The Consistency of Ibn *Ḥibbān* to *the Ḥujjiyyah* Narrated by *al-Mudallīsīn in Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*

Konsistensi Ibn Ḥibbān dengan Ḥujjiyyah yang diriwayatkan oleh al-Mudallīsīn dalam Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān

Mohd Nor Adli bin Osman * (ᵃ), Muhamad Rozaimi bin Ramle (ᵇ)
(*)Islamic Studies Section, School of Humanities, Universiti Sains Malaysia, 11800 USM, Pulau Pinang, Malaysia. adliosman@usm.my
(ᵇ) Department of Islamic Studies, Faculty of Human Sciences, Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris, 35900 Tanjung Malim, Perak & Universiti Islam Antarabangsa Tuanku Syed Sirajuddin, 02000 Kuala Perlis, Perlis

Abstract

Imam Ibn Ḥibbān was a prominent scholar in various Islamic sciences, particularly ḥadīth. Among his major works is Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān. In this book, as well as in other works such as al-Thiqāt and al-Majrūḥīn min al-Muḥaddithīn, he explicitly stated that he would not accept ḥadīth narrations classified as riwāyah al-mudallas. However, instances of such narrations appear in Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān, indicating differences in the methodology applied across these works. Furthermore, notable discrepancies exist between Ibn Ḥibbān's definition of riwāyah al-mudallas and those of other muḥaddithīn. This study aims to examine Ibn Ḥibbān 's definition of riwāyah al-mudallas and evaluate the consistency of his methodology in addressing these narrations. To achieve these objectives, the research employs a qualitative approach, collecting data primarily from major ḥadīth sources and analyzing them using both inductive and deductive methods. The findings of this study reveal that Ibn Ḥibbān defines al-mudallis as a narrator who reports from a teacher they have met but narrates reports they have not directly heard or a narrator who reports from a contemporary without ever meeting them, using terminology that implies otherwise. Moreover, Ibn Ḥibbān followed his methodological principles and objectives when including riwāyah al-mudallas in his Ṣaḥīḥ. This study contributes to a deeper understanding of the concept of riwāyah al-mudallas among ḥadīth scholars and Ibn Ḥibbān's approach in addressing these narrations in his collection.

Keywords: *Ibn Ḥibbān, Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān, Riwāyah Al-Mudallas , Methodology, 'An'anah*

Abstrak:

Imam Ibn Ḥibbān adalah sosok terkemuka di berbagai bidang ilmu pengetahuan Islam, termasuk ilmu ḥadīts. Di antara karya besarnya adalah Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān. Dalam kitab ini, serta dalam karya lainnya seperti *al-Thiqāt* dan *al-Majrūḥīn min al-Muḥaddithīn*, ia secara tegas menyatakan bahwa ia tidak akan menerima riwayat ḥadīts yang diklasifikasikan sebagai *riwāyah al-mudallas*. Namun, terdapat beberapa riwayat semacam itu dalam *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*, yang menunjukkan adanya perbedaan metodologi yang diterapkan dalam karya-karyanya tersebut. Selain itu, terdapat perbedaan yang cukup signifikan antara definisi Ibn Ḥibbān tentang *riwāyah al-mudallas* dengan definisi para *muḥaddithīn* lainnya. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengkaji definisi *riwāyah al-mudallas* menurut Ibn Ḥibbān dan mengevaluasi konsistensi metodologinya dalam menyikapi riwayat-riwayat tersebut. Untuk mencapai tujuan ini, penelitian menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif, dengan mengumpulkan data terutama dari sumber-sumber utama ḥadīts dan menganalisisnya melalui metode induktif dan deduktif. Temuan

penelitian ini mengungkapkan bahwa Ibn Ḥibbān mendefinisikan *al-mudallis* sebagai seorang perawi yang meriwayatkan dari guru yang pernah ia temui tetapi menyampaikan riwayat yang tidak ia dengar secara langsung, atau seorang perawi yang meriwayatkan dari sezaman tanpa pernah bertemu dengannya, dengan menggunakan istilah yang seolah-olah menunjukkan sebaliknya. Selain itu, Ibn Ḥibbān berpegang pada prinsip dan tujuan metodologisnya ketika memasukkan *riwāyah al-mudallas* dalam *Ṣaḥīḥ*-nya. Penelitian ini memberikan kontribusi dalam memperdalam pemahaman tentang konsep *riwāyah al-mudallas* di kalangan ulama ḥadīth serta pendekatan Ibn Ḥibbān dalam menyikapi riwayat-riwayat tersebut dalam karyanya.

Kata Kunci: *Ibn Ḥibbān, Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān, Riwāyah Al-Mudallas , Metodologi, ʿAnʿanah*

Introduction

During the second and third centuries hijri, the evolution of ḥadīth terminology peaked with the appearance of fundamental classifications such *as ṣaḥīḥ, ḥasan, ḍaʿīf, and mawḍūʿ*. Advanced isnad-related terminology like *al-munqaṭiʿ*, *al-mudallas, al-mursal, al-muʿḍal,* and *al-muḍṭarib[1]* emerged as particularly important in discussions on *ḍaʿīf ḥadīth*, building upon these foundations. *Riwāyah al-mudallas* gained prominence among them because of its close relationship to isnād continuity, a key factor in ḥadīth authentication. In general terms, the definition of riwāyah al-mudallas is aptly articulated by *Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī*, who describes it as follows:

> *A narrator who has met his teacher transmits a report which he did not actually hear directly from that teacher, yet he relates it using ambiguous wording that gives the impression of direct auditory transmission.[2]*

This definition highlights the critical role of taṣrīḥ bi al-samāʿ in verifying a student's direct reception of ḥadīth from his teacher. The absence of such a declaration renders the transmission epistemically questionable, placing the ḥadīth in the category of ḍaʿīf. However, If the ḥadīths in the *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* are examined more comprehensively, one will find several ḥadīths at the level of riwāyah al-mudallas in the book. The existence of these ḥadīths is due to the fact that there are several narrators of riwāyah al-mudallas who were evaluated by Ibn Ḥibbān and who narrate in ʿanʿanah, which indirectly makes the narrated ḥadīth considered riwāyah al-mudallas. Among the ḥadīths are:

---

1   Muḥammad ʿAjjāj al-Khaṭīb, *Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth: ʿUlūmuhu wa Muṣṭalaḥuhu* (Beyrut: Dar Al-Fikr, 2015), 337.

2   Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Taʿrīf Ahl al-Taqdīs bi-Marātib al-Mawṣūfīn bi-al-Tadlīs*, ed. ʿAsim ʿAbd Allah (Lebanon: Maktabah Al-Manar, 2008), 16

> *Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Junayd transmitted to us, Qutaybah ibn Saʿīd narrated to us, saying: Hushaym narrated to, from Ḥumayd, It was narrated from Anas that: The Prophet used to go round to all his wives with one bath.[3]*

Hushaym is widely recognized by major nuqqād such as al-ʿIjlī[4], Ibn Saʿd[5], and Ibn Ḥibbān[6] as a narrator who engaged in tadlīs. Harald Motzki[7] notes that prior to Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, ʿanʿanah was accepted with greater flexibility, as seen in early sources like the Muṣannaf of ʿAbd al-Razzāq. However, after the era of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ scholarship, ḥadīth scholarship—particularly as represented by al-Albānī's method, analyzed by Muhammad Amin—adopted stricter standards, especially toward al-mudallis. Consequently, Hushaym's use of ʿanʿanah has come under greater scrutiny in post-classical ḥadīth criticism due to concerns about possible disruptions in the transmission chain.[8]

This finding is indirectly different from the stance expressed by Ibn Ḥibbān at the beginning of this book, where explicitly refused to include the ḥadīths of *riwāyah al-mudallas* in his work. The following statements illustrate Ibn Ḥibbān's position on his methodology, including those found in *al-Thiqāt:*[9]

> *"In the sanads, there are al-mudallis who do not explain to a khabar (narration) from whom they hear it. So indeed, the al-mudallis, as long as he does not explain that he heard from his teacher, it is not necessary to argue with the khabar because there is no certainty that the narrator heard from his teacher who is ḍaʿīf and the khabar becomes invalid by mentioning the name of the teacher when he is found and identified. As long as the al-mudallis does not mention in the khabar 'I heard' or 'he has told me,' even though he is a thiqah, then it is not permissible to argue with his khabar."*

---

3   Muḥammad Ibn Ḥibban, *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān,* ed. Shuʿayb al-Arna'ūṭ, 3rd ed. (Beyrut: Muasasah Al-Risalah, 2017), 356.

