

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM

THREE

Edited by

Kate Fleet, Gudrun Krämer, Denis Matringe,
John Nawas, and Everett Rowson

With

Roger ALLEN, Edith AMBROS, Thomas BAUER, Johann BÜSSOW,
Ruth DAVIS, Maribel FIERRO, Najam HAIDER, Konrad HIRSCHLER,
Nico KAPTEIN, Hani KHAFIPOUR, Alexander KNYSH, Corinne LEFÈVRE,
Scott LEVI, Roman LOIMEIER, Daniela MENEGHINI, M'hamed OUALDI,
D. Fairchild RUGGLES, Emilie SAVAGE-SMITH, Ayman SHIHADDEH, and
Susan SPECTORSKY



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2018

Beirut 1414/1993; al-Shāfiʿī, *Kitāb al-umm*, 7 vols., Būlāq 1321–6/1903–8; al-Shāfiʿī, *Risāla*, ed. Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir, Beirut 1358/1939; al-Suyūṭī, *Tadrib al-rāwī fī sharḥ Taqrīb al-Nawāwī*, ed. Māzin al-Sarsāwī, 2 vols., al-Dammām 1431/2010–1.

STUDIES

Mohammad Mustafa Azmi, *Studies in early ḥadīth literature with a critical edition of some early texts*, Indianapolis 1978²; Jonathan Brown, Did the prophet say it or not? The literal, historical, and effective truth of ḥadīths in early Sunnism, *JAOs* 129/2 (2009), 259–85; Jonathan A. C. Brown, *Hadīth. Muhammad's legacy in the medieval and modern world*, Oxford 2009; Ron Buckley, On the origins of Shīʿī ḥadīth, *MW* 88/2 (1998), 165–84; Michael Cook, The opponents of the writing of Tradition in early Islam, *Arabica* 44/4 (1997), 437–530; Eerik Dickinson, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ al-Shahrāzūrī and the *isnād*, *JAOs* 122/3 (2002), 481–505; Josef van Ess, *Zwischen Ḥadīth und Theologie. Studien zum Entstehen prädestinatianischer Überlieferung*, Berlin 1975; GAS; Ignaz Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien*, 2 vols., Halle an der Saale 1889–90; Andreas Görke and Gregor Schoeler, *Die ältesten Berichte über das Leben Muhammads*, Princeton 2008; Sebastian Günther, Fictional narration and imagination within an authoritative framework. Towards a new understanding of ḥadīth, in Stefan Leder (ed.), *Story-telling in the framework of non-fictional Arabic literature* (Wiesbaden 1998), 433–71; Wael Hallaq, The authenticity of prophetic ḥadīth. A pseudo-problem, *SI* 89 (1999), 75–90; G. H. A. Juynboll, *Muslim tradition. Studies in chronology, provenance and authorship of early ḥadīth*, Cambridge 1983; G. H. A. Juynboll, *Encyclopedia of canonical ḥadīth*, Leiden 2007; Cristopher Melchert, The *Musnad* of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal. How it was composed and what distinguishes it from the Six Books, *Der Islam* 82/1 (2005), 32–51; Hossein Modarressi, *Tradition and survival. A bibliographical survey of early Shīʿite literature*, vol. 1, *ʿAlī and his personal associates. Kūfan Shīʿism in the Umayyad period. The period of persecution (136–198)*, Oxford 2003; Harald Motzki, Dating Muslim traditions. A survey, *Arabica* 52/2 (2005), 204–53; Albrecht Noth, *The early Arabic historical tradition. A source-critical study*, trans. Michael Bonner, Princeton 1994, 1997²; Pavel Pavlovitch, *The formation of the Islamic understanding of kalāla in the second century AH (718–816 CE). Between scripture and canon*, Leiden 2016; Fazlur Rahman, *Islamic*

