CRITICAL RIGOR VS. JURIDICAL PRAGMATISM: HOW LEGAL THEORISTS AND ḤADĪTH SCHOLARS APPROACHED THE BACKGROWTH OF *ISNĀD*S IN THE GENRE OF *ʿILAL AL-ḤADĪTH*

JONATHAN BROWN

Abstract

Modern scholarship has accepted the 'backgrowth of *isnād*s' in the early ḥadīth tradition, but this phenomenon did not occur without controversy among classical Muslim scholars. Ḥadīth critics were aware that material was being pushed back to the Prophet, a phenomenon they approached through the lens of *ziyāda* (addition). By examining works devoted to criticizing ḥadīth narrations (*ʿilal*) from the 3rd/9th to the 8th/14th centuries, we will see that the original non-Prophetic versions of many ḥadīths survived alongside their Prophetic counterparts well into the 5th/11th century. More importantly, certain ḥadīth scholars from the 3rd/9th to the 7th/13th centuries believed that Prophetic reports in the canonical ḥadīth collections were actually statements of other early Muslims. The position of these critics, however, was marginalized in the 5th/11th century, when mainstream Sunni jurists chose to accept the Prophetic versions categorically. Although the jurists' position became dominant in Sunni Islam, criticism of the backgrowth of *isnād*s has continued in the work of select ḥadīth scholars until today.

Introduction

According to current scholarship, the 3rd/9th century witnessed the culmination of a movement from a reliance on the legal precedents of various early Muslim authority figures to a focus on the Prophet's legacy. In the ḥadīth tradition, this phenomenon manifested itself in the backgrowth of *isnād*s: instances in which Muslim scholars of the 2nd/8th and early 3rd/9th century attributed the legal and doctrinal maxims of members of the early Muslim community to the

Correspondence: Jonathan Brown, Dept. of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, University of Washington, 229 Denny Hall, Box 353120, Seattle, WA, 98195-3120. *E-mail*: brownj@uchicago.edu.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2007

Also available online – www.brill.nl

Prophet. It was these reports, falsely ascribed to the Prophet, which comprised the bulk of the great canonical and non-canonical ḥadīth collections produced in the mid to late 3rd/9th century.

The backgrowth of *isnād*s, however, did not occur without controversy. It sparked a debate among Muslim scholars that lasted into the 5th/11th century and vestiges of which survive to this day. Muslim ḥadīth critics of the Abbasid period were keenly aware that material was being pushed back to the Prophet, although they clearly extended more charity to the ḥadīth tradition than Western scholars. These Muslim scholars explained the backgrowth of *isnād*s in terms of the concept of *ziyāda*, or Addition, according to which a report from a Companion or later figure was inappropriately raised up to the Prophet. Although the great ḥadīth collections of the 3rd/9th century did indeed focus almost exclusively on Prophetic reports, non-Prophetic versions of these reports survived alongside them in other works well into the 5th/11th century. By examining books devoted to criticizing ḥadīth narrations (*kutub al-ʿilal*) from the late 3rd/9th to the 8th/14th century, we will see that certain ḥadīth scholars of the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries believed that reports considered Prophetic in the canonical ḥadīth collections were actually statements made by Companions and other early Muslims. The position of these rigorous scholars, however, was marginalized in the 5th/11th century, when influential Sunni scholars elected to accept the Prophetic versions of such reports regardless of evidence for the backgrowth of their *isnād*s. This development occurred as part of an open debate over Addition in which the pragmatic position of the jurists and legal theorists ultimately triumphed over the emphasis of ḥadīth critics on historical accuracy. Although the majority of influential participants in the later Sunni ḥadīth tradition embraced the jurists' position, criticism of the backgrowth of *isnād*s has continued in the work of select ḥadīth scholars until today.

The Schachtian Framework and the Backgrowth of Isnād*s*

All interpreters in the early Islamic tradition derived their authority from a perceived connection to the Prophet, either through reports transmitted from him, teachings inherited from his Companions, or a reputation for piety in the Prophet's idiom. By the dawn of the 3rd/9th century, however, these varied and often competing con-

nections to the Prophet's legacy had inundated legal discourse with a cacophony of authoritative statements from the Prophet, his Companions, their students and finally early legal synthesists like Abū Ḥanīfa (d. 150/767), Mālik b. Anas (d. 179/795) and al-Layth b. Saʿd (d. 175/791).

Beginning with Goldziher's analysis of the explosive growth of Prophetic reports in the early Abbasid period and later Joseph Schacht's pioneering study of legal ḥadīths, Orientalists concluded that Muslim scholars of the late 2nd/8th and early 3rd/9th centuries attempted to resolve this interpretive plurality by investing the legal reports of the Prophet with more authority.[1] This transition has been associated with Muḥammad b. Idrīs al-Shāfiʿī (d. 204/819-20), whose famous *Risāla* documents his campaign to identify the notion of authoritative precedent (*sunna*) solely with Prophetic ḥadīths.[2]

As articulated by Schacht, this movement from the precedent of the community to the precedent of the Prophet has become the regnant vision of early Islamic legal history. Even one of Schacht's most vociferous critics, Wael Hallaq, agrees that by approximately 830 CE "the full authority to determine the law was transferred from the hands of Muslims to those of God and his Messenger."[3] Al-Shāfiʿī represented the culmination of this process: "[t]he elimination of the role of the Companions' reports from the construction of law was completed by Muḥammad Ibn Idrīs al-Shāfiʿī… who insisted, consistently and systematically, that the Quran and the Sunna of the Prophet are the sole material sources of the law."[4]

---

[1] See Ignaz Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, ed. and trans. S.M. Stern and C.R. Barber (Chicago: Aldine Atherton, 1971), 2:76 ff. For surveys of the state of the field of the early Islamic tradition and the authenticity question, see: Harald Motzki, *The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence: Meccan Fiqh before the Classical Schools*, trans. Marion H. Katz (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 1-49; idem, "Dating Muslim Traditions: a Survey," *Arabica* 52, no. 2 (2005): 204-53; Fred M. Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins: The Beginnings of Islamic Historical Writing* (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1998), 1-25; Ze'ev Maghen, "Dead Tradition: Joseph Schacht and the Origins of 'Popular Practice,'" *Islamic Law and Society* 10, no. 3 (2003): 276-347.

[2] Joseph Schacht, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), 13. For discussions of Schacht's thought, see Motzki, *The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence*, 18 ff.

[3] Wael B. Hallaq, "The Authoritativeness of Sunni Consensus," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 18 (1986): 431; idem, *A History of Islamic Legal Theories* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 17.

[4] Hallaq, *A History of Islamic Legal Theories*, 18.

Building on the contributions of Susan Spectorsky and Harald Motzki, Christopher Melchert has adjusted the Schachtian framework by noting that Schacht took al-Shāfiʿī too much at his word; in the first half of the 3rd/9th century, Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855) and ʿAbd al-Razzāq al-Ṣanʿānī (d. 211/827) continued to rely on the legal opinions of the Companions when Prophetic ḥadīths were absent.[5] Nonetheless, Melchert agrees that one of the general defining developments of jurisprudence in the 3rd/9th century was that "hadith reports from the Prophet eclipsed reports from the Companions and later authorities."[6]

According to the Schachtian framework, the movement away from the precedent of numerous authoritative figures such as the Prophet's Companions and their Successors to the Prophet himself manifested itself in the 'backgrowth' of *isnād*s. Schacht's reasoning was simple and clear. Books surviving from what he termed the "ancient" schools of law, like Mālik's *Muwaṭṭa'*, include far more authoritative reports from later figures than from the Prophet himself.[7] The collections compiled after al-Shāfiʿī, however, such as the canonical Six Books and the *Sunan* of al-Dāraquṭnī (d. 385/995), were undeniably focused on Prophetic reports.[8] Furthermore, these collections often included reports attributed to the Prophet that the authors of earlier ḥadīth collections had attributed to Companions or Successors. A report in the *Muwaṭṭa'* may be attributed to a Companion, while a generation later al-Shāfiʿī attributes the same report to the Prophet through a defective *mursal isnād* (in which there exists a gap in the *isnād* between the Prophet and the person

---

[5] Christopher Melchert, "The Traditionist-Jurisprudents and the Framing of Islamic Law," *Islamic Law and Society* 8, no. 3 (2001): 401. See also Susan A. Spectorsky, "Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal's Fiqh," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 102 (1982): 461-5; 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 (1991): 1-21.

[6] Melchert, "The Traditionist-Jurisprudents and the Framing of Islamic Law," 399.

[7] Schacht, *Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, 22. Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā al-Laythī's recension of the *Muwaṭṭa'*, for example, contains 1,720 narrations, of which 613 are statements of the Companions, 285 of the Successors and 61 with no *isnād* at all; Muhammad Abd al-Rauf, "*Ḥadīth* Literature–I: the Development of the Science of *Ḥadīth*," in *The Cambridge History of Arabic Literature: Arabic Literature until the End of the Umayyad Period*, eds. A.F.L Beeston et al. (London: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 273.

[8] Schacht, *Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, 4.

quoting him). Two generations later, in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of al-Bukhārī (d. 256/870), we find the same ḥadīth with a complete *isnād* to the Prophet.[9] Schacht contended that the Prophetic versions of these reports had clearly been forged after the compilation of works such as the *Muwaṭṭa'*, since if they had existed earlier, then scholars like Mālik no doubt would have included them in their writings to trump their adversaries in legal debates.[10]

According to the Schachtian framework, the development of legal discourse in the first two and a half centuries of Islam was thus a slow process of finding more and more compelling sources of authority for legal or doctrinal maxims. Statements from Successors, especially polemical ḥadīths, were the oldest and thus most historically accurate.[11] In debates between early legal scholars, however, the problem of competing Successor reports was solved by disingenuous experts attributing these statements to the next highest rung on the ladder of authority: the Companions of the Prophet. We should thus treat these Companion reports as historical fabrications.[12] By the mid 2nd/8th century, the problem of competing reports from the Companions resulted in such statements being pushed back to the Prophet himself. Al-Shāfiʿī proved the greatest champion of this total reliance on Prophetic ḥadīths. Since the major Sunni ḥadīth collections consist almost entirely of reports from the Prophet, much of their material must have been put into circulation after al-Shāfiʿī's time.[13]

Schacht's conclusions yielded a simple rule: the farther back the *isnād* of a ḥadīth goes, the more assured we should be of its fabrication and the later the date that this fabrication occurred.[14] Schacht's conclusions have been further developed by G.H.A. Juynboll,[15] and

---

[9] Ibid., 165-6.

[10] Schacht, "A Revaluation of Islamic Tradition," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1949): 151.

[11] Schacht, *Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, 157.

[12] Ibid., 150.

[13] Ibid., 4-5.

[14] See Schacht, *Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, 39, 165; idem, "A Revaluation of Islamic Tradition," 147.

[15] G.H.A. Juynboll, "Some Isnad-Analytical Methods Illustrated on the Basis of Several Woman Demeaning Sayings from Hadith Literature," *al-Qantara* 10 (1989): 353, 369; idem, *Muslim Tradition: Studies in Chronology, Provenance and Authorship in Early Ḥadīth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 17; idem, "Islam's First *Fuqahā'*," *Arabica* 39, no. 3 (1992): 299-300.

together their discussion of the backgrowth of *isnād*s has provided the dominant framework for approaching early Islamic intellectual history.[16]

The research of Harald Motzki, however, has demonstrated that Schacht's and Juyboll's conclusions about the origins and dating of ḥadīth are problematic. First, Schacht's premise that an early scholar's failure to employ a Prophetic ḥadīth in a debate in which it would have been pertinent somehow proves that this Prophetic ḥadīth did not exist at that time was a flawed argument *e silentio*.[17] Perhaps the scholar did not know the ḥadīth existed or did not consider it useful for that argument. Second, by consulting a range of sources far more expansive than those examined by Schacht and Juynboll, Motzki has demonstrated that certain traditions (here we will use the term 'tradition' to indicate the general text a ḥadīth, while 'narration' will denote a specific transmission of that report) actually appeared earlier than these previous scholars believed. Rather than being active forgers of ḥadīth, early legal scholars and ḥadīth transmitters such as al-Zuhrī (d. 124/742-3), Ibn Jurayj (d. 150/767) and Sufyān b. ʿUyayna (d. 196/811) were in general reliably passing on reports from the previous generation. By showing that two independent sources had heard a report from a common reference, Motzki was able to date some ḥadīths to the time of the Companions in the second half of 1st/7th century.[18]

Yet a central tenet of the Schachtian framework remains: *isnād*s do seem to have grown backwards. A Companion report that Mālik inserted in his *Muwaṭṭa'* in the mid 2nd/8th century appears as a Prophetic ḥadīth in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* a century later. How did the Muslim scholarly community respond to this development? Could this significant change in legal epistemology have occurred silently

---

[16] See, for example, Michael Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma: A Source-Critical Approach* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 110; Fred Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins*, 120; Norman Calder, *Studies in Early Muslim Jurisprudence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 189.

[17] See Motzki, "*Quo vadis, Ḥadīṯ*-Forschung? Eine kritische Untersuchung von G.H.A. Juynboll: 'Nāfiʿ the *mawlā* of Ibn ʿUmar, and his position in Muslim *Ḥadīṯ* Literature,'" *Der Islam* 73, no. 1 (1996): 40-80.

[18] Motzki, *The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence*, 297; idem, "The *Muṣannaf* of ʿAbd al-Razzāq al-Ṣanʿānī," 18-20. See also, Motzki, "The Murder of Ibn Abī Ḥuqayq," in *The Biography of Muḥammad,* ed. Harald Motzki (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 170-239; idem, "Der Fiqh des Zuhrī: die Quellenproblematik," *Der Islam* 68 (1991): 1-44.

and left no trace?[19] As Fred Donner states in his rebuttal of the revisionist school of Islamic historiography, it is inconceivable that the divided and decentralized early Muslim community could somehow orchestrate a "comprehensive redaction of the tradition as a whole into a unified form"[20] without leaving ample historical evidence. Similarly, Motzki notes that the forgery of ḥadīths on a mass scale would have been prevented by the communal oversight of ḥadīth scholars.[21] As a corollary, we can posit that the massive backgrowth of *isnād*s could not have swept across the landscape of Islamic scholarship with no cries of alarm.

As we shall see, it did not. Rather, the movement from Companion and Successor reports to ḥadīths of the Prophet left in its trail discarded non-Prophetic reports and an ongoing controversy over the proper priorities of ḥadīth criticism. Western scholars have overlooked evidence of this lingering debate because they have so far focused almost exclusively on the great ḥadīth compendia of the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries. Expanding our scope of analysis to include collections of flawed reports (*kutub al-ʿilal*) shows that some ḥadīth scholars were very aware of the backgrowth of *isnād*s and that a debate over which versions of a report were the most accurate continued for centuries after the compilation of the canonical ḥadīth collections in the 3rd/9th century.