4   Jamāl al-Dīn Abū al-Ḥajjāj Yūsuf ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl fī Asmāʾ al-Rijāl*, ed. Bashshār ʿAwwād Maʿrūf. (Lubnan: Muasassah Al-Risalah, 1992), 283

5   Jamāl al-Dīn Abū al-Ḥajjāj Yūsuf ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl fī Asmāʾ al-Rijāl*, 283

6   Muhammad bin Ḥibbān, *Al-Thiqāt*, (Beyrut: Dar Al-Kutub Al-`Illmiyyiah, 1998), 587

7   Harald Motzki, *The Muṣannaf of ʿAbd al-Razzāq al-Ṣanʿānī as a Source of Authentic Aḥādīth of the First Century AH*, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. 50, No. 1 (1991),1-22, https://doi.org/10.1086/373461

8   Kamarudin Amin, Nasiruddin al-Albani on Muslim's Sahih: A Critical Study of His Method. *Islamic Law and Society*, 11 no 2, (2004)149-176, https://www.jstor.org/stable/3399302.

9   Muḥammad Ibn Ḥibbān, *Al-Thiqāt*,11.

The same thing was also stated by Ibn Ḥibbān in *the Al-Majrūḥīn min Al-Muḥaddithīn*[10]:

> *"The narrators of thiqah al-mudallis who also hide (the names of their teachers) in their reports, such as Qatādah, Yaḥyā ibn Abī Kathīr, al-Aʿmash, Abū Isḥāq, Ibn Jurayj, Ibn Isḥāq, al-Thawrī, Hushaym, and the like, are numerous. They are among the imams who are called pious and known for the waraʾ in the religion. They write from all teachers, narrate from whom they listen, and sometimes do al-tadlīs from their teachers after they hear from them in groups considered weak, so it is not permissible to argue with their khabar. As long as the al-mudallis does not mention in his khabar, even if he is a thiqah, 'told to me' or 'I heard,' then it is not permissible to argue with his khabar."*

Likewise, it is also found in the *muqaddimah* of *the Ṣaḥīḥ* Ibn Ḥibbān[11]:

> *"As for the al-mudallis who belong to the thiqah and 'just' people, we do not argue with their khabar unless they have explained what they heard from their teachers, such as al-Thawrī, al-Aʿmash, Abū Isḥāq, and the like from among the pious imams, members of the religion. Because when we receive the khabar of al-mudallis that he did not explain what he heard from his teachers, even if they are thiqah, it means that we are also forced to accept the narrations of al-munqaṭiʿ and mursal in their entirety because it is not known that this al-mudallis could have done al-tadlīs in this khabar from a ḍaʿīf. By saying his name, the khabar became ḍaʿīf when identified."*

Ibn Ḥibbān, based on his statements in three key works, appears to reject narrations from *al-mudallis*. However, Muhammad Abu Shuʿalik, in *Zawāʾid Ibn Ḥibbān: Dirāsah wa Naqd*, identifies several *mudallas* ḥadīths within *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*, suggesting inconsistency in Ibn Ḥibbān's own methodology. This raises critical questions: Did Ibn Ḥibbān consistently apply his stated criteria? This paper critically examines selected *isnād* to assess whether his practice aligns with his theoretical conditions. The term *ḥujjiyyah* here refers to the probative value of a ḥadīth, its capacity to serve as a valid source for religious rulings or argumentation. Clarifying this concept is central to evaluating Ibn Ḥibbān's methodological consistency.

---

10   Muḥammad Ibn Ḥibban, *al-Majrūḥīn min al-Muḥaddithīn*, ed. Hamdi ʿAbd Al-Majid, 2nd ed. (Riyadh: Dar Al-Shamiʿi, 2012), 86.

11   Ibn Ḥibbān, *Sahih Ibn Ḥibbān*, 61.

Comparison Between *Mutaqaddimīn* and *Mutaʾakhkhirīn* in Ḥadīth Authentication

Studies on ḥadīth criticism among classical and modern scholars have demonstrated significant developments from the era of mutaqaddimīn to mutaʾakhkhirīn. For instance, Al-Muwāzanah bayna al-Mutaqaddimīn wa al-Muta'akhkhirīn fī Taṣḥīḥ al-Aḥādīth wa Taʿlīlihā by Hamzah al-Malībārī[12] focuses on the differences between the methods accepted by earlier scholars and the newer approaches in ḥadīth criticism. This is particularly true when it comes to identifying factors that influence the authenticity and weakness of ḥadīths. Al-Malībārī highlighted how the traditional method of ẓāhir al-isnād used by mutaqaddimīn scholars has evolved, especially with the application of ʿilāl al-ḥadīth by modern critics in assessing the soundness of both the chain and the text of the ḥadīth.

In *Naẓarāt Jadīdah fī ʿUlūm al-Ḥadīth*, Ḥamzah al-Malībārī compared the approach of the *mutaqaddimīn*, which emphasized the practical application of ḥadīth criticism, with the theoretical perspectives adopted by the *mutaʾakhkhirīn*, particularly in the analysis of ʿilāl al-ḥadīth to assess the authenticity of ḥadīth. This study offers a new perspective on the development of ḥadīth sciences from the practical to the theoretical aspects.[13]

On the other hand, *al-Manhaj al-Muqtaraḥ li Fahm al-Muṣṭalaḥ* by Ḥātim al-ʿAwnī [14] provides a more systematic approach to understanding the technical terms (*muṣṭalah*) of ḥadīth criticism, particularly in the context of evaluating and applying *muṣṭalaḥ* relevant to ḥadīth studies. *Nashʾat ʿIlm al-Muṣṭalaḥ wa al-Ḥadd al-Fāṣil bayna al-Mutaqaddimīn wa al-Mutaʾakhkhirīn* by ʿIṣām ʿĪdū[15] provided a historical analysis of the emergence of *muṣṭalaḥ al-hadith* and the clear distinctions in the approaches of *mutaqaddimīn* and *mutaʾakhkhirīn* in identifying authentic and weak ḥadīths. Meanwhile, *Hadith Criticism in the Levant in the Twentieth Century, From Ẓāhir al-Isnād to ʿIlāl al-Ḥadīth* by Aḥmad Ṣnūbar[16] examined the shift in the approach to ḥadīth criticism in the Levant in the 20th century, which influenced

---

12 Ḥamzah ʿAbd Allāh al-Malībārī, *al-Muwāzanah bayna al-Mutaqaddimīn wa al-Mutaʾakhkhirīn fī Taṣḥīḥ al-Aḥādīth wa Taʿlīlihā*, (Lubnan: Dar Ibn Hazm)

13 Ḥamzah ʿAbd Allāh al-Malībārī, *Naẓarāt Jadīdah fī ʿUlūm al-Ḥadīth: Dirāsah Naqdiyyah wa Muqāranah bayna al-Jānib al-Taṭbīqī ladā al-Mutaqaddimīn wa al-Jānib al-Naẓarī ʿinda al-Mutaʾakhkhirīn,*(Lubnan: Dar Ibn Hazm)

14 Ḥātim ʿĀrif al-ʿAwnī, *Al-Manhaj Al-Muqtaraḥ li Fahm Al-Muṣṭalaḥ,* (Riyadh: Dar Al-Hijrah, 1996), 107

15 Muḥammad ʿIṣām ʿĪdū, *Nashʾat ʿIlm al-Muṣṭalaḥ wa al-Ḥadd al-Fāṣil bayna al-Mutaqaddimīn wa al-Mutaʾakhkhirīn,* (Azwiqat: Jordan, 2016), 169.

16 Ahmad Snober, H*adith Criticism In The Levant in the Twentieth Century: From Ẓāhir al-Isnād to ʿIlāl al-Ḥadīth.* (Edinburgh: University Press, 2020), 56

intellectual currents in the Islamic world, with a focus on the transition from *ẓāhir al-isnād* to the acceptance of *ʿIlāl al-Ḥadīth* as a method for reinforcing the accuracy of ḥadīth evaluation.

