TH_Vol1_A01.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page i

THE ḤADĪTH

TH_Vol1_A01.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page ii

Critical Concepts in Islamic Studies

Other titles in this series

The Koran
Edited with a new introduction by Colin Turner
4 volume set

Islam and Globalization
Edited with a new introduction by Shahram Akbarzadeh
4 volume set

Political Islam
Edited with a new introduction by Barry Rubin
3 volume set

Shi'ism
Edited with a new introduction by Paul Luft and Colin Turner
4 volume set

Sufism
Edited with a new introduction by Lloyd Ridgeon
4 volume set

Islam: Primary Sources
Edited by Lloyd Ridgeon
6 volume set

World Islam
Edited with a new introduction by Andrew Rippin
4 volume set

Islam in Southeast Asia
Edited by Joseph Liow and Nadirsyah Hosen
4 volume set

Forthcoming titles:

Islamic Law
Edited by Gavin Picken
4 volume set

Jihad and Martyrdom
Edited by David Cook
4 volume set

Islam in the West
Edited by David Westerlund and Ingvar Svanberg
4 volume set

Islamic Medical and Scientific Tradition
Edited by Peter Pormann
4 volume set

TH_Vol1_A01.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page iii

THE ḤADĪTH

Critical Concepts in Islamic Studies

Edited by
Mustafa Shah

Volume I
Codification, Authenticity

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

TH_Vol1_A01.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page iv

First published 2010
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN, UK

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
270 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Editorial material and selection © 2010, Mustafa Shah; individual owners retain copyright in their own material

Typeset in 10/12pt Times NR MT by Graphicraft Limited, Hong Kong
Printed and bound in Great Britain by
MPG Group Ltd, Bodmin, Cornwall

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
The Hadith / edited by Mustafa Shah.
v. – (Critical concepts in Islamic studies)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
Contents: v. 1. Hadith, codification, authenticity – v. 2. Isnads: transmission, terminology, and the issue of dating – v. 3. Hadith: scholarship, perspectives, and criticism – v. 4. Hadith: narrative, Context, and content.
ISBN 978-0-415-47398-9 (set, hardback) – ISBN 978-0-415-47619-5 (volume 1, hardback) – ISBN 978-0-415-47620-1 (volume 2, hardback) – ISBN 978-0-415-47621-8 (volume 3, hardback) – ISBN 978-0-415-54331-6
[redacted]
BP135.H28 2009
297.1′24–dc22
2009020040

ISBN 10: 0-415-47398-5 (Set)
ISBN 10: 0-415-47620-8 (Volume II)

ISBN 13: 978-0-415-47398-9 (Set)
ISBN 13: 978-0-415-47620-1 (Volume II)

Publisher's Note

References within each chapter are as they appear in the original complete work.

TH_Vol1_A01.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page v

CONTENTS

VOLUME I CODIFICATION, AUTHENTICITY

Acknowledgements xi
Chronological table of reprinted articles and chapters xiii

Introduction **1**

1 Ḥadīth and Sunna **57**
IGNAZ GOLDZIHER

2 Early development of written tradition **77**
NABIA ABBOTT

3 Oral Torah and *Ḥadīṯ*: transmission, prohibition of writing, redaction **116**
GREGOR SCHOELER

4 The opponents of the writing of tradition in early Islam **156**
MICHAEL COOK

5 *Lā taqra'ū l-Qur'āna ʿalā muṣḥafiyyīn wa-lā taḥmilū ʿl-ʿilma ʿanī l-ṣaḥafiyyīn*: some notes on the transmission of *ḥadīth* **252**
MEIR J. KISTER

6 The epistemological problem of writing in Islamic civilization: al-Ḫaṭīb al-Baġhdādī's (d. 463/1071) *Taqyīd al-ʿilm* **288**
PAUL L. HECK

7 The author and his work in the Islamic literature of the first centuries: the case of ʿAbd al-Razzāq's *Muṣannaf* **320**
HARALD MOTZKI

TH_Vol1_A01.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page vi

8 Muslim tradition: the question of authenticity **351**
JAMES ROBSON

9 The authenticity of prophetic *ḥadîth*: a pseudo-problem **365**
WAEL HALLAQ

10 Competing paradigms in the study of Islamic origins: Qur'ān 15:89–91 and the value of *isnād*s **381**
HERBERT BERG

11 Notes towards a fresh perspective on the Islamic Sunna **408**
JOHN BURTON

VOLUME II *ISNĀDS*: TRANSMISSION, TERMINOLOGY, AND THE ISSUE OF DATING

Acknowledgements vii

12 The evidence of *isnāds* **1**
JOSEPH SCHACHT

13 The *isnād* in Muslim tradition **12**
JAMES ROBSON

14 The date of the great *fitna* **22**
G. H. A. JUYNBOLL

15 Dating Muslim traditions: a survey **39**
HARALD MOTZKI

16 Eschatology and the dating of traditions **82**
MICHAEL COOK

17 Eschatology, history, and the common link: a study in methodology **105**
ANDREAS GÖRKE

18 The *isnād* system: its validity and authenticity **130**
MUSTAFA AZAMI

19 Nāfi', the *mawlā* of Ibn 'Umar, and his position in Muslim Ḥadīth Literature **185**
G. H. A. JUYNBOLL

TH_Vol1_A01.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page vii

20 (Re)appraisal of some technical terms in *ḥadīth* science **219**
G. H. A. JUYNBOLL

21 The *common link* and its relation to the *madār* **260**
HALIT OZKAN

22 Some aspects of the Islamic traditions regarding the site of the grave of Moses **292**
AMIKAM EL'AD

23 Critical Rigor vs. Juridical Pragmatism: how legal theorists and Ḥadīth scholars approached the backgrowth of *isnāds* in the genre of *'ilal al-ḥadīth* **306**
JONATHAN BROWN

24 Varieties of the *ḥasan* tradition **340**
JAMES ROBSON

25 Traditions from individuals **354**
JAMES ROBSON

26 Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ al-Shahrazūrī and the *isnād* **367**
EERIK DICKINSON

27 The categories high and low as reflections on the *Riḥlah* and *Kitāba* in Islam **408**
LEONARD LIBRANDE

28 *Isnād*s and *Rijāl* expertise in the exegesis of Ibn Abī Ḥātim (327/939) **420**
MEHMET AKIF KOÇ

VOLUME III SCHOLARSHIP, PERSPECTIVES, AND CRITICISM

Acknowledgements vii

29 The *Muṣannaf* of 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Ṣan'ānī as a source of authentic *aḥādīth* of the first century a.h. **1**
HARALD MOTZKI

30 The *Musnad* of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal: how it was composed and what distinguishes it from the Six Books **26**
CHRISTOPHER MELCHERT

TH_Vol1_A01.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page viii

31 Where are the legal *Ḥadīth*? A study of the *Muṣannaf* of Ibn Abī Shayba **44**
SCOTT C. LUCAS

32 *Ḥadīth* in the responses of Isḥāq B. Rāhwayh **70**
SUSAN SPECTORSKY

33 Bukhārī and early hadith criticism **93**
CHRISTOPHER MELCHERT

34 The life and works of Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī **114**
CHRISTOPHER MELCHERT

35 Criticism of the proto-hadith canon: al-Dāraquṭnī's adjustment of the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* **145**
JONATHAN A. C. BROWN

36 How we know early Ḥadīth critics did *matn* criticism and why it's so hard to find **179**
JONATHAN A. C. BROWN

37 The contribution of the *mawālī* to the six Sunnite canonical *ḥadīth* collections **213**
JOHN A. NAWAS

38 The introduction of *ḥadīth* in al-Andalus: (2nd/8th–3rd/9th centuries) **223**
ISABEL FIERRO

39 The piety of the hadith folk **246**
CHRISTOPHER MELCHERT

40 The *Aʿlām al-Ḥadīth* of al-Khāṭṭābī: a commentary on al-Bukhārī's *Ṣaḥīḥ* or a polemical treatise? **265**
VARDIT TOKATLY

41 *Al-uṣūl al-arbaʿumi'a* **308**
ETAN KOHLBERG

42 On the origins of *Shīʿī Ḥadīth* **341**
RON BUCKLEY

43 An insight into *ḥadīth* methodology of Jamāl al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Ṭāwūs **361**
ASMA AFSARUDDIN

44 Ibāḍi Ḥadīth: an essay on normalization **381**
JOHN C. WILKINSON

TH_Vol1_A01.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page ix

45 Portrayal of the *ḥajj* as a context for women's exegesis: textual evidence in al-Bukhārī's 'al-Ṣāḥīḥ' 407
AISHA GEISSINGER

46 Women and *ḥadīth* transmission: two case studies from Mamluk Damascus 428
ASMA SAYEED

47 The scholars of ḥadīth and the retentive memory 453
LEONARD T. LIBRANDE

48 Ibn Ḥajar's *Hady al-sārī*: a medieval interpretation of the structure of al-Bukhārī's *al-Jāmiʿ al-ṣaḥīḥ*: introduction and translation 463
MOHAMMAD FADEL

VOLUME IV NARRATIVE, CONTEXT, AND CONTENT

Acknowledgements vii

49 Hard-boiled: narrative discourse in early Muslim traditions 1
DANIEL BEAUMONT

50 Modern literary theory applied to classical Arabic texts: Ḥadīth revisited 28
SEBASTIAN GÜNTHER

51 Fictional narration and imagination within an authoritative framework: towards a new understanding of *Ḥadīth* 34
SEBASTIAN GÜNTHER

52 Oral traditions of the Prophet Muḥammad: a formulaic approach 69
R. MARSTON SPEIGHT

53 A look at variant readings in the *ḥadīth* 79
R. MARSTON SPEIGHT

54 Man's "hollow core": ethics and aesthetics in *ḥadīth* literature and classical Arabic *adab* 90
STEFAN SPERL

55 Dreams as a means to evaluate *ḥadīth* 119
LEAH KINBERG

56 'Even an Ethiopian slave': the transformation of a Sunnī tradition 139
PATRICIA CRONE

TH_Vol1_A01.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page x

57 On "concessions" and conduct: a study in early *ḥadīth* **151**
MEIR J. KISTER

58 The "cyclical reform": a study of the mujaddid tradition **177**
ELLA LANDAU-TASSERON

59 Varieties of pronouncement stories in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: a gospel genre in the ḥadīth literature **208**
NEAL ROBINSON

60 An early Muslim tradition in light of its Christian environment **239**
JUAN PEDRO MONFERRER-SALA

61 Knowledge, women, and gender in the ḥadīth: a feminist interpretation **252**
SA'DIYYA SHAIKH

Index 262

TH_Vol1_A01.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page xi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The publishers would like to thank the following for permission to reprint their material:

Transactions Publishers for permission to reprint Ignaz Goldziher, 'Ḥadīth and Sunna', in S. M. Stern (ed.), *Muslim Studies*, Vol. 2, trans. (1967–71), C. R. Barber and S. M. Stern (Chicago and New York: Aldine, Atherson), pp. 17–37.

The Oriental Institute of The University of Chicago for permission to reprint Nabia Abbott, 'Early Development of Written Tradition', *Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri II: Qur'ānic Commentary and Tradition* (University of Chicago Press, 1967), pp. 5–32.

Taylor & Francis Books UK for permission to reprint Gregor Schoeler, 'Oral Torah and *Ḥadīṯ*: Transmission, Prohibition of Writing, Redaction', *The Oral and the Written in Early Islam*, trans. Uwe Vagelpohl (Routledge, 2006), pp. 111–41.

Koninklijke BRILL NV for permission to reprint Michael Cook, 'The Opponents of the Writing of Tradition in Early Islam', *Arabica*, 1997, 44, 437–530.

The Institute of Asian and African Studies at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem for permission to reprint Meir J. Kister, *'Lā taqra'ū l-Qur'āna 'alā muṣḥafiyyīn wa-lā taḥmilū 'l-'ilma 'anī l-ṣaḥafiyyīn*: Some Notes on the Transmission of *Ḥadīth', Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, 1998, 22, 127–62.

The Institute of Asian and African Studies at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem for permission to reprint Harald Motzki, 'The Author and his Work in the Islamic Literature of the First Centuries: The Case of 'Abd al-Razzāq's *Muṣannaf*', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, 2003, 28, 1–31.

Koninklijke BRILL NV for permission to reprint Herbert Berg, 'Competing Paradigms in the Study of Islamic Origins: Qur'ān 15:89–91 and the Value of *isnāds*', *Method and Theory in the Study of Islamic Origins* (E. J. Brill, 2003), pp. 259–90.

TH_Vol1_A01.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page xii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Taylor & Francis Journals for permission to reprint John Burton, 'Notes Towards a Fresh Perspective on the Islamic Sunna', *Bulletin of the British Society for Middle Eastern Studies*, 1984, 11, 1, 3–17.

Disclaimer

The publishers have made every effort to contact authors/copyright holders of works reprinted in *The Ḥadīth (Critical Concepts in Islamic Studies)*. This has not been possible in every case, however, and we would welcome correspondence from those individuals/companies whom we have been unable to trace.

