



---

Ibn Hajar's Hady al-sārī: A Medieval Interpretation of the Structure of al-Bukhārī's al-Jāmi' al-ṣaḥīḥ: Introduction and Translation

Author(s): Mohammad Fadel

Source: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. 54, No. 3 (Jul., 1995), pp. 161-197

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](http://www.uchicago.edu)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/546299>

Accessed: 30/03/2011 21:06

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=ucpress>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*.

IBN ḤAJAR'S *HADY AL-SĀRĪ*: A MEDIEVAL INTERPRETATION OF  
THE STRUCTURE OF AL-BUKHĀRĪ'S *AL-JĀMI' AL-ṢAḤĪḤ*:  
INTRODUCTION AND TRANSLATION

---

MOHAMMAD FADEL, *The University of Chicago*

I. INTRODUCTION

IBN Ḥajar al-<sup>ᶜ</sup>Asqalānī (773–852/1372–1449)<sup>1</sup> was an Egyptian who lived in the late Mamlūk period. Although he wrote in many different fields, he earned his scholarly reputation for his works on Prophetic tradition. Perhaps his most famous work is his commentary upon *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, known as *Fatḥ al-bārī bi-sharḥ ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*. *Hady al-sārī* is his introduction to this commentary.<sup>2</sup>

*Hady al-sārī* is a lengthy work. Much of it consists of indexes: a glossary of rare words found in the *Ṣaḥīḥ*, vocalizations of ambiguous proper names, full identification of the transmitters al-Bukhārī cited in his work, etc. The first four chapters, however, present his view of the generic features of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* as a text. In these chapters, Ibn Ḥajar is concerned with revealing the structure of the work and explaining the complexities which arise in this work as a result of its structure.

Chapter 1 is a history of the *ḥadīth* movement from the death of the Prophet to the time of al-Bukhārī and an evaluation of al-Bukhārī's position in that movement. Chapter 2 includes Ibn Ḥajar's explanation of the purpose(s) of *al-Jāmi' al-ṣaḥīḥ* and al-Bukhārī's criteria for citing texts therein. In this chapter, he also attempts to explain al-Bukhārī's method in writing chapter titles (see below). Chapter 3 is a discussion of techniques al-Bukhārī used in citing his material: **taqṭī'**<sup>3</sup> (abbreviation), *ikhtīṣār* (summation), and *tikrār* (repetition). In this chapter, Ibn Ḥajar discusses the reasons which led al-Bukhārī to use these techniques and what the contexts are in which he uses them. The final chapter is Ibn Ḥajar's discussion of the "suspended," or the **mu'allaq**, reports found in *al-Jāmi' al-ṣaḥīḥ*.

These chapters represent a type of *ḥadīth* criticism whose main purpose is not to determine the historicity of the transmitted material. Although Ibn Ḥajar uses the research of the earlier historical critics, his purpose in these chapters is to reveal the work's internal coherence and structure by attempting to understand the conventions of the book. In addition, Ibn Ḥajar does not claim to have reached his conclusions about the work as a result of statements attributed to the book's author. Rather, the author claims to base his conclusions upon his reading of the text.

<sup>1</sup> Abū al-Faḍl Aḥmad b. <sup>ᶜ</sup>Alī b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. <sup>ᶜ</sup>Alī al-<sup>ᶜ</sup>Asqalānī. For a more detailed biography, see the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2d ed.

<sup>2</sup> Ibn Ḥajar al-<sup>ᶜ</sup>Asqalānī, *Hady al-sārī*, ed. Ibrāhīm <sup>ᶜ</sup>Aṭwa <sup>ᶜ</sup>Awaḍ (Cairo, 1963).

<sup>3</sup> Words that are transliterated in boldface are technical terms. I always transliterate the term when it is first used by the author. Thereafter I use the English translation unless I have been unable to find a one-word equivalent in English, in which case I will preserve the boldface transliteration throughout the translation.

Nevertheless, why should we be concerned with a work such as this? Perhaps the first reason to study this work is the position of its author, Ibn Ḥajar. While modern academic scholarship in both the Arab world and the Western world seems to ignore the intellectual life of the Mamlūk period,<sup>4</sup> this era produced works which were of considerable importance for Muslim intellectuals up to the modern age.<sup>5</sup> Ibn Ḥajar's commentary, *Fath al-bārī*, is one of those books. Later Muslim scholarly tradition was to know him simply as "al-ḥāfiẓ," the *ḥadīth* scholar, *par excellence*. Not only did his reading of al-Bukhārī come to occupy a privileged position within the tradition of Bukhārī criticism after his death, it was well on its way to canonization even during his lifetime. His biography reports that Muslim rulers from Morocco and Iran intervened with the Mamlūk sultān to obtain copies of the work as it was being written.<sup>6</sup> Thus, if *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* is recognized as a critical part of the Muslim literary canon, then influential readings of this canonical work likewise deserve scholarly attention.

Another equally important reason is its place in intellectual history. While Ibn Ḥajar and his works can and should be the object of intellectual history, he himself is also a historian of ideas. For example, Ibn Ḥajar's observations on the nature of al-Bukhārī's text provide an interesting perspective on the differences between it and another important *ḥadīth* work from roughly the same period, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. Ibn Ḥajar's representation of authors of *ḥadīth* works such as al-Bukhārī and Muslim shows them to be far from mere "collectors" of texts. Each of their works represents a different type of writing, with Muslim tending more to "pure" literary history and al-Bukhārī allowing interpretive concerns to dominate the structure of his work.

Ibn Ḥajar's interpretation of the different *ḥadīth* works can be profitably compared with that of Ignaz Goldziher, the founder of modern *ḥadīth* studies.<sup>7</sup> One of the main conclusions of Goldziher's research into the literary origins of *ḥadīth*, on the one hand, and its relationship to the development of Islamic law, *fiqh*, on the other, was the existence of two parties in the first centuries of Islam, the *ahl al-ra'y*, "the partisans of opinion," and *ahl al-ḥadīth*, "the partisans of the *ḥadīth*." According to Goldziher, much of early Islamic intellectual history is a result of the battles waged between these two forces.<sup>8</sup> This bitter conflict, in the opinion of Goldziher, led to forgery of *ḥadīth* material *en masse*. Goldziher's scholarly successors, moreover, have allowed the questions of literary history raised by him to dominate subsequent *ḥadīth* scholarship. Unfortunately, this has obscured other important questions regarding the early *ḥadīth* movement.<sup>9</sup>

Consequently, the early traditionists have come to be viewed by modern scholars as more or less passive collectors. The differences in their works are subsequently reduced to

<sup>4</sup> The typical stance toward this period by modern historians of thought is to dismiss it as a period of mere compilation and commentary. See, for example, Ignaz Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, 2 vols., trans. C. R. Barber and S. M. Stern (London, 1971), vol. 2, p. 245.

<sup>5</sup> The situation in the Arab world is slightly more complex, given the presence of "traditional" intellectuals who share a certain continuity with the tradition of learning which Ibn Ḥajar so ably represented. Thus, when I use the term "modern scholarship," I mean those scholars who are associated with the new institution of learning, the national university.

<sup>6</sup> *Fath al-bārī* was composed as a series of lectures which were delivered over the course of twenty-five years, 817–42/1414–38.

<sup>7</sup> Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, vol. 2, chap. 8, "The Ḥadīth Literature," pp. 189–251.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 77–85.

<sup>9</sup> For a summary of modern accounts of the beginnings of Islamic law and the *ḥadīth* literature, see Harald Motzki, *Die Anfänge der islamischen Jurisprudenz*, Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, vol. 50, no. 2 (Stuttgart, 1991), chap. 1, "Die Anfänge der islamischen Jurisprudenz in der Forschung des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts," pp. 7–49.

each author's critical (from the perspective of literary history) acumen. This characterization, however, only obscures the problem of authorship in these different works. Moreover, this position also obscures the manner in which the six books became canonized.<sup>10</sup> Instead, the canonization of these six books is understood *implicitly* as marking a type of canonization akin to the canonization of the gospels, in which, by analogy, other *ḥadīth* works come to be considered less true.

It is doubtful, however, whether this analogy is helpful, for one does not find Muslim *ḥadīth* critics assigning "truth" values to texts based solely on considerations of their textual sources. This can be seen clearly in instances where a text exists in different sources with different versions. When two versions of a single text exist, one in al-Bukhārī, and one in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Ibn Khuzayma, for example, one cannot say solely on the basis of the text's inclusion in al-Bukhārī that it is the authoritative version of the text. Indeed, it is doubtful that *ḥadīth* critics even thought in terms of an "authoritative" version of a text.<sup>11</sup>

Goldziher's research, however, was not confined to questions of the authenticity of the *ḥadīth* literature. In chapter 8 of his *Muslim Studies*, he reveals his knowledge of the structural complexities and the differences in the various *ḥadīth* collections. For example, he discusses the important differences between al-Bukhārī's collection and that of his younger contemporary, Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj. His vision of early Islamic intellectual history as a battle between *ahl al-raʿy* and *ahl al-ḥadīth*, however, results in a somewhat equivocal position toward the work of al-Bukhārī. Although Goldziher claims him as a clear representative of *ahl al-ḥadīth*, Goldziher's subsequent discussion of the book's structure casts into doubt the accuracy of his initial characterization.

The theoretically problematic nature of *al-Jāmiʿ al-ṣaḥīḥ* is most clearly revealed when Goldziher contrasts it with Mālik's *Muwattaʿa*.<sup>2</sup> Commenting on the presence of *fatwās* (legal opinions) in the latter, Goldziher says: "A transmitter of the *ḥadīth* school would have put forward not *fatwās*, but *ḥadīths* going back to the Prophet."<sup>12</sup> More importantly, however, he also notes that "Mālik b. Anas is not a *mere collector* of traditions but is first and foremost an interpreter of them from the point of view of praxis" (emphasis added).<sup>13</sup>

On the other hand, Goldziher describes the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of al-Bukhārī as a *muṣannaḥ*, a type of *ḥadīth* work which was organized by legal topic instead of by narrator, as had been the previous practice in the **musnad** collections. According to Goldziher, this genre of *ḥadīth* collection was introduced in the third century to prove the relevance of the *ḥadīth* to law. He says that the "structure of this book (*al-Jāmiʿ al-ṣaḥīḥ*) is that of a pure work of traditions (without addition of *raʿy* as in Mālik)."<sup>14</sup> Goldziher explains al-Bukhārī's chapter titles as his attempt to propagate the doctrine of the *ahl al-ḥadīth* by alerting readers to the point of the quoted texts.<sup>15</sup>

Immediately after making this statement, however, Goldziher begins to qualify it. On page 218, for example, he says, "By this example, I wished to show in how unmistakable

<sup>10</sup> They are: *al-Jāmiʿ al-ṣaḥīḥ* of al-Bukhārī (d. 256/869), the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Muslim (d. 261/875), the *Sunan* of Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī (d. 275/889), the *Sunan* of al-Tirmidhī (d. 279/892), the *Sunan* of al-Nasāʿī (d. 303/915), and the *Sunan* of Ibn Māja (d. 273/886). In this respect, it is important to remember that there were several other works, both in the *ṣaḥīḥ* and the *sunan* modes, written after the deaths of these six authors. Why were they not included in the canon?

<sup>11</sup> For an explanation of this *lack* of canonization of the **sunna**, see Bernard Weiss, *The Search for God's Law* (Salt Lake City, 1992), pp. 259–60.

<sup>12</sup> Goldziher, "Hadīth Literature," p. 198.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 199.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 216.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

a way al-Bukhārī tried to win over readers to a certain *partisan opinion* in the headings and introduction of the chapters in his collection” (emphasis added). On page 220, Goldziher remarks that “he (al-Bukhārī) always thinks first of the theoretical applications for which his material should, or should not, be used.”

Although the representation of al-Bukhārī began by emphasizing the differences between him and Mālik, differences which represented the conflict between the *ahl al-raʿy* and the *ahl al-ḥadīth*, Goldziher concludes his description of al-Bukhārī’s work in a manner almost identical to the comments cited earlier in his description of the *Muwaṭṭaʿ*.<sup>2</sup> This equivocation is only heightened when Goldziher contrasts Muslim with al-Bukhārī. The *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Muslim, we are told, is similar in design and purpose to al-Bukhārī’s *Ṣaḥīḥ*. In almost the next breath, however, he tells us that Muslim is not overly concerned with the practical application of the material which he cited!<sup>16</sup>

This, then, is another reason to study Ibn Ḥajar’s *Hady al-sārī*. In the first four chapters of this work, especially in chapters 2–4, Ibn Ḥajar devotes detailed attention to the generic features of *al-Jāmiʿ al-ṣaḥīḥ*. In the course of his exposition, he provides many answers to the questions Goldziher raised but only partially succeeded in answering.

Ibn Ḥajar, in writing his commentary on al-Bukhārī, was able to take advantage of the scholarship of previous centuries. According to the consensus of learned opinion, al-Bukhārī’s purpose in writing his book, while it included the goal of separating valid *ḥadīths* from those which were less reliable, was not limited to this. His purpose was also to cite these texts in a manner that would reveal their legal ramifications. Thus, Ibn Ḥajar quotes al-Nawawī (d. 676/1277) as saying: “The purpose of al-Bukhārī is not limited to *ḥadīths*. Rather, his goal is to derive from them certain meanings and to use them as evidence for certain topics.”<sup>17</sup> Al-Nawawī further explains that this is why one finds such great differences in the cited material within the different chapters of the book, some having many *ḥadīths*, others having only one and still others having none.

The great differences in the material cited in various chapters even led some critics to conclude that al-Bukhārī had not completed the book. Furthermore, in instances where the material cited did not seem appropriate for al-Bukhārī’s chapter title, this same group of critics maintained that one had to conclude that these texts had been inserted incorrectly by copyists.<sup>18</sup>

Ibn Ḥajar recognizes this as a possible explanation for some of the problematic sections of the book. He cautions, however, that this explanation is valid “only in a few places, as shall be made clear, by the will of God” [p. 19]. Instead of explaining the inconsistencies in al-Bukhārī’s material as a result of scribal incompetence, Ibn Ḥajar introduces a critical distinction in the types of texts which al-Bukhārī cited in his work:

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., pp. 226–29. Furthermore, according to Ibn Ḥajar, Bukhārī’s *Ṣaḥīḥ* contained *fatwās* of both Companions and Followers, and interrupted reports, just like the *Muwaṭṭaʿ*<sup>2</sup> of Mālik. Significantly, Muslim’s *Ṣaḥīḥ* is almost entirely composed of formally valid *ḥadīths*.

<sup>17</sup> *Hady al-sārī*, p. 19. Subsequent page references to the Arabic text of this work will appear throughout this paper in brackets.

<sup>18</sup> For example, Abū al-Walīd al-Bājī (d. 474/1081) reported that one of the copyists of *al-Jāmiʿ al-ṣaḥīḥ*, al-Mustamlī, said: “I copied the book of

al-Bukhārī from the original which was in the possession of Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Farabrī (d. 320/932). I saw that parts of it had been completed, while others had been left unfinished. Among them were titles in which he had yet to place anything, and among them were *ḥadīths* which he had yet to group into chapters with titles. Therefore, we put the two together.”

I have inserted death dates throughout the text of the translation using parentheses instead of the customary brackets.

primary and secondary. The former, which he refers to as the *aṣl*, are cited using the expression *ḥaddathanā*, some equivalent expression, or valid <sup>ᶜ</sup>an<sup>ᶜ</sup>ana. Texts cited in this manner are formally valid according to al-Bukhārī's stipulations. Their relationship to the chapter title under which they are cited can be ambiguous, however.

On the other hand, al-Bukhārī wished to include texts which did not meet his formal stipulations for validity, although he deemed them valid for argumentation. In these cases, he cited these texts in a suspended form or would even use the wording of a formally weak text in the title of the chapter if its meaning supported al-Bukhārī's argument. Ibn Ḥajar refers to these formally deficient texts, as *tabaᶜ*, secondary [p. 20]. According to Ibn Ḥajar, al-Bukhārī intended these texts to serve as a type of commentary on the primary texts in the case of ambiguity in the primary texts:

In this context (ambiguity in the *aṣl*) the title serves to interpret the *ḥadīth*, taking the place of the jurist's statement, for example, "The meaning of this general *ḥadīth* is particular," or "the meaning of this specific *ḥadīth* is general." Thus, the title creates the impression of analogy because of the existence of the unifying *ratio legis*. . . . That which we have mentioned about the general and the particular is also true for the unqualified and the qualified term. The same is also the case for the explanation of the problematic, clarification of the ambiguous, interpretation of the apparent, and detailing the succinct. This is where most of the problematic instances of titles of this book lie. This is the reason behind the famous saying of the nobles, "Al-Bukhārī's jurisprudence (*fiqh*) is in his titles."