This is not to suggest that Muslim ḥadīth critics acknowledged the backgrowth of *isnād*s on the scale that Schacht, Juynboll and others have described. Muslim scholars maintained much more charitable presuppositions towards transmitted material. The ḥadīth corpus is so vast that our attitudes towards its authenticity are necessarily based more on the axioms of our critical worldview

---

[19] This seems to be the contention of Juynboll, who states that the process of "doctoring" Companion reports (in which they were ascribed to the Prophet in the wake of al-Shāfiʿī's career) left us with the original, Companion versions in the earliest surviving ḥadīth sources but not in later works like the canonical ḥadīth collections. As we shall see, these original Companion reports did indeed survive in later sources—outside the ḥadīth canon. Juynboll does note, however, that Muslim ḥadīth critics identified certain transmitters as being guilty of "raising" reports up to the Prophet; Juynboll, "Islam's First *Fuqahāʾ*," 299-300; idem, "Rafʿ," *Encyclopaedia of Islam* CD-ROM edition v. 1.0.

[20] Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins*, 27.

[21] Motzki, "Dating Muslim Traditions: a Survey," 235.

than on empirical fact.[22] Out of thousands of extant ḥadīths, Schacht based his conclusion about the backgrowth of legal *isnād*s on only forty-seven traditions, which he believed undermined the *prima facie* historical reliability of the entire ḥadīth corpus.[23] Conversely, the Muslim critics examined here identify a total of seventy-six instances of the backgrowth of *isnād*s. But for them, those reports that do not exhibit this flaw are *prima facie* words of the Prophet.

Terminology and the Approach of Ḥadīth Critics

Examining the manner in which Muslim ḥadīth scholars approached and evaluated the backgrowth of *isnād*s requires a conceptual translation of the relevant terms and concepts used by these critics. First, we must remember that Muslim scholars criticized different narrations of a ḥadīth without dismissing that Prophetic tradition as a whole—an important distinction from the content-based criticism of Western scholarship, which rejects the provenance of all the narrations of a report the meaning of which is suspect from a historical-critical perspective. For example, a ḥadīth critic could reject one *isnād* of the ḥadīth "Indeed, actions are determined by intentions (*innamā al-aʿmāl bi'l-niyyāt*)," while upholding the authenticity of that tradition *via* other narrations.[24] Ḥadīth scholars of the 3rd/9th century and beyond referred to reports attributed to the Prophet as *marfūʿ* (literally 'raised up'), while reports attributed to one of his Companions (and in some cases later figures such as Successors) were referred to as *mawqūf* (literally 'stopped at').[25] We will thus use the terms *marfūʿ* for Prophetic and *mawqūf* for non-Prophetic (i.e., from Companions or later figures) reports respectively.

---

[22] For a discussion of where the burden of proof for proving/disproving the authenticity of Prophetic ḥadīths lies, see David S. Powers, "On Bequests in Early Islam," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 48, no. 3 (1989): 199-200.

[23] Schacht, *Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, 4, 169, 175.

[24] For an example of this, see n. 51 below for the report "*yujā'u bi'l-mawt yawm al-qiyāma ka'annahu kabsh amlaḥ…*," which is criticized as being *mawqūf* through its narration by the Companion Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī but not by Abū Hurayra.

[25] Statements made by Successors are generally called *maqṭūʿ*. As several instances in this article demonstrate, however, the term *mawqūf* could be used to describe these reports as well. See, for example, al-Dāraquṭnī's criticism of Muslim's report from the Successor Ibn Abī Laylā below.

Muslim scholars from the 2nd/8th to the 4th/10th century devoted a great deal of attention to collecting and sorting the reports of Companions or Successors along with Prophetic ḥadīths. Abū Nuʿaym ʿAbd al-Malik al-Jurjānī (d. 323/935), for example, is described by a later ḥadīth scholar as memorizing *mawqūf* reports to the same extent that later experts memorized Prophetic ones.[26] Al-Bukhārī's first writings were compilations of the legal statements of the Companions and Successors.[27] Although they seldom surface in the major ḥadīth compendia of the 3rd/9th century, even as late as the 5th/11th century Companion traditions were in circulation alongside their Prophetic counterparts among scholars who had complete *isnād*s back to the originator of the report. In one of the last great ḥadīth collections containing these full-length *isnād*s, the *Sunan al-kubrā* of Abū Bakr Aḥmad al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066), the author occasionally includes his own Companion version of reports otherwise attributed to the Prophet.[28] Another major ḥadīth collector of the 5th/11th century also cultivated a vast number of reports with full *isnād*s; in his famous *Tārīkh Baghdād*, al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (d. 463/1071) occasionally provides Companion ḥadīths together with corresponding Prophetic versions.[29]

---

[26] Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī, *Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāẓ*, ed. Zakariyyā ʿUmayrāt, 4 vols. in 2 (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1419/1998), 3:26.

[27] Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt al-shāfiʿiyya al-kubrā*, ed. Maḥmūd Muḥammad al-Ṭanāḥī and ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Muḥammad al-Ḥalw, 10 vols. ([Cairo]: ʿĪsā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī, 1383/1964), 2:216.

[28] Note: I will use the Wensinck ḥadīth citation format (*kitāb*, *bāb*) for *muṣannaf* texts and Wensinck's citations for Ibn Ḥanbal's *Musnad* (cued to the Maymaniyya print). Al-Bayhaqī includes both *marfūʿ* and *mawqūf* versions of the report "*lā tuzawwiju al-mar'atu al-mar'ata wa lā tuzawwiju al-mar'atu nafsahā*…" that he received from his teacher, al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1014); Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Bayhaqī, *al-Sunan al-kubrā*, ed. Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Qādir ʿAṭā, 11 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1420/1999), 7:178 (*kitāb al-nikāḥ, bāb lā nikāḥ illā bi-walī*). On another occasion al-Bayhaqī narrates a report (*al-witr ḥaqq fa-man aḥabba an yuwattira*…) both *mawqūf* and *marfūʿ* through different *isnād*s meeting at al-Zuhrī and then continuing to the Prophet/Companion; idem, *al-Sunan al-kubrā*, 3:35 (*kitāb al-ṣalāt, bāb al-witr bi-rakʿa wāḥida*).

[29] See, for example, al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Tārīkh Baghdād*, ed. Muṣṭafā ʿAbd al-Qādir ʿAṭā, 14 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1417/1997), 2:446 (*lā tashtarū al-samak fī al-mā' fa'innahu gharar*); 5:14 (*lammā māta al-nabī zurra ʿalayhi*), 38 (*inna Allāh lā yaqbiḍu al-ʿilm intizāʿan yantazīʿuhu min al-ʿulamā'*); 6:282-3 (*man samiʿa al-nidā' wa lam yujib*…); 7:10 (*laysa ʿalā al-mar'a iḥrām illā fī wajhihā*); 8:209 (*in naqadta al-nās naqadūk*…); 9:16 (*ʿamal al-abrār min al-rijāl al-*

The backgrowth of *isnād*s was a recognized problem. Ḥadīth critics of the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries were aware that specific transmitters or scholars were elevating these non-Prophetic reports to Muḥammad. Al-Tirmidhī (d. 279/892) quotes the famous early ḥadīth critic Shuʿba b. al-Ḥajjāj (d. 160/776) as calling one transmitter a "serial raiser (*raffāʿ*)" of *mawqūf* reports to the Prophet.[30] The author of an early work on weak transmitters, Ibn ʿAdī (d. 365/975-6), notes that one Abū ʿAlī al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī b. Shabīb al-Muʿammarī (d. 295/907) used to raise *mawqūf* ḥadīths to the Prophet and add material to the texts of ḥadīths (*rafaʿa aḥādīth hiya mawqūfa wa zāda fī al-mutūn ashyāʾ laysa* [sic] *minhā*). Ibn ʿAdī quotes an earlier critic who said that raising *mawqūf* reports up to the Prophet was particularly common among transmitters in Baghdad.[31] In one of the earliest efforts to systemize the Sunni study of ḥadīth, al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1014) established an independent category of impugned narrators for those who raise *mawqūf* reports to the Prophet.[32] Transforming *mawqūf* reports into Prophetic ḥadīths was, of course, not always insidious. Sometimes critics attributed it to carelessness, as in the case of the respected early scholar Abān b.

---

khiyāṭa…); 9:69 (*man nasiya al-ṣalāt wa lam yadhkurhā illā wa huwa maʿa al-imām*…); 9:94 (*marra rajul mimman qablakum bi-jamjama*…); 9:252 (*al-kursī mawḍiʿ qadamihi wa'l-ʿarsh lā yuqaddaru qadruhu*); 9:302 (*lā ta'khudhū al-ḥadīth illā ʿamman tujīzū shahādatahu*); 9:329 (*inna Allāh taʿālā ʿind lisān kull qā'il fa'l-yattaqi Allāh ʿabd*un *wa'l-yanẓur mādhā yaqūl*); 9:433 (*lā yadkhulu al-janna al-qattāt*). These citations are the beginnings of a comprehensive list of the *mawqūf/marfūʿ* narrations included in the *Tārīkh Baghdād*, based on my reading of nine out of fourteen volumes so far. An even later major ḥadīth compendium with full *isnād*s back to the Prophet is Abū Masʿūd al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad al-Baghawī's (d. 516/1122) *Sharḥ al-sunna*, which also includes some corresponding *mawqūf* narrations for Prophetic ḥadīths; this text requires further study.

[30] *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhī*: *kitāb al-ʿilm*, *bāb mā jā'a fī al-akhdh bi'l-sunna wa ijtināb al-bidaʿ*.

[31] Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Tārīkh Baghdād*, 7:383. Al-Khaṭīb's citation from Ibn ʿAdī represents an addition to Ibn ʿAdī's entry on one al-Ḥasan b. Shabīb al-Muktib al-Baghdādī, whom he describes as transforming broken *isnād*s into continuous ones; Abū Aḥmad ʿAbdallāh Ibn ʿAdī, *Al-Kāmil fī ḍuʿafāʾ al-rijāl*, 7 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1405/1985), 2:742-3. Shuʿba and Ibn Ḥanbal also criticized ʿAbd al-Malik b. Abī Sulaymān (d. 145/763) for raising ḥadīths from the Successor ʿAṭāʾ b. Abī Rabāḥ to the Prophet; al-Khaṭīb, *Tārīkh Baghdād*, 10:394.

[32] Al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, *An Introduction to the Science of Tradition*, trans. James Robson (London: Luzac and Co., 1953), 36.

Abī ʿAyyāsh (d. 138/756) confusing the opinions of his teachers with reports they transmitted to him from the Prophet.[33]

To accurately comprehend how Muslim ḥadīth critics understood the problem of the backgrowth of *isnād*s, we must appreciate their perspective. While Western scholars conceive of the development of ḥadīth literature diachronically, with the *Muwaṭṭaʾ* of Mālik predating the canonical collections in a historical progression, a Muslim ḥadīth critic of the 4th/10th century saw a synchronic mass of parallel and competing reports.[34] For him, the problem of *isnād*s growing backwards appeared as instances of coexisting *marfūʿ* and *mawqūf* narrations of the same ḥadīth. Acknowledging the backgrowth of an *isnād* involved recognizing that the *mawqūf* version was the more reliable one according to the principles of ḥadīth criticism. It is not pertinent to our study whether or not the *marfūʿ* version was actually forged from the *mawqūf* one—we are not interesting in determining authenticity here. What concerns us is that ḥadīth critics felt that they were presented with a choice between two potentially valid narrations of the same ḥadīth.

Muslim scholars articulated the backgrowth of *isnād*s through the notion of *ziyāda*, or Addition. *Ziyāda* encompassed three different, identifiable phenomena that we may term *Isnād* Addition, Literal *Matn* Addition and Normative *Matn* Addition. *Isnād* Addition involved the addition of a transmitter in the *isnād* of one narration of a ḥadīth who was not found in other narrations. Literal *Matn* Addition was the addition of material to the text of one narration not found in others. Here, however, we are concerned only with Normative *Matn* Addition, which involved the addition of normative weight to a tradition by elevating the status of the report from *mawqūf* to

---

[33] Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, ed. Muṣṭafā ʿAbd al-Qādir ʿAṭā, 12 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1415/1994), 1:90.

[34] One instance in which a Muslim critic of the classical period appears to see a third dimension to the ḥadīth tradition occurs in the work of al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, who notes that the ḥadīth in which the Prophet "took the poll tax from the Zoroastrians of Hajar (*akhadha al-jizya min majūs hajar*)" is *mursal* in the *Muwaṭṭaʾ* but *musnad* through the same *isnād* in the work of a later student of Mālik's student ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Mahdī (d. 198/814); al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Tārīkh Baghdād*, 8:335 (biography of Khayrān b. Aḥmad). For a discussion of the transmission of this ḥadīth, see Muḥammad b. Idrīs al-Shāfiʿī, *al-Risāla*, ed. Aḥmad Shākir (Beirut: al-Maktaba al-ʿIlmiyya, [n.d.]), 430 ff.

marfūʿ.[35] It literally entailed pushing back the *isnād* of a narration from a later figure to the Prophet. We will thus use the terms Normative *Matn* Addition and the backgrowth of an *isnād* interchangeably.

This tripartite division of Addition (*ziyāda*) represents my own attempt to identify the different phenomena subsumed under what Muslim scholars often treated as a unified concept. Some Muslim scholars demonstrated an awareness of the conceptual heterogeneity inherent in their notion of *ziyāda*, conflating Normative and Literal *Matn* Addition while discussing *Isnād* Addition under the separate heading of *al-mazīd fī al-asānīd* (additions in *isnād*s). Others distinguished between or conflated the different forms of Addition in other ways. As a whole, the manner in which Muslim scholars over the centuries have envisioned *ziyāda*, its connection with the three phenomena here described as Addition and their relationships with one another has lacked uniformity.[36] The shared status of these three often

---

[35] For a more extensive discussion of Addition, see Jonathan A.C. Brown, "Criticism of the Proto-Hadith Canon: al-Dāraquṭnī's Adjustment of the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*," *Journal of Islamic Studies* 15, no. 1 (2004): 8-11.

[36] Limited evidence from al-Bukhārī (d. 256/870), Muslim (d. 261/875) and al-Tirmidhī (d. 279/892) suggests that they associated an indistinct notion of *ziyāda* with both *Isnād* Addition and Literal *Matn* Addition; Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl al-Bukhārī, *Kitāb rafʿ al-yadayn fī al-ṣalāt*, ed. Badīʿ al-Dīn al-Rāshidī (Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 1416/1996), 131-3; cf. ʿUthmān b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, *Muqaddimat Ibn Ṣalāḥ wa Maḥāsin al-iṣṭilāḥ*, ed. ʿĀʿisha ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, [1409/1989]), 229; Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj al-Naysābūrī, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (Cairo: Maktabat Muḥammad ʿAlī al-Ṣubayḥ, [1963]), 1:6; Zayn al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn Rajab, *Sharḥ ʿIlal al-Tirmidhī*, ed. Nūr al-Dīn ʿItr, 2 vols. ([n.p.]: [n.p], 1398/1978), 1:419. Al-Dāraquṭnī (d. 385/995) also used the term *ziyāda* for both these phenomena; Brown, "Criticism of the Proto-Hadith Canon," 32. Al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1014) dealt with Normative and Literal *Matn* Addition separately; al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, *Maʿrifat ʿulūm al-ḥadīth*, ed. Muʿaẓẓim Ḥusayn (Hyderabad: Dāʾirat al-Maʿārif, 1385/1966); 27, 50. Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (d. 463/1071) addressed *Isnād* Addition, Normative *Matn* Addition and Literal *Matn* Addition separately (although he notes that what I have identified as Literal *Matn* and Normative *Matn* Addition are closely linked); al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Kitāb al-kifāya fī ʿilm al-riwāya*, ed. Aḥmad ʿUmar Hāshim (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-ʿArabī, 1405/1985); 449, 450-1, 464-9. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (d. 643/1245) purposefully combined the concepts of Normative and Literal *Matn* Addition under the rubrick of *ziyāda* while dealing with *Isnād* Addition separately under the title of *al-mazīd fī al-asānīd*. In his chapter on *muʿḍal* ḥadīths, however, he treates *Isnād* and Normative *Matn* Addition similtaneously; Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, *Muqaddimat Ibn Ṣalāḥ*; 229, 250-6, 480-1. Ibn Kathīr (d. 774/1374) followed Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, except

indistinct concepts under the rubric of *ziyāda* in the Muslim scholarly worldview stemmed from the fundamentally crucial role of the narrator in determining the authenticity of a transmission; regardless if it was adding a person in the *isnād*, material to the text of the ḥadīth or raising a whole report to the Prophet, all were 'additions' made by one transmitter whose reliability guaranteed these claims.[37] As such, it seems most useful to view the concept of *ziyāda* as fundamentally unified within Muslim scholarship and then follow our own conceptual breakdown of the topic.

