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INTRODUCTION

The civilisation that one readily associates with classical expressions of Islam reveals not only the diversity and vitality of the literary traditions that the religion inspired, but also the impressive levels of thought which these disciplines of learning accomplished. Notwithstanding the complex fusing of internal and external factors which facilitated this efflorescence of culture and knowledge, it was the preliminary quest to explicate the scriptural sources of Islam and the desire to elaborate systems of thought to broach such enterprise which ultimately led to the genesis of Islamic sciences such as exegesis, jurisprudence, theology, classical biography, and the Arabic linguistic sciences. One field of learning which sits pre-eminently among the sciences of classical Islam is the study of Prophetic traditions (hadīth pl. abādīth). The profusion of literature devoted to the genre of hadīth in the formative centuries of the Islamic tradition underlines the intricacy and maturity of scholarship in this field; works within the field included compilations of actual hadīths arranged thematically and those which were organised on the basis of the names of key narrators; texts in which canons for the criticism and authentication of traditions were defined; legal, theological and linguistic commentaries, poring over individual traditions and voluminous biographical dictionaries, scrutinising the details of the narrators of traditions.1

It is estimated that there are hundreds of thousands of hadīths and throughout the history of the Islamic world there have always existed distinguished institutions of learning where all aspects of the form and content of these traditions were painstakingly studied and even committed to memory in the same way that the text of the Qur'an was learnt by heart. Classical biographical literature is replete with laudatory anecdotes about individual scholars who devoted their lives not only to collating these materials, but also memorising phenomenal numbers of traditions and the chains of authority which were used to support them.2 The assiduousness with which the study of traditions continues today in the religious institutions of the world of Islam serves as testimony to the importance attached to this scriptural source, a source that over the centuries has inexorably informed the practices and conventions by which classical expressions of the faith were systematically formulated.
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Traditional Islamic scholarship takes the view that these hadiths preserved the sum and substance of the utterances, deeds, directives, and descriptive anecdotes connected with the life of the Prophet Muhammad and his Companions. Thus, together with the Qur'an, the hadiths furnish the rich substratum of sources to which the teachings and practices of Islam are conventionally anchored. The traditional understanding is that while the Qur'an serves essentially as a liturgical document, embedded within which is a distinctive range of theological, legal, eschatological, and ethical teachings, the hadiths preserve the explicit documentation for the augmentation, contextualisation, and implementation of these teachings, garnering in the process a much more exhaustive corpus of data. Within this arrangement the hadiths were deemed key receptacles of the Prophetic Sunna or exemplar, an all-embracing code of practice bequeathed by the Prophet Muhammad. The Sunna was accentuated as a construct of authority and was used to configure the normative practices and paradigms of the faith. Given that access to the Prophetic Sunna was afforded through circumspect reference to the material of hadith, much of the scholarship of the formative years of the Islamic tradition was devoted to the preservation and authentication of this scriptural source. The analysis of the content of these traditions from the legal and ritual perspectives played a significant role in the development of the discipline of jurisprudence (fiqh). And, similarly, one might argue that various attempts to synthesise and define approaches to the interpretation of the scriptural sources of Islam eventually gave birth to the schools of jurisprudence.

It has been emphasised that in its classical expression Islam was principally a religion of law, regulating spiritual and secular spheres of human activity. Indeed, subsumed within the thematic compass of jurisprudence was a gamut of topics specific to aspects of ritual such as ablution, prayer, fasting, rites of pilgrimage and dietary rules, together with subjects of an applied juridical countenance, including fiscal regulation, family law, contracts, and a detailed penal code. A cursory review of the contents of some of the classical legal texts covering positive law demonstrates the manner by which points of law invariably turned on the exposition of Qur'anic verses and, more frequently, the concomitant attestation of Prophetic traditions. Yet, it is important to bear in mind that the salient role that traditions play in the synthesis of legal discourse is replicated in many other areas of classical Islamic thought, including exegesis, theology, popular piety, mysticism, Arabic biography, and even texts of a literary flavour, confirming the all pervading import of the hadith and its authoritative status within Islam.

Intriguingly, in the current discourse of reform and modernity which feature in treatments of Islam and the Muslim world, the issue of the authority of the hadiths as a scriptural source has continued to attract intense interest and debate. Endeavours such as the Turkish project to revisit the corpus of hadith as well as arguments that these texts constitute the residues
of a patriarchal reading of Islam are common themes explored in the related discourse. While, for traditionalist and conservative readings of Islam, the hadiths remain an inviolable scriptural source which has over the centuries appositely informed the teachings of the faith, requiring neither reinterpretation nor reevaluation.

Classical Islamic sources suggest that during the lifetime of the Prophet and his Companions, the Sunna had existed integrally as part of a ‘living’ phenomenon which his peers were encouraged to emulate. The traditional understanding was that despite earlier reservations, the Prophet had permitted his Companions to record his very words and deeds.10 However, more decisively, upon the Prophet’s passing, and the demise of his Companions, later scholarship felt compelled to safeguard his religious legacy for posterity and the move towards the codification of the reports connected with his lifetime afforded a means of physically preserving all aspects of his living legacy.11 Again, traditional sources refer to the role of prominent luminaries from the early periods such as the Umayyad caliph ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Aziz (r. 99–101/717–737), Abū Bakr ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥāzm (d. 120/737) and the jurist Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhri (d. 124/742), who are all mentioned as being actively involved in efforts to preserve and codify (tahdīth) the hadith and its complementary Sunna.12

In his commentary on one of Sunni orthodoxy’s most renowned collection of hadiths compiled by the traditionist Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl al-Bukhārī (194–256/810–870), Ibn Hajar al-Asqalāni (773–852/1371–1448) emphasised that during the age of the Companions and the Successors these traditions were neither comprehensively collated nor systematically arranged.13 He suggests that such a state of affairs existed for a number of reasons: first, there were initial reservations concerning the recording of traditions for fear that they might be confused with the text of the Qur’ān; and second, many scholars from these periods possessed not only prodigious skills of memorisation, but they also were blessed with astute minds; the inference is that their being largely unacquainted with the formal means of literacy meant that they had to rely instinctively upon their retentive skills.14 Ibn Hajar explains that as scholars settled in the newly established garrison towns, religious sectarianism appeared and the movement towards the codification of Prophetic dicta and their classification gained momentum, especially during the later period of the age of the Successors. He then lists the various collections of traditions which appeared in these earlier periods, including the Muwāṭṭa’ of Mālik ibn Anas (112–179/731–795), a legal manual in which hadiths were collated together with formal statements and juridical edicts associated with Companion and Successor figures; and the muṣannaf works of revered cynosures such as Ibn Jurayj (d. 150/767), al-Awzā‘ī (d. 157/773), Sufyān al-Thawrī (97–161/715–778), and Ḥammād ibn Salama (d. 167/784); these latter compilations were organised thematically, adhering to a conventional range of legal topics. Ibn Hajar comments that by the second/
eighth century these works were followed by a number of musnad collections: in such works traditions were not arranged thematically but predominantly through reference to an individual who featured in the isnād. Among the musnad writings were the works of Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī (d. 204/819), Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal (164–241/780–855), Ishāq ibn Rihawahy (d. 238/852), and ʿUthmān ibn Abī Shayba (d. 239/853), whose brother, Abū Bakr ibn Abī Shayba (d. 235/849), even combined a musnad and musannaf type of arrangement within a single text. Ibn Hajar’s point is that despite the fact that many of the above works preserved traditions considered to be authentic and reliable, their comprehensive nature meant that they also included hadiths whose status was doubtful or apocryphal. He remarks that it was against this historical backdrop that al-Bukhārī set about compiling his own collection of hadith organised around materials deemed authentic (sahih). The canonical status conferred upon al-Bukhārī’s work over the course of subsequent centuries is a measure of the monumental nature of his achievement, although this has sometimes tended to eclipse the sheer scale of hadith scholarship and the literary endeavours this learning inspired both before and after the appearance of his work. The traditional understanding is that through a combination of written and oral transmission musannaf and musnad materials were passed down and circulated among generations of scholars before being collated during the course of the third and fourth centuries (ninth and tenth centuries C.E.).

A hadith theoretically consists of two components: the matn, which features the actual wording of the report referring to the Prophet; and its isnād (literally, support), which is defined as being a chain of authority beginning with the person narrating the tradition in question, followed by the intermediate individuals who consecutively feature in the transmission of that tradition. Ideally, the last authority in the chain will be a Companions figure, who, as a contemporary of the Prophet, is the source of the hadith or report in question. Classical Islamic sources intimate that during the first centuries of Islam individuals and groups with motives ranging from the political to the sectarian, and even those with pious intentions, were implicated in the circulation of spurious hadiths; this was purportedly carried out in an attempt to appeal to the authority of the Prophetic Sunna. To counter such developments the device of the isnād was introduced as a tool for gauging the origin and authenticity of the traditions. Scrutiny of the narrators that featured in the isnāds ultimately became the principal instrument of hadith authentication and criticism. According to the famous maxim attributed to Muḥammad Ibn Sirīn (ca. 34–110/654–728), an eminent Baṣrī scholar, the isnād had, in a derived sense, become a platform for religion and thus narration had to be sourced to trustworthy individuals. A further statement by Ibn Sirīn intimates that: ‘They never used to ask about isnād; however, when the fitna (discord) broke out, it was said: “Name us your authorities.”’
Eventually, traditions were classified on the basis of the reliability of narrators featured in the isnāds with terms such as sahih (authentic), hasan (sound), and da‘if (weak) being gradually introduced to signify the status of given isnāds attached to Prophetic reports.22

The technical definition of a tradition classed as being authentic (sahih) is one whose isnād is continuous in terms of its being transmitted by trustworthy and reliable authorities throughout all stages of its chain of authority; moreover, such a tradition should not fall into the class of materials designated as being šādhdhī (to run counter to accepted traditions), nor should it be deemed mu‘allal (to suffer from any potential defects).23 Several definitions were offered for those traditions classed as being hasan (sound), but by and large these were traditions which did not quite fulfil the criteria set for authentic ones.24 Ibn Hajar speaks of the hasan tradition as being one in which the reliability and thereby the ‘precision’ of the narrator is somewhat diminished, although its isnād is continuous and transmitted by trustworthy narrators (‘udāl) and it is neither šādhdhī nor mu‘allal.25 The weak (da‘if) tradition was defined as a report which did not meet the criteria of either the authentic or sound traditions. Classical scholarship identified discrete degrees of weaknesses which were specific to such classes of traditions, grading them accordingly with a panoply of technical terms being introduced to define their relative status.26 It was maintained that the traditions classed as being authentic and sound should ideally furnish the raw materials for the formulation and synthesis of all aspects of faith and practice.27

The historical background of the introduction of the technical terminology remains chequered, but studies of the isnād formed an integral part of classical hadīth scholarship, evolving into a fully-fledged science. Topics such as criteria and terminology for the relative ranking of traditions and features of transmission were circumscribed in the associated literature; while, attention was also paid to defining the established conventions for the acquisition and dissemination of knowledge (taḥammul al-‘ilm).28 In the observation of the renowned traditionist Ibn Abī Hàtim al-Rāzī (240–327/854–938) the only way of discerning the import of God’s revealed word was through the traditions of the Prophet, but it was paramount to distinguish between authentic and fabricated traditions; however, only astute critics (traditionists) were qualified to make such distinctions.29 He adds that for that reason, it was imperative to determine those narrators who were dependable, trustworthy, and distinguished, from those individuals infamous for inattentiveness, poor memory, and deliberate dishonesty.30 It is evident, however, that in order for traditionists to be able to pass verdicts on the integrity of isnāds they had to have recourse to a rich stock of biographical data which could purposefully be used to reference the procedures of judgement.

Consequently, during the early third/ninth and fourth/tenth centuries, biographical genres constellated around individual narrators listed in isnāds with critical attention being devoted to the scrutiny of their status as
transmitters. This was achieved under the rubric of Ibn al-rijāl (biographical notices), although works belonging to this genre were often broached through reference to the appraisal of classes of narrators, al-Jarḥ wa-l-taʿdīl (impugning and commendation), which developed an elaborate repertoire of terms to rank individual narrators.31 Biographies covering Companion and Successor figures as well as the lives of narrators and their indigenous geographical regions and cities were also compiled.32 Numerous sub-disciplines fell within the vector of biographical scrutiny, including, for example, the resolution of ambiguities surrounding the orthography of names (al-mukhtalaf wa-l-muʿtalaf); works identifying narrators considered to be either trustworthy or weak (maʿrifat al-thiqāt wa-l-quʿāfāʾ); and, to an extent, even subtle reviews of the potential defects in isnāds (taʿlīl al-hadīth); with many of these disciplines being eventually subsumed within the field of the hadīth sciences.

Seminal contributions to the field were continually refined over successive centuries to the extent that works devoted to the biographies of the narrators cited in the isnāds of the most celebrated collections of traditions were later made the subject of commentary and supra-commentary.33 The Kamāl fī ʿashār al-rijāl by ʿAbd al-Ghanī al-Maqdisī (d. 600/1203) was a biographical dictionary devoted to scrutinising the status of narrators cited in six major hadīth collections from the third/ninth century; it was the subject of a famous commentary by the Damascene scholar Jamāl al-Dīn al-Mizzī (d. 742/1341) entitled Tahdhīb al-kamāl fī ʿashār al-rijāl. In the introduction to his work al-Mizzī explains that ʿAbd al-Ghanī’s text comprised errors and inaccuracies which he sought to remedy with his text.34 There even developed a genre of writing which painstakingly identified individuals who had been obliquely listed in isnāds by reference to an epithet (laqab), agnomen (kunyā) or even kinship (nisba).35 And there were treatises which identified textual errors made by certain scholars in the narration of the actual texts of the traditions (mutnūn) (taṣḥīḥat al-muhaddithīn).36 While traditionist scholarship took an unswervingly stern approach to materials classed as being outright fabrications (nawḍāʿār), discussions pertinent to the theoretical efficacy of traditions which did not quite meet the isnād criteria set for authentic and sound materials continued in the literature; thus, deliberations ensued as to whether such classes of traditions could be retained and cited for their paraenetic import in the context of encouraging acts of personal piety and devotion (faḍāʾīl al-ʿāmāl).37

During these periods and beyond, it was possible for subsequent scholarship to revisit the corpus of hadīths and proffer revisions relating to the ranking and status of certain traditions through reference to the isnāds, although ideally the framework through which this had to be pursued was based on the traditional canons of criticism evolved within the discipline.38 It was also accepted that such reviews may well have entailed broader arguments among scholars over the authority of a given hadīth, drawing upon concepts such as abrogation, specificity, provenance, in terms of a tradition being
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identified as a dicta originally emanating from a Companion, and indeed, aspects of jurisdiction with respect to assessing a tradition’s applied bearing.39 However, such discussions were moored to a seemingly traditionally derived apparatus of criticism. Notwithstanding the complementary deliberations, within the classical Islamic context, the view was that by virtue of the careful scrutiny of the isnād and the conventional methods for the transmission of knowledge through the traditional lecture system, the essence of the established beliefs, teachings, and practices of Islam had been dutifully extricated by traditionist scholarship from the profusion of transmitted materials and preserved for posterity.40

Medieval Sunni scholarship distinguished a number of the collections from the third/ninth century as generally encapsulating the most authentic traditions from the available materials and later these were honourably referred to as al-Kutub al-Sitta; namely, the Six Canonical Books.41 These included the Ṣaḥīḥ work of al-Bukhārī and a second Ṣaḥīḥ text compiled by Muslim ibn Ḥajjāj (d. 261/875), which was held in equal esteem to that of al-Bukhārī.42 Despite comprising a smaller number of traditions, it included an important introduction in which the canons of the author’s approach to the authentication of traditions were set out. Following the two Ṣaḥīḥ books were the Sunan compilation of Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī (200–275/815–888); the Tāmi' of al-Tirmidhī (d. 279/892); along with the two respective Sunan works of al-Nasā’ī (d. 303/915) and Ibn Mājah (d. 272/886).43 Sunan compilations covered traditions specific to legal, doctrinal, and ritual topics, although hadiths which were graded as being sound or even weak did feature in these works.44 Indeed, it is important to emphasise that among traditionist scholars it was never implied that every single tradition occurring in these six works was deemed unquestionably authentic or sound. The range of collections compiled throughout the third/ninth and fourth/tenth centuries suggests that the process of sifting through traditions was the subject of continual refinement and review; and further collections of traditions continued to be composed, including works which pored a critical eye over the content of the famous Ṣaḥīḥ and Sunan compilations.45 Other forms of collections were compiled under the rubric of mustadrak and mustakhraj: the former served as veritable supplements in which a scholar would collate traditions that met the criteria adhered to by an earlier author such as al-Bukhārī or Muslim but were not included in that individual’s work. Among the most famous works in this genre is al-Mustadrak ‘alā al-Ṣaḥīḥayn by al-Ḥakim al-Naysābūrī (321–405/933–1014); it collated additional hadiths which, according to its author, met the general criteria for the inclusion of traditions applied by both al-Bukhārī and Muslim.46 While, the mustakhraj work was simply an attempt to locate different chains of authority for traditions which featured in an existing work.47 Among the most renowned mustakhraj works were those based on al-Bukhārī’s work by al-Isma‘īl (d. 371/981), the Mustakhraj of Muslim’s Ṣaḥīḥ by Abū ‘Awāna (d. 312/924–5), and the Mustakhraj ‘alā al-Ṣaḥīḥayn of al-Bukhārī.
and Muslim by Abū Nuʿaym al-İsfahānī (d. 430/1038). The mustakhraj works were viewed as consolidating not only the processes of authentication, but also they often yielded the much coveted shorter isnāds.

