

Who Moved My *Sanad*? - Another History of *Isnād* in the Transmission and Conveyance of *Ḥadīth* and *Sunnah*

Khairil Husaini Bin Jamil

AbdulHamid Abu Sulayman Kulliyyah of Islamic Revealed Knowledge and Human Sciences, International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM), Malaysia

ABSTRACT

Article:

Accepted: January 30, 2022

Revised: April 24, 2022

Issued: June 03, 2022

© 2022 The Author(s)



This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license

Doi: [10.15408/quhas.v11i1.27211](https://doi.org/10.15408/quhas.v11i1.27211)

Correspondence Address:
husaini@iium.edu.my

This paper investigates the beginning of a phenomenon observed amongst later ḥadīth compilers that is the omission of sanads from some of their works dedicated to conveying the ḥadīths of Prophet Muḥammad. Some of them produced another specific work to present the ḥadīths with sanads and others may resort to compiling only sanads in their thabat or records of ijāzāt and samā'āt (audition certificates). This phenomenon speaks volumes about the authority of sanad and isnād in later Muslim intellectual tradition. Since many modern studies have mostly accorded its attention to the dating and function of isnād methodology, and expectedly of the formative periods of Islam, the study of sanad omission from a ḥadīth treatise has been completely neglected although it should have been examined carefully, in particular on the reception of and responses to the phenomenon amongst the scholars of ḥadīth. This paper argues that the Egyptian judge, Muḥammad ibn Salāmah al-Qudā'ī (454AH) shall be recognised as the first ḥadīth scholar to produce a ḥadīth treatise whose ḥadīths are not accompanied by sanad. He dedicated another work to preserve its sanads and by so doing, introduced the mujarrad-musnad method into ḥadīth literature. His mujarrad collection titled *Shihāb al-Akḥbār* gained incredible praise and became one of the most memorised works of ḥadīth. The method of mujarrad has also been emulated by other eminent ḥadīth scholars such as al-Daylamī and al-Nawawī and contributed to the successful dissemination of ḥadīths in later Muslim communities.

Keywords: The authority of sanad, isnad and tajrīd methodology, ḥadīth literature, al-Qāḍī al-Qudā'ī, al-Shihāb

Introduction

Sanad, as a chain of narration consisting of mostly nominal references to the transmitters involved in receiving and conveying the *ḥadīth* of Prophet Muḥammad, has been given abundant attention in modern studies. With the revival of *ḥadīth* re-verification activities in modern times, the concentration on *sanad* has increased dramatically and academic studies surrounding *sanad* literature have gained more acceptance in higher learning institutions.¹ The surge of online classes during the Covid-19 pandemic has also contributed to the revitalisation of *ijāzāh* tradition where *sanads* can be granted virtually and promptly to the attendees across the globe. With the rise of *sanad* culture, there seems to be a significant concern with the adequacy of attention afforded to the study of its counterpart that is the *matn* (the text) of the *ḥadīths*. It is true that in the medieval era, participants in *ḥadīth* learning and praxis have been generally divided into two groups: those who were heavily inclined towards the rigour of *sanad* compilation and scrutinization, and those who propagated the primacy of meaning i.e., the content of the *ḥadīth* texts. The usual Arabic reference to this dichotomy is the *riwāyah* versus *dirāyah* tension. A number of treatises germane to principles of *ḥadīth* criticism have alluded to this concern in the past.² Moreover, this methodological bifurcation has impinged upon *ḥadīth* evaluation and utilisation until today. Issues such as the prevalence of *sanad* criticism over *matn* criticism, the function of *sanad* for non-legal subjects, and the origin of *sanad* culture are amongst those of interest to modern critical assessment. Although early modern criticism of *ḥadīth*, attended mainly by the orientalist, bolstered scepticism towards *sanad* authenticity and tradition, the study of *sanad* continues to thrive and to a certain extent has been adopted even outside the field of *ḥadīth* studies. Nevertheless, studies on the history of *sanad* in general and how particular *sanad* may inform our understanding of its history still require more efforts and dedication. It is our aim from this paper to contribute to this endeavour by studying a phenomenon in the history of *sanad* that is the omission of *sanad* from works dedicated to the transmission or conveyance of *ḥadīth* and Sunnah.

¹ For further explanation on *sanad* and *matn*, see: Mustafa Shah, 'Introductions', in *The Hadith* (Oxon: Routledge, 2010).

² See: al-Ḥasan ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Khallād al-Rāmhurmuzī, *al-Muḥaddith al-Fāṣil Bayna al-Rāwī Wa al-Wā'ī*, ed. 'Ajāj al-Khaṭīb (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1994); Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh Ibn al-Bayyī 'Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥākīm, *Ma'rifat 'Ulūm al-Ḥadīth Wa Kammiyat Ajnāsīhi* (Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 2003); Aḥmad ibn 'Ali ibn Thābit al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *al-Kifāyah Fī Uṣul 'Ilm al-Riwāyah* (Riyadh: Dār Ibn al-Jawzī, 2011).

Dating the Early History of *Sanad* and *Isnād*

In general, modern academic scholarship particularly in the West, consists of two nominal camps, whom Herbert Berg in his study generally named sceptical and sanguine, in relation to their attitudes to Islamic literary sources and by extension the *ḥadīths* preserved within them.³ The sceptics are identified with certain key ideas such as the back-projection of *ḥadīth* by the Muslims of early centuries, the historicity of the genesis of Islam, and the possible manipulation and fabrication in the corpus of Islamic history. The sanguine scholars, on the other hand, are deemed more confident with the Islamic sources and materials including *ḥadīth*. At stake is the value of *sanad*, its authority and chronological history. With the adoption of the modern Historical Critical Method,⁴ the genesis and legitimacy of *sanad* have been revisited and mostly contested for the historical accounts consulted by Muslim scholars to establish its history were predominantly constructed by the *sanad* literature itself, and hence regarded close to self-proving fallacy or *petition principii*.

One famous account often brought up in such a debate is the statement of the successor of the companion of Prophet Muḥammad, known as Ibn Sīrīn (110AH). It was reported that he said: ‘They never used to ask about *isnād*; however, when the *fitnah* (discord) dominated, they would say: “Name your informants.”’⁵ Two general attitudes towards this statement have been observed in contemporary scholarship. The first takes the view that the statement was concocted to back-project an early development of *isnād* since the *fitnah* will be interpreted as referring to the earliest instance of civil war amongst the Muslims.⁶ The second group trusts the substance of this narration, but they differ on identifying the *fitnah* referred to by Ibn Sīrīn. To briefly sum up the views of the second group, the *fitnah* was associated with one of the following events: (1) the assassination of the third Rāshidūn caliph, ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān (35AH), (2) the civil war between the supporters of ‘Alī and the supporters of Mu‘āwiyah that took place in 36AH, (3) the rise of the Khārijite group, al-Azāriqah under the leadership of Nāfi‘ ibn al-Azraq (65AH), (4) the rebellious movement led by al-Mukhtār ibn

³ See: Herbert Berg, *The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam: The Authenticity of Muslim Literature from the Formative Period* (London: Curzon Press, 2000); Herbert Berg, ‘Competing Paradigms in Islamic Origins: Qur’ān 15:89–91 and the Value of Isnāds’, *Method and Theory in the Study of Islamic Origins*, 2021, 259–90, https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047401575_014.