In *Min al-Nabī ṣallā Allāhu ʿalayhi wa sallama ilā al-Bukhārī*, Ahmad Snober traced the development of ḥadīth criticism from the time of the Prophet Muḥammad (PBUH) through to the compilation of Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī. The book explored how early scholars evaluated ḥadīth and compared their methods with those employed by later scholars like al-Bukhārī, highlighting shifts in criteria for authenticity and the evolution of ḥadīth sciences over time.[17]

In Nasiruddin al-Albani on Muslim's Sahīh: A Critical Study of His Method by Kamaruddin Amin[18], the study of al-Albani's methodology demonstrated how he adapted the *ẓāhir al-isnād* method in assessing the authenticity of hadīth, despite facing criticisms regarding the lack of consideration for historical context and deeper analysis of narrators. Together, these studies form a broader and deeper understanding of the development of methodologies in hadith criticism, offering insight into how contemporary scholars renew and adjust the methods of hadīth evaluation to address new challenges in hadīth studies.

Scope and Methodology

This article examines the consistency of Ibn Hibbān's methodology in dealing with riwāyah al-mudallas in his Sahīh. While his preambles in *Sahīh Ibn Hibbān, al-Thiqāt, and al-Majrūhīn min al-Mudaddithīn* indicate a rejection of *al-mudallis*, research reveals the presence of several such reports transmitted via 'an'anah. This study collects relevant narrations and analyzes them using inductive and deductive methods to evaluate whether Ibn Hibbān's practice aligns with his stated criteria regarding al-mudallis.

Background of Writing the Book Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān

As already explained, the real name of the book *Ṣaḥīḥ* Ibn *Ḥibbān* is *al-Musnad Al-Ṣaḥīḥ ʿalā Al-Taqāsim Wa Al-Anwāʿ Min Ghayr Wujūd Qaṭʿi Fī Sanadihā Wa Lā Thubūt Jarḥ Fī Nāqilīhā*. However, apart from being known as *Ṣaḥīḥ* Ibn *Ḥibbān*,

---

17 Ahmad Snober, *Min al-Nabī ṣallā Allāhu ʿalayhi wa sallama ilā al-Bukhārī: Dirāsah fī Ḥarakah Riwayat al-Ḥadīth wa Naqduhu fī al-Qurūn al-Thalāth al-Ūwal (Jordan: Dar Al-Fath, 2021),* 98

18 Kamarudin Amin, Nasiruddin al-Albani on Muslim's Sahīh: A Critical Study of His Method. *Islamic Law and Society*, 11 no 2, (2004)149-176, https://www.jstor.org/stable/3399302.

this book is also known as *al-Anwāʿ wa Al-Taqāsim* by al-Dhahabī. Meanwhile, according to al-Suyūṭī and al-Haythamī, *Ṣaḥīḥ* Ibn *Ḥibbān* is known as *Al-Taqāsim wa al-Anwāʿ*.[19]

Ibn Ḥibbān compiled *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* to address the community's growing neglect of authentic ḥadīth, amid a rise in fabricated reports and the mixing of valid *sanad* with false *matan*. Concerned by this trend, he took proactive steps to collect and document authentic narrations based on his criteria of *ṣaḥīḥ*, aiming to preserve reliable reports and guide the public back to sound prophetic traditions.

Writing Methodology Book of Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān

The compilation of Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān has provided a platform for scholars to critically examine its methodological framework. Al-Suyūṭī, for instance, compared this work with Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Khuzaymah and regarded the latter as more authoritative, primarily due to Ibn Khuzaymah's tawaqquf in authenticating ḥadīths that had been subject to criticism.[20] However, contemporary ḥadīth scholar Shaykh Shuʿayb al-Arnaʾūṭ offered a contrasting assessment. He observed that Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Khuzaymah contains several inauthentic ḥadīths with weak chains of isnād[21], leading him to conclude that Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān holds a superior position in terms of ḥadīth quality. Furthermore, within the post-canonical era, Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān played a pivotal role in the transmission and standardization of ḥadīth, owing to its unique structural arrangement and its sustained influence on scholarly discourse beyond the canonical period.[22]

Ibn Ḥibbān 's Conditions of Gathering Sanad-Sanad Ṣaḥīḥ in the Book

Ibn Ḥibbān has placed five basic conditions for each narrator who is in the range of *sanad* in his authentic book as an indicator of the validity of a *sanad*. These

---

19 Ḥājjī Khalīfah, *Kashf al-Ẓunūn ʿan Asāmī al-Kutub wa al-Funūn,* (London: Muasassah Al-Furqan Li Turath Al-Islamiyyah, 2021), 556.

20 ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Abū Bakr Jalāl al-Dīn, *Tadrīb Al-Rāwī*, ed. Muhammad Al-Faraidi (Riyadh: Dar Al-Minhaj, 2016), 109.

21 Abd al-Raḥmān Abū Bakr Jalāl al-Dīn, *Tadrīb Al-Rāwī*, 109.

22 Davidson, G. (2022). *Carrying on the Tradition: An Intellectual and Social History of Post-Canonical Hadith Transmission.* Brill, 2016), 20

conditions are: the credibility of the narrator in religion is to express the beauty of what is narrated; famous for being honest when narrating hadith; a narrator who understands what is narrated; knowing the things that can change meaning; and not doing *al-tadlīs*.

Ibn Ḥibbān's five conditions for authentic ḥadīth differ from the consensus of the *jumhūr al-muḥaddithīn*, who include *shādh* as a key criterion. While both require connected *sanad*, *ʿadālah*, and *ḍabṭ*, Ibn Ḥibbān does not explicitly mention *shudhūdh*, making his criteria less stringent than those upheld by the majority[23].

Interpreting the Narrator *Majhul al-Ḥāl*

Ibn Hibbān was seen as mutasāhil in accrediting narrators yet mutashaddid in criticism, accepting *majhūl al-ḥāl* narrators under strict conditions, unlike the stricter jumhūr approach. Compared to criteria in al-Sakhāwī's works[24], Ibn Hibbān's approach aligns with other *mutasāhil* scholars like al-Tirmidhī, Ibn Hazm[25], and Muhammad Akmaluddīn, placing him within the more lenient strand of al-jarh wa al-taʾdīl methodology. According to al-Muʾallimī, the assessment of thiqah set by Ibn Hibbān is based on its five main conditions. These conditions are[26]:

> A narrator is assessed with a clear assessment such as *mustaqīm al-ḥadīth, kāna mutqinān*.
>
> The narrator was among his teachers, and Ibn Ḥibbān recognized the narrator.
>
> Ibn Ḥibbān knew the ḥadīths narrated by a narrator and knew the position of the ḥadīths narrated.
>
> Ibn Ḥibbān personally judged and verified the narrator
>
> Ibn Ḥibbān only knows his name.

Al-Muʿallimī's criticism of Ibn Ḥibbān's evaluation of *majhūl al-ḥāl* narrators appears overly general and fails to adequately consider the specific technical conditions

---

23   Muḥammad Abū Suʿaylik, *al-Imām al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū Ḥatim Muḥammad ibn Ḥibbān al-Bustī: Faylasūf al-Jarḥ wa al-Taʿdīl* (Damsyik: Dar Al-Qalam, 1995), 30.

24   Al-Sakhāwī, Shams al-Dīn, *Al-Mutakallimūn fī al-Rijāl*, (Beyrut: Dar Al-Basyar, 1990), 17

25   Muḥammad Akmaluddīn;   *ʿIzz al-Maʿālī wa al-Manāzil limā fī Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhī min al-Isnād al-ʿĀlī wa al-Manāzil* (Indonesia; Dar Ihya Al-Sunnah Al-Saniyyah; 2014), 168.

26   Al-Zahrānī; Muḥammad Maṭar, *ʿIlm al-Rijāl: Nashāʾatuhu wa Tatawwuruhu min al-Qarn al-Awwal ilā Nihāyat al-Qarn al-Tāsiʿ* (Madinah: Dar al-Khudiri, 1994), 161.

that Ibn Ḥibbān explicitly outlined in *al-Majrūḥīn min al-Muḥaddithīn*. Ibn Ḥibbān did not accept *majhūl* narrators arbitrarily; rather, he stipulated that a narrator should be deemed *ʿādil* in the absence of any known cause for discrediting him, given that the default assumption regarding a person is integrity unless proven otherwise, and that individuals are not held accountable for hidden faults that cannot be discerned.[27] His approach is further supported by the absence of *munkar* reports from such narrators and the lack of censure from established *nuqqād*. Therefore, Ibn Ḥibbān's evaluative method being more inclusive than the position of the *jumhūr*, particularly in his acceptance of *majhūl al-ḥāl* narrators with no apparent flaws, should not be simplistically characterized as *mutasāhil*[28], but instead deserves to be examined through a more rigorous epistemological and methodological lens.