Notwithstanding the critical reviews to which many of the aforementioned works and their contents could be subjected, as far as classical Muslim scholarship was concerned, once authenticated, the materials preserved from these earlier periods had not only preserved accurate records of the religious traditions and practices prevalent in the age of the Prophet and his Companions, but they also furnished the abundance of sources to which syntheses of the faith of Islam and its institutions were inextricably rooted. Indeed, orthodox traditionists insisted that the scholarly apparatus for determining authenticity, soundness, and forgery was fully advanced and incontrovertibly reliable.48

Western scholarship and the authenticity of the Prophetic traditions

Modern academic scholarship unequivocally accepts the critical role which the hadiths played in the synthesis of classical Islamic thought, particularly in terms of the distinct theoretical linkage that developed between law and hadith in the late second/eighth and early third/ninth centuries of the Islamic tradition, and its relevance to all other components of Islamic thought. However, arguments persist concerning not only the customary Muslim accounts of the origins, codification, and authenticity of the hadiths, but also the traditional chronology surrounding the concept of the Prophetic Sunna and its effective authority and function in the first centuries of the Islamic tradition. Overall, the emergence of Sunnism from a proto-religious movement is viewed as being conveniently glossed over in the traditional Islamic sources. As a result, issues such as the legal efficacy of reports attributed to Companion figures; the actual employment of Prophetic traditions as a scriptural source alongside the Qur’an in formulating ritual and law; and the authority of dicta ascribed to later Successor figures have all been the subject of various differences of opinion among Western scholars as far as their incidence in the early Islamic tradition is concerned.49 Even the historical inception of the isnād together with its efficacy as an instrument of hadīth criticism has been the subject of much debate within this discourse.

Arguments about the authenticity of the early Islamic sources within Western academic scholarship are not confined to the material of traditions but extend to the extant literary texts purporting to preserve data from the earliest years of Islam’s development. In spite of the existence of fragmentary evidence in the form of inscriptions, numismatic finds, and partial manuscripts from these formative periods, the fact that the earliest comprehensive archival records of many of the literary traditions of learning associated with Islam are dated to the late second/eighth century and early
third/ninth century raises a number of methodological concerns for scholars involved in the historical scrutiny of the nascent Islamic tradition.50 It is not perfunctorily claimed that such materials were the undeniable products of fabrication and manufacture: there exists provisional recognition that within the classical Islamic tradition intricate mechanisms and conventions for the transmission of knowledge had been evolved and that subtle procedures were adhered to in the processes of transmission.51 Nonetheless, some scholars have taken the view that questions remain about the accuracy of the processes of transmission and that they were seemingly susceptible to manipulation and abuse, particularly as literary works from these periods were subjected to later processes of redaction by students and even subjected to interpolation and commentary.52

Recently, Herbert Berg has referred to two nominal camps within Western academic scholarship in relation to attitudes towards the reliability and authenticity of the extant Islamic literary sources, using the terms sceptical and sanguine to describe the outlook of these two camps.53 Berg refers to sceptical scholars being of the view that the extant literary corpus of early Islam is the product of an evident attempt to project a somewhat contrived image of the historical genesis of Islam, an image inexorably informed by later perceptions of the faith.54 The assumption is that the extant corpus of materials was readily vulnerable to editorial reformulation, interpolation, back-projection, and pseudepigraphical processes in a way which allowed much more developed notions of the faith to prevail as historical truths.55 The sceptical camp would assert that much of the material which emerged from these processes can be confidently ascribed to salvation history.56 The upshot of this sceptical position in respect of the hadith predicates that the bulk of this material appeared incrementally over an extended period of time: some radical estimates refer to a period of two hundred years before its appearance and even then it was prone to further reformulation.57 Thus, while the hadiths are judged to be an essential source for classical Muslim scholarship’s theoretical construction of all aspects of the religious tradition that embodied expressions of Islam, the notion that they were authentic texts emanating from the age of the Prophet, the Companions, and the Successors is disputed by sceptical scholars.58 Many within this camp would suggest that later texts including the revered canonical hadith collections and sundry legal treatises were subjected to sustained editorial interpolation and augmentation over extended periods of time.59

Those identified by Berg as being sanguine scholars are reported to be much more confident about the reliability of the extant sources as records of Islam’s past. The implication is that such scholars would argue that through the application of detailed source criticism and analysis, it is possible to identify historical facts in the early materials and use them to appraise the veracity of the traditional depiction of Islam.60 Sanguine scholars are said to regard the scepticism of their nominal counterparts as being conspiratorial and even
presumptuous. Some among them would argue that it fails to grasp key characteristics of the nature of the transmission of literature and authorship which operated within the early Islamic tradition, and that assumptions of forgery are sometimes unwarranted. The reference to two main camps in Western academic research vis-à-vis the issue of Islamic origins and sources has been questioned by Harald Motzki who felt the classification was at least arbitrary if not inconsistent: nuances within Western academic scholarship concerning approaches to the early sources are intricately more complex than terms such as sanguine and sceptical seem to appear to indicate. Although, one would have to accept that the whole issue of authenticity and origins has proved to be an essential paradigm within which many academic studies of the materials of the traditions have been pursued. However, Motzki not only deemed Berg’s classification problematic, but also stressed that scholars have reacted against the tenor of the arguments propounded by sceptical scholarship and produced works which question such sceptical theses.

Interestingly, scholars referred to by Berg as being of ‘nominally’ sceptical and sanguine persuasions have different views regarding the utility of the isnāds as a device for determining the chronological provenance of the actual texts and individual hadīth to which they are attached. While there are those individuals who choose to ignore their value and instead focus on the critical analysis of the form and content (matn) of the hadīths in order to draw general conclusions about their origin and design, some do accept that the isnāds (or part of them) can be used to pursue a strategy for the dating of traditions. The sceptical camp proceeds from the basis that the isnāds were mostly insidious tools used to create the perception of historical depth in the matns or texts to which they are attached, categorically rejecting the idea that the materials they ‘supported’ actually emanate from the very age of the Prophet, the Companions or indeed the early Successors. Some among the sceptics would even suggest that the texts in which they appear might have been deliberately ascribed to earlier authorities through either author transfer or pseudepigraphical processes in order to achieve greater historical depth for particular traditions.

Conversely, among sanguine scholars there is a view that one should not axiomatically assume that all isnāds were completely fabricated: isnāds (or parts of them) can be related to the actual transmission of traditions. Moreover, within this camp, it could further be argued that careful analyses of the isnāds as well as their matns make it possible to countenance a much earlier provenance for the traditions (or even the texts) to which they are attached; and this would ultimately imply that these materials are closer to the periods in which Islam emerged as a religious phenomenon. In some ways the reckoning is that it would not have been possible to inflate grossly such materials on the life of the Prophet and his Companions given the proximity of the periods to the birth of Islam. However, the general conceptual thrust of this particular position does not necessarily predicate that
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traditionally defined authentic hadiths have their origins in the age of the Prophet, but that circumspect analyses of the materials found in this corpus allow conclusions to be drawn in respect of dubious isnād spread on the one hand, and instances in which real transmission is plausible on the other. Berg does suggest that the underlying assumptions adopted by scholars from both camps towards the actual sources and their respective positions apropos the issue of origins ultimately impinge upon the conclusions formulated by either camp; and he adds that this makes the reaching of a consensus among the various protagonists about the historical value of hadiths and the utility of isnāds rather improbable.67

Those individuals whom Berg believed to be unduly confident about the authenticity of the early materials and the utility of the isnād as a reliable instrument of criticism were described as being ascriptionists. Berg was referring to scholars such as Nabia Abbott, Fuat Sezgin, and Mustafa Azami, who had separately argued that the extant literary sources of Islam accurately preserved literary materials which had their origins in the early years of the Islamic tradition and possessed greater historical depth and relevance than hitherto acknowledged by Western scholarship.68 Berg does distinguish between ascriptionist and sanguine scholarship on the basis that the latter supposedly apply a much more critical approach to reading the sources. It should be noted that the work of Abbott and Sezgin had concluded that written antecedents in the form of hadith collections had originally existed in the earliest periods. Sezgin put forward techniques for the reconstruction of these so-called urtexts.69 While, it was Azami who pursued a rigorous defence of the reliability of the Muslim mechanisms of authentication, dismissing the scepticism of those who questioned the historicity of traditions deemed sahīh. He suggested that written sources had been used throughout the formative years for the transmission of traditions and that it was later Muslim accounts which underestimated the prevalence of literacy in early Islam, especially within the context of the codification of the hadith.70 Berg would argue that the views of ascriptionists failed to take into account the role that salvation history had played in the subsequent presentation of early Islam.71 Quoting Andrew Rippin, Berg summarises that ‘we do not know and probably never can know what really happened; all we can know is what later people believed happened’; indeed, he concludes that even though some sanguine scholars would claim historical gaps separating the early periods from the extant sources are being narrowed, the fact is that gaps do remain.72 Interestingly, it is also the powerful argument of ascription which is often adduced to undermine the findings of sanguine scholarship: namely, that the sources used to propound many of the theses adopted by these scholars are of a disputed provenance.73

One suspects that, notwithstanding the discovery of indisputable and comprehensive archival evidence, the stalemate surrounding the reaching of a consensus on the issue of origins and authenticity is unlikely to be
In spite of that, the impasse might appear to be academic in the loose sense of the word for the simple reason that the traditions together with the Qur'an were ultimately the sources through which classical Islam was consistently articulated. And, moreover, studies of classical Islam are ultimately engaging with and defining that very phenomenon. Although for the scholar concerned with fathoming the question of historical origins, issues germane to the authenticity and provenance of Islam’s early sources remain entirely pertinent to understanding the genesis of the faith and its development. Still, in the eyes of orthodox scholars from the early medieval periods, the hadiths were deemed one of the sacrosanct scriptural sources of Islam and it is no surprise that those early and late medieval scholars who devoted their lives to the preservation, authentication, and explication of the hadith, and perfected its associated sciences, considered themselves to be the dedicated guardians of Islam’s religious legacy.

Background to the selection of articles

Drawing principally from peer-reviewed materials published in the English language, the collection of articles and chapters comprised in these four volumes, which are divided into four broad thematic sections, aims to provide a representative selection of studies of the hadith produced within the confines of Western academic scholarship. Despite the fact that articles and chapters included in these volumes have been divided along thematic lines, it should be borne in mind that this topical classification is by no means thematically exclusive: many of the included articles broach more than one specifically defined topic. Equally, the quality of academic materials on the subject of traditions has rendered the selection process a somewhat invidious task. The range of monographs and research papers devoted to the more formal aspects of the hadith confirms the increased interest that this pre-eminent scriptural source is attracting in Western academic scholarship. Analyses of the materials found in traditions are used to explore political, historical, theological, exegetical and legal topics in early, medieval, and modern Islam, although the principal focus of this collection are the subjects and areas of learning that fall within the contours of the classical remit of hadith scholarship and its history as well as a number of studies focusing on the content of hadiths, including unique literary analyses of their form and design in addition to contributions which take up key ideas and concepts propounded upon in the literature of traditions.

The themes of authenticity and codification form the focus of Volume One of this collection. Appropriately, given the impact of his work upon academic approaches to the hadith, it commences with a chapter from Ignaz Goldziher’s Muhammedanische Studien, a work which continues to inform current discussions not only in terms of endeavours that seek to refute its author’s arguments, but also those which have built upon them and were
consequently the subject of critical appraisal. Goldziher countenanced a particularly sceptical view of the historicity of the materials comprised in the hadith. He concluded that the hadith do not 'serve as a document for the history of the infancy of Islam, but rather as a reflection of the tendencies which appeared in the community during the mature stages of its development.' His view was that 'The Prophet’s pious followers have reverently repeated the enlightened sayings of the master and have endeavoured to preserve for the edification and instruction of the community everything that he said, both in public and in private, regarding the practice of the religious obligations prescribed by him, the conduct of life in general, and social behaviour, whether in relation to the past or in the future. When the rapid succession led them to distant countries, they handed on these hadiths of the Prophet to those who had not heard them with their own ears, and after his death they added many salutary sayings which were thought to be in accord with his sentiments and could therefore, in their view, legitimately be ascribed to him, or of whose soundness they were in general convinced. These hadiths dealt with the religious and legal practices which had been developed under the Prophet and were regarded as setting the norm for the whole Islamic world'. He added that they formed the basic material of the hadith, which vastly increased during ‘subsequent generations’.

Perhaps the most critical aspect of Goldziher’s argument was his view that it was not possible to express even a tentative view as to which parts of this large corpus of extant hadith represented the original core of authentic material; indeed, he even contended that it was difficult to determine which of these hadiths ‘date back to the generations immediately following the Prophet’s death’. Goldziher demurred that ‘closer acquaintance with the vast stock of traditions induces sceptical caution rather than optimistic trust regarding the material brought together in the carefully compiled collections’.

Referring to the historical notion of the term Sunna, Goldziher ruled that while its pre-Islamic provenance as a tribal concept was undoubted, the term has to be kept distinct from hadith, adding that the linkage between the two was a much later development within which the Muslim community was supposed to honour the new sunna in the same way as the pagan Arabs had revered the Sunna of their ancestors. Explaining the historical genesis of the hadith, Goldziher adopted a ‘thesis of opposition’, based on the presumption that the cultivation and dissemination of traditions had been deliberately pursued by pious individuals who were opposed to the ruling house of the Umayyads. Goldziher claimed that the ruling Umayyads were ‘godless’ individuals who felt ‘no need to honour the founder of theocratic rule’. He added that they were concerned only by their desire for ‘Kingdom (mulk)’ and that they adopted an entirely secular outlook. His argument was that those who objected to the Umayyads were renowned for their religiosity and personal piety; however they were ‘pushed into the background by the rulers the Umayyads’. He went on: ‘they, like the Jewish rabbis under
Roman rule, occupied themselves with research into the law, which had no validity for the real circumstance of life but represented for themselves the law of their ideal society’. This led to his claim that these individuals essentially 'founded the Sunna of the Prophet upon which the law and jurisprudence of the Islamic state was to be based'.84 Goldziher did speak of the fact that the Companions of the Prophet and the generation referred to as the Successors furnished these pious individuals with “the sacred material which formed the contents and basis of their endeavour”.85 Nevertheless, he claims that fabrication of Prophetic traditions was prevalent: ‘anything which appears desirable to pious men was given by them a corroborating support reaching back to the Prophet’. Such fabrication ‘could easily be done in a generation in which the Companions, who were represented as the intermediaries of the Prophet’s words, were no longer alive’.86

Why such scholars would countenance deliberate forgery is explained by Goldziher in terms of the supposition that these luminaries ‘thought they were working against the godless tendency of the time’.87 Goldziher does infer that the development of hadith had a local character, having its ‘origins in Medina and from there was carried to all the provinces of Islam’; but equally that ‘there is a large part of it which developed independently in the provinces’.88 He argued that the self-righteous fabrication of traditions was not restricted to the pious elite, but that ‘the ruling power itself was not idle. If it wished an opinion to be generally recognised and the opposition silenced, it too had to know how to discover a hadith to suit its purpose. They had to do what there opponents did: invent, or have invented, hadiths in their turn. And that is in effect what they did’.89 The devices developed by Muslim scholars as instruments of hadith criticism were of little value; for in Goldziher’s view they could be easily manipulated: ‘among the hotly debated controversial issues of Islam, whether political or doctrinal, there is none in which the champions of the various views are unable to cite a number of traditions, all equipped with imposing isnads’.90 The significance of Goldziher’s treatment of traditions is that it decisively set in motion an approach to the early Islamic sources which accentuated issues of authenticity, laying the groundwork for revisionist analyses of the early history of Islam.