TH_Vol1_A01.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page xiii

Chronological table of reprinted articles and chapters

Date	*Author(S)*	*Title*	*Source*	*Vol.*	*Ch.*
1989–90	Ignaz Goldziher	Ḥadīth and Sunna	S. M. Stern (ed.), Muslim Studies, vol. 2, trans. (1967–71), C. R. Barber and S. M. Stern (Chicago and New York: Aldine Atherson), pp. 17–37.	I	1
1951–2	James Robson	Muslim tradition: the question of authenticity	*Memoires and Proceedings of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society* 93: 7 84–102.	I	8
1953	Joseph Schacht	The evidence of *isnāds*	*The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 163–75.	II	12
1953	James Robson	The *isnād* in Muslim tradition	*Transactions of the Glasgow University Oriental Society* 15, 15–26.	II	13
1961	James Robson	Varieties of the *ḥasan* tradition	*Journal of Semitic Studies* 6, 47–61.	II	24
1964	James Robson	Traditions from individuals	*Journal of Semitic Studies* 9, 327–40.	II	25
1967	Nabia Abbott	Early development of written tradition	*Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri II: Qur'ānic Commentary and Tradition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), pp. 5–32.	I	2
1973	G. H. A. Juynboll	The date of the great *fitna*	*Arabica* 20, 142–59.	II	14
1978	Leonard Librande	The categories high and low as reflections on the *Riḥlah* and *Kitāba* in Islam	*Der Islam*, 267–80.	II	27
1982	Meir J. Kister	On "concessions" and conduct: a study in early *ḥadīth*	G. H. A. Juynboll (ed.), *Studies on The First Century of Islamic Society* (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Northern Illinois University Press), pp. 89–107, 214–30.	IV	57
1984	John Burton	Notes towards a fresh perspective on the Islamic Sunna	*Bulletin of the British Society for Middle Eastern Studies* 11:1, 3–17.	I	11

TH_Vol1_A01.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page xiv

Chronological table continued

Date	*Author(S)*	*Title*	*Source*	*Vol.*	*Ch.*
1985	John C. Wilkinson	Ibāḍi Ḥadīth: an essay on normalization	*Der Islam* 62, 231–59.	III	44
1987	Etan Kohlberg	*Al-uṣūl al-arbaʿumiʾa*	*Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 10, 128–66.	III	41
1988	Amikam El'ad	Some aspects of the Islamic traditions regarding the site of the grave of Moses	*Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 11, 1–15.	II	22
1988–92	Leonard T. Librande	The scholars of ḥadīth and the retentive memory	*Cahiers d'Onomastique Arabe* 1993, 39–48.	III	47
1989	Isabel Fierro	The introduction of *ḥadīth* in Al-Andalus: (2nd/8th–3rd/9th centuries)	*Der Islam* 66, 68–93.	III	38
1989	Ella Landau-Tasseron	The "cyclical reform": a study of the mujaddid tradition	*Studia Islamica* 70, 79–117.	IV	58
1989	R. Marston Speight	Oral traditions of the Prophet Muḥammad: a formulaic approach	*Oral Tradition* 4, 27–37.	IV	52
1991	Harald Motzki	The *Muṣannaf* of ʿAbd Al-Razzāq Al-Ṣanʿānī as a source of authentic *aḥādīth* of the first century a.h.	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 50, 1–21.	III	29
1992	Michael Cook	Eschatology and the dating of traditions	*Princeton Papers in Near Eastern Studies* 1, 23–47.	II	16
1993	G. H. A. Juynboll	Nāfiʿ, the *mawlā* of Ibn ʿUmar, and his position in Muslim Ḥadīth Literature	*Der Islam* 70:2, 207–44.	II	19
1994	Mustafa Azami	The *isnād* system: its validity and authenticity	*On Schacht's Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence* (Islamic Texts Society), pp. 154–205.	II	18

1994	Patricia Crone	'Even an Ethiopian slave': the transformation of a Sunnī tradition	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 57, 59–67.	IV	56
1994	Neal Robinson	Varieties of pronouncement stories in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: a gospel genre in the ḥadīth literature	*Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 5:2, 123–46.	IV	59
1995	Asma Afsaruddin	An insight into *ḥadīth* methodology of Jamāl al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Ṭawūs	*Der Islam* 72, 25–46.	III	43
1995	Mohammad Fadel	Ibn Ḥajar's *Hady al-sārī*: a medieval interpretation of the structure of al-Bukhārī's *al-Jāmiʿ* al-Ṣaḥīḥ: introduction and translation	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 54:3, 161–97.	III	48
1996	Daniel Beaumont	Hard-boiled: narrative discourse in early Muslim traditions	*Studia Islamica* 83, 5–31.	IV	49
1997	Michael Cook	The opponents of the writing of tradition in early Islam	*Arabica* 44, 437–530.	I	4
1998	Ron Buckley	On the origins of *Shīʿī Ḥadīth*	*Muslim World* 88:2, 165–84.	III	42
1998	Sebastian Günther	Fictional narration and imagination within an authoritative framework: towards a new understanding of *ḥadīth*	Stefan Leder (ed.), *Story-telling in the Framework of Non-Fictional Arabic Literature* (Weisbaden: Harrassowitz), pp. 433–71.	IV	51
1998	Meir J. Kister	*Lā taqraʾū l-Qurʾāna ʿalā muṣḥafiyyīn wa-lā taḥmilū ʿl-ʿilma ʿanī l-saḥafiyyīn*: some notes on the transmission of *ḥadîth*	*Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 22, 127–62.	I	5
1999	Wael Hallaq	The authenticity of prophetic *ḥadîth*: a pseudo-problem	*Studia Islamica* 89, 75–90.	I	9
1999	Leah Kinberg	Dreams as a means to evaluate *ḥadīth*	*Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 23, 79–99.	IV	55
2000	Sebastian Günther	Modern literary theory applied to classical Arabic texts: Ḥadīth revisited	Verena Klemm and Beatrice Grundler (eds), *Understanding Near Eastern Literatures* (Weisbaden: Harrassowitz), pp. 171–6.	IV	50

TH_Vol11_A01.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page xv

TH_Vol1_A01.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page xvi

Chronological table continued

Date	*Author(S)*	*Title*	*Source*	*Vol.*	*Ch.*
2000	R. Marston Speight	A look at variant readings in the *ḥadīth*	*Der Islam* 77, 169–79.	IV	53
2001	G. H. A. Juynboll	(Re)appraisal of some technical terms in *ḥadīth* science	*Islamic Law and Society* 8:3, 303–49.	II	20
2001	Christopher Melchert	Bukhārī and early *ḥadīth* criticism	*Journal of the American Oriental Society* 121:1, 7–19.	III	33
2001	Susan Spectorsky	*Ḥadīth* in the responses of Isḥāq B. Rāhwayh	*Islamic Law and Society* 8:3, 407–431.	III	32
2001	Vardit Tokatly	The *A'lām al-Ḥadīth* of al-Khāṭṭābī: a commentary on al-Bukhārī's *Ṣaḥīḥ* or a polemical treatise?	*Studia Islamica* 92, 53–92.	III	40
2002	Eerik Dickinson	Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ Al-Shahrazūrī and the *isnād*	*Journal of the American Oriental Society* 122:3, 481–505.	II	26
2002	Paul L. Heck	The epistemological problem of writing in Islamic civilization: al-Ḫaṭīb al-Baġhdādī's (d. 463/1071) *Taqyīd al-'ilm*	*Studia Islamica* 94, 85–114.	I	6
2002	Christopher Melchert	The piety of the hadith folk	*International Journal of Middle East Studies* 34:3, 425–39.	III	39
2002	Asma Sayeed	Women and *ḥadīth* transmission: two case studies from Mamluk Damascus	*Studia Islamica* 95, 71–94.	III	46
2003	Herbert Berg	Competing paradigms in the study of Islamic origins: Qur'ān 15:89–91 and the value of isnād*s*	*Method and Theory in the Study of Islamic Origins* (Leiden: E. J. Brill), pp. 259–90.	I	10

2003	Harald Motzki	The author and his work in the Islamic literature of the first centuries: the case of ʿAbd al-Razzāq's *Muṣannaf*	*Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 28, 1–31	I	7
2003	Andreas Görke	Eschatology, history, and the common link: a study in methodology	*Method and Theory in the Study of Islamic Origins* (Leiden: E. J. Brill), pp. 179–208.	II	17
2003	Juan Pedro Monferrer-Sala	An early Muslim tradition in light of its Christian environment	*Edebiyat* 13:1, 27–35.	IV	60
2004	Jonathan A. C. Brown	Criticism of the proto-hadith canon: al-Dāraquṭnī's adjustment of the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*	*Journal of Islamic Studies* 15:1, 1–37.	III	35
2004	Halit Ozkan	The *common link* and its relation to the *madār*	*Islamic Law and Society* 11:1, 42–77.	II	21
2004	Sa'diyya Shaikh	Knowledge, women, and gender in the ḥadīth: a feminist interpretation	*Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 15:1, 99–108.	IV	61
2005	Aisha Geissinger	Portrayal of the *ḥajj* as a context for women's exegesis: textual evidence in al-Bukhārī's *'al-Ṣāḥīḥ'*	Sebastian Günther (ed.), *Ideas, Images, and Methods of Portrayal: Insights into Classical Arabic Literature and Islam* (Leiden: Brill), pp. 153–79.	III	45
2005	Mehmet Akif Koç	*Isnād*s and *Rijāl* expertise in the exegesis of Ibn Abī Ḥātim (327/939)	*Der Islam* 82, 146–68.	II	28
2005	Christopher Melchert	The *Musnad* of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal: how it was composed and what distinguishes it from the Six Books	*Der Islam* 82, 32–51.	III	30
2005	Harald Motzki	Dating Muslim traditions: a survey	*Arabica* 52:2, 204–53.	II	15
2005	John A. Nawas	The contribution of the *mawālī* to the six Sunnite canonical *ḥadīth* collections	Sebastian Gunther (ed.), *Ideas, Images, and Methods of Portrayal. Insights into Classical Arabic Literature and Islam* (Leiden: Brill), pp. 141–51.	III	37

TH_Vol1_A01.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page xvii

TH_Vol1_A01.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page xviii

Chronological table continued

Date	*Author(S)*	*Title*	*Source*	*Vol.*	*Ch.*
2006	Gregor Schoeler	Oral Torah and *Ḥadīṯ*: transmission, prohibition of writing, redaction	*The Oral and the Written in Early Islam*, trans. Uwe Vagelpohl (London: Routledge), pp. 111–41.	I	3
2007	Jonathan Brown	Critical Rigor vs. Juridical Pragmatism: how legal theorists and ḥadīth scholars approached the backgrowth of *isnāds* in the genre of *'Ilal al-ḥadīth*	*Islamic Law and Society* 14:1, 1–42.	II	23
2007	Stefan Sperl	Man's "hollow core": ethics and aesthetics in *ḥadīth* literature and classical Arabic *adab*	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 70:3, 459–86.	IV	54
2008	Scott C. Lucas	Where are the legal *Ḥadīth*? A study of the *Muṣannaf* of Ibn Abī Shayba	*Islamic Law and Society* 15:3, 283–314.	III	31
2008	Christopher Melchert	The life and works of Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī	*Al-Qanṭara* 29:1, 9–44.	III	34
2008	Jonathan A. C. Brown	How we know early ḥadīth critics did *matn* criticism and why it's so hard to find	*Islamic Law and Society* 15:2, 143–84.	III	36

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 1

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 (*ḥadīth* pl. *aḥādīth*). The profusion of literature devoted to the genre of *ḥadīth* 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 *ḥadīth*s 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 *ḥadīth*s 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.

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 2

Traditional Islamic scholarship takes the view that these *ḥadīth*s preserved the sum and substance of the utterances, deeds, directives, and descriptive anecdotes connected with the life of the Prophet Muḥammad and his Companions. Thus, together with the Qur'an, the *ḥadīth*s 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 *ḥadīth*s preserve the explicit documentation for the augmentation, contextualisation, and implementation of these teachings, garnering in the process a much more exhaustive corpus of data.[3] Within this arrangement the *ḥadīth*s were deemed key receptacles of the Prophetic *Sunna* or exemplar, an all-embracing code of practice bequeathed by the Prophet Muḥammad. The *Sunna* was accentuated as a construct of authority and was used to configure the normative practices and paradigms of the faith.[4] Given that access to the Prophetic *Sunna* was afforded through circumspect reference to the material of *ḥadīth*, 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*).[5] 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.[6]

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.[7] 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 *ḥadīth* and its authoritative status within Islam.[8]

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 *ḥadīth*s as a scriptural source has continued to attract intense interest and debate.[9] Endeavours such as the Turkish project to revisit the corpus of *ḥadīth* as well as arguments that these texts constitute the residues

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 3

of a patriarchal reading of Islam are common themes explored in the related discourse. While, for traditionalist and conservative readings of Islam, the *ḥadīth*s 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-'Azīz (r. 99–101/717–737), Abū Bakr ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥazm (d. 120/737) and the jurist Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī (d. 124/742), who are all mentioned as being actively involved in efforts to preserve and codify (*tadwīn*) the *ḥadīth* and its complementary *Sunna*.[12]

In his commentary on one of Sunni orthodoxy's most renowned collection of *ḥadīth*s compiled by the traditionist Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl al-Bukhārī (194–256/810–870), Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī (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'an; 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 Ḥajar 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 *Muwaṭṭa'* of Mālik ibn Anas (112–179/731–795), a legal manual in which *ḥadīth*s 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 Ḥajar comments that by the second/

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 4

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*.[15] Among the *musnad* writings were the works of Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālisī (d. 204/819), Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal (164–241/780–855), Isḥāq ibn Rāhawahy (d. 238/852), and 'Uthmān ibn Abī Shayba (d. 239/853), whose brother, Abū Bakr ibn Abī Shayba (d. 235/849), even combined a *musnad* and *muṣannaf* type of arrangement within a single text.[16]

Ibn Ḥajar'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 *ḥadīth*s 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 *ḥadīth* organised around materials deemed authentic *(ṣaḥīḥ)*. 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 *ḥadīth* scholarship and the literary endeavours this learning inspired both before and after the appearance of his work.[17] The traditional understanding is that through a combination of written and oral transmission *muṣannaf* 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.).[18]

A *ḥadīth* 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 Companion figure, who, as a contemporary of the Prophet, is the source of the *ḥadīth* or report in question.[19] 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 *ḥadīth*s; this was purportedly carried out in an attempt to appeal to the authority of the Prophetic *Sunna*.[20] 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 *isnād*s ultimately became the principal instrument of *ḥadīth* authentication and criticism. According to the famous maxim attributed to Muḥammad Ibn Sīrīn (*ca*. 34–110/654–728), an eminent Baṣran 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 Sīrīn intimates that: 'They never used to ask about *isnād*; however, when the *fitna* (discord) broke out, it was said: "Name us your authorities." '[21]

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 5

Eventually, traditions were classified on the basis of the reliability of narrators featured in the *isnād*s with terms such as *ṣaḥīḥ* (authentic), *ḥasan* (sound), and *ḍa'īf* (weak) being gradually introduced to signify the status of given *isnād*s attached to Prophetic reports.[22]

The technical definition of a tradition classed as being authentic (*ṣaḥīḥ*) 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 *shādhdh* (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 *ḥasan* (sound), but by and large these were traditions which did not quite fulfil the criteria set for authentic ones.[24] Ibn Ḥajar speaks of the *ḥasan* 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 (*'udūl*) and it is neither *shādhdh* nor *mu'allal*.[25] The weak (*ḍa'īf*) 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 *ḥadīth* 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 Ḥātim 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 *isnād*s 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 *isnād*s with critical attention being devoted to the scrutiny of their status as

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 6

transmitters. This was achieved under the rubric of *ilm 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-ta'dīl* (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-mu'talaf*); works identifying narrators considered to be either trustworthy or weak (*ma'rifat al-thiqāt wa'l-ḍu'afā'*); and, to an extent, even subtle reviews of the potential defects in *isnād*s (*'ilal al-ḥadīth*); with many of these disciplines being eventually subsumed within the field of the *ḥadīth* 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 *isnād*s of the most celebrated collections of traditions were later made the subject of commentary and supra-commentary.[33] The *Kamāl fī asmā' al-rijāl* by 'Abd al-Ghanī al-Maqdisī (d. 600/1203) was a biographical dictionary devoted to scrutinising the status of narrators cited in six major *ḥadīth* 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 asmā' al-rijāl*. In the introduction to his work al-Mizzī explains that 'Abd 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 *isnād*s 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 (*mutūn*) (*taṣḥīfāt al-muḥaddithīn*).[36] While traditionist scholarship took an unswervingly stern approach to materials classed as being outright fabrications (*mawḍū'āt*), 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 (*faḍā'il al-a'māl*)?[37]

During these periods and beyond, it was possible for subsequent scholarship to revisit the corpus of *ḥadīths* and proffer revisions relating to the ranking and status of certain traditions through reference to the *isnād*s, 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 *ḥadīth*, drawing upon concepts such as abrogation, specificity, provenance, in terms of a tradition being

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 7

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 *Jāmi'* 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 *ḥadīth*s 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 *mustadrakāt* and *mustakhrajāt*: 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-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (321–405/933–1014); it collated additional *ḥadīths* 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'īlī (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

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 8

and Muslim by Abū Nuʿaym al-Iṣfahānī (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 *isnād*s.

