

A Ḥadīth Collection over the Generations: The Transmission of *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*

MUHAMMAD FAWWAZ MUHAMMAD YUSOFF

ABSTRACT

The study of ḥadīth scholarship, even if concentrating ḥadīth corpus, or even extracting the transmission of ḥadīth collections, has faced growing criticism. Many scholars of ḥadīth have no lack of confidence about the preservation of ḥadīth collections, while others have thoughtfully been sceptical. The discussion of the “authenticity” of authorship of ḥadīth collections, Arabic literature furnishes with a chain of transmitters for texts made about the past. Alongside both famous Ṣaḥīḥayn of al-Bukhārī and Muslim, Ibn Ḥibbān al-Bustī (d. 354/965) - a scholar from Lashkar Gah, Afghanistan - compiled at least one gigantic ḥadīth collection usually regarded as the last collection of this ‘Ṣaḥīḥ movement’. Among the eighty-plus works that Ibn Ḥibbān’s biographers say he wrote is his famous ḥadīth collection named “al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ ‘alā al-Taqāsīm wa al-Anwā’ min ghayr wujūd qaṭ’ fī sanadihā walā thubūt jarḥ fī nāqilihā.” The Ṣaḥīḥ, like the many existing ḥadīth compilations, was handed down to succeeding generations by chains of authority. What follows is an explanatory study of the transmission of Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān in post-hadith compilation literatures to which his fame is principally due. A library-based research which focuses on descriptive analytical method is used in this study. This study also aims to examine some conceptual grounds for the exploration by looking into the literary dimension of ḥadīth literatures. Explaining the transmission of Ibn Ḥibbān’s Ṣaḥīḥ is demanding despite his noble status which is required in recognizing that the early and canonical ḥadīth collection was very limited in dissemination. Conclusion of this study notes that the availability of transmission is central for the assessment of the well-preserved book and the role of isnād and certain ḥadīth literatures are vital in transmitting and preserving the Ṣaḥīḥ.

Keywords: Ibn Ḥibbān; Ṣaḥīḥ; al-Taqāsīm wa al-Anwā’; Ḥadīth; Aṭrāf; Mustakhraj

ABSTRAK

Meskipun kesarjanaan pengajian ḥadīth masakini yang memberi tumpuan kepada korpus atau bahkan transmisi koleksi-koleksi karya ḥadīth semakin berkembang, hujahan kritikan turut sama meningkat. Dalam kesusasteraan Arab, perbincangan mengenai keaslian kepengarangan koleksi ḥadīth dilengkapi dengan rangkaian periwayatan tentang karya atau teks yang disampaikan. Di samping kedua-dua Ṣaḥīḥayn karangan al-Bukhārī dan Muslim yang terkenal, Ibn Ḥibbān al-Bustī (w. 354/965), seorang sarjana dari Lashkar Gah, Afghanistan, telah menyusun sekurang-kurangnya sebuah koleksi ḥadīth terkemuka yang seringkali dianggap sebagai ansuran terakhir daripada ‘gerakan Ṣaḥīḥ’ ini. Kebanyakan penulis biografi Ibn Ḥibbān merakam “al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ ‘alā al-Taqāsīm wa al-Anwā’ min ghayr wujūd qaṭ’ fī sanadihā walā thubūt jarḥ fī nāqilihā” antara salah satu daripada lebih lapan puluh karya yang beliau hasilkan. Seperti kebanyakan koleksi ḥadīth yang lain, Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān beralih daripada satu generasi ke satu generasi menerusi rangkaian autoriti. Justeru, menerusi kajian perpustakaan yang memberi tumpuan kepada metodologi deskriptif analitikal, makalah ini adalah kajian keterangan transmisi Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān di era pasca pengumpulan ḥadīth. Kajian ini turut bertujuan meneliti ruang penerokaan beberapa dasar konsepsi dengan melihat dimensi pengkaryaan yang terdapat dalam literatur ḥadīth. Meskipun tiada sangkalan terhadap kemasyhuran karya Ṣaḥīḥ oleh Ibn Ḥibbān, penyebaran karya beliau malah karya ḥadīth terawal amat terhad. Kajian ini menyimpulkan bahawa ketersediaan transmisi amat berharga dalam penilaian sesebuah karya yang terpelihara dengan baik dan peranan isnad serta literatur ḥadīth tertentu sangat penting dalam penyebaran dan pemeliharaan Ṣaḥīḥ.

