr. Muhammad al-Salamū in 1993, also in Ta’if. Note that only the 2001 Maktubat al-Khānji edition has the entire third tabaq of sahāba in the fifth volume, and that all figures are based upon this edition. See below for the complicated publishing history of this book.

His full name is Abū Ahmad Husayn b. Muhammad b. Bahram al-Marrūdī al-Mu’addib and he settled in Baghdad. His hadith are found in all six of the canonical Sunnī books, and Ibn Sa’d evaluated him as thiqa; Siyar, X, 216–7; al-Tabaqāt al-kubrā, VII, 165.
those of Mūsā b. ‘Uqba from Ismā‘īl b. Abī Uways (d. 216/831), Ibn Sa‘d also makes mention of the written materials of Ibn Isḥāq. Ibn Sa‘d also makes mention of the written materials of ‘Abdullāh b. Muḥammad al-Ansārī (d. around 200/815), Abū Nu‘aym al-Fndī b. Dukayn, Ma‘n b. ‘Īsā (d. 198/814), and Hishām b. Muḥammad al-Kalbī before concluding that

All of these men informed me (akhbāran) of the names of the companions of the Messenger of God and those who came after them among the tābi‘ūn among the people of fiqh and who transmitted any hadith. I have gathered all of this and have made clear all those whose names I know in their proper places.

It has taken nearly a century to arrive at an edition of Ibn Sa‘d’s al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr that is even close to being complete. The first Leiden edition was the product of a veritable “dream team” of

---

169 A Medinan scholar and nephew of Mālik b. Anas of the eleventh tabaga whom al-Dhahabī remarks is merely sādiq hādjīs; Siyer, X, 391–5. His hadith are found in the Sahīhs of al-Bukhārī and Muslim.

170 These recensions are from Ibn Isḥāq’s pupils Harūn b. Abī ‘Īsā and Ibrāhīm b. Sa‘d (d. 183/799). Little is known about Harūn except that he was a scribe of Ibn Isḥāq and that a single hadith of his is found in the Sunan of al-Nasā’ī; al-Mīzīrī, Tahdhib al-Kamāl, XXX, 102–3. Ibrāhīm b. Sa‘d, a great-grandson of the famous saḥēb ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘Awf, was a prominent Medinan hadith scholar whose transmissions are located in all six of the canonical Sunni books and who moved to Baghdad where he and Hushaym b. Bashir flourished at the end of their lives; Siyar, VIII, 304–8; Tadhkira, 185–6. Ibn Sa‘d does not explicitly say he received a book called al-Maghāzī from any of these scholars, but it is obvious in his sections of the kāliba that he is making a ‘critical edition’ of sorts in his effort to clarify the names of the men who fought in each of the definitive early Muslim battles. Ibn Sa‘d makes explicit reference to Mūsā b. ‘Uqba’s “book” in the entries of ‘Abdullāh b. Qays b. Sayf and ‘Amr b. Ta‘līq b. Zayd (al-Tabaqāt al-kubrā, III, 295) and the “book of Abū Ma‘shar” in the entry of Yazīd b. al-Muzayn b. Qays (ibid., III, 277).


172 Al-Dhahabī, Tadhkira, I, 242–3. Ma‘n was an important pupil of Mālik b. Anas and Abī Hāṭum preferred him to Ibn Wahhāb.

173 Ibn al-Kalbī’s book Kitāb al-nasab is explicitly mentioned in the entry of Khawālī b. Abī Khaṭībi; al-Tabaqāt al-kubrā, III, 209. Ibn al-Nadīm reports that Ibn Sa‘d was a transmitter of this book; Fihrist, 111. (My thanks to Professor Wadad al-Qādī for this reference.)

174 fa-kallu ha‘iddi qad akhabaran fī tasnīyati ʾishāhī nasīli ilahi ʿalī wa ma rāma ba‘dahum min al-tābi‘īna min ahli l-fa‘lī wa l-rasūl yati li l-hadith bi shay‘īn fa-jama‘tu dhālika kullahu wa bayyantu ma amkanati tasnīyatihi minhum fī maṣābīh, al-Tabaqāt al-kubrā, III, 5.
German orientalists over the years 1904–40 under the leadership of Edward Sachau. This edition lacked much of the second and third tabaqāt of saḥāba, the entire fourth and fifth tabaqāt of the saḥāba (390 entries), as well as an important section that includes 409 scholars of Medina. This edition was republished without its thorough indices in Beirut (1960–8) under the name of Ihsān ‘Abbās without any of the missing sections. The lacuna of the Medinan scholars was published by Ziyād Muhammad Manṣūr in Medina in 1983 (and again in 1987), and this material was incorporated into the “disastrous” Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya edition of 1990.175 The fifth tabaqāt of the saḥāba was published in two volumes in 1993 by Muḥammad al-Sulamī and the fourth tabaqāt of saḥāba followed two years later thanks to the labors of ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Salāmī. The primary edition used for much of this study is the uncritical and unindexed 1995–96 Dār Ihāyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī edition that includes everything except the lacunae of the second and third tabaqāt of the saḥāba, the thirty-six entries of the fifth tabaqāt of the saḥāba, and a tiny gap in the fifth tabaqāt of Medinan scholars.176 Finally, Dr. ‘All Muḥammad ‘Umar has just published the first complete and critical edition of this text under the title Kitāb al-tabaqāt al-kabīr in Cairo in ten volumes with a highly-appreciated index.177 This authoritative version is based upon five fragmentary manuscripts and the editor has devoted extra care to avoid the numerous orthographical errors that he states plague all of the earlier editions.178

The life of one of the primary transmitters of Ibn Sa’d’s al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr, Ibn Fahm, is largely unknown.179 His full name is al-Ḥusayn

---

175 This edition has been thoroughly condemned by the editor of the 2001 edition of al-Tabaqat al-kabīr, Dr. ‘All Muḥammad ‘Umar, in the introduction to his new edition (see note 177).

176 This lacuna consists of two important Ḥāshimīs, namely Ja’far b. Muḥammad al-Ṣadiq and ʿIbrāhīm b. Muḥammad b. ‘Alī “the Imam” and is found only in the 2001 Cairo edition. VII, 543–5.

177 This edition was published by Maktabat al-Khanji in Cairo in 2001; I refer to this edition as TK 2001.

178 It is curious that he does not mention the Dār Ihāyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī edition that I have used in parts of this study.

179 The primary source for this sketch is Tarikh Baghdād, VIII, 92–3; al-Dhahabī does not add anything to al-Khaṭṭāb al-Baghdādī’s material in either the Sīyar (XIII, 427–8) or the Tadhkira (II, 182). Note that none of the published editions of al-Tabaqat al-kabīr is based upon the transmission of Ibn Fahm; rather they are all from the recension of al-Ḥārīrī b. Muḥammad b. Ḥabīb al-Usāma (d. 282/895), whom we shall encounter shortly. This recension was also the only one available to al-Dhahabī and Ibn Ḥajar, among others; “Ibn Sa’d”, El2, III, 922.
b. Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Fahm al-Baghdādi and he lived from 211/826 until 289/902. Al-Dhahabī describes him as a hāfiz, genealogist, and historian (akhbārī) and includes among his teachers Muḥammad b. Sallām al-Jumaḥī, Ibn Maʿin, Abū Khaythama and his primary teacher Ibn Saʿd. Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādi includes the observation that Ibn Fahm was thiqa but extremely reluctant to transmit hadith to anyone who did not spend a lengthy period of time with him. He also reports that al-Daraquṭnī declared Ibn Fahm’s transmissions to be worthless (laysa bi-shay%), and a report from Qādī Alīmad b. Kāmil quotes Ibn Fahm’s description of his education:

I was a pupil of Ibn Maʿin, from whom I learned isnād criticism (maʿrījāt al-rijāl), and Muṣʿab b. ‘Abdullāh [al-Zubayrī], from whom I learned genealogy, and Abū Khaythama, from whom I obtained Prophetic hadith (or his book al-Musnad), and al-Hasan b. Ḥammād Sajjāda, from whom I obtained fiqh.\[180\]

Qādī Alīmad b. Kāmil is one of the few pupils of Ibn Fahm identified by either al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādi or al-Dhahabī, and it seems possible that Ibn Fahm may very well have disappeared from the pages of history had it not been for his association with Ibn Saʿd’s magnum opus.

The life of the transmitter of the recension of al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr that has survived to this day, al-Ḥārith b. Muḥammad b. Abī Usāma (d. 282/895), is nearly as obscure as that of Ibn Fahm.\[181\] Al-Ḥārith is most famous for his unique musnad, that was arranged neither on the basis of saḥāba nor legal topics (abwāb), and must have been a challenge for even the most expert hadith scholars.\[182\] He lived nearly one hundred years, studied with Yazīd b. Ḥārūn, al-Wāqidī, and ‘Affān b. Muslim, and counted al-Ṭabarī among his pupils. Ibn Ḥibbān include him among the reliable transmitters (thiqāt), al-Daraquṭnī graded him as sincere (ṣadūq), and al-Dhahabī scolds Abū l-Fath al-Azdī for labeling him daʿif. Al-Ḥārith’s reputation suffered

---

\[180\] Tārīkh Baghdad, VIII, 93; Siyar, XIII, 428.
\[181\] The information in this biographical sketch comes from al-Khaṭīb, Tārīkh Baghdad, VIII, 218-9 and al-Dhahabī, Siyar, XIII, 388-90. The bulk of al-Khaṭīb’s entry concerns al-Ḥārith’s teachers, pupils and correct genealogy.
\[182\] This musnad was later transmitted from al-Ḥārith’s student Abū Bakr b. Khalīd (d. 359/970) to the famous hadith scholar Abū Nuʿaym al-Iṣbahānī, Siyar XVII, 462. Ibn Ḥajar includes a fragment (muntuqā) of this recension in al-Majāliṣ al- SHARES (II, 58-9).
from his practice of receiving money for hadîth, and al-Dhahâbî pardons him for this practice due to his financial destitution.\textsuperscript{183} Despite this exoneration, al-Dhahâbî does include several verses of a poem by Muḥammad b. Khalâd al-Marzûbân that lambast his willingness to accept a fee for his hadîth.\textsuperscript{184}

\textbf{V.4.2 Yahyâ b. Ma‘în and ‘Abbâs b. Muḥammad al-Dûrî}

The vast majority of the information of relevance to the life of Ibn Ma‘în (158/775–233/848) is limited to his pursuit of hadîth scholarship.\textsuperscript{185} Yahyâ b. Ma‘în b. ‘Awn b. Ziyâd b. Bistâm was a mawla whose family originated from either Sarâkh or al-Anbâr. His father is reported to have been a scribe for a governor of Tabaristan and Rayy named ‘Abdullâh b. Mâlik during the time of Hârûn al-Rashîd and was later promoted to the supervisor of the kharîj of Rayy. Ibn Ma‘în is said to have inherited a million and fifty thousand dirhams from his father, all of which he spent in pursuit of his hadîth studies.

Ahmad Muḥammad Nur Sayîf has identified eight journeys made by Ibn Ma‘în in his quest for hadîth in his study 

\textit{Yaḥyâ b. Ma‘în wa kitâbuhu l-Ṭārîkh}.\textsuperscript{186} The earliest of these trips was to Kufa and Basra to hear Wâli‘ b. al-Jarrâh and may have taken place when Ibn Ma‘în was about eighteen years old. He traveled to Basra in 187/803 and heard material from al-Mu‘tâmîr b. Sulâyman a year prior to the latter’s death, and to Yemen in 192/808 with Ibn Ḥanîbal to study with ‘Abd al-Razzâq al-Ṣa‘înî. Ibn Ma‘în is reported to have had a small altercation in Kufa with Abû Nu‘aym al-Fadî b. Dûkayn,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{183} Al-Dhahâbî reports that al-Hârîth had six daughters, none of whom he married to a suitor, because both he and the prospective suitors were poor, and he did not wish to increase the number of his dependents; \textit{li siyat bi‘atîn, osgharuhuma bint siyâna sanânä mâ zoumeqju wāhidatun munhanna bî annî jagîrun wa mâ jî‘a’tu illa jagîrun wa karântu an azâda fi jâ‘alî}, 
\textit{Siyar}, XIII, 589. Al-Khaṭîb does not explain why al-Hârîth took money for hadîth, but does mention that Ibrahim al-Hârîbî told a student who complained of this practice to still seek al-Hârîth’s hadîth since he was reliable; \textit{Tārîkh Baghdâd}, VIII, 219.
\item \textsuperscript{184} Although Ibn Sa‘îd is not listed among al-Hârîth’s teachers by al-Dhahâbî, he is mentioned in the fourth verse of this fragment of poetry along with Yazîd [b. Hârûn], al-Wâqîdî, Rawh [b. ‘Ubâda], and al-Qa‘înâbî; \textit{Siyar}, XIII, 350.
\item \textsuperscript{185} A thorough biography of Ibn Ma‘în and study of his \textit{Tārîkh} that has proven valuable for these paragraphs is Ahmad Muḥammad Nur Sayîf, \textit{Yaḥyâ b. Ma‘în wa khâbîh al-Tārîkh}, I (Mecca, 1979). Useful classical sources consulted for this brief sketch include \textit{Tārîkh Baghdâd}, XIV, 177–87 and \textit{Siyar}, XI, 71–96.
\item \textsuperscript{186} Nur Sayîf, I, 52–4.
\end{itemize}
who did not appreciate being tested by the young traveler, and went to Rayy prior to 200/815-6 to benefit from the erudition of Jarîr b. 'Abd al-Ḥamîd. Ibn Ma'în's itinerary also included a visit to Wâsît with his disciple 'Abbâs al-Dûrî in order to hear hadîth from the master scholar Yazîd b. Hârûn. Nur Sayf reports that Ibn Ma'în went to Harran and Massîsâ, and spent two years in Egypt (213-4/828-9) prior to his entry into Damascus and visits to Hîmsh (214/829). Ibn Ma'în's last journey was to Mecca for the pilgrimage, but he died while in Medina, and his body was carried upon the bier of the Prophet out of honor for his lifelong devotion to the purification of the literature concerned with the preservation of prophetic locutions and practices.

There have been few hadîth scholars who transmitted a smaller percentage of the hadîth that they accumulated than Ibn Ma'în. This discrepancy was due partly to the sheer volume of the material that he collected, which was said at his death to have filled thirty satchels (qîmtar) and twenty vessels (hubb). This practice was one of the primary means employed by Ibn Ma'în for hadîth criticism, as great numbers of variants of an individual hadîth text (matn) enabled him to detect peculiarities of individual transmitters. Another anecdote that sheds light on Ibn Ma'în's critical technique and enormous volume of compilation is the report that he copied the unreliable sahîfa of 'Abd al-Razzâq → Ma'mar → Abân b. Abî 'Ayyâsh → Anas b. Mâlik in order to verify that unscrupulous scholars did not change the problematic "Abân" in the isnâd to the reliable "Thâbit." There is another report that he heard the hadîth of Ḥammâd b. Salama from eighteen different scholars, and that he preferred the transmission of al-Tabûdhakî to that of the venerable 'Affân b. Muslim. It seems safe to assume that a large part of Ibn Ma'în's prestige as a master hadîth-transmitter critic stemmed from his unparalleled library, as well as his high standards of integrity and probity.

187 Nur Sayf, I, 59; Siyar, XI, 81. Al-Khaṭîb includes a report from Ibn 'Adî that Ibn Ma'în wrote 600,000 hadîth; Tārîkh Baghchâd, XIV, 182.

186 Nur Sayf, I, 57. This anecdote is to be treated with caution, since there is but a minute number of reports on the authority of Abân b. Abî 'Ayyâsh from Ma'mar in the Musaunaf of 'Abd al-Razzâq; Motzkî, The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence, 279-80.

185 Nur Sayf, I, 55. This indicates that Ibn Ma'în had higher standards of criticism than Ibn Sa'd, since the latter made liberal use of 'Affân's transmission of Ḥammâd's materials throughout al-'Tabaqât al-kabîr.
Ibn Ma'in left for his pupils the onerous task of compiling his critical opinions into books. At least six men rose to this challenge, and the books of five of them have both survived to this day and been published. The largest amount of material was preserved by his longterm companion 'Abbās al-Dūrī (d. 271/884–5) who arranged most of the 5414 reports he collated by city and included correspondence between al-Layth b. Sa'd and Mālik b. Anas.\footnote{This book was edited by 'AbdAllāh Ahmad Hasan and published as Tārikh (Beirut: Dār al-Qalam, 1990). A thorough examination of the work's contents indicates both its extremely disorganized nature and its obsession with particularly obscure transmitters. This finding is illustrated vividly by the fact that little over 220 of the (1100) transmitters criticized by Ibn Sa'id are evaluated in this recension, and several hundred men of the former are not evaluated by Ibn Sa'id.} The edition of Ibn Muhiriz (death date unknown) is approximately a third of the size of al-Dūrī's book, and similarly lacks any discernable organization.\footnote{Kūtub ma'rifat-al-rijāl 'an Yāḥyā b. Ma'in, ed. Muhammad Kāmil al-Qāṣīr (Damascus, 1985). Ibn Muhiriz's full name is Abū l-'Abbas Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. al-Qasim and he spent at least eight years with Ibn Ma'in in Baghdad.} Ibn al-Junayd's (d. about 260/874) book consists of 936 reports, many of which overlap with the material present in the previous two texts, and it too lacks any discernable organizational structure.\footnote{Su'ūlīt Ibn al-Junayd li-Yāḥyā b. Ma'in, ed. al-Sayyid Abū l-Mu'ājjal al-Nawwari and Muhammad Muhammad Khalīf (Beirut, 1990). Ibn al-Junayd's full name is Abū Isḥāq ibn Ḥārīm b. 'AbdAllāh b. al-Junayd al-Khitābī.} Abū Sa'id al-Dārimī's (d. 280/893) Tārikh, which was used in the fourth chapter of this book, is slightly larger than Ibn al-Junayd's book, but is loosely arranged alphabetically after the introductory exposition upon the best students of eleven high profile tābi'īn. The book of Ishāq b. Manṣūr al-Kawsaj (d. 251/865) has not survived, but it is cited by Ibn Abī Ḥātim over a thousand times in his Kitāb al-jarh wa l-ta'dīl.\footnote{Nūr Sayf, I, 138. Ibn Abī Ḥātim also make use regularly of Ibn Abī Khaythama's (d. 279/892) transmission of Ibn Ma'in's opinions that does not appear to have survived as an independent work.} Finally, the short book of the rather undistinguished Ibn Ṭāhān (d. 284/897) of Baghdad contains a mere 407 reports.\footnote{His full name is Yazid b. al-Haytham b. Ṭāhān Abū Khālid al-Bāḍī; the edition was edited by Ahmad Muḥammad Nūr Sayf under the title Min kalām Abī Zekārayn Yāḥyā b. Ma’in fi l-rijāl (Beirut: Dār al-Ma‘mūn lil-Turāth, 1979).}

Abū l-Fadl 'Abbās b. Muḥammad al-Dūrī, the primary transmitter of Ibn Ma'in's opinions whose Tārikh I examine in the seventh chapter of this book, was a prominent hadīth scholar during the middle third/ninth century in Baghdad. Al-Dhahabi mentions that his teach-
ers included Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī, Yahyā b. Abī Bukayr, ‘Aflān b. Muslim and that his questions to Ibn Maʿīn concerning isnād criticism filled a large tome (mujallad kābīr).195 Al-Durri’s hadīth are found in the Sunan books of Abū Dāwūd, al-Tirmidhī, al-Nasā’ī, and Ibn Māja, and other prominent pupils of his include ‘Abdullāh b. ‘Abdallāh b. ʿAbdallāh b. ‘Abdul-Qasim al-Baghawī.196 The inclusion of al-Durri’s hadīth in four of the six canonical books becomes all the more remarkable, considering the reports suppressed by al-Dhahabi but found in Tīrīkh Baghdad that al-Durri enjoyed his date-wine (nabīd) until, supposedly, he was convinced one afternoon by a youth that it was unlawful.197 Precious little information about al-Durri has survived in addition to this pious anecdote, although it is clear that he was a public hadīth scholar and teacher, like al-Ḥarīth b. Abī Usāmah, and in contrast to the reclusive, historian Ibn Fahm.

V.4.3 ʿAbdallāh b. Ḥanbal and his son ʿAbdullāh

The life of ʿAbdallāh b. Ḥanbal dominates 181 pages of the twelfth tabaqā of al-Dhahabi’s Siyar aṭ-Ṭāhir al-nubalāʾ and has received several recent studies.198 Most of the discussion in the Western literature concerns the events surrounding the mīzna, whereas modern Arabic works tend to devote much space to his legal opinions.199 The primary focus of this biographical sketch is Ibn Ḥanbal’s elevated role in hadīth compilation and criticism both because of the nature of this study and because Cooperson’s judicious study of the various classical accounts of the mīzna has exhausted this controversial dimension of his life.200

195  Siyar, XII, 522–3.
196  Ibid.
197  The argument used by the youth was in the form of a dialogue: “What is your opinion concerning nabīd?” he asked. Al-Durri replied “It is lawful (ḥalal).” The student said “Is it better to have a little nabīd or a lot?” “A little,” he replied. The youth said “Oh shaykh, if something that is lawful is better in a small amount than in a large amount, it must be unlawful” Tīrīkh Baghdad, XII, 145. This argument is not very sound of course; divorce is lawful, and yet it is clearly favorable for one to practice it as little as possible. In fact, this argument would seem to indicate that date-wine is mukrib rather than ḥaram.
198  See, for example, Cooperson, Classical Arabic Biography, 107–53 and Nimrod Hurvitz, The Formation of Hanbalism, 23–70.
200  Cooperson seeks to answer the thorny question as to whether Ibn Ḥanbal’s
Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. Ḥanbal was born in either Khurasan or Baghdad in 164/770-1. His grandfather was a governor of Sarakhs and his father passed away while he was quite young. 201 His studies of ḥadīth began in 179/795, the year that Mālik b. Anas and ʿUammad b. Zayd died and Ibn al-Mubarak left Baghdad; his first teacher may have been the famous Qāḍī Abū Yūsuf. 202 Ibn Ḥanbal was a disciple of Ḥushaym b. Bashīr from 180/796 until the latter's death three years later and wrote over a thousand ḥadīth from this venerable shaykh. 203 He traveled to Kufa in 183/799 and acquired a copious amount of material from Wākī b. al-Jarrāḥ and Abū Nuʿaym al-Fadl b. Dukayn. 204 Ibn Ḥanbal made at least three journeys to the ḥadīth capital Basra in 186/802, 190/806, and 194/810; the first of these was to hear from al-Muʿtamir b. Sulaymān on the eve of his death, and the last one was with the master critic Yahyā b. Saʿīd al-Qāṭṭān. 205 Ibn Ḥanbal's first trip to the Hijāz in 187/802 brought him into contact with Sufyān b. ʿUyayn and al-Shāfiʿi, although he did not arrive there prior to the death of the ascetic al-Fuṣayl b. Ḥiyyā. 206 His second trip to Arabia, from 197–99/812–15, release was due to his capitulation to the doctrine of the created Qurʾān or due to the Caliph's fear of killing the pious old scholar. Western scholars such as van Ess and Hinds have favored the capitulation hypothesis on the basis of the anti-Ḥanbalī reports of al-Jāḥiẓ, al-Yaʿqūbī, and Ibn al-Murtadā, but Cooperson demonstrates that the "family" accounts of Ṣāliḥ and Ḥanbal b. ʿIṣāq that Ibn Ḥanbal did not break under pressure are equally, if not more, plausible than those of the first three men listed; see Cooperson, Classical Arabic Biography, 126.

Cooperson, 109; Sīyar, 184. Note that his father left him a sweatshop (diir al-tirīj) and property that provided Ibn Ḥanbal and his family with a source of income; Sīyar, XI, 319–20.

Sīyar, XI, 306; Duqr, 30. Al-Dhahabi’s report is on the authority of ʿAbbās al-Dūr; ʿAbdullāḥ b. Ahmad mentions that his father copied and memorized the books of Abū Yūsuf and Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Shaybānī; Sīyar, XI, 306.

Patton, 12 (3,000 ḥadīth obtained from him); Duqr, 30.

Duqr reports that Ibn Ḥanbal traveled to Rayy in 182 to hear from ʿAlī b. Muḥājir al-Kābi, although this seems to contradict the report that he was with Ḥushaym until the latter's death in 183. Duqr also reports that Ibn Ḥajar considered ʿAlī b. Muḥājir the weakest of Ibn Ḥanbal's teachers. Al-Dhahabi quotes al-Marrūdhi’s report that he heard Ibn Ḥanbal state that there was nobody from whom he had written more ḥadīth than Wākī; Sīyar, XI, 307. Al-Dhahabi also reports that Ibn Ḥanbal studied with Abū Nuʿaym in 185; Sīyar, XI, 308. Whether he spent the years 183–5 in Kufa or made two trips is not clear.

Duqr, 32. Ibn Ḥanbal also traveled to Wāṣīt on this last Basran trip to hear ḥadīth from Yazīd b. Ḥarūn. Al-Dhahabi mentions that Ibn Ḥanbal heard 12,000 reports from ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Mahdī and copied the highly valued books of Ghundar that contained the ḥadīth of Shuʿba; Sīyar, XI, 308.

Sīyar, XI, 183. Duqr makes an error on page 33 in stating that Ibn Ḥanbal
was with his companions Ibn Ma'ān and Ibn Rāhawayh and led him all the way to Yemen in order to study with 'Abd al-Razzāq prior to the weakening of the latter's memory in 200/815-6.207 There appears to have been a lull in Ibn Ḥanbal's travels after what must have been an arduous trip back from Śan‘ā‘ to Baghdad at which time he married 'Abbāsa bint al-Fadl, who bore him Ṣāliḥ in 203/818-9 and then, after her early death, Rayḥāna, who bore him 'Abdullāh in 213/828.209 His last journey may have been to Syria and is dated in a report by al-Marrūdhi to six years after the birth of Ṣāliḥ.209

The period from the return of Ibn Ḥanbal and Ibn Ma'ān from Yemen to Baghdad around the year 200/815 until the former's oath to abandon public teaching in 237/851 was one of intensive hadith compilation and criticism. I have mentioned already the sessions of Ibn Rāhawayh and Qutayba b. Sa‘īd earlier in this chapter and the names of the scholars subjected to the miḥna demonstrates the significance of Baghdad in this process. Both Abū Zur‘a and Abū Ḥātim traveled from Rayy to study with Ibn Ḥanbal during this time, and the latter of these two scholars reports that he acquired Ibn Ḥanbal's books on unlawful drinks (Kitāb al-ashriba) and faith (mān) during his first visit in 223/838.210 Ibn Ḥanbal, like his companion Ibn Ma'ān, was adamant about acquiring all of his hadith in
writing and in not relying solely upon the faculty of memory unless he was teaching fewer than a hundred ḥadīth.\footnote{Siyar, XI, 213.} Despite this devotion to written materials, Ibn Ḥanbal left the task of the compilation of his massive Musnad to his son ‘Abdullāh, and appears to have left a few short books of his own.\footnote{Al-Dhahābī argues that both al-Risāla fi l-salāt and al-Radd ‘alā l-zanādqa are forged and were not the works of Ibn Ḥanbal; Siyar, XI, 287. Furthermore, he argues that the “100,000 ḥadīth uṣūr” attributed to him never existed, as there are virtually no records of it and it would be impossible for something so large to disappear without a trace in Baghdad: Siyar, XI, 328 and XIII, 522. He does seem to agree that the following books were products of Ibn Ḥanbal with a little editorial assistance from his son ‘Abdullāh and his son’s pupil Abū Bakr al-Qaṭṭā’i: al-Nu‘aym wa l-manṣūkh, al-Tārīkh, Ḥadīth Shu‘ba, al-Muqaddim wa l-mu’akhlafūn fi l-Qur‘ān, Jāmi‘ al-Qur‘ān, al-Manāṣik, Naṣīṣ al-tashhīth, al-Imāmā, al-Zuḥūr, and Faḍlā‘il al-jahāmā. Siyar, XI, 327 and 330. See also GAS, 592-9.} As for Ibn Ḥanbal’s legal opinions, the task of organizing this material from a long list of students fell to Abū Bakr al-Khaliṣ (d. 311/923), the founder of the Ḥanbalī school of jurisprudence, and compiler of the now lost al-Jāmī‘ li-ʿulūm Ahmad b. Ḥanbal.\footnote{Melchert, The Formation of the Sunni Schools of Law, 143-55; GAS, I, 512. Al-Dhahābī records a list of al-Khaliṣ’s teachers near the end of Ibn Ḥanbal’s entry; Siyar, XI, 330-1; see also al-Khaliṣ’s entry in the Siyar, XIV, 298.}

The Musnad of Ibn Ḥanbal remains one of the most challenging texts in the genre of ḥadīth literature due to its volume and the absence of any thematic organization. Al-Dhahābī traces the transmission of this book from ‘Abdullāh b. Ahmad to Abū Bakr b. Mālik al-Qaṭṭā’i to the preacher (al-wāʾī al-waḥīf) Abū ‘Ali b. al-Muḥāchib to Abū l-Qāsim Hibat Allāh b. Muhammad to numerous illustrious scholars, such as Ibn al-Jawzdī and Ibn ‘Asākir, and observes that none of the three transmitters after ‘Abdullāh was a particularly gifted ḥadīth scholar.\footnote{Siyar, XIII, 524. He also remarks that Abū Nu‘aym al-Iṣbahānī obtained much of the Musnad from Abū ‘Ali b. al-Sawwāf (as well as al-Qaṭṭā’ī) and that al-Jākām al-Naysābūrī also received it from al-Qaṭṭā’ī.} He also offers encouraging words for a scholar to rearrange the contents of the book so as to facilitate its usage, to correct orthographic errors, and clarify the quality of many transmitters, and states “had I not been incapable of this due to the weakness of my vision, were my intention not hollow, nor my journey (death?) close, I would have done this.”\footnote{wa lān ta‘amm qad ajzatt ‘an dhālikā fī-baffi l-bāsān, wa ‘adāmā b-niyyātī, wa qarbi l-nāhili, l-rā‘imal fī dhālikā; Siyar, XIII, 325.} This task was partially completed by Ahmad al-Banna, who arranged the contents of
the *Musnad* according to legal topics in order to facilitate its use,\(^{216}\) although the first thorough, critical edition complete with *hadith*-transmitter criticism for the thousands of men in the *iṣnāds* was not completed by Ahmad Muḥammad Shākir prior to his death. This project has just been completed under the editorial guidance of Shu‘ayb al-‘Arna‘ūṭ and ‘Ādīl Murshad in fifty volumes and this beautiful new edition of the *Musnad* should greatly facilitate research of this most challenging monument of Sunnī *hadith* literature.\(^{217}\)

One last significant question that must be addressed is whether Ibn Ḥanbal was considered a jurist in the eyes of his peers and pupils. Susan Spectorlsky and Wael Hallaq have argued that Ibn Ḥanbal’s legal acumen was a later invention, largely on the basis of the fact that scholars such Ibn Qutayba, al-Tabarī, and Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr did not identify him as a jurist.\(^{218}\) Spectorsky and Hallaq seem to have overlooked some critical evidence that contradicts this thesis, for al-Tirmidhī includes many of Ibn Ḥanbal’s legal opinions in his canonical *hadith* book,\(^{219}\) Abū Dawūd al-Sijistānī’s collection of legal inquiries has been published by Rashīd Riḍā at the beginning of this past century (part of which is even translated by Spectorsky), and the esteemed jurist Muḥammad b. Naṣr al-Marwazi (d. 294/907) regularly includes Ibn Ḥanbal’s opinions in his *Ikhtilāf*

---


\(^{217}\) Another text that facilitates research with the cumbersome *Musnad* is the recently published *Aṭrāf Musnad al-Imām Ahmad bīn Ḥanbal al-muṣannāt ṣaḥīḥ al-musnad al-murātib bi-ṣaḥīḥ al-musnad al-Ḥanabal*, ed. Zuhayr b. Naṣīr (Beirut and Damascus, 1993) by Ibn Ḥajar. This book collates all of the *hadith* of identical *matn* that share an identical *iḥāb* and *ūfī* in the *iṣnād* in one place, and thus reduces the number of *ḥadīth* from about 30,000 to 12,787.

\(^{218}\) Susan Spectorsky, *Chapters on Marriage and Divorce: Responses of Ibn Ḥanbal and Ibn Rāhawayh*, 2 and Wael Hallaq, *Authority, Continuity, and Change in Islamic Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 40. These are curious sources to cite as evidence that Ibn Ḥanbal was not a jurist, since both Ibn Qutayba and al-Tabarī had sour relations with the adherents of the teachings of Ibn Ḥanbal, and Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr actually cites Ibn Ḥanbal’s legal opinions regularly in his massive work *al-Ṭadhkār*. Note also that al-Dhahabī includes a report that neither al-Tabarī nor Ibn Surayj considered Ibn Qutayba’s *Ṣaḥiḥ* to be of any value (*laya bi-ṣayy*) and that one should only rely upon him for his impressive linguistic erudition; *Siyar*, XIII, 301.

\(^{219}\) For example, al-Tirmidhī regularly quotes Ibn Ḥanbal’s opinions alongside those of Ibn Rāhawayh, Malik, al-Shāfī‘ī, and Sufyān al-Thawrī in his *Jāmi‘*. Al-Tirmidhī’s source for Ibn Ḥanbal’s and Ibn Rāhawayh’s legal opinions is none other than Ishāq b. Manṣūr al-Kawsaj, the same source used by Spectorsky in chapter 4 of *Chapters on Marriage and Divorce*; see al-Tirmidhī, *al-Jāmi‘ al-saḥīḥ*, V, 737.
al-'ulamā’ alongside those of Sufyān al-Thawrī, al-Shāfi‘i, Ibn Rāhawayh, and others. While al-Jassās’s abridgement of al-Taḥwīl’s Ikhtilāf al-fuqahā’ does not appear to include any opinions of Ibn Ḥanbal (something that is not surprising given the lack of respect shown to Abū Ḥanīfa by Ibn Ḥanbal and most hadith scholars of this age), Ibn al-Mundhir’s (d. 318/930) al-Iṣṭnāf ‘alā madhāhib ahl al-‘ilm does include the opinions of Ibn Ḥanbal, along with a host of other authorities. It does appear untenable, at least on the basis of this brief survey of early ikhtilāf al-fuqahā’ books, to argue that Ibn Ḥanbal was not a respected jurist in the third/ninth century, although it is probably true that his fame rested more heavily upon his hadith erudition than that of his legal opinions.

A few words should be said about ‘ Abdullāh b. ʿAbdmad b. Ḥanbal, a man whose life was greatly overshadowed by his illustrious father. I have already remarked that ‘ Abdullāh was born in 213/828 and that he transmitted the entire Musnad from his father, as well as the Kitāb al-zuhd. The Kitāb al-‘ītal of his father’s critical opinions is clearly a work of his own from the fact that nearly every report begins with the expression “I asked my father.” Both al-Khaṭib al-Baghdādī and al-Dhahabī include substantial lists of teachers with whom ‘ Abdullāh studied in addition to his father, among whom we find Ibn Ma’in, Abū Khaythama, Ibn Abī Shayba, and Sufyān b. Waki‘ b. al-Jarrāh (d. 247/861). His pupils include al-Nasa’ī, Abū l-Qāsim...
al-Baghawi, Ibn Sa'id, and al-Tabarani, as well as the important transmitters of the Musnad Abū ‘Ali al-Ṣawwāf and Abū Bakr al-Qaṭīfī, and the indefatigable compiler of Ibn Hanbal’s religious opinions Abū Bakr al-Khallāl. Little else has been preserved about ‘Abdullāh’s life beyond his dedication to the transmission of his father’s erudition, and it seems safe to speculate that he lived quietly in the company of hadīth scholars and free from the abuses his father received during the miḥna.227

V.5 Conclusion

The goal of this chapter was to shed light upon the religious and cultural setting of the three prominent hadīth scholars whose works I shall be analyzing in the second part of this book. The primary source was the rich Siyar al-tām al-nubalā’ of al-Dhahabī and I classified most of the 345 men found in the eleventh and twelfth tabaqāt into five groups: 1) rulers, poets, and litterateurs; 2) theologians; 3) ascetics; 4) judges, jurists, and muftis; 5) hadīth scholars. Despite the presence of extraordinary figures in all five of these groups, only the fourth and fifth ones included a significant number of hadīth scholars. I determined the most significant hadīth scholars of the lot on the basis of al-Dhahabī’s critical remarks and their own efforts at compilation. The portrait of the state of the field of hadīth scholarship in the first half of the third/ninth century that flourished without serious interruption from the largely ineffective miḥna, is of one that was anchored in Baghdad, Basra, and Kufa and strongly supported by the Eastern lands of Iran and Central Asia. Finally, it is clear from this chapter and the preceding one that Ibn Sa’d, Ibn Ma’in, and Ibn Hanbal all played a significant role in the global process of hadīth scholarship, especially with regard to hadīth-transmitter criticism and textual compilation.

227 There is a report found only in Ibn Abī Ya’lā’s Tabaqāt al-Hanābila that ‘Abdullāh accepted a judgeship at the end of his life in Khurasan; see The Formation of the Sunni Schools of Law, 140. It is curious that this post is mentioned neither by al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādi nor by al-Dhahabī.
PART TWO

THE THREE PRINCIPLES OF HADĪTH-SCHOLAR
SUNNĪ ISLAM: SAHĀBA, HADĪTH-TRANSMITTER
CRITICISM, AND HISTORY
I proposed in the introduction to this book that the three salient pillars upon which the Sunnī Islam of the ḥadīth scholars stands are the assertion of the collective probity of the saḥāba, the broad consensus among the master ḥadīth-transmitter critics regarding the reliability of several hundred ḥadīth-transmitters, and the implicit historical vision of the five-generation network of these men. This chapter analyzes both the theoretical and practical aspects of the first of these three pillars, namely the saḥāba. It articulates clearly the historical challenge faced by Muslims due to the deep involvement of the first generation of Muslims on opposing sides in the civil strife that fragmented the nascent Muslim community from 11-40/632-61, and analyzes interpretations of these events advanced by the Imāmī Shi'a, Zaydiyya/Baghdādi Mu'tazila, and the Sunnīs over the course of the third/ninth century. The findings of this chapter suggests that the fundamental divisions between the Shi'a and Sunnīs arose out of irreconcilable historiographies rather than theologies, and that the position advocated by the Sunnīs was due primarily to the catalytic role of the saḥāba in ḥadīth transmission rather than the widely circulated reports extolling their individual merits (faḍā'il).

While western scholarship has not ignored the significance of the saḥāba in the development of Islam, it has done relatively little to elucidate the historical and didactic roles of individual actors. The recent entry for the saḥāba in the Encyclopaedia of Islam is symptomatic of this problem, as it opens with the statement that “Saḥāba... are the Companions of the Prophet Muḥammad, who in many respects are key figures in the early history of Islam,” concludes a mere page and a half later with a brief (and outdated) description of Ibn Sa‘d’s classification of them, and mentions very few secondary works in the bibliography.¹ The saḥāba are mentioned only in connection with the

¹ M. Muranyi, “Ṣaḥāba,” EI2, VIII, 827–9. This volume was published in 1994.
Rāfsda (Imāmi Shiʿa: in Montgomery Watt’s *Formative Period of Islamic Thought* and are absent from his discussion of “The Triumph of Sunnism.”

Noth and Conrad mention that the theory of the superiority of the Companions of the Prophet . . . appears in the *sahih* traditions, in traditions on the *fitna*, in traditions on cities, in reports on administration, law, and the caliphate, and indeed in practically all areas covered by the early transmitters but, surprisingly, they do not consider the *sahāba* to be either a major or minor theme in early Islamic historiography. Juynboll discusses the question of the collective probity of the *sahāba* in both *The Authenticity of the Tradition Literature* and *Muslim Tradition* and asserts in the latter work that

the Companions, as a class of people, were collectively placed on a level higher than that of any other, later generations and whoever casts, or tries to cast, the slightest blemish on the reputation of a single Companion runs the risk of being ostracized.

Juynboll credits the doctrine of the collective probity of the *sahāba* to Abū Hātim al-Rāzī and thus dates it to the final decades of the third/ninth century and the first decades of the following one. The

---


Noth and Conrad, *The Early Arabic Historical Tradition: A source critical study*, translated by Michael Bonner (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1994), 22. Of some interest for this study is the inclusion of the *fitna* (the killing of ‘Uthmān, Battle of the Camel, and Battle of Siffin) among the seven primary themes: this means, according to the theories of Noth and Conrad, that these events probably have some historical veracity (pp. 33–5). However, they classify the role of the *sahāba* in the newly founded cities to be a secondary theme (pp. 54–5), which, according to their definition, means that “this new information is either literary embellishment or pure fiction” p. 27. The *sahāba* do not receive the status of “theme” in Donner’s *Narratives of Islamic Origins* (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1998) either, although *fitna* is classified under the “themes of leadership” in a more extensive manner than the three battles mentioned above by Noth and Conrad (p. 189). Donner’s *The Early Islamic Conquests* (Princeton, 1981) takes the military roles of the *sahāba* seriously, although given the subject matter of the book, one would not expect to find information about their roles off of the battlefield.


Both Juynboll and Dickinson credit the *Taqdima* of Ibn Abi Hātim with being the earliest source in which this concept is found: Juynboll, *The Authenticity of the Tradition Literature: Discussions in Modern Egypt* (Leiden: Brill, 1969), 79 and Dickinson, *The Development of Early Sunnite Hadith Criticism*, 82. Neither one of them mentions al-Wāqidi’s definition of a *sahābi* preserved in Ibn Sa’d’s *al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr* that we shall discuss below and that predates Abū Hātim’s opinion by a century.
bulk of his efforts, however, concern the probity of Abū Hurayra and arose from his investigation into the modern Egyptian controversy concerning this uniquely prolific sahābi that followed the publications of Abū Rayya in the first half of the past century. Muhammad Siddiqi observes that “the trustworthiness of the great mass of hadith” depends upon the “reliability and honesty” of the sahāba and he includes a useful summary of Ibn al-Jawzi’s list of 123 men and women who transmitted twenty or more hadith. Daniel Brown eloquently describes the sahāba as “an indispensable link in the epistemological chain between the Prophet and the rest of humanity” and observes that their collective probity is one of the three topics that “dominate the Muslim discussion of hadith authenticity” from the time of Sayyid Āḥmad Khān (1817–98) until the present. Finally, Shi‘i attitudes towards the sahāba have been clarified by two articles from Etan Kohlberg as well as the first several chapters of Jafri’s Origins and Early Development of Shi‘a Islam, although the latter’s interpretation of the event of the Saqīfa as “inextricably connected with the emergence of the Shi‘i viewpoint” seems somewhat tendentious at best.

* The Authenticity of the Tradition Literature, 62–99. It will become apparent that Juynboll’s suggestion that “once the unreliability of one Companion . . . had been established, the entire tradition criticism and, consequently, the tradition literature is put on an unfirm basis” (p. 56) is a little hyperbolic given the relatively small number of sahāba who played a meaningful role in hadith transmission; the material of dozens of “controversial” sahāba could be jettisoned without having a noticeable impact on the literature overall. Note that al-Tabarānī’s 30,000 hadith al-Majam al-kabīr mentioned in the third chapter does not have any hadith from Abū Hurayra, the most prolific by far of all sahāba; clearly there is sufficient material for the elucidation of Islamic practice even if a few major sahāba were ignored.

* Siddiqi, Hadith Literature, 14–18. Ibn al-Jawzi’s list is found in his Taqīṣ, a one-volume book filled with lists of names of all sorts of historically interesting people and devoid of any substantive biographical information.

* Daniel Brown, Rethinking Tradition in Modern Islamic Thought, 85. The other two major topics of discussion are the manner of hadith transmission and the “efficacy of ijmāʿ criticism.”


* S. Husain M. Jafri, Origins and Early Development of Shi‘a Islam (London, 1979), 27. Jafri is particularly critical of Ibn Sa‘d’s treatment of the Saqīfa in his entry on Abū Bakr and argues that “the entire section is carefully planned to show that Abū Bakr . . . was beyond doubt the only deserving candidate to succeed the dying Prophet” (p. 54). Nowhere does Jafri mention that Abū Bakr is the forty-sixth entry among the Muhājirūn at Badr while ‘Aṭī, due to his genealogical proximity to the Prophet is the third (after the Prophet himself and his uncle Ḥamza). In reality, Abū
The tranquil state of benign neglect of the sahāba in Western scholarship was shattered by the arrival of Wilferd Madelung's *The Succession to Muhammad* in 1997. Madelung's careful reading of al-Ṭabarī's history, the *Ansāb al-āshraf* of al-Baladhūrī (d. 279/892), and *Sharḥ nahj al-balāgha* of Ibn Abī l-Ḥadīd (d. 656/1258), among other works, resulted in one of the first narratives of the history of the first five caliphs in recent memory to include copious prosopographical material regarding the lives of over a hundred early Muslims. Madelung's purported 'pro-'Ālī' interpretation of the events of the first half-century of Islam, however, has been severely criticized by reviewers such as Patricia Crone and Yassin Dutton. Unfortunately, these two reviewers were so distracted by Madelung's colorful (and at times offensive) remarks concerning individual Muslims that they missed the major accomplishments of *The Succession to Muhammad*, some of which include:

1) An exploration of the concept *ahl al-bayt* (literally, "people of the house") found in the Qurʾān with regard to the families of earlier prophets, and the importance of blood kinship, two concepts that could have made 'Ālī a strong candidate for succession to the Prophet instead of the "obvious" candidate Abū Bakr;

2) An emphasis on the violent election of Abū Bakr and the first suppression of the Ansār at the Saqīfah;

3) An emphasis on the radical break from Qurʾānic practice in Abū Bakr's denial of inheritance to Fāṭima, 'Ālī, and al-'Abbās,

Bakr's entry is little different than that of any of the prominent early sahāba in *Tabaqāt al-kabīr*.

---


12 Patricia Crone, "In defence of 'Ali," *Times Literary Supplement*, 7 Feb 1997, p. 28; Yassin Dutton, *Journal of Islamic Studies*, 9 (1998) 66-9. Crone declares flatly that Madelung's opinion is "Shi'ite" while Dutton calls it "pro-'Alī"). It should be noted that Crone's *God's Caliph* (co-authored with Martin Hinds) is extremely pro-Umayyad and that she states "'Ali was a pretender, on a par with the protagonists of the first civil war" (p. 32) despite the overwhelming evidence that only 'Ālī received the oath of allegiance (*bay'a*) after the death of 'Uthmān. This episode is treated in detail below.

13 *Succession*, 6-27. Dutton challenges Madelung's argument concerning the nature of the inheritance of the Prophet (p. 69) but his suggestion that the 'People of Badr' were purified just like the family of the Prophet in the Qurʾān is hardly convincing given that only the Prophet's family were forbidden from receiving alms and received instead a special portion of the war booty; see *Succession*, 13-4.

14 *Succession*, 28-43.
as well as his willingness to slaughter various Muslim tribes on the basis of his interpretation of their refusal to pay the zakāt tax as "apostasy."\(^{15}\)
4) The discovery that 'Uthmān's nepotism originated from the beginning of his reign and that all governorships were in the hands of his kin within the first five years of his caliphate;\(^{16}\)
5) The suggestion that 'Abbās's caliphate should be described more accurately as a "counter-caliphate" due to the lack of legitimacy it suffered in the absence of a shūrā of eminent sahāba and the support of the majority of the Quraysh.\(^{17}\)

Of particular interest for this project is Madelung's extraordinary attention to the sides chosen by dozens of sahāba in the civil strife that erupted immediately after the death of the Prophet Muhammad and periodically flared until the reign of 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān.\(^{18}\)

The richness of Madelung's narrative does make it difficult to keep track of all of these men and women, and so a summary presentation of this material, as well as some additional information gleaned from Ibn Sa'd's al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr, Ibn al-Jawzī's al-Muntagam, and al-Dhahabi's Tārikh al-Islām, is the first task of this chapter. Whether Madelung's prosopographically dazzling history of the early caliphate ever recovers from the epithets hurled at it by unappreciative reviewers is of little importance, since it demonstrates what can be done with the classical Muslim sources, rather than what necessarily should be done with them by the theoretically non-partisan modern historian.

---

\(^{15}\) Succession, 47–53.
\(^{16}\) Succession, 86–7.
\(^{17}\) Succession, 141.
\(^{18}\) This feature is by far the most significant difference between Madelung's book and Crone and Hinds' God's Caliph, both of which claim to be studies of the early caliphate. How Crone and Hinds claim to elucidate the "true" original nature of the caliphate without even mentioning the roles of 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, the civil war, 'Abbās, the sahāba, Banū Hashim, the Ansār, or even the official court hadith-scholar al-Zuhri is puzzling. The student must choose between Madelung's interpretation of the early caliphs as individual actors and Crone and Hinds' thesis that the caliphs were universally respected political-religious officials, each of whom functioned more-or-less like his predecessor.
VI.2 The problem: The intra-ṣaḥāba conflicts of 11-40/632-661

There are seven discrete episodes within the first thirty years of the post-prophetic Islamic community that involve either violence or serious dissension among the men and women who embraced Islam during the lifetime of Մուհամմադ. Despite the fact that both classical Muslim historians and heresiographers have been forthright in their inclusion of these painful episodes in their books, only Madelung has investigated these conflicts thoroughly in *The Succession to Muhammad*. This section is heavily indebted to Madelung’s thorough reading of the sources and seeks both to present and supplement the information found in his book in a clear, unpolemical light in order to articulate the gravity of the early internecine strife that both Sunnis and Western historians in general continue to sweep under the carpet in their narratives of Islamic origins.

The first conflict arose the day of the Prophet’s death between the leaders of the Ansār and three Muhājirūn over the nature of the political leadership of the Muslim community. Abū Bakr’s argument that the supreme leadership should be restricted to the Quraysh triumphed over the Ansārī al-Ḥubāb b. al-Mundhir’s vision of “a commander (ṣāḥib) from among us and a commander from among you,” and the combination of ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb’s oath of allegiance (bay’a) and the beating of the Khazrajī leader Sa’īd b. ‘Ubada resolved the dispute. Despite the general bay’a that took place in the main mosque shortly after this event, several ṣaḥāba from Banū Hāshim and ‘Abd al-Shams refused to give Abū Bakr the bay’a for six months. A significant reason for this delay may have been Abū
Bakr's confiscation of the Prophet's significant revenue-producing lands and the subsequent denial of the right of inheritance to his relatives on the basis of a purported prophetic saying that prophets "do not bequeath [to heirs]."22 ‘Ali, al-‘Abbās, Abū l-‘Āṣ b. Abī Rabī‘a, Abān b. Sa‘īd, and Khalīd b. Sa‘īd are all reported to have delayed giving Abū Bakr the bay‘a until after the death of Fāṭima,23 who was buried secretly without the knowledge of the caliph. The Ansārī Sa‘d b. ‘Ubayd, who was one of the prestigious twelve nuqabī that facilitated the emigration of the Prophet to Yathrib in his time of need, never gave the bay‘a to Abū Bakr after the violence he experienced at the Saqīfah incident and may have been the only saḥābī to withhold his allegiance to ‘Umar.24

The second major conflict among the saḥābī was the ridda wars whose execution was justified again on the basis of a prophetic hadīth over the objections of ‘Umar.25 These battles pitted Abū Bakr and his Muslim armies against tribes that ranged from advocates of the self-proclaimed prophet Musaylima to Muslims who did not wish to pay the alms tax to the caliph in Medina. Ibn Sa‘d identifies six men of the fourth tabaqa of saḥābī, namely those who embraced Islam after the conquest of Mecca, who participated in the ridda wars against Abū Bakr’s fiscal policy. Only one of these men, Malik b. Nuwayrā, is reported to have been killed, despite his claim that he was not an apostate.26 All of the remaining five men were captured.

22 Succession, 50. Madelung suggests that Fāṭima must have been shocked to have her father’s purported own words used against her by Abū Bakr. The fact that the surviving wives of Muhammad also came to Abū Bakr to obtain their inheritance indicates that everyone in the Prophet’s household expected his or her inheritance to follow the rules sanctioned in the Qur‘ān. Abū Bakr’s hadīth, nahu l-anbiya‘a lā nūrīhu mā taraknūhu sadaga, is found in several places in the Sahīhs of al-Bukhārī and Muslim and raises the awkward question: was the first use of a hadīth for the purpose of disinheriting the Prophet’s own daughter, cousin, uncle, and wives?

23 Succession, 41.

24 Succession, 34–5.

25 Succession, 48–9. Madelung neglects to quote the well-known hadīth “I have been ordered to fight against the people until they testify that there is no god but Allāh and that Muhammad in the Messenger of Allāh and until they perform the prayers and pay zakāt ...” found in the Sahīhs of al-Bukhārī and Muslim; it is the eighth hadīth in an-Nawawi’s Forty Hadīths, translated by Ezzедин Ibrahim and Denys Johnson-Davies (no date, no place), 46. Note that al-Nawawi’s version is from Ibn ‘Umar instead of Abū Bakr.

and pardoned by Abū Bakr, and two of them later played a role in the victory at Qadisiya against the Sasanids. 27 Abū Bakr even married his sister Umm Farwa bint Abi Quhâfa to the powerful Yemeni rebel al-As h’ath b. Qays, who later served with distinction at the battle of Nihâwand. 28 Qays b. Makshûb, who killed at least two Muslims in the ridda wars, was forgiven by Abū Bakr over ‘Umar’s objection, 29 and ‘Uyayna b. Hişn, who had lied to the Prophet during the campaign against al-Ṭâ’if, was “brought back to Islam” by the words of Abū Bakr despite having joined the revolt of the “false-prophet” Tulayha. 30

The third episode of intra-Sahâba violence involved various members of the “pious opposition” to ‘Uthmân’s policies and the Egyptian delegation, some of whose partisans ultimately murdered him. The most flagrant confrontations include the beating of ‘Abdullâh b. Mas’ûd and ‘Ammâr b. Yâsîr, as well as the banishment of Abû Dharr al-Ghifârī to Rabadha. 31 ‘Uthmân’s harsh treatment of these early Sahâba was publicly condemned by ‘Ā’isha; other Sahâba who stirred up protest against the caliph include Talâyha b. ‘Ubayd Allâh, ‘Amr b. al-’Aṣ, and, to a lesser degree, al-Zubayr b. al-Awwâm.32 ‘Abd al-Rahmân b. ‘Awf, the Sahâbi on the shûrâ who essentially appointed ‘Uthmân as the successor to ‘Umar, stipulated that the caliph was not to lead his funeral prayers, a request that was honored in 32/652-3 and adopted by Ibn Mas’ûd. Madelung reports that the “poor Muhâjir” Jahjah b. Sa’îd al-Ghifârī threw stones at ‘Uthmân during one of his “repentence” khutbas 33 and that the Sahâbi

---

27 These two men were ‘Amr b. Ma’dî Karîb and Tulayha b. Khwâyâlîd; Ibn Sa’d, al-Ṭabaqât al-kubrâ, VIII, 592-5 and VIII, 548-9. Tulayha’s pardon is particularly surprising given the reports that he claimed to be a prophet during the ridda.

28 al-Ṭabaqât al-kubrâ, VIII, 578-81.

29 al-Ṭabaqât al-kubrâ, VIII, 590-1.


31 Succession, 96 and 109. Both of these men were among the earliest converts to Islam; ‘Abdullâh b. Mas’ûd and ‘Ammâr were among the Muhâjîrûn who fought at Badr, and Abû Dharr Jundub b. Junâda was a non-Meccan emigrant to Medina who first saw action at Uhud. The beating of ‘Ammâr, a client of Makhzûm, also generated an angry reaction from the Prophet’s Makhzûmî widow Umm Salâma; Succession, 96-7.

32 Succession, 90-2, 98-104.

33 Succession, 124. Ibn Sa’d reports that Jahjah was a poor emigrant and when he came towards ‘Uthmân during one of his “khutbas,” ’Uthmân grabbed his stick and crushed his knees with it; T. K. 2001, V, 108-9.
supervisor of the public treasury, 'Abdullāh b. Arqam, resigned in protest over 'Uthmān’s request to enrich his nephew and brother-in-law 'Abdullāh b. Khālid b. Asīd. While these incidents were mild in comparison to the ridda wars that preceded, and the civil war that erupted after, the killing of 'Uthmān, they did involve some of the most prestigious sahāba and may have been partly responsible for the failure of the Medinans to protect their caliph from the violent protesters who ultimately killed him.

Five sahāba were involved in the Egyptian delegation and the masses who surrounded 'Uthmān’s palace demanding his abdication during the last month of 35/June 656. Madelung reports that the first casualty of the “battle day of the palace” (yawm al-dār) was the sahābi Niyār b. Ṭiyāḍ, who was killed by a rock dropped from the palace by a client of Marwān b. al-Ḥakam. Rifā‘ b. Rāfi’ is also reported to have killed a partisan of ‘Uthmān outside the palace, and ‘Āmir b. Bukayr is said to have struck Sa‘īd b. al-‘Ās. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Udayṣ is considered to have been among the leaders of the Egyptian delegation, although it is not clear if he was present at the palace on the day of the assassination. Even one of the four identified killers of the caliph was none other than ‘Amr b. al-Ḥamiq.

31 Succession, 93-4. Madelung reports that the Anṣārī Zayd b. Thābit, whose recension of the Qur’ān was made the official recension to the detriment of the readings of Ibn Mās‘ūd and Ubayy b. Ka‘b, was sent by ‘Uthmān with a large gift in an unsuccessful bid to bring Ibn Arqam to his post. It was probably at this time that Zayd assumed control over the treasury, as he is reported to have been in charge of ‘Uthmān’s diwān. 33 Succession, 135. Niyār does not have an entry in the new edition of al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr, but both he and this episode are mentioned in Ibn Hajar, al-Isāba ft ṭamytz al-sahāba, III (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1978), 578-9.

32 Succession, 137. Rifā‘ b. Rāfi’ b. Mālik was a son of one of the twelve naqabā’ of the Āṣār and participated at Badr; al-Tabaqāt al-kubrā, III, 302. ‘Āmir b. Bukayr is rendered as ‘Amir b. Abi l-Bukayr by Ibn Sa‘īd (ibid., III, 209) but without the “Abi” and with the definitive article (i.e., al-Bukayr) by Ibn Hajar; al-Isāba, II, 247. Nothing appears to have been preserved about his life other than the fact that he and his three brothers ‘Āqil, Iyās, and ‘Ammālā fought at Badr.

33 Succession, 117. Al-Dhahabi quotes Muḥammad al-Dhuḥali as declaring it “unlawful to transmit hadith” from ‘Abd al-Rahmān because he was the “head of the fitna” (lā yahdaila an yuḥaddathatu ‘ashu bi sharī‘in, huwa ra‘su l-fitna); al-Dhahabi, Tārīkh al-İslām wa waṣfayt al-maškātir wa l-İlām, ed. Umar ʿAbd al-Salām Tadmuri, III (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-ʿArabi, 1986), 531-2. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Udayṣ does not receive an entry in the sahāba sections of al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr, but he is found among those who settled Egypt and identified as the head (ra‘ṣ) of the Egyptian delegation to ‘Uthmān; Ibn Sa‘īd, al-Tabaqāt al-kubrā, VII, 236. (Thanks to Ibn Hajar for this reference in al-Isāba, II, 411).
a late convert to Islam, who, after his own assassination by Ibn Umm al-Hakam in northern Iraq, earned the dubious distinction of being the first man in Islamic history to have his decapitated head sent by post to a ruler.38

Before we delve into the major roles played by the sahāba in the civil war that engulfed the entire four years of ‘Ali’s counter-caliphate, it would be useful to mention the names of the prominent sahāba who died of natural causes during ‘Uthmān’s reign, because their loss was a blow to the leadership of the Muslim community on the eve of a major crisis. Ubayy b. Kaʾb, a prominent Qurʾān scholar of the Anṣār, and six other less well known participants at Badr passed away in the year 30/650–1.39 Eight major sahāba died during the crucial years of 32–33/652–4: al-ʿAbbās b. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, Ibn Masʿūd, ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. ʿAwf, Abū l-Dardaʾ, Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī,40 Salmān al-Fārisī,41 Abū Sufyān b. Ḥarb,42 and al-Miqdād b. ʿAmr (d. 33/654).43 Finally, two famous Anṣār, ʿUbāda b. al-Sāmīt and Abū Ṭalḥa Zayd b. Sahl, passed away in 34/654–5.44 Whether these sahāba could have influenced ‘Uthmān to change his highly unpopular policies or even abdicate is purely speculative, but there is little doubt that their presence during the siege of 35/656 could have ameliorated the tense situation.

The fourth episode in the unraveling of the unity of the Muslim community during the age when numerous sahāba were still alive was the reluctance of many individuals to offer ‘Ali the bayʿa after

38. Succession, 118, 138–9. The story about ʿAmr’s head is found also in al-Tabaqāt al-kubrā, VIII, 599.
39. Al-Tabaqāt al-kubrā, III, 239–61. Other death dates for Ubayy include 19 or 20 (Ibn Maʾām and 22 (al-Waqqāḍī, on the authority of Ubayy’s descendents, and Ibn Hibbān); Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr thought that he died during the caliphate of ʿUmar, while Ibn Ḥajar follows Abū Nuʿaym and states that the most accurate date is 30; al-Isbāhānī, 1, 19–20. The six remaining “men of Badr” who died this year are Ḥārīb b. Abī Balṭaʾa, ʿAbdullāh b. Māzʾūn, Maʿmar b. Abī Saʿīd, Ḥyād b. Zuhayr, Masʿūd b. al-Rabīʾ, and Jabār b. Ṣaḥhr; al-Tabaqāt al-kubrā, III, 61, 214, 222, 89–90, and 293. Note that an additional fourteen sahāba who fought at Badr are reported by Ibn Saʿd to have died at sometime during the reign of ʿUthmān.
40. Obituaries for these first five men can be found in this sequence in al-Dhahabi, Tārikh al-ʾIslām, III, 373–414.
42. Al-Tabaqāt al-kubrā, VIII, 481–5.
44. Al-Tabaqāt al-kubrā, III, 280–1 and 262–4, respectively. Note that ‘Ubāda was the last surviving member of the twelve muqābaʿ of the Anṣār, and that some say that he lived until the reign of Muʿāwiya.
the killing of 'Uthmân. There are five reports found in al-Tabari's *Tarîkh al-musul wa l-mulûk* that name individual *saḥâba* who delayed giving Ali the *bay'â* or simply fled to Syria. These reports resurface in several later histories such as al-Masʿūdī's *Murūj al-dhahab*, Ibn al-Jawzi's *Munâẓam*, and Ibn Khaldûn's *al-Fbar*, as well as Madelung's *The Succession to Muḥammad*. The following outline summarizes the content of these five reports:

A. 'Umar b. Shabba: Sa'd b. Abî Waqqâs and 'Abdullâh b. 'Umar delayed the *bay'â*.

B. 'Abdullâh b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥasan: the 'Uthmânî Anṣâr who delayed the *bay'â* were:

1) Ḥassân b. Thâbît
2) Ka'b b. Mâlik
3) Maslama b. Mukhallad
4) Abû Sa'id al-Khûdîr
5) Muḥammad b. Maslama

C. al-Zuhrî: those Meccans who fled to Syria were:

1) Qudâma b. Maţûn
2) 'Abdullâh b. Salâm
3) al-Mughfîr b. Shu'ba

D. Ibn Sa'd → Wâqidî: those who delayed (*tarâbba'â*) giving the *bay'â* were:

1) Sa'd b. Abî Waqqâs
2) 'Abdullâh b. 'Umar
3) Ṣûhâyb b. Sinân
4) Zayd b. Thâbît
5) Muḥammad b. Maslama
6) Salâma b. Waqsh
7) Usâma b. Zayd

E. Sayîf b. 'Umar: The Medinese tried to give the *bay'â* to Sa'd b. Abî Waqqâs or Ibn 'Umar, but they both refused to accept it. 15

---


16 *Tarîkh al-Tabari*, I, 430–1 (3070); Masʿūdî, II, 353; Ibn Khaldûn, II, 1055; *Succession*, 146. Note that Ibn Khaldûn adds Salâma b. Salâma b. Wîkhsh to this list.