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 *ḥadīths* played in the synthesis of classical Islamic thought, particularly in terms of the distinct theoretical linkage that developed between law and *ḥadīth* 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 *ḥadīth*s, 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 *ḥadīth* 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

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 9

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 *ḥadīth* 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 *ḥadīth*s 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 *ḥadīth* 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

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 10

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.[61] 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.[62] 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.[63]

Interestingly, scholars referred to by Berg as being of 'nominally' sceptical and sanguine persuasions have different views regarding the utility of the *isnād*s as a device for determining the chronological provenance of the actual texts and individual *ḥadīth* 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 *ḥadīth*s in order to draw general conclusions about their origin and design, some do accept that the *isnād*s (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 *isnād*s were mostly insidious tools used to create the perception of historical depth in the *matn*s 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 *isnād*s were completely fabricated: *isnād*s (or parts of them) can be related to the actual transmission of traditions.[64] Moreover, within this camp, it could further be argued that careful analyses of the *isnād*s as well as their *matn*s 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.[65] 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.[66] However, the general conceptual thrust of this particular position does not necessarily predicate that

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 11

traditionally defined authentic *ḥadīth*s 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 *ḥadīths* 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 *ḥadīth* 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 *ṣaḥīḥ*. 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 *ḥadīth*.[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

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 12

resolved.[74] 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 *ḥadīth*s 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 *ḥadīth*, and perfected its associated sciences, considered themselves to be the dedicated guardians of Islam's religious legacy.[75]

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 *ḥadīth* 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 *ḥadīth* confirms the increased interest that this preeminent 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 *ḥadīth* scholarship and its history as well as a number of studies focusing on the content of *ḥadīth*s, 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.[76]

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 *ḥadīth*, 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

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 13

consequently the subject of critical appraisal.[77] Goldziher countenanced a particularly sceptical view of the historicity of the materials comprised in the *ḥadīth*.[78] He concluded that the *ḥadīth* 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.'[79] 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 *ḥadīths* 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 *ḥadīths* 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 *ḥadīth*, which vastly increased during 'subsequent generations'.[80]

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 *ḥadīth* represented the original core of authentic material; indeed, he even contended that it was difficult to determine which of these *ḥadīth*s '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'.[81]

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 *ḥadīth*, 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 *ḥadīth*, 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.[82] 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'.[83] He went on: 'they, like the Jewish rabbis under

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 14

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 *ḥadīth* 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 *ḥadīth* to suit its purpose. They had to do what there opponents did: invent, or have invented, *ḥadīths* in their turn. And that is in effect what they did'.[89] The devices developed by Muslim scholars as instruments of *ḥadīth* 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 *isnāds*'.[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 *ḥadīth*s 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

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 15

original manuscripts were destroyed, copies made from dictation by pupils often survived and were utilised by later compilers of pre-classical *muṣannaf*. 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 *ḥadīth* 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 '*ḥadīth* 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.[91] 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 Sībawayhi (d. 177/793).

In the context of the *ḥadīths* 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 *muṣannaf* 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 *muṣannaf* works, although in the case of Abbott she had highlighted the use of temporary notes.[92] In Schoeler's estimation Sezgin had incorrectly assumed that the existence of early written antecedents would underscore the authenticity of the classical

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 16

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 (*hypomnêmata*) provides a better means of explaining the preservation of early *ḥadīth* materials; it likewise demonstrates that seminal texts such as the *Ṣaḥīḥ* 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.[93] 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 *ḥadīth* 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'.[94] 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 *ḥadīth*, 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

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 17

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 *ḥadīth*s 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 *mawālī* (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 *Taqyīd al-ʿilm* written by the celebrated traditionist al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (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, *Sīrat al-nabī* of Ibn Isḥāq (d. 150/767 or 151/768–9); the *Muwaṭṭa'* of Mālik; and the two works attributed to al-Shāfiʿī (d. 204/820): *al-Risāla*, the epistle on the roots of law and his work devoted to substantive law, *Kitāb al-Umm*. Within this broad framework, Motzki considers whether the famous *muṣannaf* collection of traditions ascribed to the Yemeni traditionist

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 18

'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 *ḥadīths* 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 *isnād*s 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.[97] Applied to the vast corpus of materials of *ḥadīth*, the same theory yields the explanation that *ḥadīth*s 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 *ḥadīth* 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 *ḥadīth*.[98] 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'.[99] Burton was likewise troubled by the pejorative language employed throughout by Goldziher, suggesting

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 19

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 *ḥadīth*s, 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 *ḥadīths* 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 *ḥadīth* 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 *ḥadīth* 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'ī's time'.[100] He was referring to the celebrated eponym of one of the four surviving schools of classical jurisprudence, al-Shāfi'ī. 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.[101] 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.[102] 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'.[103] 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.

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 20

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-Shāfi'ī'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.'[104] 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-Shāfi'ī.

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.'[105] Having dismissed the idea that the traditions were genuine products of the Prophetic era, it followed in his view that *isnād*s were simply devices used to create historical depth for the legal doctrines they embodied; he described the classical Muslim technical criticism of the *isnād*s as being irrelevant for the purposes of historical analysis; however, he accepted that the *isnād*s 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.[106] His belief was that the *isnād*s which were adduced to support them progressively grew backwards; Schacht did claim that the regular practice of using *isnād*s was not older than the beginning of the second century, highlighting the incident of the killing of the Umayyad caliph Walīd ibn Yazīd (d. 126/744) as providing a probable historical juncture for its inception.[107] 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 *isnād*s with comparable *matns*, could yield a *terminus a quo* for the inception and promulgation of such traditions.

The subject of the origin of the *isnād* 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 Sīrīn can be approximately related to the last third of the first/seventh century and it was during this time that the *isnād* was introduced. The article largely corroborates Joseph Horovitz's study of the *isnād*, although this latter figure additionally concluded that the inspiration for the inception of the device of the *isnād* might have been provided by the Talmudic schools of the Jewish tradition.[108] Sezgin has referred to analogues provided by the transmission of pre-Islamic poetry and this is something which

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 21

Schoeler raised.[109] 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.[110]

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.[111] Motzki's own conclusions question whether dating traditions on the basis of *matn*s (*mutūn*) alone, while also discarding the value of *isnād*s is prudent; instead, promoting an investigation of the *ḥadīth* 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 '*isnāds* which extend into the first half of the second/eighth and the first/seventh centuries are without exception arbitrary and artificially fabricated is untenable'.[112] Motzki does dispute the judgement that the *ḥadīth* 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 *ḥadīth*s. 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*s 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*s: Schacht's view was that these common points of intersection not only indicated when *ḥadīth*s were probably put into circulation, but they also enabled the process of dating the doctrines and teachings comprised in them.[113] Using eschatological traditions on the basis that they can be dated

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 22

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 *isnād*s, 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.[114] 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: Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd 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 *ḥadīth*s were documents which had their origins in the second/eighth and third/ninth centuries of Islam, Azami argues that the *ḥadīth*s 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 *isnād*s and their gradual improvement; the propensity to create additional authorities; and claims concerning the misleading function of family *isnād*s. 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

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 23

rebuttal are authentic.[116] 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'.[117]

Gautier Juynboll's contributions to academic studies of the *ḥadīth* 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.[118] 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 *ḥadīth* cannot be traced back earlier than, at most, to the seventies or eighties of the first century'.[119] Interestingly, Motzki has pointed out that Juynboll's claim that single strand *isnād*s 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'.[120] 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.[121] His articles in this section are geared towards refining mechanisms for the processes of dating which are then used to evaluate *isnād*s, introducing a range of terms to define the perceived convoluted dynamics of *isnād* formation and spread. The article on Nāfiʿ 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 *ḥadīth* 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 *isnād*s 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'

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 24

(*ʿilal*) 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 *ḥadīth* criticism continued to debate their genuine Prophetic provenance.[122] The article provides an indication of the sort of highly qualified debates which were openly conducted within the confines of traditional *ḥadīth* 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 *ḥadīth* terminology: the first of these examines the type of tradition classified as being *ḥasan* 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 *isnād*s transmitted on the authority of single individuals.[123] These two studies are followed by Dickinson's article on the phenomenon of seeking elevation (*ʿuluw*) in *isnād*s, namely the pursuit of traditions with the least number of intermediaries connecting the *matn*s to their *isnād*s 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.[124] Dickinson suggests that in the early periods *ʿuluw* 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 *isnād*s 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 *isnād*s (*ʿ-l-w* and *n-z-l*) could be used to reflect an opposition of sorts between journeys in the pursuit of *ḥadīth* and the non-travelling scholar's use of written materials; the latter article looks at Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī's traditionist commentary on the Qur'an, reflecting specifically upon his employment of *isnād*s in this work; Koç offers some interesting comments concerning Ibn Abī Ḥātim'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.

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 25

INTRODUCTION

Section Three of this collection focuses upon the individual works and accomplishments of leading scholars of traditions; aspects of the history of *ḥadīth* scholarship, and standpoints and forms of criticism which featured in classical *ḥadīth* 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 ʻAbd al-Razzāq al-Ṣanʻānī, exploring divergent patterns in the work's *isnād*s 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-Ṣanʻānī's *Muṣannaf* Motzki would argue that its constellation of sources as presented through the *isnād*s is not commensurate with the sort of arbitrary fabrication of materials implied by Schacht. Al-Ṣanʻānī 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-raʾy* (advocates of personal opinion who were renowned for their pursuit of an unfettered and rational exposition of the legal sources) and *ahl al-ḥadīth* (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 *muṣannaf* text of Muḥammad ibn Abī Shayba. Lucas argues that among the 'proponents of *ḥadīth*' 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 *ḥadīth*s were readily available. The study does posit that Ibn Abī Shaybah should be placed among the strictest proponents of *ḥadīth*, 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 *ḥadīth* in the responses (*masāʾil*) of Isḥāq ibn Rāhawayh, advancing some interesting conclusions about his approach to the synthesis of the material of the *ḥadīth*.[126]

The theme of authenticity and *ḥadīth* 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 *Ṣaḥīḥ* and a second work

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 26

of his, a biographical dictionary entitled *al-Ta'rīkh 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 *Ṣaḥīḥ*, although it was the subject of 'extensive interpolation and extension' by both al-Bukhārī and later scholars. Melchert concludes that the work reflects the professionalism achieved within approaches to *rijāl* criticism of later periods.[127] 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.[128]

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 *ḥadīth* canon was still developing and therefore al-Dāraquṭnī's efforts in this respect as articulated in his *Kitāb al-ilzāmāt wa'l-tatabbu'* 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 *ḥadīth* scholarship. Indeed, one major criticism which was levelled at the classical Islamic *ḥadīth* processes of authentication by Goldziher and Schacht was that it primarily focused upon the scrutiny of the *isnād*s 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 *ḥadīth*s.

With the next selection of articles in this volume the focus shifts to more general aspects of classical *ḥadīth* scholarship. John Nawas's short piece examines the contribution of the *mawālī* 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 *ḥadīth* scholarship in secondary sources. However, through reference to statistics, Nawas

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 27

proposes that as far as the *mawālī* contribution to the canonical *ḥadīth* 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 *ḥadīth* 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,[129] whereas Vardit Tokatly reviews the theological thrust and design of one of the famous fourth/tenth century commentaries on al-Bukhārī's *Ṣaḥīḥ* by the eminent Sunnī scholar al-Khaṭṭābī (319-388/930-998).

The following three articles introduce Shī'ite scholarship and the Prophetic traditions: the first of these, by Etan Kohlberg, explores the collection of sayings by the acknowledged *imām*s referred to as the *Uṣūl al-arba'umi'a*. While the principal Shī'ite traditions were codified in texts such as the *al-Kāfī fī uṣūl al-dīn* by al-Kulaynī (d. 329/940); the renowned *man lā yaḥḍuruhu al-faqīh* by Ibn Bābawayhi (d. 381/991) and the works of the Shaykh al-Ṭā'ifa al-Ṭūsī (d. 460/1068), the *Uṣūl 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 Shī'ite *ḥadīth* literature accentuated Prophetic utterances as well as statements attributed to the *imāms*. Moreover, the *Uṣūl* are deemed to be the earliest Shī'ite sources.[130] A digest of the origins of the classical Shī'ite *ḥadīth* is presented in Ron Buckley's article; he makes the point that the move towards the identification of the Shī'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 *ḥadīth* by the Shī'ite traditionist Jamāl al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Ṭāwūs (d. 673/1274-5), a figure who is perceived to have instilled into classical Shī'ite scholarship of the traditions a whole new impetus and direction. Finally, a study of the collection of *ḥadīth*s associated with the Ibāḍī Khārijite movement is the subject of an essay by John Wilkinson.

Reviewing women's contributions to *ḥadīth* 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.[131] The scholarship of women in *ḥadīth* 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 'Ā'isha bint Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Hādī (723-816/1323-1413). Sayeed demonstrates that their pre-eminence in the field of *ḥadīth* scholarship is reflected by the remarkable frequency with which women transmitters appear in the biographical and chronological works covering this period. The final two

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 28

articles in this volume look at separate aspects of classical *ḥadīth* scholarship: Leonard Librande reviews the subject of the retentive memory of *ḥadīth* 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.[132] 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 Ḥajar entitled *Hady al-Sārī*. Fadel argues that Ibn Ḥajar 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 percipient 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 *ḥadīth* 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 *ḥadīth*. 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.[133] 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 *ḥadīth*s 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 *ṣaḥīfa* (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 *ḥadīth*, 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

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 29

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 *isnād*s 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 Khārijite 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 *ḥadīth*s 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 *ḥadīth* 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 *ḥadīth* 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-Bukhārī's *Ṣaḥīḥ*.

The classical disciplines of learning and scholarship associated with the study and preservation of the *ḥadīth* 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 *ḥadīth* 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 *ḥadīth* 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 *ḥadīth* erudition. Despite

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 30

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 *ḥadīth* 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 *ḥadīth* studies remain substantial.