Kata kunci: Ibn Ḥibbān; Ṣaḥīḥ; al-Taqāsīm wa al-Anwā’; Ḥadīth; Aṭrāf; Mustakhraj

INTRODUCTION

In general, the *Ṣaḥīḥ* genre of ḥadīth collections contain historical, theological, biographical materials as well as Qur’ānic commentaries in addition to details of religious observance, law, commerce, and aspect of public and private behaviour which are

the main interest of the *Sunans* genre. By the end of the third/beginning tenth century a large amount of ḥadīth collections had been produced, six of which have since then been regarded as being especially authoritative and are known as *Kutub al-Sitta* (Fazlur Rahman, 1979: 63). The most authoritative were considered to be the *Ṣaḥīḥs* of al-Bukhārī

and Muslim, followed in importance by the *Sunan* works of Abū Dāwūd, al-Tirmidī, al-Nasā'ī and Ibn Mājah. Studies by Siddiqi (2012: 73) and Brown (2011: 245) have tended to answer the question about dating the canonization of the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* since Goldziher (1971: 240) raised the issue

We cannot establish with chronological accuracy the date which brought the *consensus publicus* for the two *Ṣaḥīḥs* to maturity or the date when favour of the *ijmā'* was extended to the 'six books'.

According to Siddiqi (2012: 73) and Brown (2011: 245), this recognition started in the middle of the fourth/tenth century, when Sa'īd b. al-Sakan (d. 353/964) and Ibn Manda (d. 395/1004-5) declared the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*, and the two *Sunans* of Abū Dāwūd and al-Nasā'ī were the foundations of Islam. However, some scholars did not agree about the equal recognition of this book and had varying opinions on which books constituted the canon. Ibn al-Ṣalah speaks of five basic works, excluding Ibn Mājah. Later, al-Nawawī (d. 676/1277) who edited the work of Ibn al-Ṣalah, also recognizes 'five books' (*al-kutub al-khamsa*) and deliberately places Ibn Mājah's *Sunan* on the same plane as the *Musnad* of Ibn Ḥanbal (al-Nawawī: 1985, 26). We also come across with the recognition such as 'the relied-upon books', 'the Four Books', 'the Ten Books', 'the Authentic Collections' and several others. Yet among these books the position of al-Bukhārī and Muslim was always incomparable.

The reason why the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* no other canonical ḥadīth books, played such a salient role in ritual and narrative grew out of the unique status they had achieved by the beginning of fourth/tenth century. The *Ṣaḥīḥayn* would serve as the authoritative reference for "non-specialist" after an increasing separation between jurists and ḥadīth scholars (Makdisi: 1961, 10-11). And al-Bukhārī and Muslim were not just used to prove the authenticity of ḥadīth, but also to authoritatively shape the study of ḥadīth. Thus, the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* are canonical in that they are standards that can be employed to set the rules of genre. Abū Bakr al-Ḥāzimī (d. 584/1188-9) (1984, 43) characterizes Bukhārī as the best of his era in ḥadīth collection and criticism. Considerably Ibn al-Ṣalah (2006, 8) describes books of Bukhārī and Muslim are the soundest books after the book of God that is, the Quran. Ibn Taymiyya (2005, 1/183) states that not even Ibn Khuzayma or Ibn Ḥibbān come nearer al-Bukhārī's level of proficiency.

Presumably for these reasons, Ibn Ḥibbān's *Ṣaḥīḥ* conveys the impression more to have been the 'victim' of the accident of history than a requirement of theory. In principal there can be any number of ḥadīth collections at any given time. And in the first four centuries of the *hijra*, there was, according to standard view, a plethora of ḥadīth collections. Yet as Brown's (2011, 122) review of transmitter studies has shown, the earliest work on al-Bukhārī's teachers freely admits that at least one of his sources in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* was also unknown. It was only after another two generations of study that Abu Naṣr Ahmad al-Kalābādī (d. 398/1008) discovered the identity of this transmitter and produced the most comprehensive listing of all al-Bukhārī's transmitters. Brown (2011, 152) further argues

Had his [Ibn Ḥibbān] *Ṣaḥīḥ* received the generations of scholarly attention devoted to the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* during the long fourth century, it too might have been purged of unknown transmitters, in which case al-Ḥākim would have read it with glowing approval. Indeed, later scholars such as Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328), Ibn Kaḥfīr (d. 774/1373) and Zayn al-Dīn al-'Irāqī (d. 806/1404) did champion Ibn Ḥibbān's work as an exceptional source for authentic ḥadīth.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

In short, this article provides an exploratory analysis of the transmission of the *Saḥīḥ* of Ibn Ḥibbān. The qualitative portion of this study, which analyse on the chain of transmitters of the book, invites us to cast broadening roles about the significance of *sanad* in the preservation of ḥadīth collections. In collecting information regarding the transmission of Ibn Ḥibbān's *Ṣaḥīḥ* we have been dependent on three main sources: Ibn 'Asākir's *sanad*, Nūr al-Dīn al-Haytamī's *Mawārid al-Zam'ān ila Zawaid Ibn Ḥibbān*, and Ibn Ḥajar *Ithāf al-Mahara bi-l-Fawā'id al-Mubtakira min Aṭrāf al-'Ashara* (Van Ess: 1967, 318). While in order to assess the preservation of *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* in hadith scholarship, the paper will analyse introductory part of these three works from their similarity and some of the subsequent developments in post-hadith compilation literatures. This will form our comparative view of the transmission of Ibn Ḥibbān's *Ṣaḥīḥ* as well as a firm grasp of techniques in hadith transmission. The transmission of ḥadīth collection like *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* involved a series of individuals reading and hearing the book then passing it on through multiple chain of transmitters (Fawwaz Yusoff: 2019, 493). It may therefore be useful here to mention one