17 *Tarîkh al-Tabari*, I, 430 (3070); Masʿūdî, II, 353; al-Munâẓam, V, 64; Ibn Khaldûn, II, 1055; *Succession*, 148.


19 Ibn al-Jawzi substitutes Muslim b. Salâm for him.

There appears to be a relatively high degree of consensus as to the identity of these sahāba who delayed giving their oath of allegiance to ‘Ali or simply fled the Hijāz.\(^{51}\) We must add to this list, of course, Mu‘āwiya b. Abī Sufyān in Syria and ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ, who was probably at his estate in Palestine. The question as to whether Ṭālha and al-Zubayr gave their bay‘a under the sword of al-Ashtar or by their own will is unclear, as there are reports that support both possibilities, but their departure from Medina and subsequent armed insurrection left ‘Ali in the awkward position of lacking the support of any of the three surviving members of the shūrā that elected ‘Uthmān to the caliphate or of the Meccan Qurayshī aristocracy.

The fifth, and possibly most traumatic conflict between the sahāba, was the Battle of the Camel in 36/656. Unlike the ridda wars, which involved large Muslim armies against a few late-conversion sahāba, most of whom were subsequently forgiven, the Battle of the Camel involved prominent sahābi leaders and soldiers. Three groups of sahāba can be discerned in this conflict. The smallest group consists of Abū Mūsā l-Ash‘ārī, ‘Imrān b. Ḥuṣayn, and Abū Bakr al-Thaqaftī, as well as the sahāba listed above who delayed giving the bay‘a to ‘Ali, all of whom refused to fight on either side of the battle.\(^{52}\) While it is not likely that the participation of these individuals would have altered the outcome of the battle, their decision to remain neutral (i’tizāl) was admired greatly by later Murjī‘a and Sunniś who were gravely distressed by the problem of intra-sahāba warfare.

The losing side of the Camel was led by ‘A‘isha, Ṭālha, al-Zubayr, and ‘Abdullāh b. al-Zubayr, half of whom perished in this event. It was financed largely by ‘Uthmān’s governors to Yemen, two sahāba named Ya‘lā b. Umayya and ‘Abdullāh b. Abī Rabī‘a, who seized the treasury upon hearing of their caliph’s murder and returned to Mecca.\(^{53}\) The first casualty occurred prior to the arrival of ‘Ali’s army when the sahābi Ḥukaym b. Jabala was killed and ‘Uthmān b. Ḥunayf abused in the rebels’ assault on the granary of Basra.\(^{54}\)

\(^{51}\) Note that Ibn Sa‘d states that several of these men, such as Sa‘d b. Abī Waqqās, Usāma b. Zayd, Muḥammad b. Maslama, and Zayd b. Thābit, all gave the bay‘a to ‘Ali without any mention of a delay; al-Tabaqāt al-kubrā, III, 19.

\(^{52}\) Succession, 165–6 (Abū Mūsā), 161 (‘Imrānī, 167 (Abū Bakra).

\(^{53}\) Succession, 155. Ibn Abī 1-Rabī‘a is reported to have fallen off of a camel and broken a thigh, thus preventing him from joining the rebels in person; Ya‘lā fled when the defeat was inevitable.

\(^{54}\) Succession, 163. ‘Uthmān b. Ḥunayf was ‘Ali’s appointed governor to Basra.
One of the leaders of this raid was the sahābi Mujashi' b. Mas'ūd Sulami, and both he and his brother Mūjālid were killed in the Battle of the Camel fighting against 'Ali. At least three additional sahāba were killed fighting against 'Ali at the Camel, one of whom was a brother of 'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Awf. Finally, 'Ā'ishah's brother 'Abd al-Rahmān, who fought against the Muslims at Badr and Uḥud and did not embrace Islam until just prior to the conquest of Mecca, fought on his sister's side and escaped the battle with his life intact.

The leadership of 'Ali's camp who were sahāba include his sons al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, cousin 'Abdullāh b. 'Abbās, and the early convert 'Ammār b. Yāsir. His appointed governors include both early Ansār, such as Sahil and 'Uthmān b. Ḥunayf, and Qays b. Sa'd b. Ṭālha, as well as the Hashimīs 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Abbās in Ṣan'a' and Qutham b. 'Abbās in Mecca. Two over-enthusiastic sahāba on 'Ali's side were the regicidal 'Amr b. al-I'lāmiq and Jujr b. 'Adl, the latter of whom achieved prominence for his refusal to curse 'Ali and subsequent execution by Mu'āwiya. Abū Qatāda b. al-Rib'ī, who was by the Prophet's side from the time of Uḥud, and Sulaymān b. Ṣurād may also have fought on behalf of 'Ali at the Camel. Finally, Sa'd b. Abī Waqqās's nephew Ḥāshim b. 'Utbah survived the

from the Ansār. He had served under 'Umar in the organization of the kharaj of Iraq and the assessment of the poll tax on non-Muslims. His first battle with the Prophet was Uḥud; TK 2001, IV, 304-6. Hukaym's status as a sahābi is somewhat tenuous and he is not mentioned by Ibn Sa'd in al-Tabaqīt al-kabīr, see instead al-Īṣāba, I, 379.

Succession, 162-3. Both men are found among the sahāba who converted after the conquest of Mecca in al-Tabaqīt al-kubrī, VIII, 561.

The men are al-Aswād b. 'Awf (TK 2001, V, 19-20; Tārikh al-Īṣām, III, 491; Succession, 177), 'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Attāh (Tārikh al-Īṣām, III, 530-1; Succession, 176), and 'Abdullāh b. Khalaf al-Khuzā'ī (Succession, 173).


See, for example, Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntazam, V, 75 and Ibn Khaldūn, II, 1058-61. 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Abbās was one year younger than his famous brother 'Abdullāh and was thirteen when the Prophet died; TK 2001, VI, 348. Quthām led numerous raids into Khurāsān for the Umayyads and died in Samarqand during the reign of 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān; TK 2001, VI, 349-50.

Hujr b. 'Adī receives entries both as a sahābi and a tābi'i in al-Tabaqīt al-kubrī, VI, 468-70 and VIII, 582. Ibn Hajar does include him as a sahābi in al-Īṣāba, I, 314-5. The story of his execution is found in the first of these references.

Succession, 154-5 (Abī Qatāda). Ibn Sa'd puts Sulaymān at the Camel, pace Madelung (p. 183); al-Tabaqīt al-kubrī, IV, 465. Sulaymān is also credited with having written the invitation to Ḥusayn b. 'Ali to liberate Kufa and then failing to appear in his moment of need; later, Ibn Sa'd's reports, he led the ta'wārib. Sulaymān embraced Islam prior to the conquest of Mecca and lived until 54/674.
Camel, while the venerable Qur’ān-reciter Zayd b. Sūhān did not.\textsuperscript{61} While this day of warfare broke the taboo of large-scale bloodshed between sahābī-led and manned armies, few could have expected the far greater losses of life that haunted the remainder of ‘Ali’s brief counter-caliphate.

The sixth internecine conflict followed upon the precedent of the Battle of the Camel and found two sahābī-led armies engaged in open warfare.\textsuperscript{62} The Battle of Siffin differed from that of the Camel in two important respects: first, it lasted several days and was inconclusive, and secondly, the opposition to ‘Ali was led by a late convert to Islam and son of an enemy of the Prophet Muḥammad as opposed to two of the earliest Muslims and a wife of the Prophet. Despite these differences, the same three groups of sahāba that were found at the Camel persisted, with the neutrals gaining ‘Ali’s failed ambassador to Mu‘āwiya, Jarir b. ‘Abdullāh al-Bajali. Mu‘āwiya’s leadership included the sahāba ‘Amr b. al-‘Ās, his son ‘Abdullāh, and ‘Uthmān’s alcoholic uterine brother al-Walīd b. ‘Uqba. Ibn Sa‘d mentions three sahāba who fought with Mu‘āwiya at Siffin and survived: the post-Meccan conquest converts ‘Adī b. Amīra b. Farwa, Zaml b. ‘Amr, and ‘Uqba b. ‘Āmir.\textsuperscript{63} One more potential sahābī on the side of Mu‘āwiya who did not survive Siffin was al-Samayfa b. Nakūr, more commonly known as Dhū l-Kalā‘ al-Ḥimyar, a powerful leader of the Yemenis in Hims.\textsuperscript{64}

\textsuperscript{61} Succession, 234 (Hāšim). Zayd b. Sūhān’s status as a sahābī is unclear; Ibn Ḥajar included him in the third class, namely those who were alive prior to and contemporary with the revelation of the Qur’ān but who are not recorded as having met the Prophet Muhammad; \\textit{al-Isāba}, I, 582–3. See also al-Dhahabi, \\textit{Tārikh al-Isām}, III, 508–9.

\textsuperscript{62} The role of the sahābā in this conflict, the Battle of Siffin, has received recently a thorough study by Fu‘ad Jabali entitled “A Study of the Companions of the Prophet: Geographical Distribution and Political Alignments” (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, McGill University, 1999). Jabali analyzes the classical biographical dictionaries of Ibn Sa‘d, Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Ibn al-Athfir, al-Dhahabi, and Ibn Ḥajar and verifies a minimum of 123 sahāba, 43 of whom were early converts, with ‘Ali, 31 with Mu‘āwiya, and 7 neutral at Siffin (pp. 218, 237, and 241).

\textsuperscript{63} \textit{At-Taḥqīq al-kubrā}, VIII, 383, 611 and IV, 489, respectively. ‘Adī b. Amīra was among one of several clans of Kinda that left Kufa for Edessa when ‘Ali’s partisans arrived and began to insult Uthmān. His son ‘Adī b. ‘Adī was a pious friend of ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz and later governor of northern Iraq under Sulaymān b. ‘Abd al-Malik. Zaml is reported to have appeared at Siffin with a banner given to him by the Prophet, and his grandson Mudlij b. al-Miqdād b. Zaul was a notable (sharīf) in Syria. ‘Uqba b. Amīr of Qudā’a built a house and settled in Egypt after Siffin, where he died during the reign of Mu‘āwiya.

\textsuperscript{64} Al-Dhahabi, \\textit{Tārikh al-Isām}, III, 565–6. Madelung interprets his death as being
Although al-Mas'ūdi's assertion that 2800 sahāba were with 'Ali at Siffin, twenty-five of whom were killed, is almost certainly an exaggeration, there were certainly more sahābi-casualties on the Iraqi side of the battlefield. The most famous loss was the ancient 'Ammar b. Yasir, whose martyrdom at the hands of the "astray group" (al-fi'atul l-ba'ghiya) was predicted in a widely circulated hadith. Hāshim b. 'Uthbā. Abī Waqqās was not so lucky this day, nor were the Ansārīs Abū 'Amr Bashīr b. 'Amr, Khuzayma b. Thābit, and Sa'd b. al-Hārith b. al-Simma. The spokesman for the Ansār was a veteran of Badr, Sahl b. Hunayf, who had served as 'Ali's governor of Medina during the battle of the Camel, and one of the major generals was the former Yemeni apostate al-Ash'ath b. Qays. 'Ali was also blessed with the support of a powerful chief of the Ṭayy, Adi b. Ḥātim, a late convert and veteran of the victory of Qadisiyya, as well as the battle-toughened Ḥujr b. 'Adī and Sulaymān b. Surād. Three additional confirmed or potential sahāba are mentioned by al-Dhahabī among those killed at Siffin fighting against Mu'āwiyah. Despite the fact that several of 'Ali's most cherished partisans, such as Muhammad b. Abī Bakr and al-Ashtar, were not sahāba, the loss of a group of his most energetic supporters with
whom he had fought the clan of Mu‘awiya both in the Prophet’s day and thirty years later severely weakened his camp and may have been part of the reason why al-Ḥasan saw little reason to continue shedding Muslim blood for the acquisition of the caliphate after his father’s murder.

The last episode of intra-sahāba conflict is less precise than the battles and succession disputes and concerns the raids that occurred in the wake of the inconclusive battle of Ṣiffin. The most vicious of these raids, called ghārāt, at least according to Madelung, was that of the sahābi Busr b. Abī Ṭātī. This raid was ordered by Mu‘awiya in 40/660–1; it included a compulsory bay'a to Mu‘awiya by the people of Medina and the massacre of an unspecified number of ‘Alid supporters in the Hijāz and Yemen. Abū Hurayra is reported to have been the temporary governor of Medina set up by Busr, an association of which later Sunnī scholars may not have been particularly proud. Another early sahābi who may have led propaganda raids in favor of Mu‘awiya was al-Nu‘mān Bāshīr, who is reported by Madelung to have led one such expedition with Abū Hurayra. On the other side of the struggle, ‘Ali’s massacre of the Khawārij at Nahrawān in 38/658, not only put a stain on his pious image but ultimately planted the seeds of his own assassination; the deafening lack of support he received from the remaining early sahāba could only have demoralized him in his final months of struggle against all sides.

This brief historical survey of seven episodes of intra-Muslim conflict that unfolded during the first thirty years after Muhammad’s death should be seen both as an effort to highlight the entrenched role of the sahāba on opposite sides of battle, as well as demonstrate the deep insight of Madelung’s prosopographical tour de force that has been written off by some scholars as a mere pro-Shī‘ī tract. A serious

---

71 Succession, 299–307. Busr is found in the last class of sahāba, namely those who were children at the time of the death of the Prophet Muhammad; TK 2001, VI, 539–40. His raid is mentioned by Ibn Sa‘d, who observes that he killed a hundred men of Banū Ka‘b who had supported ‘Ali after ‘Ali was killed. Even al-Bukhārī mentions the killing of ‘Ubayd Allāh b. ‘Abbās’s two young sons in this raid; see al-Bukhārī, al-Tārikh al-mustaf, I, 186–8.
72 Succession, 301.
73 Succession, 297, 301. Al-Nu‘mān was the first Anṣāri born after the Hijra and was only eight years old at the time of the Prophet’s death; al-Tabaqāt al-kubrā, IV, 479–86.
problem facing the second, third, and every successive generation of Muslims has been one of historiography: how does one make sense of the struggles between the witnesses of Muḥammad? In my opinion, both Madelung and Jafri deserve credit for their arguments that the struggles for the leadership of the Muslim community emerged the day the Prophet died and not during the second half of ʿUthmān’s caliphate, as is generally depicted in Western sources.  I shall devote the rest of this chapter to elucidating how the compilers of the earliest extant books explained these rather serious intra-ṣahāba “quarrels” in the course of the third/ninth century and focus in particular on the interpretive strategies deployed by the Imāmī Shiʿa, Zaydiyya/Baghdādī Muʿtazila, and Sunni hadith scholars.

VI.3 Two minority solutions:  
The Imāmī Shiʿa and Zaydiyya/Baghdādī Muʿtazila

VI.3.1

Why are the historiographical solutions to the problem of intra-ṣahāba conflict put forth by the Imāmī Shiʿa and the Zaydiyya/Baghdādī Muʿtazila of relevance to this study? Is not this discourse a question of creed (ʿaqīda) rather than fundamentals of religion (ʿusūl al-dīn)? How is it possible that the three radically different interpretations of the nature of the sahāba that Muslims articulated during the early centuries of Islam determined to a large degree the nature of both religious law (sha riʿa) and Qur’ānic exegesis?

Given the fact that all knowledge of the Prophet’s practice, or summa, is accessible solely through reports from contemporary witnesses, and, that these witnesses are all by definition sahāba, the rejection of any sahābi’s religious authority inevitably eliminates a body of reports and thus potentially invalidates practices performed by the Prophet that would otherwise have had a legal value. Since it is impossible to articulate the sha riʿa solely on the basis of the Qur’ān,

Kennedy’s The Prophet and the Age of the Caliphs provides a good example of this habit; the violent nature of the Saqīfa is sanitized, the disinheritance of ʿAlī is left unspoken (although he does call ʿUmar’s selection of Abū Bakr a coup d’état), and the heading for ʿUthmān’s reign is called “ʿUthmān and the beginnings of internal strife.” See Kennedy, The Prophet and the Age of the Caliphs, 50–69.
these reports are necessary in order for Muslims to perform basic practices, such as prayer, almsgiving, and the pilgrimage, with any degree of cohesion. While this book is hardly the place to examine the full impact of the Imāmī Shiʿī and Zaydī/Baghdādī Muʿtazilī attitudes towards the saḥāba upon their respective constructions of Islamic law, I will show the profound impact these attitudes had on Qurʿānic exegesis in the case of the first group and examine how both the Zaydīs and Sunnīs established the authority of the vast majority of the saḥāba so as to salvage the legal value of their prophetic reports that had amassed during the first three centuries of Islam.

VI.3.2 The Imāmī Shiʿī and the saḥāba

A very brief historical survey of the development of Imāmī Shiʿīsm prior to its crystallization during the dawn of the Greater Occultation of the twelfth Imām around 329/941 is necessary in order to comprehend the impact of its radical rejection of the authority of virtually all of the saḥāba. Hossein Modarressi argues that a distinct Imāmī legal school did not exist prior to the time of the fifth Imām Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Baqir (Imām from 95–114/714–32) and Etan Kohlberg credits this Imām with the origination of the idea of the apostasy of all but a handful of saḥāba. The period of the sixth Imām, Jaʿfar al-Sādiq (Imām from 114–48/732–65), witnessed both the proliferation of legal reports as well as the rise of what Modarressi identifies as the mufawwīda movement that attributed supernatural powers to the Imāms. This movement achieved its breakthrough after the death of ʿAlī al-Riḍā (d. 203/818), when it asserted that the miraculous succession of the seven-year-old Muḥammad al-Jawād was due to ‘divine grace’, and blossomed throughout the third/ninth century. The reaction against the mufawwīda was located among the scholars of Qumm, whose insistence on the treatment of the Imāms

---

17 It is striking that the fast of Ramaḍān is the only pillar of Islam that is thoroughly articulated in the Qurʿān and in theory is free from any reliance upon prophetic reports; see Sūra: al-Baqara (2): 183–7. In practice, of course, all topically-organized hadith books have at least one chapter on fasting.


19 Crisis and Consolidation, 21.

20 Crisis and Consolidation, 32–3.
as mere human legal authorities rather than “God’s delegated authorities” earned them the pejorative title *muqadda* or “short-changers.”\(^8\)2 The *mufawwida* were aided by the theories of Hishâm b. al-Hakam (d. 179/795-6), one of which was that the *sahâba* actually became disbelievers (*kuffar*) due to their rejection of ‘Ali’s imamate at the death of the Prophet Muhammad.\(^8\)3 The struggle between the *mufawwida* and *muqadda* peaked during the Lesser Occultation (260-329/874-941) and climaxed with the former’s victory in the publication of Muhammad al-Kulaynî’s book *al-Kaâfi*, held by the Imamî Shi‘a as the first of their four canonical *hadith* books.\(^8\)4 Despite the triumph of Kulaynî’s *mufawwida* masterpiece, the early *muqadda* attitude has been preserved in al-Kashshî’s (d. fourth/tenth century) biographical dictionary, and the following comparison of these two books with regard to their attitudes towards the *sahâba* reveals only minor differences between these two early Imamî Shi‘a schools of thought on this topic.

Etan Kohlberg’s identification of five strategies employed by early Imamî Shi‘a to discredit the authority of the *sahâba* merits a brief note prior to our discussion of the *Uṣûl al-kâfi* of al-Kulaynî and al-Tusi’s *Ikhshîyâr mar’îfat al-rîjâl* (*rîjâl al-Kashshî*). The first two of these techniques were the claims of the collective apostasy of the *sahâba* and their loss of faith (*imân*) due to their failure to recognized the Imamate of ‘Ali. A third method was to identify the *sahâba* with the Qur’ânic class of people known as “hypocrites” (*munâfiqun*) due to their lack of loyalty to ‘Ali, as well as on the basis of the modification of a well known story of the hypocrites’ effort to kill the Prophet to involve fourteen famous *sahâba*.\(^8\)5 Another creative technique was to

\(^{82}\) Crisis and Consolidation, 39.

\(^{83}\) “Some Imamî Shi‘a views of the *sahâba*,” 148.

\(^{84}\) Crisis and Consolidation, 42-7. For the status of this book as ‘canonical’ see Moojan Momen, *An Introduction to Shi‘i Islam* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985), 174. Note that Sunnis probably would not call this a *hadith* book, since virtually none of the reports are prophetic locutions or practices but rather quotes of the Imams Muhammad Baqir, Ja‘far al-Ṣâdiq, and ‘Ali al-Ridâ.

restrict the meaning of sahāba in pro-sahāba hadith to the Prophet's family (ahl al-bayt). The final, and most extreme interpretation, involved the dualist notion of opposites (addād), namely that every good figure had his or her evil opposite. While this theory worked well with characters such as Adam and Satan, at least one radical Shi'i interpreted the "good" to include Muhammad, 'Alī, al-Ḥasan, al-Ḥusayn, and Fāṭima and their evil opposites as Abū Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthmān, Mu‘āwiya, and 'Amr b. al-‘Āṣ. My investigation of the Usūl al-tāfī and Ikhtiyār mar'ifat al-riyāl demonstrates the utilization of the first four of these techniques of discrediting the sahāba among both the muṣawwīda and muqassira schools of early Imāmī thought.

The most striking feature of Ikhtiyār mar'ifat al-riyāl of al-Kashshā' with respect to the sahāba is the extraordinary interpretation of the "apostasy wars" (ridda) immediately following the death of the Prophet Muḥammad. Several reports on the authorities of Muḥammad al-Baqir and his son Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq state explicitly that all of the sahāba, even ‘Ammār b. Ya‘ṣir, apostatized except Salmān al-Farīsī, Abū Dharr al-Ghifrānī, and al-Miqdād b. al-Aswād. Several of the reports also mention that four more sahāba repented from this act, thus fulfilling ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib’s prophesy that “seven will inherit the earth, aid you, and cause rain to fall.” These men are identified in a couple of reports as Abū Sāsān, ‘Ammār b. Ya‘ṣir, Shutayra, and Abū ‘Amrā and al-Kashshā’ quotes Muḥammad al-Baqir as saying that only these seven men recognized ‘Alī’s claim (ḥaqq). Only three of these men—Salmān, Abū Dharr, and ‘Ammār—receive significant attention in al-Kashshā’s work, and it is striking that absolutely nothing is said about al-Miqdād. Despite al-Kashshā’s

---

86 “Some Imāmī Shi‘i views of the sahāba,” 165. Kohlberg notes on the next page that the concept of addād was adopted by the Ismā‘īlīs.
87 Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī, Ikhtiyār mar'ifat al-riyāl (riyāl al-Kashshā’), ed. Ḥasan Muṣṭfa (Mashhad, 1348), 6–12. The question of ‘Ammār’s apostasy is found in reports on the authority of Muḥammad Baqir; ibid., 8–9 and 11–12.
88 dāqqa al-arḍ’u bi-sab‘atāin bi-him turzaquna wa bi-him tumāran minhum Salmān al-Farīsī wa l-Miqdād wa Abū Dharr wa ‘Ammār wa Ḥudhayfā wa hāna ‘Alī yaqūla wa ana imāmukum wa him alladhina sallī ‘alā Fāṭima; Ikhtiyār mar’ifat al-riyāl, 6:7. It is not clear from this report whether ‘Alī provided the names of his companions or a later Imam did so.
89 Ikhtiyār mar’ifat al-riyāl, 1 and 11–2.
90 Ikhtiyār mar’ifat al-riyāl, 12–24 (Salmān); 24–9 (Abū Dharr); 29–36 (‘Ammār). Note that most of the reports in ‘Ammār’s section have Sunnī hadith and are hadith found in the Sunnī hadith literature, such as his last drink being milk, his nickname
assertion of the mass apostasy of the *sahabā*, ten or so additional Companions do receive some positive attention in the pages that follow, and it is to these men that we shall now turn.

Al-Kashshā’i’s depiction of a small group of *sahabā* in a positive light reflects a degree of moderation within the *muqāṣṣa* Imāmī Shi‘ī interpretation of *ridda*. Salmān al-Farīsī towers above all of the other men, as he alone is identified as a *muḥaddath,* defeates Qurayshī arrogance in a conversation with ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, and even chastises the people for having “fled from the Qur’ān to the *ḥadīth.*” Abū Dharr is depicted as teaching the Prophet a supplication, telling people to “adhere to the Book of God and Shaykh ‘Ali” in the event of civil discord (*fitna*), and rejecting a 200 dinār gift from ‘Uthmān on the grounds that “the *wulayfa* of ‘Ali and the rightly-guided family (*ṭira*)” made him wealthy. We have just encountered several of these men, such as Hudhayfa b. al-Yamān, Sahl b. Hunayf, Khuzayma b. Thābit, ‘Amr b. al-Ḥamīq, among the loyal soldiers or partisans of ‘Ali in his wars, while others, such as Bilāl, Usāma b. Zayd, Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī, and Jābir b. ‘Abdullāh come as a bit of a surprise. Jābir is depicted particularly well as exhorting the Anṣār to teach their children to love ‘Ali and being personally close with the young Muḥammad al-Baqīr in Medina. Four additional Anṣār who testified as al-Ṭayyib b. al-Ṭayyib (Good son of Good), and that the party who kills him is aṣ̄ray. The absence of reports pertaining to the virtues of al-Miqdal could be very well be the editorial work of al-Tūsī, and may not reflect an act of negligence on the part of al-Kashshā’i.

*Ikhtiyār ma’rifat al-rijāl,* 12, 15–6, and 19. Al-Kashshā’i explains in a report on page three that a *muḥaddath* (literally, “one who is told”) is someone who “is made to comprehend” (*nufadhām*). Most of the reports say that Salmān achieved this state from an Imām, although one does say it was from an angel; *ibid.,* 19. William Graham has observed that ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb is identified as a *muḥaddath* in the *Ṣaḥḥah* of al-Bukhārī and Muslim; see his Divine Word and Prophetic Word in Early Islam (Paris, 1977), 37.


*Ikhtiyār ma’rifat al-rijāl,* 36–44. Usāma b. Zayd is mentioned in direct contrast with Muḥammad b. Maslama, Ibn ‘Umar, and Sa‘īd b. Abī Waqqāṣ who continued in error and did not receive any of the *jāy* per ‘Ali’s instructions; *ibid.,* 39. Likewise, Bilāl is contrasted with Ṣuḥayb, whose bad deed in the eyes of al-Baqa’ir was weeping over the death of ‘Umar, and Hudhayfa is contrasted with Ibn Mas‘ūd who erred by following the opinions of the masses (*al-qawām*); *ibid.,* 38–9. This report also includes a useful list of sixteen *sahabā* who returned to ‘Ali (called al-sābīqūn, from *Sūrat al-Wāqī‘a* [56]:10) according to the third/ninth century Imāmī scholar al-Īfḍī b. Shādhān.
to the veracity of the Prophet's statement at Ghadir Khumm that "Ali was the patron of everyone whose patron was Muḥammad" are contrasted with Anas b. Malik and al-Bara' b. ʿAẓib, both of whom refused to accept the validity of this prophetic statement and subsequently succumbed to leprosy and blindness. Finally, al-Kashshī includes reports in which Ibn ʿAbbās' extraordinary knowledge of the Qurʾān is challenged by ʿAli b. al-Ḥusayn, and in which he scolds ʿA'isha after the Battle of the Camel severely. Despite these positive qualities, Ibn ʿAbbās's controversial confiscation of a good portion of the Basran treasury is commented upon rather melancholically by ʿAli b. Abī Ṭālib: "This is a nephew of the Messenger of Allah! He did what he did despite his great knowledge and capacity—How will those who are inferior to him believe?"

Al-Kulaynī's ʿUsūl al-kāfī takes a hardline nuḥawīda departure from al-Kashshī's praise of a dozen pro-ʿAlī sahāba. In fact, al-Kulaynī's primary approach to the sahāba is exclusion, for they are rendered invisible by the blinding praise showered upon the twelve Imāms. His method of achieving this outcome is twofold, namely establishing the religious obligation of obedience to an Imām and then employing quixotic Qurʾānic exegesis in order to uncover dozens of secret references to the twelve Imāms. The first stage of this process consists of seventeen reports on the authority of Muḥammad al-Bāqir and Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq stating in various, concise ways the necessity of obeying an Imām. Examples include "We are a people whom God has made obligatory to obey" and "whoever recognizes us is a Believer, whoever rejects us is a disbeliever, and whoever neither recognizes nor rejects us is astray." Particularly conspicuous in this section is the interpretation of "those of you who are in authority" in the Qurʾānic verse "O you who believe! Obey Allāh, and obey the Messenger, and those of you who are in authority . . ." (4:59) as

---

95 man kunu mawālāhu ʿalī mawālāhu; see Succession, 253. This hadith is found in both the Musnad of Ibn Ḥanbal and Ḧāmid of al-Tirmidhī.
96 Ikhtiyār maʿrūf al-rājīl, 43. These four sahāba are Abū Ayyūb al-Anṣārī, Khuzayma b. Thābit, Qays b. Saʿd b. ʿUbāda, and ʿAbdullāh b. Budayl.
97 Ikhtiyār maʿrūf al-rājīl, 53–63.
98 hádštā lūnuʾa ʿammi rasūlī lākhtī fī 'ilmihī wa qadrīhi wajābihu niyāhā ṣafā hādštā ʿalī ʿulā yuʾminu man kāna dūmah? Ikhtiyār maʿrūf al-rājīl, 60.
100 man ʿarāfānā kāna muʾminan wa man kāna ṣināḥirānā kāna ʿaṣfānā wa man lam yaʿrifnā wa bīn yunkīmā kāna ʿaṣfīnā; ʿUsūl al-kāfī, I, 210.
a proof-text for the obligatory obedience to the Imāms. One particularly interesting report has Ja'far arguing that the Qur'ān is not a proof (ḥujja) without an interpreter (qayyim) and that since only 'Alī knew the entire Qur'ān, he was the proof after the Prophet. What makes this report special is that Ja'far felt compelled to remark that neither Ibn Mas'ūd, 'Umar, nor Hudhayfa knew the entire Qur'ān, despite their well-known erudition, something that illustrates how al-Kulaynī kept the sūhāba at the margins of his text under the lock and key of his superhuman Imāms.

Should the reader of Usūl al-kāfi remain unconvinced of the religious obligation upon Muslims to obey the Imāms from these seventeen reports, she is in store for an even larger surprise in the chapter elucidating the pillars (dā'īrāt) of Islam. The primary report used in this section is a modification of Ibn 'Umar's famous ḥadīth:

Islam has been built upon five [pillars]: testifying that there is no god but Allāh and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allāh, performing the prayers, paying zakāt, making the pilgrimage to the House, and fasting Ramadān.

This report is transmitted by Muḥammad al-Bāqir as follows:

Islam has been built upon five [pillars]: prayers, zakāt, fasting, pilgrimage, and the walāya—nobody will be questioned about anything as severely as they will be questioned about the walāya!

---

101 Usūl al-kāfi, I, 209-12. An influential Sunnī explanation of this verse can be found in al-Ṭabarī's Jāmi' al-bayā'in fi taṣfīr al-ḍalal al-Qur'ān, V (Cairo: Dār al-Ma'rīfā, 1989 [reprint of the 1325 Būlaq edition]), 93-5. The four possible interpretations of “you who are in authority” (ulū l-amr) mentioned by al-Ṭabarī are 1) the commanders (umārā'), 2) men of religious knowledge ('ibn and fiqāh), 3) Companions of Muḥammad, and 4) Abū Bakr and 'Umar. Al-Ṭabarī provides virtually no reports in support of the latter two positions and prefers the first opinion (commanders) to whom he also refers as “Imāms” because “it is known that those to whom God obliges obedience who possess our command are the Imāms and those whom Muslims entrust among the people [to lead];” wa kāna muqallīnum anna lāhadhina amara bi-ta'āthhum tu'ālā al-dīrākhum mīn dhau' amrikā lim al-ummāna wa man walī'ātha l-muslimīna dīna ghayribihum min al-nās; ibid., V, 95.


103 An-Nawawī's Forty Hadith, 34-5. This ḥadīth is found in the Ṣaḥīḥs of al-Bukhārī and Muḥammad. The Arabic is bunyā l-islāmu 'alā l-khamsin: shokādati an lā ilāha illā ilāhu wa anna Muḥammadan rasūlu ilāhi wa iqāmi l-salāt wa ita'i l-zakāt wa ḥajj l-bayt wa ṣawm Ramadān.

104 bunyā l-islāmu 'alā l-khamsin: 'alā l-salāt wa l zakāt wa l-sawm, wa l-hajj wa l-umayyāt wa lam yanāda bi-shay'in kama nūdah bi-l-walāya, Usūl al-kāfi, II, 42-5. These sentences occur in five reports. Momen observes that the term walāya (or uslāya) is “one of the most difficult Islamic terms to translate” and he interprets it to mean...
Despite the fact that Ja'far al-Sadiq is reported as whittling the pillars down to three or four in various reports, the message between these two Imams is clear: a prerequisite of faith is the recognition of the Imams.

Rather than relying upon forged prophetic hadith, al-Kulyani employs reports on the authority of Muhammad al-Baqir and his son Ja'far to offer a radical interpretation of the Qur'an itself in support of the supernatural essence of the Imams. We learn that the Imams are the witnesses of God against His creatures, guides, representatives (khulafāʾ), the light of God, signposts (ʿalāmāt), signs (āyāt), and the experts in knowledge (rāʾikhūn), all of the disciplines that come from angels, prophets, and messengers, their respective....

...that the Imam is “concerned primarily with the inner or esoteric aspects of religion... at one and the same time, master and friend in the journey of the spirit,” An Introduction to Shi'I Islam, 157. In reports such as this one, walaya refers to the Imamate of 'Ali and his designated successors.

The three pillars are prayer, alms, and walaya, while the reports with four reinstate the shahāda, and include aims, “that which Muhammad received from God,” and the walaya, Usūl al-kafi, II, 42-5.

This is stated explicitly in a long report of Muhammad Baqir; Usūl al-kafi, II, 42-4. Once again, a famous hadith transmitted by Ibn 'Umar is given new meaning with a twist: “Whoever dies without knowledge of the Imam dies in a state of pre-Islamic ignorance” (man māta wa la yari'ī imāmahu māta mitatān jahiliyyātun). The presumably original Ibn 'Umar hadith is found in the Sahih of Muslim: man khala'a yada min ta'arin lagīya bīhā juma'at l-qiyāma l-hujjata bihā, wa man māta wa layyā fi 'umūqihi bay'atun, māta mitatān jahiliyya; Sahih Muslim bi-sharh al-Nawawī, XII, 201. The setting of Ibn 'Umar's hadith indicates that it was first uttered at the time of the Battle of Harra (63/683).

Qur'an 2:143; Usūl al-kafi, I, 212-4. Note that many of these interpretations are cited in Momen, An Introduction to Shi'I Islam, 151-3.


Qur'an 24:48; Usūl al-kafi, I, 217-20. This section includes an extravagant example of Shi'I exegesis: the light is 'Ali, the niche and the bright light (kawkab duriyy) are Fāṭima, the lantern (miṣbah) is al-Hasan and the glass is al-Husayn. The expression “neither East nor West” means “neither Jews nor Christians” and “light on light” means Imam after Imam. Furthermore, the darkness in verse 24:40 refers to Abū Bakr and 'Umar (al-aamalu wa sāhibihi), the wave to ‘Uthmān (al-thālith), and the waves of darkness that follow are Mu'āwiya and the trials (fitan) of Banū Umayya.

Qur'an 16:16; Usūl al-kafi, I, 231-2


times of death,\textsuperscript{116} and all that has and will happen.\textsuperscript{117} Finally, they are the sole people who have perfect knowledge of the Qur'ān,\textsuperscript{118} and Ja'far indicates in one report that it is the Book of God that gives them knowledge of “all in the skies, earth, Heaven, Hell, past and future.”\textsuperscript{119}

Al-Kulaynī's strategy for dismissing the sāḥība and the entire hadīth enterprise is unwritten yet obvious: with super-human Imāms who know everything and to whom obedience is an obligatory pillar of Islam, who has time for the unsophisticated Companions of the Prophet? Even the extraordinary muḥaddath Salmān al-Fārisī is but a grain of sand next to the ocean of the Imāms. Al-Kulaynī does not even have to resort to the historiographical trick played al-Kashshi, namely to state that ridda refers to the apostasy of all but three sāḥība instead of the Bedouin tribes who fought Abū Bakr to avoid taxation. Rather, through a combination of Imāmī locutions, Qur'ānic exegesis, and the customization of a Sunnī hadīth, al-Kulaynī expels all of the sāḥība, including those who were loyal to the point of death in support of 'Aī, to the remotest margins of the discourse. Traces of this practice of outright suppression of the sāḥība, perfected by al-Kulaynī, can be found even today in Modarressi’s Crisis and Consolidation, despite the author’s clear hostility towards the muftawi in general.\textsuperscript{120} Al-Kashshi’s willingness to praise a dozen sāḥība appears now to be a liberal Imāmī Shi‘ī view, relative to al-Kulaynī’s tour de force, although his radical interpretation of ridda does not appear to have been seriously challenged by the Imāmī Shi‘a and remains one of its most caustic differences from the Sunnis to this day.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{116} Usul al-kasī, 1, 285-7.
\item \textsuperscript{117} Usul al-kasī, 1, 287-9.
\item \textsuperscript{118} Usul al-kasī, 1, 254-5.
\item \textsuperscript{119} Usul al-kasī, 1, 287-8. Ja’far’s argument is based upon a paraphrase of Sūrat al-Nahl (16):89: “Everything is clarified in [the Book of God]” (fihi tihānu kulli shay‘an).
\item \textsuperscript{120} Modarressi clearly does not want to talk about the first century in his book, thus avoiding the dicey question of the nature of the sāḥība. Note how he does not even mention ‘Umar by name in connection with the Islamic conquests; Crisis and Consolidation, 3. This avoidance of the sāḥība is also found in Momen’s An Introduction to Shi‘ī Islam.
\end{itemize}
VI.3.3 The Zaydiyya/Baghdādi Mu’tazila and the šaḥāba

The two major issues pertaining to the šaḥāba that receive a significant amount of attention in the early works of the Zaydiyya and Baghdādi Mu’tazila are the superiority of ‘Alī to Abū Bakr and the status of those Companions who opposed him during his counter-caliphate. These two groups adopted similar positions for both issues and the early heresiographer al-Mašiḥī (d. 377/987-8) explicitly identified the Baghdādi Mu’tazila as a group of the Zaydiyya.121 Al-Jāḥiz reports an argument for the superiority of ‘Alī to Abū Bakr by an anonymous group of Zaydi ‘ulamā’ that is virtually identical to the one associated with the Baghdādi Mu’tazīli Bishr b. al-Mu’tamir, namely that “merit is determined solely by actions” and ‘Alī was the only šaḥābi who was considered among the best men in the four categories of early conversion, asceticism, religious knowledge (fiqh), and warfare (al-mashī bi-l-sayf).”122 I shall treat each of these groups independently here and begin with the Zaydiyya since it has successfully outlived the demise of the Baghdādi school of the Mu’tazila.123

The Zaydi positions of the superiority of ‘Alī to Abū Bakr and the acceptance of the authority of the vast majority of the šaḥāba has been recorded dutifully by Western scholars for over a century. Both Goldziher’s observation that “the Zaydīs are tolerant in their judgment of the Sunni caliphate of the early Islamic age” and Watt’s assertion that “to give an adequate account of the Zaydites is more difficult than to describe any other of the Islamic sects” remain true to this day.124 The difficulty to which Watt alludes is the necessity

121 Abū l-Ḥusayn al-Mašiḥī, al-Tamhī wa l-radd ‘alā ahl al-shuqūr wa l-bida’, ed. Muhammad al-Kawthārī (Baghdād, 1968), 34-5. Ibn Abī l-Ḥadīd, about whom we will have more to say shortly, also declares the Baghdādi Mu’tazīla to be the “original” Shī’a, namely men who were partisans of ‘Ali and opponents of his adversaries: see his book Sharḥ nāḥij al-balāgha. ed. Ḥusayn al-‘Aṣfānī, XX (Beirut, 1995), 405.


123 It is not clear exactly when the Baghdādi school of Mu’tazīla vanished; one of the final famous Baghdādi Mu’tazīla in the classical period was the recently mentioned Ibn Abī l-Ḥadīd (d. 656/1258).

124 Ignaz Goldziher, Introduction to Islamic Theology and Law, translated by Andras
of the researcher of the Zaydiyya to synthesize a host of 'Alid revolts, sub-sects mentioned in the firaq literature, a significant body of material found only in manuscripts, and three arenas of action, namely Kufa, the southern Caspian provinces, and Yemen into a coherent narrative. While Madelung has provided a great service by analyzing the adoption of Mu'tazilite theology by the Zaydi Imams of the early and classical periods, as well as by editing texts concerning the history of the Caspian Zaydi principalities, the fields of Zaydi hadith literature and jurisprudence remain largely unexplored by modern scholars. Despite the challenges inherent in the study of the Zaydiyya, a pair of articles have addressed the question of the sahāba in the Zaydi conscience and a few observations about two classical Zaydi hadith books will be offered.

Etan Kohlberg identifies four distinct Zaydi attitudes towards the sahāba in general and different degrees of hostility towards 'Ali's adversaries at the battles of the Camel and Šiffin. One group, the partisans of Sulaymān b. Jarir, employed the argument that the early sahāba relied upon ḥiṣab and were thus exempt from error in their decisions to support candidates other than 'Ali. The three other Zaydi opinions ranged from withholding judgment, accusing the sahāba of error (khata) but not sin (fisq), and finally considering the opponents of 'Ali as having "gone astray like a blind camel." Kohlberg reports that the pioneering Zaydi Imam al-Qasim b. Ibrāhīm (d. 246/860) was relatively harsh towards the sahāba and that his grandson al-Hādī Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn (d. 298/911) even declared that Abū Bakr and 'Umar deserved the death penalty for passing over 'Ali. The majority of the Zaydiyya consider the rebellion of 'Ā'isha, Ťalḥa, and al-Zubayr to have been an error and sin, while


126 "Some Zaydi Views of the Companions of the Prophet," 92.
127 "Some Zaydi Views of the Companions of the Prophet," 92-3. Note that these same three attitudes are mirrored in the Zaydi reactions to Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Uthmān's rejection of 'Ali's superiority (p. 94).
simultaneously holding the belief that these three individuals died in a state of repentance, while the minority holds that they died in error.\textsuperscript{120} Kohlberg remarks that “Mu‘awiyah is painted in very dark colors” as either a grave sinner or disbeliever, and the ninth/fifteenth century Imam Ibn al-Murtada states that only the Hashwiyya (Sunnis) consider his repentance sincere.\textsuperscript{120} Finally, the most sinister sahābi in the Zaydi works examined by Kohlberg is al-Mughfira b. Shu‘ba, who is blamed for arranging the usurpation of ‘Ali’s authority from the very beginning of post-prophetic Islamic civilization.\textsuperscript{131} Despite the fact that the vast majority of Zaydi texts that describe the sahāba were composed long after the third/ninth century, there is a clear continuity between the positions found in the early, non-Zaydi hagiographical works, and the later Zaydi books that indicates a genuine reluctance to calumniate any sahābi among the Muhājirūn and Ansār even if they did not support their hero ‘Ali in his wars.\textsuperscript{132}

Perhaps the most interesting dimension of the Zaydi attitudes towards the sahāba can be found in the incorporation of a significant amount of Sunnī hadīth in their hadīth literature. Madelung has observed that one of the earliest Zaydi hadīth books, the Amāh Ahmad b. Isā compiled by Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad b. Mānṣūr al-Murādī al-Kūfī (d. second half of third/ninth century) includes a large number of reports from descendents of ‘Ali as well as material from Ibn ‘Abbās and ‘Ā‘ishah.\textsuperscript{133} The most significant Zaydi hadīth book, accord-

\textsuperscript{120} “Some Zaydi Views of the Companions of the Prophet,” 95. This is also reported by Ibn al-Murtada in the Muqaddima of Kitāb al-baṣr al-zakhkhār (San’ā': Dār al-Ḥikma al-Yamānīya, 1988), 95. Ibn al-Murtada also flatly rejects in this passage Sulaymān b. Jarīr’s opinion that any revolt against an Imam constitutes ḫuṭ.

\textsuperscript{121} “Some Zaydi Views of the Companions of the Prophet,” 96; Ibn al-Murtada, Muqaddima, 93.

\textsuperscript{122} “Some Zaydi Views of the Companions of the Prophet,” 95. Kohlberg says that the extreme vilification of al-Mughfira is unique to the Zaydiyya.

\textsuperscript{123} The willingness to attack Mu‘awiyah and al-Mughfira may have been due to the classic Zaydi definition of a sahābi as someone who has “spent a considerable amount of time with the Prophet and followed his laws” (al-sahābī ma‘ṣūliyy al-qulūb al-shaf‘īyya); Ibn al-Murtada, al-Muqaddima, 180. This is a significant departure from the Sunni definition that we encountered in Ibn al-Ṣalāh’s Muqaddima that anyone who meets the Prophet is a sahābi, and Ibn al-Murtada explicitly argues that “meeting is not companionship linguistically, legally, or by custom” (al-liq̲ā‘ liyās bi-sahāba baṣlahun layhāna wa la shar‘an wa la ‘urfān); ibid., 180. Thus, it is not clear whether either al-Mughfira or Mu‘awiyah would qualify as sahāba in the eyes of the Zaydiyya in the first place.

\textsuperscript{133} Madelung, Der Imam al-Qāsim ibn Ihairīm (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1965),
ing to Ibrāhīm b. Muhammad al-Wazir (d. 914/1508), is the six volume *al-Jami‘ al-kāfi* by Abū ‘Abdullāh Muḥammad b. ‘Alī al-

Alawi al-Kūfī (d. 445/1053-4) and includes “hadīth, āthār, locations of the *sahāba* and *tābi‘ūn*, and the opinions of the Prophet's family (*'itra*).”134 The Caspian Imāms al-Mu‘ayyid bi-llāh ʿAḥmad b. al-

Ḥusayn b. Ḥārūn (d. 421/1030), Abū Ṭalīb Yahyā b. al-Husayn b. Ḥārūn (d. 424/1033), and al-Murshid bi-llāh Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn al-Shajara (d. 499/1105-6) all composed *hadīth* books called *amanī* (“dictations”) that were arranged thematically by Yemeni scholars of the following centuries.135 A cursory examination of Abū Ṭalīb’s *Amānī* reveals that the Imām heard many *hadīth* from the master Sunnī critic Ibn ‘Adī and that a significant percentage of the reports are on the authority of Ibn ‘Umar, something that comes as a surprise given Ibn ‘Umar’s initial reluctance to give ‘Alī the *bay’a*. Abū Hurayra is conspicuously absent from these reports, but other prolific *sahāba* such as Anas b. Malik, Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī, and Jābir b. ‘Abdullāh are all present, as well as, of course, ‘Alī. Imām Abū Ṭalīb’s *hadīth* book is, in short, an eloquent testimony to Kohlberg’s observation that the general acceptance of the probity of most *sahāba* “enabled

82-3. Madelung mentions that there are also reports from prominent Iraqis such as Ibn Abī Laylā, Abū Ḥanīfa, and Ṣufyān al-Thawrī. Furthermore, he remarks that this book contains reports solely of a legal nature and that none of them discuss theological topics. The *Amānī* ʿAḥmad b. Ṣād has been published twice, according to the Yemeni scholar Muḥammad ʿAzzān, but does not appear to be available in the United States according to World Cat. A manuscript copy is preserved in the Ambrosiana Library in Milan (H 133); see CAS I, 360-1. 134 Ibrāhīm b. Muhammad al-Wazir, *al-Felāk al-dawwār fi 'ulūm al-hadīth wa l-fiqh wa l-āthār*, ed. Muḥammad ʿAzzān (Ṣanʿā’ and Sa’dā, 1994), 59-60. Abū ‘Abdullāh al-ʿAlawi receives a short notice in *Ṣiyar al-ālim al-nabālī* (XVII, 636-7) in which al-Dhahabī praises him as Imām, *thikā*, *ḥaqīqāt* and *Musnīd al-Kufa*. He also remarks that the master *hadīth* scholar al-Ṣūrī made an abridgement of his work and praised him highly. Abū ‘Abdullāh’s *al-Ja‘mi‘ al-kāfi* survives in manuscripts; see Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*, Supplement, I (Leiden, 1937-42), 318, 598.

135 Two of these books have been published without any editorial niceties: *Taysir al-matālib fi amālī al-imām Abī Ṭalīb* (Beirut, 1975) was arranged into sixty-two chapters by the Yemeni al-Qāḍī Ja‘far b. ʿAḥmad b. Abī al-Salām (d. 573/1177-8) who studied in Kufa and Mecca and is reported to have brought al-Zamakhshari’s famous Qur’ān commentary *al-Kaṣṣāf* to Yemen as well; and *Kātib al-amālī al-shihāra bi-l-amālī al-khamsīyya* (Beirut, no date) that was arranged into forty chapters by al-Qāḍī Muḥammad b. ʿAḥmad al-Qurashī (d. 623/1226) who settled in Ḥūth (midway between Ṣanʿā’ and Sa’dā). The first *hadīth* of this latter book is, perhaps not coincidentally, the same famous *hadīth* on the authority of ‘Umar that opens al-Bukhārī’s *Ṣaḥīḥ*: “Truly actions are done by intentions and to every man belongs what he has intended...”
the Zaydiyya to accept Sunni traditions without compromising the special status enjoyed by the ahl al-bayt.  

While the three major Zaydi Imams of the third/ninth century whose works have been published have very little to say about the sahāba, two early Baghdadī Mu‘tazila help fill this lacuna. Abū Ja‘far al-Iskāfī (d. 240/854–5) can be found in the twelfth ābaqa in the Mu‘tazili ghetto of Sṣayar al-l‘ām al-nuhulā‘ mentioned in the previous chapter and we are fortunate to have both his refutations to al-Jahiz’s book al-‘Uthmāniyya as well as his son Abū Muḥammad Ja‘far’s book al-Mi‘yār wa l-muwāţanā published. These two works, which deal almost exclusively with the argument for the superiority of ‘Ali over Abū Bakr, will be supplemented by a discussion of twenty sahāba who turned away from (munharif) ‘Ali according to the opinions of scholars of the Baghdadī Mu‘tazila preserved in Ibn Abī l-Ḥadīd’s Sharī‘ al-balāgha. Although the Baghdadī Mu‘tazila neither composed any major hadīth books nor survived as an independent theological school, their opinions are significant for our study because they were most likely adopted by the Zaydiyya (along with their theology) and may have influenced the fifth/eleventh century Zaydi hadīth books that were just mentioned.

Abū Ja‘far al-Iskāfī’s refutations of selected arguments put forth by al-Jahiz in al-‘Uthmāniyya are aimed not at denying the merits of the sahāba in general, but at denying that any of the sahāba were superior to ‘Ali. Five topics occupy al-Iskāfī’s attention. The first is the question of precedence in conversion to Islam, and Abū Ja‘far amasses thirty-one reports, most of which have “Sunni” isnāds, as well as some verses of poetry that argue in favor of ‘Ali. A corol-
lary to this argument is the assertion that ‘Alī was not a mere child following the Prophet’s command but rather possessed a rational faculty and made a conscious choice to enter Islam. Abū Ja’far mentions five opinions concerning the age of ‘Alī at his conversion, ranging from nine to fifteen and argues that the minimal age for a boy to achieve rationality is ten, which, coincidentally, was the age of Ibn ‘Abbās when the Prophet died. The second topic is the argument that ‘Alī’s emigration was more dangerous than that of Abū Bakr, and a third one is ‘Alī’s well-known military superiority to him. Abū Ja’far seeks to debunk the “myth” that Abū Bakr was a great proselytizer by remarking that he was unsuccessful at converting his son ‘Abd al-Rahmān, his father, his mother, his wife Namla, or his pupil Jābīr b. Muṭ‘īm and that Muṣ‘ab b. Umayr, Sa’d b. Mu‘ādh, and Buraydā b. Ḥabīb were far superior to him in this respect. The final “myth” that al-Iskāfī seeks to shatter is that of Abū Bakr’s generosity, since he argues that it was actually the Prophet who freed Bilāl and ‘Amīr b. Fuhayr, and that Abū Bakr’s support of his family was nothing meritorious since it was obligatory.

Abū Ja’far’s son, Ibn al-Iskāfī, provides even lengthier arguments for the superiority of ‘Alī to Abū Bakr than his father and exposes contradictions within the opinions of the Muslim masses, the Sunnis (‘āmma). Ibn al-Iskāfī questions why the only proof offered for Abū Bakr’s superiority is a single widespread report on the authority of Ibn ‘Umar, while the reports from Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr, Salmān al-Fārīsī, and ‘Ammār are ignored. He also observes that several
prominent sahāba, such as 'Ā'isha, Ṭalha, al-Zubayr, Ibn 'Umar, Muhammad b. Maslama, and Usāma b. Zayd, did not give 'Alī the bay'a, and were opposed to 'Uthmān's practices.146 Another criticism raised by opponents of 'Alī, namely his willingness to shed Muslim blood, in contrast to 'Uthmān's reluctance to do so in order to save his own life, is cleverly refuted by the argument that Abū Bakr shed Muslim blood in the ḥidād, and so if 'Uthmān's position was correct, then Abū Bakr's must be wrong.146 Finally, Ibn al-İskäfi’s greatest coup in defense of his position that Abū Bakr was not the greatest sahābi is Abū Bakr's own locution “O you! I am not the best among you” at the Saqffā, an explicit text that Sunni scholars have had to interpret creatively for centuries.147

A particularly insightful dimension of Ibn al-İskäfi’s polemic is directed against those who deny the legitimacy of 'Alī’s caliphate due to the abstention of the group of sahāba whom I have mentioned earlier in this chapter. How is it, he asks, that Abū Bakr’s bay'a was considered complete by just the allegiance of 'Umar and Abū 'Ubayda when Sa’d b. 'Ubāda had already received his own bay'a from a group of the Anṣār? Likewise, how could 'Umar’s bay'a be superior to 'Alī’s when the former was appointed by Abū Bakr and 'Alī was elected by a shi‘rii? And, finally, how could 'Uthmān’s šūrā be superior to 'Alī’s given that the former consisted of only six Muhājirūn whereas the latter’s consisted of numerous Muhājirūn and Anṣār? While these arguments are far from flawless,148 they do

146 Al-Miṣyār wa l-muwāzana, 21–2. Just to be safe, Ibn al-İskäfi finds a more prominent ‘Alī supporter for each of these anti-‘Alī sahāba. Umūm Salama opposed 'Ā'isha’s trip to Basra; Ibn 'Abbās was superior to Ibn 'Umar; Ṭalha and al-Zubayr actually gave the bay'a to 'Alī and then violated it; Salman was superior to Muhammad b. Maslama; and 'Amīr was greater than Usāma. Ibn al-İskäfi wisely chose to ignore Sa’d b. Abī Waqqāṣ’s failure to pledge allegiance to ‘Alī, probably because there were not any other members of the šūrā that selected ‘Uthmān who supported ‘Alī, except, of course, ‘Alī himself.
147 Al-Miṣyār wa l-muwāzana, 33–4. Ibn al-İskäfi also raises the point, noted by Madelung, that most of the sahāba did not feel that the refusal to pay zakāt constituted apostasy pace Abū Bakr; ibid., 35.
148 wa l-layyikum wa ṭustu bi-khayrikum; al-Miṣyār wa l-muwāzana, 39–40. Ibn al-İskäfi refutes three apologetic interpretations of this statement present in his own day: 1) Abū Bakr was referring to his genealogy (naqād); 2) he was referring to his religion (din); 3) he was being modest (tawādū').
149 For example, he does not address the numerous reports that have al-Ashtar
indicate the "popular" nature of the selection of 'Ali that took place without careful manipulation by the Quraysh and Muhājirūn.

The greater part of al-Mīyār wa l-muwāzana is devoted to extolling the virtues of 'Ali, largely without comparison to other saḥāba. Ibn al-Iskāfī identifies five virtues, four of which he supports with Qur'ānic proof texts, all of which were found in his hero 'Ali. These virtues are knowledge of God and His religion, early conversion (taqdīm) to Islam, warfare (jihād) against enemies, patience in adversity, and pious asceticism. Ibn al-Iskāfī demonstrates 'Ali's excellence in all of these categories on the basis of a large number of speeches attributed to him, many of which the editor of al-Mīyār wa l-muwāzana was able to identify in Sharīf al-Rādī's fifth/eleventh century compilation Nahj al-balāgha. While it is impossible to gauge the impact of Abū Ja'far al-Iskāfī and his son upon their third/ninth century contemporaries, the efforts of these two men to strike a balance between those who rejected the legitimacy of 'Ali and those who practically deified him was a uniquely moderate position that was overwhelmed by the Sunnī insistence upon 'Ali's status as the fourth greatest saḥābi and survived only among the Zaydiyya in the long run.

Ibn Abī l-Ḥaddīd's collation of twenty saḥāba who opposed 'Ali from lost texts of earlier Baghdaḍī Mu'tazila, including al-Iskāfī, is significant for its identification of men whose probity was considered questionable with regard to religious issues. Three of these men—Abū Hurayra, 'Amr b. al-Āṣ, and al-Mughira b. Shu'ba—are accused explicitly of forging anti-'Ali hadith for Muʿawiyah, while Samura b. Jundab is reported to have received a large bribe from Muʿawiyah to interpret the following Qur'ānic verses as a reference to 'Ali:

And of mankind there is he whose conversation on the life of this world pleases you (Muḥammad), and he calls Allāh to witness as to what is in his heart; yet he is the most rigid of opponents. And when '}

149 Al-Mīyār wa l-muwāzana, 53-5. These virtues are supported by the following Qur'ānic verses: 39:9, 13:19, 35:28 (knowledge); 57:10 (precedence in Islam); 4:95, 9:111 (warfare); 2:177, 3:200 (patience); none (asceticism).

150 Note Ibn al-Iskāfī's identification of the parallel between Jesus and 'Ali in their respective religious traditions: while the Christians and Rāfīḍa deified their respective leaders, the Jews and Nuṣāb (anti-'Ali proto-Sunnīs) rejected them; al-Mīyār wa l-muwāzana, 31-2.
he turns away (from you); his effort in the land is to make mischief therein and to destroy the crops and the cattle; and Allah loves not mischief.\textsuperscript{131}

Abū Hurayra fares particularly badly in this section, as no less than seven authorities ranging from ‘Umar to Abū Ḥanīfa to Ibn Qutayba, are brought forth who question his reliability as a narrator of hadith.\textsuperscript{132}

Seven sahāba are also reported as being cursed by ‘Ali on a regular basis in his qunūt,\textsuperscript{133} and Ibn Abī l-Ḥadīd mentions the suffering endured by Anas b. Mālik and Zayd b. Arqam after their refusal to testify to the veracity of the Prophet’s speech at Ghadīr Khumm.\textsuperscript{134}

The remaining nine anti-‘Ali sahāba identified by Ibn Abī l-Ḥadīd share the additional common characteristics of having converted to Islam after the Battle of Badr and lived well into the early decades of the Umayyad dynasty.\textsuperscript{135} Particularly striking is the absence from this list of the prominent Muhājirūn who opposed ‘Ali, such as Tālha, al-Zubayr, or Sa’d b. Abī Waqqās, as well as ‘A’īsha, something which indicates that the Baghdādi Mu’tazila accepted their repentance (or martyrdom) after the Battle of the Camel as sincere.

The attitude of the Zaydiyya and Baghdādi Mu’tazila towards the sahāba is of primary interest for this project because it was a mod-

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{131} Ibn Abī l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ nūḥ al-balāgha, IV, 283 and 289. The accuser in both cases is none other than Abū Ja’far al-Īsākī; the Qur’ānic verses in question are 2:20-1-5.
  \item \textsuperscript{132} Sharḥ nūḥ al-balāgha, IV, 285-7.
  \item \textsuperscript{133} These men are Abū Musā 1-Ash’ārī, ‘Amr b. al-Ās, Busr b. Abī Arqā’a, Ḥabīb b. Maslama, Mu’āwiyya, al-Muhfrā b. Shurba, and al-Walīd b. Uqba; Sharḥ nūḥ al-balāgha, IV, 294. The qunūt is non-obligatory supplication said aloud during the second ṛak‘a of the daybreak prayer; the Prophet is reported to have cursed his enemies in his qunūt for a month and then abandoned this practice; see Sāḥīḥ Muslim bi-shukr al-nawawī, V, 150-4. Al-Tahāwī reports that the Hanafis, Ibn Shubrama, and Sufyān al-Thawri do not perform qunūt in the daybreak prayer. Ibn Abī Laylā, Mālik and al-Fāsīn al-Hāj perform it prior to the ṛak‘a, and al-Shāfī‘i performs it after the ṛak‘a; al-Tahāwī/al-Jassās, Mukhtasār ikhtilāf al-‘ulamā‘, I (Beirut: Dār al-Basha’ir Islamiyya, 1996), 215. The Imāmī Shī‘ī scholar al-Muḥaqiq al-Hilli (d. 677/1277) states that it is praiseworthy (masnūn) to perform the qunūt prior to the second ṛak‘a during the second ṛak‘a of every prayer; see his Sharḥ al-‘Īsām fi masnūn al-bīda‘ wa 1-ḥaram, I (Tehran: Intisharat Istiqlal, 1373-14-15), 71.
  \item \textsuperscript{135} These men are ‘Abdullāh b. al-Zubayr (d. 73/692), Abū Mas‘ūd al-Anṣārī (d. before 60/680), ‘Aqīl b. Abī Tālib (d. before 60), al-‘Ash‘ath b. Qays (d. before 41/661), Ḥanṣāla b. al-Rabī‘ al-Kāṭib, ‘Imrān b. H̄uṣayn (d. 52/667), Jarīr b. ‘Abdullāh al-Bajall, al-Nu’mān b. Bāshīr, and Zayd b. Thābit.
\end{itemize}
erate path not taken by either the Sunnis or the Imāmī Shi'a. The argument that 'All was the greatest human after the Prophet Muḥammad on the basis of his personal qualities of religious erudition, military prowess, early embrace of Islam, and piety was unpersuasive to the majority of the Muslim Community, who insisted that only the best man could have been the first successor to the Prophet, and to the Imāmī Shi'a whose elevation of 'All rested solely upon his supposedly clear designation by Muḥammad. Their efforts to affirm the probity of all but twenty or so saḥāba, most of whom were late converts to Islam and actively engaged in acts of defamation against 'All, was seen as a threat to the historiographical visions of both parties as well. It appears to be just another accident of history that the only place where the moderate position vis-à-vis the saḥāba advocated by the Zaydiyya and the Baghdādī Mu'tazila established deep roots was the mountainous region of northern Yemen.