⁴ Jonathan Brown, *Hadith: Muhammad’s Legacy in the Medieval and Modern World*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oneworld Publication, 2009).

⁵ See the introduction to Muslim’s collection in: Ibn al-Ḥajjāj al-Naysābūrī Muslim, *al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ al-Mukhtaṣar Min al-Sunan Bi Naql al-‘adl ‘an al-‘Adl Ilā Rasul Allah*, ed. Naṣar Muḥammad al-Fāriyābī (Riyadh: Dār Ṭaybah, 2006) no. (27).

⁶ See, for instance: Joseph Schacht, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950), 36–37.

Abī ‘Ubayd al-Thaqafī (67AH) against the Umayyad caliphate, (5) the armed fight between the camp of ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr and the Umayyad governor al-Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf al-Thaqafī that took place around the year 72AH, and (6) the assassination of the Umayyad caliph al-Walīd ibn Yazīd in 126AH. The first five views located the introduction of systematic *isnād* between the first half and the second half of the first Hijrī century, whilst the last view dated it to the second Hijrī century.

Regardless of the various views on the intended *fitnah* by the statement, there are numerous other accounts that reflect the notion of *sanad* or *isnād* during the same range of time.⁷ In this paper, I will only present a personal conclusion derived from those accounts. First of all, it should be noted that although some scholars took *sanad* and *isnād* as synonyms, there are others who differentiated between the two.⁸ For them, *sanad* refers to the chain of narrators in the act of transmission, whilst *isnād* is the act of mentioning the *sanad* or the ascription of a certain *ḥadīth* text to the one who transmitted it from his informant.⁹ *Sanad*, thus, is the object and *isnād* is the action. Considering this, *sanad* can be said to have been around even though the conscious systematic method of *isnād* has not yet been widespread. Nevertheless, the general phases of *sanad* can be chronologically ordered as follows:

a) Conversational *sanad*, occasionally instructional *sanad*

At this phase, *sanad* was occasionally part of natural conversation and appears organically as often observed from the oral culture of ancient and medieval societies. The terms *musnid*, *musnad* and *isnād* have not been used technically. It was natural to find a person to sometimes mention the name of his teacher or informant to his audience. Historical reports on the first Hijri century generally reflect this phase.

b) Confessional *sanad*

As explicit in its name, the phase of confessional *sanad* reflects the conflict and dispute between factions, parties or sects. It does not necessarily involve systematic critical assessment of statement, report or narration in terms of its logical coherence, its linguistic

⁷ See: Khairil Husaini Bin Jamil, ‘ آثاره في (454هـ) كتاب شهاب الأخبار للقضاعي (454هـ) وأثره في ’، مسار التصنيف الحديثي قراءة في تأريخ الإسناد والتجريد: كتاب شهاب الأخبار للقضاعي (454هـ) وأثره في ’، *al-Burhān: Journal of Qur’ān and Sunnah Studies* 3, no. 1 (2019): 76–105.

⁸ See: ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abū Bakr Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī, *Alfiyyat al-Suyūṭī Fī ‘Ilm al-Ḥadīth*, ed. Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad Shākir Abū al-Ashbāl (al-Maktabah al-‘Ilmiyyah, n.d.); ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Bakr Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī, *Tadrib al-Rāwī Fī Sharḥ Taqrīb al-Nawawī*, ed. Abū Qutaybah Naẓar Muḥammad al-Fāriyābī (Riyadh: Dār Ṭaybah, 2006).

⁹ al-Suyūṭī wrote in his *Alfiyyah*: والسند الإخبار عن طريق * متن كالإسناد لدى فريق

aspect or its conformity to established principles or conventions. The main observation of *sanad* during this phase was the conformity of its narrators or content to the position of the faction or group. In general, the second phase of the first Hijrī century fits this vision. The term *isnād* may have been used to qualify a successful fulfilment of the criteria of confessional *sanad*. The statement of Ibn Sīrīn above can be said to refer to this phase although it is interesting to note that his statement does not necessarily pin down the beginning of the *fitnah*. The Arabic *falammā waqa‘at al-fitnah* could also indicate ‘as the *fitnah* reached its peak,’ in which case, it can be located in the next century.

c) Critical *sanad*

The beginning of the critical evaluation of *sanad* has been the point of contention in modern debates regarding the credibility of classical *ḥadīth* criticism.¹⁰ The main indication stipulated for the dating of this phase is the consistent attachment of *sanad* to a *ḥadīth*. It is perhaps befitting here to suggest that the phase of adopting critical *sanad* begins with the conscious distinction between *musnad* and *mursal*. *Musnad* indicates that the *sanad* is cited completely whilst in *mursal*, the transmission is fast-forwarded that it effectuates the omission of some narrators from the chain of transmission, usually two intermediaries between a successor and the Prophet. In other words, the emphasis now is accorded more to the continuity of transmission and the quality of unbroken chain compared to the confessional dimension of the narrator or his integrity in the previous phase. I have elaborated on the transition from the terms *musnad* vs *mursal* to the terms *muttaṣil* vs *munqaṭi‘* within the *ḥadīth* circle in another paper.¹¹ In short, this phase was the longest in the history of *isnād* and it seems not interrupted until the omission of *sanad* from *ḥadīth* works took place. This will be discussed in the coming section.

d) Customary *sanad*

The main feature of this phase is that the action of *isnād* is no longer associated with the critical assessment of its narrators and the text with which it is attached. *Isnād* has become only customary and in the words of some *ḥadīth* scholars such as al-Suyūṭī, it is meant only

¹⁰ For further information on the development of *ḥadīth* criticism, see: Scott Lucas, *Constructive Critics, Ḥadīth Literature and the Articulation of Sunnī Islam: The Legacy of the Generation of Ibn Sa‘d, Ibn Ma‘īn and Ibn Ḥanbal* (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2004).

¹¹ Bin Jamil, 'قراءة في تأريخ الإسناد والتجريد: كتاب شهاب الأخبار للقضاءي (454هـ) وأثاره في مسار التصنيف الحديث', A Reading of Isnād and Tājirīd Methodology: Shihāb al-Akḥbār of al-Quḍā‘ī (d.454H) and Its Influence on Later Ḥadīth Compilations.'

for maintaining the tradition or blessings.¹² *Ḥadīth* masters may also provide a *sanad* for the whole book or compendium rather than presenting a specific *sanad* for each particular *ḥadīth*. Although scholars are still verifying certain *sanads*, the essential *sanads* are said to have been completely reported in the written works of the *muḥaddithūn*. Oral transmission is no longer, then, regarded as the focal point for verification.