There is one critical distinction between the backgrowth of *isnād*s as conceptualized by Western scholars and what we have termed here Normative *Matn* Addition among Muslims. For Schacht, finding a Prophetic ḥadīth in a book written after an earlier scholar had attributed the same report to a Companion or Successor provided sufficient proof that the *isnād* had grown backwards. Muslim scholars, on the other hand, did not consider the coexistence of *mawqūf* and *marfūʿ* narrations of the same ḥadīth to be *prima facie* conclusive evidence of forgery. It was quite possible for reliable *mawqūf* and *marfūʿ* versions of a ḥadīth to coexist. The reliability of a report ultimately hinged on the reputation of its transmitter and corroboration. If the experts who narrated a *marfūʿ* version and a *mawqūf*

---

that he ignored the phenomenon of Normative *Matn* Addition entirely; Ibn Kathīr Ismāʿīl b. Abī Ḥafṣ, *al-Baʿith al-ḥathīth sharḥ Ikhtiṣār ʿUlūm al-ḥadīth*, ed. Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir (Cairo: Dār al-Turāth, 1423/2003); 52, 146. Al-ʿIrāqī (d. 806/1404) dealt with all three concepts separately but construed *ziyāda* as Literal *Matn* Addition only; Zayn al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥīm b. al-Ḥusayn al-ʿIrāqī, *al-Tabṣira wa'l-tadhkira*, 3 vols. in 2 (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, [n.d.], reprint of the 1353/[1935] Fez edition, edited by Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-ʿIrāqī al-Ḥusaynī), 1:174-9, 211, 2:306 ff. Al-Sakhāwī (d. 902/1497) followed him, and al-Ṣanʿānī (d. 1768 CE) argued that the discussion of Normative *Matn* Addition and *Isnād* Addition together was a mistake, since the two questions are totally distinct; Shams al-Dīn al-Sakhāwī, *Fatḥ al-mughīth*, ed. ʿAlī Ḥusayn ʿAlī, 5 vols. (Cairo: Maktabat al-Sunna, 1424/2003), 1:219; Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl al-Ṣanʿānī, *Tawḍīḥ al-afkār*, ed. Muḥammad Muḥyī al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd, 2 vols. (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, 1366/1970), 1:339. Ibn Ḥajar (d. 852/1449) dealt with all three types of Addition under the mantle of *ziyāda*; Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *al-Nukat ʿalā kitāb Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ*, ed. Masʿūd ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd al-ʿAdanī and Muḥammad Fāris (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1414/1994), 281-90.

[37] The modern ḥadīth scholar Ḥamza ʿAbdallāh al-Malībārī has reasserted the conceptual unity of *ziyāda* by underscoring the primacy of the narrator in making these various 'additions'; Ḥamza ʿAbdallāh al-Malībārī, *Naẓarāt jadīda fī ʿulūm al-ḥadīth* (Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 1423/2003); 150 ff., 176-9.

one were equally trustworthy, a Muslim critic would be hard pressed to dismiss either as incorrect.

Moreover, Muslim critics allowed for the possibility that both Companion and Prophetic versions could be entirely accurate. According to scholars like the Shāfiʿīs al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Abū Isḥāq al-Shīrāzī (d. 476/1083), Abū al-Ḥasan al-Māwardī (d. 450/1058), the Ḥanbalī Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597/1200) and the Mālikī Ibn al-Qaṭṭān al-Fāsī (d. 628/1231), it was rationally possible for a Companion to quote the Prophet directly on a legal matter (producing a *marfūʿ* ḥadīth) but to paraphrase him when ruling on the same matter after the Prophet's death (thus producing a Companion opinion or *mawqūf* report).[38] This possibility, expressed in the treatises of these later scholars, was implicit in the thought of earlier ḥadīth critics. Thus, in his famous *Sunan* the staunch traditionist of Samarqand, ʿAbdallāh b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Dārimī (d. 255/869), lists a report of the Prophet condemning opining on matters of religion when one has no firm evidence. He then immediately presents the same report attributed to the Companion Ibn ʿAbbās.[39] As al-Dārimī explained to his student, al-Tirmidhī, so long as one has an established text (*aṣl*) for a tradition from the Prophet, such disparities fall well within the range of proper ḥadīth transmission.[40] Thus Normative

---

[38] Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Kitāb al-kifāya fī ʿilm al-riwāya*, 456; Abū Isḥāq Ibrāhīm al-Shīrāzī, *al-Tabṣira fī uṣūl al-fiqh*, ed. Muḥammad Ḥasan Hītū (Damascus: Dār al-Fikr, 1400/1980), 325; Abū al-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Muḥammad al-Māwardī, *al-Ḥāwī al-kabīr fī fiqh madhhab al-imām al-Shāfiʿī*, ed. ʿAlī Muḥammad Muʿawwaḍ and ʿĀdil Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Mawjūd, 20 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1414/1994), 2:359; Abū al-Ḥusayn ʿAlī b. Muḥammad Ibn al-Qaṭṭān al-Fāsī, *Bayān al-wahm wa'l-īhām al-wāqiʿayn fī kitāb al-Aḥkām*, ed. al-Ḥusayn Āyat Saʿīd, 5 vols. (Riyadh: Dār al-Ṭayba, 1418/1997), 5: 278, 452, 456; Ibn Ḥajar, *al-Nukat ʿalā kitāb Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ*, 239-40. See also Shams al-Dīn al-Sakhāwī, *Fatḥ al-mughīth*, 1:220; Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm Ibn al-Wazīr, *Kitāb tanqīḥ al-anẓār fī maʿrifat ʿulūm al-āthār*, ed. Muḥammad Ṣubḥī b. Ḥasan Ḥallāq (Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 1420/1999), 108.

[39] *Sunan al-Dārimī*: introductory subchapters, *bāb al-futyā wa mā fīhi min al-shidda*. For another example of including a *mawqūf* narration along with a *marfūʿ* one, see *Sunan al-Dārimī*: introductory chapters, *bāb al-tawbīkh li-man yaṭlubu al-ʿilm li-ghayr Allāh*, where the Successor Makḥūl al-Shāmī narrates a report once as his own words and once as a report of the Prophet. In another example, one of the transmitters notes that the Companion "raised the ḥadīth to the Prophet" as opposed to the *mawqūf* report that preceded it; *Sunan al-Dārimī*: introductory chapters, *bāb fī faḍl al-ʿilm wa'l-ʿamal* (last two reports).

[40] *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhī*: *kitāb al-ʿilm*, *bāb mā jā'a fī taʿẓīm al-kadhib ʿalā rasūl Allāh* (*ṣ*). Here al-Tirmidhī was asking specifically about *Isnād* Addition (making a

Matn Addition was not inherently problematic. Only in cases when the *marfūʿ* version seemed contrived, or when *mawqūf* narrations were either more numerous or more reliable than the *marfūʿ* ones did a critic like al-Dārimī diagnose unacceptable Addition and the backgrowth of an *isnād*.

Many prominent ḥadīth scholars between 200/800 and 700/1300 were thus unwilling to accept the Prophetic versions of a tradition when they felt the *mawqūf* one was more reliable. Our first surviving evidence of this critical rejection of pushing back *isnād*s to the Prophet comes from ʿAlī b. al-Madīnī (d. 234/849), a magnet of ḥadīth study in Basra and one of al-Bukhārī's principal teachers. He noted that the Prophetic ḥadīth narrated through the Companion ʿAmmār b. Yāsir (d. 37/657) in which the Prophet prohibited Muslims from eating the meat of animals sacrificed to God more than three days after the slaughter (*innahu nahā ʿan akl luḥūm al-aḍāḥī fawqa thalāth*…) was problematic because the *mawqūf* version through Abū ʿUbayd Saʿd b. ʿUbayd al-Zuhrī (d. 98/717-8) → al-Zuhrī was more reliable.[41]

The Genre of ʿIlal al-ḥadīth*: a Storehouse for Non-Prophetic Narrations*

Ibn al-Madīnī's work is one of the earliest surviving books in a genre that preserved Muslims' responses to the backgrowth of *isnād*s, works of *ʿilal al-ḥadīth*.

Books of *ʿilal*, or 'flaws,' constituted a subgenre of ḥadīth literature that served as a veritable storehouse for the *mawqūf* narrations which survived alongside the great collections of Prophetic ḥadīths. Besides their formal collections, we can imagine that the libraries of ḥadīth scholars in the Abbasid period were filled with more humble and disorganized notebooks of ḥadīth narrations recorded in innumerable sessions from teachers in various cities. These sundry reports would

---

mursal ḥadīth *musnad*). This question was often inseparable from Normative *Matn* Addition, however, both in al-Tirmidhī's time and in later periods; see n. 36 above.

[41] ʿAlī b. al-Madīnī, *al-ʿIlal*, ed. Muḥammad Muṣṭafā Aʿẓamī ([n.p.]: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1392/1972), 104. Al-Bukhārī includes Abū ʿUbayd's narration from ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib; *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: *kitāb al-aḍāḥī, bāb* 16; Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥ al-bārī*, ed. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. ʿAbdallāh b. Bāz and Muḥammad Fuʾād ʿAbd al-Bāqī, 16 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1418/1997), 10:29 (#5573).

have constituted the raw material from which these scholars compiled their collections. They also would have provided the evidence that ḥadīth critics used in their attempts to identify which reports enjoyed the corroborating support of expert transmitters and which were isolated and thus unreliable. In the course of their identification of flawed narrations, scholars composing *ʿilal* treatises drew on and cited these now vanished tomes of ḥadīth. *ʿIlal* works therefore allow us a glimpse into the more evanescent manifestations of ḥadīth scholarship that rarely survived their author's death or the ravages of time. The peak of *ʿilal* work production seems to have been the late 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries, but later ḥadīth scholars also produced occasional works in this genre (see Appendix for a list of known *ʿilal* works).

Here we must distinguish between books of *ʿilal al-ḥadīth* and a later but very similar genre: collections of extremely unreliable or forged (*mawḍūʿ*) ḥadīths known as books of *mawḍūʿāt*. The distinction between these two genres is both topical and chronological, although there is a degree of overlap in both these aspects. *ʿIlal* works focus on comparing the multiple narrations of a ḥadīth to determine technical flaws like Addition but almost never explicitly criticize a report due to its meaning. *Mawḍūʿāt* works, on the other hand, expand this scope of criticism to include reports that are deemed unreliable because they include some clear indication of forgery, such as their contents contradicting the Qurʾān, more reliable ḥadīths or general Islamic principles. *Mawḍūʿāt* works thus include criticisms originating from *ʿilal* works, often identifying ḥadīths as originally having been statements of figures other than the Prophet that had been inappropriately attributed to him. This overlap in content between *ʿilal* and *mawḍūʿāt* works is most evident in Ibn al-Jawzī's *Kitāb al-mawḍūʿāt* and his *al-ʿIlal al-mutanāhiya*, for Ibn al-Jawzī listed many of the same ḥadīths in both books.[42]

---

[42] See Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar al-Kattānī, *al-Risāla al-mustaṭrafa li-bayān mashhūr kutub al-sunna al-musharrafa* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1416/1995), 118. For an example of a *mawḍūʿāt* book identifying the backgrowth of *isnād*s from a Companion to the Prophet, see Mullā ʿAlī al-Qāriʾ (d. 1014/1606), *al-Maṣnūʿ fī maʿrifat al-ḥadīth al-mawḍūʿ*, ed. ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghudda, 6th ed. (Beirut: Dār al-Bashāʾir al-Islāmiyya, 1426/2005), 67, 77, 81, 107, 116, 149, 193, 198, 199, 201, 206. For some examples of reports attributed to the Prophet but originally said by other figures, see ibid., 53 (Sufyān al-Thawrī), 62 (Abū Ḥanīfa and al-Shāfiʿī), 83 (Ibrāhīm al-Nakhaʿī).

The fact that *mawḍūʿāt* books often drew on criticisms, such as improper Normative *Matn* Addition, found in *ʿilal* works highlights the second distinction between the two genres. The *mawḍūʿāt* genre effectively succeeded that of *ʿilal* books, appearing as *ʿilal* works were falling out of production. *ʿIlal* works are rare after 400/1010, while *mawḍūʿāt* books are exclusively the product of the period after the 5th/11th century, increasing in number in the late middle and early modern periods. The earliest known *mawḍūʿāt* books were the *Tadhkirat al-mawḍūʿāt* of Abū al-Faḍl al-Maqdisī (d. 507/1113) and al-Ḥusayn b. Ibrāhīm al-Jawzaqānī's (d. 543/1148-9) *al-Abāṭīl wa al-manākīr wa al-ṣiḥāḥ wa al-mashāhīr*.[43] Al-Jawzaqānī himself inadvertently demonstrates the evolution of the *mawḍūʿāt* genre from books of *ʿilal*. Although his work clearly focuses on identifying forged ḥadīths based on their problematic contents—the hallmark of later *mawḍūʿāt* books, he himself considers his book a study of *ʿilal*. "For indeed the [study of] *ʿilal*," he notes, "is the most noble part of the science of ḥadīth."[44] Because *mawḍūʿāt* books drew on *ʿilal* works to criticize the backgrowth of *isnād*s, we will add the *mawḍūʿāt* books of Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328) and Aḥmad b. al-Ṣiddīq al-Ghumārī (d. 1960), which identify numerous instances of Normative *Matn* Addition, to the *ʿilal* works examined in this article.

---

[43] Other *mawḍūʿāt* works include al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad al-Ṣaghānī's (d. 650/1252) *Risāla fī al-aḥādīth al-mawḍūʿa* and his *Mawḍūʿāt*, Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya's (d. 751/1350) *al-Manār al-munīf fī al-ṣaḥīḥ wa'l-ḍaʿīf* and his *Naqd al-manqūl wa'l-maḥakk al-mumayyiz bayn al-mardūd wa'l-maqbūl*, two small treatises by Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Ṭāhir al-Ṣiddīqī al-Fannī (d. 986/1578-9), Shams al-Dīn Abū ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Ṣāliḥī's (d. 942/1536) *al-Fawāʾid al-majmūʿa fī bayān al-aḥādīth al-mawḍūʿa*, the *Kashf al-ilāhī ʿan shadīd al-ḍaʿf wa'l-mawḍūʿ wa'l-wāhī* by Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Ṭarābulusī al-Sandūsī (d. 1177/1763-4), Mullā al-Qārī's (d. 1014/1606) *al-Asrār al-marfūʿ fī al-aḥādīth al-mawḍūʿa* and *al-Maṣnūʿa fī maʿrifat al-aḥādīth al-mawḍūʿa*, Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Shawkānī's (d. 1839) *al-Fawāʾid al-majmūʿa fī al-aḥādīth al-mawḍūʿa* and ʿAbd al-Ḥayy al-Laknawī's (d. 1886-7) *Kitāb al-āthār al-marfūʿa fī al-akhbār al-mawḍūʿa*; al-Kattānī, *al-Risāla al-mustaṭrafa*, 117-19.