VI.4 Sunni solutions

VI.4.1 The virtues of the saḥāba

A sensible place to discover the Sunni harmonization between the warring saḥāba is in the hadīth collections of the third/ninth century. The earliest extant hadīth compilation to have a chapter (kisāb) devoted to the virtues (fadā'īl) of specific individuals is the Musannaf of Ibn Abī Shayba. Two of Ibn Abī Shayba’s pupils, al-Bukhārī and Muslim, followed his lead and included chapters on the virtues of the saḥāba in their saḥīḥs. A final third/ninth century source that I shall use merely to identify the most popular saḥāba among the early

156 Many, if not most, Zaydi scholars believed that ‘All was designated as well, but they did not consider the elections of Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, or ‘Uthmān as sinful.

Sunnis is the Kitab faḍā'il al-sahāba that is attributed to Ibn Ḥanbal but is more accurately the work of his son ʿAbdullāh.158 The following sixty-three sahāba have been arranged according to the frequency with which they receive sub-chapters (ahuwāb) in these four books:

I. Sahāba receiving sub-chapters in all four sources (alphabetically arranged):

1) Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddiq
2) Abū ʿUbayd b. al-Jarrāḥ
3) ʿĀʾisha bint Abī Bakr
4) ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib
5) Fāṭima bint Rašūl Allāh
6) al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī
7) al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī
8) Ibn ʿAbdās
9) Ibn Masʿūd
10) Ibn ʿUmar
11) Jaʿfar b. Abī Ṭālīb
12) Jarīr b. ʿAbdullāh
13) Khadija bint Khuwaylid
14) Saʿd b. Abī Waqqās
15) Saʿd b. Muʿādhd
16) ʿUbayd Allāh
17) ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb
18) Usāma b. Zayd
19) ʿUthmān b. ʿAffān
20) al-Zubayr b. ʿAwwām

II. Sahāba receiving sub-chapters in three sources

1) al-ʿAbbas b. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib (absent from Muslim)
2) ʿAmmār b. Yāsir (absent from Muslim)
3) Bilāl b. Rabāḥ (absent from Ibn Ḥanbal)
4) Khālid b. al-Walīd (absent from Muslim)
5) Ṣuhayb b. Sinān (absent from Bukhārī)
6) Ṣubayy b. Kaʿb (absent from Ibn Ḥanbal)
7) Zayd b. Ḥāritha (absent from Ibn Ḥanbal)

III. Sahāba receiving sub-chapters in two sources 159

1) ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAwf (IH, IAS)
2) ʿAbdullāh b. Salām (B, M)
3) Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī (M, IAS)
4) Abū Mūsā l-Ashʿārī (M, IAS)
5) Abū Ṭalḥa Zayd b. Sahīl (B, M)
6) Muʿādhd b. Jabal (B, IAS)

158 Since this book does not appear to have been terribly influential and was published on the basis of a single surviving manuscript, I shall be making few references to it in the following paragraphs. Furthermore, there appear to be large additions to this book by ʿAbdullāh’s pupil Abū Bakr al-Qaṭīfī.

159 Abbreviations: B: Sahih al-Bukhārī; M: Sahih Muslim; IAS: al-Muṣannaf of Ibn Ḥabīb Shayba; IH: Fadāʾil al-sahāba of Ibn Ḥanbal.
Several of the primary actors in the early civil strife who were mentioned at the beginning of this chapter receive special attention in at least one of the four sources. Sa'd b. 'Ubada, the abused Khazraj leader who never gave the bay'a to Abū Bakr nor 'Umar, enjoys a subchapter in al-Bukharī’s Sahīh, while the anti-'Ali companions Zayd b. Thābit, Hassān b. Thābit, and 'Amr b. al-‘Āṣ all receive recognition in only one of the four sources. There are sub-chapters for the anti-'Ali sahāba ‘Abdullāh b. Salām and Mu‘awiyah, the neutral Abū Mūsā 1-Ash‘ārī, and the pro-'Ali Salmān al-Fārisī and Abū Dharr in half of the sources, and the martyred ‘Ammār b. Yāsir in three of them. It is striking that the vast majority of sahāba affiliated with the immediate internecine conflict of the post-prophetic Muslim Community, however, do not receive special recognition in these four

---

160 This is the only case among these sahāba in which a sub-chapter was made by al-Bukharī but he did not actually include any hadith in it; Fath al-bāṣr, VII, 463.
hadith books, and this suggests that the collection of the fadā'īl hadith played a limited role in the Sunni affirmation of the collective probity of the sahāba.

The twenty sahāba who receive sub-chapters in the two Sahīhs, Ibn Abī Shayba’s Muṣannaf, and Kūfā fadā'īl al-sahāba are a most interesting lot for this study. Six of them are close blood relatives of the Prophet Muhammad—his daughter Fāṭima,161 grandsons al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn,162 and first cousins ‘Alī and Ja‘far b. Abī Ṭālib,163 and ‘Abdullāh b. ‘Abbās164—a finding that supports Madelung’s argument of the primacy of the family among early Muslims.165

Fāṭima’s merits include al-Miswār b. Makhrama’s report that the Prophet said “Fāṭima is a part (ḥiḍāʾa) of me and whoever angers her angers me” (Fāith al-bārī, VII, 443, 476), which, according to Muslim’s variants, was the reason why the Prophet forbade ‘Alī to take a second wife while he was married to her; Sahīh Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī, XVI, 3.4. Fāṭima is also reported to have been questioned by ‘A’isha as to why she wept and then laughed during her meeting with her father while he was on his deathbed. While the hadith in both the Sahīhs of al-Bukhārī and Muslim attributes her tears to the news of the Prophet’s impending death, the version transmitted by ‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr attributes her laughter to his prediction that she will be the first of the abt al-bayt to join him, and that of Mārūq attributes it to his declaration that she is the “First lady of the believing women” (sayyidat ‘umma al-mu’minīn) or the “First lady of the women of the Muslim Community (umma).” The ‘Urwa version is in Fāith al-bārī, VII, 443 and Sahīh Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī, XVI, 5, while the Mārūq transmission is found only in the latter (ibid.).

Al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn are invariably grouped together in one sub-chapter and both al-Bukhārī and Muslim stress the Prophet’s love for his grandchildren in several hadith on the authority of Abū Hurayra, al-Bārā’ b. ‘Azīz, and Usāma b. Zayd. Fāith al-bārī, VII, 464; Sahīh Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī, XV, 156–7. Al-Bukhārī also includes reports from Abu Bakr and Anas that al-Ḥasan most resembled the Prophet, as well as another report from Anas that al-Ḥusayn most resembled his grandfather; Fāith al-bārī, VII, 464.

Al-Bukhārī reports on the authority of Abū Hurayra that Ja‘far was particularly generous to poor folk, and that Ibn ‘Umar would say “peace be upon you, son of the possessor of two wings” to ‘Abdullāh b. Ja‘far b. Abī Ṭālib, Fāith al-bārī, VII, 499–500. Muslim includes a lengthy report on the authority of Abū Mūsā al-ʿAṣikhārī and Asmā’ of his leadership role in the return of the ship of Muhājirūn who left for Abyssinia prior to the Hijra and returned in 7/629 while the Prophet and his army were at Khaybar; Sahīh Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī, XVI, 53–4.

Al-Bukhārī has two variants of a hadith in which the Prophet says “O God teach him wisdom (al-hikmah)” and “O God teach him the Book,” Fāith al-bārī, VII, 470–1. Muslim has the expression “O God, make him understand (ṣaqqāhū)” and Ibn Abī Shayba has “O God, make him understand the religion and teach him the inner meaning (al-la‘ilī)” Sahīh Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī, XVI, 331–2; al-Kitāb al-muṣannaf fī l-hadith wa l-a‘āthar, VI, 386.

Note also Muslim’s inclusion of a sub-chapter entitled “the virtue of those who are blood relatives to the Prophet (al-qarāba)” that consists of a hadith on the authority of ‘A’isha that the abt al-bayt mentioned in the Qur’ān 33:33 are al-Ḥasan, al-Ḥusayn, Fāṭima, and ‘Alī; Sahīh Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī, XV, 157–8. This opin-
Another striking observation is the presence of only one Ansârî, Sa’d b. Mu’âdh, and one late convert, Jarîr b. ‘Abdullâh al-Bajalî among this Muhâjirûn-heavy coterie. Three of these twenty sahâba are women, and the hallmark Sunni belief in the relationship between the relative merits of the first four caliphs and their historical sequence is reinforced in all four of these sources, each of which begins with Abû Bakr and ends with ‘Alî. Finally, it is somewhat curious that all of the shûrah members appointed by ‘Umar are found among these most esteemed sahâba except the tie-breaker ‘Abd al-Rahmân b. ‘Awf.

One of the major effects of the fadâ'il chapters in these hadîth books is the redemption of three of the four sahâbi leaders of the failed insurrection against ‘Alî at the Battle of the Camel. Taḥlà’s recovery is the least thorough, as his merits are limited to the mutilation his hands suffered in his defense of the Prophet Muhammad at Uhud and do not include any actual prophetic utterances.

ions is shared strongly by al-Ṭabârî, who includes an impressive array of reports in his exegesis of this verse on the authority of Umm Salâma in particular, and Abû Sa‘îd al-Khudrî, Anâs, ‘A‘îsha, Abû Hurayra and others to a lesser degree; Jâmi‘ al-bayan, XXII, 5–7. In fact, al-Ṭabârî musters only one report (on the authority of ‘Ikrima) that suggests that this verse refers exclusively to the “wives of the Prophet” and he puts it at the end of his discussion. Ibn Kathîr actually begins his commentary on Sûra 33:33 with this lone ‘Ikrima report prior to relating much of the pre-‘Alîd Tabârî material, because his primary purpose is to argue that the term ahîl al-baqî‘ includes the Prophet’s wives as well as ‘Alî, Fatîma, and their two sons; Ta‘rif al-Qur’ân al-‘âzîm, III (Beirut: Dâr al-Ma’rifâ, 1993), 491–4. By the time we reach the popular ninth/fifteenth century jâhil, Jalâl al-Dîn al-Mârsûlî and Jalâl al-Dîn al-Suyûtí, Ta‘rif al-Jâlâyîn (Beirut: Dâr al-Kitâb al-‘Arabî, 1984), 3:10.

Sa’d b. Mu’âdh was injured in the battle against Banû Qurayza and is considered traditionally the judge who delivered the harsh verdict against this Jewish clan just prior to dying from his wounds. Both al-Bukhârî and Muslim include Ja‘îr b. ‘Abdullâh’s report that the divine Throne rocked (shu‘a‘a‘) when Sa’d was buried and al-Ba‘rî’s hadîth that the Prophet declared that the handkerchiefs Sa’d received in paradise were softer than the silk that several ahîlîyat found particularly pleasing; Fâth al-bârî, VII, 499–500; Sahîh Muslim bi-sharh al-Nawawi, XVI, 3–4. Al-Bukhârî also mentions a hadîth on the authority of Abû Sa‘îd al-Khudrî in which the Prophet praises Sa’d’s verdict against Banû Qurayza; Fâth al-bârî, VII, 500.

Jâîr’s triumphant destruction of the pagan pilgrimage site called Dhû Khalasa is celebrated in the Sahîhs of al-Bukhârî and Muslim, as is his boast that the Prophet never declined him an audience (mâ tajabûni) after his embrace of Islam; Fâth al-bârî, VII, 521–2; Sahîh Muslim bi-sharh al-Nawawi, XVI, 79–31; al-Kitâb al-musannaf fi l-ahlîdîth wa l-kitâbî, VI, 400.

Fâth al-bârî, VII, 448; Sahîh Muslim bi-sharh al-Nawawi, XV, 152; al-Kitâb al-musannaf fi l-ahlîdîth wa l-kitâbî, VI, 379. The transmitters of these reports are the Basrân Abû ‘Uthmân al-Nahdî (d. 95/714–5) and Kufan Qays b. Abî Ḥâzm al-Bajalî (d. about 90/709).
Al-Zubayr fares substantially better than Talha, as he receives the sobriquet *hauwāṭ* from Muḥammad, played a heroic role in battle versus Banū Qurayza, and was considered as one of ‘Ā’isha’s two “fathers” in another report.119 ‘Ā’isha’s merits include the angel Gabriel’s salutations, a declaration of her superiority over all other women “like *ihārīd*”121 is superior to all other foods,” the reception of gifts from *saḥāba* courting favor from the Prophet, and the honor of having her husband pass away in her room.122 She is also identified as the Prophet’s sole wife in paradise,13 although only a third of her boasts proclaimed in a report in the *Musannaf* of Ibn Abī Shayba are confirmed in the *Saḥīh* of al-Bukhārī and Muslim.174 The message from these sources in unambiguous: the disastrous insurrection led by Ṭalḥa, al-Zubayr, and ‘Ā’isha did not denigrate their elevated

---

119 The meaning of *hauwāṭ* is not particularly clear in this context. Al-Bukhārī opens the sub-chapter with Ibn ‘Abbas’s explanation that al-Zubayr was called *hauwāṭ* because he wore white clothes and Ibn Ḥajar lists several possible interpretations, including helper (*waṣīt, nāṣīt*), friend (*khaḍī*), and pure or sincere (*khaḍī*); *Fath al-bārī*, VII, 445. Al-Qāḍī ‘Iyād prefers the meaning “helper” (*nāṣīt*) although he indicates that it could mean “special” (*khass*); *Saḥīh Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī*, XV, 152. This term is used exclusively in the plural and in reference to the disciples of Jesus in the Qurʾān; see 3:52, 5:111-112, 61:14.

121 *Fath al-bārī*, VII, 444-5; *Saḥīh Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī*, XV, 152-4; *al-Kūf al-musannaf fi l-ahādīth wa l-āthār*, VI, 379.


124 This is articulated not by the Prophet but rather by ‘Āmmār and al-Ḥasan during their speeches to rally the Kufans to fight with ‘Alī against ‘Ā’isha: I know that ‘Ā’isha is the Prophet’s wife in this world and the Hereafter, but God is testing you to follow Him (or: ‘Alī) or her; *Fath al-bārī*, VII, 478; *al-Kūf al-musannaf fi l-ahādīth wa l-āthār*, VI, 393. Muslim includes a report on the authority of ‘Ā’isha herself in which the Prophet learns the identity of his wife in paradise through a dream; *Saḥīh Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī*, XV, 164.

125 These nine qualities which only Mary, mother of Jesus, enjoyed besides her are the following: 1) An angel came in my shape; 2) I was seven years old when I married the Prophet; 3) I was nine when I entered his house; 4) I was a virgin; 5) divine revelation came to him while he was in my room; 6) I was among his favorite (shaḥb) people; 7) verses were revealed (because of me?) that, had they not been revealed, the Community would have perished; 8) I saw Gabriel, and nobody else did; 9) the Prophet died in my house; *al-Kūf al-musannaf fi l-ahādīth wa l-āthār*, VI, 392. ‘Ā’isha’s vision of Gabriel is contradicted by the *ḥadīth* in both *Saḥīhs* in which he offers his greetings to her and she says to the Prophet “you see that which I do not see”; *Fath al-bārī*, VII, 476; *Saḥīh Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī*, XV, 171-2.
status as sahāba who served the Prophet with distinction during his lifetime.

One final dimension of these hadith books that warrants examination is whether they successfully answer the challenge raised by Abū Ja'far al-Iskāfī and his son to find a greater sahābi than ‘Alī. An obvious candidate for this distinction is Abū Bakr, whom I already mentioned enjoys the first sahābi sub-chapter in all four of the surveyed sources. Al-Bukhārī and Muslim include a noticeably greater number of hadith in support of Abū Bakr’s merits than those in praise of ‘Alī, but the opposite situation is found in Ibn Abī Shayba’s Musannaf and Ibn Ḥanbal’s Kitāb fadā‘il al-sahāba. A closer analysis of the material reveals a far closer competition between these two men than the number of reports suggests at first glance.

Abū Bakr’s primary merits are enumerated in five hadith. The first one is transmitted by no fewer than five sahāba and states that he would have been the Prophet’s intimate friend (khalīf) had the Prophet taken one, but is instead his “companion and brother in Islam.”

The second hadith is ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ’s direct question to the Prophet “who is most dear (abābhu) to you?” to which he replied “‘A’isha,” and when pressed to name a man, said “her father.” Two more hadith on the authority of Abū Hurayra testify to Abū Bakr’s (and ‘Umar’s) unflinching belief in anything the Prophet saw, even if it involved a talking cow or wolf, as well as the Prophet’s declaration that Abū Bakr will be in paradise because he is the only person to

---

111 Al-Bukhārī has 17 reports for Abū Bakr and only six for ‘Alī; Muslim has eight for Abū Bakr, and four for ‘Alī; Ibn Abī Shayba has 26 hadith and sixteen āthār for Abū Bakr, and 25 hadith and 36 āthār for ‘Alī; In the Kātib fadā‘il al-sahāba we find 275 reports in praise of Abū Bakr and about 370 for ‘Alī, although only 164 of them are on the authority of ‘Abdullāh b. Ahmad b. Ḥanbal. The sole transmitter of this book, Abū Bakr b. Mālik al-Qatṭār, collected the remaining reports from his other teachers.

112 This hadith is transmitted by Ibn ‘Abbās, Ibn al-Zubayr, Abū Sa‘īd al-Khadrī, and Ibn Mas‘ūd; Fath al-bārī, VII, 365–6; Sahih Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī, XV, 122–3; al-Kātib al-musannaf fi l-ḥadīth wa l-āthār, VI, 351. Ibn ‘Abbās’s version found in al-Bukhārī reads: lām kanta mutahhaddan khatiltan la-taḥkhadhu Abī Bakr wa lākini abī wa sāhibi. Abū Sa‘īd’s version, included by Muslim and Ibn Abī Shayba, has the preface that “the most beneficial person to me with respect to wealth and companionship is Abū Bakr,” amannu t-nāsī ‘alayya fi mālikī wa saḥbatī Abī Bakr.

113 Fath al-bārī, VII, 357; Sahih Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī, XV, 125; al-Kātib al-musannaf fi l-ḥadīth wa l-āthār, VI, 254–5. Recall that ‘Amr is one of the three sahāba accused by the Baghdādī Mu’tazila of forging anti-‘Alid hadith that I mentioned above in the previous section.
combine the qualities of fasting, following funeral processions, feeding the poor, and visiting the infirm.\textsuperscript{178} Finally, the Prophet’s location to an unnamed woman that “if you do not find me, go to Abū Bakr” is a not particularly subtle indicant that Abū Bakr was the most deserving of the leadership of the Muslim Community after its founder’s death.\textsuperscript{179}

Al-Bukhārī culls several additional hadīth and āthār not mentioned by Muslim in support of Abū Bakr’s greatness. The Ibn ‘Umar report that was denigrated by Ibn al-Iskāfī, namely that “we would favor Abū Bakr, then ‘Umar, then ‘Uthmān at the time of the Prophet,” opens the sub-chapter of Abū Bakr’s merits in his Sahīh.\textsuperscript{180} ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭāb declares Abū Bakr to be “the best of us” (khayrūnā) in ‘Ā’isha’s transmission of the events of the Saqīfah, as does ‘Ali himself, at least according to his son Muhammad b. al-Hanafīyya.\textsuperscript{181} Two blatantly anti-‘Ali reports that indicate the superiority of the first three caliphs to his exclusion are also found in al-Bukhārī’s Sahīh.\textsuperscript{182} Finally, al-Bukhārī drives home the point of Abū Bakr (and

\textsuperscript{178} Fath al-bārī, VII, 367–8; Sahīh Muslim bi-sharh al-Nawawī, XV, 127–8; al-Kīṭāb al-musannaf fi l-ḥadīth wa l-āthār, VI, 255–6. Ibn Abī Shayba does not include the story about the miraculous talking cow or wolf.

\textsuperscript{179} in lām rujūdī fī ǧahīr Abū Bakr; Fath al-bārī, VII, 366; Sahīh Muslim bi-sharh al-Nawawī, XV, 126.

\textsuperscript{180} kunnii nukhāyiru bayna 1-nāsī fī zamānī l-nabī ﷺ fā-nukhāyiru Abū Bakr thamma ‘Umar thamma ‘Uthmān b. Ḥassān; Fath al-bārī, VII, 364.

\textsuperscript{181} Fath al-bārī, VII, 368–9. The Ibn al-Hanafīyya report is as follows: I said to my father [‘Ali]: “which person is best (khayr) after the Prophet?” He said: “Abū Bakr.” I said “who next?” to which he replied “‘Umar.” I was afraid that he would say “‘Uthmān,” so I said “Are you the next best?” to which he replied “I am but a man among the Muslims.” Ibn Ḥajar remarks that the isnād is entirely Kufan, and the master critic Sufyān al-Thawrī is found in it. This report is found also in al-Kīṭāb al-musannaf fi l-ḥadīth wa l-āthār, VI, 353.

\textsuperscript{182} The first of these is a report on the authority of Abū Musā ʿAlī b. ʿAshṣārī in which Abū Bakr seeks to meet with the Prophet and is promised paradise for no particular reason along with the acceptance of his request (lāthim lahu wa bashshirhu bi-l jamā‘ah); this identical routine occurs for both ‘Umar and then ‘Uthmān, the last of whom is promised paradise for “a trial that will befall him” (alā habbi ṭūsībuhu). The second hadīth follows immediately and consists of a random occasion in which Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, and ‘Uthmān were on Mount Ḫudh with the Prophet when it trembled (naǧfūn), the Prophet said “Be firm, Mount Ḫudh, for there is a Prophet, a trustworthy one (ṣīdīq) and two martyrs (ṣahīd) on it!” (Fath al-bārī, VII, 370–1). How Anas b. Malik could have heard this report is left to the reader’s imagination. Note a similar report to this one on the authority of Abū Ḥurayra in the Sahīh of Muslim: the mountain is Ḫirā instead of Ḫudh, and the saḥāba ascending it are not just the first three caliphs, but also ‘Ali, Taḥā, al-Zubayr, and, in a variant recension, Ša’d b. Abī Waqqās; Sahīh Muslim bi-sharh al-Nawawī, XV, 153.
'Umar's) superiority by the inclusion of a report in which 'Ali recalls how the Prophet used to say habitually "Abū Bakr, 'Umar and I did this, Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and I did this, and Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and I did this" and prays that God will put 'Umar in the company of his "two companions" (sāhibayh), Muḥammad and Abū Bakr.183

Muslim and Ibn Abī Shayba include a few additional reports that affirm Abū Bakr's superiority without identifying any particular virtues he may have possessed. The story of Abū Bakr and the Prophet in the cave during their perilous emigration to Yathrib is quoted briefly in both of these books.184 Muslim includes 'A'isha's opinion that the Prophet Muḥammad would have appointed Abū Bakr, 'Umar, or Abū 'Ubayda as his successors had he done so, and that the Prophet called for Abū Bakr, 'A'isha, and her brother in order to write some sort of succession document to prevent future generations of Muslims from quarrelling over the identity of the greatest sāhib.185 Ibn Abī Shayba includes an extraordinary report told by Abū Bakra al-Thaqafi to Mu‘āwiyah of the Prophet's dream in which he outweighed Abū Bakr on a scale, Abū Bakr outweighed 'Umar, 'Umar outweighed 'Uthmān, and the message was "[Such is the] caliphate and prophecy, and then God gave dominion (al-mulk) to whomever He wills."186 Another hadith unique to Ibn Abī Shayba on the authority of Jābir b. 'Abdullāh is the following: the Prophet stated that "a man of paradise will enter (this room)" prior to the entrance of both Abū Bakr and then 'Umar, the third time he said this, he added "Oh God, if you wish, make it 'Alī" after which 'Alī miraculously entered. This hadith appears to be a counterweight to the previously mentioned pro-Umayyad report and may have been forged by an adherent of the ṣahābiyya position, since 'Alī follows Abū Bakr and 'Umar, and 'Uthmān is not even in the room, literally or figuratively. While

Muslim's version is found in the sub-chapter of Ṭalḥa and al-Zubayr's virtues, and not in the one devoted to Abū Bakr.187

181 in kuntu la-arjān wa yağalaka lāhu ma‘a sāhibayhka, lit. and very many was kuntu asmadu rasūlu lāhi 34 yağula: kuntu wa Abū Bakr wa ‘Umar, wa fasā'īru wa Abū Bakr wa ‘Umar, wa-injālqyu wa Abī Bakr wa ‘Umar, wa in kuntu la-arjān wa yağalaka lāhu ma‘alhumū; Fākh al-bārī, VII, 371. The setting of this hadith is at ‘Umar's funeral and the reporter of 'Ali's comments is Ibn 'Abbās.

182 Ṣahīh Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī, XV, 122; al-Kitāb al-muṣannaf fi l-ahādīth wa l-āthār, VI, 351.

183 Ṣahīh Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī, XV, 125–6.

184 khilafatan wa rubuwusatan thumma ya‘lī lāhi l-mulka man yashā‘u; al-Kitāb al-muṣannaf fi l-ahādīth wa l-āthār, VI, 355.
these sub-chapters contain many positive references to Abu Bakr, most of which are recorded as prophetic utterances, little evidence is provided for the Sunni position of the superiority of Abu Bakr over his fellow contemporaries in general, and Ali in particular.

Three hadith dominate the sub-chapters of Ali's merits in the two Sahihs and Ibn Abi Shayba's Musannaf. The first is the Prophet's statement that "you (Ali) are in relation to me as Aaron was to Moses," a hadith that Muslim heard from no fewer than nine of his teachers. A particularly striking variant of this report preserved by Muslim sets this hadith in the context of Sa'd b. Abi Waqqas's excuse for refusing to curse Ali in response to Mu'awiya's question "what prevents you from cursing Abu Turab?" Ali's military prowess is recounted in the second hadith, in which he was given the leadership position (raya) that led to the victory at Khaybar in 7/629. The Prophet's statement that Ali is one "who loves God and His messenger and whom God and His messenger love too" is found in most versions of this hadith. The final report found in all three sources is a positive spin put on Ali's nickname Abu Turab (father of dirt) that was employed as a term of abuse during the Umayyad period.

While al-Bukhari's remaining reports of Ali's merits are lackluster,

---

188 *anta minni bi-manzalatun* Hārūn min Mūsā; Fatḥ al-bārī, VII, 434; Sahih Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī, XV, 141-3; al-Kišāb al-muṣannaf fi l-ahādīth wa l-āthār, VI, 369. Muslim's nine sources, many of whom we have encountered in previous chapters, are Yahyā b. Yahyā al-Tamīmī, Abū Ja'far Muhammad b. al-Sababbāh, Ubayd Allāh al-Qawlīrī, Surayj b. Yūnūs, Ibn Abi Shayba, Muḥammad b. al-Muḥāmmad, 'Ubayd Allāh b. Mu‘ādh, Qutayba b. Sa‘īd, and Muḥammad b. ‘Abdād.

189 *mā mana‘aka an tasubba Abī Tūrāb?* Sahih Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī, XV, 143. The other two excuses that Sa‘d puts forth in this hadith are Ali's military prowess at Khaybar (the second major hadith of the virtues of Ali) and exegesis of the "sons of the Prophet" in Sura 3:61 as Ali, Fātimah, al-Hasan, and al-Husayn.

190 Fatḥ al-bārī, VII, 432-3; Sahih Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī, XV, 143-5; al-Kišāb al-muṣannaf fi l-ahādīth wa l-āthār, VI, 372-3.

191 yuhubbī wāla wa rasīlaahu wa yuhubbūthu lāhu wa rasīlaahu; the second half of this sentence is suppressed or cast in doubt in the Sahih of al-Bukhārī, but found in the books of Muslim and Ibn Abi Shayba; Fatḥ al-bārī, VII, 432-3; Sahih Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī, XV, 143-5; al-Kišāb al-muṣannaf fi l-ahādīth wa l-āthār, VI, 372-3.

192 The gist of the story in the two Sahīhs is that the Prophet found Ali asleep in the mosque instead of with Fātimah and that he wiped dirt (tūrāb) off of Ali's back from where his covering had slipped; Fatḥ al-bārī, VII, 433; Sahih Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī, XV, 147. Note that al-Bukhārī suppressed the context of this hadith, whereas Muslim identified it as a reaction of the sahābi transmitter, Sahl b. Sa‘īd, to the vilification (yashtumm) of Abū Turāb (Ali) by an unidentified Marwānid governor of Medina.
Muslim includes a hadith that is remarkably pro-Shīʿī. It is a variant transmission of the events of Ghadir Khumm, in which the Prophet declared that he left for his community two "weighty guides (thagalayn): the Book of God... and my family (ahl bayt)—I remind you, oh God, of my family." The transmitter of this hadith, Zayd b. Arqam, even clarifies the meaning of the contentious term ahl al-bayt and defines it as not just the Prophet’s wives, but all those who were prohibited from taking from the alms (sadaqa), namely the families of ‘Ali, his brothers ‘Aqil and Ja‘far, and the family of al-‘Abbās b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib. Muslim’s inclusion of this hadith, combined with his pro-‘Alīd exegesis of Sūra 33:33 not only sets him apart from al-Bukhārī’s uninspired presentation of ‘Ali and his family, but even supports Madelung’s previously cited assertion of the elevated status of the Prophet’s household during his lifetime.

The fadā’il sub-chapters found in the Sahīhs of al-Bukhārī and Muslim, the Musannaf of Ibn Abī Shayba, and Kitāb fadā’il al-saḥāba attributed to Ibn Hanbal accomplish three major tasks with regard to the classical Sunnī position on the saḥāba. The first effect is the subtle suggestion that the succession of the first four caliphs mirrored their respective excellence, as all four books are structured so that the first four saḥāba mentioned are the first four caliphs in their historical sequence. Secondly, this study uncovered that all but two of the twenty most-favored saḥāba were Quraysh Muhājirūn or wives of the Prophet. Thirdly, these sub-chapters affirm the greatness of Tālḥa, al-Zubayr, and ‘Aʿīsha despite their military foray against...
\textquote[\textbf{Alī, and some of them even endeavor to redeem ‘Ali’s ṣahābī opponents at Šiffin, Mu‘awiya and ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ. Perhaps the most striking finding is that these reports provide lackluster evidence of the superiority of Abū Bakr over ‘Alī, and the fact that six of the twenty most-favored ṣahāba are blood relatives of the Prophet could potentially support the claims of the Zaydiyya/Baghdādi Mu‘tazila and Madelung that ‘Alī was both a feasible successor to the Prophet and enjoyed a uniquely privileged relationship (like that between Aaron to Moses) with him. While these selections from a few third/ninth century hadith books clearly refute the extreme Rāfidī opinion that all but a handful of ṣahāba apostasized immediately after the death of the Prophet, they do seem a long cry from the classical Sunni ideal of the collective probity of the Companions, and, instead, promote a moderate position that certain of these men and women distinguished themselves from the masses by their loyalty to the Prophet and by his explicit praise of their actions and character.]

\textbf{VI.4.2 Ibn Sa‘d and the art of prosopography}

Ibn Sa‘d’s \textit{al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr} contains entries of variable length for 1371 male and 629 female ṣahāba. This vast array of material not only rectifies the oversight of the role of the Anṣār and later converts found in the \textit{ṣaḥā’il} chapters of the four hadith compilations just surveyed, but also emphasizes the collective role of the ṣahāba in the formative period of Islam. Ibn Sa‘d pays respect to the 140 men killed in the major battles led by the Prophet Muhammad as well as the twelve casualties at the raid on Mu‘ta, and the fifty-five ṣahāba deaths at the battle of Yamāma at ‘Aqrabā during the brief caliphate of Abū Bakr.\footnote{Fourteen ṣahāba were killed at Badr, seventy-nine at Uḥjud, five at Khandaq, thirteen at Khaybar, and twenty-two at either al-Hunayn or al-Ta‘īf according to Ibn Sa‘d. Note that he reports that eight were killed at Ajnadayn and nine at the Battle of the Bridge during the reign of ‘Umar.} \textit{Al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr} is far more than a memorial to the ṣahāba who gave their lives to the establishment of Islam and instead provides basic information as to the identities of the major figures who were the earliest Muslims, those who excelled on the battlefield, and those who were gifted with superior knowledge, three qualities which were and continue to be held in considerable esteem in the eyes of Muslims. The next several paragraphs show how Ibn
Sa‘d transcends the question of the identity of the “best” sahābi (or sahāba) that concerned many of his contemporaries and, instead, provides valuable information as to how the venture of Islam succeeded in establishing a firm base in the Hijāz during the lifetime of the Prophet Muḥammad.

Ibn Sa‘d quotes a definition of the term sahābi that was championed by his teacher Muḥammad b. ‘Umar al-Waqīdī and is remarkably similar to the one put forth by Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī a century later. Al-Waqīdī states:

> Whoever saw the Messenger of God and saw his forbearance (ḥidm) and submitted and understood (‘aqala) the religion and its goodness (rādiyahu) is a companion of the Prophet, in our opinion, even if it was for just an hour of the day. His companions are of different stations and classes, and [differ according] to precedence in their conversion. Every man is described by what he saw of the conduct of the Prophet and what he heard from him; this is what determines his degree of greatness as a companion.

All of the companions (ṣaḥāb) of the Messenger of God were Imāms who should be emulated and whose actions have been preserved. They were asked to issue legal rulings and did so, they heard hadīth, and they conveyed them.

Al-Waqīdī even divides the sahāba who outlived the Prophet into three categories according to their roles in hadīth transmission: 1) those whose hadīth were preserved; 2) those who gave fatwas; 3) those who did not transmit any hadīth, even though they may have enjoyed a close acquaintance with the Prophet out of fear of inaccurate transmission, or due either to their being ignored (by the taḥāfūn) or due

---

198 kullu man ra‘a rasūla Allāhi wa qad adhaka l-kitāna fa-aslama wa ‘aqala amma l-dhu wa rādiyahu fa-anwa ‘indahi minman sahīha i-nabi wa lau saw sa‘a min al-i-nāhāni wa lktāna ashāhānu da ‘alā marazihim wa tabaqatihim wa tashdhdihim fi l-islami fa-yuṣsfu kullu rajulun minhum bi-mā adhaka min amma l-nabi wa bi-nā sam‘a minhu fa-yaqaru dhihāka ila 'ṣābihāki da ‘alā marazihim min dhihāka; al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr, VIII, 604–5. The context of this remark is the entry of Jarfr b. ‘Abdullah al-Bajall, who entered Islam during the last five months of the Prophet’s life. Al-Waqīdī refutes the opinion attributed to Sa‘d b. al-Musayyab by his grandson that a sahābi had to spend at least a year or two or fought in a battle or two with the Prophet in order to earn his status by citing the example of Jarfr and by this definition of a sahābi.

199 wa kullu asḥāb usul Allāhi min kānu cimmamān yuqtada bi-hum wa yuḥfaz ‘alayhim nā kānu yaf‘alinna wa yustina fa-yusfinna wa sam‘ī ahbābihu fa-adddikhit; al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr, II, 439. The context for this citation is al-Waqīdī’s explanation as to why to few hadīth are transmitted on the authority of senior sahāba and so many from the younger ‘jurist’ sahāba. The simple reason for this discrepancy, he says, is due to the fact that the older sahāba passed away before they were asked many questions.
to their devotion to religious acts and *jihād*. It should be clear from these comments that al-Waqqāṭī’s opinions concerning the *ṣaḥāba* fall squarely in the Sunni camp (despite his poor reputation as a *ḥadīth*-transmitter) and it is quite likely that his effort to “gather all of the names that have reached us of participants in the Prophet’s battles . . . and who transmitted *ḥadīth* from him” inspired (if not directly contributed to) Ibn Sa’d’s prosopographical achievement.

The primary division of the *ṣaḥāba* in *al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr* is five classes according to the date of the earliest battle in which an individual participated. Ibn Sa’d identifies 333 participants at Badr, 351 who were early Muhājirūn and Ānār but did not participate at Badr, 308 who embraced Islam prior to the conquest of Mecca (8/630), 333 who entered Islam after the conquest of Mecca, and 46 who were young at the time of the Prophet’s death. While these 1371 entries represent only a fraction of the reported 30,000 participants in the expedition to Ṭābūk (who must have been *ṣaḥāba* by al-Waqqāṭī’s definition), they give some indication as to the scale of the nascent Muslim community prior to the conquest of Mecca and provide a foundation for a closer examination of the leaders, many of whom were invisible in the *fadā’il* sub-chapters of the *ḥadīth* books that we just studied.

Ibn Sa’d shifts attention away from the acrimonious dispute over the “first male *ṣaḥāḥ*” and instead identifies three groups of the earliest Muslims whose adoption of Islam was critical in the first decade of Muḥammad’s mission. The first group consists of twenty-nine men who converted to Islam prior to the Prophet’s “entry into the house of al-Arqam,” an event associated near the initiation of public preaching of Islam roughly three years into the prophetic mission. It includes famous *ṣaḥāba*, such as Abū Bakr, ʿAlī, Bilāl, Sa’d

---

200 Al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr, II, 440.
202 The division of the female *ṣaḥāba* section is, by necessity, arranged differently; the first group are the daughters, paternal aunts, paternal nieces, and wives of the Prophet, followed by 117 women who converted prior to the Hijra, and concludes with 349 women who took the oath of allegiance to the Prophet in Medina; see *al-Tabaqat al-kubrā*, VIII and Ruth Roded, *Women in the Islamic Biographical Collections* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 1994), 21–38.
203 Al-Waqqāṭī gives the number 30,000 for the Ṭābūk campaign, *al-Tabaqat al-kubrā*, II, 440.
204 The Prophet’s entry into the house of al-Arqam is not mentioned in Ibn
b. Abi Waqqas, Talha, 'Uthman, al-Zubayr, 'Abd al-Rahman b. 'Awf, Ibn Mas'ud, Abii 'Ubayda b. al-Jarrâh, and Ja'far b. Abii 'Alî, as well as six men who lost their lives in battle during the lifetime of the Prophet.\(^{205}\) Sa'id b. Zayd b. 'Amr was another member of this group, and Khabbab b. al-Aratt (d. 37/657) survived serious abuse at the hands of the Meccans but died in Kufa as 'Ali was on his way to the battle of 'Siffin.\(^{206}\) While Ibn Sa'd provides relatively little information about the remaining eleven sahâba who entered Islam "prior to Arqam," he does perform the service of indentifying the core believers whose adherence to Islam in the hostile environment of Mecca ultimately attracted the attention of the first converts among the Anṣâr.

Ibn Sa'd identifies ten Anṣâr who met the Prophet in Mecca and embraced Islam prior to the 'Aqaba meetings that occurred after the Hijra. 'Uqba b. Wahb earned a unique distinction of being a Muhâjir-Anṣâr since he stayed with the Prophet in Mecca after his conversion and did not return to his hometown until the Hijra.\(^{207}\) Dhakwân b. Qays and As'âd b. Zurâra also receive the honor of being the first Khazraj converts to Islam, although the former was killed at Uhud and the latter was to live for only nine months after the Hijra.\(^{208}\) Ibn Sa'd mentions 'Awf b. al-Hârith, Jabir b. 'Abdullâh b. Rûâb, Qutba b. 'Amir b. 'Abdul-Mâhî, and 'Uqba b. 'Amir b. Nâbî.

Hishâm's al-Širât al-nabawiyya; see W. M. Watt, Muḥammad at Mecca (Oxford, 1953), 87. Watt quotes Caetani's dating of the event to 614, one year after the first public preaching of Islam (ibid., 59). All of the references to an individual converting prior to this event in al-Tabaqât al-kubrâ are from al-Waqidi al-Muhammad b. Sâlih → Yazid b. Rûmân in the isnâd and read something like the following: "Abû Ḥudhayfa became Muslim prior to the Messenger's entry into the House of al-Anṣâr in which he called [others to Islam]] aslama Abû Ḥudhayfa qubla dakhâli rasûli lâhû 544 dara l-arqam yad'û fihû; al-Tabaqât al-kubrâ, III, 46. There are other references to Dâr al-Anṣâr with different isnâds for sahâba who converted in the house, such as Muṣ'âb b. 'Umâyr b. Ḥâshîm and Ḥâyâyî b. Umâyra b. Wahb; ibid., III, 62-66.

\(^{205}\) 'Ubayda b. al-Hârith was killed at Badr; 'Abdullâh b. Jahsh, Abii Salama b. 'Abd al-Asad, Khunays b. Ḥudhâfa, and 'Uthman b. Maz'ûn were killed at Uhud; 'Amir b. Fuhayra was killed at Bi'r Ma'ûna (4/625).

\(^{206}\) Sa'id b. Zayd was advised by his father to follow "the religion of Abraham" and is the unique transmitter of the oft-quoted hadith of the "ten promised paradise"; al-Tabaqât al-kubrâ, III, 203-6. Khabbab b. al-Aratt was a captive who was freed in Mecca by Umm 'Ammâr; ibid., III, 87-9.

\(^{207}\) Al-Tabaqât al-kubrâ, III, 280. Little else is known about his life.

\(^{208}\) Al-Tabaqât al-kubrâ, III, 300 (Dhakwân) and 307-10 (As'âd).
among the "first six Anṣārī converts," and he adds Mu‘ādh b. al-Ḥārith and ‘Uwaym b. Sa‘āda among the "first eight Anṣārī converts." While very little is known about any of these men, their acceptance of Islam during a difficult period of the Prophet’s mission must have been significant since they redirected his energy to Yathrib and laid the groundwork for the first Muslim polity.

The most important leaders among the oft-neglected Anṣār may have been the twelve nuqabā’ (leaders) who embraced Islam prior to the Hijra. These men represented eight clans among the Aws and Khazraj tribes and half of them possessed the valuable skill of literacy in Arabic. Al-Bara’ b. Ma‘rūr died a month prior to the Hijra, leaving a third of estate to the Prophet, and As‘ad b. Zurār, whom we just mentioned, also died prior to Badr. Sa‘d b. Khaythama was killed at Badr, and Sa‘d b. al-Rabi‘, ‘Abdullāh b. ‘Amr, and Rāf‘ b. Mālik were all slain at Uhud. Only four of the twelve nuqabā’ outlived the Prophet: Usayd b. al-Hudayr (d. 20/641), Abū l-Haytham al-Tayyihān (d. 20/641), Sa‘d b. ‘Ubāda (d. 15/636), and ‘Ubāda b. al-Sāmit (d. 34/654–5). The attention Ibn Sa‘d devotes to these twelve founding fathers of Medinan Islam contrasts sharply with al-Bukhari’s inclusion of only Sa‘d b. ‘Ubāda and Usayd b. al-Hudayr among his sub-chapters on the virtues of the sahāba in the..."
and emphasizes the collective nature of the first stages of the venture of Islam. The manner of presentation in *al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr* makes it somewhat challenging to reduce to a meaningful number the *ṣaḥāba* who were most significant on the battlefield. Roughly 160 men are reported to have participated in all of the battles led by the Prophet from the time of Badr or Uhud. The following is a list of thirty-four of these loyal soldiers (in alphabetical order) for whom Ibn Sa'īd provides a death date after the year 30 AH and who subsequently witnessed the unraveling of political leadership under ‘Uthmān; it contains many of the names mentioned in the previous sections, as well as some new faces.

1) ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ‘Awf (d. 32) 18) Jābr b. ‘Atīk (d. 61)
2) ʿAbdullāh b. Masʿūd (d. 32) 19) Kaʿb b. Mālik (d. 50)
3) ʿAbdullāh b. Zayd b. ‘Abd (d. 32) 20) Khabbāb b. al-ʿArātī (d. 37)
4) ʿAbdullāh b. Zayd b. ʿĀṣim (d. 63) 21) Khāwāt b. Jāibur (d. 40)
5) Abū ʿAbs b. Jabr b. ʿAmr (d. 34) 22) al-Miqād b. ʿAmr (d. 33)
6) Abū l-Yasār, Kaʿb b. ʿAmr (d. 55) 23) Miṣāḥ b. Uthāthah (d. 34)
7) Abū Qatāda b. Rībīʿ (d. 54) 24) Muḥammad b. Maslama (d. 46)
8) Abū ʿAlī b. Zayd b. Sahl (d. 34) 25) Qūdāma b. Māzʿūn (d. 36)
9) Abū Usayd al-Sāʿīdī (d. 34) 26) Rāfīʿ b. Khadij (d. 74)
10) ʿAlī b. Abī ʿAlī (d. 40) 27) Saʿūd b. Abī Waqqās (d. 55)
11) ʿAmr b. ʿAṣim (d. 63) 28) Sahl b. Hunayf (d. 38)
12) ʿAmr b. Rabīʿa b. Mālik (d. 35) 29) Saʿūd b. Zayd b. ʿAmr (d. 50)
13) ʿAmmār b. Yāsir (d. 37) 30) Ṣuhayb b. Sinān (d. 38)
14) al-ʿArqām b. Abī ʿArqām (d. 55) 31) Ṭalḥa b. ʿUbayd Allah (d. 36)
15) ʿĀṣim b. ʿAdī (d. 45) 32) al-Tūfāyil b. al-Ḥārith (d. 32)
16) al-Ḥārith b. Khazama (d. 40) 33) ʿUbdād b. al-Sāmit (d. 34)
17) Ḥudhayfā b. al-Yāmān (d. 36) 34) al-Zubayr b. al-ʿAwvām (d. 36)

Ibn Saʿīd also identifies *ṣaḥābī* leaders of fifty-five raids (*ṣaṭīya*) commissioned by the Prophet but which he himself did not join. Six of
these raids were really just assassinations, often of hostile poets, and one was a proselytizing mission that landed ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Awf a royal wife. The remaining raids were led by twenty-nine sāhiba, nine of whom led multiple ones. Zayd b. Haritha was in charge of eight expeditions, the last of which was the disastrous raid of Mu’ta in which he was killed. Ghālib b. ‘Abdullāh al-Laythī led three raids, and both ‘Alī and Khālid b. al-Walīd led two expeditions and a campaign to destroy an idol, respectively. Muḥammad b. Maslama was in charge of two raids, as well as a participant in the assassination of Kaʾb b. al-Ashraf, and Abū Qatāda b. Ribʿī, ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ, Bashīr b. Saʿd, and ‘Ukāsha b. Miḥṣan al-Asadī executed a pair of expeditions. The raids led by ‘Umar and Saʿd b. Abī Waqqāṣ both failed to engage the enemy, and the one led by Abū Bakr against Banū Kilāb resulted in the capture of a lady who was traded for Muslim prisoners held in Mecca. Once again, Ibn Saʿd does not address the question as to the name of the “greatest warrior” among the sāhiba and instead provides an array of information as to the most reliable soldiers of the Prophet’s armies as well as leaders of his special raids (sariyya).

The topic of the respective religious and secular knowledge of the

---


217 Al-Ṭufayl b. ‘Amr was sent to destroy the idol Dhū l-Kaffayn (8/630); ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ led the destruction of Suwāʾ, Khālid b. al-Walīd eliminated al-‘Uzza, and Saʿd b. Zayd al-Ashhali leveled Manār in the same year; ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭalīb led the destruction of Fulis (9/630–1); al-Tabaqīt al-kubri, II, 322–31.

218 The Prophet sent ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Awf to the Kalb tribe at Dūmat al-Jandal in the year 6/628 to spread Islam and instructed him to marry the daughter of the Christian king al-Asbagh b. ‘Amr if his tribe embraced Islam. The king converted to Islam, ‘Abd al-Rahmān married his daughter Tuḥmād bint al-Asbagh and brought her back to Medina. She bore him Abī Salama, one of the “seven jurists of Medina” and a major hadith transmitter; al-Tabaqīt al-kubri, II, 294.

219 Six of these raids occurred in the year 6/628–9; al-Tabaqīt al-kubri, II, 293–5.

220 Saʿd missed a caravan he was hoping to raid nine months after the Hijra; ‘Umar’s raid against the Hawazin, who fled the battlefield, took place in 7/629; al-Tabaqīt al-kubri, II, 252 and 308.

221 Ibn Saʿd mentions also in this section that Abū Bakr led the first pilgrimage (hajj) in the year 9/630; al-Tabaqīt al-kubri, II, 334.
sahāba is perhaps the most relevant one for this project. Ibn Sa‘d identifies no fewer than twenty-six poets among the sahāba, half of whom embraced Islam after the conquest of Mecca. These individuals include the Prophet’s poet laureates al-Hassān b. Thābit and Ka‘b b. Mālik, the famous pre-Islamic poets Labid b. Rabī‘a and Nābigha b. Ja‘da, and poets who spent much of their lives in opposition to Islam and habitually slandered the early Muslims. 222 Thirteen Anṣār, six of whom were among the twelve nuqabā‘, possessed the ability to write Arabic, something in each case that Ibn Sa‘d remarks was “rare” among the Arabs prior to Islam. 223 The Anṣār also dominate lists of sahāba who compiled the Qur‘ān during the lifetime of the Prophet, with Ubayy b. Ka‘b, Mu‘ādh b. Jabal, and Zayd b. Thābit being among the most commonly cited names. 224 Of most importance for this study is the chapter of the twenty following sahāba who “gave fatwas, were models during the time of the Prophet and afterwards, and in whom the aggregate religious knowledge is located”: 225

3) ‘Abdullāh b. ‘Amr b. ‘Āṣ 13) Abī Ó. Abī Ṭālib
6) ‘Abdullāh b. ‘Umar 16) Salmān al-Farīsī
7) Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq 17) Shaddād b. ‘Aws
8) Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī 18) ‘Ubāda b. al-Ṣāmit
9) Abū Hurayra 19) Ubayy b. Ka‘b
10) Abū Mūsā l-Ash’ārī 20) ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb

222 This group includes ‘Abdullāh b. al-Zib‘arī, Abū Sufyān b. al-Hārith, and Bushayr b. al-Hārith.

223 See, for example, the comment with regard to Sa‘d b. al-Rabī‘: kānat al-kitāba fi l-‘arabī qatila; al-Tabaqāt al-kubrā, III, 370.

224 Al-Tabaqāt al-kubrā, II, 428-9. Other names include Abū l-Dardā‘, ‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān, ‘Ubāda b. al-Ṣāmit, Tamīm al-Dārī, Abū Ayyūb al-Anṣārī, and a paternal uncle of Anas b. Mālik identified as Abū Zayd. Mujammī‘ b. Jarīya is reported by al-Sha‘bī to have compiled all but two or three surās, and Ibn Mas‘ūd heard a little over ninety surās from the Prophet and the rest from Mujammī‘. (Note that Mujammī‘ does not have an entry in al-Tabaqāt al-kubrā, but is in al-Isāba, III, 366.) The sources for this information are al-Sha‘bī, Ibn Sirin, Qatāda, Anas, and Muhammad b. Ka‘b al-Quraṭī.

225 man kāna yuṭī bi-l-Madīna wa yuqālā bi-hi min asḥābī rasūli lāḥi  š ‘alā rasūli lāḥi  wa ba‘da  dāhikā wa ild man intahā ‘ilmukum; al-Tabaqāt al-kubrā, II, 418.
The evidence in support of the special status of these ṣaḥāba ranges immensely. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Awf, ‘Abdullāh b. ‘Amr, Abū Bakr, Abū Dharr, Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī, Ibn ‘Umar, ‘Imrān b. al-Ḥusayn, Salmān al-Fārisī, Shaddād b. ‘Aws, and ‘Ubāda b. al-Ṣāmīt each receive three or fewer reports in support of their exceptional religious knowledge. Abū Ḍūsā, ‘Alī, Ibn ‘Abbās, Ibn Mas‘ūd, Mu‘ādh b. Jabal, and Ubuyy are praised for their superior knowledge of the Qurʾān, some of whom praise each other’s Qurʾānic knowledge.226 ‘A‘isha is the only ṣaḥāba identified as an expert of sunan, and Abū Hurayra’s self-defense against the charge of spreading too many ḥadīth (ikhtār al-ḥadīth) is articulated both here as well as in his biography among the ṣaḥāba of the third tabqa.227 The masters of legal opinions (fathā, fiqh, or qadā) include ‘A‘isha, ‘Alī, Ibn ‘Abbās, and Zayd b. Thābit. Sulaymān b. Yasār is quoted as saying that ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān elevated Zayd’s opinions above those of everyone else, and al-Zuhri mentions that Zayd’s legal authority continued in Medina until his death in 45/665.228 Ibn Sa‘d also provides some tantalizing references to the religious advisors (shūrā) of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar which include Ibn Mas‘ūd, Abū l-Dardā’, and Abū Dharr according to Shu‘ba and ‘Uthmān, ‘Alī, ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Awf, Mu‘ādh, Ubuyy, and Zayd b. Thābit according to al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad.229 Finally, only ‘Alī, ‘Umar, and Zayd b. Thābit are included in all

226 For example, Abū Musā praises Ibn Mas‘ūd’s recitation, and Ibn Mas‘ūd praises Mu‘ādh as an “obedient ummā” like the prophet Ibrahim, as well as Ibn ‘Abbās: al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, II, 423, 425-6, 434. Note also that ‘Umar and Anas praise Ubuyy as the most learned in Qurʾānic recitation; ibid., II, 422.
227 This apology rests upon both two Qurʾānic verses (Sūra 2:159-60) and a prophetic ḥadīth in which Abū Hurayra’s memory was miraculously safeguarded by his cloak. Ibn Sa‘d also includes a report with Ibn ‘Umar’s praise of Abū Hurayra: “you are the most knowledgeable among us of the Messenger of God and have memorized the most ḥadīth,” al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, II, 432-3 and IV, 479-88.
228 Al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, II, 431. Zayd’s greatest triumph was ‘Uthmān’s adoption of his reading of the Qurʾān as the official text; this act seriously offended Ibn Mas‘ūd, who wryly complained that Zayd was a “mere youth with two locks of hair playing with boys” (wa Zayd ibn Thābit ghulāmun lahu shu‘abatāni ya‘abu ma‘a l-qiblām) at the time he was hearing the Qurʾān directly from the Prophet’s mouth; ibid., II, 422.
229 Al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, II, 419 (Shu‘ba’s report) and 426 (al-Qāsim). Note also the report in ‘Umar’s lengthy entry that he refused to employ saḥaba such as ‘Uthmān, ‘Alī, ‘A‘īma, al-Zubayr, and ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Awf in the territories due to his “rejection against tainting them with work” (ahhrakhu an ādammahum bi-l-‘amal) and instead designated others such as Abū Hurayra, Sa‘d b. Abī Waqqās, ‘Amr b. al-‘As, Mu‘āwiya, and al-Mughīra b. Shu‘ba in these regions; ibid., III, 150.
five reports that identify the sahābi bastions of knowledge in a special sub-section of this chapter.\textsuperscript{230}

Does Ibn Sa'd's catholic presentation of the sahāba provide any rivals to the proponents of the superiority of 'Ali b. Abī Tālib? Despite his modest-length biography, 'Ali's precedence and status with regard to the Prophet "like Aaron to Moses" is affirmed by Ibn Sa'd.\textsuperscript{231} Although he shares pride of place with Zayd b. Thābit with regard to legal knowledge, the latter can hardly be considered a competitor in the realms of combat and precedence. Ibn Mas'ūd, on the other hand, was one of the earliest converts, participated in all of the Prophet's battles, and may even have had superior knowledge of the Qur'ān than 'Ali. Mu'ādh b. Jabal and Ubayy b. Ka'b were both early Anṣāri converts who shared equally distinguished military careers and exceptional knowledge of the Qur'ān. 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, whose entry in al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr is by far the longest among the sahāba, may be the strongest competitor to 'Ali, despite his post-Arqam conversion; Ibn Sa'd notes not only his military support and legal knowledge, but includes a list of twelve major precedents (awā'il) that he inaugurated during his caliphate, many of which irrevocably shaped the course of Islamic civilization.\textsuperscript{232} While Ibn Sa'd avoids the polemical dispute as to the identification of the "greatest sahābi" in al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr, he does provide a mine of useful information that can be employed to distinguish the gifted and influential sahāba from the hundreds of Muslim soldiers who simply disappeared from history the moment the fighting ceased.

\textsuperscript{230} Al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr, II, 426. The five sources are Sahl b. Abī Khaythama, al-Miswar b. Makhrama, Masrūq (two reports), and al-Sha'bi. Ubayy is mentioned in four of the reports, Mu'ādh and Ibn Mas'ūd in three. 'Uthmān and Abī Musā in two, and Abī I-Dardā in one.

\textsuperscript{231} Al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr, III, 13-5. Ibn Sa'd includes this hadith in 'Ali's entry.

\textsuperscript{232} These precedents are: 1) adoption of the title "commander of the Believers" (amlr al-mu'minīn); 2) inauguration of the Hijri calendar in Rabi'a 1, 16 AH; 3) compilation of the Qur'ān on leaves of parchment (sukuf); 4) designation of night-time vigils (probably tarawīḥ prayers) during Ramadan as a practice (sunna); 5) severe punishments for alcohol consumption (80 lashes); 6) foundation of a night patrol in Medina; 7) conquests (jihād) of Syria, Iraq, and Egypt; 8) Extraction of land tax (khanaq) and poll tax (jizya); 9) construction of garrison towns (qasā'ī); 10) appointment of judges (qādi'; 11) pension-register (diwan) arranged by tribe and precedence in Islam; 12) transportation of food by ship from Egypt to Medina; al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr, III, 150.
Ibn Hanbal’s mighty \textit{Musnad} towers over the nine works of identical structure that were composed by his contemporaries, most of which are now lost.\textsuperscript{231} The format in which it has survived is due to his son ‘Abdullah’s labors, and reflects a Sunni perspective not unlike the one found in the recent discussion of the \textit{fadā’il} chapters in the two \textit{Sahīhs} and \textit{Musannaf} of Ibn Abī Shaybā. The first four sections of the \textit{Musnad} consist of the hadith transmitted by the first four caliphs in their chronological sequence, followed by the remaining six \textit{sahāba} promised paradise in Sa‘īd b. Zayd’s report.\textsuperscript{231} A very brief division of four additional \textit{sahāba} come next and is followed immediately by the \textit{ahl al-bayt} and Banū Hāshim.\textsuperscript{235} The placement of these latter two groups of \textit{sahāba} prior to the seven “prolific ones” (\textit{mukhtarûn})\textsuperscript{236} suggests ‘Abdullāh b. Ahmād’s reverence for the blood relatives of the Prophet Muhammad similar to the respect we witnessed in Muslim’s \textit{Sahīh}. The remaining sections are arranged geographically (Meccans, Medinans, Syrians, Kufans, and Basrans) and conclude with the Ansār and other tribes (\textit{qabī’il}). All in all, some seven hundred \textit{sahāba} are found in the \textit{Musnad} as hadith-transmitters of strikingly different degrees of quantity.

The onerous task of counting hadith has been facilitated by Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqālānī, who, as was mentioned earlier, grouped all reports that shared a common \textit{sahābi} and \textit{tābī’i} under one heading called a \textit{atrāf} (plural \textit{atrāf}) in his book \textit{Aṭrāf musnad al-Imām Ahmād ibn Hanbal}. We can, thanks to Ibn Ḥajar, rather easily identify six classes of \textit{sahāba} who transmitted twenty or more \textit{atrāf} in the \textit{Musnad} of Ibn Ḥanbal. The first category consists solely of Abū Hurayra, whose

\textsuperscript{231} These books were identified above, V.2.6, note 101.
\textsuperscript{231} They are in the following order in the \textit{Musnad}: Ṭalḥa, al-Zubayr, Sa‘īd b. Abī Waqqās, Sa‘īd b. Zayd, ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Awf, Abū ‘Ubaydā b. al-Jarrāh.
2278 atrāf are more than double the quantity of material transmitted by the next most prolific sahābī. The second group, which I have labeled ‘primary transmitters’, includes ‘Ā’isha, Ibn ‘Umar, Anas, Ibn ‘Abbās, and Jābir b. ‘Abdullāh. The next group, ‘secondary transmitters’, has four members—Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī, Ibn Mas‘ūd, ‘Alī, and ‘Abdullāh b. ‘Amr, while the ‘tertiary transmitters’ consist of ‘Umar, Umm Salama, Abū Dharr, Abū Mūsā, and Abū Umāma al-Bāhili. 219 Eighteen sahāba transmitted between fifty and a hundred atrāf in the Musnad, and another twenty-four transmitted between twenty and fifty. The following tables provides a basic overview of this data; the number of atrāf Ibn Hajar attributes to each of these sahāba in al-Bukhārī’s Sahih is included as a tool to identify these two scholars’ respective preferences of certain men and women over others. 218

### Table 6.1: Abū Hurayra, Primary, Secondary, and Tertiary sahāba

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Tab</th>
<th>City/Region</th>
<th>Ibn Hanbal</th>
<th>Bukhārī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abū Hurayra</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>2278</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ā’isha bint Abī Bakr</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Abdullāh b. ‘Umar</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anas b. Mālik</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Abdullāh b. ‘Abbās</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Mecca, Tā’if</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jābir b. ‘Abdullāh</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Abdullāh b. Mas‘ūd</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Alī b. Abī Ṭalib</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Medina, Kufa</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Abdullāh b. ‘Amr</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Medina, Egypt</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. al-‘Āṣ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Umar b. al-Khāṭṭāb</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umm Salama</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

217 His name is Ṣudayy b. ‘Ajān and he embraced Islam after the conquest of Mecca. Abū Umāma settled in Syria and lived until 86/705. Note that Ibn Sa‘īd states that Abū Umāma was only 61 years old when he died, which would make him too young to be a sahābī; al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā, VII, 196. Al-Dhahabī includes a report that Abū Umāma was thirty at the time of the Farewell Pilgrimage, which would make him over a hundred years old when he died; al-Dhahabī, Sīrār, III, 359–63.

218 Ibn Hajar provides this information regarding the atrāf of the sahāba in Sahih his introduction to Fā’il al-bārī, Ṣaduq al-sā‘ir, 659–61.
Table 6.1 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Tab</th>
<th>City/Region</th>
<th>Ibn Hanbal</th>
<th>Bukhārī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Syria, Rabadha</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Mūsā al-Askhārī</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Ummāna al-Bahill</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab refers to the *jahāba* of the *sahābi* in Ibn Sa‘d’s *al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr*.