Al-Bukhārī usually resorts to this when he cannot find a *ḥadīth* which meets his criteria of validity and whose apparent meaning is [the same as] what he intends to establish in the chapter [p. 25].

The relationship of formally deficient material to the formally valid material was not the only source of structural complexity, however, according to Ibn Ḥajar. Another important source of confusion was al-Bukhārī's abbreviation and repetition of *ḥadīth* texts. He would abbreviate a *ḥadīth* when it contained several ideas which could be used as evidence for different topics. Because he did not wish to repeat the text unless it provided additional information, he would cite it completely only once. In all subsequent instances, he would cite only that part of the text which was relevant to the new chapter.

On the other hand, he would often repeat the same text, *matn*, in its entirety if he could cite it with a different *isnād* or if there were differences in the text's wording. Another reason leading to the repetition of *ḥadīth* texts is that al-Bukhārī wished to establish that a meeting had taken place between two transmitters who had appeared in an earlier text cited with <sup>ᶜ</sup>an<sup>ᶜ</sup>ana [p. 26].<sup>19</sup>

From this discussion, we see that al-Bukhārī was greatly concerned with the economy of his presentation. The cost of this, however, was that technical *ḥadīth* information regarding different *isnāds* and transmitters is scattered throughout the book. In this regard, this technical *ḥadīth* information is made *secondary* to considerations of the text's legal implications.

This puts us in a better position to understand the position of al-Bukhārī's *al-Jāmiᶜ al-ṣaḥīḥ* in relation to the *Muwattaʿa*<sup>2</sup>, on the one hand, and to *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* on the other. Ibn Ḥajar reports that some *ḥadīth* critics objected to the unqualified description of *al-Jāmiᶜ al-ṣaḥīḥ* as superior to the book of Mālik, "because they both share the criteria of validity

<sup>19</sup> Al-Bukhārī would not accept transmissions of the <sup>ᶜ</sup>an<sup>ᶜ</sup>ana variety until he had established that the two

transmitters had met and were not just contemporaries.

and an exaggerated critical sense. Furthermore, the fact that there are more *ḥadīths* in al-Bukhārī does not require that it has the virtue of being more valid” [p. 21].

Ibn Ḥajar replies noting that the two authors’ respective concepts of validity is substantively different:

The answer to that [objection] lies in the two authors’ respective understanding of validity. Mālik does not consider interruption in the **isnād** to be a defect in the *ḥadīth*. For this reason he cites **mursals**, **munqati**<sup>c</sup>s, and communications (*balāghāt*) as part of the main object of the book, whereas al-Bukhārī considers interruption a defect in the **isnād**. Thus, he does not cite these *ḥadīths* except as something *outside the main object of his book*, e.g., **ta**<sup>c</sup>**liqs** and titles of chapters (emphasis added) [p. 21].

Ibn Ḥajar seems to imply that the only difference in the two works is a formal one: al-Bukhārī is much more rigorous than Mālik in separating primary texts from secondary texts. It seems important to add, however, that Mālik was not concerned with providing technical information about **isnāds** and transmitters in the manner of al-Bukhārī. It seems that what gives the latter’s book its complexity is its desire to provide legal information at the same time that it is providing information of interest to *ḥadīth* scholars. The book’s organization is a result of the tension between these two goals.

That this is so is confirmed by Ibn Ḥajar’s discussion of the scholarly community’s reception of the books of al-Bukhārī and Muslim. While the overwhelming majority of scholars, according to Ibn Ḥajar, agree that al-Bukhārī’s material is more valid than that of Muslim, some preferred Muslim. Ibn Ḥajar mentions two of those critics who preferred Muslim, Abū <sup>c</sup>Alī al-Ḥāfiẓ al-Naysābūrī (d. 349/960) and “one of the Maghribī scholars,” whom Ibn Ḥajar later identifies, significantly, as Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1064).

Later scholars attributed to Abu <sup>c</sup>Alī the statement, “there is not a book under Heaven more valid than the book of Muslim.” Ibn Ḥajar says that Abu <sup>c</sup>Alī does not mean to say that Muslim’s criteria of validity are more exacting than al-Bukhārī’s nor that his transmitters were more competent than al-Bukhārī’s; rather, Abū <sup>c</sup>Alī was referring to the different ways in which the two books were organized, a difference that made Muslim’s book more useful for the traditionist:

[H]e (Abū <sup>c</sup>Alī) seems to have given Muslim precedence over al-Bukhārī for a reason other than that which we have been discussing, i.e., the relevant criteria of the transmitters necessary for establishing a valid transmission. Rather, he gave precedence to Muslim because Muslim composed his book in his town with his texts in front of him during the lifetime of many of his teachers. Thus, he was able to be very careful in preserving the wording of his *ḥadīths* and was able to inspect them closely during composition. *Furthermore, because he did not attempt to do that which al-Bukhārī did, i.e., derive legal rulings around which chapters could be organized, something which necessitated taqī*<sup>c</sup> *of his ḥadīths according to their topics, Muslim was able to gather all the paths of the ḥadīth in one place, and could limit himself to ḥadīths and omit mawqūfs* (emphasis added) [p. 23].

This point is strengthened by Ibn Ḥajar’s identification of the “Maghribī *shaykh*” as Ibn Ḥazm. As is well known, Ibn Ḥazm was a Zāhirite who rejected analogy. If we accept what Ibn Ḥajar says about al-Bukhārī’s chapter titles, Ibn Ḥazm’s preference of Muslim makes sense: the *ḥadīths* which al-Bukhārī had cited in his book, even those that Ibn Ḥajar refers to as primary texts, despite the high critical standards of al-Bukhārī, were too enmeshed in al-Bukhārī’s interpretations to be of much use for a Zāhirite such as Ibn

Ḥazm. For someone who was interested in radical legal change, on the other hand, Muslim's book allowed greater interpretive freedom, since it was not in the service (or to a significantly lesser extent) of any legal system.<sup>20</sup>

Ibn Ḥajar makes a very strong case in *Hady al-sārī* for the uniqueness of *al-Jāmi' al-ṣaḥīḥ*. At the same time, his analysis suggests that the text of al-Bukhārī is operating on many different levels. The function of his introduction, then, is to alert the reader to the many sides of this work so that he can get the most out of the text.

This brings us back to our time and our concerns. If Ibn Ḥajar's account of the structure of al-Bukhārī's work can be accepted as plausible, it requires that we begin to take seriously the notion that the *form* of a report can dramatically affect the *content* of the report. In other words, before we can understand the significance of a text's citation in a work such as *al-Jāmi' al-ṣaḥīḥ*, we must understand the function of that citation within the context of the work.

*Hady al-sārī* provides some clues to solving the problematic relationship of form and content in al-Bukhārī's work. While Ibn Ḥajar reached many conclusions regarding the conventions of *al-Jāmi' al-ṣaḥīḥ*, modern scholars should test these conclusions against the evidence provided by the work itself. This method will eventually result in a greater understanding of the generic structure of *al-Jāmi' al-ṣaḥīḥ*. By doing this, we should be able to gain a deeper understanding of early Islamic intellectual history and of the role played by the *ḥadīth* movement within it.<sup>21</sup>

## II. *HADY AL-SĀRĪ*

### THE INTRODUCTION

In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate [p. 15].

The *shaykh*, the Imām, the scholar, the pious doctor, the proof of Islām, the destination of knowledge seekers, the pillar of traditionists, the ornament of gatherings, the unique one of his age, alone in his epoch, revivifier of the noble *sunna*, suppressor of innovators and the misguided, the bright comet, Abū al-Faḍl Aḥmad b. ʿAlī b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-ʿAsqalānī, known as Ibn Ḥajar, may God reward him with Paradise, by His favor and generosity, said:

Praise belongs to God who has eased the people of Islām's breasts to the *sunna*. Thus, they were led by it and in its study found comfort. He destroyed the ones iniquitous in their innovations after they had become excessive in disputing it and their innovations had exceeded all bounds. I witness that there is no god except God, alone, with no partner, the knower of the heart's submission and of its refusal [to submit], the One aware of its hidden secrets, be they united or separate.

I also bear witness that Muḥammad is His servant and His messenger, the one, by whose right falsehood became low after it had been high. Through his mission, the lights

<sup>20</sup> Ibn Ḥajar also points out that many Maghribi jurists who had written on *ḥadīths* having legal implications use Muslim and not al-Bukhārī due to the texts' "existence in Muslim in their entirety whereas al-Bukhārī had abbreviated them" [p. 24].

<sup>21</sup> Itikhar Zaman pointed out examples of the

results of this method when applied to *Al-Jāmi' al-ṣaḥīḥ* in his lecture entitled "Early Islamic Intellectual History: Orientalist Hadith Scholarship and the Significance of Deobāndī Hadith Criticism," presented at the annual meeting of the Middle East Studies Association (MESA), 1991, Washington, D.C.

of guidance reappeared and their proof became manifest, after they had been extinguished. May God bless him and grant him peace as long as the Heavens and the Earth endure, the former in its loftiness, and the latter in its vastness; and, may He bless his family and Companions, those who crushed the armies of the apostates, and who conquered their fortresses. They abandoned their homes and desire for the love of the one calling them to God, never to return to them after bidding them farewell. They were zealous in following his words, deeds, and manners, thereby preserving the noble *sunan* (norms) from disappearance.

To begin (*ammā baʿd*): the study of the religious sciences, which are received from the best of mankind, is the noblest thing which has been singled out for special attention, and the most appropriate thing in which precious days should be spent. No rational man would doubt that the axis of these sciences is the Book of God [which is] followed and the *sunna* of His select Prophet. The remaining sciences are either tools to understand them, and they are the lost things which are sought, or they are unrelated to them, and they are the harm to be overcome.

I have seen that the Imām Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Bukhārī in his *al-Jāmiʿ al-ṣaḥīḥ*, was enlightened from their bright light, in establishing and in deriving [knowledge], and that he drank from their thirst-quenching wells eagerly. Because of his good intention, he was blessed with good fortune in that which he compiled: both friend and foe submitted to it, and both consenting and contestant accepted his conclusions about the validity [of *ḥadīths*] willingly.

I asked God’s guidance about [my desire] to add to it explanatory notes about its benefits which would make clear its purposes and reveal its meanings by explaining its subtle and difficult points.<sup>22</sup> And, I also asked that I should precede this with an introduction which explains its structure and draws attention to its unique features. The introduction will be comprehensive but brief and easily grasped. It will open the book’s closed doors, make its difficult paths easy, and ease the breasts.

The introduction will be limited to ten chapters, God willing:

1. An explanation of the reason which led the author to compose this book.
2. An explanation of the book’s subject, revealing his purpose in [writing] the book. There will also be an investigation of the author’s criteria for including *ḥadīths*, and it will be established that it is among [p. 16] the most valid compilations of Prophetic *ḥadīths*. Appended to this will be a discussion of his marvelous and unique chapter titles in whose precision he was unique among his peers. Through his careful attention to them, he became more famous than his colleagues.
3. An explanation of his purpose in summarizing *ḥadīths* and practicing *taqṭīʿ*, as well as the benefit derived from the repetition of certain *ḥadīths*.
4. An explanation of his reason for including *taʿliq*s and *āthār mawqūfa*, despite the fact that this is contrary to the main object of the book.<sup>23</sup> I (Ibn Ḥajar) appended to this section a summary list of those *taʿliq*s which are attributed to the Prophet and pointed out which narrators attributed them to the Prophet.
5. A brief explanation of the rare words present in the book’s texts, arranged in the order of the letters of the dictionary, so that its use would be convenient and easy.

<sup>22</sup> “By explaining . . .” is a paraphrase for the Arabic expression “*taqyīd awābidihi wa iqtināṣ shawāridihi*,” which literally means “by chaining its wild beasts and

hunting down its runaways.”

<sup>23</sup> My translation ends at the point where this appendix begins.

6. Indication of the correct spelling and vocalization<sup>24</sup> (*ḍabt*) of its problematic names, agnomen (*kunā*), and genealogies. This is divided into two categories. The first includes **al-mu<sup>3</sup>talifa** and **al-mukhtalifa** which can be organized around a rule facilitating its review and its repeated usage; those names which do not fall under this category will be mentioned in the text. The second includes the problematic names which appear [in the text] only once (*al-mufradāt*).

7. Identifying his teachers whose descent Bukhārī neglected to mention if the names are common, like Muḥammad, but not for rare names like Musaddad. There will also be a brief discussion of all the unknown and ambiguous names which are in the book.

8. Discussion of the book's *ḥadīth*s which Abū al-Hasan al-Dāraqutnī (d. 385/995) and other *ḥadīth* critics criticized and the answer to their objections one *ḥadīth* at a time. This will clarify that there is nothing in the book which contradicts his criteria of inclusion as we have established them.

9. A review of all his narrators who have been subjects of criticism, arranged according to the dictionary, and a reply to the charges, fairly and impartially, as well as excusing the author for having included some against whom there are strong objections. This was either because the author rejected the charges leveled against the narrator, or because the author narrated a *ḥadīth* of the suspect transmitter which was in agreement with the *ḥadīth* of a more reliable transmitter, or for another reason.

10. An index of his book, chapter by chapter, and an enumeration of the *ḥadīth*s in each chapter. The number enumerated here will include the repeated *ḥadīth*s. I arranged it following the method of the Shaykh al-Islām, Abū Zakariyyā al-Nawawī (d. 676/1277), may God be pleased with him, in order to gain blessings through him. Then, I added to it an explanation of the appropriateness [of the book's order], which I acquired from Shaykh al-Islām Abū Hafs al-Bulqaynī (d. 805/1403), may God be pleased with him. Then, I followed it with the names of the Companions which appear in the book, arranged in alphabetical order, and an enumeration of how many *ḥadīth*s each one has in the book. Here, the precise number of the book's *ḥadīth*s without repetition will be found.

I concluded the introduction with a biography revealing his unique attributes and virtues, inclusive of his accomplishments and deeds, so that mention of him adorns the book's conclusion.<sup>25</sup>

When these chapters are completed and these principles established, I shall begin to explain the book, seeking the aid of *al-Fattāḥ* and *al-Wahhāb*.<sup>26</sup> First, I shall narrate the chapter and its *ḥadīth*, God willing, and, if the relationship between the two is hidden, I shall explain it. Second, I shall reveal the information, both regarding the **isnād** and the text, which can be validly gained from the *ḥadīth*. This includes supplements, additions, clarification of the unclear, pointing out a **mudallis**' declaration that he received the text directly and a succeeding transmission from one who heard [the text] from a senile teacher. I will acquire this [information] from the oldest **masānid** (sing. **musnad**), **jawāmi<sup>c</sup>** (sing. **jāmi<sup>c</sup>**), and **mustakhrajāt** (sing. **mustakhraj**), as well as the **ajzā<sup>3</sup>** (sing. **juz<sup>2</sup>**)

<sup>24</sup> Hereafter, I will translate *ḍabt* as "vocalization."

<sup>25</sup> "Adorns . . ." is a paraphrase for the Arabic "wā-siṭata 'iqdi nizāmihā wa surrata miski khitāmihā."

<sup>26</sup> *Al-Fattāḥ* and *al-Wahhāb* are two of the divine names of God in Muslim tradition, the former meaning "the one who disposes of affairs decisively and fairly,"

while the latter means "the one who gives (often)." For the meaning of *al-Fattāḥ*, see al-Zamakhsharī, *al-Kashshāf*, 4 vols. (Beirut, n.d.), vol. 3, p. 259, and al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi<sup>c</sup> al-bayān fi ta'wil āy al-qur<sup>2</sup>ān*, 12 vols. (Cairo, 1987), pt. 22, p. 65 (Qur<sup>c</sup>ān 34:26).

and the *fawā'id* (sing. *fā'ida*), on the condition that all I cite must meet either the conditions of validity or goodness (*ḥasan*).

Third, [p. 17] I shall join (*asilu*) his interrupted **mu<sup>ḥ</sup>allaq** and **mawqūf** reports [cited in the book]. In discussion of this matter, the extra benefits are united and the scattered pearls are arranged.

Fourth, I will vocalize [using words] the problematic aspects of all the matters mentioned previously, be they [proper] names or epithets, along with an explanation of the meanings of words, pointing out subtle points of rhetoric and things similar to this.

Fifth, I shall cite those legal opinions of the Imāms which are derived from the report, as well as the legal judgments, ascetic admonitions, and normative customs [likewise derived from the report]. In this regard I will limit myself to the preponderant opinions, stick to the clear, and stay away from the difficult [opinions]. However, I shall be concerned with harmonizing those reports which appear to be in conflict, by explicitly differentiating the abrogating text (*al-nāsikh*) from the abrogated text (*al-mansūkh*), the general term (*al-āmm*) from the specific (*al-khāṣṣ*), and the unqualified term (*al-muṭlaq*) from the qualified (*al-muqayyad*). I will also identify the ambiguous text (*al-mujmal*) and its clarifier (*al-mubayyin*), and the apparent (*al-zāhir*), and its interpreter (*al-mu<sup>ḥ</sup>awwil*).