[44] Al-Ḥusayn b. Ibrāhīm al-Jawzaqānī, *al-Abāṭīl wa'l-manākīr wa'l-ṣiḥāḥ wa'l-mashāhīr*, ed. Muḥammad Ḥasan Muḥammad (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1422/2001), 23, 30. Al-Jawzaqānī is responsible for the earliest instance I have found of a scholar asserting that the contents of a ḥadīth can render it false and impugn its transmitters; he states, "every ḥadīth that contradicts (*bi-khilāf*) the sunna is cast away (*matrūk*) and the person who says it ana-thema [as a transmitter] (*mahjūr*)"; ibid., 89-90.

Detecting the Backgrowth of Isnād*s in the Late 3rd/9th Century: Abū Zurʿa and Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī*

For Muslim scholars of the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries, the great political and scholarly center of Rayy was an unavoidable way-station along the Silk Road from Baghdad to Khurāsān, Transoxiana and beyond.

In the 3rd/9th century, two of the city's scholars emerged as institutions of Sunni ḥadīth study. The critical methodologies of Abū Zurʿa al-Rāzī (d. 264/878) and his friend and colleague Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī (d. 277/890) have survived primarily because they were dutifully set down by the latter's son, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī (d. 327/938). His *ʿIlal al-ḥadīth* contains thousands of narrations in which either his father, Abū Zurʿa, or both, found some flaw. Inappropriate Normative *Matn* Addition appears as a common problem. The book demonstrates that, when faced with competing Companion and Prophetic narrations of a ḥadīth, Abū Zurʿa and Abū Ḥātim selected the one that enjoyed the preponderance of evidence or expert opinion.[45]

Although the two Rāzīs never mention their contemporary collectors, the generation that produced the Six Books, they declare that some reports considered *marfūʿ* by Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855), Ibn Mājah (d. 273/886) and al-Nasāʾī (d. 303/915) are actually *mawqūf*. In one case, for example, the two Rāzīs dismiss the Prophetic version of a report because the "trustworthy transmitters (*thiqāt*)" support the Companion version. In dismissing the Prophetic version, they break with Ibn Ḥanbal and al-Nasāʾī, who chose the Prophetic *isnād*s.[46] In three other cases, Abū Zurʿa and Abū Ḥātim feel that

---

[45] This conclusion is based on a total of 33 cases in which Abū Ḥātim and Abū Zurʿa declared that inappropriate Normative *Matn* Addition had occurred and that the *mawqūf* version of the ḥadīth was correct. See Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī, *ʿIlal al-ḥadīth*, 2 vols. (Baghdad: Maktabat al-Muthannā, [1971]); 1:17 (#15); 1:53 (#133); 1:71 (#191); 1:67 (#175); 1:80 (#215); 1:89 (#238); 1:96 (#259); 1:96 (#261); 1:112 (#303 and #307); 1:122 (#334); 1:124 (#340); 2:272 (#2313), and cases listed below.

[46] Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *al-ʿIlal*, 1:28-9 (#49). This ḥadīth is transmitted through Bishr b. al-Mufaḍḍal ← Dāwūd b. Abī Hind ← Abū al-Zubayr Muḥammad al-Makkī ← Jābir b. ʿAbdallāh ← Prophet: *ʿalā kull muslim ghusl fī sabʿat ayyām kull jumʿa*. Ibn Ḥanbal has this ḥadīth *marfūʿ* through *isnād*s mentioned by Abū Ḥātim with a slight inversion in the *matn*; *Musnad Ibn Ḥanbal*: 3:304. Al-Nasāʾī has it *marfūʿ* with the same *isnād* with the addition of Ḥumayd b. Masʿada

reports accepted by Ibn Ḥanbal or Ibn Mājah as Prophetic ḥadīths were also instances of inappropriate Normative *Matn* Addition and thus cases in which *isnād*s had been pushed backwards.[47] Clearly critics like the Rāzīs were dealing with competing *marfūʿ* and *mawqūf* narrations, each of which often enjoyed support from the respected experts of previous generations. In one case, for example, Abū Ḥātim and Abū Zurʿa note that, although the *mawqūf* version is the correct one (*ṣaḥīḥ*), there are reliable *marfūʿ* versions as well.[48]

Continuing Criticism in the 4th/10th Century: Ibn ʿAmmār and al-Dāraquṭnī

The study of *ʿilal* and identifying the backgrowth of *isnād*s thrived in the 4th/10th century, when the most famous *ʿilal* works were produced.

In fact, this period saw two ḥadīth scholars pen critiques of al-Bukhārī's and Muslim's *Ṣaḥīḥ*s. Ibn ʿAmmār al-Shahīd (d. 317/929-30), a scholar of Herat who was killed in a Qarmatian attack on Mecca while performing pilgrimage, composed a small *ʿilal* work on Muslim's collection. Out of thirty-six flawed narrations culled from Muslim's *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Ibn ʿAmmār notes three instances of *isnād*s growing backwards. In each case, the author details the various

---

between him and Bishr as well as a slightly expanded *matn*; *Sunan al-Nasāʾī*: *kitāb al-jumʿa, bāb ījāb al-ghusl yawm al-jumʿa*.

[47] Abū Ḥātim favors the *mawqūf* version of a ḥadīth on what to do if you are praying and feel an impending release of gas (the report is "*fa-man wajada minkum fī baṭnihi rizz*[an]…"). Ibn Ḥanbal has this narration as *marfūʿ* (*Musnad Ibn Ḥanbal*: 1:88, 99). See Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *al-ʿIlal*, 1:31-2 (#59). In the second case (the report is *al-hirr sabʿa*…), Abū Ḥātim says that the *mawqūf* narration is more correct than the *marfūʿ* one. Ibn Ḥanbal has the same transmission but extends it all the way to the Prophet (*Musnad Ibn Ḥanbal*: 2:442). See Abī Ḥātim, *al-ʿIlal*, 1:44 (#98). In the third case, the ḥadīth "two types of dead animals and two types of blood have been made licit for you… (*ḥullat lakum maytatān wa damān*…), the two Rāzīs feel that the *mawqūf* narration is more correct, although Ibn Mājah has it *marfūʿ* through the same *isnād* (*Sunan Ibn Mājah*: *kitāb al-aṭʿima*, *bāb al-kabid wa'l-ṭiḥāl*). See Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *al-ʿIlal*, 2:17 (#1524).

[48] Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *al-ʿIlal*, 1:26. The usage of the word '*ṣaḥīḥ*' here may be misleading to readers accustomed to its meaning of 'authentic' in the context of ḥadīth. Here, however, it simply indicates that this version best represents the true nature of the report - regardless of whether or not the report is actually an authentic ḥadīth.

transmitters who communicated the *marfūʿ* and *mawqūf* versions before presenting the decisive opinion of an expert critic from the 2nd/8th century. Like ʿAlī b. al-Madīnī, Ibn ʿAmmār criticizes a statement forbidding Muslims from eating the meat of sacrificed animals more than three days after the slaughter as the backgrowth of an *isnād*. Ibn ʿAmmār quotes the early ḥadīth critic and jurisprudent Sufyān al-Thawrī (d. 161/778) as responding to a question about the Prophetic version of the report by saying, "I have not recorded it as *marfūʿ*."[49] In another report the Prophet prays, "May God ordain upon you the prayer of a people upright, worshiping throughout the night, fasting the days, neither iniquitous nor eschewers of right." Ibn ʿAmmār accuses the Transoxianan scholar ʿAbd b. Ḥumayd (d. 249/863-4) of pushing the *isnād* of this report back from the Companion Anas b. Mālik to the Prophet.[50] Ibn ʿAmmār also criticizes Muslim's only narration of a ḥadīth about the inhabitants of heaven and hell being presented with Death in the form of a goat, which is then slaughtered to demonstrate the eternity of their respective conditions. Relying on the testimony of the 2nd/8th-century ḥadīth scholar Sulaymān b. Mihrān al-Aʿmash (d. 148/765), Ibn ʿAmmār shows that this was a statement made by the Companion Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī, not the Prophet.[51]

One of the most respected and critically stringent ḥadīth scholars of the 4th/10th century was ʿAlī b. ʿUmar al-Dāraquṭnī of Baghdad (d. 385/995). He composed two *ʿilal* works, one on the corpus of ḥadīths he received from his teacher Ibrāhīm b. al-Ḥusayn al-Karajī (d.c. 370/980) and one on the contents of the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*.[52] This latter work, the *Kitāb al-tatabbuʿ*, was not polemical and did not serve as a vehicle for al-Dāraquṭnī to advance his own legal, ritual or dogmatic opinions at the expense of al-Bukhārī and Muslim. Rather, the work was a technical criticism in which al-Dāraquṭnī juxtaposed his own methodology of ḥadīth evaluation with those of two scholars

---

[49] Abū al-Faḍl Ibn ʿAmmār al-Shahīd, *ʿIlal al-aḥādīth fī kitāb al-ṣaḥīḥ li-Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj*, ed. ʿAlī b. Ḥasan al-Ḥalabī (Riyadh: Dār al-Hijra, 1412/1991), 95.

[50] Ibid., 131.

[51] Ibid., 132-3; cf. *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: *kitāb al-tafsīr*, *sūrat* 19 *bāb* 1 / *Fatḥ al-bārī* # 4730; *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: *kitāb al-janna wa ṣifat naʿīmihā, bāb al-nār yadkhuluhā al-jabbārūn wa'l-janna yadkhuluhā al-ḍuʿafā'*.

[52] Al-Khaṭīb, *Tārīkh Baghdād*, 6:56-7.

whom he studied intensively and clearly admired greatly.[53] The *Kitāb al-tatabbuʿ* thus provides a fascinating account of a scholar debating the backgrowth of *isnād*s for certain ḥadīths more than a century after they had won the approval of the great experts al-Bukhārī and Muslim.

Like the two Rāzīs, al-Dāraquṭnī was highly suspicious of Normative *Matn* Addition. If a *marfūʿ* version of a report coexisted with a *mawqūf* one, he did not accept the Prophetic version unless it was corroborated by the majority of the narrations of that ḥadīth or certified by the overwhelming expertise of master critics like al-Aʿmash.[54] Of 217 narrations that he criticizes in the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*, al-Dāraquṭnī notes fifteen instances of inappropriate Normative *Matn* Addition in which *isnād*s had been pushed back to the Prophet. For example, Muslim's sole narration of a ḥadīth in which the Prophet explains that God will grant the believers a vision of Himself on the Day of Judgment without any separation, al-Dāraquṭnī argues, is actually the words of the Successor ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn Abī Laylā (d. 82/701-2).[55] In reaching this conclusion, al-Dāraquṭnī was not only overturning Muslim's decision on this report; other prominent ḥadīth scholars had also declared this ḥadīth *marfūʿ*. Al-Tirmidhī included it as the words of the Prophet in his *Jāmiʿ* (although he notes that a *mawqūf* version also exists).[56] Ibn Mājah presents the

---

[53] Brown, "Criticism of the Proto-Hadith Canon," 16 ff. Al-Bukhārī's *ʿilal* work has unfortunately been lost. We can glean a few indications of his stance on Normative *Matn* Addition from his extant writings. He states that one narration adding a phrase in the *matn* of a ḥadīth (Literal *Matn* Addition) is allowed if the addition can be substantiated (*idhā thabata*). He makes no mention of competing narrations; al-Bukhārī, *Kitāb rafʿ al-yadayn fī al-ṣalāt*, 131-3.

[54] Brown, "Criticism of the Proto-Hadith Canon," 31-33.

[55] ʿAlī b. ʿUmar al-Dāraquṭnī, *Kitāb al-ilzāmāt wa'l-tatabbuʿ*, ed. Muqbil b. Hādī al-Wādiʿī (Medina: al-Maktaba al-Salafiyya, [1978]), 266-7. This ḥadīth is found in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: *kitāb al-imān*, *bāb ithbāt ru'yat al-mu'minīn fī al-ākhira rabbahum*. The report is "When the people of Paradise enter Paradise, God most high will say 'do you wish Me to grant you anything else,' and they will respond, 'Have you not honored our countenances, granted us entry into the Garden and saved us from Hellfire?' Then God will remove His veil, and they will never be granted anything dearer to them than gazing at their Lord most glorious (*idhā dakhala ahl al-janna al-janna qāla qāla yaqūlu Allāh tabāraka wa taʿālā turīdūn shay'*an *uzīdukum fa-yaqūlūn a-lam tubayyiḍ wujūhanā a-lam tudkhilnā al-janna wa tunajjinā min al-nār, qāla fa-yakshifu al-ḥijāb fa-mā uʿṭū shay'*an *aḥabba ilayhim min al-nazar ilā rabbihim ʿazza wa jall*)."

[56] *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhī*: *kitāb ṣifat al-janna*, *bāb mā jā'a fī ru'yat al-rabb tabāraka wa taʿālā*.

Prophetic version as the correct one. Ibn Ḥanbal also offers only the *marfūʿ* version.[57] Al-Dāraquṭnī thus reveals the backgrowth of an *isnād* found in four of the most respected or well-known ḥadīth collections of the 3rd/9th century.

In his much larger *Kitāb al-ʿilal*, which consists of 2,336 criticized narrations, al-Dāraquṭnī notes that certain narrations of ḥadīths attributed to the Prophet in the canonical Six Books were actually the words of Companions. He asserts, for example, that the correct narration of a report "the *witr* prayer is enjoined upon every Muslim… (*al-witr ḥaqq ʿalā kull muslim…*)" is *mawqūf*. "Those that have it *mawqūf*…," he explains, "are more reliable than those who have it *marfūʿ*." Abū Dāwūd (d. 275/888) and Ibn Mājah, however, include it as a Prophetic ḥadīth in their *Sunan*s. Only al-Nasāʾī, widely considered to be the third most critically demanding compiler, after al-Bukhārī and Muslim, notes that the *mawqūf* version is correct.[58] Al-Dāraquṭnī also concludes that the report attributed to the Prophet through Abū Hurayra → Saʿīd b. Musayyab, that "the molar of the unbeliever on the Day of Resurrection will be greater than [Mount] Uḥud (*ḍirs al-kāfir yawm al-qiyāma aʿzam min Uḥud…*)" is properly *mawqūf*.[59] However, both Ibn Ḥanbal and Ibn Mājah had selected Prophetic versions of this report for their collections.[60]

The Triumph of Legal Theorists and the Categorical Acceptance of Prophetic Versions

Many prominent ḥadīth critics of the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries proved much laxer with Normative *Matn* Addition than Abū Ḥātim

---

[57] *Sunan Ibn Mājah*: *kitāb al-muqaddima, bāb mā ankarat al-jahmiyya*; *Musnad Ibn Ḥanbal*: 6:16.