word connected with this subject which transmitter received the material i.e. *ijāza*. When a *shayḥ* is satisfied that his pupil knows what he has transmitted to him, he may say something like this, “I give you licence (*ijāza*) for such and such book.” In ḥadīth terminology *ijāza* means to permit someone to transmit a ḥadīth or a book on the authority of a certain scholar who give this permission. According to Mustafa A’zami (2002, 29), in certain cases, this system provided a kind of safeguard for the text. Understanding the scope and implications of such techniques require a conceptual review of the way in which early scholars recorded and transmitted the *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*. Primarily, there is a need for later students of ḥadīth to be apprehensive of how individual readings are adopted in preserving the ḥadīth collections.

CONTEMPORARY STUDIES ON ṢAḤĪḤ OF IBN ḤIBBĀN

It should be noted that Ibn Ḥibbān’s *Ṣaḥīḥ* has not survived in its original form and its present arrangement by legal topic is the work of a later hand. The principal contemporary studies (to my knowledge) are *al-Iḥsān bi Tartīb Ibn Balabān*, ed. Shu‘ayb al-ʿArna’ūt, *Al-Iḥsān fī Taqrīb Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*, ed. Markāz al-Buḥūth wa Taqniyāt al-Ma’lūmāt, *Mawāriḍ al-Ḍam’ān*, ed. Ḥusayn Sālim Asad al-Dārāni, *al-Ta’liqāt al-Ḥisan ‘alā Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*, al-Albānī. On the other hand, their introductions are substantial comprising mostly about Ibn Ḥibbān in general. The authenticity of hadith in Ibn Ḥibbān’s *Ṣaḥīḥ* is also scrutinized by three of them. Muḥammad b. Ja’far al-Kattānī (d. 1345/1927) (1993, 20) account of *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* remains in its entirety five volumes as of the late nineteenth/early twentieth century. This great Moroccan ḥadīth scholar asserts “it has been said that Ibn Ḥibbān, after Ibn Khuzayma, authored the most authentic ḥadīth collection, after *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*” (Al-Kattānī: 1993, 21). And perhaps *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* become the fourth most authentic ḥadīth collection in al-Kattānī’s views. Earlier before al-Kattānī, al-Suyūṭī (1431H, 1/183-184) indicates that *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Khuzayma* was the most authentic collection after *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, followed by *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* which, in turn, was greater than *al-Mustadrak ‘alā al-Ṣaḥīḥayn* by al-Ḥākim al-Naysabūrī.

According to Ibn ‘Asākir (al-Suyūṭī: 1431H, 1/183), Ibn Ḥibbān wrote his *Ṣaḥīḥ*, *Tārīkh*, and *al-*

Du ‘āfā’ and many others, while he was teaching in Samarqand. The actual name of his *Ṣaḥīḥ* collection is *al-Taqāsim wa al-Anwā’*, and is largely cited by al-Dhahabī, al-Haythamī, al-‘Irāqī, Ibn Balabān, Ibn ‘Asākir, al-Suyūṭī, and many others (Fawwaz Yusoff: 2020, 1). However, it is often abbreviated to *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*. Ibn Balabān (d. 739/1339) in his derivative work of *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* regularly cites it as *al-Taqāsim wa al-Anwā’* (Ibn Ḥibbān: 1952, 9). Ibn Balabān suggests, similar to Ibn Khuzayma steps, he names after his book “*al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ ‘alā al-Taqāsim wa al-Anwā’ min ḡayr wujūd qaṭ’ fī sanadīhā walā thubūt jarḥ fī nāqilīhā*.” Aḥmad Shākir indicates that this is the title written in the manuscript of Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (Ibn Ḥibbān: 1952, 9).

Brockelmann (1942, 1/273) and Sezgin (1967, 1/191) list the available manuscripts of the *al-Taqāsim wa al-Anwā’* and it is scattered in various places, including Istanbul, Cairo, Berlin, as well as Madīnah. Neither *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur* (GAL) nor *Geschichte des Arabischen Schrifttums* (GAS) mention whether these manuscripts are complete or not. Later, both add several more manuscripts that of derivative works from *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*. Sezgin (1967, 1/191) also mentions the first standard edition of *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* was first printed in one volume, in Egypt in 1952. This was Aḥmad Shākir’s edition, completing the first volume before his death. In his introduction, Shākir (Ibn Ḥibbān: 1952, 22) discusses in length the available manuscripts including the name, date of composition, scribes or copyists, and the transmission of the book. Discussing one of the manuscripts, he indicates that under the book title the transmission was written as

From the composition of *Shaykh al-Islām* Master and Custodian of Critics Abī Ḥatīm Muḥammad b. Ḥibbān b. Aḥmad b. Ḥibbān al-Tamīmī, may Allah bestow on His mercy *riwāya* of Abī al-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Hārūn al-Zūzanī (al-Sam’ānī: 1977, 3/175) from him [Ibn Ḥibbān], *riwāya* of Abī al-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. Muḥammad b. ‘Alī al-Baḥā’ī (Al-Ṣayrafi: 1989, 382) from him, *riwāya* of Abī al-Qāsim Zāhir b. Tāhir b. Muḥammad al-Shaḥḥāmī from him, *riwāya* of al-Ḥāfiz Abī al-Qāsim ‘Alī b. al-Ḥasan b. Hibat Allāh b. ‘Asākir from him.