Notes

1 For the individual collections of traditions see *Al-Kutub al-Sitta: Mawsūʿ at al-ḥadīth al-sharīf*, Ṣāliḥ ibn ʿAbd al-Azīz Āl-Shaykh (ed.) (Riyāḍ: Dār al-Salām, 1999), which comprises the six canonical collections of traditions. One of the most renowned *Musnad*s was the work of al-Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, S. T. Majdhūb (ed.), 10 vols (Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1992). Many of these collections are available on CD Roms with intricate search facilities which isolate traditions and their narrators, furnishing diagrams of the *isnād*s, while also providing biographical data: see *al-Maktaba al-alfiyya 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 *Mawsūʿa al-ḥadīth 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 *isnād*s across major collections; and *aṭrāf* (*ṭaraf*), 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 *aṭrāf* is *Tuḥfat al-ashrāf bi-maʿrifat al-aṭrāf* compiled by the famous Shāfiʿite traditionist and jurist Yūsuf ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān 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' (*ṭaraf*) 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-Risāla al-musṭatrafa li-bayān mashūr Kutub al-sunna al-musharrafa* by Muḥammad ibn Jaʿfar al-Kattānī (Beirut: Dār al-Bashā'ir al-Islāmiyya 2000). For a legal commentary see Aḥmad ibn Muḥammadal-Ṭaḥāwī's *Maʿānī al-āthār*, Muḥammad al-Najjār (ed.), 4 vols (Cairo: Maṭbaʿat al-Anwār, n.d.). Linguistic commentaries include Ibn Sallām, Abū 'Ubayd al-Qāsim. *Gharīb al-ḥadīth*, 2 vols (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al 'Ilmiyya, 1987), although the seminal work in this respect is by Ibn al-Athīr, Majd al-Dīn Abū'l-Saʿdāt al-Mubārak ibn Muḥammad al-Jazarī. *al-Nihāya fī gharīb al-ḥadīth wa'l-athār*, 4 vols, Ṭāhir al-Zāwī, Maḥmūd al-Tanāhī (eds) (Cairo: Dār Iḥyā' al-Kutub al-'Arabiyya, n.d.). A theological treatment is explored in the work of the Ashʿarite Ibn Fūrak, Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan. *Kitāb mushkil al-ḥadīth aw Ta'wīl al-akhbār al-mutashābihah*, texte édité et commenté par Daniel Gimaret (Damascus: Institut Français d'études arabes de Damas, 2003) and Ibn Qutayba, Muḥammad Abd Allāh ibn Muslim. *Ta'wīl mukhtalif al-ḥadīth* (Cairo: Maktabat al-Mutanabbī, n.d.); see the study by Guy Lecomte. *Le Traité des Divergences du Ḥadīth d'Ibn Qutayba* (mort en 276/889) (Damascus: Institut Français, 1965). Some of the seminal works on *ḥadīth* sciences which broach

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 31

the technicalities, conventions, and criteria specific to *ḥadīth* transmission include: Ibn Khallād al-Rāmahurmuzī's *al-Muḥaddith al-fāṣil bayn al-rāwī wa'l-wā'ī*, M. al-'Ajjāj al-Khaṭīb (ed.), 3rd edn (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1404/1984); al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī's *Ma'rifat 'ulūm al-ḥadīth*, Mu'aẓẓam Ḥusayn (ed.) (Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya, 1937) (The name is sometimes vocalised as Nīsābūrī). See the translation of this text by James Robson*: An Introduction to the Science of Tradition*, edited and translated by J. Robson, Oriental Translation Fund, 39 (London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1953); further manuals of terminology include al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn 'Alī, *Kitāb al-kifāya fi 'ilm al-riwāya* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1998); and his *al-Jāmi' li-akhlāq al-rāwī wa-ādāb al-sāmi'*, Maḥmūd al-Taḥḥān (ed.) (Riyāḍ: Maktabat, al-Ma'ārif, 1983). Al-Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ ibn Yaḥṣubī's *Ilmā' ilā ma'rifat uṣūl al-riwāya wa-taqyīd al-samā'*, Aḥmad Ṣaqr (ed.) (Beirut, Tunis: Dār al-Turāth, al-Maktabat al-'Atīqa, 1970). Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ al-Shahrazūrī's *Muqaddimat* or *Kitāb Ma'rifat anwā' 'ilm al-ḥadīth*. It has been translated by Eerik Dickinson: *An Introduction to the Science of the Ḥadīth* (*Kitāb Ma'rifat anwā' 'ilm al-ḥadīth*) (Reading: Garnet Publishing Limited, 2006). An excellent commentary on Ibn al-Ṣalāh's text is by the distinguished traditionist Zayn al-Dīn 'Abd al-Raḥīm ibn al-Ḥusayn al-'Irāqī, The work is entitled *Al-Taqyīd wa'l-īḍāḥ limā uṭliqa wa ughliqa min muqaddimat Ibn Ṣalāḥ* (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1993). He is also the author of the celebrated *Fatḥ al-mughīth sharḥ alfiyyat al-ḥadīth*, Ṣalāḥ 'Uwīḍah (ed.) (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1993), which is a short commentary on a versified rendition of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's text. The versification of such materials was popular. Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī. *Tadrīb al-rāwī fī sharḥ taqrīb al-Nawawī*. 2 parts in 1 vol, 'Abd al-Wahhāb 'Abd al-Laṭīf (ed.) (Cairo: Dār al-Turāth, 1972). Note that al-Nawawī's *Taqrīb* was translated into French: *Le Taqrib de en-Nawawi/traduit et annoté par* W. Marçais (Paris 1902). The full title of the original work was *al-Taqrīb wa'l-taysīr li-ma'rifat sunan al-bashīr*. Also Ibn Kathīr, Abū'l-Fidā' Isma'īl was the author of *al-Bā'ith al-ḥathīth sharḥ ikhtiṣār 'ulūm al-ḥadīth* (Cairo: Dār al-Turāth, 1979); a brief tract on the sciences was authored by Ibn Ḥajar, *Nuzhat al-nazar sharḥ nukhbat al-fikr* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1989), The seminal concordance of the traditions is the work by A. J. Wensinck (J. P. Mensing 1936 and 1943) *Concordance et indices de la Tradition Musulmane*, 7 tomes (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1936, 1943, 1955, 1962, 1965, 1967, 1969). E. J. Brill's *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, which can now be accessed on-line, has numerous entries on traditionists and related scholarship; and a small number of relevant entries appear in *Encyclopaedia of the Qur'an*, Jane McAuliffe (ed.) (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2006) (A-D), (E-I), (J-O) (P-Sh) (Si-Z). See also the *Encyclopaedia of the Canonical Ḥadīth* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2007). Compiled and edited by G. H. A. Juynboll (discussed below). For biographical dictionaries: Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl al-Bukhārī *Kitāb al-ta'rīkh al-kabīr*, 8 vols (Hyderabad: Maṭba'at Jam'iyya Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif al-'Uthmāniyya (1360–84 [1941–64]). al-Bukhārī was also the author of a biographical work on weak narrators entitled *al-ḍu'afā' al-ṣaghīr*, Maḥmūd Ibrāhīm Zāyid (ed.) (Aleppo: Dār al-Wa'ī, A. H. 1396). One of the seminal works from the fourth/tenth century is Ibn Abī Ḥātim's. *Al-Jarḥ wa'l-ta'dīl*, 5 vols (Hyderabad: Maṭba'at Jam'iyya Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif al-'Uthmāniyya, 1941–1953). Appended to this is the famous introduction entitled, *Taqdimat al-Ma'rifa*; for a study of this see Eerik Dickinson, *The Development of Early Sunnite ḥadīth Criticism: the Taqdima of Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī* (240–327/854–938) (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2001). Other influential compilations included Yaḥyā ibn Ma'īn. *Ma'rifat al-rijāl*, 2 vols, Muḥammad Qāsim al-Qaṣṣār (ed.) (Damascus: Maṭbū'āt Majma' al-Lugha al-'Arabiyya, 1985). The genesis

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 32

of more general biographical works such as Muḥammad Ibn Saʿd's *Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*, 7 vols (Beirut: Dār Beirut, 1957) is often connected with activity in the field of the *ḥadīth* biography. Later compilations such as al-Dhahabī, *Siyar aʿlām al-nubalā'*, 25 vols, Shuʿayb Arnaʾūṭ and Maʾmūn al-Ṣāghir (eds) (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1990) would have relied on many of the earlier sources. See below for the discussion of specialist *ḥadīth* biography work by Yūsuf ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb al-kamāl fī asmā' al-rijāl*, Bashār ʿAwwaḍ Maʿrūf (ed.), 35 vols (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1980–92). Shīʿite 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 Jaʿfar al-Barqī (d. 274/887). Other works included the *Rijāl al-Kashī*, a fourth/tenth century text and the *Kitāb al-fihrist* of Abū Jaʿfar al-Ṭūsī (d. 460/1067–8) together with his *Kitāb al-rijāl*; for general surveys of all the various forms of *ḥadīth* biographical writings see Ḍiyā' al-ʿUmarī, *Buḥūth fī ta'rīkh al-sunna al-musharrafa* (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1975). A more recent edition of the text was published in 1984 by Dār al-ʿUlūm wa'l-Ḥikam in Medina.

2 The two celebrated third/ninth century collections of traditions by Muḥammad ibn Ismāʿīl al-Bukhārī and Muslim ibn Ḥajjāj were identified by classical Sunni scholarship as being the finest of books following the Qur'an. Al-Bukhārī is reported to have remarked that he had memorised 100,000 traditions that were deemed authentic (*ṣaḥīḥ*) and 200,000 which were not *ṣaḥīḥ*. Zayn al-Dīn al-ʿIrāqī, *Al-Taqyīd*, p. 31. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ adds that the *ṣaḥīḥ* comprises 7,275 traditions including repetitions, although it is pointed out that this figure may include statements of the Companions and Successors; Zayn al-Din al-ʿIrāqī suggests that other estimates mention figures slightly less than this. Also see *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī*, (Abū Zakāriyya' Yaḥyā ibn Sharaf). 6 vols., 18 parts (Cairo: al-Maṭbaʿa al-Miṣriyya, n.d.), vol. 1, pp. 21. Ḥadīth scholarship did develop a terminology to rank scholars who had memorised astonishing numbers of traditions. Thus, terms such as *muḥaddith*, *ḥāfiz* and *ḥākim* were used with the last title deemed to offer the highest accolade in terms of the revered status that such an individual enjoyed in terms of memorising traditions: al-Suyūṭī, *Tadrīb*, vol. 1, pp. 44–51. For surveys of the literature of the traditions and related scholarship see Ignaz Goldziher, *Muslim Studies (Muhammedanische Studien)*, S. M. Stern (ed.), translated from the German by C. R. Barber and S. M. Stern, 2 vols (Chicago and New York). Joseph Schacht. *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*. 2nd edi. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954). Muhammad Zubayr Siddiqi, *Ḥadīth Literature: its Origin, Development, Special Features and Criticism* (Cambridge: Islamic Texts Society, 1993). Alfred Guillaume, *The Traditions of Islam* (Beirut: Khayyat, 1961 (reprint)). John Burton, *Introduction to the Tradition* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000). See the two surveys: Abdul Rauf, Muhammad. 'Ḥadīth Literature-II: The Development of the Science of *Ḥadīth*', in A. F. L. Beeston, T. M. Johnstone, R. B. Serjeant, and G. R. Smith (eds), *Arabic Literature to the End of the Umayyad Period* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 271–88; and Nabia Abbott, 'Ḥadīth Literature II: 'Collection and Transmission of *Ḥadīth*', pp. 289–98. Mustafa Azami, *Studies in Ḥadīth Methodology and Literature* (Indianapolis: American Trust Publication, 1977). Mustafa Azami, *Studies in Early Ḥadīth Literature: with a Critical Edition of Some Early Texts* (3rd edn) (Indianapolis: American Trust Publications, 1992). Gautier Juynboll, *Muslim Tradition: Studies in Chronology, Provenance and Authorship of Early ḥadīth, Cambridge Studies in Islamic Civilisation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983). Scott Lucas, *Constructive Critics, Ḥadīth Literature, and the*

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 33

Articulation of Sunnī Islam (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2004). Harald Motzki (ed.), *Ḥadīth: Origins and Development* (Aldershot: Variorum, 2004). Jonathan Brown. *The Canonization of Al-Bukhārī and Muslim* (Leiden, Boston: E. J. Brill, 2007). For broader treatments in the context of historical writing see Stephen Humphreys, *Islamic History* (London and New York: I. B. Taurus, 1997). Tarif Khalidi, *Arabic Historical Thought in the Classical Period* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994). Chase Robinson, *Islamic Historiography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

3 The author of the famous *Kitāb al-Jarḥ wa'l-tadīl*, Ibn Abī Ḥātim 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 Ḥātim, *Taqdimat al-Ma'rifa li-Kitāb Al-Jarḥ wa'l-ta'dīl*, 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 *ḥadīth* 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-Kifāya*, 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 *ḥadīth* 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, 'Sunna 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 *ḥadīth* 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 *hadīth*, 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 *mawqūf* and *marfū'* when qualifying the condition of the continuity of a tradition's *isnād*: See Zayn al-Dīn al-'Irāqī, *Fatḥ al-mughīth*, 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 Spectorsky, '*Sunna* in the responses of Isḥāq ibn Rāhwayh', in *Studies in Islamic Legal Theory*, Bernard Weiss (ed.) (Boston: E. J. Brill, 2002), pp. 51–74.

5 The relationship between *ḥadīth* and *fiqh* is explored in Wael Hallaq, 'From regional schools to personal schools of law? A reevaluation', *Islamic Law and*

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 34

Society 8:1 (2001), 1–26. Joseph Lowry, *Early Islamic Legal Theory: the Risāla of Muḥammad ibn Idrīs al-Shāfiʿī* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2007). Harald Motzki, *The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence. Meccan Fiqh Before the Classical Schools*, Translated from the German by Marion H. Katz (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2002). See also John Burton, 'Qur'an and Sunnah, a case of cultural disjunction', in Herbert Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory in the Study of Islamic Origins*, published as part of the series Islamic History and Civilization, Studies and Texts, vol. 49 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2003). Wael Hallaq, *A History of Islamic Legal Theories: an Introduction to Sunnī uṣūl al-fiqh* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). Christopher Melchert, *The Formation of the Sunni Schools of Law: Ninth and Tenth Centuries* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1999). Jonathan Brockopp, *Early Mālikī Law: Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam and His Major Compendium of Jurisprudence* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2000). Marion Katz, *Body of Text: the Emergence of the Sunni Law of Ritual Purity* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002). Imran Ahsan Nyazee, *The Book of Revenue* (Reading: Garnet Publishing, 2002), a translation of Ibn Sallām's work entitled *Kitāb al-amwāl*. See the study of this text by A. Görke, *Das Kitāb al-amwāl des Abū ʿUbaid al-Qāsim b. Sallam: Entstehung und berlieferung eines frụhislamischen Rechtswerkes* (Princeton, New Jersey, Darwin: 2003). Josef van Ess, L'autorité de la tradition prophétique dans la théologie muʿtazilite'. *La notion d'autorité au Moyen Age d'Islam, Byzance, Occident: Colloques Internationaux de la Napoule*, George Makdisi, Dominique Sourdel, and Janine Sourdel-Thomine (eds). (Paris: Presses Universitaries de France, 1982), pp. 211–26, and Baber Johansen's *Contingency in a Sacred Law* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1998). Classical scholars consistently used Qur'anic verses to highlight the importance of the Prophetic ideal: Ibn Abī Ḥātim's, *Al-Jarḥ wa'l-taʿdīl*, pp. 1–3.