Which *Muḥaddith* Removed the *Sanad*?

It is a known fact that not all genres of Islamic literature incorporated *sanads* in presenting its traditions. Although some early *tafsīr* and *sīrah* works, for instance, adopted the method of *sanad*, it is not strange to find works of early scholars especially from outside the Sunnī tradition ignoring the practice of *isnād*. For this reason, our investigation of the history of *sanad* omission will be confined to works dedicated to transmitting or conveying *ḥadīths* composed or compiled by a prominent figure well-versed in *ḥadīth* tradition. We believe that this will better reflect the development of *ḥadīth* tradition within the circle of *ḥadīth* itself.

Perhaps the first to point out this subject, even casually, was a Yemenite Tarim luminary Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Alawī Kharid Bā‘Alawī al-Ḥusaynī (960AH). In his *Ghurar al-Bahā’ al-Ḍawī*, he ascribed ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Jadīd (620AH) as ‘the first to omit *sanads* from *ḥadīths*, as he merely writes “from the Messenger of Allah PBUH.” Later authors followed suit and approved this act of his.’¹³ Moreover, Kharid Bā‘Alawī praised this ‘invention’ and wrote again in the same book: ‘This legal scholar ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad was the first individual to omit all *sanads* of *ḥadīths* and attributed the texts immediately to the one who transmitted them directly from the Prophet PBUH (i.e., the Companions). This is a noble virtue which earns him high praise from the giants amongst the scholars and the *muḥaddithūn*.’¹⁴ The fact that he mentioned that even the *muḥaddithūn* praised this new method is quite unsettling as it is not a common perception of the scholars of the field. Indeed, Kharid Bā‘Alawī’s appraisal of this act as praiseworthy was questioned by Muḥammad BāDhīb citing the famous aphorism “the *isnād* is part of the *dīn*.”¹⁵ A removal of *sanad* should not then be considered as laudable. BāDhīb also added another fact that Ibn

¹² al-Suyūṭī wrote in *Alfiyyah*: صار بقا سلسلة الإسناد * عسرهما مع كون ذا المراد * اعتبار هذه المعاني

¹³ Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Alawī al-Ḥusaynī al-Tarīmī Kharid Bā‘Alawī, *Ghurar al-Bahā’ al-Ḍawī Wa Durar al-Jamāl al-Badī’ al-Bahī Fī Dhīkr al-‘Immah al-Amjād Wa al-‘Ulamā al-‘Arīfīn al-Nuqqād Wa al-Fuqahā’ al-Mujaddidīn al-Asyād*, 2nd ed., n.d., 126.

¹⁴ Kharid Bā‘Alawī, 467.

¹⁵ Muḥammad ibn Abū Bakr BāDhayb, *Juhūd Fuqahā’ Ḥaḍramawt Fī Khidmat al-Madhhab al-Shāfi’ī* (Jordan: Dār al-Faṭḥ li’l-Dirāsāt wa’l-Nashr, 2009), 1:324.

Jadīd was not the first to omit *sanads* from *ḥadīths*, rather the method was already adopted by the teacher of Ibn Jadīd's teachers - Muḥammad ibn Sa'īd ibn Ma'an al-Qurayzī (757AH). He removed all *sanads* in his work *al-Mustaṣfā* in which he combined the content of the six canonical compendia with that of *al-Muwattā'*.¹⁶

We can verify this claim by examining the published version of *al-Mustaṣfā*. It is indeed observed that the book is devoid of *sanads* and the author himself emphasised *ikhtisār* (conciseness) as the reason for the omission. al-Qurayzī introduced his work saying:

"فهذا مختصر في سنن رسول الله ﷺ، مستخرج من صحاح كتب أئمة الحديث رحمة الله عليهم
... محذوف الأسانيد إلا المتون، مكتوب في أول كل خير علامة اسم من ذكره منهم."

'This is an abridged collection of the traditions of the Messenger of Allah PBUH, derived from the verified works of the masters of *ḥadīth*, may Allah's mercy be upon them ... with its *sanads* omitted but its texts (retained), and specified at the beginning of each tradition the name of the master who recorded the *ḥadīth* (in his compendium) ...'¹⁷

Nevertheless, it seems that al-Qurayzī himself did not introduce this method and he learned it from a predecessor. To clarify this, it is important to learn that al-Qurayzī had composed another work on *ḥadīth* titled *al-Qamar* (possibly *al-Qamar fī Aḥādīth Sayyid al-Bashar*). Since the book did not survive, we have no information concerning its structure. However, BāDhīb claimed in his editorial preface for *al-Mustaṣfā* that *al-Qamar* was composed following the style of *al-Kawkab al-Durrī al-Mustakhraj min Kalām al-Nabī al-'Arabī*.¹⁸ The work was compiled by Aḥmad ibn Ma'ad Abū al-'Abbās al-Uqlīshī al-Tujībī (550AH).¹⁹ This is interesting since the *ḥadīths* mentioned in the latter are devoid of *sanads* as well. al-Uqlīshī also has another two works which are *al-Ghurar min Kalām Sayyid al-Bashar*²⁰ and its abridged version *al-Najm min Kalām Sayyid al-'Arab wa al-'Ajam*. The

¹⁶ BāDhayb, 1:324.

¹⁷ Muḥammad ibn Sa'īd ibn Ma'an al-Qurayzī, *al-Mustaṣfā Fī Sunan al-Muṣṭafā*, ed. Muḥammad 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Ahdal, 1st ed. (Beirut: Dār al-Minhāj, n.d.), 40. The editor remarked that there is a huge similarity between this work and the later *Riyāḍ al-Ṣāliḥīn* of al-Nawawī.

¹⁸ See the editorial remark in: al-Qurayzī, 25.

¹⁹ See: Aḥmad ibn Ma'ad al-Tujībī al-Uqlīshī, *al-Kawkab al-Durrī al-Mustakhraj Min Kalām al-Nabī al-'Arabī* (Morocco, 2014); The work was also published in a dissertation. See: Ahmad Muhammad Ahmad al-Ahdal, 'A Critical Edition of "al-Kawkab al-Durri al-Mustakhraj Min Kalam al-Nabi"' by Ahmad b. Ma'add b. 'Isa b. Wakil al-Tujibi al-Uqlishi' (University of Glasgow, 1986).

²⁰ Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Tilmisānī, *Nafḥ al-Ṭīb Min Ghuṣn al-Andalus al-Raṭīb* (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1968), 2:599.

complete original did not survive, however the abridged which is *al-Najm* presented its *ḥadīths* without any *sanad*.²¹ It is highly possible that the original too was without any *sanad* since al-Uqlīshī did not mention any other differences between the two except for the length of *ḥadīth* texts presented in them. In *al-Najm*, al-Uqlīshī stated:

‘Since I have compiled *al-Ghurar min Kalām Sayyid al-Bashar*, and placed within it *ḥadīths* with lengthy texts, and it has therefore posed great challenges for many to memorise them, I decided to excerpt *ḥadīths* with simple wordings (in this separate work) so it will be more accessible for the lessons and easier to be memorised, and I name it *al-Najm*.’²²

In short, al-Qurayzī was definitely preceded by al-Uqlīshī in applying this method of removing *sanads*. The statement of Kharid Bā‘ Alawī then, can only be understood in the sense that Ibn Jadīd was perhaps the first amongst the ‘Alawiyyīn or his circle to adopt this method.