Shākir (Ibn Ḥibbān: 1952, 24) asserts obviously the scribe was one of Ibn ‘Asākir (d. 571/1175) students. He adds, this “book’s *sanad*” belongs to Ibn ‘Asākir, acknowledging that he read (Ibn ‘Asākir used *qara’ tuḥā ‘alā*) the material in 5 volumes over to his teacher, Abū al-Qāsim al-Shaḥḥāmī (d. 533/1138). This Azharī scholar, who

died in 1377/1958, completed the first volume of Ibn Balabān's derivative work of *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* by comparing four manuscripts (Juynboll: 1996, II). Since then several other workings of the *Ṣaḥīḥ* have appeared. 'Abd al-Raḥmān Muḥammad 'Uthmān edited another two volumes of the *Ṣaḥīḥ* which were published by al-Maktaba al-Salafiyya of Madīnah in 1970. However, this edition did not include anecdotes or ḥadīth status.

What deserves to be standard editions are those of Kamāl al-Ḥūt (Ibn Ḥibbān: 1987) in 10 volumes, Shu'ayb al-Arna'ūt (Ibn Ḥibbān: 1988) in 18 volumes (including two volumes of index), al-Albānī (2003) in 12 volumes, and Markāz al-Buḥūth wa Taqniyāt al-Ma'lūmāt (Ibn Ḥibbān: 2014) in 8 volumes. They have been indispensable to the study of Ibn Ḥibbān. In addition, their introductions are substantial, comprising mostly about Ibn Ḥibbān in ḥadīth scholarship. The authenticity of ḥadīth in Ibn Ḥibbān's *Ṣaḥīḥ* is also scrutinized by all of them. In this case, all of them possessed the derivative manuscript famously known as *al-Iḥsān fī Taqrīb Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān (bi-Tartīb Ibn Balabān)*. Sezgin (1967, 1/190) indicates this complete manuscript is available in 9 volumes in Cairo.

The *Ṣaḥīḥ*, edited by Shu'ayb and assistants published in 1988 used two main manuscripts which were contained in 9 volumes for the reconstruction of the work as a whole. The first manuscript provides the largest part of the text, volume 1-6, 8, and 9. The second was for the remaining volume 7. Shu'ayb (1988, 1/28) in his introduction, like a number of others, assumes that political quarrels and religious disputes within the nascent Islamic community brought about the destruction of Ibn Ḥibbān's works. Meanwhile al-Albānī and assistants give a title *al-Ta'liqāt al-Hisān 'alā Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān: wa Tamayiz Saqūmihi min Ṣaḥīḥihi wa Shādhidhihi min Maḥfuzihi* for the edition and published in 2003. Moreover, the latest edition of *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* edited by Markāz al-Buḥūth wa Taqniyāt al-Ma'lūmāt discusses in detail the features of the manuscript. To a certain degree, the Markāz compares three earlier printed versions (Kamāl al-Ḥūt, Shu'ayb, and al-Albānī) and points out the slight difference in the text and numbering between them. According to the Markāz (2014, 135), however no dissimilarity of *matn* occurred between Shu'ayb and al-Albānī.

And the number of ḥadīth reports in the *Ṣaḥīḥ (bi-Tartīb Ibn Balabān)* varies less widely in the printed editions. By counting ḥadīth reports differently, particularly where variant *asānid* are

presented one after another, different editions come up with slightly different numbers: Shu'ayb's edition counts 7491, Al-Albānī's edition counts 7448, while the recent edition of Markāz al-Buḥūth wa Taqniyāt al-Ma'lūmāt counts 7535. Ḥusayn Sālim (editor of Nūr al-Dīn al-Haythamī's *al-Mawārid*) has similar estimation with al-Albānī that of 7448 (Nūr al-Dīn al-Haythamī: 1990, 1/49). It suggests that Ibn Ḥibbān shared with al-Bukhārī and Muslim or one of them at 4801. And this leaves the number of *zawā'id* (additional ḥadīth reports) for Ibn Ḥibbān alone at 2647.