The divergence between Ibn Ḥibbān and Ibn Ḥajar in evaluating *thiqah* status lies in their methodological orientation. Ibn Ḥibbān tends to accept narrators classified as *majhūl al-ḥāl* in the absence of explicit weaknesses or transmission of *munkar* reports, whereas Ibn Ḥajar adopts a more cautious stance, refraining from elevating such narrators without corroborative evidence. For instance, ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAlī ibn Saʿīd al-Muṭṭalibī is deemed *thiqah* by Ibn Ḥibbān[29], yet categorized as *majhūl al-ḥāl* or *mastūr* by Ibn Ḥajar.[30]

Difference *Tadlīs al-Isnād* and *Irsāl al-Ḥadīth*

When looking at the debate on *al-tadlīs* as a whole, *al-tadlīs* is divided into three main divisions, namely *tadlīs al-isnād*, *tadlīs al-shuyūkh*, and *tadlīs al-taswiyah*. However, there is a difference in the debate between *tadlīs al-isnād* and *irsāl al-ḥadīth* among *al-mutaqaddimīn* and some *al-mutaʾakhkhirīn*. According to many works on *mustalah al-ḥadīth* that have reached us today, *tadlīs al-isnād* is commonly defined as follows by Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī:

---

27 Ibn Ḥibbān, *al-Majrūḥīn min al-Muḥaddithīn*, 12.

28 Naṣr al-Dīn al-Albānī, *ʿUlūm al-Ḥadīth* (Arab Saudi: Dar Ibn Hazm, 2003), 54.

29 Ibn Ḥibbān, *Kitab Al-Thiqāt*, 34.

30 Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Taqrīb al-Tahdhīb*, ed. Muḥammad ʿAwwāmah (Syria: Dar Rasyid, 2000), 331.

"A narrator has met his teacher but narrates a narration a report that he did not hear from him. When transmitting it, he uses language that suggests he did hear it directly from that teacher."[31]

This is a general definition applied when there is a meeting between student and teacher in narration. The disagreement between the *mutaqaddimīn* and *muta'akhkhirīn* arises in how they interpret this meeting, which subsequently affects their definitions of *tadlīs al-isnād* and *irsāl al-ḥadīth*. Here are the differences between the two groups:

Mutaqaddimīn

Al-Dhahabī holds the view that the era of the muta'akhkhirīn began in the early 5th century Hijri (approximately early 400H), while the era of the mutaqaddimīn ended in the late of the 3rd century Hijri (around late 300H).[32] Based on this chronological framework, Ibn Salāh who was born in 557H and passed away in 643H would, technically belongs to the *muta'akhkhirīn*. However, in terms of methodology, his approach to hadīth classification is more consistent with the principles of the mutaqaddimīn.[33]

Ibn al-Salāh classified *tadlīs al-isnād* into two forms and required the necessity of verified *samā'* for each narration. In contrast, Ibn Hajar, categorized among the muta'akhkhirūn, adopted a more flexible stance by accepting the possibility of *samā'* provided that the narrator had met the teacher at least once, even if there was no direct evidence of such transmission. He did not require explicit proof of hearing for every individual report. This illustrates a methodological divergence reflecting distinct epistemological frameworks within the hadīth tradition.

Al-Bukhārī, as a leading *mutaqaddim* scholar, was asked by al-Tirmidhī regarding the narration of Sa'īd ibn Abī 'Arūbah narrated from al-A'mash[34] regarding the narration below:

_____

31   Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Taʿrīf Ahl al-Taqdīs bi-Marātib al-Mawṣūfīn bi al-Tadlīs* 16.

32   Al-Dhahabī, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad. *Mīzān al-Iʿtidāl fī Naqd al-Rijāl*. Ed. ʿAlī Muḥammad al-Būjāwī. (Lubnān: Dār al-Maʿrifah, 1963), 4.

33   Abū ʿAmr ʿUthmān ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, *ʿUlūm al-Ḥadīth li Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ*, ed. Nūr al-Dīn (Riyadh: Dar Ibn al-Qayyim lil-Nashr wa-al-Tawzi', 2011), 73.

34   Abū ʿĪsā Muḥammad al-Tirmidhī, *ʿIlal al-Tirmidhī al-Kabīr*, ed. Nūr al-Dīn ʿIṭṭir (Kaherah: Maktabah al-Nahdah al-`Arabiyah, 2015), 343.

> *Sa'īd ibn Abī 'Arūbah narrated to us, from al-A'mash, from Abi Wail, from 'Abd Allāh said,* the Prophet PBUH said: Study the Qur'ān, for it is more apt to escape from men's minds than animals which are tethered."

<div align="right">

('Ilal al-Tirmidhī al-Kabīr)

</div>

Based on the sanad in this narration, Al-Bukhārī said:

> *"I did not know that Sa'īd ibn Abī 'Arūbah heard from al-A'mash, and he (Sa'īd ibn Abī 'Arūbah) did tadlis and narrated this narration."* [35]

Based on the commentary, al-Bukhārī considered tadlīs to occur when a narrator did not hear directly from another narrator, which aligns with the definition of al-irsāl al-khafī according to Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalānī. In general, al-Bukhārī regarded tadlīs and al-irsāl al-khafī as equivalent. This view was also shared by Imām Ahmad, who judged the transmission of Sa'īd ibn Abī 'Arūbah (d. 156H) from al-A'mash (d. 147H) as *mudallas*, since neither heard from the other, despite living in the same era.

In addition to al-Bukhārī and Ahmad ibn Hanbal, al-Bazzār stands out as another prominent scholar among the *mutaqaddimīn* whose views are instrumental in understanding their methodological stance on *tadlīs*. In his analysis, al-Bazzār asserts that when a transmitter narrates from someone he has not met using an ambiguous expression (such as *'an*), this is not necessarily considered *tadlīs*.[36] His emphasis shows that determining *tadlīs* is not solely based on the phrasing used but must also take into account the broader context of the narrator's encounter and overall reliability. This reflects the methodological flexibility and contextual sensitivity characteristic of the *mutaqaddimīn*, in contrast to the more formalistic criteria typically adopted by *muta'akhkhirīn*.

If one understand the above expression, it relates to the issue of *al-irsāl al-zāhir*, as it involves a superficial disconnection. Therefore, al-Bazzār has distinguished between *tadlīs* and *al-irsāl al-zāhir* instead of between *tadlīs* and al-*irsāl al-khafī*. Thus, he saw that among *tadlīs* and *al-irsāl al-khafī* as having the same meaning, namely that the narrator narrates from those who lived in the same era but have never met, but the narrator narrates as if he had heard a hadīth from him. Similarly, it also applies when a narrator transmits from someone he met but reports a hadīth he never actually heard.

---

35   Abū ʿĪsā Muḥammad al-Tirmidhī, *ʿIlal al-Tirmidhī al-Kabīr*, 343.

36   Aḥmad Ibrāhīm ibn al-ʿAjamī, *al-Tabyīn li-Asmāʾ al-Mudallīsīn li-Thabata ibn al-ʿAjām al-Shāfiʿī*, ed. Muḥammad Ibrāhīm Dāwūd al-Mawṣilī (Beyrut: Muasassah Al-Rayyan, 1998), 13.

Al-Bazzār's view, which at first appears to reject *tadlīs*, is in fact a technical formulation that aligns with the later definition by Ibn Hajar. As clarified by al-'Irāqī, al-Bazzār refers to a narrator reporting from a teacher whom he met but from whom he did not hear the specific hadīth, without indicating the disconnection. This reflects a more nuanced and methodological approach.[37]

Based on this expression, Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalānī is of the view that the understanding that has been given by al-Bazzār is in line with his own. However, if we examine al-Bazzār's definition of *tadlīs* more deeply, there is no indication that he limits the term only to cases where the narrator met his teacher. What is clear is that al-Bazzār stated that the narrator who narrated something he did not hear from his teacher was *tadlīs*. However, nothing in al-Bazzār's quote denies the meaning of the *tadlīs*. Therefore, al-Bazzār also sees that *tadlīs* and *al-irsāl al-khafī* have the same meaning, similar to the understanding held by al-Bukhārī and Ahmad ibn Hanbal.