methodology in history, Karachi 1965, 1995³; Joseph Schacht, *Origins of Muhammadan jurisprudence*, Oxford 1950; Gregor Schoeler, *Charakter und Authentie der muslimischen Überlieferung über das Leben Mohammeds*, Berlin 1996; Gregor Schoeler, Die Frage der schriftlichen oder mündlichen Überlieferung der Wissenschaften im frühen Islam, *Der Islam* 62/2 (1985), 201–30; Gregor Schoeler, Mündliche Thora und Ḥadīth. Überlieferung, Schreibverbot, Redaktion, *Der Islam* 66/2 (1989), 213–51; Gregor Schoeler, Weiteres zur Frage der schriftlichen oder mündlichen Überlieferung der Wissenschaften im Islam, *Der Islam* 66/1 (1989), 38–67; John Wansbrough, *Res ipsa loquitur*. History and mimesis, in John E. Wansbrough, *The sectarian milieu. Content and composition of Islamic salvation history* (Amherst NY 2006), 159–72; Iftikhar Zaman, *The evolution of a ḥadīth. Transmission, growth and the science of riḥāl in a ḥadīth by Saʿd B. Abi Waqqas*, Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago 1989; Aron Zysow, *The economy of certainty. An introduction to the typology of Islamic legal theory*, Atlanta 2013.

PAVEL PAVLOVITCH

Ḥadīth commentary

Ḥadīth commentary (*sharḥ al-ḥadīth*, pl. *shurūḥ al-ḥadīth*, or, more rarely, *tafsīr al-ḥadīth* or *taʿwīl al-ḥadīth*) is the practice of interpreting a report or a collection of reports attributed to Muḥammad, his Companions, exemplars amongst the early generations of Muslims, or, for Shīʿīs, the Imāms. Construed broadly, the term could include any formal or informal oral or written gloss on a given ḥadīth. Narrowly defined, the practice of ḥadīth commentary refers to a cumulative and transregional tradition of line-by-line Muslim scholarly exegesis on individual ḥadīth and ḥadīth collections, from the late Islamic formative period to the present day. Ḥadīth commentaries have endeavoured to explain the content (*matn*; pl. *mutūn*) of a given

report, as well as its chain of transmission (*isnād*; pl. *asānīd*). At various points in the development of the tradition, commentators explained *ḥadīth* by employing opinions and interpretive methods that were fashioned in various other disciplines of Islamic knowledge, such as law, theology, Sūfism, history, Qurʾān commentary (*tafsīr*), grammar, rhetoric, and lexicography. They also incorporated opinions and hermeneutic strategies specific to the study of *ḥadīth*: the rigorous evaluation of a given report's *isnād* based on knowledge of the biographies of the transmitters (*ʿilm al-rijāl*); knowledge of variant recitations of *ḥadīth* and *ḥadīth* collections (*ʿilm al-rivāyāt*); and, in some cases, the interpretation of the editorial choices made by a *ḥadīth* collection's compiler (*ʿilm al-tarājīm*).

Scholars of the manuscript tradition have catalogued 232 extant works of classical and post-classical commentary, just on collections that were first compiled before 430/1039. These include fifty-six commentaries on the canonical Sunnī work *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (*GAS*, 1:116–26), nine on its adaptations (*GAS*, 1:128), and seven on its headings (*GAS*, 1:129). It also includes commentaries on other canonical Sunnī collections: twenty-seven commentaries for *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (*GAS*, 1:136–40), twelve for *Sunan Abī Dāwūd* (*GAS*, 1:150–1), twelve for *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhī* (*GAS*, 1:155–6), eight for *Sunan Ibn Mājah* (*GAS*, 1:148), four for *Sunan al-Nasāʿī* (*GAS*, 1:168), and five on collections that combined *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* with *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (*GAS*, 1:132). As for *ḥadīth* compendia compiled by eponyms of the Sunnī legal schools, *al-Muwattʿa*ʿ by Mālik b. Anas (d. 179/796) attracted at least twenty-seven commentaries (*GAS*, 1:460–3), *Musnad al-Shāfiʿī* at least nine (*GAS*, 1:488–9), and *Musnad Ahmad* at least two (*GAS*, 1:506).

Al-shamāʿil al-Muḥammadiyya, a popular collection of *ḥadīth* on Muḥammad's moral qualities, appearance, and manners, received at least thirty-one commentaries (*GAS*, 1:158–9). Amongst Imāmī Shīʿī works, *al-Kāfi* garnered at least sixteen commentaries (*GAS*, 1:542) and *Kitāb man lā yaḥḍuruh al-faqīh* at least seven (*GAS*, 1:546–7). The total number of *ḥadīth* commentarial works is much greater when one includes commentaries on: popular post-classical collections; collections of “forty *ḥadīth*” (*arbaʿūn ḥadīth*); other canonical Shīʿī *ḥadīth* collections; lost, uncatalogued, or otherwise inaccessible manuscripts that are referred to by the cumulative tradition or biographical dictionaries; modern *ḥadīth* commentaries recorded in print, audio, and video formats; and commentaries composed in languages other than Arabic, especially Urdu, Persian, Indonesian, and English. For example, when lists of commentaries take at least some of these other categories into account, the number of works produced on *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* leaps from seventy-two to approximately 390 (al-Ḥasanī, 418–47).