We are left with the question of whether al-Uqlīshī can be regarded as the first to omit *sanads* from *ḥadīths*. We must also recall that our aim is to find the first to do so amongst those who are active in *riwāyah* and *dirāyah*, i.e., transmission and understanding of *ḥadīth*, since the omission of *sanads* by other groups such as the exegetes, legal scholars and chroniclers has been definitely practised since an early time.

Through searching in the biographies and reports on works of those who belong to the circle of *ḥadīth*, I have come to the conclusion that it was al-Ḥāfiẓ al-Qādī Muḥammad ibn Salāmah ibn ‘Alī Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Quḍā‘ī (454AH) who can be considered as the first *muḥaddīth* to remove *sanads* from a work dedicated to conveying *ḥadīth*. He has done so in his work titled *Shihāb al-Akḥbār fī al-Ḥikam wa al-Amthāl wa al-Ādāb fī al-Aḥādīth al-Marwiyyah ‘an al-Rasūl al-Mukhtār*²³ (translated into English and published under the title: *Light in the Heavens*). al-Quḍā‘ī was a Shāfi‘ite judge in the Fatimid court in Egypt and he collected in this work 1200 sayings of the Prophet with all its *sanads* removed. He explicitly noted: ‘I have dedicated for their *sanads* another book should reference to them be needed.’ The book referred to here is the one titled *Musnad al-Shihāb*.²⁴ In this subsequent work, he

²¹ See: Aḥmad ibn Ma‘ad al-Tujībī al-Uqlīshī, *al-Najm Min Kalām Sayyid al-‘Arab Wa al-‘Ajam*, 1st ed. (Cairo: al-Maṭba‘ah al-‘Ilāmiyyah, 1885).

²² al-Uqlīshī, 3.

²³ al-Quḍā‘ī in *Shihāb al-Akḥbār fī al-Ḥikam wa al-Amthāl wa al-Ādāb fī al-Aḥādīth al-Marwiyyah ‘an al-Rasūl al-Mukhtār*. The work is incorporated in *Musnad al-Shihāb* as will be detailed below.

²⁴ Muḥammad ibn Salāmah ibn ‘Alī Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Quḍā‘ī, *Musnad al-Shihāb*, ed. Ḥamdī ‘Abd al-Majīd al-Salāfi, 1st ed. (Beirut: Mu‘assasah al-Risālah, n.d.); Also, by another publisher. See: Muḥammad ibn

provided the *sanad* for all *ḥadīths* presented in *Shihāb al-Akḥbār*. Thus, we can conclude safely that the omission of *sanads* from the *ḥadīth* work was not due to unavailability or any potential defects from al-Quḍā'ī's view, rather the method was introduced by him for a specific reason, which he mentioned in the work, "so that it will be more accessible for everyone and easier for memorisation."

To further clarify the method of al-Quḍā'ī, let us consider the following example. For *Shihāb al-Akḥbār*, al-Quḍā'ī immediately wrote after his preface:

الأعمال بالنيات، المجالس بالأمانة

'Acts are only worth the intentions that accompany them. Keep what is said at gatherings private.'²⁵

Whilst in *Musnad al-Shihāb*, he began after the preface with:

الأعمال بالنيات، أخبرنا أبو مُجَدِّد عبد الرحمن بن عمر التجيبي، أنا أحمد بن مُجَدِّد بن زياد، ثنا مُجَدِّد بن عبد الملك الدقيقي، ثنا يزيد بن هارون، أنبا يحيى بن سعيد، أن مُجَدِّداً هو ابن إبراهيم التيمي أخبره أنه سمع علقمة بن وقاص الليثي يقول: سمعت عمر بن الخطاب η يقول على المنبر: سمعت رسول الله ﷺ يقول: الأعمال بالنيات، وإنما لامرئ ما نوى، فمن كانت هجرته إلى الله وإلى رسوله فهجرته إلى الله وإلى رسوله، ومن كانت هجرته لدنيا يصيبها أو امرأة يتزوجها فهجرته إلى ما هجر إليه. هذا حديث صحيح أخرجه البخاري عن القعني عن مالك.

Acts are only worth the intentions that accompany them. We learned via a *khbar* from Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn 'Umar al-Tujībī, he said; we learned via a *khbar* from Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ziyād, he said; we learned via a *taḥdīth* by Muḥammad 'Abd al-Malik al-Daḥīqī, he said; we learned via a *taḥdīth* by Yazīd ibn Hārūn, he said; we learned via *inbā'* from Yaḥyā ibn Sa'īd; that Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Taymī told him; that he heard 'Alqamah ibn Waqqāṣ al-Laythī said; I heard 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb RA said on the pulpit: I heard the Messenger of Allah PBUH said: 'Acts are only worth the intentions that accompany them, and every person will get the reward

Salāmah ibn 'Alī Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Quḍā'ī, *Musnad al-Shihāb*, ed. Ḥamid 'Abd Allāh al-Miḥlāwī, 1st ed. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 2011). It was also edited in a PhD thesis. See: Fā'iz Ḥāmid Muḥammad al-Qurashī, 'Taḥqīq Wa Dirāsah Musnad al-Shihāb Li al-Quḍā'ī Min Awwalihi Ilā Nihāyat al-Juz' al-Khāmis' (Umm al-Qura University, 1988).

²⁵ al-Quḍā'ī, *Shihāb al-Akḥbār*, unpublished manuscript, MSS 3859 (I), Foll. 51, Chester Beatty Library, Ireland.

according to what he has intended. So, whoever emigrated for the sake of Allah and His Messenger, then his emigration was for the sake of Allah and His Messenger. And whoever emigrated for worldly benefits or for a woman to marry, his emigration was for what he intended.’ This *ḥadīth* is *ṣaḥīḥ*, retraced by al-Bukhārī to be transmitted by al-Qa‘nabī from Mālik.

Then, al-Qudā‘ī presented his transmission of this *ḥadīth* via the *sanad* of al-Bukhārī. After that, he wrote:

المجالس بالأمانة. أخبرنا إسماعيل بن رجاء الخصب، ثنا أبو أحمد محمد بن محمد القيسراني، ثنا محمد بن جعفر الخرائطي، ثنا عمر بن شبة، ثنا عبد الله بن مسلمة بن قعنب، ح، وأخبرنا أبو عبد الله الحسين بن محمد بن ميمون بن زيد النصيبي، ثنا أبو بكر أحمد بن الحسن العسكري، ثنا أبو عمرو عثمان بن أحمد بن عبد الله بن يزيد الدقاق المعروف بابن السماك، ثنا أبو موسى عيسى بن محمد الإسكافي، ثنا أمية بن خالد، ثنا حسين بن عبد الله بن ضميرة، عن أبيه، عن جده، عن علي بن أبي طالب η قال: قال رسول الله ﷺ : المجالس بالأمانة. وفي حديث النصيبي: سمعت رسول الله ﷺ يقول.