[58] Al-Dāraquṭnī, *al-ʿIlal al-wārida fī al-aḥādīth al-nabawiyya*, ed. Maḥfūẓ al-Raḥmān al-Salafī, 11 vols. (Riyadh: Dār al-Ṭayba, 1405/1985-1416/1996), 6:100. See *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*: *kitāb al-witr, bāb kam al-witr*; *Sunan Ibn Mājah*: *kitāb iqāmat al-ṣalāt, bāb mā jāʾa fī al-witr bi-thalāth wa khams* (*subchapter #123*); *Sunan al-Nasāʾī*: *kitāb qiyām al-layl wa taṭawwuʿ al-nahār, bāb dhikr al-ikhtilāf ʿalā al-Zuhrī fī ḥadīth Abī Ayyūb fī al-witr*.

[59] Al-Dāraquṭnī, *al-ʿIlal al-wārida fī al-akhbār al-nabawiyya*, 9:177.

[60] *Musnad Ibn Ḥanbal*: 2:328, 334, 537 [through ʿAṭāʾ b. Yasār ← Abū Hurayra ← Prophet] and another with a slightly different *matn* with this same *isnād*; *Sunan Ibn Mājah*: *kitāb al-zuhd, ṣifat al-nār* [this version has an inverted word order in the *matn*, and its *isnād* goes through ʿAṭiyya al-ʿAwfī ← Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī ← Prophet].

al-Rāzī, Abū Zurʿa al-Rāzī, Ibn ʿAmmār and al-Dāraquṭnī. While these latter scholars only accepted Addition when the Prophetic version enjoyed the preponderance of expert evidence, others allowed one narrator to break with the predominant version of a report and attribute it to the Prophet as long as that narrator was reliable (*thiqa*).

Perhaps the earliest example of this less strict school of ḥadīth evaluation was al-Tirmidhī, who accepted the attribution of additional material to the Prophet provided it was done by a reliable ḥadīth master (*ḥāfiẓ*).[61] The compiler of one of the last collections limited to 'authentic' ḥadīths, Ibn Ḥibbān al-Bustī (d. 354/965), explains that the Prophetic version of a report presented by a transmitter is acceptable even if others identified it as *mawqūf* elsewhere so long as the first transmitter is upstanding (*ʿadl*).[62]

A student of Ibn Ḥibbān and the first great systematizer of the Sunni ḥadīth tradition, Abū ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1014), was also lax in rejecting Normative *Matn* Addition. He declared, in fact, that no Addition made by a reliable transmitter (*thiqa*) should be considered a flaw (*ʿilla*) in a ḥadīth.[63] In his landmark treatise on the science of ḥadīth collection and criticism, *Maʿrifat ʿulūm al-ḥadīth*, al-Ḥākim instructs his readers to treat as Prophetic a report that may appear as *mawqūf* but is really *marfūʿ* (*musnada fī al-aṣl*).[64] This was tantamount to accepting all but the most blatant instances of inappropriate Normative *Matn* Addition, since a critic could elevate what others considered a Companion report to Prophetic status provided he believed that the Prophetic version was the original one.

As a result, only the most egregious instances of *isnād* backgrowth alarmed al-Ḥākim. His student, Abū Yaʿlā al-Khalīlī (d. 446/1054), reports that al-Ḥākim had heard the following *mawqūf* report from a pillar of ḥadīth scholarship in Naysābūr, Abū al-ʿAbbās al-Aṣamm (d. 346/957), attributed to the Companion ʿAbdallāh b. ʿAmr: "the

---

[61] Ibn Rajab, *Sharḥ ʿIlal al-Tirmidhī*, 1:419.

[62] Ibn Ḥibbān, *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān bi-tartīb al-Amīr ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn al-Fārisī*, ed. Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir (Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, [1952]), 1:119; idem,*ʿIlal al-akhbār wa maʿrifat ruwāt al-āthār* (Riyadh: Maktabat al-Rushd, 2001), 418.

[63] Al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, *al-Mustadrak ʿalā al-Ṣaḥīḥayn*, ed. Muqbil b. Hādī al-Wādiʿī, 5 vols. (Cairo: Dār al-Ḥaramayn, 1417/1997), 1:39-40.

[64] Al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, *Maʿrifat ʿulūm al-ḥadīth*, 26-7.

son of Adam will share half the punishment of the people of Hellfire in proper proportion (*Ibn Ādam yuqāsimu nisf ʿadhāb ahl al-nār qismat*[an] *ṣiḥāḥ*[an]).” Two years later, however, al-Khalīlī heard al-Ḥākim mention that he had heard the same report from a fellow scholar in Isfahan as a ḥadīth attributed to the Prophet. When al-Khalīlī asked his teacher to transmit the Prophetic version to him, al-Ḥākim refused, explaining, “I stand by what I read from him [al-Aṣamm] as a *mawqūf* report.”[65] The Prophetic version, however, was already so dubious that neither the compilers of the Six Books nor Ibn Ḥanbal had included it in their collections. Rejecting it as a case of the backgrowth of *isnād*s is thus hardly a testament to al-Ḥākim’s selectivity.

Ibn Ḥibbān’s and al-Ḥākim’s more permissive attitude towards Normative *Matn* Addition resonated with prominent ḥadīth scholars strongly associated with specific schools of law. The Mālikī jurist and ḥadīth scholar of Lisbon, Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr (d. 463/1071), states in his mammoth commentary on the *Muwaṭṭa’* (*Kitāb al-Tamhīd*) that the Additions (*ziyādāt*) of the ḥadīth masters (*ḥuffāẓ*) concerning the text of reports are acceptable (*maqbūla*).[66] His Shāfiʿī contemporary in Khurāsān, Abū Bakr al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066), also demonstrated a latitudinarian approach to competing Prophetic and Companion reports. In his massive compendium of ḥadīth buttressing Shāfiʿī substantive law, the *Sunan al-kubrā*, al-Bayhaqī sometimes acknowledges that *mawqūf* narrations exist alongside Prophetic ones. But he generally favors the Prophetic versions.[67] Although al-Bayhaqī was a tremendous scholar of ḥadīth, he was first and foremost a dedicated adherent of the Shāfiʿī/Ashʿarī school of law and legal theory. His attitude

---

[65] Al-Khalīl b. ʿAbdallāh al-Khalīlī, *al-Irshād fī maʿrifat ʿulamā’ al-ḥadīth*, ed. ʿĀmir Aḥmad Ḥaydar (Mecca: Dār al-Fikr, 1414/1993), 326.

[66] Abū ʿUmar Yūsuf Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *al-Tamhīd li-mā fī al-Muwaṭṭa’ min al-maʿānī wa ’l-asānīd*, ed. Muṣṭafā b. Aḥmad al-ʿAlawī and Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Kabīr al-Bakrī, 2nd ed., 26 vols. ([Rabat]: Wizārat ʿUmūm al-Awqāf wa’l-Shu’ūn al-Islāmiyya, 1402/1982, 1st edition 1387/1967), 8:267.

[67] See notes 28 and 98, where al-Bayhaqī favors the *marfūʿ* versions. In one case he invokes the expert opinion of ʿAbdallāh b. Ḥarb to bolster support for the *marfūʿ* reports. For an instance where al-Bayhaqī feels that the Companion version of the report “Indeed marriage is servitude, so be wary of where you enslave your free maiden (*innamā al-nikāḥ riqq fal-yanẓur aḥadukum ayna yaruqqu ʿatīqatahu*), attributed to Asmā’ bt. Abī Bakr, is more reliable than the Prophetic versions, see al-Bayhaqī, *al-Sunan al-kubrā*, 7:133 (*kitāb al-nikāḥ, bāb man takhallā li-ʿibādat Allāh idhā lam tattaqi nafsuhu ilā al-nikāḥ*).

towards competing *marfūʿ* and *mawqūf* reports reflected the stance emerging as mainstream among legal theorists in his school and others in the 5th/11th century.

This stance privileged the practical epistemological needs of jurists and legal theorists over the critical methodology of stringent ḥadīth critics. For jurists and legal theorists of the 5th/11th century, the question of competing Prophetic and Companion narrations was an undesirable distraction.[68] In the early development of the Sunni legal tradition, Companion opinions had been an important consideration in establishing rulings. Once the Ḥanafī, Shāfiʿī, Mālikī and Ḥanbalī schools of law had matured, however, none of them granted Companion opinions authority approaching that of Prophetic ḥadīths. If a jurist could determine that a report was the words of the Prophet and not those of a lesser figure, its authority and legal utility increased dramatically. A Prophetic report could restrict or modify Qurʾānic rulings as well as govern worship and dogma.

Many jurists and legal theorists thus adopted the stance of ḥadīth critics like Ibn Ḥibbān, who accepted Normative *Matn* Addition unconditionally, provided the transmitter of that narration was reliable. The great Shāfiʿī/Ashʿarī jurist of Baghdad, Abū Isḥāq al-Shīrāzī, thus maintained that the existence of competing *marfūʿ* and *mawqūf* narrations posed no threat to the reliability of the Prophetic version; scholars should accept the Prophetic version as authoritative. He noted that this position differs from that of "some ḥadīth scholars (*aṣḥāb al-ḥadīth*)," who consider the competing *mawqūf* narrations to be "damning (*qadḥ*) for the Prophetic report."[69]

Al-Shīrāzī reveals the functionalist motivation for categorically accepting the Prophetic version by turning to a rational principle embedded in the Near Eastern composite of classical Islamic thought.

---

[68] Interestingly, when rigorous critics like al-Dāraquṭnī revealed that a Prophetic report was really *mawqūf*, a small window was opened up for jurists to rehabilitate this ḥadīth. The Ḥanafī jurist and ḥadīth scholar Ḍiyāʾ al-Dīn Abū Ḥafṣ ʿUmar al-Mawṣilī (d. 622/1225) devoted an unusual treatise to rescuing those ḥadīths al-Dāraquṭnī and Ibn al-Jawzī had proven to be *mawqūf* in their *ʿilal* works. Al-Mawṣilī explains that these reports may indeed have originally been the statements of Companions, but this means that they may still possess some legal utility. Ḥadīths that are patent forgeries (*mawḍūʿāt*) have no legal weight, while Companion reports are admissible as evidence in deriving legal rulings among jurists; Ḍiyāʾ al-Dīn Abū Ḥafṣ ʿUmar al-Mawṣilī, *al-Wuqūf ʿalā al-mawqūf*, Ms. Ahmet III 624, fol. 230b.

[69] Al-Shīrāzī, *al-Tabṣira*, 325.

The scholar invokes the axiom that "in matters of epistemology, the affirmative supersedes the negative (*al-muthbit muqaddam ʿalā al-nāfī fī al-ʿilm*)."[70] In other words, all things being equal, a report that increases the absolute amount of knowledge about law and doctrine in the Muslim community supersedes a report that offers no additional knowledge. Abū al-Muẓaffar al-Samʿānī (d. 489/1096), a younger contemporary of al-Shīrāzī from Khurāsān who defected from the Ḥanafī to the Shāfiʿī school, reiterates the acceptability of taking the Prophetic version of a report. He explains that a Companion may quote the Prophet on one occasion and paraphrase him on another when delivering his own legal ruling (*fatwā*). Al-Samʿānī adds that one should treat competing Companion/Prophetic narrations of the same ḥadīth in the same manner as one would treat two totally different ḥadīths. The Prophetic version is thus admissible regardless of how numerous or well attested the Companion counterparts are.[71]

The general acceptance of Normative *Matn* Addition was echoed by al-Shīrāzī's Ḥanbalī contemporary in jurisprudence and legal theory, Abū Yaʿlā Ibn al-Farrāʾ of Baghdad (d. 458/1066).[72] A Mālikī of Baghdad from the same period, Abū al-Walīd al-Bājī (d. 474/1081), also accepted Addition to the text of a report (*al-zāʾid*

---

[70] Al-Shīrāzī, *Kitāb al-maʿūna fī al-jadal*, ed. ʿAbd al-Majīd Turkī (Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1408/1988), 162-3. The earliest articulation of this principle that I have found appears in Abū Jaʿfar Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Ṭaḥāwī's (d. 321/933) *Sharḥ maʿānī al-āthār*, oddly in the context of Literal *Matn* Addition. Here al-Ṭaḥāwī favors the narration with Addition over the one without it because "the narration adding supersedes the one lacking (*al-zāʾid awlā min al-nāqiṣ*)"; Abū Jaʿfar al-Ṭaḥāwī, *Sharḥ maʿānī al-āthār*, ed. Muḥammad Zahrī al-Najjār, 4 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1421/2001), 1:23. For instances of this principle being employed in the context of claims made in a debate (in which, all things being equal, the person making a claim trumps the person rejecting it) in both the sixth/twelfth century and the twentieth, see Majd al-Dīn al-Mubārak b. Muḥammad Ibn al-Athīr, *Jāmiʿ al-uṣūl fī aḥādīth al-Rasūl*, ed. ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Arnāʾūṭ, 15 vols. ([n.p.]: Dār al-Malāḥ 1389/1969), 1:162; Aḥmad b. al-Ṣiddīq al-Ghumārī, *ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib imām al-ʿārifīn aw al-Burhān al-jalī fī taḥqīq intisāb al-ṣūfiyya ilā ʿAlī*, ed. Aḥmad Muḥammad Mursī (Cairo: Maktabat al-Qāhira, [n.d]), 183.

[71] Abū al-Muẓaffar Manṣūr b. Muḥammad al-Samʿānī, *Qawāṭiʿ al-adilla fī uṣūl al-fiqh*, ed. ʿAbdallāh b. Ḥāfiẓ al-Ḥakamī, 5 vols. (Riyadh: Maktabat al-Tawba, 1418/1998), 2:463; cf. al-Ṣanʿānī, *Tawḍīḥ al-afkār*, 1:340.

[72] Abū Yaʿlā Ibn al-Farrāʾ, *al-ʿUdda fī uṣūl al-fiqh*, ed. Aḥmad b. ʿAlī Sīr al-Mubārak, 3 vols. (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1400/1980), 3:1011.

min al-akhbār). If the report adding knowledge were dealt with on its own merits, he explains, scholars would accept and employ it. Any critic who would accept the *marfūʿ* report if it were narrated in isolation must thus also accept the report when it is a case of Addition to another narration.[73] This stance offered the jurists tremendous utility. For example, in the face of nine *mawqūf* narrations of a report and only one *marfūʿ* version, they could dismiss the majority Companion versions and take the lone Prophetic narration.

These 5th/11th-century jurists and legal theorists received validation for their position from al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (d. 463/1071). This towering figure in ḥadīth scholarship sought to build a bridge between the *ahl al-ḥadīth* traditionists and the more theoretically inclined devotees of the Shāfiʿī/Ashʿarī school. His *Kitāb al-faqīh wa'l-mutafaqqih* thus attempts to digest and present the system of Shāfiʿī/Ashʿarī legal theory in the transmission-based language of ḥadīth scholars. In other writings, al-Khaṭīb urges ḥadīth scholars to better understand and appreciate the complementary role of ḥadīth scholars and jurists. In this vein, he presents his readers with stories of collaboration between the archetypal jurist Abū Ḥanīfa and the ḥadīth transmitter Sulaymān b. Mihrān al-Aʿmash.[74]

In his hugely influential treatise on the discipline of ḥadīth transmission and criticism, *al-Kifāya fī ʿilm al-riwāya*, al-Khaṭīb backs the jurists' stance on Normative *Matn* Addition in the face of resistance from ḥadīth scholars. He acknowledges that the majority of ḥadīth scholars (*muḥaddithūn*) treats the *mawqūf* narration as the correct version and view the *marfūʿ* narration as an erroneous attribution to the Prophet. Al-Khaṭīb argues, however, that the existence of a competing Companion report does not affect the provenance of the Prophetic one. After all, the Companion version may represent the Companion's *fatwā*, and thus the two reports represent two totally different instances of speech. He describes how Sufyān b.