Table 6.2: Minor *sahāba*: 50–100 atrāf

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Tab</th>
<th>City/Region</th>
<th>Ibn Hanbal</th>
<th>Bukhārī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Uqba b. ‘Amir</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Juhanī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Barā’ b. ‘Azib</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu‘ādh b. Jabal</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudhayfa b. al-Yamān</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Imrān b. al-Husayn</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubayy b. Ka‘b</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Uthmān b. ‘Aflān</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burayda b. al-Husayn</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Basra, Marw</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū l-Dardā’</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ubāda b. al-Šāmit</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Syria, Ramla</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahl b. Sa‘d</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Anṣārī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu‘awiya b. Abī Sufyān</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Ayvūb al-Anṣārī</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Medina, Syria</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jābīr b. Samura al-Suwā’i</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mughira b. Shu‘ba</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa‘d b. Abī Waqqās</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Bakr al-Thaqafī</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abū Bakra Nufay’ b. Masrūḥ (or al-Hārith) lacks an entry in the *sahāba* section of *al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr*, he was a freed captive after the raid of al-Tā’if according to Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr; *al-Isfāb*, on the margin of *al-Iṣaba*, III, 358.

Table 6.3: Minor *sahāba*: 20–50 atrāf

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Tab</th>
<th>City/region</th>
<th>Ibn Hanbal</th>
<th>Bukhārī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddiq</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zayd b. Thabit</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Qaṭāda al-Anṣārī</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Medina, Kufa</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahl b. Sa‘d al-Anṣārī</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zayd b. Arqam</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.3 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Tab</th>
<th>City/Region</th>
<th>Ibn Ḥanbal</th>
<th>Bukhārī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thawbān mawšūr Rasūl Allāh</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Ramla, Hims</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usāma b. Zayd</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Syria, Medina</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Abī Awfī</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salama b. al-Akwā' al-Aslāmī</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu'ādh b. Anas al-Juhānī</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>na²</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Amr b. al-'Ās</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Nu'mān b. Bashīr</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zayd b. Khālid al-Juhānī</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Mas'ūd al-Anṣārī</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Kufa, Medina</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abdullāh b. al-Zubayr</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarīr b. 'Abdullāh</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Jazīrā</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maymūna bint al-Hārith</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Wives</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Zubayr b. al-'Awwām</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Medina, Iraq</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubayr b. Muṭṭim al-Nawfālī</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Awf b. Mālik al-Aslāmī</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Hims</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abdullāh b. al-Mughaffāl</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Rāhī al-Qibī, mawšūr Rasūl Allāh</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ammār b. Yāsir</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fadāla b. 'Ubayd al-Anṣārī</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

² His name is 'Abdullāh b. 'Alqama.

¹ Mu'ādh b. Anas lacks an entry in al-Tahqīq al-kabīr; neither Ibn Hajar nor Ibn 'Abd al-Barr indicates his date of conversion; al-Iṣāba, III, 426 and 366 (margin).

³ His name is 'Uqba b. 'Amr; and he probably died during Muʿawiyah's reign.

What does this data tell us besides the interesting observation that Ibn Ḥanbal included twice as many hadīth on the authority of 'Ali than those on the authority of 'Umar, whereas al-Bukhārī selected twice as many 'Umar hadīth as 'Ali ones? The members of the first table, namely the fifteen most prolific saḥābī hadīth-transmitters in the
Musnad, consist of six sahāba who were prominent in the fudā’il sub-chapters that we examined, 289 two who were mentioned in half of the sources, 290 and seven who received either negligible or no recognition in these books. This last group includes Abū Hurayra, Anas b. Malik, Jābir b. ‘Abdullāh, Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī, and ‘Abdullāh b. ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ, Umm Salama, and Abū Umāma; only three of these companions are found among Ibn Sa‘d’s sahāba who “gave fatwās and were models during the time of the Prophet and afterwards.” 291 While the presence of such distinguished sahāba as ‘Ali, ‘Umar, Ibn Mas‘ūd, Ibn ‘Abbās, and ‘Ā’isha among this group of fifteen prolific hadith-transmitters is to be expected, the prominent presence of mildly praised men such as Abū Hurayra, Anas, Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī, and ‘Abdullāh b. ‘Amr and even relatively unknown men such as Jābir b. ‘Abdullāh and Abū Umāma al-Bāhili comes as a surprise in light of the previously examined early Sunni books.

The forty-one sahāba found in the two charts of ‘minor’ transmitters in the Musnad include relatively few of the most exalted Companions of the Prophet. Ubayy, ‘Uthmān, and Sa‘d b. Abī Waqqās transmitted between 50 and 100 atrāf, and Abū Bakr, Usāma b. Zayd, Jarīr b. ‘Abdullāh, al-Zubayr b. al-‘Awwām, and ‘Ammār b. Yāsir transmitted a mere 20–50 atrāf. A particularly surprising case is Zayd b. Thābit, who received so much praise in al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr for his religious knowledge and yet transmitted a mere 44 atrāf in Ibn Hanbal’s Musnad. Twenty-five of these sahāba lack any recognition in the fudā’il sub-chapters of the the four books that I analyzed above, 292 and seven of them fail to transmit a single hadith in al-Bukhārī’s Sahīh. 293 Several religious advisors to the caliphs Abū Bakr and ‘Umar named by Ibn Sa‘d such as Abū I-Dardā‘, Abū Dharr, Mu‘ādh b. Jabal, and the previously mentioned Ubayy,

---

290 Abū Mūsā and Abū Dharr.
‘Uthmān, and Zayd b. Thābit, are found among these modest con­
tributors to the *Musnad*. Finally, a clique of ‘Ali’s most inveterate
enemies, such as al-Nu‘mān b. Bashīr, Mu‘āwiyah, ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ,
Samura b. Jundab, al-Mughīra b. Shu‘ba, and Ibn al-Zubayr, are
also among these minor hadīth-transmitters, while Abū Ayyūb and
‘Ammār are the only pro-‘Ali supporters found among them.

One other topic that should be addressed is the relationship between
a saḥābi’s death date and magnitude of his or her hadīth transmis­
sion in Ibn Ḥanbal’s *Musnad*. It is not a coincidence that the seven
most prolific saḥāba of the *Musnad* all lived well into the reign of
Mu‘āwiyah and three of them even witnessed the second *fitna* of
60–73/680–92. What is more surprising is just how many long-lived
saḥāba did not transmit a large amount of hadīth; eleven of the eight­
teen minor saḥāba who transmitted 50–100 atrāf and nineteen of
the twenty-three minor saḥāba in the 20–50 atrāf range lived through
at least half of the reign of Mu‘āwiyah if not longer. One would
expect far more than 41 atrāf from Sahl b. Sa‘d (d. 91/710) of
Medina and 34 atrāf from the Kufan Ibn Abī Awtā (d. 86/705),
both of whom embraced Islam prior to the conquest of Mecca, espe­
cially given the fact that 91 atrāf were traced back to Mu‘ādh b.
Jabal who passed away over sixty years prior to them. While early
death dates have been used from at least the time of al-Waqidl as
an explanation for the minor contribution to the hadīth literature
by such luminaries as Abū Bakr, ‘Uthmān, Ubayy, Abū I-Dardā’,
and al-Zubayr (not to mention Taḥṣa and ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Awf
who transmitted fewer than twenty atrāf), it should be clear from
these charts that a lengthy life was by no means a guarantee for a
privileged role in hadīth transmission, even though it was a pre­
requisite for the most prolific saḥāba.

The most important observation with regard to this project is that
the structure of Ibn Ḥanbal’s *Musnad* provides an implicit argument
for the collective probity of the saḥāba. None of the seven most
significant saḥābi transmitters was among the highly lauded Muhājirūn,
although three of them did receive sub-chapters in support of their
merits in the two *Sahīhs*, the *Muṣannaf* of Ibn Abī Shayba, and Ibn
Ḥanbal’s *Kitāb fadā’il al-saḥāba*. Fifty-three men and three women,
the majority of whom entered Islam after the battle of Uhud, trans­
mitted at least twenty atrāf in the *Musnad*. Most of these men lacked
any distinction in the fields of precedence in conversion, warfare,
and knowledge in Ibn Sa‘d’s *Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr*, although the most
exceptional individuals are almost all present. Finally, the Musnad could only have contributed to the rehabilitation of 'A'isha after the Battle of the Camel, Ibn 'Umar and Abū Hurayra after their unwillingness to support 'Ali's star-crossed counter-caliphate, and 'Abdullāh b. Amr's decision to stick by his father and Muṭawwiyā in the battle of Ṣiffin and its aftermath. Other saḥāba who rejected 'Ali's authority and raised the eyebrows of the Zaydiyya and Baghdādī Mu'tazila, such as Muṭawwiyā, Amr b. al-ʿĀs, al-Mughīra, and Samura are also included in the Musnad, although the musnad format makes it quite easy to ignore their relatively minor contributions should one wish to do so. Indeed, one of the only theoretically superior qualities of the musnad format to the topically arranged musannaf is the inherent facility for one to locate and obtain the teachings of particular saḥāba whom one prefers and avoid those whom one dislikes. In other words, an Imāmī Shiʿī could extract easily the transmissions of 'Ali, al-Ḥasan, al-Ḥusayn, Abū Dharr, Salmān, and Jābir b. 'Abdullāh from Ibn Ḥanbal's Musnad, while a Zaydī might also copy the ḥadīth of 'Ā'isha, Ibn ‘Abbās, Ibn Masʿūd, Umm Salama, and Muṭadh b. Jabal. The Sunnī adherent to the dogma of the collective probity of the saḥāba might feel obliged, by contrast, to copy Ibn Ḥanbal's entire 30,000-ḥadīth Musnad since the identity of the saḥābi from whom the ḥadīth was transmitted would be of no theoretical importance and the inclusion of his or her material would be based solely upon the endurance and patience of the copyist. Ibn Ḥanbal's "Sunnī solution" to the perpetual problem of the intra-saḥāba warfare is significantly closer to the classical doctrine of the "collective probity of the Companions" than the approaches put forth in the books of his contemporaries al-Bukhārī, Muslim, Ibn Abī Shayba, and Ibn Sa'd, and the vastness of his enterprise certainly laid the groundwork for his pupil Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzi to articulate explicitly this uniquely Sunnī belief.

VI.5 Conclusions

The doctrine of the collective probity of the saḥāba is rarely presented as a core foundational principle of Sunnī Islam. The notion that all of the witnesses of the Prophet Muhammad were honest reporters of what they saw and heard has been questioned rarely by Sunnī or Western scholars, the latter of whom tend to ignore the
The great mass of them in their narratives of early Islamic history. This chapter built upon Madelung's recent book *The Succession to Muhammad* and endeavored to demonstrate the extraordinary significance of the intra-*ṣaḥāba* wars that traumatized the nascent Muslim Community during its first three decades of post-prophetic existence.

The *Imāmī* Shi'ī position with regard to the *ṣaḥāba* in both its *mujawwida* and *muqassira* manifestations exhibited extreme historiographical, exegetical, and even cosmological interpretations of reality. Al-Kashshā'ī’s reports on the authority of Muḥammad al-Bāqir and Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq that all of the *ṣaḥāba* save Salmān al-Ḥarīrī, Abū Dharr, and al-Miqdād, apostasized during the *ridda* and that only four additional ones returned to the fold of Islam represents an extraordinary feat of sectarian historiography. Al-Kulaynī’s *mujawwida* approach avoids the historical question of the *ridda* altogether and relies instead upon creative Qur’ānic exegesis, a customized Sunnī *ḥadīth* about the pillars of Islam, and an unswerving belief in the supernatural knowledge of twelve men and boys, most of whom are never even quoted in his book. These books not only defy most sensitive readings of history and the Qur’ān, but seek to erase the thousands of men and women who literally built the foundations of Islam and spread it throughout the Fertile Crescent. This feat is accomplished by means of the creation of a “pillar of Islam,” the Imamate of ‘Alī, al-Ḥasan, al-Ḥusayn, and nine of his descendents, for which neither the Qur’ān nor the Sunnī *ḥadīth* provide unambiguous proof. While the *Imāmī* rejection of the *ṣaḥāba* who fought against ‘Alī during his counter-caliphate can be seen as a logical reaction to these traumatic events, the rejection of highly learned *ṣaḥāba* such as Ubayy b. Ka‘b, Mu‘ādh b. Jabal, and Ibn Mas‘ūd because they did not give ‘Alī the *bay‘a* at the death of the Prophet is difficult to comprehend unless one, like al-Kulaynī, considers the acknowledgement of the Imamate of ‘Alī (*al-walī‘ya*) to be one of the pillars of Islam.

The Zaydi/Baghdādi Mu‘tazilī attitudes towards the *ṣaḥāba* represents a moderate path between the *Imāmī* Shi‘ī rejectionism and the Sunnī blanket acceptance of them. Only a small number of hadīth-transmitting *ṣaḥāba*, such as Abū Hurayra, Mu‘āwiya, ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ, Samura b. Jundab, al-Nu‘mān b. Bashīr, and al-Mughīra b. Shu‘ba are rejected by partisans of these two groups for the simple reason that these men either cursed or insulted ‘Alī, or were criticized as weak hadīth-transmitters. Their rational argument for the superiority of ‘Alī over all other *ṣaḥāba*, including Abū Bakr, was
based upon his qualities of precedence in conversion to Islam, courage in warfare, religious knowledge, and, on occasion, asceticism. Unlike the Imāmī Shi'a, who would consider Ālī the best in all of these categories, the Zaydiyya and Baghdādi Mu'tazila were happy to mention other saḥāba who excelled in these qualities and were satisfied that only Ālī was considered among the best in all four categories. Although this argument failed to attract many early Sunnīs, it is possible that the moderate position of the Zaydiyya and Baghdādi Mu’tazila contributed to the profound respect for Ālī and his family found in the Musnad of Ibn Ḥanbal, Musannaf of Ibn Abī Shayba, and Sahih of Muslim that seems stronger than the fourth-place status accorded him by Sunnī doctrine.

The three third/ninth century Sunnī approaches to the saḥāba that I discussed provide hints as to how the doctrine of their collective probity came into existence. The ṣadā’il sub-chapters of the two Sahih, the Musannaf of Ibn Abī Shayba, and Kitāb ṣadā’il al-saḥāba elevated twenty saḥāba to a particularly high status. The high percentage of both Qurayshī Muhājirūn and Hashimīs among the most celebrated twenty saḥāba denigrated the role of individual Anṣār in the birth of Islam, although it did secure the authority of most of the leaders on the losing side of the Battle of the Camel. The absence of sub-chapters of ṣadā’il for many of the opponents of Ālī in the wars during his counter-caliphate indicates that the individual hadīth of this genre played a minimal role in the Sunnī adoption of the belief in the collective probity of the saḥāba.

Ibn Sa’d’s prosopographical approach to the saḥāba led him to include information about a vast number of the first generation of Muslims. His citation of al-Waqqidi’s opinion that all saḥāba were Imāms may have led him to refrain from criticizing the reliability of any of them and certainly inspired him to track down as many of them as possible. While Ibn Sa’d shuns the hot question of the “best saḥābi,” he does provide clues as to the most excellent warriors, earliest converts, most erudite scholars, and most pious ascetics among the first generation of Muslims. Despite the fact that Ibn Mas‘ūd, Ubayy b. Ka‘b, Mu‘ādh b. Jabal, and ‘Umar are not explicitly designated as rivals to Ālī, they certainly shine with similar brilliance in al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr. Ibn Sa’d’s masterpiece is certainly in harmony with the Sunnī notion of the collective probity of the Companions of the Prophet and preserves precious information about
hundreds of these religious authorities that may otherwise have been lost over the course of history.

Ibn Hanbal’s *Musnad* is the most overt champion of the principle of the collective probity of the *sahāba* among the third/ninth-century Sunnī books surveyed in this chapter. Numerous men whom history may have ignored, such as Abū Saʿīd al-Khuḍrī, Jābir b. ‘Abdullāh, and Anās b. Mālik, serve as major religious authorities alongside famous *sahāba* like ʿAlī, ʿĀʾishah, ʿUmar, Ibn ʿUmar, and Ibn Masʿūd. Even more striking is the presence of partisans of the fiercely anti-ʿAlī Umayyad regime, such as Abū Hurayra, al-Nuʿmān b. Bashīr, al-Mughīra b. Shuʿba, ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ, Samura b. Jundab, and Muʿāwiyah himself, as authoritative *ḥadīth*-transmitters. Finally, relatively unknown *sahāba*, such as Thawbān, Salama b. al-Akwa’, and Abū Masʿūd al-Anṣārī contribute almost equally to Ibn Hanbal’s book as the towering figures of Abū Bakr, Zayd b. Thābit, and ʿAmmār b. Yāsir. Ibn Hanbal’s *Musnad*, like Ibn Saʿīd’s *al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr*, exudes the spirit of the collective probity of *sahāba* regardless of their roles in the internecine conflicts of the first thirty years of post-prophetic Islamic history, and suggests that the global *activity* of *ḥadīth* compilation contributed more to the Sunnī adoption of the principle of the collective probity of the *sahāba* than the actual transmissions stressing the merits of individual Muslims found among these reports.
CHAPTER SEVEN

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE METHODS OF HADITH-TRANSMITTER CRITICISM OF IBN SA’D, IBN MA’IN, AND IBN HANBAL

VII.1

The second fundamental principle upon which the third/ninth century hadith scholars articulated Sunnī Islam was the original discipline of hadith-transmitter criticism. The two primary means of hadith-transmitter criticism employed by the third/ninth century critics were absolute grades and comparisons between individual scholars. Grades were the most popular technique and consisted of several dozen terms and expressions, the most universally prominent of which were ṭhiqa (reliable) and ḍa‘īf (weak). I traced the emergence of these two terms in connection with Shu‘ba, Mālik, and Ibn ‘Uyayna in the fourth chapter, and remarked that their students appear to have adopted them, despite the poor state of preservation of their opinions. Ibn Sa’d, Ibn Ma’in, and Ibn Ḥanbal are the earliest scholars from whom a significant body of critical opinions has survived and are of particular importance for this core Sunnī discipline.1 After a brief exposition of the most thorough classical explanation of the grades employed by hadith-transmitter critics, I shall analyze the

1 It is for this reason that I have analyzed the earliest compilations of their opinions—al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr, al-Durri’s Tārīkh, and ‘Abdullāh b. Ahmad’s ‘Ilal—instead of al-Mizzi’s Tahdhib al-kamāl, which presents all of their opinions in one location for each man. Both al-Durri and ‘Abdullāh b. Ahmad were the preeminent pupils of their master teachers, and so their reports are of particular value. One of the unintended consequences of this methodological decision was a much lower rate of overlap between the opinions of all three of these men for any individual than one would encounter had I used Tahdhib al-kamāl. It will be clear from the following analyses that al-Durri was concerned primarily with Ibn Ma’in’s opinions of unreliable transmitters, whereas ‘Abdullāh was conservative in his transmission of his father’s critical opinions. A potentially more fruitful early source for a comparative analysis of Ibn Ma’in and Ibn Ḥanbal’s critical opinions is Ibn Abī Haṭīm’s Kitāb at-jarh wa’t-ta’dīl, as the compiler has assembled a large number of their opinions from a variety of sources.
grades and their respective frequencies of employment by Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'ın, and Ibn Ḥanbal, and conclude with a comparison of their evaluations of a few hundred hadith-transmitters. A final topic that will be addressed is the relatively minor role of sectarian labels in the three sources under scrutiny. The findings of this chapter demonstrate both individual preferences for the employment of specific grades and a high degree of consensus as to the reliability (or lack thereof) of a substantial number of these men.

One of the most extensive discussions of the grades used by Sunni hadith critics is found in al-Suyūṭī's commentary on al-Nawawi's abridgement of Ibn al-Salāḥ's Muqaddima entitled Tadrib al-rāwī fi sharḥ taqrib al-Nawārī. ¹ I mentioned earlier that the twenty-third chapter of Ibn al-Salāḥ's Muqaddima includes a discussion of the expressions used in hadith criticism that was based on Ibn Abī Ḥātim's four categories of validation (ta'dīl) and four categories of invalidation (jarḥ). Al-Suyūṭī's commentary includes the opinions of al-Dhahabī, Ṭabd al-Rahmān b. al-Ḥusayn al-ʿIraqī (d. 806/1403-4), and Ibn Hajar, regarding the valences of grades not mentioned by al-Nawawi in his abridgement, many of which are found in the earliest sources of this discipline. The following is a translation of this informative section of Tadrib al-rāwī, al-Suyūṭī's comments have been summarized in the footnotes.

Topic 13: The expressions used in hadith criticism. Ibn Abī Ḥātim arranged them into appropriate categories. The categories of validation are the following:

1. The highest [terms] are trustworthy (thiqa), or precise (mutqin), or reliable (thabt), or proof (hujja), or truthful memorizer (ʿadlun Mfiṣ), or exact (dābit).

2. The second [category] is sincere (ṣadīq) or 'occupying a position of sincerity' (maḥalluhu al-ṣidq), or 'not bad' (la ba's bihi); Ibn Abī Ḥātim said that we write down the hadith of these people and consider it ṣunṣar fihi [as evidence when making a decision]. It is the second level, as we have said, because these expression do not

¹ Al-Suyūṭī, Tadhib al-rāwī, I, 186-8.
² Al-Suyūṭī remarks that the both al-Dhahabī and al-ʿIraqī added a category that is higher than this: if one (or more) of these expressions is repeated, such as thiqa thiqa, or thiqa thabt, or thiqa hujja, or thiqa ḥāṣṣ. As for Ibn Hajar (called Shaykh al-Islām by al-Suyūṭī), there exists an even higher level than this, namely anything in the superlative form (qal), such as wathqa al-nās or athbat al-nās, or related expressions; al-Suyūṭī adds la athbata minhu or man mithī bihi fīlah.
indicate exactitude (dāhibi), and we are cautious with this type of hadith as we previously mentioned [in this category]. It is reported that when Yahyā b. Ma‘in said “not bad” he meant “trustworthy” (thīqa). This case only applied to him, as transmitted by Ibn Abī Hātim on the authority of the scholars of this art. 3

[3] The third [category] is Shaykh. His hadith are written and considered [evidence when making decisions] 6

[4] The fourth [category] is “pious [with regard to] hadith” (ṣahih al-hadith) and his hadith are taken into consideration (li-l-‘itibar) [when making a judgement]. 7

As for the expressions of invalidation, they are arranged as follows:

[1] If they say “soft in hadith” (lāyyin), then his hadith are written and considered as evidence. Al-Dārāqūnī said: When I say “soft in hadith,” that does not mean that his hadith should be rejected, because he is invalidated by something that does not affect his [overall] probity (‘adillah). 8

[2] When they say “not strong” (lāyyin bi-qawī) they write his hadith, but this is worse than “soft.”

[3] If they say “weak in hadith” (rā‘if al-hadith), this is worse than “not strong.” His hadith are not rejected, although [this defect] is taken into consideration. 9

[4] If they say “his hadith are rejected” (mattārīk al-hadith), or “weak [in hadith]” (‘asāhin), or liar (khaddāhāb), then he must be ignored and his hadith may not be written. 10

3 Al-‘Īraqī says that Ibn Ma‘in never said “my opinion ‘not bad’ is the same as my opinion ‘trustworthy’”; rather, to whomever he applies this term, the person is trustworthy at a lower degree of trustworthiness. He then mentions a report from Ibn Mahdī who, when asked about Abū Khalda, said “he is sądīq, ma‘mūn, khayyir, [examples of] thiqa are Shu‘ba and Sufyān.” Also, note that al-Dhahabī considers maḥallahu al-sā‘ī lower than sądīq for linguistic reasons (i.e., it is a ‘īlīf ṣawīkūlīf).

Al-‘Īraqī also follows him in this regard.

6 Al-‘Īraqī adds: maḥallahu l-sā‘ī, lā i-sā‘ī mā hūcin, shaykh wasat, mukarrar ṣawīkūlīf al-hadith, lā hasan al-hadith. Ibn Hajar adds småtíq sàyyīl hāfiz, småtíq yahyūm, småtíq laūw sahīm, småtíq ṣawīkūlīf bi-al-khawādir. He also appends to those who were affiliated with a type of ḥudūd, such as ‘īṭāyē, qadar, nāṣh, ‘īṣā’, and tahajjum.

8 Al-‘Īraqī adds: småtíq in shā‘īn lāh, ārūf ‘īn lá bāsā bhi, suwāyib; Ibn Hajar adds to this list maqūlīf.

Al-‘Īraqī adds: fīhi ṣīn, fīhi maqūlīf, dīrījā, yūṣuf wa yunqar, láyyin bi-dhāk, láyyin bi-mātīn, láyyin bi-hūjā, láyyin bi-wādū, láyyin bi-mawṣīṣīnīn, lī-l-dā‘īf mā hūcin, fīhi khalāf, takallumī fīhi, ma‘lūn fīhi, sāyyīl hāfīz.

Al-‘Īraqī adds: småtíq in shā‘īn lāh, ārūf ‘īn lá bāsā bhi, suwāyib; Ibn Hajar adds to this list maqūlīf.


All of the following expressions are self-explanatory, as we have indicated previously: 'someone from whom the people transmitted' (ṣuḥūn waṣāli 'anhu l-nās), average (wasal), 'mediocre in hadith' (muqārib al-hadith),

inconsistent (muṭṭariḥ), non-authoritative (la yaḥtaju bihi),

unknown (ma'ajūd);

nothing (la shay'), 'not all that' (laysa bi-dhālika),

'not that strong' (laysa bi-dhāliq al-qawi), 'there is a weakness in him' or 'in his hadith' (ṣihi aw fi ḥadithihi daf');

'I do not know of any bad [qualities with regard to him]' (ma al'amū bihi ba'asan).

VII.2 Ibn Sa'd: Grades

The inclusion of Ibn Sa'd in a comparison with towering critics like Ibn Ma'in and Ibn Ḥanbal requires some explanation, especially in light of my findings in the fourth chapter that only al-Mizzi included him among the master critics. The most important reason for this decision is that Ibn Sa'd was the earliest scholar who composed a book in which a large number of critical grades were included. We are at the mercy of the memories of various pupils of Ibn Ma'in and Ibn Ḥanbal for their opinions, and even those two scholars' works were often little more than disorganized notes rather than books. Another motivating factor for the study of Ibn Sa'd's book is that he evaluated over 1100 men and employed more than thirty grades in this process. A final reason for the selection of al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr was its unique inclusion of quantitative indicators as to the amount of hadith that an individual transmitted, information that is of great value for the eighth chapter.

The following table indicates the number of individuals to whom Ibn Sa'd applied a particular grade in al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr. Note that many men receive multiple grades, and that certain grades that were applied to fewer than three individuals have not been included.

---

11 These three categories are the same as 'Shaykh' ([4] in validation above).

12 These three categories are equivalent to 'weak in hadith' ([3] in invalidation above).

13 These categories fall in the same category as 'soft in hadith' ([1] in invalidation above).

14 This is either category [1] of invalidation or category [4] of validation.

15 Some of these terms will be mentioned in the discussion of Ibn Sa'd's negative grades below.
Table 7.1: A Catalog of Grades in *al-Tabaqat al-Kabir*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Tone</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  thiqn</td>
<td>trustworthy</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  thiqn in shi'a illah</td>
<td>trustworthy, hopefully</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  da'if</td>
<td>weak</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  marif</td>
<td>known</td>
<td>ambiguous</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  ma'min</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  'abd</td>
<td>constant worshipper</td>
<td>ambiguous</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  yabih al-kadith/salih</td>
<td>pious</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  'akhu</td>
<td>knower, scholar</td>
<td>ambiguous</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  thiqn-hujja</td>
<td>trustworthy-authority</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10  thiqn-thalbi</td>
<td>trustworthy-reliable</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11  thiqn-sadiq</td>
<td>trustworthy-sincere</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12  wab'</td>
<td>pious</td>
<td>ambiguous</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13  la yuchtaja bihi and la'ya bi-hujja</td>
<td>not authoritative</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14  fatih</td>
<td>distinguished</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15  fihi da'f</td>
<td>weakness in his transmission</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16  muwak al-kadith</td>
<td>suspect in kadith</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17  baysa bi-dhak</td>
<td>not all that</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18  labu fadd</td>
<td>meritorious</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19  thiqn-hujja-thalbi</td>
<td>trustworthy, authority, reliable</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20  'ib</td>
<td>elevated</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21  sadiq</td>
<td>sincere</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22  khayr</td>
<td>munificent</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23  rifi</td>
<td>elevated</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24  manak and haraka</td>
<td>abandoned, rejected</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25  ikhlasat/sghilat/taghayyar</td>
<td>corrupted (when older)</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26  da'if jiddan</td>
<td>very weak</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27  Shaykh</td>
<td>senior teacher</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28  tukullun/jumakallam fihi</td>
<td>questionable in transmission</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29  yudallis</td>
<td>he practices deceptive transmission</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30  baysa bi-shay'</td>
<td>nothing, worthless</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31  'amir</td>
<td>compiler, comprehensive</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are several general observations that merit attention prior to a more detailed analysis of certain of Ibn Sa'd's grades. Two salient aspects of Ibn Sa'd's critical approach are the high percentage of positive grades and the overwhelming dominance of the term *thiqn*. While seventeen of these thirty grades are positive and twelve are negative, it is striking that only two of the most frequently employed...
grades are negative. Ibn Sa'd uses each of the remaining ten negative grades seventeen or fewer times throughout the entire al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr. His employment of the grade thiqa is, by contrast, staggering, as it appears by itself or in compound expressions in no less than 852 entries of hadith-transmitters. The remainder of this discussion of Ibn Sa'd's critical technique will focus on his strategies for the identification of particularly weak scholars, an examination of the recipients of ambiguous grades, and, finally, his application of unique series of positive terms for what must have been, in his opinion, the most reliable hadith scholars among his predecessors.

Ibn Sa'd's negative grades run the gamut from gentle warnings that a reliable transmitter made mistakes to harsh language. Examples of trustworthy scholars who made mistakes include 'Abd al-Wahhab b. 'Abd al-Majīd,17 Nāfi' b. 'Umar,18 and Ja'far b. Burqān al-Kilābī.19 Ibn Sa'd also identifies six reliable men who "probably made errors or were confused" or who "probably transmitted suspect hadith."20 An additional eight reliable transmitters—Sa'id b. Abī Sa'id al-Maqbūrī, Yazīd b. Abī Ziyād, 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Masūdī, Sa'id b. Iyās al-Jurayrī, Sa'id b. Abī 'Arūba, Ja'far b. Ḥāẓim, al-Ḥajjāj b. Muḥammad, and Muḥammad b. Ḥathir—are all identified by Ibn Sa'd as making errors or becoming confused at the end of their lives.21 Ibn Sa'd also reports that a few reliable transmitters, like Ibn ʿIsāq and Isrāʿīl b. Yūnūs, had their anonymous detractors who considered them weak.22 Finally, a small number of prominent scholars, such as 'Abdullāh b. Wahb, Ḥafṣ b. Ghiyāth, and even Ibn Ḥanbal's teacher Ḥushaym b. Bashir, are identified as having engaged in ṭadlz, the deceptive

16 These two grades are ḍa'īf (83 uses, plus nine ḍa'īf jiddan) and ṭa'yuḥṣajju bihi (25 uses).
17 Ibn Sa'd grades this Basran thiqa, fihi ḍa'īf; TK 2001, IX, 290-1.
18 Ibn Sa'd grades this Meccan thiqa, fihi shyār'; TK 2001, VIII, 56.
19 Ibn Sa'd grades Ja'far thiqa-salīq, kadhīr al-khīta' and remarks that he had fiqh, futūr, and ricās; TK 2001, IX, 487-8.
20 These are the Basrans Hammām b. Yahyā (rubbānā ghalāta), Hammād b. Sa'lama (rubbānā haddaḥa bi-l-hadīth munkat), and Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī (rubbānā ghalāta); Išāq b. Yūsuf al-Azraq of Wāsit (rubbānā khatīla); Ibrāhīm b. Sa'd b. Ibrāhīm of Medina (rubbānā akhīta' fi hadīth); and 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Amr b. Abī I-Walīd (rubbānā akhīta'q) of northern Iraq; see TK 2001, IX, 281, 282, 289, 317, 324, 490.
21 The expression is ṭīḥālata (or iḥṭīlata or lāghhayyarat) fi ṭāhīr 'umrāh. See TK 2001, VII, 424; VIII, 460, 486; IX, 260, 273, 278, 335, 495, respectively. Note that Dickinson has labeled this type of criticism as "conditional." Dickinson, The Development of Early Sunnite Hadith Criticism, 93-4.
22 The expression used is minhum man yastad'ījhu; TK 2001, VII, 552; VIII, 495.
act of attributing the hadith that one heard from a weak teacher to a more reliable one from whom different material was heard.25

Ibn Sa’d employs several of the negative grades found in Ibn Abi Ḥātim’s first, third, and fourth categories of invalidation that were mentioned at the beginning of this chapter. Al-Suyūtī quoted al-‘Irāqi’s opinion that the terms ‘not authoritative’, ‘not all that’, and ‘questionable transmission’ were the mildest form of invalidation, and the table above illustrates that Ibn Sa’d used these terms in moderation. His favorite grade to indicate the quality of weakness in a hadith-transmitter was da’īf, and the majority of scholars who received it were natives of Iraq.24 Several particularly harsh terms for transmitters found in both Tadrib al-rawī and Ibn Sa’d’s al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr are ‘very weak’, ‘abandoned’, and ‘worthless’, and from these signifiers one can derive the following table of Ibn Sa’d’s fifteen least favorite hadith-transmitters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.2: Ibn Sa’d’s least favorite hadith transmitters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Abān b. Abī ‘Ayyash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Abū Juzayy Naṣr b. Ťarīf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Al-Ajlāb b. ‘Abdullāh al-Kindī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ‘Amr b. Abī l-Miqdam al-Tāj’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 ‘Amr b. Shimr al-Ju’ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 ‘Amr b. ‘Ubayd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


22 Ibn Sa’d labels as da’īf a total of 83 men: 28 Kufans, 17 Basrans, 7 Medinans, 7 Meccans, 5 Baghdadis, 5 Northern Iraqis (Jazira), 5 Syrians, 4 inhabitants of Wāṣīt, 2 Khurāsānīs, 2 Egyptians, and al-Hudhayl b. Bilāl al-Fazārī of al-Madā’in. Sixty of these men (72%) are Iraqis.
Table 7.2 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Tab</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Reference (TK 2001)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jābir b. Yazid al-Jatî</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>da'īf jiddan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Muḥammad b. al-Fadl</td>
<td>Merv</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>mātrāk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Muḥammad b. al-Sā'ib</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>da'īf jiddan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>al-Muṭṭalib b. Ziyād</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>da'īf jiddan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ṭalḥa b. ‘Amr</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>da'īf jiddan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>‘Ubayda b. Mu‘ātib</td>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>da'īf jiddan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in this table sheds much-needed light on the origins of thoroughly unreliable transmitters. It is striking that the earliest group of these men lived during the fourth ṭabaqa, roughly at the turn of the first Islamic century, a generation prior to Shu’ba and the origins of hadīth criticism. Even more fascinating is the geographical distribution of these earliest weak transmitters, as Ibn Sa’d suggests that this cancer appeared simultaneously in Basra, Kufa, and Mecca, although the deepest roots were sunk in the first two of these cities. Basra seems to have been free from extremely unreliable transmitters, in the eyes of Ibn Sa’d during the two previous generations to his, while Kufa had a trio of defective transmitters in the sixth ṭabaqa and weathered al-Muṭṭalib b. Ziyād in the seventh. Given Ibn Sa’d’s positive attitude towards the vast majority of hadīth-transmitters whom he graded in al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr, it is clear that these fifteen men must have been a particularly unsavory lot to merit the harsh marks that they received.

Four ambiguous grades warrant a closer attention due to their relatively high frequency of appearance in al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr. The term ma’rūf is found in twenty-nine cases as the unique grade and in only ten as a supplementary comment.²⁵ Six of the latter set of cases

include trustworthy scholars, two are moderately reliable, and two are evaluated by the negative expression 'not all that'.26 As for the men for whom ma'ruf is their only qualitative grade, nineteen of them are Iraqi, seven from Syria, and only one from each of the cities of Mecca and Medina. None of these men appears to have played much of a role in the greater project of hadith transmission, either, for Ibn Sa'd identified only six who disseminated 'some hadith', eleven who shared 'few hadith', and the tabi'i Ka'b b. Sūr who did not transmit a single report.27 One final observation about the ambiguous grade ma'ruf is that the majority of men to whom Ibn Sa'd applied it were members of the first two generations of the tabi'în, and it is striking that al-Ḥasan b. Thābit of Kufa is the only man living after the fourth tabaqa for whom this term is his sole grade.28

The second ambiguous grade in al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr is 'ilm, the singular of the well known Arabic word for scholars, 'ulamā'. Like ma'ruf, 'ilm appears as both an independent and a supplementary grade. An interesting feature of Ibn Sa'd's use of this word is that it serves as the sole grade for eight of the men of the frontier lands (al-'awāṣim wa l-thughūr), a Syrian, and eight Medinans. Clearly this term was most popular in reference to scholars of the Hijāz and northern Syria regions, unlike the Kufan-centered grade ma'ruf.29 Even more impressive is the fact that all of the men to whom 'ilm is applied as a supplementary grade are either thiqa or thiqa-huja.

---

26 Four of these trustworthy scholars are first tabaqa tabi'în of Kufa: Ḥabīb b. Subhān al-Ḥasanī, Aws b. Dāmār, Ḥujr b. 'Adī, and 'Ali b. Rabī' al-ʿAzdī, ṬK 2001, VIII, 286, 332, 337, 345. Both weak ones are also first tabaqa tabi'în of Kufans: Hubayrā b. Yarīm and Ḥujayyā b. ʿAdī al-Kindī; ibid., VIII, 290, 344. The remaining men who received the supplementary grade of ma'ruf are Kīnānā b. Nuṣaym of Basra (thiqa in shiʿa ʿalāh), al-Ṭālī b. ʿAbd bawāsas of Wāṣit (thiqa), ʿAbd al-Walīh b. ʿAṣā al-ʿUṣūrī of Baghdad (ṣadīq in shiʿa ʿalāh), and Sulaymān b. ʿAmīr of Syria (thiqa); ibid., IX, 226, 317, 335, and 468.

27 Ka'b is the famous Basran who is reported to have come forward with a mughaf at the Battle of the Camel in an effort to prevent bloodshed and was killed by a random arrow; see ṬK 2001, IX, 90–2. Madelung suppresses Ibn Sa'd's report in favor of a contradictory one from al-Baladhūrī, which puts Ka'b in the battle on ʿA'īsha's side, where he was killed, and states instead that a partisan of 'Ali was the one who was struck by the arrow prior to the battle; Succession, 167–72.

28 He was of the seventh tabaqa; ṬK 2001, VIII, 518. Ibn Hajar evaluates him as ṣadīq, yughrib and reports that he has at least one report in the Sunan of al-Nasāʾī; Taqrib, 99.

29 The only Iraqis who received this label are the Kufans Wāki' b. al-Jarrāḥ, al-Ḥakam b. Ṭayyāba, and al-Qāsim b. Maʾân, the Baghdādī Abū l-Qāsim ʿayy bint Abī Muslim, and the venerable al-Ḥasan al-Bāṣrī.
including luminaries such as Malik b. Anas, Mujahid b. Jabr, ‘Ata’ b. Abi Rabah, Waki’ b. al-Jarrah, and al-Hasan al-Baṣri.30 There is no indication, in other words, of a recipient of the ‘ālim grade as being unreliable, and much to suggest that it is positive. Furthermore, the fact that Ibn Sa’d reports that fifteen of these transmitted ‘many hadith’ testifies to their significance in the project of hadith compilation, as is their presence across all seven tabaqāt of Islamic history.31

The final two ambiguous grades, warī’ and ‘abīd, are among a small group of expressions that Ibn Sa’d uses to identify particularly pious individuals among the hadith folk.32 Medinans and Basrans dominate this group of sixty men, and the majority of them receive the appellation ‘abīd.33 This is in contrast with Kufa, ten of whose men are recognized with the word ‘abīd and only Muhammad b. Sūqa received warī’.34 These terms serve as supplementary grades in the vast majority of the cases, and only Abū Bakr al-Nahshālī, Layth b. Abi Sulaym, and ‘Abd al-Azīz b. Abī Rawwād received less than a thiqā grade among these piety-minded transmitters.35 Once again, there are extremely prominent men among the recipients of this qualitatively ambiguous term, such as Sa’id b. al-Musayyab, ‘Alī b. al-Hasayn b. ‘Alī b. Abī ‘Ṭalib, the caliph ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-Azīz, Malik b. Anas, Hasan b. Hayy, al-Hasan al-Baṣrī, Ibn Sirīn, Ayyūb al-Sakhāyānī, and Ibn ‘Awn.36 Finally, even though Ibn Sa’d does

31 The majority of men who were considered to be ‘ālim falls in the fourth to seventh tabaqāt of Medinans (12 men).
32 Two other words that suggest piety found in al-Tabaqat al-kabīr are nāsik (12 men) and zāhid (three men). Included among the group who are distinguished by the term ‘abīd are several “strenuous worshipers” (“ubbud mujahidīn”), such as the first tabaq of Kufans Miṣ‘ād b. Yazīd al-‘Ilīf, ‘Amr b. ‘Uthā ibn-Sulāmī, and Suwayd b. Math‘āba, the Syrian Abū Bakr b. ‘Abdullāh b. Abī Maryam, the Medinan ‘Umar b. Maḥammad b. al-Munkadīr (whose father was also a famed piety-minded scholar), and the Basran Sulaymān b. al-Taymī.
33 Twenty-seven Medinans and eleven Basrans received either warī’ or ‘abīd; only Ibn Abī Dhi‘b of Medina and Muslim b. Yāsār of Basra received both grades under discussion: TK 2001, VII, 556 and IX, 185.
34 TK 2001, VIII, 438. The remaining members of this group include the Baghdādīs Mardawayh al-Sā‘igh, Abū l-Qāsim zauj bint Abī Muslim, and Abū Naṣr al-Tāmmān; ‘Abd al-Azīz b. Abī Rawwād of Mecca; Sahl Muzāhīm of Khurāsān; and Iṣḥāq b. Sulaymān of Rayy.
35 The Meccan ‘Abd al-Azīz b. Abī Rawwād was graded as ma‘rif bi-l-salāh; Layth b. Sulaym received the mark salīh-da‘if; and Abū Bakr al-Nahshālī was a transmitter “whom some declare to be weak” (munkhum man ishtad‘ifah); TK 2001, VIII, 55, 468, 499.
36 TK 2001, VII, 119, 209, 324, 570; VIII, 496; IX, 157, 192, 246, 261.
not provide any quantitative indicators for twenty-four of these pious men, he does identify sixteen of them as transmitters of "many hadith" and only six as having transmitted just a few reports.

We saw in the first chart that Ibn Sa'd applied a variety of colorful expressions to a modest group of reliable hadith transmitters. The term thiqa is supplemented with the expressions ma'mūn, thabt, and huja in numerous cases, and an impressive coterie of seventeen men are identified with the compound grades thiqa huja-ma'mūn and thiqa thabt-ma'mūn. An equally, if not more, luminous group of hadith scholars are those whom Ibn Sa'd grades as thiqa-huja-thabt, as it includes no fewer than four of Ibn Abī Ḥātim's favorite hadith scholars, as well as earlier men such as Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī and Yahyā b. Sa'īd al-Anṣāri. While these compound expressions all fall within the catalog of terms mentioned by al-Suyūṭī quoted at the beginning of this chapter, Ibn Sa'd uses what appear to be unique terms of praise for an even smaller number of men. 'Ālī b. al-Ḥusayn b. 'Ālī, al-Ḥasan al-Ṭabari, Mašūr b. al-Mu'tamir, al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr, Sa'īd b. al-Musayyab, and Sulaymān b. Yasār all are awarded both the expressions raḥī and 'ālī (elevated), and an additional seven men receive at least one of these two terms. The most exclusive term of praise employed by Ibn Sa'd is that of jāmi' (comprehensive or compiler), which he reserves for the quartet of Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī, al-Ḥasan al-Ṭabari, Sa'īd b. al-Musayyab, and al-Zuhirī. My effort to construct a hierarchy of the most reliable transmitters in the eyes of Ibn Sa'd on the basis of his grades can be found in Appendix B of this book.

---


The four scholars recognized by Ibn Abī Ḥātim in the Tāqādima who were thiqa-huja-thabt according to Ibn Sa‘d are Mālik, Shu‘ba, Suyūṭī al-Thawrī, and Ḥammād b. Ṣayd. The remaining men who received this grade are ‘Affān b. Muslim, Bakr b. ‘Abdullāh al-Muẓanī, Ḥabīb b. Hīlāl al-Bāḥili, and Hishām al-Ḍanawārī. See Appendix B below for references.

VII.3 Ibn Ma’in: Grades in al-Dūrī’s Tārīkh

The observation in the second chapter of this book that al-Dhahabī considered Ibn Ma’in to be among the “severe” hadīth-transmitter critics is confirmed by this study of his critical opinions as transmitted by his pupil ʿAbbās al-Dūrī. Although Ibn Ma’in’s use of the lackluster expression ‘not bad’ (laysa bihi ba’s) was reported to be equivalent to thiqa in the passage of al-Suyūtī’s Tadrib al-rāwī translated above, this fact merely brings the number of positive grades that he employs with any frequency in al-Dūrī’s Tārīkh to three. The terms laysa bi-shay’, da’īf, and laysa bi-thiqa are particularly popular in his evaluations, and no fewer than forty-three men were accused of being outright liars (kadhdhāb or yakdhib). While Ibn Ma’in’s colorful language is restricted to delinquent transmitters, he does identify the most reliable students of prominent scholars by means of comparative grades, something that I shall investigate after a brief exposition of his absolute grades.

Table 7.3: Ibn Ma’in’s grades in al-Dūrī’s Tārīkh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Unique</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>Multiple</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 thiqa</td>
<td>trustworthy</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 laysa bi-shay’ (LBS)</td>
<td>nothing</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 da’īf</td>
<td>weak</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 laysa bihi ba’s</td>
<td>not bad</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 laysa bi-thiqa (LBT)</td>
<td>untrustworthy</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 laysa kadhdhāb</td>
<td>worthless in</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 kadhdhāb/yakdhib</td>
<td>liar</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 yādhīf</td>
<td>pious</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 laysa bi-qaww</td>
<td>Not strong</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 laysa yahdāgu bihi</td>
<td>not authoritative</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 Al-Dhahabī’s opinion of Ibn Ma’in is found in al-Adīqiṣa, 83.
11 This observation is found in al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādi’s al-Kifāya fi ʿilm al-rīwāya as well; al-Kifāya, 38-9.
12 These terms are thiqa, laysa bihi ba’s, and yādhīf; Nur Sayf includes the following additional seven positive grades that appear rarely: thāḥt, thiqa ma’mūn, laysa bihi ba’s-thiqa, thiqa-lam yadhūkhu ulla bi-khayr, lam yadhūkhu illa bi-khayr, sadūq, rajul ṣāḥiq, shaykh sadūq. Nur Sayf, Yaḥyā b. Maʿṣīn wa kitābuhu l-Tārīkh, I, 91. Note that I have included everyone who received the grade thiqa, whether as a compound or unique grade, under the rubric thiqa in this section.
Table 7.3 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Unique</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>Multiple</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>la yuktubu 'anhu</td>
<td>His hadith are not copied.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>thabt</td>
<td>reliable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>fi hadithihi daf'</td>
<td>weakness in his transmission</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>lam sadhkhurru illa bi-khlay</td>
<td>He spoke only well of him.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>laqsa bi-dhâk</td>
<td>not all that</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>raqi su'</td>
<td>wicked man</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>masikur</td>
<td>well-known</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>sadiq</td>
<td>sincere</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>laqsa bi-hadithihi ba's</td>
<td>his hadith are not bad</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>laqsa yusâdihi shag'ân</td>
<td>absolutely worthless</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+---+-----------------------------------------------------------------+
| 1 | This column consists of evaluations of men who were *not* evaluated by Ibn Sa'd in *al-Tabaqât al-kabîr*. |
| 2 | This column consists of men who were evaluated by Ibn Sa'd in *al-Tabaqât al-kabîr*. |
| 3 | This column consists of men who received three or more grades from Ibn Ma'în. |

This table reveals several qualities of Ibn Ma'în's style of hadith-transmitter criticism. Like Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'în employed the grade *thiqa* on a regular basis to a significant number of scholars and the grade *daf'i* to those whose transmission justified caution. Both men also use grades such as 'not strong', 'sincere', and 'non-authoritative' in moderation. It is clear, however, that this is where the similarities between these two critics largely end. Ibn Ma'în denigrates a staggering 241 men as 'nothing', 76 as 'untrustworthy', and 55 as transmitters of 'worthless hadith', while Ibn Sa'd grades only six men with the first term and none with the remaining two. Ibn Ma'în rarely uses the grade *thabt*, and never employs the marks *huja*, *rafi', or *'ali*. He did identify forty-eight particularly disgraceful and dishonest hadith-transmitters, and a complete table of these men, most of whom were not evaluated by Ibn Sa'd, can be found in Appendix C.44

---

43 Ibn Ma'în did use the term *thiqa-ma'mûn* occasionally, but since it was not clear from the analysis of Ibn Sa'd's use of this term whether it added much value to the grade *thiqa*, it has not been recorded here.

44 Al-Dârî's *Tarîkh*, unlike Ibn Sa'd's *al-Tabaqût al-kabîr*, rarely provides any biographical information about the men who are evaluated and often does not even identify their full names. Furthermore, it is thoroughly disorganized, despite a rough
Ibn Ma'in's preferred method of identifying great hadith-transmitters was to use superlative and comparative Arabic expressions rather than a combination of positive absolute grades. The phrase "X is more reliable (athbat) than Y" and "X is preferable to me (ahabbu ilayya) than Y" are each found over a dozen times in al-Duri's Tarikh. Ibn Ma'in tells us, for example, that Sh'uba is more reliable than Zuhayr b. Mu'awiyah,45 Wakif is more reliable than Ibn Abi Zaid,46 Hammad b. Zayd is more reliable than Hammad b. Salama,47 and that 'Affan b. Muslim's transmission from Hammad b. Salama is more reliable than Abü Nu'aym al-Fadl b. Dukayn's transmission from him.48 Ibn Ma'in's personal preference of Wakif over 'Abd al-Rahman b. Mahdi is expressed in at least two places in al-Duri's Tarikh,49 as is his preference for Abü l-Ahwas over Abü Bakr b. Ayyash,50 and Warqa's tafsir over the tafsirs transmitted by Shaybân b. 'Abd al-Rahman and Sa'id b. Abi 'Aruba.51

arrangement by geographical region. Finally, while the editor does provide valuable references to other biographical dictionaries for each evaluated individual, there does not exist an index for the book overall, making it nearly impossible to find someone. While a detailed examination of Ibn Ma'in's least favorite hadith-transmitters is outside the scope of this project, the table in Appendix C provides a basis for future studies of the men whom the classical hadith critics wished had kept away from prophetic material altogether.

12 Al-Duri, Tarikh, I, 272.
13 Al-Duri, Tarikh, II, 37.
14 Al-Duri, Tarikh, II, 188.
15 Al-Duri, Tarikh, II, 221.
16 Al-Duri, Tarikh, I, 395 and 408. Ibn Ma'in invoked the Qur'anic curse of "God, the angels, and the people" (Sûra 2: 161) to whomever puts Ibn Mahdi above Wakif in the first reference; the second one merely states that transmission from Sufyan al-Thawri from Wakif and Yahya al-Qatîin is preferable to that from Ibn Mahdi.
18 Al-Duri, Tarikh, II, 233. This is an important reference to the existence of some sort of tafsir compilation in the first half of the third/ninth century. Ibn Ma'in explains his preference for Warqa's tafsir because it contains the teachings of Ibn Abi Najih → Mujahid whereas the tafsir of Shaybân was based on the exegetical remarks of Qatada. Ibn Ma'in also indicates his preference for Sa'id b. Abi 'Aruba's transmission of Qatada's tafsir over that of Shaybân in this same reference. Warqa's tafsir is mentioned by Sezgin, but those of Shaybân and Sa'id are not; GAS, I, 37-8. On Warqa's tafsir, see Fred Leemhuis, "MS. 1075 Tafsîr of the Caïrenee Dar al-Kutub and Mujahid's Tafsîr," Proceedings of the Ninth Congress of the Union Européenne des Arabistes et Islamistes (Leiden: Brill, 1981), 169-80. A recension of this tafsir has been published as Tafsîr Mujahidî by 'Abd al-Rahman al-Tahir b. Muhammad al-Sûraî (Islamabad, n.d.). Al-Tabarî cites Warqa's transmissions from Ibn Abi Najih of Mujahid's exegetical comments roughly 1000 times in his tafsîr, Horst, "Zur Uberlieferung im Korankommentar al-Tabarisi," 297.
Ibn Ma'in also identifies experts of particular bodies of transmissions from prominent early scholars. Examples of this include the absolute superiority of Hammād b. Salama with regard to the ḥadīth of Thābit al-Bunā'ī,52 Hammād b. Zayd with regard to the ḥadīth of Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī,53 and the trio Hishām al-Dastawā'ī, al-Awzā'ī, and ‘Alī b. al-Mubārak with regard to the material of Yaḥyā b. Abī Kathīr.54 We learn that the most reliable pupils of al-Zuhrī were Mālik, Ma'mar, Yūnus, ‘Uqayl, Shu‘ayb b. Abī Hamza, and Ibn ‘Uyayna,55 that the companions of Abū Ishāq al-Sabī‘i were Shu‘ba and Sufyān al-Thawrī,56 and that the best students of Qatāda were Sa‘īd b. Abī ‘Arūba, Hishām al-Dastawā‘ī, and Shu‘ba.57 An example of what might be described as ‘reciprocal opinions’ is Ibn Ma'in’s assertion that ‘Abd al-Razzāq was more reliable than Hishām b. Yusuf for transmissions from Ma'mar, but that Hishām was more reliable than ‘Abd al-Razzāq for material from Ibn Jurayj.58 The most detailed hierarchy of pupils from an individual transmitter is found, not surprisingly, for Ibn Ma'in’s favorite scholar, Sufyān al-Thawrī:59

A. Best pupils of Sufyān al-Thawrī:60
1) Ibn al-Mubārak
2) Yaḥyā b. Sa‘īd al-Qaṭṭān
3) Waki‘ b. al-Jarrāḥ
4) ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Mahdī
5) Abū Nu‘aym al-Fadl b. Dukayn
6) al-Ashja‘ī, ‘Ubayd Allāh b. ‘Ubayd al-Raḥmān

57 Al-Dūr, Tārīkh, II, 231 and 267.
58 Al-Dūr, Tārīkh, II, 231.
59 Al-Dūr, Tārīkh, II, 143 and 352. Recall that al-Awzā'ī was considered one of the first men to transform his teacher’s material into an organized book (masnuni).
60 Al-Dūr, Tārīkh, I, 88. This list is further refined in ‘Uthmān al-Dārimī’s Tārīkh that I cited in the fourth chapter, as Mālik is declared to be preferable to Ma’mar, Yūnus, ‘Uqayl, and Shu‘ayb b. Abī Hamza, and Ma’mar is proclaimed to be preferable to Yūnus and Ibn ‘Uyayna; al-Dārimī, Tārīkh, 41–8.
61 Al-Dūr, Tārīkh, I, 273. Note again that al-Dārimī reports that Ibn Ma'in considered al-Thawrī preferable to Shu’ba with regard to Abū Ishāq’s teachings; al-Dārimī, Tārīkh, 59.
62 Al-Dūr, Tārīkh, II, 192. Ibn Ḥanbal shared this opinion; see Maṣūṣat aqāḥ al-Imām Ahmad, IV, 39.
63 Al-Dūr, Tārīkh, I, 97. Ibn Ma'in studied with both of these men during his journey to Yemen with Ibn Ḥanbal.
64 Ibn Ma'in’s love for Sufyān al-Thawrī is expressed in several places in al-Dūr’s Tārīkh. He encouraged students to write both the ḥadīth and ra'ay of al-Thawrī and Mālik and al-Dūr reports that Ibn Ma'in never put anybody above al-Thawrī when concerned with fiqh, hadīth, or ruḥd; ibid., I, 325 and 74.
65 Al-Dūr, Tārīkh, I, 329 and 405. Once again, this group is refined by al-Dārimī in his Tārīkh: Yaḥyā and Waki‘ are preferable to Ibn Mahdī; Waki‘ is preferable to Abū Nu‘aym; al-Ashja‘ī is merely sālih; and Abū Ishāq al-Fazārī (who is not mentioned by al-Dūr) is thiqa-thiqa; al-Dārimī, Tārīkh, 61–3.
B. Second tier pupils of al-Thawrî:

1) Yahyâ b. Adam (d. 203/818)
2) ‘Ubayd Allah b. Musâ\(^{62}\)
3) Abu Ahmad al-Zubayr\(^{55}\)
4) Abu Hudhayfa (d. 220/835)\(^{64}\)
5) Qabişa b. ‘Uqba (d. 215/830)
6) Mu‘awiya b. Hishâm al-Qassâr
7) al-Firyâbi, Muḥammad b. Yusuf
8) Abu Dâwûd al-Ḥafarî

Ibn Ma‘în’s identification of the most reliable pupils of individual major hadîth scholars is clearly more nuanced and precise than Ibn Sa’d’s blanket compound grades, and would be of greater utility to the professional hadîth compiler forced to choose between the near-identical transmissions of a single hadîth from multiple pupils of a major scholar, such as Qatâda or Sufyân al-Thawrî. It appears also that Ibn Ma‘în had his hands full with miserable and mediocre hadîth-transmitters and saw little reason to praise first/seventh century scholars whose reputations were hardly in dispute in his day.


Ibn Hanbal employs a diverse set of absolute qualitative grades as well as comparative statements of the type used by Ibn Ma‘în. I have restricted my analysis of Ibn Hanbal’s grades to those found in the ‘Ilâl of his son ‘Abdullâh for men whom Ibn Sa’d evaluated in al-Tabaqāt al-kabîr. The reason for this limitation is the complexity of ‘Abdullâh’s ‘Ilâl\(^{10}\) as well as the primary goal of this chapter.

\(^{61}\) Al-Dûrî, Târikh, I, 329. Ibn Ma‘în also states that Abu Ahmad al-Zubayr, Yahyâ b. Adam, and al-Firyâbi are all equally sound in their transmissions from al-Thawrî and that Abu Dâwûd is either good or better (habîr) than them; ibid., I, 268.

\(^{62}\) Ibn Ma‘în informs us that ‘Ubayd Allah (d. 213/828) was his source for Sufyân al-Thawrî’s Jâmi‘ and that he had a written copy (sâhib) of it; al-Dûrî, Târikh, I, 381. ‘Ubayd Allah also was the source of Sufyân al-Thawrî’s opinions for al-Tirmidhi in his al-Jâmi‘ al-sahîh; see above, III.3, note 15.

\(^{55}\) His name is Muhammad b. ‘Abdullâh al-Zubayr and he died in 203 in al-Âhwâz; TK 2001, VIII, 526.

\(^{64}\) His name is Mu‘âmîl b. Sa’d and Ibn Sa’d described him as a hermit (nâsîk); TK 2001, IX, 305.

\(^{10}\) The chaotic structure of this book has been overcome by means of the alphabetically-arranged encyclopedia of Ibn Hanbal’s opinions entitled Mawsâ’il at-tawîl al-imâm Ahmad ibn Hanbal (four volumes) published by ‘Alâm al-Kutub in 1997.
which is a comparison between the grades of these two men and Ibn Ma’in. Therefore, the pool of names that fit these two criteria is only a little under 300 men, as opposed to the significantly larger samples that I examined from Ibn Sa’d and Ibn Ma’in. Despite this limitation, it is still possible to get a sense of Ibn Hanbal’s menu of grades and even identify some of his least and most favorite hadith-transmitters. The following table provides an overview of the qualitative grades used by Ibn Hanbal, according to his son ‘Abdullah.

Table 7.4: Ibn Hanbal’s grades in the ‘Ital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  thiqa</td>
<td>trustworthy</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  laysa bihi ba’s</td>
<td>not bad</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  šāliḥ</td>
<td>pious</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  mattrākh/ larakadhū</td>
<td>abandoned</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Shaykh</td>
<td>senior teacher</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  da’if</td>
<td>weak</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  munkar, lahu manākin</td>
<td>suspect hadith</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  thiqa thiqa</td>
<td>very trustworthy</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  khayyir</td>
<td>munificent</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 laysa bi-gawi</td>
<td>not strong</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 ḥafiz</td>
<td>hafiz</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 kadha wa kadha</td>
<td>this-and-that</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 mahālihu al-sidq or min</td>
<td>honest</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ma‘ādmin al-sidq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 nudrānib</td>
<td>inconsistent</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 ṣaddiq</td>
<td>sincere</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 yudalits</td>
<td>deceptive transmission</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 thabit</td>
<td>reliable</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 laysa bi-shay’</td>
<td>nothing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 laysa bi-dhāk</td>
<td>not all that</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 ỉa yusayyib shay’ān</td>
<td>absolutely worthless</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 kadḥāḥābh/ yakdhāhibu</td>
<td>liar</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ibn Hanbal employs a remarkably balanced list of positive and negative grades in the ‘Ital. Once again, the term thiqa dominates the critical discourse, followed by two slightly less positive grades, laysa bihi ba’s and šāliḥ. The relatively high number of ‘rejected’ transmitters comes as a bit of a surprise, although the other harsh grades, such as ‘nothing’, ‘absolutely worthless’, and ‘liar’ are quite infrequent.
Several new terms, most of which are positive, appear with some regularity: *thiqa thiqa*, *khayyir*, *hāfiz*, *kadha wa kadha*, and *muṭṭarīb*. Only one of these grades, *kadha wa kadha*, is ambiguous, although a closer examination reveals that most of the recipients of this expression were weak transmitters.\(^5\) I shall now attempt to articulate Ibn Hanbal’s least and most favorite *hadith*-transmitters on the basis of his grades in the *‘Ilal* of scholars who were also evaluated by Ibn Sa’d.