In addition to this, I shall also mention rules of juristic method, bits of linguistic information, and some selected differences among the legal schools, according to that which I know of the Imāms' opinions, and that which my comprehension was able to grasp. I shall follow this plan, God willing, in every chapter. If the same text should be repeated in another, different chapter, I will also mention the reason which led him to repeat it, while omitting the rest of the information. If its wording or meaning has changed, however, I will point out the specific difference resulting from that change. If it is then repeated a third time in another chapter, I will limit myself to discussing its relevance [to that chapter], explaining that which had been omitted in previous discussions, and pointing out the previous places in the work where the text had been discussed at length. But, if the first citation is distant from the third citation, I will change the order by limiting the first discussion to its relationship, and in the second citation I will discuss the various points mentioned previously, being careful to be brief and to avoid excessive comments.

It is God that I ask to favor me with His aid in completing it, by His generosity and favor, and that He guide me to that of the truth in which there has been difference [of opinion], by His permission, and that He be generous to me because of my study of the reports of His Prophet by rewarding me in the next abode, and that He pour forth unto me and those who review it, and those who read it, and those who copy it, plentiful bounties, one after the other. Indeed, He is the hearer, the One who answers.

#### CHAPTER 1

#### *An Explanation of the Reason Which Led Abū <sup>Ḥ</sup>Abd Allāh al-Bukhārī to Compose His al-Jāmi<sup>ḥ</sup> al-ṣaḥīḥ and an Explanation of His Good Intention in Doing This*

Know, may God teach you and me, that the reports of the Prophet (S),<sup>27</sup> in the age of his Companions and the oldest Followers, had neither been recorded in comprehensive

<sup>27</sup> (S) represents the standard Muslim invocation "Him and grant Him peace." placed after the Prophet's name: "May God bless

collections nor organized topically for two reasons. The first is that initially they were forbidden to do this, as has been established in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, for fear that some of it would be confused with the Great Qurʾān. The second is that their memories were vast and their intellects quick. Moreover, the majority of them were not able to write.

Then, at the end of the age of the Followers, it happened that the reports were compiled and arranged topically. This was a result of the scholars' having scattered throughout the cities and the increase of the innovations of the Khawārij, the Rawāfiḍ, and the rejecters of destiny.

The first ones to do this were al-Rabī<sup>c</sup> b. Ṣabīḥ (d. 160/777), Sa<sup>c</sup>id b. Abī<sup>c</sup> Arūba (d. 156/773), among others. They would compile individual works on each topic. This practice continued until the beginning of the third generation, when they began to make compilations of legal rules. Thus, Imām Mālik (d. 179/795) arranged the *Muwattaʿ*<sup>2</sup>, in which he sought out the strongest *ḥadīths* of the Hijāzīs. Also, he added to it the statements of the Companions and the legal opinions of the Followers, and those who came after them.

In Makka, there was Abū Muḥammad<sup>c</sup> Abd al-Malik b. Abd al-ʿAzīz b. Jurayj (d. 150/767), in Syria Abū<sup>c</sup> Amr Abd al-Raḥmān b. Amr al-Awzāʿī (d. 157/774), in Kūfa Abū<sup>c</sup> Abd Allāh Sufyān b. Sa<sup>c</sup>id al-Thawrī (161/778), and in Baṣra Abū Salama [p. 18] Ḥammād b. Salama b. Dīnār (d. 167/784). Then, many people from their time followed them in this practice, until one of the Imāms thought to make a separate work limited to the *ḥadīths* of the Prophet (S) This occurred at the very beginning of the third century. Thus, Ubayd Allāh b. Mūsā al-ʿAbsī al-Kūfī (d. 179/795) arranged a **musnad**, as did Musaddad b. Musarhad al-Baṣrī (d. 228/843), Asad b. Mūsā al-Umawī (d. 212/843), and Nu<sup>c</sup>aym b. Hammād al-Khuzāʿī (d. 228/843), who settled in Egypt. Then after that, the Imāms followed their path, until it was rare to find an Imām among the **ḥuffāz** (sing. **ḥāfiẓ**) who did not organize his *ḥadīths* as a **musnad**, such as the Imām Ahmad b. Hanbal (d. 241/855), Ishāq b. Rāhawayhi (d. 238/853), Uthmān b. Abī Shayba (d. 239/853), and other noble individuals. Some of them organized their material according to both topic and **musnad**, such as Abū Bakr b. Abī Shayba (d. 235/849).

When al-Bukhārī, may God be pleased with him, saw these collections and narrated them, and inhaled their scent and saw their face, he found them to be, in respect to their contents, inclusive of what would be considered valid and good, although many of them also included that which would be considered weak: the lean cannot be described as fleshy.

This aroused in him the desire to gather the valid *ḥadīths* in whose validity no faithful person could hold a doubt into one book. Moreover, what he had heard from his teacher, the Commander of the Faithful in both *ḥadīth* and law, Ishāq b. Ibrāhīm al-Ḥanẓalī, known as Ibn Rāhawayhi, increased his determination. This is according to what Abū al-ʿAbbās Ahmad b. ʿUmar al-Lu<sup>2</sup>lu<sup>2</sup>ī told us on the authority of al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū al-Ḥajjāj al-Mizzī. Yūsuf b. Ya<sup>c</sup>qūb informed us. Abū al-Yumn al-Kindī (d. 613/1216) informed us. Abū Maṣṣūr al-Qazzāz informed us. Al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb (d. 463/1072) informed us. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Ya<sup>c</sup>qūb informed me. Muḥammad b. Nu<sup>c</sup>aym informed us. I heard Khalaf b. Muḥammad al-Bukhārī (d. 361/971) in Bukhārā say: “I heard Ibrāhīm b. Ma<sup>c</sup>qil al-Nasafī (d. 295/908) say: ʿAbū<sup>c</sup> Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl al-Bukhārī said:

We were with Ishāq b. Rāhawayhi and he said, “If (only) you (pl.) would gather a brief book of the valid **sunna** of the Messenger (S) of God?” That [statement] fell into my heart, so I began to gather *al-Jāmiʿ al-ṣaḥīḥ*.

We were told, by means of the established **isnād**, on the authority of Muḥammad b. Sulaymān b. Fāris (d. 312/924), that he said, “I heard al-Bukhārī say:

I dreamt that I saw the Prophet (S) and it was as though I was standing directly in front of him. In my hand was a fan, which I used to protect him. So I asked one of those who interpret dreams [about it], so he said to me: “You protect him from lies,” and that was what led me to produce *al-Jāmiʿ al-ṣaḥīḥ*.

Al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū Dharr al-Harawī (d. 434, 435/1042, 1043) said: I heard Abū al-Haytham Muḥammad b. Makkī al-Kushmihānī (d. 389/998) say: I heard Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Farabrī (d. 320/932) say: Bukhārī said: I never included a *ḥadīth* in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* without first bathing and praying two *rakʿas*.

Abū ʿAlī al-Ghassānī said: it was reported from him that he said, “I composed *al-Jāmiʿ al-ṣaḥīḥ* from 600,000 *ḥadīths*.”

Al-Ismāʿīlī (d. 290/908) narrated from him that he said, “I included only the valid in this book, but the valid *ḥadīths* which I excluded are greater.” Al-Ismāʿīlī said:

That is because if he had included every valid *ḥadīth* in his possession, he would have included the *ḥadīths* of a [large] group of Companions in every chapter. Subsequently, he would have mentioned the paths of every one of them, since they were valid. Thus the book would have been very long indeed.

Aḥmad b. ʿAdī said: I heard al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥusayn al-Bazzāz say: I heard Ibrāhīm b. Maʿqil al-Nasafī say [Bukhārī said]: “I included only the valid in my book, *al-Jāmiʿ al-ṣaḥīḥ*, and I left out many valid *ḥadīths* so it would not be long.”<sup>28</sup>

Al-Farabrī also said: I heard Muḥammad b. Abī Ḥātim al-Bukhārī al-Warrāq say, “I saw Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl al-Bukhārī in a dream walking behind the Prophet (S) who was also walking. Whenever the Prophet (S) picked up his foot, al-Bukhārī would place his foot in that place.”

Al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū Aḥmad b. ʿAdī said: I heard al-Farabrī say: I heard Najm b. Fuḍayl, and he was possessed of understanding, say that he had a similar dream.

[p. 19] Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad<sup>29</sup> b. ʿAmr al-ʿUqaylī (d. 322/934) said:

When al-Bukhārī composed the *Ṣaḥīḥ*, he read it to Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Yaḥyā b. Maʿīn, ʿAlī b. al-Madīnī, and others. They found it good and testified to its validity except [in the case of] four *ḥadīths*.

Al-ʿUqaylī said: the opinion in this matter is al-Bukhārī’s, and the four [in question] are valid.

## CHAPTER 2

### *Explanation of its Object<sup>30</sup> and Revealing His Purpose in It*

It has been established that in arranging the book, he committed himself to criteria of validity, and that he includes therein only valid *ḥadīths*. That is the basis of its object.

<sup>28</sup> This is as it appears in the printed edition. Perhaps it should read after Ibrāhīm b. Maʿqil al-Nasafī, “I heard Abū ʿAbd Allāh say, . . . the quote.”

<sup>29</sup> The text reads Maḥmūd, which is a mistake.

<sup>30</sup> The text reads *mawḍiʿ*, which means “place.” This instead should be read as *mawḍūʿ*.

That this is his primary purpose is known from his name for the book, *al-Jāmi<sup>c</sup> al-ṣaḥīḥ al-musnad min ḥadīth rasūl allāh, ṣallā allāhu <sup>c</sup>alayhi wa sallama, wa sunanihi wa ayyāmihi* (The valid, documented *ḥadīths* of the Messenger of God (S), his rules, and his battles). This is also known explicitly from those reports which we have transmitted from him through the Imāms [about the book].

Subsequently, he decided to include within it legal benefits and observations.<sup>31</sup> Thus, by using his understanding, he derived from the texts many meanings and scattered them throughout the chapters of his book according to criteria of appropriateness (*munāsaba*). Furthermore, he also concerned himself with the legal verses of the Qur<sup>ʿ</sup>ān and derived from them unprecedented meanings. And he used various methods to refer to their meanings.

The *shaykh* Muḥyī al-Dīn [al-Nawawī], may God make him beneficial, said: the purpose of al-Bukhārī is not only limited to *ḥadīths*. Rather, his goal is to derive from them [certain meanings] and to use them as evidence in certain topics. It is for this reason that he omitted from many chapters the **isnād** of the *ḥadīth* and instead was content to say, “So-and-so from the Prophet (S),” or the equivalent. Sometimes he mentions the text without the **isnād**, and other times he might use it as a **mu<sup>c</sup>allaq**.

He did this because he intended to use it to argue the point which he is explaining. He makes reference to the *ḥadīth* on account of its being known. Often it had been previously mentioned in its entirety, many times only recently. Often many of his book's chapters have several *ḥadīths*, while other chapters have no *ḥadīths*. Some do not contain a verse from the Book of God, and some contain nothing at all.

Some have claimed that he did this intentionally and that his goal was to show that there were no valid *ḥadīths*, according to his requirements, which supported the idea that he was explaining. It was this that led some of those who copied his book to combine chapters which contained no *ḥadīths* with *ḥadīths* which had not been included in any chapter. Thus, comprehending it (the author's purpose) became difficult for the one studying it. But the Imām Abū al-Walīd al-Bājī al-Mālikī (d. 474/1081) explained the cause of that [ambiguity] in the introduction to his book *Fī asmā<sup>ʿ</sup> rijāl al-Bukhārī* [On the names of Bukhārī's transmitters]. He said: Al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū Dharr <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Rahīm b. Aḥmad al-Harawī informed me. He said: Al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm b. Aḥmad al-Mustamlī (d. 376/986) told us. He said:

I copied the book of al-Bukhārī from the original which was in the possession of Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Farabrī. I saw that parts of it had been completed, while others had been left unfinished. Among them were titles in which he had yet to place anything, and among them were *ḥadīths* which he had yet to group into chapters with titles. Therefore, we put the two together.

Abū al-Walīd al-Bājī said: the validity of this statement is strengthened because Abū Ishāq al-Mustamlī's transmission, Abū Muḥammad al-Sarakhī's transmission, Abū al-Haytham al-Kushmihānī's transmission, and Abū Zayd al-Marwazī's transmission differ in the order of their arrangement, although all of them copied it from the same manuscript. This resulted from what each one took to be the proper position in the work of the glosses or the separate notes added to it. This is also strengthened by the fact that you find two or more titles, sequentially, without any intervening *ḥadīths*. Al-Bājī said:

<sup>31</sup> This could be read as *ḥukmiyya* (legal), as I have done, or perhaps, *ḥikamiyya*, which means “wise.”

I brought this matter up in this context because of the concern which the people of my city have shown in seeking the connection joining the title of the chapter and the *ḥadīth*s which follow it. Their excessive concern with this problem has led to arbitrary interpretations which are unjustifiable.

I said: in situations in which it is difficult to understand the relationship between the title and the *ḥadīth*, this is a good rule to apply. But this occurs in only very few places, as shall be made clear, by the will of God.

It appears to me, however, that al-Bukhārī, despite this, used different methods to title his chapters. [p. 20] Thus, if he found a *ḥadīth* which was appropriate to the chapter, even if only in a hidden manner, and it was valid according to his criteria, he cited it using the conventions of his book, which are “He told us [*ḥaddathanā*],” an equivalent expression, or <sup>ʿ</sup>an<sup>ʿ</sup>ana meeting his criteria. However, if he could not find a *ḥadīth* which satisfies his criteria, despite its suitability for argumentation, he included it in the book but used an expression which was different from those expressions he used in citing *ḥadīth*s which met his criteria. It is for this reason that he used *taʿliq*s, as will be explained in the chapter concerning the status of the *taʿliq*. However, if he could not find for the chapter a *ḥadīth* valid under his or others’ criteria, but there was a *ḥadīth* which is beneficial (*yustaʿnas bihi*) and because some people give such texts precedence over analogy, he used the wording of that *ḥadīth* or its meaning as the title of the chapter. In such cases, he would then cite a verse from the Book of God testifying to the validity of its meaning or a *ḥadīth* supporting the general import of that [weak] report. Thus, the *ḥadīth*s in the book are of three types, and this will be explained in detail, God willing.

Let us now begin to ascertain the criteria of validity used in the book and to establish that his book is the most valid book of Prophetic *ḥadīth*. Al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū al-Faḍl b. Ṭāhir (d. 507, 508/1113, 1114) said: in that which I read to the reliable Abū al-Faraj b. Ḥammād was that Yūnus b. Ibrāhīm b. ʿAbd al-Qawīyy informed him on the authority of Abū al-Ḥasan b. al-Muqayyar, on the authority of Abū al-Muʿammar al-Mubārak b. Aḥmad from him [al-Bukhārī]:

Al-Bukhārī’s criteria is that he cites *ḥadīth*s, the reliability of whose transmitters is agreed upon and which he can trace back to a famous companion, without any disagreement among the reliable scholars; moreover, the *isnād* must be continuous and unbroken. If there were two or more who narrated from the companion, then it is good, although one narrator is sufficient, provided that the path to him is valid.

He said: that which al-Ḥākim Abū ʿAbd Allāh (d. 405/1014) asserted about the criteria of al-Bukhārī and Muslim, i.e., that they required that there be two or more narrators from the companion and that there be two or more narrators from the famous follower, and so forth, is contradicted by the fact that they both cited *ḥadīth*s of a group of Companions who only have one narrator.

[Ibn Ḥajar said:] that which al-Ḥākim said, although it is incorrect concerning some of the Companions whose *ḥadīth*s al-Bukhārī cited, is valid for those after them, for there is not in the book a primary *ḥadīth* text<sup>32</sup> that was transmitted by someone who [subsequently] had only one transmitter.

<sup>32</sup> The Arabic reads *ḥadīthu aṣl*. This refers to Ibn Ḥajar’s division of the texts in al-Bukhārī into primary and secondary, the former being valid, con-

nected *ḥadīth*s, and the latter being texts found in his titles which do not meet al-Bukhārī’s standards of validity.

Al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū Bakr al-Ḥāzimī (d. 584/1188), may God have mercy upon him, said: what al-Ḥākīm said is the opinion of one who has not plunged deeply into the hidden parts of *al-Ṣaḥīḥ*. Had he only read the book completely in the manner it deserves to be read, he would have found several examples from the book which would have contradicted his claim. Then, in summary, he [al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū Bakr] said: the criteria of *al-Ṣaḥīḥ* is that the *ḥadīth*'s *isnād* be connected and that its narrator be a Muslim and truthful. He can neither be a *mudallis* nor have gone senile. He must be known for probity, precision, care, intelligence (*salīm al-dhihn*), making few errors, and having proper belief.