---

[73] Abū al-Walīd Sulaymān b. Khalaf al-Bājī, *al-Ishāra fī uṣūl al-fiqh*, ed. ʿĀdil Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Mawjūd and ʿAlī Muḥammad ʿAwaḍ (Riyadh: Maktabat Nizār Muṣṭafā al-Bāz, 1418/1997), 239.

[74] Here Abū Ḥanīfa answers a legal question in the presence of al-Aʿmash, who then inquires as to how he arrived at that response. Abū Ḥanīfa replies, "From one of your ḥadīths," to which al-Aʿmash responds, "Yes, we are the pharmacists and you are the doctors"; al-Khaṭīb, "Naṣīḥat li-ahl al-ḥadīth," in *Majmūʿat al-rasā'il fī ʿulūm al-ḥadīth*, ed. Ṣubḥī al-Badrī al-Sāmarrā'ī (Medina: al-Maktaba al-Salafiyya, 1389/1969), 33.

ʿUyayna used to narrate a ḥadīth from the Prophet and an identical *fatwā* from a Companion without considering the two reports related.[75]

Al-Khaṭīb's efforts to straddle the divide between jurists and ḥadīth critics manifested itself in his other writings on Normative *Matn* Addition. In his *Tamyīz al-mazīd fī muttaṣil al-asānīd* (now lost), he apparently adopted a position closer to that of the ḥadīth scholars he mentioned in the *Kifāya*. The 8th/14th-century Ḥanbalī scholar Zayn al-Dīn Ibn Rajab (d. 795/1392) explains how al-Khaṭīb's efforts to be all things to all people angered some ḥadīth scholars, who rejected his adoption of the legal theorists' stance in his *Kifāya*, as well as the legal theorists, who rejected his position in the *Tamyīz*.[76] In his evaluation of ḥadīths in the *Tārīkh Baghdād*, al-Khaṭīb assumes an approach similar to that of al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī; he rejects only the more flagrant backgrowth of *isnād*s.[77]

Al-Khaṭīb's pro-jurist stance on Normative *Matn* Addition was adopted by the major architects of the later Sunni ḥadīth tradition. The Mālikī al-Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ b. Mūsā (d. 544/1149) recognized that the majority of jurists (*fuqahāʾ*) and legal theorists (*uṣūliyyūn*) accepted Addition unconditionally, provided the narrator of the Prophetic report was trustworthy. Al-Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ omitted any note of ḥadīth scholar dissent.[78] In his definitive treatise on the ḥadīth sciences, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (d. 643/1245) categorically adopted the legal theorists'

---

[75] Al-Khaṭīb, *al-Kifāya*, 449, 456.

[76] Ibn Rajab, *Sharḥ ʿIlal al-Tirmidhī*, 1:428. Here the modern ḥadīth scholar Nūr al-Dīn ʿItr suggests that al-Khaṭīb was not altering his position because the *Tamyīz* was devoted to the question of *Isnād* Addition. Since we do not have access to the *Tamyīz*, however, we are dependent on Ibn Rajab's analysis of its content. Because he felt it was appropriate to mention the book in the context of Normative *Matn* Addition, it seems likely that the work actually addressed this issue at least in part.

[77] Al-Khaṭīb notes, for example, that the correct version of the little-known Prophetic ḥadīth "never did two men love one another for [the sake of God]… (*mā taḥābba rajulān fī Allāh*…)" is *mawqūf*. He also notes the correct *mawqūf* versions of Abū Dāwūd's frequently criticized ḥadīth (mentioned above) on not answering the call to prayer (Saʿīd b. al-Jubayr ← Ibn ʿAbbās ← Prophet: *man samiʿa al-nidāʾ fa-lam yujib fa-lā ṣalāt lahu*…) as well as a ḥadīth on buying fish that Ibn Ḥanbal included in his *Musnad* as *marfūʿ* (← Yazīd b. Abī Ziyād ← Musayyib b. Rāfiʿ ← ʿAbdallāh b. Masʿūd ← Prophet: *lā tashtarū al-samak fī al-māʾ fa-innahu gharar*; *Musnad Ibn Ḥanbal*: 1:288); al-Khaṭīb, *Tārīkh Baghdād*, 6:282-3; 2:446; 9:446-7.

[78] Al-Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ b. Mūsā, *Ikmāl al-Muʿlim bi-fawāʾid Muslim*, ed. Yaḥyā Ismāʿīl, 9 vols. (Mansoura, Egypt: Dār al-Wafāʾ, 1419/1998), 1:102.

position as articulated by al-Khaṭīb. Regardless of competing Companion reports, the Prophetic version should be taken as correct because the affirmative supersedes the negative in matters of legal epistemology.[79] Almost every major Shāfiʿī ḥadīth figure upheld the categorical acceptability of taking the Prophetic version, provided its transmitter was reliable, among them al-Nawawī (d. 676/1277), Ibn Jamāʿa (d. 733/1333), Jamāl al-Dīn al-Mizzī (d. 742/1341), Zayn al-Dīn al-ʿIrāqī (d. 806/1404), Ibn al-Jazarī (d. 833/1429), Shams al-Dīn al-Sakhāwī (d. 902/1497), Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505) and Shaykh al-Islām Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī (d. 926/1520). In the words of al-Anṣārī, "the transmitter [of the Prophetic version] is affirming and thus supersedes the person negating it (i.e., narrating the *mawqūf* version)."[80] The Mālikī scholar of Marrakesh, Ibn al-Qaṭṭān (d. 628/1231), seems to have followed al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī in upholding the categorical acceptance of Addition by trustworthy transmitters. Ibn al-Qaṭṭān stated that this is the opinion of "most of the legal theorists and a party from among the scholars of ḥadīth." Like al-Shīrāzī and Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, he explained that the transmitter narrating the Prophetic version has preserved knowledge (*ḥafiẓa*) that the transmitters of the *mawqūf* narration have not.[81] The Ḥanafī scholar of Herat, Abū al-Fayḍ al-Faṣīḥ al-Harawī (d. 837/1434) also followed Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, stating that Addition by a reliable narrator

---

[79] Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, *Muqaddimat Ibn Ṣalāḥ*, 229.

[80] Muḥyī al-Dīn Abū Zakariyyā Yaḥyā al-Nawawī, *Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, 15 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Qalam, 1407/1987), 1:145; idem, *al-Taqrīb li'l-Nawawī* (Cairo: Maktabat Muḥammad ʿAlī Ṣubayḥ, 1388/1968), 11; Badr al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm Ibn Jamāʿa, *Manhal al-rāwī fī ʿulūm al-ḥadīth al-nabawī*, ed. Muḥammad al-Sayyid Nūḥ (Mansoura, Egypt: Dār al-Wafāʾ, 1402/1981), 167; al-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt al-shāfiʿiyya*, 10:424 (biography of al-Mizzī); al-ʿIrāqī, *Al-Taqyīd wa'l-īḍāḥ li-mā uṭliqa wa ughliqa min Muqaddimat Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ*, ed. Muḥammad ʿAbdallāh Shāhīn (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1420/1999), 79; idem, *al-Tabṣira wa'l-tadhkira*, 1:178; al-Sakhāwī, *Fatḥ al-mughīth*, 1:219; idem, *al-Ghāya fī sharḥ al-Hidāya*, ed. Abū ʿĀʾish ʿAbd al-Munʿim Ibrāhīm ([Cairo]: Maktabat Awlād al-Shaykh, 1422/2001), 178; al-Suyūṭī, *Tadrīb al-rāwī*, ed. ʿIzzat ʿAlī ʿAṭiyya and Mūsā Muḥammad ʿAlī, 2 vols. (Cairo: Maṭbaʿat Ḥassān, 1980), 1:276; Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī, *Fatḥ al-bāqī bi-sharḥ Alfiyyat al-ʿIrāqī*, ed. Thanāʾallāh al-Zāhidī (Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 1420/1999), 162.

[81] Ibn al-Qaṭṭān, *Bayān*, 5:351, 430. For these citations and indispensable assistance in navigating Ibn al-Qaṭṭān's *magnum opus*, I am indebted to Muṣṭafā Abū Sufyān's extremely useful treatise *Ārāʾ Ibn al-Qaṭṭān al-Fāsī fī ʿilm muṣṭalaḥ al-ḥadīth min khilāl kitābihi Bayān al-wahm wa'l-īhām* (Rabat: Maṭbaʿat al-Maʿārif al-Jadīda, 2002).

(ziyādat al-thiqa) is accepted categorically by the majority of jurists and ḥadīth scholars.[82] The great Indian Ḥanafī ḥadīth scholar of the nineteenth century, ʿAbd al-Ḥayy al-Laknawī (d. 1304/1886-7), also advocated the categorical acceptability of a *marfūʿ* narration regardless of competing *mawqūf* versions, provided the former had a reliable *isnād*.[83]

The Survival of the Ḥadīth Critical Methodology

Although central figures in the Sunni ḥadīth tradition such as al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī and Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ validated the jurists' pragmatic but uncritical acceptance of Normative *Matn* Addition, a series of ḥadīth scholars continued to uphold the rigorous approach of the Rāzīs and al-Dāraquṭnī.

Majd al-Dīn Ibn al-Athīr (d. 606/1210) estimated that while jurists accepted Normative *Matn* Addition by a trustworthy narrator regardless of opposing evidence, many ḥadīth scholars still maintained that the *mawqūf* report was the correct version.[84] For them, a ḥadīth critic must choose the correct version of the report by examining the totality of its existing narrations rather than relying on a fixed rule of acceptance. If the majority of the reliable narrations of the ḥadīth were from a Companion, a Prophetic version was of dubious provenance. The great Ḥanbalī scholar and preacher of Baghdad, Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597/1200), attempted to walk a critical middle ground on the backgrowth of *isnād*s. He explained that a *mawqūf* narration presents no inherent threat to the authenticity of a *marfūʿ* version. Only when the majority of narrations are *mawqūf* does a solitary *marfūʿ* version lose its reliability. He thus accepted Normative *Matn* Addition, except in circumstances in which it was clearly a minority opinion.[85] Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1348) seconded

---

[82] Abū al-Fayḍ Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Faṣīḥ al-Harawī, *Jawāhir al-uṣūl fī ʿilm ḥadīth al-Rasūl*, ed. Abū al-Maʿālī Aṭhar al-Mubārakfūrī (Medina: al-Maktaba al-ʿIlmiyya, [1973]), 38.

[83] ʿAbd al-Ḥayy al-Laknawī, *Ẓafar al-amānī bi-sharḥ mukhtaṣar al-sayyid al-sharīf al-Jurjānī*, ed. ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghudda (Aleppo: Maktab al-Maṭbūʿāt al-Islāmiyya, 1416/1996), 332-3.

[84] Ibn al-Athīr, *Jāmiʿ al-uṣūl*, 1:170.

[85] ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn al-Jawzī, *Kitāb al-mawḍūʿāt*, ed. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Muḥammad ʿUthmān, 3 vols. (Medina: al-Maktaba al-Salafiyya, 1386-88/1966-68), 1:34.

this moderate approach, as did his teacher Ibn Daqīd al-ʿĪd (d. 702/1302). If a reliable transmitter narrates a Prophetic ḥadīth, but his colleagues have it as a Companion report, then a critic should take the word of the majority. "An individual," al-Dhahabī explains, "may err." If both sides seem equal, then one should present both versions in one's work.[86] Similarly, Ibn Rajab favored this emphasis on analyzing circumstances (*qarāʾin*) to determine the correct form of the report. A Prophetic version may be accepted provided that it does not disagree with other Companion versions that are more reliable.[87] Khalīl b. Kaykaldī al-ʿAlāʾī (d. 761/1359) noted that the great early ḥadīth critics like al-Bukhārī considered the specific circumstances of each case of competing *marfūʿ* and *mawqūf* reports, acting on the best evidence and not some categorical principle (*qāʿida*) like the one advanced by al-Khaṭīb and Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ.[88] The Yemeni Sunni, Ibn al-Wazīr (d. 840/1436), reiterated the importance of considering circumstances (*qarāʾin*). The individual ḥadīth critic must evaluate each case according to its merits.[89]

This approach received its most compelling support from the Cairene Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī (d. 852/1449). He stated that Normative *Matn* Addition was acceptable only when it did not differ with a more reliable Companion narration. Ibn Ḥajar, who disapproved of the widespread unconditional acceptance of Addition among jurists, expressed dismay that so many ḥadīth scholars from his own Shāfiʿī school upheld this notion. After all, a categorical acceptance of Normative *Matn* Addition could lead to instances in which a Prophetic narration contradicted more reliable *mawqūf* versions, thus rendering it anomalous (*shādhdh*) and disqualifying it from an authentic (*ṣaḥīḥ*) rating.[90] One of Ibn Ḥajar's students,

---

[86] Al-Dhahabī, *al-Mūqiẓa fī ʿilm muṣṭalaḥ al-ḥadīth*, ed. ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghudda (Aleppo: Maktab al-Maṭbūʿāt al-Islāmiyya, 1405/[1984-1985]), 52; al-Ṣanʿānī, *Tawḍīḥ al-afkār*, 1:343. Al-Dhahabī identifies numerous instances of *isnād* backgrowth in his *Mīzān al-iʿtidāl*; see al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān al-iʿtidāl fī naqd al-rijāl*, ed. ʿAlī Muḥammad al-Bajāwī, 4 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Maʿrifa, [n.d.], reprint of 1963-4 Cairo ʿĪsā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī edition, citations are to the Beirut edition), 1:90, 214, 251, 265.

[87] Ibn Rajab, *Sharḥ ʿIlal al-Tirmidhī*, 1:424, 429.

[88] Ibn Ḥajar, *al-Nukat ʿalā kitāb Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ*, 296.

[89] Ibn al-Wazīr, *Tanqīḥ al-anẓār*, 139.

[90] Ibn Ḥajar, *Nuzhat al-naẓar fī tawḍīḥ Nukhbat al-fikar fī muṣṭalaḥ ahl al-athar*, ed. ʿAbd al-Samīʿ al-Anīs and ʿIṣām Fāris al-Ḥarstānī (Amman: Dār ʿIṣām, 1419/1999), 45.

Ibrāhīm b. ʿUmar al-Biqāʿī (d. 885/1480), espoused his teacher's stance, but Ibn Ḥajar's more influential protégé, al-Sakhāwī, abandoned it for the categorical acceptance of al-Khaṭīb, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ and the legal theorists.[91]

The more critical trend in ḥadīth scholarship received its support from scholars who specialized in the complexities of *isnād* criticism, like al-ʿAlāʾī and Ibn Daqīq, or from iconoclastic figures who were committed to rejuvenating the study of ḥadīth as the centerpiece of Sunni Islam, like al-Dhahabī and Ibn al-Wazīr. The weightiest proponent of this stance on Normative *Matn* Addition was the great Mamluk-era scholar Ibn Ḥajar.