6 See Abū ʿAbd Allāh Shams al-Dīn ibn Qayyim, *Iʿlām al-muwaqqiʿīn ʿan rabb al-ʿālamīn*, ed. Ṭāhā ʿAbd al-Raʾūf Saʿīd (4 vols, Beirut: Dār al-Jīl, 1972), vol. I, pp. 8–27. Christopher Melchert. 'Traditionist Jurisprudents and the Framing of Islamic Law'. *Islamic Law and Society* (2001:8:3), pp. 383–406. See. Abdul Hakim al-Matroudi's *The Ḥanbalī School of Law and Ibn Taymiyya: Conflict or Conciliation*. Culture and Civilisation in the Middle East Series. (London and New York: Routledge, 2006) and the chapter which explores arguments about Ibn Ḥanbal's legal legacy especially pp. 10–12. Patricia Crone, *Roman Provincial and Islamic Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 23–34, in which it is stated that 'Ḥadīth is the real stuff of Islamic law'. For a different explanation of the emergence of *Sunna* see Yasin Dutton's '*Sunna, Ḥadīth*, and *Madinan ʿAmal*', *Journal of Islamic Studies* 4:1 (1993), 1–31. The ideas in this article can be examined further in Yasin Dutton, *The Origins of Islamic Law* (London: Curzon Press, 1999) and '*ʿAmal*' v. *Ḥadīth* in Islamic Law: the case of *Sadl al-Yadayn* (Holding one's hands by one's sides)', *Islamic Law and Society* 3:1 (1996), 13–40.

7 For example see Muḥammad ibn Idrīs al-Shāfiʿī. *Kitāb al-umm*, 5 vols, Muḥammad Zuhrī al-Najjār (ed.) (Beirut: Dār al-Maʿrifa, n.d.). Muwaffaq al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad ibn Qudāma's, *al-Mughnī fī fiqh al-imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal al-Shaybānī*, 13 vols (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1985). Ibn Rushd, al-Qāḍī Abū Walīd, *Bidāyat al-mujhtahid wa nihāyat al-muqtaṣid*, 2 vols (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1986). These last two texts offer a comparative approach to substantive law, comprising numerous references to traditions to support legal points. The latter work was translated by Imran Ahsan Nyazee, *The Distinguished Jurist's Primer: a Translation of Ibn Rushd's Bidayāt al-mujtaḥid wa niyāhat al-muqtasid*. Reviewed by Muḥammad ʿAbdul al-Rauf (Reading: Garnet Publishing 1994–6); and Al-Mardāwī, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Abū'l-Ḥasan ʿAlī

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 35

ibn Sulaymān, *Al-Inṣāf fī ma'rifat al-rājiḥ min al-Khilāf*, Muḥammad Ḥasan al-Shāfi'ī, 12 vols (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1986). For an earlier theoretical discussion of traditions see Majid Khadduri. al-Shāfi'ī's *Risāla, Treatise on the Foundations of Islamic Jurisprudence* (Cambridge: Cambridge Texts Society, 1987); and Joseph. Lowry. 'The Legal Hermenutics of Al- al-Shāfi'ī and Ibn Qutayba: A Reconsideration', *Islamic Law and Society* (2004:11.1), pp. 1–41. The Ḥanbalite scholar Ibn 'Abd al-Hādī (d. 744/1343) was the author of *Tanqīḥ taḥqīq aḥādīth al-ta'līq* which was a commentary on a treatise by Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 511–597/1116–1200) entitled *taḥqīq aḥādīth al-ta'līq*. This latter text was in turn an exposition of a legal treatise entitled *al-Ta'līq al-kabīr fī 'l-khilāf* by Abū Ya'lā (d. 526/1132). While Ibn al-Jawzī set about fastidiously analysing and supplementing the *isnād*s and traditions adduced in Abū Ya'lā's work, Ibn 'Abd al-Hādī reviewed the materials, gauging, augmenting, and reassessing Ibn al-Jawzī's commentary. Illustrating the fascinating intersection of traditionist and legal strategies, the text provides an excellent example of the way in which legal discourse was referenced to the traditions and revisited through *isnād* and *rijāl* driven syntheses: *Tanqīḥ taḥqīq aḥādīth al-ta'līq*, 2 vols, Ayman Sha'bān (ed.) (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1998). For more on approaches to the interpretation of traditions see the two articles by Scott Lucas. 'The Legal Principles of Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl al-Bukhārī and their Relationship to Classical Salafī Islam'. *Journal of Islamic Studies* (2006:13.3), pp. 289–324; and his 'Divorce, *Ḥadīth*-Scholar Style: from Al-Dārimī to al-Tirmidhī'. *Journal of Islamic Studies* (2008), pp. 1–44. Also see Ulrike Mitter, 'Unconditional manumission of slaves in early Islamic law: a *Ḥadīth* Analysis', *Der Islam* 78 (2001), 35–72, and Claude Gilliot, 'Le traitement du *ḥādīth* dans le *Tahdhīb al-ātār* de Ṭabarī', *Arabica* 41:3 (1994), 309–51.

8 See A. Zubaidi, 'The impact of the Qur'an and Ḥadīth on medieval Arabic literature', in A. F. L. Beeston, T. M. Johnstone, R. B. Serjeant and G. R. Smith (eds), *Arabic Literature to the End of the Umayyad Period* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 322–43.

9 See http://blogs.reuters.com/faithworld/2008/03/07/turkey-explains-revision-of-hadith-project (accessed 23rd February 2009) and http://www.csmonitor.com/2008/0311/p01s03-woeu.html (accessed 24th February 2009). See also Ibrahim Hatiboglu, 'Transmission of Western *ḥadīth* critique to Turkey: on the past and future of academic *ḥadīth* studies', *Journal of Ḥadīth Studies* 4:2 (2006), 37–53. Earlier discussions on reform can be discerned in the work of the Indian scholars Sayyid Ahmad Khan (1817–98) and Ameer Ali (1849–1928). The reform movement followed in the wake of the emergence of the pan-Islamic movement championed by Jamāl al-Dīn al-Afghānī and Muḥammad 'Abduh, although these two individuals were driven more by the goal of uniting the Islamic world as opposed to reviewing strategies towards the interpretation of scriptural sources. Afghānī was horrified at the efforts of Khan as were those representatives of orthodox Islam. See Christian W. Troll's *Sayyid Ahmad Khan: a Reinterpretation of Muslim Theology* (New Delhi: Vikas, 1978) and Martin Forward. *The Failure of Islamic Modernism*?: *Syed Ameer Ali's Interpretation of Islam* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1999). Also *Islam in Transition: Muslim Perspectives*, John J. Donohue and John L. Esposito (eds) (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007). Revisionist approaches to the traditions had appeared in the Arab world: Maḥmūd Abū Rayya. *Aḍwā' 'alā al-Sunna al-Muḥammadiyya* (Cairo, 1958). And for the discussion of *ḥadīth* and women see Barbara Freyer Stowasser, *Women in the Qur'an: Traditions, and Interpretation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994); *Beyond the Exotic: Women's Histories in Islamic*

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 36

Societies, Amira El-Azhary Sonbol (ed.) (New York: Syracuse University Press, 2005). Also Asma Barlas 'Believing Women' in *Islam: Unreading Patriarchal Interpretations of the Qur'an* (Texas, 2002), and Fatima Mernissi, *The Veil and the Male Elite: a Feminist Interpretation of Women's Rights in Islam*, translated by Mary Jo Lakeland.

10 Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī's *Taqyīd al-ʿilm*, Yūsuf al-ʿIshsh (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 *ḥadīth* 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 scholarships' understanding of this period: see Ibn Abī Ḥātim. *Taqdimat al-maʿrifa li-Kitāb Al-jarḥ wa'l-taʿdīl*, vol. 1, p. 2*f*.

12 Al-Rāmahurmuzī, *al-Muḥaddith*, pp. 613–16. Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Taqyīd al-ʿilm*, pp. 59, 106–8. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr. *Jāmiʿ bayān al-ʿilm wa faḍlihi* (Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 2007), pp. 107–8.

13 The Successors (*tābiʿūn*) 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 f/t 85). The evolution of the Islamic sciences is associated with figures among these *tābiʿūn* and the 'Successors of Successors': *tābiʿī al-tābiʿīn*. 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 *ḥadīth*', *Le Muséon, Revue d'Etudes Orientales* 118:3–4 (2005), 355–86; and Gautier Juynboll, 'Early Islamic society as reflected in its use of *isnāds*', *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 Isḥāq 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 *ḥadīth*. 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-Asqalānī, *Hadī al-sārī muqaddimat Fatḥ al-bārī sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 15 vols (Riyāḍ, Damascus: Dār al-Salām, Dār al-Fayḥā', 2000). Based on edited manuscripts of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ibn Bāz and Fu'ād ʿAbd al-Bāqī, introductory volume, pp. 8–9. See also the earlier Al-Khaṭṭābī, *Aʿlām al-sunan fī sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 2 vols, Yūsuf al-Kattānī (ed.) (Rabat: Maṭbaʿat al-ʿUkkāz, 1990). Other notable commentaries on al-Bukhārī's collection are *Irshād al-sārī*, compiled by al-Qasṭallānī (d. 922/1516) and *'Umdat al-qārī'* by Badr al-Dīn al-ʿAynī (d. 855/1451). A more recent work was by the twentieth century scholar Muhammad al-Shanqīṭī entitled *Kawthar al-maʿānī al-darārī fī kashf 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*

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 37

al-qudsī 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 ascribes statements to God, although these are distinguished from Qur'anic utterances.

15 For example Ibn Ḥanbal'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 *isnād*s. 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 *musnad*s are set out in al-Suyūṭī. *Tadrīb*, vol. 2, pp. 154–6. In the works classed as *muṣannaf*s, 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 *Ḥadīth* collection, *Arabica* 49 (2002) 376–82.

16 For a summary of different types of compilations see Zayn al-Dīn al-'Irāqī, *Al-Taqyīd wa'l-īḍāḥ*, pp. 29–35; and Suyūṭī. *Tadrīb*, vol. 2, pp. 88–144.

17 Further *Ṣaḥīḥ* compilations from later periods included the works of Ibn Khuzayma (223–311/923), Abū 'Awāna (d. 316/929), and Muḥammad al-Bustī, Ibn Ḥibbān (d. 354/965) whose *Kitāb al-Majrūḥīn wa'l-ḍu'afā' wa'l-matrūkīn*, 3 vols, Maḥmūd Ibrāhīm Zāyid (ed.) (Aleppo: Dār al-Wa'ī, A. H. 1398) was an influential *rijāl* source. Classical scholars insisted that both Bukhārī and Muslim never claimed to have encompassed all the authentic traditions: Zayn al-Dīn al-'Irāqī, *Al-Taqyīd wa'l-īḍāḥ*, p. 30 *f*. Also note the discussion by Shākir in his edition of Ibn Ḥibbān's *Ṣaḥīḥ* in which he draws attention to weaknesses in the *isnād* of a tradition declared *ṣaḥīḥ*. Note the nature of his analysis: vol. 1, p. 187. (f/n 2). *Ṣaḥīḥ* Ibn Ḥibbān (Arranged by 'Alā' al-Dīn al-Fārisī edited by Muḥammad Shākir) (Cairo, Dar al-Ma'ārif, 1952). Jonathan Brown, *The Canonization of Al-Bukhārī*. Cf. Ghassan Abdul-Jabbar, *Bukhari* (Makers of Islamic Civilisation Series) (Oxford: Oxford University Press; I. B. Taurus, 2007).

18 See al-Rāmahurmuzī, *al-Muḥaddith*, pp. 379–402 in which various *madhhab*s 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 *tadwīn*: 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' (*ṣaḥīfa*) 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 dirāya* in respect of *ḥadīth* scholarship: the former covers matters pertaining to the exact transmission of the very texts of statements (*matn* pl. *mutūn*) 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-Sitta: Mawsū'at al-ḥadīth al-sharīf* (*bāb bayān an al-isnād min al-dīn*), pp. 675–6.

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 38

Cf. *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī*, vol. 1, p. 84. And see al-Rāmahurmuzī, *al-Muḥaddith*, pp. 414–16. The renowned ʻAbd 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.

21 Loc. cit. and al-Rāmahurmuzī, *al-Muḥaddith*, pp. 414–16.

22 See Zayn al-Dīn al-ʻIrāqī, *Fatḥ al-mughīth*, pp. 13 *ff*. Also see the discussion in Nawawī's commentary on Muslim's *Ṣaḥīḥ* (p. 28) and the fact that some scholars (al-Khaṭṭābī) used the term *saqīm* when referring to *ḍaʻīf*. Dickinson has used the term sound for (*ṣaḥīḥ*) and fair for *ḥasan*. The quest for authenticity witnessed scholars seeking *isnād*s which had lesser numbers of intermediaries separating the initial narrator from the Prophet. It became part of the famous *riḥla fī ṭalab al-ḥadīth* (journeys in the quest for traditions) with shorter *isnād*s being called *al-ḥadīth al-ʻālī*. See Librande's article below (ch. 27). Also see al-Suyūṭī, *Tadrīb*, vol. 2, p. 160 *f*, in which figures such as Sufyān al-Thawrī and Ibn Ḥanbal state that the seeking *ʻulw* (shorter *isnād*s making them higher in rank) in *isnād*s was a *Sunna*.

23 Zayn al-Dīn al-ʻIrāqī, *Fatḥ al-mughīth*, pp. 13 *ff*; Zayn al-Dīn al-ʻIrāqī, *Al-Taqyīd*, pp. 23–6.

24 Of course, even if the narrators in an *isnād* were all deemed trustworthy (*thiqāt*), there remained further criteria which had to be applied when ranking the tradition: see Zayn al-Dīn al-ʻIrāqī, *Al-Taqyīd wa'l-īḍāḥ*, pp. 23–4; and Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bāʻith al-ḥathīth*, pp. 17–20. See the relevant definition of *ṣaḥīḥ* in Eerik Dickinson's *An Introduction to the Science of the Ḥadīth*, pp. 5–6.