He [al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū Bakr al-Ḥāzimī] said: the method of those who compose *ṣaḥīḥs* is that they study the quality of the reliable transmitter's transmissions in his reports from his reliable teachers. Some of them, their *ḥadīths* are valid and established, while the *ḥadīths* of others are corrupted.

He said: there is some ambiguity in this subject. The manner in which it is clarified is knowledge of the transmitters' classes in respect to the narrator of the original report and the ranks of their sources of knowledge. Let us make this clear with an example. Suppose that you know that the students of al-Zuhrī (d. 124/742), for example, are five groups. Each group has an advantage over the one following it. The transmissions of the first group are the most valid, and these are the transmitters that al-Bukhārī seeks. The second group is equivalent to the first in critical ability. However, the first group, in addition to their ability, also spent a long time studying with al-Zuhrī. Among them were some who would accompany al-Zuhrī in travel and would remain with him when he was settled in one place. The second group, however, did not study with al-Zuhrī a long time, so it was not able to become sufficiently acquainted with his *ḥadīths*. Therefore, their mastery of al-Zuhrī's material was below the first's, although they satisfy Muslim's criteria (i.e., Muslim accepts the reports of both the first and the second group).

He [Abū Bakr al-Ḥāzimī] gave us [as] examples from the first group Yūnus b. Yazīd al-Aylī (d. 159/775), ʿUqayl b. Khālīd al-Aylī (d. 141, 142, 144/758, 759, 761), Mālik b. Anas, Sufyān b. ʿUyayna (198/814), and Shuʿayb b. Abī Ḥamza (d. 162, 163/778, 779). From the second group he gave as examples al-Awzāʿī, al-Layth b. Saʿd (d. 175/791), ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Khālīd b. Musāfir (d. 127/744), and Ibn Abī Dhiʿb (d. 158/775).

He (Abū Bakr al-Ḥāzimī) said: examples of the third group are Jaʿfar b. Burqān (d. 150, 151, 154/767, 768, 770), Sufyān b. Ḥusayn, Ishāq b. Yaḥyā al-Kalbī. Examples of the fourth are Zamʿa b. Ṣāliḥ, Muʿāwiya b. Yaḥyā al-Ṣadafī and al-Muthannā b. al-Ṣabāḥ (d. 149/766). Examples of the fifth are ʿAbd al-Quddūs b. Ḥabīb, al-Ḥakam b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Aylī, and Muḥammad b. Saʿīd al-Maṣlūb.

The first group satisfies the criteria of al-Bukhārī. He might, [p. 21] however, cite those *ḥadīths* of the second group which he considers to be valid, without including all [of them]. As for Muslim, he cites the *ḥadīths* of both groups inclusively and cites the *ḥadīths* of the third group in the manner that al-Bukhārī cites the second group's reports. As for the fourth and fifth, neither al-Bukhārī nor Muslim concerns himself with them.

I said: most of the reports which al-Bukhārī cites from the second group are *taʿliqs*, and he occasionally included a *taʿliq* from the third group. The above-mentioned principle, however, is valid only for those who have narrated many *ḥadīths* [such as al-Zuhrī]. By means of this principle, then, the students of Nāfiʿ (d. 117/735), al-Aʿmash (d. 148/765), Qatāda (d. 118/736), and others should be measured. As for those who did not narrate many *ḥadīths*, the two *shaykhs* (Muslim and Bukhārī) relied upon the [individual]

reliability and probity [of the transmitters], and also the rarity of their errors in citing their *ḥadīths*.

Among these (those who did not transmit many *ḥadīths*), however, were some on whom they (Muslim and Bukhārī) relied extensively. Thus, they both included *ḥadīths* of individuals such as Yahyā b. Saʿīd al-Anṣārī (d. 143/760), even when they were alone in reporting them. Among them (these *ḥadīths*), however, were those (the transmitters) in whom they could not place great trust, so they only cited from such ones those reports for which others transmitted parallel versions. The latter case is more common.

Al-Imām Abū ʿAmr b. al-Ṣalāḥ (d. 643/1245) said in his book, *Fī ʿulūm al-ḥadīth*, according to that which Abū al-Ḥasan b. al-Jawzī informed us on the authority of Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Shāfiʿī from him directly (*samāʿan*): the first to compose a *ṣaḥīḥ* was Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl al-Bukhārī. He was followed by Abū al-Ḥusayn Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj al-Qushayrī. Although Muslim had studied with al-Bukhārī and had benefited from him, they also shared several teachers. Their two books are the most valid books after the Book of God the Mighty.

As for that which was transmitted to us from al-Shāfiʿī (d. 204/820), may God be pleased with him, that he said: I do not know of a book of knowledge on Earth more correct than the book of Mālik, he (Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ) said: some of them narrated this using a different expression, i.e., “more valid than the *Muwattaʿa*?” He (al-Shāfiʿī) said that, however, before the books of al-Bukhārī and Muslim had been written.

Moreover, the book of al-Bukhārī is the more valid of the two and the more beneficial. As for that which was transmitted to us from Abū ʿAlī al-Ḥāfiẓ al-Naysābūrī (d. 349/960), the teacher of al-Ḥākim Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥāfiẓ, that he said: “There is not a book under Heaven more valid than the book of Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj,” it, and the statement of one of the Maghribī scholars who preferred Muslim to al-Bukhārī, are unproblematic if the intent is that Muslim’s book is superior to al-Bukhārī’s in that Muslim did not include anything in the book other than valid *ḥadīth*. For, after the book’s opening invocation (*khuṭba*), there is nothing except valid *ḥadīth*, unmixed with the likes of that which is in al-Bukhārī’s book in the titles of his chapters which do not meet the criteria of validity.

It does not follow from this, however, that Muslim’s book is superior to al-Bukhārī’s in respect to validity. If what was intended [by this statement] is that the *ḥadīths* of Muslim are more valid than the *ḥadīths* of al-Bukhārī, then that is rejected, and God knows best.

[Ibn Ḥajar said:] there are some points in the previous statement which require evidence and explanation, for some of the Imāms have found problematic the unrestricted description of al-Bukhārī’s book as more valid than Mālik’s book because they both share the criteria of validity and an exaggerated critical sense. Furthermore, the fact that there are more *ḥadīths* in al-Bukhārī does not require that it have the virtue of being more valid.

The answer to that [objection] lies in the two authors’ respective understanding of validity. Mālik does not consider interruption in the *isnād* to be a defect in the *ḥadīth*. For this reason he cites *mursals*, *munqatiʿs*, and communications (*balāghāt*) as part of the main object of the book, whereas al-Bukhārī considers interruption a defect in the *isnād*. Therefore, he does not cite such *ḥadīths* except as something outside the main object of his book, such as *taʿliqs* and titles of chapters. Moreover, there is no doubt that although some may consider the interrupted report to be a valid argument, it is weaker than the connected report, since both reports share in the probity and reliability of their transmitters. Thus, the transparency of al-Bukhārī’s work is clear. It is certain that al-Shāfiʿī said that unrestrictedly

about the *Muwaṭṭa*<sup>2</sup> in respect to the collections that were extant in his age, such as the compilations of Sufyān al-Thawrī, Ḥammād b. Salama, and others. That is a preference which is granted without argument.

Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's comment also requires that the scholars are in agreement that al-Bukhārī's book is more valid than Muslim's, save that objection which he mentioned from Abū ʿAlī al-Naysābūrī above and one of the *shaykhs* of the Maghrib, [p. 22] i.e., that Muslim's book is preferable to al-Bukhārī's without, however, an explicit mention of validity as the criterion of preference.

We say: we were informed by means of the valid **isnād** from Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Nasāʿī (d. 303/915), and he is the teacher of Abū ʿAlī al-Naysābūrī, that he said: "There is nothing in these books [of *ḥadīth*] better (*ajwad*) than the book of Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl." He could mean by "better" nothing other than the quality of al-Bukhārī's **isnāds**, as is the immediate understanding arising from the convention of the *ḥadīth* specialists. A statement such as this from one such as al-Nasāʿī, due to his precision, inspection, care, and investigation in the criticism of transmitters, and his precedence in this matter over the people of his age, is the clearest expression [of praise one can earn]. Indeed, some of the specialists have even considered him superior in his knowledge of these matters to Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj. Al-Dāraquṭnī and others considered him superior in these and other issues, giving him precedence over the Imām of Imāms, Abū Bakr b. Khuzayma (d. 311/924), author of *al-Ṣaḥīḥ*.

Al-Ismaʿīlī, in his *Madkhal*, said: I have studied *al-Jāmiʿ* that Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Bukhārī composed and found it to be inclusive, as it was named, of many of the valid **sunan**, and pointing to many important derived meanings. Only one who has joined a knowledge of law and lexicography to knowledge of *ḥadīth* and its transmitters as well as knowledge of transmissions and their weaknesses can attain that which al-Bukhārī achieved. Furthermore, such a person must be very capable in all these subjects, having delved deeply into all of them. He, may God have mercy upon him, was the one who devoted his entire life to these pursuits. Thus, he became an expert and reached the end point of knowledge, and he surpassed the others. He joined to this a pure intention and the desire to be beneficial, so God benefited [us] through him and benefited him.

He (al-Ismaʿīlī) said: many, among them al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī al-Ḥalwānī (d. 242/856), imitated his method, except that he limited himself to the **sunan**. Another was Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī (d. 275/889), who was a contemporary of Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Bukhārī. His method in that which he called the *Sunan* was to mention that which had been narrated concerning the subject even if there was weakness in its **isnād**, assuming there were no other *ḥadīths* on the topic. Another was Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj. He was close to al-Bukhārī in time and thus desired the same goal as al-Bukhārī. He took from him [directly] or from his books, but he was not as exacting on himself as was Abū ʿAbd Allāh. Thus, he transmitted on the authority of many transmitters whom al-Bukhārī omitted. The goal of all was good, however, although not one of them reached the same level of exactitude as Abū ʿAbd Allāh. Furthermore, not one of them was able to derive meanings and discuss the subtle legal points of the *ḥadīth* in al-Bukhārī's fashion. Nor did any of them entitle their chapters in such a way as to bring out the relationship between the chapter's title and the *ḥadīth* narrated therein. Bounty is God's; He shows preference with it to whomever He wishes.

Al-Ḥākīm, Abū Aḥmad al-Naysābūrī (d. 375/985), who was a contemporary of Abū ʿAlī al-Naysābūrī, and is given precedence over him in knowledge of the transmitters,

said, in what al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū Yaʿlā Al-Khalīlī (d. 446/1054) related in *al-Irshād*, the summary of which is: May God be merciful to Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl. He organized the texts (*uṣūl*), meaning the texts of the rulings in the *ḥadīth*, and he explained [them] to the people. Everyone who worked on this subject after him borrowed from his book, like Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj.

Al-Dāraquṭnī, whenever the two *ṣaḥīḥs* were mentioned, would say, “were it not for al-Bukhārī, Muslim would not have gone or come.” Another time he said, “What did Muslim do? All he did was take al-Bukhārī’s book and compose a **mustakhraj** based upon it, while making some additions.” Abū al-ʿAbbās al-Qurtubī in the beginning of his book, *al-Mufḥim fī sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, openly declared that which we have related from al-Dāraquṭnī.

What the Imāms have said concerning the superiority of al-Bukhārī is great, and it is sufficient to note their agreement that he was more knowledgeable in this discipline than Muslim and that Muslim used to testify to his precedence, his leadership, and his singularity in the knowledge of this in his own lifetime. This even resulted in Muslim abandoning his own teacher, Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā al-Dhuḥalī (d. 258/871), according to the famous story, which we shall mention in detail, God willing, in the biography of al-Bukhārī. This is a general explanation [of al-Bukhārī’s superiority].

As for the specific reasons of his superiority over Muslim, we have already established that the basis of a valid *ḥadīth* is connectedness, the precision of the transmitters, and the absence of defects. Upon observation, the narrators in al-Bukhārī’s book are more careful and are more closely connected. The proof of this lies in the following considerations: (1) The first is that those whose *ḥadīths* al-Bukhārī included in his book, but Muslim did not, are just over 430 transmitters, 80 of whom are mentioned as being weak. [p. 23] Those whose *ḥadīths* Muslim transmitted, but al-Bukhārī did not, are 620 transmitters, 160 of whom are mentioned as being weak. There is no doubt that including the transmissions of those who were never mentioned as weak is more appropriate than to include the *ḥadīths* of those who were mentioned as weak, though these accusations may not be substantial. (2) The second is that al-Bukhārī did not include many of the *ḥadīths* of those transmitters who were mentioned as weak. Furthermore, he did not include the books of any one of them, in whole or in part, with the exception of the corpus of ʿIkrima (d. 105/723) on the authority of Ibn ʿAbbās (d. 68/687), as opposed to Muslim who included most of those books, such as Abū al-Zubayr (d. 126/743) on the authority of Jābir (d. 78/697), Suhayl (d. 138/755) from his father, al-ʿAlāʾ b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (d. 132, 138/749, 755) from his father, Ḥammād b. Salama from Thābit (d. 123, 127/740, 744), in addition to others. (3) The third is that of those transmitters whom al-Bukhārī was alone in including, most of them were his teachers whom he had met and with whom he had studied. Thus he knew their conditions and was well acquainted with their *ḥadīths*. Therefore, he was able to distinguish their valid *ḥadīths* from the products of their imagination. Of the transmitters that Muslim had included and mentioned as being weak, however, most of them preceded his generation, as they were Followers and those after them. Furthermore, there is no doubt that the traditionist is more knowledgeable of his teachers’ *ḥadīths* than those who had preceded them. (4) The fourth is that al-Bukhārī only selectively included transmissions from the second class of narrators, whereas Muslim includes them as principle texts, as has been established previously by al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū Bakr al-Ḥāzimī.

These four considerations concern the transmitters' precision. There remains the issue of connectedness, which is the fifth consideration. Muslim's method, as he said explicitly in the introduction to his *Ṣaḥīḥ*, and where he responded vehemently to those who criticized him, was to consider the **mu<sup>c</sup>an<sup>c</sup>an** connected if the two transmitters were contemporaries, though their meeting had not actually been established, unless the **mu<sup>c</sup>an<sup>c</sup>in** was a **mudallis**. Al-Bukhārī, however, does not consider the **mu<sup>c</sup>an<sup>c</sup>an** to be connected until their meeting has been established, even if only once.

Al-Bukhārī used this method in his *Tārīkh*, and in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* he used it extensively. Sometimes, he would even include a *ḥadīth* which seems to have no apparent connection to the topic, but it establishes that the narrator had studied directly with that teacher, since prior to that he had included some transmission of his which was **mu<sup>c</sup>an<sup>c</sup>an**. You will see this clearly when it occurs, God willing. This is why his book is superior because, although we may grant Muslim's claim of connectedness, it is obvious that al-Bukhārī's criteria make the claim of connectedness clearer, but God knows best.

As for those considerations that are related to defects, and it is the sixth aspect, the number of their *ḥadīths* which have been criticized reached 210, as will be made clear in detail in an independent chapter. Fewer than 80 of these are al-Bukhārī's, and the remainder are Muslim's. There is no doubt that that which has been criticized less is better than that which has been criticized more, but God knows best.

As for Abū <sup>c</sup>Alī al-Naysābūrī's statement, we have yet to find for him an explicit declaration that Muslim's book is more valid than al-Bukhārī's, contrary to what the unrestricted statement of al-Shaykh Muhyī al-Dīn [al-Nawawī] implies in his *Mukhtaṣar fī <sup>c</sup>ulūm al-ḥadīth* and in his introduction to his commentary on al-Bukhārī, where he says:

The majority have agreed that al-Bukhārī is the more valid of the two, and the more beneficial of the two. But Abū <sup>c</sup>Alī al-Naysābūrī and one of the Maghribī scholars said that Muslim's is more valid.

The import of Abū <sup>c</sup>Alī's statement is to deny greater validity to any work other than Muslim's book. As for claiming greater validity, however, that is uncertain, since his statement is unqualified (*muṭlaq*). Thus, he could have intended either that the book of Muslim is superior or he could have merely intended that the two books are equal, but God knows best.

But, as Abū <sup>c</sup>Alī's opinion appears to me, he seems to have given Muslim precedence over al-Bukhārī for a reason other than that which we have been discussing, i.e., the relevant criteria of the transmitters necessary for establishing a valid transmission. Rather, he gave precedence to Muslim because Muslim composed his book in his town with his texts in front of him during the lifetime of many of his teachers. Thus, he was able to be very careful in preserving the wording of his *ḥadīths* and was able to inspect them closely during composition. Furthermore, because he did not attempt to do that which al-Bukhārī did, i.e., derive legal rulings around which chapters could be organized, something which necessitated **taqṭī<sup>c</sup>** of his *ḥadīths* according to their topics, Muslim was able to gather all the paths of the *ḥadīth* in one place and could limit himself to *ḥadīths* and omit **mawqūfs**. It was only in a few places that he made use of them, and that was secondary, not intended.