But even the advocacy of two giants like al-Dhahabī and Ibn Ḥajar cannot compete with the list of figures associated with the categorical acceptance of Normative *Matn* Addition. Al-Khaṭīb, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, al-Nawawī, al-Mizzī, al-ʿIrāqī, al-Suyūṭī, al-Sakhāwī, al-Anṣārī and al-Laknawī are recognized as scholars laureate of Sunnism and its ḥadīth sciences. Abū Bakr b. Nuqṭa (d. 629/1231) elegized al-Khaṭīb by stating, "No one of sound thought can doubt that the later scholars of ḥadīth are utterly dependent on (*ʿiyāl ʿalā*) Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb."[92] Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ penned the formative treatise on the study of ḥadīth that has served as the basis for almost all later works on the subject. His student al-Nawawī remains one of the top authoritative references in the Shāfiʿī school and among Sunnis in general. Al-Suyūṭī played such a salient role in shaping later Sunnism that he has been described as the "apex of religious sciences,"[93] and al-Anṣārī was honored during his life with the title *Shaykh al-Islām*. Representing the efflorescence of ḥadīth scholarship in India in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, al-Laknawī is perhaps the most cited ḥadīth master of the modern period.

---

[91] Al-Ṣanʿānī, *Tawḍīḥ al-afkār*, 1:339-40. For al-Sakhāwī's discussion of this issue, see his *al-Ghāya fī sharḥ al-Hidāya* and his *Fatḥ al-mughīth*, n. 80. The famous Ḥanafī scholar, lexicographer, and Indian immigrant to Cairo Muḥammad Murtaḍā al-Zabīdī (d. 1791 CE) also seems to have followed Ibn Ḥajar's opinion. Al-Zabīdī's stance, however, is not entirely clear; Muḥammad Murtaḍā al-Zabīdī, *Bulghat al-arīb fī muṣṭalaḥ āthār al-ḥabīb*, ed. ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghudda (Beirut: Maktabat al-Maṭbūʿāt al-Islāmiyya, 1408/[1988]), 190-1.

[92] Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Ghanī Ibn Nuqṭa al-Baghdādī, *Kitab al-Taqyīd li-maʿrifat ruwāt al-sunan wa'l-masānīd*, ed. Kamāl Yūsuf al-Ḥūt (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1408/1988), 154.

[93] E. Geoffroy, "al-Suyūṭī," *Encyclopaedia of Islam* CD-ROM Edition v. 1.0.

The Continuation of ʿIlal *Criticism*

Although it has remained the minority opinion, the continuation of a more rigorous approach to the backgrowth of *isnād*s has manifested itself in a small number of *ʿilal* studies produced after the 5th/11th century as well as several *mawḍūʿāt* books.

One of the most independently critical ḥadīth scholars after the 5th/11th century was Abū al-Ḥusayn ʿAlī b. Muḥammad Ibn al-Qaṭṭān al-Fāsī (d. 628/1231), who was born in Fez and spent most of his professional life in the service of the Almohad sultan in Marrakesh. Within a century of Ibn al-Qaṭṭān's death, his works had traveled to Damascus, where al-Dhahabī praised and occasionally rebutted his contributions to *ʿilal* criticism.[94] Ibn al-Qaṭṭān's most well-known work on ḥadīth is his *Bayān al-wahm wa'l-īhām al-wāqiʿayn fī kitāb al-Aḥkām*, a criticism of the ḥadīth mistakes made in ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn al-Kharrāṭ al-Ishbīlī's (d. 582/1186) juridical work *al-Aḥkām al-wusṭā min ḥadīth al-Nabī*.

Ibn al-Qaṭṭān explicitly upheld the categorical acceptance of Normative *Matn* Addition (as mentioned above). It is therefore curious that his *Bayān* includes a section on reports that earlier critics had accepted as Prophetic but which were actually *mawqūf*. Here he notes instances of *isnād*s being pushed back to the Prophet in prominent ḥadīth collections such as Abū Dāwūd's *Sunan*. Unlike 4th/10th and 5th/11th-century scholars like al-Dāraquṭnī and al-Bayhaqī, Ibn al-Qaṭṭān could no longer rely on an expansive personal corpus of narrations that extended from his time all the way back to the first generations of Islam.[95] Instead, Ibn al-Qaṭṭān was forced

---

[94] See al-Dhahabī, *Siyar aʿlām al-nubalāʾ*, vol. 22 of 25, ed. Bashhār ʿAwwād Maʿrūf and Muḥyī Hilāl al-Sirḥān (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1401/1981), 307; idem, *Mīzān al-iʿtidāl*, 1:556 (biography of Ḥafṣ b. Bughayl). For al-Dhahabī's rebuttal of Ibn al-Qaṭṭān, see Bashshār ʿAwwād Maʿrūf, *al-Dhahabī wa manhajuhu fī kitābihi Tārīkh al-islām* (Cairo: ʿĪsā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī, 1976), 173-5. Cf. Al-Laknawī, *al-Rafʿ wa'l-takmīl fī al-jarḥ wa'l-taʿdīl*, ed. ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghudda, 8th ed. (Beirut: Maktab al-Maṭbūʿāt al-Islāmiyya, 1425/2004), 256-9.

[95] Ḥadīth scholars to this day, of course, maintain chains of transmission back to the Prophet—the shortest known *isnād* today includes only 20 intermediaries to the Prophet. By the 7th/13th century, however, these living *isnād*s were cultivated for pietistic value and did not constitute the bulk of ḥadīth material examined by scholars. This came from ḥadīth collections compiled in previous centuries.

to rely on the myriad of *sunan*s, *musnad*s, *muʿjam*s and ḥadīth notebooks that had reached him from scholars of the earlier period. Ibn al-Kharrāṭ and other legally-oriented ḥadīth scholars had concluded that a specific report stating that not heeding the call to prayer nullified one's prayer originated with the Prophet. Relying on the ḥadīth collection of Qāsim b. Aṣbagh (d. 340/951), Ibn al-Qaṭṭān objects that the version of this report containing the words "except he who has an excuse" is actually *mawqūf*.[96] Here Ibn al-Qaṭṭān rejects a narration of this ḥadīth accepted by Abū Dāwūd in his *Sunan*.[97] He also proves more critical than al-Bayhaqī, who had noted the existence of *mawqūf* versions but ultimately opted for the Prophetic one.[98] In the case of another narration that appears as a Prophetic ḥadīth in Abū Dāwūd's *Sunan*, Ibn al-Qaṭṭān casts doubt on the origins of the report. One cannot accurately determine whether the *isnād* truly goes back to the Prophet, Ibn al-Qaṭṭān states, because in one recension of the *Sunan*, Abū Dāwūd expresses doubt over his source for the transmission.[99]

In a small *mawḍūʿāt* work analyzing sixty-four ḥadīths circulating at his time, the 8th/14th-century firebrand Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328) also revealed the backgrowth of *isnād*s that had occurred in several supposedly Prophetic reports. Ibn Taymiyya criticized five ḥadīths as being sayings of members of the early Muslim community (*kalām baʿḍ al-salaf*) pushed back to the Prophet.[100] As is common in

---

[96] Ibn al-Qaṭṭān, *Bayān*, 2:277-8. The report is "He who hears the call [to prayer] but does not reply, then there is no prayer for him, except those that have an excuse/whom an excuse prevented from following [the call] (*man samiʿa al-nidāʾ/al-munādī fa-lam yujib illā min ʿudhr /fa-lam yamnaʿhu min ittibāʿihi ʿudhr fa-lā ṣalāt lahu*). This ḥadīth comes from the Prophet through Ibn ʿAbbās → Saʿīd b. al-Jubayr → ʿAdī b. Thābit and then branches out to many transmitters.

[97] *Sunan Abī Dāwūd: kitāb al-ṣalāt, bāb al-tashdīd fī tark al-jamāʿa* (through Maghrāʾ al-ʿAbdī ← Shuʿba ← ʿAdī b. Thābit… Prophet: *man samiʿa al-munādī fa-lam yamnaʿhu min ittibāʿihi ʿudhr…*).

[98] Al-Bayhaqī, *al-Sunan al-kubrā*, 3:80, 248.

[99] Ibn al-Qaṭṭān, *Bayān*, 2:282; *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*: *kitāb al-ṣawm, bāb fī man samiʿa al-nidāʾ wa'l-ināʾ ʿalā yadihi* (the report is "If one of you hears the call [to the dawn prayer] but has a container of water in his hand, do not put it down until he has fulfilled his need with it [in other words, until he drinks it] (*idhā samiʿa aḥadukum al-nidāʾ wa'l-ināʾ ʿalā yadihi fa-lā yadaʿhu ḥattā yaqḍiya ḥājatahu minhu*").

[100] See, for example, the report "there is no comfort for the believer in lieu of meeting his Lord (*lā rāḥa li'l-mu'min dūn liqāʾ rabbihi*)"; Ibn Taymiyya, *al-Aḥādīth al-ḍaʿīfa wa'l-bāṭila*, ed. Majdī Fatḥī al-Sayyid (Tanta, Egypt: Dār

mawḍūʿāt books, Ibn Taymiyya does not provide us with the labyrinthine narrations of each problematic ḥadīth. Since he is either drawing on earlier works of *ʿilal* or *mawḍūʿāt* and generally dealing with reports with little basis in the ḥadīth corpus, he includes only his conclusion for each report.[101]

He states that the report "the love of the earthly life is the origin of every sin (*ḥubb al-dunyā raʾs kull khaṭīʾa*)" is actually from the Companion Jundub b. ʿAbdallāh al-Bajalī (d. c. 65/685). "But as for being from the Prophet," he adds, "there is no known *isnād*."[102] In the case of the report "honor your backs with support, for indeed in [backs] there is benefit for men (*akrimū zuhūrakum bi-isnād, fa-inna fīhā manāfiʿ li'l-nās*)," Ibn Taymiyya concludes, "I do not know of this attributed to the Prophet (*marfūʿ*)."[103] Ibn Taymiyya also dismisses as *mawqūf* some of the reports that al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī declared sound (*ṣaḥīḥ*).[104] Ibn Taymiyya concludes with a statement reminiscent of the critical rigor of the Rāzīs and al-Dāraquṭnī. No matter how useful a report attributed to the Prophet might seem, "It is not

---

al-Ṣaḥāba li'l-Turāth, 1410/1989), 13. This edition of this work did not take into consideration the manuscript found in the Süleymaniye Library. See idem, *Aḥādīth mawḍūʿa*, Ms Fatih 2266/6, Süleymaniye Library, fol. 228b. See also the report "he who was blessed with something, let him follow it (*man būrika lahu fī shayʾ fal-yalzamhu*)." The Tanta edition states only that the ḥadīth is forged (*mawḍūʿ*), but the Istanbul Ms. has "reported from some of the Salaf"; Ibn Taymiyya, *al-Aḥādīth al-ḍaʿīfa*, 15; cf. Ms., 228b. See also the report "'O ʿAlī, be one who knows (*ʿālim*), or a student, or listen, but do not be the fourth or you'll perish.' It was said, 'What is the fourth?' The Prophet said, 'the barbarian who does not know, does not learn and does not ask the learned ones (*al-ʿulamāʾ*) about questions of his religion (*yā ʿAlī, kun ʿālim*[an] *aw mutaʿallim*[an] *aw mustamiʿ*[an]*, wa lā takun al-rābiʿa… al-hamaj alladhī lā yaʿlamu, wa lā yataʿallamu wa lā yasʾalu al-ʿulamāʾ ʿan amr dīnihi*)"; idem, *al-Aḥādīth al-ḍaʿīfa*, 35-6; cf. Ms., 229b. This seems to have been a statement of the Companion ʿAbdallāh b. Masʿūd; see *Sunan al-Dārimī*: introductory chapters, *bāb fī dhahāb al-ʿilm*.

[101] For example, none of the reports he rejected as backgrowths of *isnād*s appears as a Prophetic ḥadīth in the Six Books, the *Musnad* of Ibn Ḥanbal, the *Sunan* of al-Dārimī or Mālik's *Muwaṭṭaʾ*.

[102] Ibn Taymiyya, *al-Aḥādīth al-ḍaʿīfa*, 14; Ms. 228b. Oddly, other scholars have attributed this saying to Jesus; see Abū al-Fayḍ Aḥmad al-Ghumārī, *al-Mughīr ʿalā al-aḥādīth al-mawḍūʿa fī al-Jāmiʿ al-ṣaghīr* (Beirut: Dār al-Rāʾid al-ʿArabī, 1402/1982), 55.

[103] Ibn Taymiyya, *al-Aḥādīth al-ḍaʿīfa*, 21; cf. Ms., 228a.

[104] Ibn Taymiyya, *Majmūʿ fatāwā shaykh al-islām Ibn Taymiyya*, ed. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Qāsim al-ʿĀṣimī, 37 vols. (Riyadh: Maṭābiʿ al-Riyāḍ, 1381-86/1961-67), 1:254-5.

possible to say 'from the Prophet, may the peace and blessings of God be upon him' for what he did not say."[105]

The Continuity of ʿIlal *Criticism Today*

This persistent effort to identify *isnād*s that had been pushed back to the Prophet has continued into the modern period with the ḥadīth scholarship of the traditional Moroccan Sufi Aḥmad b. al-Ṣiddīq al-Ghumārī (d. 1960).

In a work identifying the flaws found in the *Jāmiʿ al-ṣaghīr*, a ḥadīth collection compiled by Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī, al-Ghumārī ruthlessly criticizes this doyen of ḥadīth scholarship and commanding figure in the Sunni tradition. He exclaims that al-Suyūṭī possessed "absolutely (*bi'l-marra*)" no grasp of the science of ḥadīth criticism, and he states about one ḥadīth accepted by al-Suyūṭī that this is "a disgrace… exposing a fault in him the shame of which can never be washed away…."[106] Among the flawed reports, al-Ghumārī identifies twelve that al-Suyūṭī had included as Prophetic ḥadīths but which were actually statements by later authorities pushed back to the Prophet. Like Ibn al-Qaṭṭān, al-Ghumārī had to rely on earlier masters for the details of *ʿilal* criticism. He thus cites experts such as al-Bukhārī, Mālik, Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1064) and al-Dhahabī.[107] In one case he states that a report was originally said by ʿAlī, another by the caliph ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz (d. 101/720) and another by Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq (d. 148/765).[108]

Although he does not explicitly state his stance on the subject, al-Ghumārī demonstrates an affinity for the more stringent minority view on the acceptability of Normative *Matn* Addition. In an effort to prove that a particular ḥadīth criticized for being *mawqūf* was actually a Prophetic statement, al-Ghumārī notes that "most ḥadīth scholars, jurists and legal theorists" support the categorical acceptance of Addition. Yet he goes on to prove the *marfūʿ* status of the

---

[105] Ibn Taymiyya, Ms., 229a.

[106] Al-Ghumārī, *al-Mughīr*; 47, 74. Another modern work of *ʿilal* is Yaḥyā b. ʿAbdallāh al-Shihrī, *ʿIlal ḥadīth ḥajj al-bayt al-ḥarām fī kull khamsat aʿwām* (Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 2005).

[107] Al-Ghumārī, *al-Mughīr*, 10, 16, 18, 19, 23, 31, 55, 69, 98, 107, 122 and 127.

[108] See ibid., 10, 23 and 98 respectively.

