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

Khairil Husaini Bin Jamil
AbdulHamid Abu Sulayman Kulliyah of Islamic Revealed Knowledge and Human Sciences, International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM), Malaysia

ABSTRACT

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

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

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

² See: al-Ḥasan ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥamān Ibn Khallād al-Rāmhmuzū, *al-Muḥaddith al-Fāṣil Bayna al-Rāwī Wa al-Wāʾî*, ed. ʿAjāj al-Khaṭīb (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1994); Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh Ibn al-Bayyīʿ Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥākim, *Ma rifat Ulūm al-Ḥadīth Wa Kammiyat Ajnāsihi* (Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 2003); Ahmad ibn ʿAli ibn Thābit al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *al-Kifāyah Fi Usul ʾIlm al-Riwaḥ* (Riyadh: Dār Ibn al-Jawzī, 2011).
Dating the Early History of Sanad and Isnād

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

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

---

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

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

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

\(^6\) See, for instance: Joseph Schacht, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950), 36–37.
Abī ‘Ubayd al-Thaqafī (67AH) against the Umayyad caliphate, (5) the armed fight between the camp of ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr and the Umayyad governor al-Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf al-Thaqafī that took place around the year 72AH, and (6) the assassination of the Umayyad caliph al-Walīd ibn Yazīd in 126AH. The first five views located the introduction of systematic isnād between the first half and the second half of the first Hijrī century, whilst the last view dated it to the second Hijrī century.

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

a) Conversational sanad, occasionally instructional sanad

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

b) Confessional sanad

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

---

7 See: Khairil Husaini Bin Jamil, "قراءة في تاريخ الإسناد والتجريد: كتاب شهاب الأخبار. للقضايا (454هـ) وإثارة في: بحثالتصنيف الحديثي: A Reading of Isnād and Tajrīd Methodology: Shihāb al-Akhbār of al-Quḍā‘ī (d.454H) and Its Influence on Later Ḥadīth Compilations.", al-Burhān: Journal of Qurʾān and Sunnah Studies 3, no. 1 (2019): 76–105.

8 See: ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Abū Bakr Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī, Alfiyyah al-Suyūṭī Fī ʿIlm al-Ḥadīth, ed. Ahmad ibn Muhammad Shākir Abū al-Asbāḥ (al-Maktabah al-ʿIlmiyyah, n.d.); ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Bakr Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī, Tadrīb al-Rāwī Fī Sharḥ Taqrīb al-Nawawī, ed. Abū Qutaybah Nazar Muḥammad al-Fāriyābī (Riyadh: Dār Ṭaybah, 2006).

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

c) Critical sanad

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

d) Customary sanad

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

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

¹¹ Bin Jamil, قراءة في تاريخ الإسناد والتجريد. كتاب شهاب الأخباز للقضاعي (ق544)، وآثاري في مسار التصنيف الحديثي: A Reading of Isnād and Tajrīd Methodology: Shihāb al-Akhbār of al-Quḍāʿī (d.454H) and Its Influence on Later Ḥadīth Compilations.
for maintaining the tradition or blessings.\textsuperscript{12} Hadîth masters may also provide a sanad for the whole book or compendium rather than presenting a specific sanad for each particular hadîth. Although scholars are still verifying certain sanads, the essential sanads are said to have been completely reported in the written works of the muhaddithûn. Oral transmission is no longer, then, regarded as the focal point for verification.

Which Muḥaddith Removed the Sanad?

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

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

\textsuperscript{12} al-Suyûṭî wrote in Alfiyyah: وأعراضًا في هذه الأزمنة عن لجعسرا مع كون ذا الوراد همار بق سلسلة الإسلاض

\textsuperscript{13} Muhammad ibn Ṭalî ibn Ṭalî Ḳharîd BâʿAlawî, Ghurar al-Bahâʾ al-Ḍâwî Wa Durar al-Jamâl al-Badî, 2nd ed. Munich: Fîh al-Ammah, 1997, Arabic ed. 2nd ed., n.d., 126.