25 Ibn Ḥajar *Nuzhat*, p. 45, and al-Suyūṭī. *Tadrīb*, vol. 1, p. 153 *ff* (al-Suyūṭī, *Tadrīb*, p. 179 *f*). Cf. Zayn al-Dīn al-ʻIrāqī, *Fatḥ al-mughīth*, pp. 50 *f* for a definition of *ḥasan*. Cf. Juynboll: *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 (*ḍabṭ*) 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*, *munqaṭiʻ*, *mudallas*, *shādhdh*, *munkar*, *muʻdal*, *ziyādāt al-thiqāt*, *muʻallal*, *muḍṭarib*, *mudraj*, *mawḍūʻ*, *maqlūb* can be looked up in Dickinson's *An Introduction to the Science*: see the following pages: pp. 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-ʻIrāqī's *Fatḥ al-mughīth*, pp. 66–147.

27 An array of terms was developed to rank narrators and these are set out in the *rijāl* literature under the rubric *marātib al-taʻdīl* (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: *ḥujja* (absolutely dependable); *thiqa; mutqin; thabt; laysā bihi ba's*; *ṣadūq*; *ṣāliḥ*; al-ʻIrāqī cites Ibn Abī Ḥātim as stating that if terms such as *laysā bihi ba's* or *ṣadūq* 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). *Marātib al-jarḥ* dealt with ranking impugned individuals using terms such as *kadhdhāb* or *waḍḍāʻ* (mendacious or given to forgery); *matrūk al-ḥadīth* (discarded as a narrator); *mardūd al-ḥadīth* (rejected as a narrator) and *layyin* (weak in memory). Also see Al-Khaṭīb's *al-Kifāya*, pp. 35–46; al-Zayn al-Dīn al-ʻIrāqī, *Fatḥ al-mughīth*, pp. 178–83. It became customary, particularly among jurists, to classify reports (*akhbār*) in terms

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 39

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 *mutawātir*; those with lesser degrees of frequency as far as the chains of transmissions are concerned were called the *āḥād*. The *āḥād* were further divided into *mashhūr*, *'azīz*, and *gharīb* categories, Al-Suyūṭī, *Tadrīb*, vol. 2, pp. 179–3 *ff*; al-Khaṭīb's *al-Kifāya*, pp. 16–19; Ibn Ḥajar *Nuzhat*, pp. 26–38; Zayn al-Dīn al-'Irāqī, *Fatḥ al-mughīth*, pp. 307–315. See also the discussion of *mutawātir* in Gautier Juynboll, '(Re)appraisal of some technical terms in Ḥadīth science', *Islamic Law and Society* 8:3 (2001), 303–49, 326–36. He translates *mutawātir* 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 past: the theory of *tawātur* according to Ghazālī', *Studia Islamica* 61 (1985), 81–105; also Wael Hallaq's 'On inductive corroboration, probability and certainty in Sunni legal thought', in *Islamic Law and Jurisprudence*, Nicholas Heer (ed.) (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1990), pp. 3–31. There was recognition among *ḥadīth* scholars that attaining *tawātir* in traditions was improbable; Al-Suyūṭī devoted a short tract encompassing such traditions entitled *Al-Azhār al-mutanāthira fī al-akbār al-mutawātira*.

28 The classical literature circumscribes methods for the acquisition and transmission of knowledge and these were listed in the following order of primacy: 1.) *Samā'*: this related to active audition and was considered the most esteemed form of transmission. It entailed a student listening to his mentor who might be reciting from memory or a book; the process might also involve dictation. 2.) *Qirā'a*: this involved reading before a mentor from memory or a book. It is sometimes referred to as *'Arḍ* and was likewise applied to instances where a student was present when someone else was engaged in *qirā'a* with a mentor. The teacher would listen and be in a position to correct students should the need arise. 3.) *Ijāza*: permission or license. This form of transmission has nine further sub-divisions in some of the literature. It basically involves a mentor granting permission to a specific student to disseminate a given text, a part thereof, or even a single narration. 4.) *Munāwala*: this would involve a mentor handing over a received text or document to a student or students who would then be told that they could disseminate that text or document; in its highest form *munāwalà* is sometimes equated with *ijāza*. 5.) *Mukātaba* or *al-Kitābà*: a scholar would himself write down some materials for an absent student, or indeed have them dictated for that individual. It would also cover instances in which a scholar would actually write the materials down himself and hand them to that very student. 6.) *I'lām*: this would entail a mentor 'informing' a student that a text or narration was from a certain source without the mentor expressly granting permission for it to be disseminated. 7.) *Waṣiyya*: this involved designating someone to pass on traditions by virtue of a will; this might be in the form of some sort of instruction in instances when someone was embarking on a journey. 8.) *Wijāda*: finding traditions in works and transmitting and passing them on (one might add it is through *wijāda* that many of the classical books on traditions are now received through printed editions of earlier texts). For definitions of all these designated forms of dissemination and acquisition see: al-Rāmahurmuzī, *al-Muḥaddith*, pp. 420–80; al-Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ, *Ilmā'*, pp. 62–121; Zayn al-Dīn al-'Irāqī, *Fatḥ al-mughīth*, pp. 187–229; Al-Suyūṭī, *Tadrīb*, vol. 2, pp. 8–61; Zayn al-Dīn al-'Irāqī, *Al-Taqyīd wa'l-īḍāḥ*, pp. 159–89. Even the technical compass of standard

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 40

formulae such as *ḥaddatha* (to narrate), *akhbara* (to relate), and *anba'a* (to inform), which had been used to introduce formally the *isnād*s 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 ʿAbd al-Barr, *Jāmiʿ bayān al-ʿilm wa faḍlihi* (Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 2007), pp. 465–72; Al-Khaṭīb's *al-Kifāya*, pp. 297–310; cf. Zayn al-Dīn al-ʿIrāqī. *Al-Taqyīd wa'l-īḍāḥ*, pp. 160 *ff*. Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ, *Ilmāʿ*, pp. 122–34. Some discussion on this can be found in Azami's *Studies in Ḥadīth 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 Ḥātim. *Taqdimat al-maʿrifa li-Kitāb Al-Jarḥ wa'l-tadīl*. vol. 1, pp. 4–6. He adds that it was through the channels of transmission (*naql*) and dissemination (*riwāya*) 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 traditions in which 'impugned' individuals featured in the *isnād*s. Thus, a lot would depend on the subject matter of the materials for which they were informants: see the discussion in Dhahabī's *Mizān al-iʿtidāl fī naqd al-rijāl*, 2 vols, Edited by ʿAlī Muḥammad al-Bajāwī (Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿArabiyya, 1963), pp. 1–3; al-Suyūṭī. *Tadrīb*, vol. 1, pp. 296–349. Paragons from these periods who regularly feature as authorities in the early *rijāl* literature include: Shuʿba ibn al-Ḥajjāj (d. 160/786), Yaḥyā ibn Saʿīd al-Qaṭṭān (d. 198/814), ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Mahdī (d. 198/814), Sufyān al-Thawrī (d. 161/787), Sufyān ibn ʿUyayna (d. 198/814), Yaḥyā ibn Maʿīn (d. 233/847), Ibn al-Madīnī (d. 234/848), Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, al-Bukhārī, Abū Zurʿa al-Rāzī (d. 264/878), Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī (d. 277/890). See the first volume of Ibn Abī Ḥātim's *Al-Jarḥ wa'l-taʿdīl* for biographical entries on these figures and many others.

32 See the survey by M. Young in M. Young, J.D. Latham, and R.B. Serjeant, (eds), *Religion, Learning, and Science in the Abbasid Period* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990) and Wadad al-Qadi, 'Biographical dictionaries: inner structure and cultural significance', in George Atiyeh (ed.), *The Book in the Islamic World* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1995), pp. 93–122. Also see F. Ḥammadah. *al-Manhaj al-Islamī fī'l-jarḥ wa'l-taʿdīl: dirāsah manhajiyah fī ʿulūm al-ḥadīth* (al-Ribāṭ, al-Maghrib: Maktabat al-Maʿārif, 1982); Franz Rosenthal, 'On medieval authorial bibliographies: Al-Yaʿqūbī and Ibn Ḥajar', *Literary Heritage of Classical Islam: Arabic and Islamic Studies in Honor of James A. Bellamy*, Mustansir Mir in collaboration with J. E. Fossum (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1993), pp. 255–74; George Makdisi, '*Ṭabaqāt*-biography: law and orthodoxy in classical Islam', *Islamic Studies* 32 (Islamabad) (1993), 371–96; Ruth Roded, *Women in the Islamic Biographical Collections* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1994); Eerik Dickinson, *The Development of Early Sunnite ḥadīth Criticism*: see the discussion in Chapter Six, pp. 80–126, especially pp. 121–2. For the more specialised *ḥadīth* inspired specialist biographies see Ibn Ḥanbal's *al-ʿIlal wa maʿrifat al-rijāl*, 2 vols, Waṣiyyat Allāh ʿAbbās (Beirut: Al-Maktab al-Islamī, 1988); Ibn Ḥibbān, Muḥammad al-Bustī, *Kitāb al-Majrūḥīn min al-muḥaddithīn* (cited above); Aḥmad ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-ʿIjlī, *Taʾrīkh al-thiqāt* (as arranged by Nūr al-Dīn al-Haythamī with revisions by Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī), A. Qalʿajī (ed.) (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1984); ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAdī al-Jurjānī *Al-Kāmil fī ḍuʿafāʾ al-rijāl*, 9 vols, ʿĀdil Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Mawjūd

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 41

and ʿAlī Muḥammad Muʿawwaḍ (eds) (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1997). Al-Dhahabī's *Mizān al-iʿtidāl fī naqd al-rijāl* is in many ways a supplement to al-Jurjānī's *Al-Kāmil:* see the intro., pp. 1–3, While, Ibn Ḥajar's *Lisān al-mizān*. 7 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al ʿIlmiyya, 1996) is based around al-Dhahabī's work. In his introduction to this work Ibn Ḥajar stresses that the traditions serve as a fulcrum of God's law. P. 97. ʿAlī ibn ʿUmar al-Dāraquṭnī, *Kitāb al-ḍuʿafā' wa'l-matrūkīn*, Ṣubḥī al-Sāmarrā'ī (ed.) (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1975). Also see Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Al-Istiʿāb fī maʿrifat al-aṣḥāb* and al-Samʿānī's *al-Ansāb*. Works were also devoted to verifying the dates of the deaths of narrators. See Iftikhar Zaman, 'The science of *rijāl* as a Method in the Study of *ḥadīth*s', *Journal of Islamic Studies* 5 (1994), 1–34. Also exploring the canons of criticism is Suhaib Ḥasan ʿAbd al-Ghaffār, *Criticism of Ḥadīth Among Muslims with Reference to Sunan Ibn Mājah* (London: Taha and Al-Qur'an Society, 1986).

33 See also Ibn Ḥajar's *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb* (Hyderabad: Dā'irat al-Maʿārif al-Nizāmiyya, A.H. 1325), 12 vols.

34 As is stated above ʿAbd al-Ghanī al-Maqdisī devoted his biographical treatise al-*Kamāl fī asmā' al-rijāl* to the narrators of these Six Books. Perceived shortcomings in the work inspired al-Mizzī to produce a commentary on this text (see his introduction pp. 147–8). Al-Dhahabī's al-*Kāshif fī maʿrifat man lahu riwāya fī'l-kutub al-sitta* was based on Mizzī's work.

35 Khalaf ibn ʿAbd al-Malik ibn Bashkuwāl, *Kitāb ghawāmiḍ al-asmā' al-mubhama al-wāqiʿa fī mutūn al-aḥādīth al-musnada*. Al-Dhahabī, *Al-Muqtanā fī sard al-kunā*, 2 vols (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1997). Muslim has a work entitled *Kitāb al-kunā wa'l-asmā'* and *al-kunā wa'l-asmā'* was the work of al-Dulābī (d. 320/932).

36 For example, Abū Aḥmad al-Ḥasan ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-ʿAskarī, *Taṣḥīfāt al-muḥaddithīn*, Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Shāfī (ed.) (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1988) and for a treatment specific to the general Islamic sciences see his *Sharḥ mā yaqaʿ fīhi al-taṣḥīf wa'l-taḥrīf*, ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Aḥmad (ed.) (Cairo: Maṭbaʿat Muṣṭafā al-Bābī, 1963). Al-Khaṭṭābī's *Iṣlāḥ ghalaṭ al-muḥaddithīn* is another such work.

37 See Zayn al-Dīn, *Fatḥ al-mughīth*, p. 147 and Al-Khaṭīb's *al-Kifāya*, pp. 133–35. A recent scholar ʿAbd Allāh al-Juday'. *Taḥrīr ʿulūm al-ḥadīth*, 2 vols. (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Rayyān, 2003), vol. 2, pp. 1108–1114, discusses a number of reports cited in the above works in which Ibn Ḥanbal is reported to have been less rigorous in scrutinising *isnāds* germane to *faḍā'il al-aʿmāl*, but suggests the very report implying this is in fact weak, p. 1109. See Melchert'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, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Muḥammad ʿUthmān (ed.) (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr, 1983).

38 The process of on going *ḥadīth* scrutiny is a salient feature of classical scholarship and continues even today: this is evident in the many works of Nāṣiruddīn al-Albānī. See Kamaruddin Amin, Nāṣiruddīn Albānī on Muslim's *Ṣaḥīḥ*. 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 *ḥadīth* literature, but across the literary sciences of Islam. The so-called *samāʿāt* (the list of authorities from whom a text was audited and transmistted).

41 The introduction of this term is dated to sometime around the late fifth/eleventh century: Muḥammad ibn Tāhir al-Maqdisī (d. 507/1113–4) listed Ibn Mājah's *Sunan* in his work entitled *Shurūṭ al-a'imma al-sitta* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 42

al-'Ilmiyya, 1984); earlier Muḥammad 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: *Shurūṭ al-a'imma 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 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī*, vol. 1, pp. 10–12. Al-Dārimī's *Musnad* (which was arranged in a *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, *Ḥadīth Literature*, pp. 73–4. And p. 69 for al-Dārimī.