### Table 7.5: Some of Ibn Hanbal’s least favorite transmitters in the *‘Ilal*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Tab(^a)</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahān b. Abī ‘Ayyāsh</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>mātrūk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Abān</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>tarakahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Ishāq</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>mātrūk, layṣa bi diāk, lohu manākīr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Abdullāh b. Wahb</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>tarakahu(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Amr b. ‘Ubayd</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>kadthabah, tarakahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghalīb b. ‘Ubayd Allāh</td>
<td>North Iraq</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>tarakahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥārith b. ‘Abdullāh al-‘Awār</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>one of the liars(^d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥasan b. Dinār</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>tarakahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad b. Abī Yahyā</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>tarakahu l-nāṣu hadīthahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Isā b. Abī ‘Isā</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>layṣa yusāwi hadīthahu shay’ān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishāq b. Yahyā b. Ṭalha</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shaykh mātrūk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jābir b. Yazīd al-Ju’fī</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>tarakahu(^f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khalaf b. Khalīfa</td>
<td>Wāṣij</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>tarakahu wa lam aktub ‘anhu shay’ān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad b. al-Hajjāj</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>tarakhu (or taraknū) hadīthahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad b. Saʿlīm</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>shibh al-mātrūk, maʿjud’ā(^e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad b. ‘Ubayd Allāh al-‘Arzānī</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>mātrūk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Muḥanna b. al-Ṣabbāh</td>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>la yusāwi hadīthahu shay’ān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ṣaḥ b. Dinār</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>mātrūk, LBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shahr b. Hāvshab</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>tarakahu, daʿafah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suwayd b. ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>mātrūk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭalha b. ‘Amr</td>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>mātrūk, la shay’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ubayda b. Muʿāṭṭib al-Dabbī</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ʿālī dāf, tarakahu(^h)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^5\) Ibn Hanbal reports that two of the eight men who received this grade were declared weak by Yahyā Ḥaṭṭān, that another one transmitted suspect *ḥadīth*, and that a fourth one was *muṭṭarīb*. Only Ibrāhīm b. al-Muḥājir al-Bajally received this grade as well as the positive *layṣa biḥi ba’s* in the *‘Ilal*; *Maṭbu’āt aqīl al-Imām Ahmad*, 1, 41–2. Note that in the case of Muslim b. Khālid al-Zaunī that Ibn Hanbal “shook his hand” (*yuharrīk yadayahu*) when he said *kadha wa kadha* in a manner that insinuated that he was not reliable; *ibid.*, III, 347–8.
Table 7.5 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Tab</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Umar b. Hāš al-'Abdi</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td></td>
<td>tarakā' hadithahu wa kharragāhū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Umar b. Qays, Sandal</td>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>laya jušā' hadithahu say'an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usama b. Zayd al-Laythi</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>tarakāhū; lahu manākīr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ya'qūb b. Muḥammad b. Isā</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LBS, laya jušā' say'an</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tabaqā of each scholar is derived from Ibn Sa'd's al-Tabaqīt al-Kabīr.

Ibn Hanbal rejected Ibn Wahb's hadith because he saw him asleep during one of Ibn 'Uyayna's lectures in Mecca. His son reports that he later transmitted hadith on Ibn Wahb's authority from one of his pupils; Mawsū'at aqwāl al-Imām Ahmad, 11, 299–300. The story of Ibn Wahb's notorious nap is found also in al-Dīrī, Tārīkh, 1, 92.

Ibn Hanbal is merely quoting the opinion of his teacher Wākī' b. al-Jarrāh; Mawsū'at aqwāl al-Imām Ahmad, III, 141–2.

Ibn Hanbal attributes this opinion to al-Sha'ībī; Mawsū'at aqwāl al-Imām Ahmad, I, 213–4.

Ibn Hanbal attributes this opinion to Ibn al-Mubārak; Mawsū'at aqwāl al-Imām Ahmad, I, 252 3.

Ibn Hanbal claims that Yahyā l-Qāṭṭān, Ibn Mahdī, and even Sufyān al-Thawrī rejected Jābir's hadith; Mawsū'at aqwāl al-Imām Ahmad, I, 185–7.

Ibn Hanbal reports that Ibn al-Mubārak rejected him and that Hāš b. Ghiyāth declared him to be weak (dā'afah); Mawsū'at aqwāl al-Imām Ahmad, II, 263, 4.

Ibn Hanbal mentions that 'Ubayda is on the list of those transmitters whom Ibn al-Mubārak abandoned; Mawsū'at aqwāl al-Imām Ahmad, II, 418.

This is Yahyā l-Qāṭṭān's opinion; Mawsū'at aqwāl al-Imām Ahmad, III, 83–4.

Several observations concerning Ibn Hanbal's list of disgraceful transmitters are in order. The first one is the geographical diversity of these men. While Iraqis in general, and Kufans in particular, dominate the list, it is important to note that a quarter of the rejected transmitters hail from the Hijāz, and an additional three lived in Egypt and Syria. The second point is that the vast majority of weak scholars lived during the second/eighth century and were members of generations who were pupils of the tābi'in and their successors, much as we found in the case of Ibn Sa'd's least favorite transmitters in Table 7.2. Finally, Ibn Hanbal records the opinions of several of the earliest master critics whom we identified in the second chapter, such as Ibn al-Mubārak, Wākī', and, in particular, his teacher Yahyā b. Sa'id al-Qāṭṭān. This is a sharp break from Ibn Sa'd and Ibn Maʿīn, both of whom cite specific authorities very infrequently, and was a practice that was adopted by critics such as al-Bukhārī and Ibn Abī Ḥātim during the second half the third/ninth century.
Ibn Ḥanbal employs both absolute and relative grades in his discussion of reliable transmitters in the Ḥadīth. We learn that ‘Abd al-Wārith b. Sa‘īd was more reliable than Ibn ʿUlayya but inferior to Ḥājjād b. Zayd,88 that Abū ʿl-Zubayr Muḥammad b. Muslim had the largest quantity of hadīth from the saḥābi Jābir b. ʿAbdullāh,89 that ʿAffān b. Muslim was more reliable than Ibn Mahdī,10 and that al-Layṭh b. Saʿd was the most sound pupil of Saʿīd al-Maqburī.71

Ibn Ḥanbal observed that Wākī made more errors (khata) than Ibn Mahdī but that Ibn Mahdī committed a greater number of orthographical mistakes (tashīf) than Wākī.72 Another insightful observation shared by Ibn Ḥanbal is that al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad and Ibn Sīrīn transmitted hadīth exactly as they were heard, while al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī and al-Shaʿbī transmitted merely the message without concern for the exact words.73 Ibn Ḥanbal was particularly interested in the hierarchy of pupils of al-Zuhrī, and told his son that while ʿAlī b. al-Madīnī favored Ibn ʿUyayna, he himself preferred Mālik because the latter made only two or three mistakes in his transmission rather than the twenty or so errors of the former.74 Finally, Ibn Ḥanbal identified four men Shuʿba, Sufyān al-Thawrī, Zāʾida b. Qudāma, and Zuhayr b. Muʿāwiya—as equals whom he graded as ḥājīz-mutathabbit and may be considered four of the most prestigious transmitters in his eyes.15

The following table identifies a group of Ibn Ḥanbal’s favorite hadīth scholars on the basis of the qualitative grades that he assigned to them in ʿAbdullāh’s Ḥadīth.

---

88. Mawsūʿat aqwāl al-Imām Ahmad, II, 394-5. Ibn ʿUlayya also was considered by Ibn Ḥanbal to grasp jurisprudence better than Hushaym b. Bashīr; ibid., I, 94-9.
89. Mawsūʿat aqwāl al-Imām Ahmad, III, 311-2. This is confirmed by our study of the nāṣrī of Ibn Ḥanbal’s Mawād in the next chapter; see VIII.4, note 88.
90. Mawsūʿat aqwāl al-Imām Ahmad, III, 13-5. This quote may apply only to their respective transmissions from Shuʿba.
91. Mawsūʿat aqwāl al-Imām Ahmad, III, 205-6.
92. Mawsūʿat aqwāl al-Imām Ahmad, II, 345.
93. Mawsūʿat aqwāl al-Imām Ahmad, III, 271.
94. Mawsūʿat aqwāl al-Imām Ahmad, III, 211. Ibn Ḥanbal states that the best pupils of al-Zuhrī who transmitted a large amount of material were Yūnus, ʿUqayl, and Maʿmar, and that Maʿmar was the best of these three; ibid., III, 210.
95. Note that three of these four men were Kufans; this city appears to have housed both the best and worst transmitters of this period.
Table 7.6: Some of Ibn Hanbal's most reliable hadith scholars in the 'Hai

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Tab</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Abd al-'Aziz b. Ṣuyayb</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ḥāfiz, ḥāfiz</td>
<td>II, 365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd al-Ḥamid b. Ja'far</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ḥāfiz, ḥāfiz, LBB</td>
<td>II, 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd al-Malik b. Abi Sulaymān</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ḥāfiz, ḥāfiz</td>
<td>II, 379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Ghallāb Yūnus b. Junayr</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>thabt</td>
<td>IV, 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Sīmān Dirār b. Murra</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ḥāfiz, ḥāfiz</td>
<td>II, 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahz b. Asad</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>thabt'</td>
<td>I, 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawud b. Abi Hind</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ḥāfiz, ḥāfiz</td>
<td>I, 353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammad b. Zayd</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Imām</td>
<td>I, 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Jurayj, 'Abd al-Malik</td>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>mustathbat</td>
<td>II, 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ismā'il b. Sālim al-Asadī</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ḥāfiz, ḥāfiz</td>
<td>I, 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahmās b. al-Ḥasan</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ḥāfiz, ḥāfiz, Shaykh</td>
<td>III, 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahdi b. Maymūn</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ḥāfiz, ḥāfiz, ḥāfiz</td>
<td>III, 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Azdī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik b. Anas</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td></td>
<td>ḥāfiz, mustathbat</td>
<td>III, 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarwān b. Mu'āwiyah al-Fazārī</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td></td>
<td>ḥāfiz, ḥāfiz, ḥāfiz</td>
<td>III, 338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mughfīra b. Miqām</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ḥāfiz, ḥāfiz</td>
<td>III, 390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musā b. 'Ullāy</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ḥāfiz, ḥāfiz, Shaykh</td>
<td>III, 414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadaqa b. Khālid</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ḥāfiz, ḥāfiz, śāliḥ</td>
<td>II, 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa'īd b. Abi Sadaqa</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ḥāfiz, ḥāfiz</td>
<td>II, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shu'ba b. al-Ḥajjāj</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td></td>
<td>ḥāfiz-mustathbat</td>
<td>II, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulaymān b. Sa'īd al-Thawrī</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td></td>
<td>ḥāfiz-mustathbat</td>
<td>II, 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wāqi' b. al-Jarrāh</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ḥāfiz, ḥāfiz</td>
<td>IV, 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yalīyā b. Sa'īd al-Qūtān</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nobody like himd</td>
<td>IV, 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazid b. Zuray'</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>reyhānāt al-Basra</td>
<td>IV, 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zā'ida b. Qudāma</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ḥāfiz-mustathbat</td>
<td>I, 384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuhayr b. Mu'āwiyah</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ḥāfiz-mustathbat</td>
<td>I, 396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a All references are to Mawsū'at aquīl al-Imām Ahmad.
b Ibn Ḥanbal reports that Ibn Mahdi considered only Bahz to be thabt; Mawsū'at aquīl al-Imām Ahmad, I, 168-9.

The second grade for Mahdi is from Shu'ba; Mawsū'at aquīl al-Imām Ahmad, III, 405. Recall from the second chapter that there was not any evidence of Shu'ba using the expression ḥāfiz ḥāfiz.

c The exact quote of Ibn Ḥanbal is: mā nā'aynā miḥla 'Yalīyā b. Sa'īd fi ḥāfiz l-sha'n—yinī fi l-hadīth—hawān sāhibu ḥadīth l-sha'n; Mawsū'at aquīl al-Imām Ahmad, IV, 114.

This analysis of the grades employed by Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'in, and Ibn Ḥanbal, as well as the identification of both their least and most favorite transmitters, sheds light on the first generation of Sunni hadith critics for whom a significant body of opinions has survived. These three men contributed to the standardization of the technical vocabulary of the nascent discipline of hadith-transmitter criticism,
and established firmly the grades *thiqa, laya bihi ba's, sālih, da'if, and matrīk*. This being said, each of the three scholars displays fiercely independent approaches to his craft. Ibn Sa'd comes across as particularly positive, and applied a variety of expressions, such as *rafi', tāl, alim, and warn*, which were idiosyncratic, and others, such as *hujja and thabt*, which were ultimately more popular with later critics than with his contemporaries. Ibn Ma'in’s severity in al-Dūrī’s *Tarīkh* is manifest in his penchant for declaring a multitude of *hadith*-transmitters to be entirely worthless, untrustworthy, or even liars, and his precision is evident in his preference for relative grades over absolute ones for many prominent *hadith* scholars. Finally, Ibn Ḥanbal emerges as a moderate critic who applied motley positive expressions and relative grades to strong scholars, and who identified weak transmitters with both his own opinions as well as those of his predecessors. The importance of the standardization of the critical vocabulary of *hadith*-transmitter criticism by Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'in, Ibn Ḥanbal and their contemporaries, lies not merely in the establishment of a set of tools that could distinguish weak *hadith* from strong ones solely on the basis of *ismāds*; rather, it provided a vehicle by which individual scholars could express whom among their predecessors they considered to be trustworthy authorities of the prophetic teachings that lay at the very heart of the Sunni articulation of Islam.

VII.5 Reliable and unreliable transmitters in the eyes of Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'in, and Ibn Ḥanbal: A comparative study

One of the initial goals of this project was the deceptively simple task of constructing a database of the critical opinions of Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'in, and Ibn Ḥanbal in order to ascertain whether they agreed or disagreed over the reliability of several hundred transmitters. This project originally envisioned a simple three-way comparison, but was stymied unexpectedly by the discovery that these three critics were interested in quite different pools of transmitters. Indeed, it came as a shock that a paltry 78 of Ibn Sa'd’s 1105 evaluated men received grades from both Ibn Ma'in and Ibn Ḥanbal in al-Dūrī’s *Tārīkh* and ‘Abdullah’s *Ilt*, respectively. Although this endeavor was salvaged by the fact that Ibn Ma'in graded 203 of Ibn Sa'd’s men (18.4%) and Ibn Ḥanbal graded 266 (24%) of them, it is necessary to explain
why only 7% of Ibn Sa'd's evaluated men in *al-Tabaqāt al-kabir* received grades from both Ibn Ma'in and Ibn Hanbal.

A closer look at the temporal and geographical distribution of Ibn Sa'd's 1105 evaluated transmitters is the first step towards understanding why the originally planned comparison was impossible. The following table provides an overview of these men:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>T6</th>
<th>T7</th>
<th>T8</th>
<th>T9</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>275</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>237</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazira</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khurasan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Awāṣir</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayla</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rayy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mada'in</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anbār</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andalus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ifriqiyya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1105</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart reveals Ibn Sa'd's deep interest in hadith-transmitters who lived during the first three generations of Islamic history, as well as those who lived in the cities of Kufa, Medina, and Basra. In fact, one third (363 men) of Ibn Sa'd's graded men in *al-Tabaqāt al-kabir* were members of the first three *tabaqa* of these three cities, and 247 of the Medinan who were graded (22.3% of the total sample) lived

---

The letter T refers to *tabaqāt*; only the transmitters from Kufa, Medina, Basra, Mecca, Syria, Egypt, and Yemen are arranged in this manner. Note that Ibn Sa'd does not provide any critical opinions for the small number of Yemenis found in *al-Tabaqāt al-kabir*.
prior to the generation of Mālik b. Anas (tabaqa 6). Ibn Sa'd’s overwhelming interest in first/seventh century transmitters in general, and the men of Medīna in particular, does not appear to have been shared by either Ibn Ma'in or Ibn Hanbal, both of whom devoted their energies to the generations immediately preceding themselves and to Iraqīs. This disparity, coupled with Ibn Ma'in’s predilection for uncovering the very worst transmitters, seems to account for the surprising lack of overlap between Ibn Sa'd and his two Baghdādī contemporaries.

The seventy-eight men who received grades from all three of the sample critics are a diverse lot of second/eighth century transmitters from Syria to Khūrāsān. Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'in, and Ibn Hanbal agreed upon the reliability (or lack thereof) of all but sixteen of these men, and it is striking that Ibn Hanbal is always found in the majority opinion. The following table elucidates the sixteen cases over which consensus did not exist:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Ibn Sa'd</th>
<th>Ibn Ma'in</th>
<th>Ibn Hanbal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Abd al-Jabbār b. 'Abbās</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>šīh da'if</td>
<td>LBB</td>
<td>LBB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Bakr al-Nahešāf</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>‘iṣqa</td>
<td>‘iṣqa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Janāb al-Kalbi</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>da'if</td>
<td>LBB</td>
<td>yudallis, lahu manākhir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bukayr b. 'Amar</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>‘iṣqa-nūsh'a da'yī, tarakahū’</td>
<td>LBDh in ḥadīth, LBQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ibn Sa'd’s thorough treatment of Medīna scholars was in no doubt due to the influence of his teacher al-Wāqīdī, and it is not always clear whether the grade for a transmitter found in the Medīna tābabā is the opinion of Ibn Sa'd or his teacher. Note that al-Wāqīdī played a minor role in the Kufan and Basran chapters; rather, natives of these cities, such as al-Faquī b. Dukayn, Wa‘lī, and ‘Alī b. Muslim, appear to have supplied Ibn Sa'd with much of his information about these transmitters.

Note that only three of the 78 men whom all three scholars graded lived prior to the fourth tābabā.

This is actually the responsibility of al-Dūrī; a cursory glance at al-Dārimī’s Tārikh and Kawāsaj’s recension preserved in al-Jahān wa lā‘idātī appear to contain a far higher percentage of Ibn Ma'in’s positive grades than the former book.

Abbreviations: LBS: laṣah bi-shay; LBB: laṣah bi-ha ba's; LBDh: laṣah bi-dhāk; LBQ: laṣah bi-qāt; LBT: laṣah bi-thiqā; LHBS: laṣah hadīthu bi-shay’.
Table 7.8 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Ibn Sa'd</th>
<th>Ibn Ma'in</th>
<th>Ibn Hanbal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al-Hārith al-A`war</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>da'îf</td>
<td>LBB</td>
<td>kadhdhāb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makhrama b. Bukayr</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>da'îf, LBS</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mubārak b. l`adāla</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>fihi da'îf</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>yuḍallīs, da'îf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Nāḍr b. `Arabī</td>
<td>Jazīra</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Makhrama b. Medina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qābūs b. Abī Zabyān</td>
<td>Rayy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>fihi da'îf</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa`îd b. Sinān</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>thabl</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>munkar, da'îf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salama b. Wardān</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>da'îf</td>
<td>thiqa, thabt</td>
<td>sarakahu, da`afah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shahr b. Hawshāb</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td></td>
<td>yuḍallīs, LBB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>Umar b. </code>Alī al-Muqaddām</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>yuṣūd`af</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usāma b. Zayd al-Laythī</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>yuṣūd`af</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazīd b. Abī Ziyād</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>LBDh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Zanjī, Muslim b. Khaṭīb</td>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Many errors</td>
<td>thiqa, sālih</td>
<td>kadhdā wa kadhdā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ibn Hanbal’s precise grade is “I hope that he is not bad” wa` ku`na katlfrā l-badfthi katlfrā l-ghalafī wa l-khata`ī wa la`kinnahu ku`na yaghlatu; TK 2001, VIII, 60-1.

Ibn Hanbal seems to want to have it both ways, as he also evaluated Abu Janab as thiqa; Maṣṣūlī aqwāl al-Īmām Ahmad, IV, 112.

Ibn Hanbal reports that this was the opinion of Hafs b. Ghiyāth; Ibn Ma`īn obtained this information from Yabīyā l-Qatān; al-Duri, Ṭārikh, II, 231.

Ibn Hanbal attributed this opinion to al-Sha`bī; Maṣṣūlī aqwāl al-Īmām Ahmad, I, 213-4.

Ibn Hanbal reports that this was the opinion of Yabīyā l-Qatān; Maṣṣūlī aqwāl al-Īmām Ahmad, I, 77-8.

Ibn Sa`d’s exact words are: wā kana kahīra l-haddithi kahīra l-ghalīfī wa l-khata`ī fi hadithihi wā kana fi hadenihī nīma l-ra`īnū wā lakinnahu kana yaghlatu; TK 2001, VIII, 60-1.

Ibn Sa`d, Ibn Ma`īn, and Ibn Hanbal all agree upon the reliability (or lack thereof) of sixty-two men found in al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr, and forty of these evaluations consist of positive grades. The following table presents this group of transmitters:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Ibn Sa’d</th>
<th>Ibn Ma’in</th>
<th>Ibn Hanbal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abān b. Abī 'Ayyāsh</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>mattrūk</td>
<td>mattrūk</td>
<td>mattrūk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abbād b. Mansūr</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>da‘īf</td>
<td>LBS, LBQ</td>
<td>Speciala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd al-'Azīz b. Abān</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Specialb</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>tarakahā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd al-Hamīd b. Ja‘far</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa, LBB</td>
<td>thiqa, thiqa, LBB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd al-Rahmān b. Ishāq</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>da‘īf</td>
<td>da‘īf</td>
<td>mattrūk, lahu manākīr, LBDb yudhifāhu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd al-Wahhāb b. Mujāhid</td>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>da‘īf</td>
<td>da‘īf</td>
<td>LBS, da‘īf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abdullāh b. Sa‘īd</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa, Shaykh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'A‘īd b. Ḥabar</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>sādiq</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>sādiq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'A‘īd b. Ḥabar</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>sādiq</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>LBB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Amr b. Marzūq al-Bāhilī</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>LBB</td>
<td>sāhib khayr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Amr b. al-Muhājir</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Amr b. ‘Ubayd</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>kadhāba, tarakahu sādiq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asad b. ‘Amr al-Bajālī</td>
<td>Baghdad na</td>
<td>thiqa-inshā‘a</td>
<td>thiqa, LBB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Aṣim b. ‘Ubayd Allāh</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>in yuhdajju</td>
<td>yatlaqān</td>
<td>hadīthahu’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Awzā‘ī</td>
<td>‘Awāsim</td>
<td>thiqa-hujja</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa, sālih</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Awf b. Abī Jamīla</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa, sālih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāwūd b. Abī Hind</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa, sālih, kayris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitṛ b. Khalīfa</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>thiqa-inshā‘a</td>
<td>thiqa, lāmah</td>
<td>thiqa, sālih, kayris tarakahād</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghālib b. ‘Ubayd Allāh</td>
<td>Jazīra</td>
<td>da‘īf</td>
<td>da‘īf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Ibn Sa'd</th>
<th>Ibn Ma'in</th>
<th>Ibn Hanbal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 Habib b. Abi 'Amra al-Himān</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa, Shaykh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 al-Hasan b. Dinār</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>da'if</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Ishāq b. Yahyā</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>yustad'if</td>
<td>Da'if, LBS</td>
<td>Shaykh, matrūk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Jabir b. Yazīd</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>da'if jiddan</td>
<td>LBS,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Ja'far b. Burqān</td>
<td>Jazīra</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>thiqa-sadiq</td>
<td>r/a'īf</td>
<td>LBB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Jarir b. Ḥāzim</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Kahmas b.</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa, Shaykh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Khārijja b. Muṣ'āb</td>
<td>Khurāsān</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>tarakhalu</td>
<td>LBS, LBT</td>
<td>Special 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Mahdi b. Maymūn</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa thiqa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Mālik b. Anas</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>thiqa-luṣja</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>hāfiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 al-Mas'ūdī, 'Abd al-Rahmān</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>jobyād</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Mindal b. 'Ali</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>fīh da'if</td>
<td>turkā</td>
<td>da'if</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Muhammad b. Aḥād b. Abū Ṭal‘ālān</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Muhammad b. 'Ali</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa, muḥtarīb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Muhammad b. al-Ṭeṣāfī</td>
<td>Khurāsān</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>matrūk</td>
<td>LBS, da'if</td>
<td>LBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Muhammad b. Hasan</td>
<td>Wāṣat</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>LBB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Muhammad b. Sālim</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>da'if</td>
<td>da'if</td>
<td>matrūk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Muhammad b. Yazīd</td>
<td>Wāṣat</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>LBB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Musā b. 'Uqba</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Sadaqā b. Khālid</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa thiqa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Sa'īd b. Muhammad</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>da'if</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>da'īf,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Sa'īd b. Zayd</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>'indah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Salama b. Sālikī</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>da'fahū</td>
<td>LBS, LBT</td>
<td>LBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Salm b. Sālim al-Balkhī</td>
<td>Khurāsān</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>da'if</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>LBDh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Shu'ba b. al-Hājjāj</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>thiqa-luṣja</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>hāfiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Sufyān al-Thawrī</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>thiqa-luṣja</td>
<td>thiqa,</td>
<td>hāfiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Ṭalḥa b. 'Arnr</td>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>da'if jiddan</td>
<td>LBS, da'if</td>
<td>matrūk,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Ṭalḥa b. Yahyā</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>ḫāṣir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Thawr b. Yazīd</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Ibn Sa'd</td>
<td>Ibn Ma'in</td>
<td>Ibn Hanbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ubayda b. Mu'atib</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>da'if jiddan</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>fihi da'if, iarakahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Umar b. Muhammad b. Zayd</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>sālih</td>
<td>thiqa, LBB, Shaykh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Umar b. Qays Sandal</td>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>da'if</td>
<td>da'if</td>
<td>layla yusūn, hadīthhu shay'ān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umayy b. Rabī'a</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa, Shaykh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uthmān al-Batti</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa, LBB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥuyayna b. 'Abd al-Rahmān</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>thiqa- inshā’ā lālāh</td>
<td>LBB</td>
<td>LBB, sālih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wuhayb b. Khālid</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>thiqa-hajja thabt</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahyā b. Zakariyyā</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>thiqa- inshā’ā lālāh kāyās</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazīd b. Ḥāzim</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>thiqa- inshā’ā lālāh</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazīd b. Yazīd</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>thiqa- inshā’ā lālāh</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>sālih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuhayr b. Mu'āwiyah</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>thiqa-thabt thabt</td>
<td>thiqa</td>
<td>hāfiz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Ibn Hanbal reports that Mu‘ādh b. Mu‘ādh “did not like his transmission;” Mawsū‘at aqwal al-Imām Ahmad, II, 221.
2. Ibn Sa‘d reports that “he had much material from Sufyān [al-Thawrī] and then he got confused afterwards, and so the people abstained from his hadith” wa kāna kāhirā l-rasā‘iyat ‘an Sufyān thumma khalaṣta ba‘da dhālikhu fa-ansakū ‘an hadīthihī; TJ 200 I, VIII, 528.
3. Ibn Hanbal obtained this opinion from Ibn ‘Umar; Mawsū‘at aqwal al-Imām Ahmad, II, 291-3.
4. Ibn Hanbal reports that this was the opinion of Wākid; Mawsū‘at aqwal al-Imām Ahmad, III, 141-2.
5. Ibn Hanbal obtained this opinion from Ibn ‘Umar; Mawsū‘at aqwal al-Imām Ahmad, I, 252-3.
6. Ibn Hanbal reports that this was the opinion of Yahyā al-Qāṭān, Ibn Mahdī, and Sufyān al-Thawrī (at the end of his life); Mawsū‘at aqwal al-Imām Ahmad, I, 185-7.
7. Abdullāh reports that his father forbade him to write any of Khārijīya’s hadith (nahāriy an aqīla anhu shay’ān); Mawsū‘at aqwal al-Imām Ahmad, I, 325-7.
9. Ibn Hanbal attributed this grade to Yahyā al-Qāṭān; Mawsū‘at aqwal al-Imām Ahmad, II, 46.
10. Ibn Ma‘in attributed this grade to Yahyā al-Qāṭān; al-Diwar, Tarikhī, II, 164.
11. Ibn Hanbal reports that this was the opinion of Ibn Mu‘āwiyah; Mawsū‘at aqwal al-Imām Ahmad, II, 418.
This group of hadīth-transmitters, for whose quality there is consensus among Ibn Sa‘d, Ibn Ma‘īn, and Ibn Ḥanbal, is a mixture of familiar and new names. Nearly three-quarters of the men hail from Kufa (18 men), Basra (16), and Medina (12), while the remaining sixteen are natives of Syria (4), Khurasan (3), Mecca (3), al-Jazira (2), Wāṣīṭ (2), Baghdad (1), and al-Awāṣīm (1). A particularly striking finding is that all three of the Khurasānīs and all three of the Meccans are weak transmitters. More than half of the transmitters lived in the fourth and fifth tabaqāt, which corresponds roughly to the first half of the second/eighth century, and particular attention is received by the fifth tabaqâ of Kufans. Seven of Ibn Sa‘d’s least favorite transmitters received negative grades from both Ibn Ma‘īn and Ibn Ḥanbal, while only five of his favorite ones received positive grades from both of these men. In fact, the paucity of grades for Ibn Sa‘d’s favorite men from Ibn Ma‘īn and Ibn Ḥanbal supports my assertion that these latter two critics did not trouble themselves to affirm the reliability of master scholars like Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī, al-Zuhrī, and Manṣūr b. al-Mu‘tamir, and, instead, chose to devote their energies towards the elucidation of the best pupils of these illustrious men. In fact, Ibn Sa‘d’s practice of grading “obviously” reliable hadīth-transmitters among the tābi‘īn seems to have been idiosyncratic in his day and was declared irrelevant by Ibn Abī Ḥātim in his Taqdima.
It is possible to acquire a far larger body of comparative grades than the above sample if the analysis is limited to just two of these three critics at a time. I mentioned earlier that Ibn Ma'in graded 203 of Ibn Sa'd's 1105 evaluated men, and it is striking that there is agreement between the two critics in 177 cases (87%) and disagreement in only 26 of them (13%). The following table depicts the geographical and generational distribution of the men upon whom Ibn Sa'd and Ibn Ma'in were in harmony over their absolute reliability or lack thereof:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>T 1</th>
<th>T 2</th>
<th>T 3</th>
<th>T 4</th>
<th>T 5</th>
<th>T 6</th>
<th>T 7</th>
<th>T 8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khurasan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazira</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rayy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>`Awasiq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once again, there are few surprises to be found in this data. The majority of graded-men are found in the three primary cities of hadith scholarship, Kufa, Medina, and Basra, and in the fourth to seventh tabaqa. Two-thirds of these men (117) are considered reliable, and in four cases Ibn Ma'in actually evaluates a transmitter with a higher grade than Ibn Sa'd. The following men are evaluated as *saduq* by Ibn Sa'd and *thiqa* by Ibn Ma'in:

---

88 For details and references, see Lucas, “The Arts of Hadith Compilation and Criticism: A Study of the Emergence of Sunni Islam in the third/ninth century,” Appendix B.

89 The following men are evaluated as *saduq* by Ibn Sa'd and *thiqa* by Ibn Ma'in:
the sixty men whom both Ibn Sa’d and Ibn Ma’in declared to be weak, including Abū Ma’shar of sira fame, the Egyptian hadith-transmitter Ibn Lahi’a (d. 174/790), the Qur’anic exegete Muqātīl b. Sulaymān, and the akhbar Muhammad b. al-Ṣā’ib al-Kalbī. Six of the men evaluated by Ibn Sa’d as da’if jiḍan were also given harsh grades by Ibn Ma’in, and five of Ibn Ma’in’s group of liars (kaḥdhiib) received negative marks from Ibn Sa’d. While a significant percentage of these weak transmitters are Kufans (30%), it is important to observe that Medinans (25%), Basrans (17%) and Khurasanīs (10%) constitute over half of these unreliable men, and that over a quarter of the reliable transmitters are Kufans as well.

A comparison between the grades of Ibn Sa’d and Ibn Hanbal yields a net sample of 266 hadith-transmitters. Ibn Sa’d and Ibn Hanbal agreed over the quality of 227 of these men (85%) and disagreed over only 39 of them (15%). The following table displays the geographical and generational locations of the 227 transmitters for whom their exists a qualitative consensus between Ibn Sa’d and Ibn Hanbal.


See TK 2001, VII, 597 and al-Dūrī, Tārīkh, I, 118. Note that two other composers of biographies of the Prophet, Ibn Ishāq and Mūsā b. ʿUqba, were considered by both Ibn Sa’d and Ibn Ma’in to be reliable, although Ibn Ma’in declared that Ibn Ishāq was ‘not strong’ and a Qadarī in a second report in al-Dūrī’s Tārīkh; ibid., I, 181.

TK 2001, IX, 524 and al-Dūrī, Tārīkh, II, 369. Ibn Sa’d remarks that the Egyptians did not consider Ibn Lahi’a to be weak.


Three of these men, ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Zayd, Ṭalḥa b. ʿAmr, and ʿUbayda b. Muʿāṭiṣ, were also evaluated as weak by Ibn Hanbal; the remaining three are the Kufans ʿAmr b. Shirm al-Juʿfī, Muhammad al-Kalbī, and Yaḥyā b. Salama.

These five men are ‘Abd al-Ḥakīm b. Manṣūr of Wāṣi, Abū Jābir al-Bayyādī of Medina, the qāḍī Abū l-Bakhtiari of Baghdad, our Kufan friend Jābir al-Juʿfī, and Yusuf b. Khalīd of Basra. Note that Yusuf is one of the few men whom Ibn Ma’in declared to be a heretic (ṣuḥūj); al-Dūrī, Tārīkh, II, 107.

26% of the reliable men are Kufans; 19% are Basrans, and 27% are Medinans.

For details and references, see Lucas, “The Arts of Hadith Compilation and Criticism: A Study of the Emergence of Sunni Islam in the third/ninth century,” Appendix C.
This table indicates that although Ibn Ḥanbal was more interested in first/seventh century hadīth-transmitters than Ibn Maʿin, he remained concerned primarily with transmitters of the second/eighth century. 97 Three quarters of these men were held in high esteem by both Ibn Saʿd and Ibn Ḥanbal, and it is noteworthy that all but one of the twenty-five men I identified as Ibn Ḥanbal’s favorite transmitters received a minimal grade of thiqa from Ibn Saʿd. 98 Twenty-five men whom Ibn Saʿd evaluated with the grades thiqa-ṣujja or thiqa-thabt, including Abū l-Walīd al-Ṭayālīsī, Maṭṣūr b. Zādhān, ‘Ubayd Allāh b. ʿUmar b. Ḥafṣ, and Yahyā b. Saʿīd al-Anṣārī, received positive grades from Ibn Ḥanbal, although occasionally of a less enthusiastic pitch than those articulated by Ibn Saʿd. 99 Several of the prominent transmitters whom both Ibn Saʿd and Ibn Ḥanbal evaluated as weak

---

97 Note that 32 of the men (14%) whom Ibn Ḥanbal evaluated lived prior to the fourth tāhāqa, whereas Ibn Maʿin graded only 14 men (8%) during this time.
98 The one exception, the Egyptian Mūsā b. ʿUlayy, was graded thiqa in shā’ a ṭābī by Ibn Saʿd and thiqa thiqa, Shaykh by Ibn Hanbal, TK 2001, IX, 552 and Mawsūʿat aqwil al-Imām Ahmad, III. 414.
99 Note, for example, that Ibn Hanbal declared that Abū l-Walīd was not ṣabī, but rather ṭawqīn only in what he transmitted from Shuʿba; Mawsūʿat aqwil al-Imām Ahmad, IV, 41-2. Another example is Wuhayb b. Khālid, who was graded thiqa-ṣujja by Ibn Saʿd but a mere LBB by Ibn Ḥanbal; TK 2001, IX, 288 and Mawsūʿat aqwil al-Imām Ahmad, IV, 103.
are the Medinan ‘Abdullah b. ‘Umar b. Ḥafs, the Kufan ṭābi‘ī al-Ḫārith al-A‘war, the pupil of al-Zuhri, Yūnus b. Yazīd al-Aylī, and the Meccan Muslim b. Khālid al-Zanjī. Kufans are prominent, once again, among both the reliable (23%) as well as the unreliable transmitters (31%) for whom Ibn Sa‘d and Ibn Ḥanbal were in agreement, although Basra surpassed Kufa with 25% of the reliable men and only 20% of the unreliable ones.

This study demonstrates the high degree of consensus between three contemporary hadith-transmitter critics of the first half of the third/ninth century. Despite my initial disappointment over the embarrassingly small number of men who received grades in all three of the sources that I analyzed, it was possible to cull a more substantial sample of 203 and 266 transmitters by restricting the comparison to Ibn Sa‘d and Ibn Ma’in, and Ibn Sa‘d and Ibn Ḥanbal, respectively. I found a consistently high degree of consensus in all three of the comparisons between the opinions of these critics, and it is unlikely that my findings would change significantly were I to include additional reports from other sources. I have argued that this consensus had a deep impact on the articulation of Sunnī Islam because it drew a border between those first and second century men whose transmissions were acceptable to Sunnī hadith compilers and those who were not, thus limiting the massive corpus of prophetic teachings that could find its way into the canonical works of Sunnī Islam. While the hadith-transmitter critics appear to have designated hundreds, if not thousands, of their predecessors in the camp of reliable men, a significant body of men was deemed unreliable by the critics of the generation immediately preceding the compilation of the Sahīḥs of al-Bukhārī and Muslim. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine how these two quintessential Sunnī books could have been compiled had it not been for the willingness of scholars such as Ibn Sa‘d, Ibn Ma’in, and Ibn Ḥanbal to pursue and expand rigorously the discipline of hadith-transmitter criticism to a level that far outstripped the efforts of their teachers.

Did sectarian labels play a significant role in the discipline of hadith-transmitter criticism? Were Ibn Sā'd, Ibn Ma'in, and Ibn Ḥanbal more inclined to grade first and second century advocates of the Qadariyya or Murji'a positions on human agency and the nature of faith as trustworthy, given that these positions were found to be repugnant by many of their contemporaries? Or were these labels unrelated to an individual's skill in hadith-transmission? The following discussion demonstrates the lack of relationship between quality transmission and sectarian affiliation in the cases of the adherents of the Qadariyya, Murji'a, and tashayyūr found in al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr, and closes with a brief discussion of the terms sāhib hadith and sāhib sunna.¹⁰¹

Slightly over twenty transmitters found in al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr are identified as adherents to Qadar, a belief associated with the championing of human freedom and responsibility for one's bad acts.¹⁰² This position is associated often with a famous epistle attributed to al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī,¹⁰³ although none of our three critics suggests that al-Ḥasan was related to the Qadariyya. Basrans of later generations do make a strong showing in this group, including the master hadith-transmitters Qatada b. Di'ama and Hishām al-Dastawārī,¹⁰⁴ as well

¹⁰¹ Note that five 'Uthmānīs, three Khawārij, and the Mu'tazilī 'Amr b. 'Ubayd are found in al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr as well. All five of the 'Uthmānīs—'Abdullāh b. Shāqiq al-'Uqaylī, Ibn 'Awm, Ḥamnūd b. Zayd, Yazīd b. Zūray', Bishr b. al-Mufaqdāl—were excellent hadith scholars and hailed from Basra; TK 2001, IX, 125, 261, 287, 290, 291. Two of the Khawārij (Ṣadaqa b. Mūsā and Jābir b. Zayd Abū l-Sha'ṭā') were considered reliable. The unreliable Khārijī was the famous Berber pupil of Ibn 'Abbās, 'Ikrima; while Ibn Sā'd evaluated him as 'not an authority' (ibid., VII, 282), al-Bukhrā'ī did include material from him in his Sahih. Note also that the three Qadāns, two Murji'īs, two Shi'īs, one Khārijī and one 'Uthmānī found only in al-Dūrī's Tarīkh do not appear to affect my findings concerning the lack of relationship between sound transmitters and their sectarian affiliations; the fact that the three Jahmīs and three Rāfīdīs were detested by Ibn Ma'in, while appearing to contradict my thesis, merely shows that the tolerance of the Sunnī hadith critics of the third/ninth century extended to all but the most extreme Islamic beliefs in circulation.

¹⁰² Al-Dhahābī cites Qatada's purported definition of Qadar as "everything is by the power of God except acts of disobedience" (kullu Shay'īn bi-qadari ilāhī illa l-ma'āṣī); Tadhkira, I, 93.

¹⁰³ See van Ess, Theologie und Gesellschaft, II, 41-50.

¹⁰⁴ Other reliable Basran Qadārīs include 'Atā' b. Abī Māzūr, 'Awf b. Abī Jamīl, and Ḥusayn b. Dhakwān al-Mu'allīm; ibid., IX, 244, 257, 270. Note that Ibn Ma'in identified 'Awf and Ḥusayn as Qadārīs, while Ibn Sā'd did not; al-Dūrī, Tarīkh, II, 148, 208.
as the unreliable Yazid b. Aban al-Raqashi, 'Abbad b. Mansur, 'Abd al-A'la al-Qurashi, and 'Abbad b. Suhayb.\textsuperscript{108} The famous Qur'anic exegete Ibn Abi Najih, along with his companions Sayf b. Sulayman and Zakariya b. Ishaq, formed a Qadari enclave of reliable hadith-transmitters in Mecca,\textsuperscript{105} while only one of the five Medinan Qadaris appears to have been an unreliable transmitter.\textsuperscript{110} Two of the Syrian Qadaris were also reliable transmitters,\textsuperscript{111} although Ibn Sa'd grades both Makhlul al-Sham'al and al-Wac'il b. 'A~a' as daf'a.\textsuperscript{112} Far from being stigmatized, the majority of hadith-transmitters associated with the Qadari position were held by Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'in, and Ibn Hanbal in high esteem.

The seventeen Murji'\a found in al-Tabaqat al-kabir are the most geographically diverse lot of the three sectarian groups under investigation.\textsuperscript{113} The Kufan Murji'\a range from the major hadith scholars Mis'ar b. Kidam and Abii Mu'awiya al-Qarlr, to the famous, albeit unreliable, jurist 'Abbad b. 'Abbas ai-Raqashr, 'Abbad b. Man~ur, 'Abd al-A'la al-Qurashl, and 'Abbad b. ~uhayb. 108 The famous Qur'anic exegete Ibn Abr

\textsuperscript{108} TK 2001, IX, 244, 269, 291, 298. Ibn Hanbal identified 'Abbad b. Mansur and Abd al-A'la as a Qadari, while Ibn Sa'd did not; Mawsii'at aque'i al-Imam Ahmad, II, 221, 306.

\textsuperscript{109} TK 2001, VIII, 44, 55.


\textsuperscript{111} TK 2001, IX, 456, 470. Thawr b. Yazid al-Kalaj and the Damascene qadi Yahya b. Hamza; TK 2001, IX 471, 473. Only Ibn Ma'in identified Yahya as a Qadari, al-Duri, Tarikh, II, 341. The latter was not given a traditional grade by Ibn Sa'd or in the 'Ital, although Ibn Hanbal's opinion in Ibn Abi Hatim's al-Jaw' wa l-i'ad al-layla bi bi' bi's Mawsii'at aque'i al-Imam Ahmad, IV, 112.

\textsuperscript{112} Note that Ibn Hanbal graded al-Wac'in as "not bad" and thiqa; Mawsii'at aque'i al-Imam Ahmad, IV, 81. Another Syrian Qadari, Sa'd b. Bashir al-Azdi, lacks a formal grade in our three primary sources but is evaluated by Ibn Hanbal as layla bi' bi's in the recension of Ibn Hani; ibid., II, 27.

\textsuperscript{113} Thirteen of these men were identified by Ibn Sa'd as Murji'\a; Ibn Hanbal identified an additional four men who received grades from Ibn Sa'd, but whom the latter did not designate with this label. Note that Ibn Sa'd distinguished al-Hasan b. Muhammad b. al-Hanafiyya as the originator of the initial position of ijtihad, namely that the first two Caliphs were excellent but that one should avoid judgment upon the merits of 'Uthman and 'Ali; TK 2001, VII, 322.

\textsuperscript{114} TK 2001, VIII, 484, 515, and 451, respectively. Three additional reliable Kufan Murji'\a include Qays b. Muslihn al-Jadali, Musila b. Abi Kathir, and 'Umar b. Dharr; TK 2001, VIII, 434, 458, 482. A fourth Murji'\a, Abii Bakr al-Nahshali, was evaluated as thiqa by Ibn Ma'in and Ibn Hanbal, but Ibn Sa'd merely remarks that "some folk declare him weak;" TK 2001, VIII, 499; al-Duri, Tarikh, I, 246; Mawsii'at aque'i al-Imam Ahmad, IV, 197.
Khurāsānī Murjiʿa were clearly unreliable, and a father-son pair of Meccan Murjiʿa received lackluster grades. The remaining Murjiʿa were isolated individuals in five Iraqi cities, and only ʿAbū Khālid al-Dalālī of Wāsīṭ was considered an unreliable transmitter among them. As with the previous case, the Sunni hadith-transmitter critics of the third/ninth century clearly did not consider a scholar’s affinity for Murjiʿa beliefs as a barrier for inclusion among the trustworthy disseminators of prophetic material.

The general acceptance by Sunni scholars of adherents to tashayyuʿ, the belief that ʿAlī was superior to ʿUthmān but inferior to ʿAbū Bakr and ʿUmar, as reliable hadith-transmitters is manifest in the opinions of Ibn Saʿd, Ibn Maʿīn, and Ibn Ḥanbal. Only a third of the eighteen members of this group were graded as weak by one or more of our critics. Two of these men, ʿAbū ʿAbdullāh al-Jādālī and ʿAlī b. Qādīm, were reported to have practiced “severe” (shadīd) tashayyuʿ, while ʿAmm b. Abī l-Miqdām al-Jīlī and Khālid b. Makhlād were described as possessing “excessive” (mufrit) tashayyuʿ. Both Ibn Saʿd and Ibn Maʿīn declare Fīrūz b. Khallīfah, Iyās b. Jāy, Abu ʿGhassān ʿAlīk b. Ismāʿīl, ʿAws b. Abī Jamīl, Jaʿfīr b. Sulaymān, and ʿAbbad b. ʿAwwām, to be trustworthy, despite their affinities for tashayyuʿ.

Six additional advocates of tashayyuʿ were awarded positive qualifications by Ibn Saʿd and Ibn Maʿīn. Both ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Abī Rawwād was “known for his piety” according to Ibn Saʿd, while his son, ʿAbd al-Majīd b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, was considered ṭabīʿī by Ibn Saʿd and ṭabīʿī by Ibn Maʿīn; TK 2001, IX, 377, 378; al-Ḏuri, Tārīkh, II, 273-4; Mawsūʿat ʿal-ʿImām Ahmad, II, 74. The third Khurāsānī Murjiʿī, ʿAbī Ishaq Ibrāhīm b. Sulaymān al-Zayyān, is mentioned only by Ibn Saʿd, who did not give him a qualitative grade; TK 2001, IX, 383.

ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Abī Rawwād was "known for his piety" according to Ibn Saʿd, while his son, ʿAbd al-Majīd b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, was considered ṭabīʿī by Ibn Saʿd and ṭabīʿī by Ibn Maʿīn; TK 2001, VIII, 55, 62; al-Ḏuri, Tārīkh, I, 51.

Ibn Saʿd graded ʿAlī b. Ḥabīb (Basra) as ṭabīʿī in ʿal-ʿaʿīḥ; Shabāb b. Sawwār (al-Mādāʾin) as ṭabīʿī, ṣalīḥ; al-Muʿallā b. Mansūr al-ʿRāzī (Baghdad) as ṭabīʿī, and Saʿīd b. ʿAjlān (Jazāra) as ṭabīʿī; TK 2001, IX, 226, 322, 344, 466.

This finding is corroborated by the case of ʿAbd al-Razzāq al-Ṣanʿāʾī, a major wāris of Ibn Ḥanbal, who was accused of ṭashayyuʿ; see Motzki, The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence, 67-8.


TK 2001, VIII, 505, 530. The remaining two weak adherents to ṭashayyuʿ are ʿHānī b. Hānī al-Hamdānī and Aṣḥāb b. al-Nubātā; TK 2001, VIII, 342, 345. Note that all six of these men are Kufans, and that ʿAbd al-ʿAbdullāh and ʿHānī were both first ṭabīʿīs tābiʿīn.

TK 2001, VIII, 484, 496, 528; IX, 257, 289, 332; al-Ḏuri, Tārīkh, I, 246 (Fīrūz, 247 (Ḥasan), 248 ('Awf); II, 13 (Abū Ḥassān), 194 (Jaʿfīr), 164 ('Abbad).
itive grades by Ibn Sa’d, and it is interesting that three of them were found among the first tābaqa of tābi’un: ‘Abdullah b. Shaddād b. Usāma of Medina, ‘Abdullah b. Shaddād b. al-Hadīr of Kufa, and Abū ʿl-Aswād al-Du’ālī of Basra. While the numbers of adherents to tashāyṣu’ has been inflated slightly due to Ibn Sa’d’s inclusion of five first-generation pro-ʿAli tābi’un in al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr, the pattern of independence between sectarian affiliation and reliable hadīth transmission is affirmed by the group that most closely approached the position of the Zaydiyya and Imāmiyya with regard to the merits of ʿAlī b. Abī Tabīb.

The final sectarian labels of interest to this project are the intriguing šāhīb hadīth and šāhīb sunna. As with the three previous labels, none of our three critics provides any indication as to the exact meaning of these two expressions. Thirty-nine men found in al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr receive one of these designations from either Ibn Sa’d or Ibn Hanbal in the ‘Iṣlāḥ, and virtually all of them lived in Baghdad, Kufa, and Basra. Ibrāhīm b. Abī ʿl-Layth of Baghdad and Miṣrī b. ʿAlī of Kufa stand out as the only two šāhīb hadīth who received negative qualitative grades in this entire lot. Ibn Hanbal identifies explicitly the three šāhīb al-hadīth of Baghdad in


128 Al-Khallāl claims to quote Ibn Hanbal’s opinion that šāhīb sunna refers to someone who says “ʿAbū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUthmān,” which is the correct position, and then adds the name ʿAlī, al-Khallāl, al-Sunūṣ, I, 408. Juynboll is of the opinion that these two terms were not interchangeable, since a šāhīb al-sunna could be a weak hadīth-transmitter and a šāhīb al-hadīth could be an adherent to multiple religious innovations (bida’); Juynboll, “Sunna,” E12, XI, 880. While this position is not contradicted by my findings, what is perhaps of greater interest is the extraordinary frequency with which Ibn Sa’d, Ibn Ma’in, and Ibn Hanbal employed these two terms in their works.

129 The only non-Iraqis are al-Naṣr b. Shumayl of Khurasan, Abū ʿIshāq Ibrāhīm b. Muhammad al-Fazārī of al-ʿAwāsim, and Jaʿfar b. Rabī’a of Egypt; TK 2001, IX, 377, 494, 520. Note that none of these men hail from the Hijāz.

130 Ibn Sa’d grades Ibrāhīm as yudāʿaf and Miṣrī as fihi daʿī; TK 2001, IX, 364; VIII, 502. Note that the latter is identified as being among ahl al-sunna instead of šāhīb sunna by Ibn Sa’d. Ibn Ma’in states that Miṣrī was rejected due to his habit of hadīth fabrication, and Ibn Hanbal declares him to be daʿī; al-Dūrī, Taʾrīkh, I, 325; Mawsīʿat aqwil al-Imām Ahmad, III, 396. The only other man who is identified as being from ahl al-Sunna is the Baghdādī Mardawayh al-Saʿīgh (Abī al-Ṣamad b. Yazīd); TK 2001, IX, 367.
his day as Abū Kāmil Muzaffār b. Mudrik, Abū Salama Maṇṣūr b. Salama, and al-Haytham b. Jamīl, and also applies this label to Ja’far b. Rabī‘a of Egypt and the Basran Wuhayb b. Khālid. Ibn Sa’d recognizes only Zā‘īda b. Qudāma, Su‘ayr b. al-Khīms, ‘Abdullāh b. Idrīs, Abū Usāma Ḥammād b. Usāma, Muḥammad b. ‘Ubayd al-Tanāfīsī, and Ahmad b. ‘Abdullāh b. Yūnūs, all of whom were Kufans of the sixth and seventh tabāqāt, as sāḥib sunna wa jamā‘a, the full title of the firqa that is normally abbreviated as Sunnism. In fact, the only Kufans and Basrans who lived in earlier tabāqāt than this group were ‘Alqāma b. Qays, al-Mughīrah b. Miqṣam al-Ḍabbī, Jarīr b. Ḥāzim, and the master critic Shu‘ba. The preponderance of sixth through eighth tabāqāt Kufans and Basrans who are identified as sāḥib sunna, along with their dozen or so Baghdādī contemporaries, suggests strongly the Ḥaḍīth provenance of this term that was applied initially to Ḥaḍīth scholars who flourished during the second half of the second/eighth century.

Table 7.12: An overview of transmitters identified as sāḥib sunna

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Ibn Sa’d</th>
<th>Ibn Ma’in</th>
<th>Ibn Ḥanbal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Abd al-Raḥmān b.</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ḥāzyūr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Abd al-Malik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Abdullāh b. Idrīs b.</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Ishaq al-Fazārī</td>
<td>‘Awāsim</td>
<td>na</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū l-Qāsim za‘ūj bint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abī Muslim</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>na</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Ma’mar, Ismā‘īl b.</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>na</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrāhīm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Usāma Ḥammād b.</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Usāma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad b. ‘Abdullāh b.</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yūnūs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Alqāma b. Qays</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[126\] Maṣūṣ‘at aqwā‘al-Imām Ahmad, III, 375, 399; IV, 72.
\[129\] TK 2001, VIII, 207, 456; IX, 278, 280. ‘Alqāma was a first tabāqā Kufan and was identified as sāḥib sunna only by Ibn Ḥanbal; Maṣūṣ‘at aqwā‘al-Imām Ahmad, III, 29. Al-Mughīrah was a fourth tabāqā Kufan; Jarīr and Shu‘ba were fifth tabāqā Basrans.
Table 7.12 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Ibn Sa'd</th>
<th>Ibn Ma'in</th>
<th>Ibn Hanbal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥajjāj b. al-Minhal</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>thiqā</td>
<td></td>
<td>LBB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamza b. 'Umāra</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>sadiq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrāhīm b. Abī l-Layth</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>yad'af</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ismā'īl b. Ibrāhīm</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>na</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LBB^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarīr b. Ḥāzim</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>thiqā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansūr b. Bashīr</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>thiqā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mardawayh al-Ṣa'īgh</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>thiqā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindal b. 'Ali</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>dhikī ḍā'if</td>
<td>turīka</td>
<td>ḍā'if</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mu'āfa b. 'Imrān</td>
<td>Jazira</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>thiqā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mughīra b. Miqasim</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>thiqā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad b. 'Ubayd</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>thiqā</td>
<td>khayyir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ṭanāfīsī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su'ayr b. al-Khims</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>shari'f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahb b. Jarīr b. Ḥāzim</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>thiqā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Za'ida b. Qudāma</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>thiqā</td>
<td>hāfiz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\^ Ibn Sa'd says ṣaqīlū bi-sunna instead of ṣāḥib su'ūma.
\^ Ibn Hanbal actually quoted Ibn Ma'in's position in this case; Mawsū'at aqwāl al-Imām Ahmad, 1, 93.

VII.7 Conclusions

The story of hadīth-transmitter criticism, whose prepubescent stage was analyzed in the fourth chapter, has now reached its adulthood. The generation of Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'in, and Ibn Hanbal systematized this discipline, begun by Shu'ba, Malik, and Yahyā l-Qaṭṭān, and applied it to an unprecedented number of men. The analysis of the grades used by these three scholars has uncovered several examples of individual terminology and personal styles of criticism. While the grades thiqā and ḍā'īf enjoyed the widest currency, over a dozen terms were used by these three men to indicate different shades of reliability and delinquency with regard to hadīth transmission. It also became apparent, to my surprise, that Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'in, and Ibn Hanbal were interested in grading very different pools of men, and, as a consequence, their personal tastes limited the scope of the comparative qualitative analysis between these three critics. I salvaged my analysis through the adoption of bilateral, rather than
trilateral, comparisons between these critics, and it uncovered more than an 85% consensus between Ibn Ma'in and Ibn Sa'd, and between Ibn Ḥanbal and Ibn Sa'd. It is this consensus as to the identities of the most authoritative hadith-transmiters of the first two centuries of Islam that must be considered as a fundamental pillar in the articulation of Sunni Islam by the critical hadith compilers of the third/ninth century.
Behind all the myriad grades and details found in the works of Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'in, and Ibn Ḥanbal there exists a common historical vision of the first two centuries of hadith transmission that is at the core of the Sunni articulation of Islam. The task of this last chapter is to construct a coherent narrative that does justice to this key third/ninth century historiographical dimension of Sunnism that tends to be overlooked in the secondary literature. This narrative focuses on the primary actors of hadith transmission and articulates the untold story of the fall of Medina as the undisputed capital of hadith and the rise of Kufa and Basra during the second/eighth century. This implicit historical vision of hadith transmission, coupled with the belief in the collective probity of the saḥāba and the original discipline of hadith-transmitter criticism, are, in my opinion, the foundations upon which Sunni Islam was constructed by the hadith scholars of the third/ninth century.

The following narrative is based almost exclusively upon the works of Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'in, and Ibn Ḥanbal, or their pupils. The first source is Ibn Ḥanbal's Musnad, or to be more precise, Ibn Ḥajar's study of this work that has been published as Aṭrāf musnad al-Imām Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal. This book has already played a key role in the identification of the most prolific saḥāba with regard to hadith in the sixth chapter, and has been reemployed here to uncover their most significant tābi'n pupils. The recensions of both al-Dūrī and al-Darīmī of Ibn Ma'in's opinions contain much useful information about individual prominent transmitters, and the latter book is particularly helpful in that it opens with eleven scholars whose companions (ṣaḥāb) all are evaluated comparatively in the same location.1 Finally, Ibn

Sa'd's *TaブqAth al-kabira is of fundamental significance for this narrative because of its extensive notes on individual transmitters, especially in the Hijaz, and Ibn Sa'd's unique habit of providing quantitative grades in over six hundred cases. While these grades are the ambiguous expressions 'many hadith', 'some hadith', and 'few hadith', they do indicate the massive scope of hadith transmission during the first two post-prophetic centuries of Islam, and provide vivid proof of the crash of Medinan hadith transmission during the early ‘Abbasid period.

It is necessary to expand upon the theme of the magnitude of hadith transmission prior to the succinct narrative of the major actors involved in this venture. Ibn Sa'd distinguishes 299 transmitters of 'many' hadith, 155 of 'some', and 228 of 'a few' in the generations following the sahāba. When we consider that several hundred additional men are reported to have transmitted an unspecified quantity of prophetic material, it becomes clear that at least a thousand people subsequent to the sahāba were involved in this project prior to the generation of Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'in, and Ibn Hanbal. If each of the forty-seven transmitters of 'many hadith' found in Medina, Mecca, Kufa, and Basra of the generation preceding Ibn Sa'd, had at his disposal, as a conservative estimate, five hundred hadith, there would have been 23,500 hadith in circulation solely in these four cities.

Although I shall endeavor to identify the most prominent scholars in each of the five periods of my narrative of hadith transmission, it is clear that a thorough description of this vast expression of Islamic piety transcends the scope of this chapter.

My emphasis upon prolific hadith-transmitters is supplemented by qualitative remarks about these men throughout this narrative. The reason for the inclusion of this information is threefold. First, I seek to demonstrate the high correlation between prominent hadith scholars and reliable scholars, in the eyes of Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma’in, and Ibn Hanbal, something that is unacknowledged by scholars, such as

---

1 These are khāhir al-hadith, lāhu or indahu ahādith, and qālī al-hadith, respectively.

2 The sahāba receive neither qualitative nor quantitative grades in *TaブqAth al-kabir.

3 This estimate is probably conservative since one of these men, Abū Dāwūd al-Tayālīsī, transmitted over a thousand hadith that are found in the surviving recension of his Musnad; furthermore, Ibn Ma’in reports that Wā'il b. al-Jarrāḥ, another one of these forty-seven men, collected 800 hadith just from his teacher al-A’mash; al-Dīrī, *Tarīkh*, I, 276.
Secondly, as was seen in the previous chapter with regard to Ibn Ma'in and Ibn Ḥanbal, critics often employed relative grades, which in turn enable us to ascertain the relative influences of individual pupils of major scholars upon the following generation of students. Finally, one of the most remarkable aspects of qualitative hadīth-transmitter criticism is the willingness of some early scholars in general, and, in particular, Ibn ʿAwn, to distinguish between the ṭāḥrīn who transmitted hadīth precisely and those who transmitted merely the gist of the report (bi-l-maʾnā) or who engaged in deceptive transmission (ḥaddīs). The affiliation of these negative practices with generally reliable hadīth scholars by the early critics adds credibility, in my opinion, to the overall narrative of the first two centuries of hadīth transmission, while, paradoxically, it suggests that a significant percentage of the vast hadīth corpus never consisted of the exact locutions of the Prophet Muhammad, even though the reports were considered faithful to his practices and opinions.

One question that must be addressed prior to the beginning of this narrative is the date of the origins of hadīth transmission on a significant scale. M. M. Azami states confidently that “it is beyond doubt that the system of āmād began from the time of the Prophet” and his impressive collection of fifty saḥāba for whom there are references to the act of written hadīth transmission suggests that this activity has existed at all times during Islamic history. Nabia Abbott states that “traditions were already being written down by quite a few even in Muḥammad’s day” and does not appear to attach a post-prophetic date to the origins of hadīth. While Juynboll is interested

---

1 Juynboll’s chronology of the development of hadīth, about which I will have more to say in footnote 10, misses many of the most important hadīth scholars and focuses primarily on cases of weak or controversial transmitters; see Muslim Tradition, 39–66. This rendering leaves the reader with the erroneous impression that the vast majority of transmitters were unreliable according to the Muslims’ own standards, something that is not supported by the early sources I have studied.

2 The topic of ḥaddīs is discussed above, chapter II.2; see also Muqaddima Ibn al-Salih, 230–6.

3 This conclusion is corroborated by studies which compared the variants of individual reports, such as Motzki’s “The Jurisprudence of Ibn Ṣīhāb al-Zuhri”, 38–47.

4 M. M. Azami, Studies in Early Hadīth Literature, 237. Pages 34–182 of this book consist of the heart of Azami’s argument for the perennial transmission of hadīth in written form, although most of the references are unique and derive from later sources.

5 Abbott, Studies in Arabic Literary Papryri, II, 7.
primarily in the isnād and its utility for dating hadith, he does suggest that hadith were in circulation in the (late) first century, since they were “standardized” during the lifetime of al-Zuhri.10 Donner dates the collection of accounts of themes of Qurʾān, pre-Islamic Arabia, nubuwawa, umma, futūh, and jina, to the years 70–100/689–718 and hypothesizes that these collectors “synthesized these materials into fairly coherent stories related to particular themes.” Motzki, too, has stressed the importance of ‘Atā b. Abī Rabah’s limited employment of hadith, which he has demonstrated on the basis of his original analysis of ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s Musannaf, as “prime witnesses” for the existence of prophetic hadith in the first century.11 The message from these secondary sources is unambiguous—some hadith were in circulation during the first century, but there does not appear to have been any development during the lifetimes of most sahābas.

I would like to propose that hadith transmission did not begin in earnest until the first civil wars, and that it commenced in Medina, the one city populated by many sahābas that was relatively unaffected by the wars.12 An intriguing piece of evidence for this claim is a report found in al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr that dates the wide scale transmission of hadith transmission to Medina in the immediate aftermath of the killing of ‘Uthmān.13 The report names the sahāba Ibn ‘Abbas,
Ibn ‘Umar, Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī, Abū Hurayra, ‘Abdullāh b. ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ, Jābir b. ‘Abdullāh, Rāfi‘ b. Khadij, Salama b. al-Akwa’, Abū Wāqīḍ al-Laythī, and ‘Abdullāh b. Buḥayna, among the founders of this activity. This report is supported further by my findings in the sixth chapter that all seven of the most prolific saḥāba in the Musnad lived until at least the year 50/670, and by the fact that five of them lived in Medina. The primary consequences of this finding are that the first period of my narrative is titled “Before ḥadīth,” and that I consider the true foundations of this quintessential Sunnī discipline to have been established by the younger saḥāba and tābī‘un during the early Umayyad reign.