Based on a less sceptical reading of the sources, in a chapter which discusses the development of written tradition, Nabia Abbott adopts the view that hadiths were already being written down during the life of the Prophet. She argues that a background of literacy in pre-Islamic and early post-Islamic Arabia is a feature of these early periods, contrary to what is generally implied in the sources. She further contends that in these early periods there existed an interest in both Biblical and extra-Biblical books and thus levels of literacy were relatively advanced. Thus, as far as the issue of the codification of traditions is concerned, Abbott accepts that prominent Companions of the Prophet were actively collating traditions to the extent that even when
original manuscripts were destroyed, copies made from dictation by pupils often survived and were utilised by later compilers of pre-classical musannaf. This very fact would imply that the levels of authenticity among traditions were higher than recognised by Goldziher. However, Abbott admits that initially the corpus of hadith literature was relatively fluid, allowing groups such as storytellers (quṣṣāṣ) to introduce materials into the existing body of traditions. She also attaches greater significance to the Umayyad’s active role encouraging movements towards the codification of the traditions and the Prophetic Sunna, although in her view this Sunna would have included precedents set by Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and other prominent Companions, although these were principally concerned with the fundamentals of economic life. Even on the issue of whether opposition to the recording of traditions was a pronounced feature of the early tradition, Abbott’s view is that those luminaries who were in favour of writing down traditions outnumbered those opposed to the practice.

The debate surrounding the origin of the construct of opposition to writing down traditions and its impact upon the moves towards codification is the subject of Gregor Schoeler’s article. He notes that it was Joseph Horovitz who once commented that ‘hadith and Qur’an relate to each other as oral and written doctrine do in Judaism’. This is based on the existence of an abstract distinction between the Bible or (written Torah) and the Oral Torah: namely, the oral doctrine in the form of the teachings of the Talmud (Mishnah and Gemarah) and the accompanying Midrash works. Traditions exist in which the Prophet warned his companions against writing down anything other than the Qur’an. Horovitz related this prohibition to parallels with Judaism, a point rejected by Goldziher. Schoeler’s treatment of the subject offers a further distinction between written records of these ‘oral’ sources, which had existed in the form of hypomnêma (private notes or aides-memoires used as mnemonic aids in lectures), and syngramma (a text whose fixed format was intended to be much more formal). Schoeler had argued that with the exception of the Qur’an, the idea of fixed written texts had not yet materialised in the early Islamic tradition, claiming that the first fixed book of its kind was composed by the Basran grammarian Sibawayhi (d. 177/793).

In the context of the hadiths Schoeler’s arguments are important because they imply that the recording of traditions had existed in early Islam in the form of private notes; and it was in this medium that pre-classical musannaf works probably existed. His view is that such texts would have furnished the sources for the later extant collections, although reference is made to the integration of oral and written mechanisms for the transmission of knowledge. Abbott and Sezgin contended that early written antecedents had furnished the sources for the later pre-classical and classical musannaf works, although in the case of Abbott she had highlighted the use of temporary notes. In Schoeler’s estimation Sezgin had incorrectly assumed that the existence of early written antecedents would underscore the authenticity of the classical
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muṣannaf which would have been sourced to these written materials. Schoeler claimed that such a perception was misleading and that the existence of lecture and private notes (hypomnēmata) provides a better means of explaining the preservation of early hadith materials; it likewise demonstrates that seminal texts such as the Ṣahīḥ compilations of both al-Bukhārī and Muslim and other forms of literature probably relied upon such materials.

Schoeler does accept that the construct of opposition towards the codification of tradition did exist in places such as Basra and Kufa, although in his view this did not mean that written notes were not utilised for lectures and private purposes; however, he draws attention to the striking parallels which exist between Judaism and Islam as far as opposition to the writing of oral teachings is concerned. He adduces the explanation offered by Goldziher that opposition to the codification of traditions emanated from the belief that the existence of written materials was a hindrance to the free development of the law and its interpretation; the claim is that the ‘oral tradition’ afforded scholars with a greater measure of flexibility when interpreting sources. But Schoeler further reasoned that there was a supplementary dimension to the opposition to writing down the tradition and this had to be understood within the context of the Umayyad project to codify the Prophetic traditions, a project which he believes was opposed by scholars in centres such as Kufa and Basra, although developments in the third/ninth century witness this opposition finally dissipating. According to Schoeler, the traditions which speak of the hostility towards the codification of traditions were projected back to the figure of the Prophet at later historical junctures. In his opinion the debate has its origins in later periods of Islam’s history.

The theme of opposition to the codification of hadith is the subject of Michael Cook’s extended article. There are points on which both Schoeler and Cook agree; however, Cook does note that there are ‘substantial disagreements’. It was Cook’s position that Jewish origins were at the heart of the Muslim tradition of orality (scripturalism) and that this construct of hostility towards codification was not restricted to specific centres of the early Islamic world such as Kufa and Basra but rather its theoretical compass was more pervasive, existing from the inception of Islam. Cook’s argument is that Islam and Judaism shared the same epistemological conception of an oral tradition which existed alongside written scripture, although in Islam this hostility was overcome relatively quickly and codification took off with great vigour in the third/ninth and fourth/tenth centuries. Cook insisted that traditions which are in favour of writing always presuppose a background of hostility and that, intriguingly, in the traditional sources it is always a literate people who are being asked to refrain from the writing of traditions. On the issue of the authenticity of the hadith, Cook concluded that ‘although traditionist literature preserves substantially authentic materials from the second half of the second century; it can tell us a good bit about
the first half of that century, but its use as evidence for a period anterior to that is less valuable.'95 And he added that both he and Schoeler operated on the 'assumption that large amounts of Tradition are likely to be fabricated.'96

Continuing this theme of transmission, the article by Meir J. Kister examines actual hadiths and historical reports relative to the processes of codification, using them to gauge sensitivities towards the issue of the hostility against writing traditions. Kister concludes that this opposition manifested itself in the early tradition on the basis that it was exclusively controlled by pre-eminent groups within early society but that from the beginning of the second century new generations of scholars from among the mawâli (non-Arab converts and clients) soon became widely involved in transmission and codification. Paul Heck’s contribution examines mechanisms for the transmission of knowledge and their applied format as featured in the later periods of the Islamic tradition with reference to the work entitled Taqyid al-ilm written by the celebrated traditionist al-Khaṭīb al-Bağhdādi (d. 463/1071). Heck proposes that epistemological concerns remained prominent even for those texts whose format was intended to be formally fixed (syngramma); and, that the transmission of whole texts had implications for the use of the isnād. The point accentuated throughout this study is that al-Khaṭīb’s text was not intended to be an historical digest of attitudes towards the codification of traditions in the first two centuries of the Islamic tradition, but rather it was an attempt to establish writing as an authoritative source of knowledge in a way which did not impinge upon the traditional hierarchies of oral transmission and that it was the realities of fifth/eleventh century Iraq which shaped the conceptual imperatives of al-Khaṭīb’s work.

The subject of the authenticity of early literary texts, together with the practices associated with the processes of ascription is analysed in the proceeding article by Harald Motzki. He makes the point that concerns are often raised about the reliability of classical Muslim scholarship’s use of ascription when referring to early literary texts; this is something Berg regularly criticises. However, Motzki alludes to the fact that Western perceptions of dating texts are sometimes inappropriately applied when evaluating Islamic literature, to the extent that accepted conventions and characteristics adopted within the indigenous tradition towards the shaping of literary texts and presenting historical data are sometimes misconstrued. He comments that this applies to the early centuries of Islam, especially when it is the case that the ‘author’ of a work is the teacher of all that a text comprises. Thus, questions are typically raised about the authorship of the historical biography of the Prophet, Ṣirat al-nabī of Ibn Ishâq (d. 150/767 or 151/768–9); the Muwatṭa’ of Mâlik; and the two works attributed to al-Shâfi‘i (d. 204/820): al-Risâla, the epistle on the roots of law and his work devoted to substantive law, Kitâb al-Umm. Within this broad framework, Motzki considers whether the famous muṣannaf collection of traditions ascribed to the Yemeni traditionist
'Abd al-Razzāq al-Ṣan'ānī (d. 211/826) can be used to draw attention to some of the features of authorship in the early tradition, critically assessing whether the text deserves the title of one of the earliest preserved compilations of mainly legal traditions. This article is quite important for understanding perspectives among recent scholarship apropos authenticity in the early literary tradition and the reasons for conflicting differences of opinion.

A summary of the issues concerning the authenticity of the traditions and the conventional Islamic perception of their import is provided by James Robson While, in his contribution to the discourse on the question of authenticity, Wael Hallaq ironically suggests that it is essentially a diversion because all scholars, be they of ascriptionist, sceptical, or sanguine persuasions, axiomatically share the same fundamental assumption that early and classical Muslim scholarship essentially believed that they had in their possession the authentic stock of hadiths bequeathed from the time of Islam’s appearance: and, it is these materials which were used to define the religious tradition that was Islam. Needless to say, the objection against such a view would be that those scholars seeking to unravel issues of origins are not necessarily concerned with the question of idealistic or impressionistic perceptions of the past. Continuing with this theme of authenticity, Berg’s article examines methodological tensions between sanguine and sceptical scholarship as illustrated through reference to isnāds in a sample of classical Qur’anic exegesis. He then explains why the contrasting arguments adduced by opposing camps are respectively deemed reductive.

In the final article in this volume, John Burton presents his standpoint concerning the origin of the corpus of traditions. Burton views are essentially placed within the vector of his theories on the topic of the collection of the Qur’an and the fact that qirā’āt (variae lectiones) were the inevitable product of an attempt to develop an exegesis of the legal discourse of the Qur’an, circumventing doctrinal inconsistencies in the text. Applied to the vast corpus of materials of hadith, the same theory yields the explanation that hadiths were engendered by later scholarship’s attempt to explain religious doctrine and practice. In his own introductory survey of the Prophetic traditions John Burton commented that ‘Goldziher’s study opened the door for the modern examination of the hadith phenomenon’; and that on the subject of Goldziher’s central contention that the traditions were valuable sources specific to later doctrinal developments in Islam, his ‘magnificent insight deserves the highest praise’ adding, that it helped contextualise the hitherto incomprehensible confusions and contradictions encountered in the literature of hadith. He did question many of the assumptions and points made by Goldziher, including his characterisation of the Umayyads as haughty and worldly, judging that he had mistakenly believed the propaganda of their implacable opponents. In such respects Burton suggested that Goldziher’s work shows ‘signs of its age’. Burton was likewise troubled by the pejorative language employed throughout by Goldziher, suggesting
that his ‘approach suffers also from a tone of amused condescension appropriate, perhaps, to the age of confident Western political and scientific superiority in which he was nurtured’.

The subject of the isnād is the focus of the materials comprised in Volume Two of this collection and it is through specific reference to transmission, terminology, and the actual dating of traditions that this is pursued. It commences with a chapter from Joseph Schacht’s *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, a book which has significantly impacted upon academic approaches to the study of traditions. The arguments prefaced in the works of both Goldziher and Schacht continue to feature prominently in studies that broach the subject of the authenticity, codification and transmission of hadiths, in addition to the function of isnāds, not only in terms of endeavours which take up the theoretical threads of thought put forward by these two individuals, but also research which has either qualified their theses or sought to refute them.

Joseph Schacht took Goldziher’s forthright contention that the hadiths were the products of a somewhat developed version of Islam a stage further, making the point that he considered his own work to be ‘a not unworthy continuation of the studies he (Goldziher) inaugurated.’ While Goldziher had implied that among the morass of hadith materials there had existed an authentic core which had its origins in the age of the Prophet, despite his refraining from identifying this original core, Schacht denied that the hadith had any real connection with the Prophet or indeed his Companions. He was also disappointed that academic scholarship had only paid lip service to the findings of Goldziher. Focusing his attention on the specific corpus of legal traditions, he confidently stated that while his work confirmed Goldziher’s results and went beyond them in many respects, it posited the view that ‘a great many of traditions in the classical and other collections were put into circulation only after Shāfi’i’s time’. He was referring to the celebrated eponym of one of the four surviving schools of classical jurisprudence, al-Shāfi’i. Schacht’s reasoning was that this figure was the first jurist to define Sunna as the model behaviour of the Prophet, propounding the argument that previously the paradigm of Sunna merely represented the traditional usage of the community. Schacht commented that strictly speaking the term Sunna connoted precedent and that its evolution into the construct of Prophetic authority was a later development; he advanced the thesis that deference to Prophetic sanction was a very gradual process. He added that the ‘first considerable body of legal traditions from the Prophet originated towards the middle of the second century’, in opposition to slightly earlier traditions from Companions and other authorities, including the ‘living tradition’ of the ‘ancient schools of law’. Thus, when employing the term ‘traditions’, Schacht was not implying that these were the actual sayings of the Prophet, but rather they were fabricated materials which had their origins in the late Umayyad period, reflecting administrative and popular practices.
Accordingly, traditions referring to Companions and Successors were older in provenance than those which were ascribed to the Prophet. Schacht believed that collections from the classical era mostly eschewed traditions from Companions, Successors, and later authorities, implying that this was a measure of the success of al-Shafii’s accentuation of the authoritative status of Prophetic traditions. In his estimation remnants of the dispute about the authority of the sources showed that ‘arguments in favour of traditions from the Prophet are often derived from, or secondary to, arguments against them.’ Schacht even suggested that it was never inevitable that the first generation of Muslims after the Prophet should want to refer to his real or alleged rulings as a source of guidance, although he was prepared to countenance that despite opposition, reference to the Prophetic traditions was to become the defining paradigm of classical legal discourse and that this was down to the endeavour of al-Shafii.

Schacht’s position was that ‘every legal tradition from the Prophet, until the contrary is proved, must be taken not as an authentic or essentially authentic, even if slightly obscured, statement valid for his time or the time of the Companions, but as the fictitious expression of a legal doctrine formulated at a later date.’ Having dismissed the idea that the traditions were genuine products of the Prophetic era, it followed in his view that isnades were simply devices used to create historical depth for the legal doctrines they embodied; he described the classical Muslim technical criticism of the isnades as being irrelevant for the purposes of historical analysis; however, he accepted that the isnades could be used for the purpose of dating traditions, although it was the content of the matn and its design which had to be examined in order to gauge a tradition’s origin. His belief was that the isnades which were adduced to support them progressively grew backwards; Schacht did claim that the regular practice of using isnades was not older than the beginning of the second century, highlighting the incident of the killing of the Umayyad caliph Walid ibn Yazid (d. 126/744) as providing a probable historical juncture for its inception. Classical Muslim scholarship does refer to its being introduced following a period of fitna. In this chapter Schacht posits the view that the common link, which is identified as the narrator who features in different isnades with comparable matns, could yield a terminus a quo for the inception and promulgation of such traditions.

The subject of the origin of the isnad is tackled in the articles of James Robson and Gautier Juynboll. The former takes the position that the period of fitna spoken of by Ibn Sîrin can be approximately related to the last third of the first/seventh century and it was during this time that the isnad was introduced. The article largely corroborates Joseph Horovitz’s study of the isnad, although this latter figure additionally concluded that the inspiration for the inception of the device of the isnad might have been provided by the Talmudic schools of the Jewish tradition. Sezgin has referred to analogues provided by the transmission of pre-Islamic poetry and this is something which
Schoeler raised. Juynboll’s article proposes an evaluation of Schacht’s dating of the so-called fitna, positing the view that by interpreting the semantic compass of the term it is possible to trace its introduction, as mentioned by Horovitz and affirmed by both Abbott and Sezgin, to the last third of the first century, although Juynboll does suggest that the whole issue reveals that ante-dating traditions was an early phenomenon.

Perhaps the most in-depth survey on the subject of dating traditions is provided by Harald Motzki’s seminal study. Not only does the article present a detailed overview of the methodological bases of much of his work, but it also evaluates the significance of current positions adopted on the issue of dating traditions. It has been suggested that Motzki is Schacht’s leading critic. Motzki’s own conclusions question whether dating traditions on the basis of *matn* (mutūn) alone, while also discarding the value of *isnād*s is prudent; instead, promoting an investigation of the *hadith* materials which combine *isnād* and *matn* analysis, he contends that it was imperative to avoid sweeping generalisations about the issue of fabrication and that scholarship should focus upon a source critical study of the actual materials. Motzki had commented that Schacht’s premise that ‘*isnād* which extend into the first half of the second/eighth and the first/seventh centuries are without exception arbitrary and artificially fabricated is untenable’. Motzki does dispute the judgement that the *hadith* are and must be considered historically fictitious until otherwise proven, but he also adds that it is equally true that claims concerning historical authenticity have to be treated cautiously: namely, that individual studies of the materials in question must be meticulously applied to confirm or deny authenticity. This sort of approach has certainly been a distinguishing feature of his work.