Mutaʾakhkhirīn

As has been explained, the muta'akhkhirīn are those who define the meaning of tadlīs al-isnād as stated by Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalānī, namely:

> *"The difference between tadlīs al-isnād and al-mursal al-khafī is very subtle. The difference lies in this: tadlīs is specific to the narrator who narrates from what is known that the narrator has met the narrator who is above him, while when the narrator is contemporaneous with him but it is not known that the narrator has met him, then that is the meaning of al-mursal al-khafī.[38]"*

Based on this statement, the books written by him define that there should be a meeting between the narrators, not just that they live in the same era. To prove the validity of the meeting between the narrators, it must be established that they transmitted the hadīth directly. This differs from the definition given by the *mutaqaddimīn* group, as discussed in the previous section. The *mutaqaddimīn* group holds the view that both meanings fall under *tadlīs al-isnād*.

One of the narrators to describe the above situation is al-Aʿmash, who narrated from Mujāhid. If we examine the narrations involving these two narrators holistically, many *mudallas* reports from al-Aʿmash appear with the expression of *ʿanʿanah* from Mujāhid. However, some narrations show that there was a meeting

---

37   Zayn al-Dīn al-ʿIrāqī, *al-Taqyīd wa al-Īḍāḥ Sharḥ Muqaddimat Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ*, ed. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Muḥammad ʿUthmān (Beyrut: Dar al-Fikr, 2023), 80.

38   Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Nuzhat al-Naẓar fī Tawḍīḥ Nukhbat al-Fikar*, ed. ʿAlī Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī ʿAbd al-Majīd, (Mesir: Dar Ibn Al-Jauzi, 2011), 5.

between al-Aʿmash and Mujāhid (tasrīh bi al-samāʿ). One of examples is found in the sahīh Ibn Khuzaymah, where the expression samiʿtu is used:

> *Yūsuf ibn Mūsā narrated to us, Wakīʿ narrated to us, al-Aʿmash narrated to us, I heard Mujāhid narrate: from Tāwūs, from Ibn ʿAbbās said; The Prophet PBUH has passed through two cemeteries in Makkah or Madīnah, so the Prophet PBUH has heard the voices of two people who are being punished in the graves of both, so the Prophet PBUH said; "They are being punished, but they are not being punished for anything difficult to avoid." Then he said: "Indeed, one of them used not to take care to avoid getting urine on his body or clothes, and the other used to walk around spreading gossip." Then he called for a palm stalk, which he broke in two and placed a piece of it on each grave. It was said to him: "O Messenger of Allāh, why did you do that?" He said: "May it be reduced for them so long as this does not dry out" or: "until this dries out."[39]*

In this hadīth, it is clear that there is *tasrīh bi al-samāʿ* between al-Aʿmash and Mujāhid. Thus, al-Aʿmash represents an example relevant to both perspectives, *mutaqaddimīn* or *mutaʾakhkhirīn*.

One of the scholars of *mutaʾakhkhirīn* who share a similar understanding to Ibn Hajar al-ʿAsqalānī is Khatīb al-Baghdādī. Based on the book *al-Kifāyah fī ʿIlm al-Riwāyah*, al-Khatīb al-Baghdādī provides a detailed commentary on his methodology in the narration of *tadlīs*. From his explanation, Ibn Hajar interprets two key principles[40]: *First*,"there is no distinction among the scholars that *irsāl al-hadīth* does not include *riwāyah al-mudallas*," and; *Second***,** "the narration of contemporaries who never met" and "the narration of those who do not live contemporaneously" are treated under the same ruling.

From these two main views stated above, it is clear that he and Khatīb al-Baghdādī share the same conceptual understanding of *tadlīs*. Based on this, Khatīb al-Baghdādī distinguishes between the two meanings in a way that differs from most *mutaqaddimīn*.

---

39   Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Isḥāq, *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Khuzaymah*, ed. Markaz al-Buḥūth wa-Taqniyat al-Maʿlūmāt (Mesir: Dar Al-Taʿsil, 2014), 33.

40   Abū Bakr Aḥmad ʿAlī, *al-Kifāyah fī ʿIlm al-Riwāyah*, ed. Ibrāhīm Ḥamdī and Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Sawraqī (Madinah: Maktabah al-ʿIllamiyah, 2010), 48.

Evaluation Between Two Definitions

Based on the two definitions provided, it is clear that these two groups define *tadlīs al-isnād* and *irsāl al-ḥadīth* differently. The *mutaqaddimīn* believes that both previously stated meanings are included in the definition of *tadlīs al-isnād*, whereas the *muta'akhkhirīn* distinguishes between the two terms.

However, from the perspective of the *muta'akhkhirīn*, the difference between the terms *tadlīs* and *al-irsāl al-khafī* is recognized from a specific and general perspective. *Tadlīs al-isnād* is characterized by the presence of *iham sama'*[41] in the narration, whereas *al-irsāl al-khafī* is more broadly defined. The latter applies when it cannot be established that any interaction between the two narrators occurred—even if they lived during the same era, they remain disconnected.

Analysis of Hadiths *Riwāyah Al-Mudallas* Inside Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān

Based on the statements found in *al-Majrū'īn min al-Muhaddithīn* and *al-Thiqāt*, it is clearly evident that Ibn Hibbān defined *al-tadlīs* in a manner consistent with the approach of the *mutaqaddimūn* and some *muta'akhkhirūn*. Accordingly, to better understanding of his methodology concerning the transmission of narrations by *riwāyah al-mudallas* in his Saḥīḥ, the analysis may be divided into two main aspects: the conditions established by Ibn Hibbān and the practical application of those conditions in his inclusion of *riwāyah al-mudallas* narrators within his Saḥīḥ collection.

Ibn Ḥibbān 's Conditions for Including the Narrator *Riwāyah Al-Mudallas*

Ibn Ḥibbān has specified certain rules for including narrators who perform *tadlīs* in his narration;

The** al-mudallis **used the phrase** tasrīh bi al-samā' **in his** Saḥīḥ **book, or it is pronounced differently elsewhere.

In this context, Ibn Ḥibbān believes that the narration in *'an'anah* by the *al-mudallis* is one of the flaws that arise on the *sanad* route. As a result, Ibn Ḥibbān has stated in the *mukaddimah* of his authentic book that a *al-mudallis* must explain that he has heard straight from the narrator who is above him in the *sanad*.[42] To

---

41   The image is as if the *riwāyah al-mudallas* has heard from his teacher.

42   Ibn Ḥibbān, *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* 162.

demonstrate Ibn Ḥibbān 's perspective, it can be seen in the example below:

> *Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Junayd narrated to us, Qutaybah ibn Saʿīd narrated to us, from Ḥumayd, It was narrated from Anas that: The Prophet used to go round to all his wives with one bath.*[43]

Ibn Ḥibbān narrated this ḥadīth in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* with the recitation of *ʿanʿanah*. However, there is a pronunciation of the same *taṣrīḥ bi al-samāʿ* narrated in Musnad Abī Yaʿlā:

> *Abū Bakr ibn Shaybah narrated to us, Hushaym narrated to us, Ḥumayd al-Ṭawīl narrated to us, from Anas ibn Mālik:"Indeed, the Messenger of Allāh (PBUH) surrounded his wives one night, and then he took a bath."*[44]

The narration between Hushaym and Ḥumayd al-Ṭawīl affirms the validity of *taṣrīḥ bi al-samāʿ*, which underlies Ibn Ḥibbān's decision to include an *ʿanʿanah* report in his *Ṣaḥīḥ*, as it is corroborated by other chains that explicitly state *samāʿ*. This demonstrates his selective and principled methodology, rather than a lenient one. Motzki supports this approach by showing that *ʿanʿanah* reports in early compilations such as the *Muṣannaf* of ʿAbd al-Razzāq are typically substantiated by *taṣrīḥ bi al-samāʿ*. Amin likewise defends Ibn Ḥibbān's method as being grounded in a sound *uṣūlī* framework. Al-Malībārī situates this approach within the *manhaj* of the *mutaqaddimīn*, which is defined by methodology rather than chronology. Scholars such as Ibn Balbān and al-Rājiḥī upheld this tradition, in contrast to figures like al-Albānī, who critiqued it without fully appreciating its epistemological underpinnings.[45]

The al-mudallis does not perform al-tadlīs except on the thiqah narrator.