VIII.2 Before ḥadīth: Saḥāba who died 11–40/632–660

Only ten saḥāba who passed away prior to Mu‘āwiya’s assumption of the caliphate played a noteworthy role in ḥadīth transmission. ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān were both religious as well as political leaders in Medina, and the Qur’ānic expert Ubayy b. Ka‘b transmitted a minor amount of ḥadīth to Ibn ‘Abbās, Abū L-‘Aliya al-Riyāḥī, and his son Ṭuḥayl. ‘Umar’s decision to send ‘Abdullāh b. Mas‘ūd first to Himṣ and then to Kufa was of great consequence to the shape of ḥadīth scholarship, since an illustrious group of pupils surrounded Ibn Mas‘ūd in his second posting. Kufa was also home to many minor transmitters of ‘Alī’s ḥadīth, none of whom approached the stature of Ibn Mas‘ūd’s disciples. A final saḥābi who settled in Iraq, (Rāfi‘), that are found in the Sunan of Abū Dāwūd, see al-Isāba, I, 497. Al-Dhahabī includes a near-identical version of this report with the same isnād and names Ibn Sa‘d as his source; Sunan, II, 606–7.

Despite their public positions, it is surprising that only 167 atrāf from ‘Umar and 73 from ‘Uthmān are found in Ibn Ḥanbal’s Musnad; this fact contributes to the argument that ḥadīth transmission began in earnest after the outbreak of the first fitnah. Note that a taraf represents, on average, a little less than three ḥadīth in the Musnad.

Ubayy transmitted 6 atrāf to Ibn ‘Abbās, 8 to the Basran tābi‘ī Abū l-‘Aliya, and 7 to his son that are found in the Musnad of Ibn Ḥanbal. Ibn ‘Abbās also transmitted 17 atrāf from ‘Umar.

Ibn Mas‘ūd is the most prolific pre-fitna saḥābi with 369 atrāf in the Musnad, a feat that must have been due largely to his high caliber pupils.

None of ‘Alī’s students transmits more than 19 atrāf in the Musnad, while Abū Wā’il, ‘Alqama, and Abū l-Ahwaṣ transmit 43, 33, and 33 atrāf from Ibn Mas‘ūd, respectively.
Hudhayfa b. al-Yaman, also contributed to the dissemination of prophetic material, although he too appears to have lacked any prominent disciples. While the three Medinan sahāba were overshadowed immediately by the prolific post-fitna sahāba-transmitters, we shall see that none of the longer-lived Kufan sahāba ever transmitted as many hadith as Ibn Ma's'ud and 'Ali.

It is possible, had hadith transmission commenced prior to the first fitna, that Syria would have played a far greater role than it did in its early development. Four sahāba settled in Syria and transmitted a modest body of material that ultimately found its way into Ibn Ḥanbal's Musnad. Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī's time in Syria was cut short, due largely to his piety-minded criticism that irritated Mu'āwīya, and much of his surviving material passed through non-Syrian pupils. Ibn Sa'd identifies a few Syrian "companions" of Mu'ādh b. Jabal, and the Kufan Ibn Abī Laylā appears to have played some role in disseminating his hadith. Abū l-Dardā' and 'Ubāda b. al-Ṣāmiit were both sent by 'Umar to Hims and Jerusalem, respectively, and neither one of them was able to attract any pupils who were capable of attracting the wholesale admiration of Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'in, or Ibn Ḥanbal. While it is tempting to speculate that Syria would have had a greater impact upon hadith scholarship had these sahāba outlived the first civil war, the failure of these four men to attract superior students helps explain the general absence of Syrian hadith scholars of widespread acclaim prior to al-Awzā'ī.

**VIII.3 Foundations: Sahaba and senior tabi‘ūn who died 40-80/660-699 and their pupils who lived prior to 120/738**

While the political capital of the Umayyads was in Syria, the religious capital lay to the south in Medina. Five of the seven most

---

19 Two of the transmitters of multiple arāf of his material are the Basran Abū l-Aswad al-Du‘ā’ār (9 arāf) and ‘Abdullāh b. al-Ṣāmiit (14 arāf).
21 Ibn Abī Laylā transmits 9 arāf in the Musnad from Mu'ādh.
22 Abū l-Dardā'’s most prominent pupil in the Musnad is Abū Idrīs al-Khāwīlānī (7 arāf).
23 Although al-Zuhri spent much time in Syria, he is always considered a Medinan because of his family’s roots in that city, as well as the fact that the vast majority of his teachers were Medinese.
prolific *sahāba* thrived in this city and were blessed by a number of distinguished pupils among the *tābi'un*. The *hadīth* of these men and women were disseminated to Kufa and Basra, where they found fertile ground. Mecca also experienced a brief period of energetic *hadīth* transmission during this period, largely due to the efforts of Ibn ‘Abbās and the major *tābi’un* ‘Aṭā‘ b. Abī Rabāḥ and Mujāhid b. Jabr. But Medina, city of the Prophet, was the most critical center and catalyst for *hadīth* transmission and requires a closer investigation as to the reasons for its prominence.

Did the Umayyads play an active role in the elevation of Medina as the *hadīth* capital of the Islamic world during their reign? There is strong evidence that Abū Hurayra, the most incessant transmitter of prophetic locutions among the *sahāba*, had close relations to the regime, as he was appointed acting governor when Marwān left town for pilgrimages or other functions.24 Two of Marwān b. al-Ḥakam’s sons, ‘Abd al-‘Azīz and Muhammad, are reported by Ibn Sa‘d to have transmitted *hadīth* from Abū Hurayra, and it is quite likely that the caliph ‘Abd al-Malik was familiar with some of his material.25 This being said, Abū Hurayra’s prominence in the field of *hadīth* transmission was due most likely to his success in attracting at least four extraordinarily prolific students: Abū Sāliḥ Dhakwān (d. 101/719), Abū Salama b. ‘Abd al-Raḥman (d. 94/713), ‘Abd al-Raḥman b. Hurmuz al-A’raj (d. 117/735), and Hammām b. Munabbih (d. 101/719). Ibn Ḥanbal collected 733 *atrāf* on the authority of Abū Hurayra from just these four sources in his *Musnad*, a sum that is greater than the total amount of *hadīth* he accumulated from all but four other *sahāba*.26

The three next most prolific *sahābe* in Medina, ‘Ā’isha, Ibn ‘Umar, and Jābir b. ‘Abdullāh, all appear to have achieved their high status on the basis of their impressive students. Over one quarter of ‘Ā’isha’s transmissions found in the *Musnad* were transmitted by her nephew ‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr (d. 94/713), and significant amounts of material reached this book from Abū Salama b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān and al-Qāsim

---

24 TK 2001, V, 253. The three reports that mention this fact do not specify during which year(s) these events took place.
26 Abū Sāliḥ contributed 200 *atrāf*, Abū Salama 195, al-A’raj 195, and Hammām 143; this represents roughly one third of the Abū Hurayra material found in Ibn Ḥanbal’s *Musnad*. 
b. Muhammad b. Abî Bakr (d. 108/726). Ibn ‘Umar’s mawla and pupil Nâfi’ (d. 117/735) is the largest transmitter of hadîth from any single sahabi in Ibn Hanbal’s Musnad, and Ibn ‘Umar’s son Sâlim (d. 106/724) also played a significant role in the dissemination of his father’s material. Jâbir b. ‘Abdullâh was one of the longest-lived Medinan sahabi and the benefactor of the work of his Meccan pupil Abû 1-Zubayr (d. 128/746), whom I have placed in the following period of hadîth transmission due to his presence in the third tabagha in Ibn Sa’d’s book.

A final group of three sahaba enriched the vibrant community of hadîth scholars in Medina during the Umayyad decades of the first and second centuries. Abû Sa’îd al-Khudrî, transmitted an impressive amount of hadîth, especially given the absence of a single exceptionally prolific pupil. ‘Abdullâh b. ‘Amr b. al-‘Âs is reported to have transmitted written hadîth on a sahifa entitled al-Sâdiq to his grandson Shu’ayb b. Muhammad, who in turn passed it on to his son ‘Amr b. Shu’ayb, and it appears that eighty-five of ‘Abdullâh b. ‘Amr’s aṭrâf in the Musnad were derived from this sahifa. Finally, Umm Salama, the second most prolific widow of the Prophet Muhammad, taught a modest body of hadîth that found its way into the Musnad, despite the absence of any particularly strong champions of her material.

A fundamental reason for the dominance of Medinan hadîth lies in the dedication of numerous tâbî’un who disseminated hundreds of hadîth to their own pupils, many of whom hailed from Iraq and else-

1 Both Abû Salama and al-Qâsim transmitted 68 aṭrâf from ‘A’isha.
3 Abû Sa’îd’s most prolific pupil in the Musnad was the Basran Abû Nadra al-Mundhir b. Mâlik who transmitted 50 aṭrâf from him; a second notable student was the Kufan ‘Âqîya b. Sa’d al-Awdî who added another 48 aṭrâf to Ibn Hanbal’s compendium.
4 Although ‘Abdullâh b. ‘Amr is associated with Egypt, his grandson and great-grandson lived in Medina; Ibn Sa’d includes them in the second and third tabaghs of Medinans, respectively: TK 2001, VII. 239–40 (Shu’ayb) and 412 (‘Amr).
5 The largest number of aṭrâf of her material pass through Abû Salama (12); no other individual transmits more than ten aṭrâf from her in the Musnad.
where Ibn Sa‘d preserves many of al-Waqidi’s observations about the large numbers of sahāba from whom several of these men transmitted these reports. Abū Salama b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān, whose mother was the royal princess of Kinda mentioned above in the sixth chapter, was responsible for 252 atrāf in the Musnad from Abū Hurayra, ‘Ā’isha, Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī, Umm Salama, and Jābir b. ‘Abdullāh, and heard reports from at least an additional five sahāba as well. 

‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr, another Medinan son of a sahābi, transmitted a colossal amount of prophetic material from his aunt ‘Ā’isha, as well as at least another eleven sahāba. Abū Salama b. ‘Abd al-Raḥman, whose mother was the royal princess of Kinda mentioned above in the sixth chapter, was responsible for 252 atrāf in the Musnad from Abū Hurayra, ‘Ā’isha, Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī, Umm Salama, and Jābir b. ‘Abdullāh, and heard reports from at least an additional five sahāba as well. 

Al-Qāsim b. Muhammad b. Abī Bakr not only transmitted a notable body of material from his aunt ‘Ā’isha, but is reported by Ibn ‘Awn to have transmitted what he heard literally, as opposed to the common habit of imprecise transmission (bi-l-ma‘nī), something which must have increased the value of his hadīth in the eyes of later, more critical compilers. While these men are only four of the fifty Medinans who transmitted ‘many hadīth’ during this period, according to Ibn

Abū Salama transmitted 150 atrāf from Abū Hurayra, 68 from ‘Ā’isha, 12 from Abū Sa‘īd, 12 from Umm Salama, and 10 from Jābir. Al-Waqidi reports that Abū Salama heard hadīth from Zayd b. Thābit, Abū Qatāda, Ibn ‘Umar, ‘Abdullāh b. ‘Amr, and Ibn ‘Abbās as well; TK 2001, VII, 153. Al-Waqidi’s claim that he transmitted from his father is contradicted by Ibn Ḥanbal, who states that he did not hear anything from him since he was very young at his time of death; al-Dūrī, Ṭartīḥ, I, 64.


Ibn ‘Awn’s opinion is found in both al-Taḥāqīf al-kabīr and ‘Abdullāh’s Ṭālī; see TK 2001, VII, 186 and Manusī‘at aqīdāt al-Imām Ahmad, III, 166.
Sa’d, their role in the establishment of their hometown as the capital of hadith scholarship during the Umayyad era may have been even more critical than that of the small core of sahāba who eagerly described the practices of the Prophet whom they had witnessed.

Another reason for the prestige accorded to Medina was its role in exporting hadith to the cities of Kufa and Basra. One of the most significant bridges between Medina and Kufa was the work of Abū Ḥātim al-Ashja’ī and Abū Zur’ā b. ‘Ammīr, a grandson of the sahābi Jarīr b. ‘Abdullāh. Both Masrūq b. al-Ajdā (d. 63/683) and al-Aswād b. Yazīd (d. 75/694), two disciples of Ibn Mas’ūd, brought a significant body of prophetic teachings back to Kufa from ‘A’isha, and ‘Atiyāya b. Sa’d al-‘Awfī (d. 110/728) performed the same service for Abū Sa’īd al-Khudrī. Muhammad b. Sīrīn (d. 110/728), one of the venerable tābi’īn of Basra, brought a substantial body of Abū Hurayra hadith to his home, and Abū Naḍrā did the same with hadith of Abū Sa’īd al-Khudrī. These are only a few examples of the most prominent Iraqi tābi’īn who acquired prophetic material in Medina in order to enhance the state of hadith transmission in their home towns.

Although Kufa never enjoyed the presence of a sahābi who was more prolific than Ibn Mas’ūd, an additional five men contributed

---

1. Only two of these fifty men receive a grade inferior to thiqa by Ibn Sa’d: ‘Ikrima mawlā Ibn ‘Abbās and al-Muṭṭalib b. ‘Abdullāh are evaluated as ‘not authoritative’ (layrā yuḥtaju bihi); ṬK 2001, VII, 282, 409. Juynboll discusses briefly the controversial nature of ‘Ikrima’s transmissions; Muslim Tradition, 55-7.
2. Abū Sahlīh was considered reliable by both Ibn Ma’an and Ibn Ḥanbal; Ibn Abī Hātim, al-Jafr wa l-‘adā’, III, 450-1.
3. Both men transmitted 34 aṭrāf from Abū Hurayra that were included in the Musnad of Ibn Ḥanbal, and Ibn Sa’d mentions that both of them transmitted from Abū Hurayra; ṬK 2001, VIII, 197, 191.
4. Masrūq is responsible for 36 aṭrāf from ‘A’isha found in the Musnad, while al-Aswād contributed 42. ‘Atiyāya was the most prolific transmitter from Abū Sa’īd, with 48 aṭrāf in the Musnad. ‘Atiyāya is also one of the most important sources of Ibn ‘Abbās’s exegetical comments in al-Ṭabarī’s tafsīr, see GAS, I, 30-1. His highly recognizable family-isnād occurs approximately 1560 times in this book; note that the incorrect version of this isnād appears in Horst, “Zur Überlieferung im Koran­kommentar al-‘Tabars,” 294, and that the correct one is found in Berg, The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam, 96.
5. Ibn Sīrīn heard 68 aṭrāf from Abū Hurayra found in the Musnad; Abū Naḍrā transmitted 50 aṭrāf from Abū Sa’īd al-Khudrī in this book as well.
a body of ḥadīth that equaled a little more than 350 atīf in the Musnad of Ibn Ḥanbal. Abū Musā ʿAlī-Abār, a rugged general and governor of Iraq, appears to have been the most prolific Kufan after Ibn Masʿūd and ʿAlī, due largely to the role of his son Abū Burda (d. 104/722), who served as a qādi in this city. A second saḥābi, al-Barāʾ b. ʿĀzib, gained prominence because of the volume of material transmitted by the centurion Abū ʿIshāq al-Sabīʿi, whom we shall encounter in the next period. A similar case to that of al-Barāʾ and Abū ʿIshāq is Jābir b. Samura al-Suwāʿi, and his devoted student, Simāk b. Ḥarb al-Dhuḥli, also of the next period. Finally, al-Mughīra b. Shuʿba and Saʿd b. ʿAbī Waqqāṣ, two men whom we saw in the sixth chapter were at opposite ends of the spectrum with regard to permissibility of the Umayyad practice of cursing ʿAlī, each contributed 51 atīf to the Musnad of Ibn Ḥanbal, and were clearly unsuccessful in attracting any prolific pupils to disseminate their reports.

The strength in Umayyad-era ḥadīth scholarship in Kufa was located in an impressive array of tābīʿūn, many of whom had been pupils of Ibn Masʿūd. Leading transmitters of Ibn Masʿūd’s ḥadīth include Abū Wā’il Shaqīq b. Salama, ʿAlqama b. Qays, Abū ʿAlī-Ḥaṣan ‘Awf b. Mālik, al-ʿAswad b. Yāzīd, and Masrūq b. al-ʿAjda’. All of these men are reported by Ibn Saʿd to have heard reports from a variety of saḥāba, such as ʿUmar, ʿAlī, and Abū Mūsā, and Abū Wāʾil is said to have traveled as far as Syria to hear from Abū ʿDardā’. A particularly significant pupil of these disciples of Ibn Masʿūd was the short-lived Ibrahīm al-Nakhaʾī (d. 95/714), who was a nephew of both ʿAlqama and al-ʿAswad, and, according to Ibn ʿAwn, transmitted ḥadīth imprecisely (bh-l-maʿnā). Another particularly well-versed
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17 Over one third (41) of Abū Mūsā’s 118 atīf in the Musnad can be traced through his son.

18 Abū ʿIshāq is responsible for 37 of al-Barāʾ’s 94 atīf in the Musnad.

19 Simāk transmitted 35 of Jābir’s 54 atīf in the Musnad.

20 Ibn Saʿd identifies a total of nineteen men, all of whom received the grade ṭabīqa, who transmitted ‘many ḥadīth’ in the first two jabāqīt of Kufans.

21 Abū Wāʾil contributed 43 atīf from Ibn Masʿūd to the Musnad; ʿAlqama and Abū ʿAlī-Ḥaṣan each added 33 atīf; al-ʿAswad supplied 19 atīf, and Masrūq added a mere 14.

22 TK 2001, VIII, 222.

23 TK 2001, VIII, 386–402. We shall see shortly that Ibrahīm’s disciples Mansūr b. al-Muʿtamir and al-ʿAʾmash were the key figures of the next generation of Kufan ḥadīth scholars; another one of his pupils, al-Ḥakam b. ʿUtayba (d. 115/733) lived in the period currently under discussion.
The heart of Umayyad-era hadith transmission in Basra was one of the longest-lived sahāba and five impressive tābiʿīn. Anas b. Mālik, the Anṣārī servant of the Prophet Muhammad, owed his prominence both due to his remarkable longevity and the dedication of his disciples Thābit b. Aslam al-Bunānī (d. 123/740) and Qatāda b. Diʿāma (d. 117/735). It is important to note that Ibn ʿAwn cast doubt on the precision of Anas’s transmission of prophetic locutions, as he remarked that Anas would often say “or how the Messenger said it” after reciting a hadith. Two tābiʿīn who were senior to Thābit and Qatāda were al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī and Muḥammad b. Sirīn, both of whom heard reports from many sahāba. Al-Ḥasan contributed small amounts of material from Abū Hurayra, ʿĪmrān b. Ḥusayn, Anas, Samura b. Jundab, Jābir b. ʿAbdullāh, and Abū Mūsa to the Musnad of Ibn Ḥanbal, and he is reported to have transmitted reports to

---

20 Al-Dīrān, Tāriḥ, I, 351.
21 TK 2001, VIII, 374. Saʿīd transmitted 138 atrāf from Ibn ʿAbbās and 14 atrāf from Ibn ʿUmar in the Musnad. Ibn Saʿīd reports that Saʿīd only wrote down Ibn ʿAbbās’s hadith after his teacher went blind, and that Ibn ʿAbbās was quite upset when Saʿīd’s actions were brought to his attention. He also reports that al-Ḥālid b. Muzāḥim’s (d. 105/723) alleged tafsīr from Ibn ʿAbbās was actually obtained from Saʿīd when the latter visited him in Rayy and not from Ibn ʿAbbās directly; ibid., VIII, 418. See also GAS, I, 28–30. A recension of al-Ḥālid b. Muzāḥim’s tafsīr is cited 670 times in al-Ṭabarī’s tafsīr, see Horst, 304–5.
22 Thābit contributed 187 atrāf from Anas to the Musnad, and Qatāda added an additional 142; this consists of a little over a third of Anas’s material in the Musnad.
23 on kamā qāla rasūlu llāhi restrial; TK 2001, IX, 20.
24 Al-Ḥasan transmitted 33 atrāf from Abū Hurayra, 19 from ʿĪmrān, 9 from...
several *tābiʿūn* in Mecca during one of his visits there. Ibn ‘Awn reports that al-Hasan’s primary difference from his contemporary and friend, Muhammad b. Sirin, was that he transmitted *hadith* imprecisely, whereas Ibn Sirin used the exact words in his reports. Furthermore, Shu’ba learned from his mother that Ibn Sirin heard *hadith* directly from Abū Hurayra and Ibn ‘Umar, and Ibn Ma’in adds that he heard from Hudhayfah as well. The final major *tābiʿi* of Basra during this early period was Abī Naṣr al-Mundhir b. Malik (d. 108/726), a close pupil of Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudri, whom Ibn Ma’in favored over the major Kufan student of Abū Sa‘īd, ‘Aṭīyya b. Sa‘d al-‘Abbāsi. The final major locale of significant *hadith* transmission during the greater part of the Umayyad era was the holy city of Mecca. Ibn ‘Abbās enjoyed a diverse group of devoted pupils, who ranged from the Khārījī ‘Ikrima, to the martyred Sa‘īd b. Jubayr of Kufa, to Tawus b. Kaysān of Yemen. Two other students of Ibn ‘Abbās, Mujāhid b. Jabr (d. 102/720) and ‘Ata b. Abī Rabah (d. 114/732),
may have been known more for their role in the origins of Qurʾānic exegesis and fiqh than hadith, and Ibn Saʿd reports that Mujāhid read the Qurʾān to Ibn ʿAbbās no fewer than thirty times. Ibn ʿAtāʾ’s prominence is illustrated further by Ibn Maʿān’s report that people thought it odd that Ibn Abī Laylā, who was his senior, asked ʿAtāʾ questions pertaining to religion, and Ibn Maʿān reports that Mujāhid made a trip to Kufa that enabled him to disseminate his erudition in the second most important city of religious learning in his day. Note also that Ḥikrima is reported to have traveled to Kufa during the insurrection of al-Mukhtar, and that the Basran notable Ibn Sīrīn heard reports from him there as well. While Mecca was clearly overshadowed by its northern neighbor with regard to hadith transmission, it is important to recognize that Ibn ʿAbbās’s impressive circle of pupils impacted both the fields of hadith transmission, fiqh, and Qurʾānic exegesis during the period immediately following the first civil war.

In the eyes of the generation of Ibn Saʿd, Ibn Maʿān, and Ibn Ḥanbal, the seeds of Sunnī hadith compilation and criticism were planted firmly during the Umayyad period, particularly in the cities of Medina, Kufa, Basra, and Mecca. Medina dominated the origins of this movement, due to the presence of seven exceptionally articulate saḥāba and their loyal pupils, several of whom came from Iraq. There is little evidence of overt Umayyad sponsorship of hadith transmission during this time, with the notable exception of ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, and several prominent scholars did their utmost to avoid the regime. There is also very little evidence of hadith being written at this point, and the employment of isnāds would have been 

---

50 TK 2001, VIII, 28. Mujāhid contributed 21 ʿarāf on the authority Ibn ʿAbbās, 21 on the authority of Ibn ʿUmar, and 11 on the authority of ʿĀʾisha in the Musnad, ʿAtāʾ transmitted 34 ʿarāf from Ibn ʿAbbās, 37 from Jabir b. ʿAbdullāh, and 13 from ʿĀʾisha. Note that Ibn Maʿān reports that Yahyā l-Qaṭṭān denied that Mujāhid heard hadith directly from ʿĀʾisha; al-Durū, Tārīkh, I, 77. This same opinion is attributed to Shuʿba by Ibn Ḥanbal in the Itak Muṣannaf uqūrā’ al-Imām ʿAbd al-Razzāq, III, 223.

51 Al-Durū, Tārīkh, I, 203 (Ibn Abī Laylā’s questions); I, 263 (Mujāhid’s trip to Kufa).

52 TK 2001, IX, 193.

53 See, for example, Juynboll, Muslim Tradition, 33–9. Note that Ibn Saʿd reports that ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz was thiqā-muʾmīn and transmitted ‘many hadith’; TK 2001, VII, 397.
utterly unnecessary, for the simple reason that it would have been easy for each ṭābi‘ī to recall whether their saḥābi teachers had heard their prophetic reports from the Prophet himself or from another saḥābi. There does appear to have been a relatively high degree of laxity in precision transmission during this period, as major transmitters, such as Anas, al-Sha‘bī, Ibrāhīm al-Nakha‘ī, and al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, were all reported to have conveyed the general meaning of the Prophet’s locutions instead of his exact words. This imprecision should not, of course, be confused with fabrication, since we can safely assume that there was an effort by these early pious scholars to convey the message of whatever teaching they had learned rather than the actual citation. While this sketch can hardly do justice to the vast enterprise of hadīth transmission during the first eight Umayyad decades as depicted in our third/ninth century sources, it does highlight a coterie of significant saḥāba and ṭābi‘ūn whose work set the stage for a period of systematic compilation by a couple dozen of their pupils, most of whom carried out their work uninterrupted by the violent transfer of power from the house of Bānī Umayya to the descendents of Ibn ʿAbbās.

VIII.4 The first compilers: The generation who died 120–150/738–767

The generation of Muslim scholars who lived during the twilight years of the Umayyads and the dawn of the ‘Abbāsids transformed radically the nature of hadīth transmission. Most of these men were identified as specialists of a particular body of hadīth from a ṣaḥābi or ṭābi‘ī, and they themselves cultivated easily identifiable circles of disciples. References to written materials become frequent in this period, although it is clear that the production of well organized books (tasnīf) of hadīth required at least another generation to develop. While Medina maintained a high level of hadīth scholarship into the early ‘Abbāsid period, it was arguably surpassed by a group of Basrans during this time, and Kufa and Mecca experienced a slight reduction in their numbers of prominent hadīth folk.

---

63 This assumption rests less on the religious sincerity of these early men than on the practical challenge of sheer fabrication in places where multiple authorities lived and were consulted by students who could have detected easily idiosyncrasies in one of their teacher’s reports.
Medina enjoyed the presence of over thirty transmitters of ‘many hadith’ during this transition period, according to Ibn Sa’d. The most famous of these men, al-Zuhri (d. 124/742), spent almost his entire adult life in the service of the Umayyads, and synthesized the materials of Sa’id b. al-Musayyab, ‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr, and Sālim b. ‘Abdullah b. ‘Umar, among others, for his pupils.64 While the importance of al-Zuhri and his close relationship with the Umayyads has long been recognized and even studied in some detail by Nabia Abbott and Michael Lecker,65 several other major hadith transmitters of Medina have received relatively little attention. ‘Ubayd Allāh b. ‘Umar b. Ḥašṣ (d. 147/764) was a prolific pupil of Nāfi’ mawla Ibn ‘Umar,66 and Hisham b. ‘Urwa (d. 146/763) transmitted a significant body of ‘A’isha’s hadith from his father.67 Ibn Ma’in reiterates that ‘Amr b. Shu’ayb’s hadith that trace back to his great-grandfather ‘Abdullah b. ‘Amr were weak because they were transmitted solely by means of written materials, although, on a positive note, he affirms that ‘Amr was reliable with that which he heard from Sa’id b. al-Musayyab and ‘Urwa b. Zubayr.68 Yahyā b. Sa’id al-Anṣārī (d. 143/

---

64 Al-Zuhri contributes 91 atṣāf of ‘A’isha from ‘Urwa to the Musnad of Ibn Hanbal, as well 82 atṣāf of Ibn ‘Umar from Sālim, and 33 from Anas b. Mālik, whom he apparently heard directly. For a list of his teachers, see TK 2001, VII, 429.


66 Ibn Sa’d evaluated him as thiqa-hujja, TK 2001, VII, 531. Ibn Ḥanbal includes 193 atṣāf of his from Nāfi’ on the authority of Ibn ‘Umar in the Musnad. He evaluated him as thiqa and as the most reliable pupil of Nāfi’; Mawsū‘at aqwil al-Imām Ahmad, II, 408-9. Ibn Ma’in held the opinion that ‘Ubayd Allāt was as reliable as Mālik in his transmissions from Nāfi’; al-Dārīmī, Tarikh, 152.

67 Ibn Ḥanbal includes 103 atṣāf from Hishām b. ‘Urwa b. ‘A’isha in the Musnad. Note that Hishām was one of the first Medinaans to move to Bagdad, a trend that was to intensify in the following generation. Ibn Sa’d evaluates him as thiqa-thabt-hujja and Ibn Ma’in states that he is as reliable as al-Zuhri in his transmissions from his father—‘Urwa; TK 2001, VII, 462 and al-Dārīmī, Tarikh, 203.

68 Al-Dūrī, Tarikh, II, 355. Ibn Sa’d does not grade ‘Amr b. Shu’ayb, but does mention his well-known sahifa in his entry in the third tabaqah of Medinaans; TK 2001, VII, 412. Ibn Abī Hāmīn includes three additional opinions from Ibn Ma’in, ranging from bayna bi-adith, juttahu hadithunu, and that he got angry when asked about ‘Amr and said “What can I say about him? The Imāms (of hadith) transmit from him!” Al-Jarh wa l-tadārīk, VI, 238-9. Ibn Ḥanbal is reported to have said: “I do not know of anyone who has rejected (yarakah) the hadith of ‘Amr b. Shu’ayb → his father → his grandfather” although he was unsure about the reliability of ‘Amr’s other reports; Mawsū‘at aqwil al-Imām Ahmad, III, 99-100. Ibn Hibban observes that Ibn Ḥanbal, Ibn al-Madīnī, and Ibn Rāhawayh all consider ‘Amr’s hadith authoritative (wastajuna bi-hadithihā); ibid. (extracted from Kitiib al-majruḥān, II, 71).
760) was considered by Su'yân al-Thawrî to have been one of the four hadith transmitters of this generation, and Abû l-Zinâd 'Abdullâh b. Dhakwân (d. 131/748) shared a teaching circle with the prolific jurist and hadith-transmitter Rabî'a b. Abî 'Abd al-Rahmân al-Râ'y (d. 136/753) in the Prophet's mosque in Medina for awhile. Despite the presence of high caliber hadith-transmitters in Medina who outlived al-Zuhrî, it is quite significant that only al-Zuhrî was able to build an enthusiastic core of pupils, and we shall see that it was even more significant that almost all of these men, with the notable exception of Mâlik b. Anâs, chose to reside in cities other than Medina.

Basran scholars seized the mantle of hadith scholarship during the period of 120-150/738-767 and held it at least through the generation of Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'in, and Ibn Hanbal. Ūmâyad b. Abî Ḥumayd al-Tawîl (d. 142/759) was a major transmitter of hadith from Anâs b. Mâlik, copied the writings (kutub) of al-Jâsîn al-Bârî, and read them back to him. Ayyûb al-Sakhûyâni (d. 131/749) was

---

76 The other four hadith mentioned by al-Thawrî are 'Abd al-Mâlik b. Abî Sulaymân and Ismâ'îl b. Abî Khalîd of Kufa, and 'Âsîm al-Ahwal of Basra. Ibn Sa'd grades Yahyâ thiqah-thâthîa, Ibn Ma'in evaluates him as thiqah and Ibn Hanbal calls him both thiqah and "among the most reliable people" (min nihilat al-nâs); TK 2001, VII, 517-8, al-Dârimî, Târîkh, 44, and Mawsû'aât aqwil al-Imâm Ahmad, IV, 120-2. Ibn Sa'd reports that Yahyâ ordered Mâlik to write 100 hadith that the latter had heard from al-Zuhrî just prior to Yahyâ's departure for Iraq. Mâlik's student (and Ibn Sa'd's informant) Ismâ'îl al-Uwaysî was surprised that Yahyâ merely took the hadith from Mâlik without any oral verification. Mâlik's reply to his student's incredulity was that "[Yahyâ] was above that due to his deep understanding (of Islam)" (fa-qultu li-Mâlik: fa-ma'qara'ahii 'alayko, wa Ima'qara'tohii 'na'yi' qilâ: tâ kâna afghawu min dhâlîka); ibid., 518.

11 Despite Rabî'a's inam "al-Râ'y", Ibn Sa'd reports that he transmitted 'many hadith', even though some hadith scholars avoided them due to his ra'y (wa ka'am'mah yataqarrab li-râ'y); TK 2001, VII, 511. Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Hanbal, and Abû Ḥâtim al-Râzî all evaluate Rabî'a as thiqah; ibid., Mawsû'aât aqwil al-Imâm Ahmad, I, 371-2, and Ibn Abî Ḥârim, al-Jârî wa l-tâdîl, III, 475. Rabî'a's pupils include Shu'ba, Su'yân al-Thawrî, and Mâlik; ibid.

12 TK 2001, VII, 568. Ibn Sa'd and Ibn Hanbal evaluate Abû l-Zinâd as thiqah; ibid., Mawsû'aât aqwil al-Imâm Ahmad, II, 240-1. Ibn al-Madîni also remarks that "nobody after the senior inshân was more knowledgeable than Ibn Shihâb (al-Zuhrî), Yahyâ b. Sa'd (al-Ansâri), Abû l-Zinâd, and Bûkayr b. al-Ashajj (d. 120/738);" al-Jârî wa l-tâdîl, V, 49.

13 Ibn Sa'd identifies fifteen Basrans as transmitters of 'many hadith'; the only men who receive negative grades are 'Alî b. Zayd b. Ju'dân (isti'dîf) and 'Amr b. 'Ubayy ("worthless"); TK 2001, IX, 251 and 272.

14 Ibn Hanbal includes 124 aqwil of Anâs from Ūmâyad al-Tawîl in the Mawsû'a, although Ibn Ma'in claims that Ūmâyad heard only 24 hadith directly from Anâs and that he obtained the rest from Thâkîr al-Bunâni; al-Durî, Târîkh, II, 246. The report about Ūmâyad copying al-Hasan's notes is found in ibid., II, 268 and from
found among Ibn Sa'\textsuperscript{d}'s most highly decorated hadith scholars in the previous chapter, and is reported by Ibn 'Awn to have been the most knowledgeable student of the hadith of Ibn Sirin.\textsuperscript{14} Ibn Ma'\textsuperscript{in} preferred Dawud b. Abi Hind (d. 139/756) to the q\={a}d\={i} 'A\={s}im b. Sulaym\={a}n al-Alwal (d. 141/758), both of whom are reported to have been reliable transmitters who disseminated large quantities of hadith.\textsuperscript{15} A parallel to the ascetic Medinan Mu\={h}ammad al-Munkadir can be found in the Basran Sulaym\={a}n al-Taym\={i} (d. 143/760), a disciple of Qat\={a}da, whom Ibn Sa'\textsuperscript{d} reports would spend entire nights in the mosque with his son and refused to transmit a sahi\={f}a of hadith from Jabir b. 'Abdull\={a}h that he had not heard from one of his pupils.\textsuperscript{16} Finally, at the opposite spectrum from Sulaym\={a}n al-Taym\={i}, we find the wealthy Ibn 'Awn (d. 151/768), a reliable companion of al-Sha'\={b}i, whose critical comments concerning the degree of precision of several major scholars' hadith transmission have permeated this narrative.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{14} Ibn Hanbal (on the authority of Hamm\={a}d b. Salama) in Mawsii\={u}t aqwa\={i}l al-Im\={a}m Ahmad, I, 311. In one report, 'Abdull\={a}h b. Ahmad mentions that he heard this information from both his father and Ibn Ma'\textsuperscript{in}. Note that Ibn Hanbal preferred Habib b. al-Shahid (d. 145/762) to Humayd, whereas Ibn Ma'\textsuperscript{in} said that they were equal; \textit{i.e.}, I, 312 and Ibn Abi Ha\={u}m, \textit{al-farh wa l-t\={a}dil}, III, 219. Ab\={u} Ha\={u}m reports that 'Ubayd Allah b. 'Umar, Yah\={y}a b. Sa'\textsuperscript{d} [al-An\={s}ari], Su\={y}\={a}n al-Thawri, Malik, and Shu'\={a}ba transmitted hadith from him; \textit{i.e.}.

\textsuperscript{15} Al-Bukh\={a}r\={i}, \textit{Tiirikh al-kabir}, I.1 (Hyderabad, 1361-2), 409-10. Ibn Hanbal includes 83 Ibn 'Umar a\={r}af\={i} from Na\={f}i' on the authority of Ayy\={u}b in the \textit{Musnad}, as well as 24 Ibn 'Abbas a\={r}af\={i} from 'Ikrima. Ibn Sa'\textsuperscript{d} reports that some of Ayy\={u}b's pupils were surprised that he transmitted from 'Ikrima, to which he replied "I do not accuse him [of weakness]" \textit{It\={a} atahimihu}; \textit{TK} 2001, VII, 284. Ibn Hanbal reports essentially the same information; \textit{Mawsii\={u}t aqwa\={i}l al-Im\={a}m Ahmad}, III, 25-6.

\textsuperscript{16} Al-D\={u}r\={i}, \textit{Tiirikh}, II, 166; \textit{TK} 2001, IX, 254-5. 'A\={s}im served as q\={a}d\={i} of al-Mad\={a}\={a} during the reign of al-Man\={s}\={u}r and was reported to have been one of Su\={f}\={a}n al-Thawri's "four huj\={u}f\={a}," see \textit{ibid.}, VIII, 464. Ibn Sa'\textsuperscript{d} and Ibn Ma'\textsuperscript{in} evaluate Dawud as thiqa and Ibn Hanbal grades him as thiqa thiqa; \textit{Mawsii\={u}t aqwa\={i}l al-Im\={a}m Ahmad}, I, 353-4. 'A\={s}im receives the grade of thiqa from these three scholars as well; \textit{TK} 2001, IX, 235 and 321, al-D\={a}r\={i}mi, \textit{Tiirikh}, 161, and \textit{Mawsii\={u}t aqwa\={i}l al-Im\={a}m Ahmad}, II, 202-3.

\textsuperscript{17} \textit{TK} 2001, IX, 251-2. Azami credits Sulaym\={a}n b. Qays al-Yashkuri (d. 70-80) as the source of this sahi\={f}a: \textit{Studies in Early Hadith Literature}, 52-3. Ibn Sa'\textsuperscript{d}, Ibn Ma'\textsuperscript{in}, and Ibn Hanbal all grade Sulaym\={a}n al-Taym\={i} as thiqa; \textit{TK} 2001, IX, 251-2, al-D\={a}r\={i}mi, \textit{Tiirikh}, 49, and \textit{Mawsii\={u}t aqwa\={i}l al-Im\={a}m Ahmad}, II, 94-5. For more information, see above, III.2.

\textsuperscript{18} \textit{TK} 2001, IX, 261-8. Ibn Sa'\textsuperscript{d} and Ibn Ma'\textsuperscript{in} grade Ibn 'Awn as thiqa, and the former remarks that he was 'Uthm\={a}n; \textit{ibid.} and al-D\={a}r\={i}mi, \textit{Tiirikh}, 57. Ibn al-Mad\={i}mi considered Ayy\={u}b and Ibn 'Awn superior to their Basran contemporaries Hish\={a}m b. Hass\={a}n, Kh\={a}lid al-Hachdha\={h}, 'A\={s}im al-Alwal, and Salama b. 'Alqa\={m}a; Ibn Abi Ha\={u}m, \textit{al-farh wa l-t\={a}dil}, V, 130-1. For more information, see above, III.2.
The burden of hadith transmission in Kufa during this time fell upon a small group of men, three of whom cultivated identifiable bodies of disciples. The most senior of these scholars was Abū Ishāq 'Amr b. 'Abdullāh al-Sabīr (d. 127/745). His circle of pupils included most of the major Kufans of the following generation, such as Sufyān al-Thawrī, Abū Bakr b. 'Ayyāsh, his own son Yūnus, and the Basran Shu'ba. Manṣūr b. al-Mu'tamir (d. 132/750), a pupil of Abū Wā'il and Ibrāhīm al-Nakḥā'i, was favored by Ibn Ma'in over Qatāda and declared to be more reliable in his transmission than al-Hakam b. 'Utayba (d. 115/733). A particularly famous pupil of Manṣūr was the Khurāsānī ascetic al-Fuqayl b. 'Iyāq., who traveled to Kufa explicitly for the purpose of studying with him, prior to his retirement in Mecca. Sulaymān b. Mihrān al-A'mash (d. 148/765) achieved prominence as an expert reciter of the Qur'ānic reading of Ibn Mas'ūd, as well as a pupil of the Medinan transplant Abū Sāliḥ Dhakwān. Ibn Ma'in cautions us, however, that al-A'mash’s hadith from Anas and Ibn Abī Awfā were not actually heard from these

---

18 Ibn Sa'd recognizes only eleven Kufans of this time as transmitters of ‘many hadith’, two of whom he grades as weak. These two weak transmitters are Ḥammād b. Abī Sulaymān and Abū Sahl Muhammad b. Sālim; TK 2001, VIII, 451, 480. Note that Ibn Ma’in declares that Ḥammād was trustworthy, at least in al-Dārimi’s recension; al-Dārimi, Tārikh, 58. The general evaluation of Ibn Hanbal is that Ḥammād was ‘mediocre in hadith’ (mqānib al-hadith) and that only the reports transmitted by experts such as Sufyān al-Thawrī and Shu'ba should be considered; Mawsu'at aqād al-Imām Ahmad, I, 302–7. Note that there is a lone report from al-Marrāqī that Ibn Hanbal graded Ḥammād as thiqāt; ibid., I, 305.


20 Al-Dārimi, Tārikh, 59–60.

21 Al-Bukhārī, al-Tārikh al-kabīr, IV.1, 346.

22 Al-Dārī, Tārikh, I, 194 and 326. Ibn Ma’in declared Manṣūr to be the Kufan equivalent of Ayyāb al-Sakhḥiyānī, and Ibn Sa’d declared him to be thiqât-mu’tamim sahīh ‘ālit; TK 2001, VIII, 456. Ibn Ḥanbal, however, preferred al-Hakam to Manṣūr with respect to transmission from Ibrāhīm al-Nakḥā’i, although he notes that Manṣūr was more accurate than al-A’mash; Mawsu’at aqād al-Imām Ahmad, III, 401–3. He also states that nobody except Ibn Abī Najīḥ has transmitted more material from Muḥāhid than Manṣūr; ibid., III, 403.

23 TK 2001, VIII, 61. An interesting report, this time from Ibn Ma’in, is that Manṣūr’s pupil, Ja‘far b. Ḥāzim, would copy his hadith on a slate, and then erase them and write more complete versions of the same reports from his other teacher, al-Mughīrā b. Miqsam al-Dabbī (d. 136/753); al-Dārī, Tārikh, I, 355. Ibn Sa’d evaluated both Ja‘far and al-Mughīrā as thiqât and includes them among those who transmitted ‘many hadith’; TK 2001, VIII, 456 (al-Mughīrā); IX, 278 (Ja‘far).
two men (nursal), since he merely saw them in his youth and did not attend their classes. Despite many irregularities in his vast corpus of hadith, al-A’mash exhibited a profound influence upon two generations of scholars, namely that of Sufyán al-Thawrî and Shu’ba, and that of Wâkî b. al-Jarrâh. Finally, Ismâ’il b. Abî Khâlid (d. 146/763) and ‘Abd al-Malik b. Abî Sulaymân (d. 145/762) both earned the distinction from their pupil Sufyán al-Thawrî as being among the “four huffâz” of their era.

Three major scholars graced the sacred city of Mecca during the transition from Umayyad to ’Abbasid sovereignty in the central lands of Islam. Abu l-Zubayr Muḥammad b. Muslim transmitted a vast array of hadith from the Medinan saḥâbi Jâbir b. ‘Abdullâh that achieved inclusion in the Musnad of Ibn Hanbal. While Shu’ba’s notorious distaste for Abu l-Zubayr is dutifully recorded by Ibn Sa’d, the latter, along with Ibn Ma’in and Ibn Hanbal, considered him to be a reliable transmitter. The second prominent hadith scholar of this time in Mecca was ’Amr b. Dînâr (d. 126/744), who transmitted a modest amount of hadith from Jâbir b. ’Abdullâh found in Ibn Hanbal’s Musnad, as well as reports on the authority of Abu Hurayra from Abu Šâlih. ‘Amr’s prestige may have been tempered by the fact that he did not actually hear directly the hadith he transmitted on the authority of al-Barâ’ b. ‘Azîb, and by his star-pupil’s...

---

84 Al-Dûrî, Târikh, I, 241.
87 Abû l-Zubayr’s 255 aṭrâf from Jâbir represent 43% of the latter’s total corpus in the Musnad.
89 ’Twenty-one aṭrâf from Jâbir found in the Musnad were transmitted by ‘Amr.
91 Al-Dûrî, Târikh, I, 91. Ibn Ma’in also reports praise of ‘Amr from the latter’s contemporary, Qur’ânic exegete and prolific hadith-transmitter, Ibn Abî Najîh; ibid.
observation that he transmitted hadīth imprecisely.92 The third major Meccan scholar of this time was Ibn Jurayj (d. 150/767), a pupil of ‘Aṭā‘, Abū l-Zubayr, and ‘Amr and one of the earliest composers of a book arranged according to legal topics.93 Ibn Jurayj’s hadīth were praised by Ibn Ḥanbal, who declared that they were equal to those of his illustrious younger contemporary Mālik.94

We have arrived at the midway point in the chains of the vast majority of isnāds of reports collected by Ibn Sa‘d, Ibn Ma‘īn, and Ibn Ḥanbal. The greater part of the hadīth-transmitters whom we have encountered thus far either heard directly from the Prophet Muḥammad or from a sahābi, and thus would have had little need for an isnād in order to identify the sources for their hadīth. The logical starting place for the isnād is during the lifetime of the scholars whom we have just encountered, the generation of al-Zuhri, Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī, al-A‘mash, and ‘Amr b. Dīnār, some of whose pupils requested that they identify their sources for certain reports.95 These pupils were of the generation of Shu‘ba and Sufyān al-Thawrī, men who, as I argued in the fourth chapter, initiated the art of hadīth criticism and who expressed keen interest in isnāds. If my hypotheses are correct, the birth date of the isnād would fall, at the latest, around the year 100/718, during the heyday of the generation who passed away between 120–150/738–767.96 While it is conceivable

1, 87. This report is also transmitted by ‘Abdullāh b. Ahmad b. Hanbal; Mawsū‘at aṣqal al-Imām Ahmad, III, 95.
97 ṬK 2001, VIII, 41. This report comes from Ibn ‘Uyayna, whom Ibn Sa‘d met in Mecca. Ibn Ḥanbal also mentions this report in ‘Abdullāh’s ṭabā, see Mawsū‘at aṣqal al-Imām Ahmad, III, 95.
100 For two such examples of this practice found in ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s Musannaf, see The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence, 119, 122, and 152. The large number of defective isnāds in the early sources would seem to argue against the widespread practice of isnād-examination.
101 This is the date selected by Juynboll, albeit for different reasons; see above, VIII.1.
that isnāds were used by the first generation of tābī‘un, as an oft quoted report by Ibn Sīrīn suggests, their wholesale employment would not have been necessary until the generation of compilers who flourished during the end of the Umayyad period, since most of the scholars of this time would have been merely the second or third names in each chain of transmitters. A second significant transformation to be witnessed among the men of the generation that experienced the transition between the Umayyad and ‘Abbāsid regimes was the beginnings of a split between jurists and hadith scholars. The fact that thirteen of the sixteen saḥāba identified by Abū Ḫishāq al-Shirazi (d. 476/1083) as experts in Islamic law (fiqh) have appeared in our narrative as major hadith-transmitters indicates the tight bond between experts in law and hadith from the outset of Islamic history. All seven of the Medinan fuqahā whom Abū Ḫishāq identifies among the first generation of the tābī‘un are reported by Ibn Sa‘d to have transmitted ‘many hadith’ and were held to be reliable. This same story is repeated for at least eight of the second-generation Medinan jurists as well. Basran jurists

---

77 See Juynboll, Muslim Tradition, 17-8 and Azami, Studies in Early Hadith Literature, 213. This quote is found as early as in the Introduction to Muslim’s Sahih Sahih Muslim bi-sharh al-Nawawi, 1, 78.

78 Mowli’s conclusions are worth quoting in this regard. “If one investigates more precisely where the weakness of the isnāds lie, it becomes clear that except in the rarer of cases the responsibility lies not with Ibn Jurayj’s sources, but with their informants, that is, the discontinuities usually date from the first century. This conclusion fits the observation made above, that at this time the use of isnāds was not yet customary. This explains the weaknesses of isnāds with the scholars of the second half of the first/seventh century;” The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence, 241.


81 Abū Ḫishāq, Ṭabaqāt al-fuqahā’, 62-6. These eight men were ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī, al-Zuhūrī, ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, Muhammad b. al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī, ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Qāsim b. Muhammad, Rabi‘a al-Ra‘y, Abū l-Zinād, and Yahyā b. Sa‘d al-Anṣārī. Note also that the Meccan jurists ‘A‘ārī, Mujāhid, Ibn Abī Mulayka, ‘Amr b. Dīnār, and Ibn Abī Najīf are also all major reliable hadith-transmitters. The only exception was ‘Īrāma, who transmitted a large quantity of material, but whose authority was questioned by Ibn Sa‘d, although it has been shown that he was vindicated ultimately by Ibn Ma‘īn (in the al-Dārimī recension) and al-Bukhārī; see above, note 58.
identified by Abū Ishāq include al-Ḥasan al- Баṣrī, Ibn Sīrin, Qatāda, Ayyūb, Ibn ‘Awn, as well as several other šābīʿīn who transmitted a significant quantity of hadith and were considered reliable transmitters.102 Things in Kufa, however, were different. One of the six companions of Ibn Masʿūd had a mixed reputation, and only three of them were reported explicitly by Ibn Saʿd to have transmitted ‘many hadith’.103 Ibn Saʿd does not provide any quantitative information about the three jurists of Abū Ishāq al-Shirāzī’s second tabqa of Kufans, although it was possible to demonstrate the significant role of at least one of them in my analysis of Ibn Ḥanbal’s Musnad.104 The third tabqa, however, breaks the harmonious norm of jurist/reliable-hadith-transmitters, and, instead, includes Hammād b. Abī Sulaymān, a weak transmitter of many hadith, and Ibn Shubrama, a reliable transmitter of very few hadith.105 While Ibn Shubrama exerted a major influence upon the prolific hadith-transmitter and jurist Sufyān al-Thawrī,106 Hammād b. Abī Sulaymān was the primary teacher of Abū Ḥanīfa, eponym of one of the four Sunnī madhhabs, who was not considered by Ibn Saʿd’s generation to have been much of a hadith-transmitter.107 It appears from this analysis that the split between

102 Abū Ishāq, Tabaqat al-fuqahā’, 87–91. Other reliable prolific hadith scholars of Basra who were also jurists include Abū Qilāba, Abū l-ʿAliya, Yūnus b. Ḫubayy, and Humayd al-Tawīl.

103 Abū Ishāq, Tabaqat al-fuqahā’, 79–86. Ibn Saʿd declared al-Ifārīn al-ʿArwar to be weak, while Ibn Maʿin said that he was ‘not bad’, and Ibn Ḥanbal quoted al-Shaʾbī calling him a liar; ṬK 2001, VIII, 268, al-Dūrī, Tārīkh, I, 265 and Maṣṣṣat al-waqāʾī al-ʿImām Ahmad, I, 213–4. The three reliable prolific companions of Ibn Masʿūd were: ʿAlqama, al-Aswād, and Masroq; the two remaining ones were ʿUbayd b. Amr and Shurayḥ al-Qāḍī.

104 It was obvious from the analysis of the ṣaʿīf of the Musnad of Ibn Ḥanbal that Saʿd b. Jubayr played a major role in the dissemination of Ibn ʿAbbās’ hadith; see above, note 58. As for Abū Ishāq’s remaining two jurists, I assume that both Ḫibrāḥin al-Nakhaʿi and al-Ṣabīʿī played at least moderately important roles in hadith transmission due to the existence of circles of hadith-friendly pupils identified by Ibn Maʿin in al-Dārīmī’s Tārīkh, as well as the fact that their hadith is included in all six of the canonical Sunnī books. Al-Thawrī identifies Ibn Shubrama and Ibn Abī Laylā as his two primary teachers of fiqh, ṬK 2001, IX, 247 and Maṣṣṣat al-waqāʾī al-ʿImām Ahmad, III, 285.

105 Only one of Abū Ishāq’s five jurists fits the previous mold of expertise in fiqh and hadith, namely al-Ḥakam b. ʿUṭayba. Ibn Saʿd provides neither qualitative nor quantitative grades for two of the jurists in this tabqa: Ḥabīb b. Abī Thābit and the qāḍī Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Abī Laylā. Both Ibn Maʿin and Ibn Ḥanbal are reported to have graded Ḥabīb as ṣīḥa; Ibn Abī Ḥāmid, al-farḥ wa l-taʿādil, III, 107–8 and Maṣṣṣat al-waqāʾī al-ʿImām Ahmad, I, 220–2. Ibn Ḥanbal reports that Yahyā l-Qattān declared Ibn Abī Laylā to be weak and he himself indicates a preference for his fiqh over his ‘inconsistent’ hadith (fīhi iṣṣirāt); al-farḥ wa l-taʿādil, VII, 323. Ibn Maʿin grades Ibn Abī Laylā as ṣawma bi-dhiik; ibid.

106 See above, note 81.
jurists and hadith scholars originated in Kufa around the end of the first/eight century and, only later, spread to Medina and Baghdad.

A final problem that I must address is Abū Ḥanīfah, who flourished during the period under discussion, because he was a weak transmitter of hadith in the opinions of Ibn Sa’d and his contemporaries and, consequently, would not have been considered a religious authority in the eyes of the first Sunnis of the third/ninth century according to my arguments. In other words, was Abū Ḥanīfah considered a Ṣūnnī by the third/ninth century hadith scholars? While Ibn Ḥanbal transmits several highly negative reports from his predecessors about Abū Ḥanīfah, there is a fascinating report in al-Durf's Tārīkh in

---

108 A study of the problems surrounding the authentic teachings of Abū Ḥanīfah can be found in van Ess, Theologie und Gesellschaft, I, 183-212. See also U. F. 'Abd-Allāh's entry "Abū Ḥanīfah" in Encyclopaedia Iraonica, I (London, 1982), 295-301. 'Abd-Allāh states that "the disputes between Abū Ḥanīfah and the proponents of Hadith pertained primarily to his rejection of isolated Hadith (ahadith al-ghād)," observes that al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādi was chastised two centuries after his death by Ibn Khalīkān for having included "slanderous" reports by hadith critics in his biographical notice for Abū Ḥanīfah in Tārīkh Baghdād, and hypothesizes that "Abū Ḥanīfah seems in general to have always been highly esteemed by the majority of the Muslim community"; ibid., 300 and 296. He does not mention Ibn Ḥibbān's observation that Abū Ḥanīfah was not skilled at hadith (lam yaktu l-hadithu sinā‘a‘atu), made errors in 130 of the 130 hadith he transmitted, and was therefore not an authority with regard to reports (akhbār); Ibn Ḥibbān, Kīthā al-majūshin, III, 63. Ibn Ḥibbān also criticizes Abū Ḥanīfah for being a proselytizer of the Muqāfīf and includes several reports of his detractors, including one which makes reference to al-Humaydī, while reading a book called Rejūfation Abū Ḥanīfah in the Masjid al-Hāḍam, refused to mention Abū Ḥanīfah’s name because of the sanctity of the location; ibid., III, 54-73. 'Abd-Allāh also ignores Ibn 'Adī’s collection of predominantly hostile reports, but does record an anecdote that Shu’bā was disposed favorably to Abū Ḥanīfah; that includes Ibn Abī Dāwūd’s observation that the Imāms of the major regions—Aybub al-Sulṭānīyān, Sufyān al-Thawrī, Mālik, al-Layth b. Sa’d, al-Awza‘ī, and Ibn al-Mubārak—all had issues (shakillamā fibi) with Abū Ḥanīfah; al-Ka‘imī fi da‘ifat al-nīqāl, VII, 2476. Ibn ‘Adī’s personal verdict is that the majority of Abū Ḥanīfah’s hadith have errors of a variety of types, and that only ten of his three hundred hadith are sound, largely due to the fact that he was not one of the hadith scholars (ahl al-hadith); ibid., VII, 2479. Even Abū Nu‘aym al-Iṣbahānī has negative things to say about Abū Ḥanīfah in his short book of weak transmitters; Abū Nu‘aym, Kītāb al-dī‘asat, 194. He appears to be particularly disappointed by Abū Ḥanīfah’s refusal to abandon his belief in the ‘created’ Qur‘ān, as well as his many errors and inaccuracies”; qita bi-khalq al-Qur‘ān wa-stufba min kāmi‘ihi l-radī‘ ghayra murratin kathir al-khata‘ wa l-awākhām.

109 Mawsū‘at arqa‘ al-imām Ahmad, IV, 16-21. The chorus of anti-Abū Ḥanīfah hadith-folk found in these reports includes Mālik (Abū Ḥanīfah “duped [kada] the religion”), Ibn Mehdi, Hammād b. Salmā, Sharik, and Ḥafṣ b. Ghiyāth; even Sufyān al-Thawrī is reported to have encouraged Abū Ḥanīfah to repent on two
which Ibn Ma'īn, in a candid tone, remarks “I will not lie before God—it is likely that we heard a legal opinion of Abū Ḥanīfa that we found to be good, and so we adopted it.” The term used to describe Abū Ḥanīfa by both Ibn Sa'd and Ibn Qutayba is sāhib al-ra'y, an expression that stands in a clear contrast to the expression sāhib sunna that was examined briefly in the previous chapter. Very few men are identified by either Ibn Sa'd or Ibn Qutayba as belonging to the sāhib al-ra'y, although it is significant to note that only Ibn Qutayba includes men who excelled in hadith transmission in this group. Since Ibn Sa'd does not express his opinions as to the relationship of the term sāhib al-ra'y to sāhib sunna anywhere and includes Abū Ḥanīfa in both the fourth tabaqa of Kufans as well as the men of Baghdad, it seems safe to assume that he considered this famous jurist to have been a member, albeit unreliable and non-authoritative, in the greater project of hadith transmission that lay at the heart of the third/ninth century articulation of Sunnī Islam.

occasions. Al-'Uqaylī quotes Ibn Ḥanbal's opinion of Abū Ḥanīfa as a liar, da'īf, and that his hadith should not be mentioned; ibid., IV, 19. In Ta'rikh Baghdādī, Sufyān al-Thawrī is reported by Ibn Ḥanbal to have described Abū Ḥanīfa as “neither trustworthy nor secure” (ghayr thiqa wa ghayr ma'min), and Ibn Ḥanbal himself is claimed to have stated that Abū Ḥanīfa was worse (ashaddu 'ala i-mustāmin) than 'Amr b. 'Ubayy, a founder of the Mu'tazila, because he had disciples (lahū asḥāb); ibid., IV, 20-1.

This same quote is put into the mouth of Yahyā l-Qattān by Ibn Ma'in in Ta'rikh Baghdādī, XIII, 345. Ibn Ma'in appears to have been less hostile to Abū Ḥanīfa than Ibn Ḥanbal and Ibn Sa'd, as al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī reports a variety of opinions attributed to him in which he insists that Abū Ḥanīfa was too noble to lie, that he was asduq, that his hadith should not be written, and, in a few reports, that he was thiqa; Ta'rikh Baghdādī, XIII, 421-2. Note also the report cited from Taḍkhirat al-huffaz that Wakī gave faüns according to the madhhab of Abū Ḥanīfa; see above III.3, note 22.

VIII.5  The demise of Medina and the rise of Iraq: 'The generation who died 150-180/767-796'

Five major trends can be observed in the development of hadith scholarship during the first generation of scholars who spent the better part of their adult lives under 'Abbāsid rule. The first of these is the promulgation of systematically organized books, a topic mentioned in both the third and fourth chapters of this study, and that was supported by 'Ali b. al-Madini's oft-cited list of "those who composed books (ṣnāf')" in his three-part outline of master hadith scholars.\(^{112}\)

The second trend, which I discussed in detail in the fourth chapter, was the dawn of both hadith criticism, due to men such as Sufyān al-Thawrī, and hadith-transmitter criticism, by the likes of Shu‘ba and Malik. The third trend during this period was the near-total collapse of quality hadith scholarship in Medina due to several diverse factors that require investigation. The fourth change was a deepening of Kufan hadith scholarship, due to the labors of the industrious pupils of Abū Ishāq al-Sabīrī, Mansūr, and al-A‘mash. A final trend was the continuous rise of Basran hadith scholarship, that was propelled largely by the younger pupils of Qatāda, as well as by those of Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī. It will be clear from this section that shortly after the middle of the second century the twin cities of Iraq had eclipsed thoroughly the original capital of hadith scholarship in the Ḥijāz, and that the reasons for this transformation had less to do with the greater 'Abbāsid investment in Iraq and more to do with the internal dynamics of the hadith-folk themselves.

What happened to Medina, home of Abū Hurayra, Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyab, and al-Zuhri? It is tempting to suggest that the failed revolt of Muhammad b. al-Hasan al-Nafs al-Zakiyya (145/762) was a reason for this precipitous decline in hadith scholarship, but this is untenable when we consider revolts, such as the Battle of Ḥarra (63/683), that did not make a dent in religious scholarship, despite a

\(^{112}\) This presentation, along with copious references, can be found above in IV.2.1. The men identified by 'Ali b. al-Madini as the first book compilers are Malik, Ibn Ishāq, Ibn Jurayj, Ibn 'Uayyna, Sa‘īd b. Abī 'Arūba, Hammād b. Salama, Abū 'Awana, Shu‘ba, Ma‘mar, Sufyān al-Thawrī, al-Awzā‘ī, and Hushayn b. Bashir. All of these men, except Hushaym and Ibn ‘Uayyna, are found in the period currently under discussion. Note also al-Tirmidhi’s list of the earliest compilers, cited above III.2, note 14.
terrible loss of life.\(^{113}\) Furthermore, al-Nafs al-Zakiyya’s brother raised a revolt in Basra that was quelled, while, simultaneously, Basran hadith scholarship reached unprecedented heights. The construction of Baghdad, begun during the reign of al-Manṣur, is another possible reason for this decline, and, while certain prominent Medinans, such as Ibn Išāq and his only Medinan pupil, Ibrāhīm b. Sa’d, were tempted to relocate there, the number of emigrants would have hardly necessitated a collapse in scholarship. A close examination of Ibn Sa’d’s \(\text{al-Tabaqa}\)\(\text{t}\) \(\text{al-kabir}\), as well as al-Dārīmī’s \(\text{Tārih}\), suggests that the probable reasons for the fall of Medina lie in the rapid increase of weak Medinan transmitters and the decision of the vast majority of al-Zuhri’s pupils not to settle in the City of the Prophet.