\textsuperscript{14} Muḥammad BâDhîb, Juhūd Fuqahāʾ Ḳarḍarawt Fī Khidmat al-Madhhab al-Shâfiʿî (Jordan: Dâr al-Fatâḥ, dirasât wa-nashr, 2009), 1:324.
Jadīd was not the first to omit sanads from ḥadīths, rather the method was already adopted by the teacher of Ibn Jadīd’s teachers - Muḥammad ibn Sa’īd ibn Ma’an al-Quṣayrī (757AH). He removed all sanads in his work al-Mustaṣfā in which he combined the content of the six canonical compendia with that of al-Muwaṭṭa‘.16

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

"فهذا مختصر في سنن رسول الله ﷺ، مستخرج من صحاح كتب أئمة الحديث رحمة الله عليهم ...

ومن هم الذين أخرجوا من الصحاح الإسلامية الأسانيد إلا الدتون، مكتوب في أول كل خبر علامة اسم من ذكرونه."

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

Nevertheless, it seems that al-Quṣayrī himself did not introduce this method and he learned it from a predecessor. To clarify this, it is important to learn that al-Quṣayrī had composed another work on ḥadīth titled al-Qamar (possibly al-Qamar fī Aḥādīth Sayyid al-Bashar). Since the book did not survive, we have no information concerning its structure. However, BāDhīb claimed in his editorial preface for al-Mustaṣfā that al-Qamar was composed following the style of al-Kawkab al-Durrī al-Mustakhraj min Kalām al-Nabī al-‘Arabī.18 The work was compiled by Aḥmad ibn Ma’ad Abū al-ʿAbbās al-Uqlīshī al-Tujībī (550AH).19 This is interesting since the ḥadīths mentioned in the latter are devoid of sanads as well. al-Uqlīshī also has another two works which are al-Ghurar min Kalām Sayyid al-Bashar20 and its abridged version al-Najm min Kalām Sayyid al-ʿArab wa al-ʿAjam. The

16 BāDhayb, 1:324.
17 Muḥammad ibn Sa’īd ibn Ma’an al-Quṣayrī, al-Mustaṣfā Fī Sunan al-Mustaṣfā, ed. Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Ahdal, 1st ed. (Beirut: Dār al-Minhāj, n.d.), 40. The editor remarked that there is a huge similarity between this work and the later Riyāḍ al-Ṣāliḥīn of al-Nawawī.
18 See the editorial remark in: al-Quṣayrī, 25.
19 See: Ahmad ibn Ma’ad al-Tujibī al-Uqlīshī, al-Kawkab al-Durrī al-Mustakhraj Min Kalām al-Nabī al-ʿArabī (Morocco, 2014); The work was also published in a dissertation. See: Ahmad Muḥammad Ahmad al-Ahdal, ‘A Critical Edition of “al-Kawkab al-Durrī al-Mustakhraj Min Kalām al-Nabī” by Ahmad b. Ma’add b. ʿIsa b. Wakil al-Tujibī al-Uqlīshī’ (University of Glasgow, 1986).
20 Ahmad ibn Muḥammad al-Tilmisānī, Naḥḥ al-Ṭib Min Ghuṣn al-Andalus al-Raṭīb (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1968), 2:599.
complete original did not survive, however the abridged which is al-Najm presented its hadīths without any sanad.\textsuperscript{21} It is highly possible that the original too was without any sanad since al-Uqlīshī did not mention any other differences between the two except for the length of hadīth texts presented in them. In al-Najm, al-Uqlīshī stated:

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

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

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

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

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item See: Ahmad ibn Maʿad al-Tujibī al-Uqlīshī, al-Najm Min Kalām Sayyid al-ʿArab Wa al-ʿAjam, 1st ed. (Cairo: al-Maṭbaʿah al-ʿUlamīyyah, 1885).
\item al-Uqlīshī, 3.
\item al-Quḍāʾī in Shihāb al-Akhbār fī al-Ḥikam wa al-Amthāl wa al-Ādāb fī al-Aḥādīth al-Marwiyyah ‘an al-Rasūl al-Mukhtār. The work is incorporated in Musnad al-Shihāb as will be detailed below.
\item Muhammad ibn Salāmah ibn ʿAlī Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Quḍāʾī, Musnad al-Shihāb, ed. Ḥamdī ʿAbd al-Majīd al-Salafi, 1st ed. (Beirut: Muʿassasah al-Risālah, n.d.); Also, by another publisher. See: Muḥammad ibn
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
provided the sanad for all ḥadīths presented in Shīḥāb al-Akhbār. Thus, we can conclude safely that the omission of sanads from the ḥadīth work was not due to unavailability or any potential defects from al-Qudāʾī’s view, rather the method was introduced by him for a specific reason, which he mentioned in the work, “so that it will be more accessible for everyone and easier for memorisation.”

To further clarify the method of al-Qudāʾī, let us consider the following example. For Shīḥāb al-Akhbār, al-Qudāʾī immediately wrote after his preface:

الأعمال بالنيات، الأجل بالأمنة

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

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

 الأعمال بالنيات، أخبرنا أبو عبداء عبد الرحمن بن عمر النجيمي، أنا أحمد بن مهند بن زياد، نما مهند بن عبد الملك الدقيق، ثم يزيد بن هارون، أنا يحيى بن سعيد، أنا جهاد هو ابن إبراهيم النجيمي أخبرنا أنه سمع علامة بن وقاص الليفي يقول: سمعت عمر بن الخطاب يقول: إنما الأعمال بالنيات، وإنما لامرئ ما نوى، فمن كانت تستوجب إلى الله وإلى رسوله فهجرت إلى الله وإلى رسوله، ومن كانت تستوجب إلى الدنيا يصيبها أو امرأة تستوجب إلى ما تستوجب إليها. إن هذا حديث صحيح أخرجوه البخاري عن القعنبي عن مالك.

Acts are only worth the intentions that accompany them. We learned via a khabar from Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ʿUmar al-Tujībī, he said; we learned via a khabar from ʿAhmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ziyād, he said; we learned via a taḥdīth by Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Malik al-Daqqīqī, he said; we learned via a taḥdīth by Yazīd ibn Hārūn, he said; we learned via ṣibāʿ from Yaḥyā ibn Saʿīd; that Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Taymī told him; that he heard ʿAlqamah ibn Waqqāṣ al-Laythī said; I heard ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb RA said on the pulpit: I heard the Messenger of Allah PBUH said: ‘Acts are only worth the intentions that accompany them, and every person will get the reward

Salāmah ibn ʿAlī Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Qudāʾī, Musnad al-Shīḥāb, ed. Hamīd Abū Abd Allāh al-Miḥlāwī, 1st ed. (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah, 2011). It was also edited in a PhD thesis. See: Fāʾiz Ḥāmid Muḥammad al-Qurashi, ‘Taḥqīq Wa Dirāsah Musnad al-Shīḥāb Li al-Qudāʾī Min Awwal-i Ilā Nihāyat al-Juzʿ al-Khāmis’ (Umm al-Qura University, 1988).
according to what he has intended. So, whoever emigrated for the sake of Allah and His Messenger, then his emigration was for the sake of Allah and His Messenger. And whoever emigrated for worldly benefits or for a woman to marry, his emigration was for what he intended.’ This hadīth is sahīh, retraced by al-Bukhārī to be transmitted by al-Qa`nabī from Mālik.

Then, al-Quḍā‘ī presented his transmission of this hadīth via the sanad of al-Bukhārī.