42 The title of al-Bukhārī's work was *al-Jāmi' al-musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ al-mukhtaṣar min umūr rasūl Allāh wa sunanihi wa ayyāmihi*; while Muslim's work had the title *al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ al-mukhtaṣar min al-sunan bi-naql al-'adl 'an al-'adl 'an rasūl Allāh*. The term *musnad* reflected the fact that the *isnād*s were deemed continuous right back to the Prophet, while the use of the term *al-Jāmi'* implies that all the main topics covered by *ḥadīth* are included al-Bukhārī's work. Scholars did point out differences between the criteria (*shurūṭ*) 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 *rāwī* uses the term *'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 *ḥadīth* sciences that al-Bukhārī's work is superior in authority to that of Muslim: *al-Taqyīd wa'l-īḍāḥ*, 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, *Al-Taqyīd wa'l-īḍāḥ*, p. 30 *f.* Cf. Ibn Kathīr's, *al-Bā'ith*, p. 18 and see al-Mizzī. *Tahdhīb al-kamāl*, 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. *Tadrīb*, vol. 1, pp. 91 ff. Also see Nawawī's commentary on Muslim's *Ṣaḥīḥ* and the section on *Bāb ṣiḥat al-iḥtijāj bi'l-ḥadīth al-mu'an'an*, vol. 1, pp. 128–44. Al-Bukhārī included a number of suspended traditions (*mu'allaq*) in his collection: these were *matn*s in which the supporting *isnād* was wholly or partially elided; or those with one or two narrators missing from the beginning of his *isnād*. 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 *mu'allaq isnād*s in his commentary on al-Bukhārī's text. A number of the other *sunan* works included the full *isnād*s. See 'Abd Allāh al-Juday', *Taḥrīr 'ulūm al-ḥadīth*, vol. 2, p. 851. In this context mention is also made of Mālik's famous *balāghāt* (his use of reports which reached him without the requisite *isnād* documentation). Also see *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī*, vol. 1, pp. 16–17, in which it is stated that the *mu'allaq isnād* rarely occurs in Muslim's work. For a translation of Muslim's introduction see Gautier Juynboll, 'Muslim's introduction to his *Ṣaḥīḥ*, translated and annotated with an excursus on the chronology of *fitna* and *bida'a*', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 5 (1984), 263–311.

43 The works of Abū Dāwūd and Ibn Mājah took the title *Sunan*s; the former's *Sunan* comprises around 4300 traditions (5274 including repetitions). The *Jāmi'* of al-Tirmidhī's was referred to as *al-Jāmi' al-mukhtaṣar min al-sunan 'an rasūl*

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 43

Allāh wa maʿrifat al-ṣaḥīḥ al-maʿlūl wa mā ʿalayhi al-ʿamal; it was called the *Jāmiʿ al-Ṣaḥīḥ* by some but the use of this term was criticised: see Ibn Kathīr's *al-Bāʿith al-ḥathīth*, p. 25. The *Sunan* work of al-Nasāʾī was known as the *al-Mujtabā 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 (*zawāʾid*) traditions. See the edition of Ibn Mājah's collection by Fuʾād ʿAbd al-Bāqī. The *Muwaṭṭaʾ* 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 *zawāʾid* (additional) Ibn Mājah's work offered supplementary materials.

44 In his *Fatḥ al-mughīth*, p. 62, Zayn al-Dīn al-ʿIrāqī 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-Dārimī (181–255/797–868), al-Dāraquṭnī (306–385/918–995), Ibn Manda (d. 301/911); and al-Bayhaqī (384–458/994–1065) and even further *Musnads* such as the work of Abū Yaʿla al-Mawṣilī (201–307/816–919). Also significant was al-Ṭabarānī's (d. 360/970) *Muʿjam* works. One of these, entitled *al-Muʿjam al-Kabīr*, followed a *musnad* inspired alphabetical arrangement of Companion narrators. For a survey of the various types of collections consult M. Siddiqi, *Ḥadīth Literature*, pp. 43–57. Al-Tirmidhī included a final chapter on *ʿIlal* in his *Jāmiʿ* and this dealt with the canons of authentication applied in his work; it was the subject of a commentary by Ibn Rajab (d. 795/1392) entitled *Sharḥ ʿilal al-Tirmidhī*. Al-Tirmidhī introduced a number of new technical terms when classing traditions. Also see Ibn al-Ṣalāh's *Ṣiyānat Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim min al-iklāl wal-ghalaṭ*, Ehited by Muwaffaq ʿAbd al-Qādir (ed.) (Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1984).

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

47 Abū Nuʿaym al-Iṣfahānī (d. 430/1038), who was also the author of a *Mustakhrij ʿalā maʿrifat ūlūm al-ḥadīth*, but this was a text on the terminology of traditions (*ʿūlūm al-ḥadīth* or sciences) intended to complement materials missed by al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī in his text on the subject. Larger more general collections included: Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn, al-Bayhaqī, *Shuʿab al-īmān*, 17 Vols.

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 44

(ed.) M. Zaghlūl (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 2000). Ibn al-Athīr's *Jāmi' al-uṣūl*; and Ibn Kathīr's *Jāmi' al-asānīd wa'l-sunan: al-hādī li-aqwam al-sunan*, 37 vols, 'Abd al-Mu'ṭī Amīn Qal'ajī (ed.) (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al 'Ilmiyya, 1994), and the collection of traditions by 'Alī ibn Abī Bakr al-Haythamī, 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 *Musnads* of Ibn Ḥanbal, Al-Bazzār (d. 292/905) and al-Mawṣilī; it also includes materials from al-Ṭabarānī's (d. 360/970) famous *Mu'jam* works. Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī was the author of a work entitled *Jam' 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 Shī'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 Shī'ism, edited with a new introduction by Colin Turner and Paul Luft.

49 For a general summary of the issues see Herbert Berg, *The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam: the Authenticity of Muslim Literature from the Formative Period* (London: Curzon Press, 1999), p. 26 *f.* See the review of this work by Harald Motzki, 'The Question of the Authenticity of Muslim Traditions Reconsidered: A Review Article' in Berg's *Method and Theory*, pp. 211–57; and Herbert Berg (ed.). *Method and Theory*, 'Competing paradigms in the study of Islamic origins: Qur'ān 15:89–91 and the value of *isnāds*', pp. 259–90.

50 John. Walker, *A Catalogue of the Arab-Byzantine and Post-Reform Umaiyad Coins* (London, British Museum, 1956). Adolf Grohmann, 'The Problem of Dating the Early Qur'ans', *Der Islam* (1958:33), pp. 213–31; and his *From the World of Arabic Papyri* (Cairo: Al-Ma'ārif Press, 1952). Robert Hoyland, 'The content and context of early Arabic inscriptions', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 21 (1997), 77–102. And his recent 'Epigraphy and the Linguistic Background to the Qur'an.' In G. Reynolds (ed.), *The Qur'an in its Historical Context* (London: Routledge, 2008), pp. 51–69. For summaries see Sheila Blair. *Islamic Calligraphy* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007). And François Déroche. *Islamic Codicology: an Introduction to the Study of Manuscripts in Arabic Script* (Al-Furqan Islamic Heritage Foundation: London, 2006). Translated by Deke Dusinberre and David Radzinowicz. Edited by Muhammad Isa Waley.

51 See: Gregor Schoeler, *The Oral and the Written in Early Islam*, translated by Uwe Vagelpohl, edited and introduced by James E. Montgomery, Routledge Studies in Middle Eastern Literatures (London: Routledge, 2006). A. Görke. *Das Kitāb al-amwāl des Abū 'Ubaid al-Qāsim b. Sallam: Entstehung und Uberlieferung eines fruh-islamischen Rechtswerkes* (New Jersey, Princeton, Darwin, 2003). Tarif Khalidi, *Arabic Historical Thought in the Classical Period*, pp. 362–78 for a look at *ḥadīth* within the context of Islamic historical literature. Robert Hoyland. 'History, fiction, and authorship in the first centuries of Islam', in Julia Bray (ed.), *Writing and Representation in Medieval Islam: Muslim Horizons* (London and New York: Routledge, 2006), pp. 16–46. J. J. Witkam. 'Establishing the Stemma: Fact or Fiction?' *Manuscripts of the Middle East* (1988:3), pp. 88–101.

52 Norman Calder, *Studies in Early Muslim Jurisprudence* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993). The point is made that as far as the corpus of the *ḥadīth* is concerned the larger compilations and recensions of traditions appeared after the late second century and went through lengthy processes of transmission and dissemination.

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 45

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-Qanṭara* 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. Seikaly, 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.

53 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'ān 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 Loquitor*: 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-Ḥijāz 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

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 46

article entitled 'The implications of, and opposition to, the methods and theories of John Wansbrough', *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion* 9:1 (1997), pp. 3–22. See also Jawid Mojaddedi's article 'Taking Islam seriously: the legacy of John Wansbrough', *Journal of Semitic Studies* 45:1 (2000), 103–14; and Gerald Hawting, 'John Wansbrough, Islam, and monotheism', *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion* 9:1 (1997), 22–38. Relative to all this is the discovery of the Ṣan'a Qur'anic manuscripts. G-R., Puin, 'Observations on Early Qur'ān Manuscripts in Ṣan'a' *The Qur'an as Text*, Ed. Stefan Wild (Islamic Philosophy, Theology and Sciences: Texts and Studies, XXVII). (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996), pp. 107–111. Cf. Cook, Michael. Cook, 'The Stemma of the Regional Codices of the Koran', *Graeco-Arabica* (2004:9–10): pp. 89–104. Somewhat relevant is Alan Jones 'The Word Made Visible: Arabic Script and the Committing of the Qur'an to Writing' *Texts*, *Documents and Artefacts: Islamic Studies in Honour of D. S. Richards*. Ed. Chase F. Robinson (Islamic History and Civilization: Studies and Texts, 45). (Leiden: Brill, 2003) pp. 1–16.

54 See the discussion in Herbert Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory:* 'Competing paradigms in the study of Islamic origins'. For related arguments see Patricia Crone, 'Two legal problems bearing on the early history of the Qur'ān', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 18 (1994), 1–37. Claude Gilliot, 'The beginnings of Qur'ānic exegesis', in Andrew Rippin (ed.), *The Qur'ān: Formative Interpretation* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1999), pp. 1–27. Andrew Rippin, 'Lexicographical texts and the Qur'ān', in Andrew Rippin (ed.), *Approaches to the History of the Interpretation of the Qur'an* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), pp. 158–74. Andrew Rippin, '*Tafsīr Ibn ʿAbbā*s and criteria for dating early *Tafsīr* texts', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 18 (1994), 38–83. Andrew Rippin, 'Studying early *Tafsīr* texts', Miszellen: *Der Islam* (1995), pp. 310–23. Norman Calder. *Studies in early Muslim jurisprudence* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993).

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'anic 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-Ḥasan 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

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 47

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 *ḥadīth* were therefore products of an attempt to fill the void, albeit they were the residue of applied exegesis: John Burton 'Qur'an 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 *Ṣaḥīḥ* 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 *ḥadīth* 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.

60 Individuals such as Georg Stauth, Harald Motzki, Gregor Schoeler, Miklos Muryani and Kees Versteegh are placed within the sanguine camp: Georg Stauth, *Die Überlieferung des Korankommentars Mujāhid b. Gabr. Zur Frage der Rekonstruktion der in den Sammelwerken des 3. Fh. D. H. benutzten frühislamischen Quellenwerke*, PhD dissertation, Universität Gießen, 1969. Harald Motzki. 'The *Muṣannaf* of 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Ṣan'ānī as a Source of Authentic *aḥadīth* of the First Century', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 50:1991, pp.1–21 (Article no. 29 of this collection); Harald Motzki, *The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence*; Harald Motzki, 'The author and his work in the Islamic literature of the first centuries: the case of 'Abd al-Razzāq's *Muṣannaf*', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 28 (2003), 1–31 (Article no. 7 of this collection). Also Harald Motzki, 'Dating the So-Called *Tafsīr Ibn 'Abbās:* Some Additional Remarks' Jerusalem *Studies in Arabic and Islam* (2006:31), pp. 147–163. A number of Schoeler's articles have been translated and presented in the following work: Gregor Schoeler, *The Oral and the Written in Early Islam*, 'Abd Allāh ibn Wahb, *Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, 2 vols,

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 48

Miklos Muranyi (ed.) (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1993); and Miklos Muryani, *'Abd Allāh b. Wahb. Leben und werk. Al-Muwaṭṭa', Kitāb al-Muḥāraba*, Quellenstudien zur ḥadīth und Rechtsliteratur in Nordafrika (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1997). Kees Versteegh, *Arabic Grammar and Qur'anic Exegesis in Early Islam* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993). Also see Uri Rubin, *The Eye of the Beholder: the Life of Muḥammad as Viewed by the Early Muslims: a Textual Analysis* (Princeton, 1995); the chapter entitled the evidence of the *isnāds.* Also see Fred Donner. *Narratives of Islamic Origins: Beginnings of Islamic Historical Writing* (New Jersey: Princeton, 1998). Pp. 26–9. Further discussions about origins and authenticity are discussed by Robert Serjeant: 'Meccan Trade and the Rise of Islam: Misconceptions and Flawed Polemics', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (1990:110), pp. 472–86 in which he deals with Crone's reading of early Meccan trade as portrayed in the sources in *Meccan Trade and the Rise of Islam* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987). See Crone's response entitled 'Serjeant and Meccan Trade', *Arabica* (1992:39), 216–40. For further discussions on the authenticy of the early historical narratives see Michael Lecker's 'The Death of the Prophet Muḥammad's Father: Did Wāqidī invent some of the evidence?' *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*. (1995:145), pp. 9–27. Lecker also has a contribution in Berg's *Method and Theory* on the subject of 'King Ibn Ubayy and the *Quṣṣāṣ*', pp. 29–71. The article takes up the issue of the *status quo* in Medina and the significance of *sīra* reports, which intimated that upon the arrival of the Prophet in this agricultural settlement the Yathribīs had a leader, Ibn Ubayy, whom they were on the verge of crowning as their King. It is the veracity of this claim as presented in the work of Ibn Isḥāq that Lecker proceeds to consider, using the debate between Patricia Crone and Robert Serjeant concerning the traditional portrayal of the events in question as a starting point for his own treatment of the sources. See also Marco Schöller. 'Sīra and *tafsīr*: Muḥammad al-Kalbī on the Jews of Medina' in *The Biography of Muḥammad the Issue of the Sources*. Harald Motzki (ed.) Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2000), pp. 18–48.

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 Kūfan grammar and the *Tafsīr Muqātil*', *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, Muryani, 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), expecially the opening chapter.

63 Harald Motzki, 'The Question of the Authenticity of Muslim Traditions Reconsidered: A Review Article' in Berg, *Method and Theory*, pp. 211–12.

64 Harald Motzki (ed.), *Ḥadīth: Origins*, p. xxxvii.

65 In his introduction to Harald Motzki (ed.), *Ḥadīth: Origins and Development* (Aldershot: Variorum, 2004), Motzki mentions that classical scholarship's use

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 49

of *matn* criticism has been underestimated, p. xxxiii (f/n 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*s 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–xlix.

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.