Among the narrators who performed *tadlīs* exclusively from *thiqah* transmitters is Sufyān ibn ʿUyaynah; he ranks in the second highest position in the list of *al-mudallis*.[46] Ibn Hibbān included this narrator's Hadīths in his authentic collection,

---

43   Ibn Ḥibbān, *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* 162.

44   Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī ibn al-Munṭahā, *Musnad Abī Yaʿlā*, ed. Saʿīd Muḥammad al-Sannārī (Mesir: Dar Al-Hadith, 2018), 381.

45   ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Rājiḥī, *Dirāsāt fī Manhaj Ibn Ḥibbān fī al-Taḥsīn wa al-Taḍʿīf* (Riyadh: Dār al-Rāyah, 2011), 62.

46   Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Taʿrīf Ahl al-Taqdīs bi-Marātib al-Mawṣūfīn bi al-Tadlīs,* 32.

regardless of whether they feature tasrīh bi al-samā' or 'an'anah. An example is as follows:

> *Abū Khalīfah narrated to us, Ibrāhīm ibn Bashshār al-Ramādī narrated to us, Sufyān (ibn 'Uyaynah) narrated to us, from al-Zuhrī, from Sa'īd al-Musayyib, from Abū Hurayrah; indeed, 'Umar used to pass by in front of Ḥassān ibn Thābit, when he was reciting verses in the mosque, then 'Umar reprimanded him until Ḥassān said: "I used to recite verses in the mosque when there were more people in it." Then he turned to Abū Hurayrah and said, "By Allāh, have you ever heard the Messenger of Allāh (PBUH) say: "Reward me, O Allāh, strengthen him with the Holy Spirit," Abū Hurayrah replied: "Yes."*[47]

This statement indicates that Ibn Ḥibbān assessed *'an'anah* contextually rather than absolutely, in line with the manhaj of the mutaqaddimīn, which relies on corroborative *qarā'in* and supportive evidence, as explained by al-Malībārī. Scholars such as Ibn Balbān and al-Rājiḥī uphold this methodology, whereas al-Albānī criticizes it without fully engaging with its evaluative framework.

The narration must be corroborated by mutāba'āt or shawāhid outside the book.

It is well known that *riwāyah al-mudallas* constitutes a type of light *ḍa'īf* ḥadīth that can be elevated to a better dignity if other ḥadīths support the narrations. The support from other ḥadīths, whether from the point of view of *sanad* or *matan*, is what is meant by *mutāba'āt or shawāhid*. Ibn Ḥibbān, when including narrations of *riwāyah al-mudallas*, also takes this element into account. Among the examples of ḥadīth in this context are as follows:

> *Ibrāhīm ibn Isḥāq al-Anmāṭī narrated to us, Ḥumayd ibn Mas'adah narrated to us, Mu'tamir ibn Sulaymān narrated to us, from Dāwūd ibn Abī Hind, from al-Ḥasan, from Jundub RA, indeed the Prophet PBUH said: "Whoever performs the dawn prayer, then he is in the assurance of Allāh SWT, then be devout to Allāh SWT, O son of Adam (do not until) Allāh SWT asks you for a guarantee from His guarantee."*[48]

This ḥadīth is narrated by al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, one of the riwāyah al-mudallas,

---

47 Ibn *Ḥibbān*, *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*, 532.

48 Ibn *Ḥibbān*, *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*, 532.

who uses ʿanʿanah from Jundub ibn ʿAbd Allāh. However, there are other ḥadīths that are also narrated by al-Ṭabarānī in al-Muʿjam al-Kabīr, which can be used as mutābaʿāt in the ḥadīth in Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān. The ḥadīth is as follows:

> *Ibrāhīm ibn Nāʾilah al-Aṣbahānī narrated to us, ʿUbayd ibn ʿUbayd al-Tammār narrated to us, Muʿtamir ibn Sulaymān narrated to us, from his father, from al-Ḥaḍramī, from Abī al-Ṣuʿār, from Jundub ibn ʿAbd Allāh. Indeed, the Prophet PBUH said:"Whoever performs the dawn prayer, then he is in the assurance of Allāh SWT."*[49]

This statement indicates that Ibn Ḥibbān did not evaluate riwāyah al-mudallas hastily or in absolute terms; rather, he considered the presence of mutābaʿāt as corroboration. This reflects a critical and contextual methodology consistent with the manhaj of the mutaqaddimīn, as articulated by al-Malībārī.

Objectives Related to Sanad
Rejecting the Claim of *Tafarrud* of the Narrator in the Hadīth

Ibn Ḥibbān prepared several chapters in *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* to counter claims of *tafarrud*. For example, consider the ḥadīth related by Ibn Jurayj from al-Aʿmash, which includes the following *ʿanʿanah*:

> *al-Mufaḍḍal ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Janadī Abū Saʿīd al-Shaykh al-Ṣāliḥ bi Makkah narrated to us, said: ʿAlī ibn Ziyād al-Lāhjī narrated to us, said: Abū Qurrah narrated to us, from Ibn Jurayj, from al-Aʿmash, from Khaythamah ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, from ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAmr, indeed the Prophet PBUH forbade to pray in the cemetery."*[50]

The transmission of this ḥadīth by Ibn Jurayj through the usage of the *ʿanʿanah* formula from al-Aʿmash has been a focal point in ḥadīth evaluation. In his article, Harald Motzki explains that Ibn Jurayj is classified as a *mudallis*, yet not a fabricator[51]; rather, he is regarded as a *thiqah* transmitter who often narrates

---

49　Sulaymān ibn Aḥmad al-Ṭabarānī, *Al-Muʿjam Al-Kabīr* ed. Hamdi ʿAbd al-Majid Al-Salafi (Kaherah: Maktabah Ibn Taymiyyah, 2019), 162.

50　Ibn *Ḥibbān*, *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*, 588.

51　Harald Motzki, *The Muṣannaf of ʿAbd al-Razzāq al-Ṣanʿānī as a Source of Authentic Aḥādīth of the First Century AH*, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. 50, No. 1 (1991),1-22, https://doi.org/10.1086/373461

honestly. This perspective aligns with that of Ibn Balbān in *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*, who continues to accept most of his transmissions even without the condition of *taṣrīḥ bi al-samāʿ*.[52] In contrast, al-Albānī tends to reject ḥadīths from *al-mudallīs* that are transmitted solely through *ʿanʿanah*, unless accompanied by *taṣrīḥ bi al-samāʿ*.[53] Al-Rājiḥī, meanwhile, adopts a more balanced approach by evaluating each narration individually, taking into account *mutābaʿāt* and *shawāhid*.

Ibn Hibbān's inclusion of this hadīth challenges the view that only Hafs ibn Ghiyāth transmitted it from Ash'ath ibn 'Abd al-Malik, thereby negating the claim of tafarrud. The chapter heading explicitly states:

> *"The explanation of a khabar that rejects the view of those who claim that this khabar is indeed only narrated by Ḥafṣ ibn Ghiyāth from Ash'ath ibn 'Abd al-Malik."*

The ḥadīth in question is:

> *Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Abī 'Awn al-Rayyānī narrated to us, saying Hannād ibn al-Sarī narrated to us, saying, Ḥafṣ ibn Ghiyāth narrated to us, from Ash'ath, from al-Ḥasan, from Anas ibn Mālik said: "The Prophet PBUH has forbidden to pray between the graves".[54]*

Denying that al-Mudallis committed al-tadlīs in a narration.

When an alternative narration includes the pronunciation of *taṣrīḥ bi al-samāʿ*, it indirectly refutes the occurrence of *al-tadlīs* in the *sanad*. Numerous instances in *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* illustrate this situation.

The arrangement of headings in the book not only indirectly addresses the *matan* related to the issue of Fiqh is the same but also sheds light on the problems present in the *sanad* of the narration. Thus, even though Ibn Ḥibbān has included a narration in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* that features *ʿanʿanah* from the history of *al-mudallis*, he has also organized a heading that denies the occurrence of *al-tadlīs* by one of the narrators. The following examples further illustrate this point:

---

52   Ibn *Ḥibbān*, *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*, 588.

53   Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī, *Silsilat al-Aḥādīth al-Ḍaʿīfah wa al-Mawḍūʿah*, (Riyadh: Maktabat al-Maʿārif, 1992), jil. 1, 160.