After that, he wrote:

Keep what is said at gatherings private. We learned via a khabar from Ismā‘īl ibn Rajā‘ al-Khaṣīb, he said; we learned via a taḥdīth by Abū Aḥmad Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Qaysarānī, he said; we learned via a taḥdīth by Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far al-Kharā‘īfī, he said; we learned via a taḥdīth by ʿUmar ibn Shabbah, he said; we learned via a taḥdīth by ʿAbd Allāh ibn Maslamah ibn Qa‘nab; another sanad: and we also learned via a khabar from Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad ibn Maymūn ibn Zayd al-Naṣībī, he said; we learned via a taḥdīth by Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī, he said; we learned via a taḥdīth by Abū ʿAmru ʿUthmān ibn Aḥmad ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Yaẓīd al-Daqqāq, also known as Ibn al-Sammāk, he said; we learned via a taḥdīth by Abū Mūsā ʿĪsā ibn Muḥammad al-Īskāfī, he said; we learned via a taḥdīth by Umayyah ibn Khālid, he said; we learned via a taḥdīth by Ḥusayn ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Ḍūmayrah; from his father; from his grandfather; from ʿAlī ibn Abū Ṭālib RA that he said: the Messenger of Allah PBUH said: Keep what is said at gatherings private. In the wordings of al-Naṣībī: I heard the Messenger of Allah PBUH said.26

26 al-Quḍā‘ī, Musnad al-Shihāb, n.d., 35–38.
This conduct of al-Quḍāʿī has left several impacts on the classical studies of ḥadīth. First of all, al-Quḍāʿī pioneered the method of composing two separate works for the same set of ḥadīth. One would be known by its original title and the other's title will begin with the term Musnad. This adds a new connotation for this term as it indicates that a musnad is a work composed for a set of ḥadīth relayed in another work without their sanads. Secondly, we also learn the opposite term for musnad - as a ḥadīth supported with sanad. al-Quḍāʿī wrote:

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

al-Quḍāʿī uses here the term mujarrad. It indicates a treatise where the sanad is removed from a text of ḥadīth which was previously attached to it. The act should be called tajrīd and understood as the opposite of the act of isnād. It is, therefore, convenient to substantively say that a ḥadīth is either musnad (attached with a sanad) or mujarrad (devoid of it). The musnad, then, is either muttaṣil (with unbroken chain) or munqaṭṭī’ (with discontinuity). Moreover, the term has also been approved by later ḥadīth scholars such as al-Dhahabī. In his account of al-Quḍāʿī, al-Dhahabī stated: ‘He was a judge in the court of Egypt … he was the author of Shihāb in both its forms; mujarrad and musnad.’

Amongst the contemporary scholars, the Saudi renowned figure Bakr Abū Zayd included the collection of mujarrad ḥadīth texts as a form of takhrīj or ḥadīth retracement practised by early compilers of ḥadīth.

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

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

---

27 al-Quḍāʿī, 1:34.
28 Muḥammad ibn Ahmad ibn `Uthmān Abū `Abd Allāh al-Dhahabī, Siyar Aʿlām al-Nubalāʾ, ed. Shuʿayb al-Arnāʾūṭ (Beirut: Muʿassasah al-Risālah, 1985), 18:92.
29 Bakr Abū Zayd, al-Taʿṣīl Li Uṣūl al-Takhrīj Wa Qawāʿid al-Jarḥ Wa al-Taʿdīl (Riyadh: Dār al-ʿĀṣimah, 1992), 153.
Here, al-Quḍāʾī was mentioned only second to Ibn al-Sunnī. Abū Zayd’s attribution could not be verified at the moment since the manuscript of al-Ījāz did not survive. Nonetheless, Ibn al-Sunnī was not known for removing sanads given all his other works such as al-Qanā’ah, ‘Amal al-Yawm wa al-Laylah, al-Ṭībb al-Nabawī and al-Targhib fī Faḍā’il al-A’māl wa Thawāb Dhālik, were composed in conventional ḥadīth style, i.e., all ḥadīths are supported with sanads. Moreover, there was no report by the biographers of Ibn al-Sunnī on the act of sanad omission. It seems that the statement of Ibn Rajāb was meant for identifying the pioneers of collecting the compact speeches (jawāmiʿ al-kalim) of the Prophet. It is true that by focusing on aphorisms and short sayings, al-Quḍāʾī seems to attend to this new genre of jawāmiʿ al-kalim. In this case, Ibn al-Sunnī could have been the first person to produce this new genre. Although, there is another contemporary of him, the renowned Shāfiʿite al-Qaffāl al-Shāshī (365AH) who has been attributed with a work titled Jawāmiʿ al-Kalim wa Badāʾiʿ al-Ḥikam which could have belonged to same genre.