68 Herbert Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory*, pp. 259–60. Sezgin believed extant compilations could be sourced to earlier written antecedents and that an exclusively written tradition existed from the time of the Prophet. Fuad Sezgin, *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums (Qur'ānwissenschaften, ḥadīth)* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967), cf. Gregor Schoeler, *The Oral and the Written in Early Islam*, p. 28. Nabia Abbott, *Studies In Arabic Literary Papyri, I: Historical Texts* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1957). See also Nabia Abbott, *Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri II, Qur'ānic Commentary and Tradition* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1967); Nabia Abbot, *Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri III, Language and Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1972). Mustafa Azami, *Studies in Early Hadīth Literature.*

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.

70 Mustafa Azami, *Studies in Early Hadīth Literature*, p. 19.

71 Herbert Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory*, p. 261. See f/n no. 4. Berg's point is that these modern scholars had accepted that the *isnād*s 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, Miszellen: 'Studying early *ṭafsīr* 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*

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 50

Literature to the End of the Umayyad Period, pp. 317–21, in which a useful summary of the issues is presented.

75 al-Rāmahurmuzi, *al-Muḥaddith al-fāṣil*, p. 159.

76 This much is evident from the available bibliographies of *ḥadīth* studies. For example see http://www-personal.umich.edu/~beh/islam_hadith_bibl.html; and http://www.uga.edu/islam/hadith.html. See also the *Journal of Ḥadīth Studies* http://www.hadisevi.com/index-e.htm Accessed 10th March 2009. Munawwar Anees and Alia N. Athar, *Guide to Sira and Hadith Literature in Western Languages* (London, New York, 1986).

77 The work was published in 1889–90 with large parts of it being devoted to the subject of *ḥadīth.* 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 *ḥadīths* were primary sources.

79 Alors Sprenger, 'On the origin and progress of writing down historical facts among the Musulmans', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1856), 303–29. Joseph Horovitz, 'Alter und Ursprung des *Isnād*', *Der Islam* 8 (1918), 39–47.

80 Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, vol. 2, p. 18.

81 Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, vol. 2, p. 19.

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

83 Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, vol. 2, pp. 42–3. See also Julius Wellhausen, *The Religio-Political Factions in Early Islam*, R. C. Ostle (ed.), translated by R. C. Ostle and S. M. Walzer (Amsterdam, Oxford: North-Holland Publishing, 1975).

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-Ṣaḥāba*) are technically defined as individuals who lived during the time of the Prophet having met him and embraced the faith; while, the Successors (*al-Tābi'ūn*) are those individuals who were contemporary with the *al-Ṣaḥāba* but had not met the Prophet. See *Ṣaḥīḥ 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 Ḥanbal 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 *Tābi'ūn.* Al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī's *Ma'rifat*, pp. 22–25 devotes a section to twelve classes (*ṭabaqāt*) of Companions.

86 Goldziher also referred to the phenomenon of *al-riḥla fī ṭalab 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

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 51

endeavour as it simply added to the stock of materials in circulation. Goldziher devotes a chapter to this practice, Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, vol. 2, pp. 164–80.

87 Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, vol. 2, pp. 42–3.

88 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 *ḥadīth* 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.

89 Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, vol. 2, pp. 43–4.

90 Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, vol. 2, p. 44.

91 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.

92 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 aides-mémoire or lecture notes, and published books'. Alors Sprenger, 'On the origin and progress of writing', cited above.

93 For further on this see: Mustafa Shah, Review Article of Gregor Schoeler, *The Oral and the Written in Early Islam,* in the *Journal of Qur'anic Studies 10.1* (Edinburgh University Press: 2008), pp. 98–122. See. Pp. 109–115.

94 Michael Cook, 'The opponents', pp. 490–3.

95 Michael Cook, 'The opponents', pp. 490–3.

96 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, Patrica 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 *sīra* Texts: the *Hijra* in the Corpus of 'Urwa ibn Zubayr', *Der Islam* (2005:82), pp. 209–220.

97 Burton, John. *The Collection of the Qur'ān* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977). Cf. for an overview of the background of *qirā'āt* see the entry in the *Encyclopaedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*. Kees Versteegh (ed.), vol. 4 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2008), pp. 4–11.

98 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.

99 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

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 52

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.

100 Joseph Schacht, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954), p. 4; The classical corpus of traditions was in his view replete with many inauthentic traditions. See Joseph Schacht, 'A Revaluation of Islamic Traditions', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1949), pp. 143–54.

101 Joseph Schacht, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*. See the Preface.

102 Joseph Schacht, p. 58.

103 His thesis is that two generations before al-Shāfi'ī, reference to traditions from the Companions and Successors was the rule, while reference to the Prophet was the exception; al-Shāfi'ī 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 Ḥadīth*. P. xxiii.

105 Joseph Schacht, *Origins*, p. 57.

106 Joseph Schacht, *Origins*, p. 163.

107 Joseph Schacht, *Origins*, p. 37 and pp. 163–75.

108 Joseph Horovitz, 'Alter und ursprung des *isnād*'.

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 *rāwī*s 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*).

112 Harald Motzki, *The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence*, p. xiii; and Harald Motzki, 'The Prophet and the cat: on dating Mālik's *Muwaṭṭa'* and legal traditions', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 22 (1998), 18–83; and Wael Hallaq. 'On Dating Mālik's *Muwaṭṭa'* '. *UCLA Journal of Islamic and Near Eastern Law* (20012:1.1), pp. 47–65.

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

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 53

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'.

114 Both scholars refer to the work of the Byzantinist scholar Paul Alexander in this respect 'Medieval apocalypses as historical sources', *The American Historical Review* 73 (1968), 997–1018. For further context see Wilferd Madelung, 'Apocalyptic prophesies in Hims in the Umayyad age', *Journal of Semitic Studies* 31 (1986), 141–85. Also Lawrence Conrad, 'Umar at Ṣargh: the evolution of an Umayyad tradition on flight from the plague', in Stefan Leder (ed.) *Story-telling in the Framework of Non-fictional Arabic Literature* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1998), pp. 488–528. Also Harald Motzki (ed.), *Ḥadīth: Origins and Development*, in which he outlines some of his own criticisms of Cook's reasoning, pp. xl–xli.

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 Hadīth 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: *Uṣūl al-fiqh al-Islamī li'l-mustashriq Schacht: dirāsa 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 *isnād*s 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 *isnād*s 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 *isnād*s 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 *isnād*s, 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 of or tampering with *isnād*s', 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?

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 54

Eine kritische Untersuchung von G. H. A. Juynboll: "Nāfiʿ the *mawlā* of ibn 'Umar"; and his position in Muslim Ḥadīth literature', *Der Islam* 73 (1996), 40–80, and 193–231, although Juynboll has argued in his *Encyclopaedia* (p. 435) that these points are unconvincing excursions. Motzki takes the view that when examined in detail examples of the common link can be shown to be the result of real transmission processes. Harald Motzki, 'The collection of the Qurʾan: a reconsideration of Western views in light of recent methodological developments', *Der Islam* (2001), pp. 2–34, p. 28. See Marston, R Speight. 'The will of Saʿd b. Abī Waqqās: the growth of a tradition'. *Der Islam* (1973:50), pp. 249–67 and David Powers, 'The will of Saʿd b. abī Waqqās: A Re-assessment', *Studia Islamicus* (1983:58), pp. 33–53.

119 Op. cit., p. 23.

120 Gautier Juynboll, *Muslim Tradition*, p. 207. Motzki, 'The question of the Authenticity of Muslim Traditions Reconsidered: A Review Article', pp. 214–5. And See Rafael Talmon's 'Review of Juynboll, Gautier, *Muslim Tradition: Studies in Chronology, Provenance and Authorship of Early* Ḥadīth, *Cambridge Studies in Islamic Civilisation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983). *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* (1988:10), pp. 248–257.

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', '*isnād* 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 Ḥadīth science'. Juynboll states that a bundle reflects the transmission path of a tradition from 'old times to the lifetimes 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 *mutābiʿ*. See *Encyclopaedia*, p. xxiii *f*. His other important studies include 'Some *isnād* analytical methods illustrated on the basis of several woman-demeaning sayings from Ḥadīth literature', *Al-Qanṭara*: *Revista de Estudios Arabes* 10 (1989), 343–84; 'The role of *Muʿammarūn* in the early development of the *isnād*', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 81 (1991), 155–75; and 'Dyeing the hair and beard in early Islam: a Ḥadīth-analytical study, *Arabica* 33 (1986), 49–75. G. H. A. Juynboll, Shuʿba b. al-Ḥajjāj (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 Shuʿba, 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 Shuʿba's devising *isnād* 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 Shuʿba 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 *ḥadīth*. 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

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 55

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.

122 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.

123 Among James Robson's other studies are 'The transmission of Muslim's *Ṣaḥīḥ*', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1949: 49–60); 'The transmission of Abū Dāwūd's *Sunan*', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 14 (1952), 579–88; 'The transmission of al-Nasā'ī's *Sunan*', *Journal of Semitic Studies* 1 (1956), 38–59; 'The transmission of Tirmidhī's *Jāmi'* ', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 16:2 (1954), 258–70; 'The Form of Muslim tradition', *Glasgow University Oriental Society*, (1955–6:16), pp. 38–50; 'The transmission of Ibn Mājah's *Sunan*', *Journal of Semitic Studies* 3 (1958), 129–41; 'The material of tradition', *Muslim World* 41 (1951), 166–80 and 257–70; 'Tradition: standards applied by Muslim traditionists', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 43 (1960), 459–79. He also translated the famous *Mishkāt al-Maṣābīḥ*, al-Tibrīzī's revised version of al-Baghawī's collection of traditions.

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

125 See his study of this figure: Christopher Melchert, *Ahmad ibn Hanbal* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2005). And for the editions of the *Musnad* see Gautier Juynboll, 'Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir (1892–1958) and his edition of Ibn Ḥanbal's *'Musnad', Der Islam* 9 (1972), 221–47. The point about Ibn Ḥanbal's standard of authentication when citing material germane to *al-targhīb wa'l-tarhīb* is also touched upon in Allāh al-Juday'. *Taḥrīr 'ulūm al-ḥadīth*, vol. 2, pp. 1108–1114.

126 These were preserved in *masā'il* works which were essentially a collection of legal opinions proffered by scholars such as Ibn Rāhawahy and Ibn Ḥanbal on legal topics. Al-Kawsaj (d. 251/865) collated both these figures' *masā'il*. Such sources were inductively analysed in order to construct the juridical methodology applied in their synthesis.

127 He suggests that Bukhārī's authorship of the *Ṣaḥīḥ* 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.

128 Herbert Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory*, Christopher Melchert 'The early history of Islamic Law', pp. 293–324, p. 324.

129 It was Marshall Hodgson who first coined the term 'hadith folk' in his work: *The Venture of Islam*, 3 vols (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), vol. 1, p. 234. For Sufism and traditionists see Ahmet Karamustafa, *Sufism: the Formative Period* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), pp. 87 *ff*. Also related are: George Makdisi, 'The Ḥanbalī School and Sufism', *Boletin de la Asociacion Espanola de Orientalistas* 15 (1979), 115–26. George Makdisi, 'Ḥanbalite Islam', in M. L. Swartz (ed.), *Studies on Islam* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), pp. 216–74. Christopher Melchert. 'The Ḥanābila and the early Sufis', *Arabica* 48:3 (2001), 352–67. Qamar al-Huda, 'Qur'an and Ḥadīth in the School of al-Suhrawardī', in Khaleel Mohammed and Andrew Rippin (eds), *Coming to Terms with the Qur'an: a Volume in Honor of Professor Issa Boullata, McGill University* (New Jersey: Islamic Publications, 2008), pp. 159–76.

TH_Vol1_A02.qxd 9/11/09 14:05 Page 56

130 See also Robert Gleave, 'Between *ḥadīth* and *fiqh*: the "canonical" *imāmī* collections of *akhbār*', *Islamic Law and Society* 8:3 (2001), 350–82; and Rainer Brunner, 'The role of *ḥadīth* as cultural memory in Shī'ī history', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 30 (2005), 318–60. A place such as Kufa was an important centre for Shī'ite traditionist scholarship, but it was soon displaced by Qumm in the third century: Shī'ī Ḥadīth 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).

131 Cf. Aishah Geissinger, 'The exegetical traditions of 'Āi' sha: some notes on their impact and significance', *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 6:1 (2004), 1–21.

132 See also Leonard Librande, 'The supposed homogeneity of technical terms in Ḥadīth study', *Muslim World* 72 (1982), 34–50.

133 Franz Rosenthal, 'Muslim social values and literary criticism: reflections on the Ḥadīth of Umm Zar'', *Oriens* 34 (1994), 31–56. Jamal Elias, 'The *Ḥadīth* traditions of 'Āi'sha as prototypes of self-narrative', *Edebiyat* 7:2 (N.S. 1997), 215–33. Sahair Calamawy. 'Narrative Elements in the Ḥadīth Literature'. In: Beeston, A. F. L., *et al.* (Eds.), *Arabic Literature to the End of the Umayyad Period* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 308–16.

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

135 A number of Joseph Kister's other studies include: 'Rajab is the Month of God. A study in the Persistence of an early tradition', *Israel Oriental Studies* 1 (1971), 191–223; '*Ḥaddithū 'an banī isra'īla wa-lā ḥaraja*: a study of an early tradition', *Israel Oriental Studies* 2 (1972), 215–39; 'Pare your nails: a study of an early tradition', *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 11 (1979), 63–70; 'A bag of meat: a study of an early ḥadīth', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 33 (1970), 267–75; 'O God, tighten thy grip on Mudar . . . some socio-economic and religious aspects of an early *ḥadīth', Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 24 (1981), 242–73; 'Land property and *jihād*: a discussion of some early traditions', *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 34:3 (1991), 270–311; 'Adam: a study of some legends in *tafsīr* and *ḥadīth* literature', *Israel Oriental Studies* 13 (1993), 113–74; 'The locust's wing: some notes on locusts in the *ḥadīth*', *Le Museon* 106:3 (1993), 347–59; ' "And He was born circumcised": some notes on circumcision in *ḥadīth*', *Oriens* 34 (1994), 10–30; ' "The Crowns of this Community" . . . Some notes on the turban in the Muslim tradition', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, no. 24 pp. 217–245, 2000. Other content based studies include Roberto Tottoli, 'At Cock-crow: some Muslim Traditions about the Rooster'. *Der Islam*, (vol. 76, no. i, pp. 139–147, 1999. R Tottoli. 'Muslim Traditions Against Secular Prostration and Inter-religious Polemic'. *Medieval Encounters* (1999:5.1), pp. 99–111. And 'Muslim Attitudes Towards Prostration (*sujud*) II: the Prominence and Meaning of Prostration in Muslim Literature'. *Le Museon* (1998:111.3), pp. 405–426, 1998.

136 Cf. David Cook, 'New Testament citations in the *ḥadīth* literature and the question of early Gospel translations into Arabic, in Emmanaluela Grypeou, Mark Swanson and David Thomas (eds), *The Encounter of Eastern Christianity with Early Islam* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2006), pp. 185–223.