Remaining with the theme of the chronological provenance of the Prophetic traditions, the article by Michael Cook attempts to test the Schachtian hypothesis of dating *hadiths*. Cook offers a useful summary of the constructs that inform Schacht’s thesis, including the view that *isnād*s reached perfection in the classical works of the second half of the third century and that many of them were at first haphazardly put together. Added to this was the belief that their gradual improvement coincided with the material growth of tradition: the most perfect and complete *isnād*s were attached to later materials. As Cook notes it was this assumption that *isnād*s had the tendency to grow backwards that emboldened Schacht to propose a method for identifying the provenance of reports with similar contents (*matn*s) which had several *isnād* variants: the reasoning is that the spread of *isnād* was used to conceal deliberate manufacture. *Ex hypothesi*, such *isnād*s had a common transmitter who featured in the third or even fourth generation of the *isnād*: Schacht’s view was that these common points of intersection not only indicated when *hadiths* were probably put into circulation, but they also enabled the process of dating the doctrines and teachings comprised in them. Using eschatological traditions on the basis that they can be dated
on external grounds, Cook set out to compare the externally derived results with those derived by the application of Schacht’s hypothesis. The conclusion he reaches is that there are evident discrepancies which undermined dating on the basis of the common link; the matn based dating did not correspond with isnād based dating. However, a defence of the use of isnāds, configured through reference to the concept of the common link, to date traditions is outlined in Andreas Görke’s article. He insists that there were subtle distinctions which had to be taken into account when using eschatological materials. Görke includes a case study which explores an apocalyptic tradition in which the Prophet is said to have predicted a distinct correspondence between the name (ism) of the forthcoming mahdī and his own name: Muhammad ibn ’Abd Allāh. Görke points out that his own study yields a perfect correspondence between matn-based results and those derived from an isnād-based analysis based on the common link, proposing some important prerequisites which need to be applied when exploring such types of traditions.

Joseph Schacht’s Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence has been the subject of a monograph length critique by Mustafa Azami, highlighting what he perceived were inconsistencies in the arguments and conclusions of its author.115 Chapter Seven of his critique offers a detailed discussion of the reliability of the isnād mechanism, revisiting examples of isnād analysis cited by Schacht in his own work. Azami takes the view that Schacht failed to consult the full range of literature specific to the periods he was studying; he also claimed that misunderstandings of the sources feature in his quotation of materials. Rebutting Schacht’s contention that the hadiths were documents which had their origins in the second/eighth and third/ninth centuries of Islam, Azami argues that the hadiths found in the classical collections and subsequently verified by traditionist scholarship as being authentic were reliable documents which undoubtedly had their origin in the lifetime of the Prophet. He further maintains that the isnād was in reality employed in the lifetime of the Prophet and that by the end of the first century its usage was fully evolved. In this chapter from his critique Azami analyses a number of the central theses advanced by Schacht, including a detailed review of his reference to the common link and the very isnād used to exemplify this phenomenon, which he shows to be misrepresented. Azami further questioned a number of Schacht’s key postulates, including his reference to scholarship’s arbitrary use of isnāds and their gradual improvement; the propensity to create additional authorities; and claims concerning the misleading function of family isnāds. Berg has suggested that Azami’s methods are not altogether different from those applied by Abbott and Sezgin, adding that while his defence of the isnād system has been both original and valuable, the ‘dismissal of a few examples does not necessarily weaken the overarching patterns suggested by Schacht’ and more critically he contends that Azami’s work is based on the presupposition that the traditional sources used to construct his own
rebuttal are authentic. Cook has made the point that Schacht’s conclusions in respect of Muslim tradition and law ‘rest largely on a foundation of mutual consistency and overall plausibility which is not easily confirmed or refuted’ but he adds that it is possible ‘to chip away at the edifice, as Azami has done, by seeking out errors, oversights, and inconsistencies of various kinds’.

Gautier Juynboll’s contributions to academic studies of the hadith have been distinctly defined by his efforts to develop isnād based methods for dating traditions, which were in his own words ‘rightly or wrongly’ attributed to the Prophet Muḥammad. Many would argue that modern academic studies of the tradition are deeply indebted to his work, although some of the underlying assumptions from which he proceeds in his methodology of dating traditions have been questioned. Juynboll was inspired by Schacht’s conception of the phenomenon of the common link and its use as a means of dating traditions to the extent that much of his work has ventured to defend and expand this ‘brilliant’ theory, theoretically addressing and improving some of the inconsistencies and defects sometimes identified with its application. Adopting a similar scepticism towards the authenticity of the traditions, Juynboll does posit an earlier provenance for their historical emergence compared to that of Schacht, although he contends that ‘the earliest origins of standardized hadith cannot be traced back earlier than, at most, to the seventies or eighties of the first century’. Interestingly, Motzki has pointed out that Juynboll’s claim that single strand isnāds are ‘generally unhistorical and may even have been fabricated by the later collector in whose work they appear’ makes him ‘even more sceptical than Schacht’. Regarding the authority of the Prophetic Sunna, Juynboll claims this term had a more general connotation, although it was narrowed down to the exemplary behaviour of the Prophet towards the end of the first seventh century. His articles in this section are geared towards refining mechanisms for the processes of dating which are then used to evaluate isnāds, introducing a range of terms to define the perceived convoluted dynamics of isnād formation and spread. The article on Nāfi typifies the general thrust of his methodology, although it was the subject of a detailed critique by Harald Motzki. Additionally, Juynboll’s attempt to connect the idea of the common link with references in the Islamic hadith literature to the term madār is the subject of Halit Ozkan’s article in which it is maintained that there are major differences separating Juynboll’s use of the term and its semantic compass in classical Muslim scholarship. Staying with the theme of the common link, Amikam El’ad’s study of the traditions relating to the site of the grave of Moses seeks to shed light on the possible dating of the traditions in question and, applying this theory, explain their transmission.

The backward growth of isnāds is a phenomenon which has received much attention in modern scholarship and Jonathan Brown’s article suggests that the issue was broached by classical Muslim scholarship through the ‘lens’ of ziyāda (additions). He explains that works devoted to detecting the ‘defects’
(‘itil) of traditions actually uncovered the fact that parallel versions of these ‘Prophetic reports’ had existed, showing that they were originally non-Prophetic utterances, despite their presence in the canonical collections. These were instances of isolated Prophetic statements which had numerous Companion versions of the same material. Brown asserts, for reasons of legal utility, classical jurists favoured accepting the Prophetic imprimatur of these materials despite the fact that proponents of rigorous hadith criticism continued to debate their genuine Prophetic provenance. The article provides an indication of the sort of highly qualified debates which were openly conducted within the confines of traditional hadith scholarship. It likewise addresses the nature of discussions about issues of textual authority and the debates which prefigured them. Returning to issues of classification, James Robson’s two articles that follow are devoted to key aspects of hadith terminologies: the first of these examines the type of tradition classified as being hasan and the perceived difficulties classical scholarship had with reaching a consensus regarding a definitive classification of this term, while the second deals with the theoretical features of isnāds transmitted on the authority of single individuals. These two studies are followed by Dickinson’s article on the phenomenon of seeking elevation (‘uluw) in isnāds, namely the pursuit of traditions with the least number of intermediaries connecting the matns to their isnāds which, it is argued, created a greater spiritual proximity to the Prophet. The interest in this aspect of scholarship was rife during the time of the celebrated traditionist Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (577–643/1181–1245), who was renowned for his influential introduction (Muqaddima) to the sciences of traditions. Dickinson suggests that in the early periods ‘uluw was associated with exactitude and precision relating to the processes of transmission, but such concerns, despite being continued by staid traditionist scholars, were not the principal interest of less serious individuals who viewed such isnāds with spiritual imperatives in mind.

The final two articles included in this Volume are by Leonard Librande and Mehmet Koç, respectively. The former considers the way in which high and low categories of isnāds (‘-l-w and n-z-l) could be used to reflect an opposition of sorts between journeys in the pursuit of hadith and the non-travelling scholar’s use of written materials; the latter article looks at Ibn Abī Hātim al-Rāzī’s traditionist commentary on the Qur’an, reflecting specifically upon his employment of isnāds in this work; Koç offers some interesting comments concerning Ibn Abī Hātim’s use of materials narrated by individuals whose reliability was called into question. The inference is that such materials were deemed acceptable within the confines of exegetical literature because of their exhortative function. It should be evident from the range of articles and chapters included in this volume that the isnād inspired remarkably sophisticated levels of discourse within classical scholarship, confirming its all pervasive import in the context of the transmission, authentication, and codification of traditions.
Section Three of this collection focuses upon the individual works and accomplishments of leading scholars of traditions; aspects of the history of hadith scholarship, and standpoints and forms of criticism which featured in classical hadith studies. The first article by Motzki is essentially about whether disregarding the value of the isnād, as has been the strategy with both Goldziher and Schacht, was correct. Motzki answers this question through a historical source analysis of the work of the Yemenite traditionist ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Ṣan‘ānī, exploring divergent patterns in the work’s isnāds as well as the author’s methodology. His conclusions are that sources such as this, together with the famous collection of the traditionist Muḥammad ibn Abī Shayba do have a greater historical value than thus far recognised and can serve as important sources for critical syntheses of the early periods. In terms of al-Ṣan‘ānī’s Musannaf Motzki would argue that its constellation of sources as presented through the isnāds is not commensurate with the sort of arbitrary fabrication of materials implied by Schacht. Al-Ṣan‘ānī is identified as one of the mentors of Ibn Ḥanbal and it is this latter figure’s famous Musnad collection of traditions that is the subject of Christopher Melchert’s study. The article explores the composition and features of the Musnad, drawing attention to the way the text was distinguished from the other famous collections from this period and the possible reasons for this; the article also includes some fascinating observations about the geographical provenance of the materials in this work.125

The academic debate concerning the constructs of authority in the early Islamic tradition and the references to the supposed antithesis between ahl al-ra‘y (advocates of personal opinion who were renowned for their pursuit of an unfettered and rational exposition of the legal sources) and ahl al-hadith (advocates of a more traditionally informed approach to the sources), particularly the processes which governed the resort to adducing Prophetic, Companion, and Successor reports, provides the background for Scott Lucas’ quantitative study of the musannaf text of Muḥammad ibn Abī Shayba. Lucas argues that among the ‘proponents of hadith’ not only were these individuals chiefly reliant upon the legal precedents set by Companions and Successors, but that they made no distinction between adducing Companion and Successor reports on the one hand, and those which had a Prophetic provenance. He reasons that this was true even when Prophetic hadiths were readily available. The study does posit that Ibn Abī Shaybah should be placed among the strictest proponents of hadith, especially in respect of his accepting the legal authority of the reports connected with post-successor jurists. On a connected subject Susan Spectorsky proffers an analysis of the use of hadith in the responses (masā‘il) of Ishāq ibn Rāhawayh, advancing some interesting conclusions about his approach to the synthesis of the material of the hadith.126

The theme of authenticity and hadith criticism is the subject of the first of two further contributions by Melchert. Revisiting Norman Calder’s suspicions about al-Bukhārī’s authorship of his celebrated Sahih and a second work
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of his, a biographical dictionary entitled al-Tārīkh al-kabīr, which was said to be one of his late works, Melchert assesses the historical background of this text based on an analysis of its contents and features. He proposes that the text was composed before the Sahih, although it was the subject of "extensive interpolation and extension" by both Al-Bukhari and later scholars. Melchert concludes that the work reflects the professionalism achieved within approaches to rijāl criticism of later periods. Melchert’s second article provides a review of the life and works of Abū Dāwūd, noted for his Sunan collection of traditions and his association with some of the great paragons of Sunni orthodoxy. He draws attention to the historical importance of this figure and the significance of the period in which he lived. Relative to Berg’s spectrum of sanguine and sceptical scholars, Melchert has stated that he places himself closer to those scholars whom Berg classified as being sceptical, although he adds that he is not at the sceptical extreme of someone such as Gerald Hawting.

Referring to ‘a long and elaborate tradition’ of the formal criticism of the works of al-Bukhārī and Muslim, Jonathan Brown examines the seminal contribution to scrutiny of these texts ventured by the pre-eminent fourth/tenth century scholar of traditions al-Dāraquṭnī. He emphasises that the emergence of hadith canon was still developing and therefore al-Dāraquṭnī’s efforts in this respect as articulated in his Kitāb al-ilzāmūt wa’l-tatabbīt must be viewed as an intrinsic part of the process of canonisation and not a challenge to it. This article is followed by a contribution which reconsiders the application of matn criticism in classical hadith scholarship. Indeed, one major criticism which was levelled at the classical Islamic hadith processes of authentication by Goldziher and Schacht was that it primarily focused upon the scrutiny of the isnāds alone and not the evaluation of the content of the texts (mutūn) to which they were attached. However, Brown insists that examples of matn criticism from the third/ninth and fourth/tenth centuries confirm that activity was far more fertile than hitherto recognised due to the fact that its proponents concealed this aspect of their scholarship in an effort to fend off the censure of their rationalist opponents. The point suggested here is that ‘sensitivity to historical anachronism, logical impossibility, limits of “thinkable thought” and a rejection of material that contradicts what they “knew” to be historically, dogmatically and legally true’ can be found among key traditionist luminaries when evaluating hadiths.

With the next selection of articles in this volume the focus shifts to more general aspects of classical hadith scholarship. John Nawas’s short piece examines the contribution of the mawāli to the preservation and authentication of traditions, particularly those which occur in the Six Canonical Books. It was Goldziher who had originally asserted that these non-Arabs had been instrumental in the development of the Islamic sciences, a view which seems to have exerted some influence upon perceptions of classical hadith scholarship in secondary sources. However, through reference to statistics, Nawas
proposes that as far as the mawāli‘ contribution to the canonical hadith collections is concerned it was almost equal in part to that of the Arabs. This article is followed by a historical survey of the introduction of hadith studies in Islamic Spain during the second/eighth and third/ninth centuries by Isabel Fierro. It appears to question the conventional chronology presented in the traditional sources regarding the genesis of such learning in Andalusia. On a separate subject, the popular yet strict piety associated with the juridical–theological movement, which emerged in the late second/eighth century and was identified by Marshall Hodgson as representing the ‘hadith folk’, or traditionists, is the subject of Melchert’s article, whereas Vardit Tokatly reviews the theological thrust and design of one of the famous fourth/tenth century commentaries on al-Bukhārī’s Sahih by the eminent Sunnī scholar al-Khaṭṭābī (319-388/930-998).

The following three articles introduce Shi‘ite scholarship and the Prophetic traditions: the first of these, by Etan Kohlberg, explores the collection of sayings by the acknowledged imāms referred to as the Usul al-arba‘umi‘a. While the principal Shi‘ite traditions were codified in texts such as the al-Kāfī fi usul al-dīn by al-Kulaynī (d. 329/940); the renowned man là yahdurahu al-faqīh by Ibn Bābawayhī (d. 381/991) and the works of the Shaykh al-Tā‘īf al-Tūsī (d. 460/1068), the Usul al-arba‘umi‘a are purported to represent the sayings of the imāms as transmitted by scholars of traditions, reflecting the fact that in terms of a hierarchy of sources Shi‘ite hadith literature accentuated Prophetic utterances as well as statements attributed to the imāms. Moreover, the Usul are deemed to be the earliest Shi‘ite sources. A digest of the origins of the classical Shi‘ite hadith is presented in Ron Buckley’s article; he makes the point that the move towards the identification of the Shi‘ite construct of Sunna and legal norms took place during the rule of the early Abbasids. Focusing on individual scholarship, Asma Afsaruddin reviews the methodology and schema applied in the study of hadith by the Shi‘ite traditionist Jamāl al-Dīn Ahmad ibn Ṭawūs (d. 673/1274-5), a figure who is perceived to have instilled into classical Shi‘ite scholarship of the traditions a whole new impetus and direction. Finally, a study of the collection of hadiths associated with the Ibāḍī Khārijite movement is the subject of an essay by John Wilkinson.

Reviewing women’s contributions to hadith scholarship, Aisha Geissinger investigates the theme of female participation in the early development of Qur’anic commentary through reference to al-Bukhārī’s chapter on exegesis. The scholarship of women in hadith is likewise analysed in Asma Sayeed’s study of the careers of two prominent women scholars of the region of Mamlūk Damascus: namely, Zaynab bint al-Kamāl (646-740/1248-1339) and Ḥā’isha bint Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥādi (723-816/1323-1413). Sayeed demonstrates that their pre-eminence in the field of hadith scholarship is reflected by the remarkable frequency with which women transmitters appear in the biographical and chronological works covering this period. The final two
articles in this volume look at separate aspects of classical hadith scholarship: Leonard Librande reviews the subject of the retentive memory of hadith scholars. Traditional literature is replete with anecdotes extolling the incredible ability of these scholars to memorise materials, but Librande seeks to contextualise certain aspects of this remarkable trait.\textsuperscript{[1]} The final contribution is by Mohammad Fadel and its focal point is the work of al-Bukhārī, although it is broached in the context of the introductory volume to the seminal commentary on this text composed by Ibn Hajar entitled Hady al-Sārī. Fadel argues that Ibn Hajar was subtly attempting to draw attention to the profundity of the relationship which exists between the form and the function of the traditions comprised in al-Bukhārī’s text. It is believed that unravelling the nature of this relationship, will help resolve some of the complexities that surround the intellectual background in which the text was conceived. Fadel is of the view that this will further allow a perceptive gauging of the somewhat inspired schema for the presentation of traditions devised by the text’s author.