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

---

30. Abd al-Rahmān ibn Aḥmad Zayn al-Dīn Ibn Rajab al-Hanbalī, Jāmiʿ al-ʿUlūm Wa al-Ḥikam Fī Sharḥ Khamsīn Ḥadīthan Min Jawāmiʿ al-Kalim, 8th ed. (Beirut: Muʿassasah al-Risālah, 1999), 1:56.
31. For an elaboration of the concept of ījāz, see: Mahendra Shahputra, “al-Ījāz Fī al-Ḥadīth al-Sharīf Fī Sunah Abī Dāwūd” (Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University Jakarta, 2015), 31–32.
32. Abd al-Ḥayy ibn Aḥmad Ibn al-ʿImād al-Hanbalī, Shadharāt al-Dhahab Fī Akhbār Man Dhahab, ed. Muhammad al-Arnaʿū (Beirut: Dār Ibn Kathīr, 1986) According to the editor Muḥammad al-Arnaʿū the work is currently being edited for modern publication.
the form of literary works. He gave due credit to both the sanad and the meaning of the ḥadīths, and invited both the common and the scholars to engage in ḥadīth learning and practice.

**The Legacy of Mujarrad-Musnad Method**

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

a) The work of al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī on learning astronomy and astrology titled al-Qawl fī ‘Ilm al-Nujūm, Hal al-Shurūʿ fīhi Mashrūʿ aw Madhmūm. al-Khaṭīb mentioned that he audited al-Quḍāʾī’s session at the Holy Mosque in Makkah.33 The ḥadīths in the survived part of this work were devoid of sanads, a feature that is quite strange given all other works of al-Khaṭīb. The above title was attributed to him by Muḥammad al-Mālikī, Ibn al-Jawzī, Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī and al-Dhahabī. Moreover, al-ʿIrāqī, al-Subkī, Mughal Ṭāy, Ibn Ḥajar, al-Sakhawī and al-Suyūtī had quoted from this work.34 al-Nawawī copied al-Khaṭīb’s comment on a ḥadīth from this work.35 It is possible that the present manuscript is an abridged version of the original work by al-Khaṭīb. However, if al-Khaṭīb himself omitted the sanads, it reflects an escalation of this method amongst ḥadīth scholars from the contemporary of al-Quḍāʾī.

b) It seems that Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh Ibn al-ʿArabī al-Muʿāfirī al-Ishbīlī (543AH) was also influenced by al-Quḍāʾī in his work Sirāj al-Muhtadīn fī Ādāb al-Ṣāliḥīn. The modern editor of the work, Muḥammad ibn al-Amīn Bū Khubzah remarked that Ibn al-ʿArabī emulated al-Quḍāʾī in his style but the former attempted to avoid the inclusion of ḥadīths he evaluated as weak and highly unreliable.36

c) Another scholar who was also inspired by al-Quḍāʾī was Sulaymān ibn Mūsā ibn Sālim

---

33 Ahmad ibn ʿAli ibn Thābit al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Tārīkh Madīnat al-Salām Wa Akhbār Muḥaddithihā Wa Dikr Quṭṭānihā al-ʿUlamāʾ Min Ghayr Ahlihā Wa Wāridīhā (Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 2001), 11:512.
34 Khaṭirul Husaini Bin Jamil, ‘Traditional Sunni Epistemology in the Scholarship of al-Hafiz al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādi (463AH/1071CE)’ (SOAS, University of London, 2017), 71.
35 ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Ibn al-ʿĀṭṭār, Fatāwā al-Imām al-Ṣawāʾil al-Musammā bi al-Masāʾ il al-Māthūrah, 6th ed. (Beirut: Dār al-Bāšāʾir al-Islāmiyyah, 1996), 266.
36 See editorial remark in: Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Muʿāfirī al-Ishbīlī Ibn al-ʿArabī, Sirāj al-Muḥtaḍīn Fī Ādāb al-Ṣāliḥīn, ed. Muḥammad Abū Uways al-Ḥusaynī Bū Khubzah (Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 2009).
Abū al-Rabīʾ al-Kilāʾi (634AH) of Valencia. His work was titled Miṣbāh al-Zulam min Ḥadīth Rasūl Allāh ṣalla Allāh ʿalayhi wa sallam. Unfortunately, nothing can be said about this work except that it was read by Ibn Jābir al-Wādī Āshī before his teacher al-Qāḍī Abū ʿAbbās Ibn al-Ghāmmāz, who received it from the author. The work is currently considered lost.