Keep what is said at gatherings private. We learned via a *khabar* from Ismā‘īl ibn Rajā’ al-Khaṣīb, he said; we learned via a *taḥdīth* by Abū Aḥmad Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Qaysarānī, he said; we learned via a *taḥdīth* by Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far al-Kharā’itī, he said; we learned via a *taḥdīth* by ‘Umar ibn Shabbah, he said; we learned via a *taḥdīth* by ‘Abd Allāh ibn Maslamah ibn Qa‘nab; another *sanad*: and we also learned via a *khabar* from Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad ibn Maymūn ibn Zayd al-Naṣībī, he said; we learned via a *taḥdīth* by Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥasan al-‘Askarī, he said; we learned via a *taḥdīth* by Abū ‘Amru ‘Uthmān ibn Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Yazīd al-Daqqāq, also known as Ibn al-Sammāk, he said; we learned via a *taḥdīth* by Abū Mūsā ‘Īsā ibn Muḥammad al-Iskāfī, he said; we learned via a *taḥdīth* by Umayyah ibn Khālid, he said; we learned via a *taḥdīth* by Ḥusayn ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ḍumayrah; from his father; from his grandfather; from ‘Alī ibn Abū Ṭālib RA that he said: the Messenger of Allah PBUH said: Keep what is said at gatherings private. In the wordings of al-Naṣībī: I heard the Messenger of Allah PBUH said.²⁶

²⁶ al-Qudā‘ī, *Musnad al-Shihāb*, n.d., 35–38.

This conduct of al-Quḍā'ī has left several impacts on the classical studies of *ḥadīth*. First of all, al-Quḍā'ī pioneered the method of composing two separate works for the same set of *ḥadīth*. One would be known by its original title and the other's title will begin with the term *Musnad*. This adds a new connotation for this term as it indicates that a *musnad* is a work composed for a set of *ḥadīth* relayed in another work without their *sanads*. Secondly, we also learn the opposite term for *musnad* - as a *ḥadīth* supported with *sanad*. al-Quḍā'ī wrote:

‘This is a compendium in which I provided the *sanads* for all those I recounted in the book *Shihāb*, namely the aphorisms, counsels and directions for refined behaviour. Whosoever wishes to read only the texts of the sayings *masrūdatan mujarradatan* (enumerated and devoid of *sanad*) shall consult that work. And whosoever wishes to know the *sanad* shall look up this compendium.’²⁷

al-Quḍā'ī uses here the term *mujarrad*. It indicates a treatise where the *sanad* is removed from a text of *ḥadīth* which was previously attached to it. The act should be called *tajrīd* and understood as the opposite of the act of *isnād*. It is, therefore, convenient to substantively say that a *ḥadīth* is either *musnad* (attached with a *sanad*) or *mujarrad* (devoid of it). The *musnad*, then, is either *muttaṣil* (with unbroken chain) or *munqaṭi'* (with discontinuity). Moreover, the term has also been approved by later *ḥadīth* scholars such as al-Dhahabī. In his account of al-Quḍā'ī, al-Dhahabī stated: ‘He was a judge in the court of Egypt ... he was the author of *Shihāb* in both its forms; *mujarrad* and *musnad*.’²⁸ Amongst the contemporary scholars, the Saudi renowned figure Bakr Abū Zayd included the collection of *mujarrad ḥadīth* texts as a form of *takhrīj* or *ḥadīth* retracement practised by early compilers of *ḥadīth*.²⁹

However, Abū Zayd opined that the renowned student of al-Nasā'ī, known by the name Abū Bakr Ibn al-Sunnī (364AH) was the first to compile the *mutūn* (texts) in *mujarrad* form. This is due to a statement by al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī that reads:

‘The scholars have collected the compact speeches (*jawāmi' al-kalim*) of the Prophet PBUH. For instance, Abū Bakr Ibn al-Sunnī composed a work titled *al-Ījāz wa*

²⁷ al-Quḍā'ī, 1:34.

²⁸ Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn 'Uthmān Abū 'Abd Allah al-Dhahabī, *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'*, ed. Shu'ayb al-Arnā'ūtī (Beirut: Mu'assasah al-Risālah, 1985), 18:92.

²⁹ Bakr Abū Zayd, *al-Ta'sīl Li Uṣūl al-Takhrīj Wa Qawā'id al-Jarḥ Wa al-Ta'dīl* (Riyadh: Dār al-Āshimāh, 1992), 153.

Jawāmi' al-Kalim min al-Sunan al-Ma'thūrah. al-Qāḍī Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Quḍā'ī also compiled his compact speeches in a work titled *al-Shihāb fī al-Ḥikam wa al-Ādāb*.³⁰

Here, al-Quḍā'ī was mentioned only second to Ibn al-Sunnī. Abū Zayd's attribution could not be verified at the moment since the manuscript of *al-Ījāz* did not survive.³¹ Nonetheless, Ibn al-Sunnī was not known for removing *sanads* given all his other works such as *al-Qanā'ah*, *'Amal al-Yawm wa al-Laylah*, *al-Ṭibb al-Nabawī* and *al-Targhīb fī Faḍā'il al-A'māl wa Thawāb Dhālik*, were composed in conventional *ḥadīth* style, i.e., all *ḥadīths* are supported with *sanads*. Moreover, there was no report by the biographers of Ibn al-Sunnī on the act of *sanad* omission. It seems that the statement of Ibn Rajāb was meant for identifying the pioneers of collecting the compact speeches (*jawāmi' al-kalim*) of the Prophet. It is true that by focusing on aphorisms and short sayings, al-Quḍā'ī seems to attend to this new genre of *jawāmi' al-kalim*. In this case, Ibn al-Sunnī could have been the first person to produce this new genre. Although, there is another contemporary of him, the renowned Shāfi'ite al-Qaffāl al-Shāshī (365AH) who has been attributed with a work titled *Jawāmi' al-Kalim wa Badā'i' al-Ḥikam* which could have belonged to same genre.³²

Nevertheless, there has been no clear evidence on the composition of text-only *ḥadīth* work amongst those before al-Quḍā'ī. In addition to this, it was also the method of al-Quḍā'ī that has been acknowledged as a model by those who adopted the same or similar method after him. This will be demonstrated in the discussion below. It is highly important to note here that al-Quḍā'ī's composition in both *mujarrad* and *musnad* styles has contributed to a significant discussion on the concept of preservation of *ḥadīth* and Sunnah. The aim of *mujarrad* was to facilitate the preservation and practice of *ḥadīth* and Sunnah through memorisation. To achieve this aim, al-Quḍā'ī was ready even to remove the *sanads* which have been the core business of *ḥadīth* scholars for centuries. Nevertheless, the value of the *sanads* epistemically and pedagogically has never been compromised to the extent that he dedicated a huge effort in producing the *musnad* for *Shihāb al-Akhbār*. If the early *ḥadīth* teachers spoke of the importance of both *riwāyah* and *dirāyah*, al-Quḍā'ī has manifested it in

³⁰ 'Abd al-Rahmān ibn Aḥmad Zayn al-Dīn Ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī, *Jāmi' al-'Ulūm Wa al-Ḥikam Fī Sharḥ Khamsīn Ḥadīthan Min Jawāmi' al-Kalim*, 8th ed. (Beirut: Mu'assasah al-Risālah, 1999), 1:56.