The articles included in Volume Four present studies of hadith literature from a number of varied approaches. The first selection of articles explores the traditions from the perspective of literary narrative and discourse, an approach which is seldom attempted in the study of narrative. Daniel Beaumont’s contribution draws attention to both the features and function of narrative form (khabar), utilising a theory of narratology to explore the dynamics of composition in the context of hadith. Beaumont argues that in respect of narrative form and the act of narrating, it is paramount that the isnād and matn be considered part of an integral unit.\textsuperscript{[13]} The two studies by Stefan Günther offer further attempts to apply modern literary theory to the material of the traditions. Despite the fact that the first article was written much later than the second, it actually constitutes a brief revisiting of the subject, serving to explain the context of many of the arguments propounded in the earlier article. Günther does speak of the fictional function of the traditions, although this should not be confused with the term fictitious but rather that it connotes a resourceful rearrangement of the realm of experiences of a former ideal generation; in this sense, the materials are seen as possessing a defined instructive dimension. In the first of the two articles by Marston Speight a brief formulaic treatment of the hadiths is outlined based on their originally being an orally transmitted and preserved body of materials, while in his second article, some of the features of variant readings that appear in the corpus of traditions are examined using the sahiha (codex or document) ascribed to Hammām ibn Munabbih (d. 101/719 or 132/750). Speight has previously applied form analysis to variant traditions for the purposes of dating them. Finally, also applying literary criticism to the study of hadith, the article by Stefan Sperl examines the literary form of a selected sample of traditions from the canonical literature within the context of practical ethics. Sperl underlines the timeless and universal appeal of
the materials as intrinsic features of their design for he argues that they transform the image of the past into a seemingly absolute present with the isnâds thereby bridging the gap between present and past.

The final selection of articles deals with general aspects of the context and content of traditions. The first of these by Leah Kinberg ventures an investigation into the role that dreams played in the process of evaluating traditions with reference to the reliability of transmitters; the content as well as the significance of some of the traditions are carefully reflected upon.134 Focusing on the wording of a specific tradition, Patricia Crone reviews the background to the erroneous ascription of a statement to the Khârijite movement concerning the eligibility of slaves to the office of caliphate, attempting to flesh out why such an ascription actually occurred. Kister’s study of hadiths germane to concessions and conduct in the early Islamic tradition draws attention to the fluidity of certain religious and socio-political as reflected in early hadith literature, although he tempers this with the view that the collating of divergent materials from these periods appears to confirm that there was a sincere effort on the part of scholarship to establish the Prophetic Sunna.135 The famous mujaddid tradition in which mention is made of God’s sending to the community at the turn of every century an individual or individuals who will restore and revive religion is analysed by Ella Landau-Tasseron. On an entirely different subject Neal Robinson examines one of the sections from Muslim’s collection of traditions with the aim of probing varieties of pronouncement stories which occur in the text, intimating the possible existence of a Gospel genre within the corpus of traditions.136 On a somewhat related theme Juan Pedro Monferrer-Sala attempts to trace Eastern Christian influences in a hadith featured in an early Andalusian treatise. The final article in this section is a piece that employs a feminist hermeneutic to consider gender constructs in the traditions that appear in the chapter on knowledge in al-Bukhârî’s Sahîh.

The classical disciplines of learning and scholarship associated with the study and preservation of the hadith boast a splendid literary heritage that spans the many centuries of the Islamic tradition; not only is the literary output associated with the formative years of that tradition remarkably copious and sophisticated, but equally outstanding is the panoply of works produced over successive historical periods. Indeed, even today the distinct trajectories of this scholarship continue to inform the study of the traditions in the Arab and Islamic world. Within Western academic discourse the analyses of hadith literature together with its formal sciences have been pursued from a wide range of approaches and perspectives with the paradigms of authenticity and origins playing a significant role in shaping key aspects of this discourse and its compass of enquiry. In this respect the formative years of classical hadith learning have typically received a greater proportion of attention and interest. This is largely due to the reason that these periods are deemed to represent the golden age of hadith erudition. Despite
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the considerable achievements and distinct advances made in the field by modern academic scholars, it remains an age which scholarship is still exploring and probing. At the same time, the vast corpus of hadith related materials and literature in terms of specialist rijāl biographies, texts on isnād criticism and terminology, commentaries, collections of traditions from the ensuing historical periods, appears to offer an equally rich profusion of materials with which current scholarship is only beginning to engage; thus, in many respects the academic potential and challenges of hadith studies remain substantial.

Notes

1 For the individual collections of traditions see Al-Kutub al-Sitta: Mawsū‘ at al-hadīth al-sharīf, Saiḥīh ibn ʿAbd al-Azīz Al-Shaykh (ed.) (Riyād: Dār al-Salām, 1999), which comprises the six canonical collections of traditions. One of the most renowned Musnads was the work of al-Imām Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal, S. T. Majdhūb (ed.), 10 vols (Beirut: al-Maktab al-Īslāmī, 1992). Many of these collections are available on CD Roms with intricate search facilities which isolate traditions and their narrators, furnishing diagrams of the isnāds, while also providing biographical data: see al-Maktaba al-alфиyya li-l-sunna al-nabawiyya by al-Turāth (www.turath.com accessed 8th May 2009) and the materials produced by Harf: www.harf.com (accessed 5th May 2009); see Mawsū‘a al-hadīth al-sharīf, comprising some 62,000 traditions; it also boasts a vocabulary search facility and deals with the process of takhrīj, which relates to tracing the different paths of transmission as reflected in the isnāds across major collections; and atraf (ṭarāf), which focus upon content similarity across the seminal collections; there is also a section which deals with technical terminology and biography. A classical work on the atraf is Tuhfat al-ashraf bi-μu‘rīfah al-atraf compiled by the famous Shafi‘īte traditionist and jurist Yūsuf ibn ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Mizzī (d. 742/1341). This work provides the isnād strands of traditions as they feature in the canonical books, beginning with an initial ‘excerpt’ (ṭarāf) of a tradition, while using abbreviated symbols to identify the collection in which the tradition features, although this is achieved via an alphabetical arrangement of narrators. A survey of famous Sunni works is provided in the al-Riṣāla al-mustatrafah li-bayān musštār Kutub al-sunna al-musharrasa by Muḥammad ibn Jaʿfar al-Kattānī (Beirut: Dār al-Baṣhīr al-Īslāmīyya 2000). For a legal commentary see Muḥammad al-Taḥwīl’s Maʿāni al-āthār, Muḥammad al-Najīb (ed.), 4 vols (Kairu: Maḥbāf al-Anwār, n.d.). Linguistic commentaries include Ibn Sallām, Abū ʿUbayd al-Qāsim. Gharīb al-hadīth, 2 vols (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-Īlmiyya, 1987), although the seminal work in this respect is by Ibn al-Athir, Majd al-Dīn Abū ʿl-Ṣādāt al-Mubārak ibn Muḥammad al-Jazārī. al-Niḥāya fi gharīb al-hadīth wa’l-āthār, 4 vols, Taḥir al-Zawī, Muḥmūd al-Tanāḩī (eds) (Kairu: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Kutub al-Ārabiyya, n.d.). A theological treatment is explored in the work of the Ashʿarīte Ibn Fūrak, Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan. Kitāb musbīkh al-hadīth aw Taʾwil al-akhdhār al-mutashābīhah, texte édité et commenté par Daniel Gimaret (Damascus: Institut Français d’études arabes de Dama, 2003) and Ibn Ṭuṭayba, Muḥammad Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad. Taʾwil muskhalaf al-hadīth (Cairo: Maktabat al-Mutanabbi, n.d.); see the study by Guy Lecomte. Le Traité des Divergences du Ḥadīth d’ Ibn Ṭuṭayba (mort en 276/889) (Damascus: Institut Français, 1965). Some of the seminal works on hadith sciences which broach
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of more general biographical works such as Muhammad Ibn Sa‘d’s Tabaqat al-Kubrā, 7 vols (Beirut: Dār Beirut, 1957) is often connected with activity in the field of the hadīth biography. Later compilations such as al-Dhahabi’s Siyār al-lām al-mubārāt, 25 vols, Shu‘ayb Arna‘ūt and Ma‘mūn al-Sāghiḥ (eds) (Beirut: Mu‘assasat al-Risāla, 1990) would have relied on many of the earlier sources. See below for the discussion of specialist hadīth biography work by Yūsuf ibn ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Mizzi, Tahdīth al-kamāl fi asma‘ al-rijāl, Bashār ‘Awad Mārūf (ed.), 35 vols (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1980–92). Shi‘ite scholars also produced specific genres of biographical texts with a range of classical compilations being credited to figures between the third/ninth and fifth/eleventh centuries; included among these is the Kitāb al-rijāl of Abū Ja‘far al-Barqū (d. 274/887). Other works included the Rijāl al-Kāshi, a fourth/tenth century text and the Kitāb al-rijhrist of Abū Ja‘far al-Tūsī (d. 460/1067–8) together with his Kitāb al-rijāl; for general surveys of all the various forms of hadīth biographical writings see Dīyā’ al-‘Umarī, Buhūth fi tārīkh al-sunnah al-musharrafah (Beirut: Mu‘assasat al-Risāla, 1975). A more recent edition of the text was published in 1984 by Dār al-‘Ulim wa‘l-Hikam in Medina.
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3 The author of the famous Kitāb al-Jaḥ wa’l-tadīl, Ibn Abī Hātim al-Rāzī, makes the point that while the Qur’ān was revealed as a source of guidance for all matters, it was through Prophetic direction that the teachings of scripture were fleshed out: Ibn Abī Hātim, Taqdimat al-Ma'rifa li-Kitāb Al-Jaḥ wa’l-tadīl, vol. 1, p. 1 f. Schacht stated that ‘The sacred law of Islam is an all embracing body of religious duties rather than a legal system proper; it comprises on an equal footing ordinances regarding cult and ritual, as well as political and (in the narrow sense) legal rules’. Joseph Schacht, The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence. See the opening remarks of his preface. The issue of authority is looked at in Aisha Y. Musa, Hadith as Scripture: Discussions on the Authority of the Prophetic Traditions in Islam (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008). It should be borne in mind that an historical nexus for the disputes between rational theologians such as the Mu’tazila and the more orthodox scholars about the function of the hadith do appear to reflect a protracted debate about issues germane to the very authority and weighting of certain types of transmitted Prophetic reports; see the discussion in al-Khaṭīb’s al-Kifayya, pp. 23–6; al-Suyūṭī, Tadrīb, vol. 1, pp. 73 ff. Further discussions on the more general issue of authenticity see G. H. A. Juynboll, The Authenticity of the Tradition Literature. Discussions in Modern Egypt (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969) and Charles J. Adams, ‘The authority of the Prophetic hadith in the eyes of some modern Muslims’, in Donald P. Little (ed.), Essays on Islamic Civilization Presented to Niyazi Berkes (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976), pp. 25–47. Daniel Brown, ‘Sunnah and Islamic revivalism’, in Rethinking Tradition In Modern Islamic Thought (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 108–132. Also, a volume of the Oriente Moderno (2002:1), Roberto Tottoli (ed.) has been devoted to hadith in Modern Islam.

4 The appeal to Prophetic authority or Sunna emerged as a key concept in classical Islamic thought, confirming the definitive significance of the corpus of Prophetic traditions in the configuration of all aspects of the faith. Terms such as athar and khabar were initially used synonymously with hadith, although gradually scholars used the former terms to designate those reports which were not Prophetic utterances or statements but rather materials attributed to a Companion or Successor figure; some traditionist scholars maintain the two terms have a similar import. The technical literature which defines such phenomena uses terms such as muwaqqīf and marfū’ when qualifying the condition of the continuity of a tradition’s isnād. See Zayn al-Dīn al-Ṭraḍāqī, Fatḥ al-mughfīth, pp. 69, 71, and al-Suyūṭī, Tadrīb, vol. 1, pp. 183–5. For a discussion of the aspects of Sunna see, for example, Wael Hallaq, Authority, Continuity, and Change in Islamic Law (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001) and Wael Hallaq, The Origins and Evolution of Islamic Law (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 69–70. Susan Spectorisky, ‘Sunnah in the responses of Ishaq ibn Rahwayh’, in Studies in Islamic Legal Theory, Bernard Weiss (ed.) (Boston: E. J. Brill, 2002), pp. 51–74.

5 The relationship between hadith and fiqh is explored in Wael Hallaq, ‘From regional schools to personal schools of law? A reevaluation’, Islamic Law and
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The Successors (al-Baqi‘) (10) Al-Khaṭṭāb ibn al-Khaṭṭāb al-Jarrah mentioned in the Hadith Collection which he compiled with his Companions (see the discussion below in f/t 85).

10 Al-Khaṭṭāb ibn al-Baghdādī’s Taqyīd al-imān, Yusuf al-Ishāsh (ed.) 2nd edn (n.p: 1974), pp. 49–60. Reasons for the prohibition of the writing of traditions are discussed, including the fear that the hadith might be confused with the word of God; the concern that it might distract from sacred scripture; the belief that the written word was essentially transient; and, the fear that such materials could fall into the hands of those ‘unauthorised’ (lacking the required learning to deal with the materials). That the Arabs were an illiterate people is a theme often accentuated in the classical literature, but it seems that the prohibition of writing down traditions is set against a background of literacy and the Qur’an abounds with reference to writing; see Versteegh’s references to the ayat al-dayn in Kees Versteegh, The Arabic Language (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2001), p. 54, and Cook’s article ‘The Opponents’, pp. 442, 476 and 495 (ch. 4).

11 This is the perception which forms the basis for later scholars’ understanding of this period: see Ibn Abī Hātim. Taqdimat al-maw‘īf li-Kitāb Al-jarrāh wa’t-ta’dīl, vol. 1, p. 2f.


13 The Successors (tābi‘īn) are defined as those individuals who had not seen the Prophet in his lifetime but were distinguished as ‘second generation’ luminaries who were contemporary to his Companions (see the discussion below in 8f 85). The evolution of the Islamic sciences is associated with figures among these tābi‘īn and the ‘Successors of Successors’: tābi‘ī al-tābi‘īn. For example see Harald Motzki, ‘The Role of Non-Arab Converts in the Development of Early Islamic Law’ Islamic Law and Society 6:3 (1999), 293–317. Gautier Juynboll, ‘The Role of Non-Arabs, the Mawālī, in the Development of Muslim hadith’, Le Muséon, Revue d’Études Orientales 118:3–4 (2005), 355–86; and Gautier Juynboll, ‘Early Islamic society as reflected in its use of inā‘ād’, Le Muséon (1994:107.1), pp. 151–94. Also see the articles in Patronate and Patronage in Early and Classical Islam, Monique Bernards and John Nawas (eds) (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2005).

14 The remarks of the traditionist Iṣḥāq ibn Rāhawayh (d. 238/852), who is said to have suggested to al-Bukhārī that a succinct text which brought together the authenticated traditions of the Prophet was a desideratum, inspired him to compile his collection of hadith. A reference is made to al-Bukhārī having a dream in which he uses a fan in the presence of the Prophet and having asked scholars to interpret its meaning, he was told that he was shielding the Prophet against falsehoods. Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, Ḥadīṭ al-sārī muqaddimāt Fath al-bārī sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, 15 vols (Riyāḍ, Damascus: Dār al-Salām, Dār al-Fayhā, 2000). Based on edited manuscripts of ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz ibn Bāz and Fuʿād ‘Abd al-Baqī, introductory volume, pp. 8–9. See also the earlier Al-Khaṭṭābī, Al-ʿĀlm al-sunan fi sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, 2 vols, Yusuf al-Kattānī (ed.) (Rabat: Maṭbahat al-Ukāz, 1990). Other notable commentaries on al-Bukhārī’s collection are Irshād al-sārī, compiled by al-Qastallānī (d. 922/1516) and ‘Umdat al-ṣārī’ by Badr al-Dīn al-Aynī (d. 855/1451). A more recent work was by the twentieth century scholar Muhammad al-Shanqūṭī entitled Kawthar al-maʿānī al-khāshīf khabāyā Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, 16 vols, 2nd end (Amman: Dār al-Bashīr, 1993). For a study of the class of traditions referred to as ḥadīth
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al-qudsi see William Graham, Divine Word and Prophetic Word in Early Islam: A Reconsideration of the Sources with Special Reference to the Divine Sayings or Hadith Qudsi (The Hague: Mouton, 1977). These are traditions in which the Prophet attributes statements to God, although these are distinguished from Qur’anic utterances.