An analysis of the members of the generation of Mālik b. Anas in \(\text{al-Tabaqa}\)\(\text{t}\) \(\text{al-kabir}\) reveals the bleak landscape of Medinan hadith scholarship during the early ‘Abbāsid period. Ibn Sa’d identifies a mere ten men as having transmitted ‘many hadith’ in this \(\text{tabaqa}\). He evaluates three of these men as \(\text{da’if}\), one of them as ‘non-authoritative’, and describes ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Zayd b. Aslam as \(\text{da’if jiddan}\).\(^{114}\) Two men receive the lackluster grade \(\text{sālih}\),\(^{115}\) and only ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Abdullāh b. Mājishūn, Sulaymān b. Bilāl, and Ibrāhīm b. Sa’d receive the grade \(\text{thiqa}\).\(^{116}\) Three additional Medinan contemporaries of Mālik who transmitted a small amount of hadith were evaluated by Ibn Sa’d as unreliable.\(^{117}\) Even Abdullāh b. ‘Umar b. Ḥafṣ (d. 171/787), a prominent transmitter from Nāfi‘ of Ibn ‘Umar’s hadith who

\(^{113}\) Many prominent hadith scholars, most of whom were far from the revolt of Nāfis al-Zakiyya, may have supported it; see Zaman, \(\text{Religion and Politics under the Early ‘Abbasids}\). 73-6.

\(^{114}\) Abū Ma’shar and ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Abī l-Zinād are graded \(\text{da’if}\); Hishām b. Sa’d al-Khāshīb receives \(\text{juced’ud’}\); Abū Bakr b. ‘Abdullāh b. Muḥammad was graded \(\text{al-yasa yuhtajju bihi}\); TK 2001, VII, 597, 594, 576, and 582. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Zayd’s entry can be found in TK 2001, VII, 592. Ibn Ma’in declared his hadith to be worthless, and Ibn Ḥanbal also declared him to be weak; al-Dūrī, \(\text{Tārih}\), I, 115 and Mansū’at aqrāb al-Ma’in Ahmad, II, 325-6. Note that Ibn Zayd’s exegetical opinions are cited by al-Ṭabarī over 1800 times in his \(\text{tafsīr}\); see Horst, “\(\text{Zur Überlieferung im Korankommentar at-Tabarīs}\),” 305.

\(^{115}\) These men are: Abdullāh b. Ja’far b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān and al-Zuhri’s nephew, Muḥammad b. Abdullāh; TK 2001, VII, 580, 579. Ibn Ma’in grades the nephew of al-Zuhri as \(\text{da’if}\), while Ibn Ḥanbal said \(\text{sālih al-hadith in shā’i’ā lāh}; \text{al-Dārīmī, Tārih}, 48 and Mansū’at aqrāb al-Ma’in Ahmad, III, 281.

\(^{116}\) TK 2001, VII, 593, 589, 582.

\(^{117}\) These men are Kāthīr b. Abdullāh b. ‘Awf, Yazīd b. ‘Iyād, and Saḥbal b. Muḥammad; TK 2001, VII, 591, 598. Ibn Ma’in evaluates the first two of these men as \(\text{dā’if}\); al-Dūrī, \(\text{Tārih}\), I, 107 and 60.
lived into this period, was considered weak by Ibn Sa'd and Ibn Hanbal.\footnote{TK 2001, VII, 532 and Mawsu'\={a}t aq\={a}\={i}l al-Im\={a}m Ahmad, II, 268. Note that Ibn Ma'in considers 'Abdull\={a}h's transmission from Na\={f}t as q\={a}\={i}b; al-D\={a}r\={i}mi, Tarikh, 131. Thirty-nine atr\={a}f from 'Abdull\={a}h → Na\={f}t → Ibn 'Umar are found in the Musnad of Ibn Hanbal.} While it is not entirely clear why Medinan transmitters of this generation were, on the whole, such a sorry, unreliable lot, it seems more appropriate to put the blame on these individuals rather than any external causes.

Another reason for the decline of Medinan hadith scholarship, in addition to the preponderance of unreliable transmitters at this time, was the global dispersion of al-Zuhri's most prominent students, the majority of whom never had any tie to his hometown in the first place. One reason for this dispersion was, without doubt, the fact that al-Zuhri himself left his home city in order to serve the Umayyad caliphs from 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz to Hishâm, and that he spent much time on his estates outside of Medina.\footnote{Lecker provides a useful overview of these estates; "Biographical Notes of Ibn Shih\={a}b al-Zuhri," 50-62.} I mentioned in the previous chapter that Ibn Hanbal considered Ma'mar, Yunus b. Yazid, and 'Uqayl b. Khalid to have been the most prodigious transmitters of al-Zuhri's knowledge, and it is significant that the first of these men spent much of his life in the mountainous refuge of Šan'a' and the latter two lived in the port city of Ayla.\footnote{Sec above, VII.2, note 55 and VII.3, note 83.} Two other important pupils of al-Zuhri, al-Layth b. Sa'd and al-Awzâ'î, were natives of Egypt and Syria, and even the youngest major student of his who lived well into the next period of hadith scholarship, Ibn 'Uyayna, lived in Mecca. Even though a couple of al-Zuhri's students engaged in questionable practices of hadith transmission,\footnote{Ibn Ma'in reports that al-Awzâ'î took a book of Zuhri material from Muhammad b. al-Walid al-Zubaydi, the ḥadi of Him\={a}s, and transmitted the material as if he had heard it from al-Zuhri himself; al-D\={a}r\={i}mi, Tarikh, I, 152. Ibn Ma'in also considers the Zuhri material handled by Ibn Jurayj to be worthless; al-D\={a}r\={i}mi, Tarikh, 44. Ibn Hanbal observes in the 'Hud that the Egyptian Yazid b. Abi Ḥassib transmitted Zuhri material from books that he had not actually heard; Mawsu'\={a}t aq\={a}\={i}l al-Im\={a}m Ahmad, IV, 146. Note that Ibn Sa'd grades Yunus as 'non-authoritative' and that Ibn Hanbal reports that Yahy\={a} I-Qat\={a}\={i}n rejected (tak\={a}h) his hadith; TK 2001, IX, 529; Mawsu'\={a}t aq\={a}\={i}l al-Im\={a}m Ahmad, IV, 180. Ibn Ma'in, however, declares Yunus to be thiq\={a}; al-D\={a}r\={i}mi, Tarikh, 45.} the absence of a core of major Zuhri pupils in his hometown unquestionably contributed to its qualitative decline during the middle decades of the second century.

\footnote{TK 2001, VII, 532 and Mawsu'\={a}t aq\={a}\={i}l al-Im\={a}m Ahmad, II, 268. Note that Ibn Ma'in considers 'Abdull\={a}h's transmission from Na\={f}t as q\={a}\={i}b; al-D\={a}r\={i}mi, Tarikh, 131. Thirty-nine atr\={a}f from 'Abdull\={a}h → Na\={f}t → Ibn 'Umar are found in the Musnad of Ibn Hanbal.}
Kufa, which has been recognized as a major ḥadīth center only recently by Western scholarship,124 flourished in this age with several virtuoso scholars. I have discussed already in the fourth chapter the acumen of Sufyān al-Thawrī at some length, and Ibn Sa’d reports how, during his period of hiding from the Caliph in Basra, Yaḥyā l-Qattān and Ibn Malīdī seized the opportunity to write down al-Thawrī’s ḥadīth.125 Zuhayr b. Mu‘āwiya (d. 173/789), a companion of Abū ʿIshāq and al-A’mash, was one of four huffāz according to Ibn Ḥanbal, and Sa’īd b. Mansūr is quoted as telling one of his Egyptian pupils “write down Zuhayr’s ḥadīth.”126 The third Kufan of Ibn Ḥanbal’s four huffāz, Zā’ida b. Qudāma (d. 161/778), was held in higher esteem than Zuhayr by Ibn Ma’in,127 and is one of the few men identified by Ibn Sa’d as ṣāḥib sunna wa jamā’a.128 Ibn Ma’in considered Isra’īl b. Yūnus (d. 160/777) to be more reliable than the Kufan qāḍī Sharīk b. ʿAbdullāh (d. 177/793),129 who in turn was more reliable than Abū l-Ahwāṣ Sallām b. Sulaym (d. 179/795).130 Shaybān b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān

124 See Christopher Melchert, “How Ḥanafism came to Originate in Kufa and Traditionalism in Medina.”
125 Ibn Sa’d reports that Ibn al-Mubārak, Jarīr b. Ḥāzim, Ḥammād b. Salāma, and Ḥammād b. Zayd all heard from al-Thawrī in Basra. Only Abū ʿAwāna, apparently, did not attend Sufyān’s sessions, because he felt that the latter had insulted him during a pilgrimage; TK 2001, VIII, 492-5.
126 TK 2001, VIII, 487-8. Recall that Sa’d b. Mansūr was a major Khurāsānī ḥadīth compiler who ultimately settled in Mecca and was a member of the generation of Ibn Sa’d; see above, V.2.6.
127 Al-Dūrī, Ṭarrīkh, I, 322. Ibn Ma’in remarks that Zā’ida checked (ʿarada) his written ḥadīth with Sufyān al-Thawrī.
129 Al-Dūrī, Ṭarrīkh, II, 52. However, according to al-Dārīmī, Ibn Ma’in preferred Sharīk’s transmissions from Abū ʿIshāq al-Sabīrī to those of Isra’īl; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, al-jāzi‘ wa l-talā‘ī, IV, 366-7. This is also the opinion of Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī; ibid. Ibn Sa’d mentions that Isra’īl transmitted many ḥadīth and was thiqa, but that “some people declare him to be weak” (minhum man yudī‘īfdu); TK 2001, VIII, 495. Ibn Ma’in grades him as both sādiq and thiqa and Ibn Ḥanbal grades him as sāḥib al-ḥadīth, Shaykh, and thiqa; al-Dārīmī, Ṭarrīkh, 58, 72, 235 and Mawsī‘at aqwāl al-ʿImām Ahmad, I, 89-91. Sharīk receives the grade of thiqa-miṣ‘īn, with many errors from Ibn Sa’d, and, with the exception of his old transmissions from Abū ʿIshāq, is considered inferior to Isra’īl by Ibn Ḥanbal as well; TK 2001, VIII, 499-500 and Mawsī‘at aqwāl al-ʿImām Ahmad, II, 141-4.
130 Al-Dūrī, Ṭarrīkh, I, 271. Ibn Sa’d evaluates Abū l-Ahwāṣ as sāḥib and reports that he transmitted many ḥadīth; TK 2001, VIII, 500. Ibn Ḥanbal grades him as ‘not bad, thiqa’ and notes that “he probably made mistakes;” Mawsī‘at aqwāl al-ʿImām Ahmad, II, 125.
(d. 164/781), a reliable, prolific hadîth-transmitter and grammarian, was recruited by Dawud b. 'Ali b. 'Abdullâh b. 'Abbas to serve as a royal tutor in Baghdad, and Ibn Sa’d mentions that the somewhat obscure ‘Īsâ b. al-Mukhtâr heard the musannaf of Ibn Abî Laylâ, in what is one of the earliest references to a musannaf in al-Tabaqât al-kabîr. One final Kufan of note from this period, Ṣâlih b. Ḥâyi (d. 167/784), synthesized the qualities of legal expertise (fiqh) and sound hadîth transmission, a combination that his senior contemporary, Abû Hanîfâ, seems to have lacked.

The companions of Qatâda and Ayyūb, as well as the labors of the critically-minded Shu’ba b. al-Hajjâj, elevated the status of Basran hadîth to a level of unequivocal superiority during the first half-century of the ‘Abbasid caliphate. Shu’ba’s contribution to Islamic scholarship has been dealt with in much detail in the fourth chapter, and his pupils formed the nucleus of Basran hadîth transmitters for the generation of the teachers of Ibn Sa’d and Ibn Hanbal. Hishâm al-Dasta’wâ’î (d. 152/769) was one of the most reliable links between Qatâda, Yahyâ b. Abî Kathîr, and Abû l-Zubayr, and his own pupils Shu’ba, Yahyâ l-Qattân, and Abû Nu’aym al-Faql b. Dukayn.

---

120 TK 2001, VIII, 498. Ibn Ma’in grades Shaybân as “reliable with everything” and Ibn Hanbal praises him as thabt and superior to al-Awzâ’î with respect to his material from Yahyâ b. Abî Kathîr due to his sound book (kitâb sahibî); al-Dârimî, Târikh, 53 and Mawsû’at aquaṣî al-Imâm Ahmad, II, 165–6. I mentioned in the previous chapter that Ibn Ma’in preferred the tafsîr of Sa’îd b. Abî ‘Arûba from Qatâda to the tafsîr of Shaybân; see above VII.2.

121 TK 2001, VIII, 500. Īsâ transmitted this musannaf to the Kufan qâdi Bakr b. ‘Abd al-Rahmân (d. 211/826), who transmitted hadîth from it during Ibn Sa’d’s lifetime; see also TK 2001, VIII, 530 (Bakr b. ‘Abd al-Rahmân). Both of these men were descendents of the sahibî Abû Laylâ, and Ibn Sa’d did not grade either one of them. Īsâ does not appear to have an entry in al-Jâhî wa l-ta’dîl, but both he and Bakr did transmit hadîth found in the Sunans of Abû Dâwûd, al-Nâsîî, and Ibn Mâja; Ibn Hajar, Taqrib, 376 and 65. Bakr was a teacher of Ibn Abî Shayba and Ibn Abî Hâjîn reports that neither his father nor Abû Zur’â would write his hadîth; al-Jâhî wa l-ta’dîl, II, 389. Note that al-Mizzî does not add any additional information about Īsâ b. Mukhtâr; Tâdhrib al-kamîl, XXIII, 27–8.


123 These names were supplied by al-Bukhârî; al-Târikh al-kabîr, IV.2, 198. Ibn Ma’in reports that Hishâm was one of the best transmitters from Qatâda and Yahyâ b. Abî Kathîr; al-Dûrî, Târikh, II, 192 and 143, respectively. Ibn Sa’d grades him ihqua-thabt-hujja, while Ibn Hanbal calls him thabt; TK 2001, IX, 279 and Mawsû’at aquaṣî al-Imâm Ahmad, IV, 39–41.
Ma'mar b. Rashed (d. 153/771), who lived much of his life in San'a', was another significant pupil of Qatada who, according to Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzi, was the only scholar of his generation to collect hadīth from all six of the leading teachers of his day.133 Despite a tendency to transmit much that he did not hear from Qatada, Sa'īd b. Abī 'Arūba (d. 156/773) was considered by Ibn Ma'in and Ibn Hanbal to have been one of his premier pupils.134 Turning to Ayyūb's disciples, we find that Hammād b. Zayd was his most prominent pupil due to his twenty year tenure with him, and that Ibn Ma'in considered 'Abd al-Wārid b. Sa'id (d. 180/796) equal to Hammād and preferable to both 'Abd al-Wāhid b. Ziyād al-Thaqafi (d. 176/792) and Wuhayb b. Khālid.135 Finally, Hammād b. Salama (d. 167/784), a maternal nephew of Humayd al-Tawil, was evaluated as the best transmitter from Thābit al-Bunanf by Ibn Ma'in and Ibn Jānbal,136 and Ibn Sa'd makes explicit references to two transmitters of his books (asnāf) in al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr.137

The generation of Malik, Sufyān al-Thawrī, and Shu'ba introduced the disciplines of hadīth compilation and criticism to Islamic civilization.138 The dedicated pupils of al-Zuhri, Abū Ishāq al-Sabī',

133 These six master teachers were al-Zuhri, 'Amr b. Dīnār, Abū Ishāq al-Sabī', al-'A'mash, Qatada, and Yahyā b. Abī Kathīr; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, al-Ja'fū wa l-ta'dīl, VIII, 256-7. A unique report on the authority of al-Marrūdhi cites Ibn Hanbal's evaluation of Ma'mar as thabtun illā anīma fi līhā hadithātih Shay'ān; Mawsī'at al-aqwal al-Imām Ahmad, III, 381. Motzkī has discovered that about 32% of 'Abd al-Razzaq's Muṣarnūf is derived from Ma'mar's reports (excluding the kītab al-maghāzi and kītab al-jāmī), which are almost exclusively Ma'mar's reports, and that 29% of Ma'mar's material purports to come from al-Zuhri, 25% from Qatada, and 11% from Ayyūb; The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence, 57-9.

134 Al-Durarī, Tārīkh, II, 192 and Mawsī'at al-aqwal al-Imām Ahmad, II, 39-43. Ibn Sa'd transmits 'Affān b. Muslim's warning that scholars should not trust any hadīth from Qatada in which Sa'id does not say hadadhihi; TK 2001, IX, 273. Ibn al-Nadīm reports that Sa'id composed a Kītab al-sunan; Fihrist, 283. Sa'id's transmission of Qatada's exegetical comments on the Qur'ān is cited nearly 3060 times by al-Ṭabarī and is by far the most frequently cited isnād in his taṣfīr; see Horst, 301-2.

135 Al-Dārīnī, Tārīkh, 54-5. Ibn Sa'd evaluates 'Abd al-Wārid as thiqā ṭuqā, 'Abd al-Wāhid as thiqā, and Wuhayb as thiqā-ṭuqā; TK 2001, IX, 288-90. Ibn Hanbal also has positive things to say about these three pupils of Ayyūb; Mawsī'at al-aqwal al-Imām Ahmad, II, 392-3 and IV, 103.

136 Al-Durarī, Tārīkh, II, 207 and Mawsī'at al-aqwal al-Imām Ahmad, I, 297-302. In another report in 'Abdullāh's ṫal, Ibn Hanbal declares that Hammād has transmitted the most material from three scholars: Thābit, Humayd al-Tawil], and Hīshām b. 'Urwā; ibid.

137 TK 2001, IX, 292. These transmitters were 'Ubayd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Ḥalīf and Ibrāhīm b. Abī Suwayd. Ibn al-Nadīm mentions a Kītab al-sunan attributed to Hammād; Fihrist, 283.

138 The evidence for this claim is presented above in chapter four.
al-‘Amash, Qatada, and Ayyūb served as both transmitters and organizers of their teachers’ vast repertoire of prophetic and post-prophetic material. Ibn al-Nadim reports no fewer than seven books titled *Kitāb al-sunan* during this time, all of which appear to have been the earliest systematic efforts to arrange transmitted materials according to legal categories, such as ritual purity, prayer, and inheritance.\(^{139}\) The collapse of Medina, due largely to the emergence of a significant percentage of prolific, yet unreliable, hadith transmitters, and the dispersion of al-Zuhri’s disciples, was more than compensated for by the hadith renaissance of Kufa and the continuous acumen of Basran scholars. It is worth noting that the prominence of hadith scholarship in Basra was accompanied by the absence of the materialization of a school of fiqh, as Abu Ishāq al-Shirāzī identifies only Sawwār b. ‘Abdullāh al-Qādī and ‘Ubayd Allāh b. al-Ḥasan al-‘Anāzī (d. 168/784) as jurists in this city during this time.\(^{140}\) While several scholars, like Mālik, Sufyān al-Thawrī, and Ḥasan b. Ḥayy, maintained a high degree of proficiency in both the disciplines of hadith and fiqh, the divorce between these two branches of Islamic knowledge appears to have become mildly pronounced in the generation prior to al-Shāfi’ī’s efforts to negotiate a reconciliation between them. The stage was set by the efforts of the hadith scholars, some of whose relationships I have just outlined, for the final transformations of hadith transmission that were realized by their students: the birth of multiple small, remote hadith centers, the rise of Syria, and the book market of Baghdad.

### VIII.6 The refinement of hadith compilation and criticism:
The generation who died 180-220/796-835

Almost all of the hadith scholars who flourished under the early ‘Abbāsids were teachers of the men of the generation of Ibn Sa‘d, Ibn Ma‘īn, and Ibn Ḥanbal. The trend of book compilation continued into this period, as Ibn al-Nadim identifies over a dozen books


\(^{140}\) Abū Ishāq, *Tabaqāt al-fuqahā‘*, 91.
that were published by men of this generation, most of which were arranged by legal topics (sunan) or were Qur'anic commentaries. The scholars of Basra and Kufa, many of whom were disciples of Shu'ba and Sufyân al-Thawrî, continued to develop both the arts of hadîth compilation and criticism initiated by their teachers. A new trend at this time was the blossoming of satellite towns and cities, each of which housed a small number of highly competent hadîth scholars whose material was prized by the following generation of compilers. Syria also reemerged as a vibrant center of hadîth scholarship. The final transformation of this period was the dramatic arrival of the Baghdadî book market, something that can be gleaned from al-Tabaqat al-kabir and Ibn al-Nadîm's Fihrist. While Baghdad appears to have eclipsed Kufa and perhaps even Basra during the generation of Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'in, and Ibn Hanbal, it is important to bear in mind that it was still a junior partner to the two well-established Iraqi ansâr, whose native hadîth scholars were unrivaled in the Islamic community.

Basra remained the primary engine of hadîth compilation and criticism down to the end of the second/eighth century and into the third/ninth one. The extraordinary importance of Yahyâ b. Sa'id al-Qattân (d. 198/813) and his younger friend 'Abd al-Rahmân b. Mahdi (d. 198/814), both of whom were disciples of Sufyân al-Thawrî and Shu'ba, has been demonstrated in the fourth and seventh chapters of this study. Yazid b. Zuray (d. 182/798), whom Ibn Sa'd identifies as a highly reliable hadîth scholar with 'Uthmânî sympathies, was a prominent pupil of Shu'ba, and Ibn Ma'in considered his transmission of material from Sa'id b. Abî 'Arûba to be superior to that Ibn 'Ulayya's material from him. Both Ibn 'Ulayya (d. 193/809), who read the books of Ibn Jurayj and studied with Ayyûb al-Sakhtiyânî, and the most authoritative disciple of Ḥammâd b.
Salama, 'Affan b. Muslim (d. 220/835), left their native homes of Basra to settle in Baghdad, and contributed to its rapid rise as a center of hadith transmission. Other major pupils of Shu'ba, such as Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī (d. 203/819), Ghundar Muḥammad b. Ja'far (d. 194/810), and 'Amr b. Marzūq al-Bāhili (d. 214/829), appear to have remained in Basra, where they were sought out by the likes of Ibn Ma'rūn and Ibn Ḥanbal. Finally, Bahz b. Asad (d. 197/813), whom Ibn Sa'd identifies as a very reliable and prolific transmitter, was regarded extremely highly by his contemporary Ibn Mahdi and taught hadith he obtained from Shu'ba and Ḥammād b. Salama to Qutayba b. Sa'id and Ibn Ḥanbal.

Kufan hadith scholars during the late second and early third centuries consisted primarily of pupils of al-A'mash and companions of Ṣufyān al-Thawrī. The Murjī' transmitter Abū Muʿāwiyah al-Dārīr (d. 195/811) is reported to have been more sound than the Basran Jarīr b. Ḥāzim (d. 170/786) with respect to material from al-A'mash, despite the fact that he forgot a quarter of the 1600 hadith that he acquired from this scholar during a period of illness. One of the
longer-lived pupils of al-'Amash of this time was Abū Bakr b. 'Ayyāsh (d. 193/809), although he was far inferior to the master Kufan hadith scholar of his day, Waki' b. al-Jarrāḥ (d. 197/813). Waki' studied with Ibn 'Awn after al-'Amash passed away, boasted that every hadith he wrote down from Sufyān al-Thawrī had been memorized initially, and habitually read hadith from his books to his students, a practice that was adopted by his admiring pupil, Ibn Hanbal. Abū Nu‘aym al-Fadl b. Dukayn (d. 219/834) was another highly-respected pupil of both al-'Amash and Sufyān al-Thawrī, and five of the second-tier companions of Sufyān al-Thawrī in the eyes of Ibn Ma'in were graded as either thiqā-sadiq or sadiq by Ibn Sa'd, and flourished alongside their more illustrious contemporaries in Kufa.

10 TK 2001, VIII, 508. Ibn Sa'd grades Abū Bakr as thiqā-sadiq but remarks that he made many errors (ghalaf). He also observes that he was particularly pious (min al-kabbād). Ibn Ma'in merely mentions that he was inferior to Abū l-Ahwās (whom Ibn Sa'd grades as sālīk); al-Dūrī, Tārīkh, I, 272 and TK 2001, VIII, 500. Ibn Hanbal is reported to have graded Abū Bakr as sadīq, thiqā, sāhib Qur'ān wa khayr; Muwās'at aqwal al-Imām Ahmad, IV, 193-5. Recall that al-Dhahabi identified Abū Bakr as a Shaykh al-Islam in Tadkhīrat al-khuffājī, see above, III.3.

11 Al-Dūrī, Tārīkh, I, 341. Waki' is reported to have selected carefully from Abū Bakr b. 'Ayyāsh's hadith.

12 Al-Dūrī, Tārīkh, II, 190. Ibn Ma'in reports elsewhere that Waki' accumulated 800 hadith from al-'Amash; ibid., I, 276.

13 ma katabu 'an al-Thawrī hadithan qānūn kāntu ahfajāku ithā roja'tu 'ila l-manzīli kataban; ibid., I, 229.

14 Al-Dūrī, Tārīkh, I, 351. Ibn Ma'in also reports that he witnessed Waki' reading from a book entitled Kitāb al-zuhd and refused to recite to his students Ibn 'Umar's hadith "be a stranger in this world" kun fi l-dunya kal'annaka gharība uwa 'abīn sabīl; ibid., I, 411. This Kitāb al-zuhd might be the same text as the 1994 Kitāb al-zuhd attributed to Waki' published in Riyadh; see above IV.4.7. Ibn al-Nadim mentions a Kitāb al-sunan attributed to Waki'; Fihrist, 283. For a reference to his Musannaf, see below, note 181.


16 These five scholars were Ubayd Allah b. Mūsā, Abū Ahmad al-Zubayrī, Yahyā b. 'Adam, Mu‘āwiya b. Hishām, and Qābiya b. ‘Uqba; TK 2001, VIII, 522, 526, 527. Note that Ibn Sa'd grades Yahyā slightly higher than these other men and observes that Ubayd Allah had more material from Isrā‘īl b. Yunus than any one of his age and that he was a master Qur'ān reciter in his mosque. See above, VII.3 for further references.
Finally, 'Abdullāh b. Idrīs (d. 192/808), Abū Usāma Ḥammād b. Usāma (d. 201/816), and Muḥammad b. 'Ubayd al-Ṭanafīsī (d. 204/819), were reliable and prolific transmitters who all received the tantalizing sectarian affiliation ṣāḥib sunna wa jamāʿa from Ibn Saʿd.\(^{157}\)

Several new and exciting centers of hadith transmission sprouted during the high ‘Abbāsid caliphate. While some scholars, like the peripatetic Ibn al-Mubārak, refused to be tethered to any particular town for too long a period of time, the majority of adventurous hadith folk ultimately settled in one or another location.\(^{158}\) ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Ṣanʿānī (d. 211/826) and Hishām b. Yūsuf (d. 197/813) established Sanʿāʾ as one of the most prestigious cities for hadith in the Islamic world for roughly half a century, largely due to the fact that their teacher Maʿmar b. Rashīd lived there for the last twenty years of his life, as well as the massive amount of material they collected from Ibn Jurayj, Sufyān al-Thawrī, and Ibn ʿUyayna.\(^{159}\) Palestine received a boost with the arrival of Shuʿbāʾs master pupil, Ādam b. ʿAbī Iyās (d. 220/835), in ‘Aṣqalān, and Sufyān al-Thawrī’s disciple Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Fiṣḥābī (d. 212/827) in Qisārīya (Caesarea).\(^{160}\)

The city of Wāṣif boasted Hushaym b. Bashlr (d. 183/799), who eventually settled in Baghdad, and Yazīd b. Ḥārūn (d. 206/821), who

---

\(^{157}\) TK 2001, VIII, p11. 517, 520. Ibn Maʿm evaluates Ibn Idrīs and Abū Usāma as thiqa. and al-Dūrī reports that Ibn Maʿm would “only speak well” of Muḥammad al-Ṭanafīṣī; al-Dārīmī, Ṭarīkh, 52, 97 and al-Dūrī, Ṭarīkh, I, 353. Ibn Hanbal’s opinion of Ibn Idrīs and al-Ṭanafīṣī is slightly less positive than that of Ibn Maʿm, although he declares Abū Usāma to be ṣāḥib saḥīḥ al-kitāb; see Maṣūlī, Ṣad al-imām Ahmad, II, 227–8 (Ibn Idrīs), I, 293–4 (Abū Usāma) and III, 292–3 (al-Ṭanafīṣī).

\(^{158}\) Ibn al-Mubārak is praised by Ibn Saʿd as Imām, ṣaḥīḥ-fuqāʿ; TK 2001, IX, 376. See above, IX, 4.6, for a discussion of his role in hadith-transmitter criticism. An edition of his famous book Kitāb al-ṣaḥīḥ wa l-raqīʿiq was present in Qayrawān prior to the end of the third/ninth century; Murānji, Beitrag, 74. This book has been published, and appears to contain a modest number of hadith with complete isnāds.

\(^{159}\) TK 2001, VIII, 108. The significance of ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s Mustawṣaf for the reconstruction of the first two centuries of Islam cannot be overstated and has been demonstrated by Motzki’s The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence; for a biography of the compiler, see ibid., 62–8. Recall that the value of the hadith of ‘Abd al-Razzāq and Hishām inspired Ibn Maʿm and Ibn Hanbal to make the arduous journey from Baghdad to Yemen.

\(^{160}\) TK 2001, IX, 496 (Ādam); 495 (al-Fiṣḥābī). Al-Dhahābī identifies al-Fiṣḥābī’s city of residence as Caesarea and notes that he died just prior to Ibn Hanbal’s trip to see him; Tadḥikāra, I, 275–6. Ibn al-Nadīm reports the existence of a Qur’ānic exegesis of al-Fiṣḥābī, as well as various books of fiqh; Fīrūz, 285. Al-Bukhārī included 281 hadith from Ādam in his Sahīḥ, 137 of which were transmitted by Shuʿbā; Sezgin, Buhārī’nin Kaynakları, 217 (#33).
counted Sulaymān al-Ṭaymi, Ḥumayd al-Ṭawīl, and three of Ṣufyān al-Ḡawrī’s “four ḥuffāẓ” among his teachers. Finally, Ibn ‘Uyayna and his disciple, ‘Abdullāh b. al-Zubayr al-Ḥumaydi (d. 219/834), elevated the thriving Meccan ḥadīth scene, which received another boost from the influx of prolific pious ḥadīth scholars, such as al-Fudayl b. ‘Iyāḍ (d. 187/803), ‘Abdullāh b. ṫaṣā (d. about 190/805), and Abū ‘Abd al-Ḡafrān al-Muqrī (d. 213/828), who chose to live their final years in the holiest city of Islamdom.

One of the more spectacular transformations of this period was the rise of Syria as a major ḥadīth center. One reason for this change was the steady stream of proficient ḥadīth scholars who came to the frontier era in order to wage war (or encourage others to do so) against the Byzantines. While this raiding was a part of official ‘Abbāsid policy, it appears as though the erudite ḥadīth folk who settled in Maṣṣāṣa and other frontier areas may have been following the example of the ascetic Ibn al-Mubārak, rather than the caliph Hārūn. Maṣṣāṣa housed Abū Ishāq al-Fazārī (d. 185/801), who, despite his habit of making many errors in his ḥadīth, was considered by Ibn Sa‘d as a sāḥib sunna. Muḥammad b. Ḥātim (d. 210/825), a native Syrian, brought his trove of materials from al-Awzā‘i and Ma‘īn to Maṣṣāṣa, and Makhlaḍ b. al-Ḥusayn (d. 191/807), a Basran,

---

161 TK 2001, IX, 315 (Hushaym) and 316 (Yazīd). These three teachers are Yuhayy b. ʿAbdallāh b. ʿAbdullāh b. Dinar, and ‘Abdullāh b. ṫaṣā b. ʿAbdullāh b. Ḥumayd. Ibn Ḥanbal described Yazīd as ḥāṣib mutaqin li-l-ḥadīth, while Ibn Maʿīn and Ibn al-Madhini called him thīqa; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, al-jārī wa l-ta’dil, IX, 290. Ibn al-Yadīn reports a Kitāb al-jarrī’ī attributed to Yazīd; Fihrist, 284.

162 Ibn ‘Uyayna has been discussed in some detail above, IV.4.5. Ibn Maʿīn considered him to be the preeminent pupil of ʿAmr b. Dirār; al-Dārimī, Tārīkh, 55–6. Ibn Sa‘d considered al-Ḥumaydi to be thīqa although Ibn Maʿīn refused to take ḥadīth from the latter due to his lack of scrutiny (zayasahhād); TK 2001, VIII, 63 and al-Durū, Tārīkh, I, 99. Note that al-Ḥumaydi’s Musnad contains 1300 ḥadīth and was edited in two volumes by Ḥabīb al-Ḡafrān al-Awzā‘i in 1963. Al-Bukhārī included 33 ḥadīth from al-Ḥumaydi in his Sahih, 27 of which are attributed to Ibn ‘Uyayna; Sezgin, Behrāt’un Kaynaklari, 213 (#19). Ibn Sa‘d reports that al-Fudayl, ‘Abdullāh b. ṫaṣā, and Abū ‘Abd al-Ḡafrān all transmitted many ḥadīth and were reliable scholars; TK 2001, VIII, 61–2. Al-Fudayl came from Khurāsān, while the later two men were Basrans. Al-Bukhārī includes only 12 ḥadīth from Abū ‘Abd al-Ḡafrān in his Sahīh, 213 (#17).

163 TK 2001, IX, 494. His full name was Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad and his Kitāb al-siyar has been published; Abū Ishāq al-Fazārī, Kitāb al-siyar, ed. Fārūq Ḥammāda (Beirut, 1987). Ibn ‘Uyayna called him an Imām, Ibn Maʿīn praised his ḥadīth from al-Mughīra (b. Ṣaḥbān al-Dabbā), and Ibn Maʿīn said thīqa thīqa; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, al-jārī wa l-ta’dil, II, 128–9.
added a pile of transmissions from Hishām b. Ḥassān to the mix. Ibn Ma'īn is reported to have considered ‘Abdullāh b. Yūsuf al-Kalā‘ī’s (d. 218/833) recension of the Muwatta’ as the most reliable version of Mālik’s book and al-Bukhārī identified him as one of the most reliable Syrians. Finally, three hadīth scholars of Himṣ and Damascus, two of whom were plagued with charges of deceitful transmission, contributed greatly to the rehabilitation of these old cities of Syria that had once been home to the sahāba Mu‘ādh b. Jabal and Abū l-Dardā’.

The most vibrant center for the transmission of hadīth at the turn of the third century may have been the royal capital of Baghdad. We have seen how certain individuals, especially Medinans like Hishām b. ‘Urwa, Ibn Ishāq, Ibn Abī l-Zinād, and Ibrāhīm b. Sa‘d, had been lured to Baghdad with lucrative jobs or other enticements, and it appears that the hadīth-folk reached a critical mass in this city only during the following generation. Hushaym b. Bashīr, Ibn Ḥanbal’s first significant hadīth teacher, immigrated from Wāṣit, Qirād Abū Nūḥ came from Basra with a wealth of material from Shu‘ba, and Ibn ‘Ulayya arrived with exceptional familiarity with the books of Ibn Jurayj. A final Basran arrival in Baghdad, whom we have already encountered, was ‘Affān b. Muslim, and it is clear that Ibn Sa‘d took advantage of his neighbor from the fact that much of his Ḥammād b. Sa‘lama material related to the sahāba cited in al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr was obtained from this prestigious scholar.

161 TK 2001, IX, 493. Makhlad’s mother was a wife of Hishām b. Ḥassān, an expert in the hadīth of Ibn Sīrīn.

162 Al-Dhahabi, Sīyar, X, 357–8. In one version of this report, Ibn Ma’īn professes the superiority of the Muwatta’s of both al-Kalā‘ī and al-Qa’nabī. Al-Bukhārī included 335 hadīth from ‘Abdullāh b. Yūsuf in his Sahīh, 272 of which came from Mālik and 57 of which came from al-Layth b. Sa‘d; Sezgin, Bukhārī’nin Kaynakları, 212 (#18). Note that al-Kalā‘ī ranks second, after Musāḥaddad, in the list of al-Bukhārī’s most frequently cited sources in his Sahīh.

163 Al-Walid b. Muslim (d. 194/810) and Baqiyya b. al-Walid (d. 197/813) were both guilty of engaging in much iθdīs; TK 2001, IX, 474–5. Ibn al-Nadīm reports the existence of a Kitāb al-sunan fi l-fiqh and Kitāb al-maghāzi for al-Walīd; al-Fihrist, 281. The third major Syrian was Abū Mustur ‘Abd al-‘A’la, the qādī of Damascus who died in prison in 218/833 as a result of the miθnā; ibid., IX, 479.

164 TK 2001, IX, 337.

165 TK 2001, IX, 327–8; al-Dhāri, Tārīkh, 1, 67. Ibn Ma’īn also mentions that Ibn ‘Ulayya was inferior to Ḥammād b. Zayd with respect to Ayyūb, something that is hardly surprising given his opinion that nobody was more erudite with Ayyūb’s material than Ḥammād; ibid., II, 169.
Ibn Ḥanbal distinguished three unparalleled “Companions of hadith” of his day in Baghdad, the most precise of whom was Abū Kāmil Muẓaffār b. Mūdrik (d. 207/822). Al-Haytham b. Jamīl (d. 213/828) was considered by Ibn Ḥanbal to have had the most hadith memorized among these three scholars, and al-Dhahābī reports that he went bankrupt twice in the course of his insatiable quest for hadith. The third member of this trio, Abū Salama Mansūr b. Salama al-Khuzaʿī, was reported by Ibn Saʿd to have been reluctant to teach hadith, then succumbed for a few days, and finally moved to Maṣṣīṣa in 210/825. These three scholars not only contributed to the hadith culture of Baghdad but also, if the anecdotal evidence is correct, played a major role in the education of Ibn Maʿīn and Ibn Ḥanbal with respect to iṣnād analysis.

One of the most significant developments for the discipline of hadith transmission in Baghdad was the emergence of the book market. Ibn Saʿd identifies several transmitters of books in his day, all of whom he could have met in person. Yaʿqūb b. Saʿd b. Abān (d. 194/810) transmitted both the Maghāzi of Ibn Iṣḥāq as well as many ḥadīth of al-Aʿmash. Saʿd b. Ibrāhīm b. Saʿd (d. 201/816), a qāḍī for Hārūn al-Rashīd, transmitted his father’s books, while his brother, Yaʿqūb (d. 208/823) transmitted his father’s recension of Ibn Iṣḥāq’s Maghāzi. The Maghāzi of Abū Maʿṣhar was available from Husrayn b. Muhammad b. Bahram, who also distributed the Tafsīr of Shaybān b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān that Ibn Maʿīn considered inferior to the similar work of Saʿd b. Abī ʿArūba. Saʿd’s books were available from

---

169 This report is from the Ḥal and can be found in Mawsūʿat aqwāl al-Imām Ahmad in each of the three men’s entries: Abū Kāmil (III, 363); al-Haytham b. Jamīl (IV, 72); and Abū Salama Mansūr b. Salama (III, 399). Al-Dhahābī mentions that Ibn Maʿīn learned how to scrutinize hadith from Abū Kāmil, Tadhkira, I, 262.

170 Tadhkira, I, 262. Al-Haytham’s teachers included Ḥammād b. Salama, Mālik, al-Layth b. Saʿd, and Zuhayr b. Muʿawiyah; he left Baghdad at some point to settle in Antioch, and thus contributed to the hadith florescence in the frontier lands during this time. A less positive effect of this move was that his hadith are found only in the Sunan of Ibn Maja out of the six Sunnī books.


172 I have just mentioned Abū Kāmil’s role in the education of Ibn Maʿīn; al-Darāqūṭī is quoted as stating that both Ibn Maʿīn and Ibn Ḥanbal learned the discipline of iṣnād criticism (“ilm al-rijāl) from Abū Salama, presumable prior to his departure from Baghdad in 210/825, Tadhkira, I, 263.


'Abd al-Wahhāb b. ‘Aṭā‘ al-Ijlī, and it is quite likely that his tafsīr was a critical component of ‘Abd al-Wahhāb’s own tafsīr, identified in the Fihrist. Sufyān al-Thawrī’s ǧāmi‘ was available from his disciple ‘Ubayd Allāh b. ‘Ubayd al-Raḥmān al-Ashja’ī (d. 182/798), although Ibn Ma‘īn states that he obtained this book from ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Mūsā (d. 213/828) in Kufa. Zā‘ida b. Qudāma’s writings could be procured from Mu‘āwiya b. ‘Amr al-Azdi (d. 214/829), who was also a disseminator of Abū Iṣḥāq al-Fazārī’s Kitāb al-siyar. Finally, the Musannaf of Wākī’ was available from the bookseller (al-wārīq) al-‘Abbas b. Ghalib (d. 233/848), a contemporary of Ibn Sa’d who actually outlived him, and whose inclusion in al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr may have been the work of Ibn Fahm or al-Hārith b. Abī Usāma.

The fifth, and final period of hadīth transmission in this narrative brings the material to the teachers of the books I have subjected to investigation in this and the two preceding chapters. Ibn Sa’d drew liberally upon the knowledge of ‘Affān b. Muslim, Abū Nu‘aym, Muḥammad al-Ṭanāfisī, Wākī b. al-Jarrāḥ, and, of course al-Wāqūdī, all of whom he met in person. Ibn Ḥanbal included much material from the Iraqis Wākī’, Yaḥyā b. Sa‘īd al-Qārṭān, ‘Affān b. Muslim, and Yazīd b. Hārūn in his Musnad, and his journey with Ibn Ma‘īn to San‘a’ to acquire copious written materials from ‘Abd al-Razzāq and Hīshām b. Yūsuf makes sense in light of the decimation of the caliber of hadīth compilation in the Hijāz that occurred during the previous period. The discovery of the dominance of the hadīth

---

176 TK 2001, IX, 335.
177 Fihrist, 284. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb is credited here as well with a Kitāb al-sunan fi tafsīr and a Kitāb al-nāsīkh wa l-mansūkh.
179 See above, VII.3, note 62. This finding is interesting, since we observed in the previous chapter that Ibn Ma‘īn considered al-Ashja’ī to be a superior scholar to ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Mūsā. Recall too, that al-Tirmidhī acquired the legal opinions of Suhān al-Thawrī from the scribe of the Kufan ‘Ubayd Allāh [see above, III.3, note 15].
180 TK 2001, IX, 343.
182 The most prominent disciples of Mālik alive in Medina at this time were Ma‘īn b. ‘Isa (d. 198/814), whom Ibn Sa’d grades ṭiqa-thaḥīt, ‘Abdullāh b. Nāfis al-Sāighi (d. 206/821) whom Ibn Sa’d declares was inferior to (dun) Ma‘īn; and, perhaps, Mu‘arrif b. ‘Abdullāh (d. 220/835), whom Ibn Sa’d grades as ṭiqa; TK, VII, 615–16. Abū Ḥātim preferred Ma‘īn to ‘Abdullāh al-Sāighi and declared than Ma‘īn was the most reliable (mahdhq) member of Mālik’s companions; al-Jarrāḥ wa l-ta’dil, VIII, 278.
scholars of Basra, Kufa, and Baghdad in the fifth chapter of this study is consistent with the findings of this chapter based upon al-Tabaqāt al-kabīr, al-Dūrī's Tārīkh, and Ibn Ḥanbal’s identification of the three original Ashāb al-hadith in Baghdad.

The rise in sophistication of hadith compilation and criticism, manifest in the work of Yahyā ʿI-Qaṭṭān and the book market of Baghdad, was also matched by the qualitative improvements in the realm of jurisprudence, as this was the age of the great Ḥanafi authorities Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Shaybānī and al-Qāḍī Abū Yūṣūf. It is quite informative that Ibn Saʿd acknowledges the hadith erudition of these two men, and yet declares that it became spoiled due to their contacts with the raʿy of Abū Ḥanīfah.183 The circulation of so many hadith books arranged according to legal topics (kutub al-sunan or fārāʾīd) at this time indicates that there was never any absolute divorce between experts in fiqh and those in hadith, but, rather, the dispute was clearly over the religious authority of individual reasoning (raʿy), something in which the hadith folk did not place much confidence when undertaken by disciples of Abū Ḥanīfah.184 Indeed, there do not appear to have been complaints over Mālik’s or Sufyān al-Thawrī’s use of independent reasoning at this time, and even al-Dūrī provides several examples of Ibn Maʿfīn’s opinions on the topics of hunting, and, in particular, prayer, in his Tārīkh.185 The message from these sources by the articulators of Sunnī Islam is unambiguous—the authoritative Muslim teachers must combine the qualities of hadith erudition, reliable transmission, and a somewhat strict avoidance of the opinions of Abū Ḥanīfah and his disciples. How and when Abū Ḥanīfah became a Sunnī authority in the eyes of hadith scholars is outside the scope of this book; what is clear is that his disciples were not welcome by Ibn Saʿd and his contemporaries.186

---

184 Ibn Saʿd’s comment concerning Muʿallā b. Mansūr, a Baghdādi scholar associated in other sources with the teachings of Abū Ḥanīfah, is illustrative of this point: “some hadith scholars transmit from him, and some do not transmit raʿy from him;” TK 2001, IX, 344 and Melchert, “How Ḥanafism came to Originate in Kufa and Traditionalism in Medina,” 329–30.
186 Note also Ibn Abī Shaybān’s al-Raḍād ‘alā Abī Ḥanīfah, included in the published edition of his Musannaf, which rejects roughly 120 legal opinions of Abū Ḥanīfah on the basis of hadith and aḥār; al-Kuṭāb al-musannaf fi l-ḥadith wa l-aḥār, VII, 276–325.
One particularly conspicuous absence from the discussion of this period is, of course, Muhammad b. Idris al-Shafi‘i. Ibn Sa‘d and Ibn Ma‘in appear to ignore him, if they even knew him, and the references to him in the Ilal indicate Ibn Hanbal’s admiration of his rhetorical capabilities, rather than his legal acumen. While it is true that prior to the mid-third/ninth century the majority of the material found in the sunan books was not prophetic reports and consisted instead of sahābi and tabi‘ī ʾāthār, there still must have been a substantial body of ḥadīth in circulation prior to the date of al-Shafi‘i’s composition of the Risāla (around the year 200/820). The reason why Mālik had only a modest number of prophetic ḥadīth in his Muwatta’ and Ibn Hanbal included about 30,000 ḥadīth in his Musnad was not necessarily due to an explosion of ḥadīth fabrication, as is insinuated by Juynboll, but, rather, due partly to the rapid decline of Medina as a center for ḥadīth transmission and the whims of the various compilers of his book. Had Mālik actually left his beloved city and visited Basra or Kufa (or even Ṣan‘ā‘), he may have been inclined to transmit even more ḥadīth than the hundreds that are found in the Muwatta’ and other classic compilations. The notion that al-Shafi‘i stimulated a “ḥadīth revolution” is not even remotely supported by Tabaqat al-kabīr or Ibn Ma‘in’s critical opinions, both of which suggest strongly that al-Shafi‘i merely articulated something that the

---


188. See Juynboll, Muslim Tradition, 28–9.

189. Note that hundreds of ḥadīth transmitted by Mālik that were not included in the Yahyā al-Laythī edition of the Muwatta’ can be found in the classical Sunni compilations. One of the first scholars to thoroughly examine Mālik’s myriad ḥadīth in many Eastern recensions of the Muwatta’ was the Shaykh al-Īslām al-Dārāqūṭī, whom we encountered above, III.5; see his slender book Aḥādīth al-Muwatta’ wa ittiḥād ar-ruwāt ‘an Mālik wa ikhlīṣāhum fihā ziyyādatan wa naqṣan, ed. Muḥammad Zāhid al-Kawthārī (no place, no date). Al-Dārāquṭī notes that there are 565 ḥadīth in all of the recensions of the Muwatta’, 71 in some of the recensions, and 6 in which Mālik does not identify his source; ibid., 37. See also Siddīqī, Ḥadīth Literature, 7–8.

190. Możtaki has come to a similar conclusion, on the basis of his sophisticated analysis of the Muṣannaf of ʿAbd al-Razzāq: “The growth of the stock of traditions within and outside of the schools is not necessarily to be laid at the door—as Schacht assumes—of forgers opposed to the ancient schools and counter-forgers within schools ... it has been possible to demonstrate that ‘typical common links’ like ʿAmr b. Dīnār, Ibn Jurayj, and Ibn ʿUyayna are not generally to be considered as forgers or propagators of contemporary forgeries, as Schacht identified them.” See The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence, 297.
hadith-folk long had known: the best source for the Prophet’s prac­tice (sunna) was the corpus of hadith, passed from the sahāba to the tābiʿūn, from the tābiʿūn to the generation of al-Zuhri, Ayyūb, and al-A’mash, and from this generation to the generation of Shu’ba, al­Thawri, and Mālik, the latter whom of course, was a primary teacher of al-Shāfiʿi.191

VIII.7 Conclusion

The purpose of this skeletal narrative of the development of the first two centuries of hadith scholarship has been to uncover the story behind the massive, and at times confusing, critical works by what may have been the first generation of Sunnī scholars. I have limited myself to the earliest available sources that depict both this history and the close correlation between the men whom Ibn Saʿd identifies as having transmitted many hadith and those whom Ibn Maʿin identifies as being close to major scholars of each generation. I have made extensive use of Ibn Ḥajar’s study of the ḥadīth of the Musnad of Ibn Hanbal because it sheds valuable light upon the relationships between the most prolific sahāba and their most influential tābiʿūn disciples that are only hinted at in al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr. Although this discussion has included quite a few names, it is important to realize that it includes only the elite transmitters of the first two centuries of Islam from among the thousands of men Ibn Saʿd and his contemporaries dutifully recorded in their books. Just as I endeavored to articulate al-Dhahabi’s vision of the development of hadith scholarship down to his day in the third chapter, I have done my utmost to be faithful to the historical vision of hadith scholarship, as understood by Ibn Saʿd, Ibn Maʿin, Ibn Hanbal, and other early articulators of Sunnī Islam in the third/ninth century. It is this critical historical vision, after all, that I argue lies at the core of the initial articulation of Sunnī Islam by the hadith scholars of the third/ninth century.

191 For an insightful reappraisal of the delayed influence of al-Shāfiʿi and his Risāla, see Wael Hallaq, “Was al-Shāfiʿi the Master Architect of Islamic Jurisprudence?”
CHAPTER NINE

CONCLUSION

This study began with the hypothesis that the major hadith scholars of the third/ninth century played a far greater role in the articulation of Sunnī Islam than did al-Shāfī’i and Abū ʿl-Ḥasan al-Ashʿarī, two men traditionally associated with the crystallization of Sunnism. One of the primary reasons for my focus upon the hadith scholars of this period is the historical fact that the Sahīhs of al-Bukhārī and Muslim have remained the most exalted books, after the Qurʾān, in the opinions of virtually all Sunnī scholars of the past twelve centuries, a feat unmatched by any legal or theological work found in the four primary schools of law or the three schools of theology associated with Sunnism.1 How did these two books achieve this status? In order to answer this question, it was necessary to examine initially three related topics: 1) the long-term evolution of Sunnī hadith scholarship; 2) the rise of both hadith and hadith-transmitter criticism during the three generations prior to al-Bukhārī and Muslim; and 3) the state of hadith scholarship on the eve of these two compilers, which I have dubbed the generation of Ibn Saʿd, Ibn Maʿin, and Ibn Ḥanbal.

A narrative of the evolution of hadith scholarship over its seven most vibrant centuries was the task of the second and third chapters, the aim of which was to provide a historical context for the most influential hadith scholars and books in the Sunnī tradition. I relied heavily upon al-Dhahabī’s Tadúbirat al-buzzī? for the seven-phase narrative of this tradition, and paid particular attention to the men whom he identified with the sobriquet Shaykh al-Īslām. Few scholars, if any, in Islamic civilization have devoted such an enormous amount of time and paper to the elucidation of the development of Sunnī hadith compilation and criticism as al-Dhahabī, and I endeavored to make my presentation as faithful as possible to his critical eye. Two particularly important findings in these chapters were the dating of

---

1 The three Sunnī schools of theology are the Ashʿarī, Māturīdī, and that of the hadith folk, which, for lack of a better expression, is the one that opposes staunchly rational speculation on theological topics.
the first hadith compilations to a full century prior to the two Sahihs and, secondly, the surprisingly high volume of compilation and criticism that occurred during the century after their production. This latter observation indicates that there was much material that fourth/tenth century scholars felt needed to be preserved that had not been included in the books of al-Bukhārī and his contemporaries, and that the two Sahihs represented a high watermark in the evolution of hadith scholarship, but were not the culmination of this ubiquitous Sunnī tradition. It was also clear that a closer investigation of the sources composed during the generation of scholars who lived prior to al-Bukhārī and Muslim, as opposed to the Mamlūk days of al-Dhahābī, would be necessary to uncover exactly how this high watermark was reached, as well as to ascertain the fundamental assumptions upon which these books were built.

We inched closer to our goal of identifying the process by which Sunnīsm was articulated with an investigation of the origins of hadith criticism in the fourth chapter. I reasoned that if my hypothesis that hadith scholars played the major role in the shaping of Sunnī Islam was correct, then the critical disciplines constructed by the most prominent of these scholars must have exerted a major influence upon the nature of the core sources that were compiled according to their guidelines. The primary challenge was to isolate the earliest and most important designers of this craft, and to distinguish between the mere hadith critics, such as Suṭyān al-Thawrī, and the more specialized hadith-transmitter critics, like Shu'ba, Mālik, and Yaḥyā 1-Qaṭṭān. A particularly significant finding was that hadith-transmitter criticism was not applied on a vast scale until the generation immediately preceding al-Bukhārī and Muslim, which just so happened to be the generation of Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'īn, and Ibn Ḥanbal, the first group of critics whose opinions have been well preserved.

A thorough investigation of the nature of hadith scholarship and its relationship to literateurs, theologians, ascetics, and jurists of the generation of Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'īn, and Ibn Ḥanbal, was necessary due to the importance of these men upon the development of hadith compilation and criticism. Al-Dhahābī's Siyar ʿalām al-nubalāʾ provided a spectacular bird’s eye view of the intellectual and religious life of the central lands of Islam during the first half of the third/ninth century, and depicted the preeminence of Iraqi scholars, along with the shift of the hadith centers east to Khurāsān and even central Asia, from where all six of the canonical compilers emerged. The
The florescence of book production was evident during this time, and my decision to label this period as the “generation of Ibn Sa‘d, Ibn Ma‘in, and Ibn Hanbal” was due to both the influence of these scholars in general upon hadith compilation and criticism, as well as the accessibility of their opinions, which I subjected to rigorous analysis in Part II of this book.

One of the key assumptions that I have made in this study has been that the primary books that I investigated in Part II, namely Ibn Sa‘d’s al-Tabaqat al-kabir, al-Dūrī’s Tārīkh, the Ḥal of ‘Abdullāh b. ʿĀhmād, and Ibn Ḥanbal’s Musnad, are the appropriate works for the analysis of the emergence of Sunnī Islam. While I have shown in the fourth chapter that the critical opinions of Ibn Ma‘in and Ibn Ḥanbal were among the most highly esteemed of their era, Ibn Sa‘d’s opinions do not seem to have been particularly important until, perhaps, the time of al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī. Even though I justified the inclusion of al-Tabaqat al-kabir on the basis of the large number of both qualitative and quantitative opinions it contains, one nagging uncertainty remained: did any of these three scholars consider himself to be Sunnī? In fact, there does not appear to be much evidence that the term “Sunnī” was much in use during the time to which I am dating its origins, and we saw that the term saḥīḥ sunna occurred very infrequently in al-Tabaqat al-kabir, and never in al-Dūrī’s Tārīkh. How could I claim to be describing the nature of the emergence of Sunnī Islam when the precise self-identities of its first adherents are so opaque?

My solution to this problem has been to approach Sunnism not as a creed articulated by an individual, but, rather, as a textual tradition based upon three fundamental principles, each of which I analyzed in Part II of this book. The first of these principles is the collective probity of the saḥāba, all of whom were authorities for the purpose of hadith transmission, regardless of their relationship to the acrimonious conflicts that emerged immediately following the death of the Prophet Muḥammad. The second principle is a methodology, the precise nature of which remains somewhat mysterious, for hadith-transmitter criticism, and a consensus as to the identities of the most authoritative transmitters of religious material during the first two centuries

---

2 A perusal of Tārīkh Baghdad suggests that al-Khaṭīb drew copiously upon Ibn Sa‘d’s opinions found in al-Tabaqat al-kabir.
of Islam. I demonstrated the existence of this consensus in chapter seven, where I found a rate of 87% agreement regarding the reliability of the transmitters whom Ibn Sa'd and Ibn Ma'în graded, and 86% for those whom Ibn Sa'd and Ibn Ḥanbal graded. The final, and perhaps most subtle, principle guiding the hadith scholars who compiled the most important Sunni books is a historical vision as to the five-generation development of their craft. I articulated this narrative on the basis of a close analysis of the major sahâbî and tâbi‘î transmitters in the Musnad of Ibn Hanbal, the most prolific transmitters identified in Ibn Sa'd’s al-Tabaqât al-kabîr, and the individuals who cultivated circles of disciples (âshâb) according to Ibn Ma'în and Ibn Ḥanbal. This vision, which has hitherto been ignored or even obfuscated by most modern scholars, is perhaps the most eloquent expression of the network of authoritative scholars whose transmissions inspired the compilers of the third/ninth century to travel thousands of miles in order to acquire and include in their hadith books.

The biggest risk that I took in this project was the conscious decision to postpone a detailed analysis of any major hadith book of the third/ninth century until after an investigation of the critical prosopographical literature of the same period. The reason for this procedure lay largely in the esoteric nature of the isnâd, namely the hidden story behind the men who transmitted each hadith. How much material did each name in the isnâd transmit? Was a transmitter a prominent pupil of the source from which he obtained the report? Was he a semi-reliable, excellent, or mediocre transmitter? While these questions are occasionally answered in the commentaries of major hadith books, the reader, more often than not, must perform the “background check” of the transmitters himself. This book then, should be seen as a necessary preliminary step in order acquire some of the prosopographical knowledge that the compilers of the great hadith books had in their memories and felt little obligation to include in their works. In other words, I have identified the men whom I believe were considered the most reliable hadith scholars in the Sunni tradition from the time of its origins until the third/ninth century and whose presence in an isnâd enhanced greatly the value of the hadith to which it was attached.

Several exciting avenues of research in the Sunni hadith literature have become apparent during the course of this project. An analysis of the roles of the sahâba in hadith transmission is an urgent task in
order to reveal their didactic efforts that ultimately played a significant part in the articulation of Islamic law. Another topic of importance is the need to uncover the teachings of the generation of Waki', Yahyā l-Qattān, and ‘Affān b. Muslim, whose non-extant writings formed the nuclei of their pupils’ books, such as the Musannaf of Ibn Abī Shayba and the Musnad of Ibn Hanbal, from which they can be recovered, at least partially, with patience. The century of vigorous hadith scholarship from Ibn Abī Hātim to al-Ḥakim al-Naysābūrī remains another vast uncharted ocean of knowledge, and particular attention must be devoted to the extraordinary Sunnī scholars of Iran during this time. Finally, none of the six canonical Sunnī hadith books has received a thorough examination in a Western language, a task that I hope this study has made a little less intimidating.

The portrait of Sunnī Islam that I have sketched on the basis of several major books in the genre of hadith literature suggests that its articulation and survival was the work of men identified as ḥujjāz. The word ḥāfiz means far more than “one who has memorized the Qurʾān,” as is found in colloquial parlance, but, rather, evokes the concepts of “protection,” “safeguarding,” and “preservation.” This term has permeated this study, ranging from Ibn Sa’d’s citation of Sufyān al-Thawrī’s “four ḥujjāz,”¹⁴ to Ibn Ḥanbal’s application of the term to at least nine men in the ‘Ital,² to the second half of the title of al-Dhahabī’s Tadhkira al-Ḥujjāz and the bulk of its contents. Although Ibn Sa’d appears personally not to have used the term ḥāfiz, the entire principle behind al-Tabaqat al-Kabīr is the identification of the channels of transmitters who preserved the teachings and practices of various men.

¹ Various derivatives from the root h-f-z occur in a couple dozen verses in the Qurʾān. The word ḥāfiz occurs twice (12:64 and 86:4) and refers to God as the “best protector” (khayrun ḥujjāz) in the first case and an ambiguous guardian in the second. The plural form of ḥāfiz is associated with those who perform prayers regularly (6:92, 23:9, 70:34, as a verb, see 2:238), those who are chaste (“guard their orifices;” see 23:5, 33:35, 70:29; as a verb see 24:30, 33:25), those who keep their oaths (5:79), and the Prophet Joseph’s brothers (12:12, 63, 65). The Qurʾān also declares that God is “protector (ḥujfiz) over everything” (11:57, 34:21) and that “Lo! We, even we, reveal the Reminder, and lo! We verily are its Guardian” (1:9). Finally, the angels who record all human activity in writing are referred to as ḥujjāzīn (82:10).

² These four men were ‘Abd al-Malik b. Abī Sulaymān and iterations of the root hujjāz refer to the channels of transmitters who preserved the teachings and practices of various men.

the Prophet down to his day of critical hadith compilation. Ibn Abī Ḥātim defines explicitly the sahāba as the men and women who “preserved (hafiz) from the Prophet that which he informed them concerning God, what he legislated, ruled, judged, entrusted, ordered, forbade, warned against and inculcated” and that the tabīʿun “preserved from the sahāba that which they had disseminated concerning regulations, practices, and all that we have described the sahāba as having (known).” While the sobriquet hāfiz became restricted to fewer and fewer hadith scholars over the centuries, at least in the eyes of someone like al-Dhahabi, it was an unambiguous stamp of religious authority that was adopted by Sunnī scholars to distinguish the truly exceptional and indispensable men of learning from the thousands of trustworthy transmitters, all of whom played far more modest roles in the seven-century epic of hadith compilation and criticism. If we venture to describe Shiʿī Islam as essentially a “firqa of the Imāms,” it would seem most appropriate to declare Sunni Islam, at least as understood by the hadith scholars, as the “firqa of the hāfiz.”

---

1 fa-hafiz ‘anhu әә mә baltaghahum ‘an Allāhi ‘azza wa jallā, wa mә sawna wa sharā‘a wa ḥakama wa qadā wa nadaba wa amino wa nubā wa bazaru wa addaba; Taqdima, 7.
2 fa-hafiz ‘an sahābi rasūli ‘lāhi әә mә nasārāhu wa bahththāhu min al-ahkāmi wa l-sunnī wa l-āthāri wa sa‘iri mә waṣafna l-sahāba bihi; Taqdima, 8.
APPENDIX A

The following table consists of the *hadith* scholars who are mentioned as authorities in only one of the ten sources analyzed in chapter IV.3.