54   Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī, *Silsilat al-Aḥādīth al-Ḍaʿīfah wa al-Mawḍūʿah*, 587.

Al-Faḍl ibn al-Ḥubāb narrated to us, saying: Muḥammad ibn Kathīr narrated to us, from Shuʿbah, from Abī Isḥāq, from al-Aswad, and Masrūq, saying: We have testified that ʿĀʾishah said, "There is no day that the Prophet PBUH has passed, except for the Prophet (peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him)to perform the prayer of two rakʿahs after the Asr prayer."[55]

This statement highlights Ibn Ḥibbān's methodological precision in negating the possibility of *tadlīs* by strategically employing chapter headings and corroborative *taṣrīḥ bi al-samāʿ*, reflecting the *manhaj* of the *mutaqaddimīn* as explained by al-Malībārī. This approach is supported by scholars like Ibn Balbān and al-Rājiḥī, while contrasting with al-Albānī's more literal critique. The naration is as follows:

al-Ḥasan ibn Sufyān narrated to us, said: Muḥammad ibn Khallād al-Bāhilī Abū Bakr narrated to us, said: Bahz ibn Asad narrated to us, said: Shuʿbah narrated to us, said: Abū Isḥāq narrated to us, said: I heard both Aswad and Masrūq say: we testify indeed ʿĀʾishah said, "There is not a day that the Messenger of Allāh (PBUH) has spent with her, unless the Prophet performs the prayer of two rakʿahs after ʿaṣr"[56]

This hadith is under the heading:
"Explaining about a khabar that rejects those who claim that Abū Isḥāq did not hear this news from al-Aswad and Masrūq."

Objectives Related to Matan
Arguing with the narration

There are also several *al-mudallis* whose narrations Ibn Ḥibbān included for the purpose of deriving legal rulings from them. The intended narration is as follows:

Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā ibn Zuhayr narrated to us, Ibrāhīm ibn Bastām narrated to us, Abū Dāwūd narrated to us, Shuʿbah narrated to us, from al-Aʿmash, and Ḥubayb ibn Abī Thābit, and ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ibn Rafīʿ, from Zayd ibn Wahb, from Abī Dharr, said: The Prophet PBUH said: "Whoever says: "There is no God but Allāh, So he went into Paradise," and I asked, "Even though he is an adulterer and a thief?" The Prophet replied: "though he is an adulterer and a thief."[57]

---

55 Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī, *Silsilat al-Aḥādīth al-Ḍaʿīfah wa al-Mawḍūʿah*, 122.

56 Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī, *Silsilat al-Aḥādīth al-Ḍaʿīfah wa al-Mawḍūʿah*, 123.

57 Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī, *Silsilat al-Aḥādīth al-Ḍaʿīfah wa al-Mawḍūʿah*, 483.

In this ḥadīth, al-Aʿmash and Ḥabīb ibn Abī Thābit are narrators of *al-mudallis*. They narrated this ḥadīth using *ʿanʿanah* from Abī Dharr. However, since ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ibn Rafiʿ, who is not an associate of the al-mudallis, also transmitsthis ḥadīth, it is considered free of *ʿillah tadlīs*.

Ibn Ḥibbān included this narration in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* to affirm that a servant may enter Paradise by Allāh's mercy, even if guilty of major sins such as adultery and intoxication, provided they have declared: "There is no God but Allāh." This is a matter of ʿaqīdah that Ibn Ḥibbān placed in his *Ṣaḥīḥ*, despite it being transmitted by two narrators previously criticized for *tadlīs*. The ḥadīth appears under the chapter heading: *"Mentioning a khabar concerning the nature of Muslims and faith by mentioning the assembly of the two branches."*

Scholarly evaluations, such as those by al-Muʿallimī[58] and al-Maṣrī[59] affirm that Ibn Ḥibbān did not treat all forms of tadlīs equally; rather, he accepted certain cases under clearly defined criteria rooted in corroborative evidence and isnād consistency. This approach aligns with the methodology of ahl al-ʿilal, as explained by al-Malībārī, who also refrains from outright rejection of mudallis narrators, opting instead for contextual scrutiny and comparative transmission analysis. Thus, the inclusion of mudallisūn narrations in Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān should not be interpreted as methodological leniency, but rather as a refined form of tadqīq manhajī that integrates isnād principles with purposeful textual arrangement and scholarly reasoning.

Conclusion

The analysis of *al-mudallis'* narrations in Ibn Ḥibbān 's Ṣaḥīḥ Book concludes that he adhered to his stated conditions when interacting with these narrations. Although there appears to be a superficial contradiction between his declared approach and the inclusion of *ʿanʿanah* narrations in his Ṣaḥīḥ book, a holistic analysis of his methodology resolves this apparent tension. Ibn Ḥibbān considered two primary factors, conditions and objectives when incorporating *al-mudallis'* narrations in his Ṣaḥīḥ. Finally, the findings of this study demonstrate that there is no real contradiction between his theoretical framework and the practical inclusion of *mudallis* narrations in his Ṣaḥīḥ.

---

58 ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Muʿallimī al-Yamānī, *al-Tankīl bimā fī Taʾnīb al-Kawtharī min al-Abāṭīl*, (Riyadh: Dār al-Rāyah, 1986), 236.

59   Dīb al-Maṣrī, *al-Imām Ibn Ḥibbān wa Manhajuhu fī al-Jarḥ wa al-Taʿdīl*, (Riyadh: Dār Ibn ʿAffān, 1993), 359.

Authors' contributions

All authors contributed to the study's conception and design. Author 1 provides the materials in the writing and subsequently makes comments within the writing. Author 2 provides comments to be aligned in a scientific manner. Both authors pour their expertise into the writing.

Data availability statement

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analyzed in this study.

Conflicts of Interest

None of the authors of this study has a financial or personal relationship with other people that could inappropriately influence or bias the content of the study.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

References

'Alī, Abū Bakr Aḥmad. *al-Kifāyah fī 'Ilm al-Riwāyah*. Edited by Ibrāhīm Ḥamdī and Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Sawraqī. Madīnah: Maktabat al-'Illāmīyah, 2010.

Ābādī, Muḥammad Abū Laith al-Khayr. *'Ulūm al-Ḥadīth Aṣluhā wa Mu'āṣiruhā* Bangi: Dar Al-Syakir, 2009.

'Abd al-'Azīz al-Rājiḥī. *Dirāsāt fī Manhaj Ibn Ḥibbān fī al-Taḥsīn wa al-Taḍ'īf*, Riyadh: Dār al-Rāyah, 2011

'Abd al-Fattāḥ Abū al-Ghuddah. *Taḥqīq Asmāʾ al-Ṣaḥīḥayn wa Jāmi' al-Tirmidhī*. Dimashq: Dār al-Qalam, , 1994

Abū Su'aylik, Muḥammad. *Imām al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū Ḥātim Muḥammad ibn Ḥibbān al-Bustī Falsafiyy al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl*. Dimashq: Dār al-Qalam,, 1995.

Al-'Irāqī, Zayn al-Dīn. *al-Taqyīd wa al-Īḍāḥ Sharḥ Muqaddimat Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ*. Edited by 'Abd al-Raḥmān Muḥammad 'Uthmān. Beyrūt: Dar al-Fikr, 2023.

Al-Albānī, Nāṣir al-Dīn. *'Ulūm al-Ḥadīth*.. Arab Saudi: Dar Ibn Hazm, 2003.

——— . *Silsilat al-Aḥādīth al-Ḍa'īfah wa al-Mawḍū'ah. al-Riyāḍ*: Maktabat al-

Maʿārif, 1992

Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī. *Nuzhat al-Naẓar fī Tawḍīḥ Nukhbat al-Fikar*. Edited by ʿAlī Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī ʿAbd al-Majīd. 2nd ed. Miṣr: Dār Ibn al-Jawzī., 2011.

———. *Taʿrīf Ahl al-Taqdīs bi-Marātib al-Mawṣūfīn bi al-Tadlīs. Edited by ʿĀṣim ʿAbd Allāh. Lubnān: Maktabat al-Manār,* 2008.

———. *Taqrīb al-Tahdhīb. Edited by Muḥammad ʿAwwāmah. Sūriyā: Dār Rashīd,* 2000.