15 For example Ibn Hanbal’s Musnad comprised some 30,000 traditions, adopting a system of seniority among Companions and Successors, beginning with the musnad of Abū Bakr and listing all the traditions in which he is cited in isnāds. This is followed by the musnad of Umar and then successive Companions. It is the case that in some instances such figures are often the subject of a given report as opposed to featuring in the actual isnād. The arrangement adopted by musnad works was not however conducive to the referencing and locating of specific traditions. The various approaches to organising musnads are set out in al-Suyūṭī, Tadrīb, vol. 2, pp. 154–6. In the works classed as musannafs, the thematic approach of the arrangement facilitated the process of sourcing and identifying traditions. See Marston Speight, ‘Some formal characteristics of the Musnad type of Hadīth collection’, Arabica 49 (2002) 376–82.

16 For a summary of different types of compilations see Zayn al-Dīn al-Iraqī, Al-Ṭaqyīd wa’l-īddāh, pp. 29–35; and Suyūṭī, Tadrīb, vol. 2, pp. 88–144.


18 See al-Rāmahurmuzī, al-Muḥadīthīn, pp. 379–402 in which various madhhabs or approaches towards the codification of traditions are set out, including one in which early scholars made use of written materials to memorise traditions before erasing their notes pp. 611–24. Also, al-Suyūṭī speaks of this representing a third madhhab relative to tawdīn: see Suyūṭī, Tadrīb, vol. 2, p. 65, and Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Jāmi‘ bayān al-‘ilm, pp. 98–109. Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī’s Taqyīd al-‘ilm, pp. 64–113, discusses the earliest stages of preservation and transmission, including references to the ‘codex’ (sahīṭa) type collections of several Companions. The idea of oral and written mechanisms for the dissemination of knowledge is taken up by Schoeler in The Oral and the Written, particularly in terms of the intersection between written notes and later materials intended to be more fixed in format, pp. 111–42.

19 A further sub-division is referred to by classical scholarship between ‘ilm al-riwāya and al-‘ilm dīrīya in respect of hadīth scholarship: the former covers matters pertaining to the exact transmission of the very texts of statements (mawānī pl. mutān) attributed to the Prophet; while the latter encompasses rules specific to types of narrators and their status and the more subtle issues of transmission, Al-Suyūṭī, Tadrīb, vol. 1, pp. 40 ff.

20 See the introduction to Muslim’s collection of traditions incorporated in Al-Kutub al-Sittah: Mawsū’at al-hadīth al-sharīf (bāb bayān an al-īnād min al-‘ilm), pp. 675–6.
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Cf. Sahih Muslim bi-sharh al-Nawawī, vol. 1, p. 84. And see al-Rāmahurmuzā, al-Muhaddith, pp. 414–16. The renowned ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Mubārak (d. 181/797) stated that the isnād was a veritable part of faith: see the above reference to Muslim’s introduction, p. 676.

22 See Zayn al-Dīn al-ʿIraqī, Faith al-mughith, pp. 13 ff. Also see the discussion in Nawawī’s commentary on Muslim’s Sahih (p. 28) and the fact that some scholars (al-Khaṭṭābī) used the term sajīm when referring to ʿdīf. Dickinson has used the term sound for (ṣaḥīḥ) and fair for ḥasan. The quest for authenticity witnessed scholars seeking isnādī which had lesser numbers of intermediaries separating the initial narrator from the Prophet. It became part of the famous riḥla fi talab al-hadīth (journeys in the quest for traditions) with shorter isnāds being called al-hadīth al-ʿaṭī. See Librande’s article below (ch. 27). Also see al-Suyūṭī, Ṭadrīb, vol. 2, p. 160 ff, in which figures such as Sulaymān al-Thawrī and Ibn Hanbal state that the seeking ʿuḥūr (shorter isnāds making them higher in rank) in isnāds was a Siṣma.
24 Of course, even if the narrators in an isnād were all deemed trustworthy (thiqa), there remained further criteria which had to be applied when ranking the tradition: see Zayn al-Dīn al-ʿIraqī, Al-Taqyīd wa-l-ʿaṭī, pp. 23–4; and Ibn Kathīr, al-Baʿith al-hadīth, pp. 17–20. See the relevant definition of ʿaḥīṭ in Eriek Dickinson’s An Introduction to the Science of the Hadīth, pp. 5–6.
25 Ibn Hājur Najḥat, p. 45, and al-Suyūṭī. Ṭadrīb, vol. 1, p. 153 ff (al-Suyūṭī, Ṭadrīb, p. 179 f.). Cf. Zayn al-Dīn al-ʿIraqī, Faith al-mughith, pp. 50 ff for a definition of ḥasan. Cf. Juyonbī: Encyclopaedia, pp. xxiv–xxv in which a discussion of these technical terms is set forth. He avers that his own methodology for classing traditions in the context of his work renders the classical Muslim terms as being ‘unworkable’, adding that they ‘constitute a fossilised convention’. In his view medieval Muslim isnād appraisal was impotent, inconsistent, and superficial. p. xxiv. Reliability or (daḥti) related to a narrator’s effective precision in the acquisition and dissemination of traditions (whether via oral or written means).
26 Within this context translated definitions of technical terms such as mursal, mungattā, muddallās, shāhīdh, munkar, muḍ‘al, ziyādāt al-thiqa, mu‘allal, muḍ‘arīb, mudraj, muwādā, maqīlah can be looked up in Dickinson’s An Introduction to the Science: see the following pages: 39, 43, 55, 57, 59, 45, 63, 67, 71, 73, 77 and 79, respectively, for the aforementioned terms. Lucid Arabic definitions are provided in Zayn al-Dīn al-ʿIraqī’s Faith al-mughith, pp. 66–147.
27 An array of terms was developed to rank narrators and these are set out in the rijāḍ literature under the rubric marāṭib al-tuḍāl (ranks of commendation). Differences as far as the descending order of this ranking is concerned do exist, but the following terms in descending order would be used for those deemed dependable and whose narrations could be adduced: ḫajja (absolutely dependable); thiqa: mutaqin; thabt; layṣā bihi ba‘ṣ; sādīq; sāliḥ; al-ʿIraqī cites Ibn Abī Ḥātim as stating that if terms such as layṣā bihi ba‘ṣ or sādīq are used when referring to a narrator, they imply that the traditions transmitted by that individual should be noted but subjected to scrutiny (p. 179). Marāṭib al-tuḍāl dealt with ranking impugned individuals using terms such as kadhdhūb or waḍdā‘ (mandacious or given to forgery); mattrūk al-hadīth (discarded as a narrator); mardīd al-hadīth (rejected as a narrator) and layṣīn (weak in memory). Also see Al-Khaṭṭābī’s al-Kīfāya, pp. 35–46; al-Zayn al-Dīn al-ʿIraqī, Faith al-mughith, pp. 178–83. It became customary, particularly among jurists, to classify reports (akhbār) in terms
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of aspects of the quantitative status of their chains of transmission. Classical literature refers to the following schema: those reports which were adduced through multiple chains of transmission to an extent that precluded the possibility of their being the product of deliberate forgery were referred to as mutawātīr; those with lesser degrees of frequency as far as the chains of transmissions are concerned were called the āhād. The āhād were further divided into mashhūr, ʿazz, and gharīb categories, Al-Suyūṭī, Tadrīb, vol. 2, pp. 179–315; al-Khaṭīb’s al-Kifāya, pp. 16–19; Ibn Ḥajar Nuzhat, pp. 26–38; Zayn al-Dīn al-ʿIrāqī, Fath al-mughīṭhī, pp. 307–315. See also the discussion of mutawātīr in Gautier Juynboll, ‘(Re)appraisal of some technical terms in Sunni legal thought’, in Islamic Law and Society 8:3 (2001), 303–49, 326–36. He translates mutawātīr using the term ‘broad authentication’. He also looks at some of the sub-divisions of this term (ch. 20 below). Also see the discussion in his Encyclopaedia, pp. xxiv–xxv. For a study of the legal aspects of this see Bernard Weiss, ‘Knowledge of the law and society’, in Islamic Law and Jurisprudence, Nicholas Heer (ed.) (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1990), pp. 3–31. There was recognition among hadith scholars that attaining tawātūr in traditions was improbable; Al-Suyūṭī devoted a short tract encompassing such traditions entitled Al-Azhār al-mutanāthira fi al-akhbār al-mutawātīrā.
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formulae such as baddatha (to narrate), akhbara (to relate), and amba'a (to inform), which had been used to introduce formally the isnāds of traditions, provided subtle glimpses of the mode of contact among mentors, students, and narrators; indeed some argued such terms presupposed a background of transmitting written material: see Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, Jāmi' bayān al-ilm wa fadlīhī (Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 2007), pp. 465–72; Al-Khaṭīb’s al-Kifāya, pp. 297–310; cf. Zayn al-Dīn al-‘Irāqī. Al-Tayyīd wa l-tādīl, pp. 160 ff. Qāḍī ‘Iyāḍ, Ihnā’, pp. 122–34. Some discussion on this can be found in Azami’s Studies in Hadith Methodology and Literature; and Christopher Melchert, ‘The etiquette of learning in the early Islamic study circle’, in J. Lowry, Stewart, and Toorawa (eds), Law and Education in Medieval Islam, Studies in Memory of Professor George Makdisi (2004), pp. 33–44, 36–40.

29 Ibn Abī Hātim. Taqdimat al-mu'rifā li-Kitāb Al-Jarḥ wa'l-taqlīl, vol. 1, pp. 4–6. He adds that it was through the channels of transmission (naql) and dissemination (rīwāya) that proper comprehension of the Qur’an and the Prophetic Sunna was assured.

30 Loc. cit.

31 This was a highly sophisticated process as issues remained as to the treatment of informants: see the discussion in Dhahabi’s Mizān al-‘tādīl fī naqd al-rījāl, 2 vols, Edited by ‘Alī Muḥammad al-Baṯawī (Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Arabiyāya, 1963), pp. 1–3; al-Suyūṭī, Taḍrīb, vol. 1, pp. 296–349. Paragons from these periods who regularly feature as authorities in the early rījāl literature include: Shu’ba ibn al-Ḥajjāj (d. 160/786), Yahyā ibn Ṣa‘īd al-Qaṭṭān (d. 198/814), ‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn al-Mahdī (d. 198/814), Sufyān al-Thawrī (d. 161/787), Sufyān ibn ‘Uyayn (d. 198/814), Yahyā ibn Ma‘n (d. 233/847), Ibn al-Māḏinī (d. 234/848), Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal, al-Bukhārī, Abū Zur’ā al-Rāzī (d. 264/878), Abī Hātim al-Rāzī (d. 277/890). See the first volume of Ibn Abī Hātim’s Al-Jarḥ wa'l-taqlīl for biographical entries on these figures and many others.
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33 See also Ibn Ḥajar's Tahāthīb al-tāḥdīth (Hyderabad: Dāʾīrat al-Māʾārif al-Nizāmīyya, A.H. 1325), 12 vols.

34 As is stated above 'Abd al-Ghani al-Maqdisī devoted his biographical treatise al-Kāmil fī ṣūrah al-rījāl to the narrators of these Six Books. Perceived shortcomings in the work inspired al-Mizīz to produce a commentary on this text (see his introduction pp. 147–8). Al-Dhahabi's al-Kāshīf fī maʿrījat man lahū riwāya fīl-kutub al-sittā was based on Mizīz's work.


36 For example, 'Abd Ahmad al-Ḥasan ibn 'Abd Allāh al-ʿAskārī, Taḥṣīfāt al-muhaddithīn, Ahmad 'Abd al-Šāfiʿī (ed.) (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1988) and for a treatment specific to the general Islamic sciences see his Sharḥ muḥāfaẓ fīhī al-taḥṣīf waṭ-taḥrīf, 'Abd al-ʿĀẓīz Ahmad (ed.) (Cairo: Muṭāṣaf Muṭṭaf al-Bābi, 1963). Al-Khaṭṭābī's Islām ghalaṭ al-muhaddithīn is another such work.

37 See Zayn al-Dīn, Fath al-mugāthīth, p. 147 and Al-Khaṭṭābī’s al-Kifāya, pp. 133–35. A recent scholar 'Abd Allāh al-Juday. Taḥrīr ʿulūm al-Hadīth, 2 vols. (Beirut: Muṭāṣaf Muṭṭaf al-Rayyān, 2003), vol. 2, pp. 1108–1114, discusses a number of reports cited in the above works in which Ibn Hanbāl is reported to have been less rigorous in scrutinising reports cited in the above works in which Ibn Hanbāl is reported to have been less rigorous in scrutinising isnāds germane to faḍā’il al-ʾummāl, but suggests the very report implying this is in fact weak, p. 1109. See Melchoir's article below (ch. 30). One of the early works devoted to collating materials deemed fabricated traditions is Ibn al-Jawzī's Kitāb al-mawḍūʿāt, 3 vols, 'Abd al-Rahmān Muhammad 'Uthmān (ed.) (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr, 1983).

38 The process of on going hadīth scrutiny is a salient feature of classical scholarship and continues even today: this is evident in the many works of Nasīrūddīn al-Ṣaḥīḥī. See Kamāruddīn Amin, Nasīrūddīn al-Ṣaḥīḥī on Muslim's Saḥīḥ. A critical study of his method', Islamic Law and Society 11:2 (2004), 149–176.

39 Differences among jurists, as far as legal and ritual materials are concerned, are one of the consequences of such deliberations and the import of such discourse features in the classical literature on ikhtilāf al-fuqahā’.

40 The device of the isnād was used to corroborate the provenance of a written text not just in the field of hadīth literature, but across the literary sciences of Islam. The so-called samāʿāt (the list of authorities from whom a text was audited and transmitted).

41 The introduction of this term is dated to sometime around the late 7th/eighth century: Muḥammad ibn Tāhir al-Maqdisī (d. 507/1113–4) listed Ibn Mājah's Sunan in his work entitled Shurūṭ al-aʿīma al-sittā (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub
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al-‘Ilmiyya, 1984); earlier Muhammad ibn Musā al-Ḥazimī (d. 584/1184) was the author of a work which looked at ‘conditions’ for the inclusion of traditions in the work of five of the six collectors, excluding Ibn Mājah: 

\textit{Sharūṭ al-a‘immā \textit{al-khamsa}} (the previously mentioned work by Dār al-Kutub includes both tracts in a single edition). Scholars from different regions of the Islamic world retained their own preferences regarding the primacy of these works see \textit{Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī}, vol. 1, pp. 10–12. Al-Dārūmī’s \textit{Musnad} (which was arranged in a \textit{muṣannaf} format) was preferred by some to Ibn Mājah’s work on the basis that the latter work comprised a greater number of weak traditions. See the discussion in M. Siddiqi, \textit{Ḥadīth Literature}, pp. 73–4. And p. 69 for al-Dārūmī.