³¹ For an elaboration of the concept of *ījāz*, see: Mahendra Shahputra, *'al-Ījāz Fī al-Ḥadīth al-Sharīf Fī Sunan Abī Dāwūd* (Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University Jakarta, 2015), 31–32.

³² 'Abd al-Ḥayy ibn Aḥmad Ibn al-'Imād al-Ḥanbalī, *Shadharāt al-Dhahab Fī Akhbār Man Dhahab*, ed. Muḥammad al-Arna'ūt (Beirut: Dār Ibn Kathīr, 1986) According to the editor Muḥammad al-Arna'ūt, the work is currently being edited for modern publication.

the form of literary works. He gave due credit to both the *sanad* and the meaning of the *ḥadīths*, and invited both the common and the scholars to engage in *ḥadīth* learning and practice.

The Legacy of *Mujarrad-Musnad* Method

Keeping the above concern of exploring the development within the circle of *ḥadīth*, we will continue to probe into the emulation of al-Quḍā'ī's method, particularly the *tajrīd*, amongst the succeeding *ḥadīth* scholars. The works mentioned below have been said to have a connection in one way or another to *Shihāb al-Akhbār* or *Musnad al-Shihāb*.

- a) The work of al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī on learning astronomy and astrology titled *al-Qawl fī 'Ilm al-Nujūm, Hal al-Shurū' fīhi Mashrū' aw Madhmūm*. al-Khaṭīb mentioned that he audited al-Quḍā'ī's session at the Holy Mosque in Makkah.³³ The *ḥadīths* in the survived part of this work were devoid of *sanads*, a feature that is quite strange given all other works of al-Khaṭīb. The above title was attributed to him by Muḥammad al-Mālikī, Ibn al-Jawzī, Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī and al-Dhahabī. Moreover, al-'Irāqī, al-Subkī, Mughal Ṭāy, Ibn Ḥajar, al-Sakhāwī and al-Suyūṭī had quoted from this work.³⁴ al-Nawawī copied al-Khaṭīb's comment on a *ḥadīth* from this work.³⁵ It is possible that the present manuscript is an abridged version of the original work by al-Khaṭīb. However, if al-Khaṭīb himself omitted the *sanads*, it reflects an escalation of this method amongst *ḥadīth* scholars from the contemporary of al-Quḍā'ī.
- b) It seems that Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh Ibn al-'Arabī al-Mu'āfirī al-Ishbīlī (543AH) was also influenced by al-Quḍā'ī in his work *Sirāj al-Muhtadīn fī Ādāb al-Ṣāliḥīn*. The modern editor of the work, Muḥammad ibn al-Amīn Bū Khubzah remarked that Ibn al-'Arabī emulated al-Quḍā'ī in his style but the former attempted to avoid the inclusion of *ḥadīths* he evaluated as weak and highly unreliable.³⁶
- c) Another scholar who was also inspired by al-Quḍā'ī was Sulaymān ibn Mūsā ibn Sālim

³³ Aḥmad ibn 'Alī ibn Thābit al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Tārīkh Madīnat al-Salām Wa Akhbār Muḥaddithihā Wa Dhikr Quṭṭānihā al-'Ulamā Min Ghayr Ahlihā Wa Wāridihā* (Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 2001), 11:512.

³⁴ Khairil Husaini Bin Jamil, 'Traditional Sunni Epistemology in the Scholarship of al-Hafiz al-Khatib al-Baghdadi (463AH/1071CE)' (SOAS, University of London, 2017), 71.

³⁵ 'Alā' al-Dīn Ibn al-'Aṭṭār, *Fatāwā al-Imām al-Nawā' al-Musammā Bi al-Masā'il al-Manthūrah*, 6th ed. (Beirut: Dār al-Bashā'ir al-Islāmiyyah, 1996), 266.

³⁶ See editorial remark in: Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Mu'āfirī al-Ishbīlī Ibn al-'Arabī, *Sirāj al-Muhtadīn Fī Ādāb al-Ṣāliḥīn*, ed. Muḥammad Abū Uways al-Ḥusaynī Bū Khubzah (Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 2009).

Abū al-Rabī‘ al-Kilā‘i (634AH) of Valencia. His work was titled *Miṣbāh al-Zulam min Ḥadīth Rasūl Allāh ṣalla Allāh ‘alayhi wa sallam*.³⁷ Unfortunately, nothing can be said about this work except that it was read by Ibn Jābir al-Wādī Āshī before his teacher al-Qāḍī Abū al-‘Abbās Ibn al-Ghammāz, who received it from the author.³⁸ The work is currently considered lost.

d) Whilst speaking on the concept of *jawāmi‘ al-kalim*, Ibn Rajab stated:

‘And there were later scholars who followed in the footsteps of al-Quḍā‘ī and added many more traditions or sayings to this category ... Then, al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Ṣalāh (643AH) hosted a dictation session for what he called *al-aḥādīth al-kulliyah* (principle-forming *ḥadīths*). He compiled *ḥadīths* with general principles based on which the framework of religion is constructed, and *ḥadīths* with wordings that possess the generalisable quality. The sessions managed to compile twenty-six *ḥadīths*. Then, the pious *imām* and master, Abū Zakariyyā Yaḥyā al-Nawawī (676AH) took these *ḥadīths* and added some more until it reaches forty *ḥadīths* in total. He called his collection *al-Arba‘ūn* (The Forty). It became widespread and it was memorised by many.’³⁹

It is clear that both *al-Aḥādīth al-Kulliyah* of Ibn al-Ṣalāh and *al-Arba‘ūn* of al-Nawawī were devoid of *sanads*.

e) There is a work titled *Sirāj al-Muttaqīn al-Muntakhab min Kalām Sayyid al-Mursalīn* penned by Abū Zayd ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Anṣārī al-Usaydī al-Qayrawānī (699AH), also known as Ibn al-Dabbāgh. According to al-Wādī Āshī, the author completely follows the style of *al-Shihāb*.⁴⁰

The above accounts portray how the work of al-Quḍā‘ī has inspired others in their literary activities, although it does not demonstrate clearly how the exact *mujarrad-musnad* method was pursued by others. To illustrate the application of this method by others, let us look at the following examples.