[p. 24] It is for this reason that Abū <sup>c</sup>Alī said what he said, although I have seen some of the Imāms say that it is possible that he did not see the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of al-Bukhārī. That seems to me unlikely. What I have mentioned is more plausible, but if Abū <sup>c</sup>Alī had ever

said explicitly that which has been attributed to him, his argument would be refuted by that which we have mentioned previously, both in general and in detail, and God is the granter of success.

As for the Maghribī *shaykh*, no statement is related by them (the Maghribīs) specifically ascribing superior validity to Muslim; rather, there is one unqualified statement regarding Muslim's superiority according to that which Abū al-Faḍl al-Qāḍī ʿIyād (d. 544/1064) related in the *Ilmāʿ* from Abū Marwān al-Tubnī. He (Abū Marwān) said, "One of my teachers preferred the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Muslim to the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of al-Bukhārī." I, however, have discovered the explanation for this preference from one of the Maghribīs. I read in the *Fihrist* of Abū Muḥammad al-Qāsim b. al-Qāsim al-Tujībī, "Abū Muḥammad b. Ḥazm (456/1064) preferred the book of Muslim to the book of al-Bukhārī because after Muslim's invocation, there is nothing in the book except *ḥadīth*."

I think that this Ibn Ḥazm is the *shaykh* of Abū Marwān al-Tubnī, whose name al-Qāḍī ʿIyād omitted. It is possible that it is another person, although the reason for the preference would be the same.

Another example of this is the statement of Maslama b. Qāsim al-Qurṭubī<sup>33</sup> (d. 353/964), and he was a contemporary of al-Dāraquṭnī. When he mentioned the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Muslim in his history, he said, "No one has made a book like it." That also is to be taken as praise for its excellent composition and the excellence of its organization.

I have noticed that many of the Maghribīs who have written on legal *ḥadīths* while omitting the texts' *isnāds*, such as ʿAbd al-Haqq (d. 581/1185) in his *Aḥkām* and *Jamʿ*, rely on Muslim's *Ṣaḥīḥ* for the transmission and citation of texts instead of al-Bukhārī. This is due to their (the texts') existence in Muslim in their entirety, whereas al-Bukhārī had abbreviated them. This is another reason of preference which has nothing to do with the matter of validity, but God knows best.

Now that this has been established, this argument for al-Bukhārī's superiority can be met by another argument for its superiority, one that also has nothing to do with validity. It is that which al-Imām, the model [scholar], Abū Muḥammad b. Abī Jamra (d. 599/1202) mentioned in his abridgment of *Ṣaḥīḥ* al-Bukhārī. He said:

One of the mystics (*ʿārifīn*) whom I met told me that one of the masters, well known for his virtue and superiority said: "The *Ṣaḥīḥ* of al-Bukhārī, if it is read in a time of crisis, the crisis is resolved, and it has not been brought upon a boat which subsequently sank."

He (Ibn Abī Jamra) also said: the prayers of al-Bukhārī were answered, and he prayed for his readers, may God have mercy upon him.

The most important reason which requires preferring al-Bukhārī is what his book included by way of the chapter titles, whose brilliance confused great intellects, and astonished the mind and eyes. They reached this rank, and obtained this station, because of an awesome cause which necessitated this. This cause is revealed in what Abū Aḥmad b. ʿAdī narrated from ʿAbd al-Quddūs b. Humām, who said:

I witnessed several *shaykhs* say: Al-Bukhārī changed the titles of his *Jāmiʿ*, meaning he finalized them (*bayyadahā*), between the grave of the Prophet (S) and his pulpit, and he would pray two *rakʿas* for every title.

<sup>33</sup> The text calls him Muslim b. Qāsim, which is an error.

Now, let us begin discussion of the titles and clarify that which remained hidden to those who were not scrutinizing and that which expressed the criticisms of a raw youth before an experienced old or middle aged man, falling well short of his goal.<sup>34</sup>

The first item of his titles to fall under criticism was the first *ḥadīth* he included, which he used to begin the book and open the book's invocation. Blame succeeded in returning some of his critics toward his side, while others persisted in their opposition.

Let us mention a rule which explains the different types of titles in the book, some of which are obvious in their purpose, while others are hidden. The ones that are clear, however, are not a matter of our concern here. The clear titles are those that signify the chapter's contents by way of correspondence (*muṭābaqa*). Its purpose is to inform [the reader] of the chapter's contents without consideration of the amount of the benefit, as though al-Bukhārī is saying, "this is the chapter in which there is this and that," or "the chapter in which there is evidence for such and such a ruling," for example.

Sometimes, the title is taken [either] from the exact wording of the chapter's text—a portion of it, that is, or from its meaning. Usually, this [i.e., in the latter case] happens when the wording of the text can bear more than one meaning. Therefore, he will specify one of the meanings by those *ḥadīths* which are mentioned below the title.

The opposite of this can also be found, however, i.e., the ambiguity can be [p. 25] in the *ḥadīth*, while the title clarifies it. In this context, the title serves to interpret the *ḥadīth*, taking the place of the jurist's statement, for example, "the meaning of this general *ḥadīth* is particular," or "the meaning of this specific *ḥadīth* is general." Thus, the title creates the impression of an analogy because of the existence of the unifying *ratio legis* or that the particular which is intended to convey a more general meaning than its apparent meaning does so by way of *al-a<sup>c</sup>lā* or *al-adnā*.<sup>35</sup> That which we have mentioned about the general and the particular is also true for the unqualified term and the qualified term. The same is also the case for the explanation of the problematic, clarification of the ambiguous, interpretation of the apparent, and detailing the succinct. This is where most of the problematic instances of this book's titles lie. This is the reason for the frame of the saying of many nobles "Al-Bukhārī's jurisprudence (*fiqh*) is in his titles."

Al-Bukhārī usually resorts to this when he cannot find a *ḥadīth* which meets his criteria of validity and whose apparent meaning is [the same as] what he intends to establish in the chapter. He also may do this for the purpose of sharpening the intellect [by requiring the reader] to make explicit the implicit and to bring the hidden into the open. Indeed, he does this often, meaning the latter, where he mentions the explanatory *ḥadīth* for that context in either a previous or a later place in the book, as though he is referring the reader to it, pointing to it by way of subtle suggestion and reference.

<sup>34</sup> "Falling . . . goal" is a paraphrase of an Arabic proverb which reads "awradahā irāda sa<sup>c</sup>ḍin wa sa<sup>c</sup>-dun mushtamilun, ma hākadhā tūradu yā sa<sup>c</sup>du al-ibīlu." See Abū al-Faḍl Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Maydānī, *Majma<sup>c</sup> al-amthāl*, 4 vols., ed. Muḥammad Abū al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (Cairo, 1978), vol. 3, p. 427.

<sup>35</sup> *Al-adnā* refers to the *a fortiori* argument, which entails mentioning only a *naw<sup>c</sup>* (pl. *anwā<sup>c</sup>*), "species," while intending the *jins*, "type." An example is the word "Fie" in verse 17:23 "Do not say to them [your parents] 'Fie!'" It includes hitting, cursing, kill-

ing, etc. To prohibit a *naw<sup>c</sup>*, therefore, is to prohibit at the same time the *jins* of that *naw<sup>c</sup>*. *Al-a<sup>c</sup>lā* is when the *jins* is mentioned, but the sense of the utterance is restricted to only particular species of the *jins*. An example is verse 9:103, "Take from their property charity." Property, however, is understood to apply only to certain types of property. It entails, then, a restriction of the word's meaning. See, Abū al-Walīd Ibn Rusḥd, al-Ḥafīd, *Bidāyat al-mujtahid* (Cairo, n.d.), p. 2.

Often he titles his chapters using the interrogative, such as “Chapter: Is This Such and Such?” or “Those Who Said Such and Such,” and so forth. This is when he is not certain which of the two possibilities is correct. In doing this, his goal is to explain whether or not a specific ruling has or has not been established. Thus, he will give the chapter a title using a ruling, although his goal is to show that the conclusiveness of the rule is yet to be established or that the evidence supports both possibilities. Although one of the two positions might be more apparent [to him], he wants to leave the matter open for inquiry and to point out that there remains room for further interpretation or that there is a contradiction that requires a suspension of judgment. This occurs when he believes there is indeterminacy in the texts or that the method used in deriving the ruling is a controversial type of inference.

He often uses titles that appear to be of little utility, but when the observer is careful and precise, its meaning appears. For example, his statement, “Chapter: A Man’s Saying, ‘We Have Not Prayed.’” This statement is a rebuttal to those who find such a statement detestable. Another example is his statement, “A man’s saying, ‘the prayer passed us.’” This is likewise an argument against those who detest this unqualified wording.

Often his titles reflect particular events which do not immediately appear at first glance, such as his statement, “Chapter: The Imām’s Using a Toothpick in the Presence of His Subjects.” Because it might be thought that use of the toothpick is something low, some people might imagine that it is more appropriate for it to be done in private, so as to protect their good reputation. But, as it occurred in the *ḥadīth* that the Prophet (S) used a toothpick in the presence of the people, this signifies that it falls under the rubric of proper grooming, nothing else. Ibn Daqīq al-ʿĪd (d. 702/1302) pointed this out.

Often he titles the chapter with a word that refers to the meaning of a *ḥadīth* which did not meet his criteria of validity, or he may use the explicit wording of a *ḥadīth* which failed to meet his criteria in the title. He will then include in the chapter a text which will bear its meaning, sometimes in an apparent manner, other times in a hidden manner.

An example is his statement, “Chapter: The Commanders Are from the Quraysh.” This is the wording of a *ḥadīth* transmitted from ʿAlī [b. Abī Tālib], may God be pleased with him, but it did not meet al-Bukhārī’s criteria. However, he did include in the chapter the *ḥadīth* “There shall always remain a governor from the Quraysh.”

Another example is his statement, “Chapter: Two, or More, Are a Group.” This is the wording of a *ḥadīth* transmitted from Abū Mūsā al-Ashʿarī, but it does not meet al-Bukhārī’s standards. He then transmitted in this chapter, “(You two) make the *adhān*, and say the *iqāma*, and let one of you (two) lead the other (in prayer).”<sup>36</sup>

Sometimes he was content to use the wording of a *ḥadīth* which is not valid according to him as the wording of the title. He then included with it a report from a Companion or a verse from the Qurʾān, as though he is saying that there are no valid *ḥadīths* in the chapter which satisfy his criteria.

A lack of concern for these subtle goals has caused some careless readers of the book to believe that he did not put it into final form [*tabyiḍ*]. The one who observes carefully achieves his goal, and the one who is serious will find what he seeks.

<sup>36</sup> The *adhān* is the first call to prayer, and the *iqāma* is the second (and final) call to prayer.

The ʿAllāma Nāṣir al-Dīn Aḥmad b. al-Munayyir Khatīb al-Iskandiriyya (d. 683/1284) collected four hundred titles of this type, and al-Qāḍī Badr al-Dīn Ibn Jamāʿa commented upon them and summarized them, making some additions. One of the Maghribīs, Muḥammad b. Mansūr b. Hamāma al-Sijilmasī, commented upon this [problem of the titles], but his work is not very long. Indeed, all that is in the book is about one hundred titles, and he named his book *Fakk aghrāḍ al-Bukhārī al-mubhama fī al-jamʿ bayna al-hadīth wa al-tarjama* [Unlocking al-Bukhārī's ambiguities in the relationship of the *ḥadīth* to its title]. Zayn al-Dīn ʿAlī b. al-Munayyir, the brother of al-ʿAllāma Nāṣir al-Dīn, also discussed at great length this matter in his commentary on the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of al-Bukhārī. I also happened upon a volume from a book entitled, *Tarjumān al-tarājim* [The interpreter of the chapter titles] of Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. Rushayd al-Sabtī (d. 721/1321), which includes discussion of this issue. The volume reached the Book of Fasting. Had it been completed, it would have been extremely useful. Despite its incompleteness, it remains a very beneficial work, and God is the granter of success.

## CHAPTER 3

*Explanation of His Abbreviation and Summation of Ḥadīths and the Benefit in His Repetition of Ḥadīths in Different Chapters* [p. 26]

Al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū al-Faḍl Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir al-Maqdisī said, in a work of his which he called *Jawāb al-mutaʿannit* [A reply to the stubborn], according to what we were told: know that al-Bukhārī, may God have mercy upon him, would mention a *ḥadīth* in his book in several contexts. Moreover, in every chapter that he uses it, he cites it with a different *isnād*. Furthermore, with his vast understanding, and deductive abilities, he would extract from a single text an appropriate meaning for the different chapters in which he cites it. Rarely does he cite a *ḥadīth* in more than one context with the same *isnād* and the same wording. Rather, he cites it from different paths for reasons which we shall mention, but God knows best what his object is in doing this.

One of his techniques is to cite the *ḥadīth* from one companion, then cite it again from another companion, with the purpose of clearing it from the charge of being anomalous (*gharāba*). He follows the same technique for the transmitters of the second and third generations, and so forth, until he reaches his own teachers. The one who is not familiar with the craft [of *ḥadīth*] thinks this constitutes a repetition, but it does not, for it provides new information.

Another reason [for doing this] is that by using this method, he was able to include other *ḥadīths*, each version of which contains different ideas. Thus, he cites each one in a different chapter using a path different than the first.

Another reason is that there are *ḥadīths* which some transmitters have narrated in their entirety while others narrated only in a summary fashion. He narrates them as they have come down to him so as to exonerate their transmitters from any suspicions.

Another reason is that the wording of the narrators may differ. Thus, one transmitter might report the *ḥadīth* using a word that bears a certain meaning, and another transmitter might have reported that *ḥadīth* using a different expression for the very same word which could give an entirely different meaning [to the *ḥadīth*]. In this case, he will cite

each version, assuming they are valid according to his criteria, with its path, and make a separate chapter for each version.

Another purpose is the issue of *ḥadīths* which exist both as **muttaṣil** and **mursal**. The probability of connectedness appeared more likely to him, causing him to include it. He narrates the **mursal** version to alert the reader that its existence as a **mursal** did not affect his judgment about the connectedness of the *ḥadīth*.<sup>37</sup>

Another is those reports which exist both attributed to the Prophet (S) and attributed to a Companion. His treatment of these is similar to the previous question.

Another reason is those *ḥadīths* in which one of the narrators added a transmitter to the **isnād**, and another omitted him. In such a case he narrates both versions, where he believes that the transmitter heard it from a teacher who reported it to him from another teacher. Later, the transmitter met the other teacher who reported it to him directly. Thus, the transmitter would narrate both versions.<sup>38</sup>

Another reason is that he may cite a *ḥadīth* whose narrator transmitted it with **an<sup>c</sup>ana**, so he cites it from a different path which makes explicit that there was a meeting [between the different transmitters], as is well known about his method concerning establishing a meeting before accepting the **mu<sup>c</sup>an<sup>c</sup>an**. These are the reasons he may repeat a single text in one or more places.

As for his abbreviation of *ḥadīths* in certain chapters, and his abridgement of them in others, this is because of the text's brevity, or the interconnectedness of its parts, and its having expressed two or more judgments together. In this case, he repeats it according to the meaning desired, while at the same time he tries to make sure it is not empty of *ḥadīth* information. Thus, he cites the *ḥadīth* from a teacher other than the one on whose authority it had been cited previously, as has been explained in detail above. Thus, you gain for that *ḥadīth* many paths. Sometimes he would add to it the provenance (*makhraj*) of the *ḥadīth* where he knows of only one path for it. In such cases, he acts freely with it, at times citing it connected, at others **mu<sup>c</sup>allaq**, sometimes he cites it completely, other times he limits himself to that part which is of relevance to him in that chapter. Thus, if the text contains several unconnected ideas, he mentions each idea in a separate chapter to avoid lengthening the book. Sometimes, however, he will cite it in its entirety. These are his reasons for abbreviation.