42 The title of al-Bukhārī’s work was \textit{al-Jāmī’ al-musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ al-mukhtāṣar min ummūr rasīl Allāh wa sunanthing wa ayyāmihī; while Muslim’s work had the title \textit{al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ al-mukhtāṣar min al-sunan bi-naqīl al-‘ad́ūn al-‘ad́ūn} min rasīl Allāh. The term \textit{musnad} reflected the fact that the \textit{insād} were deemed continuous right back to the Prophet, while the use of the term \textit{al-Jāmī’} implies that all the main topics covered by \textit{ḥadīth} are included in al-Bukhārī’s work. Scholars did point out differences between the criteria (\textit{ṣharūṭ}) employed by both al-Bukhārī and Muslim, arguing that the former’s standards were much higher than those employed by Muslim. Thus, regarding traditions in which the \textit{rāwī} uses the term \textit{‘an} (on the authority of) when referring to his source, it is stated that al-Bukhārī stipulated that narrators should not only be contemporaneous, but there should also be evidence that the two should have actually met, whereas Muslim was of the view that such individuals being contemporaries was sufficient. Thus it is regularly argued in many of the classical texts on \textit{ḥadīth} sciences that al-Bukhārī’s work is superior in authority to that of Muslim: \textit{al-Taqyīd wa l-‘idāh}, p. 30 f, although it was scholars of North Africa who preferred Muslim’s work on account of its arrangement and, to an extent, content: Zayn al-Dīn al-‘Irāqī, \textit{Al-Taqyīd wa l-‘idāh}, p. 30 f. Cf. Ibn Kathīr’s, \textit{al-Bā’ith}, p. 18 and see al-Mizzā. \textit{Tahdīḥ al-kāna’l}, pp. 147–8. Al-Bukhārī prefaced each of the sections within chapters with informative headings which critically informed his arrangement and selection of traditions. Cf. al-Suyūṭī, \textit{Tadrīb}, vol. 1, pp. 91 ff. Also see Nawawī’s commentary on Muslim’s \textit{Ṣaḥīḥ} and the section on \textit{Bāb sībat al-līṭtiqā bi l-ḥadīth al-mu’āt̊an}, vol. 1, pp. 128–44. Al-Bukhārī included a number of suspended traditions (\textit{mu’āllaq}) in his collection; these were \textit{matn} in which the supporting \textit{insād} was wholly or partially elided; or those with one or two narrators missing from the beginning of his \textit{insād}. This feature was ostensibly linked to the fact that the tradition either has not met his own stipulated condition as applied in his work (this was often the case when he included statements attributed to the Companions); or that such a feature reflected an abbreviated way of listing traditions already fully adduced in his text. Ibn Ḥajar actually completed many of the \textit{mu’āllaq} \textit{insād} in his commentary on al-Bukhārī’s text. A number of the other \textit{sunan} works included the full \textit{insād}. See ‘Abd Allāh al-Juday’, \textit{Tadrīb} ‘udām al-ḥadīth, vol. 2, p. 851. In this context mention is also made of Mālik’s famous \textit{balāghāt} (his use of reports which reached him without the requisite \textit{insād} documentation). Also see \textit{Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī}, vol. 1, pp. 16–17, in which it is stated that the \textit{mu’āllaq} \textit{insād} rarely occurs in Muslim’s work. For a translation of Muslim’s introduction see Gautier Juynboll, ‘Muslim’s introduction to his \textit{Ṣaḥīḥ}, translated and annotated with an excursus on the chronology of \textit{fitna} and \textit{bid’ā’}, \textit{Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam} 5 (1984), 263–311. The works of Abū Dāwūd and Ibn Mājah took the title \textit{Sunan}; the former’s \textit{Sunan} comprises around 4300 traditions (5274 including repetitions). The \textit{Jāmī’} of al-Tirmidhī’s was referred to as \textit{al-Jāmī’ al-mukhtāṣar min al-sunan ‘an rasīl
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Allāh wa marifat al-saḥāḥ al-ma'ālul wa ma'dalayhi al-marāḥ, it was called the Jāmi’ al-Saḥīḥ by some but the use of this term was criticised: see Ibn Kathīr’s al-Ba‘ith al-hathīth, p. 25. The Sunan work of al-Nasā’ī was known as the al-Muṣājabā min al-sunan on the basis that it was originally an abbreviated version of a work called al-Sunan al-kubrā and it contained some 5761 traditions. Ibn Mājah’s work comprises around 4341 traditions: 3002 of these are also found in the other five works, leaving 1339 additional (zawā’id) traditions. See the edition of Ibn Mājah’s collection by Fu‘ād ‘Abd al-Bāqī. The Muwaṣṣa’ of Mālik was preferred by some scholars to Ibn Mājah’s work, but most of its traditions could be found in the other five collections. Thus by virtue of the zawā’id (additional) Ibn Mājah’s work offered supplementary materials.

44 In his Faṭḥ al-muqāthīh, p. 62, Zayn al-Dīn al-‘Irāqī explains that the Sunan of Abū Dāwūd would consider including weak traditions. This was due to the fact that its author placed together the most authentic traditions on given topics, but if there were no such traditions, he would include weak ones which he preferred to personal opinion. He additionally provided anecdotes on the status of the material cited. Also see Burton’s Introduction, pp. 126–8.

45 There were also compilations which adopted the sunan format and these were composed by distinguished traditionists such as al-Dārīmī (181–255/797–868), al-Dāraqaṭnī (306–385/918–995), Ibn Manda (d. 301/911); and al-Bayhaqī (306–385/918–995), published as a single work and it contained some 5761 traditions. See the edition of Ibn Manda’s work by Fu‘ād ‘Abd al-Bāqī, 1984). See also Burton’s Introduction, pp. 126–8.

46 Al-Bukhārī’s criteria would have been inferred from his work. A much shorter conflation of texts belonging to the same genre is the ilzāmī wa'l-tatabu’ compiled by al-Dāraqaṭnī (306–385/918–995), published as a single work and edited with an extensive commentary by Muḥammad ibn Muqbil (Medina: al-Maktaba al-Salafiyah, 1978). See Saḥīḥ Muslim bi-sharh al-Nawawī, vol. 1, pp. 24 and 26–7, for his comments on al-Dāraqaṭnī’s work and the fact that he had identified 200 traditions in both Saḥīhs which fell short of their stipulated criteria. Zayn al-Dīn al-‘Irāqī, al-Taqyīd wa’l-īdāḥ, p. 30 f. Classical scholarship did question some of the supplementary revisions proffered by al-Hākim. Thus, Zayn al-Dīn al-‘Irāqī notes that al-Dhahabi did compose an abbreviated version of al-Hākim’s work and that he raised a number of points regarding its contents, adding that Ibn Daqīq al-‘id (d. 702/1302), followed this up and claimed that some of the narrators featured in ‘insād cited by al-Hākim would not have been accepted by al-Bukhārī. ‘Abd al-Raḥīm ibn al-Ḥusayn, al-Taqyīd wa’l-īdāḥ, p. 34 f. al-‘Irāqī offers some interesting discussions on the whole issue; the subject is also discussed by al-Suyūṭī. Tadrīb, vol. 1, pp. 105–7.

47 Abū Nu‘aym al-Īsfahānī (d. 430/1038), who was also the author of a Mustakahrij ‘idā ma’rifat ilām al-hadīth, but this was a text on the terminology of traditions (ilām al-hadīth or sciences) intended to complement materials missed by al-Hākim al-Naysābūrī in his text on the subject. Larger more general collections included: Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn, al-Bayhaqī, Shu‘ab al-‘īmān, 17 Vols.
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(ed.) M. Zaghbūl (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 2000). Ibn al-Athīr’s Jāmi’ al-usūl, and Ibn Kathīr’s Jāmi’ al-asānīd wa’t-sunan: al-hādi; li-aqvam al-sunan, 37 vols, ‘Abd al-Mu’ti Amīn Qal‘ajī (ed.) (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 1994), and the collection of traditions by ‘Alī ibn Abī Bakr al-Haythami, Nūr al-Dīn (d. 807/1405) entitled Majma’ al-zawā’id wa manba’ al-fawā’id, 10 vols (Cairo: Maktabat al-Qudsī, 1933–3). This was a text which collated traditions from the Masnad of Ibn Ḥanbal, Al-Bazzār (d. 292/905) and al-Mawsī; it also includes materials from al-Ṭabarānī’s (d. 360/970) famous Ma’jam works. Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī was the author of a work entitled Jami’ al-jawāmi’ which served as a veritable encyclopaedia of traditions.

48 Shi‘ism applied different constructs of hierarchical authority and its traditional literature reflected this fact. Collections included specifically defined corpuses of Prophetic reports in addition to statements attributed to the authoritative imāms. Articles on aspects of Shi‘ite approaches to Ḥadīth literature have been included in Volume III of this work, although the focus in this collection is ostensibly on Sunnī materials. For more related material on Shi‘ism the reader is referred to the Critical Concepts in Islamic Studies book (Routledge 2009) focusing on Shi‘ism, edited with a new introduction by Colin Turner and Paul Luft.


52 Norman Calder, Studies in Early Muslim Jurisprudence (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993). The point is made that as far as the corpus of the hadith is concerned the larger compilations and recensions of traditions appeared after the late second century and went through lengthy processes of transmission and dissemination.
The issue of the reliability of informants from these early periods is discussed in Chase Robinson, *Islamic Historiography*, p. 58. Also see Ella Landau-Tasseron, ‘On the reconstruction of lost sources’, *Al-Qanara* 25 (2004), 45–91. Lawrence Conrad, ‘Recovering lost texts: some methodological issues’, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 113:2 (1993), 258–63. Lawrence Conrad, ‘Historical evidence and the archaeology of early Islam’, *Quest for Understanding: Arabic and Islamic Studies in Memory of Malcolm H. Kerr*, S. Sekaly, R. Baalbaki and P. Dodd (eds). (Beirut: American University of Beirut, 1991), pp. 263–282. Abdelfattah Kilito, *The Author and His Doubles: Essays on Classical Arabic Culture* (Syracuse University Press, 2001), translated by Michael Cooperson. For issues germane to the authenticity of letters see Averil Cameron and Lawrence Conrad (eds), *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East I: Problems in the Literary Sources* (Princeton: The Darwin Press, 1992) and the article by Wadad al-Qadi ‘Early Islamic State letters: the question of authenticity’, pp. 215–75. Berg’s nominal classification has been criticised by Harald Motzki who speaks of inconsistencies and shortcomings in the semantic compass of the two terms: ‘The Question of the Authenticity of Muslim Traditions Reconsidered: A Review Article’ in Berg’s *Method and Theory*, pp. 211–57. See pp. 212–4. Herbert Berg, *The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam: the Authenticity of Muslim Literature from the Formative Period* (London: Curzon Press, 1999). See his article entitled ‘Competing paradigms in the study of Islamic origins: Qur’an 15:89–91 and the value of isnāds’, pp. 259–90 (ch. 10), especially pp. 259–64. Herbert Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory*. Berg points out that in referring to two camps he was not suggesting that one specific perspective was correct and its opposite otherwise, but rather he wanted to draw attention to the theoretical and methodological bases of each of the camps together with the reasons for the evident antithesis in their respective approaches and conclusions. He states that his contribution to the debate about the authenticity of the extant literary sources was inspired by the late John Wansbrough, whose work on the origins of the early Islamic tradition had brought to the fore the issue of the authenticity of the early literary sources and the emergence of the Qur’an as a *textus receptus ne varietur*. Wansbrough accentuated the critical role that salvation history played in traditional accounts of the origins of Islam, arguing that the paucity of archival records of Islam did not substantiate the historical image of Islam presented in the extant sources. Archaeological evidence and non-Islamic literary facts did not corroborate Islam’s own version of its history: it was argued that discrepancies in the Islamic literary sources highlighted the contrived nature of traditional accounts of early Islam. His work had left its mark on the range of approaches to the study of early Islam pursued by sceptical scholarship, although his approach was informed by the scepticism advocated by Goldziher. While there exists a general scepticism concerning the authenticity of the sources, the methodologies for dealing with these sources vary. Wansbrough influenced the work of scholars such as Michael Cook, Patricia Crone, Andrew Rippin, Norman Calder and Gerald Hawting. John Wansbrough, ‘Res Ipsa Loquitur: history and mimesis’. In Berg’s *Method and Theory*, 3–19. Michael Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985). Wansbrough did argue that the geographical region of al-Hijāz was possibly an intrusive element in the religious configuration of second/eighth century Islam. He suggested that the faith had its origins in Iraq. John Wansbrough, *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977). Averil Cameron and Lawrence Conrad (eds), *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East I: Problems in the Literary Sources* (Princeton: The Darwin Press, 1992). See Berg’s


55 Even on fundamental points of doctrine such as the uncompromising monotheism championed by Islam, Gerald Hawting has suggested that the polytheism predicated of the ancient Arabs was insidiously exaggerated in the later sources to the extent that the Qur‘ānic references to idolatry were misconstrued in the subsequent Islamic tradition. G. R. Hawting, The Idea of Idolatry and the Emergence of Islam: From Polemic to History, Cambridge Studies in Islamic Civilization Series (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002). Michael Cook remarked that scholars were faced with two obvious strategies: one of these advocated using sources which were independent of the tradition: his work with Patricia Crone entitled Hagarism was one such effort. The other is informed by an attempt ‘to isolate and date the oldest elements preserved within the Islamic tradition, and more generally to seek to establish some criteria of stratification for its vast literary remains’. Michael Cook, Early Muslim Dogma (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. vii.

56 Other explanations for the genesis of these materials include the view that Islam as a new religion became ‘more and more aware of itself as distinctly different from other religions’ and attributing anecdotes, sermons, and documents that highlighted the distinctiveness of Islam helped ensure that this Islamic identity was separate and independent of other religions, particularly Christianity and Judaism. See Suleiman Ali Mourad, Early Islam between Myth and History: Al-Husayn al-Baṣrī (d. 110H/728CE) and the Formation of his Legacy in Classical Islamic Scholarship (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2006), pp. 8–9.

57 One recent scholar has proffered the view that the political turmoil and internecine conflicts associated with the early Islamic tradition had the effect of fracturing attempts to reconstruct the past. A cultural disjunction had separated
the nascent religious ethic of the Prophetic age from the subsequent efforts to recover them. The religious literary legacy of the second/eighth centuries was in effect ‘culturally’ and ‘temporally’ remote from the conditions that produced the Qur’ān; consequently, the Sunna served ‘to bridge the 100 years’ gap’ between the teachings of the Qur’ān and the earliest literary materials on the subject. The hadith were therefore products of an attempt to fill the void, albeit they were the residue of applied exegesis: John Burton ‘Qur’ān and sunnah, a case of cultural disjunction’, in Herbert Berg (ed.), Method and Theory, pp. 137–57, see especially p. 141 f. I should stress that Burton would not consider himself to be of the sceptical camp as far as origins are concerned.

58 It would be suggested that the fabrication of traditions was linked to internal strife and discord as well as disagreements and arguments germane to ritual and law. See for example Suleiman Ali Mourad, Early Islam between Myth and History, pp. 1–11. The inference made here is that rival factions and sectarian movements sought to legitimise their claims by reference to religious authority and sanction, which was achieved by resorting to pseudepigraphy and fabrication; ideas were projected back to the founding fathers of the faith. Another factor viewed as having a direct impact on the processes of accretion relates to contact between the established monotheistic traditions of the region and Islam. Mourad argues that the assumed need to assert the religious distinctiveness of Islam was achieved by inflating its original teachings. For other perspectives cf. Joseph Van Ess, ‘Political ideas in early Islamic religious thought’, British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies 28 (2001), 151–64; and Fred Donner, ‘From believers to Muslims: confessional self-identity in the early Islamic community’, Al-Abḥāth 50–51 (2002–3), 9–53.

59 Norman Calder, Studies in Early Muslim Jurisprudence (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993), p. 91. Within such a synthesis even al-Bukhārī’s Šābiḥ is viewed as being the product of augmentation by figures other than its putative author. Calder claimed that the text would have emerged into its final format much later. See the Melchert article below on al-Bukhārī and hadith criticism (Ch. 33). It was Burton who began his Review Article of Calder’s book by declaring that: ‘I Dislike this book. The tone adopted grates’, Journal of the American Oriental Society (1995:115.3), pp. 453–462. He also speaks of the three intellectual predecessors informing Calder’s thinking: Goldziher, Schacht, and Wansbrough, adding that the last figure’s influence was most palpable in this work, p. 453. Melchert has argued that Calder’s study ranks alongside Schacht’s work as far as its critical approach to the sources is concerned.
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61 Herbert Berg (ed.), Method and Theory, pp. 262–3. See the discussion in the opening chapter of Kees Versteegh’s Arabic Grammar and Qur’anic Exegesis. Cf. Kees Versteegh, ‘Grammar and Exegesis: The origins of Kufan grammar and the Tafsīr Muqāṭīt’. Der Islam 67.2 (1990), 206–42. Also see Motzki’s ‘The Question of the Authenticity of Muslim Traditions Reconsidered: A Review Article’ in Method and Theory, in which he refers to shortcomings in presumptuously questioning the actual authorship of texts as is the case with Tabarī’s Tafsīr, pp. 239–41.

62 Harald Motzki, ‘The Question of the Authenticity of Muslim Traditions Reconsidered: A Review Article’ in Berg’s Method and Theory, pp. 211–57. See pp. 212–4 and pp. 224–5. He states that Fück, Kister, van Ess, Muryni, Schoeler, and himself have also reacted against the theses of the sceptics. Regarding Berg’s classification, he states that it is based upon conclusions which are too generalised and not substantiated by the available sources, Op. cit, p. 211. It is also the case that scholars such as Kees Versteegh have also taken a very critical view of the sceptical approach to the early sources; see his Kees Versteegh, Arabic Grammar and Qur’anic Exegesis in Early Islam (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993), especially the opening chapter.


65 In his introduction to Harald Motzki (ed.), Hadith: Origins and Development (Aldershot: Variorum, 2004), Motzki mentions that classical scholarship’s use
of *matn* criticism has been underestimated, p. xxxiii (fn 90). He also speaks of both his and Schoeler’s use of *matn-cum-isnād* analysis to distinguish between cases of general transmission and instances in which the spreading of *isnād* occurs, p. xlix. Motzki points out that others have also used this approach, including Johannes Kramers, Maher Jarrar, Joseph van Ess and Gregor Schoeler: see, pp. xlviii–xlxi.

66 Hallaq has offered the view that the *sunan* of the Companions formed the basis of the practice in the garrison towns and provinces and it reflected first-hand knowledge of what the Prophet said or did. He goes on to state that these Companions were seen as being invested with the highest knowledge of the Prophet and his ways. He notes that their *sunan* along with his own served as rich guides to legal conduct. This in his view explains the process of the projection of their narratives back to the Prophet. Hallaq concludes this was unjustifiably characterised as a process of forgery; but it was not: these individuals were simply articulating the Prophetic convention as understood by them. See Wael Hallaq, *The Origins and Evolution of Islamic Law*, pp. 69–70.