Al-Dhahabī, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad. *Siyar Aʿlām al-Nubalāʾ*. Beyrūt: Muʾassasat al-Risālah, 2015.

———, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad. *Mīzān al-Iʿtidāl fī Naqd al-Rijāl*. Ed. ʿAlī Muḥammad al-Būjāwī. Lubnān: Dār al-Maʿrifah, 1963.

Al-Dīn, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Abū Bakr Jalāl. *Tadrīb al-Rāwī*. Edited by Muḥammad al-Faraʾidī. al-Riyāḍ: Dār al-Minhāj, 2016.

Al-Khaṭīb, Muḥammad ʿAjjāj. *Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth: ʿUlūmuhū wa Muṣṭalaḥuhū*. Bayrūt: Dār al-Fikr,, 2015.

Al-Malībārī, Hamzah ʿAbd Allāh. *Nazarāt Jadīdah fī ʿUlūm al-hadīth: Dirāsah Naqdiyyah wa Muqāranah bayna al-Jānib al-Tatbīqī ladā al-Mutaqaddimīn wa al-Jānib al-Nazarī ʿinda al-Mutaʾakhkhirīn*. Lubnān: Dār Ibn Hazm,, 2003.

———, *al-Muwāzanah bayna al-Mutaqaddimīn wa al-Mutaʾakhkhirīn fī Taṣḥīḥ al-Aḥādīth wa Taʿlīlihā. Lubnān: Dār Ibn Ḥazm* 2001.

Al-Muʿallimī ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, *al-Tankīl bimā fī Taʾnīb al-Kawtharī min al-Abāṭīl*, Riyadh: Dār al-Rāyah, 1986

Al-Raḥmān, Abū ʿAmr ʿUthmān ibn ʿAbd. *ʿUlūm al-Ḥadīth li Ibn Ṣalāḥ*. Edited by Nūr al-Dīn. al-Riyāḍ: Dār Ibn al-Qayyim lil-Nashr wa-al-Tawzīʿ, 2011.

Al-Suyūṭī, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Abī Bakr Jalāl al-Dīn. *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥuffāẓ*. Beyrūt: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah, 2019.

Al-Sakhāwī, Shams al-Dīn. *al-Mutakallimūn fī al-Rijāl*. Bayrūt: Dār al-Bashāʾir, 1990.

Al-Tirmidhī, Abū ʿĪsā Muḥammad. *ʿIlal al-Tirmidhī al-Kabīr*. Edited by Nūr al-Dīn ʿIṭṭir. al-Qāhirah: Maktabat al-Nahḍah al-ʿArabiyyah, 2015.

Al-Ziriklī, Khayr al-Dīn. *al-Aʿlām*. Bayrūt: Dār al-ʿIlm lil-Malāyīn, 2002.

Amin, Kamarudin (2004). Nasiruddin al-Albanī on Muslim's Ṣaḥīḥ: A Critical Study of His Method. *Islamic Law and Society, 11(2)*, 149-176, https://www.jstor.org/stable/3399302

Awnī, Ḥātim ʿĀrif. *al-Manhaj al-Muqtaraḥ li Fahm al-Muṣṭalaḥ*. al-Riyāḍ: Dār al-Hijrah, 1996

Dīb al-Maṣrī, *al-Imām Ibn Ḥibbān wa Manhajuhu fī al-Jarḥ wa al-Taʿdīl*, Riyadh: Dār Ibn ʿAffān, 1993.

Ḥājjī Khalīfah. *Kashf al-Ẓunūn ʿan Asāmī al-Kutub wa al-Funūn*. London: Muʾassasat

al-Furqān li-Turāth al-Islāmī, 2021.

Ibn al-ʿAjamī, Aḥmad Ibrāhīm. *al-Tabyīn li-Asmāʾ al-Mudallīsīn li-Sabaṭah Ibn al-ʿAjamī al-Shāfiʿī*. Edited by Muḥammad Ibrāhīm Dāwūd al-Mawṣilī. Beyrūt: Muʾassasat al-Rayyān, 1998.

Ibn Balbān, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn. *al-Iḥsān bi-Tartīb Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*. Beyrūt: Muʾassasat al-Risālah, 2024.

Ibn Ḥibbān, Muḥammad. *al-Majrūḥīn min al-Muḥaddithīn*. Edited by Ḥamdī ʿAbd al-Majīd. 2nd ed. al-Riyāḍ: Dār al-Shāmiʿī, 2012.

⸻. *Kitāb al-Thiqāt. Bayrūt: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah*, 1998.

⸻. *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*. Edited by Shuʿayb al-Arnaʾūṭ. 3rd ed. Beyrūt: Muʾassasat al-Risālah, 2017.

Ibn Isḥāq, Abū Bakr Muḥammad. *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Khuzaymah*. Edited by Markaz al-Buḥūth wa-Taqniyat al-Maʿlūmāt. Miṣr: Dār al-Taʾṣīl,, 2014.

ʿĪdū, Muḥammad ʿĪshām. *Nashaʾat ʿIlm al-Muṣṭalaḥ wa al-Ḥadd al-Fāṣil bayna al-Mutaqaddimīn wa al-Mutaʾakhkhirīn*. Azruqāt: Jordan,2016

Laṭīf, Maḥmūd ʿAbd. *al-Jāmiʿ li-Aḥkām al-Ṣalāh*. ʿAmmān: Dār al-Waḍāḥ,, 2004.

Maḥmūd, ʿAbd al-Majīd. *Maʿālim Fiqh Ibn Ḥibbān*. al-Qāhirah: Dār al-Muḥaddithīn, 2012.

Manṣūr, Saʿd al-Dīn. *Ibn Ḥibbān wa-Qīmat Kitābayh al-Thiqāt wa-al-Majrūḥīn*. Malaysia: Majlis Penerbitan Ilmiah, 2010.

Maṭar, al-Zahrānī; Muḥammad. *ʿIlm al-Rijāl: Nashāʾatuhu wa Tatawwuruhu min al-Qarn al-Awwal ilā Nihāyat al-Qarn al-Tāsiʿ*. Madinah: Dar al-Khudiri, 1994.

Motzki, H. (1991). The Muṣannaf Of ʿAbd Al-Razzāq Al-Sanʿānī As A Source Of Authentic Aḥādīth Of The First Century A. H. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies, 50*(1), 1–22, https://doi.org/10.1086/373461

Muḥammad Akmaluddīn; *ʿIzz al-Maʿālī wa al-Manāzil limā fī Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhī min al-Isnād al-ʿĀlī wa al-Manāzil* (Indonesia; Dār Iḥyāʾ Al-Sunnah Al-Saniyyah; 2014)

Muḥammad al-ʿAbdul Laṭīf, ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. *Ḍawābiṭ fī al-Jarḥ wa al-Taʿdīl*. Madīnah: Islamic University of Madīnah, 2017.

Muntaḥannā, Aḥmad bin ʿAlī bin. *Musnad Abī Yaʿlā*. Edited by Saʿīd Muḥammad al-Sannārī. Miṣr: Dār al-Ḥadīth, 2018.

Salih, Maryam Sufian Sami, and Mazin Mizhir Ibrahim. "Examples of Errant Narrators According to Ibn Ḥibbān in His Work al-Majrūḥīn: A Comparative Study." *Dragoman* 2025, no. 17 (2025): 459–87.

Snober, Aḥmad. *Min al-Nabī SAW ilā al-Bukhārī: Dirāsah fī Ḥarakah Riwayat al-Ḥadīth wa Naqduhū fī al-Qurūn al-Thalāth al-Ūlā*. Jordan: Dār al-Fatḥ, 2021.

⸻, *Ḥadīth Criticism in the Levant in the Twentieth Century: From Ẓāhir al-Isnād to ʿIlal al-Ḥadīth*. Edinburgh: University Press, 2020.

Al-Ṭabarānī, Sulaymān ibn Aḥmad. *al-Muʿjam al-Kabīr.* Edited by Ḥamdī ʿAbd al-Majīd al-Salafī. Kaherah: Maktabah Ibn Taymiyyah, 2019.

Zainudin. "Ailal Rashid's Critical Contribution to Sahih Al-Bukhari in the Book of Sahih Al-Bukhari Nihayah Usturah." *Jurnal Studi Ilmu–Ilmu Al–Qur'an Dan Hadis* 23, no. 1 (January 2022): 1. https://doi.org/10.14421/qh.2022.2301-01.