One of al-Bukhārī's commentators related that in one of the copies of the book, in [the Book of] Pilgrimage, in the chapter on hastening to stand [at **an<sup>c</sup>Arafat**] after the chapter on shortening the sermon at **an<sup>c</sup>Arafat**, that Abū **an<sup>c</sup>Abd Allāh** said: "In this chapter the *ḥadīth* of Mālik from Ibn al-Shihāb [al-Zuhri] should be added, but I do not wish to add to it a superfluous (repeated) *ḥadīth*." This statement means that he does not repeat a *ḥadīth* in his book which has both the same text and **isnād**. If such a thing has occurred in the book,

<sup>37</sup> There is a controversy among *ḥadīth* specialists as to which form should be given greater credence in the event that both a **mursal** and a **muttaṣil** version exist. See **an<sup>c</sup>Uthmān b. <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Rahmān Ibn al-Ṣalāh**, *Muqaddimat ibn al-ṣalāh*, ed. Bint al-Shāṭi<sup>2</sup> (Cairo, 1989), pp. 228–29, and al-Bulqaynī, *Maḥāsin al-iṣṭilāh*, on the bottom half of *Muqaddimat Ibn al-Ṣalāh*, p. 212.

<sup>38</sup> For example: A related to B who related to C

that the Prophet did x. Then, C tells D on the authority of B from A that the Prophet did x. Later, however, C meets A, who narrates x to him directly. Then, C tells E on the authority of A that the Prophet did x. Thus, we have two different *isnāds* for the same text and for the same transmitter C: (1) D ---- C ---- B ---- A, the Prophet, (2) E ---- C ---- A, the Prophet.

then it is accidental. In any case, that actually happened only a few times, and when I reach them in my commentary, I shall point them out, God willing.

As for mentioning [p. 27] only part of a text, then not citing the rest of it in another context, he rarely did such a thing. This occurs when the omitted text is a statement of a companion, but there might be a reason which could lead to part of it being considered attributable to the Prophet. In such cases, he summarizes that which he thinks can be attributed to the Prophet and omits the rest, since it has nothing to do with the purpose of his book.

An example of this is the *ḥadīth* of Huzayl b. Shuraḥbīl from ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd, may God be pleased with him, who said: “The people of Islām do not abandon their freed slaves (*ahl al-Islām lā yusayyibūn*),<sup>39</sup> although the people of the Jāhiliyya did do this.”<sup>40</sup> Al-Bukhārī cited it in this manner, and it is a summary of a *mawqūf ḥadīth*, the beginning of which is: “A man came to ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd and said, ‘I have freed a slave of mine and left him. He died and left property but no heir’. ʿAbd Allāh said: ‘The people of Islām do not abandon their freed slaves, although the people of Jāhiliyya did do this. You are the possessor of his bounty so you can have his estate. But if you are afraid of sinning and feel ashamed, then we shall accept it and put into the treasury’.”

Al-Bukhārī limited his citation to that part which can be attributed to the Prophet, and that is ʿAbd Allāh’s statement: “The people of Islām do not abandon their freed slaves.” Al-Bukhārī reasoned that the statement’s generality requires that it had been transmitted from the Lawgiver. He then summarized the remainder, since it is not part of the book’s subject. This is among the most hidden instances of this type that I have come across.

With this established, it has become clear that he does not repeat [a *ḥadīth*] except for some reason. Even if it does not appear to be connected with the *isnād* or the text, it has been repeated because of a different ruling that the text contains which is emphasized by the second title. It follows from this that such repetitions should not be considered superfluous. How [could it be otherwise] when he does not empty it of additional information regarding the *isnād*, which is that he cites it from a different teacher, as has been made clear in detail previously. This is clear to whoever does a comprehensive reading of his book, and is honest to himself, and God is the granter of success, there is no God other than Him.

#### CHAPTER 4

#### *Explanation of his Reason for Citing Muʿallaqs Which are Marfūʿ and Mawqūf and an Explanation of the Rules [Governing] That*

The meaning of *taʿliq* is that report in which one or more names have been omitted from the beginning of its *isnād*, even if it is the entire *isnād*. Sometimes, al-Bukhārī is certain of its attribution, so says: “He said,” while at other times he is uncertain of it, so says: “It is mentioned. . . .”

<sup>39</sup> *Sayyaba ʿabdahu* means to free one’s slave while renouncing both rights of inheritance and obligations of blood money. See Majd al-Dīn b. al-Athir,

*al-Nihāya fī gharīb al-ḥadīth wa al-athar*, 5 vols. (Beirut, 1979), vol. 2, p. 431.

<sup>40</sup> The Arabic is “aʿtaqtu ʿabdi sāʾibatan.”

The **mu<sup>c</sup>allaq** which is **marfū<sup>c</sup>** is of two types. The first is that which is found in another place in the book connected. The second is that which is in the book only as a **mu<sup>c</sup>allaq**. As for the first, we have already explained the reason for it in the chapter preceding this one. He cites it **mu<sup>c</sup>allaq** because it can only be cited from one path,<sup>41</sup> since it is one of his principles that he does not repeat [a *ḥadīth*] unless repetition has a benefit. When the paths of the *ḥadīth* are few, then, and the text is inclusive of several rulings, he needs to repeat it. In this case, however, he takes liberty with the **isnād** by summarizing it out of fear of being lengthy.

The second type, and that is the *ḥadīth* which is not mentioned in the book except as a **mu<sup>c</sup>allaq**, comes in two forms. Either he cites it using a form [implying] certainty (*jazm*), or he cites it using a form [implying] weakness (*tamriḍ*).<sup>42</sup>

Knowledge of the transmission's validity up to the transmitter on whom al-Bukhārī suspended the text is gained from the first form. Nevertheless, one must still inquire into those transmitters of the *ḥadīth* whose names he has revealed. Sometimes, they meet his criteria, while at other times they do not.

As for those that meet his criteria, there are several reasons why he did not cite these texts connected. One is that he has already cited a *ḥadīth* similar in meaning being free therefore not to cite the full version because of the previous complete citation. Thus, he cited it as a **ta<sup>c</sup>liq** to be brief. Another reason is that he had heard it in that manner; or he heard it but doubted his having heard it from his teacher; or he heard it from his teacher during a discussion (*mudhākaratan*), so he did not think to include it as part of the work. This happens most often in those texts which he cited on the authority of his teachers. An example of this is in the Book of Trusteeship (*wikāla*), where he said:

<sup>c</sup>Uthmān b. al-Haytham said: <sup>c</sup>Awf told us, Muḥammad b. Sirīn told us, from Abū Hurayra, may God be pleased with him, who said: the Messenger of God (S) appointed me as an agent for the *zakāt* of Ramadān, . . . the rest of the *ḥadīth*.

He also cited this *ḥadīth* in other places, among them the chapter on the virtues of the Qur<sup>ṭ</sup>ān and the chapter in Iblīs. However, he did not say “<sup>c</sup>Uthmān told us,” in any of the places where the *ḥadīth* is cited. Thus, it is apparent that he did not hear it from him.

The author has used this expression for that which he did not hear [p. 28] from his teachers in a number of *ḥadīths* where he cites them on their authority using the expression, “So-and-so said (*qāla fulān*).” In another context, however, he would cite them with an intermediary between him and them, and many examples of this will be seen. For example, he said in the *Tārīkh*, “Ibrāhīm b. Mūsā said: Hishām b. Yūsuf told us,” then he (al-Bukhārī) mentioned a *ḥadīth*. Then, he said: “They told this to me on the authority of Ibrāhīm.”

This, however, is not always the case in everything that he has cited using this expression, i.e., “he said.” Because of the possibility [that he did not hear it], texts he cited using this expression should not be taken to mean that he heard them from his teachers. It does not follow from this, however, that he is a **mudallis**, for al-Khaṭīb (al-Baghdādī) and others have said explicitly that the phrase “he said” should not be taken to mean “he heard” unless it is the practice of the transmitter to use this phrase only for those reports which

<sup>41</sup> The Arabic is “ḥaythu yaḍīqu makhraj al-ḥadīth.”

<sup>42</sup> These are formal categories based upon the voice

of the verb. To cite a text with the active voice, for example, “he said,” is to use *jazm*. To cite a text with the passive voice, for example, “It is said,” is to use *tamriḍ*.

he has heard. This requires that for those whose custom in this matter is not known, the possibility [that he did not hear it from his teachers] remains, and God, the High, knows best.

As for that which does not meet his criteria, it may satisfy the criteria of others, and may be good and valid for argumentation. It might be weak not on account of a weakness in its transmitters but because of a minor interruption in its *isnād*. Al-Ismā'īlī said:

Al-Bukhārī might do this either because he heard it from that teacher through an intermediary [whose reports] from that teacher he considers reliable because he [the intermediary] is known and famous in [transmitting] from that teacher or because he heard it from someone who does not meet his criteria of validity. By naming who tells it, he draws attention to that *ḥadīth*. He does not cite it in order to relate it himself.

I said: the cause of this is that he desired to cite it, but not as part of the book's principal texts.

An example of that which is valid by the standards of others is his statement in [the Book of] Ritual Purity, "ʿĀ'isha, may God be pleased with her, said, 'The Prophet (S) used to remember God at all times.'" This *ḥadīth* is valid according to the standards of Muslim, and he cited it in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* as will be seen.

An example of that which is good and appropriate for argumentation is his statement, "Buhz b. Ḥukaym from his father, from his grandfather, who said, 'God is more worthy to be ashamed of than the people.'" It is a good, famous *ḥadīth* from Buhz, and the authors of the *Sunan* cited it as will be seen.

An example of that which is weak due to interruption [in its *isnād*], except that it is saved by another consideration is his statement in [the Book of] *Zakāt*, "Ṭāwūs said: 'Mu'adh b. Jabal said to the people of Yaman: bring me garments, either small or used, for the poor as your *ṣadaqa* instead of wheat and barley, as it is easier for you and better for the Companions of Muḥammad (S).'" Its attribution to Ṭāwūs is valid; however, Ṭāwūs did not study with Mu'adh.

One of the recent commentators, however, raised an objection about the judgment concerning the form [implying] certainty, and that it does not establish the validity of the *ḥadīth* up to the **mu'allaq 'anhu**. He [the one raising the objection] noted that the author cited a *ḥadīth* about which the objector said:

ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Faḍl said on the authority of Abū Salama on the authority of Abū Hurayra from the Prophet (S), that he said, "Do not say one prophet is more worthy than another . . . the *ḥadīth*." Abū Mas'ūd al-Dimashqī was certain that this report is not valid, because ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Faḍl transmitted it from al-A'raj from Abū Hurayra, not from Abū Salama. Moreover, this objection is strengthened by the fact that the author cited it in another context connected (**muttasil**), and he said: "From ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Faḍl from al-A'raj from Abū Hurayra."

This objection is rejected, and the rule [about his **ta'liqs**] remains valid, and is not contradicted by this weak argument. Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī (d. 204/819) narrated this *ḥadīth* in his *Musnad* from ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Faḍl from Abū Salama from Abū Hurayra, just as al-Bukhārī had suspended it exactly. Thus, Abū Mas'ūd's claim that ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Faḍl did not transmit the report except from al-A'raj is shown to be false. Rather, it has been established that ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Faḍl learned this *ḥadīth* from two teachers, and we shall explain this in more detail in the proper place, God willing.

The second type is the form [implying] weakness. Validity to whom the *ḥadīth* was suspended cannot be obtained from this form. Some of this type may be valid, however, while others may not, as we shall demonstrate. As for that which is valid, we did not find that which meets his criteria of validity except in a very few places. Furthermore, we have discovered that he does not use this form except when he cites the *ḥadīth* with its meaning, not its wording. An example in his statement in [the Book of] Medicine, “[a report] is mentioned on the authority of Ibn ʿAbbās from the Prophet (S) concerning the use of the Fātiḥa of the Book as a charm [to heal the sick].” He related this *ḥadīth* in another context as a **musnad**, using the path of ʿUbayd Allāh b. al-Akhnas from [p. 29] Ibn Abī Malīka from Ibn ʿAbbās, may God be pleased with both of them, that a group of the Prophet’s (S) Companions passed through a tribe, one of whose members had been stung (by a scorpion). Then, he mentioned the *ḥadīth* about their treating the man using the Fātiḥa. In the *ḥadīth* the Prophet (S), when they informed him of what happened, says: “The best thing for which you have taken a wage is the Book of God.”

This, as you see, shows that in the first version discussed, he cited only the report’s meaning, and therefore, he did not cite it using the form [implying] certainty. This is because there is nothing in the connected version which suggests that the Prophet (S) himself said anything about using the Fātiḥa as a charm. All that he did was not to forbid them from doing so. This [knowledge] is obtained from al-Bukhārī’s presentation [of the material].

As for those reports in which he used the form [implying] weakness which were not cited in another context, some are valid, although not by his criteria, some are good, some are weak, and thus, rejected, except that they are in conformity with practice, and, some are weak, and thus, rejected, with no mitigating circumstances which would compensate for their formal deficiency.

An example of the first is al-Bukhārī’s statement in [the Book of] *Ṣalāt*: “It is mentioned from ʿAbd Allāh b. Sāʿib that he said, ‘The Prophet (S) recited “al-Muʿminūn” during the morning prayer up to the story of Moses and Aaron, or Jesus, at which point he coughed, so [he stopped reciting] and he bowed (*rakaʿ*).’” This is a valid *ḥadīth* under the criteria of Muslim. He included it in his *Ṣaḥīḥ*. Al-Bukhārī, however, did not cite [any *ḥadīths* transmitted] by one of its transmitters. He said in [the Book of] Fasting:

It is mentioned on the authority of Abū Khālid from al-Aʿmash from al-Ḥakam, and Muslim al-Baṭīn and Salama b. Kāhil from Saʿīd b. Jubayr, and ʿAtāʾ and Mujāhid from Ibn ʿAbbās, who said, “A woman said to the Prophet (S), ‘My sister died, and she still had to fast two months consecutively, . . . the *ḥadīth*.’”

The transmitters of this *ḥadīth* are all cited in the *Ṣaḥīḥ*, except that there are great differences in its **isnād**. Moreover, Abū Khālid Sulaymān b. Ḥayyān al-Aḥmar was alone in citing it in this fashion, and the best students of al-Aʿmash differed from him in this regard, as will be demonstrated, God willing.

An example of the second kind, which is the good, is his statement in [the Book of] Sales, “It is mentioned from ʿUthmān b. ʿAffān, may God be pleased with him, that the Prophet (S) told him: ‘When you sell, weigh [the sold material], and when you buy, ask that it [the material bought] be weighed.’” Al-Dāraqūṭnī transmitted this *ḥadīth* from the path of ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Mughīra, who is truthful (*ṣadūq*), from Munqidh, the client of ʿUthmān. Saʿīd b. al-Musayyab accepted this [as a valid transmission] from ʿUthmān and followed it. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, in his *Musnad*, cited it from the path of [Saʿīd b. al-

Musayyab], except that in its **isnād** is Ibn Lahī<sup>c</sup>a. Ibn Abī Shayba transmitted it in his *Muṣannaf* [using the path] from <sup>c</sup>Atā<sup>c</sup> from <sup>c</sup>Uthmān, in which there is an interruption. The *ḥadīth* is good, then, because of these factors which strengthen it.

An example of the third, and it is the weak which has no [external formal] support [<sup>c</sup>*ādīd*], except that it is in concord with practice [<sup>c</sup>*amal*], is his statement in [the Book of] Bequests: "It is mentioned from the Prophet (S) that he ruled that debts are to be paid off before bequests." Al-Tirmidhī (d. 279/892) narrated this connected with the *ḥadīth* of Abū Ishāq al-Sabī<sup>c</sup>ī from al-Ḥārith al-A<sup>c</sup>war from <sup>c</sup>Alī. Al-Ḥārith is weak, and al-Tirmidhī declared the *ḥadīth* to be strange (*istaghrabahu*). He also mentioned the consensus of the knowledgeable in favor of this opinion, however.

The fourth kind, and it is that which is weak and without [external formal] support is extremely rare in the book. Moreover, where it occurs, the author explicitly mentions its [the *ḥadīth*'s] weakness, contrary to his practice toward the previous kind. An example of this is his statement in the Book of Prayer, "It is mentioned from Abū Hurayra, who attributed it [to the Prophet], 'The Imām shall not pray a voluntary prayer in the place [in which he led the congregational prayer].'" This is not a valid *ḥadīth*. Abū Dāwūd cited it from the path of Layth b. Abī Sulaym from al-Ḥajjāj b. <sup>c</sup>Ubayd from Ibrāhīm b. Ismā<sup>c</sup>īl from Abū Hurayra. Layth b. Abī Sulaym is weak, and his teacher's teacher is unknown. Furthermore, others' transmissions differed with him over it.

This [discussion] is comprehensive of all that is in the book concerning **ta<sup>c</sup>liq**s attributed to the Prophet, both those in the form [implying] conclusiveness (*jazm*) and those in the form [implying] weakness (*tamrīd*). Al-Nawawī has reported that the expert traditionists as well as others have agreed to give these two [forms] due consideration<sup>43</sup> but that it is not appropriate to take something which is weak as certain merely because the form requires its validity to the one to whom it was attributed. Therefore, it is not appropriate [to cite] anything weak in [the form implying] certainty, since it, as a form, requires that its attribution to the speaker (*al-mudāf ilayhi*) be valid. He said:

Many authors, jurists, and others have ignored this [distinction]. Al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066) was severely critical of those who did not adhere to this [distinction between the two forms], for it is a woeful example of laxity on the part of the one who does it. [The one who does this] says [about the valid] "it is mentioned" and "it is narrated" and says [about] the weak "he said" and "he narrated." This [practice] leads to a reversal of meanings and a departure from correctness.