THE TRANSMISSION OF IBN ḤIBBĀN'S *ṢAḤĪḤ*

As discussed above, all these editions certainly do not reproduce the original *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*. Ibn Balabān, the great scholar and editor of his time, rearranges the *Ṣaḥīḥ* which he described easy for students to comprehend (Ibn Ḥibbān: 2014, 1/232). Ibn Balabān presents at the end of each of the ḥadīth an index of the original location in the *Ṣaḥīḥ*. Obviously Ibn Balabān was not alone in adopting this feature, another sort of re-arrangement belong to 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Abd Allāh b. Qalīj al-Mughulṭay (d. 762/1361), Ibn Zurayq, Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad (d. 803/1400), and Ibn Mulaqqin, 'Umar b. 'Alī b. Aḥmad al-Andalūsī (d. 804/1401). In like manner they rearranged the *Ṣaḥīḥ* according to the topics of jurisprudence leaving out any commentaries or anecdote by them. Perhaps this was because Ibn Ḥibbān's arrangement is difficult to understand, as professed by al-Suyūṭī (1431H, 1/184). At this point, al-Suyūṭī adds the reason is that Ibn Ḥibbān is an expert on kalām, astronomy and philosophy.

There are sources from which we can gain more insight into the history of the *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*; such as the books of *atrāf*. *Atrāf* is a genre of ḥadīth literature similar to the *mustakhraj*. It is an index of ḥadīth which is organised primarily according to the Companion who narrated the text, but which also focuses on the key components of the text rather than the whole *matn* (Brown: 2011, 105). Al-Kattānī (1993, 167-168) lists among early scholars to produce an *atrāf* of the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*, Khalaf b. Muḥammad al-Wāsiṭī (d. 400/1010) and Abū Mas'ūd Ibrāhīm al-Dimashqī (d. 401/1010-11). Khalaf (Sezgin: 1967, 1/220) produces three – or four – volume *atrāf* (one volume, seven *juz*'s, of which has survived in manuscript form), while

Abū Mas‘ūd’s work exists today in only partial and unpublished form (Brown: 2011, 132-133).

Unlike *mustakhraj*, which are organized along the chapter structure of the template book, *atrāf* books usually present the ḥadīth according to the Companion at the beginning of the *isnad* (Brown: 2011, 105). As stated in *Lahz al-Alḥāz* (Ibn Fahad: n.d., 232), Zayn al-Dīn al-‘Irāqī (d. 806/1404) composed *Atrāf Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* up until sixty categories of the third division of the *Ṣaḥīḥ*. He also uses *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* as one of the sources when analysing the ḥadīth that al-Ghazālī had included in his famous *Iḥyā’ ‘Ulūm al-Dīn* (The Revival of the Religious Sciences) (Al-‘Irāqī: 1987, 1012). In the meantime, Zayn al-Dīn al-‘Irāqī’s son-in-law, Nūr al-Dīn ‘Alī b. Abī Bakr al-Haythamī (d. 807/1404) (1990, 78-79) compiled *al-Mawārid al-Zam‘ān ilā Zawā‘id Ibn Ḥibbān*. Although ten years younger than Zayn al-Dīn al-‘Irāqī, he became a committed disciple for he traveled together with Zayn al-Dīn al-‘Irāqī to many cities in Egypt, and also to Makkah to perform pilgrimage, Madīna, Jerusalem, Damascus, Aleppo and other places (Ibn al-‘Imād: 1993, 105). His *Mawārid* represented those ḥadīth included in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* that do not appear in the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*. In other words, this work listed ḥadīth that Nūr al-Dīn al-Haythamī believed al-Bukhārī and Muslim should have included in their collections.

In the same way of ḥadīth scholars, Nūr al-Dīn al-Haythamī presents his detailed records of transmission of the *Ṣaḥīḥ* in the introduction (Nūr al-Dīn al-Haythamī: 1990, 1/90). According to the information, he possessed two transmissions which went back to:

1. ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr b. Khalīl al-Makkī (d. 777/1375) and Abū ‘Umar ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm b. Jamā‘a al-Kinānī (d. 767/1365) ← Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Ṭabarī (d. 722/1322) ← Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Abī al-Faḍl al-Mursī (d. 655/1257) ← Abū Rūḥ ‘Abd al-Mu‘īz b. Muḥammad al-Harawī (d. 618/1221) ← Tamīm b. Abī Sa‘īd al-Jurjānī (d. 531/1136) ← Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. Muḥammad al-Baḥḥā‘ī ← Abū al-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Harun al-Zūzanī ← Abū Hatim Muḥammad b. Ḥibbān al-Tamīmī al-Bustī.
2. Ibn Jamā‘a ← Abū al-Faḍl Aḥmad b. Hibat Allah b. ‘Asākir (d. 699/1299) ← Abū Rūḥ ‘Abd al-Mu‘īz b. Muḥammad al-Harawī ← Tamīm b. Abī Sa‘īd al-Jurjānī ← Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. Muḥammad al-Baḥḥā‘ī ← Abū al-Ḥasan

Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Harun al-Zūzanī ← Abū Hatim Muḥammad b. Ḥibbān al-Tamimi al-Bustī.