67 Herbert Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory*, pp. 287–90. Berg comments that both camps would seemingly agree that ‘we still have very little, if any, firm knowledge about the first few decades of Islam’. Again this position is criticised by Motzki in his Review Article, pp. 212–3.


69 See Gregor Schoeler, *The Oral and the Written in Early Islam*, p. 28. Abbott was likewise convinced that written sources had been used in these early periods.


71 Herbert Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory*, p. 261. See fn no. 4. Berg’s point is that these modern scholars had accepted that the *isnād* used to guarantee the authenticity of a given text or report were on the whole reliable. In his earlier piece on ‘The implications of’, Berg does argue, like Wansbrough, that some of the earliest Western treatments of the early Islamic periods and literary traditions have produced accounts of Islamic origins which scarcely differed from Muslim ones. See pp. 4 ff.

72 He noted that even if one were to accept that a number of studies have posited the existence of texts prior to the period identified by Wansbrough as marking the earliest date for the appearance of Arabic literature, they are still separated from the people under discussion (the Prophetic age) by a whole century: Herbert Berg (ed.) *Method and Theory*, p. 286.

73 This has been discussed in respect of the history of Arabic linguistic thought. See Andrew Rippin, *Miscellen: ‘Studying early *tafsīr* texts*, *Der Islam* 72:2 (1995), 310–23.

74 On a somewhat related note ‘that the Muslim and the Western methods of *ḥadīth* criticism are irreconcilable’ due to their resting on ‘totally different premises’ still rings true. N. J. Coulson, ‘European criticism of hadith literature’, in *Arabic...*
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Literature to the End of the Umayyad Period, pp. 317–21, in which a useful summary of the issues is presented.

75 al-Ra‘mahuruzi, al-Mu‘addith al-fāsīl, p. 159.


77 The work was published in 1889–90 with large parts of it being devoted to the subject of hadith. Goldziher had been trained in disciplines such as classics, philosophy and oriental languages at the University of Budapest, travelling to Germany before completing his doctorate at the age of nineteen. He had been a student of Biblical studies and the Semitic languages. See Róbert Simon, Ignáz Goldziher: his Life and Scholarship as Reflected in his Works and Correspondence (Budapest: Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1986). Raphael Patai, Ignaz Goldziher and his Oriental Diary: a Translation and Psychological Portrait (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987).

78 Similar doubts about the authenticity of the traditions had been expressed in the studies of individuals such as Aloys Sprenger, Joseph Horovitz, Gustav Weil, Alfred Von Kremer, Snouck Hurgronge and William Muir, many of whom wrote biographical and historical accounts of early Islam for which the hadiths were primary sources.


82 Goldziher, Muslim Studies, vol. 2, pp. 40–41.


84 Goldziher contends that the Abbasids (r. 750–1256) were behind these developments, proving to be patrons of the religious élite; they encouraged scholarship in the sciences of Islam.

85 The Companions (al-Saḥāba) are technically defined as individuals who lived during the time of the Prophet having met him and embraced the faith; while, the Successors (al-Taḥārūn) are those individuals who were contemporary with the al-Saḥāba but had not met the Prophet. See Saḥīḥ Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī, vol. 1, p. 35 ff. He explains that a Companion is a Muslim who has actually met the Prophet, even if the nature of this acquaintance was brief, adding that the majority of traditionist scholarship (including figures such as Ibn Hanbal and al-Bukhārī) held this view. Although, jurists and theologians argued that the acquaintance had to be ‘prolonged’. Al-Khaṭīb’s al-Kifāya, pp. 49–51; and parallel discussions apply to those designated as being Taḥārūn. Al-Hākim al-Naysābūrī’s Ma‘rifat, pp. 22–25 devotes a section to twelve classes (tabaqāt) of Companions.

86 Goldziher also referred to the phenomenon of al-rīḥla fi ṭalāb al-‘ilm (journeys partaken for the acquisition of knowledge). Arabic biography is replete with narratives which speak of scholars travelling from city to city in the Islamic world in search of traditions. This too was in his estimation a somewhat illusory


Goldziher, Muslim Studies, vol. 2, p. 166. Interestingly, it is asserted that the Umayyads had ‘no scruples in promoting tendentious lies in a sacred religious form’, but that they were always able to find ‘pious authorities who would be prepared to cover such falsifications with their undoubted authority.’ Goldziher’s treatment of the hadith argues that the materials in question did not emanate from the Prophet or his Companions, but rather they were the insidious products of deliberate forgery.


Interestingly, it is asserted that the Umayyads had ‘no scruples in promoting tendentious lies in a sacred religious form’, but that they were always able to find ‘pious authorities who would be prepared to cover such falsifications with their undoubted authority.’ Goldziher’s treatment of the hadith argues that the materials in question did not emanate from the Prophet or his Companions, but rather they were the insidious products of deliberate forgery.

Cook has made the point that Goldziher was strongly averse to conceding even a parallel between Judaism and Islam. See Michael Cook. ‘The opponents of the writing of tradition in early Islam’, in Arabica 44 (1997), pp. i–iii, 437–530, p. 509.

Abbott does point to the research of Alors Sprenger who also inspired Schoeler’s reference to hypomnêma and syngramma. Alors had spoken of the need to ‘distinguish between notes intended as autes-mémoire or lecture notes, and published books’. Alors Sprenger, ‘On the origin and progress of writing’, cited above.


Schoeler himself has referred to a ‘crisis among academics regarding approaches to the source material’. He mentions the prudent trust in the overall integrity of the core of primary sources as advocated by individuals such as Fuad Sezgin and to an extent Montgomery Watt; while in contradistinction, noting that there were individuals such as John Wansbrough, Patricia Crone and Michael Cook who would question the historicity of the sources which portray the life of Muhammad, dismissing whether such sources present true indisputable facts as opposed to the impressionistic projection of later ideas. Gregor Schoeler, ‘Foundations for a new biography of Muhammad: the production and evaluation of the corpus of traditions from ‘Urwah B. Zubayr’, in Herbert Berg (ed.), Method and Theory, pp. 21–28. Cf. Stefan Leder, ‘The use of composite form in the making of the Islamic historical tradition’, in Phillip Kennedy (ed.), On Fiction and Adab in Medieval Arabic Literature (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2005), pp. 125–45. And also Gregor Schoeler. ‘Reconstructing the Earliest sîra Texts: the Hijra in the Corpus of ‘Urwa ibn Zubayr’, Der Islam (2005:82), pp. 209–220.


John Burton. An Introduction to the Tradition, p. xvii. Burton countered the implication by Goldziher that pious individuals were consciously engaged in a policy of ‘widespread deception and fraud on behalf of their own opinions’. He went on to state that ‘many of these scholars were men of deep piety and undoubted probity who saw themselves as engaged in mapping out in exquisite detail a statement of the revealed will of God’, p. xvii.

John Burton, An Introduction to the Tradition, p. xii. Burton’s point is that the sheer number of traditions point to lively interest in religious affairs taken
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by the ruling house and various officials and functionaries. On p. xxv Burton lists such examples of Goldziher’s use of pejorative terms referenced to Muslim Studies, vol. 2, pp. 44, 49, 51, 55, 78, 80, 81, 106, 126.


102 Joseph Schacht, p. 58.

103 His thesis is that two generations before al-Shaﬁʿi, reference to traditions from the Companions and Successors was the rule, while reference to the Prophet was the exception; al-Shaﬁʿi turned that round, making the appeal to Prophetic authority an axiomatic feature of legal discourse, see p. 4, pp. 11–20, and p. 213. Conversely see Zafar Ansari, ‘The Authenticity of the Traditions. A Critique of Joseph Schacht’s Argument e silentio’, Hamdard Islamicus (1984:7), pp. 51–61. This looks at the argument that a tradition cannot be conceivably earlier than the earliest extant source in which it is adduced by a scholar or compiler.

104 Joseph Schacht, Origins, pp. 57 and 80. The implication is that the sunna was not exclusively embodied in traditions from the Prophet. Burton then argues that Schacht had denied himself the chance of realising that fiqh was the ‘documentary precipitation of an academic exercise; a paper war whose raw materials had been supplied by the exegesis of a document, the Holy Qur’an. See his Introduction to Hadith. P. xxiii.

105 Joseph Schacht, Origins, p. 57.

106 Joseph Schacht, Origins, p. 163.


109 Ignaz Goldziher, Schools of Koranic Commentators. With an introduction on Goldziher and hadith from ‘Geschichte des Arabischen Schrifttums’ by Fuat Sezgin; edited and translated by Wolfgang H. Behn (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006). For a summary of the various perspectives see Chapter One of Herbert Berg, The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam. Cook refers to Schoeler’s point that pre-Islamic poets had rāwīs who would transmit and refine the poetry of their mentors, stating that no examples of isnāds in the citation of poetry have been produced, op. cit. p. 511.

110 See the above discussion with reference to Muslim’s introduction.

111 Herbert Berg (ed.), Method and Theory: in the article by Christopher Melchert entitled ‘The early history of Islamic Law’, Pp. 293–324, pp. 301–2, interestingly, Melchert says it is not Motzki’s fault that the latter is incorrectly associated with treating as reliable the traditions which occur in the famous Six Books (al-Kutub al-Sitta).


113 This common link was supposedly the fabricator of tradition who would have disseminated the traditions to a cluster of other figures, although Schacht added that there existed the possibility that the names of transmitters were used by anonymous persons to promulgate a tradition therefore ‘its occurrence gives only a terminus a quo’ for the use of that tradition. Cook explains that eschatological traditions could be externally dated on the assumption that they were essentially
a fabricated ‘prediction’ (recounting) of the past: a fabricator first correctly predicts what is in fact the past and then the future, getting it ‘more or less wrong’.


115 Azami hails from a family of traditionist luminaries. He completed his PhD under the supervision of Arthur Arberry. The thesis was published under the title Studies in Early Hadith Literature: with a Critical Edition of Some Early Texts. Azami’s critique of Schacht’s work has been translated into Arabic by A. H. al-Matroudi: Usuli al-faqih al-Islami li-l-mustashriq Schacht: dirasa naqdiyya (Riyadh: King Sa’ud University, A.H. 1426).

116 Herbert Berg, The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam, p. 26. Motzki has claimed that Berg sometimes relies on statements which he ‘seems to consider evident, proven or generally accepted but which are not. For example, when evaluating the arguments of the non-sceptical “reactionaries” he says: “The arguments of Abbott, Sezgin, and Azami rely on biographical materials that were produced symbiotically with the isnāds they seek to defend. These sources are not independent”’. And he adds that such a claim that the biographical materials were produced symbiotically with the isnāds and that the two sources are not independent has not been substantiated by him or anyone else. Motzki, ‘The Question of the Authenticity of Muslim Traditions Reconsidered: A Review Article’, p. 214.

117 See his article on eschatology, p. 25. He added that Schacht’s concept of the spread of isnāds has implications which subvert the common link method. Motzki questioned the arguments of Schacht and Juynboll on the incidence of backward growth, the spread of isnāds, and the common link. In reference to the common link this may well have been ‘an early systematic collector who professionally passed on his material to students in a teaching circle’. Hence the tradition could be older than the common link, he argues: Motzki (ed.), Ḥadīth: Origins, p. xl. He does add that it cannot be dismissed that certain common links came into being ‘through invention or of tampering with isnāds’, but notes that genuine common links were a distinct possibility.

118 For a brief summary see Jonathan Brown’s review of Juynboll’s Encyclopaedia of Canonical Hadith in Journal of Islamic Studies 19:3 (2008), 391–97 and Christopher Melchert’s review in Islamic Society and Law 15 (2008), 408–423. Also see Motzki (ed.), Ḥadīth: Origins, pp. xl–xli. The Encyclopaedia in question provides English translations of most of the major traditions which feature in the so-called al-Kutub al-Sitta; in this work Juynboll updates the central thrust of his meth-odology and approach to dating, including the specific terminology he developed. Critically, the traditions are introduced within the context of alphabetically arranged biographical entries of ‘originators’: namely those figures who, according to Juynboll’s reading of the Common Link hypothesis, are reasonably believed to be responsible for the dissemination of the various traditions comprised in the Kutub al-Sitta and other compilations. The Nāfi’ article was the subject of a detailed refutation by Motzki: Harald Motzki, ‘Ḥadīth-Forschung?


121 Gautier Juynboll, *Muslim Tradition*, p. 30. In Wael Hallaq, *The Origins and Evolution of Islamic Law*, p. 69, mention is made of there being a delay in perceiving this model as fully authoritative in the early period. For Juynboll’s assessment of the common link see pp. 206–8. The sophisticated aspects of the theory, in addition to Juynboll’s introduction of terminology such as ‘partial common links’, ‘isdād bundles’, ‘spiders’ and ‘dives’, to explain features of the phenomenon and refine the methodology, are revisited in his article on the ‘(Re)appraisal of some technical terms in Hadith science’. Juynboll states that a bundle reflects the transmission path of a tradition from ‘old times to the life-times of the collectors’ and therefore must be viewed upwards; where as the spider ‘reflects the transmission “history” of a certain tradition by back projection’ and works its way downwards. He also links dives with the classical term *mutābī‘*. See *Encyclopaedia*, p. xxiii f. His other important studies include ‘Some isdād analytical methods illustrated on the basis of several woman-demeaning sayings from Hadith literature’, *Al-Qanara: Revista de Estudios Arabes* 10 (1989), 343–84; ‘The role of Mu'ammarān in the early development of the isdād’, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 81 (1991), 155–75; and ‘Dyeing the hair and beard in early Islam: a Hadith-analytical study, *Arabica* 33 (1986), 49–75. G. H. A. Juynboll, Shu‘ba b. al-Hajjāj (d.160/776) and his Position Among the Traditionists of Basra’ *Le Museon* (1998:3.1), pp. 187–226. In Juynboll’s view the common link revealed the ‘originators’ who are reasonably believed to be responsible for the dissemination of Prophetic traditions. In his study of Shu‘ba, a renowned scholar of traditions from Basra, he highlights this individual’s role in the proliferation of scores of traditions noted for their ‘edifying’ content. This was all supposedly achieved through Shu‘ba’s devising isdād strands which were used to authenticate sayings ascribed to the Prophet. The suggestion is that the invention of such traditions were overlooked due to their seeking to ‘further the cause of Islam’ and these materials had also become rather popular. However, it is also claimed that Shu‘ba himself was concerned at the blatant invention of traditions whose content could not be classed as ‘edifying’ that he brought into circulation an entire cluster of traditions which sternly rebuked those who deliberately invented hadith. This was something of a paradox in Juynboll’s view due to the fact that it represented an instance in which an ‘invented’ tradition was being used to discourage the very practice
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of fabrication, a fact that escaped the attention of scholars. Juynboll also argues that traditions which speak of obedience to a ruler and certain eschatological traditions were also put into circulation by Shu’ba. Of course, these arguments are predicated on the basis that the common link betrays the originators of traditions, a hypothesis which some dispute as not fully demonstrated by the data.

The reasoning is that if such traditions where accompanied by multiple versions going back only to the Companions (ḥadīths classed as mawqūf), then these individuals were reluctant to countenance their Prophetic origin.


The work was translated by Dickinson: An Introduction to the Science of the Ḥadīth, see above.


These were preserved in masāʾil works which were essentially a collection of legal opinions proffered by scholars such as Ibn Rāhawāh and Ibn Hanbal on legal topics. Al-Kawṣay (d. 251/865) collated both these figures’ masāʾil. Such sources were inductively analysed in order to construct the juridical methodology applied in their synthesis.

He suggests that Bukhārī’s authorship of the Šubḥī remains questionable. Also see Johann Fück. ‘Beiträge zur Überlieferung von Buhārī’s Traditionssammlung’, Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 92 (1938), 60–87; Melchert considers this his finest piece of work.


130 See also Robert Gleave, ‘Between hadith and fiqh: the “canonical” imāmī collections of ḥabhār’, Islamic Law and Society 8:3 (2001), 350–82; and Rainer Brunner, ‘The role of hadith as cultural memory in Shi‘i history’, Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam 30 (2005), 318–60. A place such as Kufa was an important centre for Shi‘ite traditionist scholarship, but it was soon displaced by Qumm in the third century: Shi‘i Hadith in Arabic Literature to the End of the Umayyad Period, Cambridge History of Arabic Literature (Cambridge: University Press, 1983), pp. 299–307, p. 301. Also for more general articles see the materials by Etan Kohlberg, Belief and Law in Imāmī Shi‘ism (Aldershot: Variorum; Brookfield, 1991).


134 In a related study Kinberg has explored the role dreams play in the appeal to legitimacy and authority: ‘Literal dreams and prophetic Hadiths in classical Islam: a comparison of two ways of legitimation’. Der Islam 70 (1993), 279–300. (miszellen).