He also said:

Al-Bukhārī, may God have mercy upon him, was careful in his use of these two forms, and he gave them their proper judgment in his *Ṣaḥīḥ*. Thus, he says some of what he has to say in one title using a form [implying] weakness, and in another, using a form [implying] conclusiveness, keeping in mind that which we have mentioned. This makes one aware of his care and piety. Using this principle, his statement, "I have not included in *al-Jāmi<sup>c</sup>* [p. 30] *al-ṣaḥīḥ* anything which is not valid" should be taken to mean that for which I have cited its **isnād**, and God knows best.

It has already become clear from our detailed classification of his suspended reports, however, that there is no need for this interpretation. Everything which is in the book is valid meaning that it is all acceptable. Only rarely is there something in it which can be

<sup>43</sup> He means that they have agreed to cite valid material using *jazm* and weak material using *tamrīd*.

rejected out of hand. This is the judgment [concerning] the reports attributed to the Prophet.

As for the **mawqūfs**, he uses the form [implying] certainty with those which are valid in his mind, although they may not meet his formal requirements of validity. He uses the form [implying] uncertainty, however, with reports in whose **isnād** there is weakness or interruption, except in those places where the report's weakness is strengthened by its existence by way of a different route or because of its fame from the one who transmitted it. He cites the legal opinions of the Companions and the Followers, as well as their opinions in many matters of exegesis of Qur<sup>ʿ</sup>ānic verses, for the purpose of gaining comfort in them, and to strengthen his preferred opinion on those questions in which there are differences among the Imāms.

Therefore, it should be said that everything which is cited in the book is either that for which titles were written, or that by which titles were written.<sup>44</sup> The purpose of this work, essentially, is the valid *ḥadīths* which are **musnad**, and this is that for which he wrote titles. As for **mawqūfs**, **ta<sup>ʿ</sup>liqs**, and, yes, verses from the Qur<sup>ʿ</sup>ān, these are mentioned only secondarily. Thus, all of these are used to write the titles. When they are considered together, however, and when they are also considered in relation to the *ḥadīths*, they explain one another, some explaining (*mufasssir*) and others being explained (*mufassar*). Thus, under this consideration, some of these are also that for which he wrote titles. His primary purpose, however, is *ḥadīth*, so understand that, for it is a proper explanation by which many objections to the author's citation of this type of material can be explained, and God grants success.

## APPENDIX I

### INDEX OF PROPER NAMES FOUND IN THE TRANSLATION<sup>45</sup>

ʿAbd al-Haqq b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ishbīlī, Abū Muḥammad: an Andalusian scholar of *ḥadīth*, he is commonly known as Ibn al-Kharrāt. His two most famous works, *al-Jam<sup>ʿ</sup>* and *al-Ahkām* are still in manuscript form. *Al-A<sup>ʿ</sup>lām*, 4:52; *Al-Siyar*, 21:198–202 [p. 180].

ʿAbd al-Quddūs b. Ḥabīb al-Kilā<sup>ʿ</sup>ī al-Shāmi al-Dimashqī, Abū Sa<sup>ʿ</sup>īd: he is considered to be weak by all. *Lisān al-mizān*, 1912 ed., 4:45–48 [p. 175].

ʿAbd al-Raḥīm b. Aḥmad al-Harawī, Abū Dharr: a transmitter of *ḥadīth* and Mālikī jurist from Herat. He adopted the Mālikī school after meeting al-Bāqillānī in Baghdad. *Nafḥ al-ṭīb*, 2:70–71; *Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāz*, 3:1103–8 [p. 172].

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Khālid b. Musāfir: he was a student of al-Zuhri and acquired a book from him which, according to Ibn Ma<sup>ʿ</sup>īn, contained two to three hundred of his *ḥadīths*. While in Egypt, al-Layth b. Sa<sup>ʿ</sup>d transmitted these *ḥadīths*. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 6:165–66 [p. 175].

<sup>44</sup> The text says “mimmā tarjama lahu aw mimmā tarjama lahu.” I have read it as “mimmā turjima lahu aw mimmā turjima bihi.”

<sup>45</sup> The following are the works used in preparing this appendix:

Al-Dhahabī, *Siyar a<sup>ʿ</sup>lām al-nubalā<sup>ʿ</sup>*, 25 vols. (Beirut, 1982–85).

Al-Dhahabī, ed. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Yaḥyā al-Mu<sup>ʿ</sup>al-

limī, *Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāz*, 4 vols. (Hyderabad, 1388/1968).

Ibn ʿImād al-Ḥanbalī, *Shadharāt al-dhahab*, 8 vols. (Cairo, 1931).

Khayr al-Dīn al-Ziriklī, *Al-A<sup>ʿ</sup>lām*, 11 vols., 3d ed. (Beirut, 1969).

al-Maqqarī, ed. Iḥsān ʿAbbās, *Nafḥ al-ṭīb*, 8 vols. (Beirut, 1968).

- Abū Dāwūd, Sulaymān b. al-Ash<sup>c</sup>ath: he compiled one of the six authoritative *ḥadīth* collections. *Al-A<sup>c</sup>lām*, 3:182 [p. 177].
- Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal: he was the eponym of the Hanbalī legal school who became famous by enduring persecution for his refusal to adopt the Mu<sup>c</sup>tazilite position on the createdness of the Qur<sup>ʿ</sup>ān. *Al-A<sup>c</sup>lām*, 1:192–93 [p. 171].
- Al-<sup>c</sup>Alā<sup>ʿ</sup> b. <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ya<sup>c</sup>qūb al-Ḥuraqī al-Madanī Abū Shibl: al-Wāqidī reported that his book (*ṣaḥīfa*) was famous in Madīna. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 8:186–87 [p. 178].
- A<sup>c</sup>mash, Sulaymān b. Mihrān, al-Kūfī, al-Asadī *bi-al-walā<sup>ʿ</sup>*, Abū Muḥammad: he was an important <sup>c</sup>Irāqī scholar of the Followers. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 4:222:62 [p. 176].
- Asad b. Mūsā b. Ibrāhīm b. al-Walid b. <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Malik b. Marwān al-Umawī: he was known as *Asad al-sunna*. Al-Nasā<sup>ʿ</sup>ī considered him a *thiqa* (reliable source), although he was not impressed by his writings (*wa law lam yuṣannif kāna khayran lahu*). *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 1:260 [p. 171].
- Al-Awzā<sup>c</sup>ī, <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Raḥmān b. <sup>c</sup>Amr, Abū <sup>c</sup>Amr: he was the Imām of Syria and the eponym of the Awzā<sup>c</sup>ī legal school, which did not survive. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 6:238–42 [p. 171].
- Al-Bayhaqī, Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Shāfi<sup>c</sup>ī, Abū Bakr: he wrote several famous works on *ḥadīth* and Shāfi<sup>c</sup>ite *fiqh*. *Al-A<sup>c</sup>lām*, 1:13 [p. 189].
- Al-Bulqaynī, Sirāj al-Dīn <sup>c</sup>Umar b. Raslān al-Shāfi<sup>c</sup>ī, Abū Ḥafṣ: he wrote *Maḥāsin al-istilāḥ*, a commentary on *Muqaddimat Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ*, a work on the science of *ḥadīth*. It has been printed along with *al-Muqaddima*, ed. Bint al-Shāṭi<sup>ʿ</sup> (Cairo, 1989). *Al-A<sup>c</sup>lām*, 5:205 [p. 169].
- Al-Dāraquṭnī, <sup>c</sup>Alī b. <sup>c</sup>Umar b. Aḥmad Abū al-Ḥasan: he was the leading collector of *ḥadīth* of his generation and wrote several surviving works on the science of *ḥadīth* as well as his own compilation, *Sunan al-Dāraquṭnī*, which has been published. *Al-A<sup>c</sup>lām*, 5:130 [p. 169].
- Al-Ḥakam b. <sup>c</sup>Abd Allāh b. Sa<sup>d</sup> al-Ayli, Abū <sup>c</sup>Abd Allāh: Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal claimed that all of his *ḥadīths* were forged (*mawḏū<sup>c</sup>a*). *Lisān al-mizān*, 2:332–34 [p. 175].
- Al-Ḥākim Muḥammad b. <sup>c</sup>Abd Allāh al-Naysābūrī, Abū <sup>c</sup>Abd Allāh: one of the most famous scholars and compilers of *ḥadīth*. He wrote works on the science of *ḥadīth* and *al-Mustadrak <sup>c</sup>alā al-ṣaḥīḥayn*, in which he claims to have included *ḥadīths* valid according to the conditions of Muslim and al-Bukhārī but which they ignored. *Al-A<sup>c</sup>lām*, 7:101 [p. 174].
- Ḥammād b. Salama b. Dīnār al-Baṣrī al-Taymī *bi-al-walā<sup>ʿ</sup>*. Known as Abū Salama, he was generally considered to be a reliable transmitter of *ḥadīths* and was also well known for his asceticism. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 3:11–16 [p. 171].
- Al-Hasan b. <sup>c</sup>Alī b. Muḥammad al-Ḥalwānī, al-Hudhalī, Abū <sup>c</sup>Alī: all the authors of the six valid collections narrated *ḥadīths* from him except al-Nasā<sup>ʿ</sup>ī. His position on whether the person who maintains that the Qur<sup>ʿ</sup>ān was created is an unbeliever or not was a source of some controversy. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 2:302–4 [p. 177].

Ibn Hajar al-<sup>c</sup>Asqalānī, *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 12 vols. (Beirut, 1968).

Ibn Hajar al-<sup>c</sup>Asqalānī, *Lisān al-mizān*, 6 vols. (Hyderabad, 1329/1911).

Ibn Khallikān, ed. Iḥsān <sup>c</sup>Abbās, *Wafayāt al-a<sup>c</sup>yān*, 8 vols. (Beirut, 1968).

Muḥammad b. Ja<sup>c</sup>far al-Kattānī, *Al-Risāla al-mus-*

*taṭrafa*, 3d ed. (Damascus, 1383/1964).

Please note that the page numbers in brackets at the end of entries in this section refer the reader to the first instance in the translation where the name appears.

- Al-Ḥāzīmī, Muḥammad b. Abī ʿUthmān Mūsā b. ʿUthmān, al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū Bakr Zayn al-Dīn: he wrote a number of works on the science of *ḥadīth*, including *Kitāb al-ʿtibār fī al-nāsikh wa al-mansūkh min al-akhbār* and *Shurūṭ al-ʿimma al-khamsa*, both of which have been published. *Al-Aʿlām*, 7:339; *Al-Risāla al-mustaṭrafa*, 80 [p. 175].
- Al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī b. Muḥammad b. Yahyā al-Tamīmī al-Naysābūrī, Al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū Aḥmad: he was known as Ḥusaynak and was a close companion of Ibn Khuzayma (see below), who used to represent him at the *majlis al-sultān* whenever Ibn Khuzayma could not attend. *Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāz*, 3:968–69 [p. 178].
- Al-Husayn b. ʿAlī b. Yazīd, Abū ʿAlī: he was a famous *ḥadīth* scholar and was the teacher of Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥākīm al-Naysābūrī. *Al-Aʿlām*, 2:266; *Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāz*, 3:902–5 [p. 176].
- Ibn Abī Shayba, ʿUthmān b. Muḥammad (Abū Shayba) b. Ibrāhīm b. ʿUthmān b. Khustī al-Kūfī al-ʿAbsī *bi-al-walāʾ*, Abū al-Ḥasan: in addition to his **musnad**, he also compiled a commentary on the Qurʾān. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 7:149–51 [p. 171].
- Ibn Abī Shayba, ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad (Abū Shayba) b. Ibrāhīm, Abū Bakr: he is known as Abū Bakr Ibn Abī Shayba, author of the *Muṣannaḥ Ibn Abī Shayba* (which has been published and is the subject of the Ph.D. dissertation of Harald Motzki of the University of Hamburg). He is the brother of ʿUthmān b. Abī Shayba. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 6:2–4 [p. 171].
- Ibn Ḥazm, ʿAlī b. Aḥmad, Abū Muḥammad: he is the famous Spanish Zāhirite jurist who wrote extensively in many scholarly fields. *Al-Aʿlām*, 5:59 [p. 180].
- Ibn Jurayj, ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Jurayj al-Umawī *bi-al-walāʾ*: Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal mentions him with Saʿīd b. Abī ʿArūba as among the first to compose (*ṣannaḥa*) books. In addition to being a transmitter of *ḥadīth*, he was also a prominent Ḥijāzī jurist. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 6:402–6 [p. 171].
- Ibn Khuzayma, Muḥammad b. Iṣḥāq, Abū Bakr: a jurist and transmitter of *ḥadīth*; it is reported that he wrote over 140 books. He was nicknamed the “imām of imāms” (*imām al-ʿimma*) by al-Subkī. He compiled a collection of valid *ḥadīths* known as *Ṣaḥīḥ ibn Khuzayma*. *Al-Aʿlām*, 6:253 [p. 177].
- Ibn al-Munayyir, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Mansūr: an Alexandrian scholar and man of letters. *Al-Aʿlām*, 1:212 [p. 183].
- Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, ʿUthmān b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān, Abū ʿAmr: he is known as Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ and is author of the famous *Muqaddima fī ʿulūm al-ḥadīth* on the science of tradition. *Al-Aʿlām*, 4:369 [p. 176].
- Ibrāhīm b. Maʿqil al-Nasafī, Abū Iṣḥāq: he was a transmitter of *ḥadīth* and served as the judge of Nasaf. He also composed a *musnad* and a *tafsīr*. *Al-Aʿlām*, 1:70 [p. 172].
- ʿIkrima b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Barbarī: he was the client (*mawlā*) of Abū al-ʿAbbās ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbbās. ʿIkrima was well known as an exegete (*mufasssīr*) and was accused of having Khārijī sympathies. *Al-Aʿlām*, 5:43–44. Ibn ʿAbbās was one of the most prominent younger companions and became prominent in both exegesis (*tafsīr*) and law (*fiqh*). *Al-Aʿlām*, 4:228–29 [p. 178].
- Iṣḥāq b. Ibrāhīm b. Makhlad b. Ibrāhīm b. Maṭar al-Ḥanzalī, Abū Yaʿqūb: he was known as Ibn Rāhawayhi; he settled in Naysābūr and is considered to be one of the Imāms. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 1:216–19 [p. 171].
- Iṣḥāq b. Yahyā b. ʿAlqama: he was known as al-ʿAṣfī. He transmitted *ḥadīths* from al-Zuhri. The only student to transmit his material was Yahyā b. Ṣāliḥ. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 1:255–56 [p. 175].