During the late formative period, the earliest forms of commentary on *ḥadīth* collections were delivered by the compilers of the collections themselves. Manuscript evidence from an early dictated copy of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* suggests that Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl al-Bukhārī (d. 256/870) and his closest student, Yūsuf al-Firabrī (d. 320/932), offered notes to their students with additional information concerning the trustworthiness or age of the transmitters in the chains of transmission (Mingana, 11–2). Another form of early commentary on *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* was the thousands of chapter headings (*tarājīm*) under which al-Bukhārī arranged his collection. Each heading suggested to

readers how a particular *ḥadīth* or group of *ḥadīth* might best be interpreted and what their legal or theological import ought to be (Lucas, 289–324; Burge, 168–97). Muḥammad al-Shaybānī's (d. c.189/805) recension of Mālik's *Muwatta'*, as well as four key Shī'ī *ḥadīth* collections compiled in the fourth-fifth/tenth-eleventh centuries, likewise contained explicit and implicit legal commentary interspersed with the *ḥadīth* (Gleave, 350–82).

In contrast to the genre of Qur'ān commentary—which had already, by the fourth/tenth century, developed an encyclopaedic and systematic line-by-line approach to interpretation—many early interpreters chose to comment sporadically on popular *ḥadīth* that contained arcane language or unknown transmitters or had an ambiguous legal or theological meaning that required clarification. Notable grammarians and philologists such as Abū 'Amr al-Shaybānī (d. c.213/828) and Abū 'Ubayd al-Qāsim Ibn al-Sallām (d. 224/838) began to hone an early genre of *ḥadīth* commentary to address these kinds of problems; this genre was called “commentary on obscurities of the *ḥadīth*” (*sharḥ gharīb al-ḥadīth*). In some cases, these works were devoted to elucidating the arcana of a single hadith. For instance, Muḥammad b. Jarīr al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923), a jurist who composed the most widely-known classical line-by-line Qur'ān commentary, produced one such work on a *ḥadīth*, with arcane language that articulated the ideal qualities of a husband (Gilliot, 67). As the genre developed, these works came to address the more technical issues of language and *ḥadīth* criticism alongside theological and legal polemics that arose from a large collection of “difficult” *ḥadīth*, such as Ibn Fūrak al-Iṣbahānī's (d. 406/1015) *Kitāb mushkil al-ḥadīth* and Abū Ja'far

al-Ṭaḥāwī's (d. 321/933) *Sharḥ Mushkil al-Āthār*, amongst others.

As for the earliest written commentaries on major collections of *ḥadīth*, Abū Sulaymān Ḥamd b. Muḥammad al-Khaṭṭābī (d. 388/998) of Bust was amongst the first to compose *shurūḥ* on *Sunan Abī Dāwūd* and *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*. Like al-Iṣbahānī and other early *ḥadīth* commentators, he commented on selected *ḥadīth* that posed legal or theological problems and glossed obscure words. In his commentary on *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, al-Khaṭṭābī was particularly interested in explaining *ḥadīth* in a way that would defend traditionists from the charge that they had anthropomorphised God (Tokatly, 53–91).

By the fifth/eleventh century, networks of Mālikī judges in southern Spain and North Africa used *ḥadīth* collections for devotional study and recitation, legal instruction, and reference. Commentary on Mālik's *Muwatta'* flourished in particular, due to the foundational importance of the work to the Mālikī legal school. Notable examples include Ibn 'Abd al-Barr's (d. 463/1071) *Kitāb al-tamhīd* and Abū l-Walīd al-Bājī's (d. 474/1081) *al-Muntaqā*. Meanwhile, scholars from the Muslim West produced influential commentaries on celebrated Sunnī collections: Ibn Baṭṭāl of Córdoba (d. c.449/1057) commented on *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*; Abū 'Abdallāh al-Māzarī (d. 536/1141–2) and Qāḍī 'Iyād b. Mūsā (d. 544/1149) composed celebrated commentaries on *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*; and Abū Bakr b. al-'Arabī (d. 543/1148) did so on *Sunan Tirmidhī*. Commentary on collections that combined selected *ḥadīth* from *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, and the *Muwatta'* were also popular, such as Qāḍī 'Iyād's *Mashāriq al-anwār 'alā ṣiḥāḥ al-āthār*. As al-Khaṭṭābī had done, early