The former, Nūr al-Dīn al-Haythamī said that he read back the *Ṣaḥīḥ* to ‘Abd Allāh al-Makkī who settled in Cairo, using *bi-qirā’ati ‘alāyhi* (Nūr al-Dīn al-Haythamī: 1990, 1/90). And the latter transmission through Ibn Jamā‘ah covers a long period with few links, a type considered more valuable. Al-Haythamī got it when he was listening to a reading by Zayn al-Dīn al-‘Irāqī to Ibn Jamā‘a. As for another contemporary study of this version, al-Albānī (2002) published *Ṣaḥīḥ* and *Da‘īf Mawārid al-Zam‘ān*, the principal aim of which was to distinguish what he deemed weak ḥadīths from the *Mawārid*.

And another *atrāf* for the *Ṣaḥīḥ* is that of “the ten books” by Nūr al-Dīn’s al-Haythamī student which contains an extremely long index of transmitters. Ibn Ḥajar names these ten volumes *Ithāf al-Mahara bi-l-Fawā‘id al-Mubtakira min Atrāf al-‘Ashara* (1451H, 1/58). He adopts *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* as an exercise in tracing ḥadīth through the usual channels back to the oldest collections. The title refers to ten books, but Ibn Ḥajar used the *Sunan* of al-Dāraquṭni as an eleventh volume to supply missing parts of Ibn Khuzayma’s *Ṣaḥīḥ*. Ibn Ḥajar composed an *Ithāf al-Mahara* that included the individual texts of the *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*, along with ḥadīth from *Sunan* of al-Dārimī, *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Ibn Khuzayma, *al-Muntaqā* of Ibn al-Jārud, *Mustakhraj* of Abī ‘Awāna, *Mustadrak* of al-Ḥākim, *Muwattā’* of Mālik, *Musnad* of al-Shāfi‘ī, *Musnad* of Aḥmad and *Sharḥ Ma‘ānī al-Āthār* of al-Ṭaḥāwī.

Just as al-Mizzī (d. 742/1341) (Van Ess: 1967, 318) had done a century earlier for ḥadīth in the Six Books with *Tuḥfat al-Ashrāf* (Juynboll: 2005, 7/213), Ibn Ḥajar isolates ḥadīth in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* by Companion and Successor. This arrangement makes it easier to compare different transmissions of effectively the same ḥadīth report (Melchert: 2005, 32). The individual *musnads* comprise complete *isnāds* but do not contain the complete *matns* supported by these *isnāds*. Only the *ṭaraf* (plural *atrāf*), a technical term which indicates the “gist” or an epitomising phrase of each *matn*, precedes the sometime substantial list of names from the *isnad* as it occurs in the various collections. Within each Companion’s *musnad* the material is presented in the alphabetical order of the third and sometimes fourth links in the *isnāds*. For the record, the abbreviation used in *Ithāf al-Mahara* for the *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* is *hb*.

This Egyptian scholar, who died in 852/1449, possessed the *Ṣaḥīḥ* in two transmissions. Ibn Ḥajar got the first three volumes from Ibrāhīm b. Aḥmad al-Tanūkhī by reading it over to him, using *qara'tu*. And the last two volumes were received by Ibn Ḥajar from Khadīja bt. Ibrāhīm b. Ishāq b. Sulṭān, using *sami'tu*. Both Ibrāhīm and Khadīja got it from Abī 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zarrād, using *'an*. Abī 'Abd Allāh got it from al-Hāfiẓ Abū 'Alī al-Bakrī from Abū Rūḥ 'Abd al-Mu'īz b. Muḥammad al-Harawī (d. 618/1221) from Tamīm b. Abī Sa'īd al-Jurjānī (d. 531/1136) from Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī b. Muḥammad al-Baḥḥā'ī al-Zūzanī from Abū al-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Hārūn al-Zūzanī from Abū Ḥātim Muḥammad b. Ḥibbān al-Tamīmī al-Bustī, *akhbaranā* being used at each of these stages (Ibn Ḥajar: 1415H, 1/164).

CONCLUSION

Primarily, the focal point of analysis is on examining the preservation of Sunnī religious text in which one of its prominent scholars, Ibn Hibban is included in the ḥadīth crème de la crème. The basic principles and terminology of the science of ḥadīth transmission in transmitting the ḥadīth collection mentioned could be considered as a conventional approach by ḥadīth scholars over the generations. In addition to manuscript, a transmission of hadith collection can be traced through several methods. Although the tradition of the sanad has ceased after the compiling of hadith collections, the concept of sanad still persists and is a major identity of Muslim scholarship. This is reflected in the transmission of a hadith collection such as Sahih Ibn Hibban or the authorization of transmitting a book to the next generation. Most importantly the Ṣaḥīḥ, like the many existing ḥadīth collections, was handed down to succeeding generations by clear and uninterrupted chains of authority. In dealing with the transmission, we have been mainly dependent on details given by Ibn Ḥajar, Abū Bakr al-Haythamī, and Ibn 'Asākir. The similarity between the transmissions allows us to conclude that then was a single transmitter of the first and second generation after Ibn Ḥibbān that goes back to Abū al-Ḥasan Muḥammad al-Zūzanī and Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī al-Baḥḥā'ī al-Zūzanī. Based on the information also we can assume that the Ṣaḥīḥ was originally contained in 5 volumes. The technical terms involved with transmitting the Ṣaḥīḥ derived from the verb *q r*, to read and was used