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

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

It is clear that both al-Aḥādīth al-Kulliyyah of Ibn al-Ṣalāh and al-Arbaʿūn of al-Nawawī were devoid of sanads.

e) There is a work titled Sirāj al-Muttaqīn al-Muntakhab min Kalām Sayyid al-Mursalīn penned by Abū Zayd ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad ibn Ṭālib ibn Ṭālib Allāh al-Ḥāfiz al-Anṣārī al-Usaydī al-Qayrawānī (699AH), also known as Ibn al-Dabbāgh. According to al-Wādī Āshī, the author completely follows the style of al-Shihāb, the above accounts portray how the work of al-Quḍāʾī has inspired others in their literary activities, although it does not demonstrate clearly how the exact mujarrad-musnad method was pursued by others. To illustrate the application of this method by others, let us look at the following examples.

Towards the end of the fifth Hijrī century, the muḥaddith Abū Shujāʿ Shirūyē ibn Shahrdār al-Daylamī (509AH) composed a work on hadith dedicated for the common public. He named the work Firdaws al-Akhbār bi Maʾṭūr al-Khiṭāb al-Mukharraj ʿalā Kitāb al-

---

37 Muhammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Tālibī, Turāṭ al-Maghāribīah Fi al-Ḥadīth al-Nabawī Wa ʿUlāmīhi (Beirut: Dār al-Bashāʾir ir al-Islāmiyyah, 1995), 265; Muhammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh Abū ʿAbd Allāh Ibn al-Abbār, al-Takmilah Li-Kitāb al-Silah (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1995), 4:101.
38 Muhammad ibn Jābir al-Wādī Āshī, Barnāmij Muḥammad Ibn Jābir al-Wādī Āshī, 3rd ed. (Tunisia: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1982), 223 (40). See the footnotes.
39 Ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī, Jāmīʿ al-ʿUlūm Wa al-Ḥikam Fī Sharīḥ Khamsīn Ḥadīthan Min Jawāmīʿ al-Kalim, 1:56.
40 al-Wādī Āshī, Barnāmij Muḥammad Ibn Jābir al-Wādī Āshī, 60-61 (23).
Shihāb. Apart from explicitly mentioning his exploit of al-Shihāb in the title, Abū Shujāʿ also omitted all sanads from his work, exactly in the same style of tajrīd applied by al-Quḍāī. Then, it was the former’s son, Abū Mansūr Shahrdār, who arduously provided all the sanads in a subsequent work which has been famously known as Musnad al-Firdaws. This is definitely a clear example of the adoption of the mujarrad-musnad method.

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

Conclusion

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

41 Shirūyē ibn Shahrdār Abū Shujāʿ al-Daylamī, Firdaws al-Akhbār Bi Maʾthūr al-Khitāb al-Mukhārraj ʿalā Kitāb al-Shihāb, 1st ed. (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-ʿArabī, 1987).
42 Only parts of its manuscript were found.
43 al-Tilmisānī, Naft al-Tib Min Ghusn al-Andalus al-Rājīb, 2:599. al-Tilmisānī said: The author compared al-Najm to Shihāb al-Quḍāī.
44 See editorial remark: ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Dūmī al-Ḥanbalī Ibn Badrān, Sharh Kitāb al-Shihāb Fi al-Ḥikam Wa al-Mawāʾīẓ Wa al-Adāb, ed. al-Ṭālib Nūr al-Dīn, 1st ed. (Kuwait: Dār al-Nawādir, 2007), 22.
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