Andalusī commentators also used live lessons and written commentaries on *ḥadīth* collections to defend their positions on law and theology and to polemicise against the doctrines of their opponents. Although these works were more comprehensive than al-Khaṭṭābī's, they were not encyclopaedic. Often commentators omitted explanations of *ḥadīth* if they found their narrative content not significant for legal instruction. Moreover, as in the *sharḥ gharīb al-ḥadīth* sub-genre, some commentators would choose to discuss only a *ḥadīth*'s chain of transmission if it were deemed somehow problematic.

The cumulative tradition continued to develop in the seven/thirteenth century, largely through the work of Shāfi'ī *ḥadīth* scholars living in Egypt and Syria, who earned the generous patronage of the Mamlūk ruling elite. In this period, following the example of Abū Zakariyyā' al-Nawawī's (d. 676/1277) commentary on *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, commentators began to include systematic analyses of each *ḥadīth* in the collection, without omission, each *ḥadīth*'s *isnād*, without omission, and the rationale behind each *ḥadīth*'s organisation under headings (*tarājim*), largely without omission. Al-Nawawī described his work as a "medium-sized commentary" (*sharḥ mutawassit*) that included comprehensive explanatory detail without going so far as to tire his readers (Calder, 107). Likewise, the most renowned Sunnī *ḥadīth* commentary on *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī's (d. 852/1449) *Fath al-bārī* ("Victory of the Creator") was built on al-Nawawī's earlier model in its attention to *ḥadīth* and its characterisation as a *sharḥ mutawassit* (al-ʿAsqalānī, *Intiqād*, 1:7). A rare Ḥanafī scholar of *ḥadīth*, Badr al-Dīn al-ʿAynī (d. 855/1451), composed a commentary on *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* titled

ʿUmdat al-qārī ("Pillar of the reciter") to rival al-ʿAsqalānī's work. *ʿUmdat al-qārī* relied more heavily on methods of rhetoric (*ʿilm al-balāgha*) to explain *ḥadīth* than did al-ʿAynī's Shāfi'ī competitors. Al-ʿAynī nevertheless borrowed heavily from the commentaries of al-Nawawī and al-ʿAsqalānī, to the point that he was alleged by al-ʿAsqalānī to have borrowed his opinions without attribution (al-ʿAsqalānī, *Intiqād*, 1:10).

These works often took a lifetime to complete and were embedded in a competitive culture of live performance, in which patronage, prestige, and legal and theological commitments were at stake (Blecher, Ḥadīth commentary in the presence of students, patrons, and rivals). In many cases, commentators died before completing their works, and bibliographies of this genre are littered with partially completed commentaries. Ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī (d. 795/1393) and al-Nawawī commented on about one-third of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* before they died, but these works were so valuable and detailed that they continued to be transmitted by copyists, students, and scholars and have even been issued in modern printed editions.

During the Mamlūk period, commentaries on shorter collections, such as topical works of forty *ḥadīth* (*arbaʿūn*), also served to educate general audiences on popular topics such as the principles of Islam, *jihād*, and Ṣūfism. Ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī's *Jāmiʿ al-ʿulūm wa-l-ḥikam* ("Compendium of knowledge and wisdom") and Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytamī's (d. 974/1567) *Fath al-mubīn* ("Victory of the manifest") were two such commentaries on the *Arbaʿūn* of al-Nawawī that discussed matters of law and lexicography, respectively. In total, al-Nawawī's *Arbaʿūn* gave rise to at least forty commentaries (Pouzet, 55–7; Alavi, 349–56).