with the preposition 'alā in the case of Nūr al-Dīn al-Haytamī and Ibn Ḥajar. Additionally, a detailed discussion of the main assumptions underlying these types of data as well as a discussion of more general issues relevant to the study of ḥadīth collections transmission can be found elsewhere. It is worth noting that there undertakes a similar practise of Sunnī transmission of ḥadīth collections that operates in parallel to the standard or established Islamic literatures. The extant compilation of prophetic tradition in six canonical works of al-Bukhārī, Muslim, Abū Dawūd, al-Tirmidhī, al-Nasā'ī, Ibn Mājah and many others works of ḥadīth collections has been survived by the generational culture of ḥadīth studies. In conclusion it may be noted that the availability of transmission is central for the assessment of the well-preserved book and the role of isnād and certain ḥadīth literatures are vital in transmitting and preserving the Ṣaḥīḥ or ḥadīth collection. Hence the authorization to transmit was tied primarily to the book.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research was made possible with generous funding from Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia (USIM) under the Geran Universiti 2018, with the project number PPPI/FPQS/0118/051000/17018. However, the opinions and content are those of the grantee and do not necessarily represent the standpoint of the USIM.

REFERENCES

- Abū Bakr al-Ḥāzimī. 1984. *Shurūṭ al-A'imma al-Ḥamsa*, Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya.
- Al-Ḍahabī. 1982. *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'*. Beirut: Muassasa al-Risāla.
- Al-Ḍahabī. 1991. *Al-Ishāra ilā Wafayāt al-A'yān*. Beirut: Dār Ibn al-Athīr.
- Al-Ḍahabī. 1998. *Taḍkirā al-Huffāz*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya.
- Al-Ḍahabī. 2014. *Al-Ihsan fī Taqrib Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*, ed. Markāz al-Buḥūth wa Taqniyāt al-Ma'lūmāt. Cairo: Dār al-Ta'sil.
- Al-Nawawī, Muhy al-Dīn. 1985. *Al-Taqrib wa al-Taysīr li-Marīfat Sunan al-Bashīr al-Nadhīr*. Beirut: Dar al-Kitāb al-Arabī.
- Al-Qalqašandy. 1980. *Nihāyat al-'Arab fī Ma'rifa Ansāb al-'Arab*. Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-Lubnānī.
- Al-Sam'ānī. 1977. *Al-Ansāb*. Hyderabad: Dā'ira al-Ma'arif al-'Uthmaniyya.