Towards the end of the fifth Hijrī century, the *muḥaddith* Abū Shujā‘ Shirūyē ibn Shahrḍār al-Daylamī (509AH) composed a work on *ḥadīth* dedicated for the common public. He named the work *Firdaws al-Akḥbār bi Ma‘thūr al-Khiṭāb al-Mukharraj ‘alā Kitāb al-*

³⁷ Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Talīdī, *Turāth al-Maghāribah Fī al-Ḥadīth al-Nabawī Wa ‘Ulūmihi* (Beirut: Dār al-Bashā‘ir al-Islāmiyyah, 1995), 265; Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh Abū ‘Abd Allāh Ibn al-Abbār, *al-Takmilah Li-Kitāb al-Ṣilah* (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1995), 4:101.

³⁸ Muḥammad ibn Jābir al-Wādī Āshī, *Barnāmij Muḥammad Ibn Jābir al-Wādī Āshī*, 3rd ed. (Tunisia: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1982), 223 (40). See the footnotes.

³⁹ Ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī, *Jāmi‘ al-‘Ulūm Wa al-Ḥikam Fī Sharḥ Khamsīn Ḥadīthan Min Jawāmi‘ al-Kalim*, 1:56.

⁴⁰ al-Wādī Āshī, *Barnāmij Muḥammad Ibn Jābir al-Wādī Āshī*, 60-61 (23).

Shihāb. Apart from explicitly mentioning his exploit of *al-Shihāb* in the title, Abū Shujā‘ also omitted all *sanads* from his work, exactly in the same style of *tajrīd* applied by al-Quḍā‘ī.⁴¹ Then, it was the former’s son, Abū Maṣṣūr Shahrīdār, who arduously provided all the *sanads* in a subsequent work which has been famously known as *Musnad al-Firdaws*.⁴² This is definitely a clear example of the adoption of the *mujarrad-musnad* method.

Finally, the aforementioned works of al-Uqlīshī constituted another legacy of the *tajrīd* method. al-Uqlīshī first composed his book *al-Ghurār*. Then he extracted *ḥadīths* that fulfil two conditions: the wordings should be short and they were not already recounted by al-Quḍā‘ī in *al-Shihāb*. He named the abridged version *al-Najm* and made it approximately similar to the size of *al-Shihāb*.⁴³ Some have also considered this work an addendum for *Shihāb al-Akḥbār*.⁴⁴ Ultimately, he produced *al-Kawkab al-Durrī* whose *ḥadīths* were not present in *al-Najm* but contributed to his vision of offering an outstanding work with similar aims and styles to *al-Najm*, and of course, *al-Shihāb*.

Conclusion

The history of *sanad* and *isnād* lies at the heart of the construct of Islamic intellectual tradition, especially for the Sunnis, since *sanad* forms the foundational blocks for the legitimacy of traditions received from the past. However, dating the systematisation of *sanad* has been a subject of debate in modern scholarship following the development of certain philosophies and methodologies in historical research. The present author proposes a general timeline for the history of *sanad* consisting of four phases: 1) conversational *sanad*, 2) confessional *sanad*, 3) critical *sanad*, and 4) customary *sanad*. To address the main question of this paper which is “who first omitted *sanads* from a *ḥadīth* work amongst the *muhaddithūn*?”, the author highlights the *mujarrad-musnad* method introduced by the fifth Hijrī century Egyptian judge, Muḥammad ibn Salāmah al-Quḍā‘ī. The scholar has been an inspiration for later *ḥadīth* scholars in the exercise of *tajrīd*, and since his work *Shihāb al-Akḥbār* receives wide acceptance and students of *ḥadīth* have been encouraged to memorise it, others emulated his approach. It is important to note that the *mujarrad-musnad* method did not compromise the authority of *sanad*. It is rather observed that *tajrīd* has contributed to the extensive dissemination of *ḥadīth* in later Muslim communities.

⁴¹ Shirūyē ibn Shahrīdār Abū Shujā‘ al-Daylamī, *Firdaws al-Akḥbār Bi Ma`thūr al-Khiṭāb al-Mukharraj ‘alā Kitāb al-Shihāb*, 1st ed. (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabī, 1987).

⁴² Only parts of its manuscript were found.

⁴³ al-Tilmisānī, *Nafḥ al-Ṭīb Min Ghuṣn al-Andalus al-Raṭīb*, 2:599. al-Tilmisānī said: The author compared *al-Najm* to *Shihāb al-Quḍā‘ī*.

⁴⁴ See editorial remark: ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Dūmī al-Ḥanbalī Ibn Badrān, *Sharḥ Kitāb al-Shihāb Fi al-Ḥikam Wa al-Mawā‘iz Wa al-Ādāb*, ed. al-Ṭālib Nūr al-Dīn, 1st ed. (Kuwait: Dār al-Nawādir, 2007), 22.

References

- Abū Shujā' al-Daylamī, Shirūyē ibn Shahr-dār. *Firdaws al-Akhhār Bi Ma'thūr al-Khiṭāb al-Mukharraj 'alā Kitāb al-Shihāb*. 1st ed. Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-'Arabī, 1987.
- Abū Zayd, Bakr. *al-Ta'sīl Li Uṣūl al-Takhnīj Wa Qawā'id al-Jarḥ Wa al-Ta'dīl*. Riyadh: Dār al-'Āṣimah, 1992.
- al-Ahdal, Ahmad Muhammad Ahmad. 'A Critical Edition of "al-Kawkab al-Durri al-Mustakhraj Min Kalam al-Nabi" by Ahmad b. Ma'add b. 'Isa b. Wakil al-Tujibi al-Uqlishi'. University of Glasgow, 1986.
- al-Dhahabī, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn 'Uthmān Abū 'Abd Allāh. *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'*. Edited by Shu'ayb al-Arnā'ūṭ. Beirut: Mu'assasah al-Risālah, 1985.
- al-Ḥākim, Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh Ibn al-Bayyī' Abū 'Abd Allāh. *Ma'rifat 'Ulūm al-Ḥadīth Wa Kammiyat Ajnāsīhi*. Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 2003.
- al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Aḥmad ibn 'Ali ibn Thābit. *al-Kifāyah Fī Uṣul 'Ilm al-Riwāyah*. Riyadh: Dār Ibn al-Jawzī, 2011.
- . *Tārikh Madīnat al-Salām Wa Akhhār Muḥaddithihā Wa Dhikr Quṭṭānihā al-'Ulamā Min Ghayr Ahlihā Wa Wāridihā*. Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 2001.
- al-Quḍā'ī, Muḥammad ibn Salāmah ibn 'Alī Abū 'Abd Allāh. *Musnad al-Shihāb*. Edited by Ḥamdī 'Abd al-Majīd al-Salafī. 1st ed. Beirut: Mu'assasah al-Risālah, n.d.
- . *Musnad al-Shihāb*. Edited by Ḥamid 'Abd Allāh al-Miḥlāwī. 1st ed. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 2011.
- al-Qurashī, Fā'iz Ḥāmid Muḥammad. 'Taḥqīq Wa Dirāsah Musnad al-Shihāb Li al-Quḍā'ī Min Awwalihi Ilā Nihāyat al-Juz' al-Khāmis'. Umm al-Qura University, 1988.
- al-Qurayzī, Muḥammad ibn Sa'īd ibn Ma'an. *al-Mustaṣfā Fī Sunan al-Muṣṭafā*. Edited by Muḥammad 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ahdal. 1st ed. Beirut: Dār al-Minhāj, n.d.
- al-Rāmhurmuzī, al-Ḥasan ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Khallād. *al-Muḥaddith al-Fāṣil Bayna al-Rāwī Wa al-Wā'ī*. Edited by 'Ajāj al-Khaṭīb. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1994.
- al-Suyūṭī, 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Bakr Jalāl al-Dīn. *Tadīb al-Rāwī Fī Sharḥ Taqīb al-Nawawī*. Edited by Abū Qutaybah Naẓar Muḥammad al-Fāriyābī. Riyadh: Dār Ṭaybah, 2006.