More concise works of *ḥadīth* commentary also continued to prove valuable to readers, as they helped clarify ambiguities in pronunciation for recitation and gloss obscure words, without the toil required of readers (and authors) of more encyclopaedic works. An example is Badr al-Dīn al-Zarkashī's (d. 794/1392) *al-Tanqīḥ al-īlfāz*, a concise commentary on *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* that received both praise and criticism in the supercommentaries that followed. Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505) composed a concise commentary in the manner of Zarkashī on each of the six canonical Sunnī *ḥadīth* collections. In this way, al-Suyūṭī produced commentaries on collections that had, until then, been largely overlooked, notably *Sunan Nasā'ī* and *Sunan Ibn Mājah*. To do so, al-Suyūṭī built these commentaries on the *sharḥ gharīb al-ḥadīth* sub-genre, especially on *al-Nihāya fī gharīb al-ḥadīth wa-l-athar* ("The conclusive work on the obscurities of the *ḥadīth* and reports") by Majd al-Dīn Ibn al-Athīr (d. 606/1210).

Under Ottoman patronage, larger works of *ḥadīth* commentary on important Sunnī collections continued to be delivered orally in study sessions (*majālis*) and circulated in written form. Shams al-Dīn al-Safīrī's (d. 956/1549) *Sharḥ 'iddat aḥādīth Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* and Yūsuf-zāde's (d. 1167/1754) *Najāḥ al-Qārī* are notable examples. *Ḥadīth* commentary also thrived on popular post-classical amalgamations of selections from multiple classical collections. Examples include 'Alī b. Sulṭān Muḥammad al-Qārī's (d. 1014/1606) *Mirqāt al-mafāṭīḥ* and Zayn al-Dīn al-Munāwī's (d. 1031/1622) *Fayḍ al-qadūr*.

Across the western Indian Ocean, the practice of *ḥadīth* commentary on Sunnī collections also found a robust after-life, particularly under the patronage

of Gujarātī sultans. Having recognised that *ḥadīth* scholars facilitated not only their piety but also their political legitimacy, Gujarātī sultans attracted scholars from Mamlūk-era Egypt to travel to India along trade and pilgrimage routes. In exchange for court appointments and land revenues, Gujarātī patrons acquired distinguished Mamlūk-era written commentaries on *ḥadīth* for their libraries, and earned laudatory dedications and exaltations from Egyptian-trained *ḥadīth* scholars (Badr al-Dīn al-Damāmīnī's, d. 827/1424, *Maṣābiḥ al-Jāmi'*, 1:5–12; Ishaq 87–8, 93–4, 105–6). One Gujarātī sultan, Maḥmūd Shāh I (r. 862–917/1458–1511) was even remembered for having mired himself in the minutiae of a *ḥadīth* commentarial debate, effecting a change in future compendia that circulated in India (*Mirāt-i Sikandirī*, 110). Later, the practice of *ḥadīth* commentary was cultivated amongst Indian-born and Indian-trained *ḥadīth* commentators in the tenth/sixteenth through the twelfth/eighteenth centuries, who continued to compose super-commentaries on Mamlūk-era works (Ishaq, 80–190, 232–46).

In Persia, the production of large multi-volume commentaries on Shī'ī collections flourished under the direct patronage of the Ṣafavids. In the eleventh/seventeenth century alone, some fifteen Shī'ī scholars are known to have written commentaries on *al-Kāfi* (Arastu, xxxvi–xxxvii). Most notable amongst the commentaries on Shī'ī collections from this period are Muḥammad Bāqir al-Majlisī's (d. 1110/1698–9) commentaries on *al-Kāfi* and *Tadhīb al-aḥkām* and Muḥsin Fayḍ al-Kashānī's (d. 1091/1680) commentary on a digest of the four canonical Imāmī Shī'ī *ḥadīth* collections. Shī'ī commentators explained not only *ḥadīth* attributed to Muḥammad

but also those attributed to Shīʿī Imāms. Nevertheless, like Sunnī commentaries, Shīʿī commentaries elucidated difficult legal and theological concepts and advocated for particular normative commitments in those debates. Muḥammad Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī (d. 1050/1640), a Ṣafavid-era philosopher and theologian, famously used the medium of *ḥadīth* commentary as a means to explore complex themes in Ṣūfī thought (Eschraghi, 91–9; Rustom, 9–22). Ṣafavid-era Shīʿī collections would also be taken up again in the modern period. Al-Qummī’s (d. 1940) *Safīnat al-bihār* (“The ship of the seas”), for example, was composed to help readers navigate al-Majlisī’s Ṣafavid-era *ḥadīth* collection, *Bihār al-awwār* (“Oceans of light”).