- Al-Ṣayrafi. 1989. *Al-Muntaḥab min al-Siyāq li-Tārīḥ Naysabūr li-l-Fārisī*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya.
- Al-Suyūṭī. 1431H. *Tadrīb al-Rāwī fī Sharḥ Taqrīb al-Nawāwī*. Riyadh: Dār Ibn al-Jawzī.
- Al-Suyūṭī. 1983. *Ṭabaqāt al-Huffāz*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya.
- Amal Elesha Marogi. 2012. Zayd, ‘Amr and ‘Abdullāh: Theory of Proper Names and Reference in Early Arabic Grammar Tradition. In *The Foundations of Arabic Linguistics: Sibawayh and Early Arabic*, edited by Amal Elesha Marogi. Leiden: Brill.
- Brockelmann, C. 1937-1942. *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*. Leiden: Brill.
- Brown, J. 1913-1963. “Ḥadīṭ” in *Encyclopaedia of Islam* 2. Leiden: Brill.
- Brown, J. A. C. 2011. *The Canonization of al-Buḥārī and Muslim: The Formation and Function of the Sunnī Ḥadīṭ Canon*. Leiden: Brill.
- Dickinson, E. 2001. *The Development of Early Sunnite Ḥadīṭ Criticism: The Taqdima of Ibn Abi Ḥātim al-Rāzī (240/854-327/938)*. Leiden: Brill.
- Fazlur Rahman. 1979. *Islam*. Chicago: The University Chicago Press.
- Fuat Sezgin. 1967. *Geschichte des Arabischen Schrifttums*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Goldziher, I. 1971. *Muslim Studies (Muhammedanische Studien) vol. II*, ed. S. M. Stern, trans. C. R. Barber and S. M. Stern. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Harald Motzki. 2005. Dating Muslim traditions: A survey. *Arabica* T. 52, Fasc. 2 April 2005.
- Ibn al-‘Imād. 1993. *Shadārāt al-Dahab fī Aḥbār man dahab*, edited by ‘Abd al-Qadīr al- Arna’ūt and Maḥmud al- Arna’ūt. Beirut: Dār Ibn Kathīr.
- Ibn al-Salah. 2006. *Kitāb Ma’rifat Anwā’ ‘Ilm al-Ḥadīṭ*, trans. Erik Dickinson (An Introduction to the Science of the ḥadīṭ). Reading: Garnet Publishing Ltd.
- Ibn Fahd. nd. *Lahz al-Aḥāz*. Damascus: al-Qudsī.
- Ibn Ḥajar. 1415H. *Ithāf al-Mahara bi-l-Fawā’id al-Mubtakira min Aṭrāf al-‘Ashara*, ed. Markāz Ḥidmāt al-Sunna wa al-Sīra al-Nabawiyya. Madinah: Islamic University of Madinah.
- Ibn Ḥibbān. 1952. *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*, ed. Aḥmad Ṣākir. Egypt: Dār al-Ma’ārif.
- Ibn Ḥibbān. 1987. *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*, ed. Kamāl Yūsuf al-Ḥūt. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya.
- Ibn Ḥibbān. 1993. *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān bi-Tartīb Ibn Balabān*, ed. Ṣu‘ayb al-Arna’ūt (Beirut: Muassasa al-Risāla, 1993), 1/16.
- Ibn Taymiyya. 2005. *Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā*, ed. ‘Āmir al-Jazār and Anwar al-Bāz, Mansura: Dār al-Wafā’.
- Juynboll, G.H.A. 1996. Aḥmad Muḥammad Ṣākir (1892-1958) and his edition of Ibn Hanbal’s Musnad. In *Studies on the Origins and Uses of Islamic Ḥadīṭ*. Aldershot: Variorum.
- Melchert, C. 2005. The musnad of Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal, how it was composed and what distinguishes it from the six books. *Der Islam* 82: 32-51.
- Muḥammad b. Ja’far al-Kattānī. 1993. *al-Risāla al-Mustatrafā li-bayān Mashhūr Kutub al-Sunna al-Mushrifā*, ed. Muḥammad al-Muntaṣir. Beirut: Dār al-Bashāir al-Islamiyya.
- Muhammad Fawwaz Bin Muhammad Yusoff. 2019. *Ḥadīṭ scholar and historiography: Some reflections on the Sīra Corpora of Ibn Ḥibbān al-Bustī’s (d. 354/965) Kitāb al-Ṭiqāt*. *Arabica* 66(5): 485-505.
- Muhammad Fawwaz Bin Muhammad Yusoff. 2019. On biographical dictionaries of ḥadīṭ transmitters: Rethinking development in the Islamic literature. *Al-Bayān: Journal of Qur’ān and Ḥadīth Studies* 17(2): 125-146.
- Muhammad Fawwaz Bin Muhammad Yusoff. 2020. The authentication of ḥadīth: Ibn Ḥibbān’s introduction to his ṣaḥīḥ. *Al-Masāq: Journal of the Medieval Mediterranean*. DOI: 10.1080/09503110.2020.1712546.
- Muḥammad Mustafa A’zami. 2000. *Studies in Early Ḥadīṭ Literature*. Kuala Lumpur: Islamic Book Trust.
- Muḥammad Mustafa al-A’zami. 2002. *Studies in Ḥadīṭ Methodology and Literature*. Kuala Lumpur: Islamic Book Trust.
- Muḥammad Nasir al-Din al-Albānī. 2003. *al-Ta’liqāt al-Hisān ‘alā Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*, Jeddah: Dār Bawāzīr.
- Muḥammad Zubayr Siddiqi. 2012. *Ḥadīṭ Literature Its Origin, Development & Special Features*. Cambridge: The Islamic Texts Society.
- Najm Haider. 2011. *The Origins of the Shi’a: Identity, Ritual, and Sacred Space in Eight-Century Kufah*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Nūr al-Dīn ‘Alī b. Abī Bakr al-Hayṭamī. 1990. *Mawāriḍ al-Zamān ilā Zawā’id Ibn Ḥibbān*, ed. Ḥusayn Sālim Asad al-Dārāni, Damascus: Dār al-Thaqāfa al-‘Arabiyya.
- Van Ess, J. 1967. Review of *Tuḥfat al-Ashraf bi-Ma’rifat al-Aṭrāf*. *Oriens* 20: 318-319.
- Yaḥyā b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Yaḥyā al-Bakrī Al-Shahrī. 1421H. *Zawā’id Rijāl Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān ‘alā al-Kutub al-Sitta*, Ph.D. Diss, Umm al-Qura University.
- Yāqūt Al-Ḥamawī. 1977. *Mu’jam al-Buldān*, Beirut: Dār Ṣādir.
- Zayn al-Dīn Al-‘Irāqī. 1987. *Tahrīj Aḥādīth Iḥyā’ ‘Ulūm al-Dīn (li-l-‘Irāqī wa Ibn al-Subkī wa al-Zubaydī)*, ed. Abī ‘Abd Allāh Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad al-Ḥaddād. Riyadh: Dār al-‘Āshima.

AUTHOR

Muhammad Fawwaz Bin Muhammad Yusoff
Fakulti Pengajian Quran dan Sunnah
Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia
Bandar Baru Nilai, 71800, Nilai,
Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia.
fawwaz@usim.edu.my