ḥadīth according to the criteria of the more stringent ḥadīth scholars as well, demonstrating how the narrations of the *marfūʿ* version enjoy noticeable numeric superiority over the *mawqūf* one. Concluding that the *marfūʿ* version is the most reliable, he explains that "this is what reason accepts and investigation supports, for error could occur in three [narrations] (the number of *mawqūf* ones), but not in nine (the number of *marfūʿ* ones)."[109] Commenting on the principle that "the affirmative supersedes the negative in matters of epistemology," al-Ghumārī states that invoking this principle does not alone suffice to triumph in an argument; one still needs to present proof (*dalīl*).[110]

Conclusion

Al-Ghumārī's critique of al-Suyūṭī exemplifies the tension between the critical tendency in ḥadīth scholarship, evident in figures such as al-Dāraquṭnī and Ibn al-Qaṭṭān, and the epistemological pragmatism of the legal tradition. The fact that well into the 7th/13th century some ḥadīth scholars were insisting that Prophetic reports found in the canonical ḥadīth collections were actually Companion statements suggests that the ḥadīth tradition possessed much more critical inertia than has been supposed. That a few ḥadīth scholars have continued to unmask the backgrowth of *isnād*s until today proves that this critical strain has endured despite the majority acquiescence to the priorities of the legal tradition. The fact that some *mawqūf* narrations circulated alongside their *marfūʿ* counterparts well into the 5th/11th century in the *ʿilal* works of al-Dāraquṭnī, the *Sunan* of al-Bayhaqī and al-Khaṭīb's *Tārīkh Baghdād* suggests that the movement from the precedent of Companions and Successors to Prophetic ḥadīths in the 3rd/9th century was not executed with conspiratorial decisiveness. Remnants of the pre-backgrowth *isnād*s endured for two centuries. Even a century after Ibn ʿAmmār and al-Dāraquṭnī had unmasked 'backgrown' *isnād*s in the revered *Ṣaḥīḥayn*, al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī and Abū Isḥāq al-Shīrāzī still had to contend with ḥadīth scholars who would not accept the *marfūʿ* version of a

[109] Al-Ghumārī, *al-Istiʿāḍa bi-ḥadīth wuḍūʾ al-mustaḥāḍa*, ed. ʿAdnān Zuhār (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1422/2001), 38.
[110] Al-Ghumārī, *ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib*, 190.

ḥadīth if the *mawqūf* narration enjoyed more support. The movement from non-Prophetic to Prophetic ḥadīths was thus still a subject of debate in the mid 5th/11th century.

Moreover, this debate over Normative *Matn* Addition was an open one. Both sides presented their priorities publicly. In his capacity as a rigorous ḥadīth critic, al-Dāraquṭnī considered the preponderance of expert evidence to be the determining factor in identifying whether a report originated with the Prophet or a later figure. On the other hand, jurists and legal theorists from among 5th/11th-century Shāfiʿīs, Mālikīs, Ḥanbalīs and later Ḥanafīs, chose to accept an isolated Prophetic narration over multiple Companion versions because this allowed them to increase the legal utility of that report. The development of the Sunni scholarly tradition's approach to the backgrowth of *isnād*s is thus a gradual prioritization of legal utility over critical accuracy.

Appendix: Books of ʿIlal al-ḥadīth

The following is a chronological list of those authors who composed *ʿilal* works, many of which have not survived. It is important to note that *ʿilal* criticism was not limited only to separate *ʿilal* books—some ḥadīth collections included *ʿilal* commentaries, such as Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. ʿAmr al-Bazzār's (d. 292/904-5) massive *Musnad* and later Ḍiyāʾ al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Wāḥid al-Maqdisī's (d. 643/1245) *al-Aḥādīth al-mukhtāra*.[111]

- Yaḥyā b. Maʿīn (d. 233/847-8)[112]
- ʿAlī b. al-Madīnī (d. 234/849)[113]
- Sufyān b. Saḥbān (fl. 220/835)[114]

---

[111] Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bāʿith al-ḥathīth*, 55. See Ḍiyāʾ al-Dīn al-Maqdisī, *al-Aḥādīth al-mukhtāra, aw al-mustakhraj min al-aḥādīth al-mukhtāra mimmā lam yukharrijhu al-Bukhārī wa Muslim fī Ṣaḥīḥayhimā*, ed. ʿAbdallāh b. ʿAbdallāh Duhaysh, 13 vols (Beirut: Dār Khiḍr, 1421/2001).

[112] Yaḥyā b. Maʿīn, *Kitāb al-ʿilal wa maʿrifat al-rijāl*, ed. Abū ʿAbd al-Hādī al-Jazāʾirī (Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 1425/2004). This book was recorded by Ibn Ḥanbal's son ʿAbdallāh and addended to his father's *ʿilal* work.

[113] ʿAlī b. al-Madīnī, *al-ʿIlal*, ed. Muḥammad Muṣṭafā Aʿẓamī ([n.p.]: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1392/1972).

[114] Sufyān b. Saḥbān was considered a member of the *aṣḥāb al-raʾy*, but had a book called *al-ʿIlal*; Ibn Abī al-Wafāʾ (d. 775/1374), *al-Jawāhir al-muḍiyya fī ṭabaqāt al-ḥanafiyya*, ed. ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Muḥammad al-Ḥalw, 5 vols.

- Abū Khaythama Zuhayr b. Ḥarb (d. 234/848)[115]
- Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855)[116]
- Abū Ḥafṣ ʿAmr b. ʿAlī al-Ṣayrafī (d. 248/862-3)[117]
- Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl al-Bukhārī (d. 256/870)[118]
- Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā al-Dhuhlī (d. 258/873)[119]
- Aḥmad b. Muḥammad Ibn al-Athram (d. 261/875)[120]
- Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj al-Naysābūrī (d. 261/875)[121]
- Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā al-Tirmidhī (d. 279/892)[122]
- Abū Zurʿa al-Dimashqī (d. 280/894)[123]
- Ibrāhīm al-Ḥarbī (d. 285/898)[124]
- Abū ʿAlī ʿAbdallāh b. Muḥammad al-Balkhī (d. 294/907)[125]
- Abū Isḥāq Ibrāhīm b. Abī Ṭālib al-Naysābūrī (d. 295/908)[126]
- Abū Yaḥyā Zakariyyā b. Yaḥyā al-Sājī al-Baṣrī (d. 307/919-20)[127]

(Giza: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1398-1408/1978-1988), 2:227. Ibn Abī al-Wafāʾ cites Ibn al-Nadīm's (d. circa 385-8/995-8) *Fihrist*, where the information does not appear; cf. Abū al-Faraj Muḥammad b. Isḥāq Ibn al-Nadīm, *The Fihrist*, ed. and trans. Bayard Dodge (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970, reprint Chicago: Kazi Publications, 1998), 508 (citations are to Kazi edition).

[115] Ibn al-Nadīm, *The Fihrist*, 554.

[116] Ibn Ḥanbal, *Kitāb al-ʿilal wa maʿrifat al-rijāl*, ed. Ṭalʿat Qūj Yikīt and Ismāʿīl Ūghlī, 2 vols. (Istanbul: al-Maktaba al-Islāmiyya, 1987).

[117] See Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Sulamī, *Suʾālāt Abī ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī liʾl-Dāraquṭnī*, Ms. Ahmet III 624, Topkapı Sarayı, fol. 163a.

[118] Al-Kattānī, *al-Risāla al-mustaṭrafa*, 117.

[119] This book was called *ʿIlal ḥadīth al-Zuhrī*; al-Dhahabī, *Siyar aʿlām al-nubalāʾ*, volume 12 of 25, ed. Shuʿayb Arnāʾūṭ and Ṣalāḥ al-Shammar (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1403/1983), 284.

[120] Ibn Nadīm, *The Fihrist*, 537. Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī reports that some people deny Ibn al-Athram's attribution of his *ʿilal* book to Ibn Ḥanbal; al-Khaṭīb, *Tārīkh Baghdād*, 5:318.

[121] Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj al-Naysābūrī, *Kitāb al-tamyīz*, ed. Muḥammad Muṣṭafā al-Aʿẓamī (Riyadh: Maṭbaʿat Jāmiʿat al-Riyāḍ, [1395/1975]).

[122] Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā al-Tirmidhī, *ʿIlal al-Tirmidhī al-kabīr*, ed. Ṣubḥī al-Sāmarrāʾī et al. (Beirut: ʿĀlam al-Kutub, 1989).

[123] Fuat Sezgin, *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums*, 13 vols. (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967-2000), 1:302.

[124] Ibid., 7:172.

[125] Al-Dhahabī, *Siyar aʿlām al-nubalā*, vol. 13 of 25, ed. Shuʿayb Arnāʾūṭ and ʿAlī Abū Zayd, 11th ed. (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1419/1998), 529.

[126] Ibid., 13:550.

[127] Al-Dhahabī, *Siyar aʿlām al-nubalāʾ*, vol. 14 of 25, ed. Shuʿayb Arnāʾūṭ and Akram al-Būshī (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1403/1984), 199.

[128] Muwaffaq al-Dīn ʿAbdallāh b. Aḥmad Ibn Qudāma, *al-Muntakhab min al-ʿIlal liʾl-Khallāl*, ed. Ṭāriq b. ʿAwḍallāh b. Muḥammad (Riyadh: Dār al-Rāya, 1419/1997).

- Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Khallāl (d. 311/923)[128]
- Ibn ʿAmmār al-Shahīd al-Harawī (d. 317/929-30)[129]
- Abū al-Ḥasan Aḥmad b. ʿUmayr Ibn Jawṣāʾ (d. 320/932)[130]
- Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. ʿAmr al-ʿUqaylī (d. 323/934)[131]
- Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī (d. 327/938)[132]
- Abū al-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qaṭṭān (d. 345/956-7)[133]
- Ibn Ḥibbān al-Bustī (d. 354/965)[134]
- Abū al-Ḥasan al-Nasawī al-Shāfiʿī (d. before 380/990)[135]
- Al-Ḥajjājī, Abū al-Ḥusayn Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Naysābūrī (d. 368/979)[136]
- ʿAlī b. ʿUmar al-Dāraquṭnī (d. 385/995)[137]
- Abū Aḥmad Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Ḥākim (d. 378/988)[138]

---

[129] Abū al-Faḍl Ibn ʿAmmār al-Shahīd, *ʿIlal al-aḥādīth fī kitāb al-ṣaḥīḥ li-Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj*, ed. ʿAlī b. Ḥasan al-Ḥalabī (Riyadh: Dār al-Hijra, 1412/1991). This is an *ʿilal* work of Muslim's *Ṣaḥīḥ*.

[130] Al-Dhahabī, *Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāẓ*, 3:13.

[131] Although this work is primarily a collection of weak transmitters, it contains a great deal of *ʿilal* criticism. I believe this is thus the book that some later scholars refer to as al-ʿUqaylī's *Kitāb al-ʿilal*. See, for examples, Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. ʿAmr al-ʿUqaylī, *Kitāb al-ḍuʿafāʾ al-kabīr*, ed. ʿAbd al-Muʿṭī Amīn Qalʿajī, 4 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1404/1984); 2:62, 124; 3:82, 488.

[132] Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī, *ʿIlal al-ḥadīth*, 2 vols. (Baghdad: Maktabat al-Muthannā, [1971]).

[133] Al-Sakhāwī, *al-Maqāṣid al-ḥasana fī bayān kathīr min al-aḥādīth al-mushtahira ʿalā al-alsina*, ed. Muḥammad ʿUthmān al-Khisht (Beirut: Dār al-kitāb al-ʿarabī, 1425/2004), 381.

[134] Ibn Ḥibbān al-Bustī, *Kitāb al-majrūḥīn min al-muḥaddithīn al-ḍuʿafāʾ wa'l-matrūkīn*, ed. Maḥmūd Ibrāhīm Zāyid (Aleppo: Dār al-Waʿī, 1396/1976), 1:40. Ibn Ḥibbān had several works (most seemingly lost) on *ʿilal*, one devoted to the ḥadīth of Mālik b. Anas and one to ḥadīth supposedly narrated by Abū Ḥanīfa; al-Dhahabī, *Siyar aʿlām al-nubalāʾ*, vol. 16 of 25, ed. Shuʿayb Arnāʾūṭ and Akram al-Būshī, 11th ed. (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1419/1998), 95. Yaḥyā al-Shihrī has collected many of Ibn Ḥibbān's *ʿilal* criticisms and published them as *ʿIlal al-akhbār wa maʿrifat ruwāt al-āthār* (Riyadh: Maktabat al-Rushd, 2001).

[135] Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 527.

[136] Al-Dhahabī, *Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāẓ*, 3:104.

[137] ʿAlī b. ʿUmar al-Dāraquṭnī, *al-ʿIlal al-wārida fī al-aḥādīth al-nabawiyya*, ed. Maḥfūẓ al-Raḥmān al-Salafī, 11 vols. (Riyadh: Dār al-Ṭayba, 1405/1985-1416/1996); idem, *Kitāb al-ilzāmāt wa'l-tatabbuʿ*, ed. Muqbil b. Hādī al-Wādiʿī (Medina: al-Maktaba al-Salafiyya, [1978]).

[138] Al-Dhahabī, *Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāẓ*, 3:124.

- Al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1014)[139]
- Abū al-Faḍl Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir al-Maqdisī (d. 507/1113)[140]
- ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn al-Kharrāṭ (d. 581/1185)[141]
- ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597/1200)[142]
- Ibn al-Qaṭṭān, Abū al-Ḥusayn ʿAlī b. Muḥammad al-Fāsī (d. 628/1231)[143]
- Ibn ʿAbd al-Hādī Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Ḥanbalī (d. 744/1343)[144]
- Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī (d. 852/1449)[145]

---

[139] See editor's introduction, al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, recension and translation by Moḥammad b. Ḥosayn Khalīfe-ye Nīshābūrī (fl. 720/1320), *Tārīkh Nīshābūr*, ed. Moḥammad Reḍā Shafiʿī Kadkanī (Tehran: Āgāh, 1375/[1996]), 38-42.

[140] Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad b. ʿAlī al-Maqrīzī (d. 845/1441), *Kitāb al-muqaffā al-kabīr*, ed. Muḥammad al-Yaʿlāwī, 8 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1411/1991), 5:735.

[141] This book was called *al-Muʿtall min al-ḥadīth*; al-Dhahabī, *Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāẓ*, 4:97.

[142] Ibn al-Jawzī had several works devoted to weak or forged ḥadīths. See ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn al-Jawzī, *Kitāb al-mawḍūʿāt*, ed. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Muḥammad ʿUthmān, 3 vols. (Medina: al-Maktaba al-Salafiyya, 1386-88/1966-68); idem, *al-ʿIlal al-mutanāhiya fī al-aḥādīth al-wāhiya*, ed. Khalīl Mays, 2 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1983).

[143] Ibn al-Qaṭṭān al-Fāsī, *Bayān al-wahm wa'l-īhām al-wāqiʿayn fī kitāb al-Aḥkām*, ed. al-Ḥusayn Āyat Saʿīd, 5 vols. (Riyadh: Dār al-Ṭayba, 1418/1997).

[144] Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505), *Dhayl Ṭabaqāt al-ḥuffāẓ*, ed. Zakariyyā ʿUmayrāt (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1419/1998), 233.

[145] This work was entitled *al-Ẓahr al-maṭlūl fī al-khabar al-maʿlūl*; al-Kattānī, *al-Risāla al-mustaṭrafa*, 117.