In the nineteenth century, figures in the Salafī reform movement also turned to the practice of commentary on Mamlūk-era collections. Muḥammad al-Shawkānī’s (d. 1834) *Nayl al-awṭār sharḥ Muntaqā al-akḥbār*, a commentary on a *ḥadīth* collection compiled by a seventh/thirteenth-century Syrian scholar, offered an iconoclastic interpretation of Islamic law that eschewed traditional legal-school affiliations. Twentieth-century Salafis have tended to be more interested in the genre of *ḥadīth* criticism than in commentary. Nevertheless, al-Shawkānī’s *Nayl al-awṭār* also enjoyed posthumous circulation in print, through the efforts of Ṣiddīq Ḥasan Khān of Bhopal (d. 1890) and his team of editors. Likewise, Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī (d. 1999), most notable for his revolutionary approach to *ḥadīth* criticism, also added some brief commentary in his newly-authenticated *ḥadīth* collections, including his well-known *Silsilat al-aḥādīth*.

The modern period also witnessed the proliferation of commentary on Sunnī collections in South Asia, with the help of

the Deobandī reform movement in North India and the development of the printing press (Zaman). This group not only emulated explicitly their Mamlūk predecessors but also addressed modern concerns in the context of British colonialism and often defended the Ḥanafī legal tradition from secular ideologies, competing religious movements from both outside and inside Islam (especially the Ahl-i Ḥadīth and Aḥmadiyya movements). These works were often dictated in Urdu as part of a reformed *madrassa* curriculum and were later published in Arabic. The most popular works were also published in Urdu and English. The list of normatively and stylistically influential *ḥadīth* commentaries developed by Deobandī scholars over several generations is too long to include here. The most noteworthy multi-volume works are commentaries by Rashīd Aḥmad Ganguhī (d. 1905) and Anwār Shāh al-Kashmīrī’s (d. 1933), respectively, on *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*; Khalīl Aḥmad’s (d. 1927) commentary on *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*; Shabbīr Aḥmad ʿUthmānī’s (d. 1949) commentary on *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*; and Muḥammad Zakariyyā’ al-Kāndhlawī’s (d. 1982) commentary on the *Muwattaʿ*.⁷ Meanwhile, Ṣiddīq Ḥasan Khān and Muḥammad al-Mubārakfūrī (d. 1935), who were sympathetic to the Ahl-i Ḥadīth, polemicised against the Ḥanafī school through their commentaries on *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* and *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*, respectively.

In the contemporary Islamic world, similar trends in marshalling the medium of *ḥadīth* commentary for social criticism are evident, especially in the Southeast Asian context (Woodward, 565–83). Female religious authorities who emerged from contemporary women’s piety movements in the Middle East and elsewhere have also begun to hold live commentaries

on *ḥadīth* that engage the classical tradition while opening up new areas of discussion, particularly women's health issues, for the first time in the tradition's history (Mahmood, 79–117).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SOURCES