Table A: Other Critics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Death Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Amr b. Dinār</td>
<td>126/744</td>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td>Ibn al-Madini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Uthman b. ‘Āsim,</td>
<td>127/745</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>Ibn ‘Adi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Ḥasīn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Ishāq al-Sabī,</td>
<td>127/745</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>Ibn al-Madini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Amr b. ‘Abdullāh al-Hamdānī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālik b. Dinār</td>
<td>131/749</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>Ibn ‘Adi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayyūb b. Abī Tamīma al-Sakhīyānī</td>
<td>131/749</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>Ibn ‘Adi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahyā b. Abī Kathīr</td>
<td>132/749</td>
<td>Yamāma</td>
<td>Ibn al-Madini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahyā b. Sa’īd b. Qays al-Ansārī</td>
<td>143/760</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>Ibn Hibbān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hishām b. ‘Urwa</td>
<td>146/763</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>Ibn Hibbān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Ishāq, Muḥammad</td>
<td>150/767</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>Ibn al-Madini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma‘mar b. Rāshīd</td>
<td>153/770</td>
<td>Basra, Yemen</td>
<td>Ibn al-Madini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa’īd b. Abī ‘Arūba Mihrān</td>
<td>156/773</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>Ibn al-Madini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrāhīm b. Taḥmān al-Zahīd</td>
<td>168/784</td>
<td>Nishapur</td>
<td>al-Ḥākim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Ishāq al-Fazārī, Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad</td>
<td>185/801</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Ibn Abī Ḥātim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarīr b. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd</td>
<td>188/804</td>
<td>Rayy</td>
<td>Ibn ‘Adī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Period 2 (200–300/815–912): Other Critics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Death Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Sa‘d, Muhammad</td>
<td>230/845</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>al-Mizzī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrāhīm b. Muhammad b. ‘Ar‘ara</td>
<td>231/846</td>
<td>Basra,</td>
<td>Ibn ’Adī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khalaf b. Sālim</td>
<td>231/846</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>Ibn ’Adī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Makhzūmī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Shadhakūnī, Sulaymān b. Dāwūd</td>
<td>234/848</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>Ibn ’Adī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Dhuwārī, Muhammad b. Yahyā</td>
<td>258/872</td>
<td>Nishapur</td>
<td>Ibn Ḥibbān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad b. Yahyā al-Harrānī</td>
<td>267/880</td>
<td>Harran</td>
<td>Ibn ’Adī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Wārā, Muhammad b. Muslim</td>
<td>270/883</td>
<td>Rayy</td>
<td>Ibn ’Adī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm b. Awrāmā</td>
<td>271/884</td>
<td>Isfahān</td>
<td>Ibn ’Adī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad b. ‘Awf al-Himṣī</td>
<td>272/885</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Ibn ’Adī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Period 3 (300–400/912–1009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Death Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abū Sa‘īd ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Ahmad</td>
<td>347/958</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>al-Mizzī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ṣaʿdāfī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

The following table is my interpretation of Ibn Sa'd's favorite hadith transmitters on the basis of the grades they receive in al-Tabaqat al-kabir. See above, VII.2.

Table B: Ibn Sa'd's most reliable transmitters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Reference (TK 2001)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ayyūb al-Sakhtyānī</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>thiqa-huğja-thabt, jami'</td>
<td>IX, 246–50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 al-Hasan al-Baṣrī</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>thiqa-huğja-ma'mūn, jami', raft', 'āli</td>
<td>IX, 157–78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Sa'id b. al-Musayyab</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>thiqa-thabt-ma'mūn, jami', raft', 'āli</td>
<td>VII, 119–43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 'Affān b. Muslim</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>thiqa-huğja-thabt</td>
<td>IX, 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bakr b. 'Abdullāh</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>thiqa-huğja-thabt, ma'mūn</td>
<td>IX, 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Habbān b. Hilāl al-Bāhili</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>thiqa-huğja-thabt</td>
<td>IX, 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Ḥammād b. Zayd</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>thiqa-huğja-thabt</td>
<td>IX, 287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ḥishām al-Dastawā'ī</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>thiqa-huğja-thabt</td>
<td>IX, 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Ḥishām b. 'Urwa</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>thiqa-huğja-thabt</td>
<td>VII, 462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Mālik b. Anas</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>thiqa-huğja-thabt, ma'mūn</td>
<td>VII, 570–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Ṣu'ba b. al-Hajjāj</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>thiqa-huğja-thabt, ma'mūn</td>
<td>IX, 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Ṣuŷān al-Thawrī</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>thiqa-huğja-thabt, ma'mūn</td>
<td>VII, 492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Yahyā b. Sa'id al-ʾAnṣārī</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>thiqa-huğja-thabt</td>
<td>VII, 517–8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Men whose grades were at least thiqa-huğja and jami' or thiqa-thabt and jami'.
2 Men whose grades were at least thiqa-huğja-thabt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Grades Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\text{'Abd al-Malik b. Abi}) Sulaymān al-Fazārī</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(\text{thīqa-thābi-ma'mūn}) VIII, 469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{'Abdullāh b. Idrīs})</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(\text{thīqa-hujja-ma'mūn}) VIII, 511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Abū Nu'aym al-Fadl b. Dukayn})</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(\text{thīqa-hujja-ma'mūn}) VIII, 523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{al-Awaāsī})</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(\text{thīqa-hujja-ma'mūn}) IX, 494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Hāfīs b. Ghiyāth})</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(\text{thīqa-thābi-ma'mūn}) VIII, 512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Ibn al-Mubārak})</td>
<td>Khurāsān</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(\text{thīqa-hujja-ma'mūn}) IX, 529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Mā'n b. 'Isā})</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(\text{thīqa-thābi-ma'mūn}) VII, 615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Qatāda b. Di'amā})</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(\text{thīqa-hujja-ma'mūn}) IX, 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{'Urwa b. al-Zubayr})</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(\text{thīqa-thābi-ma'mūn}, \ 'āli}) VII, 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Wakī b. al-Jarrāḥ})</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(\text{thīqa-hujja-ma'mūn}, \ 'āli}) VIII, 517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Yaḥyā b. Sa'id al-Qattān})</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(\text{thīqa-hujja-ma'mūn}, \ 'āli}) IX, 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Zuhayr b. Mu'āwiya})</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(\text{thīqa-thābi-ma'mūn}) VIII, 497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{'Abdullāh b. 'Utba b. Mas'ūd})</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(\text{thīqa, 'āli}) VII, 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Abū Bakr b. 'Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Hārith})</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(\text{thīqa, 'āli}) VII, 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{'Alī b. al-Husayn b. 'Alī})</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(\text{thīqa-ma'mūn, 'āli}) VII, 209-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{al-Hakam b. 'Uthayba})</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(\text{thīqa, 'āli}) VIII, 450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Mansūr b. al-Mu'tamīr})</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(\text{thīqa-ma'mūn, 'āli}) VIII, 455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Muḥammad b. Sīrīn})</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(\text{thīqa-ma'mūn, 'āli}) IX, 192-205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad})</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(\text{thīqa, 'āli}) VII, 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Sulaymān b. Yāsār})</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(\text{thīqa, 'āli}) VII, 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{al-Zuhārī})</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(\text{thīqa, jāmī}) VII, 429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Men whose grades were at least \(\text{thīqa-hujja}\) or \(\text{thīqa-thābi}\).

' Men whose grades were at least \(\text{thīqa}, \ 'āli\) or \(\text{thīqa}, \ 'āli\).
APPENDIX C

Note: See above, Table 7.1, for a guide to the abbreviations.

Table C: Ibn Ma'ān’s liars and other disgraceful transmitters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Reference (al-Dūrī, Tarikh)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Abd al-Hakīm b. Mansūr</td>
<td>Wāsīt</td>
<td>kadhdhāb, LHBS</td>
<td>I, 293, 315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd al-Mālik b. Harūn</td>
<td>(Kufa)</td>
<td>kadhdhāb</td>
<td>I, 234, 257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Ḥāmid Sulaymān</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>kadhdhāb</td>
<td>I, 346, II, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Bakr al-Hudhālī</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>kadhdhāb, LBS, LBT</td>
<td>II, 69, 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Jābir al-Bayyādī</td>
<td>Medīna</td>
<td>kadhdhāb</td>
<td>I, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū l-Jārūd Ziyād b. Mundhir</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>kadhdhāb-khabith, LBT</td>
<td>I, 269, 333, 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Hamdān</td>
<td>Hit</td>
<td>kadhdhāb</td>
<td>I, 339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Sa'd al-Saghānī</td>
<td></td>
<td>shayyāmin min al-shayyānin, LBS</td>
<td>II, 278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Sufyān b. al-Sawāf</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>yakhdhīb</td>
<td>II, 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū l-Tayyib</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>kadhdhāb</td>
<td>II, 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Amr b. Jumay'</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>kadhdhāb-khabith, LBT</td>
<td>I, 337; II, 308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The father’s name is either Zayd or Yazid according to al-Dhahabi; Mizān al-ītīdal, II, 208.
2 This is actually the opinion of Ghundar, at whose mosque Abū Bakr al-Hudhālī was a regular worshipper.
3 Ibn Ma'ān remarked that “nobody in Baghdad could be worse than Abū Dāwūd” wa lam yakūn bi-Baghdad rajū’ī illā wa humma khayyān min Abī Dāwūd; al-Dūrī, Tarikh, I, 401.
4 His name is Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahmān.
5 This is the founder of the Jārūdīyya sect of the Zaydiyya that we mentioned briefly in the previous chapter. Al-Dhahabi mentions that al-Tirmidhī included one of his hadith in his Jāmī'; Mizān al-ītīdal, II, 93–4.
6 Al-Dhahabi provides his name as al-Qāsim b. Bahrām; Mizān al-ītīdal, III, 369 and IV, 583.
7 ‘Amr was a companion of al-A’mash and served later as qādi for Hūlān.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Reference (al-Dürü, Tarih)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Amr b. Khālid</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>kadhdhib, LBT</td>
<td>I, 232, 327; II, 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Aūb b. 'Ajlān</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>kadhdhib, LBT,</td>
<td>I, 256, 403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayyūb b. Mudrik</td>
<td>Damascene</td>
<td>kadhdhib, LBT,</td>
<td>II, 69, 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busr b. Abī Aṣār</td>
<td>(Syria)</td>
<td>rajul su'</td>
<td>I, 112; II, 345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāwūd b. 'Abd al-Jabbār</td>
<td>(Baghdad)</td>
<td>yakhdhib, LBT</td>
<td>I, 57; II, 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faḍl b. Ḥsā al-Raqāšāh</td>
<td></td>
<td>rajul su'</td>
<td>II, 206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghiyāth b. Ibrāhīm</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>kadhdhib</td>
<td>I, 340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥasan al-Ṣu'ūl</td>
<td></td>
<td>kadhdhib</td>
<td>I, 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Haytham b. 'Adi</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>yakhdhib, LBT</td>
<td>I, 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Husayn b. Dūmayra</td>
<td>Medīna</td>
<td>kadhdhib, LBS</td>
<td>I, 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Husayn b. Ulwān</td>
<td></td>
<td>kadhdhib II, 294</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Zabāla, Muḥammad b.</td>
<td>Medīna</td>
<td>kadhdhib, LBT,</td>
<td>I, 133, 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥasan</td>
<td></td>
<td>yasruq al-hadīth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrāhīm b. Abī Yaḥyā</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>kadhdhib, LBS,</td>
<td>II, 196, 260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥsāq b. Idrīs</td>
<td></td>
<td>yaddu l-hadīth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jābir b. Yazīd al-Ju'fī</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>kadhdhib, LBS,</td>
<td>I, 210, 216, 268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khusayb b. Jāḥdar</td>
<td></td>
<td>kadhdhib10</td>
<td>II, 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahdī b. Hilāl</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>kadhdhib</td>
<td>II, 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu'allā b. Hilāl</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>kadhdhib, LBS</td>
<td>I, 270, II, 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mughīra b. Sa'īd11</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>rajul su'</td>
<td>I, 374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b.</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>yakhdhibu, LBT</td>
<td>I, 256, 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abī Yaẓīd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad b. Mujīb</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>kadhdhib, 'adnaw</td>
<td>II, 238, 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad b. 'Uthaym</td>
<td>(Kufa)</td>
<td>kadhdhib, LBS</td>
<td>II, 152, 217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

8 This is the same Busr whose destructive raid on behalf of Mu'awiya during the first fitna was described above. Ibn Ma'in reports that the Medinans did not consider him to have heard anything from the Prophet, whereas the Syrians claimed that he did; al-Dürü, Tarih, I, 112.

9 Ibn Abī Ḥātim reports that his full name is al-Husayn b. 'Abdullāh b. Dūmayra b. Abī Dūmayra; al-Jafr wa l-ta'dil, III, 57-8.

10 This is the expression used by Yaḥyā al-Qāṭān, according to Ibn Ma'in.

11 Founder of the extremist Shi'i sect known as the Mughfiriyya, who led a revolt in Kufa in 119/737. Madelung reports that al-Mughīra was a follower of Muḥammad al-Baqir, until the latter's death, and then preached that the Madī was Muḥammad b. 'Abdullāh al-Nafṣ al-Zakiyya. Note, however, that al-Mughīra was executed twenty-five years prior to the latter's revolt; see Madelung, "al-Mughfiriyya," EP, VII, 347-8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad b. Ziyād al-Maymūnī</td>
<td>Kufa, Baghdad</td>
<td>kadidhāb khabīb</td>
<td>II, 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musā b. Muṭayr</td>
<td></td>
<td>kadidhāb</td>
<td>I, 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nūḥ b. Darrāj</td>
<td></td>
<td>kadidhāb, LBS</td>
<td>1338, I, 267, II, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Qāsim b. 'Abd al-Rahmān</td>
<td></td>
<td>laysa yusāwī</td>
<td>I, 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatān b. Su'ayr b. al-Khimṣ</td>
<td></td>
<td>replaced by 'anhu</td>
<td>II, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīla b. Sulaymān</td>
<td>Wāsihi</td>
<td>kadidhāb, LBT</td>
<td>II, 112, 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabīḥ b. Sa'īd</td>
<td>Khulīd (?)</td>
<td>kadidhāb khabīb</td>
<td>I, 161, 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talīd b. Sulaymān</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>kadidhāb, LBS</td>
<td>I, 209, 394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ubayd b. al-Qāsim</td>
<td></td>
<td>kadidhāb, LBT</td>
<td>I, 294, II, 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umayr b. Ishāq</td>
<td>(Basra)</td>
<td>laya yusāwī shay'ān</td>
<td>II, 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usayd al-Jammāl</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>kadidhāb</td>
<td>I, 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yūnus b. Khabbāb</td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>replaced by 'anhu</td>
<td>I, 299, 342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yusuf b. Khālid al-Samīti</td>
<td>Basra</td>
<td>kadidhāb, laya</td>
<td>I, 150, II, 107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 Nūḥ served as a qādī in both of these cities; Mizān al-ṣūdāl, IV, 276.
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an-Nuwayrī's Forty Hadith. Translated by Ezzedin Ibrahim and Denys Johnson-Davies.

No place, no date.
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Encyclopaedia Iranica, London, 1982–.
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### INDEX OF PROPER NAMES

Abbreviations: ‘AA: ‘Abdullāh; ‘AR: ‘Abd al-Rāhīm; M: Muḥammad

Note on death dates: Space and time have conspired against the undertaking of an exhaustive study of the death dates of those scholars for whom multiple opinions are found in the sources. In general, I have followed the opinions of al-Dhahabi or Ibn Hajar, and have made every effort to be consistent throughout this book.

Numbers in italics indicate that the name is found in the footnotes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. ‘Abd al-Ḥakam al-Malik</td>
<td>(d. 214/829)</td>
<td>175, 177-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Abī Labīd</td>
<td>321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Ahmad b. Ḥammuwayh</td>
<td>(d. 381/991)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Ahmad b. Ḥanbal (d. 290/903)</td>
<td>18, 52, 80, 84, 86, 92, 128, 135, 159, 185, 199, 211, 213, 214, 217, 256, 256, 256, 261, 267, 276, 287, 302, 303, 308, 344, 347, 373, 379, life 216-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. ʿAmr (naqib)</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ</td>
<td>(d. 65/685)</td>
<td>234, 273, 274, 276, 278, 280, 289, 289, 331, 334, 334, 335, 342, 348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. ʿAmr b. Ḥāram</td>
<td>257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA al-Anṣārī (d. 481/1090)</td>
<td>58, 59, 60, 96, 102, 106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. al-Aqrām</td>
<td>335, 229, 229, 314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Budayl</td>
<td>233, 242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Ḫuhayna</td>
<td>331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Ḫurayda</td>
<td>65, 148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥasan</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. ʾĪdrīs</td>
<td>—see Ibn ʾĪdrīs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Jaʿfar b. Abī Ṭālīb</td>
<td>257, 258, 276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Jaʿfar b. ‘AR</td>
<td>333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Jaḥsh</td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Kaʿb al-Murādī</td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Khālaf al-Khuzāʿī</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Khālid b. Asīd</td>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. M al-Anṣārī (d. about 200/815)</td>
<td>205, 205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. M al-Farḥādḥānī (d. 300/912)</td>
<td>379</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Ṭalik (governor)</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Maḥṭūn</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. al-Mughaffal (d. 59/679)</td>
<td>279, 280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Nāfiʿ al-Sāʾigh (d. 206/821)</td>
<td>176, 178, 366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Nāfiʿ al-Zubayrī (d. 216/831)</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Qays b. Ṣayf</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Rājāʿ (d. about 196/810)</td>
<td>363, 363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Ṣaʿīd</td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Saʿd</td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Saʿd</td>
<td>231, 256, 273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA al-Ṣārī</td>
<td>332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Sawwār (d. 228/843)</td>
<td>173, 174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Shaddād b. al-Hādi</td>
<td>323, 323</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Shaddād b. ʿUsāma</td>
<td>323</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Ṣaḥiq al-Uḍaylī</td>
<td>329</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Ṭāhir (governor; d. 230/845)</td>
<td>161, 165-7, 191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA, ‘Umar F.</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. ʿUmar b. Ḥafṣ</td>
<td>(d. 171/787)</td>
<td>319, 353, 354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. ʿUrays</td>
<td>272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. ʿUtba b. Masʿūd</td>
<td>297, 298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Yazīd (Ibāḍ)</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. Yusuf al-Kalāʿī</td>
<td>—see al-Kalāʿī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. ʿZayd b. ʿAbd Rabbih</td>
<td>(d. 63/683)</td>
<td>271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. al-Zibʿarī</td>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AA b. al-Zubayr—see Ibn al-Zubayr</td>
<td>335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron (prophet)</td>
<td>266, 275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abān b. Abī Ayyāsh</td>
<td>139, 142, 209, 209, 293, 304, 312, 315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abān b. Saʿīd</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbād b. ʿAwwarn</td>
<td>322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbād b. Bishr</td>
<td>257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbād b. Katīb</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abbad b. Mansur 312, 321, 322

Abbad b. Suhayb 321

Abnas b. Abd al-Mujalib 224, 226, 227, 230, 236, 263, 276

Abbas b. al-Walid al-Narsi (d. 237) 181

Abbas b. Ghailib (d. 233/848) 366

Abbasa bint al-Fadl (wife of Ibn Hanbal) 213

Abbot, Nabin 6, 329, 342

Abd al-Alla b. Amr 141

Abd al-Alla al-Qurashi 321, 321

Abd al-'Aziz b. Abi Han 304, 312

Abd al-'Aziz b. Abi Rawwad 296, 296, 322

Abd al-'Aziz b. Marwan 333

Abd al-'Aziz b. Suhayb 307

Abd al-Ghaffar b. Dawayd 173, 178

Abd al-Ghani al-Maqdisi 600/1204 104, 107, 108, 110

Abd al-Ghani b. Sa'id al-Misri 409/1018 6, 68, 100, 101

Abd al-Hakam b. 'AA (d. 237/851-2) 175

Abd al-Hakim b. Mansur 317, 392


Abd al-Humayd al-Kissi (d. 249/863) 96

Abd al-Jabbir b. Abbás 310

Abd al-Jabbir b. 'Imran al-Marzubani 387/991 (d. 162)

Abi al-Karim al-Jazari 142

Abi al-Majid b. 'Abd al-'Aziz b. Abi Rawwad 322

Abi al-Malik b. Hubib al-Ardalusi 258/853 18, 178


Abi al-Malik b. Marwan (caliph) 65, 293, 293, 333

Abi al-Malik b. Muslama 224/839 173

Abi al-Mun'im al-Parawi 608/1211-2 27

Abi al-Qarih al-Baghdadisi 129/1037 37, 226

Abi al-Razzaz al-Samani (d. 211/826) 9, 9, 12, 68, 71-2, 72, 79, 103, 130, 141, 179, 208, 209, 213, 213, 255, 301, 322, 330, 347, 352, 362, 366, 368

Abi al-Sattar al-Shaykh 43, 55

Abi al-Wahhab b. 'Ata' al-Ijli 295, 365, 366

Abi al-Wahhab b. 'Abd al-Majid 292

Abi al-Wahhab b. Mujahid 142, 149, 312, 315

Abi al-Wahid b. Ziyad (d. 176/792) 187, 357, 357

Abi al-Warrid b. Sa'id (d. 180/795) 139, 187, 190, 306, 357, 357

Abdân, 'AA b. Uthman (d. 221/836) 173, 175

Abdân al-Ahwazî, 'AA b. Ahmad (d. 306/918) 379

Abida b. Amr 61

Abramov, Binyamin 247

Abu 'AA al-Jadalî 322, 322

Abu 'AA M b. 'Ali al-Kûfi (d. 445/1053-4) 249, 249

Abu 'Abd al-Jabir (d. 211/825-5) 271

Abu 'Asak al-Yahudi 272

Abu Ahmad, al-Hakim M b. M (d. 378/988) 53, 84, 89, 90, 91, 94

Abu Ahmad al-Zubayrî, M b. 'AA b. al-Zubayr (d. 203/818-9) 302, 302, 361

Abû l-Ahwâs 18f. b. Malik 331, 337, 337

Abû l-Ahwâs M b. Hayyân 300

Abû l-Ahwâs Sallâm b. Sulaymî (d. 179/793) 141, 355, 355

Abû l-'Alâ' al-Hamâchâni (d. 560/1163-4) 59, 104, 107

Abû 'Ali b. Daysam al-'Askari 135

Abû 'Ali al-Haddâd, al-Hasan b. Ahmad (d. 515/1121) 103

Abû 'Ali b. al-Mudhhab 214

Abû 'Ali al-Másârjîsî (d. 368/978) 80
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Abû 'Ali al-Sawwâf 214, 217
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Abû 'Amra Bashîr b. 'Amr 235, 240

Abû 'AR al-Sulami 90, 95, 98 (Sufî), 133 (tâbi'î)

Abû l-'As b. Abi Rabî'a 227
Abū Isḥāq Ibrāhīm b. Awramā
(d. 271/884) 378

Abū Isḥāq Ibrāhīm b. Sulaymān
al-Zayyāt 322

Abū Isḥāq al-Sābī'ī, 'Amr b. 'AA
al-Hamādānī (d. 127/745) 66, 69,
115, 128, 138, 139, 141, 301, 327,
337, 337, 343, 345, 352, 353, 353,
357, 357, 377

Abū Isḥāq al-Shirāzī
(d. 476/1083) 5, 12, 38, 48,
89, 99, 106, 348, 349, 356,
358

Abū Isra'il Isma'il b. Abī Isrā'il
al-Mula'i 317

Abū Ja'far M b. al-$abbaJ:
264

Abū Ja'far M b. Ma'nūr
al-Murādi (d. 248) 248

Abū Jahl 270

Abū Janab al-Kalbi 210, 311

Abū 1-Jarud Ziyād b. Mundhir
382

Abū Juzayy Na'am b. Tarif 293

Abū Kamil al-Muzaffar b. Mudrik
(d. 207/822) 324, 365, 365,
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Abū Khalda 289

Abū Khalid al-Dālānī 322

Abū l-Khayr 63

Abū l-Khayr al-Tālqānī, Ahmad b.
İsmā'il (d. 590/1194) 104

Abū Khaythama Zuhayr b. Ħarb
(d. 234/848) 49, 52, 69, 75, 79,
126, 123, 125, 180, 181, 193, 199,
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Abū Kurayb 188

Abū Laylā 336

Abū Ma'am Isma'il b. Ibrāhīm
324

Abū Mansūr Za'zal 163

Abū Manshar 204, 205, 317, 333,
365

Abū Mas'ūd al-Aqsārī, 'Uqba b. 'Amr
(d. before 60/660) 244, 249

Abū Mas'ūd al-Ash'ārī 257, 260, 285

Abū Mu'awwīya M b. Khāzīm
(d. 195/811) 321, 360, 360

Abū l-Mughīrā 'Abd al-Qudūs b.
al-Hajjāj 77, 189

Abū Muqaddās Ahmad b. al-Ḥusayn
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(d. 245/859) 169, 170
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169, 170
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Abū Mushir 'Abd al-Alā b. Mushir
(d. 218/833) 55, 71, 77, 118, 123,
125, 150, 176, 177, 180, 189, 196,
201, 364

Abū Muṣir al-Ḥakam b. 'AA al-Balkhī
322

Abū Nadr M b. M al-Tūsī (d. 344/955-6) 59, 91

Abū Nadra al-Mundhir b. Mālik
(d. 108/726) 334, 336, 336, 339,
339

Abū Naṣr al-Sijji (d. 444/1052-3) 56

Abū Naṣr al-Tammār (d. 228/843)
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Abū Nu'aym al-Faḍīl b. Dukayn
(d. 219/834) 66, 70, 76-9, 129,
141, 203, 205, 208, 212, 217, 230,
297, 300, 301, 301, 310, 356, 361,
361, 366, 381

Abū l-Qasim 'Abd al-Karim b. M
(d. 617/1220) 27

Abū l-Qāsim Ḥabāb Allāh b. M 214

Abū l-Qāsim zu'af bīni Abī Muslim
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Abū Sa'd al-Saghbānī 382
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<td>al-Ḥukaym b. Jābala</td>
<td>232, 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥukaym b. Ḥubayr</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥulqū</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥumayd b. Abī l-Ḥumayd al-Ṭawīl</td>
<td>(d. 142/758) 293, 344, 349, 357, 357, 377, 374, 373, 363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥumaydī, 'AA b. al-Zubayr</td>
<td>(d. 219/834) 75, 176, 186, 188, 350, 363, 363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥumaydī, Abū 'AA M b. Abī Naṣr</td>
<td>(d. 488/1095) 53, 54, 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥurvīz, Nimrod</td>
<td>195, 200, 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥusayn b. Dhakwān al-Mu'ālīm</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥusayn b. Ḥumayrī</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥusayn b. Ḥaḍīs b. al-Ḍālī</td>
<td>(d. 212/827) 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥusayn b. al-Ḥasan al-Rāzī</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥusayn b. Ḥurayīyah</td>
<td>244/858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥusayn b. Ibrāhīm</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥusayn al-ʿUṣfī</td>
<td>203/818–9 58, 59, 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥusayn al-ₖarābīsī</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥusayn b. M b. Bahram</td>
<td>(d. 213 or 214/628–9) 204, 204, 365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥusayn b. M al-Najār</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥusayn b. ʿUwān</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Abī al-Barr (d. 163/1071)</td>
<td>13, 29, 53, 54, 57, 59, 60, 92, 93, 95, 100, 102, 104, 104, 111, 121, 215, 216, 223, 243, 276, 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Abī ʿAswād (d. 223/838)</td>
<td>174, 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Abī ʿAwīf, 'AA b. al-Qāma (d. 86/705)</td>
<td>66, 279, 280, 281, 345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Abī Dāwūd (d. 316/929)</td>
<td>77, 79, 84, 88, 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Abī Dhībī, M b. ʿAR (d. 159/776)</td>
<td>296, 321, 358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Abī Duwād</td>
<td>164, 165, 194, 199, 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Abī l-Ḥādīd (d. 656/1258)</td>
<td>19, 224, 246, 250, 253, 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Abī l-Ḥuqayq</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Abī Khaythama, Ahmad</td>
<td>(d. 279/892) 52, 78, 93, 118, 135, 166, 187, 210, 379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Abī Laylā</td>
<td>64, 153, 249, 254, 332, 332, 340, 349, 351; his musammāf 356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Abī Mulayika</td>
<td>65, 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Abī Najīf, 'AA</td>
<td>147, 300, 321, 345, 346, 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Abī Shawwārīb (d. 244/858)</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Abī Shayba, Abū Bakr</td>
<td>(d. 235/649) 9, 19, 52, 68, 69, 76, 78, 79, 81, 84, 86, 115, 120, 123, 125, 131, 180, 186–8, 190, 191, 195, 216, 255, 276, 281, 282, 284, 356, 367, 375; approach to the şehāba 255–66; overview of his Musammāf 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Abī Ya'qūb</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Abī l-Zārād</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ibn 'Adī, Abū Ahmad 'AA al-Jurjānī (d. 365/976) 12, 16, 43, 48, 50, 51, 53, 55, 72, 83, 89, 90, 93, 114, 120-1, 121, 122, 123, 125, 131-3, 145, 152, 153, 188, 209, 249, 350

Ibn 'Afrā' 246

Ibn al-Ahram, Abū Ja'far M. b. al-'Abbās (d. 310/922) 52

Ibn al-Anbārī (d. 328/940) 56

Ibn al-'Arabī, Muḥyī l-Dīn 96, 112

Ibn al-'Arabī (d. 340/951-2) 53, 97

Ibn 'Asākir, Abū l-Qāsim 'Alī b. al-Hasan (d. 571/1175) 97, 103, 105, 106-8, 196, 118, 214

Ibn al-Athīr, 'Izz al-Dīn (d. 630/1233) 103, 110-1, 234

Ibn al-Athīr, Majd al-Dīn 106

Ibn al-Athram (d. 434/946) 80


Ibn Bashkuwal, Khalaf b. 'Amālik (d. 578/1182) 108

Ibn Buʿban al-Fārisī (d. 739/1338-9) 80, 91

Ibn Daqīq al-Idā, Taqī al-Dīn M. b. 'Ali al-Manfalūṭi (d. 702/1303) 28, 45, 60

Ibn Fāhīm (d. 289/902) 17, 159, 211, 366; life 206-7, 206

Ibn al-Farāḍī (d. 403/1012-3) 81

Ibn Fārūkh al-Ishbīlī (d. 699/1300) 56

Ibn Ghaylān 136

Ibn Ghazzāla 163, 167

Ibn Haddād (d. 344/956) 57, 57

Ibn al-Haddād (d. 517/1123) 103


Ibn al-Hanafīyya, M. 141, 262, 262


Ibn Ḥānis 327

Ibn Ḥāyyūn, Abū 'AA (d. 305/917) 92

Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1064) 81, 82, 90, 93, 95, 95, 96, 96, 100, 102, 104, 112

Ibn Ḥibbān, Abū Ḥātim al-Buṣī (d. 354/963) 11, 16, 48, 50, 51, 64, 80, 83, 84, 91, 92, 93, 110, 112, 114, 116, 118-20, 121, 122, 124, 125, 131, 143, 145, 149, 153, 178, 189, 207, 230, 342, 350

Ibn Ḥishām (d. 218/833) 164-5, 268-9

Ibn al-Ḥusayn (d. 619/1222) 56

Ibn Idris, 'AA (d. 192/808) 135, 139, 297, 324, 362, 362, 381


Ibn al-Iṣkāf, Abū M. Ja'far 19, 250-3, 250, 252, 262

Ibn al-Jabbār, Abū 'Umar Ahmad b. Khālid al-Qurtubi (d. 322/934) 53, 92, 95

Ibn al-Jārūd, 'AA b. 'Ali b. Jārūd (d. 307/919-20) 80, 90, 93

Ibn Jawās (d. 320/932) 53

Ibn al-Jawāz, Abū 'Amr Ahmad b. Khayr (d. 833/1429) 44, 44
Ja'far b. M al-Ṣādir (d. 148/765) 44, 206, 238, 239, 240, 242–5, 245, 251, 283
Ja'far b. Mubashshir (d. 234/849) 176
Ja'far b. Rabî‘a 323, 324
Ja'far b. Sulaymān (d. 178/794) 187, 322
Ja'far b. Sulaymān (gvr. who beat Mālik) 199
Jafri, S. Hosain 223, 225, 226, 237
al-Jāhiz (257/868) 19, 129, 165–7, 173, 194, 212, 246, 250; difference between hadīth folk and jurists 167
Jahāb b. Sa‘īd al-Ghifar 228, 228
Jahm b. ‘Umar (d. 128/746) 17, 65
Jarfr b. ‘Ālam al-Bajāf (d. 54/674) 19, 234, 256, 259, 267, 279, 280, 396
Jarir b. ‘Abd al-Jilām (d. 188/804) 139, 140, 209, 377
Jarir b. Ḥāzim (d. 170/786) 138, 292, 313, 324, 325, 345, 355, 360, 360
Jālābī, Š. 68, 216
Jawābīs, Abū Bāk r al-Rāzī 68, 216
Jawābīs, Š. Ḥosain 223, 225, 226, 237
Jawābīs, Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥasan (d. 498/1104–5) 104
Jesús 260; parallel with ‘Alī 233
Jubayr b. Muṣ‘īm (d. 57/677) 251, 279, 280
Jālābīsī, 257
al-Jumalī, M b. Sallām (d. 231/846) 78, 165, 167, 207
Junaydī, Abu 1-Qasīm 55
Jundab b. Zuhayr 235
Khālid al-Hadhīḥā’ 344
Khālid b. al-Ḥārith (d. 186/802) 187
Khālid b. Khali 174
Khālid Mā’dān 65
Khālid b. Makhlād 70, 322
Khālid b. ‘Abd al-ʿAlī al-Makhtūmī (d. 231/846) 378
Khālid b. ‘Abd al-Walīd 227, 256, 272, 272
Khālidī, Tarīf 34, 39, 41, 47
Khalīfa b. al-Khayyā‘ī (d. 240/854) 48, 186
Khālidī, Tai’ī b. Mā’dān 29
Khālidī ‘Abd b. Bāk r Ahmad b. M (d. 311/923) 87, 93, 158, 197, 213, 214, 217, 252, 233
Khārīja b. Muṣ‘āb 313, 314, 315
Khārīja b. Zayd b. Thābit 119, 348
Khalīfā b. al-Khaṭābī, Hamd b. M 29
Khāwī b. Khawīr 205
Khawwāt b. Jubayr (d. 40/660) 271
Khayyāmī b. Sulaymān (d. 343/955) 97
Khunays b. Ḥudhayfā 269
Khuṣayb b. Jahār 383
Kīnāna b. Nu‘aym 295
al-Kindī 191
al-Kisā‘ī 69, 163, 163, 164
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Kohlberg, Etan 19, 223, 238, 239, 240, 247-9
al-Kulaýnî, M 18, 239, 242-5, 283

Labid b. Rabî‘a 273
Lapidus, Ira 17, 158, 192, 195
Labîn b. Abî Sulaymî 151, 296, 296
Lecker, Michael 342, 354
Leemhuis, Fred 300
Luqmân 171

M b. ‘AA b. ‘Ammâr (d. 242) 182
M b. ‘AA ibn ukktî al-Zubri 353
M b. Abî al-Sulâmî (d. 238/852-3) 176
M b. ‘Abbâd 264
M ‘Abd al-Ra‘uf 106
M b. ‘Abd al-Salam Harûn 250
M b. Abî Bakr 235, 251
M b. Abî Yahya 313
M b. Ahmad al-Qurashi‘, al-Qâdi (d. 623/1226) 249
M b. Ajlân 313
M ‘Alî al-Baqirî (d. 632/1233) 238, 239, 240-4, 240, 241, 244, 283
M b. ‘Ammâr al-Ra‘zî 135
M b. ‘AR, Amîr of Cordoba 81
M b. ‘Awf al-Himîn (d. 272/885) 378
M b. Bakkar (d. 216/831) 173, 174, 177
M b. Dâwûd (d. 342/953) 56
M b. al-Fa‘îl 294, 313, 315
M b. al-Hajjâj 304
M b. al-Hanafiyya—sec ibn al-Hanafiyya
M b. al-Hasan 313
M b. al-Hasan b. Abî Yazîd 383
M b. al-Hasan or al-Husayn b. Ishkáb 135
M b. Hâtim al-Zammî (d. 246/861) 164, 167, 199
M b. al-Husayn b. ‘Alî 348
M b. Ibrâhîm 135, 137
M b. Ibrâhîm Lahîdân 13
M b. Ishq b. Ibrâhîm 161
M b. Jawâd 238
M b. Ka‘b al-Qurazi 273
M b. Katûhrî (d. 210/825) 292, 363
M b. Khalad al-Marzubân 208
M b. M b. Raja‘ 135, 137
M b. Marwân b. al-‘Askarî 333
M b. Maslama (d. 46/666) 231, 232, 241, 246, 252, 252, 271, 272, 272, 355
M b. Mujîb 363
M b. al-Munkadîr (d. 130/747-8) 58, 65, 344
M b. Muslim al-Râzî 136
M b. al-Muthanna 79, 264
M b. Nûh 194
M b. al-Šabbâb al-Dîlâmî (d. 227/841) 182, 186, 187
M b. al-Sâ‘îb al-Kalbî 142, 143, 294, 317, 317
M b. Sa‘îd al-Muqri 135, 142
M b. Sabîh 269
M b. Sâîhî al-Hâshîmî, al-Qâdi 102
M b. Sa‘îm 304, 313
M b. Sûqa 296
M b. ‘Ubayd Allah al-‘Arzûnî 304
M b. ‘Ubayd al-Tânâfîsî (d. 204/819) 324, 325, 362, 365
M b. ‘Ubayd Allah al-‘Ubbî (d. 228/843) 162
M b. ‘Uthaymîn 383
M b. ‘Uthmân al-Kûfî, Ibn Karâmî (d. 256/870) 68
M b. Wâhîb b. ‘Aqîyya 173, 176
M b. al-Walîd al-Zubâydi 132, 354
M b. Yahyâ (teacher of Ibn Abî Hâtim) 134, 135, 137, 142
M b. Yahyâ al-Hârrânî (d. 267/880) 134, 378
M b. Ya‘qûb b. ‘Umar al-Waṣînî 134
M b. Ya‘qûb 313
M b. Ziyâd 138
M b. Zîyâd al-Ma‘mûnî 384
M b. Ziyâd, Ibn al-Arâbî (d. 231/846) 164
M b. Zîyâd, Ibn al-A‘îbî 164, 167, 199
M b. Zîyâd, Ibn al-A‘îbî 164, 167, 199
Madelung, Wilferd 168, 224-6, 224-7, 228, 229, 231, 233, 234, 235, 237, 247, 249, 252, 255, 283, 295
Mahlûnî, al-Qâdi al-Husayn (d. 390/942) 87
M b. al-Mahâdi (caliph) 161, 356
M b. al-Mahâdi 383
M b. Maymûn 139, 307, 307, 313
M b. Maymûn (d. 239/854) 137, 137
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Majmūd b. al-Warrāq 162
Makdisi, George 101
Makhlih b. al-Husayn (d. 191/807) 363, 364
Makhrama b. Bukayr 311
Makhtul al-Shami 321
Makkī b. Ibrāhim (d. 215/830) 36
al-Malāṣi (d. 377/987–8) 216
Mālik b. ‘Amr al-Najjār 205
Mālik b. Dinār (d. 131/749) 377
Mālik b. Nuwayra 227, 227
Ma'āmar b. Abī Sarh 239
Ma'mar b. Rašīd (d. 153/770) 68, 72, 72, 115, 128, 129, 132, 148, 209, 213, 301, 301, 305, 352, 354, 357, 362, 363, 367
al-Ma'mūn 4, 17, 69, 71, 158, 160, 161, 161, 192–4, 193, 194, 196–8, 197, 202, 203
Ma'n b. 'Isa (d. 198/814) 205, 205, 297, 366, 381
al-Mansūr (caliph) 69, 161, 162, 199, 199, 344, 353
Mansūr b. Bashīr 325
Mansūr b. Mahdī (d. 236/851–2) 160
al-Mansūr b. al-Mu'tamir (d. 132/750) 66, 131, 133, 339, 142, 153, 297, 315, 327, 337, 345, 345, 352, 381
Mansūr b. Zādham 318
Mardawayh al-Sā'igh ('Abd al-Samad b. Yazid) 296, 325, 325
al-Marrādānī 212, 213, 213, 343, 357
Marwān b. al-Hakam 299, 333
Marwān b. Mu'āwiyah al-Fazārī 307, 375
Mary, mother of Jesus 260
Maslama b. Mukhllad 231
Masrūq b. al-Ajda' (d. 63/683) 36, 64, 258, 275, 336, 336, 337, 347, 349
Ma'sūd b. al-Rabi' 230
Ma'sūdī 162, 231, 231, 235
Mātur b. Tahmān 151
Mayānjī, Abū Ḥafs (d. 580/1184) 27
Maymūn b. Mihrān 65
Maymūnā bint al-Ḥārith (d. 61/681) 279, 280
Melchert, Christopher 1, 4, 14, 84, 87, 126, 133, 138, 178, 193, 197, 200, 216,
Mīnād b. Yazid al-Ḫīlī 296
Mīndal b. 'Alī 313, 323, 323, 325
al-Minhāl b. ‘Amr 140
Mīnorsky, V. 86
al-Miqdād b. ‘Amr (d. 33/654) 226, 230, 239, 240, 247, 271, 283
Mis'a b. Kidām (d. 155/772) 52, 68, 321, 321, 361
Mīsāh b. Uthāthā (d. 34/654–5) 271
al-Miswar b. Makhrama 258, 275
Modarressi, Hossein 238, 245, 245, 250
Momen, Moojan 243, 245
Moses (prophet) 265, 275
Motzkí, Harald 1, 5, 6, 9, 25, 72, 330, 330, 347, 348, 357, 362, 368
Mu'adān b. Anas al-Juhani (d. 75/694) 279, 280
Mu'ād b. Bishr 86
Mu'ād b. al-Ḫārith 270, 270
Mu'awād b. 'Imrān 142, 325
Mu'ād b. Jabal (d. 18/639) 246, 256, 273–5, 275, 278, 280–4, 332, 332, 348, 364
Mu'ād b. Mu'ād b. Asad (d. 219/834) 182
al-Mu'allā b. Hilal 148, 383
al-Mu'allā b. Mansūr al-Rāzī (d. 211/825) 176, 178, 180, 187, 322, 367
Mu'ammār b. 'Abbād 168
Nawas, John 158, 192, 196-7, 196-9
al-`Nawawi, Yahyā b. Sharaf (d. 676/1277) 26, 41, 50, 60, 65, 227, 102, 108, 288
al-`Nazzām 168
Nīyār b. `Iyād 229
Noth, Albrecht 222, 222
Nu`aym b. Hammād (d. 228/843) 130, 146, 186, 189, 194, 201
Nuḥ b. Dārrāj 384
al-Nu`mān b. Bāshīr (d. 63/684-5) 231, 236, 236, 254, 280, 279, 281, 283, 285
al-Nu`mān b. Mālik 205
Nūr Sayf 208, 208, 209
Paton 192, 198
Qābīsā b. Uqba (d. 215/830) 64, 302, 361
Qābīsā b. Waqqāṣ 183
Qābūs b. Abī Zaybāh 311
Qādī `Iyād b. Mūsā (d. 341/1149) 27, 104, 108, 260
al-Qādirī, `AA b. Maslama (d. 221/836) 59, 69, 70, 71, 77, 78, 79, 81, 103, 178, 184, 185, 188, 208, 364
al-Qāsim b. `AR 384
al-Qāsim b. Ashbagh al-Qurtubi (d. 340/951-7) 92, 93, 95
al-Qāsim b. Ibrāhīm (d. 746/860) 247, 247, 250 1
al-Qāsim b. Ma`n 295
Qata`ū b. Su`ayr b. al-Khāmis 384
al-Qawārid, `Ubayd Allāh b. `Umar (d. 235/849) 120, 199, 203, 264, 378
Qays b. Abī Hāzim (d. about 90/709) 259
Qays b. Makshūh 228
Qays b. Mūsīm al-Jadālī 327
Qays b. Sa`d b. `Ubāda 233, 242
Qays b. al-Rabī' 138, 137, 138
Qūrād, Abū Nūh 364
Qudāma b. Ma`zūn (d. 36/656-7) 231, 271
Qurād 135
Quṭra b. `AR 132
al-Qurtūbī, Abū `AA (d. 671/1272) 44
Qutayba b. Sa`īd (d. 240/854) 79, 179, 185, 190, 192, 193, 198, 213, 254, 360; his four hajjāz 190
Qutba b. `Amīr b. Ḥathīra 269, 270
Qutham b. `Abbās 233, 233
Rābī' b. al-Ḥāṣan al-Sa`nī (d. 609/212-3) 72
Rābī' b. Sulaymān (d. 270/884) 178
Rābī' b. Waqqāṣ (d. 224/839) 182
Rābī' a-Ra'ī b. Abī `AR (d. 136/753) 343, 343, 348, 351, 377
Rāfī' b. Khādir (d. 74/693) 231, 270, 270, 330, 331, 345
al-Rāmādī, Ibrāhīm b. Bashshār (d. 224/839) 170, 172
Rāmūhurmūzī (d. 360/971) 26
Rashīd Riḍā 215
Rūh b. `Ubāda 298
Rayhāna (wife of Ibn Ḥanbal) 213
Rib`i b. Ḥirāsh 133
Rīf`ī b. Rāfī' 229, 229
Robson, J. 25, 103
Roshenthal, Franz 47, 85
al-Ruhāwī, `Abd al-Qādir (d. 617/1221) 53, 103, 104, 104, 107, 108, 110
al-Rūyānī, Abū Bakr (d. 307/919) 84
Ṣabīn b. Sa`d 384
Sachau, E. 206
Sa`d b. Abī Waqqāṣ (d. 55/675) 19, 34, 233, 239, 341, 252, 254, 256, 262, 264, 264, 265, 268, 271, 272, 272, 274, 276, 278, 280, 335, 337
Sa`d b. al-Ḥārith b. al-Ṣimrān 235
Sa`d b. al-Rabī' 270, 273
Sīla b. Sulaymān 384
Sīlāl, Abū Ṭāhir (d. 376/1186) 76, 103, 105, 107, 108
Sīmāk b. Ḥabīr al-Dhuhūlī 337, 337
Spektoršky, Susan 215, 215
Suḥayb b. al-Khīrīm 324–5
Suḥayb b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Bakr (d. 348/959) 105–6
Suḥayb b. Khalid al-Hudhali 272
Suḥayb al-Raʾs b. Ziyād al-Baṣrī (d. 200/815) 378
Sūfyan b. Saʿd—see al-Thawrī, Sūfyan
Sūfyan b. ʿUayyin—see Ibn ʿUayyin
Sūfyan b. Walī (d. 247/861) 216
Suḥayb b. Sinān 231, 231, 247, 256, 233
Suḥayb b. al-Qāsim al-Harrānī 136
Suḥayb b. ʿAmīr 295
Suḥaybān b. ʿAbd al-Malik 234
Suḥaybān b. Bilāl 333
Suḥaybān b. Būrnyda 148
Suḥaybān b. Ḥarb (d. 224/839) 70, 136, 139, 174, 180, 185, 187, 188
Suḥaybān b. Jarīr 168, 247, 248
Suḥaybān b. Qays al-Yashkūrī 344
Suḥaybān b. ʿUyaynī (d. 54/674) 233, 235
Suḥaybān al-Taymi (d. 143/760) 4, 58, 66, 70, 70, 296, 339, 344, 363
Suḥaybān b. Yāsīr 119, 274, 348, 381
Suṣaiy b. Yūnūs 264
al-Ṣūrī, M. b. al-Mubārak (d. 215/830) 72, 71, 117, 180, 182, 249, 256
Suwayd b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz 138, 304
Suwayd b. Ghaṣila 64
Suwayd b. Ḥalīb al-Asḥāfī 294
Suwayd b. Mathʿāba 296
Suwayd b. Saʿīd (d. 240/854) 178
al-Suyūṭī, Jalāl al-Dīn (d. 911/1505) 12, 28, 34, 85, 293, 297, 298;
grades used by ḥadīth criticism 288–90
al-Taḥārānī, Abū l-Qāsim Suḥaybān b. Ahmad (d. 360/971) 81, 83, 87, 92, 94, 97, 97, 103, 110, 217, 223
al-Taḥādhdhāki, Mušā b. Ismaʿīl (d. 223/838) 70, 76, 182, 183, 185, 187, 209
al-Taḥāwwī, Abu Jaʿfar Ahmad b. M. (d. 321/933) 68, 78, 80, 93, 93, 110, 216, 254
Tāḥīr (general) 197
Talīd b. Suḥaybān 394
Talha b. ʿAmīr 304, 313, 315, 317
Talha b. ʿUbayd Allāh (d. 36/656) 19, 34, 228, 232, 239, 246, 247, 252, 252, 254, 255, 259, 260, 260,
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Yahya b. Barmak 168
Yahya b. Hamza 321
Yahya b. al-Jazzar 323
Yahya b. Sa’id b. Aban (d. 194/810) 365
Yahya b. Sa’id al-Ansari (d. 143/760) 58, 68, 65, 65, 119, 297, 318, 344, 346, 348, 363, 375, 377
Yahya b. Salama 294, 317
Yahya b. Yusuf al-Zamami (d. 229/844) 182
Yahya b. Yahya al-Laythi (d. 234/848) 81, 177, 178, 178, 186, 368
Yahya b. Yahya al-Tamimi (d. 226/841) 79, 185, 189, 192, 264
Yahya b. Umayya 232, 232
Yaman b. al-Mughira 149
Yaqub b. Ibrahim b. Sa’d (d. 208/823) 365
Yaqub b. M. b. Isaa 305
Yaqubi 212
Yaqut al-Hamawi (d. 626/1229) 163, 165
Yazid b. Abi Habib 354
Yazid b. Abi Ziyad 292, 311
Yazid b. Aban al-Raqashi 321
Yazid b. Amira al-Zubaydi 332
Yazid b. Hayyan 265
Yazid b. Hazim 314
Yazid b. Iyad 353
Yazid b. Khumayr 139, 208
Yazid b. al-Muzayn b. Qays 205
Yazid b. Rumain 269
Yazid al-Shami 149
Yazid b. Sufyan 133
Yazid b. Yazid 314
Yazid b. Zurai (d. 182/798) 86, 187, 190, 307, 320, 359, 359
Al-Yaun, Abu ‘AA (d. 658/1260) 108, 110, 110
Yunus b. ‘Abd al-A’la 86
Yunus b. Abi Isbaq al-Sabi 345
Yunus b. Habib (d. 267/880) 72, 135
Yunus b. Khabbab 384
Yunus b. ‘Ubayd 67, 67, 138, 349, 359
Yunus b. Yazid al-Ayl (d. 152/769) 66, 128, 147, 149, 151, 301, 306, 319, 354, 354
Yusuf b. ‘Abd al-‘Aziz al-Dabbagh al-Andalus (d. 546/1151) 48
Yusuf b. Abi Yusuf 331
Yusuf b. Khalid 317, 384
Yusuf b. Khalil (d. 648/1250) 110
Yusuf b. Yahya al-Butayti (d. 231/846) 177-8, 194, 201
al-Zahrani, Bishr b. ‘Umar 144
Zakariyya b. Durayd al-Kindi 33
Zakariyya b. Isbaq 321
Zakariyya b. Yahya al-Sajj (d. 307/919) 117, 379
Zaki b. Birzali 108
al-Zamakhshari 249
Zaman, M Qasim 3, 9, 17, 158, 192, 198
Zami b. ‘Amr 234, 234
al-Zanjani, Abu l-Qasim Sa’id b. ‘Ali (d. 471/1078-9) 55, 82, 100, 106
al-Zanjani, Musqit b. Khalid 304, 311, 319
Zayd b. Arqam (d. 68/787-8) 254, 254, 265, 265, 273, 280, 345
Zayd b. Haritha 272, 246, 256
Zayd b. Khalid (d. 78/697) 279, 280
Zayd b. Kharija 276
Zayd b. Suhay 234, 234
Zayd b. Thabit (d. 49/663) 36, 36, 229, 231, 232, 246, 254, 257, 273, 274, 275, 278, 280, 281, 335, 348
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Zayd b. Yuhayi' 263
Zaynab bint al-Amir Sulaymân (d. after 210/825) 159, 161
Zaynab bint Khuzayma 257
Zaynab Sha'ri'ya 27
Zi'ra b. Hubaysh (d. 818/700-3) 64, 65
Zivad b. Minã 330
Zubayda (d. 216/831) 159, 161
al-Zubayr b. al-'Awwam (d. 36/656; 19, 34, 226, 228, 232, 246, 247, 251, 252, 254, 256, 260, 262, 263, 265, 269, 271, 274, 276, 279, 281)
Zu'far b. al-Hudhayl 331
Zubayr b. Mu'awiya (d. 173/789) 297, 300, 305, 307, 314, 315, 355, 365, 373, 381
al-Zurqanî, M b. 'Abd al-Baqî (d. 1121/1710) 71, 130
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'Abbasids 3, 65, 68, 81, 160-1, 167-70, 341, 346, 352-3, 358, 362, 363; patronage of 198
‘Abid 296
‘Abi 252
Abū 56, 77
‘Abd/mu‘rāf, definition 30
‘Aghlabids 161
‘Alī al-ḥaṣa 224, 240, 258, 263, 276
Ahwāz 104, 302, 379
Ajnadayn 266
Aleppo 28, 99, 110
Alexandria 59, 103
‘Alī b. Abu Ta’līb 295-6
Amorium 163
Anatolia 4-4, 355
Anbar 208, 307
al-Andalus 55, 56, 59, 60, 73, 76, 81, 82, 87, 92, 94, 95, 100, 102, 104, 108, 177, 204, 307
‘Anṣār 204, 225, 226, 230, 233, 235, 236, 248, 259, 265, 268, 273, 276; first converts 269-70
Anthropomorphism 65
Arab kalām 96
‘Aqaba 269
‘Aqrabā‘ 266
Asceticism, Ascetics 130, 141, 169, 191, 344, 345
Ash’arīs 97, 160, 201, 202, 371
‘Asqalān 362
Astray group (al-f‘ī‘a tu bāghiyā) 235
‘ārif, definition 42; in the Musnad and Sauhā 276-9
‘Awāsim 307, 312, 315, 316, 318, 324
Awa 270
Ayla 307, 318, 354
Ayyūbid 109
Badr 37, 224, 233, 235, 254, 266, 268, 271
Baghdādī Mu’tazila 18-9, 237-8, 266, 282-4; attitude to ‘Alī 250-5; attitude to the sahāba 245, 250-5
Baghūr 179, 185, 190
Ba‘bakk 42
Balkh 65, 170, 176, 179, 184, 192
Banū ‘Abd al-Shams 226
Banū Hāshim 225, 226, 250, 276
Banū Ka‘b 236
Banū Kilāb 272
Banū Qurayza 259, 260
Battle of the Bridge 266
Battle of the Camel 232, 242, 247, 254, 259, 295
Battle of Harra 352
Battle of Šifīn 234-6, 247, 269
by‘a, of Abū Bakr 226-7, 252, of ‘Alī 230-2, 252; of Mu‘āwiyah 236
Beirut 122
Berber 320
Bi‘r Ma‘ṣāna 269
Biographical dictionaries 100, 106
(see also sahāba)
Bukhāra 59, 73, 82, 88, 86, 106, 123
Byzantines 355, 363
Caesarea 362
Cairo 42, 110
Caliph 195-7
Caspian provinces 247
Central Asia 109
Companions of the Prophet—see sahāba
Constantinople 65
Cordoba 59, 61, 74, 81, 92, 109, 111, 175-8
Crusaders 106

dóll: definition 29
Damascus 49, 71, 74, 77, 81, 99, 106-7, 109, 115, 123, 150, 161, 170, 174, 176, 177, 182, 209, 383
Dār al-Kāmiliyā 109
Dhī l-Kaffāny 272
Dhīl Khalaṣa 259
Dumaż al-Jandal 272
Egypt 27, 57, 59–60, 65, 68, 78, 87, 94, 100, 105, 109, 123, 124, 161, 170, 175, 177, 182, 189, 191–2, 194, 209, 277–9, 304, 305, 307, 317, 318, 324, 334, 335, 379; three wonders of 162
Egyptian delegation to 'Lithmān 229–30
Elevated ismād – see al-ismād al-‘āli
fā'īl of Abū Bakr 261–4
fā'īl of ‘All 264–5
Fatimids 94, 100
futuṣ 267
fīgh 77, 340, 347–50, 356, 358, 367
Fuls 272
Gaza 109
Ghadīr Khumm 242, 254, 383
ghārāt 236
gharīb, definition 31
Hit 382
Hadīth criticism, technical terms 139–40, 144–51, 156
Hadīth disciplines ('uṣūm al-hadīth) 26–40, 100
Hadīth, source for Sunni Islam 11–3
ḥaft, significance of term 375–6
Hamadan 174
Hamadhān 59, 103
Hanafi (madhhab) 93, 174–5, 178–9, 200, 367
Hanbal (madhhab) 85, 107, 110, 200, 214
Harràn 107, 209, 378
hāṣan, definition 29
Hashwiyā 248
hawār 260
Hawāzin 272
Herat 59, 73, 80, 94, 96, 102, 106, 111, 190
Hijāz 42, 60, 94, 124, 143, 152, 191, 212, 232, 236, 267, 295, 303, 352, 366
Hims 65, 162, 174, 181, 189, 209, 234, 235, 279, 331, 332, 364
House of al-Arqām 268–9
Hudaybiyya 37
Hulwān 387
Humayma 161
Hunayn 266
Ibādi 145
Idols 272
Ifriqiyya 174, 307
Ikhshīdids 94
Ikhānīs 42, 109
Imām, for al-Dhahabī 179; for Ibn Mahdī 132; for al-Kulaynī 242–5; hadith scholar 116–20, 125, 131, 143–5, 149, 153, 150, 200, 342, 363; of the Sunna 132 (see also Shī‘a, Imāmī)
Imprecise transmission (al-rīwāya bi-l-ma‘nā) 152, 329, 335, 337, 341
Iran 61, 73, 83, 85, 86, 89, 91, 94, 97, 98, 177; western 103
Iraq 60, 65–7, 70, 73, 80, 84, 99, 107, 109–11, 124, 177, 179, 187, 189, 191–2, 233, 234, 278, 279, 295, 304, 305, 310, 331, 332, 372
Irbil 27
iyāj 321
Isfahan 59, 61, 72, 75, 89, 91, 92, 94, 97, 103, 110, 176, 378
ismād, esoteric nature 374; origins 347–8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page(s) or Section</th>
<th>Definition or Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ja'īfiyya</td>
<td>200, 320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jazīra (N. Iraq)</td>
<td>124, 279, 307, 311-13, 315, 316, 318, 325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>106, 332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jur'diyya</td>
<td>382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jur'ūs 173, 175-90; relations with hadith scholars 167, 548-50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jur'ūn 59, 89, 105, 123, 142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>juz'jan</td>
<td>173, 175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalām 57, 69, 83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalb 272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khānaqa 91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khārīj, Khawārīj 2, 193, 236, 320, 339</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khaybar 264, 266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khaṭra 270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khūtāšān 55, 59, 60, 69, 73, 76, 80, 84, 89, 91, 98, 99, 105, 109, 122, 124, 190, 212, 217, 307, 310, 313, 315-8, 322, 355, 372, 378, 379, 381</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khwārazm 104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kullābiyya 83, 201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lāṭiqiyya 200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law, Islamic 4-5 (see also madhāhib)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy in Arabic 270, 273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madā'īn 307, 316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>madhāhib (schools of law) 35, 67-8, 77, 88, 101, 130; founders of 158 maghāzi 365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maghrib 104, 108, 110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māhiyya</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majorca 104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālikī (madhhab) 92, 96, 112, 175, 178, 194; biographical dictionaries 104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamālik 372; biographical dictionaries 112; famous scholars 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma'nāt 272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maqlūb, definition 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maqī', definition 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maqū'ī, definition 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marāfī 294-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maw 21, 65, 76, 105, 106, 137, 154, 173, 182, 184, 185, 190, 278, 294, 378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masāhur, definition 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māṣṣīfa 69, 170, 209, 363, 364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master hadith-transmitters (Dhahabī) 51-54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master hadith-transmitter critics (Dhahabī) 49-50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturidis 202, 371</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>madhābih, definition 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>madqāfī, definition 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mīrāna 17, 71, 158, 160, 192-202; letters 192-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongol 27, 60, 109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosul 73, 87, 170, 182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mu'āllāl, definition 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mu'dal, definition 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mu'ārīq, definition 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mu'tadab, definition 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muṣawwida 238-40, 242, 245, 283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muṣītus 74, 173, 175-80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mughiriyā 383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muḥaddith 241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥaddith al-Islam 57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhājirūn 204, 226, 228, 248, 252-4, 259, 265, 268</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mu'jam 84, 89, 92, 103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muṣahhād 93, 96, 105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muṣafiqīn 239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muṣākar, definition 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mu'unga'i, definition 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muqaddama 239-41, 283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Saqifa 223, 224, 226, 252, 262
Sa'dah 96, 208, 212
Sasanids 228
Schools of law—see madhhab
Seljuqs 61, 101
Seville 109
Shāhīdāth 152; definition of 30
Shāfi'i (madhhab) 87, 89, 91, 93, 99, 105, 107, 177-8, 200
Sharakhan 27
Shāsh (Tashkent) 91
Shaykh al-Islam 55-61
Shaykh al-Sunnah 56
Shi'a, Shi'i 2, 86, 138, 145, 162, 197, 376
Shi'i century 86
Shi'a, Imam 18, 200, 222, 255, 282, 283, 383, 323; attitudes to the caliphs 237-45; early history 238-9; Pillars of Islam 243-4; Qur'anic commentary 242-5, 283, 295, 296, 304, 305, 307, 310-16, 318-4, 377, 378, 381, 385
Tāhirī 32, 40, 44, 45, 46, 53, 63, 97; famous books 38; presentations 113-114, 116-121; utility of 47
Tabaristan 89, 208
Tāhirī 64, 66-7, 113, 119, 121, 127, 151, 257, 293, 305, 315, 319, 322, 323, 329, 341, 343, 348-9, 369; Basrans 338-9; definition of 32; Kufans 337-8; Medinans 335-6; reports of 191
Tabuk 268
Western scholarship, hadith 1-9, 10-11, 25, 111; Ibn Hazm 96; nihāya 195-8
Yaman 66, 266, 377
Yathrib 227, 263, 270
Yawm al-dīr 229
Yemen 65, 72, 208, 213, 232, 236, 247, 339, 377
Zhāhirī, Zhāhirīs 83, 95, 104, 106, 112, 200
Zanj revolt 73, 81
Zaydi, Zaydiyya 18, 193, 237-8, 253, 266, 282-4, 323, 382; attitudes to sahāba 246-50; definition of sahābi 246; Caspian Imams 249; hadith books 248-50