- Al-Ismā'īlī, Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl b. Mihrān, Abū Bakr: a scholar of *ḥadīth* from Naysābūr who collected the *ḥadīths* of Mālik, al-Zuhrī, Yaḥyā b. Sa'īd, 'Abd Allāh b. Dīnār, and Mūsā b. 'Uqba. *Al-A'lam*, 6:259 [p. 172].
- 'Iyād b. Mūsā, al-Qādī Abū al-Faql: he was a Mālikī jurist who wrote extensively on *ḥadīth*. He also wrote *Tartīb al-madārik*, a work on the history of the Mālikī school. *Al-A'lam*, 5:282 [p. 180].
- Ja'far b. Burqān al-Kilābī al-Jazarī al-Raqqī, Abū 'Abd Allāh: *ḥadīth* critics considered him to be reliable except in his transmissions from al-Zuhrī. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 2:84–86 [p. 175].
- Jābir b. 'Abd Allāh: he was one of the younger companions of the Prophet who is reported to have lived well into the Umayyad period. *Al-A'lam*, 2:92 [p. 178].
- Khalaf b. Muḥammad al-Bukhārī: *Siyar a'lam al-nubalā'*, 16:70 [p. 172].
- Al-Khalīlī, Khalīl b. 'Abd Allāh b. Aḥmad b. Ibrāhīm b. al-Khalīl al-Qazwīnī, Abū Ya'qūb: he was a judge and a scholar of *ḥadīth* and wrote *al-Irshād fi 'ulamā' al-bilād*, to which Ibn Ḥajar referred in the text. *Al-A'lam*, 2:368 [p. 178].
- Al-Khāṭib al-Baghdādī, Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. 'Alī: he is the author of *Tarīkh Baghdād*, as well as numerous other works on the science of *ḥadīth*. *Al-A'lam*, 1:166 [p. 171].
- Al-Kushmīhanī, Muḥammad b. Makkī al-Marwazī, Abū al-Haytham: he was a transmitter of *Ḥaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*. *Shadharāt al-dhahab*, 3:132 [p. 172].
- Al-Layth b. Sa'īd: he was the Imām of Egypt and a student of Mālik. His famous letter to Mālik is preserved in al-Qādī 'Iyād's *Tartīb al-madārik*. *Al-A'lam*, 6:115.
- Mālik b. Anas: he is the eponym of the Mālikī school of jurisprudence and the famous Imām of Madīna. *Al-A'lam*, 6:128 [p. 171].
- Maslama b. al-Qāsim: he was an Andalusian historian and transmitter of *ḥadīth* from Qurṭuba who traveled extensively in the East and wrote works on the science of transmitters (*'ilm al-rijāl*). *Al-A'lam*, 8:122 [p. 180].
- Al-Mizzī, Yūsuf b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān, Abū al-Ḥajjāj: he wrote many works on the science of transmitters, the most famous of which is *Tahdhīb al-kamāl*. *Al-A'lam*, 9:313 [p. 171].
- Mu'āwiya b. Yaḥyā al-Ṣadafī al-Dimashqī, Abū Rawḥ: he served as the treasurer of al-Rayy in the days of al-Mahdī. He was not considered to be a very reliable transmitter and was accused of buying books and then "transmitting" them. The date of his death is not known. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 10:219–20 [p. 175].
- Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān: he was known as Ibn Abī Dhi'b, a famous scholar of the Medinese from the generation of the Followers. *Al-A'lam*, 7:61 [p. 175].
- Muḥammad b. 'Alī, Abū al-Faṭḥ: he is known as Ibn Daqīq al-'Īd. He was a famous Egyptian transmitter of *ḥadīth* and jurist, who wrote extensively on legal *ḥadīths*. *Al-A'lam*, 7:173–74 [p. 182].
- Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. 'Abd al-Malik Abū Bakr: he is known as Ibn Abī Jamra. He was a Spanish Mālikī jurist. His abridgment of al-Bukhārī has been published. *Al-A'lam*, 6:213 [p. 180].
- Muḥammad b. Muslim b. Tadrus, Abū al-Zubayr: it is reported that al-Layth b. Sa'īd obtained two books from Abū al-Zubayr containing *ḥadīths* of Jābir. Although controversial, he is considered reliable; many of his students were considered unreliable, however. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 9:440–43 [p. 178].
- Muḥammad b. Sa'īd al-Maṣlūb: charged with heresy (*zandaqa*), he was executed by al-Mansūr. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 9:184–86 [p. 175].
- Muḥammad b. Sulaymān b. Fāris: *Al-Siyar*, 14:388 [p. 172].

- Muḥammad b. ʿUmar b. Muḥammad: he was a Maghribī traveler who wrote a famous account of his trip to the Ḥijāz. *Al-Aʿlām*, 7:205 [p. 183].
- Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Dhuhālī al-Naysāburī, Al-Ḥafīz Abū ʿAbd Allāh: he was a very respected scholar of *ḥadīth* from Naysābūr. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 9:511–16 [p. 178].
- Muḥammad b. Yūsuf b. Maṭar al-Farabrī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh: al-Kushmīhanī transmitted al-Bukhārī’s *Ṣaḥīḥ* from al-Farabrī. *Shadharāt al-dhahab*, 2:286 [p. 172].
- Musaddad b. Musarhad b. Musarbal al-Baṣrī al-Asadī, Abū al-Ḥasan: he was considered one of the most reliable transmitters of *ḥadīth* of his generation in Baṣra. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 10:107–9 [p. 171].
- Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj al-Qushayrī, Abū al-Ḥusayn: he compiled the famous collection of *ḥadīths* known as *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, which is second in validity only to al-Bukhārī’s collection. *Al-Aʿlām*, 8:117–18 [p. 171].
- Al-Muthannā b. al-Ṣabāḥ al-Yamani al-Abnāwī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh: he was a descendant of the Persian *abnāʿ* who had settled in Yaman in pre-Islamic times. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 10:35–37 [p. 175].
- Nāfiʿ: he was the *mawlā* of ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, one of the prominent younger Companions. *Al-Aʿlām*, 8:319 [p. 176].
- Al-Nasāʾī, Aḥmad b. ʿAlī b. Shuʿayb Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān: he compiled one of the six authoritative collections of Prophetic *ḥadīths*. *Al-Aʿlām*, 1:164 [p. 177].
- Al-Nawawī, Muḥyī al-Dīn Yaḥyā b. Sharaf al-Shāfiʿī, Abū Zakariyyā: he compiled many famous collections of *ḥadīths*, e.g., *Riyāḍ al-ṣāliḥīn*, as well as works on the science of *ḥadīth* and Shāfiʿī *fiqh*. *Al-Aʿlām*, 9:184–85 [p. 169].
- Nuʿaym b. Ḥammād b. Muʿāwiya b. al-Ḥārith b. Humām b. Salama b. Mālik al-Khuzāʿī al-Marwazī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh: he was considered to be a reliable transmitter and compiled books on the teachings of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Shaybānī and Abū Ḥanīfa as well as works replying to the *Jahmiyya*. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 10:458–63 [p. 171].
- Qatāda b. Diʿāma al-Sadūsī al-Baṣrī, Abū al-Khaṭṭāb: he was a leading transmitter of *ḥadīth* and jurist among the Followers in Baṣra. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 8:351–56 [p. 176].
- Al-Qaysarānī, Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir b. ʿAlī b. Aḥmad al-Maqdisī: he was a famous sixth-century *ḥāfiẓ* who composed many works on the science of *ḥadīth*. He died in Baghdad. *Al-Aʿlām*, 7:41; *al-Risāla al-mustatrafā*, 123 [p. 174].
- Al-Rabīʿ b. Ṣabīḥ al-Saʿdī al-Baṣrī, Abū Bakr: he was a *mawlā* Saʿd b. Zayd Manāt, who, despite his reputation for piety, made errors in his transmissions. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 3:247–48 [p. 171].
- Saʿīd b. Abī ʿArūba Mihrān al-ʿAdwī al-Baṣrī, Abū al-Naḍr: he was a *mawlā* of Banī ʿAdī b. Yashkur. He was a *qadari*, although not a propagator of their doctrine. His transmissions are generally considered reliable (those made before the onset of senility, ca. 143). *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 4:63–66 [p. 171].
- Al-Shāfiʿī, Muḥammad b. Idrīs: he is the eponym of the Shāfiʿīte legal school who wrote the oldest surviving work on Islamic legal theory (*uṣūl al-fiqh*), *al-Risāla*. *Al-Aʿlām*, 6:249–50 [p. 176].
- Shuʿayb b. Abī Ḥamza Dīnār al-Umawī, al-Ḥimṣī, Abū Bishr: he was a scribe of al-Zuhrī and was considered one of his most reliable transmitters. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal was reported to have seen his books and praised them for their precision. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 4:351–52 [p. 175].

- Sufyān b. °Uyayna: a famous transmitter of *ḥadīth* in Makka during the second century. *Al-A°lām*, 3:159 [p. 175].
- Sufyān b. Ḥusayn al-Wāsiṭī, Abū Muḥammad: he was considered reliable except in his transmissions from al-Zuhrī. He died during the reign of either Hārūn al-Rashīd or al-Mahdī. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 4:107–9 [p. 175].
- Suhayl b. Abī Šāliḥ: he was generally considered reliable, although al-Bukhārī cited his material only if it was accompanied by another *ḥadīth*. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 4:263–64 [p. 178].
- Sulaymān b. Khalaf al-Bajī, Abū al-Walīd: he was a Mālikī legal scholar who wrote many works on legal theory, positive law, as well as a commentary on the *Muwaṭṭa°*. *Al-A°lām*, 3:186 [p. 173].
- Al-Ṭayālīsī, Sulaymān b. Dāwūd, Abū Dāwūd: he was one of the earliest collectors of *ḥadīth* to compile a **musnad**. *Al-A°lām*, 3:187 [p. 187].
- Thābit b. Aslam al-Bunānī al-Bašrī, Abū Muḥammad: he was one of the Followers and transmitted many *ḥadīths* from the Companion Anas b. Mālik. He was also a storyteller (*qāṣṣ*). *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 2:2–4 [p. 179].
- Al-Thawrī, Sufyān. b. Sa°id b. Masrūq al-Kūfī, Abū °Abd Allāh: many of the *ḥadīth* critics gave him the nickname “Commander of the Faithful in *ḥadīth*.” *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 4:111–15 [p. 171].
- Al-Tirmidhī, Muḥammad b. °Isā: he compiled one of the six authoritative collections of Prophetic *ḥadīths*. *Al-A°lām*, 7:213 [p. 189].
- °Ubayd Allāh b. Mūsā b. Abī al-Mukhtār al-Kūfī al-°Absī *bi-al-walā°*, Abū Muḥammad: he is considered reliable by many, although his *Shi°i* sympathies caused some critics to consider him unreliable. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 7:50–53 [p. 171].
- °Uqayl b. Khālid b. °Aqil al-Aylī al-Umawī, *mawlā* °Uthmān b. °Affān: he was reported to be the most reliable transmitter of al-Zuhrī after Mālik. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 7:255–56 [p. 175].
- Al-°Uqaylī, Muḥammad b. °Amr, Abū Ja°far: he is the author of *al-Du°afā° al-kabīr*, ed. °Abd al-Mu°ṭī Amīn al-Qal°ajī (Beirut, 1984). *Al-A°lām*, 7:210 [p. 172].
- Yaḥyā b. Sa°id b. Qays al-Anšārī, Abū Sa°id: he was an important source for Mālik in his *Muwaṭṭa°*, as well as having served as a judge. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 11:221–24 [p. 176].
- Yūnus b. Yazīd b. Abī al-Nijād al-Aylī, *mawlā* Mu°āwiya b. Abī Sufyān, Abū Yazīd: he became well known as a student of al-Zuhrī, although he was accused of having transmitted some unknown material (*manākīr*) attributed to al-Zuhrī. *Tahdhīb-tahdhīb*, 11:450–52 [p. 175].
- Zam°a b. Šāliḥ al-Jundī al-Yamanī: he is considered an unreliable transmitter, especially in connection with his al-Zuhrī material. His date of death is not known. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 3:338–39 [p. 175].
- Zayd b. al-Ḥasan b. Zayd b. al-Ḥasan b. Sa°id al-Kindī, Tāj al-Dīn, Abū al-Yumn: he was known as *musnid al-shām*. *Wafayāt al-a°yān*, 2:339–42; *Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāz*, 4:1402. *Al-A°lām*, 3:96–97 [p. 171].
- Al-Zuhrī, Muḥammad b. Muslim b. °Ubayd Allāh Ibn Shihāb: he was a famous transmitter of *ḥadīths* about the Followers and one of their leading scholars. *Al-A°lām*, 7:317 [p. 175].

## APPENDIX II

TECHNICAL TERMS<sup>46</sup>

<sup>2</sup>*a-la-fa, kha-la-fa*

**Al-mu<sup>2</sup>talifa** and **al-mukhtalifa** are two terms denoting names which appear to be the same in writing but are pronounced differently, for example, *bishr* and *busr*. *Muq.*, 590.

*ja-ma-<sup>c</sup>a*

**Jāmi<sup>c</sup>** (pl. **jawāmi<sup>c</sup>**) is a collection of *ḥadīths* arranged topically and includes all religious topics of relevance to a Muslim, not just legal points, for example, Bukhārī's *Al-Jāmi<sup>c</sup> al-ṣaḥīḥ*.

*ja-za-<sup>2</sup>a*

**Juz<sup>2</sup>** (pl. **ajzā<sup>2</sup>**) is a small collection of *ḥadīths* either on one topic or from one narrator.

*ḥa-fa-za*

**Ḥāfiḥ** is a title which denotes, in the context of *ḥadīth* studies, a scholar who has devoted himself to the study of traditions, i.e., a *ḥadīth* specialist.

*kha-ra-ja*

**Mustakhrāj** denotes a special type of *ḥadīth* collection in which a collector of *ḥadīth* compiles the same texts of a previous work but cites them with **isnāds** to himself, using a path other than the original path used by the original compiler of the work, for example, al-Ḥumaydī's *Al-Jam<sup>c</sup> bayna al-ṣaḥīḥayn*.

*da-la-sa*

**Tadlis** is a term denoting: (1) either a reporter's transmission of a report from a teacher whom he has met without his having actually heard that text from the teacher or (2) the transmitter's use of a name for his teacher other than the one by which he is commonly known. The reporter who does this is called a **mudallis**. Transmitters of *ḥadīth* accept the reports of a **mudallis** but in cases where he uses a form requiring that he heard it from the teacher, for example, "fulān told me"; if the **mudallis** were to say "from fulān," however, it would not be taken to mean that he had heard the text from the teacher. *Muq.* 230–36.

*ra-sa-la*

**Mursal** is a *ḥadīth* text in which a Follower omits the name of the Companion who transmitted the *ḥadīth* from the Prophet, according to the usage of the *ḥadīth* specialists. Jurists (*fuqahā<sup>2</sup>*) and legal theorists (*uṣūliyyūn*) use this term to denote any *ḥadīth* text in which someone other than a Companion says: "The Messenger of God (S) said: . . ." *Muq.*, 202–12.

<sup>46</sup> For an introduction to the different genres of *ḥadīth* works, see Maḥmūd al-Ṭaḥḥān, *Uṣūl al-takhrīj wa dirāsāt al-asānīd* (Aleppo, 1978). *Muq.* refers to *Muqadimmat Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ*.

*ra-fa-<sup>ᶜ</sup>a*

**Marfū<sup>ᶜ</sup>** is a report which is attributed, literally “raised,” to the Prophet.

*sa-na-da*

**Musnad** when used for a *ḥadīth* collection means a collection of *ḥadīths* arranged according to the Companion who transmitted the report from the Prophet, for example, *Musnad* of Ibn Ḥanbal or the *Musnad* of al-Ṭayālīsī [p. 5].

**Musnad** when used to describe a *ḥadīth* text denotes a text which was transmitted directly, from transmitter to transmitter, without any interruptions. The term **muttaṣil** is synonymous. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, however, reports that the term **musnad** is at times used by some *ḥadīth* critics to refer to any text attributed to the Prophet, even if there is an interruption in its **isnād**. He, however, considers the two terms synonymous. I have treated them synonymously in the translation and have rendered them as “connected” *Muq.*, 190–92.

**Isnād** refers to the documentation of the *ḥadīth* text’s transmission history. This usually precedes all *ḥadīth* texts, for example, “Mālik told me on the authority of Nāfi<sup>ᶜ</sup> on the authority of Ibn <sup>ᶜ</sup>Umar that the Prophet said. . . .”

*<sup>ᶜ</sup>a-la-qa*

**Ta<sup>ᶜ</sup>liq, Mu<sup>ᶜ</sup>allaq** is a term denoting a *ḥadīth* text in which one or more narrators have been omitted from the beginning of the **isnād**, *Muq.*, 167, 226–28. It literally means “to suspend.” **Ta<sup>ᶜ</sup>liq** describes the act of “suspending” a text without proper attribution, while **mu<sup>ᶜ</sup>allaq** describes the text itself.

*<sup>ᶜ</sup>a-na-<sup>ᶜ</sup>a-na*

**<sup>ᶜ</sup>An<sup>ᶜ</sup>ana** is a term used to describe the transmitter’s statement in the *ḥadīth*’s **isnād**, “So and so from, i.e., **<sup>ᶜ</sup>an**, So-and-so.” It is controversial because the student does not mention how he acquired the text from the teacher. *Muq.*, 220–26. One who practices **<sup>ᶜ</sup>an<sup>ᶜ</sup>ana** is called the **mu<sup>ᶜ</sup>an<sup>ᶜ</sup>in**, whereas the **mu<sup>ᶜ</sup>an<sup>ᶜ</sup>an <sup>ᶜ</sup>anhu** is the source of the text.

*qa-ṭa-<sup>ᶜ</sup>a*

**Taqṭi<sup>ᶜ</sup>** is a technical term which Ibn Ḥajar defines as separating a *ḥadīth*’s text into several parts, each of which expresses a different idea or theme.

**Munqaṭi<sup>ᶜ</sup>** is a *ḥadīth* text in whose **isnād** there is an interruption, meaning that within the **isnād** there is a transmitter who did not hear the report from the transmitter above him in the **isnād** and that the name omitted between the two is not mentioned. This also includes those **isnāds** which include an ambiguous reference, such as *shaykh* or “man.” *Muq.*, 213–15.

*ma-ta-na*

**Matn** is the text, the “content” of the *ḥadīth* report.

*wa-qa-fa*

**Mawqūf** is a report which is “stopped” at a Companion, although it can also be used to describe reports of the Followers. *Muq.*, 194–95.