Sikandar b. Muḥammad (Manjhū b. Akbar), *Mir'āt-i Sikandarī*, ed. Satish Chandra Misra and M. Lutfur Rahman, Baroda 1961; Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī, *Silsilat al-aḥādīth al-dā'iḥ wa-l-mawḍū'a wa-atharuhā al-sayyi' fi l-umma*, 2 vols., Damascus 1399/1979; Khalīl Aḥmad, *Badhl al-majhūd fi ḥall Abī Dāwūd*, ed. Muḥammad Zakariyyā', 20 vols., Lucknow 1972–80; Badr al-Dīn al-'Aynī, *Umdat al-qārī*, ed. 'Abdallāh Maḥmūd Muḥammad 'Umar, 25 vols., Beirut 2001; Badr al-Dīn al-Damāmīnī, *Maṣābīh al-jāmi'*, ed. Nūr al-Dīn Ṭālib (Qatar 2009), 1:5–12; Rashīd Aḥmad Ganguhī, *Lāmi' al-darāvī 'alā Jāmi' al-Bukhārī*, ed. Muḥammad Zakariyyā', 10 vols., Mecca 1975; Abū Bakr Ibn al-'Arabī, *Arīdat al-aḥwadhī*, ed. Jamāl Mar'ashlī, 14 vols., Beirut 1997; Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Fath al-bārī*, ed. Aḥmad Ṣāqir, Beirut 1970; Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Intiqād al-i'tirād*, 2 vols., Riyadh n.d.; Abū l-Walīd Ibn al-Bājī, *al-Muntaqā*, ed. Muḥammad 'Abd al-Qādir Aḥmad 'Aṭā, Beirut 1999; Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *al-Tamhīd*, ed. Muḥammad 'Abd al-Qādir Aḥmad 'Aṭā, 11 vols., Beirut 2010; Ibn Baṭṭāl, *Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, ed. Yāsir Ibn Ibrāhīm (vols. 2–5 ed. Abū Anas Ibrāhīm b. Sa'īd al-Ṣubayḥī), 11 vols., Riyadh 2003; Zayn al-Dīn Ibn Rajab, *Jāmi' al-'ulūm wa-l-ḥikam*, ed. Muḥammad b. Ḥāmid b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb, Damascus 2008; 'Iyād b. Mūsā, *Ikmāl al-mu'lim*, ed. Yaḥyā Ismā'īl, al-Mansura 1998; Muḥammad Zakariyyā' al-Kāndhlawī, *Awejaz al-masālik*, ed. Taqī al-Dīn al-Nadwī, 18 vols., Damascus 2003; Muḥsin Fayḍ al-Kashānī, *Kitāb al-wa'fi*, Isfahan 1986–96; Anwār Shāh al-Kashmīrī, *Fayḍ al-bārī*, ed. Muḥammad Badr Mīrtahī, 6 vols., Beirut 2005; Ḥamd b. Muḥammad al-Khaṭṭābī, *I'lām al-sunan*, ed. Yūsuf Kattānī, 2 vols., Rabat 1980; Ḥamd b. Muḥammad al-Khaṭṭābī, *Ma'ālīm al-sunan*, 2 vols., Beirut 1981; Muḥammad Bāqir al-Majlisī, *Kitāb mir'āt al-'uqūl*, 4 vols., Teh-

ran 1903–7; Muḥammad b. 'Alī al-Māzarī, *Kitāb al-mu'lim*, Cairo 1993; Muḥammad 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Mubarakfūrī, *Tuḥfat al-aḥwadhī*, ed. 'Abd al-Wahhāb 'Abd al-Laṭīf, and 'Abd al-Raḥmān Muḥammad 'Uthmān 10 vols., Medina 1963–7; Abū Zakariyyā' al-Nawawī, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī*, ed. Muḥammad Fu'ād 'Abd al-Bāqī, Cairo 1955; 'Abbās al-Qummī, *Safīnat al-biḥār*, 2 vols., Najaf 1936; Muḥammad b. 'Alī al-Shawkānī and Muḥammad Ṣiddīq Ḥasan Khān, *Nayl al-awṭār min asrār Muntaqā al-akhbār wa-bi-hāmihihī Kitāb 'awn al-biḥār*, 8 vols., Būlāq 1880; Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūfī, *Tanwīr al-ḥawālik*, 2 vols., Cairo 1951; Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī, *Fath al-Mulḥim*, ed. Muḥammad Taqī 'Uthmānī, 6 vols., Damascus 2006.

FURTHER READING

Joel Blecher, Hadith commentary, *Oxford bibliographies*, ed. Andrew Rippin, New York 2016 (DOI: 10.1093/obo/9780195390155-0192); 'Abd al-'Azīz b. Aḥmad Dihlawī, *The garden of the hadīth scholars. Bustān al-Muḥaddīthīn*, trans. Muḥammad Akram Nadwī and Aisha Abdurrahman Bewley, London 2007; Claude Gilliot, Sharḥ, *EI2*; Ṣiddīq Ḥasan Khān, *al-Ḥiṭṭa fi dhikr al-ṣiḥāh al-sitta*, Beirut 1987; *GAS* 1:116–68, 460–547.

STUDIES

Khalid Alavi, *Arba'īn al-Nawawī* and its commentaries, *IS* 24/3 (1985), 349–56; Rizwan Arastu, Preface, in Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā al-Kulaynī, *Al-Kaḥfi, The earliest and most important compilation of tradition from Prophet Muhammad and his Successors* (Dearborn 2012), xxxvi–xxxvii; Joel Blecher, Ḥadīth commentary in the presence of students, patrons, and rivals, *Oriens* 41 (2013), 261–87; Joel Blecher, Revision in the manuscript age. New evidence of early versions of Ibn Ḥajar's *Fath al-bārī*, *JNES* 76/1 (2017), 39–51; Joel Blecher, *Said the prophet of God. Hadīth commentary across a millennium*, Oakland 2017; Stephen R. Burge, Reading between the lines, *Arabica* 58/3 (2011), 168–97; Norman Calder, *Islamic jurisprudence in the classical era* (Cambridge 2010), 74–115; Armin Eschraghi, I was a hidden treasure, in Anna Akasoy and Wim Raven (eds.), *Islamic thought in the Middle Ages. Studies in text, transmission and translation in honour of Hans Daiber* (Leiden 2008), 91–9; Claude Gilliot, *Exégèse, langue*