- al-Suyūṭī, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abū Bakr Jalāl al-Dīn. *Alfiyyat al-Suyūṭī Fī ‘Ilm al-Ḥadīth*. Edited by Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad Shākīr Abū al-Ashbāl. al-Maktabah al-‘Ilmiyyah, n.d.
- al-Talīdī, Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh. *Turāth al-Maghāribah Fī al-Ḥadīth al-Nabawī Wa ‘Uḥūmihi*. Beirut: Dār al-Bashā’ir al-Islāmiyyah, 1995.
- al-Tilmisānī, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad. *Nafḥ al-Ṭīb Min Ghuṣn al-Andalus al-Raṭīb*. Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1968.
- al-Uqlīshī, Aḥmad ibn Ma‘ad al-Tujībī. *al-Kawkab al-Durrī al-Mustakhrāj Min Kalām al-Nabī al-‘Arabī*. Morocco, 2014.
- . *al-Najm Min Kalām Sayyid al-‘Arab Wa al-‘Ajam*. 1st ed. Cairo: al-Maṭba‘ah al-I‘lāmiyyah, 1885.
- al-Wādī Āshī, Muḥammad ibn Jābir. *Barnāmij Muḥammad Ibn Jābir al-Wādī Āshī*. 3rd ed. Tunisia: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1982.
- BāDhayb, Muḥammad ibn Abū Bakr. *Juhūd Fuqahā’ Ḥaḍramawt Fī Khidmat al-Madhhab al-Shāfi‘ī*. Jordan: Dār al-Fatḥ li’l-Dirāsāt wa’l-Nashr, 2009.
- Berg, Herbert. ‘Competing Paradigms in Islamic Origins: Qur’ān 15:89–91 and the Value of Isnāds’. *Method and Theory in the Study of Islamic Origins*, 2021, 259–90. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047401575_014.
- . *The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam: The Authenticity of Muslim Literature from the Formative Period*. London: Curzon Press, 2000.
- Brown, Jonathan. *Hadīth: Muhammad’s Legacy in the Medieval and Modern World*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oneworld Publication, 2009.
- Ibn al-Abbār, Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh Abū ‘Abd Allāh. *al-Takmilah Li-Kitāb al-Ṣilah*. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1995.
- Ibn al-‘Arabī, Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Mu‘āfirī al-Ishbīlī. *Sirāj al-Muhtaḍin Fī Ādāb al-Ṣāliḥīn*. Edited by Muḥammad Abū Uways al-Ḥusaynī Bū Khubzah. Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 2009.
- Ibn al-‘Aṭṭār, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn. *Fatāwā al-Imām al-Nawāī al-Musammā Bi al-Masā’il al-Manthūrah*. 6th ed. Beirut: Dār al-Bashā’ir al-Islāmiyyah, 1996.
- Ibn al-‘Imād al-Ḥanbalī, ‘Abd al-Ḥayy ibn Aḥmad. *Shadharūt al-Dhahab Fī Akhbār Man*

- Dhahab*. Edited by Muḥammad al-Arna'ūṭ. Beirut: Dār Ibn Kathīr, 1986.
- Ibn Badrān, 'Abd al-Qādir al-Dūmī al-Ḥanbalī. *Sharḥ Kitāb al-Shihāb Fi al-Ḥikam Wa al-Mawā'iz Wa al-Ādāb*. Edited by al-Ṭālib Nūr al-Dīn. 1st ed. Kuwait: Dār al-Nawādīr, 2007.
- Ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī, 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Aḥmad Zayn al-Dīn. *Jāmi' al-'Ulūm Wa al-Ḥikam Fī Sharḥ Khamsīn Ḥadīthan Min Jawāmi' al-Kalim*. 8th ed. Beirut: Mu'assasah al-Risālah, 1999.
- Jamil, Khairil Husaini Bin. 'Traditional Sunni Epistemology in the Scholarship of al-Hafiz al-Khatib al-Baghdadi (463AH/1071CE)'. SOAS, University of London, 2017.
- . 'قراءة في تاريخ الإسناد والتجريد: كتاب شهاب الأخبار للقضاعي (454هـ) وأثاره في مسار التصنيف'. *الحديثي: A Reading of Isnād and Tajrīd Methodology: Shihāb al-Akhbār of al-Quḍā'ī (d.454H) and Its Influence on Later Ḥadīth Compilations.* *al-Burhān: Journal of Qur'an and Sunnah Studies* 3, no. 1 (2019): 76–105.
- Kharid Bā'Alawī, Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn 'Alawī al-Ḥusaynī al-Tarīmī. *Ghurar al-Bahā' al-Dawī Wa Durar al-Jamāl al-Baḍī' al-Bahī Fī Dhikr al-A'immah al-Amjād Wa al-'Ulamā al-Ārifīn al-Nuqqād Wa al-Fuqahā' al-Mujaddidīn al-Asyād*. 2nd ed., n.d.
- Lucas, Scott. *Constructive Critics, Ḥadīth Literature and the Articulation of Sunnī Islam: The Legacy of the Generation of Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'īn and Ibn Ḥanbal*. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2004.
- Muslim, Ibn al-Ḥajjāj al-Naysābūrī. *al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ al-Mukhtaṣar Min al-Sunan Bi Naql al-'adl 'an al-'Adl Ilā Rasul Allah*. Edited by Naẓar Muḥammad al-Fāriyābī. Riyadh: Dār Ṭaybah, 2006.
- Schacht, Joseph. *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950.
- Shah, Mustafa. 'Introductions'. In *The Hadith*. Oxon: Routledge, 2010.
- Shahputra, Mahendra. 'al-Ījāz Fī al-Ḥadīth al-Sharīf Fī Sunan Abī Dāwūd'. Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University Jakarta, 2015.