et théologie en Islam (Paris 1990), 67; Robert Gleave, Between *ḥadīth* and *fiqh*, *ILS* 8/3 (2001), 350–82; Muḥammad ‘Iṣām ‘Arār al-Ḥasanī, *Iḥāf al-qārī* (Damascus 1987), 418–47; Muhammad Ishaq, *India’s contribution to the study of ḥadīth literature* (Dhaka 1955), 80–190, 232–46; Scott C. Lucas, The legal principles of Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl al-Bukhārī and their relationship to classical Salafī Islam, *ILS* 13/3 (2006), 289–324; Saba Mahmood, *Politics of piety. The Islamic revival and the feminist subject* (Princeton 2005), 79–117; Alphonse Mingana, *An important manuscript of the traditions of Bukhari with nine facsimile reproductions* (Cambridge 1936), 11–2; Mohammed Rustom, Psychology, eschatology, and imagination in Mullā Ṣadrā Shirāzī’s commentary on the *ḥadīth* of awakening, *Islam & Science* 5/1 (2007), 9–22; Louis Pouzet, *Une herméneutique de la tradition islamique. Le commentaire des Arba‘ūn al-Nawawīya*, Beirut 1982; Vardit Tokatly, The *‘Ālām al-ḥadīth* of al-Khaṭṭābī, *SI* 92 (2001), 53–91; Mark R. Woodward, Textual exegesis as social commentary, *JAS* 52/3 (1993), 565–83; Muhammad Qasim Zaman, Commentaries, print and patronage, *BSOAS* 62/1 (1999), 60–81.

JOEL BLECHER

al-Hilālī, Muḥammad Taqī al-Dīn

Muḥammad Taqī al-Dīn al-Hilālī (1894–1987) was a Muslim activist, traveller, and scholar with a specialisation in Arabic language and *ḥadīth* studies. Born in al-Farkh in the Tāfilālt region of southern Morocco, his family was also rooted in Tunisia and claimed Arab descent through the Banū Hilāl and ultimately to the prophet Muḥammad through Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī.

Al-Hilālī’s father was a local jurist and a deputy *qāḍī*. Al-Hilālī began his religious education at home and soon joined the Tijāniyya Ṣūfī order. Around 1916 he left to study and teach in a rural area of

western Algeria and returned to Morocco four years later, where he continued his education at the Qarawiyyīn mosque-cum-university in Fez. After experiencing a series of spiritual and epistemological crises, al-Hilālī recanted his Ṣūfī convictions in 1921 and embraced a more textualist understanding of Islam. Determined to delve into scriptural sources, he left Morocco for Egypt in 1922 in search of greater religious knowledge. In Egypt he became a disciple of Rashīd Riḍā (d. 1935), befriended the future founders of the pietistic association Anṣār al-Sunna al-Muḥammadiyya, and occasionally preached to villagers in Upper Egypt. It was at this time that al-Hilālī was told by a professor of al-Azhar that he already knew far more *ḥadīths* by heart than anyone at the venerated university. Having formed the idea that India was the last bastion of *ḥadīth* knowledge, al-Hilālī went there, in 1923, to study *ḥadīth* with Muslim scholars associated with the Ahl-i Ḥadīth movement after which he moved to southern Iraq and worked as a teacher. In 1927, he relocated to the Hijāz to join his former Egyptian associates and disciples of Rashīd Riḍā who had been recruited to build up the new Saudi religious and educational system. He left the emerging Saudi realm in 1930.

Over the following three decades al-Hilālī stood out as a staunch anticolonial activist who sought to balance a commitment to modernist reform with a desire to purify Islam. Although he was a self-proclaimed Salafī in both theology and law—meaning that he abided by the Ḥanbalī creed as developed by Ibn Taymiyya and refused to follow any of the established schools of Islamic law—he sometimes deemphasised religious purity (as he understood it) in order to mobilise